

The *tsifteteli* of irony and the dance of the ignorant *Lilipouans*: a cultural identity conflict in an ostensibly childish song

Aikaterini Giampoura

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany
katerina.giampoura@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper studies the old Greek children’s radio show Edo Lilipoupoli transmitted from December 1977 to May 1980 by the Third Program of the Greek State Radio. The considerations of this paper result from the examination of the content of the radio show regarding its cultural and social parameters and correlations as a collective media project. The insight gained from this endeavour is significant, particularly due to the common claim among the broadcast listeners and contributors that the children’s radio program Edo Lilipoupoli functioned as a “mirror” of Greek society. The broadcast can be therefore understood as a kind of social snapshot depicting the ideological and identity conflict between the conservative and the progressive voices prevailing in society during that time.

The analytical interest focuses on one specific song, very popular in the context of the radio show, with the title “We are not Zulu”. This approach will include an analysis of the lyrics in connection to their setting, i.e. morphology, harmony, instrumentation as well as the singer’s performance. Within the framework of this music-aesthetic and linguistic analytical point of view, I will try to identify the role and function of humour in the song and pursue an interpretive approach in the context of its sociocultural implications. The conclusions will form an attempt to bring out the point of view of the show’s contributors.

Keywords: Orientalism, archaeolatry, irony, music, identity.

1. A radio fairy tale “mirrors” the Greek society

It was December 1977 just before Christmas, about three and a half years after the fall of the military dictatorship (1967-1974) in Greece, when the first episode of the experimental children’s radio show *Edo Lilipoupoli* (Gr. *Εδώ Λιλιπούπολη*; Eng. “Lilipoupoli here”) ¹ was transmitted, initiating a journey to an imaginary, although not so distant land. A peculiar radio-theatrical world slowly began to unfold in the listeners’ minds, where elements of reality and

¹ In this paper I have rendered Greek and German into English.

fantasy would freely intertwine with each other. In a purely fairy-tale manner, that is, “in a condensed and symbolic way”, as Bausinger (1999: 262) suggests, *Lilipoupoli* captured very aptly and entertainingly the post-dictatorial regime-changing era in Greece at the end of the 1970s, a period later named *Metapolitefsi*, characterised of rapid political developments.

In *Lilipoupoli* one recognises the much older Greek tradition of radio drama, which became very popular with listeners and flourished in the post-war years. Martin Esslin calls radio theatre the “Theatre of the Mind” (Ash 1985: 13) since, like any other conventional storytelling practice, radio theatre is also “blind” (Ash 1985: 8). By that meaning, the narration of the dramatised story depends solely on sound. In this sense, the songs heard during the show were integrated into the plot of every episode and often functioned as commentary or played an underlining role.

The award-winning composer Manos Hadjidakis, at that time director of the Third Programme of the Greek National Radio, expressed the position that *Lilipoupoli* would speak to children “responsibly, with clear qualitative language, addressing issues that plague and hurt the country”.² Among the pedagogical purposes of the show, the scriptwriters of *Lilipoupoli*, a group of people of progressive political beliefs, strove to cultivate in the children the notion of active political consciousness, in the sense of free, critical thinking. To this purpose, humour was engaged in a “subtle and elegant” way, as the singer Marielli Sfakianaki (personal communication) describes it, leading to a form of sociopolitical and sociocultural satire, expressed indirectly through insinuations, political overtones, caricaturistic impersonations and parody, which were artfully embedded in the music, the dialogues, the development of characters, as well as in the overall episode plots.

In this sense, *Lilipoupoli* manifested two “levels” of humour and for that reason appealed not only to children but also to adults. The first level of humour is more superficial and appreciated mainly by the children audience, while the second one requires historical and cultural knowledge available usually to the adult audience (cf. Gavriilidou & Tsakona 2004-2005: 145). As one of the singers of the show, Antonis Kontogeorgiou, aptly argues in a TV interview, *Lilipoupoli* resembles cartoons, where “children see certain things and adults see things completely differently, but it works authentically for everyone” (Skevas 2000).

Lilipoupoli is a fictional place, a world emerging out of a fairy tale. The similarities to Greek society are nevertheless apparent. *Lilipoupoli* was conceived as a kind of miniature of contemporary Greece. The name “Lilipoupoli” derives from Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*. Gulliver, in one of his travels ends up accidentally on the islands of Lilliput and Blefuscu, both inhabited by tiny people. *Lilipoupoli* is inhabited by its own (maybe as well tiny) residents, the so-called *Lilipoupolites*. Moreover, almost every place name in *Lilipoupoli* is a compound word with the segment “lili”, either in form of a prefix or a suffix which generated the desirable meaning the scriptwriters of the show wanted to achieve. For example, the sea of *Lilipoupoli* is called *Lilipelagos* (Lili-pelagos: the word for the open sea in Greek); the seaport is called *Porto Lili*; the mountain is called *Lilibaya* (Lili-baya: a rather untypical ending, possibly chosen due to its unusual sounding to give an exotic character to the name place); the village is called *Lilitsa* (Lili-tsa: typical ending of a rural or rustic location); the field is called *liligros* (lili-[a]gros: the word for field or meadow in Greek); the archaeological site is called *Papualili* (Papua[ns]-lili), where the ancient tribe of the *Lilipouans* (Lili-[Pa]puans), ancestors of the *Lilipoupolites* lived, and so on. As one can see from these examples, in *Lilipoupoli* there is everything that one can encounter in Greece, as in other countries as well, both in terms of landscape (mountain/sea), in terms of lifestyle, and surroundings (urban life/village life), or in terms of historical continuity (antiquity/contemporary life).

² From the cover of the music album *Edo Lilipoupoli. Music and Songs from the Children’s Radio Programme*, with a selection of the most popular songs of the show, conducted by Manos Hadjidakis himself.

In the world of *Lilipoupoli*, reality and imagination weave together. Thus, a variety of human types have acquired their radio form as ‘sound caricatures’ and have been given double roles, an overt and a symbolic one, a usual crossover approach often encountered in theatrical revues and satirical representations, a technic which made the analogy with reality more direct. So, some of the *Lilipoupolites* we meet are the posh singing snake *Ofi-Sophie* with the golden voice; the resourceful and always ingenious scientist *Dr Drakator*; the ubiquitous journalist *Brinis*; the typical Greek middle-class married couple with *Snow White*-housewife and the spoiled and selfish *Prince*-husband; the opposing official authority stubborn and disbelieving fisherman *Dystropingas*; the rather conservative and certainly mercenary lady *Pipineza*-mother with her cheeky talking *Parrot*-son; and, last but not least, the canny mayor of *Lilipoupoli*, *Harhoudas*, who gets involved in numerous scandals, such as bribing, illegally selling public land, secret restoration of the monarchy, and tactics that refer directly to the previous dictatorial regime, such as secret surveillance of political opponents and citizens, or taking over the public radio station, with the ultimate goal to abolish elections in *Lilipoupoli*.

1.1. Conservatism, archaeolatry, and cultural identity

The post-dictatorial era in Greece gave the impression of a fresh beginning to modern Greeks, after a long time of suffering and suppression. The Greek composer Giorgos Kouroupos left his career in France and returned to Greece in 1977 to take over as deputy director of the Third Programme, as the right hand of Manos Hadjidakis. In a 2018 interview, Kouroupos, with an expression of bitterness and disappointment with the current situation in the country, recalls the following: “We thought Greece would become a European place like the rest” (Allamanis 2022: 40), and by that he meant a democratic and progressive country, a society governed by the rule of law.

In *Lilipoupoli*, the process of self-reflection was accompanied by bold sarcasm towards the ideological-political identity of a part of Greeks, who still referred to the moral security of patriotism and archaeolatry,³ as it was propagated through the triptych “Homeland-Faith-Family”, from around 1936 (General Metaxas’s totalitarian regime) until after the fall of the seven-year military dictatorship of the Colonels (1967-1974). The catchphrase “Homeland-Faith-Family” captures the main ideological legacies of conservatism (Gazi 2010: 31).

As Kaliambou (2006: 148) mentions, these three values formed the most important pillars of Modern Greek identity since the founding of the Greek state in 1830. “For faith and homeland” was a common motto of the rebellious Greeks against Ottoman rule at the beginning of the 19th century. After the Second World War, the motto “Homeland-Faith-Family” was politically instrumentalised by the military junta’s colonels in Greece (1967-1974) as their political-ideological manifesto. The combination of these three values is still present in the perception of Modern Greeks and refers to conservative attitudes in everyday parlance (Kaliambou 2006: 148).

Particularly, the value “Homeland” does not refer solely to Greece as a modern state, but also to Greek classical antiquity. The instrumentalisation of the past, accompanied even by distortion or misinterpretation of historical events, has been a tactic engaged by conservative political parties with the purpose of boosting patriotism and gaining popularity among the voters. As Giannakopoulos (2021) very aptly states,

³ In the Dictionary of Modern Greek *αρχαιολατρία*, that is *archaeolatry*, is described as excessive admiration for the culture of classical antiquity (Bampiniotis 2005: 288). The terms *αρχαιομανία/archaiomania* (excessive admiration of the ancestors), *αρχαιοπληξία/archaioplixia* (excessive attachment to the ancestors) as well as *προγονοπληξία/progonoplixia* (excessive attachment to the ancestors), are terms also mentioned in the same conceptual framework, bearing equally negative connotations.

Time and again antiquarianism has been identified or has evolved into a barren or dangerous archaeolatry. Dangerous, because it has been the vehicle for the cultivation of blind patriotism, based on unrealistic positions on the uniqueness of the Greek race. Barren, because it imposes a blind acceptance of every traditionalism and uncritical adherence to positions and ideas that prevent doubt and dissent.

The obsession with tradition and antiquity as essential features of the conservative mentality is an issue that one encounters frequently in *Lilipoupoli*, often to the point of exaggeration. There are episodes that in one way or another capture this idea and express it in a humorous and satirical way, such as, for example, the mockery of the overly well-known television presenter Aiki Nicolaidou, a central figure of nationalist propaganda during the seven-year junta of the colonels on the Armed Forces Television Channel Y.EN.E.D (Allamanis 2022: 22). The reason that archaeolatry is taking on such proportions in *Lilipoupoli* is certainly not to educate and enforce the national pride in the standards of a conservative upbringing under the old ideological triptych “Homeland-Faith-Family”. On the contrary, in *Lilipoupoli* those very representatives of such extreme conservative beliefs were the targets of parody and satire, such as Georgios Papadopoulos, one of the dictators of Greece during the seven-year military junta (Giampoura 2014: 74; 2020: 245; Allamanis 2022: 181).

2. Parody, satire, and irony in *Lilipoupoli*

Important terms to deal with in *Lilipoupoli* are parody, satire, and irony. Parody was originally associated with Greek music and indicated a distorting imitation of an existing form or older work. Later, other forms of imitation were also subsumed under it (Wehse 2002: 577). As Rose (2006: 7) suggests, the parodic imitation of an existing work creates a new work whose form is externally preserved but has undergone a comic re-functioning (*komische Umfunktionierung*), where the inner meaning has been altered. Parody is also considered an imitation of politicians, singers, and other famous personalities, in terms of voice, manner of speech, singing style, etc. (Der Musik-Brockhaus 1982: 443). According to Hutcheon (2000 [1985]: 43-44) “Both satire and parody imply critical distancing and therefore value judgements”.

Satire is not a general, but a collective term for aesthetic works characterised by an aggressively ironic rhetoric (Meyer-Sickendiek 1998: 447). Satire denotes “a genre of literature whose goal is not only to point out a social vice but to make clear that this vice is intolerable” (Draitser 1994: xxi), while Highet (1962: 3) stresses that satires “have the urgency and immediacy of actual life”. In short, satire deploys irony, has a critical function, and refers to current reality.

Hutcheon (2000 [1985]: 62) links parody and satire in a particularly interesting way. She begins by distinguishing the two basic functions of these literary genres. On the one hand, she ascribes an internal function to parody, directed towards and related to the parodied work itself without creating a window of communication with its environment. In this case, then, we speak of an autonomous work mimesis (*Gattungsparodie*, genre parody). By applying this theoretical framework to music, emerges a sort of mimesis on an intramural/intramusical basis, which takes place in a purely musical way in composition, performance, interpretation, voice imitation, etc. or in Cadenbach’s terms, it results to “a piece of music [...] composed with the intention of ironic-witty alienation” (Cadenbach 1998: 791). Stripped from its internal meaning through comic re-functioning (Rose 2006: 7), the purpose of the new work is basically to entertain through a witty musical conception or simply to evoke a joyful mood. In such cases of *Gattungsparodie*, there are no clear or targeted sociopolitical implications or the intention of an indirect critical commentary. Hutcheon (2000 [1985]: 62) also sees in satire an external function (political, cultural, moral, ideological etc.) linked to the context in which the humorous act takes

place and therefore attributes to it a critical and corrective role. Accordingly, in a song, the function of satire is extramural and targets outside the musical material.

Hutcheon (2000 [1985]: 62) suggests two kinds of mutual overlap between parody and satire: on the one hand, there is a *satirical parody*, with an intramural character that functions on a more self-referential basis, which aims at another form of coded discourse, such as a pre-existing work; and on the other, there is *parodic satire*, with an extramural character, which aims at something outside the text and uses parody as a “typical weapon” (Hight 1962: 18), to achieve its satirical or corrective purpose.

By analogy to humour, parody or parodied music works are mainly considered self-referential and, in this sense, more autonomous, as they are conceived and performed in relation to an existing musical form or previous work. On the other hand, satire or satirical music works are considered hetero-referential and tend to convey their meaning in the social sphere, thus a communicative social function is therefore attributed to them (Kaden 2016).

The last concept mentioned here, that needs to be elaborated on, is that of irony. Barbe (1995: 63) refers to “signals” that “yield irony”, such as a particular way of talking, intonation, and gestures that influence the meaning of an utterance, or the juxtaposition of conflicting words, actions, or words and actions. To recognise an instance of irony, participants need linguistic, contextual, situational, and personal background knowledge so they can recognise the inconsistencies between the literal and the intended meaning of the said (Barbe 1995: 16). There is often a form of criticism in the speaker’s utterance (Barbe 1995: 31). According to Hutcheon (2000 [1985]: 31), “[i]rony participates in parodic discourse as a strategy [...], which allows the decoder to interpret and evaluate”. The argumentative and axiological role of irony has been stressed by Attardo (2001: 114) as well, in connection to Berrendonner (1981) and Braester (1992). So, just like parody and satire, irony contains the function of evaluation and criticism.

3. Sociology of music and humour

From a sociological perspective, music is understood as a social practice, an interaction between meaning, structure, and function. Therefore, music as a cultural phenomenon *per se* is difficult to be understood outside human society. Christian Kaden (2016) stresses the perception of music as a form of communication. This constitutes a particularly important claim that highlights the social character of music.

The sociology of music focuses on three major thematic areas. The first deals with the functionality of music and includes the social conditions and circumstances of the social environment of musical practice, such as its motivations, aims, and effects, often concerning the social classes and their musical preferences or tastes, the social status of musicians, the influence of power and social institutions, etc. (Giese et al. 2016). Building on Adorno’s theoretical writings on the dialectical relation between music and society, Rummenh oller (1978: 75) advocates the critical function of music, stressing that the music of an era reflects not only its time, but also proposes solutions for its improvement.

The second research field is dedicated to social structuring and seeks answers to how social structures are reflected in the internal structure of music. In this sense, the reproduced social relations can be perceived as communication and interaction, mirroring the economic or institutional structures of society (Giese et al. 2016).

The third thematic area focuses on the symbolic power of music. Musical works or musical practice, in general, often project an implicit reference to social conventions or even suggest a critical view, which can be perceived as resistance to a situation or a social phenomenon (Giese et al. 2016). Through the compositional style of the artist, the listener becomes aware of the musical values and the meanings the composer wants to communicate (Tarasti 2012: 4).

Of particular interest here are the first and third thematic areas: functionality and symbolic power, as this is where music functions critically with the aim of social change and improvement. By looking at humour from an analogous functional perspective, we can see points of intersection with music. The connection that emerges is primarily based on the social nature of both music and humour to lampoon and exercise critique.

3.1. The music idiom of *Lilipoupoli*

In terms of sound, *Lilipoupoli* consisted of a continuous interchange between dialogues and songs, whereas the latter were integrated into the plot, either by highlighting or commenting on the current action. For example, if the plot mentioned the seaport of *Lilipoupoli*, the song “An Evening at Porto Lili” was most likely to be heard; if it was about the ancestors of the *Lilipoupoli*’s inhabitants, the song “We are not Zulu” could not be missed.

All four composers of the show (Nikos Kypourgos, Dimitris Maragopoulos, Nikos Christodoulou, Lena Platonos) had enjoyed formal western music education and pursued advanced studies abroad. Thus, the cultural and educational standards of the composers of the show were in the sphere of the so-called high culture, and they matched their compositions mostly following this music-aesthetical direction.

One finds in *Lilipoupoli* all kinds of instrumental combinations, which refer to different musical styles, dances, or rhythms. The spectrum ranges from folk, rock, funk, blues, avant-garde, waltz, or tango to melodies that refer to Chinese or even African music, and of course includes Greek urban folk music, with the Greek popular dances *tsifteteli* and *hasapiko*, all of them tailored stylistically to the western music compositional idiom of *Lilipoupoli*. Therefore, if a song refers aurally or stylistically to a *tsifteteli* or a *hasapiko*, it is to be understood merely as mimesis, or even as a parody of these dances.

In the following analysis, I will examine the lyrics of the song in connection to the music, i.e. the morphological and music-aesthetic elements, as well as the singer’s interpretive style. Through the combination of the linguistic and paralinguistic elements of the song, I will try to explain how humour emerges, how it can be interpreted, and how it functions within its sociocultural context.

4. *Den eimaste Zoulou* song analysis

The song I will be presenting is entitled *Δεν είμαστε Ζουλού/Den eimaste Zoulou* which translates as “We are not Zulu”. It is chosen among other humorous songs in the show because of its particular setting and the complex meaning it conveys. This composition brings together very skilfully several musical styles, seemingly unrelated to each other but also to the literal meaning of the lyrics. To listeners unfamiliar with the musical language, its symbolisms and codes, the music chosen by the song’s composer Dimitris Maragopoulos seems first to simply underline the lyrics, on the one hand, and on the other, to entertain the listener with familiar-sounding melodies. This music, showing an ostensible childishness but artful at its core, is made by a technically proficient composer, who is also willing to experiment with the established meanings of the musical language, creating incompatibilities between verbal and musical “utterances”, so as to form circumstances that allow an additional perspective of interpretation, that indirectly touches the then sociocultural situation of the country. The composer of the song Maragopoulos (personal communication) reports that during his collaboration in *Lilipoupoli* he was still very much influenced by his former music studies in Berlin, and that he followed Bertolt Brecht’s and Kurt Weill’s compositional-ideological direction in his crossover use of various musical styles in songs, so that these can function as complementing and commenting agents within the unfolding of the radio-theatrical episode plot. However, the listener is not

always able to grasp the coded meanings that emerge from this additional level of song understanding and therefore realise its “second level of humour” (Gavriilidou & Tsakona 2004-2005: 145). There is namely a prerequisite knowledge that connects the musical styles with certain meanings and contents, within a predetermined sociocultural context.

The song is about the “historical” settlement of the *Lilipuans*, the ancestors of *Lilipoupolites*, on the territory that later became the so-called *Lilipoupoli*. The song is composed at its beginning to refer to Afro-American music. The use of the C major pentatonic key (C-D-E-G-A) accompanied by syncopation, the somewhat extended harmony with a modal associated function, the strongly rhythmic character, and the drums, together with other elements from the gospel tradition, such as the singing style of the choir or the expressive shouting of the singer, point to the musical topos “Africa”. The closing phrase (*came ashore packed with bundles and chests/on Cape Plop’s/golden-rose tip.*) refers stylistically to Blues and the music-theatrical genre of Musical. The lyrics narrate the *Lilipuans’* ancient journey in their quest to find new land to settle:

Ti mera ekeini tin archaia
(On that ancient day)
ton propappoudon
(the great-grandfathers’)
I palia trellopara
(crazy old gang)
apovivastike me bogous kai baoula
(came ashore packed with bundles and chests)
stou Kavou Bloum
(on Cape Plop’s)
ti chrysorodini mytoulas.
(golden-rose tip.)

After this first verse, the song increasingly resembles a tribal dance ritual: all vocal and instrumental lines condense into a repeating eighth-note homorhythmic iambic pattern, where the strong intonation in the melody of the song coincides with the intonation of the words, while in this transitional quatrain with bridge function the lyrics create a paired rhyme. Gradually, these elements in music and lyrics lead the song to an expressive outburst, as the male singer (baritone) concludes with an upward tonal howl in the last word (*stoma*), using falsetto in the high register of his vocal range. The lyrics go as follows:

Kai ta vouna etouta akoma
(And these mountains still)
antilaloun ap’ to souxe,
(echo the hit,)
antilaloun ap’ to souxe,
(echo the hit,)
pou tragoudame m’ ena stoma:
(we sing in chorus:)

Since Africa is often stereotypically associated with primitiveness in Western culture (Jarosz 1992: 106, 108), this transition somewhat justifies the composer’s aesthetical decision to underscore *Lilipuans’* primitive origins in a stylistically “African” manner.

However, the expression *antilaloun ap’ to souxe* (echo the hit), and particularly the use of the slangy word *souxe* in a context that refers to a ritual act (even though a parody of it) creates

incongruity and causes jocularity in connection to a ceremonial event that in normal circumstances demands a degree of formality and seriousness. The colloquial term *souxe*, originating from French (Fr. *succès*, Eng. *success*), meaning a song with a great public appeal that has become a hit, helps to prepare for what musically follows. We detect, namely, contextual incongruity between the verbal context (lyrics and choice of words) and the situational context (ceremonial event). This fact lends a humorous character to the musical bridge at this point in the song, since instead of the expected mode of RITUALISTIC and SOLEMN (register-script FORMAL), we experience verbally a transition to the TRIVIAL and MUNDANE (register-script INFORMAL) (cf. Attardo 2001: 108 ff.).

After the music bridge, while the listener is expecting the refrain to sound rhythmically and melodically similar to the African style preceded, experiences a musical surprise, which functions as a violation of expectations: the music changes again, completely this time, and instead of “African”, now sounds like something that refers to the popular Greek *tsifteteli* dance and mode of entertainment. In my opinion, this compositional choice is justified. Since the previously mentioned word *souxe* stands in Greek for an extremely popular piece of music, then it seems rather expected for it to sound in the most representative popular musical style for the average Greek. At the same time, the old notorious words of the ancient *Lilipians* are sung in quotation marks, as the lyrics indicate:

“*Den eimaste Zoulou,*
 (“We are not Zulu,
den eimaste Papoua
 (we are not Papuan,
eimaste I agria
 (we are the wild)
fyli ton Lilipoua!”
 (tribe of Lilipian!”)

The made-up name *Lilipua/n* rhymes with *Papua/n* and refers acoustically to the homonymous tribe of the indigenous people of New Guinea. Therefore, an association with the Papuan tribe and the qualities evoked by the word *Papuan* emerges in the form of stereotypical images of half-naked people living in primitive conditions, while practicing customs and rituals, that in the eyes of Westerners are often perceived as savagery, cruelty, and barbarism. In this context, the name *Lilipian* functions as a pun, as a word game with two meanings, suggesting that the *Lilipians* are not only considered the ancient ancestors of the modern *Lilipopolites* and the cultural foundations of their modern civilization, but are characterised of savageness and primitiveness, attributes they seem to have passed on to their modern descendants, as those embrace and proudly exclaim in the song refrain.

Interesting, however, is the claim of the *Lilipians*, to be different from primitive indigenous tribes such as the Zulu or Papuan (*We are not Zulu/we are not Papuan*), even though they do describe themselves as *wild* (*we are the wild/tribe of Lilipian!*), a characterisation that stereotypically refers to such tribes. Four facts, however, refute this claim. One is their contradicting claim “we are the wild/tribe of Lilipian!”, which functions as a pun, right after the two preceding negational self-definitory claims; secondly, the suffix *-puans* in the name *Lilipians*, deriving from the name *Papuan*; thirdly, the music topos “Africa” that has preceded during the bridge, right before the refrain (*And these mountains still... sing in chorus*). In other words, the background is constructed verbally and paralinguistically in such a way that refers to a ceremonial dance of a tribal ritual by a supposed indigenous tribe resembling that of the Zulus and Papuans. Fourthly, the use of *tsifteteli* is the musical “utterance” that implies another viewpoint and functions as a subversion of the meaning of the lyrics. It suggests, namely, the

opposite of what was verbally expressed in the refrain. In short, the paralinguistic “utterance” (music, *tsifteteli*) contradicts the verbal “utterance” (lyrics) and thus cancels its meaning. The song in this sense acquires elements of irony, an irony that becomes a lot clearer as soon as the refrain kicks in.

What is the reason (and for whom?) *tsifteteli*, such a popular dance, works in this way and evokes such associations and connections? Here it seems useful to examine the dance *tsifteteli* in connection with the concept of Orientalism (Said 1979), an idea that has strongly influenced the self-image of contemporary Greeks. *Tsifteteli* is a dance, a Greek version of the belly dance, which was widely practised in the territory of the former Ottoman Empire. The *tsifteteli* rhythm (4/4 time, divided as eighth-fourth-eighth-fourth-fourth) is melodically based on the Arabic Maqam, the Arabic musical modes. For the present song, the chosen Maqam is *Hijaz Kar* (E-F-G#-A-H-C-D#-E), whose sound is considered the oriental Maqam *par excellence*. The *Hijaz Kar* mode consists of two identical tetrachords, each consisting of the following intervals: one semitone-three semitones-one semitone. Furthermore, two identical intervals of augmented seconds (F-G# and C-D#) are formed within the unfolding of the music key, an element that intensifies the oriental sound. In addition, orchestration-wise, the particularly jocular playing of the violin accompanied by the tambourine, contribute to recreating the typical sound elements for this musical style.

Edward Said (1979) suggested the term *Orientalism* as the persistent Eurocentric prejudice against the Orient. By *Orient*, he referred to the Arabo-Islamic culture. On the other side of Orientalism, there was a modernised interpretation of the German-derived ideological construction of Hellenism (Gourgouris 1996) that provided the central direction in the formation of Modern Greek national identity. According to Gourgouris (1996), the Hellenism-Orientalism dichotomy was formed on the following axes. Hellenism promoted the study of the idealised “civilised” European Self as culturally superior, while from the perspective of Orientalism the study of the “barbarian” Other was treated as inferior. Furthermore, Gourgouris contends that the idea of Hellenism made Greek antiquity the ancestor of European culture, while at the same time post-Ottoman Greece was excluded from that cultural construction.

Therefore, at the heart of the contemporary reception of Hellenism nests the rejection of certain Oriental cultural elements (such as the *tsifteteli* dance), which are considered by intellectuals to be inferior and trivial, and far from holding a candle to the “civilised” Western cultural spirit. In other words, *tsifteteli* should function as a symbol of the dominant mode of entertainment frowned upon by intellectuals. This is the case not only for Greece: in the whole Balkans, intellectuals with European education disdain the popular music that sounds oriental, without nevertheless showing the same dislike for the western-sounding popular music (Konstantinidis 2016: 4). An example of this is Hadjidakis (1980: 21-24) himself, who in 1978 expressed his detest with the Greeks’ mode of entertainment reduced to *bouzoukia*.⁴ In his music compositions Hadjidakis also studiously avoids the use of the *tsifteteli*, since for him the *tsifteteli* is the symbol of the Orientalist devaluation of Greek culture. As one can deduce from Kouroupos’ words, “[w]e thought Greece would become a European place like the rest” (see Section 1.1), the desired identity of the post-dictatorial, progressive, highly educated youths of Greece was following the cultural construction of what was considered European, where the Orient had no place.

After the first refrain is sung in chorus, the song continues with a second couplet in the previous “African” musical style again. The lyrics in this verse take us to the present day, to the contemporary *Lilipoupoli*, and focus this time on the anniversary celebrations of the Landing Day.

⁴ *Bouzouki* is a basic instrument in Greek popular music and, within this framework, it is used in its plural form *bouzoukia*. This form, therefore, stands as a general expression for a type of Greek popular music and mode of entertainment, where the *tsifteteli* dance is often performed.

Tis apovaseos ti mera
(The Landing Day)
tine giortazoum ' oloi
(we all celebrate)
mera para mera
(every other day)
perikyklonontas me varkes kai feloukes
(circling with boats and feluccas)
ton Kavο Bloum
(Cape Plop)
pou tou petame strakastroukes.
(and shooting fireworks at it.)

The reason the *Lilipoupolites* seem to hold these ceremonies is to remember and re-enact that “ancient day”, the “Landing Day”, for their amusement and joy. Interesting is the effect of the following verse lines *The Landing Day/we all celebrate/every other day*, indicating, on one hand, the significance of this historical event and, on the other, the ridiculous frequency of its celebration *every other day*. This exaggeration seems to be an oblique ironic reference to holders of conservative ideologies, with immeasurable admiration of the past, who do not miss the opportunity to celebrate every possible anniversary related to the achievements of the ancestors, often in an exaggerated and tasteless way. It is in this particular stanza, that the theme of archaeolatry is touched upon, parodied and ridiculed through exaggeration.

Interesting here is the use of formal forms (e.g., *apovaseos* a word ending with an archaic ending of *Katharevousa* rather than *apovasis* in *Demotiki*)⁵ alongside colloquial terms (e.g., *strakastroukes*, an onomatopoeic noun, which is derived from the sound small firecrackers make when they explode) in the same verse. These elements also contribute to the humorous character of the song. In other words, there is also register humour in form of the incongruity of registers (cf. Attardo 2001: 108), where the historical event of the landing, which was decisive for the founding of *Lilipoupoli*, is celebrated not with any particular grandiosity but by throwing “humble”, small-sized firecrackers, called in everyday parlance *strakastroukes*, as young children usually do on similar occasions. This antithesis can be seen as another case of contextual incongruity which belittles such grand events and, if transferred in the real world, functions as a mockery of national celebrations. Moreover, the name of the Cape triggers an emotion of mirth because of its second compound *Plop*, another place name in *Lilipoupoli*, which imitates the sound something makes when it hits the water, and thus alludes to baby/preschool sort of speech. Further on, the song continues as expected with the next bridge, again in the familiar ritualistic manner:

Ki aeras, kyma kai chom'
(And wind, wave, and earth)
antilaloun ap' to souxe,
(echo the hit,)
antilaloun ap' to souxe,
(echo the hit,)

⁵ *Katharevousa* (The Pure [Language]) is a constructed language that emerged from a combination of vernacular elements and ancient Greek when the Greek state was founded in the nineteenth century. *Katharevousa* was the official language of the Greek state up to 1976. *Demotiki* or *Demotic* roughly denotes the Modern Greek language.

pou tragoudame m' ena stoma:
(that we sing in chorus:)

It is interesting that for such a great historical event, for which a ritual type of celebration is held, the people of *Lilipoupoli* choose to praise it with what they describe as a *hit*, that is, with a cultural material, a *souxe* song, considered of poor aesthetic specifications, not worthy of the importance of the event celebrated. As a result, what is ultimately conveyed to the listener is more like a comic parody of a ritual, since it contains all the elements of a ritual, but in the wrong way, in the wrong style, and in the wrong quality and proportions. With a touch of incoherence, acting inconsistently and paradoxically, the *Lilipoupolites* ultimately appear rather ridiculous in the context of their “serious” activity. In other words, there is ironic humour because we are presented with a formal event, but its linguistic-musical “utterance” activates an informal register. Moreover, several sources are involved simultaneously that work together to induce humour, such as register humour, caricatural parody, irony and satire, co-presence of incongruous registers, a phenomenon that Attardo (2001: 100) defines as *hyperdetermined* humour. So, this song can be perceived as a multimodal source of humour, since consisting of verbal text (lyrics) as well as music. This leads initially to the complexity produced by the setting of the lyrics into music, a procedure that includes numerous compositional and aesthetic decisions, along with the orchestral performance, the singer’s interpretation etc. Consequently, humour emerges not exclusively in a verbal or musical manner, but from the complex combination of both sources.

The song concludes with the familiar refrain in quotation marks, once again in *tsifteteli* rhythm:

“*Den eimaste Zoulou,*
(“We are not Zulu,)
den eimaste Papoua,
(we are not Papuans,)
eimaste disengona
(we are the great-grandchildren)
ton agrion Lilipoua!”
(of the wild Lilipouans!”)

The difference in comparison to the first appearance of the refrain lies in the last two lines. The characterisation of *wild* is retained and thus is consolidated in the consciousness of the listeners. The *Lilipouans* are nothing but wild. What is also emphasised in these verses is the historical continuity that connects the ancient *Lilipouans* with the modern *Lilipoupolites*. As it is emphatically suggested, the *Lilipoupolites* are the great-grandchildren, namely the direct descendants of the ancient *Lilipouan* tribe. Could it be that this characteristic of the wildness of the ancestors has finally been passed on to the descendants?

One element that could speak in favour of this view is that, while the first refrain is uttered by the ancient *Lilipouans* celebrating their existence (and relayed through the mouths of contemporary *Lilipoupolites* in quotation marks), the second refrain addresses the present, and is uttered as a self-definition, as an element of identity, by the modern *Lilipoupolites* (also in quotation marks), claiming *WE are the great-grandchildren*. They shout it as if they too are in tune with the ancient value of wildness. The second element remains the *tsifteteli* dance rhythm, with all its symbolic implications and associations.

According to Barbe (1995: 63), “[s]ignals for irony include a particular way of speaking, intonation, and gestures that influence the meaning of the said. The juxtaposition of either conflicting words, actions, or words and actions yields irony.” So, based on the traditional

concept of irony, as saying something and meaning the opposite, here we have a synergy of words and sounds, semantically indicating two opposing ideas. One utterance is verbal and can be found in the lyrics, and the other “utterance” is relating to sound and is detected in the music of the song. Furthermore, the singer’s performance functions as a paralinguistic element, while the composer’s stylistic choices function as an extra-linguistic element. However, since we have no visual elements but only aural ones, we can describe the composer’s decisions as ‘sound gestures’, because the setting to music reflects the composer’s perspective of how the lyrics should be presented and expressed. After all, a gesture indicates the manner something is being expressed. All these elements combined tend to subvert or even invalidate the literal meaning of the lyrics and imply the opposite.

Grice (1975: 43) introduces the term *implicature* to refer to a kind of meaning which is not semantically encoded but arises in specific conversational contexts, so that not only what is said but also what is implied are components of the speaker’s meaning (see Bella 2015: 116). The informal syllogism leading to the ironical allusions has the following form.⁶

1. The *Lilipians* argue that they are not Zulu, they are not Papuan (they are not savage, primitive, and uncivilised).
2. This statement in this musical context (*tsifteteli*) is untrue.
3. The listener understands that the song is trying to convey a different message.
4. Given the maxim of relevance, that message should be relevant message to the context.
5. The most relevant in this case seems to be the exact opposite of what is implied by the semantic content of the *Lilipians*’ statement.
6. Based on the above, the composer of the song must be implying that the *Lilipians* are savage, primitive, and uncivilised.

The positions can be summarised as follows: “we are not Zulu/we are Zulu” an opposing pair that is perceived as a kind of metonymy and interpreted as “we are not savage and uncivilised/we are savage and uncivilised”. According to Attardo (2001: 110-122), whenever an utterance with an inappropriate but contextually relevant literal meaning is produced, this creates a violation of Grice’s (1975: 41-58) *co-operative principle* (CP). Here, the “utterance” with the inappropriate meaning is musical and is specifically identified in the use of the *tsifteteli*.

In agreement with Attardo (2001: 111-114), when we detect irony, as is the case in this song, what is essentially violated is the maxim of manner. Music here indicates a manner or gesture, according to which something is uttered, which ultimately leads to an implication of the opposite of its actual semantic meaning. From the Gricean perspective (1975: 53), in similar cases, we have a violation of the maxim of quality. However, since we are dealing with a multimodal text, which conveys its meanings in both verbal and non-verbal ways, that is in both spoken words and musical gestures, that all end up being perceived as irony, we are detecting a simultaneous violation of the maxims of manner and quality.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I tried to present an interpretative analytical approach to the song “We are not Zulu”, from the late 70’s popular Greek children’s radio show *Edo Lilipoupoli*. In the present song analysis, humour results using subtle overtones and insinuations, and indirect associations in connection to the musical styles chosen to frame the meaning of the lyrics.

⁶ Sequence 1-6 refers originally to the Gricean (1975: 50) general pattern for the concept of *Conversational Implicatures* and is adapted to the present song from Bella’s (2015: 125) applied syllogistic model.

The humorous aspect, in this case, can be described in terms of Hutcheon (2000 [1985]: 62) as *parodic satire*, a sort of parody with extramural/extramusical character and function, aiming at something outside the literal meaning of the song lyrics. From this perspective, parody serves as satire, touching on sociopolitical, cultural, ideological, etc. issues of the wider social context. In short, the result is satire, while the means is parody.

The two refrain verses connect the historical past of the *Lilipuan*s with the present of the *Lilipoupolites*. Thus, the music portrays and represents not only the musical identity of the ancient *wild Lilipuan*s, but also that of the contemporary *Lilipoupolites*. The music topos “Africa”, during the music bridge, underlines and supports partly the lyrics, while at the same time insinuates a cultural identity for the contemporary *Lilipoupolites*, for which they are either unaware of or trying to renounce for themselves. Namely, the *Lilipoupolites* assume that they are not Zulu, not Papuan, i.e., they bare no cultural resemblance to the indigenous tribes of Africa or New Guinea, and by this, they do not identify with being “underdeveloped”, “primitive” or “uncivilised.” Right after, they contradict themselves and state that they are the *wild Lilipuan*s (first refrain, concluding line) or they are direct descendants, the *great-grandchildren of the wild Lilipuan*s (second refrain, concluding line), namely that they are actually *wild*, a term whose meaning refers to primitiveness. Whereby, the entire refrain verse is musically underscored with the *tsifeteli*, turning the concluding phrase into a pun. What the *Lilipoupolites* now stress in their song is that, even though they proudly claim to be direct descendants of the *wild Lilipuan* tribe, they have no cultural characteristics in common either with the African Zulu or with the Papuans of New Guinea, that is, they do not consider themselves savage, uncivilised, or primitive. The “African” music that preceded during the bridge, functions as an introduction to what they will sing right after. “African” rhythm and *tsifeteli* dance (in the sense of Orientalism) are equated at the end, in terms of meaning, suggesting that the *Lilipuan*s are just as “uncivilised” and “barbaric” as the Zulu and Papuans “primitive”. The word pun *Lilipuan* indirectly supports this argumentation.

What is interesting in this case is the simultaneous synergy of verbal and paralinguistic humour that gives an ironic character and satirical function to the song. The fictional world of *Lilipoupoli* was meant to be a “mirror” of Greek society, so in this sense, the *Lilipoupolites* represent the Greek people, connecting older generations with younger ones. The *tsifeteli* dance is an extremely popular and widespread mode of nightlife entertainment in Greece. In the context of the song, *tsifeteli*, originating from the East and functioning as a symbol of cultural decadence (based on the theory of Orientalism), musically represents the taste and identity of the ordinary modern Greek and, by extension, the cultural development of the country. With this musical-aesthetic correlation, the show’s contributors allude that the country’s cultural development is also in decline. Against this background, the song seems rather ironic, since it indirectly suggests that the identity of Greece lies largely in the Orient and it remains “barbaric” and “regressive”, even if the Greeks insist on claiming the opposite. In other words, despite the attempt of contemporary Greeks to construct a Western-oriented identity, with the aim of making Greece a “European place like the rest” of the “civilised” western countries, they end up still belonging to the “uncivilised” Orient.

The analysis of this song has revealed a satirical kind of ridicule through exaggeration, parody, and irony, consisting morphologically of musical styles with specific connotations. The song mocks the average Greek with a very clever aesthetic-compositional trick: by having the *Lilipoupolites* sing that they do not belong with the primitive Zulus and Papuans, while proudly shouting afterwards that they are descendants of the *wild Lilipuan*s, that is, descendants of uncivilised and savage indigenous tribes. The fact that the *Lilipoupolites* identify themselves through the quoted phrase of the *Lilipuan*s, which describes themselves as *wild*, indicates that they, as modern descendants, are blatantly ignorant of who they are today. For, despite the theoretical denial of this negative characterisation of themselves as savages and primitives, the

tsifteteli that has been chosen to accompany the lyrics musically comes to invalidate this claim in practice.

According to Gazi (2010: 34),

‘Catchphrases’ or ‘slogans’ perform both descriptive and persuasive functions, while they also function as ‘social symbols’ with often ambiguous meanings, which multiply their dynamics and power, and include words of everyday, familiar vocabulary. In a ‘catchphrase’ each word contained within it becomes a ‘link’ to an ideological programme.

Even though a parody of a catchphrase, the slogan *We are not Zulu/we are not Papuans/we are the wild/tribe of Lilipuan!*, within the narrative context of the show, ought to function as a stimulant to the patriotism and pride of the *Lilipoupolites*, enhancing their feeling of archaeolatry. For modern Greeks a similar hypothetical catchphrase would have its point of departure on the timelessly stereotypical global projection of Greece as the source of civilisation, the cradle of democracy, the birthplace of philosophy, and so on. How can the contemporary Greeks, nevertheless, prove themselves worthy of their glorious past, when the country has been in political deadlock more than a few times, with the ruthless cancellation of all democratic institutions by repeated dictatorships, combined with the cultural quagmire into which the country has fallen, expressed through the taste and musical preferences of the common contemporary Greeks? It is no coincidence that one of the objectives of the Hadjidakian Third Programme was to culturally uplift its audience, that is, to educate and cultivate people through art, but also politically, in a broader sense of the word. Adapted to the children’s audience, this was also the purpose of *Edo Lilipoupoli*. For these reasons, and poignantly in the song refrain, the song’s composer Dimitris Maragopoulos, indirectly comments and touches on this fact, “illustrating” both the past and the present of the contemporary *Lilipoupolites* musically as a *tsifteteli*, implicating a regressive historical course, stripped from all sorts of GLORY-connotated musical manifestations, as if he wanted to suggest the cultural ‘poverty’ in which the country has fallen.

The sense of superiority (Attardo 2001: 120) deriving from both humorous and musical practices gives the humourist the impression of symbolic power (Giese et al. 2016) over the humorous target on a sociocultural or sociopolitical level. Through *tsifteteli*, the contributors of the Third Programme exercise indirectly critique and, at the same time, ironically mock the cultural inconsistency characterising part of the contemporary Greeks: those convinced of the higher value of the Greek race due to the “glorious past”, who identify themselves as civilised and cultured, while their lifestyle indicates, in fact, the opposite.

In this multidimensional, ostensibly childish song, and within the framework of this interpretational perspective, emerges a cultural identity conflict at the end of the 1970s. Two groups of people find their cultural representation musically. The one is represented by contemporary Greeks, who claim to be modern and civilised, and the other is represented by the ones mocking the former for their misguided conviction. The latter comprise not only the programme’s contributors (scriptwriters, composers, musicians, singers, etc.), but also the listeners of the Third Programme, who align themselves with the Hadjidakian Programme and are ideologically, culturally, and politically oriented towards progressive directions, or they simply have a sense of humour and enjoy making fun of themselves (Christidis 1979). In the presented song, the target of the satire is in essence the contemporary Greeks, while the group identified with the cultural values of the Third Programme are the ones who distance themselves from the great majority of the contemporary Greeks and exercise sociocultural critique through the subversive role of music.

In conclusion, I suggest that humorous satire, parody, and irony are activated not only verbally, i.e., through the song lyrics, but in combination with musical codes and associations, which I have sought to present in the context of this analysis. This approach could be understood both as a form of an extension to the theoretical framework introduced by Attardo (2001: 100) regarding the concept of *hyperdetermined humour*, or even as an attempt to extend the GTVH to include other forms of textual genres that are not shaped by the linguistic code alone, but also by the musical one, and contain meanings that are perceived and understood musically, within a predetermined sociocultural context.

References

- Allamanis, G. I. (2022). *Ston Kairo tis Lilipoupolis. I Viografia mias Radiofonikis Ekpompis* [In the Time of Lilipoupoli. A Biography of a Radio Show]. Athina: Topos.
- Ash, W. (1985). *The Way to Write a Radio Drama*. London: Elm Tree Books.
- Attardo, S. (2001). *Humorous Texts: A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. Humor Research 6. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bampiniotis, G. (2005). *Lexiko tis Neas Ellinikis Glossas. Me Scholia gia ti Sosti Chrisi ton Lexeon* [Dictionary of Modern Greek. With Comments on the Correct Use of Words]. Athina: Kentro Lexikografias.
- Barbe, K. (1995). *Irony in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bausinger, H. (1999). 'Märchen', in Brednich, R. W. (ed.), *Enzyklopädie des Märchens. Handwörterbuch zur Historischen und Vergleichenden Erzählforschung*, Vol. 9, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, col. 250-274.
- Bella, S. (2015). *Pragmatologia. Apo ti Glossiki Epikoinonia sti Glossiki Didaskalia* [Pragmatics. From Linguistic Communication to Linguistic Teaching]. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Berrendonner, A. (1981). *Elements de Pragmatique Linguistique*. Paris: Minuit.
- Braester, M. (1992). 'Du 'signe ironique' à l' énoncé ironique'. *Semiotica* 92 (1/2), pp. 75-86.
- Cadenbach, R. (1998). 'Parodie', *Metzler Sachlexikon Musik*. Stuttgart, Weimar: J. B. Metzler.
- Christidis, M. (1979). 'Ekei opou yparchei eleftheria!' [Where there is freedom!]. July 1. Column Tilekritiki. *Kathimerini*.
- Draitser E. A. (1994). *Techniques of Satire. The Case of Saltykov- Ščedrin*. Humor Research 2. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gazi, E. (2010). *Patris, Thriskeia, Oikogeneia. Istoría enos Synthimatos (1880-1930)* [Homeland, Faith, Family. The Story of a Catchphrase (1880-1930)]. Athens: Polis.
- Gavriilidou, Z. & Tsakona V. (2004-2005). 'Oi chioumoristikoi michanismoí sta komiks: Análysi tis seiras istorion tou Asterix' [Humour mechanisms in comics: Analysis of the Asterix comic series]. *Glossologia* 16, pp. 145-165.
- Giampoura, A. (2014). *Die Musik in der Kinderradiosendung „Edo Lilipoupoli“ als Soziopolitischer und Ästhetischer Kommentar*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin MA Thesis.
- Giampoura, A. (2020). 'Children's songs as sociopolitical comment in the Greek radio show *Edo Lilipoupoli*', in Mildorf, J. & Verhulst, P. (eds.), *Radio Art and Music. Culture, Aesthetics, Politics*, Lanham: Lexington Books, pp. 235-253.
- Giannakopoulos, I. (2021). 'Archaiognosia kai Ellinolatria' [Antiquarianism and Hellenolatry]. Retrieved May 19, 2022 from <https://faretra.info/2021/03/06/archaiognosia-kai-ellinolatria-grafei-o-ili-as-giannakopoulos/>.
- Giese D., Kaden C. & Schrammek B. (2016). *Musiksoziologie, Ortsbestimmung*, in Lütteken, L. (ed.), *MGG Online*, Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. Retrieved April 21, 2022 from <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/28268>

- Gourgouris, S. (1996). *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization, and the Institution of Modern Greece*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, California.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). 'Logic and conversation', in Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.
- Hadjidakis, M. (1980). *Ta Scholia tou Tritou. Mia Neoelliniki Mythologia* [Third Programme's Comments. A Modern Greek Mythology]. Athina: Exantas.
- Highet, G. (1962). *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hutcheon, L. (2000, [1985]). *A Theory of Parody. The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Jarosz, L. (1992). 'Constructing the Dark Continent: metaphor as geographic representation of Africa'. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 74 (2), pp. 105-115.
- Kaden, C. (2016). 'Musiksoziologie, Problemfelder, Interaktion, Kommunikation', in Lütteken, L. (ed.), *MGG Online*, Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. Retrieved April 21, 2022 from <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/28268>
- Kaliambou, M. (2006). *Heimat-Glaube-Familie. Wertevermittlung in Griechischen Populärmärchen (1870-1970)*. Mitsou, M.-E. (ed.) Münchener Schriften zur Neogräzistik, Vol. 3, Neuried: Ars Una.
- Konstantinidis, P. (2016). 'I Tyrannia tis Evropis epi tis Ellinikis Mousikis. O Evrocentrismos ton Antimachomenon Ekdochon tis Ellinikotitas' [The Tyranny of Europe over Greek Music. The Eurocentrism of the Conflicting Versions of Greekness]. Paper presented at the 8th Interdepartmental Musicological Conference. Megaro Mousikis, Athens, 25-27 November, pp. 336-345. Retrieved March 9, 2022 from <http://hellenic-musicology.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ConfProc2016.pdf>
- Meyer-Sickendiek, M. (1998). 'Satire', in Ueding G. (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, Vol. 8, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, col. 447-469.
- 'Parodie' (1982), in *Der Musik-Brockhaus*, Wiesbaden: Brockhaus; Mainz: Schott, p. 443.
- Rose, M. A. (2006). *Parodie, Intertextualität, Interbildlichkeit*. Bielefeld: Asthesis Verlag.
- Rummenhüller, P. (1978). *Einführung in die Musiksoziologie*. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen.
- Said, Edward W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books. A Division of Random House.
- Swift, J. (2004, [1726]). *Gulliver's Travels*. London: Collector's Library.
- Tarasti, E. (2012). *Semiotics of Classical Music. How Mozart, Brahms and Wagner Talk to Us*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Wehse, R. (2002). 'Parodie', in Brednich, R. W. (ed.), *Enzyklopädie des Märchens. Handwörterbuch zur Historischen und Vergleichenden Erzählforschung*, Vol. 10, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, col. 577-587.
- Wirth, U. (ed.) (2017). *Komik. Ein Interdisziplinäres Handbuch*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

Audio-Visual Material

- Kypourgos, N. & Maragopoulos, D. & Platonos, L. (1981). *Edo Lilipoupoli. Music and Songs from the Children's Radio Programme*. Lyrics by Marianina Kriezi, Orchestra conducted by Manos Hadjidakis. MINOS-EMI AE, 14C 045 711592. CD.
- Skevas, G. (2000). 'O Manos Hadjidakis kai to Trito Programma' [Manos Hadjidakis and the Third Programme]. *Paraskinio*. Television Documentary, EPT1. Retrieved November 13, 2022 from <https://archive.ert.gr/68875/>