

quality often shows more enthusiasm than talent, but dedicated and capable poets are not lacking, even with limited opportunities to express rebellious ideas. Ethiopian poetry is usually idealistic, expressing hope for the country and encouraging fellow Ethiopians to promote the best interests of their native land. Poets of note in more recent years include Aseffa Gebre-Mariyam Tesemma (b. 1935), the author of the national \*anthem, and Aberra Lemma (b. 1953).

■ E. Littmann, *Die altamharischen Kaiserlieder* (1914); Hiruy Welde-Sillasé, *Mishafe qiné* (1926), and *Iné-nna wedajocché* (1935); Mahteme-Sillasé Welde-Mesqel, *Amarinnya qiné* (1955); M. Kamil, *Amharische Kaiserlieder* (1957); Haddis Alemayyehu, *Fiqr iske meqabir* (1965); Habte-Mariyam Werqineh, *T'intawi ye-Ëtyopiya timhirt* (1970); R. K. Molvaer, *Tradition and Change in Ethiopia: Social and Cultural Life as Reflected in Amharic Fictional Literature ca. 1930–1974* (1980); Mengistu Lemma, *Yeg'iz qinéyat, yenne t'ibeb qirs* (1987); Gebre-Igziabihier Elyas and R. K. Molvaer, *Prowess, Piety and Politics: The Chronicle of Abeto Iyasu and Empress Zewditu of Ethiopia (1909–1930)* (1994); R. K. Molvaer, *Socialization and Social Control in Ethiopia* (1995); “About the Abortive Coup Attempt in Addis Abeba from 5 Tahsas to 8 Tahsas 1953 (14–17 December 1960),” *Northeast African Studies* 3 (1996); *Black Lions: The Creative Lives of Modern Ethiopia's Literary Giants and Pioneers* (1997); and “Siniddu Gebru: Pioneer Woman Writer, Feminist, Patriot, Educator, and Politician,” *Northeast African Studies* 4 (1997); Ayele Bekerie, *Ethiopic: An African Writing System: Its History and Principles* (1997); R. K. Molvaer, “The Achievement of Emperor Tēwodros II of Ethiopia (1855–1868): From an Unpublished Manuscript by *Aleqa Tekle-Ëyesus* (*Aleqa Tekle'*) of Gojjam,” *Northeast African Studies* 3 (1998); “Afeferq Yohannis and Debebe Seyfu: Notes on Ethiopian Writers of the Late Twentieth Century,” *Northeast African Studies* 6 (1999); and “Some Ethiopian Historical Poems,” *Aethiopica* 9 (2006).

R. K. MOLVAER

**ETHNOPOETICS** Gr. *ethnos*, “nation”; and *poiēsis*, “creation, a making-process.” The term was coined in 1968 by the poet and anthropologist Jerome Rothenberg in collaboration with George Quasha as a parallel term to “ethnomusicology.” Thus, to paraphrase a cl. definition of the latter, ethno-poetics could be said to comprise “the study of social and cultural aspects of [poetry] in local and global contexts” (Pegg). Ethno-poetics, which emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, generally refers to the develop. of an interest among poets and scholars, esp. anthropologists, in (1) a hypothetical worldwide body of poetry, equivalent in value, that included materials heretofore deemed crude, “primitive,” or “uncivilized,” such as folk poetry and oral trads., shamanistic incantations, anonymously or collectively composed works, and other nonliterary verbal events saturated with meaning for their particular cultures; (2) the humanistic and expressive value of alternative (poetic, e.g.) ethnographic writing; and, in response to the decentralization of “highbrow” art in the post-1968 academic curriculum, (3) the study of and/or

participation in poetry movements, poetic practices and activities, and bodies of work that reflected the lives and aspirations of politically or socioeconomically underrepresented members of the world's many communities, as well as in underrepresented aspects (hidden social hurts and hist., collective origins, and so forth) of more traditionally canonical verse. Most broadly, the movement sought to locate poetry and the poetic in a global range of utterances and local expressive practices, focusing initially on the collection, trans., and sometimes emulation by Western (esp. U.S.) scholars and poets of indigenous verbal artifacts as “poetry.” The intentions were to acknowledge the cultural and aesthetic sophistication of these expressions, to introduce the Western literary establishment to these powerful cultural writings, and to declare them equal in significance and achievement to the canon of poetic masterpieces by individuated and revered poets. Major participants in the movement have included Rothenberg and Quasha; anthropologists Dell Hymes, Barbara Tedlock, and Dennis Tedlock (also a poet and literary trans., of, among other texts, the Mayan *Popol Vuh*); linguistics scholar Ulli Beier; poets Armand Schwerner, Charles Stein, and Nathaniel Tarn (who also holds a doctorate in anthropology); and others who translated, wrote, anthologized, or otherwise edited journals. and books showcasing the traditional praise songs, incantations, verbal ceremonies, or individual poems of indigenous people and poets writing with an awareness of their ethnic trads. One of the major tenets of the movement, stated in the first issue of the jour. *Alcheringa*, a key publication, was “to combat cultural genocide in all of its manifestations” (Rothenberg and Tedlock, 1975); emphasis on the “tribal” as a concept and a specific social formation and of a vatic or bardic understanding of poetics permeates much of the movement's discourse.

Critiques of ethno-poetics have arisen in response to theoretical revisions of both “nationalism/ethnicity” and “poetry”—the two primary components of the neologism. “Nation” has been complicated by “postnationalism,” “ethnicity” by “hybridity,” and “poetry” by “poetries” and by critical approaches that do not attend to distinctions in genre. Until the late 1980s and 1990s, ethno-poetics primarily consisted of efforts by Western, majority-culture poets and scholars to bring globally underrepresented poetries to the attention of other Western, majority-culture poets and scholars under the banner of an avant-garde modernist universalism (ethno-poetics claims kinship with the Western avant-garde's attraction to “primitivism”), coupled with a desire to heal cultural damage. However, some post-colonial critics later faulted ethno-poetics for cultural imperialism and a failure to put such works in their appropriate historical and political context. The tendency of ethno-poetics to find similarities across cultures conflicted with the poststructuralist emphasis on difference and incommensurability, as well as skepticism about the distinction between oral and written trads.

A wider understanding of ethno-poetics might consider the historical and intellectual relationship between ethnography and poetry/poetics, incl. (1) poetry

or poetic writing by ethnographers (incl. Ruth Benedict, Renato Rosaldo, Edward Sapir, Michael Taussig, Ruth Behar, Susan Stewart, and others) that embodies or thematizes elements common to both ethnographic and literary inquiry, such as the experience of ling. and cultural defamiliarization, the participant-observation method of fieldwork, cultural documentation, the problem of “self”-positioning, and the ethics and violence of representation; (2) repoliticized scholarship and creative work by indigenous or ethnic subjects and communities about themselves that portray their own complexity as not merely tribal or ethnic but also as cosmopolitan, hybrid, or multi-influenced aesthetic and social agents; and (3) continued exploration of “cultural poetics” as a valid mode of scholarly inquiry, and the need for social engagement in poetic praxis.

■ **Critical Studies:** *Modern Poetry from Africa*, ed. U. Beier and G. Moore (1962); *Technicians of the Sacred*, ed. J. Rothenberg, 2d ed. (1985), and *Shaking the Pumpkin* (1972); J. Rothenberg and D. Tedlock, “Statement of Intention,” *Alcheringa* 1 (1975); R. Finnegan, *Oral Poetry* (1980); D. Tedlock, *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation* (1983); *Symposium of the Whole*, ed. J. Rothenberg (with D. Rothenberg) (1985); M. Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity* (1992); B. Tedlock, *The Beautiful and the Dangerous* (1992); S. Stewart, *On Longing* (1993); *Poems for the Millennium*, ed. J. Rothenberg and P. Joris, 3 v. (1995–2008); S. Hartnett and J. Engels, “Aria in Time of War’: Investigative Poetics and the Politics of Witnessing,” in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (2005); M. Taussig, *Walter Benjamin’s Grave* (2006); K. Stewart, *Ordinary Affects* (2007).

■ **Journals:** *Alcheringa*; *A Gathering of the Tribes*; *Cultural Anthropology*; *XCP: Cross-cultural Poetics*; *Tropiques*.

■ **Web Sites:** C. Pegg, “Ethnomusicology,” *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy, <http://www.grovemusic.com>; UbuWeb: Ethnopoetics, <http://www.ubu.com/ethno>.

M. DAMON

**ETHOS** (Gr., “custom,” “character”). In cl. rhet., one means of persuasion: an audience’s assessment of a speaker’s moral character (e.g., honesty, benevolence, intelligence) primarily as reflected in the discourse, although at least secondarily dependent on the speaker’s prior reputation. In the *Rhetoric* 1:1356a, Aristotle distinguishes three ways of achieving persuasion: ethical (*ethos*), emotional (*\*pathos*), and logical (*logos*); and although he comes close to affirming *ethos* as the most potent means of persuasion, he gives it the least theoretical devel.; that devel. must for the most part be traced outside rhet., in the works of moral philosophers on virtue. From the standpoint of education, however, *ethos* became historically the most widely addressed principle of rhet., as theorists from the Sophists through the Ren. humanists made the study of ethics a central means of preparing students for civic responsibilities. Along with *pathos*, *ethos* serves to distinguish rhet.’s inclusive concerns from dialectic’s more

exclusive concentration on formal validity in *logos*. Although *ethos* centers in the speaker and *pathos* in the audience, the force of *ethos* consists in arousing \*emotions; and the nature of *pathos*, or what emotions can be aroused, depends on the character of their host.

This conceptually close relation between *ethos* and *pathos* is evident not only in cl. rhetorical treatises but in the long trad. of writing \*‘‘characters.’’ This literary genre, comprised of short disquisitions on personality types and behaviors, originated with Aristotle’s pupil Theophrastus and achieved high popularity in the Ren. The devel. of “humoral psychology” and such works as Ben Jonson’s *Every Man in His Humour* further reveal the traditionally close union of *ethos* and *pathos* (see HUMORS). From the standpoint of rhet., *ethos* in poetry bears obvious relations to \*persona and authorial identity: *ethos* is, in sum, the strategic rationale of both, a determinant of the audience’s response to the speaker or speakers in a text as well as to the artist as speaker of a text, investing the latter speaking role with something of the *ethos*-driven quality of *auctoritas*, famously described by Virgil as belonging to that orator who, “influential in piety and deeds,” can rule the ignoble mob with words (*Aeneid* 1.148–53). Among mod. critics, *ethos* has figured in the discussion of such subjects as the distinction between dramatized and undramatized speakers, or between dramatic \*monologues and \*lyric poems, as well as in discussions of the morality of impersonal narration and the character of implied authors.

See RHETORIC AND POETRY.

■ M. Joseph, *Shakespeare’s Use of the Arts of Language* (1947), ch. 5, 9; G. T. Wright, *The Poet in the Poem* (1962); E. Schütrumpf, *Die Bedeutung des Wortes ethos in der Poetik des Aristoteles* (1970); Group  $\mu$ , ch. 6; S. Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980); W. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2d ed. (1983); C. Gill, “The *Ethos*/Pathos Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism,” *CQ* 34 (1984); W. Booth, *The Company We Keep* (1988); J. M. May, *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (1988); Corbett, esp. 80–86; E. Schütrumpf, “The Model for the Concept of *Ethos* in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*,” *Philologus* 137 (1993); Lausberg, *Ethos et pathos: Le statut du sujet rhétorique*, ed. F. Cornilliat and R. Lockwood (2000); R. Amossy, “*Ethos* at the Crossroads of Disciplines: Rhetoric, Pragmatics, Sociology,” *PoT* 22 (2001); F. Woerther, “Aux origines de la notion rhétorique d’‘ethos,’” *Revue des Études Grecques* 118 (2005); D. Randall, “*Ethos*, Poetics, and the Literary Public Sphere,” *MLQ* 69 (2008).

T. O. SLOANE

**EUPHONY** (Gr., “good sound”). Euphony, particularly in dramatic works and poetry, is a smoothness and harmony of sounds that are agreeable to the ear and pleasing in the physical act of pronouncing them or in the mental act of their unvoiced performance.

John Milton begins his elegiac “Lycidas” with euphony’s engaging calmness, “Yet once more, O ye Laurels, and once more, / Ye Myrtles brown, with ivy never