From Structure to Agency to Comparative and 'Cross-national' History? Some Thoughts Regarding Post-1974 Greek Historiography

KONSTANTINOS CHATZIS AND GEORGIA MAVROGONATOU

Giannis Antoniou, *Oi Ellines michanikoi. Thesmoi & Idees, 1900–1940* (Athens: Vivliorama, 2006), 486 pp., ISBN 9608087554.

Efi Avdela, *'Dia logous timis': via, synaisthimata kai axies sti metemfyliaki Ellada*, 2nd edn (Athens: Nefeli, 2006), 254 pp., ISBN 9602116560.

Kostas Fountanopoulos, *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima sti Thessaloniki, 1908–1936. Ithiki oikonomia kai syllogiki drasi sto Mesopolemo* (Athens: Nefeli, 2005), 411 pp., ISBN 9602117354.

The fall of the Colonels' junta seven years after its imposition in 1967 is a watershed event for Greek historiography, as it freed the country from the asphyxiating ideological and political framework of the years following the Greek civil war in the 1940s. From the mid-1970s onwards, and as a result of drawing on major international trends, historical research in Greece underwent a spectacular expansion in terms of its subject matter. This involved the adoption of theoretical approaches, techniques and methods that, although not entirely absent, had certainly been the exception within the body of domestic scholarly output until then.[1]

Dr Konstantinos Chatzis, LATTS-Ecole des Ponts ParisTech, 6 et 8 avenue Blaise Pascal – Cité Descartes, 77455 Marne-la-Vallée cedex 2, France; chatzis@mail.enpc.fr. Dr Georgia Mavrogonatou, School of Applied Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Law, National Technical University of Athens, Polytechneioupolis, 15780 Zografou, Athens, Greece; gmavr@central.ntua.gr. All translations of quotations from untranslated sources are by the authors.

[1] The main journals in which this group of researchers expressed their views were *Sygchrona Themata* (1962, republished in 1977), a general social sciences journal, and the following historical journals: *Mnimon* (1971), *Ta Istorika* (1983), *Istor* (1990) and *Historein* (founded in 1999, it is an English-language review).

Contemporary European History, **19**, 2 (2010), pp. 151–168 © Cambridge University Press 2010
doi:10.1017/S0960777310000068

The polyphony of views within the community of historians over more than thirty years in post-junta Greece did not prevent the creation of specific research agendas. Each of these agendas mobilised a sufficient number of researchers to acquire – on its own or in tandem with other agendas – a dominant position within the field of historical research in Greece (see the first two sections). What is the situation today? Are there specific research agendas – either sufficiently consolidated or under development –in current research production?

A comprehensive analysis of this question is well beyond the scope of this review article. Instead, we propose a less ambitious exercise. We shall present three recent (and, in our opinion, important) books that, in their own particular ways, express common sensitivities that until now have had little impact on Greek historical research. In order to highlight the innovative elements within these works – and as a form of counterpoint – we shall give a brief overview of certain dominant elements in the field of historical production in Greece from 1974 onwards (first section).[2] After presenting the three books (second section), the third and final part of the essay will draw on the preceding material to discuss a few issues that we believe could form the subject matter of fruitful research and discussion by the community of historians interested in modern Greece.

Greece and the West : the modernisation issue

A ghost hovers over a large part of post-junta Greek historical and sociological production dating from the 1970s and 1980s, namely the question of the 'nature' of modern Greek society in comparison to the 'nature' of the advanced countries of the West. We might call this the modernisation issue.[3] This theme can be seen as the common denominator in a series of studies carried out by historians and historical sociologists.[4] In examining different periods of modern Hellenism (i.e. from 1700 to the present), such studies have focused on various thematic areas

[2] Concerning historiographical production on modern Greece in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see *Sygchrona Themata*, special issue, nos. 35, 36 and 37 (December 1988); Paschalis Kitromilidis and Triantafyllos Sklavenitis, eds., *Istoriografia tis neoteris kai sygchronis Elladas, 1833–2002* (Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research, 2004). See also in English Alexander Kitroeff, 'Continuity and Change in Contemporary Greek Historiography', *European History Quarterly*, 19 (1989), 269–98; Antonis Liakos, 'Modern Greek Historiography (1974–2000): The Era of Tradition from Dictatorship to Democracy', in Ulf Brunbauer, ed., *(Re)Writing history: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004), 351–78; Dimitra Lambropoulou, Antonis Liakos and Yannis Yannitsiotis, 'Work and Gender in Greek Historiography during the Last Three Decades', in Berteke Waaldijk, ed., *Professions and Social Identity: New European Historical Research on Work, Gender and Society* (Pisa: Edizioni Plus–Pisa University Press, 2006), 1–14. This bibliography is purely indicative.

[3] 'Modernisation' is a very loaded term and modernisation theory has come in for much criticism. For the purpose of this review essay, we accept that certain features of the developed Western world may be labelled as 'modern', and modernisation is therefore used as a type of shorthand for a comparison of those specific features found in the 'developed' world and elsewhere, Greece in our case. See Thomas Gallant, *Modern Greece* (London: Arnold, 2001), xiii.

[4] With regard to the role played by the 'modernisation issue' in the Greek historiographical production of the period see also Liakos, 'Modern Greek Historiography'.

ranging from the history of ideas to economic history and have encompassed the history of the state and its political landscape. But the roots of the issue regarding the modernisation of Greek society are to be found before the 1974 turning point. This question had already been raised by two major scholars of Greek history, Konstantinos Dimaras (1904–92) and Nikos Svoronos (1911–89), who worked in different thematic fields. Dimaras was a specialist in the Greek variants of the Enlightenment and Romanticism, while Svoronos, although a Byzantinist, was also interested in the social and economic history of modern Hellenism.[5] Each tackled their subject matters from a particular methodological perspective and point of departure. However, both the 'liberal' Dimaras and the 'Marxist' Svoronos were equally interested in the problem of the modernisation of Greek society, an issue that they passed on to subsequent researchers, many of whom were their students or were influenced by their work.[6]

For present purposes, and despite a danger of generalising about analyses and positions that bear the personal stamp of their authors, we contend that a major part of the research that focuses on the modernisation issue shares the following characteristics: first, it focuses, for the most part, on the 'macroscopic' level of analysis (the national state in its entirety, the major sectors of economy – industry, agriculture, banking, etc.);[7] and, second, it is influenced by an idealised picture of 'the West' (a 'West' often taken as an undifferentiated whole or bloc). As a result of this idealisation, the evolution of Greek society often takes on the form of a history of omissions and absences, distortions and deviations. We shall now illustrate these two characteristics through a series of important (and extensively discussed) studies in three fields: the history of the Greek state and its relation to society, economic history and the history of ideas.

The Greek state and its relation to society sparked the interest of many scholars in the 1970s and 1980s, especially historical sociologists. Drawing on the then innovative work of John Petropulos, some researchers placed the concept of 'clientelism' (patronage) at the centre of their analyses.[8] According to the historical sociologist Konstantinos Tsoukalas, the lack of strong social classes (bourgeoisie and landowners) during the nineteenth century made the Greek state fertile ground for

[5] K. T. Dimaras, *Neoellinikos diafotismos* (Athens: Ermis, 1977); idem, *Ellinikos romantismos* (Athens: Ermis, 1982). See also C. T. Dimaras, *La Grèce au temps des Lumières* (Geneva: Droz, 1969) and Svoronos, *Histoire de la Grèce moderne* (Paris: PUF, 1953).

[6] The revival of Greek historiography in the early post-Junta years was in large part the result of a generation of historians (Philippos Iliou, Spyros Asdrachas, Vassilis Panagiotopoulos, Giorgos Dertilis, etc.) whose work was imbued with both the 'school of Enlightenment' (Dimaras) and the Marxist problematic (Svoronos). See Liakos, 'Modern Greek Historiography'.

[7] This observation is less valid for the history of ideas: here we find studies that also investigate 'microscopic' fields of analysis (the views of specific thinkers, the 'micro'-processes by which modern ideas were transfused to Greece, and so on).

[8] J. Petropulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece, 1833–1843* (Princeton University Press, 1968).

the development of the ruling class.[9] The latter 'plundered' the state and transformed its machinery into the key social mechanism for collecting and redistributing the economic surplus. It also used state resources (mostly public-sector positions) to maintain its dominance through a broad network of 'clientelism'. As a result of the particularity of the Greek case, Tsoukalas claims that, in contrast to 'the West', the state apparatus in Greece has not always functioned in a rational way (according to Weberian criteria of rational bureaucracy). To support his claims Tsoukalas invokes quantitative analyses. He emphasises, for instance, what he considers the exceedingly high number of public-sector employees in Greece, or the disproportionate amount (and non-productive character) of state expenditure in relation to gross national wealth. Another historical sociologist, Nikos Mouzelis, uses the concept of patronage to analyse the process of the integration of the 'masses' in the country's political system. For Mouzelis, there is a sharp contrast with advanced capitalist Western societies in which this integration occurred through the emergence of class-based political parties. For the author, this contrast demonstrates once again that the Greek case is a 'deviation' from the Western paradigm.[10] Finally, for the historian Giorgos Dertilis, the Greek case is characterised by the relative autonomy of politics vis-à-vis social structures and conflict, an autonomy whose intensity and duration transcend the corresponding phenomena in advanced Western societies (the practices of patronage using the state apparatus were supposed to account in large part for this Greek peculiarity).[11]

These analyses of the Greek state and its relation to society emerged mostly from the work of sociologists and political scientists who erected their theoretical edifices on the basis of secondary accounts. But during the 1980s a new generation of economic historians studied the history of Greece in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by drawing on primary sources.[12] Despite differences in the subject matters, sources and emphases, the issue of modernisation was not absent from these works. Indeed, they largely focused on the question of the economic development of the country compared with the path taken by the industrialised West: 'what were the causes of Greece's economic "underdevelopment" [compared with that of the

[9] Konstantinos Tsoukalas, *Koinoniki anaptyxi kai kratos. I sygkrotisi tou dimosiou chorou stin Ellada* (Athens: Themelio, 1981). In English, see Constantine Tsoucalas, 'On the Problem of Political Clientalism in Greece in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, 5, 1 (1978), 5–15; 5, 2 (1978), 5–17. According to the dominant interpretations of the era this happened, first, because the absence of major industry in nineteenth-century Greece meant that the country did not witness the emergence of a robust bourgeoisie; and, second, because the 'appropriation' over an extended period of time of former Ottoman land by the independent Greek state after the 1821 Revolution became an obstacle to the emergence of a powerful class of landowners.

[10] See Nikos Mouzelis, *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment* (London: Macmillan, 1978); idem, *Politics in the Semi-periphery: Early Parliamentarism and Late Industrialisation in the Balkans and Latin America* (London: Macmillan, 1986).

[11] Giorgos Dertilis, *Koinonikos metaschimatismos kai stratiotiki epemvasi, 1880–1909* (Athens: Exantas, 1977).

[12] We should note here that the majority of historians who brought about a revival of Greek historiography in the 1970s specialized in the history of Hellenism in the Ottoman Empire and the Venetian dominions. See, for example, the recent book by Spyros Asdrachas and collaborators, *Elliniki oikonomiki istoria, 15os–19os aionas* (Athens: Politistiko Idryma Omilou Peiraios, 2003).

developed West]?' and 'why was there no heavy industry in Greece?' were among the most important questions asked at that time. The main approaches and tools here were once again macroscopic analyses and statistical data such as population censuses, rates of employment, the degree of mechanisation within industrial plants, wages – including gender-related pay – seasonal employment and the cost of living and purchasing power.[13] The analyses led to two main conclusions. First, the delay in industrialisation was the result of a limited labour market and high costs, the absence of state loans, bank strategies, a limited domestic market, and the role of domestic capital and the capital of the Greek diaspora, whose members seldom invested in industry. The second conclusion stressed the absence of a large working class in the form it took in west European countries. The explanation for this absence focused on the predominance of small-scale agricultural holdings that was strengthened by the redistribution of land by the Greek state after 1871 and after the Greek–Turkish Wars of 1912–22 – which also prevented mass migration from agricultural to urban regions.[14]

The tendency to look for deviations from the Western 'standard' is also evident in work that belongs in the field of the history of ideas. Authors belonging to this strand of research tend to focus on the transfusion and grafting of Western ideological currents (such as Enlightenment thought, Romanticism, socialism) on to Greek society. Paschalis Kitromilidis, for instance, claims that although the Enlightenment movement found fertile ground in Greek intellectual circles, the resulting political liberalism did not become a dominant cultural tradition in Greece, despite the fact that the state that emerged after the 1821 Revolution massively adopted modern Western institutions.[15]

Compared with the historical (and sociological) writing of the 1970s and 1980s, a major part of which incorporated the common issue of (problematic) 'modernisation', the historiography of the 1990s and the early twenty-first century is marked by a smaller degree of homogeneity as it witnessed the appearance of several new approaches and topics on the historiographical scene. These benefited to a certain degree from a process of deconstruction from within the modernisation paradigm. Thus, more recent context-sensitive studies that draw on new, more reliable quantitative evidence have questioned the claim regarding the allegedly overdeveloped

[13] Some major contributions of the period include Christina Agriantoni, *Oi aparches tis ekviomichanisis stin Ellada ton 19° aiona* (Athens: Emporiki Trapeza tis Ellados, 1986); Kostas Kostis, *Agrotiki oikonomia kai Georgiki Trapeza. Opseis tis ellinikis oikonomias sto mesopolemo (1919–1928)* (Athens: MIET, 1987); Christos Hatziiosif, *I giraia selini. I viomichania stin elliniki oikonomia, 1830–1940* (Athens: Themelio, 1993).

[14] See Lambropoulou et al., 'Work and Gender', 4–5; Lida Papastefanaki, 'Misthoti ergasia', in Kostas Kostis and Sokratis Petmezas, eds., *I anaptyxi tis Ellinikis oikonomias ton 19o aiona* (Athens: Alexandreia, 2006), 253–91, esp. 254–60.

[15] Paschalis Kitromilidis, *Neoellinikos Diafotismos* (Athens: MIET, 1996), esp. chapter 10 and the conclusion (the book is based on the author's doctoral dissertation, 'Tradition, Enlightenment and Revolution', Harvard University, 1978). See also Nikiforos Diamandouros, *Cultural Dualism and Political Change in Post-authoritarian Greece* (Madrid: Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones, 1994). The cause of this 'failure' is rooted, in the authors' opinion, in an indigenous cultural tradition formed over time by the Byzantine experience, the Orthodox Church and the Ottoman past.

('hypertrophic' in Tsoukalas's terminology) state apparatus in Greece during the nineteenth century.[16] Moreover, most economic historians today acknowledge that the Greek economy throughout the nineteenth century developed slowly, but in a way that allowed it to remain connected to the developed economies of that time, and in some cases to converge with them.[17] This assessment is bolstered by recent findings in international historiography (especially with regard to the nineteenth century) that stress that the existence of mechanised establishments did not constitute an indispensable condition for industrialisation and that extensive industrialisation is not a necessary condition for economic development.[18] The 1990s have also witnessed criticism of the tendency among the advocates of the paradigm of (problematic) modernisation in the 1970s and the 1980s to idealise an undifferentiated West – thus creating a kind of (positive) 'Occidentalism' among the Greek research community[19] – and to highlight the various 'delays' and 'absences' in Greek society by using not the actual Western societies as a yardstick but representations thereof.[20]

[16] See, e.g., Kostas Kostis, 'Dimosia oikonomika', in Kostis and Petmezas, *I anaptyxi*, 293–335; Giorgos Dertilis, *Istoria tou Ellinikou kratous, 1830–1920* (Athens: Estia, 2005), I, part 4, ch. 3. In this two-volume work, Dertilis, one of the protagonists of the discussion in the 1970s on the character of Greek society, revised several of his initial positions in the light of subsequent research carried out by him and other historians. For a close critical reading of this work by the most prominent historian of Greek industry, see Christina Agriantoni, 'Giorgos B. Dertilis, *Istoria tou Ellinikou kratous 1830–1920*', *Sygchrona Themata*, no. 94 (July–September 2006), 9–15. The authors provide new (and more solidly grounded) quantitative data, while noting that the 'bloated' Greek state apparatus during its early years can largely be accounted for by the specific needs common to all new states at their foundation.

[17] This is the case with the following, for example: Agriantoni, 'Giorgos B. Dertilis'; Dertilis, *Istoria tou Ellinikou*; Kostas Kostis and Sokratis Petmezas, 'Eisagogi', in Kostis and Petmezas, *I anaptyxi*, 21–37; Alexis Fragkiadis, *Elliniki oikonomia, 19os–20os aionas* (Athens: Nefeli, 2007). For macroeconomic data see Giorgos Kostelenos, 'Makrooikonomika megethi', in Kostis and Petmezas, *I anaptyxi*, 39–79. For comparisons with 'developed' countries, see Paul Bairoch, *Victoires et déboires. Histoire économique et sociale du monde du XVIe siècle à nos jours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1997), II, 241 and *passim*.

[18] See, e.g., Christina Agriantoni, 'Viomichania', in Kostis and Petmezas, *I anaptyxi*, 219–51, esp. 221–2; Dertilis, *Istoria tou Ellinikou*, I, Introduction, ch. 4.

[19] Concerning the term 'occidentalism', see James G. Carrier, ed., *Occidentalism. Images of the West* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). The use to which it is put here is a personal one.

[20] See, for example, the introductory remarks by Gunnar Hering in his monumental work *Die politischen Parteien in Griechenland, 1821–1936* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1992). Hering recalls, for example, that vote buying was not an unknown phenomenon in countries as advanced as nineteenth-century Britain. In France, proven clientelistic practices under the July Monarchy have even been theorised by Guizot (see, e.g., Lucien Jaume, 'Un libéralisme élitaire. Guizot et les doctrinaires', in idem, *L'individu effacé ou le paradoxe du libéralisme français* (Paris: Fayard, 1997), 119–69). Staying with France and returning to Kitromilidis's position concerning the weakness of political liberalism as a political culture in Greece (see above), we should remember that even in a country like France, (political and economic) liberalism did not really catch on if we are to believe Pierre Rosanvallon when he depicts the French political model as an 'illiberal democracy'. See Pierre Rosanvallon, *Le modèle politique français. La société civile contre le jacobinisme de 1789 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil, 2004). The tendency to idealise the West when making comparisons is not merely a Greek phenomenon. The debate on the German *Sonderweg* seems also to have been based, at least to a considerable extent, on an idealised vision of the British situation. See Jürgen Kocka, 'German history before Hitler: The Debate about the German "Sonderweg"', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 23, 1 (1988), 3–16.

From structures to agency: three recent books

The three books presented in this review essay belong to this new and more heterogeneous Greek historiographical production that emerged from 1990 onwards. Despite differences in their subject matters, the books share certain characteristics that make them conducive to a joint presentation and discussion. First, in contrast to the majority of works that focus on the history of the Greek state and economy, that adopt macroscopic approaches and mostly highlight structures, these three studies accord a central position to the historical actors themselves (as agents of historical change) and to the constitution of their social identities.[21] Second, none of the three authors abandons the issue of the modernisation of Greek society, which they examine (albeit arguably as a secondary issue) through the actions of the various actors that figure in their analyses.[22]

Evi Avdela's book *'Dia logous timis': via, synaisthimata kai axies sti metemfyliaki Ellada* ('For reasons of honour': violence, emotions and values in post civil-war Greece) concerns the 1950s and 1960s and examines the crimes and interpersonal violence committed by people (male or female) who invoke personal or family honour to justify their acts.[23] This is not the first time Avdela has examined gender-related issues, a field she has represented consistently in Greece since at least the beginning of the 1980s.[24] In fact, her personal journey as a historian incorporates a large part of the changes in Greek historiography (such as the shift from structures to agency) from 1975 onwards. Indeed, Avdela is also the author of a work of reference on the sexual division of labour in the public sector in Greece during the first half of the twentieth century.[25] Although the issue of the social identity and life experience of employees is not completely absent from the work (see, e.g., pp. 205–35), this study is, in accordance with the dominant historiographical standards of the time, underpinned mostly by statistical data (number of employees, career patterns and so on) and by an analysis of the related institutional framework. In Avdela's new book, numbers are rare if not completely absent. Instead, they are replaced by meanings. If the author infers

[21] They are not the only ones. The interest in how individual and social identities are formed is one of the defining characteristics of recent Greek historiographical production. In English, see, e.g., Polymeris Voglis, *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners during the Greek Civil War (1945–1950)* (New York: Berghahn, 2002). Other references can be found in Liakos, 'Modern Greek historiography'; Lambropoulou et al., 'Work and Gender'.

[22] Clearly, for the authors of the present review essay, the choice of these three books does not mean that there are no other significant works in recent Greek historiography. Moreover, to the reasons for choosing these three books we have already presented in the main text, we should also add a further one: the affinity of the works in question with the interests of the authors of the present review.

[23] The author has published some of the findings of her analysis in English in Efi Avdela, 'Emotions on Trial: Judging Crimes of Honour in Post-civil-war Greece', *Crime, History & Societies*, 10, 2 (2006), 33–52.

[24] See, e.g., Efi Avdela, *Le genre entre classe et nation: essais d'historiographie grecque* (Paris: Editions Syllepse, 2006). This book contains numerous references to women and gender studies in Greece.

[25] Efi Avdela, *Dimosioi ypalliloi genous thilykou. Katamerismos tis ergasias kata fyla ston dimosio tomea, 1908–1955* (Athens: Idryma Erevnas kai Paideias tis Emporikis Trapezas tis Ellados, 1990).

from her database[26] certain quantitative conclusions concerning the development of the phenomenon over time – 'honour crimes' witnessed a surge in the 1950s, marked by the violence of the civil war of the previous decade, while the 1960s witnessed a significant reduction as they largely disappeared in the years leading up to the Junta (p. 19) – the study 'belongs less to the history of "criminality" and more to a historical investigation of the way in which the meaning that people attribute to their behaviour and the behaviour of others is constructed and transformed' (p. 27). By highlighting the issue of 'honour' and its role in behaviour (more specifically in violent acts), the author weaves a debate with classic anthropological studies focusing on Greece in the second half of the twentieth century. Since the 1960s, these had regarded the concept of honour (to which they attributed a gendered character) as an organizing principle of social relations in Greece.[27] Yet at the same time Avdela is a historian writing after the 'cultural turn' and the 'linguistic turn'. As a result, in the author's opinion, the 'content of the code of honour is not static' (p. 28) and does not characterise a specific cultural region (the Mediterranean basin, for instance) (p. 27), 'but is determined by the historical social and cultural context while it undergoes transformations in time and in function of the social group that invokes it' (p. 28). By drawing from the body of international literature on the topic, the author claims that honour is not merely a social value but is 'identified with emotion', an 'emotion that is historically and culturally determined' (p. 29). Finally, given that emotion is, according to the author, a 'mental construct that is born in the field of social interaction', it does not exist 'independently from its articulation' and 'assumes a meaning and validity only after it has been carried out in the public field of discourse' (p. 29).

Following her theoretical premises, the author organises her archival material (judicial archives, newspapers, magazines, along with contemporary legal, anthropological and sociological texts) into four chapters. These take the reader from the perspective of the protagonists of each individual 'melodrama' to a series of 'official' discourses regarding 'honour crimes'. In the first chapter, using newspaper records of 'honour crimes', the author engages in a systematic presentation and analysis of the 'rhetorical devices' (such as 'she led a dissolute life', 'he corrupted her', 'red-handed') that correspond to the various 'cultural scenarios' of 'honour crimes' – that is, the reasons invoked by the perpetrators of homicides and serious bodily harm to justify their actions (p. 42).[28] In the second chapter, the protagonists are the multiple 'surroundings' (village, neighbourhood or professional milieu) that underlie and justify the attitudes, behaviour and motives of those involved in 'honour

[26] For her research purposes, the author took a sample of 340 cases from the Athens daily press during the period 1949–67 (p. 17) and accessed the records of approximately fifty trials (p. 18).

[27] The author refers to, among others, the classic work by John K. Campbell, *Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964). On John Campbell and his work see the recent book edited by Mark Mazower, *Networks of Power in Modern Greece: Essays in Honour of John Campbell* (London: Hurst, 2008).

[28] The reader may recall that in his novel *Stoicheia gia ti dekaetia tou '60* (Athens: Stigmi, 1989), Thanasis Valtinos had already used the daily press to depict 1960s Greece and even reproduced several extracts from articles concerning 'crimes of honour'. Avdela mentions this and pays homage to the author on page 15 of her book..

crimes'. Based mostly on the testimonies of trial witnesses concerning the 'nature' (the 'moral' quality) of those involved in the 'honour crime' – a 'nature' that is often expressed through stereotypical characterisations such as 'decent and hard-working' for men and, 'morally upright and a good housewife' for women – Avdela uses the individual 'crime stories' to highlight 'broader conceptions on social relationships, the family, gender relations, moral standing and decency' (p. 97) in post-civil war Greece. In the third chapter, the author turns her attention to the institutional actors at each trial: the prosecutors, the judges and the jury and their often antagonistic relations. By drawing her material mostly from legal journals and general content magazines, the author analyses the process through which lawyers, judges, criminologists and journalists have come to question the traditional code of honour – a family-based code that transforms any insult to any family member into an insult to its representatives in the public sphere: father, siblings and so on – invoked by perpetrators to justify their violent behaviour, as an anachronistic residue of a parochial era that does not befit a progressively more modernised (and 'individualistic') country. In this context, the attitudes and verdicts of jurors are gradually deemed as being too lenient towards the perpetrators. As a result of this criticism, the role of trial juries was curtailed during the 21 April Dictatorship (1967), which also changed the jury system of criminal law to a mixed court system. The final chapter sheds light on another category of 'official' discourse regarding 'honour'. Avdela analyses the Greek legal and scholarly debate that accompanied the validation of the New Penal Code of 1950, particularly the section that focused on so-called 'crimes against honour' (revilement, slander, defamation), as well as the scientific discourse of sociologists, anthropologists and social psychologists investigating the value system of Greek society and its transformation between 1950 and 1970. In doing so, the author is not so much interested in the truth-value of these analyses; by adopting a Foucauldian perspective (scientific discourse creates a web of power relations), Avdela treats these discourses as historical narratives that bear the stamp of their era and will lead to the construction of strong and resistant representations regarding the specificity of Greek society – representations that are still at play in many analyses of contemporary Greece.

All these discourses contributed to the complete delegitimisation of the traditional concept of honour. For the author, this demotion of the concept of honour and its dissociation from interpersonal violence represents a process that came from above, from the state's representatives and from the intellectual elite who tried to promote an 'authoritarian modernisation'[29] in post-civil war Greece, for the purpose of controlling social conflict and regulating violence at both political and family level. At the same time, this undermining from above was met and bolstered by other processes from below that were less systematic and controlled, in the context of the major changes that affected Greece in the 1950s and the 1960s, especially regarding the family and social relations with the new (and progressively Westernized) urban

[29] Unfortunately, the author does not clarify exactly what she means by 'authoritarian modernisation', a term that has been used to characterise policies pursued by regimes ranging from the Brazilian military junta of the 1960s and 70s, to Kemalist Turkey, or even Nazi Germany and Stalinism.

conditions of the period (at this stage, the author could have provided some clues as to these developments in the case of Greece). In order to bolster her analysis of the delegitimisation process of the traditional (and family-centred) concept of honour, Avdela broadens her frame of reference and draws on Greek songs and film of the 1960s. The author feels that film in particular captured many of the changes in post-civil war Greece: deconstruction of the old hierarchical relationships in the public and private spheres, presentation of new and perhaps contradictory ideals of manhood, presentation of non-conventional female behaviour that a decade before would have been deemed socially unacceptable.

Kostas Fountanopoulos's *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima sti Thessaloniki, 1908–1936. Ithiki oikonomia kai syllogiki drasi sto Mesopolemo* (Work and the labour movement in Thessalonica, 1908–1936: moral economy and collective action during the inter-war period) is a study of the labour movement in the city of Thessalonica during one of the more dramatic periods in the movement's history. Although they address different themes, Fountanopoulos and Avdela overlap on a number of issues. The question of the modernisation of Greek society from above is tackled in both books, and gender also plays a key role in the analyses offered by the two historians (moreover, on a number of occasions, Fountanopoulos actually casts a critical eye on Avdela's work[30]). Last but not least, the identity issue also straddles the two books.

Fountanopoulos's book, like Avdela's work, is the result of theoretically informed empirical research. On several occasions the author explicitly discusses questions of a methodological and theoretical nature and refers to the theses of a number of authors (without always convincing the reader of the relevance of the authors being quoted[31]). Of all the authors referred to by Fountanopoulos, one in particular has pride of place: E. P. Thompson, who coined the celebrated expression 'the moral economy',[32] which Fountanopoulos actually puts on the cover of his book. It is the author's determination to restore subjectivity to the subjects that he studies, namely their system of beliefs and values (pp. 17–18). This aspect undoubtedly lends originality to his work within the body of historiographical production dealing with

[30] On the relations between class and gender, for example, see pp. 185–6. Here, the author refers to the Greek-language version of Avdela's article, 'Classe, ethnicité et genre dans la Thessalonique post-ottomane', in idem, *Le genre entre classe*, 131–51.

[31] The reference (pp. 72–3) to Harry Braverman, *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974), for example is, in our opinion, ill-chosen. Braverman tackles certain subjects (scientific management, numerically controlled machine tools, etc.) that are absent from Fountanopoulos's field of research. Moreover, for Braverman, skill can be objectively evaluated and observed, whereas Fountanopoulos (p. 161 and ch. 2) sees skill as a socially constructed phenomenon (i.e., the main reason a given kind of work is regarded as 'skilled' or not has less to do with its 'objective' content than the worker's power to present to and to impose their work on other industrial actors as 'skilled'). In our opinion, Stephen Marglin – another 'radical' author – would complement Fountanopoulos's approach more precisely: Stephen A. Marglin, 'What Do Bosses Do? The Origins and Functions of Hierarchy in Capitalist Production', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 6, 2 (1974), 60–112.

[32] Antonis Liakos (who supervised Fountanopoulos's thesis, which forms the basis for this book) had already referred to Thompson in his own work. See, e.g., Antonis Liakos, *Ergasia kai politiki stin Ellada tou mesopolemou* (Athens: Idryma Erevnas kai Paideias tis Emporikis Trapezas tis Ellados, 1993), 93–4.

Greek workers, which is largely focused on the objective conditions of the working class (such as economic and social factors).[33]

Drawing inspiration from Thompson, Fountanopoulos considers working-class consciousness as a dynamic process of construction whose analysis involves three interacting levels, which the author terms 'empirical', 'cultural' and 'symbolic' (pp. 389–90). The division of labour into production sites, government policy, the attitude of employers to their employees, union employment policies, economic conditions, and individual and collective worker survival strategies all relate to the empirical level of class identity. The 'cultural level' essentially concerns what Thompson calls the 'moral economy', namely conceptions rooted in cultural traditions of how workers view their work and how work should be exercised and distributed in society. Finally, the third level, which embodies the lessons of the 'linguistic turn',[34] concerns the various symbolic practices (including discursive practices) whereby the working class gives meaning to and represents its experiences and which help to forge a sense of group unity. In particular, this level includes the vocabulary and arguments used by workers in their confrontations with other groups such as bosses and various representatives of the state.

Fountanopoulos uses this theoretical prism to interpret the multi-ethnic labour movement – with the tobacco workers at its vanguard – in Thessalonica in the inter-war period.[35] In the first part, the author contends that until the late 1920s at least, social antagonism between workers and employers mainly related to control of work process at production sites as well as to the definition of the modus operandi of the labour market. In the author's view, while employers essentially saw the work process in terms of hard economics (keeping production costs down), for workers – and particularly the most skilled among them – the manner in which they perceived work-related issues was a function of their own specific 'moral economy'. The author claims that this consisted of three separate components: first, the absence of a clear separation between 'work' and 'outside work' (the only thing that counts in the workers' opinion is the end product); second, the family-oriented nature of work

[33] This is true of economic historians who, within the larger framework of industrialisation in Greece, have debated a series of themes such as the ethnic and gender composition of the labour force, the cost of labour, salary levels, the seasonal nature of industrial work and so on (see above). It is also true of other researchers – mostly labour law specialists – who have focused on union rights, collective bargaining agreements and so on. See Antonis Liakos, 'I istoriografia tou ergatikou kinimatos', 161–70.

[34] Or rather 'lingustic turns' in the plural as Miles Taylor rightly points out in his 'The Linguistic Turns in British Social History', *Bollettino del diciannovesimo secolo*, 4 (1995), 5–13. Taylor stresses that British social historians have taken at least three linguistic turns: the 'culturalist' linguistic turn of E. P. Thompson, the 'contextualist' linguistic turn most closely identified with Gareth Stedman Jones, and the 'post-modernist' linguistic turn championed by Patrick Joyce. Fountanopoulos refers to all of these authors.

[35] The multi-ethnic character of this movement was reflected in the existence of several types of – 'mixed' and 'mono-ethnic' – professional association. Following the gradual departure of Muslims from the city between 1912 and 1925, Thessalonica was left with two ethnic communities, Greeks and Jews. See Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts: Christians, Muslims and Jews,1430–1950* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005).

(presence of all family members on the shop floor); and third a division of labour following a gender-based pattern.

After identifying the 'moral economy' of the workers of Thessalonica, the author looks at their collective forms of action over this period (strikes, street protests and union organisation). He contends that the strikes of the 1914–28 period were principally aimed at controlling the work process (as a means of tackling unemployment among other things) and were generally triggered when employers tried to change the existing rules of the game. Conversely, labour unrest between 1929 and 1936, when the dictator Ioannis Metaxas (1871–1941) came to power, was mainly caused by the economic crisis of the 1930s and the problem of unemployment. Labour-movement strategy during this period was targeted less on employers and more on the state. According to the workers' 'moral economy', it was the state's responsibility to provide acceptable living standards for its citizens, by protecting them from increases in the prices of subsistence goods fuelled by speculation, for example. The author makes a series of comments concerning the specific features of collective action during this period (which, as Fountanopoulos reminds us, often triggered state-sponsored violence that has now been largely forgotten).[36] Thus between 1914 and 1928, and more particularly during the 1922–28 period marked by the massive arrival of Greeks from Asia Minor and the exodus of the Turkish community, the strikes, which were designed to send a strong message to employers, were especially long. They reached their annual maximal intensity at a time when, from a labour-market perspective, the bargaining power of employers was considerably diminished. Conversely, strikes over the 1929–36 period were considerably shorter and fragmented over time as the purpose was mainly to send a strong political message to the state.

Thanks to his analysis of the labour-movement actions in inter-war Thessalonica, Fountanopoulos concludes that strikes are not merely an automatic result of established class consciousness but an activity whereby workers forge their identities through confrontation with other groups: the author contends that it is not union activity that causes strikes, but strikes that facilitate and encourage union activism (which was particularly intense in Thessalonica during this period.)[37] However, although very important, collective mobilisation is not enough in itself to forge a collective identity. As such, the role of language and an intellectual framework through which the working class perceives itself and gives a sense to its work experiences and struggles is also decisive. Fountanopoulos analyses the rhetoric used by the workers of the city to back up their claims. Both they and their union representatives happily invoked the principles enshrined in the bourgeois country's Constitution of time in order to thwart the action of the representatives of the state. Or they harked back

[36] Concerning state-sponsored violence see Mark Mazower, 'Violence and the State in the Twentieth Century', *American Historical Review*, 107 (2002), 1158–78, which deals with mass violence (genocide, ethnic cleansing, deportations); and Alain Dewerpe, *Charonne 8 février 1962. Anthropologie historique d'un massacre d'Etat* (Paris: Gallimard, 2006), which focuses on violence perpetrated by the state in representative democracies.

[37] There was also a very high rate of worker unionisation from a nationwide perspective: in 1919, seven out of ten workers in Thessalonica belonged to unions (p. 313).

to a past that they had in common with their adversaries. Consequently, the battle appeared to be waged more around gestures of 'appropriation' and a strategy of using the adversary's ideology against him than a frontal opposition between conflicting ideological systems.[38]

Thus, Fountanopoulos's book tackles a series of important and – within the Greek historiographical context – frequently original questions, and offers a number of answers based on the inter-war labour movement in Thessalonica. It is obligatory reading for any historian interested in the Greek labour movement as well as in the social history of the country in general. Nonetheless, as it covers a relatively long period (1908–36), adopts a broad perspective on the working community – from small production units to 'large' factories – and addresses a broad range of subjects affecting the city's working population, from the organisation of labour to different forms of collective protest: strikes, union action, street protests and the rhetoric employed by the labour movement, we believe that the book tackles some issues less successfully than others. So, for example, while the work process is accorded its due importance in understanding worker behaviour, the description of how work is organised in various different sectors is not as thorough as we may have wished (here we regret the absence of corporate archives as a source of information).[39] And, in the same vein, while Fountanopoulos's theoretical model stresses the importance of the adversary (employers, but also the state) for forging a working-class identity, his description of these actors in interaction with the labour movement is relatively simplistic. For example, who exactly were these representatives of the Greek state (works inspectors as well as other central government officials in Thessalonica, such as the chief of police) whose modernising zeal, in the author's opinion, frequently prevented them from fully understanding worker attitudes?

Among the many merits of Giannis Antoniou's book *Oi Ellines michanikoi. Thesmoi & Idees, 1900–1940* (Greek engineers: institutions and ideas, 1900–1940) is its focus on Greek engineers as a particular group of Greek modernisers. Avdela and Fountanopoulos evoke in their books other groups of modernisers (such as judges, journalists or factory inspectors), but do not make them the central focus of their work. Antoniou's book is currently also the only work devoted entirely to this professional group: up to now, Greek historians and sociologists have largely neglected the groups comprising the country's economic and social elite.[40]

[38] Concerning this phenomenon, for other (Greek and non-Greek) examples see, among others, Michael Herzfeld, *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State* (New York and London: Routledge, 2004).

[39] The organisation of work in Greek firms in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is a relatively neglected topic in general. Nevertheless, the reader may refer to Lida Papastefanaki, *Ergasia, technologia kai fylo stin Elliniki viomichania. I klostoÿfantourgia tou Peiraia, 1870–1940* (Herakleon: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2009), ch. 7 in particular.

[40] One can mention the work focused on Greek capitalists in the first half of the twentieth century by Aliki Vaxevanoglou, *Oi Ellines kefalaiouchoi, 1900–1940: koinoniki kai oikonomiki proseggisi* (Athens: Themelio, 1994). Probably because of their major role in national political developments, it is the military that have most attracted the attention of Greek researchers interested in professional groups. See Thanos Veremis, *The Military in Greek Politics: From Independence to Democracy* (London: Hurst, 1997), which also contains other relevant references.

The general subject matter of Antoniou's book is the national identity of Greek engineers, mainly during the inter-war era, although the period between the creation of the Greek state in 1832 to the beginning of the twentieth century is covered in a less detailed fashion in chapter 2. The author investigates both the 'objective' dimensions (demography, education, sectors of activity and the profession's organisational structure) and the corresponding 'subjective' dimensions of this identity, as they were formed through a spectrum of ideological representations of the role of Greek engineers and the profession's prospects in the country. By drawing on a multitude of sources (training institute archives, the technical press of the time, etc.), the book narrates the 'success story' of the 'professionalisation' of Greek engineers (although we feel that the author could here have made more use of the resources of the sociology of professions).

By the mid-nineteenth century, Greece counted just a few dozen engineers. They were mostly members of the army engineering corps (founded in 1829), but were used in all kinds of tasks and assignments carried out by central government authorities (such as roads, hydraulic and marine engineering works, city planning and public building projects). At that time, the Military School, founded in 1828, was the sole engineering training institute in Greece.[41] Less than one hundred years later, in 1941, the profession numbered about 3,000 (half of whom were civil engineers) (p. 307). Just as in the nineteenth century, the state was again the main employer of Greek engineers, through large public works projects. In fact, in 1934, about 43 per cent of engineers worked for the State – many in the Ministry of Transportation which was set up in 1914 – and for local government, 26 per cent worked on a freelance basis and only 4.5 per cent worked in industry (pp. 313–314).[42] And although one-third of these graduated from foreign technical schools (p. 308), the professional community already had its alma mater, the National Technical University of Athens (NTUA). The origins of this school date from 1837, when the Polytechnic School of Athens was established as a Sunday school for training workers and foremen in building techniques. In 1914–17, NTUA became the academic equal of the University of Athens, and between 1915 and 1940 about 2,000 engineers graduated from it (including the first sixteen female engineers[43]) (pp. 245–6), most of them of upper- and upper-middle-class origin; between 1929

[41] On Greek military engineers see Konstantinos Chatzis, 'Des ingénieurs militaires au service des civils: les officiers du Génie en Grèce au XIXe siècle', in Chatzis and Efthymios Nicolaïdis, eds., *Science, Technology and the Nineteenth Century State: The Role of the Army* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2003), 69–90; Fotini Assimacopoulou, Konstantinos Chatzis and Georgia Mavrogonatou, 'Implanter les "Ponts et Chaussées" européens en Grèce: le rôle des ingénieurs du corps du Génie, 1830–1880', *Quaderns d'Història de l'Enginyeria*, 10 (forthcoming).

[42] This limited presence can be explained by the two-tier structure of Greek industry during this period: a great number of small-scale, low-productivity industries with outdated technological equipment existed alongside the larger industrial units characteristic of the Second Industrial Revolution.

[43] On these female engineers see Konstantinos Chatzis and Efthymios Nicolaïdis, 'A Pyrrhic Victory: Greek Women's Conquest of a Profession in Crisis, 1923–1996', in Annie Canel, Ruth Oldenziel and Karin Zachmann, eds., *Crossing Boundaries, Building Bridges: Comparing the History of Women Engineers, 1870s–1990s* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 2000), 252–78, esp. 261–4.

and 1937, only 1.5 per cent of graduates came from a working-class background (p. 253). With the creation in 1923 of the Technical Chamber of Greece, a corporatist organisation where membership was obligatory and the profession's sole and exclusive representative, the engineering profession gained further momentum. Moreover, the Technical Chamber was the official technical consultant to the Greek state. The establishment of the Chamber paved the way for the official 'closure' of the profession at the beginning of the 1930s, thus securing it an elite social identity which has held fast in spite of the continual swelling of its ranks since the mid-nineteenth century.

The section that deals with the subjective components of Greek engineers' identities proves to be the most interesting part of Antoniou's book.[44] In his final chapter the author analyses the specific dominant ideological currents reflected in the public discourse of engineers during the inter-war era. During the early 1920s the profession laid claim to a hegemonic role for itself in the name of applied science and the ideology of rationalisation. Over the next decade, Greek engineers who continued to subscribe to ideas of rationalisation embarked on a quest for other ideologies to underpin their specific identity. Between 1931 and 1936, Nikolaos Kitsikis (1887–1978, re-elected unanimously as president of the Technical Chamber over a long period, professor at the NTUA and a deputy of the United Democratic Left after the Second World War) spoke passionately of the necessity of creating a 'technical state' run by engineers and other scientists. The suspension of parliament in 1936 by Ioannis Metaxas brought an end to the brief technocratic 'revolt' of Greek engineers, who were to produce a Greek version of reactionary modernism during the 1936–40 period, subordinating the technocratic ideal to the official ideology of the dictatorship (an ideological construct involving the idea of a linear continuity between ancient Greece, Byzantium and Christian Orthodoxy, and the modern Greek nation-state).[45] Thanks to the author's research – which we can associate with another recent study on the reception given to the 'technocratic ideal' by other sections of Greek society – the intellectual and political landscape during the inter-war period appears richer than that previously depicted by existing research, which focused on the great clashes between monarchists and Venizelists (after the Greek politician Eleftherios Kyriákou Venizelos, 1864–1936), or between the communists and the bourgeoisie.[46]

Antoniou's book is the first major work devoted to Greek engineers over the 1832–1940 period and calls for further study. For example, although the main activities in which Greek engineers were involved have been identified by the author, a systematic assessment of their actions within each field requires further work. Similarly, although it is now well established that the Greek engineering community never lost touch

[44] See also in English Yiannis Antoniou, Michalis Assimakopoulos and Konstantinos Chatzis, 'The National Identity of Inter-war Greek Engineers: Elitism, Rationalization, Technocracy, and Reactionary Modernism', *History and Technology*, 23, 3 (2007), 241–61.

[45] Jeffrey Herf, *Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture, and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich* (Cambridge University Press, 1984).

[46] Vasilis Vogiatzis, 'Epistimoniko ideodes kai dianoïtikes oikeiopoiiseis tis technologias ston Elliniko mesopolemo (E. Venizelos, I. Metaxas, G. Theotokas, D. Glinos – 'Archeion Philosofias')', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Athens, 2009.

with what was happening in advanced Western countries, the actual manner in which they imported foreign experience into the areas of training, practice, professional organisation or ideology, and assimilated, reinterpreted and adapted these in the Greek context also requires further work. And, as we wait for such research to be carried out, we can only praise Antoniou's book which, apart from its solid depiction of the Greek engineering world, also has the merit of helping to deconstruct a number of stereotypes concerning Greece during the inter-war period.

A plea for more comparisons and 'cross-national' histories

In concluding this review essay, we should like to present several more personal reflections that lie at the juncture of the books reviewed here and our own current research preoccupations. We have seen how several Greek historians and historical sociologists in the 1970s and 1980s began comparing – either explicitly or as a sort of backdrop – the trajectory of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Greece with that of the developed West and outlined a whole range of absences and distortions concerning the Greek case. But we have also seen how more recent studies – sometimes carried out by the same researchers, but later in their careers – questioned these differences by contributing new (and more reliable) empirical data and by highlighting certain biases that made some of the findings based on the initial comparisons just a little tenuous.

Despite the problems with these early works that attempted to compare modern Greece with the developed West, we still feel that comparison remains an essential tool for gaining a better understanding of Greek history.[47] The three works discussed here, which remain essentially Helleno-centric, may help us to push the comparison process further and to broaden the scope of comparison. First, we are not obliged to compare Greece with Western countries only.[48] Nor do comparisons have to be confined to the national macro-level or to overarching social and economic structures. 'Contrasting' (as opposed to 'unifying') comparisons – that is, those comparisons that seek and explain differences – need not be the sole objective of comparative analysis.[49] Lastly, it is possible for the units of comparison to be of a very diverse nature and straddle

[47] Such 'defects' in comparative analysis are far from being a purely Greek phenomenon. See, e.g., the remarks by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt in his essay 'Comparative History – a Contested Method', *Historisk Tidskrift*, 127 (2007), 697–714, and John Breuilly, 'Introduction: making comparisons in history', in Breully, *Labour and Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Essays in Comparative History* (Manchester University Press, 1992), 1–25.

[48] Here we should mention three recent works that focus on the Greece–Turkey tandem: Faruk Birtek and Thalia Dragonas, eds., *Citizenship and the Nation-State in Greece and Turkey* (London: Routledge, 2005); Anna Frangoudaki and Caglar Keyder, eds., *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey: Encounters with Europe, 1850–1950* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2007); Umut Ozkirimli and Spyro R. Sofos, *Tormented by History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008). We should also mention Gerasimos Augustinos, ed., *Diverse Paths to Modernity in Southeastern Europe: Essays in National Development* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991).

[49] For a typology and discussion of different types of comparison, see, among others, A. A. van den Braembussche, 'Historical Explanation and Comparative Method: Towards a Theory of the History of Society', *History and Theory*, 28 (1989), 1–24.

several spatial and temporal 'scales'.[50] With regard to the topics of the three books discussed here, we could imagine, for example, comparative studies of the labour movement in different cities (Greek and non-Greek); of the professionalisation of the engineering communities in Greece and elsewhere; or an analysis of temporally circumscribed phenomena such as a civil war and its aftermath.[51] Including meso- and micro- levels in comparative historical analysis offers the opportunity to obtain more context-sensitive analyses as well as taking into account the perspectives of those who actually experienced and took part in the particular phenomena under comparison. In particular, we note that the realm of ideas, meanings and behaviour can actually constitute the object of comparative analysis: take a study of 'honour crimes' and their development in various urban contexts, for example.

The three works analysed here also encourage us to envisage for Greece in the twentieth century what one might call a cross-national kind of history that would sit alongside or work in tandem with a comparative approach *stricto sensu*.[52] Such an approach would put the emphasis on the links of interdependence and the interactions existing between Greek and non-Greek entities to be studied together within larger entities that transcend national borders.[53] For example, through which channels did

[50] Concerning the objectives and different ways of practising comparative analysis, see Breuilly, 'Introduction: making comparisons'; *Historisk Tidskrift*, 127 (2007), special issue; Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor, eds., *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-national Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

[51] For a comparative analysis of the Greek and Spanish civil wars see Stathis Kalyvas, 'How Not to Compare Civil Wars: Greece and Spain', in Martin Baumeister and Stephanie Schüler-Springorum, eds., *'If You Tolerate This . . .': The Spanish Civil War in the Age of Total War* (Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag, 2008), 247–63. We should note that the Greek civil war currently constitutes one of the most dynamic areas of Greek historiography. See, for instance, the two recent compilations in English: Mark Mazower, ed., *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943–1960* (Princeton University Press, 2000); Philip Carabott and Thanasis Sfikas, eds., *The Greek Civil War: Essays on a Conflict of Exceptionalism and Silences* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

[52] Under the heading of 'cross-national' we include a number of approaches which, in spite of their differences, give due emphasis to circulations and connections ('transnational history', 'connected history', '*histoire croisée*', '*Transfergeschichte*'). Comparative and 'cross-national' analyses are sometimes presented as being somewhat antagonistic. We subscribe to the 'conciliatory' theses of Jürgen Kocka, who advocates combining both approaches. See Jürgen Kocka, 'Comparison and Beyond', *History and Theory*, 42 (2003), 39–44. For a discussion on comparative history and 'cross-national' history and the relations between the two, see the references in note 52 and the following books and articles: Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, eds., *De la comparaison à l'histoire croisée* (Paris: Seuil, 2004); Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier, eds., *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives* (New York: Berghahn Books, forthcoming).

[53] 'Cross-national' history is not totally foreign to Greek historians, particularly those focusing on migration. See, e.g., the essays on this topic published in *Sygchrona Themata*, no. 92, January–March 2006, 21–86. And, even if it is not intended as such, Liakos, *Ergasia kai politiki*, may be read as a contribution to the history of a transnational institution, the International Labour Organisation (one may consult the online proceedings from the conference 'Transnational Social Policies: Reformist Networks and the International Labour Organisation, 1900–2000', Geneva, 7–9 May 2009). The same is true of the book by Giorgos Stathakis on the Marshall Plan in Greece: *To dogma Truman kai to schedio Marshall. I istoria tis Amerikanikis voïtheias stin Ellada* (Athens: Vivliorama, 2004). Concerning the Marshall Plan as a subject of transnational analysis, see, e.g., Sheryl Kroen, 'Negotiations with

the different versions of the technocratic ideal, which was clearly a transnational reality in the inter-war period, arrive and take root in Greece? What sort of relations did the Greek 'modernisers' who figure in the works by Fountanopoulos, Avdela and Antoniou have with the 'modernisers' of other nations?

Not least, we should note that by circumscribing the Greek case in a tight network of comparisons and placing it in a larger space in which different kinds of circulations (of men, ideas, objects, institutions) are at work, we may hope that in addition to improving our understanding of the history of modern Greece, Greek historiography will actually be able to conduct a more effective dialogue with other national historiographies around transnational topics.[54]

the American Way: The Consumer and the Social Contract in Post-war Europe', in John Brewer and Frank Trentmann, eds., *Consuming Cultures, Global Perspectives: Historical Trajectories, Transnational Exchanges* (Oxford: Berg, 2006), ch. 10. The authors of this review essay have also sought to adopt a 'cross-national' perspective on Greece in a number of their publications; see, e.g., Konstantinos Chatzis and Georgia Mavrogonatou, 'Eaux de Paris, eaux d'Athènes, 1830–1930: histoires croisées d'un réseau urbain', *Almagest* (forthcoming); see also F. Assimacopoulou et al., 'Implanter les "Ponts et Chaussées"'; Konstantinos Chatzis, 'Ecrire les sciences de l'ingénieur en grec: autour de deux livres pionniers en matière de technologie antisismique', *Etudes Balkaniques*, 43, 2 (2007), 111–124; Konstantinos Chatzis, '"Sous les yeux de l'Occident": Statistiques et intégration européenne au XIXe siècle, l'exemple de la Grèce', *Histoire & Sociétés*, no. 21, March 2007, 8–17.

[54] Concerning the relations between Greek and other national historiographies, see, among others, the reflections by Thomas Gallant, 'Greek Exceptionalism and Contemporary Historiography: New Pitfalls and Old Debates', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 15, 2 (1997), 209–16. Concerning the national historiography of another 'peripheral' country, Portugal, see Mafalda Soares da Cunha and Pedro Cardim, 'From Periphery to Centre: The Internationalisation of the Historiography of Portugal', *Historisk Tidskrift*, 127 (2007), 643–57.