

Gender in modern Greek historiography

Papadogiannis, Nikolaos

Historein. A review of the past and other stories

Published: 01/01/2017

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Papadogiannis, N. (2017). Gender in modern Greek historiography. *Historein. A review of the past and other stories*, 16(1-2), 74-101.

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Gender in modern Greek historiography

Nikolaos Papadogiannis

ABSTRACT

This article analyses the emergence and development of the study of gender in modern Greek historiography in the broader sense, exploring works that incorporate, even to an extent, the factor of gender. It shows that despite the manifold barriers that gender historians have faced, there is a slow but steady process of diffusion of gender in modern Greek historiography in general. The article also shows that historical research on gender relations in Greece initially focused on the study of women, historicising, however, their relations with men. Thus, in line with what Kantsa and Papataxiarchis argue about relevant scholarship at the international level, no linear transition from the study of women to the examination of gender relations occurred in modern Greek historiography. What has transpired, however, in the last two decades is that relevant historiography has gradually broadened to encompass a more systematic analysis of the (re)making of masculinities. It has also been enriched by the study of the intersection of gender and age as well as of transnational flows and their impact on gender, tendencies somewhat neglected in other reviews of the study of gender in Greek historiography.

1) Introduction

Historian Rüdiger Hachtmann has recently described the history of tourism in Germany as a “small wallflower with future”.¹ He wishes to stress its remarkable potential to develop further, but also the difficulties that scholars engaging with it face. This metaphor, in my opinion, also beautifully demonstrates the condition of gender history in Greece, especially given its capacity to further help reconsider deeply entrenched assumptions in historiography.

This article analyses the diverse and shifting approaches to gender in the historiography of modern Greece, a term which is used interchangeably in the article with modern Greek historiography. I need to offer some clarifications, however, concerning the scope of my analysis. The article addresses historians who were at a point linked with the Greek academia, either as students or members of staff, but also ones who might have worked on the history of Greece in the late modern era, while being based in non-Greek academic environments. In so doing, the article addresses works in which Greece is the or one of the considered case-studies. This body of

literature addresses either Greece a context where shifting gender relations have unfolded or representations of Greece/Greekness and their gender connotations. Greek Diasporic identities are also part of the analyses I take into account, as long as they have been studied in relation to gender. However, I probe the extent to and the ways in which historians who have dealt with them regard them as part of the history of modern Greece. In dealing with these settings, I concentrate on the late modern era, namely from the late 18th century on: I do not regard the modern Greek state as well as the Greek national identities that emerged in this period as a continuation of politics and identities that had existed beforehand.

Moreover, given the interdisciplinary character of many works addressing gender, it is quite challenging to clearly discern which of those fall squarely into the category of historical research. I have thus tried to follow a broad understanding of the latter concept and include the works of all those scholars who describe themselves also as historians. Nevertheless, the article tries to illuminate the extent and the ways in which interdisciplinary debates have affected their work. Furthermore, since the works analysed here do not fit neatly into a women's/gender history dichotomy, as I mention below in detail, I use the more inclusive term "gender history" for all of them, highlighting, simultaneously, whether relevant works focus on women. Finally, the article refers to the entirety of historical research that considers gender, regardless of whether the latter plays the central or a peripheral role in these analyses. In so doing, it considers published monographs, edited volumes, journal articles and book chapters. Moreover, it refers to a few unpublished PhD and MA theses that have made a signal contribution, in my opinion, to the study of modern Greece from the perspective of gender.

The article extensively draws on the arguments put forth in older and really illuminating reviews of gender in Greek historiography, authored by Efi Avdela as well as by Eleni Fournaraki and Yannis Yannitsiotis.² Resonating particularly with Avdela, it demonstrates that the study of gender in Greek historiography has extensively dealt with middle-class women and female labour.³ The article wishes to complement these analyses, however. It discusses thoroughly relevant studies that have seen print since the articles of Avdela, Fournaraki and Yannitsiotis were

published. Moreover, these reviews do not expand to historical research on modern Greece that considers gender, but which was not produced in Greece. In considering these additional works and in re-assessing the ones addressed by Avdela, Fournaraki and Yannitsiotis, this article aims to make a contribution by analysing in more detail the ways in which the scope of gender history research dealing with Greece has expanded in the last decades: it shows in particular that gender is growingly examined in modern Greek historiography in interplay not only with social class, but also with age, a parameter that is not addressed in the aforementioned reviews. Moreover, while Avdela pointedly remarks that historical research has neglected family relations in rural Greece,⁴ I wish to demonstrate that this condition has started changing: modern Greek historiography dealing with gender has recently and slowly started exploring contexts beyond urban centres, such as small provincial towns and rural areas. Moreover, in slightly disagreeing with Avdela that very few works on gender history written in Greece take a transnational perspective,⁵ this article argues that there is a clear increase in transnational approaches to historical research on modern Greece that considers gender.

The article proceeds in five steps. It first briefly addresses the importance that has been assigned to the study of gender in modern Greek historiography. It then proceeds to examine the ways in which gender has been studied from the perspective of social sciences and humanities internationally, also probing the echoes of such shifting approaches to research on Greece. The next three sections analyse developments in the main themes addressed by modern Greek historiography dealing with gender. The third section focuses on the study of the middle-class from the perspective of gender. The next section addresses another main element of gender history from its inception in modern Greek historiography: the interest in labour relations. Similar to the previous section, it demonstrates the shifting approaches to female labour by gender historians up to the present. The following section addresses two recent developments: the expansion of the scope of gender in modern Greek historiography beyond urban centres and, thus, beyond the middle and the working class; and its growing interest in the intersection of gender and age.

2) The importance assigned to gender in modern Greek historiography

The first books on the history of gender were authored in Greece already in the 19th century.⁶ The emergence of historical research on gender in the framework of modern Greek historiography is indelibly linked with the Feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s. At that point, several Feminist magazines and student groups appeared: Autonomy was a rallying cry for them, conceptualised as developing collective action clearly distinct from Party politics. *Σκούπα* [Broom] and *Σφίγγα* were among those magazines, which, however, in general proved to be short-lived. Feminist work was also published by the *Εκδοτική Ομάδα Γυναικών* [Women's Publishing Group] as well as in the journal *Δίνη* [Whirlpool, published between 1986 and 2005]. Feminist student groups were created at numerous academic units in Athens, such as at the Law, Philosophy and Agriculture schools of the University of Athens, as well as at its departments of Medicine and Biology. In November 1980, the House of Autonomous Groups and the autonomous Feminist movement continued to be active until the mid-1980s.⁷ Most autonomous Feminists were university students or alumnae, some of which had studied abroad. Some of those autonomous Feminists, such as Efi Avdela and Angelika Psarra, who have played a prominent role in the study of gender in modern Greek historiography, studied in France and were influenced not only by the women's liberation movement, but also the academic environment there.⁸

The 1970s and 1980s were an era that witnessed significant changes in modern Greek historiography in general. This condition should be attributed to developments in research on Greece in general and Greek historiography in particular from the collapse of the Greek military junta in 1974. What followed was a proliferation of studies by historians and social scientists, whose main theme was what they viewed as Greece's particular encounter with modernity, namely one which differed from what had been transpiring in the rest of Europe.⁹ Such publications, which appeared in the 1970s and 1980s, included the work of scholars, such as sociologists Constantinos Tsoukalas and Nicos Mouzelis as well as historian Giorgos Dertilis.¹⁰ Some main points that appeared in these publications were the following: the adoption of the "centre-(semi)periphery" scheme, which some of these scholars employed to prove the dependence of Greece on advanced industrialised societies; the thesis that no significant industrialisation occurred in Greece in comparison to other

European countries, which resulted in no clear demarcation of social class boundaries, at least in the 19th century; and the extensive use of the notion of clientelism¹¹, which such works depicted as the main path through which the rural masses accessed the bureaucratic mechanisms of the state.¹² Overall, while these scholars did not always agree in the specific concepts they used and the particular conclusions they reached, they believed that Greece's path to modernity was marked by "absences" and "distortions".¹³

The 1980s also witnessed the emergence and rise in prominence of a tendency in modern Greek historiography, namely "new history", which addressed this purported "distorted" manifestation of modernity as well.¹⁴ Historians subscribing to this approach delved into economic history, aiming to closely examine financial structures, such as those purportedly impeding industrialisation. Nevertheless, in contrast with the aforementioned scholars, such as Tsoukalas and Mouzelis, the work of an advocate of "new history", Christos Hadjiiosif, stressed the social divisions and the concomitant conflicts existing in the Greek urban centres and in the countryside in the 19th and the 20th century.¹⁵ Environments where "new history" flourished were research centres funded by the National Bank of Greece and the Commercial Bank of Greece as well as of new universities that were founded in the periphery of Greece during the 1980s.¹⁶

The relationship between gender history and "new history" may be described as a difficult one: In the gaining momentum in Greek academia paradigm of "new history", gender appeared of secondary importance.¹⁷ As a result, the rising prominence of this paradigm contributed to its marginalisation at the Greek universities. Quite tellingly, between 1985 and 1995, six books on gender history were published by scholarly institutions, which were not, however, formally linked with Greek universities.¹⁸ Nevertheless, the production of "new" and gender history were not mutually exclusive: An article of Avdela on gender history appeared in a volume co-edited by Hadjiiosif on bourgeois modernisation in early 20th century Greece.¹⁹ Moreover, some of the aforementioned institutions that published works on gender history, such as the *Ιδρυμα Έρευνας και Παιδείας της Εμπορικής Τράπεζας της*

Ελλάδος [Research and Education Institute of the Commercial Bank of Greece], also promoted “new history”.

The 1990s heralded an era of stagnation for the study of gender in modern Greek historiography. This was particularly linked with the fact that several of the aforementioned institutions that also supported historical research on gender closed down. Nevertheless, this stagnation began to be reversed by the end of the decade: gender has been attracting increasing attention in modern Greek historiography, a process that has continued in the 2000s and the 2010s. In particular, the number of publications dealing exclusively or to an extent with gender history has significantly increased since then. The same applies to PhD dissertations taking the perspective of gender history.²⁰ In addition, chapters dedicated to gender history, according to Fournaraki and Yannitsiotis, have been appearing in “so-called general historical works”.²¹ The establishment of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes dealing with gender history in the Greek academia has certainly contributed to this diffusion. One such is the EU-funded interdisciplinary MA program “Women and Genders: Anthropological and Historical Approaches” of the Department of Social Anthropology and History at the University of the Aegean. In the meantime, the creation in 2007 of the Greek National Committee of the International Federation for Research in Women’s History (IFRWH) has further encouraged the study of gender in modern Greek historiography: for instance, it organized the first conference ever held in Greece that was dedicated to gender history.²²

This tendency has been assessed in different ways, though: according to Avdela, gender is still largely assigned a marginal position in modern Greek historiography.²³ By contrast, Fournaraki and Yannitsiotis claim that a “dynamic process of *diffusion* of women’s and gender history in [Greek] historiographical production as a whole” has transpired from the end of the 1990s. Indeed, the study of gender has been helping reconsider the historical research on a growing number of topics in modern Greek historiography; testament to this is that gender is used as an analytical category in studies which are not primarily presented as gender history, as shown in the following sections in detail. Nevertheless, there are still limits to this diffusion. I would concur with Avdela that it is cultural historians that aim to render their work more complex

by taking gender into account, as made clear in the following three sections of this article. Several historiographical fields seem to largely ignore gender representations and practices. A prominent case in point is diplomatic history. While a new diplomatic history has emerged in “Western” academic environments, which aims to consider, among others, the allocation of gender roles among policymakers as well as how gendered stereotypes and assumptions influenced their decisions, such reflection has not made headway in modern Greek historiography.²⁴ Similarly, with the exception of the work of Margaret Poulos, which is mentioned below, military history has mostly neglected gender in Greek historiography. Therefore, the aim of gender historians dealing with Greece to demonstrate that gender is an analytical category that can be used to approach all topics and fields in history is far from constituting a widely held assumption among historians.²⁵

The article shall now turn to examine the concrete ways in which gender has been studied in international historiography and whether and the extent to which such endeavours have affected modern Greek historiography.

3) From women to gender and beyond in international scholarship

During the 1960s and 1970s, women’s history gained momentum in the “West”, being linked with the diffuse radicalism of that era, especially with the women’s liberation movement.²⁶ The roles assigned to women in modern “Western” societies had been linked with biological characteristics; thus, the dominant view in the “West” portrayed their identity as uniform regardless of specific context and era. History was confined to the action of men. Women’s history, by contrast, aimed to challenge these assumptions by rendering women visible historical subjects. Its point of departure was to shed light onto the experiences that women shared.²⁷

While women’s history has followed several paths, it has largely pivoted in Britain, the USA, Italy and France around the metaphor of the separate spheres. Caroll Smith-Rosenberg’s essay entitled “The Female World of Love and Ritual” proved to be really influential for this field. Smith-Rosenberg claimed that the acute distinction of gender roles in the USA during the 19th century led to the emergence of a homosocial female world. US American historians, such as Nancy Cott, built on this idea and

argued that a separated domestic female sphere was the site of Feminist identity making.²⁸ The separate spheres metaphor continued to influence various historians even in the 1990s and 2000s, remaining to be particularly popular among Italian and German Feminist historians.²⁹

The body of scholarship pivoting around “women’s culture” sometimes reverted to ahistorical and essentialised notions of gender, reproducing binary distinctions between “men” and “women”, approaching their relations in a static way and utilising different categories and asking different questions for each. Despite the enduring popularity of the separate spheres metaphor and the “women’s culture” argument among some Feminist scholars, however, historians have growingly dealt from the late 1980s onwards with gender relations rather the history of women. Gender historians increasingly focused on the discursive and shifting constructions of femininity in relation to masculinity. They probed the mechanisms that shaped and reproduced gender difference.³⁰ In adopting such an approach, some gender historians were influenced by post-structuralism and the so-called “linguistic turn”. Those historians aimed to challenge “grand narratives” that approached femininity as a fixed position and underplayed the diverse and shifting meanings attached to gender. A prominent case in point is Joan Wallach Scott. In her pathbreaking article “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis”, authored in 1986, she claims that historians should place emphasis on “how the subjective and collective meanings of women and men as categories of identity have been constructed”. In this vein, she stresses the need to situate “gender” in a broader context with regard to issues of power, scrutinising how gender was constructed in and affected by economic and political institutions. Her definition of gender thereby encompassed four interrelated elements: symbolic representations; normative concepts; political and social institutions; and subjective identity.³¹ Philosopher and gender theorist Judith Butler has also been a pioneer of the combination of Feminism and post-structuralism. In her book *Gender Trouble*, which has been influential among historians as well, she argues against the distinction between (biological) sex and (cultural) gender, claiming that sex is yet another cultural construction.³²

The transition from women's to gender history was also facilitated by research that addresses masculinities in relation to femininities. The work of sociologist R. Connell has been trendsetting in this sense since the 1980s. Connell has been constantly revising her approach to gender and she published alongside James Messerschmidt relatively recently an updated outline for a comprehensive approach to masculinities, where she incorporates some of the criticism that has been voiced against her work. In this outline they argue that the model of hegemonic (and complicit) masculinities is formulated in tandem with desirable or "emphasised femininities", in opposition to subordinated masculinities.³³ They stress that "hegemonic masculinity" should not be approached in a "statistical sense"³⁴, nor as a fixed notion, but rather as a malleable one, to which contribute, among other factors, the women's liberation movement, the emergence of models of "managerial masculinity" and intergenerational conflicts in migrant communities. From the late 1980s-early 1990s on, historians have also shown growing interest in the making of masculinities.³⁵

Meanwhile, gay and lesbian history also began to develop in the late 1970s and early 1980s due to the activity of the homosexual liberation movement and the growing academic interest in the history of sexuality.³⁶ As the 1980s progressed, relevant research began to question whether it makes sense to refer to "gays" and/or "lesbians" prior to the creation of communities or the emergence of individuals that employed those terms. Treating such an approach as "ahistorical", a growing number of scholars, at least in North America and Western Europe, have begun to probe the complex ways in which sexuality and gender are performed, how homosexuality is produced as deviant and how the normative discourses lambasting homosexuality have been resisted. In this vein, they have scrutinised whether homoerotic sexual behaviour was necessarily tantamount to a single (homo)sexual identity. Challenging this assumption, Martha Vicinus, expert at English, Women's Studies and History, examines educated Anglo-American women that developed erotic friendship with other women, while often flirting with men as well, between 1778 and 1928.³⁷ Vicinus argues that these women "fashioned recognisable sexual identities". She thus seeks to uncover their "complex identifications, embedded in class, national and racial associations".³⁸ Other scholars who critically interrogate what they view as "ahistorical" approaches to the terms "gay" and "lesbian" have stressed the need to

construe such identities not only as complex, but also as unstable. They tend to be influenced by post-structuralism and, especially, the work of Judith Butler, usually defining themselves as subscribing to “queer theory”.³⁹ In any case, the relationship between developments in gender history and in the study of gay, lesbian and queer subjects is complex: historian Jeanne Boydston claims that, despite her intentions, Scott did not avoid conceptualizing gender as a set of fixed oppositional categories, juxtaposing men to women. Thus, Scott, according to Boydston, failed to pave the way for the study of subjects with gender identities that do not fit neatly into the male versus female taxonomy.⁴⁰

“Gender”, as defined by historians in the 1980s, has come under fire for another reason as well: In trying to render their work more nuanced, gender historians have also addressed the interweavings of gender, social class and race from the mid-to-late 1980s.⁴¹ Nevertheless, some of their fundamental propositions at that point appeared to undermine this aim. In particular, as Boydston aptly remarks, by arguing that “gender is a primary way of signifying relations of power”, Joan Scott “virtually ruled out (as naive) distinctions between male and female that might not be about this kind of differentialising power”.⁴² The issue whether gender is necessarily a primary principle of social classification was particularly propelled into the limelight by Feminists who were “women of colour”. Such scholars argued that the “Western” Feminist vision, which informed women’s history as well, was too narrow to analyse the status of women of colour in the “West” as well as the oppression of women in the Third World. Some of them went further to challenge whether women’s oppression may necessarily be associated with gender.⁴³ In this vein, they stressed the importance of “race” as a system of meaning based on and reproducing power relations.

Overall, the ways in which historians in the “West” have been approaching gender have been diversifying since the 1980s. In assessing this process, historian Sue Morgan has argued that relevant historians have shifted from a history of subjects (namely women) to a history of (gender) relations.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, it might to an extent be inaccurate to discern such a linear transition in international historiography and in the humanities in general, as anthropologists Venetia Kantsa and Evthymios

Papataxiarchis aptly remark. An acute distinction between women's and gender history would obscure the fact that the several methodological concerns voiced by scholars analysing gender actually date back to research on women in the 1970s.⁴⁵

All the aforementioned shifting approaches to gender at the international level have influenced several fields of the humanities and the social sciences in Greece, but in different ways and to a different extent. According to a categorisation offered by Kantsa and Papataxiarchis, social sciences and humanities in Greece can be classified into three categories, according to their approach towards gender. Kantsa and Papataxiarchis argue that in the fields of sociology of education, political science and economics (especially in relation to work), scholars in Greece continue analyse "women", neglecting all efforts to de-essentialise conceptualisations of gender that have developed internationally since the 1980s. In the fields of linguistics, psychology and architecture, only a limited number of scholars show keen interest in gender. Finally, historians and social/cultural anthropologists have been receptive of shifting developments towards gender at an international level.⁴⁶ The article shall now turn to modern Greek historiography that has considered gender from the 1980s on, showing in detail the topics it has dealt with as well as its methodological approaches. It will show the extent to and the ways in which those historians have been affected by shifting approaches to gender in the "West".

4) Gender and the middle class

The first works on gender history in modern Greek historiography focused on women as subjects of history, studying the action of specific individuals or groups of women. Nevertheless, in contrast with what Morgan argues and lending support to Kantsa's and Papataxiarchis's assertion, this was no history of subjects as opposed to a history of relations: The initial approaches to gender in modern Greek historiography considered, simultaneously, the (re)shaping of the relations between women and men. In this respect, the study of the interconnections between gender and social class has been a leitmotiv in the work of gender historians studying modern Greece from the 1980s on. Gender historians working on Greece in the 1980s evinced significant interest in the gender and social class identities of what could broadly understood as middle-class women and their activity in the second half of the 19th century as well

as in the first four decades of the 20th century. Those gender historians introduced a novelty in the study of the middle class in modern Greek historiography in general, namely the examination of practices that shaped middle-class subjects in Greece.⁴⁷

In embracing such a perspective, a number of ground-breaking historical analyses of gender explored individual and collective subjects involved in women's protest. Noteworthy in this respect is the work of Eleni Varikas. Varikas shared the aim of the Feminists of the 1970s and 1980s to demonstrate that the women's subordination to man appeared in specific social cultural contexts and was not bereft of contestation. In this sense, her seminal work entitled *Η Εξέγερση των Κυριών* [The rebellion of ladies], which was first published in 1987 by the *Ίδρυμα Έρευνας και Παιδείας της Εμπορικής Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος* addresses women's mass mobilisation in Greece between 1833 and 1907, focusing particularly on the era from the 1870s on. Two questions figure prominently in her analysis: first, whether the emergence of Feminism in 19th century Greece was merely the outcome of mimesis of trends flourishing elsewhere in the "West" or whether it should be attributed to domestic factors. Given the fact that the women's liberation movement of the 1970s and 1980s in Greece was accused by its opponents of simply imitating foreign trends, Varikas was keen on clarifying that this was not the case, not just for the Greek Feminists of that era, but also for those of the late 19th and early 20th century. The second issue that Varikas stresses is associated with a divergence between Greek Feminists of the late 19th century and of the subsequent decades: how was it possible that the former managed to employ an ardently nationalist rhetoric, while subscribing to an internationalist Feminist cause?

In this work, Varikas probes how women developed gender consciousness. Avoiding a narrow interpretation of Marxism, she does not seek to discern types of "false consciousness" as opposed to the Feminist one. By contrast, she seeks to analyse how women made sense of their gendered experience. In a sense, her way of approaching "consciousness" resembles the concept of "identity". Her analysis particularly highlights the doctrine of equality in difference, which middle-class men formulated in the mid-to-late 19th century. This drew on two assumptions: the first was that men and women were essentially different in biological terms, which, however, also

affected their behaviour in general. In this allocation of roles, femininity was linked with emotion. The second assumption rested on a separation of the “public” from the “private” sphere, confining women to tasks associated with the latter. In this vein, women were not officially proclaimed to be inferior to men, but merely different, although such difference was certainly not free from gender hierarchies: Positions of power were reserved only for men. Still, women were expected to play a pivotal role in Greek society: they were assigned the duty to nurture the male patriots and fighters whom the dominant irredentist Grand Idea expected to “liberate” Greek lands from foreign rule. Women were supposed to accomplish this task as mothers: it was becoming growing legitimate for middle-class women to engage in specific activities in the “public sphere”, which were regarded as extensions of their maternal role, namely of what they did in the “private sphere”: they could become teachers or philanthropists, contributing through such activities to the instilling of patriotic ideals or to curing men who had taken part in wars against enemies of the nation, such as in 1897. In this respect, Varikas’s book is also original for shining light on political activity before women were granted voting rights in Greece. Varikas has also enriched mainstream political history in Greece by analysing forms of political activity that the latter, which has focused on political parties and workers’ protests, has neglected.⁴⁸

Quite crucially, Varikas shows that several middle-class women appreciated this equality in difference doctrine and developed a form of gender consciousness which drew on it: they took pride on being competent mothers, teachers and philanthropists and sought to increase their social status through such activities. A small segment of middle-class women developed a particular gender consciousness, namely a Feminist one, whose relationship to the equality in difference notion was far more complicated. Those women stressed “women’s” values, reproducing to an extent the roles that the equality in difference doctrine assigned to women. Nevertheless and in contrast with this doctrine, they also put emphasis on equality rather than difference from men, an equality that was based on human rights. The *Εφημερίς των Κυριών* [Ladies’ newspaper] and its editor, Callirhoe Parren, featured prominently in this first manifestation of Feminism in Greece.

Historical research on gender that has been published since the late 1990s largely builds on the aforementioned book, while also expanding their scope in several ways. In general, the link between nationalism and the making of middle-class women has been a topic that has figured prominently in gender history since the 1980s.⁴⁹ The same applies to the issue of education of middle-class women.⁵⁰ Moreover, from the 2000s onwards historical works that touch upon gender and the middle class have explored sport, often in relation to nationalist visions.⁵¹

What has also been gaining ground in the examination of gender in modern Greek historiography is a transnational approach to the history of Greek middle-class women. Notable in this sense is the recent work of Evrydiki Sifneos, Despoina Vlami, Angelika Psarra, Efi Kanner and Haris Exertzoglou. Sifneos and Vlami form part of an approach to Greek Diaspora that has gained momentum since the 2000s: no longer emphasising the ties of the Diaspora with its country of origin, advocates of this new trend focus on its relationship with the host society.⁵² Sifneou and Vlami have probed the merchant Diaspora, analysing interconnections between gender and class. Sifneou analyses communities residing in the Sea of Azov.⁵³ Vlami addresses middle-class women of the Greek trading Diaspora in the 18th and 19th century, focusing on those who lived in Livorno.⁵⁴ This is one of the few works referring to gender and the middle class also about the era prior to 1850. Vlami does not explore women that were involved in collective action. Rather, she analyses the intersection between gender, social class and ethnicity as well as the sociality of those women.⁵⁵

Psarra focuses on a more recent era and studies an issue that had been largely underexplored by that point in relevant scholarship: the ties with the “West” that Greek Feminists developed at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century.⁵⁶ The fact that these Feminists presented their cause as anchored in Greek nationalism has misled researchers to underscore their connectivity with Feminists in other “Western” countries. Psarra explores several types of such transfers, including the circulation of the work of non-Greek Feminist works among Greek Feminists as well as the face-to-face interaction of Greek and US American as well as French Feminists. Such contacts were embedded in staunch Orientalism that Greek Feminists shared at that point and which continued in the first decades of the 20th century, as the

work of Effi Gazi also demonstrates.⁵⁷ This Feminist Orientalism portrayed the “East” as static and marked by the subordination of women to men; the “East” was juxtaposed with the “West”, where Greek Feminists believed that there was potential for women’s emancipation.

The work of Efi Kanner and Haris Exertzoglou draws on elements of a transnational perspective that had appeared already in *Η Εξέγερση των Κυριών*. Varikas had illuminated the contact between subjects in Greece and Greek Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Empire, treating this, however, as an extension of a topic of Greek history. By contrast, Kanner and Exertzoglou studied ethno-religious communities as topics connected with Ottoman history, avoiding, however, to approach the Ottoman Empire as a sealed container. They survey in particular the shifting gender representations and practices in late Ottoman Empire as a result of modernisation processes and discourses, which drew, albeit sometimes ambivalently, on the “West” as a role-model. They also consider transfers across the borders of Greece and the Ottoman Empire, such as the circulation of the *Εφημερίς των Κυριών* in both countries. In following such an approach, they particularly address Orthodox middle-class women in late Ottoman Empire, exploring their relationship with Muslims residing there as well as with the Greek state. Kanner analyses issues, such as philanthropy and the discourses on women that circulated in the Orthodox community in Istanbul. Kanner complements Varikas’s work by showing the spread of the “equality in difference” doctrine in the Orthodox community of Istanbul. The latter also endorsed a “public”/“private” dichotomy: representations of “public” as a “masculine” realm appeared already from the second half of the 18th century. Middle-class women were expected to help Hellenise the Orthodox millet by making the non-Greek-speaking Orthodox accept the superiority of Greek language and “culture”. They were envisaged to contribute to this goal mainly through philanthropic activities, which were once again viewed as an extension of their maternal role. Thus, a “feminine” private sphere was considered to be complementary and, in fact, a pillar for a “Hellenised” Orthodox male public sphere. Men who treated women as inferior than men continued to exist, according to Kanner, but were far from hegemonic in that community in the second half of the 19th century.

Haris Exertzoglou also addresses the Greek Orthodox communities in the main urban centres of the Ottoman Empire, especially in Istanbul and Ismir.⁵⁸ The topic of his research is the reception of the widespread social, cultural and political change that occurred in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century. To examine this, he explores the ways in which the “poor” and the “women” served as metaphors through which such change was understood. These metaphors not only allowed the elites of these communities to try to shape behavioural patterns of the “women” and the “poor”, but also affected the actual practice of those subjects. Similar to Kanner, Exertzoglou addresses the ways in which the Greek Orthodox tried to become hegemonic in the Orthodox millet. He demonstrates that, rather than subscribing to Greek irredentism, they opted for *ελληνοοθωμανισμός* [Graeco-Ottomanism], namely the effort to ensure a high level social status in the Ottoman Empire rather than contributing to the territorial expansion of the Greek state. Exertzoglou shows, however, that both Greek irredentism, as analysed by Varikas, and *ελληνοοθωμανισμός* rested on the same approach to gender relations, which revolved around the “equality in difference” doctrine. What is particularly novel in Exertzoglou approach is his effort to approach Orthodox and Muslim communities from both a comparative and a transnational perspective, developing what could be depicted as an *histoire croisée* analysis of them.⁵⁹ In studying the formation of the public sphere in the Ottoman Empire and its gendered connotations, he shows that the former was not totally fragmented along religious lines. The Orthodox endorsed an ardent Orientalism, which construed the “East” as “feminine”, a tendency that had made headway in the “West” as well, there were interconnections between the Muslims and the Orthodox. Moreover, Exertzoglou analyses the shifting gender relations among Muslims in the urban centres of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, showing that the pattern of the nuclear family gained traction among middle-class Muslims in the 19th century. The latter, similar to the Orthodox middle class, also developed a specific allocation of gender roles.

The other notable development in the analysis of this intersection by gender historians dealing with Greece from the 1990s onwards is they addressed the shaping of masculinities far more than the study of modern Greece from the perspective of gender had done in the 1980s. A trendsetting in this respect publication was the

journal article by Antonis Liakos.⁶⁰ Liakos builds on Connell's approach to hegemonic masculinity, as it appears in Connell's *Masculinities* (London, Polity Press, 1996) and analyses how their shifting understanding affected the work of Rigas Feraios. He explores the gender connotations of both images and the text in Feraios's work and reaches two conclusions. The first is that the conceptualisation of masculinity, which the ascending middle class in Europe developed in the second half of the 18th century as well as at the beginning of the 19th century and its link with nationalism affected Feraios as well. Such conceptualisation prized not only a clear demarcation of gender roles, but also a self-controlled male body as a symbol of nation as well as the middle-class dominated society. This appeared in Feraios's work through the symbol of Hercules holding a club and was juxtaposed with the purported vagueness of the behaviour of the sultan in terms of gender. The club, a male sexual symbol, would be an emblem of the "Hellenic Republic", whose creation Rigas Feraios aspired. The formulation of Greek national visions and middle-class identities rested not only on the signification of femininity, as shown in the works that address the "equality in difference" doctrine, but also of masculinity. Liakos's article is groundbreaking for research on gender internationally: while such research largely argues that emotion was associated with femininity in the 19th century, Liakos shows that, at least in the writings of Feraios, the proper man had to combine "reason" and "emotion", while dealing with family issues in the context of the "private" sphere.⁶¹

One more work moving in that direction, but which explores a more recent era, is that of Dimitra Vasileiadou.⁶² Vasileiadou analyses the practice of duel as a core component of middle-class masculinities in Greece in the mid-to-late 19th century as well as until the end of World War I. Vasileiadou shows that such development was not specific to Greece. Drawing on the work of Robert Nye and Ute Frevert, she demonstrates that it resembled what occurred elsewhere in the "West" at that point.⁶³

Another relatively recent study that considers the shaping of masculinities in Greece was published by Yannitsiotis, who analyses the making of the middle class in the port city of Piraeus in the last quarter of the 19th century.⁶⁴ Yannitsiotis pays particular attention to the interconnected construction of gender and social space. He

considers the metaphorical usage of masculinities and femininities, analysing their implications for the making of *peiraikotita*, namely the local identity in Piraeus.

To sum up, the interest of gender historians in the middle-class has been enduring, albeit in shifting ways, from the inception of the field until today.

5) Gender and labour relations

One more area, which gender historians working on Greece addressed already in the 1980s, was that of labour. In general, historical research on labour relations has intensified in Greece since the late 1980s- and not necessarily from the perspective of gender.⁶⁵ A controversial issue among historians dealing with the issue was whether Greece witnessed the formation of a working class. While historians, such as Petros Pizaniias, challenge this, Antonis Liakos draws on the work of E. P. Thompson and discerns a process of social class formation, shaped by diverse subjects, such as union members and the state. Liakos claims that work is not just an economic issue, but also a cultural construct. Thus, he has contributed to the abovementioned swelling chorus of historians who paid increasing attention to cultural practices from the late 1980s on. The work of gender historians dealing with labour relations has also constituted an integral piece of this tendency: They have highlighted the interconnections in the formation of social class and gender identities, seriously considering the cultural practices through which these identities were formed as well as the agency of the subjects they studies. They have also scrutinised gendered hierarchies in diverse workplaces, ranging from factories to homes (in the case of domestic workers).

A main concern for gender historians that have explored female labour since the 1980s has been the link between professional hierarchies and gender in the public sector. A concomitant topic they have analysed in depth is the Feminist reaction to such gendered hierarchies and the Feminist collective action to protect women's wage work in the Interwar years. Quite significant in this respect is the work of Efi Avdela. Avdela has explored in a number of publications from the late 1980s the labour of women who worked beyond the "private" sphere in the early 20th century.⁶⁶ In all these publications, Avdela argues that the number of women who engaged in such work steadily increased at the beginning of the 20th century. She demonstrates that

women who worked in factories were usually young and their employment did not normally last long. Women who became civil servants were young, albeit somewhat more elderly than those working in the industry. Female civil servants usually worked due to necessity, in order to contribute to their family's income as well as to accumulate an amount they needed for their dowry. They generally stopped working, as soon as they got married. Avdela's relevant work also addresses the issue of women's militancy in the Interwar years. She demonstrates that, in contrast with the late 19th century, Feminism in Greece pivoted around female labour and women's voting rights.⁶⁷ Moreover, she analyses the various strands of Feminism that appeared in Interwar Greece. It should be noted that Avdela's book *Δημόσιοι Υπάλληλοι γένους θηλυκού* [Female civil servants] in particular introduces the systematic study of labour from the perspective of social history in interconnection with the analysis of gender relations, as Papastefanaki pointedly argues. Testament to this is the use of both quantitative sources, showing the shifting number of female civil servants, but also of quantitative ones, which shed light on their experiences.⁶⁸

From the 1990s on and, especially, since the 2000s, the analysis of labour in modern Greek historiography from the perspective of gender has intensified. The works of Kostas Fountanopoulos and Leda Papastefanaki are noteworthy in this respect: Fountanopoulos particularly examines the making of working-class cultures and militancy in Thessaloniki in the early 20th century.⁶⁹ Although gender is not the main focus of his research, it constitutes one of the factors, which he carefully examines. Fountanopoulos analyses patterns of female labour. A compelling point that he makes is that women were not necessarily employed as unskilled labour. He critically reflects on relevant statistics, asserting that they should not be taken at face value, since tended to label female work as "unskilled", even if it required complex skills. Moreover, in contrast to Avdela, he argues that the integration of women into the job market should not be conceptualised as an extension of the "private sphere" roles allocated to them by the hegemonic discourse on gender. While, according to Fountanopoulos, this explains the positions assigned to them in the tertiary sector, such as in the field of education, it does not furnish an adequate explanatory package for the job positions offered to women in the secondary sector, such as in machine shops, already in the early 20th century.

Leda Papastefanaki puts the exploration of the allocation of gender roles at the workplace into the forefront of her analysis, while examining a textile industrial complex at the port city of Piraeus, called “Retsina”.⁷⁰ She draws on the research of Joan Scott.⁷¹ Resonating with Scott’s analysis, Papastefanaki argues that the examination of gender is not meant merely to add more information to the study of other topics, but, rather, to help fundamentally reconsider their historical analysis by highlighting the (re)making and legitimisation of gendered hierarchies in structuring social interaction in general. She also echoes the arguments put forth by Sonya Rose, namely that the study of industrial relations should consider not only economy, but also culture; and that gender was key to the shaping of such relations.⁷² In this vein, Papastefanaki shows that there was a very clear and gendered allocation of roles in the industrial complex she explores. She proves that this allocation was linked with power relations not only between different social classes, but also within the same class. In particular and similar to Fountanopoulos, she demonstrates that male workers earned higher wages than their female colleagues for the same work. She adds that almost exclusively men progressed towards the higher ranks of the industry’s hierarchy. Again similar to Fountanopoulos, she shows that, even if the tasks assigned to women required intellectual skills, they were quite frequently labelled as akin to “unskilled” labour, which, as she also notes, was reflected in relevant statistics. A particularly novel element of her work is that she convincingly argues that women did not necessarily work for short periods. By contrast, she discerns two types of employment: one containing skilled male and female workers, both skilled and unskilled, who worked for long periods (over 10-15 years); and one including mainly women working at irregular intervals and who usually withdrew from work, when they got married. According to data Papastefanaki presents about 16 textile industries in Piraeus, around 30% of women worked longer than 10-15 years. In so doing, she critically approaches a number of sources, such as official statistics and population censuses, which underestimated the participation of women in the workforce.⁷³ Papastefanaki complements these sources by extensively using documents stemming from archives of businesses, which record their female employees in more detail. In carefully elaborating on these issues by concentrating on the “Retsina” industrial complex, she avoids a methodologically nationalist approach:

she compares the allocation of gender roles there with what happened elsewhere not only in Greece, but also in the USA and the UK.

The examination of female labour by gender historians since the 1980s has focused on industrial workers. Still, the recent work of Pothiti Hantzaroula is an exception to this trend, as she explores domestic workers in Greece in the first half of the twentieth century. This was the topic of her PhD research as well as of a monograph and a number of articles.⁷⁴ Hantzaroula was correct to note that historians who dealt with the working class in Greece, such as Pizanias, tended to exclude from the scope of their analysis forms of labour that did not manifest themselves in the “public” sphere. In addressing domestic work, Hantzaroula probes the ways in which these female workers were shaped as subordinate subjects in terms of social class and gender. In doing so, she introduces the study of emotions in the field of gender history in modern Greek historiography. In terms of sources, her work is also novel, since it is one of the first cases in gender history of Greece where interviews are used extensively. Hantzaroula follows an interdisciplinary to oral history: She draws on the work of anthropologist and oral historian Riki van Boeschoten as well as of historian Luisa Passerini, who was also her PhD supervisor at the European University Institute in Florence. In using oral testimonies, she does not expect them to simply reflect the actual experience of those workers. Rather, they indicate how the interviewees made sense of such experience in forging their class and gender identities. Hantzaroula discerns three types of female domestic workers concerning their attitude towards domestic labour: those who came from the Cycladic islands treated domestic labour as a means of accumulating money for their dowry. For female refugees from Anatolia, it served as a means of survival; they often engaged in domestic and industrial work interchangeably. Finally, for women from continental Greece it functioned as a means of adoption from the family for which they worked.⁷⁵

In the last two decades, the transnationalisation that has appeared in the study of middle-class women from the perspective of gender has also emerged in the study of female labour. This is evident in those studies of migration that also address gender. The work of Lina Ventoura is particularly noteworthy in this respect.⁷⁶ She stresses that until the mid-1970s women tended to be sidelined in relevant research, since their

mobility was considered to be a secondary phenomenon, dependent on the movement of men. From that point onwards, relevant scholarship has growingly challenged this assumption, shedding light, for instance, on mutual aid networks established by women in the Diaspora. She also concurs with those scholars criticising a simplistic argument, according to which migration was a quintessentially emancipating experience for female migrants. Indeed, Ventoura argues that female migrants escaped from the restrictive honour codes of their natal areas; some of the women who migrated were actually those who had breached those rules. Nevertheless, research should consider several factors, such as their education, the existence or not of mutual aid networks in the host societies and the reasons why these women were forced to or decided to migrate, to illuminate whether migration contributed to female emancipation or subordination. In any case, there is no one-size-fits-all answer to this question. Ioanna Laliotou's work on migration and cultures of transnationalism between the USA and Greece also addresses the intersection of social class, race and gender in the making of the migrants' subjectivity. She highlights, for instance, the ways in which labour was formulated as a gender-specific concept in representations circulating among migrants.⁷⁷ Despite the fact, as mentioned in the second section of this article, that gender has been growingly analysed in the "West" in relation to race, this development has largely failed to affect gender as approached in modern Greek historiography. Laliotou's work is one of the few exceptions.

Finally, the study of labour by gender historians from the 2000s on has also taken more seriously into consideration the making of masculinities. Dimitra Lambropoulou has meticulously scrutinised the making of class and gender identities of construction workers in Athens between 1950 and 1967.⁷⁸ Her work clearly shows that social class and gender are mutually constitutive. She explores their homosociality to prove that it reproduced hierarchical relations. In this vein, she demonstrates how the master substituted the role of the parents with regard to the young apprentices. The latter were regarded in the context of such homosociality not only as lacking job-related skills, but also as imperfect men; only by becoming competent construction workers, relying on themselves and not needing the guidelines of the master would they be able to overcome this state of "imperfection". The male homosociality of construction workers was also conducive to intimacy and

solidarity, however, which developed particularly in the social space of piazza that those workers frequented. Such solidarity, according to Lambropoulou, underpinned the intense political activity of construction workers in Athens. It is noteworthy that Lambropoulou's work has influenced anthropologists of gender as well: In analysing male homosociality in Athens, Kostas Yannakopoulos cites her work, when stressing the development of queer performance by some men who gathered in the piazzas.⁷⁹

Therefore, not only have gender historians working on labour refrained from equating the "public" with men and the "private" with women, but they have also uncovered the diverse ways in which femininities and masculinities are shaped and performed in various contexts.

6) Beyond the middle class and labour relations

The article has analysed so far the shifting approaches of gender historians to the analysis of the middle class and labour, topics that have figured prominently in their analyses. Still, the scope of their research has broadened since the 2000s, a process that this section is addressing in detail.

In this respect, modern Greek historiography no longer necessarily approaches gender solely in terms of the relations between heterosexual men and women: quite tellingly, the very promising ongoing research of Despo Kritsotaki scrutinises the emergence and development of discourses on intersex people in Greece. It shows that during the 19th century, similarly to what occurred elsewhere in the "West", medical discourses treated such people as morally and socially deviant. In the second half of the 20th century, medicine moved further in the "West" in general and in Greece in particular and proposed interventions in the human body to eliminate the intersex condition.⁸⁰ However, historical research on Greece beyond heterosexual men and women has been limited; relevant analyses have been mainly pursued by anthropologists, especially Yannakopoulos, Venetia Kantsa and Elisabeth Kirtsoglou.⁸¹

The study of gender in modern Greek historiography has also expanded in terms of the topics it has been considering. In addressing militancy in relation to the position of women in Greek society, relevant historiography had concentrated on Communist,

Socialist and Liberal organisations. However, historians have growingly begun to probe the discourse of Conservative organisations on gender. This is manifest in the examination of Conservative responses to youth cultures, which I address later in this section. It is also scrutinised in the work of Effi Gazi on the slogan *Πατρίς-Θρησκεία-Οικογένεια* [Fatherland-Religion-Family]. Gazi explores the emergence of this slogan in the era between 1880 and 1930.⁸² Gazi also analyses the gendered connotations of this slogan and the debates surrounding it. In this vein, she highlights the reaction of school advisors to the ways in which Rosa Imvrioti taught history at Marasleios Pedagogical Academy. They mounted a loud critique of her teaching, which was linked not so much to her Marxist orientation, but, rather, to the fact that she was a woman. They echoed militaristic stereotypes, which were spreading elsewhere in Europe, such as in fascist Italy, according to which teaching history was expected to instill a “masculine ethos” to pupils and which women were portrayed as incapable of transmitting. Besides this topic, gender historians dealing with Greece have also examined right-wing approaches to gender during the Civil War as well as in post-Civil War Greece, especially the treatment of those women that were affiliated with the Left.⁸³

Although a comprehensive history of consumption in Greece and its link with gender relations awaits to be written, the perspective of gender has also begun to work its way into the topic of mass consumption in Greece. Although the latter has hitherto been underexamined, the monograph of Achilleas Hadjikyriacou has illuminated the ways in which masculinity was portrayed in relation to consumption in Greek popular cinema in the era between 1949 and 1967. He has also probed the reception of these movies in a broad range of newspapers and magazines.⁸⁴ Panagiotis Zestanakis has scrutinised the link between masculinity and consumption in the magazine *Click* in the late 1980s, showing how it tracked and helped shape a pleasure-oriented masculinity that gained momentum in the middle class.⁸⁵ Zestanakis has also examined the representations and practices of female car drivers and motorbike riders in Athens during the 1980s.⁸⁶ At that point, a growing number of women engaged in these activities, although they were still fewer than male car drivers and motorbike riders. The research of both Zestanakis and Hadjikyriacou draws on Connell’s conceptual framework with regard to masculinities and rides on the wave of the

growing interest in masculinities that gender historians working on Greece have evinced since the 2000s. The latter work of Zestanakis is also linked with a novel tendency among scholars dealing with gender in Greece to seriously consider the spatial turn in history, which examines the multiple and shifting meaning assigned to space and their complex link with human activities.⁸⁷

One more topic that was first approached from the perspective of gender at that point was that of warfare. Margarite Poulos has explored the relationship between women on the one hand and the preparation and the experience of war on the other in the 19th and 20th century in her monograph.⁸⁸

In terms of thematic expansion, another tendency in gender history of Greece is the effort to consider the practices of the numerous women that lived beyond the main urban centres. Really noteworthy in this respect is also the monograph of Efi Avdela on violence and honour codes in post-Civil War Greece.⁸⁹ Avdela's book is based on a wide range of sources, including trial minutes and press coverage of honour-related incidents of violence, covering both urban and rural areas. She does not aim to offer quantitative data concerning where such incidents occurred. However, rather than confined to specific areas, such as Mani and Crete, as it is widely held, Avdela shows that they were widespread almost throughout Greece. Avdela also demonstrates that the use of violence was growingly delegitimised as a means of defending honour during the 1960s: an increasing number of incidents described as "honour crimes" were recorded in the 1950s, but they dropped in the following decade to almost disappear prior to the establishment of the dictatorship in 1967. In doing so, Avdela complements the work of several anthropologists who have probed honour codes in Greece and whose work on the Greek countryside, as Yannitsiotis aptly remarks, has largely been neglected so far by historians of Greece.⁹⁰ The novelty of her work also lies in an analysis of honour as an "emotional regime"⁹¹, which builds on a concept introduced by anthropologist William Reddy. Alongside the work of Hantzaroula, this monograph shows that growing interest of gender historians dealing with Greece in emotions.

One more work that touches upon gender relations not only in urban centres, but also in provincial towns and in rural areas, is that of Evdoxios Doxiadis. Doxiadis explores the links between women, law and property during the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Greek state (1750-1850).⁹² He shows the ambiguous impact of this transition on women's rights with regard to property. Although their relevant rights were formally codified and recognised by the Greek state, a number of developments, such as the emergence of a modern judicial system that excluded women, "allowed men almost total control over their wives' properties".⁹³ Still, despite the publication of those works by Avdela and Doxiadis, which deal to a greater or lesser extent with rural areas, gender relations in the latter remain to be underexamined in modern Greek historiography.

One more way, in which the scope of gender history research has expanded in modern Greek historiography since the 2000s, is manifest in the growing weight it has been assigning to intersections beyond that between gender and social class. In this vein, several historical works have addressed the relationship between gender and age in Greece in the Interwar years as well as in the 1960s-1970s. With regard to the former era, the relevant historical research revolves around gender relations in the EON (*Εθνική Οργάνωσις Νεολαίας*, National Youth Organisation). EON was the official youth organisation established by the authoritarian regime that ruled Greece between 1936 and 1941. Nevertheless, according to Rosa Vasilaki the EON paved a "bizarre path to emancipation" for women despite the aims of the regime that established it and which confined women to the "private" sphere.⁹⁴ Female EON members had the opportunity to develop networks beyond the supervision of their parents through their participation in this organisation. This was a watershed that enabled them to develop skills and undertake responsibilities that many of them found useful in the early 1940s, when taking part in the left-wing resistance against the Tripartite Occupation of Greece. By contrast, Odette Varon-Vassard, who has authored a monograph on left-wing youth resistance groups during the Tripartite Occupation and dedicates a section to their female members, there is no linear trajectory between the membership of the EON and in those resistance groups. The former was quintessentially the tool of an authoritarian regime and imposed a similar

pedagogy, which was fundamentally different from the militant activity in the framework of resistance in the early 1940s.⁹⁵

Work on youth and gender during the 1960s and 1970s in Greece has probed both the discourse on youth and the experience of those partaking in youth culture. The work of Avdela has been groundbreaking in this respect as well. She shows that the spread of novel forms of youth leisure in Greece from the 1950s, emanating from elsewhere in the “West” and, especially, the USA, caused rancorous debates around whether and to what extent they jeopardised the dominant gender norms: a wide array of social and political subjects, both right-wing and left-wing, claimed that these flows made girls repudiate the “advantages of purity” and rendered boys violent.⁹⁶ In doing so, Avdela appropriates a notion introduced by Passerini, namely that youth serves as a metaphor for social change.⁹⁷ In another work that Avdela has recently published, she examines the Greek juvenile justice system in the 1950s and 1960s and the varying ways in which it treated young people of differing gender.⁹⁸ Her work on the Greek juvenile justice system shows its gendered approach towards sexuality. It was common for young women to be subjected to chastity tests, regardless of their specific accusation. Those who were found to have engaged in sex were regarded as immoral in general. By contrast, the same system regarded sexual relationships as a “normal” element of the behaviour of young men. What this book also highlights is that young heterosexual men often engaged in same-sex practices without developing a gay identity: it was a rite of passage to sexually active life. In demonstrating this tendency, Avdela incorporates the argument put forth by Yannakopoulos that heterosexual male desire in Greece has frequently adopted same-sex sexual practices.⁹⁹ It is noteworthy that Avdela’s book is one of the very few historical works on gender that deal with same-sex sexual practices.

The interweavings of gender and age in the 1960s also appear in the work of Kostas Katsapis. Katsapis has written a couple of books: the first addresses the emergence of youth culture in Greece by focusing on the reception of rock ‘n’ roll music, as well as the reaction of a wide array of social and political subjects towards it.¹⁰⁰ The second focuses on Conservative reactions against youth culture.¹⁰¹ While Katsapis’s work does not concentrate on gender, this factor is addressed in his analysis. Resonating

with Avdela, he shows that the fear of the potentially “harmful” impact of novel leisure practices on the making of masculinities and femininities figured prominently in the critiques of rock ‘n’ roll music in Greece.

In his work on politics and everyday life in the era between 1967 and 1974, Kostis Kornetis also deals with youth in relation to gender.¹⁰² His relevant research is based on both written and oral sources. In dealing with the latter, Kornetis follows an approach similar to that of Hantzaroula: he does not seek factual validity in them but, rather, insights into how the interviewees construed their experience. In doing so, Kornetis considers how events that transpired between the narrated era and the point when the interview was conducted may have also affected the memory of his interviewees. This approach heavily draws on the conceptual framework of his PhD supervisor, Luisa Passerini. In terms of periodisation, resonating with historian Arthur Marwick, Kornetis argues that Greece also experienced substantial cultural and social transformations in the era of the “Long 1960s”, which, according to Marwick, lasted from ca. 1958 to approximately 1974.¹⁰³ In this context, the number of university students increased and so did the ratio of female to male university enrolment. Kornetis shows that women played an important role in clandestine groups that opposed the dictatorship and became growingly emancipated in everyday life: for instance, they developed a “more uninhibited attitude toward [heterosexual] sexuality” before marriage.¹⁰⁴ However, considering the varying impact of the “Long Sixties” developments on people of differing gender, Kornetis shows that such emancipation did not lead to full equality between heterosexual women and men in groups that struggled against the dictatorship.

Nikolaos Papadogiannis probes left-wing youth politics, leisure and sexuality in the following years, namely between 1974 and 1981.¹⁰⁵ He analyses the symbolic representations of specific political performances and their links to gender, showing, for instance, that eloquent speaking in assemblies was associated by the groups in question with heterosexual masculinity. He also argues that the experience of young left-wingers in post-1974 Greece, including their political activities, leisure pursuits and sexual practices, was a plural phenomenon, varying according to gender and social class: in this vein, the transition to democracy constituted an era of both

opportunities and constraints for (young) people of differing gender. Drawing on Kevin Murphy and Jennifer Spear, he shows the complex ways in which sexuality and gender were entangled and mutually constitutive in the rhetoric and experience of the left-wingers under study.¹⁰⁶ Some groups, such as the pro-Soviet Communist youth, endorsed in the post-1974 era a normative rhetoric, lauding the stable heterosexual couple and, thus, lambasting performances of masculinity and femininity that strayed from this. Still, premarital sexual relationships, often ephemeral, continued to be a common practice among young left-wingers of all stripes after the restoration of democracy. While, however, multiple ephemeral relationships were a source of pride for heterosexual male young left-wingers, they impeded the progress of women towards the higher ranks of such organisations. Thus, he stresses that the perspective of gender helps develop a nuanced analysis of the relationship between the restoration of democracy and the liberalisation/pluralisation of lifestyles. Papadogiannis also indicates the shifting meanings attached to femininities and masculinities within left-wing youth groups, especially due to the emergence of the women's and the homosexual liberation movement. In contrast with other "Western" countries, they appeared in Greece not in the late 1960s, but after the collapse of the dictatorship and, especially, between the late 1970s and the mid-1980s. The relationship between Feminism/homosexual liberation and the Left was strained, ranging from hostility in the case of pro-Soviet Communists to cautious openness concerning Eurocommunists¹⁰⁷. Nevertheless, echoing Connell, who argues that masculinities are dynamic and affected by the making of femininities as well, Papadogiannis shows that the women's liberation movement affected not only female, but also some male left-wingers. Feminism made those male left-wingers reflect on the formulation of a non-sexist male behaviour as well as criticise a strict discipline on gender and sexual mores promoted by pro-Soviet and some Maoist groups. Thus, what appeared was an entanglement between the reconfiguration of collective action patterns and gender. Such an interconnection was not unique in Greece, but common across Europe at that point in the 1970s.¹⁰⁸

While gender historians have been growingly examining youth in Greece, often in comparison to what happened elsewhere in the "West", less has been written on

gender relations among elderly people. Thus, the intersection of gender and age has far from been saturated as a topic in gender history of Greece.

7) Conclusions

This article analyses the emergence and development of gender in modern Greek historiography, exploring works that incorporate, even to an extent, the factor of gender. It shows that, although historical works on women had been authored already in the 19th century, the systematic analysis of gender practices and representations began in modern Greek historiography in the 1980s in the context of the women's liberation movement. Gender history, however, was largely marginalised in Greek academic institutions at that point, which was also linked to its ambiguous relationship with the rising in prominence "new history" paradigm. After an era of stagnation between the early and the late 1990s due to lack of funding and institutional support, gender history has been gaining momentum in modern Greek historiography and has been growingly incorporated into Greek academia. This development is related to new programmes dealing with gender that have been established in Greek universities as well as the creation of the Greek National Committee of the IFRWH. In this vein, since the late 1990s, what can be observed is a process of diffusion of the study of gender in modern Greek historiography, as Fournaraki and Yannitsiotis argue: even some historians whose research does not concentrate on gender tend to take this into account. As a result, it is becoming more challenging to refer to "gender history" as a totally distinct field. Still, this does not mean that all strands of modern Greek historiography have been influenced by reflection on gender: diplomatic and military history are two remarkable exceptions. Thus, the abovementioned diffusion should be construed as limited.

Similar to what Papataxiarchis and Kantsa have argued about the study of gender at the international level, modern Greek historiography witnessed no linear transition from the study of women to the exploration of gender-or, to challenge Morgan's argument, from a history of subjects to a history of relations. Works dealing with gender in modern Greece initially focused on the history of women as subjects of history, evincing, simultaneously, a clear interest in gender relations; they explored how the construction of gender difference was linked with values linked with social

class as well as with shifting notions of citizenship. The topics that initially featured prominently in this historiographical strand, as Avdela has aptly remarked, were women's militancy in the late 19th century and the first four decades of the 20th century, the practice of middle-class women as well as female labour. At that point, "new history", whose main concern was to scrutinise economic structures that led to a purported particular Greece's path to modernity, were gaining momentum in Greek academia. Historical research on gender critically reflected and helped revise such work by addressing social class issues from the perspective of social and cultural history, one that did not present the "economic" sphere as determining the "social".

The interest in the middle and working class continues to figure prominently in modern Greek historiography dealing with gender from the late 1990s on, as does the effort to probe the shifting understandings of gender difference and their implications for the understanding of social and political conditions in general. Nevertheless, in both cases relevant analyses are marked by what I would like to label as a growing transnationalisation of their scope. One more development that this article has demonstrated is the growing expansion of gender-related themes explored in modern Greek historiography: while the concern for the history of women as subjects of history has not evaporated, this expansion includes a growing interest among gender historians in masculinity, but also two tendencies that have not been addressed in previous accounts of gender in modern Greek historiography: from the 2000s onwards such analyses have considered in more detail the intersection of gender not only with social class, but also with age, focusing on youth. They have also begun to consider gender relations among people who live beyond the urban centres, although the relevant topic continues to be underexamined.

Such enrichment should be attributed to the fact that gender historians working on Greece have been receptive to an extent of developments in research on gender mainly in the UK, the USA, France and in the European University Institute in Florence. The aforementioned enrichment should be also linked with their engagement, especially in the last two decades, in an interdisciplinary dialogue particularly with social/cultural anthropologists, from whom they have been influenced but whom they have also affected; the anthropologists have also been quite

open to shifting approaches to gender in the academia worldwide, especially in the “West”.

There are developments in gender history and theory internationally, however, of which gender historians dealing with Greece, both in Greek academia and in other academic environments, have largely not been receptive: Quite tellingly, queer theory has largely failed so far to have an impact on gender history of Greece. Issues, such as the formation of homosexuality in relation to the making of heterosexuality as well the shifting meanings attached to them have received little attention from gender historians working on Greece. In any case, they will hopefully be able to secure the financial and institutional support that will enable them to continue to engage in a transdisciplinary and transnational dialogue; it is not at all a remote possibility that the ensuing crisis will jeopardise this, preventing the “small wallflower” from further blossoming.

¹ R. Hachtmann, ‘Tourismusgeschichte – ein Mauerblümchen mit Zukunft! Ein Forschungsüberblick’, in *H-Soz-u-Kult*, 2011. Accessible online at: <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/2011-10-001> (last accessed: 23 August 2016).

²Efi Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου στην Ελλάδα. Από τη διαταραχή στην ενσωμάτωση» [Gender history in Greece. From subversion to incorporation], in Venetia Kantsa, Vasiliki Moutafi, Evthymios Papataxiarchis (eds), *Φύλο και κοινωνικές επιστήμες στη σύγχρονη Ελλάδα* [Gender and social sciences in contemporary Greece], Athens: Alexandria, 2010, 89-117; Eleni Fournaraki, Yannis Yannitsiotis, “Three Decades of Women’s and Gender History in Greece: An Account”, *Aspasia* 7 (2013): 162-173.

³ Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου», 104.

⁴ Ibid, 103.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ For an overview of such works, see: Angelika Psarra and Martha Michailidou, “‘Few women have a history’: Callirhoe Parren and the beginnings of women’s history in Greece”, *Gender & History* 18:2 (2006): 400-411.

⁷ See, for instance: Nikolaos Papadogiannis, “Red and Purple? The impact of second-wave Feminism on young Greek Eurocommunists in the 1970s”, *European Review of History* 22:1 (2015): 101-119.

⁸ For instance, the PhD dissertation of Efi Avdela at Université Paris 7 – Jussieu was supervised by Michelle Perrot, a specialist in women’s and gender history. See: http://historiography.gr/index.php/en/?option=com_content&view=article&id=22:2015-10-20-15-30-19&catid=16:historians&Itemid=113 (last accessed: 25 August 2016)

⁹ Dimitra Lambropoulou, Antonis Liakos, 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, 2-4; Yannis Yannitsiotis, “Social History in Greece: New Perspectives”, *EAST CENTRAL EUROPE / L’EUROPE DU CENTRE-EST: Eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 34-35:1-2 (2008), 104-107.

¹⁰ About relevant works, see, for instance: Nicos P. Mouzelis, *Politics in the Semi-Periphery* (London: Macmillan, 1986); Constantinos Tsoukalas, *Εξάρτηση και Αναπαραγωγή. Ο κοινωνικός ρόλος των εκπαιδευτικών μηχανισμών στην Ελλάδα (1830-1922)* [Dependence and Reproduction. The social role

of education in Greece (1830-1922)], Athens: Themelio, 1976; Giorgos B. Dertilis, *Κοινωνικός μετασχηματισμός και στρατιωτική επέμβαση 1880-1909* [Social transformation and military intervention 1880–1909], Athens: Exantas, 1977.

¹¹ In emphasising clientelism as a means of analysing politics and social relations in Greece, scholars have been greatly influenced by the work of John Petropoulos, especially his *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece, 1833-1843*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968. The book was translated into Greek in 1986, but, according to Liakos, it had influenced historians and political scientists already beforehand. See: Antonis Liakos, «Η νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία το τελευταίο τέταρτο του εικοστού αιώνα» [Modern Greek historiography in the last quarter of the 20th century], *Σύγχρονα Θέματα*, 76-77 (2001): 80.

¹² Lambropoulou, Liakos, Yannitsiotis, “Work and Gender”, 2-4.

¹³ *Ibid*, 2-4.

¹⁴ Two examples of work that follow this approach are: Christina Agriantoni, *Οι απαρχές της εκβιομηχάνισης στην Ελλάδα τον 19^ο αιώνα* [The beginnings of industrialisation in Greece in the 19th century], Athens: Emporiki Trapeza tis Elladas-Istoriko Archeio, 1986; Christos Hadjiiossif, *Η γηραιά σελήνη. Η βιομηχανία στην Ελλάδα 1830-1940* [The old moon. Industry in Greece 1830-1940], Athens: Themelio, 1993.

¹⁵ Hadjiiossif, *Η γηραιά σελήνη*.

¹⁶ Yannitsiotis, “Social History”, 108.

¹⁷ Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου», 94.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, 93-94.

¹⁹ Giorgos T. Mavrogordatos, Christos H. Hadjiiossif (eds), *Βενιζελισμός και Αστικός Εκσυγχρονισμός* [Venizelism and Bourgeois Modernisation], Heraclio: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 1992

²⁰ Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου», 94.

²¹ Fournaraki, Yannitsiotis, “Three Decades”, 163.

²² *Ibid*, 164

²³ Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου», 105.

²⁴ See, for instance, the special forum of the *Diplomatic History* journal, issue 36:4 (2012), entitled “Gender and Sexuality in American Foreign Relations”.

²⁵ About this aim of gender historians, at least as voiced in the following volume that has attracted a remarkable number of historians dealing with gender in Greece, see: Glafki Gotsi, Androniki Dialeti, Eleni Fournaraki, “Εισαγωγή” [Introduction], in Glafki Gotsi, Androniki Dialeti, Eleni Fournaraki (eds), *Το φύλο στην ιστορία. Αποτιμήσεις και παραδείγματα* [Gender and History. Reviews and paradigms], Athens: Asini, 52.

²⁶ Georg G. Iggers, “Reflections on the Historiography of the Twentieth Century from the Perspective of the Twenty-first Century”, in Efi Gazi, *Key Debates in 20th century Greek historiography*, 2015, 10.

²⁷ Eleni Fournaraki, «Το σύγχρονο εγχείρημα της ιστορίας των γυναικών. Πτυχές μιας μετατόπισης προς μια ιστορία της σχέσης των φύλων» [The contemporary undertaking of women’s history. Aspects of a shift towards a history of gender relations], *Μνήμων*, 19 (1997), 187-190.

²⁸ For instance, see: Nancy Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: Woman’s Sphere in New England 1780-1835*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977. On an overview of the separate spheres approach and its critiques, see also: Efi Avdela, Angelika Psarra, «Ξαναγράφοντας το παρελθόν. Σύγχρονες διαδρομές της ιστορίας των γυναικών» [Rewriting the past. Contemporary itineraries of women’s history], in Efi Avdela, Angelika Psarra (eds), *Σιωπηρές Ιστορίες. Γυναίκες και φύλο στην ιστορική αφήγηση* [Silent histories. Women and gender in historical narration], Athens: Alexandria, 1997, 31-33.

²⁹ Sue Morgan, “Introduction: Writing Feminist History: Theoretical Debates and Critical Practices”, in Sue Morgan (ed.), *The Feminist History Reader*, Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2006, 8.

³⁰ Fournaraki, «Το σύγχρονο», 198.

³¹ Joan Wallach Scott, “Gender. A Useful Category of Historical Analysis”. *The American Historical Review* 91:5 (1986), 1053-1075.

³² Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge, 1990.

³³ RW Connell, James W. Messerschmidt, “Hegemonic Masculinity. Rethinking the concept”, *Gender and Society* 19:6 (2005): 829–859.

³⁴ *Ibid*.

³⁵ See, for instance: Michael Roper and John Tosh (eds), *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*, Routledge: London, 1991.

³⁶ Morgan, “Introduction”, 19.

³⁷Martha Vicinus, *Intimate Friends: Women who loved women, 1778-1928*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

³⁸Ibid, xxii-xxiii.

³⁹Morgan, "Introduction", 22.

⁴⁰ Jeanne Boydston, "Gender as a Question of Historical Analysis", *Gender & History* 20:3 (2008): 564; another article that similarly argues that the study of gender should critically approach binary systems of signification, which gender historiography has largely failed to do in practice, according to the author, is the following: Anna Krylova, "Gender Binary and the Limits of Poststructuralist Method", *Gender & History*, 28.2 (2016), 307-323. It should be noted that both Boydston and Krylova are in favour of reconfiguring the way in which gender is used as a concept by historians rather than discarding it.

⁴¹ Gisela Bock, "Women's History and Gender History: Aspects of an International Debate", *Gender & History*, 1.1 (1989): 7-30.

⁴² Ibid, 563. On Scott's relevant point, see: "Gender: A useful category", 1069.

⁴³ About the factors causing the oppression of Third World women, see, for instance, the following work of the Africanist Cheryl Johnson-Odim: "Common Themes, Different Contexts: Third World Women and Feminism", in Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres (eds), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

⁴⁴ Morgan, "Introduction", 11.

⁴⁵ Venetia Kantsa, Evthymios Papataxiarchis, «Χρήσεις του φύλου στις κοινωνικές επιστήμες. Ένας συγκριτικός ελληνικός απολογισμός» [The uses of gender in social sciences. A comparative Greek account], in Venetia Kantsa, Vasiliki Moutafi, Evthymios Papataxiarchis (eds), *Φύλο και κοινωνικές επιστήμες στη σύγχρονη Ελλάδα* [Gender and social sciences in contemporary Greece], Athens: Alexandria, 2010, 6-7.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 1-50.

⁴⁷ Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου», 97.

⁴⁸ Gender history in general has challenged such a perspective, offering a broader understanding of politics. For this remark, see: Avdela, «Η ιστορία του φύλου», 99-100. About women's militancy in general in Greece before women gained voting rights, see: Dimitra Samiou, *Τα πολιτικά δικαιώματα των Ελληνίδων, 1864-1952* [The political rights of women in Greece, 1864-1952], Athens, P. N. Sakkoulas-EIE, 2013.

⁴⁹For a recent relevant work, see: Demetra Tzanaki, *Women and Nationalism in the Making of Modern Greece: The Founding of the Kingdom to the Greco-Turkish War*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

⁵⁰ Katerina Dalakoura, *Η εκπαίδευση των γυναικών στις ελληνικές κοινότητες της οθωμανικής αυτοκρατορίας (19^{ος} αι.-1922): Κοινωνικοποίηση στα πρότυπα της πατριαρχίας και του εθνικισμού* [Women's education in the Greek communities of the Ottoman Empire: Women's socialization, patriarchy and nationalism, nineteenth century to 1922], Athens: Gutenberg, 2008; Eirini Rizaki, *Οι «γράφουσες» Ελληνίδες. Σημειώσεις για τη γυναικεία λογοσύνη του 19^{ου} αιώνα* [The Greek "writing women": Notes on women intellectuals of the nineteenth century], Athens: Katarti, 2007; Sidirola Ziogou-Karastergiou (ed), *Γυναίκες στην ιστορία των Βαλκανίων: ιστορίες ζωής γυναικών εκπαιδευτικών* [Women in the history of the Balkans: Life stories of women teachers], Thessaloniki: Vanias, 2010.

⁵¹Christina Koulouri, *Sport et société bourgeoise. Les associations sportives en Grèce 1870-1922*(Sport and bourgeois society. The sport associations in Greece, 1870-1922), Paris: L' Harmattan, 2000; Yannis Yannitsiotis, "Urban Space and National Self-Presentation," in Christina Koulouri (ed) *Athens, Olympic City 1896-1906*, Athens: International Olympic Academy, 2004, 237-294; Eleni Fournaraki, "Bodies that Differ: Mid- and Upper-Class Women and the Quest for 'Greekness' in Female Bodily Culture (1896-1940)," in Eleni Fournaraki and Zinon Papakonstantinou (eds), *Sport, Bodily Culture and Classical Antiquity in Modern Greece*, London and New York: Routledge, 2011, 49-85; Eleni Fournaraki, «Κατασκευάζοντας το ελληνοπρεπές σώμα: έμφυλες και ταξικές σημασιοδοτήσεις της άθλησης και της εθνικής ταυτότητας στη συγκυρία των Ολυμπιακών Αγώνων του 1896» [Constructing the body akin to the Greek nation: gender and social class in the signification of sport and national identity in the context of the 1896 Olympic Games], in Gotsi, Dialeti, Fournaraki (eds), *Το φύλο*, 303-338.

⁵² Leda Papastefanaki, «Ανάμεσα στην ιστορία της βιομηχανίας και την ιστορία της εργασίας: η οπτική του φύλου στην ελληνική ιστοριογραφία» [Between the history of industry and the history of labour: the gender perspective in Greek historiography], in Gotsi, Dialeti, Fournaraki (eds), *Το φύλο*, 92.

⁵³ Eurydiki Sifneou, *Έλληνες έμποροι στην Αζοφική: Η δύναμη και τα όρια της οικογενειακής επιχείρησης* [Greek merchants in the Azov Sea. The power and the limits of a family enterprise], Athens: INE/EIE, 2009.

⁵⁴ Despoina Vlami, «Γυναίκες, οικογένεια, κοινωνία της εμπορικής διασποράς, 18^{ος}-19^{ος} αι.» [Women, family, society of the merchant diaspora, 18th-19th cent.], *Τα Ιστορικά* 45 (2006): 243-280.

⁵⁵ The aforementioned contributions of Sifneou and Vlami are novel not only due to the transnational perspective they take, but also because they are among the few works on gender history of Greece that address the “family” as an autonomous research field, as Dimitra Vasileiadou aptly remarks. See: Dimitra Vasileiadou, «Όταν η ιστορία της οικογένειας συνάντησε την ιστορία του φύλου», in Gotsi, Dialeti, Fournaraki (eds), *Το φύλο*, 204.

⁵⁶ Angelika Psarra, “A gift from the New World: Greek feminists between East and West (1880-1930)”, in Anna Frangoudaki / Caglar Keyder (eds), *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey: Encounters with Europe, 1850-1950*, I.B. Tauris: London / New York 2007, 150-175.

⁵⁷ Ibid; Efi Gazi, «Πατρίς, Θρησκεία, Οικογένεια»: *Ιστορία ενός συνθήματος (1880-1930)* [“Fatherland, Religion, Family”: History of a slogan, 1880-1930], Athens: Polis, 2011, 210.

⁵⁸ Haris Exertzoglou, *Οι «χαμένες πατρίδες» πέρα από τη νοσταλγία. Μια κοινωνική-πολιτισμική ιστορία των Ρωμιών της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας (μέσα 19^{ου}-αρχές 20^{ου} αιώνα* [Beyond the “lost homelands”: A socio-cultural history of the *Romioi* in the Ottoman Empire [mid-nineteenth–early-twentieth century], Athens: Nefeli, 2010.

⁵⁹ On *histoire croisée*, see: Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, “Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity”, *History and Theory* 45 (2006): 30-50.

⁶⁰ Antonis Liakos, «Ο Ηρακλής, οι Αμαζόνες και οι ‘τραγανιστές βουκίτσες’: Αναπαραστάσεις του φύλου και της εξουσίας στο έργο του Ρήγα» [Hercules, Amazons and the “crunchy bites”: representations of gender and power in Rigas’s work], *Μνήμων*, 23 (2001): 99-112.

⁶¹ About the disassociation of masculinity from emotion in the “West” since the Enlightenment, an assumption that Liakos contests, see: Victor Seidler, *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*, London: Routledge, 1989.

⁶² Dimitra Vasileiadou, «‘Ανδρες, ανδράρια ή ρεκλαματζήδες;’ Μονομαχία και πολιτική στην ελληνική πρωτεύουσα (1870-1918)» [Real or fake men? Duel and politics in the Greek capital city, 1870-1918], in Dimitra Vasileiadou, Panagiotis Zestanakis, Maria Kefala, Maria Preka (eds), *(Αν)μιλώντας στις βεβαιότητες. Φύλα, αναπαραστάσεις, υποκειμενικότητες* [Talking (back) to certainties: gender, representations, subjectivities], Athens: OMIK, 2013, 85-112.

⁶³ She especially draws on: Robert A. Nye, “Honor codes in modern France. A historical anthropology”, *Ethnologia Europaea* 21 (1991): 5-19; Ute Frevert, “Male crime in nineteenth century Germany: Duelling”, in Margaret Arnot, Cornelia Osborne (eds), *Gender and Crime in modern Europe*, London: Routledge, 1999, 173-188.

⁶⁴ Yannis Yannitsiotis, *Η κοινωνική ιστορία του Πειραιά. Η συγκρότηση της αστικής τάξης, 1860-1910* [The Social History of Piraeus. The Making of the Middle Class, 1860-1910], Athens: Nefeli, 2006.

⁶⁵ For instance: Michalis Riginos, *Παραγωγικές Δομές και Εργατικά Ημερομίσθια στην Ελλάδα, 1909-1936* [Structures of production and workers’ wages in Greece, 1909-1936], Athens: Emporiki Trapeza tis Ellados, Istoriko Archeio, 1987; Petros Pizaniyas, *Οι φτωχοί των πόλεων. Η τεχνονομία της επιβίωσης στην Ελλάδα τον Μεσοπόλεμο* [The poor of the cities. The know-how of survival in Interwar Greece], Athens: Themelio, 1993; Antonis Liakos, *Εργασία και Πολιτική στην Ελλάδα του Μεσοπολέμου. Το Διεθνές Γραφείο Εργασίας και η ανάδυση των κοινωνικών θεσμών* [Work and politics in Greece in the Interwar years. The International Labour Office and the emergence of social institutions], Athens: Emporiki Trapeza tis Elladas-Istoriko Archeio, 1993.

⁶⁶ For instance: Efi Avdela, «Το αντιφατικό περιεχόμενο της κοινωνικής προστασίας: η νομοθεσία για την εργασία των γυναικών στη βιομηχανία (19^{ος}-20^{ος} αιώνας)» [The ambiguous content of social protection: the legislation concerning female labour in industry (19th-20th century)], *Τα Ιστορικά* 11 (1989): 339-360; Efi Avdela, «Στοιχεία για την εργασία των γυναικών στο Μεσοπόλεμο: όψεις και θέσεις» [Data on female labour in the Interwar years: facets and positions] in Giorgos T. Mavrogordatos, Christos H. Hadjiiossif (eds), *Βενιζελισμός και Αστικός Εκσυγχρονισμός* [Venizelism and Bourgeois Modernisation], Heraclio: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 1992; Efi Avdela, *Δημόσιοι Υπάλληλοι γένους θηλυκού. Καταμερισμός της εργασίας κατά φύλα στο δημόσιο τομέα, 1908-1955* [Female civil servants. Allocation of work according to gender in the public sector, 1908-1955], Athens: Idryma Ereynas kai Paideias tis Emporikis Trapezas tis Ellados, 1990.

⁶⁷ Although it addressed labour, it was mainly middle-class women that got involved in these Feminist initiatives.

⁶⁸ Papastefanaki, «Ανάμεσα», 97-98.

⁶⁹ Kostas Fountanopoulos, *Εργασία και εργατικό κίνημα στη Θεσσαλονίκη. Ηθική οικονομία και συλλογική δράση στο Μεσοπόλεμο 1908–1936* [Work and the labour movement in Thessalonica: Moral economy and collective action during the Interwar period 1908–1936], Athens: Nefeli, 2005; Leda Papastefanaki, *Εργασία, τεχνολογία και φύλο στη νεοελληνική βιομηχανία. Η κλωστοϋφαντουργία του Πειραιά (1870–1940)* [Labour, technology and gender in the Greek industry: The textile industry of Piraeus (1870–1940)], Heraklion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2009.

⁷⁰ Papastefanaki, *Εργασία*.

⁷¹ Papastefanaki was particularly inspired by Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

⁷² Sonya Rose, *Limited livelihoods. Gender and class in 19th century England*, London: Routledge, 1992.

⁷³ On population censuses and the participation of women in the workforce, see also: Avdela, *Δημόσιοι Υπάλληλοι*, 16-18; on the unreliability of some sources and the potential of others to uncover the participation of women in the workforce and gender hierarchies at the workplace, see also Papastefanaki, «Ανάμεσα», 85-87, 89.

⁷⁴ Pothiti Hantzaroula, *Σμιλεύοντας την υποταγή: Οι έμμισθες οικιακές εργάτριες στην Ελλάδα το πρώτο μισό του εικοστού αιώνα* [Curving subordination: Domestic workers in Greece in the first half of the twentieth century], Athens: Papazisis, 2012.

⁷⁵ On the topic of female domestic workers from the perspective of historical demography, see: Violetta Hionidou, “Domestic Service on Three Greek Islands in the Later 19th and Early 20th Centuries”, *History of the Family* 10/4 (2005), pp. 473-489.

⁷⁶ Lina Ventoura, «Μετανάστευση γυναικών: γέννηση και εξέλιξη του επιστημονικού ενδιαφέροντος» [Women’s migration: inception and development of the scientific interest], *Δίνη, Φεμινιστικό περιοδικό* [Whirlpool, Feminist journal] 6 (1993): 230-240.

⁷⁷ Ioanna Laliotou, *Transatlantic Subjects. Acts of Migration and Cultures of Transnationalism between Greece and America*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004, 110.

⁷⁸ Dimitra Lambropoulou, *Οικοδόμοι. Οι άνθρωποι που έχτισαν την Αθήνα 1950–1967* [Construction workers: The men who built Athens 1950–1967], Athens: Vivliorama, 2009.

⁷⁹ Kostas Yannakopoulos, “‘Naked Piazza’. Male (homo)sexualities, masculinities and consumer cultures in Greece since the 1960s”, in Kostis Kornetis, Eirini Kotsovili, Nikolaos Papadogiannis (eds), *Consumption and Gender in Southern Europe since the Long 1960s*, London, Bloomsbury, 2016, 296.

⁸⁰ Despo Kritsotaki, «Ιατρική και ερμαφροδιτισμός στην Ελλάδα, 1870-1970» [Medicine and intersexuality in Greece, 1870-1970], in Dimitra Vasileiadou, Panagiotis Zestanakis, Maria Kefala, Maria Preka (eds), *(Αντι)μιλώντας στις βεβαιότητες. Φύλα, αναπαραστάσεις, υποκειμενικότητες* [Talking (back) to certainties: gender, representations, subjectivities], Athens: OMIK, 2013, 198-222.

⁸¹ Yannakopoulos, “‘Naked Piazza’”; Venetia Kantsa, «Οικογενειακές υποθέσεις. Μητρότητα και ομόφυλες ερωτικές σχέσεις» [Family hypotheses. Maternity and same-sex sexual relations], in Evthymios Papataxiarchis (ed), *Οι Περιπέτειες της ετερότητας. Η παραγωγή της πολιτισμικής διαφοράς στη σημερινή Ελλάδα* [The adventures of Otherness. The construction of cultural difference in Greece today], Athens: Alexandria, 2006; Elisabeth Kirtsoglou, *For the Love of Women. Gender, Identity and Same-Sex Relations in a Greek Provincial Town*, London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

⁸² Gazi, «Πατρίς, Θρησκεία, Οικογένεια».

⁸³ Katherine Stefatos, “The Psyche and the Body: Political Persecution and Gender Violence against Women in the Greek Civil War,” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 29 (2011): 251–277; Tasoula Vervenioti, *Η γυναίκα της Αντίστασης: Η είσοδος των γυναικών στην πολιτική* [The woman of the Resistance: the entry of women to politics], Odysseas: Athens, 1994; Tasoula Vervenioti, *Διπλό βιβλίο: Η αφήγηση της Σταματίας Μπαρμπάτση- Η ιστορική ανάγνωση* [Double Book: The narration of Stamatiia Barbatsi- the historical approach], Athens: Vivliorama, 2003; Tasoula Vervenioti, “Left-wing Women between Politics and Family”, in Mark Mazower (ed), *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation and State in Greece, 1943–1960*, Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000, 105–121.

⁸⁴ Achilleas Hadjikyriacou, *Masculinity and Gender in Greek Cinema*, Bloomsbury Academic: London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney.

⁸⁵ Panagiotis Zestanakis, «Εκδοχές του ανδρισμού στα ελληνικά lifestyle έντυπα της δεκαετίας του ’80: Playboy, Status, Klik (1985-1990)» [Versions of masculinity in the Greek lifestyle magazines of the 1980s: Playboy, Status, Click (1985-1990)] (Unpublished MA thesis, Rethymno: University of Crete, 2008).

⁸⁶ Panagiotis Zestanakis, «'Δεξιά λωρίδα': Επιλογές μετακίνησης και (ανα)σημασιοδοτήσεις της θηλυκότητας στην Αθήνα της δεκαετίας του 1980», in Dimitra Vasileiadou, Panagiotis Zestanakis, Maria Kefala, Maria Preka (eds), *(Αντι)μιλώντας στις βεβαιότητες. Φύλα, αναπαραστάσεις, υποκειμενικότητες* [Talking (back) to certainties: gender, representations, subjectivities], Athens: OMIK, 2013, 176-194.

⁸⁷For a volume considering the spatial turn in approaching gender in Greece, see Kostas Yannakopoulos, Yannis Yannitsiotis (eds), *Αμφισβητούμενοι χώροι στην πόλη: Χωρικές προσεγγίσεις του πολιτισμού* [Contested urban spaces: Spatial approaches to culture], Athens, Alexandria, 2010. In a sense, however, the making of space and its link with gender hierarchies and identities was a topic raised by gender historians in Greece from the outset and without reference to the spatial turn, when they challenged, for instance, the association of the “public” with men and of the “private” with women.

⁸⁸Margaret Poulos, *Arms and the Woman: Just Warriors and Greek feminist Identity*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

⁸⁹Efi Avdela, *Δια λόγους τιμής. Βία, συναισθήματα και αξίες στη μετεμφυλιακή Ελλάδα* [For reasons of honour: Violence, emotions and values in the post-Civil war Greece], Athens: Nefeli, 2002.

⁹⁰ Relevant anthropological work includes: John K. Campbell, *Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964; Ernestine Friedl, *Vassilika: A Village in Modern Greece*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. On Yannitsiotis' remark, see: Yannitsiotis, “Social History”, 123.

⁹¹ Anthropologist William Reddy argues that “the complex of practices that establish a set of emotional norms and that sanction those who break them I call emotional regime”. See: William M. Reddy, *The navigation of feeling: a framework for the history of emotions*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 322-23.

⁹²Evdoxios Doxiadis, *The Shackles of Modernity: Women, Property, and the Transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Greek State, 1750-1850*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

⁹³Ibid, 257.

⁹⁴Eleytheria (Rosa) Vasilaki, «Φύλο, μνήμη και πολιτική: οι γυναίκες στη μεταξική κοινωνία» [Gender, memory and politics: women in Metaxas' society], *Ta Ιστορικά* 48 (2008): 79-102.

⁹⁵Odette Varon-Vassard, *Η ενηλικίωση μιας γενιάς: νέοι και νέες στην Κατοχή και στην Αντίσταση* [The coming of age of a generation: young men and women in the Occupation and the Resistance], Athens: Vivliopoleion tis “Estias”, 2009.

⁹⁶Efi Avdela, “‘Corrupting and Uncontrollable Activities’: Moral Panic about Youth in Post-Civil-War Greece”, *Journal of Contemporary History* 43:1 (2008):25-44.

⁹⁷Luisa Passerini, “Youth as a metaphor for social change: Fascist Italy and America in the 1950s”, in Giovanni Levi, Jean-Claude Schmitt, *A History of Young People in the West*, vol. 2, Cambridge and London: Harvard UP 1997, 281-340.

⁹⁸Efi Avdela, «*Νέοι εν κινδύνω*»: επιτήρηση, αναμόρφωση και δικαιοσύνη ανηλίκων μετά τον πόλεμο [Youth in danger: custody, rehabilitation and juvenile justice after the war], Polis, Athens, 2013.

⁹⁹For instance: Kostas Yannakopoulos, “Amis ou amants? Amours entre hommes et identités sexuelles au Pirée et à Athènes”, *Terrain* 27 (1996): 59-70.

¹⁰⁰ Kostas Katsapis, *Τχοι και απόχοι. Κοινωνική ιστορία του ροκ εν ρολ φαινομένου στην Ελλάδα, 1956-1967* [Sounds and echoes. A social history of the rock ‘n’ roll phenomenon in Greece, 1956-1967], Athens: IAEN, 2007.

¹⁰¹ Kostas Katsapis, *Το «πρόβλημα νεολαία». Μοντέρνοι νέοι, παράδοση και αμφισβήτηση στη μεταπολεμική Ελλάδα, 1964-1974*, [Youth as a “problem”, Modern youth, tradition and challenging in postwar Greece, 1964-1974], Athens, Ekdoseis Aproveptes, 2013.

¹⁰² Kostis Kornetis, *Children of the Dictatorship. Student Resistance, Cultural Politics and the 'Long 1960s' in Greece*, Berghahn, New York, Oxford, 2013.

¹⁰³ Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties. Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, c. 1958- c. 1974*, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

¹⁰⁴ Kornetis, *Children of the Dictatorship*, 207.

¹⁰⁵ Nikolaos Papadogiannis, *Militant Around the Clock? Left-wing youth politics, leisure and sexuality in post-dictatorship Greece, 1974-1981*, Oxford/New York: Berghahn, 2015; Nikolaos Papadogiannis, “Confronting ‘Imperialism’ and ‘Loneliness’: Sexual and Gender Relations among Young Communists in Greece, 1974-1981,” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 29 (2011): 219-250; Nikolaos Papadogiannis, Sebastian Gehrig, “‘The personal is political’: sexuality, gender and the Left in Europe during the 1970s”, *European Review of History* 22.1 (2015): 1-15.

¹⁰⁶Kevin P. Murphy, Jennifer M. Spear, “Introduction”, in *Historicizing Gender and Sexuality*, Kevin P. Murphy, Jennifer M. Spear (eds), *Historicizing Gender and Sexuality*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, 1-11

¹⁰⁷Eurocommunist organisations advocated political pluralism and were to a greater or lesser extent critical of the USSR in terms of the implementation of the Communist ideology. Eurocommunism, according to Tony Judt, was given official currency by the secretary-general of the Spanish Communists, Santiago Carillo, in his 1977 essay *Eurocomunismo y Estado* [Eurocommunism and the State]. See: Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*, London, Vintage Books, 2007, 495-96, 550.

¹⁰⁸Papadogiannis, Gehrig, “The personal is political”.