BOOK REVIEWS

Historein Historein

To cite this article:

John Seed

Marx: A Guide for the Perplexed

Continuum: London, 2010. 191 pp.

Eleni Andriakaina
Panteion University

> "In our cheerful discourses,
> better than in the formal reasoning of the
> schools, is true wisdom to be found."
> — David Hume, *The Epicurean*

"Alas! Another book on Marx!" I jabbered, wresting John Seed's book *Marx: A Guide for the Perplexed* from the selves of Foyles bookshop at Charing Cross, London, while most of the customers were rushing to the second floor to attend a concert of a young violin virtuoso. Since the 1960s, studies on Marx and Marxism have been booming. What might a new title offer to the existing wide assortment of books, interpretations, conferences and articles in the field of Marxian studies? Owing more to the perversion of the collector rather than the interest of the scholar, I left Foyles holding my fetish firmly in my hand while the virtuoso's violin was agonising over Donizetti's *Una Furtiva Lagrima*.

❖

Teaching Marx today is not an easy task. How it is possible to familiarise university students with a thinker whose philosophical, political and sociological writings marked the history of modernity and postmodernity in East and West? How is it possible to teach Marx without trying to normalise the tensions inherent in the double project not only to interpret the world but to change it as well? In what ways should a university teacher handle the polarised attitudes of his/her students to Marx's thought – ideological and dogmatic attitudes often ranging from total and unconditional approval to strong opposition? Is it feasible to teach Marx ignoring, omitting and skipping the various and often contradictory interpretations of his texts by subsequent scholars without sacrificing the fruitfulness of its contradictions and falling into the trap of a quasi-religious search for its real, final meaning?

In John Seed's book one may find not only a precious companion for an intellectual journey through Marx's major works but also a lucid and comprehensive accompaniment for the teaching of contemporary, modern or postmodern, interpretations of Marxian thought. The author is an English historian. His main interests are in social history, public memory and politics in the eighteenth century and he currently works on the history of migrants in London. In a 191-page book, he traces the development of Marx's thought and maps out the interconnections and tensions between its layers – philosophical, political and scientific.

Armed with an acute reflexive awareness, the product of a long practical experience as an academic teacher and a historian, Seed decides to limit the breadth of his subject by focusing on "what Marx himself prioritised" (11). The book shows the relevance of political intervention for historical understanding,

of practice for critical theory, of lived experience for philosophical reflection as it focuses selectively on some key texts: *Grundrisse* and *Capital*, *The Class Struggles in France* and *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, *The Critique of Gotha Programme* along with various newspaper articles and polemics written with the purpose of guiding the politics of the working-class movement. The aim of the study is stated loud and clear: "to return to the texts of Marx and to explore ways of making sense of them" (6), not with a view to manufacture yet one more final interpretation of Marx but rather "to indicate how different and equally productive readings are often possible" (13).

And indeed, this laconic statement conveys the purpose of a book that doesn't claim to be a revealing new "truth" about Marx or adding some new arguments to Marxology and to the vast literature on Marx. Yet, I think that the contribution of the book lies less in *what* Seed writes about Marx and more on *how* he writes – *how* he approaches, reads and interprets the Marxian texts. It seems to me that the primary value of the book lies in its specific historical outlook on the exposition and the interpretation of Marx's ideas – a mode of thinking, reading and interpreting texts that especially suits the historian's craft. The readings of Marx's texts that Seed's book provides are distinguished by historical sensitivity – a sensitivity very different to the kinds of contextualisation of theory that especially characterise the sociology of knowledge. Although the book situates Marx's ideas in their social, cultural and intellectual context, it doesn't slide into any kind of sociological reductionism. *Marx: A Guide for the Perplexed* tones down arguments about a "seamless web" connecting thought and society, as it traces the process through which a student of philosophy, a German youth of bourgeois origins, turned out to be a revolu-

tionary intellectual who came to talk of abolishing philosophy and of overthrowing the bourgeoisie! *Social being determines social thought* but this determination isn't automatic. It is always mediated by imagination, experience, interpretations and dreams.

In a similar vein, Seed is equally distanced from historicist and "presentist" approaches, keeping instead a balanced critical view that permits him to shift between two levels of analysis: on the one hand, the author highlights the utility and the continuing relevance of Marxian writings for the present. In doing so, he shows their value for analysing the problems of contemporary societies today without falling prey to the fallacy of anachronism. On the other hand, he reads Marx's texts for their own sake; namely, with an aesthetic and historical sensitivity to the plurality of Marx's voices and demands. In other words, I think that Seed's study helps us comprehend the creative inconsistencies, contradictions and tensions in Marx's various writings. These tensions were, to a great extent, the product of Marx's creative genius: his desire to appeal to heterogeneous audiences, to connect scholarship and partisanship, to overcome the contradictions that marked his own life-history, the fragmented nature of modernity and the positivistic distinction between abstract theorising and concrete empirical analysis.

The merits of Seed's approach are best exemplified in two chapters of the volume: chapter 3, entitled "Materialist histories", and chapter 4, named "Political economy and the history of capitalism". Here the presentation follows the distinction between the two levels of analysis – the abstract and the concrete, the theoretical and empirical historical analysis – in order to show how Marx succeeds in overcoming these sterile oppositions. As

Seed comments, the theoretical schema of "historical materialism" could not be conjured out of the air by thinking that is abstracted from careful empirical research:

> The importance of empirical research and historical specificity was something Marx and Engels insisted on throughout their career. "Empirical observation must in each separate instance bring out empirically, and without any mystification and speculation, the connection of the social and political structure with production," *The German Ideology* had stated. This was a point that Engels was forced to repeat again and again in the years after Marx's death as increasing numbers of young disciples seized on "the economic interpretation of history" as the magic key which opened the door to an understanding of the past (65).

By misusing the distinction between theoretical reflection and concrete analysis, "a rigid and mechanistic Marxism reduces complex realities to simple abstractions" (72). But for Marx "in any historical situation attention has to be paid to the historically specific characteristics of an entity such as the petite bourgeoisie which make it always a unique reality" (71). On the other hand, Seed shows the dialectic between theory and experience, stressing Marx's sensitivity and critical attitude towards both the rationalistic and the empiricist fallacies. As he puts it, "it is impossible to deduce the concrete either from concepts or from empirical data" (76). Contrary to what common sense might suggest, Seed shows that for Marx abstract deductive analysis is necessary insofar as everyday experience and the knowledge we acquire from it is also incomplete – namely, it is itself an abstraction.

Thanks to this balanced and discriminating approach, John Seed's book succeeds in avoiding dogmatism, determinism, reductionism and excessive abstraction in favour of a flexible, concrete approach to Marxian writings. He therefore manages to provide us with a precious guide to the thought of Marx, a guide that could be used in order to introduce university students to the various subsequent interpretations of his theory.

Yet, the expert scholar familiar with the literature on Marx may note an absence in this concise *Guide for the Perplexed*. Although the book is written in the light of the subsequent interpretations of Marx's writings, it doesn't enter into a direct dialogue with the existing literature on Marx. Should one consider this "absence" as a defect? I don't think so. Sometimes, in seeking in a study an answer to a question that the author doesn't seek to explore, one runs the risk of missing the target. Seed reads Marx's texts fully aware of the controversies over their interpretation and this enables him to bring out their complexity without sacrificing their heterogeneity. As he puts it, "the heterogeneity of Marx's texts . . . destabilises the position of the reader who must constantly submit himself, herself to revision and re-reading" (14). The purpose of the book (which appears in the Guides for the Perplexed series, published by Continuum) is to provide us with a guide to reading Marx's key texts and to make these more accessible. In Seed's *Guide*, university teachers and students may discover not a perplexing study of Marx but a clear path through the perplexity of reading and teaching Marx today.

Yannis Voularis and Loudovikos Kotsonopoulos (eds)

Στα μονοπάτια του Αντόνιο Γκράμσι: Πολιτική και πολιτισμός από το έθνος-κράτος στην παγκοσμιοποίηση

[Along the pathways of Antonio Gramsci: Politics and culture from the nation-state to globalisation]

Athens: Themelio, 2010. 214 pp.

Seraphim Seferiades

Panteion University/University of Cambridge

That Gramsci's work is open to multiple readings is both a blessing and a curse. For the student (and active citizen) the challenge is, of course, to navigate through the resultant complexities in a progressive spirit – à la Lakatos' progressive research programme: not to phobically shy away from recognising the work's perplexing variety of meanings and theoretical trajectories, but, rather, to do so in a manner that pays respect (and promotes) its constitutive theoretical core. In case one fails to take into account permutations (and even ambiguities) in the corpus, the predictable outcome is premature closure: mistakenly assuming the corpus to be unidimensional, one impoverishes it. The opposite danger, of course, is theoretical deformation: failing to engage in an immanent reading of the work and its evolution results in perverse and ultimately faulty interpretations. This

volume, edited by Yannis Voulgaris and Loudovikos Kotsonopoulos, takes on precisely such a difficult and important task: to judiciously navigate through the "Gramscian pathway" (as the volume's title appropriately declares).

In tracing the historical-epistemic conditions in which the Gramscian corpus was produced and appropriated, Voulgaris notes an expansive progression from the national to the European, and then to the global. This is both factual, reflecting the actual thematic foci of Gramsci's work, and – perhaps more crucially – "subjective": regarding the ways in which the work was interpreted and appropriated. Voulgaris suggests that Gramsci was first seen as a theorist contributing a novel reading of Italian unification; subsequently as proponent of the distinctiveness of European socialism; lastly as someone shedding new light to the ever-present link between the national and the global. Underlying each and every phase were of course a variety of profound political (and scholarly) preconditions and implications: for example, the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the several varieties of "western Marxism", the emergence of new social movements (some of them with an ostensibly postmaterial outlook) and, finally, globalisation. Voulgaris claims that key Gramscian concepts, such as "hegemony" and the "passive revolution", retain a lasting significance and need to be recast in light of the new global environment. Especially nowadays, no hegemonic project is possible unless it has an international horizon and what may be construed as democratic embeddedness: functional democratic institutions. This is all well, but the question remains: will the democracy envisioned (as an institutional form) be capable of transcending the narrow confines of the capitalist state? If not, the hegemony will not be Gramscian but the exact opposite, some new variety of reorganised capitalism: a direct negation of Gramsci's constitutive theoretical core.

These are, of course, thorny questions of the utmost theoretical (and practical-political) importance appearing in the problèmatique of several chapters, and encompassing at least three key areas of modern social and political theory: the nature of the capitalist state, the question of democracy, and socialist strategy.

Examining the impact that Gramsci's work had on cultural studies, Myrsini Zorba's chapter, for example, stresses the autonomous significance of "superstructures" (entailing the complexity of domination and the need to undertake resistance at the level of "civil society" via a contentious popular culture); hence, the importance of a democratic ethos (what she dubs "the possibility of society's democratic reform versus . . . revolutionary violence" (39); and the ubiquitous nature of power (à la Foucault). This is undeniably so, lest we forget: that the "democracy" we are talking about – hypostatised and super/a-historically absolute – is but bourgeois parliamentarism, a capitalist state form Marxists (including Gramsci, of course) sought to overthrow; that culture (i.e., battles of signification) was a resource to be mobilised precisely for that purpose; and that multifaceted power was a problem *revolutionaries* had to grapple with. The volume is ambivalent on that count. Indeed, sometimes Gramsci is portrayed as a Second International scholar (even its contemporary utterly reactionary incarnations) on the pretext that he recognised the importance of culture, civil society and the not necessarily violent nature of socialist struggle. These themes are all inextricably linked. Hypostatising "democracy", castigating "revolutionary violence" and reducing counterhegemonic culture-work to civil society banalities is exceedingly facile, but does it reflect Gramsci's endeavour? "Socialism will be democratic or it will not be at all," exclaimed Poulantzas in *State, Power, Socialism*, but at a time of an all-out bourgeois-democratic implosion (incidentally, not historically unprecedented), is it not

an imperative to exclaim also the obverse? *That democracy will be socialist or it will not be at all*? To wit, it is about time we revisit a notion unceremoniously lost in several post-Gramscian treatises: that democracy qua *bourgeois democracy* is still a structure constituted for the purpose of maintaining and reproducing systemic domination, with no scruples regarding the use of coercive violence when actors seeking democritic deepening encroach on its sacrosanct code of practice: the private appropriation of socially produced surplus. Relatedly, easy as may be (indeed painfully obvious) to castigate "revolutionary violence", how is one to respond to state violence against actors seeking socialism? One may well opt for rejecting socialism, of course, but this is definitely not Gramsci's option: directly or indirectly espousing it seriously distorts his overall concerns and the theoretical *medium res* informing his argument.

This general thrust of depoliticising Gramsci, of approaching his writings as if produced in a political vacuum, has resulted in a number of false antinomies (unscrupulously utilised for political – rather than merely research – purposes): identity vs. strategy; state vs. civil society; finally, war of movement vs. war of position. These are all issues meticulously aired in the fine chapters by Marilena Simiti and co-editor Loudovikos Kotsonopoulos. Ironically, the rift between identity and strategy (identity devoid of strategy or identity as an end in itself), for instance, entails accepting existing *dominations* at best as irrelevant and at worst as unproblematic. Not all new social movements adopted this line of thinking, of course. But that we ended perceiving them through the lenses of an undifferentiated, classless "civil society" facing an – equally classless – state reflects precisely an instance of the hegemony Gramsci sought to expose. Similarly ironic has been the trajectory of that concept as well: while "civil society" was initially perceived as area of domination

and resistance, argues Simiti, via the "governance" discourse, it progressively became part and parcel precisely of the dominant hegemonic discourse Gramsci wrote against. And so was the case with the intra-institutional "war of position", diligently analysed by Kotsonopoulos. Scholars have, of course, noticed the conceptual difference between it and its corollary concept of the "war of movement". What they have tended to miss is the corollary nature of the relationship: that "war of position" was so conceived and named ("position" to do what?) as prefatory for waging the "war of movement" – intended to overthrow capitalism. These issues and the reading here offered are, of course, controversial. But the debate is long overdue and the volume offers an excellent opportunity to (re-)open it.

The volume is impressive in the broad variety of themes it brings to focus. Effi Gazi's chapter on the way Gramsci influenced the original notion, and subsequent emergence, of a "subaltern history" (with all the ensuing historiographical controversies); Georgios Giannakopoulos' examination of the link between the concept of hegemony and Saidian Orientalism (and, via that, postcolonial studies in general); Maria Tzevelekou's highlighting of Gramsci's typically neglected attention to language (and his many key contributions to modern linguistics); finally, Yiannis Papatheodorou's theoretical chapter on the complex relationship between Gramsci, Machiavelli and Althusser. Equally impressive, indeed impeccable, is the scholarship of the volume. All the chapters are meticulously researched and drafted, in a language that is engaging and dense, yet straightforward. This, of course, brings us back to the book's political significance and ramifications. This is a collection of essays on an important subject, which deserves to be critically studied and debated on both counts: its scholarship and its underlying politics.

**Anna Frangoudaki
and Çağlar Keyder (eds)**

*Ελλάδα και Τουρκία:
Πορείες εκσυγχρονισμού.
Οι αμφίσημες σχέσεις τους με
την Ευρώπη, 1850–1950*

**[Greece and Turkey:
ways to modernity;
the encounters with Europe,
1850–1950]**

**Athens: Alexandria, 2008.
397 pp.**

Foti Benlisoy
Istanbul

It is well known that the domination of Europe over non-European areas was legitimised and understood through a specific vocabulary that represents a dichotomous perception of social reality. According to this Eurocentric modernisation paradigm, western history is cast as the privileged domain of dynamic social change, prosperous economic development and a developed civil society as well as circumscribed state power and the rule of law. On the contrary, non-western societies are portrayed as geographies characterised by a despotic state, limited economic development (or prolonged stagnation), a weak civil society and the absence of the rule of law. Thus, the history of non-western societies is conceptualised through a narrative of lacks and absences, where modernisation is understood as an imitation and replica of institutions and practices belonging to the so-called

western world. Therefore, such a historical account perceives modernity mostly as an institutional and legal set of practices with distinct cultural artefacts that were shaped within the European context and subsequently exported to the non-western world. While this Eurocentric conception has been criticised harshly and has lost ground in the past two decades, we cannot underestimate its pervasive legacy, which has infiltrated almost all aspects of Ottoman and Middle Eastern historiography.

This volume is a collection of articles edited by Anna Frangoudaki and Çağlar Keyder. Instead of relying on a self-evident and dichotomous conception of West and East, this volume brings together different studies aiming to illustrate how these terms were historically constructed and contested. In their coauthored introduction, Frangoudaki and Keyder identify the common thread binding the different contributions as "the theme of experiencing, reacting to and producing modernity", pointing out the common focus on the right balance between "tradition and imported modernity" (12). In that respect, the authors claim that in both Greece and Turkey nationalism has come to the forefront as a saviour: "It was discovered as the perfect solution which permitted the building of a modernity on a reconstructed bed of tradition" (ibid). Thus, there emerges a distinct articulation of a particular kind of modernity with a reinterpreted or reinvented tradition. Many of the contributors to the volume deal with various aspects of that articulation, from different points of views.

Ioannis Tassopoulos' contribution ("Constitutionalism and the ideological conversion to national unity under the Greek constitution of 1864") deals with the "paradox of progressive liberal constitutionalism and regressive liberal ideology" in Greece. Although from the last quarter of the nineteenth century Greece saw a remarkable consolidation and growth towards the maturity of parliamentary democracy, on the other hand there was a "gradual ideological conversion of Greek life, from the philosophy of political liberalism and enlightenment to national messianism, ethno-centrism and intolerance" (22). However, this paradox, according to Tassopoulos, did not led to a confrontation between these two but rather "the Romanticist takeover took the form of conversion rather than transformation". In order to grasp this conversion, Tassopoulos points to the development of constitutionalism in relation to the social structure of Greece during the second half of the nineteenth century. He claims that in the absence of social conflicts, the transition from absolutism to democracy was associated with national aspirations. In conclusion, "the critical dialectic between liberalism and democracy, individual rights and participation, which set the dynamics of constitutional development in Europe, never fully worked out in Greece and the distinction between liberalism and democracy remained rather blurred and confused" (40–41). Tassopoulos' conclusion that the synthesis between liberalism and democracy that occurred in Europe failed to take place in Greece until the late twentieth century is a reminder of the conventional evaluation of modernisation at the periphery as a history of absences. However, in the past two decades revisionist approaches in British and German historiography have demystified the conception of a liberal-democratic West essentially characterised by a weak state and a strong civil society. In that respect, one can argue, on the contrary, that this synthesis between liberalism and democracy occurred in Western Europe only after the end of the Second World War.

Haris Exertzoglou's article, "Metaphors of change: 'tradition' and the East/West discourse in the late Ottoman Empire", examines how

modernist projects, such as education, were articulated in the language of "tradition". Moreover, he provides many examples showing that in the educational affairs of the Greek Orthodox communities of the Ottoman Empire "tradition" was invoked constantly. The discourse on the restoration of the national tradition and, thus, national regeneration was a key feature of the modern education system. According to Exertzoglou, the articulation of education with the discourse on tradition and the constant reference to the restoration of tradition was not a conservative reaction to rapid social and cultural change but "was in fact a way of trying to come to terms with an inevitable but uncertain modernity whose long-term implications were unknown" (85). He underlines that this discourse specifically addressed the literate urban middle classes and allowed them to cope with a variety of novel problems such as the position of women, the management of the urban poor, etc. In fact, this tension between the experience of modernity and the evocation of tradition was a characteristic of nationalist discourse in general. Exertzoglou cites Partha Chatterjee in order to underline the "inherent contradiction of nationalist discourses between the defence of the national self, which presumably antedates modernity, and the claim for self-government through Western institutions" (91). Although, non-western nationalisms accepted the universal western models, they also stressed the particularity of their nations and their unique character. Exertzoglou notes that "nationalist discourses have attempted to embrace both modernisation and tradition, by separating form from principle in the case of the former, and by emphasising the historical roots of the latter". Thus, while on the one hand the imitation of superficial western patterns was condemned, on the other modernisation was linked directly with the restoration of an imagined Greek national tradition. The Greek claim to find a place in the modern world of nations could only be achieved by evoking and restoring the Greek tradition. Lastly, Exertzoglou also points out to the device of a parallel strategy by the Ottoman Muslim reformists, where reference to the restoration of "tradition" as a way of coping with rapid social change was common both for Greek nationalists and Muslim reformists.

Angeliki Psara's contribution, "A gift from the new world: Greek feminists between East and West, 1880–1930", deals with the same issue of utilising national tradition as a mechanism for modernisation. She indicates that the emerging feminist movement sought to disassociate itself from its western counterpart while striving to ally itself with the Greek national cause. Psara underlines that Greek feminists "made every effort to purge their feminism of any western connotations, and present it in true Greek colours" (227). Similar to many other parts of the world, "patriotic feminism", i.e., women's preoccupation with national matters, was presented as the basic legitimising mechanism of their inclusion in the public sphere. Indeed, Greek feminists constantly tried to stress the "national" character of their project: "their systematic recourse to ancient Greek glory made up for all that was lacking in contemporary Greece, and allowed them to assume the role of mediator between women of the West and East" (229). Moreover, Greek feminists utilised the ancient Greek legacy as "the basic argument in support of the 'distinction' of modern Greece as compared to the 'uncivilised' neighbouring countries, 'Balkan' and 'Eastern'" (237). This effort of the Greek women to disassociate themselves from Eastern or Muslim women, according to Psara, formed a "peculiar feminist orientalism" (237).

In a similar vein, Zafer Yenal ("'Cooking' the nation: women, experiences of modernity, and the girls' institutes in Turkey") also stresses the construction of gender roles as a defining

feature of modernisation and nation-building processes in modern Turkey. By citing Chatterjee and Shakry, Yenal underlines that the anticolonial national movements in countries such as India and Egypt claimed modernisation only by "discovering tradition": "In this process, while the *material* aspects of western civilisation in relation to science, technology, economic organisation and state administration were to be adopted without any hesitation, the *spiritual* domain had to be protected from encroachments" (293). In fact, the spiritual or "cultural" and not the former material aspect ("civilisation") was the sphere where the nation could claim its superiority and distinctiveness. Obviously, the principal site for expressing this distinct cultural and spiritual quality of the national culture was the home, and it was the women's responsibility to protect and nurture this aspect. However, according to Yenal, in the case of Turkey "the articulation between the place of women in society and the nationalist/modernising project is different" in that it applied a "wholesale Westernisation of the role of women not only in the public realm but also in the private sphere" (294). Yenal deals with the girls' institutes in Turkey and indicates "the significantly transformative role that these institutions have played in the creation of a new normative order through women" (303). Through the girls' institutes, which instructed young, middle-class women on issues such as appropriate table manners, rules of public conduct and the importance of hygiene, the state sought to transform the family and the private realm according to modern western norms.

Contrary to the aforementioned, dominant scheme of imitation and replication, Biray Kolluoğlu-Kırlı ("Cityscapes and modernity: Smyrna morphing into İzmir") argues that urban development in İzmir in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries "should not be bound to the framework of *Tanzimat* or European colonisation". According to her, the urban devel-

opment of İzmir "was a locally induced process and an organic part of developments seen also in other Mediterranean ports" such as Beirut, Thessaloniki or Alexandria. According to Kolluğlu-Kırlı, the fire of Smyrna in 1922, which devastated a large area of the city, "presented an ideal opportunity for envisioning grandiose urban schemes. The reconstruction of Smyrna literally meant building a new and drastically different city" (329). This changed the character of urban development itself, in the sense that during the Ottoman period Smyrna's urban management was locally induced, and therefore "nineteenth-century Smyrna did not have a Haussmann or an Anspach, nor grand schemes of urban planning" (335). However, this changed in the republican era when urban planning became a rule. In the 1930s, urban development followed the designs of the central government in Ankara rather than the will of local agencies. In that respect, Kolluoğlu-Kırlı concludes that during the republican era "urban development was geared towards a more totalitarian and nationalist interpretation of modernity" (352). This meant that "spatially, nineteenth-century Smyrna represented a fractured heterogeneity and an intense density, in contrast to the standardised homogeneity and apparent hollowness of the republican city" (352).

Ioanna Petropoulou ("From West to East: the translation bridge; an approach from a western perspective") comments on the translation of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century western novels into *karamanlidika* (Turkish written in Greek letters), used by the Turkish-speaking Christian Orthodox population of Asia Minor. She suggests that the translation of western literary products had important modernising effects, as evidenced by the secular content of the translated novels and by the introduction of modern methods for the production, distribution and consumption of books – modern individualistic patterns of reading:

"Foreign novels were conductors of modernity *par excellence*" (163). She insists on the role played by the Karamanli press in transmitting modern ideas and western publishing practices (*le roman feuilleton*). She especially underlines the role played by Evangelinos Misailidis ("This modernising figure, this anticlerical 'press baron', was a true intellectual, an 'organic intellectual' in the western sense") and his *Anatoli* newspaper. However, this is a rather one-sided account of the role of the Karamanli press. Although *Anatoli* and its editor, Misailidis, were among the principal popularisers of the genre of the western novel among their readers through translations and publications of serialised novels, the same paper also harshly criticised the replacement of religious books in homes with western novels and condemned the harmful effects of this genre. Therefore, it can be said that the press served two contradictory purposes, amplifying once again the articulation of tradition with modernity. On the one hand, it served as one of the main channels for the dissemination of new and secular ideas in social, political, cultural and educational matters. On the other, it became the primary forum for the defence of religious and traditional values and practices in the sphere of education and culture.

In sum, by addressing various aspects of convergent and divergent trajectories of modernisation in Greece and Turkey, the volume offers valuable information and analysis in order to think about modernisation beyond teleological-determinist and Eurocentric schemes. However, one may notice that the critique of the Eurocentric modernisation paradigm should not lead us to culturalist approaches where modernity is conceived as multiple insofar as it is defined mainly in the context of civilisational or cultural referents. In contrast, we should conceive the plurality of modernisms as "coeval", i.e., as sharing the same historical temporality of modernity found in other parts of the world.

Ada Dialla

Η Ρωσία απέναντι στα Βαλκάνια: Ιδεολογία και πολιτική στο δεύτερο μισό του 19ου αιώνα

[Russia vis-à-vis the Balkans: ideology and politics in the second half of the 19th century]

Athens: Alexandria, 2008. 399 pp.

Nikolaos Chrissidis
Southern Connecticut State University

Consider this question. Stripped from myths about the inscrutability of a supposed Russian "soul", from stereotypes about the "big bear" friend or foe (depending on one's viewpoint) and from contemporary or subsequent ideologically laden historiographical schemes (be they Marxist, liberal or otherwise), what were the views of Russian intellectuals and publicists on the Slavic question in the Balkans in the second half of the 19th century? This book is an attempt to provide an answer to this question. It is intellectual history at its best since it combines a highly sophisticated discussion of ideological trends in the Russian public sphere with a firm grasp of contemporary domestic policies and international entanglements. The book thus achieves what its subtitle suggests: an examination of ideas and policies on the Balkans as expressed and de-

bated in the Russian public sphere during a period of rapid and upsetting developments both domestically and internationally.

Ada Dialla, the author, focuses on Russian nationalist discourse as it appeared in the "thick journals" (the variety periodicals that served as one of the mainstays of public speech at the time), newspapers, pamphlets, broadsheets as well as archival sources (from the Russian Archive of Foreign Policy) and other publications. By way of a thorough, critical and comparative reading of these sources, she highlights the various debates generated by Slavism and Panslavism with regard to the Balkans. Such debates took place more or less unhindered, especially after the Great Reforms of the 1860s relaxed censorship and until 1881 and the accession of Alexander III. Participants were historians and other university professors, military generals, literary authors, political scientists, legal scholars, former government ministers and public intellectuals. Dialla approaches the theme thematically and chronologically. Her chronological framework covers the period between the end of the Crimean War in 1856 and the century's end. The book is divided into two parts. Part one covers the period between the Crimean War's end and 1878. Here Dialla discusses the Russian defeat in the war and its repercussions. In particular, she illuminates Russian attempts to redefine enemy and friend and also to define Russianness through the "others", whether these others were other Slavs, western Europeans, Eastern Orthodox peoples or Asians. The book's second part focuses on the period between the Treaty of Berlin of 1878 and the century's end. Here Dialla examines the various dimensions of the Eastern Question, Russian foreign policy and the discourses generated by the Eastern Question in the empire. In this part, Panslavism comes in for particular consideration. In a very welcome move, Dialla takes Panslavism

seriously and goes beyond its utopian and unfulfilled dreams to discuss those visions that transcended narrow national boundaries and extensive imperial ones in favour of federal solutions. The book closes with a consideration of Panslavism's failure in the domestically and internationally charged circumstances of the 1880s and 1890s. Writing in clear and sophisticated prose, Dialla is commendably sensitive to the shades of terminology and language. The rich and up-to-date bibliography contains an annotated section on the various periodicals used, a feature which will be of particular use to readers unfamiliar with these materials.

In a concise and informative introduction, Dialla lays out the empirical sources and the theoretical parameters of her study. She discusses orientalism, the "invention of eastern Europe", imperialism both in the domestic and in the international front, as well as the construction of the "other" in the public sphere. Moreover, she challenges the paradigm of the specificity of Russia and instead seeks to consider the Russian nationalist discourse in the context of processes common in Europe rather than as an aberration of the "big bear" in the East. She does not necessarily subscribe to a particular theory of nationalism. Rather, she looks at the nation as a topos where various discourses came together and conversed among themselves. Therefore, what is a Russian and what is Russianness prove to be fluid, contested and, ultimately, never fully crystallised concepts, always in dispute among intellectuals and publicists. A further complicating factor was the fundamentally dynastic bent of official Russian ideology which allowed little room for national liberation struggles, emancipation of nations or other such nondynasty-oriented ventures and adventures. Dialla examines the issue of Russian identity not through some metaphysical concoctions (for example, the Russian soul) or a priori theoretical constructs (Russia as the

Orient of Europe); rather, she considers identity as a constantly changing concept that very much depended on the historical framework, and which crystallised more or less at certain points, but never became absolutely immutable or perennial. Thus, Dialla provides us with a theoretically informed but not theoretically dictated account. In her narrative, Slavism and Panslavism are complex phenomena that defy easy categorisation or categorical statements assigning them to liberal, conservative or any other ideological current.

Chapter One covers the syndrome of insecurity which the Crimean War's failure bequeathed to the Russians. The war's trauma exposed the state's weakness both internally and externally. After all, or so it appeared, Russia was a giant with glass legs. The defeat was seen as a national disgrace and resulted in a torrent of criticism against the government. Clamour for reforms, already loud in the mouths of Slavophiles and westernisers alike, intensified in both volume and in breadth. The concepts of nation and Russianness played a significant role in the relevant discussions, as did comparisons between Russia and western Europe. In these discussions, liberal and radical westernisers utilised a discourse that approximated that of political nationalism and aimed at a radical reform of the state along lines of participatory political structures. Conversely, Slavophiles countered with a cultural nationalism that exploited the concept of the *narod* (the common people) and their supposed pure Russianness in order to advance an agenda of moral return to the good old Russia that had been corrupted by Peter the Great's westernising reforms. Although there was some convergence (on the need for certain liberties and freedoms, on the abolition of serfdom, on the need for reform), the two ideological camps did not shape common visions for the future. In the process of debate, mod-

ernisation, nationalism, social emancipation and relations with western Europe and the Balkans all came up for consideration. Running through these debates were two constant themes: that Russia needed to somehow define itself vis-à-vis the West and that it also needed to reform internally. Chapter Two traces this process of definition by looking at what the author calls the European ambivalence regarding Russia's European credentials. In the relevant European portrayals, Russia occupied a middle position between the developed world (understood as western Europe) and the barbaric East, belonging fully to neither. Such portrayals emphasised invariably Russia's arrested development, its brutality as the gendarme of Europe, its semi-barbaric character, and last but not least, its long-term subjection to nomadic influences. In this context, the fact that the Russians were Christians was not of much help either, given that Eastern Orthodoxy was viewed at best as a schismatic and at worst as a ritualistic religion. With the growing decline of the Ottoman Empire, by the nineteenth century Russia had replaced it in the European collective imagination as Europe's internal "other". Coming on the heels of such ideas was Russophobia, most poignantly expressed in the international relations engendered by the Eastern Question. Thus, the cultural and civilisational barriers that had been developed in particular during the Napoleonic Wars by European authors (and were most vividly outlined in de Custine's 1843 bestselling book) now acquired the additional dimension of a struggle between civilisation and barbarism on the chessboard of the Eastern Question. Such ideas were common among European thinkers of various political colourings. More importantly, these ideas formulated the backdrop and defined the terminological and conceptual framework within which the Russian counterdiscourses developed.

Chapter Three focuses on these counter-discourses in all their imaginary and imaginative dimensions. For as much as western Europe was an imagined community of civilised nations, the Russians constructed an imagined community from an imperial framework. Despite the eventual differences, both Slavophiles and westernisers were influenced by the philosophical and intellectual currents of western Europe and even accepted that Russia had a place in Europe. The question was of course what kind of place and on what terms. Predictably, the answers varied. Romantic Slavophiles idealised a pre-Petrine (that is, before Peter the Great) past with its patrimonial bent, organic relations between the social classes and moral bonds fostered by Russian Orthodoxy. Conversely, westernisers emphasised that Russia could profit from emulating certain policies of European countries and learning from their example. Neither camp was fully integrated or united in its views, and included both moderate and extremist viewpoints. As an example of the more extreme thinkers, Dialla focuses on Nikolai Danilevskii, a scion of the service gentry and author of a book on Russia and Europe that became the catechism of Panslavism. First published in a series of articles in 1869, the work was reprinted as a book five times before 1895. Danilevskii denied the existence of common laws of historical development and emphasised the special character of the Slavic world. He thus placed at the basis of his examination the existence of historical-cultural types among peoples. As a biologist, he thought also in terms of development: each type underwent birth, growth and decline. In such a scheme, western Europe was on the decline, whereas the Slavic world was on the rise, since they were younger than the western Europeans. The future belonged to the Slavs, something that according to Danilevskii exacerbated the West's innate Russophobia.

Despite its initial success, Danilevskii's scheme came up for criticism, even from among Slavophiles who were unwilling to reject the existence of at least some common pan-European bonds. Still, the particular bonds among Slavs became the object of research and reflection among a variety of scholars and publicists. Chapter Four traces this process by focusing on the work of philologists, historians and public intellectuals within the framework of what Dialla calls the ideology of Slavism. In this context, thinkers emphasised the existence of a Slavic world while at the same time pointing out the elements of Russianness that (supposedly) permeated it. Research into Slavic history and philology proved the existence of a common Slavic world. Shared features also included a similar state formation trajectory, conciliarity (emphasis on the community) and, more controversially and awkwardly, Eastern Orthodoxy. Despite cultural and historical differences, the Slavs were fundamentally one big family. Russia in particular served as the Antemurale Europae because of its permeable borders in the East. Complementary to that was a *mission civilizatrice* of Russia in the East. Given the religious difference among the Slavs, thinkers sought to mollify them by emphasising the commonality of ecclesiastical language. Philology and comparative linguistics became the handmaidens in such efforts. Ultimately, however, most thinkers were forced to focus on the Orthodox South Slavs. The lonely voice of Konstantin Leontiev sought to emphasise the preponderance of Orthodoxy even at the expense of Slavic identity or national emancipation. Moderate and extremist Slavophiles battled it over whether scientific research should have the ultimate goal of proving the existence of common bonds, whether it should also point out differences and separateness, or whether it should seek to highlight the superiority of the Russian language. Hard on the heels of philologists were the Slavic benevolent societies

who sought to spread the academic messages to a wider audience through public lectures, libraries and scholarships for Russians and other Slavs, always under the watchful eye of the Russian imperial government.

In Chapter Five, Dialla shifts the focus on the Russian government and its policies in the context of the Eastern Question. Here Dialla provides a concise overview of Russian foreign policy towards the Ottoman Empire and highlights the government's realism, its reluctance to appear to be upsetting the fragile equilibrium achieved by the Treaty of Paris (1856), and its efforts to undo the treaty's restrictive stipulations regarding the Black Sea. In the internal debates among foreign policy circles two lines are clearly visible: the more realist, moderate one, led by foreign minister Gorchakov (in office from 1856 to 1882), who advocated caution and European cooperation in the Eastern Question and a more aggressive policy in Central Asia (according to him, the prime area of the *mission civilizatrice* of the Russians); the more antagonistic one, led by the Russian envoy in Constantinople, Ignatiev, who supported a more activist foreign policy in the Balkans, the destruction of the Ottoman Empire and its replacement with smaller Christian nations that would be under the protection and control of Russia.

Gorchakov's line carried the day in the 1860s and 1870s. Needless to say, Slavophiles supported Ignatiev's plans, although, as Dialla notes, westernising intellectuals also accepted that Russia had a role to play in the Balkans. Chapter Six traces the public debates on the Eastern Question. Dialla analyses the ways in which conservative Slavophiles identified the Slavic Question with the Eastern Question by utilising the principle of national self-determination. Thinkers such as General Fadeev, Ivan Aksakov and Danilevskii were some the

most prominent advocates of this identification, although their focal points may have differed. Fadeev, in particular, posited an irrevocable geopolitical conflict between Russia and the West, while Danilevskii saw the Eastern Question through the lens of a cultural conflict. In such readings, the solution of the Eastern Question became the opportunity for the Slavs (read, the Russians) to create a new geopolitical situation and/or a new culture. To be sure, not all Slavophiles bought into such schemes. Some of them in fact preferred an emphasis on domestic activism on behalf of their wretched Russian brethren inside the empire. In debating Russian foreign policy, the Slavophiles were also debating whether the Russian state should become identical with the Russian nation given that, in their reading, the Eastern Question led to a redefinition of Russian identity. In their own formulation of the problem, on the other hand, liberal westernising intellectuals posited Russia's European identity by emphasising the Ottoman Empire as the European other. In helping dismantle the Ottoman Empire, Russia would highlight its European credentials. This attitude of course rejected any identification of the Slavic with the Eastern Question.

Both Slavophiles and westernisers, therefore, saw a mission for Russia in the Christian East, depending on their reading of the Russian past. Chapter Seven shows that the devil was in the details, and in the realism of the imperial government's cautious approach. Russian slavophilic nationalism emphasised the principle of national self determination as a tool for the potential future unification of all Slavs under Russian hegemony. Alternative Panslavist schemes (not without criticism from liberals) proposed a union of all Slavs under the guise of a common language; or the subjection to a monarchical Russian state with Russia playing the role of Piedmont (as

Danilevskii saw it); or the creation of a sort of federation of small states around Russia that would provide protection against the West (as Fadeev suggested). In all such schemes, acceptance of Russian control would be voluntary and would come with a degree of internal autonomy. Such plans, of course, directly answered the issue of who would inherit the Ottoman Empire, including Constantinople. Here, the slavophilic discourse directly challenged the Greek pretensions to the Ottoman legacy. The Greeks were a small, weak people and, in any case, they had already played their role in history. But Constantinople would not automatically go to the Russians, either, at least in the long term: instead, the imperial city should become the capital of the Slavic federation. (Dostoyevskii was probably the only one who consistently advocated Russian control of it.) The end result would be an eastern Europe which, although focused primarily on a federation of Slavic peoples, could potentially also include non-Slavs such as the Greeks and the Romanians. Even some liberal thinkers supported similar schemes, as a way of reining in aggressive nationalism and replacing absolutist regimes.

Then came the 1877–1878 Russo–Turkish War. Chapter Eight traces the enthusiasm the government's decision to fight generated among the small slavophilic circles. It also highlights the disappointment engendered by the experiences the Russian volunteers encountered in the Balkans. Linguistic and cultural differences and suspicions regarding Russian plans led many Balkan Slavs to a guarded, if not negative, attitude towards those who volunteered to fight on their behalf. The annulment of the Treaty of San Stefano by the Treaty of Berlin gave slavophilic circles the ammunition to fire off a torrent of criticism against Russian foreign policymakers. The mutual disappointment between Russians and Balkan Slavs turned Russian thinkers inwards: now the parameters of Russian identity were searched for internally. As Chapter Nine shows, a renegotiation of this Russian identity ensued, and it found its mainstay in support for Russian absolutism. Domestic developments and the rise of activist opposition against the government (and, of course, the murder of Alexander II in 1881) contributed to this reorientation. The result was that Russian nationalist discourse, as exemplified in slavophilic utterances, tended more and more to identify itself with the government's policies. Dialla closes her account with a consideration of the reasons for Panslavism's failure. She suggests four factors: the disappointment with Russian foreign policy failures and loss of Russian prestige, the absence of common Russian interests with the newly created Slavic states as a whole, better knowledge of the complexities and antinomies of the Slavic world, and, finally, the growing fear that Russian authenticity and originality might be lost in a sea of undifferentiated Slavism. Coupled with the general reluctance of the Russian imperial government to engage in activities that might undermine imperial regimes abroad, these factors contributed to a confluence of dynastic preferences and interests, on the one hand, and ideological imperatives and directions, on the other. By the 1890s, the turn to the East (that is, Russia's East) seemed to be a more pressing and potentially more advantageous field for imperial policymakers and intellectuals alike.

Throughout the book, Dialla emphasises that the Russian imperial government was averse to any theories that would privilege the nation over the dynastic or imperial principle, both for domestic and international policy reasons. As she repeatedly reminds the reader, the tsarist state was not a national but rather a dynastic one. In the mind of this reviewer, the following instance illustrates best the prevailing dynastic

principle: when in the first population census in 1897, Tsar Nicholas II filled the census form's entry on occupation with the words *khoziain russkoi zemli*, what he emphasised was his role as, literally, the landlord, the head, the master, the father figure and ultimate authority of the Russian land, not of the Russians only as a people, but of the lands that were under the control of the Russians, ultimately of his patrimony (the term *khoziain* having the meaning of master, landlord, chief of a family, head of a household). Thus, the innate interests and the imperial priorities and realities of everyday governance dictated a guarded, if not openly hostile, attitude on the part of the Russian government to any nationalist overtures, even when they originated from the pen of stalwart royalist commentators with impeccable conservative credentials. The end result was, as Dialla concisely notes, that "Russian nationalism was at its basis loyal to the state" (32).

Dialla is to be commended for digging deep into the shades of Slavism and Panslavism and providing a thorough, critical and comparative consideration of their various manifestations within the framework of Russian nationalist discourse. This is a theoretically informed but (it bears repeating) never theoretically overburdened book. Dialla knows well the literature on the topic and other related ones (for example, foreign policy, international relations, nationalism, etc.) in several languages. Thus, her book is in conversation with the latest directions in the historiography of the Russian Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Its particular usefulness, however, lies in that it contributes substantially to the existing historiography by illuminating the Balkan dimension. It will be read with much profit by both specialist and generalist alike.

Basil C. Gounaris

Το μακεδονικό ζήτημα από τον 19ο έως τον 21ο αιώνα: Ιστοριογραφικές προσεγγίσεις

[The Macedonian Question from the 19th to the 21st century: Historiographical approaches]

Athens: Alexandria, 2010. 158 pp.

Erik Sjöberg
Umeå University

Writing about the Macedonian Question has never been an enterprise entirely free from political concerns or personal bias, historian Basil C. Gounaris stated in a review of its historiography, written in 2000. With the Macedonian conflict of the 1990s still fresh in memory, he and his then coauthor Iakovos Michailidis claimed that there was a "story involving bribery, personal feelings, or political intrigues behind almost every book about the modern (or even the ancient) history of Macedonia". With this context in mind, "even the preparation of a bibliography is itself a political act". The politically charged atmosphere surrounding the scholarship on this issue is well known to students of the region. Nevertheless, Gounaris asserts, the history of Macedonia is far from a scholarly dead end.

The present study is intended as an introduction to the study of Macedonia and the histo-

riography about the region that has evolved since the late nineteenth century in, chiefly, four different national contexts: in Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and, later on, in Yugoslav Macedonia. In essence, it is an expanded and updated version of the above-cited paper, which appeared as a chapter in an English language monograph on the Macedonian Question.[1]

Gounaris' study is divided into four major chapters and is supplemented with a selected bibliography and a chronology covering the period from 1861 to 2005. In the introductory chapter, bearing the title "Re-approach", he sets out to define what the Macedonian Question is and has been for the past 150 years. Originally this question emerged as an offspring of the larger Eastern Question, which concerned the fate of the remaining Balkan – chiefly Macedonian – territories of the crumbling Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. After 1913, when the wider Macedonian region was divided between Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia, the three rival bidders for the territory and the national loyalty of its inhabitants, the Macedonian Question endured through changing political contexts as a set of problems related to the legitimacy of national claims, ready to surface whenever the issue of border revision emerged again in the Balkans. The core of the issue has been the control of the Macedonian territory and the struggle to define the identity of the Macedonian population(s); what is (and whose is) Macedonia, or who are the Macedonians?

Gounaris describes the issue in terms of "problem elements" and lists four such factors, which together have constituted the Macedonian Question and preserved it until today; the vagueness surrounding Macedonia's geographical and economic boundaries; the social and economic antagonism between its inhabitants concerning access to arable land and the

exploitation of natural resources; the subsequent cultural division of labour, which essentially altered the social antagonisms into national conflicts and with the manifold practical and ideological problems of the construction and the modernisation of the Balkan states, including the Ottoman Empire. The fundamental problem, according to the author, is the "nonexistence of a concrete geographical and economic Macedonian territory". A unanimously accepted definition does not exist. What is meant by Macedonia has varied according to the territorial claims of each nation state and changing political concerns. The problem was not limited to the Balkans. For western Europeans and Americans, Macedonia was initially all the troubled Ottoman Balkan provinces, including Kosovo, while it after 1945 tended to be solely identified with the Yugoslav federal republic carrying this denomination. "This distorted European perception has from the early twentieth century created its own tradition and bibliography," which according to Gounaris is part of the current problems (16). One asks oneself how the "European" perception of the term "Macedonia" can be distorted if it is the case, as Gounaris states, that there has never existed a unanimously accepted definition of it. Here the author, perhaps unintentionally, slips into using the vocabulary of the biased parties.

The major chapters, which make up the bulk of the book, are the two following. Chapter 2, entitled "150 years of historiography and cartography", is a survey of the historiography on Macedonia as well as accounts of the region's geography, ethnology and philology, from the mid-nineteenth century to the recent dissolution of Yugoslavia. Gounaris distinguishes roughly four phases in the evolution of the scholarly (and nonscholarly) production. The first one, before 1913, was marked by the attempts to justify, in the eyes of both domestic and international opinion, the one

or the other nation state's claim towards the "unredeemed" lands and brethren under Ottoman rule, through defining the "natural" ethnological boundaries of each group. After the demographic changes in the wake of the Balkan Wars and the First World War, irredentism gave way for more domestic concerns – except for in Bulgaria, where bitter memories and old national aspirations were kept alive by (Slav) Macedonian refugee lobbies. In Greek historiography, this manifested itself in the ideological incorporation of the newly acquired territory, chiefly through the glorification of the Macedonian Struggle of 1904–1908. The turmoil of the 1940s ushered in a new phase of partisan scholarship in service of national claims, reflecting the anxieties concerning the Macedonian region's uncertain future status, following the wartime Bulgarian occupation, the communist takeover in the north and the civil war in Greece. A fourth phase is finally found in the period between 1960 and 1990, when a new national school of historiography emerged in Skopje, as part of Yugoslav Macedonian nation building. This branch of historiography was largely dominated by Slav Macedonian political refugees from Greece; the country which in their output, together with Bulgaria, was projected as the gravediggers of Macedonian unity and independence. Apart from additional bibliographical references, not much is new here, compared to the earlier cited essay from 2000.

Potentially of greater interest are chapters 3, "The new Macedonian Question", and 4, entitled "Return to History", in which Gounaris reviews the body of research which was written during or resulted from the Macedonian conflict from 1990 and onwards, and attempts to map out new directions for historical research. The debate of the 1990s actively engaged Gounaris and, as one could expect, his evaluation of the scholarly output of the time bears the mark of personally held convictions to a larger ex-

tent than in the previous chapters. At the heart of this debate, which Gounaris describes as a clash between historians and, more or less, informed social anthropologists, was the issue regarding the "true" identity of the Slav-speakers in Greece. The emergence of this issue was connected to the rise of an identity political movement in western (Greek) Macedonia during the 1980s, which called for the official recognition of this group as a distinctly Macedonian minority, entitled to cultural rights within Greek society. "Was however this group 'ethnic', as it asserted?" Gounaris rhetorically asks (106). Here he reiterates his criticism, developed in earlier publications, of social anthropologists Anastasia Karakasidou, Loring Danforth and Riki Van Boeschoten, who, in the author's view, worked under the assumption that the Slav Macedonians indeed could be classified as an ethnic group, in the past as well as in the present. The core of this criticism is that the use of the label "ethnic" – by Gounaris understood along the lines of Anthony D. Smith's definition of *ethnie*, i.e., a basically premodern identity woven around shared memories or myths of origins, and cultural traditions – in the case of Macedonia's population groups in the late nineteenth century is misleading. According to Gounaris, the very concept of ethnicity, used with reference to the often multilingual population groups of the southern Balkans before the coming of nationalism, is anachronistic, since it projects the existence of what essentially is a modern national identity back into prenational times. The search for ethnic identities among the chiefly rural communities of Macedonia would thus be a misguided choice by the student of the Macedonian Question. The choice of national identity in the region at the turn of the last century was in reality a political choice to which various factors contributed, most of which were economic in nature rather than dictated by ethnic identity. According to Gounaris, this explains why

inhabitants of the Macedonian region could also change identities, sometimes as a result of their personal interests and on other occasions because of the pressure exercised by the armed bands sent into the area by the competing nation states. This view has been adopted by other Greek scholars, chiefly Gounaris' colleagues at the Centre for Macedonian History and Documentation in Thessaloniki. However, it is difficult to see that this necessarily contradicts the assertion made by the Slav Macedonian minority activists in the question posed by the author on whether theirs "was" an ethnic group or not around 1990. Judging from Gounaris' own remark that the repressive measures taken against Slav-speakers in Greek Macedonia during Metaxas' dictatorship in the 1930s "created strong memories which became enduring, [turning into] symbols of the national repression of the Slav Macedonians in Greece" (122), it would seem as if the above-outlined criteria of ethnic identity were indeed met.

However, the clash between disciplines was not just a conflict of terms, but also a disagreement with regard to methodology. Gounaris' outlook is in this respect that of a traditional historian, suspicious of oral history and the "interdisciplinarity, which is considered mandatory in the approach to every question", as well as of the influence of "extremely postmodern" views (105). Despite dismissive remarks about the contribution of social anthropologists and the whole identity issue as a dead end, it is evident from Gounaris' text that the questions raised by them indeed have served to stimulate historical research. Attention has been brought to a number of previously unexamined issues in Greek historiography on Macedonia, such as the extent to which Slavic dialects were spoken in interwar Greek Macedonia, the diaspora of Macedonian Slav-speakers in the New World and its role in identity build-

ing, to mention a few. Gounaris predicts that this research will proceed to evolve in chiefly two directions. The first is located in traditional diplomatic history, which he anticipates will continue to attract doctoral research, as more archival material becomes accessible that can shed light on the diplomatic activities of the involved states after 1974. The second direction is the continued study on identity formation, chiefly within the transnational context earlier explored by Danforth. As for Greek Macedonia, Gounaris calls for more studies of the economic integration of the region into the Greek state, which can shed light on the motives and subsequent choices of local populations.

A branch of historiography that Gounaris does not engage with is archaeology, despite its obvious impact on the new Macedonian Question. According to Gounaris, the Yugoslav Macedonian historians of refugee descent, which moulded the young nation's historical past and identity, after independence appropriated elements of the ancient Macedonian heritage as a way of detaching it from the federal Yugoslav past, in order to meet new identity political demands. This process is however nowhere put in a comparative perspective with the similar process in Greece, manifested in and resulting from Manolis Andronikos' findings at Vergina (and attempts at marketing Greek Macedonian tourism in the wake of this). This was not a negligible aspect of the Macedonian conflict in the 1990s. Perhaps Gounaris' larger familiarity with the Macedonian Struggle makes him emphasise this historical period more than the many explicit references to the ancient past in the Greek national and historical argumentation. Here, attention to the role of museums and archaeology in nationalist imagination could have illuminated the discussion further.

Nevertheless, Gounaris' book provides a well-written and useful introduction to how the his-

toriography on the Macedonian Question has evolved and shaped it. Read with caution, it ought to interest students of Balkan nationalism.

NOTE

1 Basil C. Gounaris and Iakovos Michailidis, "The Pen and the Sword: Reviewing the Historiography of the Macedonian Question", in Victor Roudometof (ed.), *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics*, Boulder: East European Monographs, 2000, 99–141.

Dimitris D. Arvanitakis

Στον δρόμο για τις πατρίδες: Η Ape italiana, ο Ανδρέας Κάλβος, η Ιστορία

[Towards the nations. The *Ape Italiana*, Andreas Kalvos, the history]

Athens: Benaki Museum Library, 2010. 452 pp.

David Ricks

King's College London

"The Greeks neither deserved their independence nor acquired it themselves. The real significance of the event lies not in their character or achievement, but in the motives and the consequences of the European intervention." Writing in March 1862, some months before the fall of King Otto, and while he was obsessed – even in the midst of the American Civil War – with the continuing Greek crisis, the greatest historical thinker of the nineteenth century, Acton, formulated the uncompromising view quoted above. Nothing, on the face of it, could seem further from the fervent conviction of Andreas Kalvos' Greek odes of 1824–1826 – yet Kalvos, long resident once again in England, could have read Acton's words, and with we know not what reflections of his own. There is always a danger that, not just historical developments, but also the nature of those writers who contributed to them, commemorated them, and are in turn commemorated today for their own contribution, may harden into received opinion, and that the flux of ideas may be simply and

crassly monumentalised. The enigmatic figure of Kalvos has suffered more than most modern Greek authors from this tendency: in this patient and deeply researched study, Dimitris Arvanitakis, by contrast, takes an unexpected and illuminating route into the circles, of men as well as ideas, that formed the young Kalvos and his motives. All readers will endorse the praise given to this book in the preface by the pioneering Kalvos scholar, Mario Vitti: the present review seeks, while broadly accepting Arvanitakis' picture, to point to a number of additional aspects which might repay further study.

The trigger for the book was something which would make the most hardened foes of technology think again: Arvanitakis lit upon what is perhaps the only surviving run of the short-lived periodical, *L'Ape Italiana* (just twelve numbers, between 15 April–30 September 1819) through an internet link to Belton House, a provincial English country house now the property of the National Trust. It was a good scholarly instinct to suspect that, though no actual contributions by the young Kalvos appear in that periodical, it might yet supply some idea of what Hazlitt in 1825 was to popularise as *The Spirit of the Age*. What Arvanitakis has set out to do is to reopen the fashionable question of nation formation through an analysis, prosopographical and ideological, of the journal in question, as a contribution to the study of Kalvos in the formative years 1816–1820. The bulk of the book, and its composite title, indicates that there are multiple agendas here, and this results in a certain awkwardness of structure; but one of its most salutary contributions is to remind us that there was a kind of Italian *émigré* circle rather different from (and, Arvanitakis concedes, less talented than) Foscolo's more celebrated group.

Of course, most Greek readers are likely to come to such a book in search of what it adds

to the Kalvos letters published by Vitti in 1963. The answer is, in an oblique way, a good deal. So much of the discussion of Kalvos has been of a romantic nature (whether that relates to his love life or to his peregrinations) that it is welcome to be plunged back into the mediocrity of his Italian circle in England. And that means that readers who skip straight to p. 149, at which point Kalvos first comes in for extended discussion, will be missing out on an ample and largely convincing contextualisation for his first English period.

Arvanitakis' decision to begin with the detailed analysis of *L'Ape*'s contributors, relegating general discussion of nation formation and the post-Napoleonic context till much later (217–63), has the merit of avoiding a long general discussion at the outset. It does not entirely avoid the problem of potted summary in the early discussion (notably 29–56): the back-story of English-Italian literary relations is rather more complex than presented here; and in particular key figures such as Thomas Gray, whose "The Progress of Poesy" was a key influence on Kalvos' ode "To the Muses", are absent from the discussion. Nor is there quite enough emphasis on the role of the only English poet whose Italian verse has been admired in Italy, Milton (who is absent from the discussion on pp. 209–10, where Kalvos' metrical theory is discussed). Overall, the presentation of the English context here is rather less rich than that of the Italian, with more reliance on secondary sources, some not of the newest. (In one extreme case, reliance on Italian sources produces a nonexistent figure, a geologist "Carl Lyell" on p. 126.) By contrast, the reader learns much about the climate Kalvos worked in from the complex ideological vagaries of, especially, Filippo Pananti: these are treated with some sympathy and in a way which is genuinely illuminating about the younger man. Arvanitakis is,

again, careful not to identify *L'Ape* and its circle with the Carbonari or to insist on Kalvos' membership at that stage – though his membership of a Masonic lodge seems probable.

An important, and related, aspect, left hanging here – inevitably perhaps, given the lack of unambiguous documentation – is that of Kalvos' adhesion to the Church of England (on p. 16 Vitti takes this as certain for a later period). I read this as perhaps as nominal as that of George Washington or other Deists of the time, and this is doubtless what Susan Ridout was seeking to probe in her letter quoted in translation on pp. 172–3 (where the word "proud" in "our proud desire of fathoming the Almighty" should read "*alazonike*" rather than "*perephane*"). The exploration here is intriguing, and might with profit have been linked to the term Foscolo later used of Kalvos, "Didimo Laico" (discussed on pp. 359–60), for which the most natural interpretation is that Kalvos is an agonised Doubting Thomas when it comes to the Christian revelation.

One important line of thought present in the book, especially in relation to Luigi Angeloni, relates to the Italian language question: here the Italian movement for *purismo* (see, in particular, 142, 243–4) may indeed have had greater relevance for the autodidact Kalvos as a rallying cry than the details of Korais' linguistic programme. Arvanitakis re-emphasises, and rightly, that Kalvos came to London "as an 'Italian'" (155). By the time we reach the open discussion of these questions in Chapter 5, we have a much more refined sense from this book of the formation of Kalvos, which rewards the reader who has persevered to this point: that being so, the attacks on the work of Dimiroulis add little to the discussion.

For a work which dwells considerably and rightly on matters of close detail, this is a well-written one. More repetition occurs in some of the discussion than is necessary (while, as mentioned above, some further contextualising of the English literary milieu would not have come amiss); and, as the book goes on, the reader can weary of the number of rhetorical or hypothetical questions which are being asked. (See, for example, the speculations on p. 129.) If, as is to be hoped, a second edition appears, the English of the references, which contain many errors of transcription or transliteration, will need to be corrected; and the lack of a full Roman-alphabet index makes the book hard to navigate at times. Such criticisms by no means undermine the value of this thoughtful, subtle and valuable book. It might of course, as readily have been given the title *In the Footsteps of Napoleon* as the forward-looking title it bears. Kalvos and his *confrères*, whatever their motives in 1819, had little inkling of how either Italian or Greek nationalism would play out – a point which this book richly establishes.

Andrekos Varnava

British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878–1915: The Inconsequential Possession

Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009. 321 pp.

Thomas W. Gallant

University of California, San Diego

Given the vast amount of scholarly attention paid to the Cyprus issue generally and to the history of the British in Cyprus specifically, it would seem obvious that the former was always of immense importance to the latter. Not so, according to Andrekos Varnava in his excellent study of the earliest phase of British imperialism in Cyprus. Instead, what he argues is that very soon after the British took control of the island, they came to realise that it was largely an "inconsequential possession". Far from being the strategic jewel of the Mediterranean, Cyprus quickly became an albacore around the empire's neck, resulting in the British on more than one occasion trying to divest themselves of the island. Varnava's study is by far the best book about the early decades of British rule on Cyprus. It engages and contributes to multiple historiographies, including the vast body of literature on European imperialism from 1871 to 1914. Unlike some recent works about Cyprus, this one is conversant with current trends in imperial historiography and explicitly adopts a broadly cultural history approach. This is refreshing in a field where even recently published works read like pieces whose writers

know nothing but the British sources and who write like its still the 1960s. This book, unlike those, deserves a wide readership and not just among Hellenists.

Varnava sets out to answer two broad questions: first, why did the British seek to gain control over Cyprus and why did they so quickly become disillusioned with it? And, second, what can the story of the British in Cyprus tell us about the processes of imperial expansion in the age of neoimperialism? The author is more successful with the former than the latter, but he still makes an exceptionally contribution to the discussion of both.

The book is divided into eight chapters and organised roughly chronologically. In his lengthy first chapter, Varnava conducts a masterful review of the literature and contextualises his study in it. As he points out, much of the scholarship on Cyprus and the British in the Mediterranean generally is inward looking and parochial; whereas in imperial historiography, scant is the discussion of the imperial encounter in Europe. One of his aims is to connect these two. He also does a nice job of contextualising his study in the broader literatures on Cyprus and imperialism. The second half of this chapter is devoted to situating the history of the British in Cyprus in its proper historical context during the era of neoimperialism. He ends by posing the central question that frames the rest of the book: how was it that Cyprus came to be such an inconsequential possession in the British Empire?

He begins to answer this query by tracing the place that Cyprus occupied in the British cultural imaginary. Late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Romanticism linked the Holy Land, the Crusades, Richard the Lionheart and Cyprus together and enshrined them in popular culture as fundamental to

development of British identity. This "spiritual imperialism" (60) had a significant impact on the imagination of the young Benjamin Disraeli (later to become Lord Beaconsfield). While this might explain his interest in the Ottoman world and Cyprus, it is insufficient as an explanation as to why, when the opportunity presented itself, Beaconsfield and his Conservative government quickly moved to take possession of the island. Three sets of factors, evident in the years 1876–1878, help to account for that. One was the ceding of the Ionian Islands to the Kingdom of Greece in 1864 and the impact that that had on British geopolitical strategy in the Mediterranean. The second was the Eastern Question. The ongoing struggle between the Russian and Ottoman empires continued to shift the balance of power in the region toward the former and away from the latter. This contributed to Conservatives' desire to strengthen Britain's position in the eastern Mediterranean. And lastly, a report from the 1840s suggested that the place that would allow them to do this best was Cyprus, which could provide the empire with a military outpost that would hold "the key of Western Asia" (65).

In Chapter 4, Varnava shows how during the first two critical years (1878–1880) of British possession of the island, the Conservatives endeavoured to show that Cyprus was the Mediterranean "Eldorado"; the Liberals countered with a discourse aimed at showing that the supposed jewel in the imperial crown was nothing more than Dizzy's folly. As he shows in the next chapter, beginning in 1880, when Gladstone and the Liberals came to power, and continuing to 1912, regardless of which party was in office, Cyprus was a problem, a "mill-stone" around the imperial neck. It became evident that Famagusta harbour was ill-suited to serve as a major naval installation for the fleet; that the island was thus not really the strategic asset that they hoped it would be; and that rather than being an economic boom to British economic interests in the region, the island was a financial bust. And so by 1912, they were ready to get rid of it, a story he returns to in Chapters 7 and 8. In these he shows how military planners and strategists came to the conclusion that Cyprus was pretty much useless as a strategic asset in the global scheme of things, and so when the opportunity presented itself in 1912, the Liberal government proposed ceding the island to Greece in exchange for the right to use the harbour of Argostoli, on the Ionian Island of Kefalonia, as a naval base. A deal that never was made.

The intervening chapter (6) stands out from the others in being topical rather than chronological in focus. It is the most important chapter in the book and certainly the most controversial. Returning to the realm of culture, he explores two key issues: how did the place of Cyprus in the British imperial imaginary change during the period after they took possession of the island, and how did British rule on the island impact Cypriot culture and especially Cypriot identities? Through a careful and skilful analysis of a variety of sources – visual, literary, mass media, etc. – he tackles these two difficult issues. One way that British control of the island was legitimated was by linking Cyprus to the trope of philhellenism. This tapped into a well-known and widespread discourse that went like this: modern, western civilisation was founded on the ideas and ideals of ancient Greece; the Hellenes of the present-day were the descendants of the Greeks of antiquity; and so the West owed them a debt. Varnava shows how the British wrote Cyprus into this Hellenic metanarrative. Ancient history, if interpreted properly, and archaeology demonstrated that Cyprus was and always had been part of Hellenic civilisa-

tion. It was, after all, the birthplace of Aphrodite herself. And so bringing western civilisation back to the island was central to the empire's civilising mission. But, this Hellenising discourse had unintended consequences. It contributed in many and important ways to the development of an explicitly Hellenic national identity among those who had previously conceptualised themselves primarily as Orthodox Christian Cypriots, as opposed to Muslim Cypriots, Latin Cypriots or Jewish Cypriots. In elevating a national identity over a religious one, he argues, British policies laid the foundation for sectarian divisions that exploded into violence on the island periodically throughout the first half of the twentieth century. This argument challenges the primordialist view dominant in Greek and Greek-Cypriot nationalist historiographies and in popular culture that Orthodox, Greek-speaking Cypriots had always possessed a Hellenic identity and that unification with Greece had been a long-held ambition. In his convincing argument, Varnava shows that there were other mechanisms and initiatives in play that contributed to the ascendancy of a Hellenic national identity over other ones based on religion or regionalism. But certainly British policies and practices were important contributing factors, even if one accepts that a Hellenic national consciousness would probably have developed among Orthodox Cypriots in any case. This chapter alone makes the book must reading.

In the final analysis, does Varnava prove his assertion that very soon after its inclusion in the British Empire Cyprus became inconsequential? My assessment is that he does. But that is not the main contribution of the book. His study of the British in Cyprus makes an important contribution to both the historiography of British imperialism and to the broader study of European imperialism. At a time, the era of neoimperialism, when European powers were gobbling up large parts of the world like hungry diners at a banquet, the story of the British in Cyprus complicates the picture of relentless, inexorably successful European imperial expansion. Filled with missteps, bad judgments, and wrong-headed polices that had unintended consequences, the British imperial encounter on Cyprus left them with a possession that served little purpose in the broader scheme of things, cost them money and resources, and so proved both in the short and the long term to be of little value strategically or economically. As told by Varnava, this is a fascinating and compelling tale. Very well-written, conceptually and methodologically sophisticated, this is by far the best book on the early years of the history of the British in Cyprus. It rightfully deserves a central place on the bookshelf of anyone interested in Cypriot, Ottoman, Greek, British or imperial histories.

Niki Maroniti

Πολιτική εξουσία και εθνικό ζήτημα στην Ελλάδα 1880–1910

[Political authority and the national question in Greece, 1880–1910]

Athens: Alexandria, 2009. 495 pp.

Effi Gazi

University of the Peloponnese

As John Breuilly has pointed out, "nationalism is inconceivable without the state, and vice versa". There is currently an important and very high quality production of scholarly works on nationalism and cultural imagination as well as on national identity in Greece. Hence, this emphasis on the ways nationalism frames the state has to a certain degree undermined research on how nationalism and national projects are shaped by state structures, political expressions and political initiatives.

Niki Maroniti has turned her attention to this particular topic. In this book, a revision of her doctoral dissertation on politics and the "national question" in Greece (1895–1903), she meticulously explores state power and authority as key mechanisms in the evolution and trajectories of the "national question" in Greece from 1880 to 1910. In fact, the author is more interested in the critical period from 1890 to 1910, which was dominated by the turbulence arising from the Eastern Question, the 1897 Greek–Turkish War, the multidimensional national crisis following the Greek defeat in

that war and the sociopolitical unrest which led to the Goudi coup of 1909. Paradoxically, it is also a neglected period, somehow squeezed between the more "popular" first part of the nineteenth century and the following "Venizelos era" in conventional terms.

The book combines a chronological and a thematic approach. The author is interested in the overlapping significance of "the national question, the constitutional question and the arising social question" (14) while she combines irredentism, reforms and modernisation processes in her definition of the "national question" (14). She is also sensitive to the overlapping temporalities of history, specifically the nineteenth-century *longue durée*, the 1890–1910 period and two particular moments: the Greek–Turkish War in 1897 and the Goudi coup and movement in 1909 (30). In this vein, the first part of the book focuses on the Eastern Question in the late nineteenth century, the Cretan uprising and the 1897 Greek–Turkish War in the domestic and foreign policy domains. The emphasis is put on national rhetoric and politics as formed by important political leaders of the era, including Charilaos Trikoupis, Theodoros Deliyiannis, Dimitrios Rallis, Georgios Theotokis and Alexandros Zaimis, but also on the particular roles of the army, the nationalist societies of Ellinismos (Hellenism) and Ethniki Etaireia (National Society), and the king. The aftermath of the 1897 war is the main background of the second part of the book, in which the management of the crisis after the Greek defeat, in particular with reference to anti-royalist sentiment, is central. The third part is devoted to the exploration of major reform plans and policies which took place at the turn of the century in the domains of the army, agriculture, education, justice and public administration. New orientations in foreign policy are also examined thoroughly in the light of the Macedonian Question. In the final part, the analysis turns to the thick

and turbulent period preceding the Goudi coup. National identity debates and confrontations, the constitutional issue, the tension between the king, leading politicians and major political forces are discussed while in the epilogue the author summarises the central developments which led to the Goudi coup.

Maroniti does not only exhaust her analysis on the macroscopic level, which includes structures, major state policies, patronage and clientelism or the overall impact of nationalism. Rightly so, as the lack of research on the particularities and specificities of politics is noticeable in Greek historiography. Also, she does not limit her analysis to a narrow conception of political history which focuses on specific (and, quite often, leading) political figures, their actions and aims, and the causes and results of these. By bringing the power/authority nexus to the fore, the author is interested in the transformation of national projects as they become conceptualised, debated, implemented, constructed, negotiated or even refuted by various factors, including the political parties, the politicians, the king (and queen), the army, the economic and social elites, and even the foreign powers. This broad and flexible definition of the power–authority nexus allows the author to unravel different political and party rationalities, conflictual political rhetoric and languages and competing instrumentalisations of irredentism. The emphasis on contingency and a careful analysis of the particularities of each political debate offer a detailed, rich and multidimensional picture of the era.

Another important merit of Maroniti's work is that it does not present the "national question" as a homogeneous, singular entity but rather as an arena where different and quite often competing projects develop. In this vein, the analysis turns to the "nationalisation" of political rhetoric but also to the ways various political interests and aims constantly reemploy and redefine "the national". Moreover, this approach is linked to an inclusive analysis which does not only focus on irredentism or the politics of the Megali Idea (Great Idea) but also on major national reforms (i.e., in the army, education, public administration, etc.), modernisation processes and changes. In this way, the book also illustrates the constant interaction between national politics inside and outside the state.

The book combines perspectives on politics with an interest in the impact of social, political and economic factors. The chapter on the *Evangelika*, the so-called Gospel riots of 1901, is indicative of the importance the author attributes to the thick fabrication of national politics, social attitudes and cultural practices and beliefs. In this respect, the work would definitely have enriched its perspective had it also presented how society was portrayed in the official national rhetoric and how social identities were forged, constituted, practiced and performed within the national state context. In this direction, the linkage between political processes, ideological currents and social attitudes would have proved quite intriguing. Even more so in the critical period following the Greek bankruptcy of 1893; the author's analysis of this time not only deserves the reader's attention but also invites further investigation of the topic (which definitely lies beyond the scope of Maroniti's book).

An index would have been very useful. In general, the book offers a coherent, well-documented, carefully presented and clearly argued view of a turbulent and critical era through the lens of organised politics, in particular in relation to the state and power. This is an important contribution to the study of modern Greek history and politics. It offers us most valuable insights into the varieties of the "national question" as well as in the perplexities of national politics.

Vassilis Nitsiakos

Στο Σύνορο: 'Μετανάστευση', σύνορα και ταυτότητες στην αλβανο-ελληνική μεθόριο

Odysseas, Athens, 2010. 472 pp.

On the Border: Transborder Mobility, Ethnic Groups and Boundaries on the Albanian-Greek Frontier

Berlin: LIT, 2010. 504 pp.

Vasileios Dalkavoukis

Democritus University of Thrace

In the winter of 1990–1991, when the Greek–Albanian border controls collapsed, under the pressure of the mass "exodus" of people trapped within its spatial – and foremost political – limits, defined in various ways by a regime that claimed for itself the "communist truth", Albania discovered the West and vice versa: in fact, both perceived each other as *terra incognita*, bound with myths, longings, propaganda and secrets. Alongside a desire to meet, both also sought to avoid the "Other". It took a long time to undo the construction of a "lack of closeness" between Albania and the West – if it has been undone at all, 20 years later.

The largest proportion of the so-called "Albanian exodus" towards the West remained in the country where it had initially headed, Greece, an "idiomorphic West", a more "intimate" one in cultural rather than geographic terms, at least before the imposed isolation of the Hoxha regime. But what changed in Albania in all these years? What remained of what we knew from the so decisive 1940s? How close or distanced is the new generation of people that live among us from the prewar "cultural intimacy",[1] that existed between Greeks and Albanians despite the establishment of borders? How did the prewar crossborder networks, roads and patterns function in the new era? And how were new ones constructed or invented, along with the new "borders" on both sides? Such questions – along with other more particular or nodal ones – have rendered Albania a preferential field of research for social anthropology, a discipline that was transformed, for this precise reason, into an "urgent discipline": an "urgent anthropology" destined to expand knowledge and mutual understanding on both sides of the border.

Vassilis Nitsiakos' book *On the Border: Transborder Mobility, Ethnic Groups and Boundaries on the Albanian–Greek Frontier* holds a pride of place among the books[2] that have tried to contribute towards the above-mentioned direction. It presents the outcome of nearly twenty years' of fieldwork in south Albania, the area that historically and culturally presents common elements with the Greek part of Epirus and which was characterised by Greeks as Northern Epirus for political and diplomatic reasons. Not only does the writer take a stance on the matter, but he also dedicates a whole chapter to the clarification of the term, which was constructed via diplomatic means and later used for political reasons in the context of Greek irredentism. He also underlines the contemporary reverse meaning of the term, which emerged after the opening of the border, when those arriving from Albania used it in order to achieve better treatment within the Greek framework, finding, however, that the host society viewed the "Northern Epirotes" with scepticism.

However, in order to understand the "reverse" of the meaning, one has to follow the central thread of the book from the beginning: Nitsiakos discusses the Greek–Albanian border within the context of "transborder mobility", exploiting critically the contemporary theoretical arsenal of social anthropology on "transnationalism".[3] According to the author, such a theoretical approach can be defined thus: "in the new migration the migrants' networks of social relations, their activities and patterns of live involve, on the whole, both host and home societies: a social field is being formed which links up the two countries, irrespective of borders and geographical conditions, while the new migrants live thus in between and form rather 'hybrid' identities" (20).

Is this wording enough, however, in order to understand Albanian migration in Greece? Nitsiakos' answer is negative: the adoption of the nation-state as an analytical category in the process of interpreting the "migratory phenomenon" is not enough, as it conceals a number of other factors that underline the complexity of the phenomenon (such as the ethnic identities on both sides of the border, local peculiarities, the prenation mobility of people in the wider region, the arbitrary drawing of the border which breached all kinds of bonds through the imposition of mobility barriers, etc.). In other words, the historical dimension of the "migration" cannot be ignored, since, in fact, it constitutes a multidimensional, cross-border mobility, in which people have always crossed the border both legally and illegally.

The ethnographic material of the book, which proves the theoretical adjustment of the "migration" as "crossborder mobility", is very rich. Through the personal routes of the informants and the piercing glance of the ethnographer, Nitsiakos successfully orders the huge amount of information he has gathered

throughout his research during the past twenty years. Issues such as the formation of Albanian identity through the indifference towards religion during the Hoxha regime, the contemporary revival of the pluralistic religious puzzle in Albania, the historical role of Greek education and Orthodoxy in the formation of a Greek-oriented identity in the Albanian south, the role of ethnic groups such as the Vlachs in the formation of this kind of border mobility, the reunion of families that were split for decades due to the drawing of the border and Cold War isolation, as well as the "illegal" daily crossing of the borders for labour reasons, are some of the examples used to validate the need for a new analytical tool to interpret the phenomenon. From this point of view, the contribution of the book to the international discussion on migration is valuable, especially since it is also available in English translation.

However, the most important contribution of this book is its ability to communicate with a broad audience. It could be characterised as a contemporary peregrination in southern Albania, through the viewpoint of an adequate observer, who eyes and records what the official discourse cannot comprehend – and therefore disregards – or avoids detecting for various reasons. The book is all what Vassilis Nitsiakos has taught us – both students and colleagues – to observe in the context of our research interaction in the Border Crossings Academic Network for the past ten years. Therefore, the dedication of the book constitutes a great honour for us all.

NOTES

1   For the term "cultural intimacy", see Michael Hertzfeld, *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*, New York: Routledge, 2005.

2   I mention at this point the indicative works

of Lois Lambrianidis and Antigoni Lymperaki, *Αλβανοί μετανάστες στη Θεσσαλονίκη: Διαδρομές ευημερίας και παραδρομές δημόσιας εικόνας* [Albanian migrants in Thessaloniki: Routes of prosperity and lapsus of public image], Thessaloniki: Paratiritis, 2001; Charis Naxakis and Michalis Hletsos (eds), *Μετανάστες και μετανάστευση: Οικονομικές, πολιτικές και κοινωνικές πτυχές* [Migrants and migration: financial, political and social aspects], Athens: Patakis, 2001, and Miltos Pavlou and Dimitris Christopoulos (eds), *Η Ελλάδα της μετανάστευσης: Κοινωνική συμμετοχή, δικαιώματα και ιδιότητα του πολίτη* [Greece of Migration. Social participation, rights and citizenship], Athens: Kritiki, 2004. A more anthropological aspect is provided in the texts edited by Fotini Tsimpiridou (ed.), *Μειονοτικές και μεταναστευτικές εμπειρίες: Βιώνοντας την «κουλτούρα του κράτους»* [Minority and migratory experiences: experiencing the "state culture"], Athens: Kritiki, 2009. The texts of Vassilis Nitsiakos, *Μαρτυρίες αλβανών μεταναστών* [Testimonies of Albanian migrants], Athens: Odysseas, 2003 and Gazmend Kapllani, *Μικρό ημερολόγιο συνόρων*, Athens: Livani, 2006 (published in English as *A Short Border Handbook*, London: Portobello, 2009) are important for the testimonies they contain. Finally, Konstantina Evangelou has researched the issue of the migratory literature, providing an analytical ergography of the migrant literary production to the present. See "Αλβανική μεταναστευτική λογοτεχνία: σκέψεις πάνω στην έννοια του 'Άλλου' με αφορμή κείμενα αλβανών μεταναστών" [Albanian migratory literature: thoughts on the concept of the "Other" in the texts of Albanian migrants], *Dia-keimena* 8 (2006): 99–110, «. . . Η βαριά βαλίτσα, ο τσιγγάνος μελισσουργός, το μικρό ημερολόγιο συνόρων . . .: λέξεις και ποιητικές από τις γραφές της μετανάστευσης» [. . . the heavy suitcase, the gipsy apiarist, the small border diary. . .: words and poetics from the writings of migration], *Dia-keimena* 11 (2009): 93–104 and «Η εμπειρία της μετανάστευσης στα λογοτεχνικά έργα αλβανών μεταναστών. Μια κειμενική προσέγγιση» [The experience of migration in the literature works of Albanian migrants: A text wise approach], in Tsimpiridou (ed.), *Μειονοτικές και μεταναστευτικές εμπειρίες*, 173–192. Some of the most characteristic literary works are: Tilemachos Kotsias, *Το τελευταίο καναρίνι* [The last canary], Athens: Kedros, 1995; Tilemachos Kotsias, *Βροχή στο μνήμα* [Rain at the grave], Athens: Kedros, 2000; Ferdinand Stavros Faras, *Οι σημειώσεις του πρόσφυγα* [The notes of the refugee], Athens: Kastaniotis, 1997; Ziko Kapourani, *Δέντρο στα χιόνια* [Tree in the snow], Thessaloniki: Diva, 2005.

3   For the emergence and the evolution of the term as an analytical tool, see Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch and Cristina Szanton Blanc, *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity and Nationalism Reconsidered*, New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1992, and Thomas Faist, *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Daniel T. Lochman, Maritere López and Lorna Hutson (eds)

Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700

Farnham: Ashgate, 2011. xiv + 275 pp.

Androniki Dialeti

University of Thessaly

This collection of essays is a welcome addition to the scholarship on friendship in early modern Europe which has been increasingly flourishing since the early 1990s. This book originated in a panel on early modern friendship at the Sixteenth-Century Studies Conference in Atlanta, Georgia, in 2005. As the title itself suggests, most contributors predominantly employ literary theory as their basic mode of analysis, with a focus on literary texts – letters, treatises, fictions, poetry and drama – rather than archival material. The book comprises thirteen essays plus an introduction and an afterword, and ranges over both Protestant and Catholic Europe, although early modern Britain figures more prominently. Building on earlier scholarship, the collection pays particular attention to early modern reconceptualisations of Greco-Roman and medieval notions of ideal friendship, the divergence between ideals and lived experience, and friendship as a political or religious bond. Configurations of friendship in the works of well-known male authors, such as Vives, Erasmus, More, Sidney, Shakespeare and Milton, are discussed in detail. However, challenging conventional notions of friendship as an exclu-

sively male-dominated terrain, several essays examine how early modern women redefined traditional models of friendship to meet their own ends and fit their own experience.

The volume is thoughtfully introduced by two of the editors, Daniel T. Lochman and Maritere López. They delineate ancient and medieval concepts of friendship with emphasis on Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* and Cicero's *De amicitia* and *De officiis*. The influence of classical models on early modern discourses of friendship is variously readdressed throughout the volume. Furthermore, the introduction offers a brief review of recent scholarly debates on early modern friendship. Finally, the editors informatively introduce the reader to the main themes and questions to be discussed in each section of the volume.

The first section of the book focuses on early modern reshapings of conventional discourses of friendship. Constance M. Furey discusses sixteenth-century humanists' revisions of the classical ideal of friendship as an exclusively homosocial bond between men, and as an alternative to marriage. In Juan Luis Vives' and Desiderius Erasmus' treatises, Furey detects the emergence of a new narrative model of companionate marriage, largely informed by reform ideals, which called for a "corporeal" and "spiritual" friendship between husband and wife, without, however, calling in question marriage as a primarily patriarchal unit. The marriage/friendship question also features in Hannah Chapelle Wojciehowski's intriguing essay on Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516). According to Wojciehowski, the central place of family in More's ideal commonwealth denotes the author's anxieties towards male homosocial bonds. Focusing on the well-known friendship among More, Peter Giles and Erasmus, the essay challenges the often idealised image of humanist friendship and suggests that such relationships were often complicated

by tense, and often homoerotic, emotions, rivalries and frustrations. Male identity and repressed homoeroticism are further analysed in the last essay of this section, in which Daniel T. Lochman discusses how Philip Sidney's *New Arcadia* (1590) departs from the established notion, drawn from Greco-Roman and medieval traditions, that passion jeopardises male friendship. According to Lochman, Sidney's rhetorical departure from the traditional narrative must be seen in relation to the popularisation of Galenic medical theories in early modern England that tended to blur the rigid divisions between the "rational" mind and the "emotional" body. Thus, the body comes at the heart of the friendship discussion here.

The second section of the volume is dedicated to alternative or marginalised forms of friendship, with an emphasis on female configurations. The section opens with Donald Gilbert-Santamaría's exploration of friendship rhetoric in Mateo Alemán's picaresque novel *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599). Reordering the classical ideal of friendship as a selfless bond between virtuous men, Alemán's novel narrates the morally ambivalent companionship between two *picaros*, which is articulated in terms of common experience and the need for solidarity in a world dominated by deceit, crime and deception. Maritere López skilfully transfers us from the devious universe of the *picaros* to the sinful world of courtesans in Renaissance Florence. Examining their correspondence, López argues that well-known courtesans, such as Camilla Pisana and Tullia d'Aragona, attempted to erase the stigma of their trade and strengthen their participation as poets in the contemporary male-dominated intellectual milieu by fashioning bonds of friendship with their male patrons. In Pisana's and D'Aragona's discursive strategies, basic principles of classical perfect friendship, such as equality, similitude and selflessness, were renegotiated to fit the patron–client relationship. In a similar vein, Allison Johnson discusses Is-

abella Whitney's strategies in *A Sweet Nosgay* (1573) to present herself as a virtuous member of the male-dominated intellectual world. As a single woman, Whitney had to shape her relations with men exclusively in terms of friendship so as to claim a public position without putting her reputation at stake. Thus, male–female friendship is presented in Whitney's poetics as an alternative to marriage, sexuality and female domesticity. This section concludes with Penelope Anderson's moderately documented essay on friendship and politics in the royalist Katherine Philips' poetics during the English Civil War. Departing from tradition, Philips employed the trope of multiple and failed female friendships to reject the theory of political patriarchalism and suggest a reshaped notion of political power as a continuous process.

A final set of essays explores friendship in ethics and politics. Special emphasis is given on the divergence between idealised representations of friendship and social efficacy. In the first essay, Sheila T. Cavanagh examines Lady Mary Wroth's departure from the classical ideals of similitude and equality as reliable foundational principles of friendship. In *Urania* (1621), set in the royal environment, friendship among social equals – kin, lovers or political allies – is often depicted as a necessary system of protection, a utilitarian bond constantly open to betrayal. Similarly, Marc D. Schachter's essay treats friendship as a disguise for utilitarian and self-interest exchange in Novella 12 of Marguerite de Navarre's *Heptaméron* (1558). De Navarre's disillusion towards true friendship reflects the broader evangelical critique of faith in human relationships. The usefulness of friendship as a social and political instrument, the perils of false friendship and the contradiction between tyrannical power and virtuous friendship also feature in William Shakespeare's *King Lear* (1608). According to Wendy Olmsted, friendship in Shakespeare is a "risk-taking adventure in which cir-

cumstances can be deceiving and truth can only be discerned gradually through time" (192). Male tyranny encounters female friendship and political solidarity in Christopher Marlow's analysis of William Cartwright's *The Lady-Errant* (1651). Cypriot women's utopian commonwealth in Cartwright's platonic drama challenges patriarchy by identifying heterosexual love with tyranny and women's affectionate friendship with egalitarianism. Returning to the incompatibility between friendship as a classical ideal and tyrannical order, Gregory Chaplin traces the configuration of the male political subject in John Milton's rhetoric. Drawing on Cicero, Milton's republican political theory legitimised fraternal communities to revolt against absolutism, which here is identified with an effeminate and denatured political order. The last essay of the section discusses friendship language in Anabaptist communities. Thomas Heilke argues that in contrast to the Lutheran and Calvinist rhetoric, which did not employ friendship as a central element in the organisation of church communities, the Swiss Anabaptist movement gradually articulated a Christian friendship discourse with which communal unity and practices were invested. The volume concludes with an afterword by coeditor Lorna Hutson, author of *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fiction of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (1994).

Even though not all papers are equally innovative and well documented, they all contribute to our understanding of the rich variety and complexity of early modern discourses and representations of friendship either as an individual interaction or as a political necessity and civil virtue. Although some of the essays are highly specialised and literary in their approach so that the broader historical context is sometimes missing, the book has a good deal to offer to cultural historians, literary critics and students of the Renaissance. Those interested in gender will also find some interesting essays.

David Rollison

A Commonwealth of the People: Popular Politics and England's Social Revolution, 1066–1649

Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 492 pp.

Photini Danou
University of Athens

In *A Commonwealth of the People*, David Rollison addresses the issue of the emergence of the commonalty as a shaping force of English constitutional culture. By combining three different theoretical approaches, the Whiggish narrative of progress, the Marxist class-struggle reading of politics and an appreciation of the constitutive power of discourse influenced by the linguistic turn, Rollison investigates the *longue durée* of popular engagement in English medieval and early modern state politics. His purpose is to provide an explanatory model of modernity viewed as an epoch dominated "not only by strong states, but also by the politics of popular sovereignty" (6).

Drawing evidence from a wide variety of sources, political treatises of populist and antipopulist thinkers, vernacular theology, popular political songs, rebel texts, constitutional documents, plays as well as publications on voyages of discovery, Rollison introduces the argument that from the Peasants' Revolt in 1381 to the execution of Charles I in the 1640s, a rev-

olution of commonalty took place in England that shifted the focal point of political discourse from theocratic and aristocratic ideals of obedience and hierarchy to more socially inclusive ideals of reciprocity and common good.

This diversity of sources along with his interpretative pluralism enables Rollison to overcome the problem of attributing some kind of unity of thought to a heterogeneous "working class" (which lumps together the middle ranks and plebs, "those who had to work for a living") by using the ideal of commonwealth[1] as an "empty signifier" (208). The word "empty signifier", in Ernesto Laclau's terms, is a concept that acquires meaning through social signifying processes.[2] According to discourse theory, abstract concepts such as Englishness, patriotism, democracy and, in our case, commonweal/th acquire meaning through social practices that take place within particular historical contexts.

Rollison goes through several historical contexts, from the Norman conquest of England to the mid-seventeenth century, in an attempt to trace the ways a "populist vernacular movement", as he suggests, ascribed meaning to the term commonweal/th so as to make it a unifying principle for the lower orders of English society in their struggle against a common enemy, the state. What he means by "populist vernacular movement" is, on the one hand, the rise of the "middle English" language as a medium in which common ideas and stories could circulate and, on the other, the rise of the nonelites as legitimate speakers on behalf of the "community of the land".

As the writer suggests, in a succession of a series of local or more extensive episodes of disobedience and resistance that took place in England on issues such as heavy taxation, the harsh behaviour of royal officials, corrupt

courts and arbitrary arrestment of villagers, seizure of lands by nobles, enclosure practices and forced labour,[3] commonwealth ideology formed in opposition to existing government. At such times, the state and the ruling classes were forced to negotiate with and even to bow to a higher authority, the commonwealth. In 1649, however, commonwealth replaced the monarchical state and so it became what it had been fighting against for centuries (2). Hence, the words "commonwealth" and "commonweal" would continue to be key terms of elite political discourse and they would never again inspire popular resistance and rebellion (464).

Rollison's book is an ambitious work of new social history, the history of political thought and cultural theory that provides historians with a new look at the political role of the lower orders in premodern societies. Though he follows the traditional Marxist explanatory model of class struggle to explain politics, he breaks with the Marxist tradition on the issue of hegemony. In Gramscian terms, hegemony, as society's superstructure, is the dominant ideology produced by the elites and forced down the social ladder through a combination of ideological domination and coercion in order to secure their political leadership and continue their economic coercion over the working class. On the contrary, in Rollison's approach commonwealth ideology emerges as a product of the common people in their fight, over the centuries, for a better life. It therefore concerns a bottom–up constitutional process that gradually forced the governing elites, if only momentarily, to accept the commonwealth as something broader than and even superior to the monarchical state. On this issue, Rollison's account also differs from John Walter's treatment of commonwealth ideology as a "public transcript" created by the government to assert legitimacy, a notion drawn from the work of James Scott.[4]

Another point in Rollison's book that draws our attention is the writer's inclusion in his discussion of the question of industrial growth, overseas trade expansion and the affirmation of English imperialism as a remedy to poverty; in other words, as England's way of becoming "the richest, happiest and hardest-working country in the world" (319).

As Rollison points out, political economy considerations began not with Adam Smith and the Physiocrats in the eighteenth century but much earlier with Sir John Fortescue, William Tyndale, Sir Thomas Smith or the two Richard Hakluyts and their expansive disposition to conquer and colonise other parts of the world in order to secure domestic harmony and common prosperity.

What was initiated with Fortescue and Smith, Rollison argues, was the acceptance of economic growth as a moral and political good in itself and a view of politics as the state management of economic activity (348–50). This development gave workers in manufacturing and merchants a crucial role in England's capitalist growth and in the production of national wealth.

In stressing this argument, however, the writer disregards the exclusionary effects of the growth of the secondary sector of the English economy for the poor peasants as well as the economic gap it created between the urban and rural economies.

Not all members of the lower strata benefited from the expansive horizons of the English capitalist economy and, in any case, at the time this expansion took place, they surely would not be in a position to realise the macro-economic effects of this development, so as to incorporate it as a desirable prospect into their collective imaginary and political culture.

Another point of critique one could make to Rollison's narrative of "England's long social revolution" is that the writer is not particularly convincing in the way he presents the English Civil War in the 1640s as an effect of the same ideas and social dynamics that repeatedly brought England to a boiling point since the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. The crowd's involvement in the civil war often pursued an independent agenda from parliamentarian or royalist priorities. Its actions ranged from rural riots in the 1640s, the antiwar clubmen mobilisation (1642–1651), the Leveller (1647) or the Digger (1649) movements later on.

Finally, a third point of critique that could be raised is that Rollison overlooks the creative dimension of the interaction between rulers and ruled in the process of ascribing meaning to the nodal concept of commonwealth, as well as the effects of this interaction on the formation of English constitutional culture. Ethan Shagan's discussion of the "points of contact" between the government and the governed in his *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*,[5] in which he introduces a similar approach to what the sociologists would call "path dependence", provides us with a useful insight into the way collaboration, along with opposition and resistance, structured English politics and constitutional culture. Rollison fails to take into consideration Shagan's influential thesis, so this dimension of consent and collaboration is not integrated in his analysis.

In conclusion, Rollison's *A Commonwealth of the People* is a book designed to illuminate the long-term history of popular politics in medieval and early modern England; it provides readers with useful food for thought on the issue of how modern constitutionalism emerged out of premodern societies. It makes a strong case for the importance of the notion of commonwealth as a constitutive element of English po-

litical identity and culture. He conceptualises the process of ascribing meaning to the concept of commonwealth as a bottom–up course – an argument that readers may choose to accept or reject. In any case, this is a stimulating book that deserves a wider readership.

NOTES

1   Rollison uses the word "commonweal" to stand for various spellings and usages prior to 1520 and "commonwealth" to refer to those in use after that date. As he argues, this change also implied a shift of meaning from moral and spiritual to more materialist values (2, note 4).

2   Ernesto Laclau, "Why do Empty Signifiers Matter to Politics?" in *Emancipation(s)*, London and New York: Verso, 1996, 36–46.

3   The Commons rebellion of 1381, Jack Cade's rebellion of 1450, the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, or Kett's rebellion in 1549 are the most striking incidents with which Rollison is concerned.

4   John Walter, "Public Transcripts, Popular Agency and the Politics of Subsistence in Early Modern England", in Michael Braddick and John Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001; James Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, Yale: Yale UP, 1990.

5   Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Panagiota Tzivara

Βενετοκρατούμενη Ζάκυνθος (1588–1594): Η νομή και η διαχείριση της εξουσίας από το Συμβούλιο των 150

[Venetian Zakynthos, 1588–1594: The allocation and management of power by the Council of 150]

Enalios: Athens, 2009. 710 pp.

Dimitris Arvanitakis

Historian, Benaki Museum, Athens

In many ways, the Ionian Sea is an advantageous area for historiographical research. Just to mention two reasons: firstly, as a "*società di frontiera*", as a society with a discrete historical journey and therefore cultural singularity, it offers historians the opportunity to approach many issues in our modern history from very different points of view; secondly, because the region's age-old historiographical tradition, along with the new concerns and trends in historiography, have led, both within and without Greece, to a significant resurgence of relevant research, such that has not been witnessed in any other Greek "local history" except for that of Crete, for similar reasons. This book proves this in the best possible way.

The *Atti del Consiglio dei 150 della magnifica Communità della città di Zante* (The records of the Council of 150 of the magnificent community of the city of Zakynthos), which extends

from 1 November 1587 to 11 August 1594, are published and discussed in this volume. The publication of this historical document, comprising the second part of the book (397–588), is preceded by part one (21–396), in which the author discusses issues such as the allocation and management of power on the island at the end of the sixteenth century, and provides an exceptionally useful, albeit incomplete, profiling of the members of the Council of 150 in this period. In the long introduction, the author utilises the contributions of the latest literature and clarifies the terminology and prosopography, while presenting the institutional context of the time, thus allowing the reader to more fully comprehend the published document.[1]

The issue at the core of this book is well known from the historiography of the past but has been more fully dealt with in recent research: it is perhaps the most critical period in the sixteenth century, in which the island's powerful families endeavoured to entrench their power. We know of the general mechanism and the rationale of it and we are aware of the parallels between the local phenomenon and the rest of the Ionian, on Crete, in Venice and in Venice's *terra ferma*. What remains for us is to transcend anecdotal cases and to comprehend the "particular", the local expression of this mechanism within the framework of the specific island.

The tendency of the island's powerful families to keep the ruling nucleus pure and to prevent others from being included in the group of citizens (*cittadini*) peaked approximately in the mid-sixteenth century. The main opponents of the citizens, as it emerges from the documents produced by the community, were the foreigners (*forestieri*), coming mainly from Greece and Italy, and persons of manual work (*arte meccanica*). In the course of the century, it was not only powerful foreigners (mer-

chants of disparate origins, individuals from the military or civil hierarchy) who had taken permanent residence in the city but also individuals from more humble families (either of foreign origin or from the island's countryside) who became more powerful through their economic activities, and this increased the numbers of those seeking the right to participate in the community. The fact that Venice had not defined, as in its other colonies, the exact criteria needed to acquire citizenship (and, of course, participation in the community council) complicated the problem. It is worth remembering that the constant renewal of the population and the opportunities to become a part of the hegemonic group of citizens brought about the need for constant renegotiation of the multilayered networks and, therefore, a constant upset to the equilibrium.

The community, complaining constantly about the inclusion of "unworthy" candidates in the General Council (*Consiglio Generale*), endeavoured to put obstacles in the way of their admission, but without any substantial results. In 1542 the community was successful in having the Venetian Senate approve its demand that 150 citizens be elected annually by the General Council, who would constitute the Minor Council (*Consiglio Minore*), which, in turn, would elect the communal appointments (*cariche*): this was the first step in the path to entrench local power. In this manner, the powerful families neutralised the General Council, to an extent. Naturally, the "*disordine*" that reigned at meetings of this council continued, and faced with the refusal of the Senate (1576) to explicitly prevent the induction of candidates about whom there were suspicions of being engaged in manual work, in 1578 they deprived (without seeking permission) the General Council of its right to annually elect the 150, thus rendering it useless. From then on, the 150 members whose tenure was over would vote for the new members.

In 1582 and 1589, having acquired true power, the Council of 150 endeavoured to clarify who (foreigners or locals) had the right to take part in the proceedings of the General Council and therefore (and this is explicitly stated in the decision of 1589) who had the right to become a candidate for the 150: evidently because they believed that candidates would appear who were not even qualified to be included in the General Council. As the author rightly points out, the large number of votes in favour of the above decisions proves the widespread approval of the view that there was a need to limit citizenship and of the tendency for local power to be exercised by an ever diminishing number of families (55 and 59).[2]

The upset of 1578 lasted until 1595, and despite the fact that the local community neglected to ask the Senate's permission, all the Venetian authorities on the island were clearly in agreement. No sooner had the local dispute come out into the open, with two different delegations (on behalf of the Council of 150 and on behalf of the many disgruntled citizens) being sent to Venice, than the latter did away with the decision (the "*novità*") of 1578, reverting to the conditions of 1542, despite the vacillations of the current and previous Venetian officials of the island as it appears from their decisions – or perhaps because of them.

It is this story – which this invaluable primary source tells us about – that Panagiota Tzivara has shed light on. The first to provide information, Ermanno Lunzi, had already implicitly suggested the context in which this was to be perceived: "There was a time during which the Council of 150 of Zakynthos, swept along by the oligarchic spirit, usurped its rights, with the decision of 15 June 1578."[3] One of the benefits of recent research and the renewal of questions is that today we can understand this act not as a "chance" moment but as a link in the chain in the formation of the leadership consciousness of the dominant stratum on the island.[4]

The data in this primary source, along with other information, provides a fuller knowledge of the mechanism and how it differed in various cases. For example, if the tendency for the entrenchment of the nobility (*nobiltà*) can be observed in the city of Venice and the *terra ferma*,[5] and in other regions of the Stato da Mar, why did it not occur in the same way everywhere – not even within the Ionian, where the reality of the islands (at first glance only) did not greatly differ. It appears, however, that it was exactly the local differences that brought about the variations. And it is worth contemplating a number of questions. If the sixteenth century was, to use Angelo Ventura's words, "the century of the aristocracy's triumph" (*il secolo del trionfo dell'aristocrazia*), that is, the reconfirmation of the ideals of the nobility, can one truly claim that "the Venetian overseas colonies partook in the aristocratic reaction of the citizens [sic]; in this case the citizens of the council of Zakynthos" (53)? Can the phenomenon that Ventura studied in the Venetian society of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries[6] be identified with the question being researched, as Tzivara maintains? It remains to be examined, but I have the impression that, although this phenomenon of the reconfirmation of the nobility generally took place in same decades and was reinforced by the spirit of the times, there is a different meaning of its local expressions, produced by very different economic and social conditions.

In trying to comprehend the local expressions of general mechanisms, the statistical analysis of the source's data has allowed the author (85–91) to provide evidence of a clear picture of the local reality, but a more thorough examination is required. In the council elections from 1588 to 1594, it seems that out of the 150 members, 116 were elected year in, year out (100

were elected seven times, and 16 were elected six of the seven times), while only 34 seats changed hands. And out of this hardcore of 116, it seems that 56 were elected with 95 percent of the vote. There can be, therefore, no doubt that one must abandon the old historiographical concept of a homogeneous "class" as an interpretative tool: the very meaning of "class" has for some time now been under doubt and it remains for us to truly understand the forms and meanings of differences in the institutionalised order – which developed gradually – of the citizens.[7] Therefore, I believe that the "number" of "individuals" is not the best way to understand (and to deal with) this problem. The basis of our interpretative viewpoint must be to understand the role of the family (extended or otherwise), as we know that only within the framework of the family can the behaviour and the choices of the "individual" be understood. It is evident that, for example, the opportunity for re-election, indeed time and time again, was linked to the size of the family, the kin or client relations, the economic standing of the family and concurrent success in other fields such as the administration or the military (81–84).

The author rightly notes that it is a mistake to believe that those belonging to the 150, even in this critical period, constituted a "unified group, whose members did not come into conflict but supported each other" (97, see also 392).[8] One need only recall the conflict between the Siguro and Mondino families or the Volterra and Balsamo families during these decades (92–100). But this indisputable fact, which brings us to the largely unexamined role of the family and networks in the context of the new "political/administrative" reality of Venetian power, gives rise to other questions that we have not fully dealt with.

Central among these questions is that of the choices through which upward mobility took place and was confirmed. What were the families' strategies? How similar were they, and to what extent did they depend on the particular characteristics (origins, length of settlement on the island, economic activity, presence in the administration or military, number of members, etc.) of each family? The answers seem self-evident, but research is still pending. The Macri family (which had ten members in the council over a seven-year period) and the Siguro family (with seven members) gained many and important appointments (*cariche*) for their members; but the Gavrilopulo family, with a monopolistic presence in the management of the public finances and six members among the 150, also only managed to gain three appointments in seven years. What is the explanation for these differences? Changing the interpretative key would bring us closer to an explanation. Thus, one could understand in greater depth the "hardcore" of the Council of 150, as the arithmetical image of the "individuals" would be transformed into the historicised image of the family, a perspective more correct and substantive for those times.

Yet another question arises in the same vein based on the data of the source and the material collected by the author: the study of the history of offices and appointments (*offitii et cariche*), of the mechanism by which administrative/bureaucratic staff was assembled; the role of the "*offitii et cariche*" in the formation of political education and their significance for the conception and organisation of power and of the state, would all prove to be critical in the eighteenth and mainly nineteenth centuries. The author deals extensively, in her introductory text (117–169), with the issue of the "*offitii et cariche*", particularly the communal ones (distribution, management), and indeed with one very important facet: the use of the right to allocate (or vote for) the appointments by three loci of power (Venice, local Venetian officers

and the citizens'community) as a weapon in the political game. Not only do we know of the persistence with which the community sought for decades (see indicatively p. 121) from the local Venetian officers or the Venetian Senate to gain the right to vote for certain appointments, but we also know of the repeated and sometimes conflicting decisions of the Venetian organs, and of the protests of the community over the monopoly that the members of the community had over certain appointments, despite decisions to the contrary having been taken in Venice.

A careful reading of the history of the "*offitii et cariche*", a clear understanding of the duties (we still do not have critical data for many); an understanding of the local variations of "*offitii et cariche*" (noted by the author on p. 121); the fact that they multiplied; the distinction between honorary communal appointments (*cariche di onore*) and salaried appointments (*cariche di lucro*);[9] the broadening or narrowing of jurisdictions; the extent to which they were pursued by powerful families; the significance of some of these for the bureaucratic career of the citizens, etc. All these are some of the questions that remain to be answered so that we can comprehend their precise importance and the exact manner in which they influenced local reality and the "political education" of the local (but not only of the local) citizens.

The author extensively discusses the case of the Gavrilopulo family (244–253), which is well known from other researches. For over a century, this family monopolised the offices of the local public treasury (*Camera Fiscale*), despite at times a storm of reaction from the community itself. Was this a unique case, or just the most well known in terms of the literature and research that has been conducted? I believe the latter applies, but in any case there is a need to go beyond case studies and to under-

stand the wider picture; to deal with the question of the mechanism itself through an analysis that would include and go beyond individual cases. The need to record the lives of such persons whenever possible ("the Gavrilopulo case is truly one of the desiderata of research", 251) must take second place to acquiring a fuller picture of broader groups and attitudes within a certain historical framework.

Many questions can be posed. This extremely useful publication, combined with the framework provided by the author, must now be read along with all the other well-known literature on the era in light of contemporary questions. It will no doubt permit a better understanding of specific events, but mainly it will shed more light on the prosopography, and contribute to a more complete understanding of the meaning and manner in which social groups formed ideas and attitudes within the framework created in the Ionian Islands by the steady imposition of the ideological world, political language and institutional framework of the Serenissima Repubblica.

NOTES

1   However, in some cases (such as for example in Unit 7 of Chapter 4 (253–273) or Chapter 5 (283–305), I believe that the title and the issues discussed do not fully correspond.

2   The decisions of 1582 and 1589 are clearly a part of the dispute over who had the right to be included in the General Council (and therefore could become a candidate for the 150), although, particularly for the second case, the vagueness of the author's translation (58–59) leaves room for misunderstanding. The decision refers to those who wished to be included in the General Council, and the process is defined (*esser aprobati*, *introdoti*, *balotati*), while it is explicitly stated that this decision does not re-

verse that of 1582, which clearly stated the criteria for the candidature of foreigners. Furthermore, the final decision of the Senate (1595) to revert to the conditions of 1542 does not mention reversing the decisions of 1582 and 1589; therefore, the cautious and suspicious Senate did not identify the two. See the entire text: Archivio di Stato di Venezia (hereafter ASV), *Senato Mar*, Registro 55, pp. 205v–206r (244v–245r), 30 Nov 1595 and ASV, *Senato Mar*, filza 129 (material attached to the decision).

3   Ermanno Lunzi, *Della condizione politica delle isole ionie sotto il dominio Veneto* (Greek edition), Athens: Nikolaidis Filadelfeos, 1856, 71.

4   See Dimitris Arvanitakis, *Κοινωνικές αντιθέσεις στην πόλη της Ζακύνθου: Το ρεμπελιό των ποπολάρων (1628)*, Athens: Benaki Museum/Hellenic Literary and Historical Archive, 2001, 97–111.

5   The "*serrata del Maggior Consiglio*" (1297) and the "*serrata cittadinesca*" (1569). See Arvanitakis, *Κοινωνικές αντιθέσεις*, 67–74.

6   Angelo Ventura, *Nobiltà e popolo nella società veneta del Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, Milan: Edizioni Unicolpi, 1993.

7   For a synopsis of the argument, see Arvanitakis, *Κοινωνικές αντιθέσεις*, 35–46.

8   It is a term she uses, however, with some looseness (compare "the 'permanently' elected group of 116 people" [86] with "in this 'powerful' group" [85]). See the author's observations directly afterwards. The use of the term "administrative oligarchy of 150" (392) to characterise the 150 who took the decision of 1589 is perhaps problematical.

9   The distinctions were not absolute and there are still many misunderstandings on this (133–134, 140–141).

Apostolos Lampropoulos and Antonis Balasopoulos (eds)

Χώρες της θεωρίας: Ιστορία και γεωγραφία των κριτικών αφηγημάτων

[States of theory: history and geography of critical narratives]

Athens, Metaichmio, 2010. 584 pp.

Alexandra Lianeri

University of Thessaloniki

The contemporary globalisation of scholarship in the human and social sciences has implied that the struggle with theoretical concepts has become a struggle over translation. As Dipesh Chakrabarty notes, there was a time when the diverse forms of understanding and practice were translated into universal categories of European origin, following a model of "rough" translation: one that was adequate to the task of comprehension. The ongoing challenge to this model is to pay attention to the very process of translation and the partly opaque relationship of difference it mediates.[1] This volume, *States of Theory*, engages with this relationship by focusing on the question of "theory" in the Greek-speaking world. Its aim is to explore how the narratives of theory entail a pluralised history and geography, forcing us to speak not of a singular state of theory, but of many. Which forms of transfer, interaction, appropriation and reorientation sustain the key references of Greek-speaking theoretical contemplation? Is theory in Greece a peripheral

enterprise involving the mere transposition of concepts? Can we map and appraise the diversity of references and categories that comprise the realm of Greek theory?

The book's response to these questions is structured around five categories, which also mark the distinct sections of the volume. The first of these categories is the literary and its implications for theory: the role of (literary) reading in constructing concepts, the multiple connections between literature and theory, and the ensuing consideration of literature as a movement outside the limits of the self and towards a dialogue with the other. In this context, Karin Boklund-Lagopoulou's semi-autobiographical essay traces the question of history and historicisation at the intersections of literature and theory over the last 35 years. Moving from structuralism, through new historicism, to poststructuralism, she focuses on key debates surrounding the problem of literary and historical context in order to conclude that the historicisation of literature is both necessary and impossible. Lito Ioakimidou focuses on the challenges posed to traditional comparative literature by literary theory and cultural studies. She is especially interested in the way the latter fields approach the encounter with the foreign as a mode of constructing, sustaining or challenging the national self. The problematic arising from this confrontation is deemed to be crucial for both comparative literature and historical studies in Greece, as it can further a fundamental goal of comparative research: the advancement of a new humanism, which highlights the interconnection of traditions, while simultaneously stressing the historicity of these traditions and their irreducible specificity. Miltos Pechlivanos engages with the historical and geographical routes of the aesthetics of reception. He argues that the establishment of the field exemplifies a series of reception acts going back to the Ger-

man appropriation of French and Anglophone reception theory, which was in turn reformulated to become the foundation of new theoretical currents. The essay fruitfully expands this dialogue to comment on contradictions of the Greek reception of reception theory, in order to suggest that these contradictions attest to the difference underlying any form of theoretical transposition. The section ends with Sophie Iakovidou's wide-ranging exploration of literary reception theory from the viewpoint of Bourdieu's field theory and Alain Viala's sociopoetics.

The second section examines two intersecting objects of contemporary theory: the migration of words and the migration of people, as speakers and listeners. Here Ioanna Laliotou focuses on both Greek and other examples in order to argue that migration is inscribed in concepts and narratives of national history, which it serves to undermine and uproot from within. Konstantinos Kavoulakos engages with the inscription of migration in theoretical reflection. His study of Adorno, Horkheimer and Habermas explores the geographical and historical dislocations of the Frankfurt school to suggest that theory lacks attachment to a single place as is fundamentally utopian. Finally, Grigoris Paschalidis charts some of the interdisciplinary and geographical routes of cultural theory and cultural studies, from the re-evaluation of the opposition between cultural and civilisation attempted by the Birmingham school to the postcolonial attempts to challenge enclosure into either universal or local boundaries.

The next theme is the theoretical reconfiguration of the polis and the political, and their intersections with the frames of historiography. Mina Karavanta's essay opens this section with a wide-ranging problematic on communities lacking association with a predefined

political order, the illegal immigrants standing of the margins of the global cities of late capitalism. Following Balibar, Karavanta explores how these communities are brought together by a shared fate and asks how the reconsideration of the literary may posit anew the question of living together in a *politeia* that brings within it the global and the local without reducing the one to the other. Alexandros Kioupkiolis takes his cue from spontaneous demonstrations in Athens that followed the 2008 destruction of Parnitha by fire in order to debate considerations of metapolitics and metademocracy by Hardt and Negri, on the one hand, and by Laclau and Mouffe, on the other. The essay deploys the Athenian example in order to critically engage with the concepts of multitude and democracy, and argues for a definition of the political in terms of an uncertainty that challenges a given social order. Effi Gazi traces the turn of late twentieth-century historiography towards narrative as the centre of historical research. In a discussion ranging from Hayden White's *Metahistory* to French structuralism and poststructuralism, and from Ankersmit and Ricoeur to Spivak and to Ginzburg's debate with White, Gazi discusses narrativity as an attempt to contextualise historical research and to reflect on the historicity of history writing. Yiannis Papatheodorou continues the debate on narrativity by focusing on the challenge posed by the "rhetorical turn" to both the idealistic dissociation of language from the social world and the positivist appeal to transparent representation of the past. Moving from White through Foucault to Ricoeur, the essay argues that the turn to historical poetics arises not merely from a shift in historiographical paradigms but from the way those shifts relate to wider changes in social and cultural history.

The topic of the next section is the plural lines of theory inscribed in disciplinary and national traditions and the various crossings, migra-

tions and translations involved in their constitution. Alexandros F. Lagopoulos examines the cross-disciplinary development of the fields of political economy, semiotics of space and literary theory by exploring some key debates about the notion of (human) space in human geography, human ecology, social anthropology and history after the 1950s. His multidirectional analysis leads to a holistic consideration of spatial categories and allows him to explore how space has been used to account for the writing and reception of literary works, and how the latter redefine, in turn, our understanding of space. Stephanos Stephanides focuses on translation theory, which he examines as central to the constitution of national literary and cultural traditions. Focusing on the tension between the promise of translation to transcend (national) boundaries and the fundamental impossibility of this transfer, the essay challenges the binary opposition between the cultural self and the cultural other, and stresses the hybrid and transcultural status of all evocations of literary "autonomy". Eleni Hodolidou turns to crossings in the discipline of education in Greece. Her essay defends an interdisciplinary understanding of pedagogy by tracing shifts caused after the 1960s by the opening of the field to other disciplines, such as sociology and psychology, but also to the cross-disciplinary research of fields such as cultural studies, literary studies and media studies.

The book concludes with the question of metatheory by which it designates the state of disenchantment with narratives of truth in the second part of the twentieth century, but also the recognition of this state as a theoretical enterprise that is itself linked to its historical moment. Maria Margaroni approaches this question by focusing on testimony as a text which occupies a marginal position in the languages of theory from which it acts to both shape and hinder theoretical reflection. Testimony, she ar-

gues, grounds theory in a quest for critique that remains aware of the conditions of its constitution and recognises that reflexivity passes through and simultaneously brings to light a moment of blindness, rather than a moment of truth. Antonis Balasopoulos focuses on the fundamental problem of the tension underlying the relationship between history and theory, which he defines in political terms as a relationship of domination. From Plato's definition of *chôra* as a frame that links theory to class domination, through the seventeenth-century English engagement with theory as central to the revolutionary subject, to De Man's return to Plato to unravel a rhetoric of mastery, the tradition of theory utilises a rhetoric of domination but also acts to challenge this rhetoric and render it self-subverting. Apostolos Lampropoulos also engages with the relationship between history and theory, which he views from the perspective posed by the category of mourning. The proclaimed death of theory, he argues, must be viewed reflexively as language and practice associated with a certain historical time. Yet this historicity does not imply that the dialogue with theory is a dialogue with things past. Theory rather operates between death and birth, and between past and present. As such, it designates a *chôra* that irrupts into the circle of mourning for "our" past: it fragments the categories of influence and identity, and acts instead to stress the heterogeneity and fragmentation of theoretical traditions.

In the light of the last two essays, the term *chôres* in the book's title acquires a complex meaning evoking at once the theoretical frames posed by the Greek linguistic, intellectual and academic communities, and the politics of time associated with these frames. The plural form is itself political as it aptly indicates the absence of unity within the space of Greek theoretical traditions. The book suggests – indeed, indicates by its very form – that Greek

theory has passed through different routes and crossings. The idioms of the volume attest to a diversity of languages, while the practice of translation deployed by the authors is made explicit through the evocation of debates and categories that stand beyond the limits of Greek theory.

The articulation of these traditions in Greek terms and in relation to local disciplinary and wider sociocultural contexts constitutes the most central contribution of the volume. The book offers an innovative encounter with contemporary theory, which takes as its point of reference Greek intellectual and linguistic traditions. Such a move allows us to raise two questions with regard to our understanding of theory in Greek terms. The first relates to the distinctness of Greek engagements with the western European and American traditions designated by the term theory: do these engagements allow us to discern a relative unity of Greek theoretical languages? In other words, in what sense, if any, can we speak of "Greek" theory as a specific conceptual and disciplinary field? The second question arises from our assessment of this specificity. What are the gains and losses of this act of translation, and how could it move beyond the mere application of categories produced elsewhere? Can a language of the periphery, an idiom formulated through acts of translation and re-translation, act to challenge and affect, in turn, the languages it posits as originals?

NOTE

1   Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000, 17.

**Kostas Yannakopoulos and
Yannis Yannitsiotis (eds)**

*Αμφισβητούμενοι χώροι στην
πόλη: Χωρικές προσεγγίσεις
του πολιτισμού*

**[Contested spaces in the city:
spatial approaches to culture]**

**Athens: Alexandria and University
of the Aegean, 2010. 380 pp.**

Dina Vaiou

National Technical University of Athens

This edited volume, *Contested spaces in the city*, is the outcome of a day-long conference organised by the Department of Social Anthropology and History of the University of the Aegean. It contains a long introduction and ten papers loosely articulated around issues to do with the social constitution of (urban) space and the different ways in which multiple spatialities in the city are continuously formed and contested. The papers broadly place their arguments in ethnographies of material culture and approach the city as a contested space from different perspectives. The majority of contributions are embedded in Anglophone debates, from which ample references are summoned to support the arguments put forward, while occasionally the Greek used reads like a "translation".

Stavros Stavrides briefly traverses two centuries of urban planning/design ideas to argue about the contested and negotiated character of urban public space, through a range of disparate examples. These examples bring to-

gether Haussmannian restructurings in Paris, fascist urban orderings in interwar Italy, the rationalistic schemes of Le Corbusier and the multitude of informal, spontaneous, sometimes illicit, microactions through which urban citizens appropriate public space, even provisionally, contest established uses and potentially contribute to the constitution of alternative forms of social relations.

Leonidas Economou touches on processes of urbanisation of the urban fringe through the example of Voula, on the southeastern coast of Attica. The state, local politicians and activists and landowners' associations emerge as the major agents in these processes, while the importance of ownership in the formation of community and the huge transfer of resources to individual owners emerges from the meticulous description of Voula. Voula, like any place, is in many ways particular but not at all unique, as it follows patterns common to a whole host of similar areas around the urban core of Athens in the interwar period. These patterns have been extensively studied and debated in other areas of scientific enquiry, with which Economou does not engage.

Kostas Yannakopoulos discusses the constitution of identity/difference through the process of habitation and appropriation of space, drawing from fieldwork in the area of Metaxourgio–Keramikos–Gazi. The process he is concerned with is the settlement of new middle classes in run-down/devalued areas of central Athens, areas in which real estate agencies and contractors are already in action, foreseeing and/or mobilising processes of gentrification. In the emerging urban landscape, respondents who identify as gay-lesbian-queer find in this area "a central neighbourhood the built environment of which is not already determined mainly as a space of familial normality" (132). For them, poor Greeks, different groups of migrants, gyp-

sies, Pomaks and others who form the mosaic of residents remain a distant scenery or an urban void – which is attractive as long as it remains contained within "decent" proportions.

Dimitris Parsanoglou and Elektra Petrakou bring to the foreground of their argumentation young women and men of migrant origin and attempt to link ideas about social space, "second generation" and urban space as a site for the constitution of cultural identities. Aiming to avoid an analysis which places individuals in already established social categories, they study new forms of sociocultural expression in which the site of reference is the city and not the ethnic origin. They convincingly argue that the "spatial" or "local" constitution of identities is an open or indirect form of struggle for inclusion, not only in (urban) space but also in the commons.

Panos Panopoulos discusses the role of sound technology in the reconceptualisation of relations and experiences in (contested?) urban spaces, like streets and schools. He argues that devices like those studied in his paper (the Walkman and mobile phones) influence our perceptions of public/private space and time: sound privacy in public space, public exposure of private listening and communication. Our perceptions of the city cross over/through particular soundscapes, permitting users to operate in more than one space/s, creating spatial links and drawing attention to sensations other than visual ones.

Venetia Kantsa approaches space from a gender and sexuality perspective, raising questions about the right to be "publicly" visible through "private" choices, thereby problematising analytically the distinction between public and private. Her fieldwork into lesbian spaces in Athens in the 1990s provides a coherent and interesting argument, both in theoretical and empirical terms, of how urban spaces are never exclusively heterosexual; they are rather sites where sexuality is performed, gets exposed to the sight of "others" and excites reactions – all of which destabilise its supposedly "private" character. In this sense, "a kiss is never just a kiss" (218): "personal"/"private" desires made public force us to rethink the ways in which space is de- and recomposed through the performance of gendered identities.

Athena Athanasiou contributes yet another original and interesting piece based on her research with Women in Black in Belgrade. Her argument is organised around five themes which run through the entire paper: the politics of transgressive mourning and public feminist resistance to the dominant national politics of memory and oblivion; the transformation of the urban square (a site par excellence of national normativity and nation myth) into a space of intimacy and a public performance of estrangement; the transgression of public/private boundaries through the embodied, gendered, performative politics of "improper" mourning; the transformation of black clothing, a conventional symbol of patriarchal femininity, into a subversive practice; the ways in which different stories contest one another for a place in history. According to Athanasiou, Women in Black show how urban spaces linked to national memory may be recaptured as heterotopias of resistance, which lay open and amplify the space of national memory as political space and space of politics.

Yannis Yannitsiotis presents the social confrontations around the localisation of an equestrian statue of Aris Velouchiotis in a central square of Lamia. He uses this as a starting point to discuss processes of memory formation, which take place in particular times and spaces and engage particular groups and individuals. Oppositional mythologies, left and right in this case, mobilise diverse disputes to do with re-

determinations of public memory in local society and point to the importance of visibility and location for the constitution of such memory.

Pausanias Karathanasis locates his argument about contested spaces on the walls of buildings which are appropriated by graffitists. The analysis focuses on different types of graffiti and dominant perceptions about the walls of the city, summoning a Latourian approach, following which graffiti are thought to have agency, an assertion which is not persuasively analysed further. Karathanasis considers graffiti as a "classic case of transgressive behaviour in the city" (343), a case of "heretic geography" (343), a "result of a structured form of youth urban culture" (344) which promotes different perspectives and uses of space.

Eleana Yalouri, finally, discusses the role of monuments in remembering and forgetting and the ways in which the past serves present priorities in this process. Although built monuments or monuments in space occupy a prominent position in her argument, other types of monuments are also mentioned (language, song, proverbs, narratives, etc.), as well as antimonuments (for the Holocaust, for example). Here monuments are thought to be agents, with biographies and social lives, in the sense that they influence people, raising feelings of joy, fear, anger, sadness – thereby affecting people's social lives. Furthermore, they are not permanent or stable, but rather changing, multifaceted and subject to contestation, giving rise to dialogues between past and present.

As already mentioned, the papers included in this volume loosely follow a linking thread set out by the editors, namely the "constitution of power and resistance through space and, conversely, the constitution of spatiality through power and resistance" (11). To engage with spaces of contestation and resistance, most

papers make extensive reference to Foucault's notion of heterotopia, which takes different contents as it adjusts to different analyses. Furthermore, almost all contributors pay homage to Lefebvre's conception of space as socially produced and as a critical part of social relations: the sociospatial dialectic strongly argued for by a number of prominent Anglophone Marxist and critical geographers since the 1970s and later rediscovered in other fields and disciplines. This conception, however, is subsequently lost or diluted in theoretical arguments which are drawn from other theorists and different analytical and explanatory frameworks. A case in point here is actor–network theory which attributes agency to nonhumans, thereby obfuscating, contra Lefebvre, structures of domination in the process of constitution and contestation of different spaces and spatialities.

The papers develop interesting concepts and perspectives about the city, which open many areas of debate and comment. However, I would like to conclude this review by raising an issue which has to do with the constitution of a "scientific community" in Greece in the broad field of urban studies (or study of the urban). For historical reasons to do with the development of various fields and disciplines in this country, which are beyond the scope of this brief review, this field has been populated for many decades by scholars with a background in architecture and planning. A voluminous body of research has been formed and enriched over the years with contributions from younger generations of researchers who grapple with some of the issues approached also in this volume. The contributors to this volume, however, only marginally engage with these "Greek debates", hence precluding fruitful cross-fertilisation of theoretical arguments and empirical findings. In my view, this is a significant limitation of the volume, despite the many positive aspects which make it a welcome addition to the Greek literature on the subject.

Alexander Kitroeff

*Ελλάς, Ευρώπη,
Παναθηναϊκός! 100 χρόνια
Ελληνικής Ιστορίας, 1908–
2008*

**[Greece, Europe,
Panathinaikos! A century of
Greek history, 1908–2008]**

**New York: Greekworks.com,
2010. 344 pp.**

Pandelis Kiprianos
University of Patras

A professor of history and director of the Centre for Peace and Global Citizenship at Haveford College, Pennsylvania, Alexander Kitroeff is also a long-time fan of the Athenian football club Panathinaikos. The title of his book declares his intention: to construct a centennial social history of one of the most important and popular Greek sporting clubs, and, from this standpoint, to provide an insight into Greek history.

Based on both primary (documents and interviews with some of the protagonists) and secondary sources, the book comprises eleven chapters, corresponding to the respective phases in the club's history and the evolution of Greek football. As suggested by the title, the history of Panathinaikos, according to the author, is viewed through two frames of reference, the Greek and the European. In other words, Panathinaikos is a Greek club, playing

and acting in a given national context, while, at the same time, it defines itself as a European club, aiming to be considered among the best in Europe.

After having outlined, in the first chapter, the first years of the existence of Panathinaikos and of sports in Greece, the author focuses, in the following two chapters, on the institutionalisation, initially, and the prevalence, thereafter, of football as the "king of sports". In the fourth chapter, the author analyses the period from 1945 to 1959, during which football came of age. The sixth chapter covers the team's six "golden" years, from 1960 to 1965, a period during which Panathinaikos dominated the Greek football league. The seventh chapter recounts one of the greatest, if not the greatest, moments in the history of Panathinaikos, the epic "playing at Wembley", in the finals of the European Champion Clubs' Cup. In the eighth chapter, Kitroeff deals with what he terms the "end of an epoch", which means the years from Wembley to 1979, a period marked by the weakening of Panathinaikos and by the transition of Greek football – in 1979 – from a semiprofessional to a fully professional sport.

The book can certainly be read chronologically, chapter by chapter, as a clear and pleasant narrative on the history of a club and its activities in a given national and international context, but it can also be seen as a portrait of interconnected issues concerning the whole of Greek society. We will, hence, focus on some of these topics, analysed by the author, which have not only marked football and sports but Greek society as a whole.

The ideological orientations of sporting leaders until the eve of the Second World War mirrored their preference for classical athletics, which were considered as the Greek

sport par excellence. "And this", Kitroeff says, "because classical athletics referred back to ancient Greece and served the ideology of the historical continuity of Hellenism from antiquity to the present. The use of classical athletics as an ideological tool led in 1934 to the failed attempt to revive them, through events tailored to the way the ancient Greeks competed" (83). This project was not adopted by the public, because football, especially after the Asia Minor Catastrophe, kept on winning fans, and consequently football ended up being, as noted in a sports newspaper in 1932, the "king of sports" in Greece.

The appeal of football is also reflected in its political reception and use. We know that Nikolaos Plastiras, two days before handing over power to the Fourth National Assembly, made his last public appearance as leader of the revolution on Sunday, 30 December 1923, among the masses watching the football match between Athens and Piraeus at the velodrome in Neo Faliro.[1] Since then, Kitroeff shows, the relationship between football and politics has remained complicated. Konstantinos Karamanlis appeared in May 1956 at the Cup game between Panathinaikos and Olympiakos, at the Alexandras Avenue grounds: "he cracked an Easter egg with the captains of the two teams and then immediately left" (85). Some years later, and after the period of the dictatorship of the Colonels, who invested in football in order to keep some balance, the relationship between football and politics became closer. It is also important to recall that at various times many prominent politicians (from Kostas Kotzias to George Rallis) served on the Panathinaikos board.

Throughout the book, the author deals with a topical aspect of football. Opposing a somewhat romantic approach, which tends to idealise the past, Kitroeff shows that violence is not a current phenomenon, although in recent years it has increased. Violent phenomena can be identified particularly in the early games between Panathinaikos and Olympiakos in the 1920s and 1930s. However, Kitroeff says, violence began to increase after 1945. Related to violence and sporting passions are two issues: the organisation of football and the role of supporters. We know that, over time, football lost its amateur character and became more and more professional, a fact which is reflected in the goals and practices of the parties involved. This development is reflected in the structure of the game, the publicity it enjoys, its rules, and, of course, the salaries of the players and their perception by society. The change has been so important that, if we follow Johan Huizinga's argument,[2] we could say that football is no longer a game.

This progress, marked by several episodes, most prominent among them being the exclusion by the competent authorities of most of the international football players from the Greek national team in 1953, an incident that is the theme of Vasilis Georgiadis' well-known film *Κυριακάτικοι ήρωες* (Aces of Football). This change continued through the creation, in 1959, of the national championship, which opened the way for "semiprofessionalism" and, twenty years later, in 1979, of professional football companies and the transition to professionalism.

This development was not linear. A whole generation, incarnated by the emblematic figure of the former player and club president Apostolos Nikolaidis, attempted to salvage the values of amateurism and fair play. A result of this tradition, according the author, is the continuing interest shown by Panathinaikos in promoting a large number of sports other than football. Here too, perhaps, are the

origins of the epithet "*vazeles*", a term for the team's fans which dates from the 1950s. "The persistence in Panathinaikos," Kitroeff writes, "of the bourgeois-based ideal of fair play and distance that this maintained to popular violence (and one version of masculinity, too) resulted in Panathinaikos supporters being called '*Vaselines*', later '*Vazeles*'" (106).

Parallel to the nationalisation and professionalisation of football, the process of organising supporters, particularly through the establishment of fan clubs, is worthy of consideration. This organisation of supporters played an influential role in the life of teams, especially the "big ones". "Fan clubs," Kitroeff writes, "existed since the beginning of the first division. They were basically local organisations in different areas of Athens which coordinated and had a relationship with the club" (152). The collective expression of feelings from the stands, he continues, "took a more coordinated form early in the 1966-1967 season when a group of supporters gathered at the stand's Gate 13. In 1968, Gate 13 was founded as the first organised fan association in Greece, and it was the forerunner of the associations that followed and multiplied after 1981, when the Panhellenic Club of Panathinaikos Friends (PALEFIP) was established.

I shall conclude with two critical issues, aptly analysed by Kitroeff, which have always beset both Greek football clubs and Greek society as a whole: the trust in institutions and the relationship with the surrounding world. The world of sports does not trust its own institutions. The distrust in football is paradigmatically reflected in "the lord of the match", the referee, who should treat both teams fairly. For this reason, until 1967 well-known foreign referees were asked to ref major matches. While the referees have been Greek since then, the problem has not been solved; in-

deed, it could be said that it has worsened with the exposure of the "*paragka*" (literally "shack"), a term, the author notes, which is used to describe match-fixing (275).

Greek athletics, and football in particular, are a mirror of the relations between Greeks and "foreigners", westerners and easterners. The image is reflected in the performance of Greek teams at all levels, too. In the words of the author: "The world of Greek football stood in awe and respect in the face of the powerful countries and football teams of Europe. They were considered as standards and examples to be imitated. This attitude had to do more with a general view on the relationship between Greece and Western Europe, which constituted the ideal developmental and cultural model or, better, the source of different models that the country had to embrace. The dissidents to this view, for ideological reasons, considered the socialist countries of Eastern Europe as the key standards. In any case, in the international football industry there were no ideological differences which intersected the East–West axis: everyone admired the big names of Europe as a whole" (163).

This picture is quite different from that of the political level, in which admiration for the West and particularly the European Union is overshadowed by its sceptical reception. This deviation can be read as an expression of the relative autonomy of sport from political ideologies. In any case, the participation of Greek teams in European cup competitions created new conditions for Greek sports and, especially, football. "Thus, the European orientation of the club," Kitroeff concludes, referring to Panathinaikos, "found a new field of expression, especially with its first European successes and, of course, the crowning moment of its appearance in the Champi-

ons League final in 1971. Then, the successful course of the team over the coming decades has crystallised the view that Panathinaikos is predominantly a 'European' team, the praiseworthy ambassador of domestic football in Europe, in a period especially during which Greece was taking its place among the countries of the European Community."

NOTES

1   Christos Hadziiossif, "Κοινοβούλιο και δικτατορία" [Parliament and dictatorship], in idem (ed.), *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας του 20ού αιώνα: Ο μεσοπόλεμος 1922-1940* [The history of Greece in the twentieth century: the interwar years, 1922-1940], 2 vols, Athens: Vivliorama, 2003, vol 2/1:101.

2   Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*, Boston: Beacon 1955 (1938).

Susan E. Alcock

Αρχαιολογίες του ελληνικού παρελθόντος: Τοπία, μνημεία και αναμνήσεις

Athens: Alexandria, 2011. 407 pp.

Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscapes, Monuments and Memories

Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 222 pp.

Dimitris Plantzos
University of Ioannina

Susan Alcock's *Archaeologies of the Greek Past*, first published in 2002 and now translated into Greek, revisits Greek archaeology in an effort to investigate how successive versions of the classical past – its earlier *strata* as it were – are "re-remembered" through material culture. Alcock's endeavour was, back when the book was written, fuelled by more than a decade's solid theoretical work on cultural memory and its collective manifestations, thus turning memory, hitherto deemed irrelevant to historical discourse and consequently banned from it, into a legitimate academic subject. Raphael Samuel's *Theatres of Memory*, for one, taught modern historians that memory – rather than merely being "an image bank of the past" – is dialectically related to history.[1] Though Alcock does not seem to have consulted Samuel's tour-de-force, she nonetheless subscribes

to his main premise, though by now in serious risk of sounding frightfully stereotypical, that remembering and forgetting the past is essential for the forging of individual and collective identities. As general interest in social remembering has been rising since the early 1990s, novel ways of assessing the past and its memory, especially within the nation framework, are constantly sought, "where the general and the particular, epochal and eventful, inform each other iteratively in scholarship as they do in life".[2]

Alcock bases her research on Jan Assmann's central thesis on cultural memory and what he termed the "memory culture" (*Erinnerungskultur*), that is the ways in which a given society ensures cultural continuity through repetitious, quasi-ceremonial reference to the past, thus allowing later generations to reconstruct their collective cultural identity.[3] Through successive revisitings, memory thus becomes the locus where the past takes its shape. Maintaining that social memory provides any given society with an image for its past and "a plan for [its] future" (21, Greek edition), Alcock embarks on her effort to reconstruct these images, plans and visions *in the past itself*, that is an effort to reconstruct social memory through the material remains of the very culture by which such memory was entertained. Her conviction may be described as this: memory gains tactility through its traces on the material culture; since the artefacts left behind by an ancient society are themselves the products of cultural mnemonics, having been created as manifestations of a shared past in the first place, then they may stand as memory's material self (49). Alcock is right to state that, although archaeologists have begun (at least back in 2002) to comprehend the power hiding in their data, social memory as a dynamic agent in ancient societies remains largely underestimated (50). She then proceeds to "push" the memory discourse back in time, as far back as the ancient Mediterranean.

The author then begins her investigation of her chosen *archaeologies*, in the face of three case studies: the Roman province of Achaia, on the ambivalent encounter between classical Greece and classicising Rome, a game of imperial politics played on a seemingly vacant cultural landscape which was thoroughly reinvented in order to be exploited; Hellenistic and Roman Crete, a tale of two islands against the backdrop of their (revisited) Minoan past; and Messenia as the archaeological landscape of many an "imagined community", ethnic and cultural. Alcock's accounts are thorough, lucid and thought provoking. Archaeology – she maintains – is not merely the sum of our digs, nor even the sum of our fully documented, abundantly illustrated catalogues. According to Alcock, *archaeologies* ought to be meaningful accounts of the past in view of the viable considerations of the present. Archaeologies are in fact, the author contends, *histories* of landscapes, monuments and – beyond all that – *memories*, a systematic rethinking of our primary material sources. Inevitably, the study of social memory heralds for the classical archaeologists their (grossly overdue) loss of innocence (295), the rather exhilarating admission that the past lies beyond its material remains.

And this is when Alcock seems to be somewhat missing the point. Some of her discussion in *Archaeologies of the Greek Past* derives from her earlier, seminal book *Graecia Capta*, published in 1993.[4] There, Alcock used in exemplary fashion results obtained through territorial surveys of mostly rural Greek sites in order to suggest that "instead of a cultural haven, an imaginary world, or a museum locked in spiritual twilight, Greece

under Roman rule must be understood as a society in the process of change, adapting and assimilating itself to a new position within an imperial system" (230). These adaptations and assimilations are now retheorised, in *Archaeologies*, within the cultural memory discourse. This reviewer, however, cannot avoid the suspicion that, even though Alcock's readings of material culture are indeed most perceptive, she takes cultural memory as yet another *artefact* available to her scrutiny, a material remain of the past to be excavated, classified and interpreted. Her archaeologies are indeed the by now well-familiar, modern archaeologies of a distant past, which we, as independent academics of an uninvolved era, are free to discuss, critique and illuminate.

Alcock is obviously taking the point of an archaeology in the Foucauldian sense, focusing on the processes, conscious or unconscious, and the ideological strategies deployed by local communities in order to articulate their cultural identity along the collective memory/collective oblivion axis.[5] Her discussion of rural and civic landscapes as dynamic fields of cultural diversity in her work proves as much. One is left, however, with the paradox of having – as a historian – to treat ancient memories as modern histories. It is indicative that whereas in chapter 1 of *Archaeologies* the author admits that – far from being agents of objective wisdom – archaeologists and historians alike are often responsible for the invention, the rewriting, or the erasure of monuments, landscapes or texts (73–74), the agency of the *present* archaeologist/historian is virtually absent from the detailed accounts that follow. As a matter of fact, the author begins her Cretan chapter with a critique, rather harsh, of a previous author – John Pendlebury (1904–1941), who compared, in his 1939 book *The Archaeology of Crete*,[6] Roman Crete with its idolised Bronze Age precursor. The

accuracy of such a comparison notwithstanding, it would be rather interesting to have at this point an exploration of how Pendlebury might have forged his own Cretan cultural and sentimental involvement with the island and its past, or to what extent Cretan archaeologies were affected by the active presence of the Knossos curator who, as a British intelligence service agent, was executed by German troops during the Battle of Crete (he was taken captive but was shot because he was mistaken for a Greek partisan).

While Alcock is right to talk, reflecting on previous literature, of a certain "memory industry" blossoming in interdisciplinary academia in recent few decades, I would have hoped, however, for a more in-depth account of how modern archaeologists "remember" what they know. This problem is far from resolved, and although we now know that the cultures we inhabit and the memories we inherit shape our archaeologies of the past – Greek or other – we are in no position to say exactly how this happens, and how it affects the integrity of our discourse. And this is a direction we ought to be taking.

NOTES

1   Raphael Samuel, *Theatres of Memory*, vol. 1: *Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*, London and Lew York: Verso, 1994, x.

2   Jeffrey K. Olick, *States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations in National Retrospection*, Durham and London: Duke UP, 2003, 5.

3   Chiefly, Jan Assmann, "Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität", in Jan Assmann and Tonio Hölscher (eds), *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988, 9–19; Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen*

Hochkulturen, Munich: Beck, 1992; Jan Assmann, "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity", *New German Critique* 65 (1995), 125–33.

4   Susan E. Alcock, *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

5   Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", in Donald F. Bouchard (ed.), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977, 139–64.

6   John D. Pendlebury, *The Archaeology of Crete: An Introduction*, London: Methuen, 1939, 365.

Polymeris Voglis

Η ελληνική κοινωνία στην Κατοχή 1941–1944

[Greek society during the occupation, 1941–1944]

Athens: Alexandria, 2011. 182 pp.

Nikos Tzafleris

University of Athens

Polymeris Voglis' study fulfils the role of a comprehensive synopsis of the historiography on the turbulent years of the Second World War and the Axis occupation of Greece. His study, however, goes far beyond that to serve as a textbook for the university student and an introduction for the broader audience to the public discussion on that historical period. Rather, and above all, it serves as a solid basis for new research in the field since it incorporates much of the enormous body of contemporary bibliographic production – particularly since 1990 – on the subject, which Voglis critically utilises to summarise, chronologically and thematically, the most significant events of that complex period. Moreover, he emphasises the points where contemporary research surpasses or refutes older historiographical givens.

Being himself part of a younger generation of historians, who, with no living memory of the past, enjoy the advantage of being at a safe distance from the facts, Voglis has dared to write a balanced analysis, away from the polemics, demagogy and extremes of past generations, who were bound by their political affiliation and their personal involvement in the events.

The historiography of the last two decades are Voglis' primary reservoir of sources and arguments. We may discern five basic axes in his narrative: the refuting of myths by utilising professional historiographical interpretations which are based more on primary sources than on political and ideological polemics; the placing of society and social history at the centre of his analysis; the incorporation of local dimensions into the wider historical framework, hence enriching the general picture; the comparison of how cities and the countryside experienced occupation; and the use of the concept of violence as a key interpretative tool in the historical appraisal of the period.

Voglis demonstrates rather clearly that the embedded memory that is based more on myth and less on the study of the archival sources no longer suffices for the interpretation of history. In this new historiography, the Albanian epic (the victories of the Greek forces in the Albanian front against the invading Italians), was not only the result of the enthusiasm and heroism of the Greek soldiers but also the outcome of certain factors, such as the underpreparedness and faulty strategic choices of the Italian army; the particular morphology of the terrain and the harsh climate conditions that prevented the full development of large forces; and the numerical superiority of the Greek army after its full mobilisation in the first stages of the conflict. Moreover, society was quick to organise and mobilise itself, a fact that should partly be attributed to the mass participation in associations such as the National Youth Organisation (EON), built up in the interwar period under Metaxas' authoritarian regime.[1] The battle of Crete did not really delay the German invasion of the Soviet Union. Contemporary research focuses more on the unprecedented participation of the local population in this battle and on German retaliation against civilians. Moreover, Voglis explores recent research on the turbu-

lent relations of Greeks with the country's minorities, which overturns the embellished view of the close relations between Jews and Christians, reveals a widespread anti-Semitism and the hostile behaviour in general against these unwanted compatriots.

The very title of the book prepares the reader for the writer's intentions. Society lies at the centre of the analysis. Voglis follows the most significant methodological turn in the historiography in the last two decades: the shift from political and military to social history. His aim is to focus on the developments within Greek society during the occupation which resulted from the special conditions of wartime and the social reality of interwar Greece. The hundreds of thousands of refugees from Asia Minor had not been fully integrated into Greek society while a number of minorities were still trying to find their place in the new environment of northern Greece. The military occupation by three totalitarian regimes, which occurred within the context of a global, multifrontal, totalitarian war, added to the social tensions of interwar Greece.

Voglis' chapter on the dismantling of the economy joins the debate within Greek historiography for a more complete study and evaluation of the economy of that period. In place of the once fragmented historiography of the wartime looting of the country, and the resulting famine, death and the black market, new studies have emerged on subjects such as forced labour inside Greece and on labour that was forced or went voluntarily to work in the the Reich, economic collaboration and the use of Greek industry to support the German war economy. Amid the dismantling of the economy and the deadly famine of the first winter under occupation (1941–1942), the situation within Greek society was explosive: the traditional civic political forces were locked in dispute over their political leverage in postwar Greece

and, like the collaborationist government, they seemed incapable of handling the situation.

It was at that time that new political forces came into the picture, the National Liberation Front (EAM) being the most important of all, placing resistance and national liberation at the forefront. The struggle for survival in the cities caused the first collective reactions against the occupiers (strikes, demonstrations and consumers' cooperatives). The radical antifascist ideological character of the resistance organisations unified the masses and it was the EAM that succeeded in uniting most of these forces and organising most of the resistance actions. Voglis attempts to interpret the resistance as a total social phenomenon, decisive for the developments within Greek society under occupation. He tries to explain the characteristics which made this movement so popular and massive by turning to the social basis of the power which helped it emerge. Lastly, he demonstrates the social, political and cultural changes that the EAM brought to wartime Greece.

It is due to the social conditions of the occupation that, according to Voglis, EAM prevailed over other organisations but also met with the reaction of the anti-EAM forces. The collapse of state institutions expanded the EAM's popular leverage as it succeeded to implement, within the regions it controlled and alongside the Greek People's Liberation Army (ELAS), institutions that enabled the direct participation of the people in political affairs. These institutions introduced citizens to the idea of active participation in public affairs, with the result that local societies controlled – but were also controlled by – EAM. The relation of ELAS with local societies was one of codependence because it relied on them for supplies but also protected them from the occupiers. However, it was also a relationship that was often tested due to the retaliations of the occupation forces,

which adopted the tactic of collective responsibility in response to partisan attacks.

The fate of the minorities during the occupation remained a taboo for earlier historical accounts. The occupation brought to the surface conflicts that had formed during the interwar period, when the Greek state implemented a policy of national homogenisation by hellenising the "new territories", those regions in northern Greece annexed from the Ottoman Empire from 1912 onwards. During the occupation the unfortunate fate of the minorities was decided, with the exception of the Muslims of Thrace. On the initiative of the Germans and with the participation of the state, the majority of Greek Jews was exterminated, while the Chams (an Albanian-speaking minority in Greek Epirus) were persecuted by the National Republican Greek League (EDES). In the case of the Slavo-Macedonians, opposing forces within the minority led to some of its members to join EAM and others to participate in armed collaboration.

From 1990 onwards, there has been an abundance of studies analysing the social conditions at a local level under occupation. In his study, Voglis takes advantage of this and incorporates the local differences and particularities into the general historiographical picture of that period. This leads us to appreciate the complexity of the occupation, the special characteristics of every region of the country and, thus, helps us build a more comprehensive narrative. The historiographical interpretations based on local archives have revealed the different, indeed political, characteristics of the resistance movement in different parts of the country. This turn has reformed the historiographical context of the confrontation between resistance and the occupier, the conflict among resistance groups and the organisation of the armed collaborationist groups. For instance, EDES' armed wing was organised

more on local kinship structures with each enjoying relative autonomy and less on a political power centre, as was the case with ELAS.

Moreover, Voglis points to the scarcity of studies on Athens, which mainly cover the first period of the famine but have little to say about 1943–1944, when civil violence and conflict with the occupier moved from the mountains to the neighbourhoods of the capital. However, Voglis fails to incorporate recent research on the different economic characteristics of the occupation in different areas of the country.[2]

Another element of Voglis' narrative is the parallel approach that he takes to unveil the difference between the city and the countryside. He distinguishes between guerrilla warfare in the mountains and resistance in the cities. The former took its characteristics from pillage and a "tradition of mutiny" in the countryside, but during the occupation it gradually acquired more political and ideological characteristics, when rebel groups were formed as military branches of the resistance organisations, gradually developing more political objectives. The latter was more conspiratory and emerged according to the special socioeconomic conditions in the occupied urban area, as previously mentioned. He stresses the famine among the working class and the impoverishment of the middle class as wealth moved from the city to the countryside through the extensive networks of the black market, especially in the first period of the occupation. Moreover, he underlines the massive flows of populations during the occupation and distinguishes between those that went from the cities to the villages through black-market networks during the first winter of the occupation and the flight from the countryside due to German retaliations, cleansing operations and scorched earth tactics, which were applied mostly after the spring–summer of 1943.

The concept of violence as an epistemological interpretive tool is central to Voglis' analysis, as it is the case for the total of the historiography of the period. A society under occupation is a typically violent society; violence prevails as a total social phenomenon in every aspect of daily life and implicates society as a whole. In this context of violence, Voglis studies at the same time armed collaboration with the occupier, civil conflicts and German retaliations. The violence that arose from the socioeconomic conditions of the occupation, famine and disease brought about the violence of the resistance. German cleansing operations and the widespread retaliation against civilians as a direct result of resistance actions created high tensions between local communities and EAM/ELAS. The impressive growth of EAM/ELAS and its adoption of a hostile stance towards other resistance groups led to a violent clash between them and, then, the latter to collaborate with the Germans. The belief of some politicians and the collaborationist government – fuelled by the Germans – that EAM was planning to seize power after the war, resulted in the arming of the Security Battalions and several other anti-communist groups. Lastly, the purpose of civil violence between EAM and anti-EAM groups – which gradually implicated all levels of Greek society – was the political control of the country after liberation.

In the last year of the occupation, Athens was the field of the most violent clashes between EAM, the collaborationist anticommunist groups and the German forces. As liberation came closer, civil unrest increased, on the foot of accusations from each side about intentions of the other to seize power. After the German withdrawal, the British took over and, joined by the anti-EAM forces, faced EAM during the Battle of Athens, in which the latter was defeated.

The events of December 1944 are a landmark in the history of the occupation. Not only do

they mark the defeat of the EAM coalition and the dissolution of ELAS, but they were also described in the official discourse as the "second round" of the civil conflict, purportedly caused by KKE in order to seize power by force (the "first round" was the civil conflict between EAM/ELAS and other resistance groups and the "third round" was the 1946–1949 civil war). This concept resumed after 1989, when the communist Left was connected to totalitarianism and was virtually equated to fascism. In any case, as Voglis rightly puts it, this is an ideological interpretation of history which is not based on the historical context of that period or the special conditions of the occupation.

NOTES

1   Giorgos Margaritis, *Από την ήττα στην εξέγερση: Ελλάδα Άνοιξη 1941–Φθινόπωρο 1942 [From defeat to uprising: Greece, Spring 1941–Autumn 1942]*, Athens: Politis, 1993, 31–47.

2   Until recently, the literature was focused on the case of Athens in order to explain phenomena such as the survival of the urban population through black-market networks, the role of Greek industry during the occupation, labour mobilisations, the sending of labour to the Reich and economic collaboration with the occupier. However, more recent research has tried to explore famine in the large urban centres of the country, the role and contribution of the industrial periphery to the Greek industry as a whole, the survival and resistance of the workers inside the factories and how the network of the economic collaboration with the occupiers and of the exploitation of the country's resources by the Axis powers spread to other regions outside of Athens. Maria Kavala, *Η Θεσσαλονίκη στη γερμανική κατοχή (1941–1944): κοινωνία, οικονομία, διωγμός Εβραίων* [Thessaloniki under German occupation, 1941–1944: society, economy, persecution of the Jews], unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Crete, 2009; Nikos Tzafleris, *Επιβίωση και αντίσταση στο Βόλο την περίοδο της κατοχής (1941–1944)* [*Survival and resistance in Volos during the Axis occupation, 1941–1944*], unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Thessaly, 2007.

Stratos Dordanas

Η γερμανική στολή στη ναφθαλίνη: Επιβιώσεις του δοσιλογισμού στη Μακεδονία 1945–1974

[The German uniform in mothballs: Collaborationism's survival in Macedonia, 1945–1974]

Athens: Estia, 2011. 526 pp.

Loukianos Hassiotis

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

European collaboration with Nazi Germany has always been a prickly matter. The official postwar narrative in Western Europe was organised around the notions of "national resistance" against German occupation or/and the British and American contribution to the defeat of fascism, while in Eastern Europe dominant narratives combined the decisive role of the Red Army and the Soviet Union with (communist or "popular") resistance against local "fascist" or "reactionary" regimes. Given that the governing elites in the West were mostly concerned with reconstruction, the continuity of the state apparatus, security and political stability, discussions about collaborationism and on the role of collaborationists in the Nazi "new order" or the Holocaust were considered counterproductive. On the other hand, in the new "people's republics" ethnic cleansing and the seizure of power by communist parties actually promoted the punishment of either actual or alleged collaborationists. However, even in this case, discussions about cooperation with the Nazis soon faded, in favour of a narrative stressing liberation by the Soviet Union.[1]

It took more than two decades for a reappraisal of the issue of European collaboration. Undoubtedly, the spirit of the generation of 1968 played a significant role, since it was a generation that instinctively refused to accept their parents' version of most things and of the Second World War in particular. It is probably not a coincidence that one of the forerunners of this reappraisal was an outsider, the American historian Robert Puxton: his book *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940–1944* represented a turning point in contemporary historiography of the Second World War, in the sense that it highlighted the domestic factors of collaborationism, while at the same time questioning de Gaulle's argument that French cooperation with the Nazis was limited.[2] Many more similar works followed, focusing not only on collaboration during the war, but also on the fate that awaited collaborationists in the postwar period. Historiographical interest in the issue has indeed risen in recent decades. After the end of the Cold War, a reappraisal of several neglected aspects of the Second World War gave rise to the revival of public debates over the experience and the challenges of the 1940s. Moreover, this interest, both scientific and public, reflects a tendency to review memories of the Second World War itself, as they were constructed afterwards in each individual country and in Europe as a whole. The reappraisal of the memory of the war also includes, obviously, the issue of collaboration, and it is often – albeit not always – free of older stereotypes, such as, for example, the quantitative and qualitative downgrading of cooperation with the enemy, or the concept of a "nationwide" resistance. Thus, over the last few years we have witnessed a relative increase in historical publications research-

ing the stories of Nazi collaborators and their subsequent fate, usually in the context of the domestic crisis that European societies experienced during the 1940s, and of the new balance of power that emerged with the Cold War.[3]

This tendency is also evident in Greece, although the respective historiographical production has been comparatively limited to date. Although we have witnessed an increase in the number of articles (as well as MA or PhD dissertations) dealing with collaborationism and the way in which postwar societies encountered it, monographs remain limited both in number and in scope. Two of them were published in the early 1980s (i.e., in the period when postwar leftwing narratives on occupation and resistance flourished, after decades of censorship and proscription), by ex-members of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) and Greek People's Liberation Army (ELAS). The more recent books on the same issue were written by Stratos Dordanas and Tasos Kostopoulos.[4]

This relative lack of published work on the issue of collaborationism in Greece can been partly attributed to technical reasons such as the lack of relevant sources or the inability to access them. At the same time, it is generally accepted that it has to do with other factors as well, such as fear of reactions (or even complaints) as well as the strong emotional reactions and the polemic that continues to accompany the debate on this issue. Of course, these factors are by no means irrelevant to developments around the issue of collaborationism in postwar Greece, that is the general impunity of Nazi collaborators and, moreover, their integration into the postwar regime, in some cases in the forefront and in some in the rearguard of the anti-communist struggle. These developments, although by no means linear, actually prohibited public discussion on the issue of collaborationism until the collapse of the colonels' dicta-

torship. Thus, as Dordanas accurately notes, the question became "an open wound in the body of Greek society" (409). The return to democracy made possible the historical reappraisal of collaborationism and of the fate of collaborationists, but the relevant discussion remained obscured for political or personal reasons.

Dordanas' book illuminates several aspects of the issue, focusing on the case of collaborationists who were active in Greek Macedonia. His major advantage is that he intercrosses important and generally inaccessible sources from judicial, diplomatic (Greek and foreign), military, prison, hospital or private archives as well as the press and other publications of the period under consideration.

The first five chapters of the book examine the efforts to secure justice after liberation from foreign occupation, initially by the National Liberation Front (EAM) and later by the official state authorities, pointing to the problems and contradictions of such an enterprise. The writer describes how the civil war shifted the interest in the prosecution of the collaborationists, enabling them to exploit the circumstances in order to move, once more, against leftists, but also to win the support – or at least the tolerance – of those who were supposed to arrest and try them. Of particular significance is his reference to the "certification industry", managed by ministers, deputies, military or police officers and other members of the national or local elites of the time, regarding the political and ideological beliefs of the accused collaborationists. These certifications are reminiscent of the public declarations of repentance or loyalty to the postwar regime, or even the letters of gratitude of minors to Queen Frederica. All of them, one could argue, represent common symbols of submission to the post-civil war state, while at the same time reflecting the kind of patron–client relationships that were

constructed during this period. The sixth chapter describes how such relationships permitted later ex-collaborationists (like, for example, Sotirios Gotzamanis, Theodoros Tourkovasilis, Konstantinos Papadopoulos or Dimitrios Theocharidis) to participate in the political landscape, besides giving them the possibility to appoint some of their supporters to the public sector. In this way, according to the writer, "the *ethnikofron* [national-minded] state closed up its ranks with new and willing anticommunists and pure patriots" (278). The following chapter narrates the exposure of this system in the mid-1960s, particularly in Greek Macedonia, after Grigoris Lambrakis' murder, in which a number of ex-collaborationists were implicated. The question of collaboration with Nazi Germany was revived, albeit only temporarily, since the colonels' dictatorship (chapter 8) tackled it in the way that best fitted its ideological principles, that is with the official recognition of ex-collaborationists as resistance fighters (against "foreign" and "interior" enemies of the nation). The relationship between collaborationists and the colonels remains a very intriguing question; indeed I believe that a specialised essay on the issue would give us very interesting data about the continuities in the Greek extreme rightwing political milieu since the Second World War. Finally, in the last chapter, the author attempts an approach to the construction of contemporary public memory regarding collaborationists. His case study refers to the ceremonies that take place in the town of Kilkis, where the memory of either biological or ideological descendants of those accused of or condemned as collaborationists clashes with the corresponding agents of the leftwing narrative.

In short, the author manages to provide a convincing picture of the fate of the collaborationists in postwar Greece. Significant features in his work are his calm and methodical approach and his detached style that avoids denunciations

and does not seek to impress. His contribution, therefore, to the study of collaboration and of its memory is unequivocal; hopefully, his work will soon find followers among colleagues engaged in modern Greek and European history.

NOTES

1 Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*, London, Penguin, 1998, 233–240; István Deák, Jan Tomasz Gross, Tony Judt (eds), *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and its Aftermath*, Princeton UP, 2000, and Claudio Pavone, "The General Problem of the Continuity of the State and of the Legacy of Fascism", in Jonathan Dunnage (ed.), *After the War: Violence, Justice, Continuity and Renewal in Italian Society*, Market Harborough, Troubador, 1999, 5–20.

2 Robert Puxton, *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940–1944*, New York, Knopf, 1972.

3 For a brief synopsis of the postwar debate over collaboration and resistance, see the preface by Tony Judt in *The Politics of Retribution in Europe*, and in particular, vii–xii. For the French case, see the classic Henry Rousso, *Le Syndrome de Vichy: De 1944 à nos jours*, Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1990.

4 Nikos Karkanis, *Οι δωσίλογοι της κατοχής: Δίκες παρωδία (ντοκουμένατα-αποκαλύψεις-μαρτυρίες)* [Collaborationists during the occupation: mockery trials (documents–disclosures–testimonies)], Athens, Synchroni Epochi, 1981; Yannis K. Douatzis, *Οι Ταγματασφαλήτες: Ντοκουμέντα από τα αρχεία τους που τεκμηριώνουν την εγκληματική τους δράση στην Εύβοια τα χρόνια της Κατοχής* [The Security Battalions: documents from their archives proving their criminal activity in Evia during the occupation], Athens, Tolidis, 1983; Tasos Kostopoulos, *Η αυτολογοκριμένη μνήμη: Τα Τάγματα Ασφαλείας και η μεταπολεμική εθνικοφροσύνη* [The self-censored memory: the Security Battalions and postwar *ethikofrosini*], Athens: Filistor, 2005; Stratos N. Dordanas, *Έλληνες εναντίον*

Ελλήνων: Ο κόσμος των Ταγμάτων Ασφαλείας στην κατοχική Θεσσαλονίκη, 1941–1944 [Greeks against Greeks: the Security Battalions' world in occupied Thessaloniki,1941–1944], Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 2006. We should also add the collective volume by Iakovos Michailidis, Ilias Nikolakopoulos and Hagen Fleischer (eds), *«Εχθρός» εντός των τειχών. Όψεις του δωσιλογισμού στην Ελλάδα της Κατοχής* ['Enemy' within the gates: Aspects of collaboration in occupied Greece], Athens, Ellinika Grammata, 2006, as well as a couple of unpublished monographs: Eleni Haidia, *Ο δωσιλογισμός στη Μακεδονία: Τα πρακτικά των δικών των δωσιλόγων, 1945–1946* (Collaborationism in Macedonia: The records of the collaborationists' trials, 1945–1946), MA thesis, Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1995, and Dimitris Kasouris, *Une épuration ordinaire (1944–1949): Histoire des procès des collaborateurs en Grèce*, unpublished PhD thesis, Paris, L'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 2009.

Sotiris Walden

Παράταιροι εταίροι: Ελληνική δικτατορία, κομμουνιστικά καθεστώτα και Βαλκάνια 1967–1974

[Unseemly partners: The Greek dictatorship, communist regimes and the Balkans, 1967–1974]

Athens: Polis, 2009. 800 pp.

Yiorgos Stathakis
University of Crete

Sotiris Walden's book has been much awaited, for two reasons. Firstly, because it refers to the period of the dictatorship in Greece, an underresearched period to which any fresh contribution is welcomed. Secondly, because it examines an issue, that is, the relations of the dictatorship with the communist world, which at the time raised a lot of debate among the political movements that were fighting the regime in Greece, and primarily among the Left-oriented student movement, which was inclined to favour the political and economic isolation of the country, both from Western and Eastern Europe.

Political isolation from Western Europe had started to produce results, with the expulsion of Greece from the Council of Europe in late 1969. Economic relations, on the other hand, were not affected, despite the "freezing" of the association agreement with the Common Market. Until 1973, the Greek economy continued

to have an impressive growth pattern, which was based on investment and exports directed to the Western European market and tourism coming from the same market. The "opening to the East" of the Athens regime and the response of the communist bloc was of crucial importance in terms of breaking its political isolation, while in economic terms it was less certain, at the time, how important it was.

Here then is an excellent study using practically most of the available diplomatic records and other sources to investigate the changing pattern of the relations of the regime in Athens with the communist Balkan and Central European countries, the USSR and China. It is a study on political and international relations, not on economic relations, which are obviously discussed, but in a separate chapter. There is also an extensive record of the bilateral relations of Greece with each and every country at the end of the book. Finally, there is a detailed account of certain areas of economic cooperation in fields such as energy, tourism, transport and some others. Yet the primary focus of the book is on the diplomatic and political relations and how the changing architecture of international relations affected the specific relations of the Athens regime with the communist world.

The conclusion is, more or less, expected and well documented. There is nothing special about the economic relations of Greece with the Eastern bloc. Preexisting patterns continued, with some short intervals. Eastern Europe had been very important in the past as a market for specific agricultural products. Actually Greece had, in relative terms, among the Western European countries, by far the highest share of trade with the East. Trade was not done through free exchange, but through the restrictive clearing system. Thus, it had to be more or less balanced and a certain pattern of trade was already there, which continued with minor fluctuations that

were determined by politics. Yet, there is not much to be added. As the Greek economy was experiencing a boom period, in which most of the trade was developing with Western Europe, the relative role of Eastern Europe rather declined. The study is very certain and conclusive on this point. In economic terms there is no indication that there was either growth or a special development of any kind. In economic terms, relations developed practically after 1974.

Economics is not the key in order to explain political relations. That is why and under what circumstances political initiatives were taken, what were the primary objectives of the dictatorship for such political "openings", why did the communist world respond in specific ways and to what extent international factors influenced the changing pattern of these relations. The book provides a very extensive and detailed account of these relations, distinguishing three subperiods: the first two years, when many economic and political relations were "frozen", followed by the period from 1970 to 1972, when there was an obvious "opening" of the dictatorship towards the communist world, and, finally, the last three years (1972–1974), which was a rather inconsistent phase.

The international framework was full of major events of crucial importance. It was a period when the Cold War was undermined by a gradual shift towards peaceful coexistence. Yet, the ongoing conflicts were intense. The war in Vietnam, the two Arab–Israeli wars, the Soviet–Chinese conflict, the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, the intervention in Chile and other political developments were of major importance. The opening of the US to China and the opening of China to the rest of the world were also crucial. Of primary importance in the Greek context was, of course, the Cyprus question, where the dictatorship was working on the removal of President Makarios.

The basic proposition of the book is the fact that the relations of the dictatorship with the communist world were determined primarily by the initiatives taken by the Greek side, rather than vice versa. The communist camp offered a rather constant response. It retained its polemic against the Greek regime, all the way through. Yet at the same time, it was positive to the idea of keeping normal economic relations in place and offered a positive response to specific common projects in energy, transport and other sectors. It also favoured the normalisation of political relations, which included cultural exchanges and other agreements. Thus, most of the explanation of the changes lies with the more systematic analysis of the changing perceptions and initiatives of the dictatorship. This is what the book does for each subperiod.

Until the end of 1969, the Greek dictatorship did not question existing relations. It made assurances that political change was an internal matter for Greece, that it would keep its Nato obligations and would keep good relations with countries with a different political system. Yet anti-communism had been presented as the main reason for the army's intervention and was the predominant element in the new regime's ideology. Thus, in the first phase existing relations were affected. Companies with agreements with Eastern Europe were all viewed with suspicion and any economic relations were scrutinised as being potentially threatening to political stability. The same is also true for the other side. The communist bloc was very polemical against the dictatorship and its American patrons. It insisted that it had negatively affected economic relations, including tourism.

Then, gradually, the regime stabilised its rule and the pressure from Western Europe increased. The 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia presented a whole range of problems for the Soviet bloc. Yugoslavia turned

completely to a Western orientation, Romania searched for an independent role and Albania left the Warsaw Pact altogether. Bulgaria was the only Balkan country to openly support the Soviet Union, but at a cost of being isolated. Within this disintegrating framework, all countries sought new "openings", and the Mediterranean world was an obvious one.

During 1969, this became evident. The Soviet Union was under pressure and the policy shift towards Greece was underway, as was the case with East Germany, which was among its closest allies and until then had no formal relations with Greece. There were concrete signs in favour of normalising relations with the Greek regime.

Yet 1970 and 1971 became the period when the "opening to the East" of the Athens regime took place. It was in any case the peak period of the dictatorship. It strengthened its relations with Washington after its expulsion from the Council of Europe, improved its relations with Ankara and responded positively to China's openings in the Balkans and the Mediterranean countries. Even more, peaceful coexistence was underway.

From December 1969 to February 1970 the Western press talked about the "opening to the East" of the Greek Colonels, probably exaggerating the situation. This period was also marked by the official visit of the Bulgarian foreign minister in May 1970. Yet with regard to the Soviet Union, the warm period did not last. After the assassination attempt on Makarios in March, Soviet–Greek relations were again "frozen". The relations with the Eastern bloc became primarily a Balkan affair.

By 1971 there was a lot of mobility in the Balkans. Diplomatic relations were established for the first time with Albania. There were impor-

tant relations with Bulgaria, with mutual visits of foreign ministers. Romania became another country that received a visit during 1971 from the Greek foreign minister. At a point there was the idea of a Balkan cooperation project, but the idea never really took off. In effect this mobility had no real economic effect or any significant political outcome. However, it was successful as a form of political communication. The "opening to the East" was an issue taken with the support of Britain and the US and, likewise, the Soviet Union backed Bulgaria in its efforts.

There is little doubt that the communist world in the Balkans was falling apart. Albania had a new relationship with China, Yugoslavia had moved towards the West, Romania had chosen a more independent stance within the Warsaw Pact and Bulgaria remained very pro-Soviet. Within this disintegrating atmosphere, the "opening" policy of the Colonels was a new political space, where no country, given the existing conflicts between them, would leave for the others. In the long, second part of the book, there is some excellent analysis of the relations with each and every country, of the successive changes of policy and the very specific type and areas of exchanges that were, in each case, important.

In the third and final subperiod, there was a six-month term in 1972 when relations were not good because of the facilities provided to the US Navy in Athens, an event which produced a lot of tension. Then in the second half, until November 1973, relations became normal again. After the coming to power of Dimitris Ioannidis, things became more intense, reaching their worst point with the events in Cyprus. During the Ioannidis period, there was not a single political exchange. Economic relations were undermined as the agreements that had been reached in the previous period concerning important new projects were all

cancelled. In any case, the fact that Ioannidis was the strongman behind the scenes made the standard diplomatic processes less functional. During this last period, the whole of the communist bloc, including Yugoslavia, became very critical of the Athens regime.

Another question refers to the Greek Left and the way it responded to the developing relations which undermined the isolation objective. The non-communist movement was very quick to criticise this approach, arguing for the independent, "third way" between the two superpowers. Yet, after some time they tended to view this "opening" as a trick on the part of the dictatorship, taken in order to counteract the political isolation imposed by Western Europe and to keep up American pressure on Western Europe for a softer political treatment.

The Communist Party of Greece (KKE), already split in two, turned the issue into another area of ideological conflict. The eurocommunist KKE (Interior) was more critical of these relations. Although it was careful to support the processes of peaceful coexistence already underway, it insisted, however, on a stricter policy towards undemocratic regimes such as the one in Greece. The pro-Soviet KKE (Exterior) did not question the policies of the Soviet bloc, and at the same time it was very critical of the KKE (Interior) on this issue, as it thought that the latter was adopting double standards on the same subject. In addition, it viewed the development of such relations as a potential weapon against the official anti-communist ideology of the regime.

The final question treated is this very foundation of the foreign policy of the dictatorship, given that most officers had little if any idea of or experience in such activities. To what extent can their foreign policy be taken seriously. The response to this question is the continuation

of the diplomatic service and the use of diplomats as acting foreign ministers, irrespective of which officer seemed be in charge. This explains part of the story, because the study of the Cypriot question, which was the main issue where the dictatorship developed its own ideas, was a tragedy. Yet this question requires a more comprehensive analysis of both Greek–Turkish and Greek–Cypriot relations.

In conclusion, this excellent book provides the most comprehensive analysis of the subject under examination. It is guaranteed to remain a permanent reference for future research on the politics and economics of the dictatorship. And such research is very much needed.