


Historein

Vol 19, No 2 (2021)

From the Greek Revolution of 1821 to the Metapolitefsi: Historiographical Debates in Greece across Two Centuries



Who is the Historian? The Formation of Modern Greek History and the Historical Community in the Short Twentieth Century

Vangelis Karamanolakis

doi: [10.12681/historein.25282](https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.25282)


Copyright © 2021, Vangelis Karamanolakis



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Karamanolakis, V. (2021). Who is the Historian? The Formation of Modern Greek History and the Historical Community in the Short Twentieth Century. *Historein*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.25282>



**Who is the Historian?
The Formation of Modern
Greek History and the
Historical Community in the
Short Twentieth Century**

Vangelis Karamanolakis

doi: 10.12681/historein.25282

To cite this article:

Karamanolakis, Vangelis. 2021. "Who is the Historian? The Formation of Modern Greek History and the Historical Community in the Short Twentieth Century". *Historein* 19 (2). <https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.25282>.

Who is the Historian? The Formation of Modern Greek History and the Historical Community in the Short Twentieth Century

Vangelis Karamanolakis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

The nineteenth century has been internationally acknowledged as the period of historicism, when the field of historical studies was established. Also, it was when the “historian” was awarded a distinct academic and professional identity, which resulted in the formation of the corresponding community of experts.¹ This was neither a straightforward process nor a simultaneous one realised in different national environments. On the contrary, it unfolded in different ways depending on sociopolitical conditions and circumstances.

In the case of Greece, for reasons I will subsequently endeavour to explain, these processes occurred later than in other Western European countries. This may seem like a paradox since the nation’s history was key to legitimising its own state-building as demonstrated by the philhellene movement at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the perception of the modern Greeks as the descendants of classical antiquity. Nevertheless, the acknowledgement of the “historian” as a distinct academic vocation occurred mainly in the final quarter of the twentieth century, and went hand in hand with the formation of the field of modern Greek history. This formation was linked with the gradual development of relevant studies as well as the building of several institutions which allowed historians to be educated and professionally integrated. Moreover, it was affected by the general political and social context. After the Second World War, due to the political situation in Greece a large number of young people were forced to emigrate and, therefore, shaped their identity as historians abroad. In any case, the Greek historical community was forged under diverse and sometimes opposing conditions: its boundaries, its accession standards, its inner hierarchy, as well as its members’ academic profile and their intervention in matters of public debate. It was more an open process rather than a straightforward and unequivocal development.

During this process, institutions were neither neutral nor did they merely serve as a context. On an international level, as well as in Greece, historical science was formed under the decisive effect of institutions such as universities, research centres, archives, academic journals, committees, etc. Historiographical production was influenced, to a great extent, by

these institutions, which dictated their formation and operational logic, the means of elevating their status, their inner connections in terms of power and their relationships with political authority and society. The institutions established fields of knowledge as well as methods of historical research and documentation. Lastly, they were instrumental in the historical community's own formation as an independent entity, to the extent they were responsible for the education of future historians. Historians were subsequently employed in these institutions.²

The historiography produced by these institutions was related to the widespread perception of modern and contemporary history held by the Greek society. This perception was linked to political and social conditions and instigated a diversity of viewpoints regarding the past, voiced not only by “academic” historians but also by local scholars, journalists, authors and others, who had a decisive impact on what would be referred to as public history. The account below, for the sake of brevity, will focus only on academic historiography and attempt to detail the terms and conditions that defined it.

Building the national continuity

As in every newly created nation-state, from the moment of its foundation, the fledgling Greek polity strove to forge a unified past, and present a common national history.³ Greek national history had a singular advantage: its reference to a glorious distant past, its ancestral past, that of ancient Greece as perceived by European thought. In this context, the 1821 Greek War of Independence had been regarded as the starting point of the nation's regeneration: the point where the nation awakened from a long dormant period, a lengthy time of enslavement, and started to occupy for the first time since antiquity a constructive role in historical developments.⁴

The Greek state acknowledged classical antiquity as an integral part of its national ideology, and a privileged point of reference on which the newly created state could be recognised by foreign forces.⁵ The Great Idea (*Megali Idea*), the vision of the Greek state expanding into the territory of the Ottoman Empire, was based on references to the ancient Greek past and its major contribution to global civilisation as well as to the common Christian identity.⁶ Scholars in the new kingdom gave precedence to studying and promoting classical antiquity. That led to the establishment of special chairs in the University of Athens, the country's first university, founded in 1837. Scholarly societies were also founded, journals were published and museums were opened to the public. The ancestral past was approached mainly via literature, as taught by German philologist August Böckh.⁷ Thanks to him and his many Greek students, who would teach at the University of Athens, literature was recognised as the academically proven historical knowledge of a nation's activities throughout a specific period in history.⁸ Ancient Greek

material remains were studied using a number of approaches, including the historical approach, which awarded literature the elevated status as the most valid interpreter of classical antiquity. As in every university in Europe, literature was acknowledged as the mother of all subsequent fields of ancient studies.⁹

While in the case of Greece antiquity was immediately studied in depth, the Byzantine era was regarded differently. Byzantium was considered the successor to the Roman Empire and, according to European Enlightenment historiography, was a period of Greek enslavement. Hence, the Greek nation was portrayed as being occupied for more than 2,100 years by a succession of foreign invaders (Macedonians, Romans, Byzantines and Ottomans). This vast intervening period, during which the Greek nation was perceived as dormant, left a significant gap in the continuity and formation of national ideology. The goal, as is the case with every national ideology, was to create a historical narrative in which the nation would have a continuous, active and notable historical presence extending over a considerable period of time. To this end, in the middle of the nineteenth century, Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos,¹⁰ the greatest historian of his time, created a historiographical paradigm of a unified and continuous Greek history which, following the European example, was divided into three periods: antiquity, medieval (Byzantine) and modern times, and also fully incorporated Byzantium in the national narrative.

Although Paparrigopoulos' paradigm was critically acclaimed, it did meet with opposition, firstly from a generation of scholars influenced by European Enlightenment ideas, who disapproved of the Byzantine Empire's totalitarian and theocratic regime.¹¹ By the end of the nineteenth century, the relationship of the Greek nation with Byzantium took a turn on the basis of the language issue. Those fighting the established archaic language (*katharevousa*) strove to create the genealogy of modern (demotic) Greek by seeking its regeneration period mostly in the final centuries of Byzantium.¹² Their adversaries (state institutions, church, university, etc.) were opposed to the acknowledgement of Byzantine studies as a distinct field, claiming that it would call into question the dominance of the ancient Greek paradigm and would confirm the national origin of demotic Greek. Their opposition was short lived, and eventually, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Byzantine studies earned their own distinguished place among the Greek sciences. The reasons behind this development were initially linked to a general shift in the academic world towards medieval times, which resulted in an international interest in Byzantium.¹³ Other reasons stemmed from the Eastern Question and the conflict between European powers concerning the fate of the Ottoman Empire. Balkan rivalries and the fighting over the Macedonian territories highlighted Greece's dire need to prove its Byzantine heritage and establish the Greek nation as Byzantium's direct descendant. Historical studies sought to validate the continuity and unifying character of Greek history, which would serve the "national rights" – a term used in order to legitimise the kingdom's irredentist claims to the wider region. The validity of these claims was attested by historical sources; therefore, recognising that sources were a significant diplomatic tool, the decision to use them was

corroborated by the academic and, especially, the university community through publications and research, several of which were funded by the state.

Once more following the international example and especially the teachings and work of Karl Krumbacher, inaugural chair of Byzantine studies at the University of Munich, the newly established field was a combination of literature, history, archaeology and folklore studies, the first being most prominent. New chairs were established at the University of Athens, new scholarly societies were founded, and a Byzantine Museum was created in the centre of the capital. Hence, a new field of studies was consolidated, not nearly as reputable and wide as that of ancient Greek studies, yet significantly prestigious, as necessitated by the founding of Byzantine studies abroad and the corresponding academic personnel in Greece, as well as by the priorities and needs of national foreign policy.¹⁴

So, what was the case with modern and contemporary times? The Greek Revolution of 1821 was considered to be the glorious event in the Greek nation's regeneration. As soon as the new state was established, the revolution became the focus of historical research: memoirs and attestations were extensively studied, sources were published and exhibitions organised. However, matters were much more complicated regarding the time between the Fall of Constantinople (1453) and the Revolution of 1821. This intervening period was regarded either as post-Byzantine or, as the crucial preparatory interval leading to the revolution; hence it was not valuable enough to be integrated as a period of noteworthy achievements. Incorporating 400 years of enslavement by a non-Christian oppressor in the national narrative proved to be a very difficult task. In this direction, Spyridon Lambros, University of Athens professor in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, played a major role in forming historical studies in Greece. Influenced by European positivism, Lambros shifted the weight from the antiquity-Byzantium dipole to that of Byzantium and modern times.¹⁵ Even during the first decades of the twentieth century, with the exception of the 1821 Revolution and the establishment of the Greek state, modern history was neither taught at the university nor did it attract much interest from those studying the national past.¹⁶

Until the early twentieth century, Greek national history was formed through a continuous discourse with European historiography. Throughout this exchange, classical antiquity always occupied a prominent place. The gradual incorporation of Byzantium and modern times into the historical narrative of Greece was highly instrumental in attributing a unified and continuous character to the national past, which stretched from antiquity to the present day. Studies concerning Greek history were based chiefly on Paparrigopoulos' historiographical paradigm, which also allowed the juxtaposition of homeland history with that of neighbouring and, in general, foreign national historiographies. The study of national history, connected to international academic developments and geopolitical conditions, aimed to legitimise the irredentist intentions of the Greek Kingdom, which would lead to the

realisation of the Great Idea. In that regard, the study and publication of sources was key to validating the national continuity and highlighting the unique cultural offering of Greece, in the context of European positivism, especially concerning the critical connection between Byzantium and modern times in the late nineteenth century.

The focus on antiquity and Byzantium identified literature as the national science that studied the past, confirming the superiority of Greek culture. Philologists, upon graduating from the School of Philosophy of the University of Athens, possessed the necessary prerequisites to teach in secondary education. In Greek schools, the “philologist” was regarded as the teacher mainly responsible for studying both pillars of national consciousness: the common language and the common past. Several philologists obtained an additional professional identity, that of the archaeologist, and could be therefore employed in the public Archaeological Institute. Naturally, archaeologists’ and philologists’ specialised practices and endeavours differed.¹⁷ Archaeological digs brought to light ancestral material remains, in particular ones that confirmed the strong contribution of Greek civilisation to the field of art. Lambros remarked during a meeting at the School of Philosophy that, to his dismay, young Greeks turned towards literature and archaeology for professional reasons, and disregarded the field of history.¹⁸

Shifting to modern times

Many Greek historians view the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) as the beginning of the *short* – as defined by Eric Hobsbawm – twentieth century. In a decade, from 1912 to 1922, the territory of the Greek state doubled in size, and its number of inhabitants multiplied as a result of the compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey. The new conditions caused by sociopolitical developments introduced new issues. Major concerns were the rehabilitation of refugees following the Asia Minor Catastrophe, as well as the integration of populations inhabiting the new northern Greek regions.¹⁹ Through no coincidence, the second Greek university was founded in northern Greece (Thessaloniki, 1926). It aimed to contribute to the national and cultural homogenisation of populations who had settled in the country after the Balkan and First World Wars.²⁰ To this end, the university furthered the Byzantine and contemporary heritage as a unifying element, limiting the reference to antiquity. Contrary to the University of Athens, which was obsessed with classical antiquity, the newly founded university insisted on the significance of demotic Greek as a way of passing on and cultivating national consciousness. Two new chairs were established, both concerning modern Greek history: the chair of the history of Ottoman-ruled and modern Greece, and the chair of history of the Balkan peoples. Additionally, a historical archive was established, with testimony pertaining to the period of Ottoman rule and the 1821 Revolution.²¹ In 1932 the University of Athens, following the Thessaloniki example, established the department of history and archaeology, as part of the School of Philosophy. Although those departments did not provide distinct degrees, they were

branches of the unified School of Philosophy. In 1936, the University of Athens also established the chair of modern European and Greek history, which was the first chair dedicated to modern Greek history.

The establishment of the chair of history of the Balkan peoples in Thessaloniki was not only associated with the city's pivotal position in the Balkans, but also with the general interest in the region's recent history. After the Balkan Wars, this interest was sparked mainly due to the diplomatic activities pursued by the Greek state. The historical science's shift into modern times, the eventful recent decades and the continuous presence of the Greek state in the international arena reaffirmed the need for knowledge on recent events. The crucial goal was to demonstrate the continuity between Byzantium and modern times, which was once more based on the excellence of Greek culture. In the 1920s and 1930s, the state established a number of institutions to collect linguistic, folkloric and historical data, as well as develop research infrastructures such as dictionaries, archives and museums, focusing on medieval and especially modern times. In the beginning of the century, the Byzantine and Christian Museum, the General State Archives, the Folklore Archive, the Historical Archive of the Greek Language and the Medieval Archive were established by means of public or private funding. These institutions were overseen mainly by university professors, and were dependent firstly on the university and, after 1926, upon the newly founded Academy of Athens. Subsequently, the gathering of relevant material – which had previously been conducted by amateur historians or folklorists – was henceforth strictly organised and subjected to specific rules, which were then declared to be “rules of procedure”, therefore acquiring *institutional status*. For example, in the case of the Medieval Archive, the main working method became cataloguing documents from the period of Ottoman rule as well as publishing sources in journals, and writing historical entries and bulletins.²²

In the 1920s there was a significant shift concerning which country Greeks with an interest in the humanities should go to attend university. After its defeat in the First World War, Germany was no longer regarded as a privileged place for foreign students. The French government attempted to fill the ensuing gap by increasing awareness of French culture, establishing the French School of Athens and awarding scholarships to Greek students. Additional attractions were the newly established chairs and entities in French education, specialising in Byzantine and modern Greek literature, especially as there were already enough chairs of Greek antiquity. Of particular note are Charles Diehl's chair of Byzantinology in Paris (1899) – linked to the interest generated by the Eastern Question – and the Institute of Modern Greek Studies in the Sorbonne (1920). The latter had been established following the personal intervention of Greek prime minister Eleftherios Venizelos, who believed its presence would strengthen the relations between the two countries, and perceived it as an ambassador of national culture.²³

The shift towards modern and contemporary history was not limited to the historical community. Events such as the Balkan Wars, the First World War and the Asia Minor Catastrophe had sparked a broader interest in modern and contemporary history, as reflected in the writings of amateur historians, local scholars and journalists. Meanwhile, a new generation of authors that emerged in the interwar period – the so-called Generation of the '30s – had developed its own understanding of the national past, based mainly on aesthetic criteria. Pre-eminent members of the Generation of the '30s, namely George Theotokas and Nobel Prize winners George Seferis and Odysseas Elytis, advanced in their writings a notion of “Greekness” that interacted with Europe and created a steady bridge between past and present Hellenism, thus forming a perception of the Greek people’s timeless attributes, which would prevail during the twentieth century.²⁴

The hour of conflict and the formation of the field of modern Greek history

In 1924, Yanis Kordatos, a graduate of Athens Law School and leader of the newly founded Communist Party of Greece (KKE), published his *Η κοινωνική σημασία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως* (The Social Significance of the Greek Revolution). The book shone a different light on the most significant event of the Greek history; it unveiled its connection to the “material factor” and Marxist ideas, and called attention to its social and class character, provoking major reactions which went beyond the field of historiography. Negative headlines appeared in a significant part of the press, professional associations and academic societies submitted resolutions and complaints, and the Holy Synod made a threat of excommunication. These reactions were not without basis: the October Revolution, the founding of the KKE, along with the organised appearance of Marxist ideas in Greece, led to a growing fear about a movement that, while limited in number, was yet combative and internationally present.²⁵

The publication of the book was a turning point in the field of national historiography. Up to that point, even in the dispute over the language issue, allowances had been made regarding the expediency and usefulness of history, always in accordance with Paparrigopoulos’ paradigm. The Marxists’ criticism affected every aspect of Greek history, by disputing fundamental assumptions on which all historiographical production was based, including that of the unity of the national body. After the publication of Kordatos’ book, two traditions competed over the formation of historical consciousness in Greece: one was academic historiography, whose goal was to protect the “national rights” through a gradually established anticommunist position, and the other was a leftist, to a significant extent Marxist, historiography which, having been excluded from all state institutions, was backed by historians and politicians whose political stance and ideological armoury were indelibly linked.

This conflict directly affected the composition of historical studies. In Europe, notably in the Annales school in France, the concept of economic and social history was being

gradually introduced, and history was being associated with social sciences; on the contrary, Greek academia rejected anything outside the rules thus far formulated by national history. During the interwar period, academic history had become more tightly bound to literature and archaeology due to the appearance of Marxist ideas in conjunction with the founding of the KKE. Social and economic history was, to a great extent, excluded from the academic domain. Historical readings linked to the aforementioned fields were repudiated by default. On these grounds, the Athens School of Philosophy rejected Michail Sakellariou's doctoral dissertation in 1939: although being so far the most important response to Kordatos' work about the 1821 Revolution, the dissertation was dismissed because economic and social elements had been used in factual interpretation.²⁶

Forming the field of modern Greek studies

The 1940s was a decade of great turbulence for Greece, with the Second World War, the German occupation and the resistance leaving their mark on Greek society. The civil war that followed – the first-ever in Cold War Europe – resulted in thousands of casualties and a torn society where the KKE was declared illegal and hundreds of thousands of Greeks settled in the people's republics of Eastern Europe as political refugees.²⁷

The experience of the Second World War had a crucial impact on a number of intellectuals, who turned more decisively towards the modern era; they sought to study the period after the Fall of Constantinople as an independent era with its own identity, thus overriding its post-Byzantine identity by which it had been so far defined. To this end, in the summer of 1942, Constantinos Th. Dimaras, to whom we will return later, published a series of essays in the *Eleftheron Vima* newspaper, presenting his plan for a systematic structuring of modern Greek studies which would be aimed mainly at the Ottoman period.²⁸ A few months later, Sakellariou also published in *Nea Estia* a multipage historical and critical note, as he himself called it, concerning modern Greek historical studies.²⁹ As far as we know, Dimaras' and Sakellariou's editorials were the first systematic attempts to form the new field of modern Greek studies, via establishing its genealogy and orientations.

In the 20 years following the Civil War, several institutions focusing on the recent past were established and, in contrast to their interwar predecessors, they placed special emphasis on history. In 1952, the Directorate of Army History was founded, followed by the Institute for Balkan Studies in 1953, which in 1960 launched *Balkan Studies*, the first Greek history journal written in English. In 1955, the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies was founded in Venice, and remains the only Greek state centre for history outside Greece itself. In 1958, the Royal Hellenic Research Foundation was established, which included the Centre of Neohellenic Studies. Finally, the School of Philosophy in Ioannina, founded in 1964, offered a third destination for the education of

historians, alongside Athens and Thessaloniki. Meanwhile, the publication of numerous journals, which devoted many pages to modern history, supplied the historiographical dialogue with new positions and data.³⁰

These institutions and their historians concentrated their research on the history of modern and contemporary Hellenism. Historiographical production, as defined mainly by the universities' staff, focused on the Venetian and Ottoman periods and the 1821 Revolution. Historiography was still being primarily approached through Paparrigopoulos' paradigm, which was the central subject of debate among Greek and foreign historians and Byzantinologists.³¹ The debate focused on the terms of the historical course of the Greek nation and especially on the relationship between Byzantium and Modern Hellenism. It also actively contributed to fully integrating Venetian and Ottoman rule into Greek history.

To this effect, institutions such as the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies served a pivotal role in systematically organising and promoting the studies of this period to a structured academic domain. Moreover, they furthered the study of the regions under Venetian rule as part of wider Hellenism, that was more important than their integration into the Venetian Empire.³² The meticulous research and negotiation of this period's archival evidence aimed chiefly to underline the role of cultural production in the formation of modern Greek consciousness.

The period of Ottoman rule was the subject of systematic research among young historians who conducted relevant doctoral dissertations in the 1960s: they traced and published sources, as well as studies, that offered new factual material; they broadened the subject matter, and introduced new perspectives, always within the context of the basic assumptions of academic historiography up to that point. The main characteristic of an important – and, arguably, most notable – section of these studies was, yet again, the connection between literature and history. In addition to the necessary documentation of political history using archival evidence, the selected historical sources originated mainly from the fields of literature and scholarship. Their elaboration, which was more reliable compared to similar publications in the past, was carried out using methods based on literature, in accordance with the historical and literary traditions established by Lambros. In fact, university teaching staffs were primarily composed of representatives of the generation which had been academically formed during the interwar period and on the basis of Lambros' teachings. That resulted in small studies based on archival evidence widely dispersed throughout modern Greek history, with minimal reference to theoretical paradigms and elaborations. Most complied with the spirit of the Greek national history continuity paradigm, either by enriching its informational background, or by clarifying or readjusting certain aspects, yet without questioning its overall character.³³

The focus on national continuity was supported by several ideals related to the concept of national-mindedness, which constituted the postwar ideology. History reinforced the national identity and contributed to the country's defence against external as well as internal enemies. The case of *Balkan Studies* is typical: its material conformed with a

conservative anticommunist policy, either by strengthening national demands – from antiquity all the way to the crucial issues of modern times, such as the Macedonian question – or by highlighting the close relation between Greece and the Western Allies.³⁴ During the Cold War,³⁵ academic institutions adopted a rigid anticommunist stance, excluding from their teachings anything that could pertain to Marxist theory. As was the case throughout the public sector, all staff members participating in teaching or research were obliged to present the necessary “social consciousness certificates” issued by the security police, which confirmed their abidance to the regime.³⁶

The 1960s were a turning point for academic historiography thanks to the establishment of a new institution, the Royal Hellenic Research Foundation (VIE), which was funded by the remnants of US financial aid to Greece in the 1950s³⁷. Following Paparrigopoulos’ paradigm, the VIE acquired three centres for national studies: the Centre of Greek and Roman Antiquity, the Centre of Byzantine Research and the Centre of Neohellenic Research (KNE). Concurrently, apart from VIE, a number of nonuniversity institutions were established, focusing on the research of economics, sociology and nuclear energy. Devised by Konstantinos Karamanlis’ conservative government that promised the modernisation of the country, these institutions focused on making research the primary requirement of science, which could now be developed outside universities. More specifically, the creation and orientation of the KNE had been chiefly carried out by Dimaras. Although remaining outside the university, Dimaras maintained a strong relationship with the institutions. In 1951, he undertook the establishment of the State Scholarship Foundation (IKY), while also initially serving as managing director of the VIE and, subsequently, manager of the KNE.

The Centre of Neohellenic Research concentrated on the period of Ottoman rule and the nineteenth century, while adopting an inventory-based approach with a historical-literary character. Its research subject was “modern Greek history and literature in its wider sense”.³⁸ Dimaras and his associates focused their research and writings on the modern Greek Enlightenment, a term introduced by the intellectual himself in 1949, in the publication of his emblematic history of modern Greek literature. Dimaras and his circle linked the development of the enlightenment with the promotion of a novel national conscience. Without questioning the continuity concept, they placed great emphasis on innovative elements contributing to the formation of the national identity, while rejecting the notion that the latter was stable and unaltered. The focus on the enlightenment highlighted the assimilative power of the Greek nation which was able to adapt foreign elements to its own cultural requirements at any given time, and incorporate components that formed the essential aspects of the Greek character. The enlightenment accentuated the lasting and productive relationship between Greece and Europe, which was a reminder of the country’s required policy during the post-civil war era. Those infrastructures played an active role in

advancing “Neohellenic studies”, a field with an historical-literary orientation, and in establishing the superiority of literary methods of studying and analysing archival evidence.³⁹

While academic historiography approached modern Greek history through multiple ways and paths, contemporary history either remained a project of ideological and political analysis with a pronounced anticommunist character, or was only being published by the Hellenic Army General Staff. The recent past, marred by civil strife, was excluded from academia.

However, the 1940s and especially the Greek Resistance (1941–1944) had been the central focus of historical research carried out by left-wing authors, as illustrated in journals, monographs, edited volumes and articles published in Greece and abroad.⁴⁰ In 1959, the illegal Communist Party of Greece (KKE) created a department of history, while in 1960 a corresponding department was also created by the United Democratic Left (EDA), the legal party representing the left in Greece. Meanwhile, members of the resistance formed unions, committees and organisations that collaborated with the respective committees and confederations abroad, aiming to write a history of the Greek Resistance. Party publications concerning the period from 1940 to 1945 highlighted the participation of communists in the national liberation struggle, as well as the correctness of the strategy followed by the KKE. The references to the heroism of Greek communists during the resistance countered their depiction as “traitors”, and brought to light the victories achieved thanks to the united popular front, as expressed by the left-wing resistance forces. The popular front was able to resume its activities in the 1960s.⁴¹

The goal was to acknowledge the national resistance and write its history so as to bestow it upon the younger generations. Modern demands were founded on the spirit of the resistance. The historian-witness was viewed as a historian-revolutionist who, since the interwar period, used past knowledge in order to change the world.

History and politics were engaged in a debate. According to academic historiography, the confirmation of the national past continuity through historical sources and the persistence in depicting Greek society as a single whole, unaffected by class or other differences, proved the fallacy of communist ideas, thus excluding them from academic truth. On the other hand, the left viewed history as the source of truth, and maintained that it would bring to light suppressed middle-class liabilities, and vindicate the struggles of the labour movement. The use of the word “people” is indicative of this controversy. According to academic historiography, the term “people” comprised the nation, the upper class and the clergy, the labourers and the farmers. Leftist historiography associated the “people” with a series of liberation struggles from 1821 to the national resistance.⁴² Leftist historiography formed a Manichean paradigm, based on the premises of “good and bad”. At one end of this heavily charged dipole was the people, a concept both generic and vague, so as to include the largest possible portion of the Greek society, which was progressive by default. At the other end stood the reactionary “oligarchy”, in

conjunction with foreign powers. Through this distinction, and through a historiographical approach that projected the current categories on the past, the left potentially widened its target audience and multiplied its members and allies. This context underlined the significance of historical sources, highlighting those which had been suppressed or misinterpreted by bourgeois historiography and which “revealed” the truth.⁴³

What we call leftist historiography was mostly shaped in the context of its dialogue with the predominant national Greek historiography. The prevalent leftist narrative did not question the notions of continuity and cultural contribution of Hellenism – the main notion conveyed by Paparrigopoulos in the nineteenth century. In general, leftist historiography did not systematically and firmly challenge this paradigm for a number of reasons. Firstly, the paradigm had a great influence on the formation of national identity; secondly, the strained relationship of the left with the issue of self-determination of minorities needs to be taken into account: the left was forced into the defensive over accusations of being an “internal enemy”, given that since the interwar period it had been in favour of Macedonia’s secession and independence from the state.

On the other hand, the notion of historical sources constituted the centre of all approaches. Sources alone could confirm or “reveal” the truth – sources which had been intentionally ignored or misinterpreted by bourgeois or communist historiography, respectively. In this war of evidence, literary methods were still deemed the most advantageous tools to approach the past. The fixation on the accuracy of the sources was primarily combined with the lack of theoretical considerations, the nonexistent link with current concerns.

On the whole, since the beginning of the twentieth century and especially after the Asia Minor Catastrophe, a wider interest in modern times arose, and the new field of modern Greek studies began to form; however, even in this field history remained connected to literature. The main objective was to integrate modern times into the unified national history, and establishing continuity as a defining element of national identity. Under the weight of studying the ancient Greek and subsequently the Byzantine paradigm, the emphasis was placed on the cultural offer of Hellenism, which strengthened the connection between history and literature. The study of modern times was largely based on literary methods and archival evidence. In light of geopolitical developments in the Balkans, defending the national continuity and the Greekness of regions that either belonged to, or were in the process of being integrated into, the Greek state was crucial in shifting the focus to modern times as well as in making the transition from Byzantium to modern Greece. Furthermore, the integration of these modern years into the national continuity strengthened the unified character of the national identity by creating genealogies and drawing strong analogies between past and present. The new notably male-dominated generations of historian-philologists that had been formed against this background conducted a series of

major as well as smaller archival studies pertaining to the totality of national history, from antiquity to modern times. Since philologists still enjoyed a superior status even in secondary education, the term “historian” in academia either referred to the few history professors in universities or even fewer researchers in centres and archives.

At the same time, a number of people, mostly within the left, residing either in Greece or abroad as political refugees, self-identified as historians and strove to use past knowledge to change the world. The state did not recognise the members of this community as historians but rather viewed them as national history falsifiers. Notably, Kordatos, the most significant and well-known Marxist historian of his time, was not referred to as a historian in his “social consciousness security file” kept by the police; he was merely labelled as a journalist and an author.

The regime change (metapolitefsi) and the institutional explosion of modern Greek history

The milestone event that would change the situation described above was the imposition of the seven-year-long military dictatorship (junta) in 1967. The junta was, according to many historians, the most extreme consequence of the civil war. Seven years later, its fall signalled the end of the civil strife in institutional, symbolical and ideological terms. The legalisation of the KKE, the abolition of the monarchy and the gradual return of political refugees marked the end of the schism. The political developments during the junta resulted in the convergence of political forces and the reforming of parties in the years of the *metapolitefsi*, therefore contributing to dissolving the conflict. The fall of the junta was linked to the collapse of national-mindedness and other predominant state concepts, such as Helleno-Christianity.⁴⁴

The *metapolitefsi* was the pre-eminent period of major change in Greek historiography and historical studies on both a symbolic and actual level. Symbolically, the *metapolitefsi* denoted the end of an “ideological” and “institutional” schism. The said schism may have started in 1924, with the backlash that followed Kordatos’ book *Η κοινωνική σημασία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης του 1821* (The Social Significance of the Greek Revolution of 1821) and ended in 1976 with the conferring of an honorary doctorate on Nikos Svoronos by the University of Athens School of Philosophy.⁴⁵ On a real level, during this period a remarkable increase in the numbers of historical staff took place, while the establishment of new institutions entailed the development of historical teaching and research. New topics and outlooks were also being considered, and efforts were being made to keep pace with developments mainly in Western Europe and America. Moreover, the *metapolitefsi* was linked to the increase in historical publications and their readership, as attested by the abundance of newspaper supplements, journals and historical series. Most importantly, after 1974, the establishment of institutions pertaining to the education of historians at undergraduate and postgraduate levels denoted that, for the first time,

historians were being acknowledged as professionals. The foundation of public and private institutions (research centres, bank foundations, archives, libraries, etc.) furthered the advancement of the pre-existing minor research infrastructure, and contributed to the creation of collectives such as those formulated around the publication of new history journals. This resulted in the development of academic research and historiographical production, with numerous independent studies, translations and an abundance of historical articles being published both in the general press and in specialised history journals.

In any case, the overthrow of the dictatorial regime brought about substantial changes and raised a series of queries regarding the country's historical course. One of the central queries concerned the circumstances leading to the military coup, the reasons for which Greece had followed a different trajectory than other European countries, the structural diversities and the institutional inadequacies. The quest to find out what had really happened was the subject of the period's most heated debate, encouraged mainly by political forces that had suffered a political and military defeat in the civil war, and had therefore linked their identity to invoking and researching the past in order to reveal the historical truth. The question of "how we got here" and the crucial demand to "rewrite history" – one with multiple political and social implications – led to a series of historical analyses and studies carried out by contemporary researchers. The majority of researchers concentrated on earlier historical periods or used macrohistorical approaches covering the late Ottoman period and usually ending in the interwar period. They aimed to review Greek political history by focusing on the beginnings of the Greek state, its formation, the way institutions operated during the long nineteenth century, from the 1830s to the 1909 Goudi coup and the eve of the Balkan Wars. Most of these studies were based on social sciences close to history (historical sociology, economic and political science) and carried out by scientists who had been educated abroad by conducting their doctoral dissertations during or immediately after the dictatorship.⁴⁶ In their studies, they sought the broad interpretive paradigms that would lead to the understanding of the present. To a great extent, history was perceived as the study and interpretation of a more or less distant past that also defined the present; this became especially pronounced in critical discussions such as clientelism, metropolitan and regional relationships, the position of Greece within an international context and the foreign character of Greek parliamentarianism. Such issues constituted the core of historiographical and political debates.

Svoronos and Dimaras, who was self-exiled in Paris during the dictatorship, were considered the fathers of the new historiographical scene that was created after 1974.⁴⁷ With them, historians belonging to a younger generation which had made its academic, but not so much literary, debut in the late 1950s and 1960s were integrated into the domestic historiographical scene. Most of them had graduated from the University of Athens and were introduced to Marxist historiography and subsequently to the French history of the

Annales tradition, having lived in France. They had acquired, in their majority, a structured academic and working experience both in Greece and abroad where they had come across modern historiographical pursuits. They reached the peak of their field in the 1970s and 1980s, and strenuously demanded to be acknowledged as professional historians. For several years following 1974, they maintained their affiliation to both Greek and French academia, and came into contact with a younger generation formed and radicalised within the country. It is worth mentioning the Greek Paleographical Society, which had already been established in 1971 during the military dictatorship by a group of students of the University of Athens School of Philosophy. In June 1975, and not without internal opposition, the society changed its name to Society for the Study of Modern Hellenism (EMNE). This change reflected the new issues which had arisen from the transition to democracy. The EMNE aimed to study modern Greek history and establish a universal history from medieval to modern times. Its journal, *Mnimon*, was among the few history journals in circulation and the most typical representative of a flourishing historical community.⁴⁸

These individuals' thinking and actions were first and foremost driven by the aspiration to change society itself and, being members of an emerging historical community, they also strove to reshape society's relationship with the past within a new institutional framework, either through education or by reapproaching historical sources. They were the exponents of a new historiographical current that occupied a pre-eminent place in historical studies during the *metapolitefsi*. The representatives of this current, known as "New History", did not form an organised group; on the contrary, they were considerably diverse. New History encompassed a series of historiographical contributions that purposely diverged from the pre-existing "traditional" history. In the case of Greece, there was an interchange of ideas between New History and French historiography mainly regarding subject matter, and not particularly on theoretical concerns. Its main characteristic was the shift towards economic and social history, as well as towards the history of ideas, or history of consciousness, which is now called intellectual history. This shift was also expressed in the publication of the journal *Ta Istorika* (1983) by three distinguished Greek historians (Spyros Asdrachas, Philippos Iliou and Vassilis Panagiotopoulos), all of whom had lived and worked in France for many years. On the whole, the representatives of "New History" organised a series of projects (university departments, research centres, archives) that set a new tone for Greek historiography. While there were institutions and individuals with different views, the overall tone within the academic community until 1989 was set by the aforementioned group, in its broad composition.⁴⁹

The key decade for historical studies was the 1980s, during the government of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (Pasok), the first-ever socialist party to hold power in twentieth-century Greece. Substantial reforms were implemented in higher education, resulting in the establishment of a series of university departments in which history acquired

superior status. The departments of history and archaeology of the universities of Athens, Thessaloniki, Ioannina (1982) and Crete (1983) became independent within the pre-existing philosophy schools, yet still maintained the close connection between history and archaeology. In 1985, the Department of History of the newly established Ionian University (1984) became operational; in 1988, the Department of History and Social Anthropology of the newly founded University of the Aegean (1984) followed. In the aforementioned departments, history was either viewed as an independent field of knowledge, or was combined with other new fields, namely that of social anthropology. Many of the departments' graduates held the academic and professional title of historian, and a significant number of them would be employed in a series of newly established research and archival institutions. New archival bodies in charge of historical research were created next to the pre-existing ones, namely the research foundations of banks, archives of political figures and parties, etc. These institutes were centres for the collection of archival material, as well as for the conducting of research programmes and publications. The most typical example is the large economic history programmes developed by banking institutions during this decade. A number of collectives were also created, concerning new historiographical interests and trends like the history of the labour movement and the history of women. The development of academic history was linked to the broadening of historical publications and their readership as reflected by the avalanche of publications, both original and translated.

The establishment of new infrastructures was realised through the exchange between historical thought and political will and action, which, in the early 1980s, coincided with Pasok's slogan of "change". The Historical Archive of Greek Youth (IAEN) is noteworthy in this respect. Created in 1983 within the framework of the newly established Under-Secretariat of Youth, the IAEN hosted two different perspectives: on the one hand, the perspective adopted by the historians in charge of the programme, which aimed at the formation of a new type of social and economic history; on the other hand the political will of the Pasok government – with the consent of left-wing political forces – to regard youth as a special category with a unique identity, as shown by the introduction of the right to vote at 18 and the establishment of the Under-Secretariat of Youth, which was especially proactive in the first years of its operation. The historical past was, without doubt, the core component of this identity. The experience of the relatively recent antidictatorship struggle and the student movement had had a catalytic effect. The IAEN was part of the legacy left by the Athens Polytechnic Uprising. Unsurprisingly, the politicians initially in charge of the IAEN had been well-known members of the anti-dictatorship student movement. Through similar processes, Pasok embraced part of the militant past, thus forming its genealogy.⁵⁰

On an academic level, the most substantial change was the full recognition of the field of modern Greek history as an independent academic field with university chairs and

research positions. The establishment of public and private institutions, the breadth of research activity and the increase in literary production led to the emergence of a distinct and rapidly developing field. At the same time, the topics and the research period were broadened. In the 1970s and 1980s, research activities, as well as university teachings, had turned to the interwar period and the Second World War, which had not been studied thus far, mainly due to political reasons.

The establishment of the new university departments led to a significant increase in academic teaching positions specialising in history. Historians in the field of the humanities and social sciences formed one of the most prestigious communities, due to the dominant presence of history in the public domain, yet without ever acquiring a unified and solid identity and orientation: the epistemological and ideological differences between them were not insignificant. At the same time, the newly established institutions made it possible for younger historians to be professionally integrated. In fact, the professional image of historians was solidified mainly during this period, and a solid body of studies on modern Greek history was formed. However, it is worth mentioning that despite having been awarded the title of “historians”, the majority of history department graduates worked in schools, and only few (admittedly more than previously) worked purely as professional historians. To the extent that during this period historians were mainly absorbed in the secondary education system, where their vocation had never been institutionalised and philologists maintained their dominant status, the two sciences remained strongly connected and the history departments played a decisive role within the schools of philosophy.

In any case, the community of historians that gradually formed in the first 15 years after the fall of the junta occupied an important place in the public dialogue concerning the country’s past as well as its present. After all, the major issues that had been raised pertaining to the very identity of Greek society in the case at hand were linked to its past. Against the backdrop of major social and political changes, society regarded past knowledge as a liberating force from current rigidities and stereotypes; hence, many historians became public intellectuals, mostly aligned with the left. Based on their symbolic and real knowledge, these historians found common ground in the interest of studying history and saving sources concerning modern history. The fact that the best-known among them had a public presence enhanced their image as historians belonging to a body of professional scientists. However, their being gradually acknowledged as experts did not entail the acceptance of their proposals. On the contrary, their positions often clashed with deep-rooted and widely spread beliefs about what history “really” means and how past knowledge is constructed. The most typical example would be the decision in August 1989 by the right-left coalition government to destroy millions of citizens’ files kept by the security police.⁵¹ Despite the organised campaigns led by historians involving legal actions, petitions, press articles and public protests, the files were destroyed in the name of national reconciliation, thus proving the extent of historians’ interference. According to

Panagiotopoulos, the leading exponent of the change in historical studies in Greece of the *metapolitefsi*,

University and nonuniversity teachings, institutionally organised as well as individual research, publications carried out by individual effort and resources, organisational initiatives, attempts to open new archives and to discover and save inaccessible archival material, this major venture of the past 20 years, this effort to promote a new belief about history, has proved to be in vain. The body of society, the wider world of intellectuals, the media, the political world and, in general, the leaders have remained unaffected.⁵²

The year 1989 was a milestone for the historical community itself, not only because of the files issue. The fall of the Eastern Bloc called into question Marxist ideology, with which the historiography of the *metapolitefsi* shared common ground. The debate over postmodernism, combined with a younger generation of historians who were academically related mainly to the Anglo-Saxon area, caused tension and created new disunities within the historical community. Furthermore, the growth of nationalism in the Balkans and the re-emergence of the Macedonian Question raised yet again the question of historians' connections to state policies and their position as defenders of "national rights". The connection between politics and history rekindled the interest in the past through a series of popularised publications, newspaper supplements, journal features, etc., as well as through lectures, events and protests in the context of an ever-developing public history. New interests were being developed and new fields established in a period that lacked a cohesive historiographical paradigm, against the background of a disparate and fragmentary historical production. The different methods of approaching restorations, disparities, national minorities, gender history, immigrants, etc., shifted the focus onto the twentieth century, which, in the case of Greek history, had been marked by traumatic events that eventually needed to be discussed and researched. The next step, from the 1990s onwards, would be to study the civil war, which remained a gaping wound in the collective memory.⁵³

This shift towards the twentieth century was followed by the establishment of new archival and research entities. A number of them mainly focused on studying leftist history and social movements in Greece, and others were created in order to highlight the work of prominent Greek politicians (Eleftherios Venizelos, Konstantinos Karamanlis, Andreas Papandreou, etc.). During the same period, a new generation of historians emerged – one that had already been formed within both the earlier and the newly founded history departments. Based on the new institutional framework established in the early 1990s, these historians were finally given the opportunity to enrol in an organised two-year postgraduate programme in Greece. A large number among them turned to the English-speaking terrain for their postgraduate studies, thus limiting their relations with French

historiography, as attested by the foundation of the English-language historical journal *Historein* in 1999.

In any case, during this short twentieth century a new academic field of history had been established, which engaged public opinion more effectively than antiquity or Byzantium had. Greek society turned to the study of modern Greek history, demanding information about its past as well as a guide for its future. This field's trajectory, while complying with academic developments on an international level, had been mainly impacted by Greek political developments, especially from the 1940s onwards. Despite its significant achievements, Greek historiography from the interwar period to the fall of the junta remained attached to its relationship with literature and showed a particular disdain towards anything that could connect history with Marxist thought. In Europe, independent historical studies were being organised, history was conversing with the social sciences and the historian's identity was being established; meanwhile in Greece the historian-philologists, whose primary goal was to defend national continuity, still remained dominant. In addition, historians who had joined the left in Greece and abroad were denied recognition and were banished from the national body. The end of discord brought about by the *metapolitefsi* was linked to the emergence of historians as a community, admittedly small in number (since philologists remained pre-eminent figures in education), yet distinct. This was not an overnight development; it gathered momentum from the 1990s onwards. And so, we, as a younger generation of historians that emerged during that period, did not encounter mistrust or confusion because of our vocation, as Iliou had, when, returning from France in the early years of the *metapolitefsi*, had applied to be registered as a "historian" on his police ID. Utterly bewildered, police officers eventually registered him as a "philologist", since the relevant professional category did not exist.

¹ See Georg G. Iggers and Q. Edward Wang, *A Global History of Modern Historiography* (London: Routledge, 2013). See also William R. Keylor, *Academy and Community: The Foundation of the French Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Reba N. Soffer, *Discipline and Power: The University, History and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994); Pim den Boer, *History as a Profession: The Study of History in France, 1818–1914*, trans. Arnold J. Pomerans (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

² For institutions and historiography, see Ilaria Porciani and Lutz Raphael, eds., *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). Especially for Greece, see Vangelis Karamanolakis, "Greece," in Porciani and Lutz Raphael, *Atlas*, 108–10.

³ Roderick Beaton and David Ricks, eds., *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past (1797–1896)* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

⁴ Antonis Liakos, "The Construction of National Time: The Making of the Modern Greek Historical Imagination," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 16, no. 1 (2001): 27–42.

- ⁵ Dimitris Tziouvas, “Reconfiguring the Past: Antiquity and Greekness,” in *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth-Century Greece*, ed. Dimitris Damaskos and Dimitris Plantzos (Athens: Benaki Museum, 2008), 287–98.
- ⁶ Alexis Politis, “From Christian Roman Emperors to the Glorious Greek Ancestors,” in *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, ed. David Ricks and Paul Magdalino (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 105–17.
- ⁷ For Böckh’s influence on philological studies, see indicatively George P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, 1913), 30–35, and Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 40–44.
- ⁸ Sophia Matthaïou, “Establishing the Discipline of Classical Philology in Nineteenth-Century Greece,” *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 8 (2012): 117–48.
- ⁹ Vangelis Karamanolakis, “The University of Athens and Greek Antiquity (1837–1937),” in *Re-Imagining the Past: Antiquity and Modern Greek Culture*, ed. Dimitris Tziouvas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 112–27.
- ¹⁰ For Paparrigopoulos, see Constantinos Th. Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος: Η εποχή του – η ζωή του – το έργο του* [Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos: His time–his life–his work] (Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, 1986). See also Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigopoulos, Byzantium and the Greek Idea,” in Ricks and Magdalino, *Byzantium*, 25–47.
- ¹¹ See Roxane Argyropoulos, *Les intellectuels grecs à la recherche de Byzance (1860–1912)* (Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research, 2001).
- ¹² For the language issue in Greece, see Peter Mackridge, *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766–1976* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- ¹³ The intellectual exchange between international and Greek academic communities was continuous and had a significant impact on the latter. Up until the beginning of the twentieth century, the University of Athens had lacked the ability to produce its own teaching staff, seeing that the doctoral dissertation was introduced in 1911, and postgraduate studies abroad were a prerequisite for an academic career. Consequently, most of the academic fields to which I refer were established, firstly, at postgraduate level abroad and eventually in Greece.
- ¹⁴ See Tonia Kiousoroulou, “Οι βυζαντινές σπουδές στην Ελλάδα” [Byzantine studies in Greece], in *Από τη χριστιανική συλλογή στο Βυζαντινό Μουσείο: Κατάλογος έκθεσης* [From the Christian collection to the Byzantine Museum: Exhibition catalogue], ed. Olga Gratsiou and Anastasia Lazaridou (Athens: Ministry of Culture, 2006), 25–36.
- ¹⁵ For Lambros and his contribution to the establishment of the history of science, see Effi Gazi, *Scientific National History: The Greek Case in Comparative Perspective (1850–1920)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000).
- ¹⁶ For history teaching at the University of Athens, see Vangelis Karamanolakis, “The History of the University of Athens and its Contribution to the Formation of the National Past (1837–1974),” in *Annali di Storia delle Università Italiane* 20, no. 2 (2016): 53–71.
- ¹⁷ For archaeology in Greece, see Damaskos and Plantzos, *Singular Antiquity*.
- ¹⁸ Vangelis D. Karamanolakis, *Η συγκρότηση της ιστορικής επιστήμης και η διδασκαλία της ιστορίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών 1837–1932* [The formation of historical science and history teaching at the University of Athens (1837–1932)] (Athens: Historical Archive of Greek Youth, 2006), 259–60.

- ¹⁹ For the history of the Greek nation, see indicatively Thomas W. Gallant, *Modern Greece: From the War of Independence to the Present* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2016).
- ²⁰ I.K. Hassiotis, “Αναζητώντας τομές και βασικά χαρακτηριστικά στην ιστορία της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής” [Searching for breakthroughs and basic features in the history of the School of Philosophy], in *Φιλοσοφική Σχολή Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης: Τα πρώτα 75 χρόνια* [School of Philosophy of the University of Thessaloniki: The first 75 years] (Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2000), 21.
- ²¹ Artemi Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou, “Ιστορικές σπουδές” [Historical Studies], in *Φιλοσοφική Σχολή* [School of Philosophy], 85.
- ²² Karamanolakis, *Η συγκρότηση της ιστορικής επιστήμης* [The formation of historical science], 357–59.
- ²³ For the French state policy of granting scholarships in Greek students from the interwar period until the civil war, see Nicolas Manidakis, “Struggling from Abroad: Greek Communist Activities in France during the Greek Civil War,” in *The Greek Civil War: Essays on a Conflict of Exceptionalism and Silences*, ed. Philip Carabott and Thanasis D. Sfikas (London: Routledge, 2004), 101–102, and Manidakis, “Από τα σχολεία στα ινστιτούτα. Οι γαλλικοί θεσμοί στην Ελλάδα: στηρίγματα της γαλλικής εκπαιδευτικής, πολιτιστικής και επιστημονικής διείσδυσης στην Ελλάδα, τέλος 19ου–πρώτο μισό 20ού αιώνα” [From schools to institutes. French institutions in Greece: Furthering the French educational, cultural and academic integration in Greece, late 19th–first half of the 20th century], in *Ο ελληνικός κόσμος ανάμεσα στην ανατολή και τη δύση, 1453–1981* [The Greek world between East and West, 1453–1981], ed. Asterios Argyriou, Konstantinos A. Dimadis and Anastasia Danai Lazaridou (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 1999), 2:275–85.
- ²⁴ See Dimitris Tziouvas, *Ο μύθος της Γενιάς του '30: Νεωτερικότητα, ελληνικότητα και πολιτισμική ιδεολογία* [The myth of the Generation of the '30s: Modernity, Greekness and cultural ideology] (Athens: Polis, 2011).
- ²⁵ For the reactions to Kordatos' book, see George D. Boubous, “Η ελληνική κοινωνία στην πρώιμη μαρξιστική σκέψη: Γ. Σκληρός – Γ. Κορδάτος (1907–1930)” [Greek society in early Marxist thought: G. Skliros – G. Kordatos (1907–1930)] (PhD diss., Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, 1996), 118–212.
- ²⁶ Karamanolakis, *Η συγκρότηση της ιστορικής επιστήμης* [The formation of historical science], 315.
- ²⁷ See Giorgos Margaritis, *Ιστορία του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου* [History of the Greek Civil War] (Athens: Vivliorama, 2001), 1:50–51. See among others David H. Close, *The Origins of the Greek Civil War* (London: Routledge, 1995), and Polymeris Voglis, *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners During the Greek Civil War* (New York: Berghahn, 2002).
- ²⁸ Republished in Constantinos Th. Dimaras, *Σύμμικτα, Δ': Λόγια περί μεθόδου* [Collective works, 4: Concerning methodology], vol. 1., 1931–1963, texts chosen by Philippos Iliou, ed. Popi Polemi (Athens: Benaki Museum, 2013).
- ²⁹ Republished in Michail V. Sakellariou, *Θέματα νέας ελληνικής ιστορίας* [Topics of modern Greek history], vol. 1 (Athens: Irodotos, 2011).
- ³⁰ See indicatively Rena Stavridi-Patrikiou, “Ο φόβος της ιστορίας” [The fear of history], in *1949–1967: Η εκρηκτική εικοσαετία* [1949–1967: The explosive 20 years] (Athens: Society for Modern Greek Culture and General Education, 2002), 67–77, and Vangelis Karamanolakis, “Ιστορία και ιδεολογία στη δεκαετία του '60” [History and ideology in the 1960s], in *Η “σύντομη” δεκαετία του '60: Θεσμικό πλαίσιο, κομματικές στρατηγικές, κοινωνικές συγκρούσεις, πολιτισμικές διεργασίες* [The “short” decade of the 1960s: Institutional framework, party strategies, social conflicts, cultural processes], ed. Alkis Rigos, Seraphim Seferiades and Evanthis Hatzivassiliou (Athens: Kastaniotis, 2008), 84–94.
- ³¹ See Antonis Liakos, “Το ζήτημα της ‘συνέχειας’ στη νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία” [The “continuity” issue in modern Greek historiography], in *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας 1833–2002* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece (1833–2002)], ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides and Triantafyllos E. Sklavenitis (Athens: Institute of Neohellenic Research, 2004), 1:53–65.
- ³² See Anastasia Papadia-Lala, “Η Βενετοκρατία στον ιστοριογραφικό λόγο: Αντιλήψεις και ερμηνευτικές προσεγγίσεις” [Venetian rule in historiographical discourse: Perspectives and interpretive approaches], in

Kitromilides and Sklavenitis, *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece], 2:556.

- ³³ The period's most significant composition has been that of Apostolos Vacalopoulos, professor at the University of Thessaloniki; in his voluminous work *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού* [Modern Greek history], vol. 1 (1961), he expanded the subject of historical research, highlighting new historical sources and forming a genealogy of revolutionary movements that led to the 1821 War of Independence. See Evangelia Balta, "Οι οθωμανικές σπουδές στην νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία" [Ottoman Studies in modern Greek historiography], in Kitromilides and Sklavenitis, *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece], 265, where the first-ever reference to the use of Ottoman sources was made by Vacalopoulos, with regard to the "search for the identity of Hellenism".
- ³⁴ A typical example is the publication of the proceedings of the conference organised by the University of Wisconsin on "Greece Since the Second World War: On the Occasion of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Truman Doctrine," special issue, *Balkan Studies* 8, no. 2 (1967).
- ³⁵ For the postwar situation in Greece, see Mark Mazower, ed., *After the War was Over: Reconstructing the State, Family and the Law in Greece, 1943–1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- ³⁶ For the control and monitoring measures of left citizens in Greece, see Nikos Alivizatos, *Les institutions politiques de la Grèce à travers les crises, 1922–1974* (Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1979).
- ³⁷ Triantafyllos E. Sklavenitis, ed., *Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών 1958–2008: Ίδρυση–πορεία–προοπτικές* [National Hellenic Research Foundation: Establishment–trajectory–outlooks] (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008).
- ³⁸ *Έκθεση Εικοσαετίας 1960–1980* [Twentieth anniversary exhibition, 1960–1980] (Athens: Centre for Neohellenic Research, 1980), 10.
- ³⁹ For Dimaras and his views, see his extensive autobiography in Constantinos Th. Dimaras and Nikos Svoronos, *Η μέθοδος της ιστορίας: Ιστοριογραφικά και αυτοβιογραφικά σχόλια. Συνεντεύξεις με τους Στέφανο Πεσμαζόγλου και Νίκο Αλιβιζάτο* [Method of history: Historiographical and autobiographical comments. Interviews with Stefanos Pesmazoglou and Nikos Alivizatos] (Athens: Agra, 1995).
- ⁴⁰ See Anna Matthaiou and Popi Polemi, *Η εκδοτική περιπέτεια των Ελλήνων κομμουνιστών: Από το βουνό στην υπερорία* [Greek communists' publishing adventure: From the mountain to exile] (Athens: Vivliorama, 2003).
- ⁴¹ Manos Avgeridis, "The Historicization of World War II in Greece after the Civil War: Looking Back on the Public Debate over a Lecture by British Historian C.M. Woodhouse," in *Perspectives on the Intersections of Politics, Activism and the Historical Profession*, ed. Stefan Berger (New York: Berghahn, 2019), 151–62.
- ⁴² See Vassilis Panagiotopoulos, "Η αριστερή ιστοριογραφία για την Ελληνική Επανάσταση" [The left-wing historiography on the Greek Revolution], in Kitromilides and Sklavenitis, *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας* [Historiography of modern and contemporary Greece], 1:567–77.
- ⁴³ Philippos Iliou, "Η έννοια του λαού στη νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία: διάρκειες και τομές" [The concept of people in modern Greek historiography: Continuities and breaks], in *Ψηφίδες ιστορίας και πολιτικής του εικοστού αιώνα* [Snippets of 20th-century history and politics], ed. Stratis Bournazos, Anna Matthaiou and Popi Polemi (Athens: Polis, 2007), 215–21.
- ⁴⁴ Effi Gazi, "Μεταπλάσεις της ελληνικής εθνικής ιδεολογίας και ταυτότητας στη Μεταπολίτευση" [Transformation of the Greek national ideology and identity in the metapolitefsi], in *Μεταπολίτευση: Η Ελλάδα στο μεταίχμιο δύο αιώνων* [Metapolitefsi: Greece between two centuries], ed. Manos Avgeridis, Effi Gazi and Kostis Kornetis (Athens: Themelio, 2015), 246–60.
- ⁴⁵ Svoronos, member of the KKE, had been employed in the Academy of Athens until 1945, and subsequently moved to Paris for his postgraduate studies thanks to a French government scholarship. In 1953, Presses

universitaires de France published his short review on Greek history from post-Byzantine times to the civil war (1946–1949). The Greek conservative press accused the book of being an anthem to communist “bandits” and a diatribe against British and American allies. Shortly afterwards, the Greek government stripped Svoronos of his Greek citizenship because of his history book.

⁴⁶ See Eleftheria Zei, “Η μελέτη του κοινωνικού από τη Γαλλία στην Ελλάδα στη Μεταπολίτευση: Κοινωνική ιστορία ή κοινωνιολογία;” [Studying the social from France to Greece in the *metapolitefsi*: Social history or sociology?], in *Συναντήσεις της ελληνικής με τη γαλλική ιστοριογραφία από τη Μεταπολίτευση έως σήμερα* [Encounters of Greek and French historiography since the *metapolitefsi*], ed. Vangelis Karamanolakis, Maria Couroucli and Triantafyllos E. Sklavenitis (Athens: École française d’Athènes, 2015), 201–10.

⁴⁷ It is worth mentioning that the volume of the journal *Synchrona Themata*, dedicated to modern Greek historiography, started with two extensive interviews with the two historians. The interviews have been reprinted as Dimaras and Svoronos, *Η μέθοδος της ιστορίας* [The method of history].

⁴⁸ See the relevant texts in the special section “Οι ομιλίες του εορτασμού της εικοσαετίας 1971–1991” [The twentieth anniversary speeches], *Mnimon* 14 (1992): 297–318.

⁴⁹ See Alexander Kitroeff, “Continuity and Change in Contemporary Greek Historiography,” in *Modern Greece: Nationalism and Nationality*, ed. Martin Blinkhorn and Thanos Veremis (Athens: Eliamep, 1990), 143–72; Antonis Liakos, “Modern Greek Historiography (1974–2000): The Era of Tradition from Dictatorship to Democracy,” in *(Re)Writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism*, ed. Ulf Brunnbauer (Münster: Lit, 2004), 351–78.

⁵⁰ For the formation of the community of historians during the *metapolitefsi*, see Vangelis Karamanolakis, *Ανεπιθύμητο παρελθόν: Οι φάκελοι κοινωνικών φρονημάτων στον 20ό αιώνα και η καταστροφή τους* [Unwanted past: The social consciousness security files in the 20th century and their destruction] (Athens: Themelio, 2019).

⁵¹ Vangelis Karamanolakis, “Historians and the Trauma of the Past: The Destruction of Security Files in Greece (1989),” in *The Engaged Historian: Perspectives on the Intersections of Politics, Activism and the Historical Profession*, ed. Stefan Berger (New York: Berghahn, 2019), 237–49.

⁵² See Vassilis Panagiotopoulos, “Τα ‘ψέματα’ των φακέλων ως ιστορική αλήθεια” [Security files “lies” as a historical truth], in *Σύγχρονα αρχεία, φάκελοι και ιστορική έρευνα* [Contemporary archives, files and historical research] (Athens: EMNE, 1991), 38–39.

⁵³ Liakos, “Modern Greek Historiography.”