SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES

No 9 & 10 • 2023–2024

The evolution of Byzantine historical Studies in Greece*

Terezakis George

The development of Byzantine historical studies throughout the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century was influenced by their relations with the field of classical sciences. This fact largely defined the main lines of the dominant research orientations.[1] What emerges from the historiographical production of the second half of the 19th century is that, with few exceptions, historians of Byzantium focused on issues related to politics, especially factual history, while showing limited interest in the evolution of social, economic, and cultural history. During the interwar period, influenced by Marxism and the labor movement, new research efforts were directed towards investigating previously overlooked economic and social structures, as well as social groups. In this context, emphasis was placed on examining the productive relations that governed them. It is crucial to stress that the goal of this study is to demonstrate the existing research within the context of the renewal of historical inquiry and the application of new methodological tools by the historians of Byzantium in Greece. This is why emphasis will be given to researchers who, influenced by international

* This study has been written within the frame of the postdoctoral research programme "The evolution of Byzantine historical studies under the influence of the political developments and rivalries of the 20th century", at the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Peloponnese. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Dimitrios Rozakis for fruitful conversations.

[1] For this see Haldon 1984: 95–132; Jeffreys, Haldon, Cormack 2008: 3–20; Kazhdan 1979: 506–553; idem 1996: 133–163; idem 1994: 66–88; idem 1982: 1–19; Laiou 1995: 43–64; Ljubarskij 1993: 131–138; Moravcsik 1966: 366–377; Ostrogorsky 1940: 227–235; Patlagean 1975: 1371–1396; Ševčenko 1952: 448–459; Sorlin 1967: 489–568; eadem 1970: 487–520; eadem 1979: 525–580; Talbot 2006: 25–43; Uspenskij 1925: 1–54; Valdenberg 1927/1928: 483–504.

historiographical developments, introduced new methodological tools in Greece. In this sense, the main focus of this study is to demonstrate the application of these new methodological tools rather than analysing the work of the scholars presented. This is why the study of the evolution of Byzantine historical studies in Greece would be better served not by attempting to identify specific historiographical issues, such as the matter of feudalism, the question of identity, or the integration of Byzantium into the national narrative of European history, but rather by highlighting the introduction of new methodological tools under the influence of international historiographical developments. Furthermore, certain Greek scholars who lived and worked abroad, such as Eleni Antoniadis Bibikou, Nikolaos Oikonomides, and Aggeliki Laiou, although not considered integral to the development of Byzantine historical studies in Greece, have nonetheless exerted varying degrees of influence on their Greek colleagues. In this context, special attention is given to the case of Nikos Svoronos, who later in his career chose to repatriate and contributed significantly to the development of social, economic, and cultural history of Byzantium in Greece.

The Early Phase: The Emergence of Byzantine Historical studies as a professional discipline

Throughout the 19th century Byzantine studies functioned as a means of promoting a Greek national identity by placing Byzantium between the ancient and the modern period.[2] Byzantium was associated with national claims, and within this context, Greek historians emphasized the significance of political and religious events, aligning with the prevailing trends in European historiography of the period. In this respect, they were hesitant to delve into its economic and social aspects.[3] Konstantinos Paparregopoulos (1815–1891) was the one who actively took on the task of presenting and shaping Byzantium as the connecting link be-

[2] More on this see Ricks 1998: vii–x.
[3] For this see Mango 1965: 29–43.

tween antiquity and modern times.[4] The *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους* [= *History of the Greek Nation*] published in the mid-19th century served the ideological needs of the newly formed Greek state in a dual capacity. It played a crucial role in the formation of national consciousness and, simultaneously, acted as a supporter of the ideology of the "Great Idea" (Megali Idea), contributing to the expansion of borders.[5] This fact holds significant importance, as the "Great Idea" is a nationalist and irredentist concept aimed at reviving the Byzantine Empire through the establishment of a Greek state. This envisioned state would encompass not only the substantial Greek populations still under Ottoman rule following the Greek War of Independence (1821–1828) but also regions with significant Greek communities, including parts of mainland Greece and the Aegean Islands that remained under Ottoman control.[6] Additionally, it's crucial not to disregard the impact of German historicism, which significantly shaped historical studies in Europe from the early 19th century onwards. The school of historicism emphasized political and religious events, particularly diplomatic and military affairs, and advocated for reconstructing the past through the thorough examination of available primary sources.[77] The impact of German historiography on Paparregopoulos is underscored by the fact that, lacking a university degree, the University of Munich conferred upon him an honorary doctorate. This recognition came after he submitted a memorandum to the Department

[4] He is the founder of the concept of historical continuity in Greece from antiquity to the present. Paparregopoulos established the tripartite division of Greek history into Ancient, Medieval, and Modern periods, challenging prevailing views at the time that considered the Byzantine Empire as a period of decadence and degeneration. For this see Dimaras 1986: 138; also see Karavas 2004: 149–169.

[5] Paparregopoulos 1846: 17–18; idem 1843; idem 1886.

[6] The official support received by Paparregopoulos is evident in the State's recommendation to the Municipalities to acquire copies of his work. The Parliament, through a resolution, provided financial support for the translation of his work into French and the publication of the epilogue of the *History of the Greek Nation* in 1878, under the French title *Histoire de la civilisation hellénique*. For this see Dimaras, 1986: 227–230; Skopetea 1988: 163–170.

[7] Iggers 1997: 26–35; Fuchs 2006: 147–162; also see Jeffreys, Haldon, Cormack 2008: 6; Haldon 1984: 123–127.

of Philosophy at the University of Munich, under the guidance of Professor Konstantinos Schinas.[8]

In the early 20th century, the approach of Paparregopoulos was continued by his descendants. Spyridon Lampros (1851–1919), an advocate of the French positivism school in Greece, voiced his concerns regarding the study of Byzantium and emphasized the necessity to gather and publish primary sources.[9] He drew inspiration from Charles-Victor Langlois and Charles Seignobos,[10] even translating their methodology book *Introduction aux études historiques* into Greek.[11] Moreover, his influences extended to the rich tradition of German historiography, starting with Friedrich Carl von Savigny, continuing through Leopold von Ranke, and reaching its pinnacle with his mentors from the "Prussian school", including Johann Gustav Droysen and Theodor Mommsen.[12] He grounded his studies in a diverse range of sources, seamlessly integrating historical research with the pursuit of national interests. As correctly noted by Effi Gazi, Lampros "endeavoured to reconcile two in-

[8] For this see Dimaras 1986: 138.

[9] Lampros 1892: 185–201. In general, proponents of positivism, drawing inspiration from sociology as a model, focus on studying population movements, forms of housing, and dietary habits – essentially, all human activities across various dimensions. They often overlook individual events and renowned figures, emphasizing a broader perspective that addresses the masses and encompasses the entirety of human activities. Therefore, historians, after initially restoring the authenticity of the sources, must then envision the intended message of the historical subject within those sources. For this see Fuchs 2006: 147–162; Haldon 1984: 100; Iggers 1997: 99–100, 120.

[10] In 1898, Langlois and Seignobos wrote *Introduction aux études historiques*, considered one of the first comprehensive manuals discussing the use of scientific techniques in historical research. Their method is grounded in the principle that all history originates from facts retrieved from firsthand documents. Historians then analyze these facts from various perspectives, allowing for an unbiased approach to history. For this see Fawtier 1930: 85–91; Prost 1994: 100–118; Assis 2015: 105–125; Fuchs 2006: 153.

[11] Langlois, Seignobos 1902.

[12] Lampros studied at the Philosophical School of Athens from 1867 to 1871 and pursued postgraduate studies at the Universities of Berlin and Leipzig from 1872 to 1875. He earned his doctorate with a thesis on the settlers of the Greek colonies. During a period when German-speaking universities were dominated by the historical "Prussian" school, Lampros systematically attended the courses of its prominent representatives, including Theodor Mommsen, Gustav Droysen, Heinrich von Treitschke, Wilhelm Wattenbach, and Ernst Curtius. For Lampros see Gazi 2000; Charitakis 1935: 3–14; Mpalanos 1928: 1–32; Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou 1994: 167–168.

herently incompatible agendas: the advancement of History as a science, prioritizing sources, evidence, and archives for factual restoration, while concurrently embracing the dramatized, transcendent, and passionate essence of a grand national narrative".[13] He considered Byzantium as the organic link between Ancient and Modern Greek history, emphasizing that the prevailing national claims should shape the content of Byzantine studies. To this end, he served as the editor of the journal *Neos Hellinomnemon* (1904–1927), where he published numerous sources on Medieval and Modern Greek history.[14] He explicitly affirmed that "there is no greater connection than that between the historian's duty and the scene of battle. In both instances, a common flag is present – the flag of the country".[15]

Until the 1920s, the approach to Byzantium aimed at constructing a national identity and was shaped by the ideological needs of the time. This was compounded by heightened political rivalries following the outbreak of World War I, during which Greece found itself "divided" between the Entente (United Kingdom, France, Russia) and the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, which later changed sides, and the Ottoman Empire).[16] What proves more intriguing is the viewpoint from which professional Byzantine historians of the period approached the study of Byzantium. Influenced by both French and German historiography, they scrutinized Byzantium primarily through

[13] Gazi 2004: 212.

[14] Gazi 2000: 130.

[15] Lampros 1905: 28. Μεγάλα κενά ανάμεσα στις υποσημειώσεις

[16] The "National Schism" was a series of disagreements between King Constantine I and Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos regarding Greece's foreign policy from 1910 to 1922, with the pivotal issue being whether Greece should enter World War I. Venizelos supported the Allies and advocated for Greece to join the war on their side, while the pro-German King preferred Greece to remain neutral, aligning with the plans of the Central Powers. Illustrative of the tense climate is the case of Lampros, who assumed the positions of prime minister and minister of education on September 27, 1916, aligning closely with the royal faction. Upon Venizelos' return, Lampros was placed under house arrest, subsequently put on trial, dismissed from the university, had his property confiscated, and was exiled first to Hydra and then to Skopelos. More on this see Gazi 2004: 195–196; Mavrogordatos 2013: 39–53; Mourelos 1980–1982: 150–188.

language, and consequently, through philology.[17] Figures such as Konstantinos Amantos (1874–1960),[18] along with Phaidon Koukoules (1881–1956)[19]

[17] The work of Karl Krumbacher is of great importance. In the preface of his book "Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur" (1891), he presented his vision concerning the study of Byzantine literature. According to Panagiotis Agapitos, "he aimed at asserting the independence of Byzantine literature as an object of research. At the same time, by insisting on historical continuity, he underlined the importance of Byzantine literature for a profounder study both of Hellenic Antiquity and of the contemporary Greek world" (Agapitos 2015: 12). More on this see Agapitos 2015: 1–52; Berger 2011: 13–26; Jeffreys, Haldon, Cormack 2008: 5; Schreiner 2011: 39–62; Tinnefeld 2011: 27–38; Vogt 2011: 63–84. Also see Moravcsik 1966: 366–377.

[18] Amantos initially studied at the University of Athens, and in 1899, he moved to the University of Munich, where he studied under Krumbacher. He received his doctorate in 1903 with a treatise on the suffixes of modern Greek toponyms. Amantos conducted numerous studies on Greece's neighbours. By 1923, he had already published one of his best-known historiographical texts, focusing on the Balkan peoples (Greece's Northern neighbors: Bulgarians, Albanians, South-Slavs). Analyzing relations with neighbouring peoples necessitated a deep understanding of their historical evolution and enduring connections with the Greeks. His doctoral thesis focused on a linguistic topic, and during his tenure at the *Historical Dictionary of the Greek Language,* he seized the opportunity to prepare a series of smaller linguistic studies, which he continued to engage with throughout his scientific life. Amantos' involvement with language, beyond professional reasons, stemmed from his belief that it was a privileged field for highlighting the continuity of the Greek nation. For this see Vogiatzoglou 1940: i–iv; Tomadakis 1940: vii–xvi; Kolia-Dermitzaki 2020: 29–62; Vlisidou 2020: 63–78; Karamanolakis 2020: 79–92; Lampakis 2020: 193–204; Charalampakis 2020: 205–218; Giakovaki 2020: 221–252.

[19] Koukoules studied at the Philosophical School of Athens, completing his thesis in 1907. With a university scholarship, he continued his studies in Munich, focusing on Byzantine history and philology under scholars such as Krumbacher, Heisenberg, and Crusius. From 1911, he dedicated his efforts to the *Historical Dictionary of the Academy*, eventually becoming its director from 1926 to 1931. Koukoules insisted on exploring the private lives of the Byzantines, a stance justified by his student Nikos Tomadakis based on dominant national goals. Specifically, Koukoules argued that the public life of the Byzantines was connected to the institutions of the Roman Empire, while their private life was intertwined with the ancient Greek world (Tomadakis 1953: vii–xix). In this context, Koukoules thoroughly studied the private life of the Byzantines to strengthen the concept of historical continuity of Greece from antiquity to the present. For this see Zoras 1955/1956: 630– 632; Karamanolakis 2006: 319.

and Ioannis K. Vogiatzidis (1877–1961),[20] were mainly involved in the compilation of the *Historical Dictionary of the Academy*. Initiated in 1914 by Georgios Hatzidakis, this dictionary aimed "to gather the complete linguistic wealth of the Greek language, serving as unequivocal evidence of the nation's unity", as he asserted.[21] According to Diana Mishkova "the interest in Byzantium and its legacy emerged simultaneously with the interest in the medieval precursors of the Balkan nation-states – an interest itself bolstered by the projects of national awakening and modern state-building. Consequently, Byzantine history – and Byzantine studies generally – long remained subsidiary to or subsumed under the medieval national histories".[22] Byzantium was no longer projected solely as the link between antiquity and modern times but as the direct ancestor of modern Greeks as well.[23] This significantly propelled the advancement of Byzantine studies in Greece, particularly during the 1910s and 1920s. New chairs for Byzantinology were established at the Universities of Athens and Thessalonike, alongside the creation of new journals and museums. Specifically, in 1924, the inaugural chair for Byzantine History was established at the University of Athens and was held by Amantos. In 1926, a chair for Byzantine History was established at the University of Thessalonike, initially occupied by Koukoules and later by Vogiatzidis.[24] We should also note the establishment of the *Byzantiologike Hetaireia* (Society), the *Society of Byzantine Studies*, and the international journal *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* (*BNJ*) under the supervision of Nikos Bees.[25] Moreover, as stated in the introduction of the Minutes of the first Assembly, the Committee had a

[20] Vogiatzidis studied at the Philosophical School of Athens and completed his postgraduate studies in Ancient and Byzantine history in Munich. Upon returning to Athens, he worked as an editor of the "Historical Dictionary of the Greek Language" (1914–1925) and published material edited by Lampros, including the late professor's *Palaiologeia and Peloponnesiaka*. For this see Karamanolakis 2006: 317; Oikonomidis 1961: 254–261.

[21] Vagiakakos 1977: 46.

[22] Mishkova 2014: 119.

[23] For this see Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou 1994: 153–176.

[24] For this see Kiousopoulou 1993: 271; Tomadakis 1953: xiii; Christofilopoulou 1994: 983–991; Oikonomidis 1961: 254–261; Savvides 2007: 336–337.

[25] Sotiriou 1920. See commentary on Sotiriou's positions in Gratziou 1987: 69–71.

twofold purpose: "the preservation and rescue of Byzantine monuments on one hand, and, on the other hand, the dissemination of knowledge to the public through lectures and publications on Byzantine history and culture in general".[26]

New directions in Historiography at the beginning of the 20th century

Gradually, new paradigms in historical research gained influence. Sociological approaches by Marxist scholars started to emerge at the beginning of the 20th century.[27] In 1907, Georgios Skleros published *To Κοινωνικό μας ζήτημα* (= *Our Social Issue*), and in 1924, Yianis Kordatos' book *Η κοινωνική σημασία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης* (= *The Social Significance of the Greek Revolution*) addressed social dimensions of the Greek Revolution that had been previously overlooked in research. *Το Κοινωνικό μας ζήτημα* encompasses the 1821 Revolution, contextualizing it within historical precursors like the Byzan- tine era and Turkish rule, which are essential for a thorough analysis of the events in 1821. More precisely, Byzantium, the Ottoman Empire, and the Revolutionary period together constitute a set of "Greek examples". Georgios Skleros utilizes these instances to showcase his interpretive skills in comprehending the materialistic conception of history. Concurrently, they provide evidence of the interconnectedness of events in

[26] Kalogeropoulos, Koukoules 1924: 363.

[27] It should be noted that Byzantine studies in Russia were already oriented towards the Byzantine agricultural economy before the October Revolution. This orientation facilitated a relatively smooth transition from the ideology of the pre-revolutionary period to the Marxist ideology embraced by Soviet researchers. As early as 1925, Feodor Uspensky pointed out that the Russian school of historians of Byzantium (Pavel Vladimirovich Bezobrazov, Petr Jakovenko, Alexander Kirpičnicov, Boris Pančenko, Nikolay Afanasevich Skabalanovic, Vasily Vassilievskij) attached great importance to the study of the agricultural economy of Byzantium. This aspect made their work a foundational background for later historians of Byzantium. For this see Uspenskij 1925: 1–54. Also see Haldon 1984: 105–108; Ostrogorsky 1940: 227–235; Patlagean 1975: 1371–1396; Valdenberg 1927/1928: 483–504.

Greek history with the broader trajectory of the European world.[28] In the same context, influenced by the element of historical materialism, Kordatos challenged the concept of national continuity. In *Η κοινωνική σημασία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης,* he briefly delves into the changes brought to Byzantine society by the Ottoman conquest and explores the continuity between these two social formations.[29] The objective is to demonstrate that Ottoman society should not be viewed as a mere decline following a glorious past, as was the case with Byzantium. Despite recognizing that Byzantine feudalism was a milder version compared to its Western counterpart, Kordatos contested the conventional narrative surrounding Byzantium.[30] The book sparked strong reactions, most notably from Neoklis Kazazis, Professor of the "Encyclopedia of Law" at the Law School of the University of Athens. Kazazis wrote two articles in the newspaper *Empros* on July 6 and 7, 1924, discussing the perceived development of "Bolshevism" in Greece. He explicitly condemns the views presented by Kordatos, arguing that Kordatos interprets the Greek Revolution not as a result of the will of "the Greek people who want to rebel against the pashas" but rather as a result of: a) the so-called bourgeois class, which, enriched from trade, shipping, and even the exploitation of Turks, seeks "its own

[28] Georgios Konstantinides Skliros (1878–1919) was an early Greek socialist who published Το Κοινωνικό μας ζήτημα based on the class structure of society. Skliros was born into a middle-class family in Trebizond in Ottoman Pontus. In his younger years, he traveled to Odessa in Russia to work as a merchant. Later, he moved to Moscow, where he engaged in medical studies at the University of Moscow in 1904. The following year, he became involved in the revolutionary movement under the influence of Georgi Plekhanov. For this see Kitromilides 2014: 510–511; Mishkova 2014: 230–231; Mpoumpous 1996: 1–44.

[29] Kordatos 1957: 20. Kordatos (1891–1961) authored over twenty historical works covering Ancient, Byzantine, and Modern Greek history. Some of his most notable books include *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας από το 1453* ως το *1961* (= *A History of Greek Literature from 1453–1961*), *Τα Τελευταία Χρόνια της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας* (= *The Last Days of the Byzantine Empire*), *Ιστορία της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής Φιλοσοφίας* (= *A History of Ancient Greek Philosophy*), *Η Κομμούνα της Θεσσαλονίκης, 1342–1349* (= *The Commune of Thessalonike, 1342–1349*). He is considered the father of Greek Marxist historiography. For more details see Karadimas 2006: 152–153; Spanakou 1991; Mpoumpous 1996: 45–117.

[30] Kordatos 1924: 16, 35–36.

emancipation and independence", b) the Orthodox Church, and c) a few intellectuals.[31] These approaches left a notable impact on Byzantine studies, particularly on research concentrated on the socio-economic history of Byzantium. Notably, during the interwar period, Andreas Andreades, an economist and professor of Public Economics at the Law School of Athens, emerged as a prominent figure.[32] The main volume of his work concerns the history of the Greek Public Finances. While the primary focus of his work revolves around the history of Greek Public Finances, his most significant contribution lies in the realm of Byzantine economy. Keynes, in his obituary, pointed out that "Andreadès' monographs on the obscure but fascinating field of Byzantine public finance, for which abundant material, largely unexplored, exists, were probably his most original and path-breaking contributions to knowledge".[33] Laiou acknowledged his contribution, stating that "any mention, however schematic, of the economists who studied the Byzantine economy cannot but give pride of place to Andreas Andreades, the first professor of public finance at the University of Athens".[34] He examined the Byzantine budget, delved into the realms of money and the purchasing power of precious metals, and actively participated in the extensive discourse on the merits and drawbacks of a free economy. In his book *Περί των Οικονομικών του Βυζαντίου* (= *On the Finances of Byzantium*), he examined the evolution of the Byzantine economy.[35] His research focused on shifts in production and other factors such as urban

[31] Mpoumpous 1996: 120–121.

[32] Andreades (1876–1935) studied law and economics at the University of Paris, completing his economic studies in London (Bigg, "Andreades, Andreas", 94). It's noteworthy that Byzantine historical studies in France, particularly led by historians of Law like Louis Bréhier, addressed the issue of Byzantine agricultural society and economy from the beginning of the 1920s. Andreades was also influenced by the sociologist and economist Fr. Simiand, who, in 1903, criticized the "three idols of historians": "the political idol" – meaning the preoccupation with political history, "the idol of individuality" – referring to the habit of conceiving history as the history of individuals, and the "chronological idol" – referring to studies on the origins of the events under examination. For this see Dosse 2015: 27.

[33] Kaynes 1935: 597–598.

[34] Laiou 2002: 7.

[35] Andreades 1908.

demographic developments and their implications on the composition of society.[36] In this context, he discusses a universally acknowledged challenge — the fundamental weakness attributed to the fragmentary nature of Byzantine sources.[37] During the 1920s, Andreades shifted his attention to the urban economy.[38] He didn't hesitate to express sharp criticism toward Georg Ostrogorsky and Franz Dölger, as he believed they were overly focused on the rural economy, neglecting the intricacies of urban economic activities in his perspective.[39]

The shift towards international historiographical developments became even more apparent at the First International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Bucharest when Sokratis Kougeas (1877–1966) emphasized the need for Greek historians of Byzantium to align with the dominant European historiographical trends.[40] This holds great importance, considering that Kougeas was a student of Lampros and later held the chair of Ancient History at the Athens School of Philosophy. In the same announcement, Kougeas established as a research prerequisite in Greece "the systematic publication of texts, documents, and inscriptions, along with the compilation of catalogues and dictionaries".[41] In this context, he cofounded the *Ellinika* journal with Amantos, who held the first chair for Byzantine History at the Department of Philosophy in the University of Athens since 1924. According to Vaggelis Karamanolakis, Amantos was the rapporteur of the "ethnographic" approach in Greece, and he believes "that the study of different nationalities in the Balkan Peninsula created a new framework for the overall understanding of Greek history. This framework reflected a re-examination of Paparregopoulos' scheme, which was now defined in terms of international relations and perils".[42] This is a period of intense reshuffles, and in this context, Amantos aligns with the prevailing national issues, especially considering the Bulgarian

[36] Andreades 1918.
[37] Andréadès 1928: 287.
[38] Andréadès, 1924: 75–115; idem 1928b.
[39] Andréadès 1928: 287–323.
[40] Megas 1924: 311.
[41] Megas 1924: 311.
[42] Karamanolakis 2006: 332. Also see see Vogiatzoglou 1940: i–iv; Charalampakis 2020: 205–218.

claims in the area of Macedonia. It is no coincidence that Konstantinos Dimaras, in his eulogy to Amantos, argued that there was no other Greek "who served the national issues more scientifically".[43] His attitude towards the Greek Communist Party reflects the ideological processes of the time and is part of his attempt to counter those who opposed the approach of "national history". Amantos often deviated from his university courses to condemn the positions of the Greek Communist Party on the issue of Macedonia.[44] Despite his harsh criticism, he opposed the application of the "Idionym" anticommunist bill submitted to the parliament on behalf of the Liberal Party a few months after the 1928 elections.[45]

In the same context, the influence of Denis A. Zakythinos (1905–1993) on the development of Byzantine studies was crucial, as he contributed to familiarizing Greek scholars with the dominant trends in French historiography at the time. In the early 1930s, his doctoral dissertation focused on the Palaeologan period, delving into the social, economic, and partly demographic history of the Despotate of Morea.[46] His apprenticeship with the linguist H. Pernot (1870–1946) helped him adopt theories and methods from the social sciences.[47] In

[43] Karamanolakis 2006 333; Dimaras 1961: 7.

[44] See Karamanolakis 2006: 333; Christofilopoulou 1994: 984; Notaris 1961: 12–13.

[45] Karamanolakis 2011: 875–876.

[46] Zakythinos 1932; idem 1953. After graduating from the University of Athens in 1927, he went to the Sorbonne. His first major work was a detailed study of the late Byzantine Despotate of the Morea, published in French [*Le despotat grec de Morée (1262–1460)*] in two volumes, one in 1932 and the other, delayed by World War II, in 1953. From 1939 to 1970 he taught Byzantine and Modern Greek History at the University of Athens, and in 1937–1946 he directed the Greek State Archives. For this see Aggelidi 1993: 338–340; Maltezou 1991/1992: 665–666; Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou 1994: 172–176.

[47] Pernot became professor of Modern Greek at the Sorbonne in Paris (University of Paris) and director of the "Archives de la parole et de l' Institut de phonétique" (later known as the Musée de la Parole et du Geste) at the Sorbonne. The core of the Modern library of the Neohellenic Institute at Sorbonne consists of his personal library and that of Emile Legrand, his mentor and coworker, which he purchased after the latter's death. His main concern was the relationship between knowledge and reality, viewing language as a vehicle for the transmission of meaningful knowledge. For this see Mirambel 1946–1948: 335–348; Karcayanni-Karabelia 2003: 10; Sofou 2021: 251–259.

his approach, social and political structures aren't denied; rather, they are studied through their linguistic articulation.[48] In the mid-1940s, he published the book *Οι Σλάβοι εν Ελλάδι* (= *The Slavs in Greece*), aiming to study toponyms as a means of approaching human geography.[49] This "linguistic turn" has been part of an effort to emphasize the role of cultural factors, among which language occupies a key place. At the same time, Zakythinos surpassed the scheme proposed by Paparregopoulos by projecting the unity of Byzantine and Modern Greek culture. He underlined the close relationship between Byzantine scholars and the Italian Renaissance, regarding the interconnection of social reality with the spiritual-cultural history of Byzantium as a research prerequisite. In studying the case of Georgios Gemistos Plethon, Zakythinos asserts that Plethon essentially introduces a new political proposition, drawing on the ideals of ancient Greece and contributing to the revival of Greek national consciousness. Plethon's proposal involves projecting the continuity of ancient Hellenism into modern political reality. Essentially, Zakythinos considers Plethon as the pioneer and advocate of a novel political ideology aligned with the concept of national continuity. In the second volume of the *Despotate of Morea*, Zakythinos explores the intellectual life of Mystras and characterizes Plethon as "the last of the Byzantines and the first of the modern Greeks", thus clearly establishing the duality of Byzantium-Modern Hellenism.[50] According to Vasilis Panagiotopoulos, this was a reaction to the methodological approaches of the entire previous period, which had promoted national claims.[51]

Until the 1940s, the subject of Byzantine History had been consolidated within the context of Modern Greek studies. The influence of the school of Historicism, in combination with the political and social expediencies of the first decades of the 20th century, had imposed the use of philological methods as the basic methodology for historical studies in general.[52] Simultaneously, under the influence of Marxism and the labor

[48] Aggelidi 1993: 338.
[49] Zakythinos 1945.
[50] Zakythinos 1953: 350.
[51] Panagiotopoulos 1989: 45. Also see Haldon 1984: 127–129.
[52] For this see Haldon 1984: 124–126.

movement, sociological and economic approaches emerged, with a special focus on the economic and social structures that had hitherto been ignored by research. Political and social developments in the 1940s, particularly after the Nazi occupation and the outbreak of the civil war, resulted in a split between the two dominant approaches. This division was later intensified by the Cold War confrontation. On one hand, the official academic community stood out as it attempted to address the prevailing ideological needs, thereby adopting the framework of national continuity. On the other hand, the representatives of the Marxist approach pursued a different path influenced by the element of historical materialism. It is interesting to examine the geographical distribution of the two dominant approaches. Representatives of academic historiography are primarily based in the universities of Athens and Thessalonike. In contrast, those who embraced the Marxist approach forged connections with Eastern European countries and France. This is especially notable as it includes exiles and self-exiles of the Greek Civil War, among them Nikos Svoronos.

The case of Nikos Svoronos (1911–1989)

At the end of December 1945, Svoronos boarded the transport ship "Mataroa" as a scholar of the French government.[53] His evolution as a historian is closely tied to his place of origin, Lefkada. The idea of the historical and linguistic unity of the Greek nation has been a recurring theme in Greek scholarship, with several figures in Greek intellectual history contributing to the development of this concept. Notable among them is Spyridon Zampelios (1815–1881) from Lefkada, who emphasized the continuity of the Greek language from ancient to modern

[53] In late December 1945, the Mataroa brought from Greece to Taranto in southern Italy a number of Greek artists and intellectuals Greek aiming to reach Paris. This trip was organized by the Director of the French Institute of Athens Octave Merlier. For this see Andrikopoulou 2007; Kranaki 2007.

times.[54] Svoronos was also influenced by the sociological approaches of Kordatos, Serafeim Maximos (1899–1962),[55] Demosthenis Danielidis (1889–1972),[56] and Skleros. In one of his last interviews, he emphasized that his work is a continuation of the Marxist approach of Skleros and Kordatos.[57] His approach was shaped by his Ionian origin, as he encountered a strictly class-hierarchical society in Lefkada with clear social evolution between the West and Greece, emphasizing the impact of barriers between social classes.[58] Two years after his graduation, he was appointed to the Medieval Archive of the Academy of Athens,

[54] He was among the first to advocate for the historical unity of ancient, medieval, and modern Greeks. Alongside Paparregopoulos, he stands out as one of the protagonists of Greek historiography in the 19th century who contested the theory of racial discontinuity of the modern Greeks, initially proposed in 1830 by the Austrian historian Jacob Philipp Fallmerayer. Influenced by the Medievalist Andreas Moustoxydis (1785-1860) and equipped with extensive language knowledge, he conducted studies on medieval and linguistic manuscripts in the major libraries of Europe and Turkey. His goal was to trace the roots of modern Greeks in the Middle Ages, particularly in Byzantium, with the aim of restoring the historical unity of Greek history. He underscored the significance of the Greek language in preserving the historical continuity of the Greeks. For this see Koumpourlis 2011: 888–908; Oikonomidis 1989: 9–10; Svoronos 1992: 11–20; Zakythinos 1974: 303–328.

[55] Maximos reached the zenith of his significant contribution to the analysis of Greek social formation in 1930 with the publication of perhaps his most important work, *Κοινοβούλιο ή Δικτατορία* (= *Parliament or Dictatorship*). This book delves into a pivotal period in Greek history, spanning from the Goudi revolution (1909) to 1928, with a particular focus on the era of "National Schism" and the aftermath of the Asia Minor Catastrophe in 1922. Maximos places the political crisis of the interwar period at the center of his analysis. His work remains one of the rare approaches that perceives and analyzes Greek political history as the history of class struggle. For this see Axelos 1989: 13–25; Karpozilos 2022: 31–49; Milios 1996: 81–99.

[56] His book *Νεοελληνική κοινωνία και οικονομία* (= *Modern Greek Society and Economy*) (1934) stands as a classic in Greek sociology. In this work, the author meticulously analyzes the institution of communities as they developed under Turkish rule. Danielides also highlighted the main differences in Ottoman structures on the latter. These structures shaped numerous aspects of modern Greek society, imparting it with an oriental character and presenting obstacles to the functioning of a modern state. For this see Stathis 2014: 29–58; Theotokas 2019: ix–xxiv.

[57] «…Evythisa tin skepsi mou mesa stin pasan ora» 1995: 113. The interview was published in the triple issue of *Synchrona Themata* in 1988, under the general title "Contemporary trends in the historiography of modern Hellenism".

[58] Asdrachas 2003b; idem 2003: 29–33; Kontomichis 2003; idem 1992: 21–29; Sklavenitis 2001:163–173.

where his research interests primarily focused on the collection and publication of primary sources.[59] In 1935 and 1936, he served as an author for the *Mega Dictionary of the Greek language*, published by Dimitrios Dimitrakos.[60] This experience significantly influenced his research interests, and the majority of his publications until the eve of World War II were mainly related to the publication of medieval sources and book reviews.[61] Subsequently, during the Nazi occupation, his active participation in the resistance and the left movement played a decisive role in shaping his approach as a historian. Kostas Tsiknakis highlights that Svoronos' first exposure to Marxist ideas occurred during his university years through his involvement in the student movement "Left Party".[62] He also joined the Communist Party of Greece.[63] This, combined with his work at the Medieval Archive of the Academy of Athens, marked the beginning of his systematic engagement with social and economic issues. His study, yet unpublished, titled *Περί των εν Ελλάδι νομισμάτων κατά την Τουρκοκρατίαν* (= *On Coins in Greece during the Turkish Occupation*), served as his doctoral dissertation at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Thessalonike. Rather than focusing on a specific area of Greece or a particular period of Ottoman rule, he chose to treat currency as an economic category and examine its operations. This study explores not only the theoretical grounds for its title in one long section but also provides an extraordinary wealth of historical evidence spanning the medieval period in Greece through the beginning of the 19th century.[64] Svoronos's decision to submit his dissertation to the University of Thessalonike was prompted by the suspicion he faced in Athens.[65] This suspicion was heightened by the forced retirement of Amantos in

[59] For this see Tsiknakis 1992: 40–42.

[60] The idea of the dictionary had been conceived by Dimitrakos since the early 1930s. The editor's main goal, according to his own words, was to document the "unified and indivisible whole of the Greek language". For this see Babiniotis 1992: 69–80; Bernal 2007: 170–190; Mackridge 2009: 299–300.

[61] Karamanolakis 2011: 881–882.

[62] Tsiknakis 1992: 39.

[63] "Σ' έναν τόπο σωτηρίας και εξορίας" 1988: 10.

[64] See Chatzijosif 1989: 26; Tsiknakis 1992: 43.

[65] Liata 1996: xi.

1939, primarily due to his ideological stance in favor of the prevalence of Demotic Greek, the standard spoken language of Greece in modern times.[66] Consequently, the defence of his dissertation was indefinitely postponed. Following the outbreak of the events in De- cember 1944, Svoronos actively participated in the battles of Kaisariani, Byron, and Ardittos.[67] After the signing of the Varkiza agreement, he sought refuge in Teichio of mountainous Fokida, making his escape abroad inevitable.[68] Svoronos himself, in an interview given to Tasos Goudelis shortly

[66] The Greek language question (το γλωσσικό ζήτημα) was a dispute about whether the vernacular of the Greek people (Demotic Greek) or a cultivated literary language based on Ancient Greek (Katharevousa) should be the official language. It was a highly controversial topic in the 19th and 20th centuries, ultimately resolved in 1976 when Demotic was made the official language. For this see Bernal 2007: 170–190; Bien 2005: 217–234; Browning 1982: 49–68; Delveroudi 1996: 221–239; Frangoudaki 1992: 365–381; idem 2002: 101–107; Jeffreys, Haldon, Cormack 2008: 7; Holton 2002: 169–179; Kazazis 1993: 7–26; Mirambel 1964: 405–436; Petrounias 1978: 193–220; Toufexis 2008: 203–217. 1964: 405–436; Petrounias 1978: 193–220; Toufexis 2008: 203–217.

[67] The "December events" refer to a series of clashes in Athens from 3 December 1944 to 11 January 1945. The conflict involved the communist EAM (National Liberation Front), its military wing ELAS (Greek People's Liberation Army), the KKE (Communist Party of Greece), and the OPLA (Organization for the Protection of the People's Struggle) on one side, and the Greek Government and the British army on the other. Some historians consider the events as the second phase of the Greek Civil War, often referred to as the "second round" in post-war terms. The "first round" involved clashes mostly between EAM and EDES (National Republican Greek League) in 1943, setting the stage for subsequent developments. This period led to the third phase, commonly known as the "third round", concluding in 1949 with the military defeat of the KKE. For this see Antoniou, Marantzidis 2004: 223–231; Charalambidis 2014; Kostopoulos 2016; Margaritis 1984: 174–193; Mazower 1995: 499–506; Sakkas 2010: 73–90.

[68] The Treaty of Varkiza was signed near Athens on February 12, 1945, between the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Secretary of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) for EAM-ELAS, following the latter's defeat during the Dekemvriana clashes. One aspect of the accord (Article IX) called for a plebiscite within the year to address issues with the Greek Constitution. This plebiscite would lead to elections and the establishment of a constituent assembly for drafting a new organic law. Both signatories agreed that Allies would send overseers to verify the validity of the elections. Moreover, all civil and political liberties were guaranteed, along with the Greek government's commitment to establishing a non-political national army. However, the promises enshrined in the Treaty of Varkiza were not upheld. The main issue was that the treaty granted amnesty only for political reasons. After the signing of the

before his death, pointed out that "I was no longer in the mood to go to the mountains or engage with political organizations because I was convinced that I would not contribute anything substantial. I made a kind of choice. I was certain that my scientific work in France would benefit the entire movement more than my presence in Greece".[69]

Svoronos in Paris experienced an unprecedented freedom. Although he did not reject the scheme proposed by Paparregopoulos regarding the connection of modern Hellenism with the late Byzantine period, he, nevertheless, shifted his interests from the nation to society, highlighting, thus, the economic and social dynamics.[70] He recognized that "the Byzantine Empire does not yet occupy, in the economic and social history of the Middle Ages, the place due to its importance".[71] As he confessed, his decision to delve into the Byzantine period strengthened after completing his dissertation on Thessalonike in the 18th century, when he realized that the means of production demonstrate a continuum from the Byzantine period to the 18th century.[72] In 1948, Svoronos participated at the 6th International Byzantine Congress in Paris with his announcement about the oath of allegiance to the Byzantine emperor and its institutional extensions. The Greek historian formulated one of the most robust perspectives on the organization and development of society, contending that the mode of production in the Byzantine economy is analogous, though not identical, to the feudal mode of production.[73] He explicitly points out that "the internal evolution of Byzan- tine society eventually created social relations analogous to those of the West".[74] Since then he systematically studied the byzantine rural society and raised questions

treaty, there was widespread persecution of communists and former EAM members and supporters. This period, immediately prior to the outbreak of the Greek Civil War, became known as the "White Terror" (1945–46). For this see Chatzijosif 2007: 363–390; Iatrides, Rizopoulos 2000: 87–103; Kostis 2014: 697–720; Sakkas 2016: 291–308; Samatas 1986: 5–75; Sfikas 2001: 5–30; Vidakis, Karkazis 2011: 149–163.

[69] "Σ' έναν τόπο σωτηρίας και εξορίας" 1988: 10.

[70] Liakos 2001: 77.

[71] Svoronos 1956: 325.

[72] "… Εβύθισα την σκέψη μου μέσα στην πάσαν ώρα" 1995: 118.

[73] Svoronos 1951: 106–142.

[74] Svoronos 1951: 136.

that until then had been ignored by research.[75] Due to the nature of the available Byzantine sources, which are not suitable for the construction of long statistical series, Svoronos moved away from the method of Ernest Labrousse regarding statistical data processing and the great recurrent cycles that determine economic activity over decades and centuries. Starting from the tax system he dealt with the examination of the economic and social structures, to conclude that there is no evidence that the Byzantine economy was moving towards feudalism in the late 11th century, separating, thus, his position from the official line of the Marxist historians of the time.[76] This became even more apparent after the publication of his book *Histoire de la Grèce Moderne* in the series "Que sais-je?" of the publishing house "Presses Universitaires de France" in the first quarter of 1953. The book covers the period from the 11th century until the end of the civil war in 1949.[77] Svoronos' alienation from the Greek Communist Party had already started after the signing of the Varkiza Agreement, primarily stemming from his disagreement with Nikos Zachariadis regarding the continuation or discontinuation of Hellenism[78] Svoronos points out: "why did I feel the need to intervene while descending the mountain, advocating for the idea of continuity?... simply put, Zachariadis' positions lacked scientific foundation…. When he asked why I insisted on this, my response was clear: "Because I believe that communist parties wield only one weapon – the truth, and

[75] Svoronos 1956: 325–335; idem 1959: 1–166; idem 1966: 1–17; idem 1968: 375–395; idem 1976: 49–67; idem 1981: 487–500.

[76] Soviet historians of Byzantium assert that feudal relations of production prevailed throughout the longest span of Byzantine history, from the 9th to the 15th century. Adhering to the Marxist framework, Byzantine feudalism is considered a necessary and well-defined stage in the evolution of productive forces. The so- called pre-feudal period (7th–9th century) witnessed the strengthening role of the Byzantine agricultural economy, ultimately giving rise to a new social formation – the feudal system. For this see Gorjanov 1950: 19–50; Kazhdan 1959: 92–113; idem 1979: 506–553; Lipchits 1974: 19–30; Oudaltsova 1974: 31–50; Sjuzumov 1969: 32–44. More on this see Laiou 1995: 43–64; Patlagean 1975: 1371–1396; Ševčenko 1952: 448–459; Sorlin 1967: 489–491, 494–518; eadem 1970: 491–493; eadem 1979: 529–534.

[77] Svoronos 1953.

[78] Other Marxist historians, such as Kordatos, have challenged the concept of national continuity.

nothing more, the historical truth".[79] The tension was evident in Theodosis Pieridis' 1951 report addressing the Communist Party of Greece, discussing the left-wing students of Paris; he testifies that "influenced by his bourgeois theories regarding the so-called objectivity of historical science, Svoronos performs more like an amateur than a professional historian".[80] In this context, the Greek Communist Party launched a campaign against the publication of his book *Histoire de la Grèce Moderne* in Greece. The reaction of the Greek state was also negative, since in the chapter on the period of the civil war, Svoronos includes the presence of EAM in the broader historical course of Hellenism, considering that it contributed positively to social justice. He reiterated this position in his article "Σκέψεις για μια εισαγωγή στη Νεοελληνική Ιστορία" (= Thoughts on an introduction to Modern Greek History) published in the Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης in March 1955.[81] This position provoked strong reactions and led to the deprivation of his Greek citizenship by the royal decree of June 29th, 1955.[82] According to Nicolas Manitakis "after the publication of his book in France, Svoronos also became a target for the Greek right-wing press. An anonymous article entitled "The work of a traitor", published in the Athens daily *Καθημερινή* on July 7, 1953, described his *Histoire* as a libel on Greece and its political regime, questioned whether the authorities were aware of the book's anti-national content, and suggested that, as an enemy and traitor of his State, Svoronos should be stripped of his citizenship – a fate reserved after 1948 for dozens and after 1952 for hundreds of communists".[83]

In these circumstances, Svoronos expressed his concerns about the course of research due to the limited number of studies on social and economic Byzantine history. This concern appears to be confirmed by Vitalien Laurent's article published in the *Revue des Études Byzantines*, which discusses the evolution of Byzantine studies in Greece throughout the 1940s, underlying the use of philological methods as the basic

[79] "… Εβύθισα την σκέψη μου μέσα στην πάσαν ώρα" 1995: 115.
[80] Iliou, Matthaiou, Polemi 2004: 110; Kiousopoulou 2011: 839.
[81] Svoronos 1955: 211.
[82] For this see Kostopoulos 2003: 57; Iliou 2004: 142.
[83] Manitakis 2004: 111–112.

methodology for Byzantine historical studies.[84] Laurent proposed two factors that delimited the period under discussion: the Nazi occupation and the civil war that followed. He pointed out that after the outbreak of the civil war Byzantine studies in general in Greece developed in close relation to the communist threat.[85] Thus, he believes that the shift in research towards the Middle Ages may be related to the insecurity prevailing in Greece in the 1940s. Yet, at the same time, he considers that the Western aid during the Middle Ages was more selfless than that of the 20th century.

The anti-communist climate after the civil war

The thorough examination of the Byzantine historical production in Greece reflects the main research orientations in the 1940s, highlighting the continued use of methodological tools from the previous period.[86] The dominant historiographical trends must be understood in the context of the political developments of the mid-20th century and the prevailing anti- communist climate after the civil war.[87] According to Dimitris Sotiropoulos "this era …. is synonymous with the triptych homeland-religion-family, and others parameters such as chauvinism, social conformism and one-dimensional anti-communist rhetoric";[88] in this sense we can point to the tension in the correspondence between Svoronos and his professor Amantos due to Svoronos' adoption of

[84] Laurent 1949: 91–128.

[85] Laurent 1949: 91.

[86] Laurent 1949: 92, 97.

[87] The intense ideological rivalry is also evident in the views expressed by Ostrogorsky on the eve of the Second World War. He notably points out that, "at present, very little remains. The Soviet government has radically dismantled Byzantine studies. Russian Byzantine studies now persist only to the extent that Russian experts in this field continue to work abroad". For this see Ostrogorsky 1940: 235.

[88] Sotiropoulos 2011: 949–950.

Marxism.[89] The ideological confrontation and conservative tendencies within the academic community became evident in the early 1940s during the well-known "trial of accents" against Ioannis Th. Kakridis. In his book *Ελληνική κλασσική παιδεία* (= *Hellenic Classical Culture*) he proposed the adoption of the monotonic system in the Greek language. According to Aggela Kastrinaki, "his colleagues accused him of being an anti-national element. They argued that he not only introduces subversive concepts into the language but also aims to degrade classical education and disconnect it from the high example set by the ancient ancestors".[90] The minutes of the meetings that dealt with this case are recorded in the volume of *Nea Estia* under the title *Η δίκη των τόνων* (= *Trial of accents*), published in 1943. Among other things, Kakridis was accused of imposing "the system of the Greek hair-communists ("μαλλιαροκομμουνιστές") of Soviet Russia".[91] Zakythinos, although he opposed Kakridis' approach, argued that he could not treat the simplification of the Greek language as an anti-national action.[92] On the other hand, extreme views were expressed, such as that of Koukoules, who, as the dean of the department of philosophy, sought to undermine Kakridis' approach, claiming that classical education flourished under the Nazi regime.[93] Furthermore, in the subsequent period, the majority of Western historians of Byzantium functioned as a defence mechanism against the approach of historical materialism, and the question of "Byzantine feudalism" became the focal point of Cold War controversies.[94] In

[89] In a reply letter dated August 6th, 1948, Svoronos points out that "as a true "internationalist", as you mentioned to me, I learned long ago that the condition of internationalism is the love of the homeland and this principle – you know that well – has long governed my actions… on the front and not from behind, from the first moment to the end, and later on, in the resistance. In this sense the focus of my studies is Modern Hellenism and its history, along with everything that revolves around it". For more details see Karamanolakis 2011: 886.

[90] Kastrinaki 2015: 29.

[91] *Η δίκη των τόνων*, 1943: 12; Also see Kastrinaki 2015: 28–29.

[92] *Η δίκη των τόνων*, 1943: 84.

[93] *Η δίκη των τόνων*, 1943: 41.

[94] From the 1950s to the early 1990s, French historians of Byzantium, led by Paul Lemerle, formed the ideological bulwark in the camp of Marxist historians of Byzantium. An example of this is the confrontation between Lemerle and Ostrogorsky regar-

1948, in his article "Processus de Féodalisation", Zakythinos categorically denied the existence of feudalism in Byzantium. Nevertheless, he concludes that in the late Byzantine period it is possible to detect "pseudo-feudal" or "para-feudal" structures.[95]

During the same period, another element that played a key role in shaping the dominant approaches is the study of the effect of elements from the earlier Byzantine period on the construction and shaping of the Ottoman state's physiognomy.[96] This fact contributed to the broadening of methodological tools used by historians of Byzantium, since they realized that combining sources both from Byzantine and Ottoman periods facilitates a more integrated approach in the sense that the sources under discussion are compared in a long term perspective. Since Byzantine-era sources are insufficient, the best way to avoid vague generalizations is to commit to long-term study and use the available

---

ding the existence of feudalism in Byzantium. Lemerle, to such an extent, completely ignored Soviet historiography in 1958 in his study *Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance: les sources et les problems*, reflecting the intense Cold War climate of the time. However, it's worth noting that the 1979 English reprint entitled *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century: The Sources and Problems* gave due credit to the Russian and Soviet tradition of economic history, although emphasizing their dogmatic approach. For this see Lemerle 1979; idem 1958; idem 1945; also see Kazhdan 1959: 92–113; Laiou 1995: 55; Ljubarskij 1993: 134; Ostrogorsky 1940: 227–235; Patlagean 1975: 1375; Ševčenko 1952: 448–459; Sorlin 1967: 489–568; eadem 1970: 487–520; eadem 1979: 525–580.

[95] Zakythinos 1948: 499–514.

[96] At the onset of the 20th century, a discussion emerged regarding the factors that shaped the physiognomy of the Ottoman Empire. Three main theories were proposed, by Herbert Adam Gibbons (1880–1934), Mehmet Fuat Köprülü (1890–1966), and Paul Wittek (1894–1978). The first theory posits that the Ottomans were the result of a blend of Islamized Greeks and Slavs with Turkish groups, emphasizing the significant influence of both Christianity and Islam in shaping the early Ottoman state. Köprülü argued that the Ottoman state originated from diverse Turkic tribes, influenced by the Seljuks and Ilkhanids. In contrast to Gibbons' perspective, he rejected the idea that the Ottomans had their roots in a mixture of Byzantines, Slavs, and Turks. Wittek' s gazi theory envisaged holy war and its requirements as the principal raison d' être behind the early Ottoman formation. These were groups of Muslim warriors who shared a common goal: waging war against Christians. See Gibbons 1916; Köprülü 1922; Wittek 1938. Also see Arnakis-Georgiadis 1947; Bryer 1986; Inalcik 1973; idem 1958: 237–242; Kafadar 1995; Lowry 2003; Vryonis 1971; idem 1969/1970: 251–308.

mid-15th century data to draw conclusions about the past. In this sense, Georgios Arnakis Georgiadis (1912–1976) is one of the pioneers who, due to the physiognomy and fragmentation of the available Byzantine sources, pointed out the need to study the early Ottoman sources, which, due to their temporal proximity to the Ottoman conquest, can also be used to illuminate earlier historical conditions.[97] In his study *Οι πρώτοι Οθωμανοί. Συμβολή εις το πρόβλημα της πτώσεως του Ελληνισμού της Μικράς Ασίας (1282–1337)* [= *The first Ottomans. Contribution to the problem of the fall of Hellenism in Asia Minor (1282–1337)*], published in 1947, he aims to emphasize the role of non-Muslim elements in the formation of the Ottoman state.[98]

Arnakis Georgiadis' approach inaugurated a period of systematic use of early Ottoman sources in Greece accompanied by a significant expansion of the available methodological tools, given, based, however, on the limitations set by the basic principles of the official academ-

[97] Between 1924 and 1929, he studied at the Robertio Academy of Istanbul, and then from 1929 to 1933 at the homonymous college (Robert College). Subsequently, from 1933 to 1939, he pursued studies at the Department of Philosophy of the University of Athens, and from 1941 to 1943 at the Department of Theology of the University of Athens. His background and familiarity with the Turkish language facilitated the use of Ottoman sources and played a crucial role in his engagement with the early Ottoman period. For this see Chasiotis 1977/1978: 521–525; Tomadakis 1975/1976: 450–453. He himself acknowledges the contribution of his professor Amantos to his approach and he points out that "I am deeply indebted to my former teacher at the University of Athens, Professor Constantine Amantos, for his wise guidance and friendly encouragement". For this see Arnakis-Georgiadis 1952: 235.

[98] Arnakis-Georgiadis 1947: 103. Over the last thirty years, the growing corpus of late Byzantine and early Ottoman sources has yielded numerous studies focusing on the transitional period of Ottoman expansion in the Balkans. While not providing a detailed historiographical overview, one cannot overlook the importance of conferences such as those at Dumbarton Oaks in 1982 and, three years later, in Birmingham at the Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. Anthony Bryer and Michael Ursinus, among others, emphasized that "Byzantinists and Ottomanists found they were talking the same language", as they shared common social, economic, intellectual, and material concerns (Bryer, Ursinus 1991: 3–4). From the 1980s to the present day, a large number of researchers have dealt with this period of transition, aiming to contribute to the study of Balkan socio-economic and demographic history. For this see Bryer 1986; Haldon 1991: 18–108; Inalcik 1973; Kiel 2009: 138–191; Necipoğlu 2009; Talbot 2006: 41.

ic historiography and the Cold War conditions of the time. Apostolos Vakalopoulos (1909–2000) underscores the importance of expanding the available sources and systematically utilizing early Ottoman sources.[99] He explicitly emphasizes "the urgent necessity of making efforts, namely employing a wide range of sources and methodological tools, to collect and scrutinize historical evidence and to reevaluate old theories".[100] Although he did not adopt Marxism as a tool for analysing social developments, he recognizes that the Byzantine society was moving towards feudalism in the late byzantine period, arguing that the mode of production in the Byzantine economy is analogous but not the same to the feudal mode of production.[101] In the first volume of the Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού, Vakalopoulos aligns with the scheme proposed by Paparregopoulos, positioning the genesis of Greek national consciousness in 1204. In the introduction of the second edition in 1974, he defines "Hellenism" "as encompassing the Greek nation in its entirety, including its political, economic, and cultural dimensions";[102] seven more volumes followed, covering the period up to 1831, a fact which contributed to the systematization of the study of the Ottoman period. He included in his study the demographic developments and focused on the investigation of the urban network during the Ottoman period.[103] The case of Vakalopoulos is indicative of the new methodological approaches adopted during

[99] He graduated from the newly established Philological Faculty of the Aristotle University of Thessalonike and initially worked as a high school teacher in the 1930s. In 1939, Vakalopoulos completed his doctorate at the University of Thessalonike and began tenure as a lecturer at the university's Philological Faculty in 1943, eventually becoming a professor in 1951. Vakalopoulos continued in the same position until his retirement in 1974. He was a founding member of the "Society for Macedonian Studies" in 1939 and a fixed presence on its board of governors. He also served as the chairman of the "Institute for Balkan Studies". Among numerous publications, his most well-known work is the eight-volume *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού, 1204–1831* (= *History of Modern Hellenism, 1204–1831*) series. For this see Karamanolakis 2008: 86; Madgearu 2008: 160; Savvides 2001: 175–179.

[100] Vakalopoulos 1974: 4.

[101] Vakalopoulos 1974: 102–106. It is of great importance that these views were formulated during the period of dictatorship in Greece, given the fact that in previous years similar approaches would have been excluded due to censorship.

[102] Vakalopoulos 1974.

[103] Vakalopoulos 1963: 265–276.

this period. He shifted his research interest to the Palaeologan period, incorporating Byzantium into the broader context of the Western Middle Ages. Simultaneously, he emphasized the role of Ottoman penetration, thereby underscoring the significance of early Ottoman sources.

The enrichment of methodological tools by the historians of Byzantium was also accentuated through another avenue—specifically, the study of the modern Greek Enlightenment as defined by Konstantinos Dimaras and his colleagues in the 1960s. During the period un- der consideration, his "school" thrived, manifested in the establishment of the Hellenic Enlightenment Study Group (OMED), the publication of the journal *Ερανιστής,* and the founding of the National Research Foundation, notably the Center for Modern Greek Research.[104] The study of this period was carried out through the examination of the available sources of the medieval and modern period. Starting from the late 1950s, Dimaras played a crucial role in the formation of the "Royal Research Foundation" (now known as the "National Research Foundation"). In 1960, he founded the "Center for Modern Greek Research" within this foundation. Christos Hadjiosif notes that the Rockefeller Foundation funded the Royal Foundation as part of a broader European policy aimed at promoting and supporting a "non-communist left", similar to its support for the sixth section of the École Pratique in Paris.[105] However, the Enlightenment school included researchers who initially diverged from Dimaras' approach. For instance, Leandros Vranousis (1921–1993), as noted by Spyros Asdrachas, "advocates for the concept of "après Byzance", illustrating the social conditions of cultural osmosis that this concept implies".[106] Vranousis' particular interest in

[104] For more details see Sklavenitis 2016: 188–204; Liakos 1994: 125–214. According to Antonis Liakos, "the Enlightenment, conceived as an interpretive tool first formulated in 1945, opposed both ideological trends of the Civil War. It rejected the ethnocentric and romantic conception of "Palingenesis" supported by the Right- wing on one hand and the scheme of the incomplete revolution and the subsequent defeat of "bourgeois" forces supported by the Left-wing on the other" (Liakos 2001: 75).

[105] Chatzijosif 1989: 28.

[106] Asdrachas 1997: 12. He attended the Zosimaia School and later pursued studies at the Philosophy School of the University of Athens. However, during the German occupation, he temporarily suspended his university studies and returned to Epirus. In 1942, he became a member of E.A.M. in Ioannina. See Sfyroeras 1996: 15–28.

the Byzantine period is primarily centred on the study of manuscripts and codices from the medieval and late medieval periods, a focus evident in his dissertation under the title *Χρονικά της Μεσαιωνικής και Τουρκοκρατούμενης Ηπείρου* (= *Chronicles of the Medieval and Turkish-Occupied Epirus*), published in 1962;[107] the dominant element of his approach is the reinterpretation of Modern Greek society through the byzantine past under the influence of Marxism. In this regard, his approach involved incorporating sources from both the Byzantine and Ottoman periods, aiming to provide additional insights into the transition from late Byzantine to early Ottoman society. He demonstrates that various changes in the political, demographic, cultural, and economic spheres significantly impacted social, political, economic, and cultural life and relations. However, these changes did not equally profoundly affect the social stratification system; specifically, Vranousis focused on the *Chronicles of Epirus (Χρονικά Ηπείρου)*, which offers detailed information about Ioannina coming under Ottoman rule. Drawing from various manuscripts, the chronicle encompasses the history of Epirus from the creation of the world to the end of the eighteenth century.[108]

During the same period, we should not overlook the intense ideological controversy arising from the Cold War confrontation. The approach of the official academic community, as reflected in the publications of the journal *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών* until the end of the 1960s, provides insight into the prevailing trends in Byzantine historiography. These trends are characterized by a predominant focus on the study of primary sources. Simultaneously, there is a noticeable scarcity of studies addressing socio-economic issues.[109] The "proper" scientific approach, as pointed out by Nikos Tomadakis in 1953 upon the death of Koukoules, is closely linked to the "proper" political stance and the "acceptable" social perceptions. Tomadakis characteristically claims that "Koukoules, being a devout and faithful Christian, aligns his views with

[107] Vranousis 1962.

[108] For this see Vranousis 1962; idem 1963: 570–571; idem 1969: 771, 775–776; idem 1964: 312–313; idem 1966: 342–348; idem 1957: 72–129; idem 1962b: 52–115; idem 1967: 1–80.

[109] Anagnostakis 2003: 11.

his faith in Byzantium".[110] The intense ideological controversy manifested in the revocation of Svoronos' Greek citizenship two years later. According to Giannis Giannopoulos, this action resulted from the initiative of Tomadakis and Apostolos Daskalakis, holding chairs in Byzantine literature and Medieval and Modern history, respectively, in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Athens.[111] Evi Gotzaridis points out that "the irony is that Svoronos managed to infuriate also KKE (Communist Party of Greece) because "he put in the same basket England and Russia in 1821". Unruffled he replied: "if some (Greek) communists consider they are the descendants of Romanov, I for one am not" …. when KKE split in August 1968 over the Soviet suppression of the Prague Spring, Svoronos joined the 'eurocommunist' offshoot, the Communist Party of the Interior; that is those who condemned the decision, wanted to free themselves from the stifling control of the Soviet Party, and embraced the idea of socialism with a human face".[112] Within this climate, the predominant historiographical production still adheres to the use of philological methods without significant deviations. The majority of Greek historians of Byzantium did not transcend the boundaries of traditional historiography and did not embrace the new models of historical analysis. This is closely associated with the social conditions of the period. Throughout the postwar era, Greek society was dominated by a numerically bloated middle class, which was affluent and held influence over the lower middle strata.[113]

[110] Tomadakis 1953: xi.

[111] Giannoulopoulos 2014: 161.

[112] Gotzaridis, "What is behind the concept", 92.

[113] According to Nikos Poulantzas, the "middle class" reproduces the ideological subset of the "traditional petty bourgeoisie". This involves the social swing, the ideological refusal to identify with the working class and its ideology, as well as the illusion of the possibility for social ascent (Poulantzas 1975: 100). Also see *Rizospastis*, 28-3-1945; Boeschoten 2002: 122–141; Burks 1984: 45–58; Gerolymatos 1984: 69–78; Kalyvas2000: 142–183; Lewkowicz 2000: 247–272; Mazower 1995: 499–506; Sotiropoulos 2011: 950–951.

The transition to the 1970s and 1980s

Until the mid-1970s, the dominant model of historical analysis was anti-Marxist.[114] The preoccupation with Byzantium was ideologically charged and inextricably linked to current political trends and the prevailing ideological directions of Greek society. This fact played a catalytic role in shaping the negative attitude of Greek historians of Byzantium toward international historiographical trends.[115] The paradox lies in the fact that since the late 1960s, the dictatorship contributed to the development of historical studies, compelling numerous historians to leave Greece.[116] One such example is that of Nikolaos Oikonomides (1934–2000).[117] In fact, he participated in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*

[114] Indicative of the Cold War controversies of the time is Kazhdan's dispute with Lemerle and Michel Kaplan, during which he accused them of portraying the agricultural history of Byzantium as primarily attributed to French historians, thereby silencing the contribution of Soviet researchers. For this see Kazhdan 1979: 506–553; idem 1979b: 491–503; idem 1994: 66–88; Talbot 2006: 32.

[115] For this see journal *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών,* v. 37 (1969–1970), 528–555, v. 38 (1971), 476–499, v. 41 (1974), 528–556, v. 42 (1975–1976), 487–506, v. 43 (1977–1978), 467–498, v. 44 (1979–1980), 463–502.

[116] With the persecutions of unfriendly professors, the military regime aimed to present the body of university teachers as an independent source of its political legitimacy, showing professors as supporters due to their prestige. Under the 5th, 9th, and 10th Constitutional Acts of 1967, the dictatorship initiated a round of purges in higher education, resulting in the dismissal of professors. The dictatorial government proceeded with the layoffs, completely disregarding their scientific competence. For this see Mpouzakis 2006: 36, 38; Papadakis 2004: 349; Papapanos 1970: 377–378; Vrychea, Gavroglou 1982: 252; Zafeiris 2011: 137.

[117] He studied at the Department of History and Archaeology of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Athens. In 1958, he spent three years in Paris, where he pursued post-graduate studies, focusing on seminars about Byzantine history, paleography, and papyrology. Specializing in sigillography during this period, he completed his Ph.D. on the "Escorial Tacticon" in Paris. Upon his return to Athens in 1961, Oikonomides was hired by Zakythinos, one of his professors at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Athens, to work at the newly established Byzantine Research Center of the Royal Research Foundation. He primarily focused on the archives of the monasteries of Mount Athos. During the dictatorship, Oikonomides participated in the "Democratic Defense", which had been formed a few months after the imposition of the dictatorial regime by personalities from the broader academic field and intellectual circles. After the disbandment of this organization in 1969, he fled abroad, first to Paris and then to Canada. In 1989, Oikonomides was elected professor of Byzantine History at the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Athens.

(= *History of the Greek Nation*), which began to be published during the dictatorship.[118] With his approach, he examines tax, economic, and social structures to understand the mechanisms and models of power, setting new interpretive schemes for the development of the Byzantine administrative system. Among other issues, Oikonomides attempted to solve the problem of determining "to what degree the middle Byzantine economy was monetized?" by analyzing and commenting on examples of monetary exchange, such as payments, wages, gifts or acts of charity, loans, etc.[119] In this context, Svoronos also participated by conducting four separate studies about the Byzantine economy, society, and partly demography. Focusing on the 4th century, his research emphasized changes in production and other factors, including indicators of monetary flow, urban demographic developments, and their implications on the composition of society. Due to the nature of Byzantine sources, he did not seek to establish numerical indexes but aimed to demonstrate general patterns regarding household and family composition. His approach promotes the examination of population distribution, specifically the spatial patterns of people's physical presence and habitation within various places of a wider region. In other words, he attempted to analyze the characteristics of the Byzantine social system in relation to "feudalism".[120] It is noteworthy that Tilemachos Louggis also participated in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. He explored the reasons why early Byzantine society had an

Among the administrative positions that he assumed were those of the director of the Byzantine Studies Center at the National Hellenic Research Foundation and the president of the Executive Committee of the Foundation for Hellenic Culture. He also served as a member of the board of directors of the Christian Archaeological Society and the National Bank Educational Foundation. For this see Lefort 2001: 251–254; McCormick 2004: ix–xiii; Nesbitt, McGeer 2000: ix–xii; Saradi 2001: 908–911; Vokotopoulos 2003: 7–10.

[118] Its main purpose was to demonstrate the continuity of the Greek nation since prehistoric times. However, the publishing committee, largely controlled by the official academic community, allowed researchers with different theoretical orientations to participate, as reflected in the volumes covering Byzantium and beyond. For this see Chatzijosif 1989: 30; Liakos 1994: 198–199; Aroni-Tsichli 2008: 378.

[119] Oikonomides 1979: 98–151; idem 1979b: 8–12; idem 1979c: 36–41; idem 1979d: 154–179. According to Panagiotis Vokotopoulos, his methodology is clearly influenced by his apprenticeship in Paris alongside Paul Lemerle, Alphonse Dain, Roger Rémondon and Vitalien Laurent (Vokotopoulos 2003: 7).

[120] Svoronos 1978; idem 1979; idem 1979b; idem 1979c.

agricultural orientation, resulting, as a consequence, from an ancient urban to a closed rural economy.[121] Following the principles of Marxist dialectics, he demonstrates that the delayed culmination of Byzantine feudalism prevented the timely formation of the feudal ruling class. Consequently, any corrective efforts proved ineffective in the medium term, leading to the succumbing of the society to regressive ideologies.[122] During this period, new Marxist approaches began to emerge. In 1974, Nikos G. Ziagkos' *Φεουδαρχική Ήπειρος και Δεσποτάτο της Ελλάδος* (= *Feudal Epirus and the Despotate of Greece*) was published, and Kordatos' book *Ακμή και Παρακμή του Βυζαντίου* (= *Prime and Decline of Byzantium*) was republished. The issue of feudalism also preoccupied Eleni Antoniadis Bibikou (1923–2017),[123] who included Byzantium in the wider scheme of medieval feudalism.[124] She emphasizes that Byzantine society was strictly class-hierarchical. In her research on deserted

[121] Born in 1945, he graduated from the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Athens in 1967 and earned a doctorate in Medieval History from the University of Sorbonne (Paris I) in 1972. Since 1975, he has been employed at the National Research Foundation. He adopts the Marxist historical analysis, emphasizing that "the attempt to justify successive events culminates in the dialectic of Hegel's History. Marx was the only one who could undertake the task of extracting from Hegelian logic the core containing Hegel's real discoveries, along with the dialectical method, stripped of its idealistic covering. The Marxist dialectic established a thoroughly solid and comprehensible way of interpreting the evolution of human society". For this see Louggis 2007.

[122] Louggis 1978.

[123] During the Dictatorship of Metaxas in 1940, she became a member of the KKE youth group, OKNE. Throughout the German Occupation, she was part of "EAM Neon" and EPON. She pursued her studies at the University of Athens under Zakythinos. In May 1947, she went to France for further studies at the École pratique des hautes études. While in Paris, she continued her political activities. She studied with Lemerle and Fernand Braudel. Later, she worked as a researcher at the National Center for Scientific Research of France (CENRS). During the Regime of the Colonels, she organized resistance activities in France. Additionally, she served as the general secretary of the Hellenic-French Movement for a Free Greece. For this see Burgel 2021; Grivaud, Petmezas 2007;

[124] Antoniadou – Bibicou 1981: 31–41. In 1974, she edited the collective volume *Le féodalisme en Byzance: Problème du mode de production de l'empire byzantine*", part of the series "Recherches internationales sous la lumière du Marxisme". Soviet historians, including Elena E. Lipsić, Mikhail I. Sjuzjumov, and Zinaida V. Udalcova, participated, thereby making their views widely known to the West. For this also see Kazhdan 1979: 506–553; idem 1996: 133–163; idem 1982: 1–19; Laiou 1995: 47–49.

villages in the geographical area of today's Greece, spanning from the 11th to the middle of the 19th century, she delves into geographical, legal, economic, and social aspects.[125] She also suggests the implementation of the Asiatic mode of production for Byzantium, pointing out that "the ongoing discussion among Marxists on the Asiatic mode of production, which should not be confused with a "theoretical quibble", indicates recent efforts to rise above sterile dogmatism".[126]

However, the new methodological approaches were not universally accepted by the academic community. This became even more apparent in 1977 with the publication of Aggeliki Laiou's book "Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire: A Social and Demographic Study". The book examines the structure and evolution of the rural society during the late Byzantine period. In Greece, the book provoked strong reactions, most notably from the professor of Byzantine history at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Ioannina Georgios Theocharidis. He argued that "the author, Aggeliki Laiou, attempted to make an omelet without eggs in order to reinforce her preconceived notions about the existence of feudalism in Macedonia and the Byzantine state in general".[127] This reaction stems from Laiou's adoption of the concept of "Byzantine feudalism" during the Cold War period. It highlights that ideological boundaries remained dominant in Greece even in the late 1970s. Furthermore, in his study of the Macedonian area published three years later, Theocharidis himself emphasizes the analysis of political history, addressing only superficial aspects of social and economic history.[128] On the other hand, it appears that other members of the official academic community are influenced by international historiographical developments, as exemplified by the case of Ioannis Karayiannopoulos (1922–2000).[129] As early as the 1950s, under the guidance of Fr. Dölg-

[125] Antoniadou – Bibicou 1979: 191–259.
[126] Antoniadou – Bibicou 1977: 347.
[127] Theocharidis 1979: 433.
[128] Theocharidis 1980.
[129] He undertook post-graduate studies in Munich on a scholarship from the State Scholarships Foundation in 1952. In 1955, he earned his doctorate from the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Munich with his thesis *Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates*. In 1963, he became professor at the Byzantine History chair in

er, he had been engaged with issues related to the social and economic history of Byzantium.[130] Even during the dictatorship, he contributed to the development of economic history. Among other topics, he explored the issue of feudalism in Byzantium.[131] Although he does not accept the prevalence of the feudal mode of production in Byzantium, he is familiar with the historiographical work of his Soviet colleagues, such as A. Kazhdan, E.E. Lipšić, M.I. Sjuzjumov and Z.V. Udalcova. Later on, he acknowledged the contribution of Russian and Soviet historians to the understanding of Byzantium on this specific issue. He pointed out that Soviet historians of Byzantium related Byzantium to the social and economic structures of Western Europe, placing it in the wider context of the Western Middle Ages.[132] In the context of the renewal of research and the application of new methodological tools, Karayiannopulos, upon the publication of the book by R. Hodges and D. Whitehouse, "Mahommed, Charlemagne and the Origins of Europe", acknowledges the enrichment of archival material in Byzantine historical studies. This enrichment stems from the inclusion of archival documents from the Arab world and the incorporation of the latest archaeological findings. Karayiannopulos considers these additions beneficial, as they have the potential to illuminate economic and social structures that had hitherto been ignored by research. According to Karayiannopulos, this development lays the foundation for a new approach closely tied to the fields of anthropology, geography, and archaeology.[133] In this context, he exam-

the Faculty of Philosophy at the Aristotle University of Thessalonike. From 1962 to 1968, he served as the editor of the *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* magazine, originally founded by Bees. In 1966, alongside Emmanuel Kriaras and Stylianos Pelekanidis, he established the "Center for Byzantine Research" at the Aristotle University. During 1967–1968, he was the dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the Aristotle University. In 1977, he played a key role in the establishment of the "Hellenic Historical Society" based in Thessalonike, collaborating with other historians, archaeologists, and philologists, and took charge of the society's publication, *Vyzantiaka*. For this see Grigoriou – Ioannidou 2000: 11–18; Stavridou Zafraka 2000: 7–15.

[130] Karayannopulos 1958.

[131] Karayannopulos 1968:152–160.

[132] Karayannopulos 1996: 71–89; idem 1994: 471–476.

[133] Karayannopulos 1997: 207–228.

ined the economic theory of André Piganiol in relation to the theories of Ernst Stein and Ostrogorsky on the Byzantine tax system of *iugatio-capitatio*.[134] Karayiannopulos suggests that Stein and Ostrogorsky were influenced by developments in the field of economic anthropology and sociology, particularly by Piganiol. He actively engages in the debate on the evolution of byzantine tax system and institutions, including Byzantium within the framework of the Western Middle Ages.

In the 1980s, new topics were introduced, such as the study of ideologies and the institution of family. In this sense, Greek historians have opened up many neglected topics to intensive scholarly exploration. For example, on the subject of feminism, they applied an interdisciplinary approach to issues of equality and equity based on gender, gender expression, gender identity, sex, and sexuality as understood through social theories.[135] It is no coincidence that during this period Byzantine historical research in Western Europe and USA turned its attention to the role and status of women in Byzantine society and culture. According to Alice-Mary Talbot "the production of articles and books on these topics became so substantial that it led to the creation of an online bibliography, now housed on the Dumbarton Oaks Web site, called the Bibliography on Women in Byzantium".[136] In addition, the establishment of universities in peripheral regions offered an alternative to proponents of the new trends.[137] In this context, studies during the following period incorporat-

[134] Karayannopulos 1960: 19–46. Inspired by the work and methodology of Fustel de Coulanges, André Piganiol was strongly influenced by sociology and actively contributed to journals such as *L'Année sociologique* and *Les Annales*. In his doctoral thesis *Essai sur les origines de Rome* he employed the comparative method, integrating anthropology, ethnography, archaeology, mythology, topography, and legal history. Piganiol conducted a comparative analysis of Greek, Hebrew, Thracian, Phrygian, and Roman civilizations, aiming to address the formation of cities through the amalgamation of diverse elements. For this see Chevalier 1970: 284–286; Duval 1969: 169; Setton 1948: 329–333.

[135] Karambelias 1988; Kavounidou 1984: 95–102; Kiousopoulou 1989: 265–276; idem 1990; Nikolaou 1993; Papadatos 1984; Pitsakis 1983: 11–21; Troianos 1993: 11–21; idem 1984: 45–48.

[136] Talbot 2006: 33.

[137] The description provided by Vasilis Kremmydas about Svoronos' involvement in the development of the University of Crete is indicative: "We formulated plans for the Institute for Mediterranean Studies and the postgraduate study programs of the

ed new conceptual, analytical, and interpretive tools. This facilitated an enhanced approach to the social sciences by Greek historians in general, with a particular focus on social anthropology and sociology.[138] The shift of interest towards the new historiographical trends is evident in the Greek publication of Laiou-Thomadaki's book in 1987 by the National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation. According to Tonia Kiousopoulou "given that Greek literature lacks recent monographs on the social and economic history of Byzantium, the publication of this study in Greek represents a significant contribution to the advancement of Byzantine and historical studies in general in Greece".[139]

Conclusions

The dominant historiographical trends that delimited the period under discussion are the products of the political developments of the 20th century and the anti-communist climate that prevailed after the civil war. In this sense, the majority of the official academic community tried to respond to the dominant ideological needs and adopted the scheme of national continuity. On the other hand, those who followed the Marxist perspective engaged with social and economic issues. The intense ideological controversy is reflected in the deprivation of Svoronos' Greek citizenship in 1955. The paradox is that since the late 1960s the dictatorship contributed to the development of historical studies, forcing many historians to leave Greece. The Byzantine research of the following period incorporated new conceptual, analytical, and interpretive

History Department at the University of Crete. During our discussions, we delved into theoretical problems but never arrived at any plausible conclusions… both of us served on the university's governing committee, where we had a substantial amount of work to tackle" (Kremmydas 2011: 973).

[138] The orientations of the journals *Mnemon*, *Synchrona Themata* and *Ta Istorika* indicate a historiographical trend towards the economic and social field, aligning with the broader methodological and ideological spectrum of "new history". This trend encompasses quantitative sociological and economic approaches, as well as the structuralism of the Annales school and Marxist class analysis. For this see Anagnostakis 2003: 9; Aroni-Tsichli 2008: 382–383; Haldon 1984: 109–119; Jeffreys, Haldon, Cormack 2008: 9–10; Loukos 1992: 302.

[139] Kiousopoulou 1989b: 299.

tools, a fact facilitated by the approach to the social sciences. The ideological transformations that marked the period after the beginning of the 1990s have significantly impacted historiographical approaches up to that time. They reinforced a tendency toward a structural and cultural approach to the past, simultaneously highlighting the political aspect. New topics, such as the issues of culture and identities, entered historiographical production under the influence of international historiographical developments.[140] The subjects of historical inquiry were no longer determined solely by their position in the social hierarchy and market mechanisms, but also by other parameters emerging from the areas of feminist theory and cultural criticism from the 1980s onwards. The new approaches underline the role of cultural elements in their social contexts and how they change over time. Thus, in historical terms, the plethora of studies on issues such as gender, age, time, and the institution of family demonstrates the transition from the study of social relations to the examination of collective identities and representations.[141] The new trends under the term "postmodernism" re-established the position of Byzantium between antiquity and modern times.

[140] For this see Haldon 1984: 129–132; Jeffreys, Haldon, Cormack 2008: 14–16; Kaz hdan 1994b: 123; Talbot 2006: 33.

[141] Antonopoulos 1986: 271–286; Karambelias 1988; Kavounidou 1984: 95–102; Kiousopoulou 1989: 265–276; eadem 1990; Nikolaou 1993; Papadatos 1984; Papadopoulou 2008: 131–198; Pitsakis 1983: 11–21; Tourtoglou 1985: 362–382; Troianos 1983: 11–21; idem 1984: 45–48.

Bibliography

Agapitos, P. 2015. "Karl Krumbacher and the history of Byzantine literature" *BZ* 108/1, 1–52.

Aggelidi, Chr. 1993. "Μνήμη Διονυσίου Α. Ζακυθηνού (1905–1993)" *Μνήμων* 15, 338–340.

Anagnostakis, I. 2003. "«Συναίνεση» με τη βυζαντινή ιστοριογραφία: η ειρωνεία" *Αρχαιολογία* 88, 8–13.

Andréadès, A. 1908. *Περί των Οικονομικών του Βυζαντίου*. Athens.

—, 1918. *Περί του πληθυσμού και του πλούτου της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*. Athens.

—, 1924. "De la monnaie et de la puissance d'achat des métaux précieux dans l'empire byzantin", *Byzantion* 1, 75–115.

—, 1928. "Deux livres récents sur les finances Byzantines: Franz Dölger, Beitrage zur Geschichte der byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung des X. und XI. Jahrhundert; Georg Ostrogorsky, Die ländliche Steuergemeinde des Byzantinischen Reichs im X. Jahrhundert. Ihre Struktur und Verwaltung" *BZ* 28, 287–323.

—, 1928b. *Η στρατολογία των υπαλλήλων και τα πανεπιστήμια εις την βυζαντινήν αυτοκρατορίαν*. Athens.

Andrikopoulou, N. 2007. *Το ταξίδι του Ματαρόα 1945. Στον καθρέφτη της μνήμης*. Athens.

Antoniadou-Bibicou, E. 1977. "Byzantium and the Asiatic mode of production" *Economy and Society* 6/4, 347–376.

—, 1979. "Ερημωμένα χωριά στην Ελλάδα. Ένας προσωρινός απολογισμός", in Sp. Asdrachas (ed.), *Η οικονομική δομή των βαλκανικών χωρών στα χρόνια της οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας (15ος-19ος αι.)*. Athens, 191–259.

—, 1981. "Προβλήματα της Φεουδαρχίας στο Βυζάντιο" *Επιστημονική Σκέψη* 1, 31–41.

Antoniou, G. & N. Marantzidis 2004. "The Axis Occupation and Civil War. Changing Trends in Greek Historiography, 1941-2002" *Journal of Peace Research* 41/2, 223– 231.

Antonopoulos, I. 1986. "Προλεγόμενα για μια τυπολογία της παιδικής ηλικίας και της νεότητας στη βυζαντινή εικονογραφία", in Sp. Asdrachas et al. (eds), *Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συμποσίου «Ιστορικότητα της παιδικής ηλικίας και της νεότητας»*. Vol. I. Athens, 271–286.

Argyropoulou, R.D. 2001. *Les intellectuels grecs a la recherche de Byzance (1860–1912)*. Athens.

Arnakis Georgiadis, G. 1947. *Οι πρώτοι Οθωμανοί. Συμβολή εις το πρόβλημα της πτώσεως του Ελληνισμού της Μικράς Ασίας (1282-1337)*. Athens.

—, 1952. "The Greek Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire" *The Journal of Modern History* 24/3, 235–250.

Aroni-Tsichli, K. 2008. *Ιστορικές σχολές και μέθοδοι. Εισαγωγή στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ιστοριογραφία.* Athens.

Asdrachas, Sp. 1997. "Λέανδρος Βρανούσης, 1921–1993: Οι δύο ιστορίες" *Ο Ερανιστής* 21, 9–14.

—, 2003. "Νίκος Σβορώνος (1911–1989). Μια σκιαγραφία", *Ο Πολίτης* 113, 29–33.

—, 2003b. *Πατριδογραφήματα*. Athens.

Assis, A. A. 2015. "Schemes of Historical Method in the Late 19th Century: Cross-References between Langlois and Seignobos, Bernheim, and Droysen", in L. E. Fernandes, L. R. Pereira & S. Mata (eds), *Contributions to Theory and Comparative History of Historiography: German and Brazilian Perspectives*. Frankfurt, 105–125.

Axelos, L. 1989. "Σεραφείμ Μάξιμος. Μια άλλη πλευρά της ελληνικής μαρξιστικής αριστεράς" *Τετράδια* 22, 13–25.

Babiniotis, G. 1992. "Διαχρονική προσέγγιση της ελληνικής γλώσσας" *Platon* 43, 69–80. Beck, H.G. (ed.) 1958. *Χάλικες. Festgabe für die Teilnehmer am XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongress, München 15-20. September 1958*. Freising.

Berger, A. 2011. "Karl Krumbacher und seine Zeit", in P. Schreiner & E. Vogt (eds), *Karl Krumbacher: Leben und Werk*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte: Jahrgang. München, 13–26.

Bernal, J. 2007. "Spelling and script debates in interwar Greece" *BMGS* 31, 170–190.

Bien, P. 2005. "Inventing Greece" *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 23/2, 217–234.

Bigg, R. 1987. "Andreades, Andreas (1876–1935)", in J. Eatwell, M. Milgate & P. Newman (eds). *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*. Vol. I. London.

Boeschoten, R.V. 2002. “The Impossible Return: Coping with Separation and the Reconstruction of Memory in the Wake of the Civil War”, in M. Mazower (ed). *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943–1960*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 122–141.

Browning, R. 1982. “Greek diglossia yesterday and today” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 35, 49–68.

Bryer, A. & M. Ursinus 1991. “Editorial Note, in A. Bryer & M. Ursinus (eds), *From Mantzikert to Lepanto, the Byzantine World and the Turks 1071–1571*: Papers given at the 19th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham March 1985” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 16, 1–8.

Bryer, A. 1986. *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, Washington.

Burgel, G. (ed) 2021. *Hélène Antoniadis-Bibicou 1923–2017: Une historienne entre la Grèce et la France, Études Balkaniques*. Paris.

Burks, R. V. 1984. “Hellenic Time of Troubles” *Problems of Communism* 33/6, 45–58.

Charalambidis, M. 2014. *Δεκεμβριανά. Η μάχη της Αθήνας*. Athens.

Charalampakis, Chr. 2020. “Ο Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος ως γλωσσολόγος”, in *Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος – Δάσκαλος – Επιστήμων – Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος 6η-8η Μαΐου 2016*. Athens, 205–218.

Charitakis, G. 1935. *Σπυρίδων Λάμπρος – Άννα Λάμπρου. Εις μνήμη Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου*. Athens.

Chasiotis, I. 1977/1978. “Γεώργιος Γεωργιάδης Αρνάκης (1912–1976)” *Ελληνικά* 30, 521– 525.

Chatzijosif, Chr. 2007. “Δεκέμβρης 1944. Τέλος και Αρχή”, in Chr. Chatzijosif & P. Papastratis (eds), *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας του 20ού αιώνα. Β΄ παγκόσμιος πόλεμος, κατοχή, αντίσταση, 1940–1945*. Vol. III. Athens, 363–390.

—, 1989. “Το έργο του Νίκου Σβορώνου και η ελληνική ιστοριογραφία. Πενήντα χρόνια αποκλίσεων και συγκλίσεων” *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 38, 24–33.

Chevalier, R. 1970. “André Piganiol” *Annales. Economies, sociétés, civilisation* 25/1, 284–286.

Christofilopoulou, A. 1994. "Οι βυζαντινές σπουδές στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών κατά τη διάρκεια του Μεσοπολέμου" *Νέα Εστία* 136, 983–991.
Delveroudi, R. 1996. "La question de la langue et les dialectes du grec moderne (1880– 1910)" *Revue des Etudes Neo-Helleniques* 5/2, 221–239.
Dimaras, K. 1986. *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος*. Athens.
—, 1961. *Το έργο του Κωνσταντίνου Άμαντου. Λόγος επιμνημόσυνος*, Athens.
Dosse, Fr. 2015. "Historical Event between the Sphinx and the Phoenix", in M. Tamm (ed.), *Afterlife of Events: Perspectives on Mnemohistory*. Basingstoke, 27–43.
Duval, P.M. 1969. "André Piganiol (1883-1968)" *Gallia* 27/2, 161.
"… Εβύθισα την σκέψη μου μέσα στην πάσαν ώρα" Συνέντευξη με τον Νίκο Σβορώνο 1995, in *Η Μέθοδος της Ιστορίας*. Athens.
Fawtier, R. 1930. "Charles Victor Langlois" *The English Historical Review* 45 (177), 85–91.
Frangoudaki, A. 1992. "Diglossia and the language situation in Greece: a sociological approach to the interpretation of diglossia and some hypotheses on today's reality" *Language in Society* 21, 365–381.
2002. "Comment: Greek societal bilingualism of more than a century" *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157, 101–107.
—, Fuchs, E. 1998. "Positivism and History in the 19th Century", in A. Despy-Meyer & D. Devriese (eds). *Positivisme, Philosophie, Sociologie, Histoire, Sciences. Actes du colloque international 10–12 décembre 1997*. Brussels, 147–162.
—, 2006. "Conceptions of Scientific History in the Nineteenth-Century West", in E. Wang & G. Iggers (eds). *Turning Points in Historiography: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Rochester, N.Y., 147–161.
Galatariotou, C. 1984/1985. "Holy Women and Witches: Aspects of Byzantine Conceptions of Gender", *BMGS* 9, 55–94.
—, 1988. "Byzantine Women's Monastic Communities: The Evidence of the τυπικά" *JÖB* 38, 263–290.
Gazi, E. 2000. *"Scientific" National History. The Greek Case in Comparative Perspective (1850–1920)*. Frankfurt am Main.

—, 2004. “Μια ρομαντική ιστορική επιστήμη. Η περίπτωση του Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου (1851–1919)”, in P. Kitromilides & Tr. Sklavenites (eds). *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας. Πρακτικά του τέταρτου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ιστορίας,* Athens, 195–213.

Gerolymatos, A. 1984. “The Role of the Greek Officer Corps in the Resistance” *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 11/3, 69–78.

Giakovaki, N. 2020. “Ο Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος και οι νεοελληνικές ιστορικές έρευνες”, in *Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος – Δάσκαλος – Επιστήμων – Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος 6η-8η Μαΐου 2016.* Athens, 221–252.

Giannoulopoulos, G. 2014. “Φράουλες ώριμες, με ζάχαρη και λεμόνι”, in *Πέντε οικουμενικοί Έλληνες στοχαστές: Αξελός, Καστοριάδης, Κονδύλης, Πουλαντζάς, Σβορώνος. Η Εφημερίδα των Συντακτών - Οι Εκδόσεις των Συναδέλφων*. Athens, 157–162.

Gibbons, H.A. 1916. *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire: A History of the Osmanlis Up to the Death of Bayezid I: 1300–1403*. Oxford University Press.

Gorjanov, B.T. 1950. “Vizantijskoe krest’janstvo pri Paleologach (= The Byzantine peasantry under the Palaeologi)” *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 3, 19–50.

Gotzaridis, E. 2011. “What is behind the concept: Fragmentation and internal critique in the Revisionist debates of Greece and Ireland” *Riserche Storiche* 41/1, 87–100.

Gratziou, O. 1987. “Από την ιστορία του Βυζαντινού Μουσείου: Τα πρώτα χρόνια” *Μνήμων* 11, 69–71.

Grigoriou-Ioannidou, M. 2000. “Νεκρολογία Ιωάννου Καραγιαννόπουλου (1922-2000)” *Βυζαντιακά* 20, 11–18.

Grivaud, G. & S. Petmezas (eds) 2007. *Byzantina et Moderna. Mélanges en l’honneur d’Hélène Antoniadis-Bibicou*, Athens.

Haldon, J. 1984. “ “Jargon” vs. “the facts”? Byzantine history-writing and contemporary Debates” *BMGS* 9, 95–132.

—, 1991. “The Ottoman State and the Question of State Autonomy: Comparative Perspectives” *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 18, 18–108.

Η δίκη των τόνων (Η πειθαρχική δίωξις του καθηγητή Ι. Θ. Κακριδή). Athens: Νέα Εστία 1943.

Holton, D. 2002. "Modern Greek: towards a standard language or a new diglossia?", in M. Jones & E. Esch (eds). *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors*. Berlin-New York, 169–179.

Iatrides, J. & N. Rizopoulos 2000. "The International Dimension of the Greek Civil War" *World Policy Journal* 17/11, 87–103.

Iggers, G. 1997. *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From scientific objectivity to the postmodern challenge*. Wesleyan University Press.

Iliou, F. 2004. "Η υπέρβαση της στρατευμένης ιστοριογραφίας" *Αρχειοτάξιο* 6, 134–142.

Iliou, F., A. Matthaiou & P. Polemi 2004. "Τρία κείμενα – Τρεις στιγμές του Θεοδόση Πιερίδη 1951–1956" *Αρχειοτάξιο* 6, 105–133.

Inalcik, H. 1958 "The Problem of the Relationship between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation", in *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongress*. München, 237–242.

—, 1973. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600*. London.

Jeffreys, E., J. Haldon & R. Cormack 2008. "Byzantine Studies as an academic discipline", in E. Jeffreys, J. Haldon & R. Cormack (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*. Oxford Univ. Press, 3–20.

Kafadar, C. 1995. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman Empire*. University of California Press.

Kalyvas, S. 2000. "Red Terror: Leftist Violence During the Occupation", in M. Mazower (ed.). *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943–1960*. Princeton University Press, 142–183.

Karadimas, E. 2006. *Σοσιαλιστική σκέψη και σοσιαλιστικές κινήσεις των φοιτητών των αθηναϊκών ΑΕΙ (1875–1922)*. Ioannina.

Kalogeropoulos, P. & Ph. Koukoules 1924. Τα υπό της εταιρείας μέχρι του νυν πεπραγμένα, *ΕΕΒΣ* 1, 365–373.

Karamanolakis, V. 2006. *Η συγκρότηση της ιστορικής επιστήμης και η διδασκαλία της ιστορίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών*. Athens.

—, 2008. “Ιστορία και ιδεολογία στη δεκαετία του 1960”, in A. Rigos, S. Seferiadis & E. Xatzivasileiou (eds)., *Η «σύντομη» δεκαετία του’60. Θεσμικό πλαίσιο, κομματικές στρατηγικές, κοινωνικές συγκρούσεις, πολιτισμικές διεργασίες,* Athens, 84–94.

—, 2011. “Από το Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών στην Ακαδημία: τα πρώτα χρόνια της ιστοριογραφικής διαμόρφωσης του Νίκου Σβορώνου”, in *Αφιέρωμα στον Νίκο Σβορώνο – Νέα Εστία* 1850, 873–887.

—, 2020. “Από τον ερευνητή στον δάσκαλο: Ο Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών (1925-1939)”, in *Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος – Δάσκαλος – Επιστήμων – Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος 6η-8η Μαΐου 2016*. Athens, 79– 92.

Karambelias, V. K. 1988. *Γάμος και παλλακεία στην ύστερη αρχαιότητα. Ρωμαϊκές καταβολές στις βυζαντινές θεσμικές προεκτάσεις*. Athens - Komotini.

Karavas, S. 2004. “Ο Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος και οι εθνικές διεκδικήσεις”, in P. Kitromilides & T. Sklavenites (eds), *Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας. Πρακτικά του τέταρτου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ιστορίας*. Athens, 149–169.

Karayannopulos, I. 1958. *Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates*. München.

—, 1960. “Η ιστορία του Piganiol για την iugatio-capitatio και οι νεότερες αντιλήψεις για την εξέλιξη των κοινωνικών και οικονομικών θεσμών στο Βυζάντιο” *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης* 8, 19–46.

—, 1968. *Τα προβλήματα της Βυζαντινής ιστορίας κατά τους τελευταίους χρόνους*. Thessalonike.

—, 1994. “Οι αγροτικές σχέσεις στο Βυζάντιο”, in P. Doukellis & L. Mendoni (eds), *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques. Actes du colloque de Corfou (14-16 mai 1992)*. Besançon, 471–476.

—, 1996. “Ein Beitrag zur Militärpronoia der Palaiologenzeit”, in W. Seibt (ed.), *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit. Referate des Internationalen Symposions zu Ehren von Herbert Hunger, Wien, 30. November bis 3. Dezember 1994* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 241 Band, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik 8). Wien, 71–89.

—, 1997. “Οι αρχές της φεουδαρχικής Ευρώπης (εξ αφορμής ενός νέου βιβλίου)” *Βυζαντιακά,* 207–228.

Karcayanni-Karabelia, V. 2003. *De la leçon d’ouverture du cours de langue et de littérature grecques modernes à la Faculté des Lettres de l’Université de Paris, par Hubert Pernot (11 décembre 1912)*. Athènes.

Karpozilos, K. 2022. “Σεραφείμ Μάξιμος. Ένας διεθνικός επαναστάτης”, in K. Karpozilos & P. Polemi (eds), *Σεραφείμ Μάξιμος. Αναμνήσεις (1908–1924)*. Athens, 31–49.

Kastrinaki, A. 2015. *Η λογοτεχνία στη δεκαετία 1940–1950*, Athens.

Kavounidou, T. 1984. “Μερικά προβλήματα στη μελέτη της ιστορίας της ελληνικής οικογένειας” *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 22, 95–102.

Kaynes, J.M. 1935. “Andrew Andréadès” *Economic Journal* 45, 597–599.

Kazazis, K. 1993. “Dismantling Greek diglossia”, in E. Fraenkel & Chr. Kramer (eds), *Language Contact – Language Change*. New York, 7–26.

Kazhdan, A. 1959. “Esce raz ob agrarnych otnosenijach v Vizantii IV-XI vv (= Once again about agrarian relations in Byzantium IV-XI centuries)” *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 16, 92–113.

—, 1979. “La byzantinologie soviétique en 1974-1975” *Byzantion* 49, 506–553.

—, 1979b. “Remarques sur le Xie siècle byzantin à propos d’un livre récent de Paul Lemerle” *Byzantion* 49, 491–503.

—, 1982. “Soviet studies on Medieval western Europe” *Speculum* 57, 1–19.

—, 1994. “One more agrarian history of Byzantium” *Byzantinoslavica* 54, 66–88.

—, 1994b. “Review Article: Marxism and the Tributary Mode of Production Pondering over John Haldon’s The State and the Tributary Mode of Production, London-New York: Verso, 1993” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9/1, 116–129.

—, 1996. “Pronoia: The History of a Scholarly Discussion”, in B. Arbel (ed.), *Intercultural Contacts in the Medieval Mediterranean*. London, 133–163.

Kiel, M. 2009. “The incorporation of the Balkans into the Ottoman Empire”, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Vol. I. Cambridge University Press, 138–191.

Kiousopoulou, T. 1989. "Η προστασία της προίκας στο Βυζάντιο (12ος-14ος αι.)" *Ιστορικά* 11, 265–276.

—, 1989b "Review of Αγγελική Λαΐου – Θωμαδάκη, Η αγροτική κοινωνία στην ύστερη βυζαντινή εποχή, μετάφραση Αγλαΐα Κάσδαγλη" *Μνήμων* 12, 298–302.

—, 1990. *Ο θεσμός της οικογένειας στην Ήπειρο κατά τον 13ο αιώνα.* Athens.

—, 1993. "Η πρώτη έδρα Βυζαντινής ιστορίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών" *Μνήμων* 15, 257–276.

—, 2001. "Βυζαντινή Ιστορία" *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 76–77, 92–94.

—, 2003. "Η μελέτη του Βυζαντίου στη Νεότερη Ελλάδα" *Αρχαιολογία* 88, 20–21.

—, 2011. "Οι Βυζαντινές σπουδές στο Παρίσι και ο Νίκος Σβορώνος", in *Αφιέρωμα στο Νίκο Γ. Σβορώνο – Νέα Εστία* 1850, 832–840.

Kitromilides, P. 2014. "Κορδάτος Γιάννης (1891-1961)" in D. Woolf (ed.), *A Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing*. Routledge, 510–511.

Kolia-Dermitzaki, A. 2020. "Η πολυδιάστατη προσωπικότητα και το πολυσχιδές έργο του Κωνσταντίνου Άμαντου. Μια βιογραφική προσέγγιση", in *Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος – Δάσκαλος – Επιστήμων – Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος 6η-8η Μαΐου 2016.* Athens, 29–62.

Kontomichis, P. 1992. "Τα γυμνασιακά χρόνια του Ν. Σβορώνου στη Λευκάδα", in St. Papageorgiou (ed.), *Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο Κοινωνικών και Πολιτικών Επιστημών. Αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη του Ν. Σβορώνου.* Athens, 21–29.

—, 2003. *Ο Τύπος της Λευκάδας (1800–1987)*. Athens.

Köprülü, M.F. 1922. *Anadolu' da Islamiyet: Türk Istilasindan Sonca Anadolu Tarih-i Denisine Bir Nazar ve Bu Tarihin Menba 'lari*. Istanbul.

Kordatos, Y. 1924. *Η κοινωνική σημασία της Ελληνικής επανάστασης του 1821.* Athens.

—, 1957. *Ιστορία της Νεωτέρας Ελλάδος.* Vol. I. Athens.

Kostis, K. 2014. *Τα κακομαθημένα παιδιά της ιστορίας. Η διαμόρφωση του ελληνικού κράτους, 18ος-21ος αιώνας.* Athens.

Kostopoulos, T. 2016. *Κόκκινος Δεκέμβρης. Το ζήτημα της επαναστατικής βίας.* Athens.

—, 2003. “Αφαιρέσεις ιθαγένειας. Η σκοτεινή πλευρά της Νεοελληνικής Ιστορίας (1926–2003)” *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 83, 53–75.

Koumpourlis, G. 2011. “Ο Σπυρίδων Ζαμπέλιος του Νίκου Σβορώνου και ο ελληνικός ιστορισμός” *Νέα Εστία* 1850, 888–908.

Kranaki, M. 2007. *Ματαρόα σε δύο φωνές. Σελίδες ξενιτιάς.* Athens.

Kremmydas, V. 2011. “Στρογγυλή Τράπεζα”, *in Αφιέρωμα στον Νίκο Σβορώνο – Νέα Εστία 1850,* 972–973.

Laiou, A. 1981. “The role of women in Byzantine society” *JÖB* 31, 233–260 [= *Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium*. Variorum Reprint, Brookfield 1992, no. I].

—,1985. “Observations on the Life and ideology of Byzantine Women” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 9, 59–102 [= *Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium*. Variorum Reprint, Brookfield 1992, no. II].

—,1995. “In search of the Byzantine economy: Assumptions, methods and models of social and economic History”, in J. Hamesse (ed.). *Bilan et perspective des études médiévales en Europe*. Louvain-La-Neuve, 43–64.

—,2002. “Writing the Economic History of Byzantium”, in A. Laiou (ed.). *The Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Washington, 3–8.

Lampakis, S. 2020. “Τα φιλολογικά του Κωνσταντίνου Άμαντου”, in *Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος – Δάσκαλος – Επιστήμων – Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος 6η-8η Μαΐου 2016.* Athens, 193–204.

Lampros, Sp. 1886. *Ιστορία της Ελλάδος.* Vol. I. Athens.

—, 1892. “Byzantinische Desiderata” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1, 185–201.

—, 1905. *Νέοι ορίζοντες εν τη ιστορική ερεύνη. Λόγος απαγγελθείς εν τω εθνικώ Πανεπιστημίω την 15η Ιανουαρίου 1905 υπό Σπ. Λάμπρου αναλαμβάνοντος επισήμως την Πρυτανείαν του ακαδημαϊκού έτους 1904–1905.* Athens.

Langlois, C. V. & C. Seignobos 1902. *Εισαγωγή εις τας ιστορικάς μελέτας κατά μετάφρασιν Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου.* Athens.

Laurent, V. 1949. “Les études byzantines en Grèce (1940–1948)” *REB* 7, 91–128.

Lefort J. 2001. “In memoriam: Nicolas Oikonomidès” *REB* 59, 251–254.

Lemerle, P. 1945. *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale,* à *l'époque chrétienne et byzantine*. Paris.

—, 1958. *Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance*. Paris.

—, 1979. *The agrarian history of Byzantium from the origins to the Twelfth Century. The Sources and Problems*. Galway.

Lewkowicz, B. 2000. "After the War we Were All Together: Jewish Memories of Postwar Thessaloniki", in M. Mazower (ed). *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943–1960*. Princeton University Press, 247–272.

Liakos, A. 1994. *«Προς επισκευήν ολομελείας και ενότητος». Η δόμηση του εθνικού χρόνου, Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ. Δημαρά (KNE/EIE). Athens,* 125–214.

—, 2001. "Η Νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία το τελευταίο τέταρτο του εικοστού αιώνα" *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 76–77, 72–91.

Liata, E. D. 1996. *Φλωρία δεκατέσσερα στένουν γρόσια σαράντα. Η κυκλοφορία των νομισμάτων στον βενετοκρατούμενο και τουρκοκρατούμενο ελληνικό χώρο* (KNE/EIE 58)*, 15ος-19ος αι*. Athens.

Lipchits, E. 1974. "La fin du régime esclavagiste et le début du féodalisme à Byzance" *Recherches International à la lumière du marxisme* 79, 19–30.

Ljubarskij, J. 1993. "New Trends in the Study of Byzantine Historiography" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47, 131–138.

Louggis, T. 2007. "Σχετικά με την αντιδραστική ιστοριογραφία στην Ελλάδα, άλλοτε και τώρα", *Κομμουνιστική Επιθεώρηση* 1. https://www.komep.gr/m-article/77f20a37- f42c-11e9-95d7-3ed1504937da/ (access on 08/12/24)

—, 2007. "Το ανατολικό χριστιανικό κράτος (395–518)", in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. Vol. 7. Athens, 92–149.

Loukos, Ch. 1992. "Οι γενιές του Μνήμονα" *Μνήμων* 14, 299–302.

Lowry, H. 2003. *The nature of the early Ottoman State*. University of New York Press.

Mackridge, P. 2009. *Language and National Identity in Greece 1766–1976*. Oxford University Press.

Madgearu, A. 2008. *The Wars of the Balkan Peninsula*. Scarecrow Press.

Maltezou, Ch.A. 1991/1992. "Denis A. Zakythinos", *BZ* 84/85, 665–666.

Mango, C. 1965. “Byzantinism and Romantic Hellenism” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 28, 29–43.

Manitakis, N. 2004. “Struggling from Abroad: Greek Communist Activities in France during the Greek Civil War”, in P. Garabott & T. D. Sfikas (eds). *The Greek Civil War: essays on a Conflict of Exceptionalism and Silences*. Centre for Hellenic Studies, King’s College London, 101–114.

Margaritis, G. 1984. “Πολιτικές προοπτικές και δυνατότητες κατά την απελευθέρωση” *Μνήμων* 9, 174–193.

Mavrogordatos, G. 2013. “Ο διχασμός ως κρίση εθνικής ολοκλήρωσης”, in Idem (ed.), *Μελέτες και κείμενα για την περίοδο 1909–1940. Για το μάθημα της πολιτικής ιστορίας της νεώτερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας*. Athens, 39–53.

Mazower, M. 1995. “Historians at War. Greece, 1940–1950” *The Historical Journal* 38/2, 499–506.

McCormick M. 2004. “Nicholas Oikonomides”, in Nicolas Oikonomides, *Social and Economic Life in Byzantium*. Ed. E. Zachariadou. Ashgate Variorum, ix–xiii.

Megas, G.A. 1924. “Eidiseis” *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων* 18/2–3, 311–314.

Milios, G. 1996. *Ο «Σοβιετικός Μαρξισμός» και οι Έλληνες στοχαστές*, Athens.

Mirambel, A. 1946–1948. “Hommage à Hubert Pernot (20 janvier 1947)” *Byzantion* 18, 335–348.

—, 1964. “Les aspects psychologiques du purisme dans la Grece modern” *Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique* 4, 405–436.

Mishkova, D. 2014. “The Afterlife of a Commonwealth: Narratives of Byzantium in the National Historiographies of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania”, in R. Daskalov & A. Vezenkov (eds), *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*. Vol. III. Leiden, 118–273.

Moravcsik, G. 1966. “Klassizismus in der byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung”, in P. Wirth (ed.). *Polychronion. Festschrift F. Dölger*. Heidelberg, 366–377.

Mourelos, Y. 1980-1982. “Η προσωρινή κυβέρνηση της Θεσσαλονίκης και οι σχέσεις της με τους συμμάχους” *Μνήμων* 8, 150–188.

Mpalanos, D. 1928. “Σπυρίδων Π. Λάμπρος (1851–1919)”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*. Παράρτημα δεύτερον – *Βιογραφικόν*. Ioannina, 1–32.

Mpoumpous, G. 1996. *Η ελληνική κοινωνία στην πρώιμη μαρξιστική σκέψη: Γ. Σκληρός – Γ. Κορδάτος (1907–1930),* Athens.

Mpouzakis, S. 2006. *Η πανεπιστημιακή εκπαίδευση στην Ελλάδα.* Vol. II. Athens.

Necipoğlu, N. 2009. *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: Politics and Society in the Late Empire*, Cambridge Univ. Press.

Nesbitt, J. & E. McGeer 2000. "Nicolas Oikonomides, 1934-2000" *DOP* 54, ix–xii. Nikolaou, K. 1993. *Η θέση της γυναίκας στη βυζαντινή κοινωνία.* Athens.

Notaris, I. 1961. *Ο ιστορικός Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος ως εθνικός δάσκαλος.* Athens.

Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, M. 1994. "Οι βυζαντινές σπουδές στην Ελλάδα. Από τον Σπυρίδωνα Ζαμπέλιο στον Διονύσιο Ζακυθηνό" in *Μνήμη Δ. Α. Ζακυθηνού.* Vol. II. Athens, 153–176.

Oikonomides, N. 1961. "Ιωάννης Βογιατζίδης" *Αθηνά* 65, 254–261.

—, 1979. "Η ενοποίηση του ευρασιατικού χώρου (945–1071) " in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους.* Vol. 8. Athens, 98–151.

—, 1979b. "Η κρίσιμη δεκαετία 1071-1081", in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους.* Vol. 9. Athens, 8–12.

—,1979c. "Η τέταρτη Σταυροφορία και η άλωση της Κωνσταντινούπολης (1204)", in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους.* Vol. 9. Athens, 36–41.

—, 1979d. "Το νέο κράτος της μέσης βυζαντινής περιόδου", in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους.* Vol. 8. Athens, 154–179.

—, 1989. *Η ενότητα του Ελληνισμού κατά τον Σπ. Ζαμπέλιο.* Athens.

Ostrogorsky, G. 1940. "В. Г. Васильевский как византинист и создатель современной российской византинологии" (= V. G. Vasilievsky as byzantinologist and creator of modern Russian byzantinology) *Annales des l'Institut Kondakov* 11, 227–235.

Oudaltsova, Z. 1974. "A propos de la genèse du féodalisme à Byzance (comment se pose le problème)" *Recherches International à la lumière du marxisme* 79, 31–50.

Panagiotopoulos, V. 1989. "Το εθνικό ζήτημα στο έργο του Νίκου Σβορώνου" *Αντί* 402, 44–47.

Papadakis, N. 2004. *Η παλίμψηστη εξουσία. Κράτος, Πανεπιστήμιο και εκπαιδευτική πολιτική στην Ελλάδα.* Athens.

Papadatos, S. *1984. Περί της μνηστείας εις το Βυζαντινόν δίκαιον.* Athens.
Papadopoulou, E. 2008. "Περί της ηλικίας και του γήρατος από τη γραμματεία του ενδέκατου και δωδέκατου αιώνα" *Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα* 17, 131–198.
Papapanos, K. 1970. *Χρονικό – Ιστορία της Ανωτάτης μας εκπαιδεύσεως.* Athens.
Paparregopoulos, K. 1843. *Περί της εποικίσεως σλαβικών φύλων εις την Πελοπόννησον.* Athens.
—, 1846. *Ολίγα αντί πολλών προς τον Γ.Γ. Παπαδόπουλον.* Athens.
Paparregopoulos, K. 1886. *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους.* Vols. I-V. Athens.
Patlagean, É. 1975. "«Economie paysane» et «Féodalité Byzantine»" *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 30, 1371–1396.
Petrounias, E. 1978. "The Modern Greek language and Diglossia", in Sp. Vryonis (ed.), *The 'Past' in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*. Malibu, 193–220.
Pitsakis, K. 1983. "Το κώλυμα γάμου λόγω συγγένειας έβδομου βαθμού εξ αίματος στο βυζαντινό δίκαιο" *Βυζαντιακά* 3, 11–21.
Poulatzas, N. 1975. *Πολιτική εξουσία και κοινωνικές τάξεις.* Vol. I. Athens.
Prost, A. 1994. "Charles Seignobos revisité", *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d' histoire* 43, 100–118.
Ricks, D. & P. Magdalino 1998. "Editor's Preface", in D. Ricks & P. Magdalino (eds), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*. London.
Rizospastis (newspaper), 28–3–1945.
Sakkas, J. 2010. "The First Casualty of a Socialist Foreign Policy? Greece and Britain in the1940s", in D. Howell, D. Kirby & K. Morgan (eds), *John Saville: Commitment and History: Themes from the Life and Work of a Socialist Historian*. London, 73–90.
—, 2016. "Η ιστοριογραφία για τα Δεκεμβριανά: παλιά αφηγήματα, σύγχρονες ερμηνείες, νέες κατευθύνσεις", in T. Sfikas, L. Chasiotis & I. Michailidis (eds), *Δρόμοι του Δεκεμβρίου: από το Λίβανο στην Αθήνα 1944.* Thessalonike, 291–308.
Samatas M. 1986. "Greek McCarthyism: A Comparative Assessment of Greek Post - civil war Repressive Anticommunism and the US Truman - McCarthy Era" *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 13/3-4, 5–75.

Saradi, G. H. 2001. “Nicholas Oikonomides (14.2.1934 – 31.5.2000)” *BZ* 94, 908–911.

Savvides, A. 2007. “Μνήμη Φαίδωνος Κουκουλέ” *Νέα Εστία* 139, 336–337.

—, 2001. “Απόστολος Ε. Βακαλόπουλος” *Βυζαντινός Δόμος* 12, 175–179.

Schreiner, P. 2011. “Das wissenschaftliche Werk Karl Krumbachers”, in P. Schreiner & E. Vogt (eds), *Karl Krumbacher: Leben und Werk* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte). München, 39–62.

“Σ’ έναν τόπο σωτηρίας και εξορίας. Ο Νίκος Σβορώνος αφηγείται στον Τάσο Γουδέλη”, 1988. *Το Δέντρο* 37–38, 10–18.

Setton, K. 1948. “Review of Piganiol André, L’Empire chrétien (Histoire générale, fondée par Gustave Glotz: Histoire romaine, tome IV, deuxième partie), Paris 1947” *The American Journal of Philology* 69/3, 329–333.

Ševčenko, I. 1952. “An important Contribution to the social History of Late Byzantium” *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 2/4, 448– 459.

Sfikas, T. 2001. “War and Peace in the Strategy of the Communist Party of Greece, 1945–1949” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 3/3, 5–30.

Sfyroeras, V. 1996. “Λέανδρος Βρανούσης (1921–1993)” *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά* 5, 15–28.

Sjuzumov, M. Y. 1969. “Istoričeskaja rol’ Vizantii I ee mesto vo vsemirnoj istorii” (= The historical role of Byzantium and its significance in world history) *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 29, 32–44.

Skarpazelos, A. K. 1964. *Από την ιστορίαν του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών. Ιστορικά κείμενα και ιστορικά στοιχεία.* Athens.

Sklavenitis, T. 2001. “Η τοπική ιστορία και ο Πάνος Γ. Ροντόγιαννης (1911–1996). Ο Νίκος Γ. Σβορώνος (1911–1989) και η κληρονομιά του”, in. *Πρακτικά 5ου Συμποσίου, Σταθμοί στην πορεία της Λευκάδας τον 20ό αιώνα, Πολιτιστικό Κέντρο Δήμου Λευκάδας. Γιορτές Λόγου και Τέχνης, Λευκάδα 3–5 Αυγούστου 2000*. Athens, 163–173.

—, 2016. “Η ίδρυση του Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών (1958) και το δίλημμα: Η ελληνική έρευνα μοχλός της εγχώριας ανάπτυξης ή συμβολή στο διεθνές μέτωπο της επιστήμης” *Μνήμων* 34, 188–204.

Skopetea, E. 1988. *Το Πρότυπο Βασίλειο και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα. Όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα (1830–1880)*. Athens.

Sofou, A. 2021. "Les archives d' Hubert Pernot et la fondation de l'Institut néo-hellénique à la Sorbonne", in M. Girard & C. Béchu (eds), *La France et la Grèce au XXe siècle: des archives à l'histoire*. Athènes, École française d'Athènes, 251–259.

Sorlin I. 1967. "Les recherches soviétiques sur l'histoire byzantine de 1945–1962" *Travaux et Mémoire* 2, 489–568.

—, 1970 "Les recherches soviétiques sur l'histoire byzantine, 1963–1968" *Travaux et Mémoire* 4, 487–520.

Sorlin I. 1979. "Les recherches soviétiques sur l'histoire byzantine, 1968-1978" *Travaux et Mémoire* 7, 525–580.

Sotiriou, G. A. 1920. *Αι Βυζαντιναί Σπουδαί. Διάλεξις γενομένη κατά την επίσημον εμφάνισιν της Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών εν τω Παρνασσώ τη 26 Ιανουαρίου 1919*. Athens.

Sotiropoulos, D. P. 2011. "Η επιστήμη ως ιδεολογικό πρόταγμα. Ο Ν. Σβορώνος και η εθνική ιστοριογραφία στην εποχή των μεγάλων ιδεολογιών", in *Αφιέρωμα στον Νίκο Σβορώνο – Νέα Εστία* 1850, 934–961.

Spanakou, Z. 1991. *Η έννοια της ιστορικής νομοτέλειας στο μεσοπολεμικό έργο του Γιάνη Κορδάτου*. Athens.

Stathis, P. 2014. "Το εικοσιένα στην αριστερή ιστοριογραφία του 20ού αιώνα", in D. Dimitropoulos & V. Karamanolakis (eds), *Οι αναγνώσεις του 1821 και η αριστερά*. Athens, 29–58.

Stavridou-Zafraka, A. 2000. "Ιωάννης Καραγιαννόπουλος (1922–2000)" *Βυζαντινά* 21, 7– 15.

Svoronos, N. 1951. "Le serment de fidélité à l'empereur byzantin et sa signification constitutionnelle" *REB* 9, 106–142 (= *Études sur l'organisation intérieure, la société et l'économie de l'Empire Byzantin*. Variorum Reprints. London 1973, no. VI).

—, 1953. *Histoire de la Grèce moderne* (Que sais-je? 578). Paris.

—, 1955. "Σκέψεις για μια εισαγωγή στη Νεοελληνική Ιστορία" *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης* 3, 208–212.

—, 1956. “Petite et grande exploitation à Byzance” *Annales* 11, 325–335 (= *Études sur l’organisation intérieure, la société et l’économie de l’Empire Byzantin.* Variorum Reprint. London 1973, no. II).
—, 1959. “Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XIe et XIIe siècle: le cadastre de Thèbes” *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 83, 1–166. (= *Études sur l’organisation intérieure, la société et l’économie de l’Empire Byzantin.* Variorum Reprint. London 1973, no. III).
—, 1966. “Société et organisation intérieure dans l’empire byzantin au XIe siècle: les principaux problèmes”, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Main Papers XII*. Oxford University Press, 1–17 (= *Études sur l’organisation intérieure, la société et l’économie de l’Empire Byzantin.* Variorum Reprint. London 1973, no. IX).
—, 1968. “L’epibole à l’époque des Comnènes” *Travaux et Mémoire* 3, 375–395 (= *Études sur l’organisation intérieure, la société et l’économie de l’Empire Byzantin.* Variorum Reprint. London 1973, no. V).
—, 1976. “Remarques sur les structures économique de l’empire byzantin au XIe siècle” *Travaux et Mémoire* 6, 49–67.
—, 1978. “Οικονομία – Κοινωνία”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. Vol. 7. Athens, 278–305.
—, 1979. “Η αναβίωση του Ελληνισμού”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. Vol. 8. Athens, 334–343.
—, 1979b. “Πολιτεία – Κοινωνία – Οικονομία (1071-1204): Η πολιτική και οικονομική κρίση”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. Vol. 8. Athens, 50–61.
—, 1979c. “Πολιτεία – Κοινωνία – Οικονομία (1071-1204): Οι εξελίξεις στην οικονομία και την κοινωνία”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*. Vol. 8. Athens, 66–73.
—, 1981. “Notes sur l’origine et la date du Code Rural” *Travaux et Mémoire* 8, 487–500.
—, 1992. “Ο Σπυρίδων Ζαμπέλιος” *Μνήμων* 14, 11–20.
Talbot, A.M. 2006. “Byzantine Studies at the Beginning of the Twenty-first Century” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105/1, 25–43.
Theocharidis, G. 1980. *Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας κατά τους μέσους χρόνους (285–1345)*. Thessalonike.

—, 1979. “Review of Laiou-Thomadakis Angeliki, Peasant society in the Late Byzantine Empire” *Μακεδονικά* 19, 433–448.

Theotokas, N. 2019. “Ο Σπύρος Ασδραχάς και η εννοιολόγηση της πρωτόγονης επανάστασης”, in S. Asrachas (ed.), *Πρωτόγονη επανάσταση. Αρματωλοί και κλέφτες*. Athens, ix–xxiv.

Tinnefeld, F. 2011. “Die Begründung der Byzantinistik als wissenschaftlicher Disziplin”, in P. Schreiner & E. Vogt, *Karl Krumbacher: Leben und Werk* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte). München, 27–38.

Tomadakis, N. B. 1940. “Κωνσταντίνος Ι. Άμαντος”, in *Αφιέρωμα εις Κ.Ι. Άμαντον*. Athens, vii–xvi.

—, 1975/1976. “Γεώργιος Γεωργιάδης (1912-1976)” *ΕΕΒΣ* 42, 450–453.

—, 1953. “Φαίδων Ι. Κουκουλές”, *ΕΕΒΣ* 23, vii–xix.

Toufexis, N. 2008. “Diglossia and register variation in Medieval Greek” *BMGS* 32, 203–217.

Tourtoglou, M. 1985. “Οι ανήλικοι στο βυζαντινό και μεταβυζαντινό ποινικό δίκαιο”, *Πρακτικά της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών* 60, 362–382.

Troianos, S. 1983. “Το συναινετικό διαζύγιο στο Βυζάντιο” *Βυζαντιακά* 3, 11–21.

—, 1984. “Η ερωτική ζωή των Βυζαντινών μέσα από το ποινικό τους δίκαιο” *Αρχαιολογία* 10, 45–48.

Tsiknakis, K. 1992. “Η πρώτη περίοδος της επιστημονικής δραστηριότητας του Νίκου Σβορώνου”, in S. Papageorgiou (ed.), *Αφιέρωμα στο μνήμη του Ν. Σβορώνου. Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο Κοινωνικών και Πολιτικών Επιστημών*. Vol. I. Athens, 35– 44.

Uspenskij, F. 1925. “Notes sur l’histoire des études byzantines en Russie” *Byzantion* 2, 1–54.

Vagiakakos, D. 1977. *Γεώργιος Ν. Χατζηδάκης (1848–1941). Βίος και έργον*. Athens.

Vakalopoulos, A. 1963. “La retraite des populations grecques vers des régions éloignées et montagneuses pendant la dominations turque” *Balkan Studies* 4, 265–276.

—, 1974. *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού – Αρχές και διαμόρφωσή του,* Thessalonike.

Valdenberg, V. 1927/1928. “Les études Byzantines en Russie (1924–1929)” *Byzantion* 4, 483–504.

Vidakis, I. & J. Karkazis 2011. “The British Foreign Policy in Greece during the period 1943-1949”, in I. Vidakis, J. Vanunu & J. Karkazis (eds), *The Pursuit of a New Order in Europe and the Middle East*. Chios, 149–163.

Vlisidou, E. 2020. “Οι σπουδές και οι παιδαγωγικές αντιλήψεις του Κωνσταντίνου Άμαντου”, in *Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος – Δάσκαλος – Επιστήμων – Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος 6η-8η Μαΐου 2016*. Athens, 63–78.

Vogiatzoglou, A. 1940. “Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος”, in *Αφιέρωμα εις Κ. Ι. Άμαντον*. Athens, i–iv.

Vogt, E. 2011. “Karl Krumbacher als Mitglied der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften”, in P. Schreiner & E. Vogt (eds), *Karl Krumbacher: Leben und Werk* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte). München, 63–84.

Vokotopoulos, P. 2003. “Νίκος Οικονομίδης” *ΔΧΑΕ* 24, 7–10.

Vranousis, L. 1957. “Η εν Ηπείρω μονή Σωσίνου” *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου* 6, 72–129.

—, 1962. *Χρονικά της Μεσαιωνικής και Τουρκοκρατούμενης Ηπείρου*. Ioannina.

—, 1962b. “Το Χρονικόν των Ιωαννίνων κατ’ ανέκδοτον επιτομήν” *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου* 12, 52–115.

—, 1963. “Διεθνές Συνέδριο εν Βενετία επί τη χιλιετηρίδι του Αγίου Όρους” *ΕΕΒΣ* 32, 570–571.

—, 1964. “Ερευνητική αποστολή εις Πάτμον, 26–30 Νοεμβρίου 1964”, *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου* 14, 312–313.

—, 1965. “Έρευναι εις Βιέννην, Βουδαπέστην και Ρουμανία” *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου* 15, 322–334.

—, 1966. “Γεώργιος Σούλης, 1927–1966”, *ΕΕΒΣ* 34, 342–348.

—, 1967. “Προλεγόμενα”, in N. Bees (ed.). *Τα χειρόγραφα των Μετεώρων*. Athens, 9*–69*.

—, 1969. “Dionysios Skylosophos. Révoltes et démarches pour la libération de la Grèce 1598–1611 dans le cadre d’ une croisade”, in *Actes du 1er Congrès International des Études du Sud-Est Européen*. Vol. III. Sofia, 771, 775–776.

Vrychea, A. & K. Gavroglou 1982. *Απόπειρες μεταρρύθμισης της Ανώτατης Εκπαίδευσης, 1911–1981*, Thessalonike.

Vryonis, S. 1969/1970. "The Byzantine legacy and Ottoman forms" *DOP* 23–24, 251–308.

—, 1971. *The decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamization from the eleventh through the fifteenth century*. Los Angeles – London.

Wittek, P. 1938. *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*. London.

Xydis, S. 1961. "Greece and the Yalta Declaration", *American Slavic and East European Review* 20/1, 6–24.

Zafeiris, C. 2011. *Αντεθνικώς δρώντες*. Thessalonike.

Zakythinos, D. A. 1932. *Le despotat grec de Morée, L'histoire politique*. Athènes.

—, 1945. *Οι Σλάβοι εν Ελλάδι: Συμβολή εις την ιστορίαν του μεσαιωνικού Ελληνισμού*. Athens.

—, 1948. "Processus de Féodalisation" *L'Hellénisme Contemporain* 5, 499–514.

—, 1952. "Mouvement intellectuel dans le Despotat de Morée" *L'Hellénisme Contemporain* 2/4–5, 339–366.

—, 1953. *Le despotat grec de Morée, Vie et Institutions*. Athènes.

—, 1966. "Le monde de Byzance dans le pensée historique de l'Europe à partir du XVIIe siècle. I. Du Romantisme au Nationalisme" *JÖB* 25, 41–47 (= *Byzance: État- Société-Économie*. Variorum Reprints. London 1973, no. I).

—, 1974. "Σπυρίδων Ζαμπέλιος. Ο θεωρητικός της ιστοριονομίας. Ο ιστορικός του βυζαντινού πολιτισμού" *Πρακτικά της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών* 49, 303–328.

Zoras, G. 1955/1956. "Επιμνημόσυνος λόγος εις Φαίδωνα Κουκουλέν" *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 6, 630–632.