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With this edited volume we are pursuing the challenging task of connecting the labour histories and historiographies of Greece and Turkey. Our methodological point of departure is largely furnished by the conceptual framework of global labour history, which stresses the need for transnational/transcontinental and diachronic comparisons. Until the 1970s, labour historians typically locked themselves into the frameworks of individual nation-states. In contrast, we seek to connect labour history studies on both shores of the Aegean within the field of global labour history. In attempting to write a comparative labour history not only of the history of contact between two polities but also of their shared history, we follow the recent twofold critique and suggestion of Marcel van der Linden, which targets Eurocentrism and methodological nationalism.

The seed of this volume was planted in Istanbul in November 2011, at the close of a conference entitled ‘Working in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey: Ottoman and Turkish Labour History within a Global Perspective’. We built upon the ideas and concepts presented there with the double aim, from the one side, to compare, contrast and position the findings and applied methodologies of Ottoman labour history with and within global labour historiography; and from the other side, to bring the labour histories conducted within some of the successor states of the Ottoman Empire into contact. We hope that we can thus contribute to the internationalization of Greek, Ottoman and Turkish labour history.
On this basis we have prepared a historiographical essay based upon a detailed critical review of the current literature to start with.

**Greek Economic and Social Historiography Regarding the Ottoman Past**

Under the influence chiefly of French historiography, Greek economic historiography developed in two independent directions: on the one hand, towards the study of the agricultural economy, and on the other, towards that of the urban sector of the economy (commerce and manufacture). The initial questions posed by studies of economic history stemmed from the widespread thinking of the 1970s on the country’s economic and social development, and the conditions under which modern Greek society was shaped.

The historian Nikos Svoronos (1911–89) had studied and worked in France since 1945. There he published his magnum opus on the commerce of Thessaloniki in the eighteenth century, a study in the Marxist ‘labrousienne’ tradition that had great influence on Greek economic historiography. In Paris in the mid 1960s, at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (IV Section), Svoronos accepted as students the young historians Spyros Asdrachas, Vassilis Panayotopoulos, Phillipe Iliou and Vassilis Kremmydas, who left Greece in order to study modern history in France. In the same period, the Byzantinist Hélène Antoniadis was teaching the course ‘Histoire économique et sociale de la Grèce médiéval et modern’ at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.

In 1979, writing the introduction to a collective volume which he had edited, Spyros Asdrachas took the opportunity to frame a series of questions regarding the structure of the Greek economy and the hegemony of commercial capital in the Greek lands under Ottoman rule. The following year, the publication of a volume in Greek with translated articles from a conference organized in Hamburg by the Association Internationale d’Études du Sud-Est Européen (AIESEE), on modernization and the Industrial Revolution in the Balkans in the nineteenth century, established the image of ‘retarded’ industrialization in the Balkans as common ground regarding the Ottoman past. In the early 1980s an economic history conference organized by the Hellenic National Research Foundation on Mediterranean Economies, spanning the thirteenth to the nineteenth century, brought historians of the vieille garde braudélienne (such as Ruggiero Romano, Alberto Tenenti, José Gentil da Silva and Maurice Aymard) together with historians of the Mediterranean from Italy, Spain and France (such as Carlo
Ginsburg and Robert Mantran) and the Balkans (Traian Stoianovich, Maria Todorova, Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopoulou, Alexandru Dutu, Olga Cicanci, Bariša Krekic and others). In general, with the participants coming mainly from Greece and the Balkans, the hegemony of French Braudelian historiography was obvious, while there was only one historian of the Anglo-Saxon tradition (Elena Frangakis), two Turkish intellectuals (İskender Gökalp and Cengiz-Osman Āktar) and no historian or Ottomanist from Turkey. Another international conference organized in 1984 by the Association on the Study of Modern Hellenism, focusing on the urban history of modern Greece and more specifically on the Ottoman heritage and the Greek state, brought together historians and urbanists from Greece, France (André Raymond, Guy Burgel) and the United States (Elena Frangakis), but again no scholar from Turkey or the Balkans. These events could be considered as the first premature attempts at international collaboration by Greek historians, before the professionalization of international history.

Concerning rural history, mainly under the influence of Spyros Asdrachas (1933–2017), Greek historiography has focused on the study of the forms and functions of agricultural structures in Greek lands under Ottoman rule, the emergence of capitalist relations through the large land estates (çiftlik), and the forms of cultivation by share-croppers. Rural historiography has also dealt with land ownership problems, the distribution of the national estates, and the land/agrarian reform organized by the Greek state after the second half of the nineteenth century and during the interwar period.

As for the history of industry, the problématique concerned the conditions of and the limits on the development of Greek industry, and the reasons why industrialization in Greece was ‘retarded’. The process of industrialization in the Greek state during the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century has been explored since the 1980s and 1990s, while studies on proto-industries in the agricultural sector under Ottoman rule, and on craft industries and occupations in pre-industrial societies under Venetian and Ottoman rule, have provided researchers with important data on the life and labour of people in the world of agriculture and craft industries in the countryside and urban areas. This has stimulated questions about the social and cultural origins of the urban workers’ strata and the process of transition to the free-wage labour market. At the same time, some approaches have drawn attention to the economic importance of the family in the cottage industry in the countryside, also dealing with the gender division of labour – where data were available.
In *Greek Economic History, 15th to 19th Centuries*, his magnum opus published in 2003, Spyros Asdrachas and his collaborators explored the ‘history of the conquered people’ or the ‘subjected peoples’ and the ‘economy of the subjected’ under Venetian and Ottoman rule.\(^{18}\)

Ottoman Studies in Greece, which had been an exclusively historical discipline concerned with the period of Ottoman rule in the Greek regions, acquired substance after the mid 1960s when Vassilis Dimitriadis and Elizabeth Zachariadou became the first historians to study Ottoman history in European and US universities. Vassilis Dimitriadis, born in Komotini in 1931, graduated from the School of Philology at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki in 1954. In the following year he was appointed director of the newly created Historical Archive of Macedonia, a post he held until 1984. In the meantime, he attended postgraduate courses in Turkish Studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London, where he studied under V.L. Ménage. Dimitriadis earned his Ph.D. in 1972 from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, with a thesis on Central and Western Macedonia according to Evliya Çelebi.\(^{19}\) He took the initiative of publishing the *Bulletin of Turkish Bibliography* (*Deltion Tourkikis Vivliografias*) in 1967–71 in Thessaloniki. The *Bulletin* contained bibliographies and extended abstracts of articles on Turkish Studies published in Turkey or elsewhere.\(^{20}\) Although the *Bulletin* was published during the dictatorship in Greece (1967–74), it is noteworthy that it included translations of articles by Ömer Lütfi Barkan about historical demography in Ottoman history, and Halil İnalcık on the administration of rules of justice.\(^{21}\) The research by Dimitriadis on the topography and population of Ottoman Thessaloniki was very influential.\(^{22}\)

Elisabeth Zachariadou (1931–2018) studied history at Athens University and Ottoman history at SOAS in London (1956–60), then followed the courses on Byzantine history given by Paul Lemerle in section IV of the Ecole Pratique in Paris in the 1960s, specializing in early Ottoman history. She worked at the National Hellenic Research Foundation until the 1980s,\(^{23}\) when she became professor of Ottoman History at the University of Crete, in the same period as Vassilis Dimitriadis. The historian John C. Alexander (=Alexandropoulos), born in 1940, studied Ottoman history at Columbia University in the United States, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1974. Alexander later worked at the National Hellenic Research Foundation, and in the 1990s he became professor of Ottoman History at the University of Thessaloniki.\(^{24}\) In general, since the 1980s Ottoman Studies in Greece has seen fruitful results, publishing Ottoman sources which have illuminated questions of the economy, population, topography and urban history, taxation and
fiscal issues, the history of monasteries and convents, and Christian communities. And in the same period Ottoman Studies has been reinforced by the establishment of new university courses, notably at the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Crete, a new university where Nikos Svoronos was a member of the governing committee. Dimitriadis and Zachariadou were elected professors in Turkish Studies in the latter department, and a programme for Ottoman and Turkish Studies was established in 1987 at the Institute for Mediterranean Studies (IMS/FORTH) by these two Ottomanists. Since the 1990s Ottoman history has been taught at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki by Alexander and his students, while research has also been conducted at the National Hellenic Research Foundation by Evangelia Balta, and by researchers at IMS/FORTH.

The publication of original sources and translations, as well as the expansion of undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Turkish and Ottoman Studies, has broadened the Greek historiography in terms of both subjects and sources. Since the end of the 1980s, and especially since the turn of the millennium, many of the classical studies on the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey have been translated into Greek: works by Paul Wittek, Halil İnalcık, Donald Quataert, Suraiya Faroqhi, Şevket Pamuk, Erik Jan Zürcher and Cemal Kafadar have been published in Greece, thanks to the careful editing of historians like Kostas Kostis and Socrates D. Petmezas (these two published many translated works in their edited series for Alexandreia publications). Edited volumes with translated articles in Greek thus brought Greek, Turkish, European and American historians of the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire together.

A Review of Ottoman and Turkish Economic and Social History and Its Internationalization

Politically instrumentalized nationalist history writing in Turkey had obstructed the internationalization of the craft in general, and in particular as regards the inclusion of non-Muslim, non-Turkish communities into the historiography of the Ottoman Empire. The limited and politically oriented understanding of the Ottoman past expressed through the Turkish nationalist historiography left no room for a shared history of different communities. Greek and Armenian histories especially were confined to the histories of minorities, seen from the perspective of the Turkish state, and in general held responsible for the failure of the Ottoman Empire. Only with the internationalization of Ottoman
history writing could this closed and ahistorical historiography be undermined. In the following we trace the process of this internationalization, which eventually led to the development of connections between the Greek and Turkish historiographies.

Economic and social history as a discipline in Turkey is relatively young. Although it is difficult to set a date for when studies in economic history began to be the object of a joint and orchestrated effort, the year 1955, when Ömer Lütfi Barkan (1902–79) established the Institute for Turkish Economic History in Istanbul, marks a point of culmination. Barkan’s personal and academic connection to the *Annales* school has been influential in the discipline from the early days of its emergence. In fact, in the 1950s Barkan made one of the earliest pleas – albeit with no adequate response – to Greek historians to use Ottoman archival sources, and so indirectly connect the historiographies in Athens.

Halil İnalcık, who passed away in July 2016 aged 100, took the study of the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire to a decisively higher level of institutionalization and internationalization. İnalcık was a professor in the Department of History at Chicago University from 1972 up to his retirement in 1986. In 1993, after having held appointments at other prominent universities in the United States, he returned to Turkey as the founding chair of the Department of History at Bilkent University, of which he remained a member until his death. İnalcık’s legacy for the internationalization of Ottoman economic and social history is his leadership in the establishment of the International Association of Ottoman Social and Economic History, which organized the first International Congress of the Social and Economic History of Turkey in 1977. In 2008 the name of the congress was changed to the International Congress of Ottoman Social and Economic History (ICOSEH). ICOSEH convened thirteen times, eight of which were outside Turkey. It still serves as one of the most important venues for the further internationalization of the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire. Although the prominent Byzantinist Nikolas Oikonomides participated in the 3rd meeting, held in Princeton in 1983, the involvement of Greek scholars and scholars working on the Greek lands of the Ottoman Empire in the ICOSEH meetings were limited for quite a while. Only with the 12th meeting in Retz in 2011 and the 13th in Alcala in 2013 can we observe the emergence of a critical mass of contributions from Greek and Turkish academics working on the Greek lands of the Ottoman Empire, another sign of enhanced academic cooperation between economic and social historiography on both shores of the Aegean, and a timely consequence of the further internationalization of Ottoman history writing.
We can argue, though, that the real spearhead for the internationalization of Ottoman economic and social history is our dear colleague Suraiya Faroqhi. Faroqhi had been one of Barkan’s students, and is one of the most prolific authors in the field. Her publications have contributed to the visibility of the Ottoman Empire in international academia in general and in economic and social history in particular. Volumes edited by Faroqhi and her collaborators have served as platforms of academic exchange. Like İnalçık, she has made her mark on the literature, especially as regards the internationalization of the field.

In the 1980s, partially also thanks to the popularity of world-systems theory, Ottoman economic history gained visibility internationally. Among others, a volume edited by Huri İslamoğlu with a most eloquent introduction was particularly influential in this regard. It contained contributions from several other economic and social historians who would define the field in the years to come, as well as Immanuel Wallerstein. Donald Quataert, to whom this volume is dedicated and whose contribution to the field of Ottoman labour history will be elaborated in detail below, was one of these historians. In 1993 Quataert published his influential and widely read book on nineteenth-century Ottoman manufacturing, and in the following year edited a book on manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic. Building upon the aforementioned historiographical developments, the 1990s marked a culmination point for the internationalization of Ottoman social and economic history writing, and this then served as a basis for the rapprochement between the Greek and Turkish historiographies on the Turkish side.

**Bridging the Aegean**

Since the turn of the millennium, social scientists from Greece and Turkey have begun to explore new aspects of society and history in both countries, examining the formation of nation-states, the transition to modernity and the emergence of citizenship, in a series of three collective interdisciplinary volumes published in Greek and English.

Since the early 1990s a new generation of historians both from Greece and Turkey have been learning Turkish and Greek as research languages, engaging with the sources and themes of a shared Greek, Ottoman and Turkish history, and thus contributing to a shared historiography that bridges the Aegean. We will name some of these scholars and their work in what follows, though without claiming to be exhaustive.

The late Vangelis Kechriotis, to whom this volume is dedicated, was one of these Greek scholars, having a keen interest in the interconnections
and shifting boundaries of the societies of the late Ottoman period. Evangelia Balta, Sia Anagnostopoulou, Paraskevas Konortas, Eleni Gara, Antonis Anastasopoulos, Elias Kolovos, Phokion Kotzageorgis, Sophia Laiou, Marinos Sariyannis, Demetrios Papastamatiou and Irini Renieri have all contributed to the emergence of a connected history writing.

Particularly important in this effort was the joint research group for the project ‘Christian Communities in Cappadocia’, initiated by Christos Hadziiossif in the 1990s–2000s and hosted at the Institute for Mediterranean Studies/FORTH. This project boosted awareness of the need for a more holistic approach, and issued trend-setting publications. Hadziiossif has been influential in the development of this inclusive historiography not by ignoring the distinct characteristics of the Orthodox Christian communities in the Ottoman society, but rather by acknowledging the multi-ethnic, multi-religious political and social order of the Ottoman Empire. In this regard, he does not conceptualize the Orthodox Christian communities as minorities, living as culturally isolated or politically non-represented social groups, but instead adopts a perspective that accommodates the multifaceted, intrinsic social and economic activities, tensions and connections that characterize their interactions. This positioning also enables the historian to better understand the political upheavals connected to nation-making processes. On this complicated issue, the Center for Asia Minor Studies in Athens pursues a valuable and purpose-oriented agenda by conserving the Greek Orthodox Christian identity both of and from the lost homelands in Anatolia.

To mention just some of the research topics where the use of Ottoman sources has enriched Greek historiography, we could cite: the interrelations among Greek-Christians and other ethno-religious communities of the late Ottoman Empire in the period of transition to nation-states; the conceptualization of Rum as a constitutive element of Ottoman history; the status of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate under Ottoman rule; the establishment of pious endowments (vakıf); the economic and political importance of Christian monasteries under Ottoman rule; economic and social history in the Ottoman Balkans, the Mediterranean and the Aegean islands; the economic, social and cultural history of the Turkish-speaking Christian Orthodox communities of Asia Minor; development of the Ottoman cities and capital formation; political mobilization and forms of collective action; the history of Ottoman political thought; and the economic history of the Black Sea. Yannis Papadopoulos uses Ottoman and Turkish sources in order to examine the experiences of the first migrants to travel between the Ottoman Empire and the United States, while Efi Kanner also studies the formation of
the discourses on women’s rights and feminist interventions that appear among the various ethno-religious groups in the Ottoman Empire, Greece, and later Turkey from the mid-nineteenth century to the interwar period, or the meanings of poverty in the late Ottoman Empire as they were elaborated in various ethno-religious contexts.  

On the Turkish side of the Aegean, Onur Yıldırım produced one of the most authoritative accounts on the population exchange by making use of sources both in Greek and Turkish. Elçin Macar published on the Greek Patriarchate and Greek community in Istanbul. The latest members of this expanding group of scholars are Ayshe Ozil, whose work is representative of the advanced level of scholarship on the non-dominant communities within the Ottoman Empire, and Merih Erol, whose recent book is an important contribution to the intersection of the cultural and political histories of the Greeks of Istanbul. Lastly, the work of the brothers Yorgo, Foti and Stefo Benlisoy should also be mentioned here, as an example of Istambulite Greeks who have long been contributing to the history of Greeks in Turkey. They are among the founders of the publishing house Istos (Greek: web and tissue), which focuses on the Greek cultural and social presence in the history of the Ottoman Empire and today’s Turkey, with publications in Turkish, Greek and Karamanlidika. Istos recently published Foti Benlisoy’s book on the understudied topic of the resistance of soldiers within the Greek army during the Greek military campaign.

In the new millennium, collaborations among Turkish and Greek researchers have offered a complex understanding of historical developments within the interrelated communities. There remains a powerful challenge to deconstruct the nationalistic historiographical approaches on both sides of the Aegean by offering combinations of sources in Greek, Turkish and Ottoman languages, and adopting a comparative perspective.

Greek Historiography on Labour

From the history of trade union organizations and their leaders, the history of the labour movement in Greece has been transposed since the 1980s to the study of culture, collective labour action and the ‘spontaneous’ or less organized workers’ reactions that activated the populations of industrial cities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the early 1980s a brief effort at the creation of an Association for the Study of the Labour Movement’s History gave an impetus to seminars and new research. Alongside a history of the labour movement that
put emphasis on the political history of workers’ organizations (Yannis Kordatos, Kostis Moskoff). Greek historiography saw the development of a historiography dealing with institutions, labour legislation and state intervention. Interest has centred on the institution of the social sector of the state mainly in the interwar years, and in its involvement with international organizations like the International Labour Organization (ILO). During the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s, the category of age was introduced, in order to study children’s labour and apprenticeship systems; the old question of class formation was re-examined in urban and agricultural sectors, while more recent approaches have provided an abundance of new realia on productive structures, division of occupations and the labour movement in Macedonia.

Since the mid 1980s, the history of labour has generated a substantive renewal of the social history of Greece by using the perspective of the history of women and gender. The studies on the subject by Efi Avdela are pioneering. Her study of women civil servants in the first half of the twentieth century introduced a systematic treatment of the social history of labour and its involvement with the history of women, linking women’s work with the social, legal and familial inferiority of women. Protective provisions for women’s work in labour legislation and the relevant provisions included in collective labour agreements were studied in subsequent research on the history of labour, while other studies have investigated anti-feminist ideas about female paid labour and the demand for the prohibition of women’s work outside the home. Focusing on a tobacco workers’ strike in multi-ethnic post-Ottoman Thessaloniki in 1914, much mentioned in the scholarship, and using the city’s Greek press, Efi Avdela has examined how metaphorical uses of class, ethnicity and gender construct meanings and symbolically organize action. By using methodologies and sources previously neglected in the Greek historiography, such as the reports of Labour Inspectors, Avdela has demonstrated that these reports ‘construct diiscursively the reality they purportedly document’, making ‘references to underlying meaning, that is external, yet related to their textuality’.

Studies from 2000 onwards have examined individual issues in the history of labour from the gender perspective, such as the relations between women’s organizations and political parties in the interwar years with regard to the legislation on the protection of women’s labour, or the multiple personae of the working woman in industry and the craft industry of female workers. Employing archives of industrial enterprises, other studies have correlated labour markets and the gender-based division of labour with the organization of urban space, and the choice of place of residence of male and female workers. The systematic
use of archives of industrial enterprises has permitted a focus on the labour process at the sites of production of thread and textile mills, a branch of industry with a high concentration of female labour, highlighting the economic dimension of women’s work in industry, investigating the interweaving of technical and gender-based divisions of labour, and examining crucial aspects of the process of industrialization (such as technological modernization, the composition of the workforce, the organization and division of labour, day wages, the occupational hierarchy, the structure of specializations, and the practices of workforce management). These approaches to a new economic history of labour have highlighted the lack of equality in the remuneration of men and women, based on a gendered division of labour and a gendered organization of work in the factory, aimed at reducing labour costs for employers.77

Using a variety of sources, research has focused on the influence of family and gender in the organization of labour and labour relationships in the Greek mines in the mid nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and has shown how the organization of labour through the subcontractor system was based to a large extent on systems of kinship and on the family and gender division of labour.78

Research has shown that various industrial enterprises adopted paternalistic gender practices in order to recruit and control the labour force. At the same time, employers’ gender-based policies in the management of the workforce in factories have also been studied. It has been argued that the management of labour issues by employers, trade unions and the state, within the framework either of employers’ paternalism or of workers’ struggles and institutional interventions, was not based exclusively on the distinction between ‘capital’ and ‘labour’, but on underlying gender-based social apportionments of labour.79 The various rhetorics that have been employed in connection with the work performed by women have also been examined.80

Dimitra Lampropoulou deals with the manual labour of a typical male occupation – that of builders – investigating the involvement of gender and class in the make-up of the male worker’s identity, using theoretical elaborations on masculinity and the body, and employing life narrations, the press and archival material.81

A distinct historiographical turn has concerned the non-market labour of servants and domestic workers. In the Greek case, research has been conducted on the legal status of male and female servants and domestic workers in Greece during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In order to bring out the experience of housemaids in the supply of paid domestic service, Pothiti Hantzaroula has used life histories and the methodology of oral history in studying domestic service
as a relationship that is permeated by, but also forms, class and gender hierarchies. Her work on the memories of housemaids has shed light on the process by which, on the one hand, subjects were formed by the family and housework was constructed as being inferior, and, on the other, social subjection was achieved. Sexual assault in domestic service and the sexual politics that assigned the blame for sexual exploitation to domestic workers is another aspect of this research. Research interest has gradually turned to the working experiences of immigrant domestic workers in contemporary Greece and the analysis of gender, class and race hierarchies in the production of their subjectivity. At the same time, the political awakening occasioned in sections of Greek society by the murderous attack upon an immigrant female cleaning worker in December 2008 provided the material for a collection of texts that examined in summary form the courses taken by history and modern policies in relation to forms of unofficial labour in an area characterized by the strong presence of a female immigrant workforce – that of cleaning and service work.

Since the new millennium, labour as a historiographical subject has captured the interest of a number of historians, mainly of earlier generations. Postgraduate and doctoral theses, as well as articles in books and journals, have suggested a renewed interest in a frontline subject. The study by Kostas Fountanopoulos, in attempting to make use of E.P. Thompson’s concept of the ‘moral economy’ and following the tradition of social and political history cultivated in Greece in the 1980s and 1990s, places emphasis on the dimension of culture in the formation of the identity of the working class as regards workers’ struggles in interwar Thessaloniki, and integrates women’s labour into the process of the formation of the working class. A renewal in social and political history from below deals with the social and cultural history of master artisans and shopkeepers in Athens and the ways that this ‘traditional petite bourgeoisie’ constituted itself as a collective subject in the first decades of the twentieth century, as the works by Nikos Potamianos indicate. His study on the workers’ mobilization against high prices in Greece during World War I and the Greco-Turkish war, and the legislation against profiteering that was adopted in the context of rising state intervention in the economy, explores the dialectic relationship between traditional representations of the merchant and emerging statism as well as the strategies of the young labour movement towards workers’ unification. In a parallel approach, the study by Kostas Paloukis on an interwar Greek Trotskyist organization (the ‘Archive of Marxism’) focuses on social mobilizations, ideology, political organization and the cultural practices of the workers’ strata.
Regarding the formation and historical evolution of the regimes and relations of labour, new research examines the social practices and legal regulations on slave labour during the Greek Revolution, in the period of transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Greek nation-state.90

Other studies since 2000 have explored skilled work, the divisions of labour in specific branches (printing, tobacco) and the transformations in labour process caused by technological change,91 and labour in the services, especially in the retail trade.92 Paid and unpaid labour offered by members of the family in the house, in family businesses and in the workplace, as well as the different family responses to economic crises and to the labour markets, constitute a new research field.93 The history of techniques and artisans, as recorded by ethnographic approaches, has provided rich material on labour and everyday life in the primary and secondary sectors of the economy.94

The history of occupational health has also been studied, linked with the handling of the very acute problems of public health and the spread of concerns about social welfare in the process of capitalist modernization in Greece in the first decades of the twentieth century. Studies have shown that medical and technical knowledge in connection with health risks in workplaces took shape socially, and crystallized in terms of institutions within a system of power relations, the elements of which were the employers, working men and women, and the state.95 In general, the history of occupational health and safety has not yet been developed through specific studies, except in the cases of the textile industry and mining.96

The history of migration is a field in which policies on labour and working conditions are discussed on a transnational level.97 Since the end of the 1990s and in the following decades, new approaches have emerged on the policies of the Greek state and of the receiving societies, in Europe and the Americas, relating to migration as well as to migrants’ subjectivities in relation to gender, class and race. These studies have introduced new topics and research tools, while highlighting the multiplicity of the immigrants’ experiences.98

**Labour History of the Ottoman Past in Greek Historiography**

Guilds as occupational institutions dominated the landscape of urban economic activities in the Ottoman Empire. The conventional literature on guilds,99 both in Greek as well as in Turkish historiography, includes valuable accounts on the history of work and labour relations. However,
until recently neither the authors who have contributed to this subfield, nor the readership of these valuable studies, have perceived them within the genre or perspective of labour history. Thanks to the opening up of labour historiography and the inclusion of labour organizations beyond trade unions, the existing literature on guilds can now be revisited through the lens of a new labour history.

Although guilds attracted the interest of scholars in Greece in the 1970s and 1980s, the focus was on the Greek-Christian guilds and their inherent democratic character. Because of the available sources, and because of the questions posed by the researchers, the emphasis has been on the regulation of prices and wages through the guilds, rather than on the internal division and organization of labour into the guilds, the composition and recruitment of the workforce, or the subcontracting of labour within and outside the guilds. In this respect, the Greek historiography on guilds offers an economic history perspective in the broader sense, but at the same time also adopts a limited perception of labour. The relations and/or antagonisms among the different ethno-religious occupational organizations, or the discrimination and harassment along ethno-religious lines regarding guild members in the mixed guilds of the Greek lands of the Ottoman Empire, have not yet been researched.

In labour history and the history of the labour movement, a special place is held by the case of multi-ethnic Ottoman Thessaloniki and the prominent role of the Jewish workers in the city. The mainly Jewish socialist organization Socialist Workers’ Federation (Fédération socialiste ouvrière, Federacion), founded in 1909 in Ottoman Thessaloniki, had been treated by Marxist Greek historiography as the inevitable consequence of the formation of the Socialist Workers’ Party of Greece, founded in the context of the Greek state in 1918. The change of paradigm came in the 1980s and 1990s, when historical research focused on the culture of the federation and introduced the concepts of gender and ethnicity into the analysis, challenging the previous interpretations of the Greek ‘national’ labour movement. Research on aspects of Jewish, Muslim and Christian Orthodox working life in Ottoman Thessaloniki has been conducted by Greek as well as Turkish and Israeli historians, in this way recognizing the case of Thessaloniki as exemplary in the context of the Ottoman Empire and during the transition to the Greek nation-state.

Undoubtedly, many gains have been made by the Greek historiography of labour: new sources, an expansion of the subject matter, an undermining of certainties, new questions and methodologies, and the introduction of new concepts. Many of the studies cited above converse with and take part in the international historiographical debate, both
with regards to their theoretical elaborations and with regard to the material to which they draw attention.

In 2014 a loose group of historians created the Greek Labour and Labour Movement History Network in Athens. The main objectives of the network are the promotion of communication and discussion between researchers, the coordination of activities, cooperation in accomplishing research projects, and communication with colleagues from other countries and with the European Labour History Network (ELHN). As trends in labour history stimulated cross-border collaboration, since its creation in 2013 the ELHN has favoured diverse working groups with specific topics (like free and unfree labour, feminist labour history, occupational health and safety, remuneration, factory history), and organized three conferences (in Turin, December 2015, in Paris, November 2017 and in Amsterdam, September 2019) in order to promote research collaboration across borders. As a recent sign of increased cooperation between historians in Greece and Turkey, several sessions were dedicated to Ottoman economic, social and labour history at the 3rd International Conference in Economic and Social History, which was organized in Greece with the special theme ‘Labour History: Production, Markets, Relations, Policies (from the Late Middle Ages to the Early 21st Century)’ (Ioannina, May 2017).

Ottoman and Turkish Labour Historiography

Labour history remained an underdeveloped subfield of the twentieth-century Turkish historiography. An assessment of the literature published in 2002 described the status of labour history as miserable. The main reasons for the severe underdevelopment of the field can be summed up with a twofold argument: a methodological one and a historical one. First, the gaze of labour history in Turkey was confined to the experiences of workers, limited to a class-based understanding of labour. This perception was based on the assumption that the working class consisted or should have consisted of proletarianized male, industrial and politically organized workers. This exclusionary and self-limiting methodology left fruitful areas of research off the radar and disqualified the vast majority of male and especially female labourers as agents or actors in labour history, since presumably they did not belong to the working class. Secondly, due to the late and limited scope of mechanized industrial production and the concomitant low level of unionization and limited success of labour organizations, the history of labour – which meant the history of the labour struggle in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey – remained
a neglected field. Starting from the new millennium, this academic landscape began to transform itself through an opening initiated by a new generation of labour historians. Y. Doğan Çetinkaya, one of the leading labour historians of this new generation, has recently produced a masterful review of the limitations of twentieth-century labour history in Turkey. Although Çetinkaya’s review and evaluation is timely and explanatory, the fact that he himself is using the lens of a newly defined broader understanding of the working class differentiates his position from the main methodological axis of this volume. Our effort aims not to broaden the limitations of working-class history, but to pursue the aims of global labour history and so use class as one of the multiple signifiers of labour history – and not as the only one. With the development of international historiography on labour, going through the stages of comparative, international and global, class as the dominant paradigm has lost ground to multiple identities. The years immediately after the turn of the millennium also mark the revision of the methodological toolbox of labour history. This paradigm shift can be seen as both the cause and result of the internationalization of labour history writing. In this regard it is not surprising that the first special section devoted to Ottoman labour history (Labor History of the Ottoman Middle East, 1700–1922), organized by Donald Quataert, appeared in one of the most prominent international journals, International Labor and Working-Class History, in 2001. In his introductory essay, Quataert highlighted the expansion of focus of Ottoman labour history to include non-guild, non-union labour, including women and children. It is this opening of the field to which we would like to contribute further. The articles in the 2001 collection (Chalcraft’s study on coal miners’ methods of resistance in the second half of the nineteenth century in Port Sa’d; Kırh’s work on the importance of regional allegiances to finding employment in Istanbul in the early nineteenth century; Zarinebaf-Shahr’s article on the role of women in the Istanbul economy in the eighteenth and nineteenth century; and Quataert and Duman’s study of a first-person narrative of a mine worker in Zonguldak in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century) paved the way for a new Ottoman labour history. If we take into consideration his oeuvre, his students’ work and also the studies of academics influenced by him, it is no exaggeration to talk about a ‘Quataert effect’ on the internationalization of Ottoman labour history. As a matter of fact, the second collection on Ottoman and Republican Turkish labour history, edited by Gavin Brockett and Touraj Atabaki and published in 2009 as a supplement of another very influential journal on international labour history, International Review of Social History, clearly showed this effect. Quataert’s epilogue to this supplement...
provides us with a good assessment of the achievements and limitations of Ottoman/Turkish labour history and the opportunities for comparative history in 2009. His urge to reconnect the histories of the successor states of the Ottoman Empire has been a major motivation for the preparation of this volume.\textsuperscript{115}

The recent expansion of the field of labour history in Turkey has also gained additional momentum with the revitalization of non-university, NGO-based involvements. A joint effort orchestrated by Erden Akbulut from the Social History Research Foundation of Turkey (TÜSTAV), with the cooperation of the History Foundation (Tarih Vakfı) and the Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey (DİSK), started to organize a series of biennial conferences. The first conference, in November 2013, was on the sources of the history of the Ottoman and Turkish labour movements. The second, in October 2015, had a thematic focus on the emergence of the working class in the Ottoman Empire. These two events were attempts to connect labour historians active both in academia as well as in labour organizations. The contributions of these conferences have not been published as proceedings, but functioned as initiators for two recent collections.\textsuperscript{116} These publications are also in accord with new developments in the field, and are part of the expansion of the perspective beyond the limitations of the dominant conventional working-class paradigm. The connection of labour historiography on the Ottoman Middle East and Turkey with global labour history and the global history of work has very recently been introduced and examined by Brockett and Balkılıç,\textsuperscript{117} whose work serves as the most updated evaluation of historiography in this regard.

A non-exhaustive list of themes incorporated into labour history would include: gender and women’s labour history; the role of ethnicity and religion in finding employment; non-unionized forms of resistance; agricultural labour relations; the variety of experiences in workplaces including daily life in factories, other shop floors and domestic service; and informal and unfree forms of labour. In the following we will review the emerging literature in these fields since 2000 in the Ottoman and Turkish labour historiography. The contributions to the present volume can be seen as a part of this new and expanded labour history writing.

\section*{Gender and Women’s Labour History, Ethnicity and Religion in Ottoman Historiography in Turkey}

Although there have been attempts to place women’s labour history on the agenda, we should admit that Ottoman and Turkish labour history
remains gender blind to a high degree. Female labour constituted the majority of the Bursa silk industry in the late nineteenth century, and thanks to this high concentration of women in the industrial workforce of late Ottoman Bursa, female workers became visible in Ottoman Studies as early as 1976 in an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.\textsuperscript{118} The case of female workers in the Bursa silk industry remains an exception to the dearth of studies on female participation in the industrial workforce of the Ottoman Empire.

Ottoman labour history has benefited only to a limited extent from the incorporation of gender into social and economic history writing since the 1990s. Faroqhi’s work at the intersection of economic and social history and women’s history\textsuperscript{119} is surely of crucial importance in this regard, and Quataert was again pioneering in bringing a gender perspective to Ottoman labour history as early as the 1990s.\textsuperscript{120} Although there were a few individual studies on the role of women in the Ottoman economy published in the first decade of the twenty-first century,\textsuperscript{121} it is not yet possible to argue that gender constituted a strand of Ottoman labour history. Gülhan Balsoy’s article from 2009 is an important attempt to gender Ottoman labour history. In her study she points to the disconnect between gender and labour history in Ottoman Studies.\textsuperscript{122} A recent contribution on women’s history in the late Ottoman Empire includes one study on female tobacco workers in the province of Salonika and another on the integration of home-based female labour into factory production in Istanbul.\textsuperscript{123} The most recent publication in the field is a novel contribution to international labour history, which skilfully compares Bursa’s raw silk industry and Bombay’s spinning industries in the late nineteenth century, from a gendered labour perspective.\textsuperscript{124} Yet although limited in their number and scope, studies on Ottoman labour history which consider the gender aspect are more developed than comparable studies conducted on the labour history of Republican Turkey. As a whole, the severe underdevelopment of gendered perspectives is a double-edged sword for Ottoman and Turkish labour history. This gender blindness not only hobbles the studies on female labourers, but due to the non-existence of masculinity studies in the field we also have a genderless and handicapped account of male workers and labourers in Ottoman and Turkish labour history.

The role of ethnicity and religion is another underdeveloped aspect of Ottoman and Turkish labour history. The Ottoman populace was multi-ethnic and multi-religious for the duration of the empire from its very beginning. Yet the historiography in general suffers from methodological nationalism. Marcel van der Linden has precisely delineated two major limitations of methodological nationalism, and highlighted the
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dangers of being confined to it for labour history. First, methodological nationalists naturalize the nation-state, and in doing so utilize it as the unit of historical research; they thus project the national unity back into history. Secondly, methodological nationalism blurs the differentiations between society, state and national territory. In the specific case of the Ottoman Empire, we are unfortunately confronted with national historiographies that work in their own silos of knowledge production without engaging with each other. Surely, as we delineated above, the borders of the historiographies in Greece and Turkey have been more permeable than this, yet we have still a long way to go. In particular, the survival of the ill-conceived perception that Republican Turkey is the successor state of the Ottoman Empire limits our understanding and analysis, and pushes us to include non-Turkish, non-Muslim elements of Ottoman society in Ottoman and Turkish labour history. Concomitantly, the role of religion and ethnicity in the field has been understudied. Similar to other avenues of research, there has been improvement in the state of the field since the new millennium, again following the lead of Quataert. Kirlı’s aforementioned work from 2001 and Yıldırım’s work on ethno-religious conflict in an Istanbul guild in the eighteenth century mark a change in this regard. Kabadayı’s article in the aforementioned collection and Akın Sefer’s contribution to the present volume can also be included in this trend.

Informal and unfree forms of labour have also been a neglected theme. As in several other areas, Quataert’s work has been path-breaking in this subject as well. In his 2006 book on labour relations in the Zonguldak coalfield, he devoted a chapter to labour enforcement. Nurşen Gürboğa’s study explores the continuation of labour enforcement in the coalfield in the mid twentieth century. Other forms of unfree labour such as convict and conscripted labour are also finding their places in the new agenda for Ottoman and Turkish labour history, and the study of forms of military labour from the perspective of labour history is another promising field of research. An important research desideratum is the inclusion into the historiography of slavery as a form of unfree labour and labour relations.

Agricultural labour relations and forms of labour recruitment and control are among the related topics that are being newly explored. Alp Yücel Kaya’s studies fall into this category, revisiting previous studies that did not belong to the Ottoman labour historiography, and examining their implications for labour regimes in agricultural production. This opening to rural and agricultural labour and the inclusion into labour history of the most important sector of the Ottoman economy is crucially important.
In a similar vein, recent studies on migration have had strong components of labour migration and therefore a high degree of relevance to labour history. Erol Kahveci has just contributed to this newly emerging field at the intersection of migration and labour history with his article in the special issue ‘Migration and Ethnicity in Coalfield History’ in the *International Review of Social History*, adding the role of ethnicity to the case of the Zonguldak coalfield.

A new strain of research in the labour historiography are non-unionized forms of labour politics. Weakening the dominant position of union-centred historiography, new studies on daily forms of resistance have come to the fore. Examples of such studies include Yiğit Akın’s and Kabadayi’s work on petitions as forms of protest intended to find, retain or improve conditions of employment. Can Nacar’s recent articles address a number of pertinent themes: elaborating methods of resistance among tobacco workers in Ottoman Xanthi and Kavala in the first years of the twentieth century, which oscillated between labour activism and militancy, analysing the dynamics of local conflicts between merchants and boatmen, and the Ottoman government’s flexible mechanisms of mediation in Black Sea ports, especially Samsun in the 1910s; and studying the vested interests and methods of resistance of porters in the Istanbul harbour, struggling both with the state as well as the Istanbul Quay Company.

One important aspect that is still missing in the Ottoman and Turkish labour historiography is a focus on experiences in the daily working lives of the labourers, including domestic servants. It is our hope that this and other neglected and/or understudied topics will find their researchers in the near future.

**Contributions to this Volume**

The contributions to this volume are grouped into three parts. Part I, Agrarian Property and Labour Relations, Rural and Urban Organization of Work, consists of five studies focusing mainly on the nineteenth century. We think it is useful to open the volume with two pieces on the relatively neglected yet important question of rural property regimes and their accompanying agrarian labour relations (Kaya, Hadziiossif), followed by studies on rural labour relations (Çelik, Öncel) and urban occupational structures (Kabadayi and Güvenç).

Alp Yücel Kaya’s opening piece, ‘Were Peasants Bound to the Soil in the Nineteenth-Century Balkans? A Reappraisal of the Question of the New/Second Serfdom in Ottoman Historiography’, addresses the
key issue of bondage to the soil. He firstly revisits the new and second serfdom debate by a critical re-reading of the cornerstone texts on the topic. Then, focusing on property regimes especially in the çiftlik, and the organization of labour relations in Tırhala in the 1850s, he examines bylaws relating to labour organization, claiming that these bylaws legitimized, institutionalized and reinforced bondage to the soil. He claims that through these bylaws the state did not introduce a second serfdom but rather adjusted and regulated labour recruitment for the changing needs of the capitalistic dynamics of agricultural production. Furthermore, by comparing the 1860 bylaw from Tırhala with contemporary examples from other locations in the Balkans, he asserts that bondage to the soil was not a local anomaly in Tırhala, but a common practice in the Ottoman Balkans of the time.

In his piece, ‘The “Invisible” Army of Greek Labourers’, Christos Hadziiossif takes undocumented agricultural labourers in twenty-first-century western Peloponnese as a departure point, and then goes back to the nineteenth-century property and land regimes, deconstructing the illusion in Greek economic historiography that the nineteenth-century agricultural labour force consisted almost entirely of free and small-landholding peasantry based upon egalitarian structures. Contrary to the generally accepted view, Hadziiossif argues that in big currant plantations the labour organization was imposed by landowners on propertyless wage-labouring agricultural workers. He states that historians working on agricultural production and property dynamics back-project to the entire Greek territory a late-period land reform that in fact was limited to a region, and argues instead for an egalitarian structure of land distribution and labour organization. By taking into consideration the technicalities of export-oriented agricultural production, property relations and the terminology used for agricultural workers in archival documentation, his analysis more clearly delineates the social stratifications and the repressive wage policies that were in operation, breaking with the egalitarian model that had hitherto been assumed.

The third piece of this part is Semih Çelik’s “No Work for Anyone in this Country of Misery”: Famine and Labour Relations in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Anatolia’. Çelik’s starting point is the general disconnect between labour and environmental history. Although there are recent studies that aim to overcome this deficiency, Çelik rightly argues that for the Ottoman case this limitation is still valid. In his chapter he uses environmental shocks, especially the mid-nineteenth-century famines, to understand and examine Ottoman perceptions of labour and nature. Based upon a close reading of petitions (which he carefully embeds in a wider range of sources) submitted by famine-struck
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common people, including peasants and bakers, and the Ottoman state’s reaction to them, Çelik uses famine as a nexus to analyse labourers’ agency and reactions – such as making the decision to migrate, sending off their children or adapting to drastic circumstances.

Fatma Öncel’s ‘Rural Manufacturing in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Countryside: Textile Workers in Three Plovdiv Villages’ is the fourth piece of Part I. Öncel revisits the proto-industrialization concept, which has generally been perceived as rather over-used within the European economic historiography. Nevertheless, she shows the usefulness of proto-industrialization as a conceptual tool for studying rural nineteenth-century Ottoman Bulgaria. By focusing on manufacturing activity in three villages in the Plovdiv region, and specifically the composition of household incomes for textile workers, she highlights the fact that economic activity in these villages was to an extent specialized, and that incomes generated by rural industrial production surpassed the shares of agriculture and animal husbandry to such a level that industrial production was not merely a side-employment, but became the main occupation for some of the mid-nineteenth-century Plovdiv villagers. After assessing this situation, which is unexpected from the conventional economic perception of the Ottoman countryside, she brings in aspects of labour organization within households and workshops, technological changes, and labour mobility and migration as explanatory factors. Öncel provides a novel approach by marrying her main sources, namely the mid-nineteenth-century Ottoman tax (temettuat) registers, which have provided the backbone for numerous studies on late Ottoman economic history, with a creative and adapted use of the concept of proto-industrialization.

The last piece of Part I, ‘Ethno-religious Division of Labour in Urban Economies of the Ottoman Empire in the Nineteenth Century’ by M. Erdem Kabadayı and Murat Güvenç, also revisits the temettuat registers dating to the 1840s. This chapter is a product of the ongoing UrbanOccupationsOETR project funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreement no. 679097. Using the methods of digital humanities, and thanks to the efforts of members of the research project team, for this chapter Kabadayı and Güvenç examined around eight hundred temettuat registers and extracted data on occupations and ethno-religious belongings for around fifty thousand observations from sixteen urban locations. After curating and coding the data, which are categorical in their nature, they first address the biases and problems in their archival sources, and then attempt to revisit the old, yet unsettled debate on the role of ethnicity and religion in the
occupational choices of Ottomans, that is, the argument over the ethno-religious division of labour.

Part II: Political Change, Migration and Nationalisms, contains four pieces all focusing on the politically unstable, transformative, and both destructive and moulding decades between the 1880s and the 1920s, for three polities: the Ottoman Empire, and the early national states of Greece and Turkey. The four pieces follow a chronological order, starting from a case study on labour relations in the port of Istanbul, and the social organization and political lives of migrant Armenian workers in the United States in the 1890s (Sefer, Dinçer), and ending with labour disputes tainted by early nationalistic fervours in Athens (Potamianos) and in Istanbul (Ülker) in the first decades of the twentieth century.

Akın Sefer’s piece, ‘Class Formation on the Modern Waterfront: Port Workers and Their Struggles in Late Ottoman Istanbul’, has at its core the drastic contemporaneous political changes and their consequences for Armenian port workers in the Ottoman capital in the 1890s. The increased and militarized political activity of Armenian political organizations resulted in the expulsion of Armenians from this key and traditionally advantageous venue for labour organization and struggle by the increasingly authoritarian Ottoman state. The politicization of the port resulted in the consolidation if not the re-emergence of labour organizations such as guilds at the end of the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, these organizations, unlike their predecessors from earlier eras, re-invented themselves as proto-nationalistic and exclusionary interest groups along strict religious lines of belonging.

The second piece from Sinan Dinçer, ‘Labourers, Refugees, Revolutionaries: Ottoman Perceptions of Armenian Emigration’, follows the migratory lives of Ottoman Armenian workers abroad, specifically in the United States, after they were expelled or forced to look for better prospects outside the Ottoman borders in the politicized and hostile environment of the 1890s, framed by Armenian revolutionary activities, repressive measures by the Ottoman state, and massacres. Mainly politically triggered, the outward international migration of Ottoman Armenians looking for employment in the United States constitutes one of the earliest examples of cross-border labour migration from the Ottoman territories. The Ottoman state first attempted to regulate and then illegalized both the departure from and the return to the Ottoman lands by Armenian subjects, which had dramatic consequences for Armenians living and working within the Ottoman Empire, and those clandestinely trying to leave the empire for work, as well as for Armenian migrant organizations in the United States.
In the third chapter in this part, ‘The Greek Labour Movement and National Preference Demands, 1890–1922’, Nikos Potamianos questions the validity of the concept of national preference relating to tensions among the workers of Athens and Piraeus, focusing on the early twentieth century. In his case study, both locals and foreigners (refugees from Anatolia) belong to the same Greek nation at an important conjuncture in its formation. The influx of refugees, who went through abrupt expropriation and consequent sudden proletarianization, created antagonisms among the established labour organizations in Athens and Piraeus. Potamianos’s study on the ‘othering’ of these refugees by their class comrades provides multifaceted insights into the daily lives and forms of struggle of the workers on both sides of this divide.

The fourth and last chapter in this part is Erol Ülker’s ‘Refugees, Foreigners, Non-Muslims: Nationalism and Workers in the Silahtarağa Power Plant, 1914–24’, which selects the only power plant of the Ottoman Empire as a venue for labour conflict in the very last years of the empire. Similar to the dynamics examined by Potamianos in the previous piece, Ülker focuses on labour conflicts among workers, which are expressed within nationalistic discourses, and carefully represented as parts of a larger process of ongoing nationalization/Turkification of the late Ottoman/early Republican Turkish labour force. Ülker’s study makes critical use of workers’ petitions to the newly emerging Turkish state organs, as well as archives, virtually untapped until now, belonging to the municipal organizations of Istanbul in these transformative years between the end of the Ottoman Empire and the inauguration of the Republic of Turkey.

The chapters in Part III: Labour Market and Emotions in the Twentieth Century have a temporal focus extending to the 1940s and 1950s. They elaborate on feelings and emotions, both genuinely felt as well as strategically constructed on a discursive level (Hantzaroula), at two ends of labour relations: workers (Palaiologos) and their employers (Papastefanaki, Özden).

In her “Fatherly Interest...”: Industrial Paternalism, Labour Management and Gender in the Textile Mills of a Greek Island (Hermoupolis, Syros, 1900–1940), Leda Papastefanaki analyses the meaning and role of industrial paternalism in connection with labour management and gender. Her study focuses on a declining industrial city, mainly textile-producing, on the central island of Cyclades in the pre-World War II decades of the twentieth century. In the interwar period, with increasing financial burdens, the textile mill owners of Hermoupolis developed paternalistic strategies, including gifts and selective bonuses and other additional benefits, and sought to reshape the workforce
and suppress wages by opting for more young and female workers. Papastefanaki argues that paternalistic measures were taken to decrease the mobility of the workforce and increase its submission. Additional indirect disciplinary measures were introduced, especially regarding the female workers. She concludes that gender-selective paternalistic practices not only legitimized capitalistic labour relations but also reshaped the social hierarchy among workers.

In ‘The Changing Organization of Production and Modes of Control, and the Workers’ Response: The Turkish Textile Industry in the 1940s and 1950s’, Barış Alp Özden puts the micro-worlds of production relations, labour control and discipline mechanisms at the core of his analysis. Özden convincingly argues that these areas provide the stage upon which workers’ identities are formed, as well as labour action performed. The introduction of new control and remuneration techniques by the employers, as well as their paternalistic measures to undermine labour resistance expressed through unionized action, provide fruitful ground to analyse these understudied yet decisive determinants of workers’ lives.

In “It Is Fair to Ask for the Improvement of Their Fate”: The Demands, Mobilization and Political Orientation of the Press Workers and Printers of Patras, 1900–1940’, Asimakis Palaiologos examines the labouring lives of a particular group of workers. Press workers and printers have generally been excluded from conventional labour historiography, with its focus on blue-collar workers with low levels of education. Patras, a port city, went through fast industrialization and urbanization in the first half of the twentieth century and housed numerous printing houses. Palaiologos elaborates on the methods of mobilization and political orientation of press workers and printers in this important industrial urban centre of Greece, and on their positioning among other labour organizations.

The last piece in this volume is by Pothiti Hantzaroula, entitled ‘Children’s Domestic Labour: Intimate Relations, Family Politics and the Construction of Identity of Domestic Workers in Interwar Greece’. Relying mainly on oral testimonies, Hantzaroula brings a neglected yet important group of workers into the research agenda. Domestic workers’ lives have been gaining attention in global labour historiography and also in Greek and Turkish labour history. Hantzaroula discerns intermingled labour and family relations, tainted with intimacy, for child and mainly female domestic servants in interwar Greece.

It is our hope through this volume to facilitate an expansion and deepening of the new Ottoman, Turkish and Greek labour history. We are convinced that only after achieving such an expansion can truly comparative perspectives be pursued. This volume, and especially this
historiographical essay, should be seen as an effort to prepare the ground for future comparative work.
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111. For a marker of this methodological change, see the introduction and contributions in the edited volume, Lex Heerma van Voss and Marcel van der Linden, eds, *Class and Other*
Identities: Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Writing of European Labor History (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002).


116. A special section of the journal *Toplumsal Tarih* 245 (2015) and the aforementioned collection in Çetinkaya and Alkan, *Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı Tarihi* include revised versions of some of the papers presented at these conferences.


119. Although Faroqhi cannot be seen as a gender historian, giving a voice to women has been a priority in her oeuvre; for a selection of some case studies, see Suraiya Faroqhi, *Stories of Ottoman Men and Women: Establishing Status, Establishing Control* (Istanbul: Eren, 2002).


121. The work of Karakışla, who is a Quataert student, is worth mentioning here: Yavuz Selim Karakışla, *Women, War and Work in the Ottoman Empire: Society for the Employment of Ottoman Muslim Women, 1916–1923* (Istanbul: Ottoman Bank Archives and Research Centre, 2005). Karakışla continued to publish on the role of women in specific occupations such as post office workers, tailors and domestic servants in the late Ottoman Empire.
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