I have no Country, I have a Homeland

Istanbulite Romiois: Place – Memory – Migration

Nurdan Türker

PETER LANG

Nurdan Türker

I have no Country, I have a Homeland

The book explores the concepts of migration, space, memory and identification drawn from the experiences of Istanbulite Romiois/Greeks and through the notion of being minority. The primary problematic examined in this book revolves around the meaning of these concepts, the functions they serve, and how they are related to the identity of minorities who have experienced ruptures like mass migrations. The concepts such as place and memory are addressed through the way in which Istanbulite Romiois/Greeks create meaningful connections around spaces, identity and memory as evidenced by spatial arrangements and how space in general and in Istanbul is specifically rendered sacred.

Nurdan Turker studied Political Science and International Relations. She finished her graduate study in the Photography Department in the Faculty of Fine Arts and completed her PhD in Social Anthropology. Her research interests include cultural studies, visual anthropology and visual narratives.

I have no Country, I have a Homeland

Nurdan Türker

I have no Country, I have a Homeland

Istanbulite Romiois: Place- Memory- Migration

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

To the memory of my beloved dad,
to my dearest mom and to my lovely niece Aslı

Table of Contents

Preface/Acknowledgments

his invaluable guidance for the subsequent stages. My friend, interpreter Thanos Zarangalis not only personally supported the *Greek/Romioi Languages* section of the book, but also helped with spelling of the Greek words. Their sincere contributions and friendship are priceless; I would like to thank each one of them.

Subject matter experts Dr. Herkül (Iraklias/Hercules) Millas and Dr. Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu reviewed the introduction and conclusion chapters and shared their invaluable opinion on every single item, and recommended source references. Their support was especially important to me, due to the ethic responsibilities that came along with being a non-Romioi researcher. I believe their corrections and the additions they suggested were an imperative factor enabling this study – not to mention their hospitality. I am grateful to them.

I cannot thank enough to my friends Dilşa Deniz, Elif Halverson and Fatima Sakarya for their wholehearted companionship, who read every word during the composition of this study, cleared my way, and shed light each time I felt lost and in the dark. Similarly, many thanks to İbrahim Eke, for his guidance and moral support through the entire dissertation process, and especially during field studies. I would like to thank to my friend Dr. Marcos Karnezos, who read my proposal and draft dissertation, for lighting my way with his valuable guidance in establishing the perspectives (axes) used to analyze the problematic.

I would like to thank to the Anthropology Department of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Yeditepe University who provided me the opportunity for this study that I planned as my doctoral dissertation on anthropology. I would like to thank to all my faculty, starting with jurors Prof. Dr. Akile Gürsoy, Prof. Dr. Nedret Kuran Burçoğlu, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Özbudun, Asst. Prof. Dr. Şefik Peksevgen and Asst. Prof. Dr. Murat Paker for their efforts and contributions, as well as Prof. Dr. Hande Birkalan Gedik, Dr. Begüm Başdaş, Asst. Prof. Dr. Yaprak Civelek, Asst. Prof. Dr. Sevil Baltalı Tırpan and my all other department professors who did not refrain to provide full support during my research proposal and interim reports.

By the nature of an academic research, there were times when I locked myself in my house and withdrew deep into my world. I am aware that I fairly neglected my family and friends who could not wait for my study to be completed. I am grateful for their precious tolerance that lasted almost six years. I can't thank enough to my friends Bahar Akpınar, Onur Eylül Kara, Sebla Selin Ok, Melike Eren, Zeynep Or and Onur Cankoçak who genuinely supported and encouraged me while converting the dissertation into this book, by reading the dissertation and helping me decide on where to focus and how to translate from an academic language into a literary one. I feel indebted to all my dear friends that I can't list

here individually, who genuinely motivated me for the book and minimized my grief after my beloved father, whom I lost during the process.

I can't thank enough translators Arda Akbaş and Fatima Sakarya for their meticulous and very careful efforts. Nina Keese also encouraged me while preparing the book proposal and provided her valuable support in proofreading of it. I would like to thank each one of them. I effected academic proofreading of the book with review of all original cited sources. I'm grateful to my friend Nurten Uzakgiden who generously offered her beautiful home in Prinkipo island to me to help complete this task.

Finally, in respectful memory of the dear late Hrant Dink, for sharing his valuable thoughts with me during the preparation of my dissertation and who started me on this remarkable journey when he asked the question, "How aware are we of differences?", which of course is the intangible foundation for this book.[1]

Certainly, there must be deficiencies despite all this support. Those I have listed above who supported me during the entire process are by no means responsible for my omissions and errors. I am fully responsible for these personally.

The entire work was made possible by the invaluable guidance, generous time commitments and genuine friendship of the Romioi of Istanbul, with whom I had in depth interviews. This study is dedicated to all the interviewees that I met with in Istanbul and Athens, and all the Romioi of Istanbul. I owe them a debt of gratitude.

Nurdan Türker, Istanbul, September 2014 & June 2020

---

1   This thank you has been written with the permission from the family of Hrant Dink.

"The famed Hercules has a rival, Antaeus. They try to destroy one another. Hercules is strong; he grabs Antaeus and slams him to the ground but every time he hits the ground, Antaeus springs back up with more energy. Since Antaeus' mother is Mother Earth, he is unbeatable as long as his feet touch the ground. Once he realizes this, Hercules pulls Antaeus off the ground, holds him up in the air and kills him there. The *Romioi*[2] of Istanbul are just like the legendary Antaeus. As long as their feet touch Istanbul, no one can destroy them easily. But, once you uproot and move them..."[3]

---

2   Turks refer to citizens of Greek origin as "Rum" which has been translated here to *Romioi*, the term which that population uses for itself.

3   *Mihail (Vasiliadis)*: Male around age 60, a *Romioi* of Istanbul. He migrated to Athens but after a number of years returned to Istanbul. Our interviews took place between August and December 2011. He is chief editor of *Apoyevmatini*, Greek newspaper in Turkey.

Chapter 1 Anthropological Journey

An anthropological exploration is a journey that takes place through a long tunnel.[4] Truthfully, this process can be portrayed as a journey, that can be generally described as one that starts with a declaration of a dissertation problematic followed by narrowing of the field of study, setting out how you are going to approach the study, reviewing all the existing literature and conducting field studies. It is indeed a journey; one whose technical side appears to dominate when set out like this, but a process whose emotional side is quite intense as well. For me, this journey through a tunnel was one where I could not see the light at the end of it until I had advanced quite far into the writing of the dissertation. It wasn't that it was complete darkness. It was just that there were moments when I felt quite anxious and alone, and yet others when I felt immersed in a completely different world with interviewees. It was a journey where I felt challenged but one that I couldn't help feeling deeply satisfied for having experienced it. This journey is a transforming one resulting in the reality that you cannot go back to the same emotional, mental and cognitive states you had before you started.[5] This book is based on my doctoral thesis that involved just such a journey. In the part that follows, I will try to describe several aspects of this transformative journey/process.

Questions, questions…

I tried to explicate the problematic–of the perception and identity representation through Orthodox religious rituals by the Romioi of Istanbul, with these questions: What sort of meaning laden relationships do people create around the *place* that they occupy? How is meaning attached to a *space* and how does a space get transformed into a place? What are the factors during that process and what sort of process are we talking about? What are the connections, dynamics and memories that establish "identity" and form the spatial meaning of Istanbul?

---

4   Ruth Behar, *The Vulnerable Observer*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1996, p. 2.
5   Tayfun Atay, "Sosyal Antropoloji'de Yöntem ve Etik Sorunu: Klasik Etnografi'den Diyalojik Etnografi'ye Doğru", in Lordoğlu (ed.), *İnsan, Toplum, Bilim 4. Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi Bildiriler*, Kavram Yayınları, Istanbul, 1996, p. 224.

How are the experiences of religious practices connected to and associated with a place? What kind of role does ethnicity or faith play in spatialization? What is the function of rituals and how is meaning imparted to them? How are the connections between daily life and rituals created? How are rituals planned and implemented; what practices are rejected or substituted and how is a correlation made between what they represent and their socio-political and psychological context? In the realm of meaning what is "sacred" equivalent to and how is space made and maintained as sacred? What does sacred mean to the Romioi living in Istanbul and in Athens? How is Istanbul experienced as a sacred place? What is the content of sacredness comprised of? What is the meaning of being in Istanbul?

I am aware that these questions are rather broad in scope, yet I believe many more questions could be asked, and that they should be analyzed in relation to each other for a better comprehension of the subject.

This starting point for this dissertation is that religious rituals, along with language, are a fundamental component of identity. This study is not an attempt to research the roots of religious rituals of *Istanbulite Romioi* Orthodox and the fundamentals of its practices. By virtue of its approach, the anthropology of religion tries to conceptualize the meanings that people attribute to religious ceremonies. Similarly, this study does not rely on, nor try to research, the presumption of universality or specificity of the concept of belief.

Even if there is a common belief that rituals continue in the same way each time as performances that rest upon predetermined scenarios, it is important to assign meaning and interpret them from a historical context. One should approach the religious rituals of the Romioi Orthodox from the realm of meaning and memory that has been kept culturally alive from generation to generation. The most significant breaking points in this memory arise with migration/forced migrations, as migration is a phenomenon which creates a break in the chain of memory across generations. Athens, the location for much of the emigration that transpired [from Turkey], constitutes a "new" environment for those who immigrated. Every new introduction is in some way a confrontation and therefore it requires a person to make themselves understood, anew. While emigration, that is leaving one's place and encountering new ones, complicates identity for the emigrant, a similar situation can arise for those who remain behind. With the mass migration of Romioi, the drop in their numbers rendered Istanbul into a different city for them. Therefore, a complication in identity was also the case for those who remained behind.

Show your colors! – Fading colors. . .

> "You may recall, we used to cover our books in middle school. The only covering papers available were blue and red. It was the geography class, with this really tough teacher. He asked us to pull out our Atlases. My Atlas was covered in blue. He got really angry, ripped the cover off and said, 'I hate blue'. (. . .) When I got home, I described what had happened. The grownups were upset and said 'we'll be more careful. How did we miss that? We'll cover everything in red from now on'. We walked on eggs shells at the time. . ." (Letha, Istanbul).

These words were spoken by *Letha,*[6] describing a time during the early 1970s that she experienced at the *Yuvakimyon* Girls high school in Fener (Istanbul) to show how in the past caution, what could best be described as the "*let's not give them cause for anger principle*" determined the way adults behaved. However, it is an example of how even something as simple as the color of a book cover could cause an unexpected negative reaction. Not surprisingly after that *Letha* made sure her books were always covered in red in order to show her colors, that is that she 'wasn't Greek'.

It would be appropriate to start examining the problematic of identity, not the least expression of which are colors, by taking up the confusion surrounding the meaning behind the words – Greek, Greek citizen, Romioi and Helene – in the light of historical context.

Who are Greek, *Romioi,* Hellenic?

Hercules Millas, the political scientist, points out that despite having lived together for so many years, the countries' peoples do not understand one another and their "knowledge" rest upon prejudices. According to him, the reasons for this can be linked to past wars and the mutual narrative of enmity that has endured for so long. Millas, who points out that the "Greeks" are not understood in Turkey, and worse that there is a widespread misperception that they are in fact understood, states that those who present themselves as experts on Greece (in Turkey) often don't even know the Greek language. Pointing to this tainted 'knowledge', he emphasizes that even though Turks complain of being misunderstood by outsiders, they in fact are misinformed about outsiders also, including neighboring Greece. As a way of illustrating the nature of this misinformation he presents these questions: "For example, when do you call a neighbor 'Greek'

---

6   *Letha*: Female in her 50s, a Romioi of Istanbul who lives in Istanbul. Our interviews took place in Istanbul in 2012.

and when do you refer to them as 'Helene' or '*Romioi*'? According to you, were the Byzantines 'Roman', 'Romioi' or 'Greek' "?[7]

   In truth, despite the mutual history and years of living together, the misinformation set out by Millas is quite interesting. It brings to mind sharp breaking points and ideological paradigmatic changes. The most significant of these was the "Treaty and Protocol for the Greek and Turkish Population Exchange" signed in 1923 which resulted in the deportation of all Muslims residing in Greece to Turkey, and all Romioi Orthodox residing in Turkey to Greece. Even if Istanbul, Tenedos/Bozcaada, Imbros/Gokceada and Western Thrace were exempt of the protocol, the people could not escape its ripple effect.

   The subject of my study is limited to the Romioi of Istanbul. However, as a diplomat and international relations expert Alexis Alexandris has pointed out, it is impossible to think that the forced removal of close to 1.5 million Romioi Orthodox from their homeland in Anatolia and Eastern Thrace would not have affected the Romioi of Istanbul.[8] Istanbul is a central place with which all Romioi of Anatolia – as with other communities- have a connection. A majority of the Romioi, both living in Istanbul today and in the past, came to the city from other Ottoman territories. As stated by *Xanthus*, an interviewee[9] "*Istanbul is a filter through which all Ottoman Romioi pass*". For this reason, even if the population exchange didn't encompass Istanbul, it was closely connected to it. One of the factors creating this close connection is the fact that a large portion of the Romioi living in Istanbul had elders or members of older generations residing outside of Istanbul. Many of them had relatives who were forced out of their homeland as a result of the population exchange. Another factor is that this center, Istanbul, lost its *hinterland* as a result of the population exchange and became isolated. Another and perhaps a more important factor was the resulting mental shock. Noting that during the Lausanne process Turkey exerted a great deal of effort to include Istanbul within the scope of population exchange, it wouldn't be off base to say that this created the initial suspicion in their minds, for the possibility of another population exchange in the future.

---

7   Herkül Millas, *Geçmişten Bugüne Yunanlılar Dil, Din ve Kimlikleri,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2004, pp. 11–12.

8   Alexis Alexandris, "Lozan Konferansı ve İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi'nin Ekümenik Boyutu: 10 Ocak 1923 Tarihli Tutanağın Önemi", trans. Efi Servou, in Aktar (ed.), *Tarihi, Siyasi, Dini ve Hukuki açıdan Ekümenik Patrikhane*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011, p. 77.

9   *Xanthus:* Male, Romioi of Istanbul, in his 60s, who lives in Athens. The interviews took place in Athens in 2010 and 2011.

In his work titled *Diplomacy and Migration* that is based on his doctoral study, historian Onur Yıldırım focused on the intense diplomatic negotiations that were occurring in the background during the creation of the population exchange protocols. He points out that the population exchange was not just something that affected Greece alone, as has been claimed up until now, but was also one of the most important historical events to shape Turkey's demographic patterns, its property ownership and social structure, and its governmental power relations. One of the most significant aspects to the population exchange, which Yıldırım identifies as possibly one of the most dramatic events to have occurred between these two nations, is the effect it had on solidifying *population exchange* as a mechanism to resolve international conflict and the problem of minorities within the theory of international relations.[10] Sociologist Ayhan Aktar cites the fact that population exchange is mentioned as a way towards resolution within the current context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as an example of the legitimacy it gained during the Lausanne Treaty as a mechanism for resolution.[11]

Forced population exchange is, to this day, one of the most dramatic events that continue to leave traces on the generations that followed. While pointing out that one can come across the physical remnants of the worlds that were broken apart by the forced population exchange in both Turkey and Greece, political scientist Bruce Clark draws attention to the continued silence on the topic. Greek tourism guidebooks mention very few Ottoman structures, and similarly Turkish tourism guides cover the cultural heritage,[12] of Greek or Christian cultural ruins with descriptions that try to brush off their significance. He gives examples of how a large number of Ottoman structures in Greece are either left in a state of neglectful abandonment or used for inappropriate purposes.[13] One of the structures that he points out is the 250 years old Dizdar Mustafa Aga Mosque in Monastiraki, the heart of Athens.[14]

---

10 Onur Yıldırım gives the example of the population exchange between India and Pakistan in 1947. Onur Yıldırım, *Türk-Yunan Mübadelesi'nin Öteki Yüzü: Diplomasi ve Göç,* İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006, pp. 6–11.

11 Ayhan Aktar, *Türk Milliyetçiliği, Gayrimüslimler ve Ekonomik Dönüşüm,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006. p. 152.

12 Cultural heritage concept was discussed in *Place and Memory* part of this book.

13 Bruce Clark, *Twice a Stranger, the Mass Expulsions that Forged Modern Greece and Turkey,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006, pp. 1–2.

14 In the website for the Athens Embassy of the Republic of Turkey, the following information is given about the mosque in the "Notes" portion of the "About the city of Athens" section: Dizdar Mustafa Aga Mosque: This second mosque which is still standing in Athens, and sometimes known as the Lower Sadirvan Mosque or Voyvoda Mosque,

Since the hotel that I stayed in while in Athens during my four fieldwork trip visits was in Monastiraki, the lonely and sad state of this mosque in middle of this very lively and busy square, which I passed by nearly every day, reminded me of the ghost village in Fethiye that was abandoned as a result of the population exchange (Kayakoy). Actually, one doesn't need to go that far for an example. The crudely built homes on top of the Byzantine era city walls surrounding Istanbul, the attempt to build a hotel in Sultanahmet by knocking down a Byzantine era church that was suddenly "noticed" at the last minute, the tiny mosques, churches and monasteries left over from the Byzantine and Ottoman eras that sit squeezed between larger buildings; the complete lack of interest in and neglect of all of these is quite obvious and brings to mind the *why* question. There has to be something more to this than the usual responses to this question – ignorance, lack of education, negative attitudes towards other cultures and religions, indifference to the environment, etc. On the one hand, there are new mosque complexes being built, while on the other, historical mosques from the Ottoman age do not receive the care they need. In the same vein, while Ottoman successes may be a source of pride over our "forefathers/ancestry", it is possible to associate Ottoman with obsolescence and underdevelopment.

This ambivalence over the past is considered to be the result of a rejection of the Ottoman legacy by the elite, according to architectural critic Sibel Bozdoğan and sociologist Reşat Kasaba who further connect it to the concept of modernization.[15] Kasaba points to the main themes of Turkish political discourse during the most of the 20th century. Accordingly, the social, economic and political problems of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey could be directly attributed to the reluctance of people to give up their old institutions and habits. The proposed solution of the discourse in question was that in order to compete in the modern world, the Turkish people needed to detach from their recent past, especially of Ottoman history. Kasaba points out that the reformers, in particular Mustafa Kemal, had envisioned for Turkey an organized, well-articulated and linear modernization process. At the end of this process, a republic would emerge that was as secular as the civilized nations of the West and ethnically homogeneous. By the 1980s however, according to Kasaba, what had been reached was a state

---

was constructed in 1759–1764 by Voyvoda Mustafa Aga in place of the Old Mosque. It is found in Athen's Monastiraki square which was once the area known as the "Turkish Market". http://atina.be.mfa.gov.tr 13/08/2012.

15 Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey,* University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997.

of economic backwardness and social flux. He points to the internal upheavals brought about by pitting secularists and Muslims, Turks and Kurds, reason and faith, rural and urban, in a more general way the old and the new, existing side by side, contending with, but more strengthening, solidifying each other in the process.[16]

The historian Çağlar Keyder, states that of all the words that have been derived from the root word "modern", the one that most clearly describes the Turkish experience is "modernization". The modernizing agent was the ruling elite while the object of modernization was the people of Turkey. Keyder points out that the most important distinction between modernization-from-above and a modernization as a self-generating societal process is that the modernizers retain state power and act in furtherance of their own self- interest. In the Turkish case, he points to the continuity between the Ottoman modernizers and the founders of the Turkish Republic.[17]

Similarly, sociologist and political scientist Şerif Mardin states that when the new state took over, it maintained the broad outline of the former state's ideology.[18] He analyzes the developments of the late 19th century and early 20th century which where inherited by the Republic of Turkey as a duality of provincial-center. When the gentry during the 19th century, regardless of occupation or ethnicity, started to exhibit more interest in economic affairs, the sphere of influence of the local notables started to change. He states that while the protector-protected relationship may have filtered into Ottoman politics earlier, this transition changed the picture completely. According to him, due to state control over the economy, the new activities of the gentry in the field of economics lead to a connection between the gentry and official authorities, which could sometimes take on a symbiotic character. He points out that because local influential individuals, who comprised the gentry class (in layers that consisted of property owners and provincial religious figures), were involved in the affairs of the lower classes, particular in the areas of religion and education, they were

16 Reşat Kasaba, "Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities", in Bozdoğan and Kasaba (eds.), in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity,* University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997, pp. 15–17.

17 Çağlar Keyder, "Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s", in Bozdoğan and Kasaba (eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity,* University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997, p. 39.

18 Şerif Mardin, "Projects as Methodology, Some Thoughts on Modern Turkish Social Science", in Bozdoğan and Kasaba (eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity,* University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997, p. 74.

very influential. As a result of this, he states that the modernization of cultural life in Turkey deepened the abyss between "great" culture and "small" culture and that the outlying regions responded to the central authority by embracing Islam and its cultural legacy even tighter.[19] During the process of modernization in Turkey, Mardin states that the outlying regions were the *bêtes-noires* of the Young Turks and the Kemalists.[20]

Anthropologist Leyla Neyzi, who evaluates the Kemalist modernization project in terms of the concept of subjectivity, points out that the Republic of Turkey was formed atop the Anatolian remains of Young Turks in 1923. Neyzi, who emphasizes that the series of legal and institutional reforms aimed at modernization during the 1920s, including Western mode of dress, such as the replacement of the fez with brimmed hats, and adoption of a Western-style alphabet, calendar, system of time-reckoning, points out that Turkish national identity was centered on the personality of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, whose black and white photographs in chic European suits. She points out that the example of Turkey has raised the questions as to what extend Kemalism has become successful in creating its own tradition as the foundation of Kemalism's subjectivity and what the relationship of this new subjects has with the past.[21] Indeed, the clues on the subject's relationship with his past are detected in the narratives of non-"Turkish/Muslim" persons. The statement "*they regret it now as well, and they say so. They say 'you left, and now we're all alone'*" from interviewee *Basilia,*[22] based on her conversations with Turkish neighbors about the diminishing numbers of Romioi, and the following statements of interviewee *Angelos*[23] are further examples:

> "Of course, we share the same kind of Istanbulite identity with those groups (. . .) whom I, being a Kemalist, would refer to as Republicans. As old Istanbulites, we could come together over that common denominator. Now, Istanbul is beginning to deteriorate from that of the 80s, and they're starting to feel rather lonely. There is a sensation there and we've picked up on that" (Angelos, Athens).

---

19 Mardin, *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010, pp. 53–76.

20 *Bêtes-noires* refers to the thing that is most detested.

21 Leyla Neyzi, Remembering to Forget: Sabbateanism, National Identity, and Subjectivity in Turkey, *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 44 (1), pp. 137–158, Jan. 2002 pp. 139–140.

22 *Basilia*: Female in her fifties; an Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Istanbul. The interviews took place in 2011 in Athens.

23 *Angelos*: Male in his forties; an Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Athens. The interviews took place in 2011 in Athens.

The interviewee *Angelos* is pointing out that the loneliness added to old Istanbulite identity that the Romioi shared with the subgroup of Turks broadly defined as Kemalist/Ataturkist, has become more problematic with the high level of migration into Istanbul. The other interviewees also emphasized the fact that being from Istanbul appears to be a common denominator between Istanbulite Romioi and Istanbulite Turks. Acknowledging its importance as an area of commonality, let us delve into this shared history. The past that comes through in the conversations of old Istanbulite Turks with their Romioi neighbors appears as a depoliticized topic. Speaking about minorities – Romioi, Armenian and Jews – as Istanbul's lost or fading "colors" obviously points to a certain level of avoidance. On the one hand, while on an individual level, Romioi and Armenian neighbors are described in terms that are quite poignant, the traumatic events that we can broadly list as those occurring in 1915, 1922, 1942, 1955 and 1964 are meanwhile either "unknown" or are described in a language reflecting the official state line.

There's a side that correlates to their individual identities when people chat about their Romioi neighbors and reminisce over their mutual memories. By emphasizing their Old Istanbulite status, there's a sense that they are promoting roots, social class and prestige. Engaging in acts of reminiscence festooned with descriptions of memories of Romioi Easter and Muslim Ramadan, of Easter sweetbreads and eggs, rock candy, *meze* appetizers like *topik* and *sarma*, *ouzo* drink and *sirtaki* dances, can, on the one hand simply present an account of the past, but it harbors the danger of curtaining off the other sides to the past. In a situation like this, fiction and non-fiction can switch places. The past can become a prisoner of the memory of the streets of Beyoglu (Istanbul) where you couldn't go out unless you were properly dressed in a hat and tie and of restaurants serving Romioi and Armenian appetizers. Reaching out to the past with such safe, hymns of praises and superficial escapes into "nostalgia" veil the real reasons beneath why they were prevented from speaking in Greek/Romioi along those same streets of Beyoglu and why the employees of those restaurants they frequented, or their neighbors were deported and left the country.[24]

It is important to understand how a relationship with the past is created in the first place, since statements like this that romanticize and aestheticize the past

---

24 In the memories of this generation, Romioi neighbors have a face and name. In the generation that followed, if they have no direct interactions with the Romioi, the latter appear in statements as the subject or object within a general category. This leads to individuals lacking a human face, voice, emotion, father-mother, child, or dreams which in fact is the heart of the categorization that nationalist rhetoric rests on.

can also have the effect of avoiding responsibility. This brings us to the concept of political subjectivity. The relationship that individuals create with the past can't be examined without looking at the way people configure knowledge, or stated another way, the way knowledge is practiced in daily life. For in fact, not understanding, or thinking you understand the Greek, Byzantine or Romioi person which was brought up in the quote from Millas at the start of this writing, and the mutual indifference to elements of Christian and Ottoman cultural legacies mentioned by Clark, is a setup that reflects a political subjectivity that's been constructed. This gives rise to the potential for the creation of either "nostalgia" towards the Romioi or an approach that's negative. Aktar points out that the process of separation during the population exchange had the effect of diminishing the social interactions between peoples who had lived together in a blended way and relegating the experiences that arise from living together to the dustbin of history. In this way, a wave of complete ignorance and misunderstanding about "the other" took over. Instead of trying to understand and respect others who are different, Aktar points out that people live in an environment of constant suspicion and uneasiness.[25] At this point it would make sense to take a closer look at the concept of difference.

The meaning of difference – "*Let's keep a low profile*"

Political scientist Anne Phillips makes clear that difference is not something that relates to our ability to notice difference. She emphasizes that differences have been perceived in an overly cerebral manner as differences in opinions and views. The liberal perception that difference is reduced to diversities of beliefs, views, preferences, goals and experiences is inadequate from the perspective of problems of the political exclusions.[26] After setting out this inadequacy Phillips, quoting from William Connelly, emphasizes that all identities are formed through difference and all identities are simultaneously under the threat of differences of the other. She suggests that there is always a danger that the identities will be dogmatized into immutable essence, and always a danger that difference will lead fear.[27] Setting out from this statement, one can say that

---

25 Ayhan Aktar, ibid, p. 151

26 Anne Phillips, "Dealing with Difference: A Politics of Ideas, or a Politics of Presence", in Benhabib (ed.), *Democracy and Difference, Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1996, p. 140. (Phillips' citation source: Connoly, *Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1991).

27 Phillips, ibid, p. 143.

the constant suspicion which resulted from the population exchange that Aktar emphasized above, is related to the concept of difference that has turned into an immutable essence and that the way that non-Muslims have attempted to live by *"keeping a low profile"*[28] in the years following the exchange reflects this concept into a behavioral position. In the public sphere, invisibility/visibility is without a doubt closely related to political representation.

In approaching the problems of public representation of difference and political presence, Phillips, emphasizes the inability to pretend that the full range of ideas, preferences and alternatives has been adequately represented when homogeneity of political elites and those charged with the job of representations are all male, white and middle class. She suggests the need to come up with mechanisms for dealing with problems revolving around marginalization without fixing boundaries or character of each group.[29] Migration is one of the processes where problems around marginalization, representation and justice are most visible. However, migration is most often viewed as a matter of security.

Political scientist Seyla Benhabib points out that, initiatives that have attempted to develop theories of international and global justice have remained silent on the matter of migration. Benhabib emphasizes that there is not only a tension between declarations of human rights and sovereign claims of states to control their borders, but there's an outright contradiction. She explains this contradiction through the idea of citizenship. She states that the status of having one's citizenship revoked, in other words the permanent status of alienage is a violation of fundamental human rights. After pointing out that this status should not deny anyone any of their basic human rights, Benhabib states that *just membership* entails the right to citizenship on the part of the alien who has met certain conditions.[30] Having one's difference be the cause of vulnerability to marginalization that extends all the way to having one's citizenship taken away, is what Romioi males in Istanbul had to experience up until the year 2000. The Republic of Turkey would strip them of their citizenship for evading their military roll call while they were in Greece or another country for college, or their educational status not conferring a valid enough reason to miss the call. Furthermore, neither Greece, nor other countries, would grant them passports or any other government issued IDs. For decades they would be reduced to living as citizens

---

28 Quoted from interview with *Letha*

29 Ibid, p. 151.

30 Seyla Benhabib, *The Rights of Others – Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2004, pp. 2–4.

of nowhere. This is evidence of how citizenship is not a simple procedural matter but is in fact closely related with discrimination.

Discrimination and the conception that views individuals or groups as bearers of or heirs to a single "culture" are closely related. This close connection becomes more visible during changes in location and migration. Marxist thinker Etienne Balibar analyzes the phenomenon of migration in relation to racism. According to Balibar, the immigration has become a category as a substitute for the notion of race through its operation with the division of labor and the hierarchies of world economies in nation states. To exemplify, he points to the fact that immigrant workers have long been the victims of discrimination and xenophobic violence in which racist clichés has played an important role. Balibar criticizes the fact that while it is accepted that there is no such thing as "human races", nevertheless, the idea that individuals' attitudes and "talents" can be explained away as connected to blood relations or associated with historical "cultures" is also accepted. He explains that like nature, "culture" functions in an *a priori* way by locking individuals or groups into a genealogy and race identification that is intangible and immutable.[31]

Sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein brings attention to the fact that there is a very close connection between xenophobia and discrimination and laying the foundation for justifying inequality experienced by individuals/groups. Such a connection sets the stage for the acceptance of roles with the lowest wages and that are economically the least rewarded in accordance with the current needs.[32] As examples of the close connection that Wallerstein points to, one can list the unhealthy working conditions at the coal mines for Turkish emigrants in Europe, particularly Germany, during the 1960s, the low wages and long working hours for the women who come to Istanbul today, from Moldava and Georgia, to work as domestic help, and the working conditions and hostility that is confronted by Kurdish workers who come to the Western part of Turkey to work in construction. One can also mention the *Varlik Vergisi* (Wealth Tax of 1942 imposed on minorities in Turkey) as a reminder of how economic opportunities or disadvantages can be ethnically determined.

---

31 Etienne Balibar, "Is There a 'Neo-Racism'?", in Balibar and Wallerstein (eds.), *Race, Nation, Class – Ambiguous Identities,* trans. Chris Turner, Verso, London, New York, 1991, pp. 20–22.

32 Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Ideological Tensions of Capitalism Universalism versus Racism and Sexism", in Balibar and Wallerstein (eds.), *Race, Nation, Class – Ambiguous Identities,* Verso, London, New York, 1991, pp. 33–34.

The Wealth Tax *(Varlik Vergisi),* which was instituted in Turkey during the Second World War, especially in Istanbul, was not merely a means to collecting financial resources. In his study on the transfer of wealth that occurred during the Wealth Tax era, which examined it in connection with "Turkification" policies, Ayhan Aktar highlights the tangible and market-oriented economic nationalism that preceded the implementation of the tax. He points out that had this occurred during the early years of the Republic and been limited to changing the capital structure of foreign companies or nationalization alone, it would have been perceived as a "reaction that was left wing, on the side of national independence and anti-imperialism". Instead, when these policies that started in the 1920s began to also be used against non-Muslim workers and civil servants, it indicated an aspect that went beyond the level of company capital and to a "human element consisting of those who don't belong".[33] In the face to face interviews that Aktar conducted with individuals who were liable for the payment of the tax or were closely related to those individuals, he reached the conclusion that the taxation had affected the "social integration" process of minorities in a negative way and characterized the Wealth Tax as a "breaking point". It destroyed all the beliefs of those who had hoped that one day anti-minority policies would surely change and solidified their "half citizen, guest" status.[34] Aktar's evaluation corroborates *Hercules*'s (Millas) comment from the interview I had in Athens, "*Varlik Vergisi (wealth tax), that was the first shock, huge shock*".

The specific event that caused or solidified half-citizenship, or the temporary status, varies by individuals. Such variances may exist as exemplified in interviewee *Iason*'s[35] statement: "*Each family's trauma, in other words, the theme that affected the family the deepest, can be different. For some families it was the Wealth Tax; for others it was the events of September 6–7, 1955; and for some 1964 has been the grandest, the deepest trauma that have affected their family*". Nevertheless, since the target was still a specific identity, one can say that all members of that group associating themselves with the same identity have been affected. One of those events was the Events of Sept. 6–7.

The doctoral study of historian Dilek Güven, which examines the Events of Sept. 6–7, 1955, sheds light on the background of what happened. In her study,

---

33 Ayhan Aktar, *Varlık Vergisi ve "Türkleştirme" Politikaları,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010, pp. 117–118.

34 A. Aktar, 2006, ibid, p. 207.

35 *Iason*: Male, around age 30, Istanbulite Romioi. After completing his high school education in a Romioi high school in Turkey, he migrated to Athens. The interviews took place in 2010 and 2011 in Athens.

Güven, who was able to conduct face-to-face interviews with those who lived through the events and to access the previously unpublished archives, points out that the attacks that were initiated against the non-Muslim residents of Istanbul and Izmir in September 1955 need to be examined in very close connection with the policies of the Turkish state described above. Güven comes to the conclusion that the Events were executed through a partnership of the then DP (Democratic Party) administration, the secret service and the party's local offices along with the participation of student and youth organizations and state-run organizations like the "Cyprus is Turkish Society". One of the surprising findings of this research was the role of the British government in organizing the Events of Sept. 6–7. As a result of these events, Turkey ended up being included as a third power in the Cyprus conflicts, just as the British had anticipated. Güven states that for the majority of the non-Muslims, the Events of Sept. 6–7 were the catalyst behind large waves of emigration as they became convinced that they were not accepted as Turkish citizens.[36]

In the in-depth interviews that I conducted with Romioi Istanbulites in Istanbul and particularly with those in Athens, the Events of Sept. 6–7 was a subject that the interviewees brought up without prompting. Those who had been attacked in their own homes described their experiences in detail. One aspect of the Events of Sept. 6–7 that surfaced in the interviews was that while the Wealth Tax and the later deportations of 1964 were realized through legislative means, this event pitted them directly against so-called native people. These face-to-face encounters deepened the fear, and for those who had experienced attacks directly in their homes especially, it solidified into a state of deep trauma. Even if the resulting emigration didn't reach the mass numbers that would occur in 1964, the collective quality to the trauma is evident.[37]

---

36 Dilek Güven, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Azınlık Politikaları ve Stratejileri Bağlamında 6–7 Eylül Olayları,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006, pp. 208–210.

37 On its effect on the diminishing numbers of the Romioi population, historian Samim Akgönül describes how the Events of Sept. 6–7 lead to a result that was observable over the long term, rather than in the short or intermediate term: "In 1955, 79.691 people reported that Romioi was their native language; 57.906 reported that Romioi was their second language and 86.655 reported that they were Orthodox Christian. In 1960, in other words, five years after the Events of Sept. 6–7, 65.539 reported that Romioi was their native language. Nevertheless, at the same time, of those who reported that Turkish was their native language, 81.849 reported knowing Romioi. When we look at the numbers reporting to be Orthodox Christians in 1960, we see the number is 106.612. In other words, the numbers of Orthodox had increased by 18.7% when compared with 1955. Contrary to just about everyone's belief, the Romioi of Turkey had

In his work titled *Türkiye Rumları,* which was based on a close examination of the published minority press in Istanbul and Athens, and face-to-face interviews conducted in Greece and Turkey along with survey methodology, historian Samim Akgönül draws attention to the psychological effects of the Events of Sept. 6 – 7th. He points out that the word used most often by Romioi of Turkey, when discussing the events of that night, is *security*.

In his comprehensive analysis of the deportations of 1964, in terms of pre-established public opinion and statements that were made and the matter of the properties of those deported, Akgönül points out how just before the deportations – just as the press had similarly prepped the public prior to the Events of Sept. 6 – 7th – there were negative statements, accusations, targeting, changes of borough names and boycott campaigns aimed at Romioi tradesmen.[38] Looking at the results of the 1965 census[39] He states that 30,000 Romioi had left the country in a very short period of time.[40] Pointing to the removal of Romioi of Greek citizenship from Turkey in 1964 as an example of the "tit for tat" policies that would become routine in Turkish-Greek relations from that date forward, Akgönül goes on to say that the daily life of the Romioi minority in Istanbul has been closely linked to the situation in Cyprus ever since the 1960s.[41] This is

---

not left the country after the Events of Sept. 6–7" (Akgönül, *Türkiye Rumları*, trans. Ceylan Gürman, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2007, pp. 221–223).

38 Ibid, pp. 257–260.

39 Among those reporting Turkish as their native language, 78.018 reported Romioi to be their second language. Those reporting Romioi to be their native language numbered 48.096. Total number of Romioi speakers therefore numbered 12.114. Excluding the 11.000 of Greek nationality, these results tell us that in five years, this minority had decreased by about 20.000 members (Ibid, p. 290).

40 Ibid, pp. 257–260.

41 It will be useful to give brief about Cyprus with quotation from Vamık Volkan who is scholar and expert in international conflicts: "Although the Cypriot Greek movement for Enosis (union with Greece) goes back a hundred years or so, it can be said the present 'Cyprus problem' began in 1931when the residence of the British governor was burned by some Grek Cypriots devoted to Enosis. (. . .) Makarios, the archbishop of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, who was born in 1913, became the leader of the struggle. The campaign for Enosis gained ground was greatly resented in Turkey. British, Greek, and Turkish foreign ministers at the London Conference in September 1955, failed to agree on a solution of the problem, while on the island tension mounted. (. . .) The Cypriot Greek guerilla organization EOKA (Ethniki Organosis Kyprion Agoniston) – the National Organization of Cypriot Fighters, created in 1955. (. . .) The Turks insisted that Taksim, the partition of the island between Turks and Greeks, was the only acceptable solution to the unrest. Negotiations between the Greek and Turkish premiers in

also a situation of continuously experiencing a state of "precautionary" hostage taking.[42] In a most striking way, Aktar describes the situation indicated as one where "human matter is used as barter during a period of crisis".[43]

After generally discussing the "past" above, in which the Istanbulite Romioi Orthodox identity has been established, changed and opened to debate, we can usefully return to the details of anthropological voyage that I will explain the fieldwork starting from the determining and narrowing of the subject.

Narrowing the subject: "How am I going to do this?"

In the beginning, facing my dissertation problematic, the issue that presented the biggest challenge was not knowing how I was going to approach it and where to begin. Knowing that the only way to get past this was experiential didn't reduce the intimidation factor.

While providing valuable general contributions to the academic and intellectual field, the writers whose works I quoted in this section – as with other

---

Zurich brought agreement, incorporated in a resolution to establish a republic. This was signed by Britain, Greece, and Turkey in February 1959 in London. (. . .) The Republic of Cyprus was officially born in August 1960. (. . .) On December 21, 1963, violence erupted in Nicosia. Two Turks were killed and five wounded. (. . .) Twenty-five thousand Cypriot Turks became refugees between December 1963 and the summer of 1964. (. . .) No political solution was founded, and tension persisted (. . .) Between December 8, 1967, and January 16 of the following year an estimated 15,000 Greek soldiers left the island they had entered clandestinely. Turkey in turn, dismantled the arrangements for military intervention. (. . .) In June 1968 representatives of the Cypriot Greeks and Turks started talks in Nicosia to find a solution to their differences. When these talks failed in 1972 after three years of negotiation, the United Nations intervened and reactivated them (. . .) In 1969 terrorist groups in support of Enosis surfaced again. (. . .) The followers of the mainland Greek junta tried to assassinate him in 1970. Grivas returned secretly to Cyprus during following year after 'escaping' from house arrest and organized EOKA B for a new fight for Enosis. (. . .) An attempt was made by EOKA B, with the support of junta, to kill Makarios on Cyprus in the summer of 1974. Makarios fled" (Volkan, *Cyprus – War and Adaptation, a Psychoanalytic History of Two Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottsville, 1979, pp. 15–22). Turkey arranged military intervention in January 20, 1974.

42 Akgönül, ibid, 251.

43 Ayhan Aktar, "Nüfusun Homojenleştirilmesi ve Ekonominin Türkleştirilmesi Sürecinde Bir Aşama: Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi, 1923–1924", in Hirschon (ed.), *Ege'yi Geçerken, 1923 Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi,* trans. Müfide Pekin and Ertuğrul Altınay, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2007, p. 112.

the writers who I will refer to in other sections – provided specific insight into narrowing the framework of this study that examines ritual-identity interplay with respect to place and memory. The comments of interviewees provided information on the patriarchate, the most important institution in that society. Where appropriate, however, I nevertheless kept the patriarchate outside the scope of this study, which aimed to examine the religious rituals of the Romioi Orthodox in a specific way. The focus of my study has been the way individuals form meaning around rituals from an anthropology of religion perspective, rather than the religious institutions themselves. For similar reasons, while acknowledging the importance of foundations and civic associations, which could appropriately constitute a study on the structural makeup of Romioi Orthodox society, I elected to keep them outside the scope of this study. Nevertheless, I conducted in-depth interviews with their administrators and volunteers.

Since my purpose in this study was to examine the role of memory within rituals, I tried to configure my study so as to draw attention to the voices of those who I interviewed. I tried to let interviewees' divergent views speak for themselves in their own words. In this way, I attempted to present the plurality of Istanbulite Romioi identity. I conducted field studies[44] in Istanbul and Athens in the years 2010, 2011 and 2012. Let us look at that process closer.

The excitement of stepping out into the field

One of the most challenging and exciting parts in the whole process was the initiation into Romioi society to which I did not know a single person, personally and yet was setting out to conduct a study on them, obtain permission as an observer and set up interviews. I was able to obtain permissions to observe, photograph

---

44 A table of in-depth interviews and rituals I participated in order to observe within the scope of the fieldwork is given in the appendix, by the title Fieldwork. The feasts I observed in this study are Dodekaimeron (Twelve days) and Pascha. Dodekaimeron (December 24-January 6) is the first of the two most important feast periods of the Christian Orthodox religion. It includes December 24/25 Christouyenna feast which is the birthday of Jesus, Protoxronia (New Year's) and January 6 baptism Fota (Theofania) celebrations. Pascha/Easter period on the other hand includes Apokria/Carnival that is about the last days before the forty days long Great Lent or the Great Fast, Megali Sarakosti (the Great Lent) and Megali Evdomada (the Holy Week) which involves Death and Resurrection. Also, Hagion Myron (Sanctification of the Holy Oil) which is celebrated almost every ten years, and which carries great importance was fortunately celebrated within the time span of the fieldwork hence gave me a chance to observe it as well. These all gave me a considerable opportunity to inte[a]rct the community.

and videotape the rituals from church employees, relying upon either Dr. İrini Dimitriyadis' reference or that of others who I became acquainted with, and by introducing myself and the scope of my study. The in-depth interviews were arranged in a similar manner. My first meetings with individuals whom I wanted to interview were also arranged with the help of Dr. Dimitriyadis. Following the interviews, often those individuals ended up introducing me to other individuals. In addition, I was able to conduct in-depth interviews with individuals who I met while conducting participant observations in churches.[45]

If I had not conducted in-depth interviews with Istanbulite Romioi who had immigrated or been forced to migrate from Istanbul to Athens, in Athens in January-March-November 2010 and November 2011, this study would have been missing a very crucial component. My aim was to try to understand how individuals who had been forced to leave their homes and their country and had experienced a very significant transition, described Istanbul and how they recalled the Easter rituals in connection to their self-perception of Romioi Orthodox identity.

One of the most important materials during the interviews was the photograph album that I prepared of photographs taken of rituals during my participant observations. I noticed that these photographs were an effective way to encourage people to open up about the subject and present their memories. In general, the topics we discussed during the interviews were not a chronological

---

45 In addition to the interviews I conducted during the fieldwork and the ones that occurred during participant observation, I conducted 117 interviews; 60 in Istanbul and 57 in Athens. The list of the interviewees (39 in Athens and 35 in Istanbul) can be found in Appendix. Some of the interviews were conducted in pairs, with husband and wife attending together, while two interviews were in groups of three and five. I observed that this type of interview affected the way memories were recalled and how they could be interpreted differently. Due to the fact that I am not Romioi Orthodox and do not speak Greek or know the theology, some of the interviewees asked who would be monitoring my information. This fair question led me to describe the scope of my study and the way it was being conducted in a more detailed manner. Besides, this reminded me of the importance of having the information that I was collecting confirmed by church employees, something I had planned on doing all along. In fact, sharing 'data' on rituals from in-depth interviews with the Khalkedon/Kadikoy and Derkon Metropolitan bishops and receiving their input helped overcome possible oversights due to my non-Orthodox researcher status. The teacher Andon Parizyanos patiently addressed my questions. Their sincere guidance and the information they provided helped greatly in determining my approach to the rituals. I am grateful for their time and support.

presentation of the past but rather a "representation of past-ness"[46] going back and forth in time. Since it was so important to observe how the interviewees were going to structure the discussion and what they were going to prefer to discuss, I followed along whatever thread of discussion arose from the interviewees' willingness to talk and presented visual material that would refresh their memories and guide the discussions.

After providing information about how I conducted the in-depth interviews, I need to emphasize the importance of participant observation. Spending three years in Istanbul not only observing feast days but attending fairs, memorials, graduations, association dinners and other get togethers, provided ethnographic 'data' but more importantly, in the words of the interviewees, I can say it was interpreted as a sign of how "*serious and meticulous of my study*" was. I believe that this trust had a profound effect on the interviews.

As I mentioned earlier, the first in-depth interviews were conducted with individuals who I had been directed to by Dr. Dimitriyadis and by Berin Myisli,[47] a doctoral student who I had met at the conference in Athens. The other interviews developed like a snowball, through individuals who had been told by the first group of individuals. Putting aside out how very valuable a contribution and importance this net of interviewees was to the research, I need to emphasize why participant observation[48] supported what had started as in-depth interviews through recommendations and introductions but led to the potential for spontaneous interviews. Unlike sociological methods that attempt to control sample size by classifying information under age, gender, occupation and economic status, since the objective of an anthropological research is interaction with a wider variety, casual meetings with unpremeditated and coincidental people is important to rectify the bias of a field study.[49] I believe it would be helpful to elaborate on the methodology, and particularly the objectivity concepts in social sciences.

---

46 Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral,* Cambridge University Press, New York, 1991.

47 I'm grateful to Berin Myisli for her contribution and friendship.

48 Participant observation in this study included observing feasts in churches, gathering after the rituals and participating in special days like charity's bazaar or graduations when many members of the Romioi community come together.

49 İlay Romain Örs, *The Last of the Cosmopolitans? Rum Polites of Istanbul in Athens: Exploring the Identity of the City*' for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the subject of Anthropology and Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University, May 1996, pp. 49–50.

How possible is "objectivity"?

Along with the diversification of subjects among anthropological studies during the past decade, the increased emphasis on "objectivity" is noteworthy. In a report of the study on the restructuring of social sciences led by Wallerstein, he defines social science as an effort in modern world "to develop systematic, secular knowledge about reality that is somehow validated empirically" and describes the term "objectivity" as the attempts to achieve this goal. The report highlights that the meaning of objectivity is tightly woven into the fact that knowledge is not *a priori,* that research can teach us what we do not know and that it can, based on old expectations, surprise us.

In the report, by drawing attention to "subjectivity", defined as the opposite of objectivity, where the researcher gathers data and can't help but interpret it entirely through their own personal prejudices, it places the question "how then could one be objective?" front and center. In connection with this question, two prevailing models are presented. The first of these is where in order to remove the risk of subjectivity in social sciences; the inclination is towards gathering measurable and comparable data in order to increase the "hardness" of the data. The other is to try to access data that has not been used previously by other researchers (undistorted) and to which the researcher would feel more uninvolved personally, something which is more commonly favored by ideographic historians. The report draws attention to doubts around what both approaches contribute to the gathering of objective data and criticisms that have been waged ever louder in recent decades over the question of "whose objectivity?" Information that is considered objective, it argues, is nothing more than what the socially and politically stronger determine it to be.[50]

---

50 *Open the Social Sciences, Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1996, pp. 90–91. In the report the approach to objectivity is presented by the writers in this way: "We agree that all scholars are rooted in a specific social setting, and therefore inevitably utilize presuppositions and prejudices that interfere with their perceptions and interpretations of social reality. In this sense, there can be no "neutral" scholar. (. . .) All data are selections from reality, based on the worldviews or theoretical models of the era, as filtered through the standpoints of particular groups of each era. In this sense, the bases of selection are historically constructed, and will always inevitably change as the world changes. If perfectly uninvolved scholars reproducing a social world outside themselves is what we mean by objectivity, then we do not think such a phenomenon exists" (Ibid. pp. 91–92).

Finally, the report, criticizes the reduction of social science to a miscellany of personal views each equally valid, and emphasizes that knowledge, as a socially formed reality does not contradict the concept of objectivity. It stresses the conviction that a restructuring by creating more pluralistic frameworks would increase objectivity, and that it is socially possible to attain more reliable information.[51] Based on these points made, while acknowledging that as a researcher with my own personal and cultural baggage, my research cannot possibly maintain a strict objectivity, my study, nevertheless, cannot be equated with "personal views". These arguments regarding objectivity and subjectivity necessitate that the fieldwork be examined even closer.

Fieldwork

Debates around methodology have started to become more prevalent in the social sciences and fieldwork is the one of the most discussed processes.[52] Fieldwork is, above all things, an encounter and a witness' attestation. Even if the interviews, the recorded voices and video and photographic images are realistic, the only definitive thing that can be said is that an encounter took place. Beginning with the initial decision over choosing the subject matter, the researcher engages in a series of decisions from the theoretical approach to be taken, to the subjects that will be brought up during in-depth interviews, to the interviews that will be recorded and the photographs and videos that will be shot as a participant observer and makes certain determinations as a result.

When a researcher starts to document what she/he has witnessed, the observations and sensations, one is confronted with the risk of freezing the moments in place and time. There is a tendency for the written or oral descriptions or depictions to become distorted rather than reflecting "reality". Depicting a moment is more than just recording or fixing a situation. Attestation

---

51 Ibid, p. 93

52 *James Clifford* and *George E. Marcus* who argue that ethnographies are in the middle of a political and epistemological crisis, emphasize that non-Western peoples can no longer be portrayed by Western authors with indisputable authority, and that the cultural representation must inevitably be conditionally historic and open to debate (Clifford & Marcus, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* University of California Press, Santa Cruz, 1986). Clifford draws attention to the importance of fieldwork, by pointing to the trend towards anthropological studies or writings on anthropology that do not integrate fieldwork (Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts,1988).

is documented in words as a result of the writer's choices, putting into words the act of bearing witness by another. However, one should not conclude that these choices are made by the researcher solely on a conscious level. The process of interpreting observations by a researcher also occurs on some level outside of the conscious. To some extent, associations occur both on a conscious and supra-conscious level for the interviewees as well.

Anthropologist Barbara Myerhoff, discusses how during fieldwork in order to get themselves noticed, recorded, listened to and photographed, interviewees can follow ways that are formal, informal, planned or spontaneous, telling stories, creating difficulties and even making scenes.[53] This corresponds to the dialogical nature of the relationship between the researcher and the interviewee during fieldwork. My interview with *Angelos* in Athens is an example of this dialogical relationship. Upon her remarkable descriptions of the key points in this dissertation even before I had a chance to bring them up, I jokingly commented *"you've described them so impressively that now I should ask who's been writing this dissertation, you or I?"* His sincere response "*don't think that way, I'm kind of doing this deliberately*", is an example of the way words can be structured. Another similar situation that is reminiscent of this dialogical relationship occurred towards the end of the interviews.

As the writing of this study started to reach its last stages, I started to share the headings, the main arguments, and some examples of what had been described by other interviewees during the in-depth interviews that were conducted in Athens and Istanbul, with the individuals with whom I had conducted the initial interviews. One of the reasons I did this was to attain "objectivity" through polyphony, by including different voices and views from the examples in the research to presenting different perspectives. I should point out here that my polyphonic approach is not a unique one. In fact, as Clifford suggests, every research is reflexive, dialogic and polyphonic, experiential, interpretive and the product of inter-subjective relations, which involve perpetual interactive positioning between the ethnographer and the informant.[54] I believe such a relationship and interaction is not limited to my interviewees and me.

What I described above is my observation that sharing anecdotes/stories resulted in a different mode of relationship. An example would be comments

---

53   Barbara Myerhoff, "Life Not Death in Venice: Its Second Life", in Turner and Bruner (eds.), *Anthropology of Experience*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1986, p. 267.

54   Clifford, "On Ethnographic Authority", *Representations* 1(2), 118-146, 1983, p. 142.

from *Miltos*[55] in Athens: While sitting in *Miltos*'s house sipping tea, old Turkish songs playing in the background, he inquired "*so, what are those in Istanbul saying, what do they tell*?" While I recounted some of the typical anecdotes of various parts of the dissertation, I had the opportunity to receive his feedback as well. I repeated the same approach with other interviewees. *Miltos* was shocked to learn, for example, that interviewee *Dimitris*[56] of Istanbul had disagreed with the police in Istanbul and said "*I will file a complaint against you*" so he asked who this person was and how he dared to talk like that to the police. In a similar fashion, questions posed by interviewee *Letha* in Istanbul on Athenians: "*Did the ones in Athens speak with you? What did they say*?" –provided different points of view from herself and other interviewees, thereby supporting the goal of diversity with the dissertation. Along with this support, the "mutual and dialogical process of collaboration and cooperation,"[57] served my goal of ensuring active participation by the interviewees in the ethnography.

One of the reasons behind my aim to emphasize plurality and the subject in my dissertation was my anxiety over the ethics[58] of conducting research around

---

55 *Miltos*: Male, in his 60s, Istanbulite Romioi and from Kurtulus/Tatavla. He migrated to Athens in 1978. His sibling and parents joined him later. The interviews took place in Athens in November 2010 and November 2011.

56 *Dimitris*: Male, in his 40s, Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Istanbul. By his own account, he had attempted to immigrate to Athens at one point, however he had later returned. The interviews took place at various dates in 2010 and 2011 in Istanbul.

57 Stephen Tyler, "Postmodern ethnography: From document of the occult to occult document", in Clifford and Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* University of California Press, Santa Cruz, 1986, p. 126.

58 Theoretician İonna Kuçuradi defines ethics as follows: "Ethical relationship, one and most fundamental of the interpersonal relationship types: it is relationship where value issues are in question when a person of certain integrity comes face to face with another person of certain integrity or in the broadest sense, when a person comes face to face with or not, with another person" (Kuçuradi, *Etik*, Ankara: Türk Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1988, p. 3). American and British Anthropological Associations have set the ethical codes to abide by in an anthropological study. The ethical code set by The American Anthropological Association (AAA) are listed as responsibilities towards the members of the researched group, the scientific discipline of research, students, sponsors plus the anthropologist's responsibilities towards his/her own government and the government of which s/he is a guest (www.aaa.net.org, 06/25/2012). These are the areas of responsibility whereas the main principle is not harming the "researched" group. The ethical codes that The Association of Social Anthropologists of the British Commonwealth (ASA) requires the researchers to comply during the research can be outlined as follows: to protect the physical, social and psychological well-being of the

a "culture" by someone who is not from that "culture". From a social sciences perspective, the relationship between science and ethics has been one of the issues that came late to Turkey. My concerns overlap with the anxiety that Akgönül experienced in his study on the Romioi. While discussing the dwindling numbers of all non-Muslim communities, which is especially evident in the case of the Romioi, Akgönül points out the ethical concerns in researching such a topic. In his opinion, the Romioi minority in Turkey are not individual sacred trusts or the last representatives of a type whose generation is dissipating, and members of minorities seem uncomfortable with being perceived that way. He also points out that members of these communities want to be treated as individuals first, not as members of a group.[59] The other issue that's important from an ethical perspective is my own identity.

The identity, position and production of the researcher

In some ways, fieldwork has been the process through which the question of "who I am", was reconsidered again and again, and presented to others. In some ways, this was true for the interviewees as well. In the words of sociologist Erving Goffman, it is a process of opening and displaying the different levels of the "identity kit".[60] The aspect that came first in these levels is categorically, my being "Turkish" and "Muslim" then, of course, my gender and my age. I can list the most helpful attributes among these, in order of importance from the perspective of the fieldwork, as my age, the quality of my Turkish – my use of 'old' words when speaking – and being a woman. I felt that being a researcher who is above a certain age (47), awakened a certain positive bias and trust in favor of my being fastidious regarding this study, independent of who I am. My use of relatively

---

participants and to respect their rights, interests, sensitivities and privacy; to protect participants as far as possible against the potentially harmful effects of the research; to prevent illicit or unlawful violations in order to prevent participants from feeling uncomfortable; to get the participant's informed consent in advance and to disclose in detail the aim of the research to the participant so the interview can be made use of in the research; to claim the participant's rights to privacy and to fulfill them; to try to respond to the participant's helpfulness the same way even after the research is over (www.theasa.org, 06/25/2012).

59 Akgönül, ibid, p.19.

60 Roger D. Abrahams, "Ordinary and Extraordinary Experience", in Turner and Bruner (eds.), *Anthropology of Experience*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1986, p. 55.

old-fashioned words like "*mütemadiyen, mamafih and mesela*" in Turkish (in place of more modern equivalents), was considered a positive attribute by some of the interviewees who commented, "*your Turkish is like the Turkish we know*". However, I should admit lacking the well-known advantages in an anthropological study of speaking the language(s) of the society being researched. Even though I tried hard, including private lessons, to learn Romioi and modern Greek, I was not able to achieve a level of fluency to allow me to conduct the interviews in Romioi. The advantage of being a women researcher only came up with a male interviewee who stated, "*if your name had been Mehmet, I wouldn't have even met with you*". Some of the interviewees stated that my gender didn't matter to them, but it made things easier in referring me to other potential interviewees. Still, I want to point out that, unlike my age and my Turkish, I didn't observe this as being an obvious advantage.

In her work on the Romioi of Istanbul, İlay Romain Örs notes that his own identity as an Istanbulite provided an important dimension allowing her to be both an insider and an outsider when in Athens.[61] Since I was not born in Istanbul, I did not have the same advantage, but even though the interviewees in Athens weren't familiar with many of the newer boroughs of Istanbul, they did know about the one I have lived in (Moda, Caddebostan) which presented an advantage in being able to discuss the old days in those boroughs, their beaches and summer cinemas.

It is no coincidence that particularly with its emphasis on fieldwork, the researcher's identity is often a problem in anthropology. It drives the researcher to consider their own internal views during the emotional nature of fieldwork, including an examination of prejudices and presumptions. A similar relationship is established between the ethnography and the reader. Since the reader will be able to see how the research was conducted, he/she has a chance to see limitations and bias of the ethnographic journey.

Getting down the writing

I should confess that the most challenging aspect of the ethnographic journey was getting down to the writing. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz points out the singularity of the interplay and interviews of an anthropologist in the course of their fieldwork and how they can never be re-created or repeated.[62]

---

61 Örs, ibid, p. 54.

62 Behar, ibid, p. 7 (Behar's citation source: Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives, Anthropologist as Author,* Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1988).

Getting down the writing is not easy since it also means leaving field and this interplay. However, I can say that recorded interviews helped to revive the interplay.

Conducting in-depth interviews and an extended study, which incorporates participant observations, certainly carries the potential to create certain interpersonal connections. I must confess that a relationship has developed between me and the individuals with whom I conducted interviews. This kind of friendship proved functional in being able to conduct these studies, which were so physically, and psychologically exhausting. The transcriptions, which are a part of fieldwork, were one of the elements that allowed me to approach the 'subject' in a level-headed manner, without damaging the warm relations that had been established. Converting the rather grueling number of interviews that had taken place over many hours into words on paper established the foundation, for me, to transition analyzing and writing more 'objectively'. Another contributing factor was that the transcriptions of the early interviews gave direction to the subsequent ones. While engaged in an endless series of stop and replay of the voice recordings and listening and writing, I was brought back to the time of the interviews and the visual, oral and sensory details of the interviews began to make more sense. However, this did not happen at once.

It occurred over a long process and I began to feel like I was the amalgamation of hundreds of voice recordings within me. When I added all the literature that I had consumed to this process, I felt like the mere carrier of the hundreds of conversing and arguing voices in my head. At some point later, slowly however, I began to hear my own voice, weak and shaky at first, amongst all the others. Even if this voice, which I had waited for, lacked confidence, for me it was like an awakening. I felt myself gradually moving towards analysis.

The first section that I started writing, *Historical Background – The Memory of the City,* was the section that intimidated me the most. One of the sources of my fear, besides the fact that it was in a subject area outside of my field of study, was the question of how to present this period which covers hundreds of years, so that only those aspects that are relevant are discussed while nevertheless providing a solid foundation to the subject matter.

Analyzing the works on the early history of Istanbulite Romioi Orthodox society especially the history, archeology, art history, political science, sociology and anthropological contexts proved to be extremely helpful in gaining some clarity on my approach. When the fieldwork was conducted simultaneously with the review of the literature on the subject, they impacted one another. For

example, while interviewee *Joanna*'s[63] statement *"I consider myself to be a descendant of the Byzantines",* prompted me to intensify my readings of literature on the history and political science of the Byzantine era, the same literature inevitably shaped the topics that I began to bring up during interviews. Similarly, the topics that interviewees emphasized helped me to construct the framework for the other chapters.

Despite the long and intense readings on the subject and all of the ethnographic "data", I couldn't seem to start writing for quite some time. Even when I tried to get past this mental block by reading more material, I just couldn't start writing. While I was in the darkest part of the tunnel of this mental journey, I departed from Istanbul at the urging of my friends. Upon returning from this trip, which I took by boat, nonstop, staring at the infinite blue sky and sea from one location to the next, the very first day back, I sat immediately down before my computer, began writing and the thoughts came tumbling out! My self-doubt decreased after the first chapter and with the addition of the historical foundation that I was able to root the subject in, I was able to pass onto the third chapter where I attempted to present the conceptual framework.

Getting acquainted with mistakes: Realizing and learning

Terminology and language play a key role in both creating and preventing errors. To provide a very clear example of this I would like to present an error of my own making. When I sent a research proposal that I had written in English to *Iason*, an academician who I had met in Athens who was very helpful to me, his email response was quite shocking. In the message *Iason* wrote:

> "Since you wrote your proposal in English and your dissertation will be in English as well, I object to the use of the term 'the *Rum*' to refer to the Romioi of Istanbul. My objection is really to everyone who uses this term. I have also written an article about this; I suggest that you read it. Just as no one refers to 'the Ermeni of Turkey' in an English article on the Armenians of Turkey, (and) just as the Jews of Turkey are referred to as Jews of Turkey not the '*Musevi* or *Yahudi* of Turkey', when writing about the Greeks of Turkey in English, especially in a scholarly text, the term '*Rum*' should not be used. This is incorrect; there is no such term in English. '*Rum*' exists only in Turkish (to address Greek residents in Turkey) and to use this term is indeed disrespectful of Greeks. You should use either 'The Greeks of Turkey' or if you wish to make a distinction between the Greeks of Turkey over those in Greece then use the 'Romioi of Turkey',

---

63 *Joanna*: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010 and 2011.

in other words, use the name that Greeks in Turkey call themselves, not the one that is used by Turks."

When I received this email, I must confess, I felt like I had been dropped into boiling water. After going over and over in my head how I had made such a terrible error, albeit unwittingly, once I was able to get over my anger at myself for having stumbled on the first step in this journey, I finally forgave myself. My response to the message is provided below, verbatim, without correction to sentence fragments.

> "Thank you very much for your warning. Believe me, your objection is very valuable. I didn't use the term '*Rum*' out of disrespect; if it was taken that way, I do apologize sincerely. The proposal was based on a pilot study during which English speaking interviewees used the term '*Rum*' and when I saw it in several readings as well, I employed it too. As you mentioned, just because it is being used doesn't render it more legitimate, and my awareness of the misuse of such terms should have been much higher. Since I needed a term to address a particular people, I should have said Romioi of Turkey. Continued misuse of words just solidifies the taint. An emic approach is very important to me and my goal is to achieve it. In my dissertation, the Romioi of Istanbul are not considered any differently than the Greeks. That kind of a distinction is something others might make; it is not only not my place to do so nor my aim, it is something I attempted to refrain from doing. By using the term '*Rum*', I ended up making a mistake that I have strived to avoid. I am so glad that you informed me on this topic, thank you very much. Besides, this issue (of labeling) has been one of the most stressing aspects on this dissertation for me."

After this rocky start, I was compelled to work with greater care, but I also cannot affirm that this study is completely free of these types of errors. I believe the toughest issue is the knot around the Turkish terms *Rum* (Romioi/Greek national in Turkey), *Rumca* (language spoken by the *Romioi* people), *Yunanca* (Greek language), *Yunan* (Greek), *Yunanlı* (Greek Individual) and Helen (Hellenic). In fact, it is precisely this naming convention that constituted one of the fundamental problems for this dissertation. When I first used the word *Romioi* I placed it in italics in order to draw attention to the contextualization of the concept of identity, but I removed the italics later in the text in order to not to impede the flow of reading. I preferred to write the word Orthodox straight but when writing the world *Istanbulite*, even if it flows and seems within context as a "local", from the perspective of ease of reading and keeping mind that reading dozens of words in italics and between quotes would degrade the speed and pleasure of reading, I put it in quotes at the start of each section but then removed the italics and quotes afterwards once the point on contextualization had been made.

In this study I used the concept of identity, what is a problematic of the study, interchangeably with "sense of belonging and identification". While some writers prefer "identification" in light of the constructive aspect to it, on the argument that identity is, *sui generis*, constructive, I used identity/sense of belonging as either interchangeable or to emphasize this interchangeable quality. Another problem revolved around the phenomenon of migration. Would I use the word migration or should it be forced migration? It is difficult to convey a comprehensive and fully nuanced meaning of these words and to distinguish between them. It was relatively easy to describe the departures by treaty that occurred in 1964 as "deportation". However, other departures that had occurred, similarly forced, were not the result of laws yet could not be called "deportations". Also, since some of the migrations had occurred to pursue better opportunities, I attempted to handle this confusion by using the expression forced migration/migration.

Likewise, because some of the terms that I translated were used differently in the Turkish translations of sources, when I used them for the first time in the sections, as "space" or "place" I wrote the English equivalent next to them initially, but later continued as simply *space* or *place*. Since the terms "space" and "place" were going to be used with great frequency in the text, I preferred to italicize as *space* and *place* in order to distinguish them.

One of the other problems revolved around proper nouns and common nouns. For example, in most of the sources Pagan beliefs are written as "pagan" without capitalizing. In order to remain faithful to the sources that I used and to prevent a hierarchy between it and Christianity and Islam I used Pagan with an upper-case 'P'. Another example of differing usages in the sources was the term ancient history, where Ancient History was used along with Hellenic or Helene. With regard to capitalization, one of the other examples of different usage was over the word god. In addition to wanting to stay faithful to my sources, in line with the emphasis placed on the word by the individuals I interviewed, in my own texts I used the upper-case 'G' when writing God.

In a similar way, when referring to Jesus and Mary, besides wanting to stay faithful to a source, in my own texts, I decided to utilize the common descriptives used by the individuals I interviewed which was Mother Mary or Jesus Christ rather than prefacing each by 'exalted or holiness' [which would have been the honorific amongst Muslims]. The names of historical figures were also used differently in texts, like Emperor Constantine, Konstantinos or Mehmed II, Sultan Mehmet or Fatih, the Conqueror. While trying to stay faithful to the way they were referred to in the sources, in my own texts I preferred to use Constantine and Mehmet II.

One of the words used most frequently in this study is no doubt "Istanbul". When referring to Istanbul, I remained faithful to sources when directly quoting and used "Byzantium", "Constantinople" and "Istanbul". Meanwhile in my own texts, while I preferred using the term *City*, for the sake of coherence and to align with the period in question, I alternated between using the names "Istanbul" and "Constantinople". Another issue was around the description of the city's' changing "rulers". Changes that occurred as a result of war, such as what followed 1453 are typically described in military sounding words like victory and winning, where the human factor and the lives lost are ignored. In order to emphasize the multi-faceted nature of what was experienced then, I used conquest/fall when describing 1453.

Another important issue was the transcription of voice recordings of the interviewees. When transcribing the spoken into writing, errors or omissions, including abbreviated, slang or shortened speech (*yeah*, instead of *yes*, *wanna* or *gonna*, instead of *wanting to* or *going to*) was maintained and written just as it sounded. In some instances, to clarify what was being said, such as in examples like "here (Athens)" a word was added in parentheses.

The names of all interviewees in the dissertation – except for Hercules (Iraklis) Millas and his wife Evi (Evangelia) Millas and Mihail Vasiliadis– were changed to protect their identity and substitute names were found with the help of Internet.[64]

After bringing the first chapter to a close with information on terminology and spelling, we can move on to the section on historical background which will provide the foundation for the subject of this dissertation, ritual-memory amongst the Istanbulite Romioi Orthodox.

The routes of the journey

In the section titled *The Memory of the City*, which follows the *Anthropological Journey* part, the history of the Byzantine era, which has a direct connection to the history of Christianity and the Orthodox Church in particular, is described in detail. The setting out of Christian doctrine, the creation of Orthodox principles and practices and the rise of different sects comprise a very crucial piece of Byzantine history. The foundation of the Romioi Orthodox sense of connection is a memory that extends as far back as Byzantium and encompasses the Ottoman era. In this section, the topics of this aforementioned legacy, the question of what

---

64 Sources that were helpful were: http://www.babynames.org.uk/greek-baby-names.htm,
 http://www.babynameworld.come/greek.asp.

kind of dynamics and memory connects individuals back to Byzantium, along with concepts of historicity, identity and nation-state are examined through Istanbul, the locus of these question over a period of time.

In the third section titled *Being Romioi Orthodox*, the sense of connection, ethnic identity, nationalism and concepts of nation-state were presented. After providing information regarding Greek/Romioi language, I examined language, which is an important component of Romioi Orthodox history, by looking at the restrictions imposed on its public expression in Turkey and the way it became a means of discrimination from native Greeks in Greece (Athens), due to its identifier connection to Istanbul. I described the legacy around the concept of religion, a key source of identity, and analyzed religious rituals through the various ways in which it became a mutual source of differentiation and cooperation that came up in the interviews.

In the fourth section titled *Migration*, starting from the foundation of insecurity which becomes a part of identity, I examined the theme of emotions arising around fear, decisions to leave and abandon the country, settling in Athens, alienation and homesickness along with the processes of staying or leaving Istanbul and resettling back in the city. Migration is an experience that disturbs identity and one's sense of place, for both those who leave and those who stay. The experience mentioned here is examined through rituals as a search by the Istanbulite Romioi in Athens for continuity and their means of experiencing Istanbulite identity.

In the fifth section, *Place and Memory*, I studied the dynamics of how a location/space becomes a place weighted with symbolism along with the permanency with which this meaning resides in memory. *City*,[65] is the *lieu de mémoire*,[66] which not only emerges as the place where behaviors reside and gain meaning but which changes with migration. In this section, I tried to find the unequal patterns of the experience of place, the practices of comparative positions between Romioi Orthodox identity and the identity of place, feelings associated with place and the connections that are created. Additionally, the way that some places become known as foreign while others are intimately familiar and the way that a sense of place changes over time, is examined.

In the seventh section titled *Epilogue* I evaluated the inferences from all of the sections and the study as a whole.

---

65 The word "City" refers to Istanbul.

66 The term "site of memory" is borrowed from Pierre Nora. (Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire", *Representations*, 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory, Spring 1989 , pp. 7–24).

Chapter 2 The Memory of the City

"I used to be a problem student. I used to say, 'I am a Byzantine, why should I study Turkish history'. I said so without any understanding. Since I did not study, I would put the book under the desk and cheat. (...) Neither Turkish teachers nor the ones from Greece mentioned Byzantium at all. Once, we had a teacher from Greece (...) We used to pull pranks on April Fool's Day. Our class was a bit too energetic, but we did nothing major really. As far as I remember we hid some where and the teacher couldn't find us. He got annoyed and when he finally found us, he slammed his fist on the table and yelled us: 'Filthy Byzantines, your mothers are all whores!' After his tantrum, we made things more difficult for him. We used to study Turkish history, not Greek. He always called them (Greeks) the enemies; we defeated our enemies, we did this and that to Constantine, oh how we defeated enemies in the Malazgirt (Manzikert) war. This outraged me, provoked me because I felt as a Byzantine. I was a Romioi, not Greek. As far as I was able to understand, I considered myself as the descendant of these people. My paternal great grandmother had come from England. However, I considered myself as one of this people. When they kept saying, we defeated enemies, Romanos Diogenes and so on... I got offended, so I said I would never ever study Turkish history. It was Emin Oktay's (historian) book... I still have those books, I brought them here with me. They are still in my house..."(Joanna, Athens).

Joanna was seventeen when she and her family migrated to Athens from Istanbul. His father used to have a barbershop in Pangalti. The family decided to migrate because they anticipated some difficulties ahead. One of the things she took when she left was the history book, which mentions the past she associates herself with in a hostile way, if at all. Moreover, such invisibility or negative impression does not arise just from the book of a Turkish historian, but also from the Greek History teacher. When she arrived in Athens after leaving Istanbul with the book that ignored and degraded her sense of belonging, a new struggle for life including academic research on Byzantine philosophy started for her. She still keeps that history book and she sometimes leafs through.

Looking backward

In this chapter, I am going cover Byzantine history that is closely associated with Orthodoxy and Christianity, through its connections with Greek Orthodoxy, from the perspective of how history was recorded, and the concepts of identity and nation state.

As it is known, historiography and identification are highly interconnected concepts, since the history is constructed through symbols considered to be peculiar to the nation and national ideology[67]. In terms of nationhood, definition of present demands justification through the illumination of the past.[68] Therefore, a convenient past is constructed to justify and, more importantly, to ensure today's realities and politics are more acceptable. According to the nation-state ideology based on such a convenient past, "only one nation lives in the nation-state and the others are minorities who live in the same place but are not part of the nation".[69]

Being a member of Istanbul Romioi Orthodox 'minority', Interviewee *Joanna* had to study the textbooks and answer the questions in the exams of a "history" class, in which the Byzantine, part of the history she feels she belongs to, is described as the enemy. For a child, no doubt, it forms the basis for a kind of trauma.

Previously I emphasized the close link of Byzantine history with Orthodoxy and Christianity. Millas who underlines this close relationship, points out that the establishment of the Church, formation and consolidation of its basic principles, development of the sect's personality, and detachment of Orthodoxy from other religions and the sects are related to Byzantine history. He argues that throughout centuries these relationships between history and religion have formed a culture within Byzantine.[70]

The Ottoman's approach to the Byzantine is interesting. Historian Selim Deringil argues that Ottomans were highly sensitive to the Byzantine past, pointing out the claims of being descendant of the Romans and Byzantine since Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror era.[71] On the other hand, in today's commonplace Turkey, as Murat Belge indicated, Byzantine is typically recalled as the "Traitorous Byzantine". Our history began after theirs had finished. Moreover, Belge refers to the number of historical Byzantine artifacts existing only in Istanbul that is three times more than the number in Greece, and the examples of research studies in China on Turks and Turkistan, when he draws attention

67 Süavi Aydın, *Kültür-Kimlik Modelleri Açısından Türk Tarih Yazımı*, for the degree of Doctor of Anthropology, Hacettepe Universitesi, 1997, p. 6.

68 Nora, ibid, p. 10.

69 Eric Hobsbawm, *On the Edge of the New Century*, interviewer Antonia Politi, trans. Allan Cameron, The New Press, New York, 2000, p. 23.

70 Millas, ibid, pp. 130–131.

71 Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains – Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876–1909*, I.B. Tauris, London, New York, 1999, pp. 28–29.

of the lack of institutions on Byzantine Studies or their limited numbers in Turkish academic circle.[72] Likewise, historian İlber Ortaylı defines Istanbul as an untouched research area.[73] Obviously with the establishment of research unit and multidisciplinary research in Turkish universities on Istanbul, it could also be possible to raise city dwellers' awareness of its protection.

Therefore, these questions will be meaningful: What kind of a civilization is the Byzantine Empire that the interviewee *Joanna* relates herself with in the distant past of Istanbul, and who are these Byzantines that are dominant in her sense of belonging? People from the past have created such a strong sense of belonging on a person living now. What kind of connections, dynamics and memory can do this? The place where we look for answers to these questions is the place, in other words, the *City*. Therefore, it could be beneficial to look at the *City*, the history of Byzantine/Constantinople/Istanbul with reference to the Greek Orthodoxy.

Byzantion, Constantinople, Istanbul

The Byzantine historian Procopius[74] describes Constantinople as being "surrounded by a garland of waters".[75] Evliya Çelebi in his *Seyahatname* (Book of Travels) lists different names of the City in different languages as follows[76]:

The first name of the Istanbul Castle was **Macedonia** in Latin.
Later cause it was built by Yanko they called it **Yankoviçe** in Syriac.
Later cause it was built by Alexander they called it **Aleksandıra** in Hebrew.
Sometime they called it **Pozanta** in Serbian.
Sometime they called it **Vejendoniya** in Ladino.
They called it **Yağfuriya** in French.

---

72 Murat Belge, "Önsöz/Preface", in *Bizans – Bir Ortaçağ İmparatorluğunun Şaşırtıcı Yaşamı*, author Judith Herrin, trans. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010, p. 11–12.

73 İlber Ortaylı, *İstanbul'dan Sayfalar,* Turkuvaz Kitapçılık Yayıncılık, Istanbul, 2008, p. 7.

74 Historian Prokopius was born in Kayseriye where was in Palastine established by Romans. It is assumed that he was born in the 500 ACor just before that (Orhan Duru, "Sunu/Preface", in *Bizans'ın Gizli Tarihi*, author Prokopius, trans. Orhan Duru, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, Istanbul, 1999, p. 10).

75 John Freely, *İstanbul, the Imperial City,* Penguin Books, London, 1998, p. 5.

76 Evliya Çelebi, *Günümüz Türkçesiyle Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi: İstanbul,* Vol. 1. Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011, pp. 25–26.

Cause ninthly it was built by Constantine they called it **Poznatyam** and
   Konstantiniyye in Greek.
They call it **Konstantinopol** in German.
They call it **Tekuriye** in Russian.
They call it **Grandorya** in Afrikaans.
They call it **Vezendonvar** in Hungarian.
They call it **Kanatorya** in Polish.
They call it **Aliyana** in Czech.
They call it **Herakliyan** in Swedish.
They call it **Istifanya** in Dutch.
In French **Igrandona**,
In Portuguese **Kostiyya**,
In Arabic **Konstantiniyye-i Kübra**,
In Persian **Kayser-zemin**,
In Indian **Taht-ı Rum**,
In Mongolian **Çakdurkan**,
In Tatar **Sakalib**,
In Ottoman language **Islambol** (Istanbul) they call it.

İlber Ortaylı who states that throughout the centuries the name of big city was
written as '*Be-makam-ı Konstantiniyye*[77] *el mahmiyye*[78] in the decrees and records
of the Ottoman Empire, suggesting that Ottomans were proud of possessing the
world capital established by the Great Constantine. Pointing out that the City
had a glorious past marked by numerous names and artifacts, Ortaylı states that
travelers coming to the City since 15th century could not keep from listing the
many names of the city.[79] However, in this study we have elected to focus on three
names of the city and to take a glance at its long history through the context of
our subject.

---

77 Islam art expert Gülru Necipoğlu indicates that throughout Ottoman rule the city
    was referred as Konstantiniyye in all imperial documents and coins, however after
    the conquest the city was mentioned as Istanbul by people (Necipoğlu, *Architecture,
    Ceremonial, and Power, the Topkapi Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*,
    The Architectural History Foundation, New York, and The MIT Press Cambridge
    Massachusetts, and London, 1991, p. 3).

78 "*Be-makam-ı Konstantiniyye el mahmiyye*" means the post of preserved position of
    Constantinople.

79 Ortaylı also emphasizes that those who refrain from using Constantinople believe that
    this word is Turkish, however Istanbul was derived from the Greek *Stinpolis*, which
    means 'towards the city' (Ortaylı, ibid, p. 11).

Byzantion

Cyril Mango, an expert on Byzantine history, art and architecture, states that there has never been a state called the Byzantine Empire, and what it was indeed was a Roman State established in Constantinople. He supports this by pointing out that the inhabitants of Constantinople called themselves *Romaioi* or simply Christians and called their country *Romania*. In addition, if a person was a native of Constantinople, but not from another part of the Empire, he/she described himself/herself as *Byzantios*.[80] As can be seen in these classifications, there was distinction between belonging to the *City* and to another part of the Empire. It was only possible for somebody to define himself/herself as *Byzantios* if he/she was a native of the *City*. This clearly indicates the significant position of the *City*.

Mango points out that Western Europeans assign a different meaning to the word 'Roman' and call Byzantines *Graeci* and Slavs as *Greki* whereas Arabs and Turks called them *Rum (Romioi)*, that is, Romans.[81] Even if Romioi/Romans has different meanings in the West, these are descriptions used in the *City*. Historian Stefanos Yerosimos, states that the people who we call Byzantine today, had always referred to themselves as Romans.[82] At this point, it will be beneficial to describe in depth who the Byzantines were, and the context of Byzantine history.

Judith Herrin, an expert on late antiquity and Byzantine studies, states that the existing difficulties in understanding Byzantium and defining its place are further multiplied when the word 'Byzantine' is used by newspapers and international conferences as a term to insult or refer to complexity. Herrin, arguing that by this way the term Byzantium conjures up an image of hypocrisy, excessive wealth, plots and assassination, when in fact the Byzantines had no monopoly on complexity, treachery, hypocrisy, obscurity or riches during the Middle Ages.[83]

---

80 Cyril Mango, *Byzantium, the Empire of New Rome,* Charles Scribner's Sons New York, 1980, p. 1.

81 Ibid, p. 1.

82 Stefanos Yerasimos, *Türk Metinlerinde Konstantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri (La foundation de Constantinople et de Sainte Sophie dans les traditions turques),* trans. Şirin Tekeli, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, p. 9.

83 Judith Herrin, *Byzantium – The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2008, p. xiv. The use of the Byzantine word mentioned by Herrin in the repertoire of stereotype and its use in this way is frequently encountered in Turkey today. The use of stereotypes such as "Byzantine games, Byzantine plots" are examples of this. In prejudices, the illustration of another culture or past as the opposite of "self" is in a sense the rationalizing of self. Byzantium expert Paul Lemerle points out that Byzantine history has not yet been fully resolved from the situation that lies between ignorance and prejudice. Lemerle relates this to having

Herrin points out, for example, that despite the stereotyping, Byzantines who produced a large number of leaders and innovative theologians never conducted an Inquisition. Her claim in her study focusing on the structures and the mentalities of Byzantium is that "the modern Western world, which originated from Europe, could not have existed had it not been shielded and inspired by what was happening further to the east, in Byzantium. The Muslim world is also an important element of this history, as is the love-hate relationship between Christendom and Islam".[84] In this case, it would be beneficial to ask what the period called Byzantine signified, since it was related with both the Eastern and the Western worlds.

As differences emerge in the periodization of Byzantine history, there are different views on exactly when to trace its beginning. According to Mango, the Byzantine Empire, as defined by the majority of historians, is said to have come into being with the establishment of the city of Constantinople, the New Rome in 324 AD, and ended with the conquest of the City by the Ottomans at 1453.[85] Some sources emphasize the date May 11, 330 when Constantine declared the establishment of the city along the Bosphorus.[86] Whichever date is considered as a founding date, Byzantine history includes many characteristics of Pagan, Hellenistic and Christian cultures and was both nourished and affected by multiple interconnected cultures. According to Herrin, Byzantium considered itself the center of the world, and Constantinople as the replacement of Rome, and though Greek-speaking, it saw itself as the Roman Empire, and its citizens Romans.[87] At this point, let's turn to when and how the first settlements occurred in this city, which was, at the time, considered to be the center of the world.

Questions like the exact size, the first settlers and the configuration of settlement in the city are hard to answer since the *City* has been built up in layers upon layers and due to the difficulties in conducting archaeological explorations.[88]

---

no great historians, but instead chroniclers whose Greek is often difficult. He criticizes that despising the works of the chroniclers is easier than reading. (Lemerle, *A History of Byzantium*, trans. Antony Matthew, A Sun Book- Walker and Company New York, 1964, p. preface).

84 Herrin, ibid, p. xiv.

85 Mango, ibid, p. 1.

86 Lemerle, ibid, p. preface.

87 Herrin, ibid, p. xvii.

88 Archaeologist and Prehistorian expert Mehmet Özdoğan states that until the excavations of Yenikapi, our information about the prehistoric period of Istanbul came from the sections outside the historical peninsula. The most striking information was obtained from the rescue excavations of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums

Geographer Erol Tümertekin states that although the *City* has a long past, it exists within a relatively limited area.[89]

Doğan Kuban, a specialist on the history of architecture, states that the first settlers of the *City* were a Greek colony called Megarans and they first settled in Chalkedon, today "Kadikoy" and then Akra, today "Sarayburnu".[90] He suggests that the Greek colonies most likely merged with the peoples of earlier settlements in these areas. İnci Delemen, a specialist on classical archaeology, states that in the 7–8 centuries BC, Greek cities around Aegean region had to establish overseas colonies due to increasing population and limited land, which triggered the initial settlement. Delemen cites the traditional view, that at around 660 BC, following Chalkedon, a group of Megarans led by Byzas founded a new colony at the other side of the Bosphorus. Since, according to legend, Byzas was a descendant of Io, the lover of Zeus and Poseidon, the God of Sea, the new colony was named as Byzantion.[91]

As it can be seen, economic reasons may have led to the settlement of the *City*. However, as Kuban points out, using traditions and a supposed kinship connection of its leaders with Gods to create a narrative to explain how the *City* came about, seems to be an establishment myth of the *City*. Based on limited written sources and myths, the selection of the location Byzantion instead of Chalkedon/Kadikoy was addressed as a story which included a warning from God to the emperor and as a sign for holy land.[92] Such a narrative implies the sanctification of the *City*.

---

in the area of Yenikapi Marmaray (Özdoğan, "Tarihöncesi Dönemlerin İstanbul'u", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010, p. 37).

89 Erol Tümertekin, *İstanbul İnsan ve Mekân,* Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, p. 17.

90 With the quotation from Herodotus (Herodotus, 1963: 289) Kuban indicates that Chalcedon was 77 years before Byzantion; according to Byzantine historian Dionysios the city was built in BC 659 (Kuban, *Istanbul an Urban History, Byzantion, Constantinopolis,* The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey, Istanbul, 1996, pp. 17–18). Delemen also emphasizes the determination of Kuban. By referring to Pilinius, Delemen draws attention to the presence of a Thracian settlement named Lycus valley before the Megarons, thus suggesting the presence of elements of Thrace, Chalcedon and Miletus as well as Megara in the interior of Byzantium (Delemen, "Bizantion: Koloni - Kent – Başkent", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı,* Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010, p. 54).

91 Delemen, ibid, p. 54.

92 Kuban, "Konstantinopolis-İstanbul'un Destansı Tarihi", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı,* Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010, p. 21.

On the other hand, from a realistic point of view, the significance of the geographical location of the *City* is indisputable. Wolfgang Müller Weiner, architecture and archaeologist, underlines the importance of the location of the *City* as the intersection of the land route between Europe and Asia and as the sea route connecting the Black Sea with the Mediterranean Sea.[93]

In addition to the spectacular geographical location of the *City*, its monumentality has been emphasized in many sources. In terms of religious artifacts, while the exact location and architectural characteristics are out of focus, the temples of Apollo, Artemis and Aphrodite in Acropolis[94] are mentioned.[95] Another important monument from the Greek period is Basilike Stoa where the Metroon and the statue of Rhea, the protector of the *City*.[96] Cults and spirituality in this monumental Pagan city continued, in a different form, following its transition to Christianity and this transition will be analyzed in the following section.

Constantinople

In many sources, the beginning of Byzantine is considered to be the date Constantine became the Emperor, since with him, Christianity has started, and supremacy had transferred from Rome to Constantinople. However, it is necessary to note that there is no clear division between Roman and Byzantine history.[97]

---

93 Wolfgang Müller Weiner, *Bizans'tan Osmanlı'ya İstanbul Limanları,* trans. Erol Özbek, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul, 1994, pp. 1–3.

94 Acropolis is the present Sarayburnu.

95 Weiner, *İstanbul'un Tarihsel Topografyası 17. Yüzyıl Başlarına Kadar Byzantion-Konstantinopolis – İstanbul,* trans.Ülker Sayın, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2001, p. 18.

96 Kuban suggest that ever since the foundation of the city, Rhea (later transformed into Kybele) was its protector (Kuban, ibid, 1996, p. 23).

97 Lemerle, ibid, p. 3. The clear-cut split seems to be more related to historiography. Interpreting the history as possessing sharply defined beginnings and ends, with definite periods/ages/phases suggests a linear progression. Such a single-track view assumes that there is a continuous progress, and the necessity or inevitability of it. This routinized, step-by-step view, with defined, completed and closed time sections, removes us from the world of meaning and context. However, in the perception of the individual, time is not periodical, intermittent, unconnected, and progressive as suggested by the widespread writing of history; it is leapfrogged and melded in one another, including a past, present and future. Hence, time expressed as an establishment, birth or beginning is not, in fact, exempt from the past.

Herrin argues that Byzantium was born old; it had imported authority of already antique architecture and sculpture belonging to its capital city. It is similar in terms of linguistic structure. Herrin, who states that continuity in language happened through work of art in poetry, theater and philosophy, argues that such continuity had strengthened the Byzantium's imperial identity.[98] Continuity in language fed harmonization in religion. While ancient Pagan faith was incorporated into Byzantium, Christian faith gradually replaced Pagan cults and gods. Since such a transition in Byzantine also reflects a reinterpretation of Christianity with references to Ancient Greek cults, it is not possible to define Christian beliefs, practices and cults here as strictly anti-Pagan and ignore the influence of Ancient Greek practices. On the other hand, the Empire's convergence to this new Christian faith had important impacts. Even though questions such as whether or not Emperor Constantine was evangelized or when are debatable, Constantine and his mother Helena are accepted as the most important saints of Greek Orthodox Christianity.[99] The impact of Emperor Constantine was crucial in sanctification of the *City* and its role in furthering faith.

Just as Hadrian did in Hadrianapolis (Edirne) and Alexander the Great in Alexandria, Constantine transformed Byzantion into new capital with his own name.[100] Thus, the *City* gained other meanings. Declaring the *City* as the Capital and naming it is a potential action that establishes a bond between the ruler and the ruled in the minds, and in other words, an emotional bond between place and human. Ceremonies play a functional role in creating such associations and strengthening the bonding.

Following a six-year intensive construction period, the city of Constantine, Constantinople, was inaugurated on 11 May 330 AD with ceremonies reminiscent of the ancient civic pride and urban festivals.[101] This date started to be

---

98 "Above all, Byzantium cherished the poems of Homer and produced the first critical editions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Although public performance of theater died away, the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes were closely studied, and often committed to memory by generations of schoolchildren. They also learnt the speeches of Demosthenes and the dialogues of Plato" (Herrin, ibid, p. xvi).

99 For further readings suggested sources: Yerasimos, *Constantinople, Istanbul's Historical Heritage*, trans. Sally M. Schreiber, Uta Hoffmann, Ellen Loeffler, Tandem Verlag, 2005. Johannes A. Straub, *Konstantine as Koinos Episkopos*". Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 21, 1967.

100 Herrin, ibid, p. 5.

101 Ibid, p. 5.

celebrated as the City's birthday.[102] Similarly defining a birthday day for a city
and celebrating its dedication with ceremonies imply creation of a semantic
world for its inhabitants and the formation of references to the future. By this
way, icons created become immortal.

According to Herrin, Constantine, while supporting Christian leaders and
helping them financially to build Christian churches, his sons also permitted a
construction of a temple in Italy, complete with priests, based on the old pagan
traditions. In the meantime, the sacrificial aspect of pagan cult was gradually
restricted, the killing of animals was replaced by the bloodless sacrifice presented
to the Christian God. Constantine the Emperor and his mother Helena, are the
most important cults in Byzantine faith. The hostels, hospitals and churches
built by her established a material culture, and their pilgrimages set a pattern
for the worship model.[103] In doing these, they did not overlook Pagan culture.
Instead, Pagan faith and its themes were rearticulated with reference to the new
faith and a new way of expression was created. At this point: this question is
meaningful: How did this new expression of faith affect the interactions of the
multilingual and multi-tribal inhabitants of the Empire? While analyzing this
situation, Mango argues that loyalty to Rome and admiration to her greatness
had been regular theme of pagan polemic, whereas Church's had the position
that Christians were citizens of the Heavenly Jerusalem and this position prob-
ably weakened the cohesion of the Empire.[104] Under these circumstances, it is

---

102 At this point, it will be useful to look closely at the *City*. In his work named
    "Constantinople", Yerasimos explains the founding of the city with the quotations
    from anonymous source *The Life of Constantine* written in the second half of 9th cen-
    tury as follows: "In reality, Constantine the Great (. . .) wanted to found a city with his
    name above the grave of Ajax on the plains before Ilion, where the Greeks, according
    to legend, left their ships during their campaign against Troy. But God told him in a
    dream to build his city in Byzantium, and that is what he did (. . .) He built the divinely
    protected city that he had envisioned, and named it after himself- "Constantinople.
    (. . .) He arranged for Constantinople to be fitted out like a new Rome and decreed
    that the city should have a senate of its own. (. . .) In addition, on the plaza called the
    Forum, he had a column erected that was carved from a single block of porphyry and
    was crowned with a bronze statue of himself. The hand of the statue held a globe, and
    on the globe was mounted a magnificent cross with the engraved words, "To you, O my
    God, I dedicate this city" [Yerasimos, ibid, p. 28. Yerasimos quoted from: Samuel N.C
    Lieu and Dominic Montserrat (ed.), *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine
    Views. A Source History,* Routledge, London, New York, 1996, pp. 127–128].

103 Herrin, ibid, pp. 9–10.

104 Mango, ibid, p. 31.

necessary to examine the language as well, which is another factor in the creation of cohesion and common identity.

In that period, while pure Latin was dominant in the western part of the Empire, and Greek in the eastern parts of the Empire; Constantinople was a melting-pot of heterogeneous elements, where the main links of solidarity were two as regional and religious.[105] Social and cultural view in the following quotation on the Empire and the City support this claim:

> "People identified themselves with their village, their city or their province much more than they did with the Empire. When a person was away from home he was a stranger and was often treated with suspicion. A monk from western Asia Minor who joined a monastery in Pontus was 'disparaged and mistreated by everyone as a stranger'.[106] The corollary to regional solidarity was regional hostility. We encounter many derogatory statements concerning 'the cunning Syrian' who spoke with a thick accent, the uncouth Paphlagonian, the mendacious Cretan. Alexandrians excited ridicule at Constantinople. (...) Religious identity was often more strongly felt than regional identity. (...) Within the Church, however, religion and regionalism overlapped to a considerable extent" (Mango, p.31).

As it could be seen from such stereotypes emanating from uncertainty and threat perceptions, in the construction of identity, an emphasis on region/place is significant. At this point, language seems to be either a decomposing or unifying factor and spatial intimacy come into prominence in societal cohesion.

There has been no new term emerged to define the identity of the Empire as a whole, and there was never a need for it in everyday life; the religion and local origin constituted his/her passport.[107] The *City*, as the unification of most vital points of coherence such as religion and place, had become the biggest settlement in the Christian world.

Material and/or symbolic transition of the *City* could not happen in a short span of time. While transformation to Christianity was occurring gradually, Pagan aspects in the new religion were immense. Nevertheless, most of the Pagan temples were closed in the 4th and 5th centuries but others continued to be functioned elsewhere.[108] It was not much different in the *City*. It could be suggested that Paganism had survived longer among the transformed folds in the collective memory of Constantinople.[109] Moreover, Constantine the Emperor did

---

105 Ibid, p. 13, 16, 31.
106 Mango, ibid, p. 31. Mango's citation source John Climacus, *Scala Paradise,* PG 1xxxviii
107 Ibid, p. 31.
108 Ibid, p. 61.
109 Kuban, ibid, p. 47

not destroy the relics of the pagan past. While churches were being built, pagan temples nevertheless continued to be repaired.[110] As an effect extended to later centuries, triumphal columns and churches of martyrs were both equally part of a common antiquity dating back to Constantine.[111] Achieving the Christian sanctity of the former pagan content of the church/*ecclesiae* concept, which means gathering in Greek, has been possible with dramatic elements such as sacrifice, self-devotion, and savior martyr concepts. This makes one think that the pagan *heron* continues to live in *martyrdom*.

Christianization has also impacted the public life in the *City*. Pagan temples were not just spaces individuals walked in. Pagan life was public in many ways. Noting that theaters, wild beast fights, hippodromes were still places people visited and congregated, Mango states that such meetings annoyed the Church, which was dependent on the community and the earnings from community. With Christianity, church became the public assembly place.[112] Furthermore, disasters at the same period – droughts, plagues of locusts, earthquakes, bubonic plague and other calamities – also caused unrest and led to rebels.[113] There were also external threats: The *City* had to defend itself against continued attacks by Arabs, Persians, Slavs, Avars and others. To deal with these, people relied on their new cults –or perhaps transformed, old Pagan cults- where Mother of God/

---

110 Ibid, p. 47.

111 Paul Magdalino, *Studies on the History and Topography of Byzantine Constantinople*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, Ashgate, 2007, p. 9. For further readings; Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture,* Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1965; Kuban, ibid, 1996.

112 Mango, ibid, pp. 63, 82.

113 Ibid, pp. 66–68. A footnote on the bubonic plague and riots would be useful. Yerasimos indicates that in 542 there was the bubonic epidemic which was unknown until that day in Constantinople where the population had reached 300.000–400.000. He states that the epidemic first appeared in October 541 at the Egyptian port of Pelesium, in the following spring it spread to major port cities such as Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople. When the number of victims surpassed 230.000, in other words two thirds of the population, the counting of casualties was abandoned (Yerasimos, ibid, p. 76). The Nika rebellion is at the beginning of the mentioned riots. Ortaylı indicates that there was a rebellion against Justinianus the Emperor in January 532 and this resulted in deaths of several thousand peoples. After this rebellion, known as Nika, was suppressed, in 537 Christmas, the famous Hagia Sophia, which was built upon the ruins of a church, was opened to worship (Ortaylı, ibid, p. 36).

Panaghia[114] was the leading cult. Herrin defines this in relation to attack in 626 as such:

> "The patriarch organized the entire civilian population in a procession around the walls of the city, carrying their icons of Christ and chanting the Akathistos hymn, which calls on the Mother of God for divine assistance. (...) Eyewitnesses alleged that they had observed a woman leading the defense, who was assumed to be the Virgin herself. The survival of Constantinople (...) perhaps required supernatural powers. Certainly, these became a feature of the city, which already claimed the name Theotokoupolis', city of the Mother of God, whose relics protected it".[115]

Ascribing the *City*'s survival from the Arab attacks to Virgin's protective powers, the Church commemorated the victory of 718 in liturgical services held every year on 15 August, which was also the feast of the Virgin's *Koimesis* (Dormition or falling asleep, known in the West as the Assumption).[116] Such a syncretism reflects the close connection between Rhea, the protector of the *City* in Pagan faith and Panaghia/Mother of God cults, and implies that Rhea continued to exist in the Panaghia/Mother of God cult. Crowning the *City* with the name of the Mother of God translated into glorification and sanctification of it. This grand pattern gained continuity with the Panaghia/Mother of God festival.

New places that connected holy powers and cults with the *City* were established and/or were reconstructed. The *City* within its walls included many monasteries, churches and shrines, which attracted pilgrims and holymen from all over the Christian world.[117] This sanctity was both created and embraced by the political power. The officials in Byzantium, The Emperor and his family were influential in the creation of this aura of godliness. Herrin, who states that Pulheria, the sister of the Emperor Theodosius, encouraged the cult of the Mother of God with all-night special liturgies, points out that in addition to relics such as veil, girdle and shroud, the common prayers and invocations with particular icons of Virgin and the Child, had strengthened the popular devotion to Mother of God.[118]

The Panaghia/Mother of God image had a very important role in the sanctification and in creation of associated experiences. This holy image, in a sense materialized with relics such as the veil, belt and shroud and with other mementos that were believed to have survived from her, became both the means to inspire

---

114 Panaghia (in Greek Παναγία), consists of *Pan* and *Hágios* words and means All Saints, All-Holy.
115 Herrin, ibid, p. 15.
116 Ibid, p. 16.
117 Ibid, p. 18.
118 Ibid, p. 19.

people, and the holy objects in the transition of faith. Icons and holy artifacts were beyond religious objects since miracles were attributed to them. Owning, protecting and expanding these were also a matter of power. Practices created and/or transformed and adopted are functional tools for political powers. Herrin points out that while the eastern half of the Roman Empire was transforming itself into the Christian Byzantium, the new traditions based on former religious faith remained tightly connected with the old imperial and classical traditions, including preservation of pagan cults. Therefore, survival and vitality of Byzantium owed much to the coexistence of these contradicting strands. According to Herrin, Constantinos Palaiologos XI's call to the inhabitants of Constantinople asking them to show the spirit and strength of their ancestors, the Greeks and Romans, while defending the city against the Ottoman Turks, is a good indication of the coexistence of the new and classical traditions.[119]

Emperor Palagios' reference to the Greek and Roman ancestors rather than Christianity during the defense of the *City* in 1453 is a clear indication of how identity is a matter of contextualization. Therefore, in the following section, I am going to detail the fall or conquest of the *City* in 1453, which created a profound change in the sense of identity, with reference to its previous history.

Istanbul – the fall/conquest of the City

Before focusing on the transformation of the *City* with its fall/conquest, I would like to analyze some important undercurrents such as iconoclasm, the Latin invasion and division/schism, in other words, the split of churches that led to Byzantium's loss of power. Before we start, it would be appropriate to discuss religious organization.

In his PhD thesis on Ecumenical Patriarchate Elçin Macar, a political scientist brings up the well-known fact that with the death of Christ, his apostles visited different regions to spread Christianity and they established churches, the first of which was in Antioch. He states that the significance of the *City*, Byzantium, emanates from its geographical location.[120] Compared to other cities in which Christ and the apostles lived, the first years of Christianity were not successful ones in either in Byzantion or its successor Constantinople, and that the high status of Patriarchate is indeed related with the City's transformation into The

---

119 Ibid, p. 32.
120 Elçin Macar, *Cumhuriyet Döneminde İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2004, p. 29.

Imperial Residence.[121] So, how then did the *City* which was prominent with its politically advantageous geographical location and the center of an empire, become a religiously significant city as well?

In addition to the canons issued on religious teaching in the Council of Chalkedon (Kadikoy), a *Pentarchy* (five leads or districts) system was adopted that upgraded the status of the Churchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople to Patriarchates.[122] According to this system, Rome, Istanbul, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem were accepted as centers of Christianity, and Constantinople/Istanbul became equal to Rome in the hierarchy.[123] Unification of worship by creating dogmas also meant keeping control and power across the vast lands of the Empire and governing the people. In this way, emperors determined how norms and values were created in the multilingual and multi-tribal lands and ensured their own sovereignty. Cooperation between emperors and patriarchs in the organizations of ecumenical council meetings was very obvious.[124] In this manner, emperors consolidated aspects of military, administrative and religious authority in their own image.

The Empire was shaken with the iconoclasm movements in 8th and 9th century.[125] One of the main threats at that period was Islam, and Islam and Iconoclasm movement are interrelated. The icons failed to protect the Empire against foreign attacks and threats, and therefore some land was had been forfeited. Herrin points out that Byzantines considered victories as gifts from God to themselves. Thus, they questioned why God gave triumphs to the Arabs and they concluded that divine favour was being withheld because of the excessive veneration of

---

121 Magdalino, "Bir Dinin ve İmparatorluğun Başkenti Olarak Konstantinopolis", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010, p. 87.

122 Elçin Macar summarizes the Councils as follows: "With the expansion of Christianity along wider lands, seven 'Ecumenical Councils' convened to preserve the unity of the teachings and to determine administrative districts (. . .) According to Orthodox resources, today's Church of Istanbul is the 'Great Church of Jesus' built by Andreas in 37, the brother of Petros, who was called the first apostle. (. . .) The Orthodox Church accepts the first seven Councils. (. . .) Catholic and Orthodox churches convened separately after the 7th Council and did not recognize each other's" (Macar, ibid, pp. 30–33).

123 Ibid, p. 33.

124 Ibid, p. 31.

125 Movements and those who embrace this movement are called by different names: iconoclasma, eikon clastic, iconoclasm, iconoclast, iconoclaster, image-smashers or infidels.

icons. Therefore, the idea occurred that if these icons ought to be destroyed, they would be destroyed to secure the support of God.[126] Icons, which were previously praised as defense mechanisms, became conceptualized as sources of devastation and they become targets.

The iconoclastic movements (for which many hypotheses have been asserted to explain their emergence) affected the relations between East and West as well. Art historian Ernst Gombrich states that all kinds of religious arts were prohibited in the Eastern Church, when one party opposing all images created for religious purposes, namely representations, gained upper hand in the Church.[127] Classical period and art history expert Robin Cormack indicates that the reasons for the emergence of this period when the figurative imageries were forbidden from A.C. 730 to 843 (except between 787–814), and the importance of it were controversial, and in chronological terms he emphasizes that the Byzantine Christian iconoclast overlaps with the prohibition of imagery in both Islam and Judaism.[128] Whatever the reason might be, iconoclasm movement did not stay limited with icons and expanded. Practices such as lighting of candles or burning of incenses were judged as superstition. Objections started against the practices based on Virgin and some saints and especially the cult of holy relics.[129] Consequently iconoclasm, which affected Byzantium deeply, gradually escalated the discrepancies that existed between Byzantine and Latin worlds.

Pointing out that the Great Schism (*schism*) started when Roman representatives did not attend the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, Magdalino states that by this way, an everlasting competition started between the Orthodox East and

---

126 Herrin, ibid, p. 108.

127 Ernst H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art*, Phaidon Press, London, pp. 137–138.

128 Robin Cormak, "Sanat Bize Tarih Kitaplarıyla Aynı Öyküyü mü Anlatır?" in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010, p. 119. The following information is offered about the theological reasons of the iconoclasm movement: "The discussion of iconoclasm reflects the theological problem of the divide between the human and divine (deific) nature of Jesus. In a new Platonist approach, the supporters of icons accepted the representation of Jesus as the representation of God (the savior) on the human body and the approval of his unity by accepting imagery as a symbol, a tool, and related to the doctrine of 'salvation'. The iconoclasts claimed either that by portraying the human nature of Jesus, the inseparable natures of him got disconnected, or that portraying his divine nature mixed up his distinct natures that should not have been combined (Ayşe Hür, "İkonoklazma", in *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 4, Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, Istanbul, 1994. p. 153).

129 Lemerle, ibid, p. 81.

the Catholic West, and whenever there was a conflict of interest between two cities, this divergence reemerged.[130] Theological dissidence and power struggle paved the way to divergence and finally the split. Polarization between the two churches about the use of art in churches, teachings and rituals that led to the split followed by confrontations, indicates that the role of religion is not something just ontological, but rather political as well. The Crusades perhaps are the most destructive examples of such conflicts.

Geoffroi de Villehardouin, one of the commanders of the Crusaders entering Istanbul, states his impressions as follows:

> "Those who had never before seen Constantinople, looked upon it very earnestly, for they never thought there could be in all the world so rich city; and they marked the high walls and strong towers that enclosed it round about, and the rich palaces, and mighty churches – of which there were so many that no one would have believed it who had not seen it which his eyes – and the height and length of that city which above all others was sovereign. And be it known to you, that no man there was of such hardihood, but his flesh trembled; and it was no wonder, for never was so great an enterprise undertaken by any people since the creation of the world".[131]

It is striking to notice reflections of such a cultural confrontation in the words of a commander of Crusaders. In this expression, it could be seen that the *City* was fictionalized as a symbol of wealth and an object of passion and admiration. This expression that aggrandizes glory and wealth of the *City* exalts invasion, canonizes possession and justifies plunder.

Steven Runciman, an expert on the Byzantine history, points out that Constantinople was filled with works of arts and masterpieces from the Helladic period. Since Venetians were well aware of the values of such things, they took away the treasures they found. However, Runciman, who states that the Frenchmen and Flemings attacked streets and houses with a passion for destruction, says that monasteries, churches and libraries did not survive these plunders. He claims that even in Saint Sophia, drunken soldiers trampled on holy books and icons, a prostitute sang a ribald French songs on the throne of Patriarch and every kind of space was subjected to plunder.[132] In order to understand the material culture of the *City*, it is enough to look at places that were subjected to

---

130 Magdalino, ibid, pp. 87–88.

131 Geoffroi de Villehardouin, *Memoirs of the Crusades, Villehardouin's Chronicle,* trans. Sir Frank Marzials, Rhys (ed.), Everyman's Library, E.P. Dutton & Co, digitized in 2008, p. 31.

132 Steven Runciman, *A history of the Crusades,* Volume III, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, 1951, p. 123.

plunder and sack. With symbolic inversions such as a prostitute sitting on the throne of Patriarch, in a way capturing was cried out.

While Crusaders were establishing their own government, Byzantine elites withdrew to rural areas to set up resistance centers and later in 1261 the government of Byzantine recaptured the City.[133] However, hate and anger against the Latin world within the public deepened. On the other hand, there was an Ottoman threat that approached the *City,* and this threat inevitably led Byzantines to ask for help from the West and forced them to make some concessions. The primary concession was the unification of Churches.

Even though some officials of the *City*, which by this time was becoming increasingly smaller and vulnerable, considered unification as a solution, this was not supported by the people, and some did prefer the Turkish sword and turban to unification.[134] Runciman highlights that it was only the politicians and a group of intellectuals who supported unification. Monks and lesser clergy were against it, and influenced by them, the people were loyal to their liturgy and Orthodox traditions did not want to leave their religious rituals and traditions. According to Runciman, with the exception of a few, while the Byzantine did not want to submit their souls to the Romans, they considered accepting Turkish rule to be dishonorable.[135]

At the time of its foundation, in the beginning of 14th century, the Ottoman state was a small, insignificant principality at the border of Islamic world that devoted itself to 'Gazâ', the holy war against Christianity, and was incrementally invading and conquering the former Byzantine lands in Anatolia and the Balkans.[136] For Sultan Mehmet II, to conquer the *City* meant strengthening his own authority and building a reputation, while for the Western world, the *City* was a buffer zone with Islam. However, this buffer zone was diminishing.

The rulers of Constantinople looked to the West for salvation by keeping unification of the Churches on the agenda until the very last moment, whereas ordinary citizens hoped for salvation from either Panaghia/Mother of God, or by

---

133 Magdalino, ibid, p. 86.

134 Ortaylı, ibid, 2008, p. 52. The Grand Duke Loukas Notaras had declared that he would rather that the turben of the Turk prevailed in the City than the mitre of the Catholic prelate (Richard Clogg, *A Concise History of Greece,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999, p. 7).

135 Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople 1453*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1965, p. 9, 19, 21.

136 Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, the Classical Age 1300–1600*, Phoenix, London, 1994, p. 3.

bowing to the inevitable fate.[137] However, unification of the Churches had a negative impact on people. On December 12th, 1452, a solemn liturgy was held in the great cathedral of the Holy Wisdom,[138] with the participation of the Emperor and the Court, and the decrees of the Union of Florence were read out.[139] In this manner, while unification was reaffirmed, at the same time the people and some members of clergy conducted religious service of their own in Pantocrator Monastery.[140]

People conducting their own religious practices according to their own faith has a very significant symbolic and psychological value. In a sense, while this implies a reaction against Latin authorities, ordinary people restored trust to their own religious practices and mitigated fears emanating from events that were out of their control. The unified church on the other hand was perceived as increasing the threat. The first and last celebration of mass by two united East and West Churches on December 12th, 1452, had a negative psychological impact on the people of Constantinople because it invoked the atrocities of Latin occupation, hence the Emperor was accused and was accursed.[141] In the *City*, at the time Hagia Sophia (St. Sophia) was the most sacred space of the Orthodox faith that was praised and valued. According to them, this holy space, Hagia Sophia, had been cursed and sacrificed to infidels; therefore, conducting religious ceremonies in this place would be a sin.[142] Hence, following unification, no pious Byzantine Orthodox walked into the Church of Holy Wisdom until May 28th.[143] Such an attitude makes us think that the sacred Hagia Sophia (Church of Holy Wisdom) was believed to have been tainted and rendered impure. Therefore, bad omens would inevitably come true.

In his work, *History of Mehmet the Conqueror* covering the events between 1451 and 1467, of which the only existing copy is preserved in the Library of Topkapı Palace, Kritovulos, a historian and chronicler who lived in 15th century, described those bad omens[144] and the "terrifying divine signs" this way:

---

137 Millas, ibid, pp. 199–200.
138 That refers to Hagia Sophia/Saint Sophia cathedral.
139 Runciman, ibid, p. 71.
140 Millas, ibid, p. 200.
141 Kuban, 1996, ibid, p. 190.
142 Yannis Kordatos, *Bizans'ın Son Günleri,* trans. Muzaffer Baca, Alkım, Istanbul, 2006, p. 49.
143 Runciman, ibid, p. 131.
144 Beside Kritovulos, it will be important to look through other sources as well. Historian Steven Runciman details the mentioned prophecies as such: "During these days everyone remembered again the prophecies that the Empire would perish. The first

"There were unusual, bizarre earthquakes, landfalls, sudden flashes of lightning in the sky, thunderstorms, horrific thunderbolts, bright flashes of light appearing in the sky, destructive rain and storms. (. . .) The icons, columns and saint sculptures in the churches sweated, the men and women were hysterical, voices from the unknown could be heard, and strange things were happening that could bode no good. Soothsayers were warning terrifying omens".[145]

These evil signs spread by word of mouth, and soldiers viewed them with foreboding and they were demoralized.[146]

Famine started in the *City* under siege, and defenses weakened. On the other hand, a war or attack meant certain death to begin with. Portraying the life of the *City* and its inhabitants as the history of wars and in military terms conceals the lives of people, the hunger, misery, injuries, killings and/or murders. Defining such tragedies as victories or conquests normalizes and internalizes it. Yet, people murdered others and were killed.[147]

Christian Emperor had been Constantine, son of Helena; the last would be similarly named. Men remembered, too, a prophecy that the city would never fall while the moon was waxing in the heavens. (. . .) But on 24 May the moon would be at the foil; and under the waning moon peril would come. On the night of the foil moon there was an eclipse and three hours of darkness. It was probably on the following day, when the citizens all knew of the hopeless message brought by the brigantine, and when the eclipse had lowered their spirits still deeper, that a last appeal was made to the Mother of God. Her holiest icon was carried on the shoulders of the faithful round the streets of the city. (. . .) As it moved slowly and solemnly the icon suddenly slipped off the platform on which it was borne. (. . .) Then, as the procession wound on, a thunderstorm burst on the city. It was almost impossible to stand up against the hail. (. . .) The procession had to be abandoned. Next day, as if such omens had not been enough, the whole city was blotted out by a thick fog (. . .) That night, when the fog had lifted, it was noticed that a strange light played about the dome of the great Chinch of the Holy Wisdom. It was seen from the Turkish camp as well as by the citizens; and the Turks, too, were disquieted" (Runciman, ibid, pp. 120–121).

145 Kritovulos. *Kritovulos Tarihi 1451–1467,* trans. Ari Çokona, Heyamola Yayınları, Istanbul, 2012, p. 117.

146 Kordatos, ibid, p. 59.

147 At this point, to visualize and to feel the tragedy, it is important to look into details. Chronicler Kritovulos defines what happened as "terrible, heartbreaking and sadder than any tragedy" (Kritovulos, ibid, p. 233). Runciman also portrays the day of Monday, May 28 as follow: "On this Monday, with the knowledge that the crisis was upon them, the soldiers and citizens forgot their quarrels. (. . .) In contrast to the silence in the Turkish camp, in the city the bells of the churches rang and their wooden gongs sounded as icons and relics were brought out upon the shoulders of the faithful and carried round through the streets and along the length of the walls (. . .) The day

Not surprisingly, the fall or the conquest of the *City* has been documented differently by both sides. This power play was a win for the victor. So, while the conquest of the *City* was celebrated and blessed by one party, this was a monumental loss and cause for mourning for the other side. Runciman states that Mehmet the Conqueror entered the City in the late afternoon on his horse, he rode through the streets of the City and arrived at the Church of Holy Wisdom. He bent down and picked a handful of earth and poured over his turban. According to Runciman, he tried to show his humility towards his God.[148] Kuban also describes his entrance to the *City* as follows:

was nearly over. Already crowds were moving towards the great Church of the Holy Wisdom (. . .) Barely a citizen, except for the soldiers on the walls, stayed away from this desperate service of intercession. (. . .) It was her feast-day on the Tuesday; and the building was decked with roses gathered from the gardens and the hedgerows. Surely she would not abandon her worshippers. Others went back to the great cathedral (Church of the Holy Wisdom), remembering an old prophesy that said that though the infidel might penetrate through the city right into the holy building, there the Angel of the Lord would appear and drive them back with his bright sword to perdition" (Runciman, ibid, pp. 129–134). Historian Halil İnalcık explains the siege as follow: "The siege of Constantinople lasted fifty-four days, from April 6, 1453 until May 29. The defending force numbered some 8,500 men; the regular Ottoman army numbered not less than fifty thousand. (. . .) A company of Genoese mercenaries formed the defenders' main regular force. When the Genoese commander (. . .) was wounded and returned to his ship, the defenders' morale collapsed" (İnalcık, ibid, p. 23). Kuban also gives the following information: "Rumours of defeat spread quickly among the defenders on the walls. The Venetians went to their ships, the soldiers to their homes to protect their families. Nothing definite is known of the actual death of the emperor and this bore the later legend of a miraculous return. The three days' sack allowed by Islamic religion to the victorious soldiers completed the ruin of an already dilapidated city. All removable objects were looted. Books and icons were burned. Palaces and churches were emptied of their treasures. The greatest drama was to take place in St. Sophia. The Great Church was packed with terrified men, women and children. The brazen doors were closed and bolted. The Turkish soldiers broke them down. They seized all the golden and silver objects, and the precious stones and jewellery of the women, and in the heat of the moment killed everyone in their way. Most of the people were taken prisoner. This was an apocalyptic scene often described by priests. No icon or saintly relic survived in this deeply religious city. In Byzantine history, there were a great number of similar carnages by foreigners or the Byzantines themselves, but united with the sense of the final collapse of something very old and imposing and godly, the "Fall of Constantinople" remained in the memory of mankind as a dreadful and prodigious event" (Kuban, ibid, pp. 192–193).

148 Runciman, ibid, p. 148.

"On May 29, 1453, in the afternoon, on a beautiful spring day on the Bosphorus, Mehmed II entered the city from the Gate of Kerlcoporta and went directly to St. Sophia. (. . .) The conqueror entered St. Sophia on horse-baclc. This was a symbolic act of victory. Then he prayed in the most splendid religious interior he had ever witnessed. The wish in the hadis (hadith) of the Prophet of Islam was fulfilled: '*Happy is the army and happy its commander who conquers Constantinople.*' It was written, eventually on the doorway of the church converted into Ayasofya Mosque".[149]

By praying at the most important temple of the *City* and having the hadith of the Prophet Muhammed engraved on the doors of Hagia Sophia, Mehmet the Conqueror declared his power to entire Islamic world.

Kritovulos, in his tirade and lament dedicated to the City, states as such: "While this City was built and brought to the peaks of prosperity and joy by Helena's son, the blissful Emperor Constantine, it was also conquered and buried in shameful slavery and misery under the rule of the unfortunate Emperor Constantine, also the son of an Helena".[150] Dukas, a historian on Byzantium who lived in Mytilenne, describes the loss of the City and the feeling of mourning as follows, in his work written shortly after 1453.[151]

"O City, City, the crown of all cities! O City, City, the center of the four corners of the earth! O City, City, the honor of Christians and the destruction of barbarians!... Which language could explain the catastrophe, the terrible imprisonment, the painful migration that befell the City. . . Shiver O Sun! You, O Earth, heave a deep sigh for the abandonment of our entire generation by the just Lord, because of our sins!"

The Ottoman Romioi

In the engraving above, the word "Sultan" appears to the left of the Conqueror's head and "Mohammed II" to the right; and "Patriarch" to the left of Gennadios's head, and "Gennadios Scholarios" to the right. The chartering in the hand of the Conqueror reads, "You, Patriarch, have all privileges of those before you".[152] "In a similar ceremony in Byzantium, Mehmet the Sultan II declared Gennadios as the Patriarch by handing him the Patriarchate Scepter and send

---

149 Kuban, ibids, p. 193.

150 Kritovulos, ibid, p. 257.

151 Nevra Necipoğlu, "Osmanlı Fethinin Arifesinde Konstantinopolis", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi, Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010, p. 180 [Necipoğlu's source of quote: Ducae Historia Turco-Byzantina (1341– 1462), Grecu (ed.), Bucharest, 1958, 385–91].

152 Cengiz Aktar, *Tarihi, Siyasi, Dini ve Hukuki açıdan Ekümenik Patrikhane*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011, end leaf.

Image 1: Chapter 2 – The image of II. Mehmet the Sultan chartering Patriarch Gennadios. Source: This engraving is in Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and photographed by Nikolaos Manginas who is photographer of Patriarchate.

him to the Pammakaristos Church[153] which is the new Patriarchate".[154] Through this chartering, the new protector of Eastern Christianity, Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror, communicates the common interests of both his own Empire and the Eastern Christianity against Western Christianity by blessing the Great

---

153 Alias Havariyyun Church was later replaced by the Fatih Mosque.

154 Macar, ibid, p. 39. Macar says that the Patriarch, whose cognomen was Scholarios (wise), was a theologian and philosopher; he also says that according to Greek historian Sathas he was 'the last Byzantine and first (Ibid, p. 39).

Church which is the only legitimate institution that survived from the Byzantine Empire to the Ottoman Empire with almost no change.[155]

The first period (15th century–19th century)

The date 29 May 1453, when Constantinople, the City was conquered by the Ottoman Turks after a long siege, happened to be a Tuesday, which is still regarded as of ill omen by Greeks.[156] The Church accepted the conquest of Istanbul by Ottomans as the "will of god".[157] Richard Clogg, an expert on Balkan history, indicates that the yoke was not expected to last for long, even though the fall of the Byzantine Empire was largely seen as forming part of God's dispensation, as a punishment for the sins of the Orthodox. Clogg emphasizes that the beliefs based on revelation and prophecy, that an eventual deliverance would ultimately come with a divine intervention and by not through human agency lasted many years. According to the prophecy imputed to the Byzantine Emperor Leo the Wise,[158] the City would be rescued from Turks 320 years after the conquest of Constantinople, namely in 1773.[159] While the transfer of the *City's* administration to Turks was being conceptualized in this manner in Constantinople, the situation was no doubt different for the Ottomans.

Historian Halil İnalcık indicates that with the conquest of Constantinople, Mehmet II became the most prestigious Muslim ruler and he regarded himself as the only legitimate heir of the Roman Empire.[160] Mehmet II, who now sees himself as the "New Roman Emperor", becomes the leader of the Orthodox community as well as the Muslim community.[161] The Conqueror, who claims to have united Islamic, Turkish and Roman traditions of universal sovereignty in

---

155 C. Aktar, ibid, p. 8.

156 Clogg, ibid, p. 7.

157 Macar, ibid, p. 49.

158 Byzantine Emperor Leo was known as wise or philosopher cognomen between A.C. 886–912.

159 Clogg, ibid, p. 7, 17, 20.

160 İnalcık, ibid, p. 56. It is said that in his palace Romioi scholars and Italian humanists read Roman history to Mehmet II, and it is even noted that in a poetry Trapezuntios, who was a Romioi, who referred addressed him in a poem: "No one can doubt that he emperor of the Romans. He who holds the seat of empire in his hand is emperor of right; and Constantinople is the center of the Roman Empire" (İnalcık, ibid, pp. 56–57). İnalcık's quote source: Franz Babinger, Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit, Münih 1953, p. 168.

161 Macar, ibid, p. 40.

his own person, appoints Gennadios[162] as the Romioi Orthodox Patriarchate in 1454 in order to make Istanbul the center of a world empire.[163]

Losing the supreme fortress of Christian civilization to the Islamic world resonated with shockwaves around the Christian world; however, the reactions of the inhabitants of the heartbreaking remnant of the once mighty empire was ambiguous.[164] Despite the vague reaction of people, one irrefutable fact was the decreasing population of the *City*. Inalcık indicates that before the conquest the population had already fallen to around thirty–forty thousand.[165] Millas also emphasizes that since the Ottomans looted the City during the conquest and its residents were sold into slavery, the number of Romioi were around fifty thousand, Mehmet II needed to revive the city once again[166] and so he took some measures to ensure a population increase.[167] The Romioi who fled before the conquest and resettled in Istanbul, and those came from the Pontus region or brought in from the Aegean islands, Anatolia, Epirus, etc. were exempted from some taxes for a while. Some were provided with housing, land and farm animals for cultivation.[168] While they were selected among the wealthy, merchants or artisans from the important cities, rather than based on their religious identity, the Conqueror also did not allow the others who had been forcibly settled to leave the city.[169]

---

162 Macar draws attention that since the patriarchal position was vacant after the resignation of Anastasios II, and upon the request of the Sultan to elect a new patriarch, Georgios Kurtesis who was ardent opponent of the unification of the Eastern and Western churches became the patriarch with the name Gennadios II (Macar, ibid, pp. 38–39).

163 İnalcık, ibid, p. 57.

164 Clogg, ibid, p.7.

165 İnalcık, ibid, p.140.

166 Millas, ibid., p. 209.

167 İnalcık explains those measures as follows: "After the conquest, Mehmet could not, according to Islamic law, prevent his soldiers from pillaging the city, since it had not voluntarily surrendered; but he wished to take the possession of his future capital as undamaged as possible. In the years following the conquest, he took steps to transform Istanbul into the world's greatest capitals. (. . .) He sought to induce the refugees to return by promising them the restoration of their property, freedom of worship and freedom of work. He released those prisoners who had fallen to him as his share of the spoils, and settled them in Fener, even for a time exempting them from taxation" (İnalcık, ibid, p. 140).

168 Millas, ibid, p. 209.

169 İnalcık, ibid, p. 141.

In summary, the *City* experienced a resettlement (forced or voluntary) and so there were radical changes in the Romioi life in the *City*. Sultan Mehmet II stipulated the conditions of this new life through a decree. With the decree dated 1454, patriarchs were forbidden to deal with any religious and political problems related to the unification of the Eastern and Western churches.[170] Hereby, the division/schism between Orthodox and Catholic world continued. Millas states that the main aim of privileges provided to Romioi were indeed to prevent any potential cooperation.[171]

With the decree, the Patriarchate gained absolute, spiritual and administrative authority above all Orthodox peoples. In addition to processing cases in private law such as church management, marriage and inheritance, Patriarchs undertook additional responsibilities for collecting some personal taxes, and transferring other taxes to the state.[172] Macar emphasizes that the Patriarch, who was the religious leader operating under the Byzantine Emperor until 1453; become also the indisputable administrator of various civil issues of his religious community after 1453. Mehmet II bestowed the Patriarch with the three-star Pasha title of the Ottoman along with a guard unit, and a prison was built for the Patriarchate because of its judicial authority, which came to be referred to as 'state within the state' by the later historians.[173]

Clogg states that the Ottoman Turks faced difficulties in trying to govern a vast agglomeration of peoples and faith wide; and in order to deal with this they classified the masses as *millets* on the basis of their religions, rather than ethnic origins. He lists these nations as follows: the ruling Muslim *millet*, the Jewish *millet*, the Gregorian Armenian *millet*, the Catholic *millet* and finally the Orthodox *millet*, the largest community after Muslims. Clogg emphasizes that calling the Orthodox community as the *millet-i Rum*, or 'Greek' *millet* was a misnomer, since this group encompassed all Orthodox Christians of the Empire, including Bulgarians, Romanians, Serbians, Vlachs or Albanians and Arabs, not just Greeks, and yet the *millet bashi* (head of the *millet*) the Patriarch have always been Greek.[174] Alexandris indicates in his doctorate study on the

---

170 Macar, ibid, p. 39.

171 Millas, ibid, p. 205.

172 Ibid, p. 204.

173 Macar, ibid, p. 40. Macar indicates that these privileges granted to the Patriarchate in 1453 were not new, they had been in effect since 7th century, as the continuation of the 'deal' to protect the rights of Christians living in the conquered regions, following the example of rights given by Prophet Muhammad to Sina Mountain monks and by Prophet Omar to the Jerusalem Patriarchate (Ibid, p. 48).

174 Clogg, ibid, p. 10.

Romioi Orthodox minority in Istanbul and Turkish-Greek relations that with this system, for the first time since the heyday of Byzantine Empire, Orthodox Christians of the Near East united under a single religious authority and the traditional ecumenical dimension of Patriarchate enhanced.[175]

Noting the risk of portraying the Ottoman Empire as an entity that never changed for seven centuries in describing this nation system, Akgönül emphasizes that the status, life and opinions of the Romioi in the 15th century could certainly not be the same in the 19th century.[176] Those centuries, of course, were not stable nor did they exhibit uniform processes. Millas points out that the privileges provided by Mehmet II did not continue consistently, noting the attempts to 'Islamize' in Istanbul in 1521, converting the church of Patriarchate into a Mosque in 1586, followed by the Ottoman administration's hard stance in the second half of 17th century after the Cretan War (1645–1669) and the execution of two Patriarchs, II. Partenios and III. Partenios, in the same period.[177] Akgönül, underlines the special status of the Romioi in the Empire, noting that Akgönül, underlines the special status of the Romioi in the Empire, noting that until the Romioi "rebellion" in 1821, the Romioi maintained a certain level of dominance because much of the Empire's territory was once part of the Byzantine empire and therefore the Romioi population prevailed in greater numbers in some regions, and for related reasons.[178] Alexandris states that, at the turn of 20th century although it is debatable to claim, as some scholars do, that beyond their ethno-religious identity, the Romioi were one of the two founding peoples of the Ottoman Empire,[179] such theories verified the significance of the Ottoman Romioi and their status as the *Millet-i Rum* in the empire.[180]

While the Romioi were described as a separate nation (*millet*), it would not be accurate to state that a similar alienation between other nations and peoples existed within the Ottoman Empire. Ortaylı indicates that the Ottomans, whether Muslim, Christian or Jewish, regarded all Europeans in their territory

---

175 Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918–1974,* Center for Asia Minor Studies, Athens, 1992, p. 23.

176 Akgönül, ibid, p. 37.

177 Millas, ibid, p. 205.

178 Akgönül, ibid, p. 42.

179 The resource quoted by Alexandris: D Kitsikis, *L'Empire Ottoman*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1985.

180 Alexandris, "The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910–1912): A Contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography", in Gondicas and Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, The Darwin Press, Princeton New Jersey, 1999, p. 45.

as foreigners. He underlines that beyond just being foreigners, this also meant a separate culture, separate traditions, and separate religions.[181] So how did this perception change and how did these people, Muslim, Christian or Jewish Ottomans, treating only Europeans as foreigners, start to consider each other as strangers as well? In the following section, I will trace the clues to this question.

Years of transformation (19th and 20th centuries)

The concept of nation-state, which is a product of the French Revolution of 1789, had a colossal influence on the 19th and especially 20th centuries. Along with the nation-state concept came the idea that sovereignty came not from God but from people or nations themselves, which led people to search for their ancestral connection. From the perspective of the rulers, this necessitated a new concept and ideology to replace religious bonds, and to differentiate a nation/category from another.[182] Clogg states that following its foundation, the new rulers of Greece faced the problem of constructing a nation as well as state; and argues that it is not easy task to create the sense of loyalty to the state that would override traditional loyalties such as people's attachment to their families, to their native village and to region.[183] A new myth/ideal that could also refer to the past was necessary to create this new allegiance to replace the attachment to land/space or religion. To achieve this new connection, they reached out to the Ancient Hellenic history and downplayed the Byzantine era.

Alexis Heraclides, a political scientist, argues that Greek national identity in 19th century – as it is today – was shaped by the Romantic view, which considers nation an unchanged cultural society and a soul. In official history, narratives that consider Greek nation as continuity since Homer without any split have been gradually accepted.[184] This is a construction of history based on an acceptance of an "essence" that is same and continuous since the beginning.

---

181 Ortaylı, ibid, 2008, p. 95.

182 Millas indicates that during the Greek "rebellion" between 1821 and 1830 the issue of 'origin' was talked the most among the Orthodox who spoke Hellenic Greek. According to supporters of the West and the French Revolution, the roots of "nation" and "ancestors" date back to ancient Greece. Whereas the structures of the Byzantine and the Church, that is the Patriarchate, were representatives of an outdated, authoritarian and "foreign" order (Millas, ibid, pp. 165–166).

183 Clogg, ibid, p. 47.

184 Alexis Heraclides, *Yunanistan ve "Doğu'dan Gelen Tehlike" Türkiye, Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Çıkmazlar ve Çözüm Yolları,* trans. Mihalis Vasilyadis and Herkül Millas, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2003, p. 50.

Millas, who points out that the Ancient Helenic world is "revived" among Greeks in different ways, states that Greek intellectuals, in particular, give their children Ancient Greek names. Old texts are translated. Superiority of the "ancestors" is emphasized and all negative things are attributed to "conservative", "backward" and religion-oriented Byzantine and its successor Ottoman order.[185] Since children are associated with the future and continuity, in the world of meanings, the naming of children after Ancient Greek names, sheds light on how ancestors and roots are conceptualized. Such a construction of the past by positioning the Byzantine in contrast to Ancient Hellenic Greece, make us think that whatever impact of Ancient Hellenic/Pagan past had on Byzantium are negated or ignored. At this point, it is elucidatory to focus on how relationships developed between the Ottomans, considered to be the successors of Byzantium, and the most important religious institution, the Patriarchate.

Millas argues that some forces loyal to the Patriarchate- Romioi intellectuals in Fener, rulers of the Church, those in cooperation with the Ottoman Sublime Porte, and some sea merchants and farmer Hellenes – advocated the Byzantine and Christian traditions. The first order of the Greek government was to establish its own church independent from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The relationship between the Greek State and the Patriarchate further deteriorated and was severed for nearly thirty years.[186]

Greece is the first independent nation state that arose out of the Ottoman territory. This period, which started with the Morean rebellion in 1821 and resulted in the foundation of Greece in 1829, was a very difficult period for the Patriarchate. Since they allegedly supported the rebellion in Morea, Patriarch Grigoris V. and Metropolitan Bishops of Ephesus (Efes), Anhialos (Ahyolu), Nikomidia (İzmit), Derki (Terkos), Adrianupoli (Edirne), Tırnovo and Thessaloniki (Selanik) were executed.[187] The foundation of the Greek state did not just affect relationships between the Ottoman state and the Patriarch. According to the Ottoman Nation (*millet*) System, people of Greek Orthodoxy were affiliated with the Head of the Nation (*millet bashi*), the Patriarch, and metropolitan bishops that were secondary in the religious hierarchy. Therefore, these executions must have had deep impacts on the people. On these impacts, Millas says that the foundation of the Greek state in 1829 was a major stage in the lives of the Romioi. The Romioi who were recognized as a community by the Ottoman rulers until that day, began

---

185 Millas, ibid, p. 166.
186 Ibid, p. 166.
187 Macar, ibid, p. 44.

to be perceived as an extension of a foreign state, even as the fifth column of the Greek state. Millas says that the Ottoman state started to be suspicious about that community, and states that the Romioi started to feel alienated from the state as well. The Romioi's participation in the state system were restricted, particularly for the inhabitants of Fener. According to Millas, thereafter the Romioi started to feel drawn to the Greek state. However, friction between the conservative Romioi in Istanbul and the newly founded nationalist Greek state continued for a long time.[188]

The changing role of the Romioi from holding important positions in state structure to that of a distrusted societal component, by the establishment of Greece is another example of contextually of identities. With changing political and ideological conditions, identities could become a source of conflict or contradiction leading to alienation and distrust and result in new alliances. Relationships between institutions could be affected by new theories and new conceptualizations. On this process, Macar argues that the 'religious Byzantine' was discovered, after Falmeyar put forward a thesis that "Greeks are not the descendants of the Ancient world" 30 years after the Greek state had been founded, after clashes between the Church and old interest groups settled down and after common interest between the Church and the state was established. By this way, problems between the Patriarchate and the Greek Church deescalated and the Patriarchate was then included in Greek national history.[189] The perception of the Patriarchate changed or was reconstructed by abandoning the former problems and clashes and through a revised narrative that focused on the religious character of Byzantium.

Previously we had stated that as a result of the nation state concept, in other words, nation-state building movements as a new ideological basis, Greece broke away from the Ottoman Empire. Such a new concept deeply influenced the multinational (multi-ethnic) Ottoman Empire. Impacts of transformations experienced in the West were not just limited to political national movements. Following the Industrial Revolution that radically transformed the economic and social life, the West shifted to factory system and, subsequently space and time concepts started to change. "Time" has since been transformed into quantifiable sections that are directly related with factory production and people in rural areas started to increasingly migrate to the cities. This was a major change affecting peoples' sensory worlds both in the West and in societies related to it.

---

188 Millas, ibid, p. 213.
189 Macar, ibid, p. 47.

The West became symbolized as 'civilization', and anything traditional began to be viewed as a barrier to civilization. The view based on 'traditional-modern duality' defined by targets and metrics such as development, improvement, production, consumption, inventions and explorations, reflects a single linear progressive point of view. It was now 'the Age of Modernization' and modernization had become the primary target in the West and in countries closely connected to the West.

The Ottoman life was not an exception. The wars the Ottoman Empire lost inevitably led to a need to reform and reorganize the army. As a result of these changes and international pressures, the Ottoman rulers could no longer remain indifferent to changing expectations within the people and its internal nations. Non –Muslim nations (*millet*) supported the modernization movement and directly participated in this process. Basic themes of the Imperial Edict of Gülhane [the Imperial Edict of Reorganization (*Tanzimat*)] in 1839 and the Imperial Edict of Reform in 1856 were articles that provided for equality between Muslims and non-Muslims.[190] Muslim citizens cannot be said to have supported this new conceptual understanding based on the equality of every nation within the Ottoman Empire and representing a new relationship between the state and the people. Because of the Edict, serious resentment had been fostered among Muslims who were already feeling that their superiority based on Sharia (*Şeriat*) was being undermined.[191] Ortaylı argues that Muslims were quick to react, and the governor of Mecca even declared a fatwa that accused the bureaucrats of Reform of being 'infidels'. Especially in the rural areas, people ignored these Edicts. Some Muslims attacked Christians who, relying on the principle of equality declared in the Reform, carried their deceased over the shoulders, unlike the traditional way of using donkeys in the bazaar in Tripoli.[192] These backlashes were actually for the perceived downgraded superiority of Muslims within other nations. Reactions did not just come from Muslims, the Patriarchate itself did not like the Edict either.

It is rumored that just after the Edict of Reform was recited in public and placed back in the sack of the 'town crier', the Greek Patriarch said "God willing, it will not be taken out of the sack again".[193] Prior to the Reform, the community affiliated with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, that is the Greek Nation, was characterized as

---

190 Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010, p. 106.

191 Deringil, ibid, p. 48.

192 Ortaylı, ibid, pp. 107–108.

193 Ibid, p. 133.

a religious group rather than an ethnic group. The Reform would be limiting the administrative, financial and legal sovereignty of the Patriarchate over Orthodox people living in the Ottoman territory- Slavs, Bulgarians, Albanians, Vlach's, etc. Moreover, their relative positioning vis-a-vis the non-orthodox nations would change as well. Macar notes that, the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not welcome the changes in the nations' administrations brought by the Royal Edict of Reform, since it would mean losing its superior position over other nations such as the Jews and Armenians.[194] Even though both Muslims and the Patriarchate reacted to some of the reforms and their enforcement were flawed at times, these reforms benefited the Romioi. Millas states that especially until 1908 while Greece did not really exhibit any real progress yet, the Romioi experienced their golden era; they regained the trust of the state and became richer especially by becoming the middleman in trade with Western countries. Moreover, some Romioi were promoted to senior positions in areas such as medicine, engineering, law and education.[195] They were represented in official state functions again and even more than before as the Ottoman rulers mistrust softened.

Political mobility and change emanating from the Imperial Edicts of Reform and Reorganization paved the way to a process in the multinational (*millet*) Ottoman state in which identities were reinterpreted. Changes in the relationship with the means of production and the press had a special place in this mobility. Communication became faster thanks to the newspaper and telegram. Newly established schools and a rise in the number of students improved the educational system. Trade expanded with railways and ports. Increases in capital, production and trade increased the interconnection between people residing in different places. All these changes inevitably fed into ideological mobility and change. On these change, historian Çağlar Keyder states that Turkish Nationalism emerged within the context of 'late' or delayed nationalisms following the model led by Germany. According to him, Turkish nationalism was nourished by the opposing nationalist movements within the Ottoman Empire, developed as a reaction to them and was also limited by them.[196]

Since mobility and the changes emphasized above rendered origin and the past problematic, the past was reconstructed with new narratives and fictions. Reconstruction of the past with rising nationalism was not just unique to

194 Macar, ibid, p. 54.
195 Millas, ibid, pp. 216–217.
196 Keyder, *Memalik-i Osmaniye'den Avrupa Birliği'ne,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2007, p. 73.

Turkism. Historian Arzu Öztürkmen, in her work, *Folklore and Nationalism in Turkey*, emphasizes that Turkism was not the only dominant cultural movement in the late Ottoman ear, and that, Turkism was already a part of a cultural system that included Hellenism and Slavism. According to her, the movement that promised original cultural myths with its origins in Central Asia and which resurrected the Empire's golden days by referring to the vast lands from Anatolia to Central Asia, quickly influenced and mobilized Ottoman intellectuals. It increased interest and awareness in the Turkish language and the origins of Turkish culture.[197]

Ziya Gökalp, who was considered as the ideologist of Young Turks, in his *Principles of Turkism*, proposed that the Turkish nation should construct its identity from its role in the past and should return to its origins.[198] Gökalp, who rejected a definition of nation with reference to race and ethnicity, and suggested a common culture including Islam,[199] stated that museums and libraries on Turkish folklore, ethnography, and archaeology ought to be founded.[200] With such institutional support, it was attempted to justify the *National History Thesis,* which traced back the origins of Turks thousands of years before the Ottoman Empire and that ancient civilizations like Hittites[201] and Sumerians were in fact of Turkish *origin*, and the *Sun-Language Theory*[202] that asserted that Turks' homeland in Central Asia was the cradle of all civilizations and hence, all languages were derivatives of Turkish.

Under these circumstances where people's roots were extended backward to the most distant past possible and eternity and continuity are praised, it gradually became harder to keep a multinational empire together. Historian Fikret Adanır states that the Young Turks' previous attempts to keep the multi-ethnic Empire together did not succeed to prevent the rise of ethnic nationalism in the first half of the 20th century. He adds that the Balkan wars in 1912–1913 were a turning

---

197 Arzu Öztürkmen, *Türkiye'de Folklor ve Milliyetçilik,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, pp. 20–21.

198 Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları,* Salkımsöğüt Yayınları, Ankara, 2010.

199 Carol Delaney, "Father State, Motherland, and the Birth of Modern Turkey", in Yanagisako and Delaney (eds.), *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*, Routledge, New York, 1995, pp. 177–199.

200 Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gokalp,* Luzac, London, 1950, p. 115.

201 Frank Tachau, "Language and Politics: Turkish Language Reform", *The Review of Politics* 26 (2) (April), 1964, pp. 191–204.

202 Heyd, ibid, p. 34.

point in this process and that, following the defeat of the Ottomans in Europe, the Committee of Union and Progress directed the rage of Muslims, especially of newly settled immigrants living in the Aegean region, towards non-Muslims.[203]

We previously emphasized that independence/rebellion movements and the nation-building process in the Balkan nations had important implications for both those nations and the Ottoman Empire. One of the leading consequences was mass migration. Muslim/Turkish immigrants, who were forced to leave their lands and homes as a result of migration and nationalist movements, took an active role in the counter movements against non-Muslims/non-Turks. Keyder, underlines that weather or not the Empire would survive in the 1910s as a structure comprising multi-ethnic people depended on the relationship of the state and its non-Muslim groups, and argues that among these groups, the Romioi were critical to this relation because of their high numbers within Istanbul's population, their economic significance and the independence of Greece.[204]

Catherine Boura, an international relations scholar, refers to those years between 1908 and 1918 as a transition period from multinational Ottoman Empire to national Turkish state.[205] They were indeed the years of major transformations. Historian Thanos Veremis, argues that especially in 1910, the Committee of Union and Progress (C.U.P.) gave up on the 'Ottomanizing' idea and for them 'Ottoman' openly implied Turk, and their 'Ottomanization' policies morphed into policies to oppress non-Turks.[206] Boura states that from 1914 on, the Committee speeded up the transformation of multinational Empire into a national state and argues that laws that led the collective national presentation of the different ethnic-religious communities were abolished.[207] At this point, looking at these processes in terms of the Romioi is going to be helpful. Noting that relations between the Romioi community and the Ottoman government deteriorated upon the rise in power of the C.U.P. in 1908, Millas states that

---

203 Fikret Adanır, "Bulgaristan, Yunanistan ve Türkiye Üçgeninde Ulus İnşası ve Nüfus Değişimi", in Zürcher (ed.), *İmparatorlukta Cumhuriyete Türkiye'de Etnik Çatışma*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011, p. 22.

204 Keyder, ibid, p. 41.

205 Catherine Boura, "The Greek Millet in Turkish Politics: Greeks in the Ottoman Parliament (1908–1918)", in Gondicas and Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, The Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999, p. 193.

206 Thanos Veremis, "The Hellenic Kingdom and the Ottoman Greeks: The Experiment of the 'Society of Constantinople'", in Gondicas and Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, The Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999, p. 189.

207 Boura, ibid, p. 200.

the Romioi supported the Freedom and Accord Party and Prince Sabahaddin. To improve relations, the Committee offered the Romioi more seats in the Parliament, but this offer was not accepted. In 1912, the Committee (along with their fifteen Romioi representatives) won the elections, and both the Freedom and Accord Party and the Romioi Community were defeated.[208]

With Balkan wars and Greece joining the Allied forces in World War I (WWI), the tension between the Romioi community and the Committee of Union and Progress intensified, and the Romioi became mistrusted again. By pointing out that following 1913, Romioi were no longer appointed as ministers, Millas notes that the Romioi communities in Thrace, Black Sea and Aegean regions were driven out to inner Anatolia, boycott campaigns were held against Romioi shops and businesses during WWI and economic restrictions were implemented.[209]

Macar states that the Ottoman Empire entered WWI in this negative and distressed atmosphere, and highlights that the Committee of Union and Progress accelerated its policy of eliminating minorities and the Ottoman nation system. During the war, their Unionist policies against minorities and attempts to end privileges of the Patriarchate agitated the Patriarchate.[210] In return the Patriarchate changed its policies as well. Millas argues that the Patriarchate gave up its traditional policies between 1918 and 1922 and started to support irredentist policies of the Greek state. The Patriarchate voiced their plea for unification with Greece on 16 March 1919, and thereafter avoided relations with the Ottoman government. Noting that the Romioi in Istanbul held demonstrations supporting Greece during the invasion of Istanbul, Millas argues that some of the Romioi from Istanbul even joined the Greek Army and fought against the Ottomans. According to him, following these events, Turks and the Romioi were split into two camps and mutual distrust, suspicion and hostility strengthened. By highlighting tragedies on both sides and what the ordinary people suffered in those years, Millas argues that the atmosphere of war rendered every atrocity "legitimate".[211]

Hostility and war between the two nations inflicted a deep wound. These pains did not end with the war. The end of war with its tragic consequences caused new dramas. Foremost among these was the population exchange. Historian Fikret Adanır states that after war, it was Venizelos who revived the population

---

208 Millas, ibid, pp. 221–222.

209 Ibid, p. 222.

210 Macar, ibid, pp. 62–64.

211 Millas, ibid, pp. 222–223.

exchange idea. He points out that following the Treaty of Sevres, the idea of population exchange was discussed for regions densely populated with Greek citizens, that is, Izmir and its hinterland, where also a migration of Muslims from that region to the inner parts of Anatolia had started. Therefore, since resistance against the Greek Army moving along the inner Anatolia was getting stronger, the Greek Prime Minister offered the Ankara government a proposition for population exchange. This time, a population exchange between Muslims under Greek occupation and the Romioi in Cappadocia and Pontus was proposed.[212] Finally, the population exchange was poised to occur, something which had been proposed as a 'solution' since the Balkan war. The Greek and Ankara Governments negotiated the terms and scope of population exchange in Lausanne.

Following the war between Turkish and Greek Armies in Anatolia, both government's representatives were invited to Lausanne, Switzerland to participate in the International Peace Conference held on November 13th, 1922.[213] The first part of the Conference ended with an agreement that stipulated a population exchange of Muslims living in Greece and the Romioi Orthodox living in Turkey. The Muslim population in Western Thrace and the Romioi Orthodox residing in Izmir, Imbros/Gokceada and Tenedos/Bozcaada were exempt from the exchange. In reality, this tragic exile had started before the Treaty. Historian Kemal Arı explains the departures as follows:

> "In September of 1922, while the Greek occupation in Anatolia and Eastern Thrace reached to an end, mass migration movements were witnessed in parallel. Following the defeat of the Greek Army against the Turkish Army, the Romioi of Turkey migrated to Greece via sea, land and railways, first from the cities of Western Anatolia and Marmara, then from Eastern Thrace and Black Sea. During the migration, massive numbers of migrants piled up in the coastal cities, especially in Istanbul and Izmir. (. . .) With the few possessions that they could carry along, arriving mostly from the Marmara cities, they accumulated in Istanbul and had serious health, nutrition and housing problems. The measures taken were inadequate. More than 30,000 people gathered along the coastal stretch from Samsun to Trabzon. Ferryboats from Greece carried migrants from Samsun, Ordu, Giresun and Trabzon piers in groups of 2,000 people. In Eastern Thrace, the Romioi immigrants who hit the road formed large groups in the train stations in a short time. Trains and ferries carried emigrants day and night along the Tekirdag – Thessaloniki line. Within a month, the number of Romioi who left Turkey and migrated to Greece was 650,000. This number surpassed 1,000,000 by the end of 1922."[214]

---

212 Adanır, ibid, pp. 23–24.
213 Yıldırım, ibid, p. 6.
214 Kemal Arı, *Büyük Mübadele Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç (1923–1925),* Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul, 1995, pp. 6–8.

The immigration wave that had already started became mandatory with the Treaty of Lausanne. The Treaty also meant that the initial emigrants, who left everything behind with the intention of returning one day, could never come back again. Those who were subject to the exchange did not want to leave and searched for ways to stay. By claiming that their place of residence was in Istanbul through their relatives residing there, they strived very hard to stay. There were only a few who managed to do it. This mandatory migration also affected the state of Turkey, while it turned the lives of exchanged people upside down. Arı emphasized that, in the Republic of Turkey, the Population Exchange was a stage that had a decisive importance on the formation of both state-society balance, and the dominant ideology of nationalism. It had a major influence on Turkey's future in terms of the composition of social classes and the formation of official ideology.[215]

On a personal level, this was a tragedy for the exchanged men, women and children. They left their hometowns where they had lived for centuries and migrated to a foreign place. Those who stayed also experienced the separation, as well as those who had to leave. Istanbul has been the *City* with which the Romioi who lived in the vast territories of Ottoman Empire for many centuries had a connection. Hence, it is impossible to address the Romioi of Istanbul distinctly from those who emigrated. While the exchange dimension of the Treaty of Lausanne affected these bonds; there were also the legal rights and definitional aspects to be considered.[216]

---

215 Ibid, pp. 6–8. International relations expert Dimostenis Yağcıoğlu, in his article *Mübadele Yapılmasaydı* evaluates the exchange through hypothetical questions "if there were no exchanges, what would have happened to the Romioi-Orthodox people living in Turkey and the Muslim-Turks living in Greece". According to him, there were three main options for minorities in two countries in 1923. Those were the mandatory exchange, having to live in an insecure place, and voluntary exchange for those who stayed. The first option was the de facto situation. He claims that the second option actually was available only to the Romioi of Istanbul, Gokceada and Bozcaada and the Western Thrace Turks. Had this option applied to all the Romioi left in Anatolia and all the Turks in Greece, those who remained on the "wrong" side could expect to be in a far worse situation than the minorities. As a result, while emphasizing the painful and traumatic aspects of the exchange, he points out that the bloody events that started in 1912 lead to the consequences and suggests that the exchange was actually not the worst option for minorities and that it was not necessarily a failed measure. Azınlıkça Issue 41, 15/8/2011 (www.azinlikca.net).

216 The Treaty signed in Lausanne at the end of the War of Independence establishes the source of minority definitions in the Republic of Turkey. Political scientist Baskın Oran states that in Turkey, the term minority refers only to non-Muslim citizens and

Alexandris points out that the Treaty of Lausanne, minorities were defined based on religion carefully avoiding the issue of ethno-national identity. He emphasizes that a multilateral mechanism was not in place to ensure compliance with these protection-related items, even if the reciprocal character of rights granted to minorities to preserve a numerical balance, created a feeling of the bilateralism. Actually, minorities could have lived prosperously as long as Turkish-Greek relations were good, just as they would be in the 1930s and early 1950s.[217] In the following section, I will try to detail those years indexed to the Turkish-Greek relations.

Chain of events

One of the periods marked by suppression in Turkish-Greek relations was the year 1941, when men in a specific age range were taken from streets, homes, and offices and drafted. Historian Dilek Güven indicates that in the first half of May 1941, in Istanbul and Thrace, all of the non-Muslim men aged 25–45, were taken off the streets, work places and schools to the military post in Davutpaşa following an identification control on the pretense of military service. Later they were transported to the labor camps in different parts of Anatolia by train from Haydarpaşa train station, and were forced to work in the construction of roads, buildings and airports etc. Güven draws attention to the timing of this deed, which coincided with the holocaust and the German army's approach to the western border of Turkey, and emphasizes that the Jews, particular, feared the

---

still, covers only the three historical non-Muslim groups (Armenians, Jews, Romioi), stemming from the Nation System (*millet* system), which was the core of the social order of the Ottoman Empire. The implications of the System, which began in 1454 and continued officially until 1839 the Rescript of Gulhane, are still present (Oran, *Türkiye'de Azınlıklar: Kavramlar, Lozan, İç mevzuat, İçtihat, Uygulama,* Tesev Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005, p. 36). However, it should not be inferred that the term "minority" in in its current usage, corresponds to the nations under the Nation System of the Ottoman Empire. Deringil says that for many centuries the concept of "minority" (ekalliyet) did not mean anything to the Ottomans, and that the present meaning of the word emerged with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne (Deringil, *Simgeden Millete - II. Abdülhamid'den Mustafa Kemal'e Devlet ve Mille*t, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, p. 93).

217 Alexandris, "Religion or Ethnicity: The Identity Issue of the Minorities in Greece and Turkey," in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsary Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004, p. 117.

possibility of a massacre. On July 27th, 1942, all of the camps were closed down and those people were allowed to return to their homes.[218]

This incident is recorded in both individual and the collective memory. Another event was the Wealth Tax (Varlık Vergisi) which interviewee *Takis*[219] states as "*where the crumbling first started*". Aktar points out that the Wealth Tax Law[220] was not only important as an economic measure, but had a political and cultural significance as well, and draws attention to its sub-processes. Those processes include preparation and passing of the Law, the way it was reflected in the media, the ways the commissions operated to determine the payable tax, limiting the payment time to a short period of one month, sequestration and the judicial sale of the goods of those who could not pay their tax debt, and sending those who could not pay to the labor camps as payment through physical labor. Aktar indicates that, considering the sub processes in their entirety, the Wealth Tax Law was an example of the "anti-minority" policies implemented many times during the Single-Party Period.[221]

Families, already weakened by having men drafted into labor camps in 1941 on the pretense of military service, were totally destroyed by the Wealth Tax in 1942. Those Laws were clear evidence that they were not welcomed by the State as well. Then, the events of September 6–7 in 1955 brought them to face not only the State, but the violence of an angry mob of people as well. Güven explains this situation as follows:

> "On 6 September 1955 at 13:00, the state radio announced a bombed attack on the house where Atatürk was born in Thessaloniki, and this news spread with a second reprint of the Istanbul Express newspaper. Later in the day, a protest rally was held in Taksim Square called by various student unions and the KTC – Cyprus is Turkish Society. Following this rally, some groups began breaking the windows of non-Muslim businesses in Istiklal Street. In a short period of time, districts like Beyoglu, Kurtulus, Sisli and Nisantasi in the vicinity of Taksim were flooded by masses of people armed with various tools and equipment who started to destroy the businesses, houses, schools, churches and cemeteries".[222]

---

218 Güven, ibid, pp. 133–135.

219 *Takis*: Man. 70 ages. Romioi of Istanbul. He migrated to Athens but lives both in Athens and Istanbul for a while. The interviews were conducted in Istanbul in September 2011.

220 The Wealth Tax Law No.4305 discussed and accepted in Grand National Assembly of Turkey on November 11, 1942 in the years of Second World War, (Aktar, ibid, 2010, p. 135).

221 Ibid, pp. 135–136.

222 Güven, ibid, p. 25.

Interviewee *Mihail,* noting the role of the state within the state in these events, describes September 6–7 as follows:

> "The People's Party, which contained this core group, was already able to oppress the people how ever they wanted, by manipulating the state to pass respective laws since the 1950's during their government. They were able to draft all men, young or old, to concentration camps with these laws, the Wealth Tax was realized by these laws. However, the events of 6–7 September did not happen by law. Those were planned by the deep state (state within the state). Later in '64, again under the People's Party government, there were the deportations by law. The Romioi population, which had over ninety thousand people, was reduced to less than thirty thousand in 18 months. Those were enabled by law" (Mihail, Istanbul).

There were attempts to cover up the organized nature of violence and evade responsibility for the attacks on September 6–7 by attributing them to the delirium of a provoked, and disorderly masses. The period before the September 6–7 events are important. The Romioi's involvement in economic life was represented negatively. The Romioi were pointed to as targets or scapegoats by the media like never before. Suspicion, hatred and hate speeches gained intensity. The collective aggression, in fact, was normalized by representing it as if it was an attempt to rescue one's own goods from the pawn-broker. Knowing that they will be protected, the aggressors' brute force and violence became natural, and spread all around the *City*.

The story of *Mustafa Effendi*, the superintendent of *Mihail*'s apartment building, on the day of 6–7 September is a stunning account:

> "Mustafa Effendi came and rescued us, saying 'there are no infidels or anything here', and wiped the mark off the door. Once they left, he dropped the flag, picked up his axe, followed them to the neighboring houses and proceeded to knock down their doors! Our superintendent, Mustafa Effendi. Quite predictable... because to him we were Yiannis, Madam Katina, Madam Eleni but they were 'the *Romioi*'" (Mihail, Istanbul).

Mihail indicates that Greek/Hellenic Cypriots in Cyprus are called 'the Greek Cypriots' in English and that there are some similar depictions in French and German, yet in Cyprus they are called "Eleno Kiprios".

> "We call them (the Cypriots) the *Romioi*. Why? It's widespread yet this is not a coincidence. Anything that happens in Cyprus that outrages the Turkish public is done by... whom? The *Romioi.* Who's the *Romioi?* It's Mihail, our buddy you know, we played marbles back in the neighborhood. Hey Mihail, they say your folks kill our folks in Cyprus? For God's Sake! Who's the 'our folks'? It's the *Romioi!* I didn't know, I was just 12 or 13 then. And the discrimination started. Just like that... It started" (Mihail, Istanbul).

In this chapter I tried to present the historical basis for the question of inter-viewee *Mihail*, "*who is Romioi?*" by detailing the Byzantine and Ottoman history that shaped the sense of identity and rituals. The interviewees' points of emphasis guided the scope as well as depth, details and focus points of the aforementioned past thereby forming a selective historical basis.

With regard to this basis, if we recall the points of emphasis by interviewees and literature, this history of Byzantium, in which some interviewees feel are their origins and some others described as a "*feeling*", includes many symbols and practices convenient for the sanctification of the *City*, Istanbul, and to develop a sense of identity and spatial meaning. In summary, these symbols were: attrib-uting the relocation of a group under the command of Byzas, (the descendant of Io, the lover of Zeus and Poseidon, The God of the Sea), from Megarans' first settlement in Kadikoy/Chalkedon to Acropolis/Sarayburnu as a sign from God and the fantasy of being descendants of Gods were the beginnings of the sanc-tification of land. In Byzantine heterodox identity, with its many characteristics from Pagan, Hellenistic, Roman and Christian cultures, main bonds of solidarity as well as differences are spatial, that is, based on place/ location.

That one has be a native of Istanbul/Byzantion in order to self-identify as Byzantions (Byzantine) demonstrates the importance of the *City* In addition to the establishment myth by Byzas as a sign of God's word and its foundation based on ancestry, declaration of it as the Capital by Emperor Constantine and dedi-cation of a birthday to the city and its celebration every year are other examples of symbolic construction for sanctification of the *City*. Another example is the alternate name of Constantinople being Theotokopolis (meaning The City of the Mother of God). Dignifying the *City* by association with the Mother of God/ Panaghia and referring to her support in the defenses of the *City*, implies rec-onciliation of the Rhea, the protector of the *City* in Pagan belief, with Mother of God/Panaghia. Following the fall of the *City* in 1453, now the sanctification of another faith/religion is observed: Mehmet II had the honor delivering Prophet Mohammed's hadith, asking for the capture of Constantinople.

While all these were establishing the sacred memory of the *City*, another major change that paved the way to a life around the church[223] was Ottoman history. All this past, spanning many fluid centuries, have accumulated to become a component of that particular identity. Vital breaking points within the past were: The Population exchange between Greece and Turkey, the Treaty

---

223 It is a quotation from interviewee *Maya*'s words. *Maya*: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Istanbul. The interviews were made in Istanbul in 2012.

of Lausanne and Turkification Policies in the Republican Era, the Wealth Tax, Events of September 6–7, and the mass deportation in 1964.

In the next chapter, while focusing on Greek Orthodox identity phenomenon with reference to belongingness, ethnic identity, nationalism and nation-state concepts, I am going to examine the discrimination - which interviewee Mihail pointed out with *"and the discrimination started. It just started. . ."*-, in terms of religion and language, where it is most visible.

Chapter 3   Being Romioi Orthodox: *"I went to the corner store, 'he said you're Romioi', so what, an alien, or what?"*

"I was such a hung-up kid that when I walked into the neighborhood and on to our street, the other kids would make fun of me. I would think 'they're saying all this because I'm Romioi' when in fact that wasn't the case. I was a troubled kid. Now I've grown up and I understand. But all of this really impacted our mental state, you know (...) We were born here, we grew up here, my grandfather, his grandfather... But when I went to the corner store, they said I am a Romioi. So, what? Are we aliens from space?" (Elena, Athens).

These are the words of *Elena*[224] who was born and raised in Istanbul. Her grand grandparents are from Cappadocia. Some of her relatives moved to Greece during the population exchange between Turkey and Greece. *Elena* and her family were allowed to stay, because they were born in Istanbul. At the beginning of 1970s they were forced to migrate to Athens.

As seen from the anecdote above, *Elena*'s a priori identity in a sense is the source of her negative experiences and disappointments in her childhood perception. The perception imprinted onto her child mind is that her identity could be an object of derision. Considering that the grocery store would be one of the first outside experiences of a kid and the frequency of visits to the store, the unfavorable reaction to her identity ought to have been traumatic. Negative attitudes against a child's group identity within public realms such as the grocery store or the neighborhood create barriers for the child to express himself/herself in public. Thereby, within the process of forming, interpreting and expressing the identity, assaults, being mocked and humiliating experiences are influential and scarring.

---

224 *Elena*. Female. Mid-fifties. When I asked her age, she said "*I was born in days of sorrow, I was 6,5 months old on 6–7 September*". Romioi of Istanbul. She migrated to Athens with her family at the beginning of 1970s. Her husband *Leonidas* is also Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010.

He just has to call me infidel!!

"Between *1953–55,* we couldn't even go out to the backyard in Fener, they would throw stones at us from the neighborhoods above. They could have Turkified (assimilated) us differently. How, you ask? Exactly like they did in America. But, he just has to call me the 'infidel'. 'Fine then', I say, 'if you don't accept me as a Turk, then I guess I'm not one'... Yet you still want to Turkify me. Now how is that going to happen? No way…" (Xanthus, Athens).

The rejection, even if interviewee *Xanthus* consented to be Turkified, implies that some other criteria than ethnic origin were in effect for acceptance as a Turk. While a Kurdish person giving consent to be Turkified is considered as a Turk, why was *Xanthus* not? What does Turkification imply? In this section, I am going to examine the feeling of belongingness with reference to the concepts of nationality, citizenship and being a subject. While examining the Greek/Romioi language as an important element of Greek Orthodox identity in terms of restrictions of language and its emergence as a 'border', I will also analyze the other important elements of religion and rituals in terms of differentiation and solidarity.

Turkification, nationalism, nation, ethnic group

In his book on the 'Turkification' policies implemented during the Single Party Period, sociologist Ayhan Aktar describes these "Turkification" policies in the early years of Republic, as "anti-minority" and discriminating. What Turkification implied was elimination of every ethnic identity other than Turkish ethnic identity in almost every sphere of life ranging from daily language in the streets to the context of history classes in schools; from education to industry and from private law to housing policies.[225]

People were expected to "unconditionally" obey these "deus ex machina" codes. Authority and control on every sphere of life, treating people not as subjects or actors but rather as tools or objects, expecting compliance, and demanding that loyalty and commitment to be continuously validated are attitudes closely related with nationalism. In the nationalist view, a person does not belong to himself, rather he/she belongs to the state and he/she has to act duly prove their commitment again and again through various means. Belongingness is not conceptualized as a concept of identity, rather as a concept of adherence. Ernest Gellner, an anthropologist, describes nationalism as a principle, which necessitates a

---

225 Aktar, 2010, ibid, p. 101.

congruency between political unit and national unit.[226] Nationalism requires an obligatory harmony between the ruler and the ruled. Therefore, these questions arise: Which persons/groups/identities are more responsible among the obligated? What are the differences between Nationalism and other potentially more demanding relations such as ethnic ties and kinship?

The Historian Eric Hobsbawm, with reference to Gellner, highlights that the principle of nationalism implies that political duties towards the structure representing the nation take precedence of other obligations. Thus, modern nationalism differs from other and less demanding forms of group identification.[227] In other words, for a coherent connection between the ruler and the ruled to be sustained, it is significant and effective to glorify duties of the ruled. At this point, it is necessary to analyze why people adopt such a demanding 'identity' and the ways they fulfill their obligations.

Gellner states that nations as a natural, God-given way of classifying people is a myth. In reality, nationalism, which sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them.[228] In other words, a stable essence or self, that allows a distinction between "us and them" could be turned into a nation and continue to be credible. Sometimes a nation could be created from thin air and it could still be convincing. Hobsbawm claims that nationalism preceded nations, in other words, nations did not make states and nationalisms but in reality, it was the other way around.[229] Under these circumstances, it is necessary to focus on the role of ethnic ties and ethnic groups in such a creation.

Anthropologist Fredrik Bath, describes ethnic groups as categories that are formed by the ascription and identification of social actors for the groups they live in, and focuses on the maintained boundaries that emerge among ethnic groups. The existence of these boundaries is dealt with exclusion and incorporation processes. According to him, ethnic groups generally describe themselves on the basis of identity, and the basic elements of such an identity design are the origin and the background. Differences specified by social interactions determine belongingness to and identification with an ethnic group. Therefore, it is necessary to focus on characteristics that people refer to while they define

---

226 Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2006, p. 1

227 Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780, Programme, Myth, Reality,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, p. 9.

228 Gellner, ibid, pp. 48–49

229 Hobsbawm, ibid, p. 10

their identity.[230] At this point, these questions are meaningful: How are these borders on the relationships among people/groups formed, become visible and fade in people's minds? What are the political contexts that lead to visibility or disappearance?

Gellner emphasizes that we have to face the fact that, as a principal of political organization, the idea that equates political boundaries with ethnic ones, and rulers and ruled ones to have the same ethnic roots, possessed a salience and authority through nationalism.[231] To paraphrase, an essence/self-credible and convenient for a conceptualization as ethnic group or nation, could be transformed to belongingness or identification, through social interactions and the belief of common roots and past. With nationalism, limits of "self/essence/ ethnic group/nation" are stretched to that of political organization, and this simultaneously constructs a perception of homogeneity within the group and creates a homogeneous 'us'. Then, how does nationalism have such a stretching effect or perception?

By emphasizing nationalism could not be understood as a simple ideology or form of politics, Anthony Smith, a scholar on nationalism, nation and ethnicity argues that nationalism should be dealt with as a cultural phenomenon as well. According to him, nationalism has to be analyzed in a wider context that includes a specific language, sentiments and symbolism.[232] Benedict Anderson, who put forward a new approach to studies on nationalism with his book *Imagined Communities*, argues that concepts such as nation, nationality and nationalism, are far from being resolved, all have proved notoriously difficult to define. He states that in order to understand them, it is necessary to look in depth how they come into historical being, how their meanings were transformed and why, today, they command such profound emotional legitimacy.[233] Thus, it could be useful to analyze differences between nationalism and other ties suggesting certain obligations.

While arguing that nationalism has to be considered with reference to concepts such as 'kinship' and 'religion' rather than issues such as 'liberalism' or 'fascism', Anderson, in an anthropological spirit, proposes a definition of nation:

---

230 Fredrik Barth, "Introduction" in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries, the Social Organization of Culture Difference*, Waveland Press, Long Grove, 1969, pp. 10–15.

231 Gellner, *Encounter with Nationalism,* Blackwell, 1994, p. 38

232 Anthony Smith, *National Identity,* Penguin Books, London, 1991, p. vii.

233 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* Verso, London, New York, 2006, pp. 3–4.

"It is an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion".[234]

In other words, 'me' living within the borders of a national state could exist within an imagined 'us' and we connect. Therefore, a person could misinterpret criticisms against such an imagined 'us' – such as Turks, Greeks- as criticism to himself/herself and thus could react. At this point, the question is how and in which ways such an imagined community exists.

It could be put forward that one of the main parts of such an existence is ceremonies and rituals. Then, ceremonies and rituals are effective means for creating social spaces.[235] Schools, one of the most important institutions of acculturation and ideological apparatuses,[236] already equate a person's individual identity with national identity, defined on the basis of a sole language, sole religion and a sole ethnic group. *Xanthus* gives an example of it in Turkey:

"They'd get me to pledge allegiance to Turkey every morning, and then they'd call me the infidel. I guess it's not me then... even if I wanted to, I could not be a Turk" (Xanthus, Athens).

The pledge *Xanthus* repeated everyday could not make him a Turk and a member of an identity to which good values are attributed. In the constructed identity, *Xanthus* was almost a foreigner and the "wrong" one.

The pledges that are red in school loudly, "contribute to the perception of common identity as part of the conscious of the members of the society."[237] In this sense, the political rituals are formulated to maintain solidarity among people and through rituals young generations are prepared for the future expectations of a particular political interest.[238] Through their formalized, repetitive, standardized structure, rituals function to create stability and are formulated to eliminate any marginal ideas and to maintain order.[239] In addition, these ceremonies,

---

234 Ibid, pp. 5–6.

235 Hande Birkalan, "Gecekondu, Hayat Hikayeleri ve Evler: Halkbilim ve Etnografide Saha Çalışması ve Refleksif Yazın Üzerine Bir Deneme", *Folklor/Edebiyat VI*, no. (XXII), 2000, p. 167.

236 The mentioned term is borrowed from scholar *Louis Althusser*.

237 Paschalis Kitromilides, "The Vision of Freedom on Greek Society", *Journal of Hellenic Diaspora*, 19 (1), 5–29, 1993, p. 5.

238 David Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power,* Yale University Press, New Haven, London 1989.

239 Ibid, p. 61.

rituals shed light on construct of identity. The discourse created or reinforced by a pledge, becomes materialized through children. With the information based on history writing that focuses on internal and external enemies, the discourse turns into a conceptualization that makes *Xanthus* an infidel. Such a discourse and history writing are strategic. Ana Maria Alonso, an Anthropologist, argues that the idea of state produced by hegemonic strategies concretize the imagined community of the nation through the everyday routines, rituals and policies of state system.[240] *Xanthus*'s citing the pledge every day was not enough for him to take part in this imagined community. What excluded him of this group is an understanding of a citizenship in which, even if you fulfill your duties, you could not exercise your rights, a citizenship in which everyone could not be a part of national unity. Such an understanding of citizenship is highly related with nationalism.

Gellner argues that the nationalist of social organization necessitates a marriage between the state and the culture. State is in a position of protecting the culture, and one gains the right to citizenship in virtue of participating in a culture rather than in virtue of lineage, ownership, residency or anything else.[241] The state's preference of a culture and people's way to participate in that culture, as well as the discrepancies and contradictions on this matter are critical. In places where nationalism prevails, these contradictions are reflected as treatment of minorities as 'foreigners' or 'second class' and forced migration. Alienation aggravated with the decline in population due to deportations and migration makes such a concept of citizenship more delicate.

Interviewee *Xantus* states that the concept of citizenship in Turkey is problematic and it is typically only associated with military service and paying taxes. He explains how he became a Greek citizen in addition to his Turkish citizenship, as follows:

> "We were treated as Turks when abroad, but as infidels or foreigners in Turkey. I figured the best would be to get a Greek citizenship, so we could be Greeks in Greece, Europeans abroad, and still be infidels in Turkey anyway. . ." (Xanthus, Athens).

In Turkey, state-citizen/person relationship is indeed problematic. The State is superior to individual/citizen. The citizen is considered not as a subject, but as a means that deliver social missions.

---

240 Ana Maria Alonso, "The Politics of Space, Time and Substance: State Formation and Ethnicity", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 379–405, 1994, p. 382.

241 Gellner, ibid, pp. 26–27.

Judith Butler, an expert on social gender, while emphasizing the ambivalence in the construction of subject, highlights the uncertainty that arises from an attempt to distinguish power enacts the subject and subject's "own" power: she asks "what or who is doing the "enacting" here? Is it a power prior to the subject or that of the subject itself?"[242]? Concepts such as becoming a subject or subjectivity have different dynamics in terms of minorities. It is more difficult for minorities, formed in some shape or form by the governors, to resist or oppose the governing forces than for the members of the dominant culture. While the latter is considered as a political demand or race for rights; there is a good chance that the former is conceptualized as a "national matter" or a "threat". Minority is a group of people who has to obey the rules constructed to define 'normal' citizens and has to consistently prove their loyalty. This position of members of minorities indicates that they could not become subjects and they are objectified. One of the effective ways of objectification is to oppress language. According to the mental equation of language-ethnicity-citizen, one of the major avenues to become a normal/acceptable citizen is Turkish. This was transmitted to masses through "*Citizens, Speak Turkish!*" campaigns. Therefore, the equation was internalized by a large population and subsequently, as a discourse became both a tool to homogenize the society, and a source that reinforced the hegemony of the ruler.

It was not just the state or its institutions that had this expectation. Power relations, which we generally relate with the state and those in political power, also exist within everyday life –visible or latent. In this sense, the following two letters may help unfold such a relationship. In the following section, I am going to try to analyze these letters.

Visibility-invisibility

While discussing my research topic, interviewee *Mihail* brought out two letters dated 1965 from his library at his home in Istanbul. One of them was the letter he published in his column at *Milliyet* daily newspaper from a reader named *Ahmet,*[243] and the other was *Mihail*'s own response to Ahmet's letter. Before reading the letter, *Mihail* characterized the times when these letters were composed as "*Cyprus has been bombed, and again the Romioi were sitting on a time bomb*".

---

242 Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power, Theories in Subjection,* Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1997, p. 15

243 The name has been changed to protect the reader's identity.

"Mr. Giorgos; Mr. Pavlos; I am calling out to you:

I read an optimistic article by Mr. Bülent Ecevit in the Opinions column in your paper dated April 21. I wonder what will be your position in a potential conflict with Greece due to Cyprus, given that, being Turkish citizens, you Messrs. Giorgos and Pavlos, are enjoying constitutional assurance, just like the Ali's and Veli's of this country. I still remember how we were treated during the occupation; you used to beat little Turkish and Muslim kids. And now most of you (I spare the handful with good faith) are maintaining your silence in face of the Cyprus crisis. Yes, not all men are alike but I still feel the pain of the cuts in our heads from the stones you threw at us with obscenities. The magnitude of your financial contributions would be immediately revealed should the financials of the Patriarchate and the many churches be thoroughly examined. I am 53 now, so I am intimately aware of these, as a Turkish child growing up in Kumkapi and Samatya. Are you *now* offering any aid to your Turkish brothers in Cyprus, whose children are left to starve, whose food supplies left by a so-called priest under inhuman conditions are still depleting yet their milk deliveries are banned and where such oppressive measures are carefully planned to coincide with our civil and religious holidays? If you do, can you freely and openly declare it? You have been asked many questions on this issue through our newspapers, yet none of them has been answered. You are content to refer to and recall your Turkish citizenship only when your own safety is concerned or threatened. You even still refrain from speaking in Turkish on this land where you have lived for centuries and prospered with many of its offerings. That just doesn't work like that Mr. Mihail, Mr. Giorgos. If you are truly a Turkish Citizen or an ally, it's time to show it. Here's your challenge.".

Ankara, Ahmet ...

The points featured in *Ahmet*'s letter are important since they indicate the Romioi Orthodox identity was positioned and the processes by which the borders among groups emerged or prevail. At the beginning of his letter by arguing that Giorgos and Pavlos exercised same rights with Ali and Veli, who are non-Romioi, *Ahmet* asked Giorgos and Pavlos to explain their positions the on current political issues. This question was not directed to the Ali and Veli mentioned in the letter, whose disposition about the Cyprus issue were obvious for *Ahmet*. Even if they did not react as expected it would not matter much. Ultimately, they belonged to "us". But what were Giorgos and Pavlos to do? The pain of profanities and the rocks thrown at *Ahmet* during the occupation were still fresh. But it seems as if his pain was more important and cherished than *Xanthos*'s pain from a rock thrown in a neighborhood in Fener chanting "*infidel*". In fact, there was almost a hierarchy of pains.

Ahmet knew about the donations to the Patriarchate and how these contributions were spent. Although he knew the answers, he asked, "*do you support your Turkish brothers suffering in Cyprus?*" For him, this is not a question, it is more of an accusation or a warning and *Ahmet* has the right to ask. In a way,

it is the perceived right to audit weather or not Giorgos and Pavlos have paid their dues, who were born on this land already more indebted than Ali and Veli. In his letter, *Ahmet* emphasizes that Giorgos has been living in this country for ages and he has enjoyed the benefits it offered. However, Ali and Veli are not in the status of benefiters, they have a birthright to live in this country and benefit from its resources. On the contrary, Giorgos is positioned as a person living in this country although he does not have a right. He is allowed to stay in this country and he is always the one in debt. Therefore, he has to eternally pay back. In the letter, *Ahmet* reminds this debt and how to pay it challenging them in a militaristic way

Being a member of the society whom *Ahmet* accused of silence, the interviewee *Mihail* read the letter and wrote an answer. Then he sent it to *Milliyet* daily newspaper. But his letter was not published. What was happening in reality was not remaining silent but having been silenced. It was an atmosphere no voice was allowed to be heard.

"Milliyet Daily News, Cagaloglu, Istanbul I would kindly request my enclosed letter to be published at your Readers' Letters column, which is a free forum. Sincerely, -- Mihail Dear Ahmet and Mehmet's. . .

I have read your letter published in this corner in 1965, my dear Mr. Ahmet... The one you addressed to Giorgos's and Pavlos's. And I figured, well, then I could reach out to the Ahmet's and Mehmet's of this country as well. Perhaps this time I will be heard. I have not lived through the years of occupation that you referred to, I was born at the onset of World War II. My earliest memories include the drafting of those born in '20. Like a dream, I vaguely remember the blocked roads, checkpoints and those drafted on their way to work without even saying goodbye to their families. They had weird stories to tell upon their return, all of whom gratefully mentioning one name only, Marshall Fevzi Çakmak. Then, we had the big slap on the face. My father was bed-ridden and could not work, but this could not have been an excuse, apparently. He would have to pay the Wealth Tax as well, just like every other citizen. Otherwise, the mattress would be removed, and the bed would be confiscated – said the civil confiscator then. And just like that, everything my father had built with years of hard work, of which all taxes had been duly paid, was gone. His illness only helped save him from exile to Askale. I was in high school by September 1955, and that direful night has been engraved in my memory in every detail ever since. And the rest was water under bridge, life went on. The years between 1957 through 1959 were depressing times for us. It was then that I was first told '*This is not the infidel-land, do not speak foreign!*' by my friends on campus, and it was then that I decided to drop out of college to avoid such humiliating labels, even though I was an A student. . . Then I enlisted, where I met the pure, innocent boys of Anatolia as a reserve officer. We were brothers, I never heard anything spiteful from them neither at school nor on the field. I never felt like an outsider with them... Years went by, but the tide turned again and here we are... What hurts me most is actually not the state-citizen

relationships, but the interaction among my fellow countrymen. The minute we attempt to defend our basic rights, we are slapped the infidel label. We avoid talking out loud in public in the presence of our wives and sisters since once they realize we are Romioi, men think its fair to physically harass them. Yes, it's the lowlife who does that but still, why would they always target us and not the others? We think twice before responding to the meanest profanities, fearing to be jailed for allegedly insulting the Turkish Nation. Better be safe than sorry, you know. . . As for the donations you mentioned, having grown up in Samatya, you sure know how the Patriarchate and the churches helped those neighborhoods. You would acknowledge that the police, security, offices of justice and such government bodies would be quite informed about what a child in Samatya could figure out. No need to search far when it comes to the aids – just take a glance at Milliyet's archives. The major contributors of the campaign for the construction of Canakkale Memorial are well known. Or, just ask the fundraisers, whom they reach out to first, and who gives most. You can even ask the treasurers who receives most charity receipt stamps. As far as speaking Turkish is concerned, please note that: First, the constitution is explicit in this regard. Second, saying 'me speak no Turkish' is only as bad as saying '*Türkçe nızani*'.[244] Third, Western Thrace immigrants don't speak Greek at all. Fourth, the new generation is as fluent in Turkish as the native Muslim Turks. And finally, I should remind that the Romioi minority is apparently *not* the reason behind Turkey's rank among the 10 least developed countries. That just doesn't work like that Mr. Ahmet, Mr. Mehmet. If you are truly a Turkish Citizen or an ally, it's time to show it. Stop trying to make us pay for other's faults, reach out to us and let's prosper together. Sincerely, -- Mihail".

In his reply to *Ahmet*, *Mihail* lists all the areas where he feels repressed and alienated as a Romioi Orthodox in the Republican era. These are not just his individual experiences but shared by all the Romioi. Language was the leading area where alienation was felt the most.

Language: "*Shush now, be quiet, they'll hear you. . .*"

"Sometimes we would forget and speak in Romioi on the street loudly. Then our mothers warned us: '*Shush now, be quiet, they'll hear you. . .*'"

Leonidas[245] says that immigrants speak loudly in their own language on the Athens subway, and adds:

> "This offends me. Once upon a time I could not speak in my native language, but here they are, blasting away" (Leonidas, Athens).

---

244 Means "Does not speak Turkish" in Kurdish.
245 *Leonidas*: Male. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Athens. The interviews were made in 2010 in Athens.

Joanna explains what she experienced when she returned home from school in Taksim by bus:

> "Of course, we would talk and laugh on the bus. And occasionally we would hear from somewhere in the back 'Hey you're a citizen, speak in Turkish!'. We did not mind it much then, but the comment 'hey citizen, speak in Turkish' just stuck" (Joanna, Athens).

"Citizen, Speak Turkish" campaigns which Aktar describes as the most important dimension of Turkification policies had been initiated during the Single Party Period and it had been reintroduced various times for different reasons.[246] Minorities tried to adapt to these policies.[247] Oran points to the repetitiveness of the campaign that Aktar pointed out in his work called *Minorities in Turkey*. He argues that these state-promoted policies applied in 1920s and 1930s

---

246 At this point, it will be helpful to give some information about the campaign. Citizen, Speak Turkish! Was one of the main subjects of the congress of Turkish Hearth (Türk Ocağı, nationalist organizations) held in 1927 (Güven, ibid, p. 114). In the annual congress of the Ottoman University Faculty of Law Student Organization (Darülfünun Hukuk Fakültesi Talebe Cemiyeti) held on January 13, 1928, it was decided to launch a campaign that would force minorities to speak Turkish (Ahmet Yıldız, "*Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene", Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919–1938)* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010, p. 287). It was also decided to put up signboards recommending Turkish to be spoken in public spaces, and to organize conferences on primary and secondary schools on this matter (Rıfat Bali, *Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni (1923–1945)*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005, pp. 135–136).

247 Having to adapt is related to objectification/objectivisation. Anthropologist Işıl Demirel analyzes the influence of 'Citizen Speak Turkish' campaigns on the Jewish society and the Ladino through the concept of disruptive practices in Foucault's 'Dits et Écrits'. Foucault describes disruptive practices as those that either fractionalize the subject in itself or separate it from others. In other words, the subject is either split in itself or split from others. Some examples for the objectivisation as a result of this process include: insane – rational, sick-healthy, guilty-the "good boy" categories (Demirel's source of quotation: Foucault, *Büyük Kapatılma,* trans. Işıl Ergüden and Ferda Keskin, Ayrıntı Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005, p. 45). Demirel, who states that non-Muslims were objectified and disconnected from the society with the Citizen Speak Turkish campaign, and associates this objectification with Foucault's enclosing process: "The result of exposing the offending group of criminals to criminal charges was that now non-Muslims were legitimately representing the criminals because they failed to speak Turkish, while Turkish speaking people were "good boys", as Foucault says. This punishment process also becomes a lesson for those criminals who have not yet been punished" (Demirel, *Çanakkale Yahudi Cemaati ile Gayrimüslim Politikaların İzinde,* Yeditepe University, unpublished MA Thesis, Istanbul, 2010, p. 59).

were repeated against non-Muslim minorities again in 1950s and 1960s.[248] Furthermore, restrictions on the use of language were visible in the periods before the Republic. Deringil states that in a report on education reform prepared during Sultan Hamid's reign, the importance of a national language was emphasized, and it was stated that education language must be Turkish. In the 18th article of first Ottoman constitution Turkish was declared as the official language of the state.[249]

The 'Citizen Speak Turkish' campaign was the reflection in Turkey, of how language, the basic element of culture, morphs into a problem for minorities and the suppression of language usage in public places. This is closely related to nationalism. In Turkey, since the national identity overlapped with that of Turkish-speaking persons of Sunni Muslim heritage, individuals from different background felt the need to be assimilated especially in the public sphere.[250] After some additional information about the 'Citizen Speak Turkish' campaign, I am going to move on to the meaning of language.

Language, which is the strongest means of communication, is also critical for the minority identity in establishing bonds with the mindset and understanding of the minority group that one identifies with. As Anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss emphasizes, language primarily is the definition of culture and an integral component of it. In the same time, it is the best and essential instrument, the special means by which people assimilate group culture.[251] Anthropologist Bozkurt Güvenç who notes that anything that exists in a society materially or in concept also exists in language, describes language as an encyclopedia, treasury and dictionary of cultural contents.[252] Indeed, understanding of the society one belongs to is formed and transferred through language. Also, language is closely related with semantics. Linguist Ernst Cassirer states, every culture is manifested in the creation of specific mental symbol worlds, certain symbolic forms.[253] He claims that the content of concept of culture cannot be detached from fundamental forms and direction of human activity.

---

248 Oran, ibid, pp. 112–113.

249 Deringil, ibid, 2009, pp. 99, 267.

250 Neyzi, *"Object or Subject? The Paradox of "Youth" in Turkey",* International Journal of Middle East Studies, 33, 411–432, August 2001, pp. 411–432, 417–418.

251 Georges Charbonniers, *Conversation with Claude Lévi Strauss*, trans. John and Doreen Weightman, Cape Editions, London, 1969, p. 150.

252 Bozkurt Güvenç, *İnsan ve Kültür*, Remzi Kitabevi, Istanbul, 2002, p. 108.

253 Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms,* trans. Ralph Manheim, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 1955, p. 113.

In his view, the "being" can be comprehended only within "action". As stated by Cassirer, although the various products of culture such as language, scientific knowledge, myth, art and religion are different in themselves, the reason behind their formation is the same. According to him, all of these cultural products are directed to transform the passive world of mere *impressions*, into the world of pure expression of the human spirit.[254] The relationship between the language and the being are the realms that have been intensively analyzed in theories. Sociologist Besim Dellaloğlu, in his work, *Benjaminia: Language, History and Geography*, states that language and thought evolve in parallel. Moreover, this also applies to the relationships between language and existence, and language and the world. He interprets Heidegger' famous phrase, "Language is the house of being" as without language, there would not be an existence. Gadamer's phrase "language is what can be understood" implies that it is not possible to be understood without expression, and one could only be understood with and within language.[255]

It is known that once the form of a language is established, it starts to include a certain quality of experience for those speaking that language.[256] Linguist Noam Chomsky, in his work *Language and Mind* argues that studying human language means approaching the "human essence". In other words, we get closer to the distinctive qualities of mind that are, so far as we know, unique to man.[257] As Anthropologist Edward Sapir claims, the content of every culture can only be expressed in its language.[258] However, since the language of a particular culture emanates from the interactions with other languages, the belief that there is a continuity between past and now should be analyzed. As Anderson says, each language looms up imperceptibly out of a horizonless past.[259]

Specific to this study, Greek is known as one of the oldest written languages that survived until today. Millas underlines that the relations of the modern Greeks with the ancient peoples such as Ancient Greeks, the Byzantines etc. are indeed 'imaginary' as Anderson described, however it does not mean that 'there

---

254 Ibid, pp. 80–81.

255 Besim F. Dellaloğlu, *Benjaminia: Dil, Tarih ve Coğrafya,* Versus Kitap, Istanbul, 2008, p. 52.

256 David G. Mandelbaum, *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2012, p. 10.

257 Noam Chomsky, *Language and Mind,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, p. 88.

258 Mandelbaum, ibid, p. 10.

259 Anderson, ibid p. 144.

is no relation at all'. Hence the behavior of the peoples who believe in the existence of such a relationship is now shaped, directed and has a meaning according to this perception.[260] It would help to take a look at the Ancient Greek and/or Byzantine history, which people believe they are descendants of.

"Ancient", "Modern" Greek[261]

Before explaining the history of Greek, it would be better to give information about characterizations Greek (as a person) and Greek (as a language). Millas points out that in the ancient era the people known as "Greeks" called themselves "Hellenes" or by the names of cities they lived; he also mentions that the differences in dialects also had an effect on Hellenes' division into tribes. Ions from these tribes were living in the region covering the western Anatolia in the east. Millas says that the other tribes in the east such as Persians and Arabs used the name "Greek" originated from "Ion" for all Hellenes because they contacted firstly with Ions. The other tribes in the west such as Romans used the word "Grek" for all Hellenes because they met Hellene tribes called Grekos/Grekoi settled in Western Greece at their first contact.

As one can see, for people in naming themselves, the cities they lived in, their *places*, becomes really important; Hellene is accepted as an umbrella name; however other people and tribes who met them called them differently. This indicates the arbitrary nature of the naming. Today the continued use of *Yunan/ Yunanlı* and *Yunanca* produced from the word *Ion* in Turkish is remarkable in the way that it shows how durable the names are, although the naming was arbitrary.

---

260 Millas, ibid, pp. 13–14.

261 Millas points out to the difficult in determining which date is "Antique", which date is "modern" in the case of a slowly developing language, and the distinction would be relative when a transition is detected. Nevertheless, he indicates that the Modern Greek is shaped by the Hellenistic Language (*koinê*) and that it reached almost "present" form in the Middle Ages. When taken in terms of syntax and words, he indicates that it can be broken into periods such as the Hellenistic Common Language (BC 300–A.C.550), Medieval Language (550–1453) and Greek of Greece (since 1453). Today, when Contemporary Greek is used, it refers to the language of *Dêmotikê*. *Dêmotikê* contains quotations from *Katharevousa*, proverbs and idioms from Ancient Greek. (Ibid, p.37, pp. 43–44.).

Millas indicates that ancient Greeks had a public consciousness based on a common language and common Gods, and the language was separated into dialects based on Achaeans, Ions and Dors, which are the roots of ancient Hellene. In the period when Athens gained power, he emphasizes that the Attic dialect (the Athenian dialect) became popular and widespread. In the period of Alexander the Great, this Attic dialect became '*lingua franca*' of Middle East.[262] Millas indicates that within a short time of a few centuries, Greek was altered by major changes and got closer to Modern Greek; and a language called Hellenistic Common Language (Hellênistikê Koinê) or Alexandrian Language (aleksandrinê) emerged in Alexandria, Antiochia and Pergamon. People whose native language was non-Greek started to use this new language and in time it became a common language for various people to use and understand each other. According to Millas, this common language accelerated the transition from city-states to empires.[263] The common language, that is *koinê*, is closely related with Christianity.

In the period of Alexander, the Emperor, *koinê,* that can be considered to be the simpler version of Ancient Greek, which had been effective in ruling the people spread across the vast empire, was imperative in spreading the Bible. *Koinê,* also called *Hellenistic Common Language* or *Common language,* is at the same time the language of Bibles and the New Testament.[264] It facilitated spreading the beliefs of Jesus. The *Koinê* language, that could help trace Christianity and which also could be defined as the synthesis of Attic dialect with other dialects, was used by multi-tribal people in spread across large territories during the Alexander the Emperor era and later Roman/Byzantine Empire era.

Millas indicates that although Byzantine Atticism is essentially similar to the Attic Greek, it has some characteristics of Hellenistic Common (koinê) and the New Testament languages. He emphasizes that in the Byzantine period, Atticism was the official state language, the historical recordings and correspondences were

---

262 Ibid, p. 161.

263 Ibid, pp. 27–28.

264 At this point, while detailing the transition into this language, it might be useful to mention the language of the Old Testament. Millas indicates that the Aramaic language, which was the *lingua franca* of the region in B.C. 6th century, influenced Hebrew; therefore, the Old Testament written in Hebrew has traces of Aramaic language. The translations of the Old Testament were made in the Hellenistic Common Language, *Koinê* language, in A.C. 1st century.

conducted in Attic, which was also the language used by the Church.[265] Interviewee *Orestis*[266] explains the language – religion interaction as follows:

> "Our sermons and religious texts were originally written in this language. It is essentially a simplified version of Ancient Greek. Anyone who knows ancient Greek has no trouble understanding Atticism. But those who speak only Modern Greek can still struggle with this language" (Orestis, Athens).

As is known, language is a living pattern, an organism and so it is changed by historical events. Interviewee *Orestis* interprets the change in language caused by 1453 as follows:

> "The year 1453 is critical for the recent Greek history and modern Greek literature. It is generically considered a key date that marks the beginning of a new era. A totally new context evolved then. Istanbul itself has a significance in history for that very reason. Older texts resembling the Modern Greek existed since the year 1000 AD, but it escalated after 1453 because the intellectuals' language started dying. People were trying to survive;

---

265 Ibid, pp. 34–36. As elaborated in this section, Greek and Romioi languages are essentially similar, and the differences are based on dialect. Greek, as it is known, has a complex, long history and a wealth of dialect. The "Modern" Greek has begun to be formed by *koinê*. Today, when Modern Greek is mentioned, the perceived language is Demotike. Quotes from Katheoursa, contains proverbs and idioms from Ancient Greek. Katheourusa is a convention between spoken language and Byzantine Atticism, which is basically close to the Attic dialect but also has features of the *koinê*. If we look at the later period; it would be necessary to wait for the 19th century for discussions on the change of the supremacy in Greece in the Ottoman administration. Clogg indicates that in the centuries during the centuries of the *Tourkokratia*, little was known about the Ancient Greek. He draws attention to *progonoplexy* (extreme devotion to Greek ancestors) and *arkaiolatreia* (admiration for antiquity), the excessive use of Greek terms just before the war of independence. According to Clogg, in this period, the initial debates about what is to be spoken in Greece started. Some supported going back to Attic Greek of the 5th century B.C. The others claimed that a contemporary spoken language should form the basis of educated discourse. Some others also suggest finding the middle way through the purging of the spoken language of foreign words. Eventually the advocated of *katharevousa*, literally 'purifying' Greek, prevailed (Clogg, ibid, pp. 27–28). Millas states that the Attic dialect and *Kathareuousa* are part of the Greek language. According to him, this language, which is more innovative in terms of syntax, but connected to the old times in terms of wording, is sometimes approaching the old language and sometimes the spoken language. He underlines that in both cases it remains as a literary language and is not spoken. Millas describes the *Kathareuousa*, which was first seen in the Ottoman period, as a compromise between the Byzantine Atticism and the language spoken (Millas, ibid, pp. 34–36).

266 *Orestis*: Male in his forties; an Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Athens. The interviews took place in 2011 in Athens.

they could obviously not really care much about philosophy and Aristotle. Therefore, the language got somewhat simpler, plainer and closer to the colloquial language – not necessarily in a bad way, but it did become more informal. Furthermore, a whole new literature evolved based on these events, such as popular poetry on Istanbul, its fall, the anguish of living as a minority in a different country, or about personal dramas. The body of writings that emerged in that environment are incomparable to the hymns or political analyses of the Byzantine. Therefore, while we accept 1000 as the starting point of the modern or contemporary Greek literature, we acknowledge 1453 to be a critical turning point, defining the 'second phase', if you will, of modern Greek literature" (Orestis, Athens).

By the transition of the city to the administration of the Ottomans in 1453, the changes in language accelerated, that had already started. A new culture was added to *City* and this culture was dominant in the administration. The effect of this on non-Turkish/non-Muslim people could be seen in language. While there was a conversion towards folk speech, a new literature emerged reflecting the conceptualization of the fall of the *City*. It could be argued that the *City*, id est Istanbul, which played a central role in this transformation in literature, gained yet another meaning.

Once we have outlined the historical background of Greek, it is appropriate to look at how the language is characterized as Greek (used by Greek people) and / or Greek (used by the Romioi) at this point.

Greek/Romioi language

During the interviews I noticed that Greek and Romioi languages were sometimes expressed as the same, and other times as different languages or dialects. Interviewee *Evi*[267] explains the difference between Greek and Romioi as follows:

> "Inherently they are not different, of course, there is a bit of a dialectic difference, but has been fading here over the years. Hercules' and my Romioi has become Greek now" (Evi, Athens).

Interviewee *Orestis* also emphasizes that the difference between Greek and Romioi language is dialectical.

> "In the expressions, for example, you will notice a distinct nuance in the dialects. Not a major difference, more of an accent really, just like you could tell someone from Ankara from the one from Istanbul, Ankara or Ordu.[268] There is no difference in writing. Essentially the Romioi we studied there is not any different from the Greek taught here" (Orestis, Athens).

---

267 *Evi* (Millas): Female. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Athens. The interview was made in Athens in 2011.

268 Similar to Bostonian vs. New Yorker accents.

Some interviewees define Romioi language as the basis of Greek. *Hercules*[269] explains the significance of Istanbul in Greek as follows:

> "Just like we consider the proper Turkish spoken in Istanbul as the original Turkish, Greek is the combination of Istanbul and Morea influences. The Romioi spoken in Istanbul is the basis of Greek. It's not the Cretan or Thessalonikian or Athenean, but the general ambiance of Istanbul and Morea" (Hercules, Athens).

Just like many Greek words are used in Turkish, Romioi language has Turkish words as well. Interviewee *Miltos* explains this as follow:

> "Most of the less fortunate and uneducated Romioi employed Turkish words, not only nouns and adjectives but verbs as well" (Miltos, Athens).

Miltos gives examples on verbs with Turkish roots that are conjugated by Greek principles: For example, 'bin-mek' (to ride) is conjugated as *Bin-evo/ Μπινεύω: (I) Binevo, (You) binevis, (he/she/it) binevi.*[270]

Other examples, both typically used in the past tense include *Vazgeçtisa/ βαζγκέτστησα meaning 'I changed my mind'* and *şaşırdısa/ σασίρντισα meaning 'I was surprised'*.

Orestis notes the following about the frequentness of Turkish words in Romioi:

"Perhaps, but I doubt it is that many. . . There are already plenty of Turkish words in Greek. . . A lot" (Orestis, Athens).

Hercules notes that the Greek do not use the words, which are used by the Romioi of Istanbul. He estimates the number of such words to be a few thousands. He gives the following examples: *'Akide şekeri (hard candy)', 'akşamcis (boozer)', akşamcılık (light boozing), akçes (bucks, coins), 'harcırahı (per diem)', 'hasisi (stingy)', 'hacıyatmaz (roly-poly)', 'hafifis', 'hafif adam*[271] *(sleazy)'*. He cites some idioms and expressions he calls 'Istanbulite' as follows:

> "For example, 'ne kadar para, o kadar boya (you get what you pay for)'. We passed many terms like *management*, or *wipers*, on to our children... The word for windshield wipers in Greek is so long that we never mastered it, we just stuck with the Turkish word instead. The children know a lot of such words now. We watch it when we talk to a Greek but among us, we keep sneaking in the Turkish words. Also, if you consider the sentence structure, you will notice the ordinary and uneducated folk might be speaking Romioi with a Turkish syntax. Especially those from Istanbul do such things like moving the

---

269 *Hercules* (Millas): Male. Late-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Athens. The interview was made in Athens in 2011.

270 Verb conjugation in Greek is as follows: Μπινεύω, μπινεύεις, μπινεύει. Μπινεύουμε, μπινεύετε, μπινεύουν.

271 It means a person who is not dignified.

verb to the end of a sentence because that's how it is in Turkish; a Greek would never do that. 'He is a good man; a good man he is'. That's Istanbulism, and you can tell it right away" (Hercules, Athens).

As can be seen, in the different characterizations of language, the words and syntax come forward and this usage shows a commonality among people from the same locality. The changes in the language by migration to Athens are described as the Greekification of language.

While they refrained from speaking in Greek/Romioi in Istanbul influenced by "Citizen, Speak Turkish!" discourse, they sometimes would speak in Turkish in the Faliro neighborhood of Athens where they emigrated and densely settled. This points to a very strong bond of the language with the memory, and the place where the memories are created. When they lived in Istanbul, speaking Romioi meant protection and preservation of the Romioi identity. On the other hand, the mindfulness about speaking in Turkish in public places of Istanbul could be said to have a compromising aspect under the oppression. Speaking Turkish occasionally along with Romioi in Athens or using some Turkish words while speaking Romioi are related to the desire to feel and continue Romioi identity of Istanbul. Because of the close relation of language with identity, according to political context, the use of language could be target for pressure and limitations. In the next section I will examine those limitations.

Limitations of language

Even though language is known as one of the basic and strongest means of communication, it cannot be confined just to that. Especially in minority societies, language has an importance beyond communication. On one hand, it is a pattern that has to be nurtured and preserved; on the other hand, it is a repressive tool and a boundary. Interviewee *Angelos* describes this as follows:

> "When you feel that you are an outsider in a society, you avoid your native language. It is your language that makes you feel different in public. You talk to your parents in Greek, which is what I used to do when I was 6 or 7. 'Hush' had become a second nature for us, which I realized only after I came to Greece. It took a good 5–6 years for me to speak out loud in public. If you noticed, people from Istanbul are always courteous. They speak politely, never out lout, they are more reserved and not noisy. It goes without thinking; we are so hardwired that it has become a second nature. I was quite amused once when I was talking pretty loudly to my good friend (Orestis) on Istiklal Boulevard and he warned me: 'Hush, keep it down a bit!'. 'Ah, Orestis' I said, 'this place has changed so

much since, you will see for yourself soon'. I felt the same myself at first, these moments are quite intriguing. . ." (Angelos, Athens).

Since interviewee *Angelos* has visited Istanbul frequently, she observed people speaking Greek in public. However, her Romioi friend *Orestis* who visited Istanbul after a long time was surprised when she heard *Angelos* speaking Greek loudly and warned her frequently. It is interesting because it indicates how the suppression of language and effects of 'Citizen Speak Turkish' campaign have survived.

People's self-restriction in the public sphere goes beyond refraining from speaking their native language. It is also related with identity. Our use of language affects the way we perceive our environment.[272] Indeed, a person's language and how it conforms to the linguistic patterns of those he communicates with affects his personality.[273] Interviewee *Millas* notes that this affect is described as manners, and shares his experiences as follows:

> "Let me put it this way. . . ever since I was a young child, I would speak differently at home than out in public. We knew then that certain things were not to be talked about outside of home. My parents never explicitly told this to us, we just knew that that's the way it was. For example, I would never talk to my mother on the bus or the streetcar, because if I did, I would have to speak in Romioi, which meant trouble. It is imbedded in you, and we obliviously thought it was good manners. Refraining from Romioi was the etiquette. As I mentioned, no one specifically told us not to speak in public, yet my mother, for example, would not call me out in the streetcar if I stood a little far but waved, gestured or whispered 'pssst'. She would not say 'come here' in Greek. I winced when I first heard tourists talking out loud in Greek at Beyoglu. 'What's going on?' I asked myself, 'it's so inappropriate.' It had become a habit. We simply don't shout. I feel weird when I hear the tourists at Beyoglu now, it sounds gross. My first thought is 'why on earth are they yelling so indecently?' I realized much later that it is not rude or indecent. . . it's just normal speech. I think it has to do with our identity, we just know our place" (Hercules, Athens).

The necessity to avoid speaking Greek or speaking in a low voice has been imbedded in peoples' minds. There is a consensus on this avoidance. Due to the potential risks of not following along, – to be snubbed-, this has become a taboo, such that *Angelos* realized that she was still speaking Greek in a low voice even five years after she came to Athens, and later she tried to stop this. Similarly, in

---

272 William A. Haviland, Harald E.L. Prins, Bunny McBride, Dana Walrath, *Cultural Anthropology, The Human Challenge,* Wadsworth Cengage Learning, Belmont, 2011, p. 105.

273 Mandelbaum, ibid, p. 10.

the 2000s when *Orestis* returned to Istanbul, he felt the need to warn his friend who was openly speaking in Greek in Istiklal Street. After years of caution since speaking Greek or Romioi in the public realm was considered inappropriate, it was daunting for the Romioi in Istanbul to hear people speaking Greek in the streets. The first instinctive reaction was that it was "*inappropriate, impudent and ugly*". All of these prove that the distinction between in and out, internal and external, private and public spheres are sharp and impact of suppression of language on identity is distinct and pertinent. One of the reasons that that this pressure lasted so long is that it was felt not just in the streets, but also in the newspapers, which were an effective and extensive way of communication at the time.

The effectiveness of a newspaper article is also related with the author, as much as the content. The writer's fame as a well-known author, one with published novels influences his trustworthiness and persuasiveness. A message from a well-known and respected person impacts the attitudes and behaviors of readers. In this context, I would like to analyze two articles from last years that *Mihail* gave me.

Peyami Safa's Article titled: "To those who claim to be 'One of us'" at Milliyet's Objective column dated July 3, 1958:

> "Two enlightened Turkish girls strolling along the boardwalk during their stay at Buyukada abruptly stopped and they both cried out 'Ooh!' Staring at each other, one asked 'Why did you say that?' the other replied 'I just overheard these youngsters speaking in Turkish!' 'Frankly, that's why I was surprised too'.I keep hearing that Buyukada has become the Little Greece. The official language there is Romioi, and they clearly dominate the streets, the dock, restaurants, hotels and the ferry. A Turk's unexpected cry of joy upon hearing Turkish in Canada would be just the same. Now I would like to ask our Romioi citizens who affirm to be one of us: You say, 'there might be a handful of perverts and ignorant among us who bear a grudge against Turkish or even Turkey, but is it fair to attribute that ignorance to the entire community?' I will answer your question with a question: Since when have those perverts and ignorant been growing in number and inhabiting Buyukada as well as the other islands, Beyoglu and many other neighborhoods? How did they populate and breed so quickly in a matter of months? If you were to visit Buyukada and some of the other neighborhoods, you will notice that unlike you claim, the spoiled ignorant are more than a few. I wonder if it's actually the *others* that are handful, those who lived and prospered here enjoying what the land offers, and are truly one of us without a doubt? Any citizen of a minority group can occasionally speak in their own language. We sure do not deny that freedom. However, how can you convince us of the loyalty of the minority member who refuses to speak in our native language as if stubbornly protesting, and glare at the others who

do? Language is the key element that defines a nation. Therefore, should bare citizenship be sufficient for those who deny the language, to be considered Turkish - one of us?".

It is necessary to focus on Safa's choice of some words in this article. For example, he used the word *dominance* to describe the large population of Romioi in Buyukada, which also suggests governance [in Turkish]. By saying "Buyukada is like Greece. Its official language is Romioi", he implies as if there is an alternative authority there. This approach is coaxing to tag Romioi as suspects and targets. He describes the large population of Romioi in some neighborhoods of Istanbul with words like *populate* and *breed*. Some adjectives such as *pervert, ignorant, spoiled* were used to describe Romioi, yet to define a young Turkish girl, the word *enlightened* was used. *The Romioi are the people who live and prosper on our land and enjoy all that it offers*. So, while the land is "ours" and a birthright for the "Turkish", the Romioi are pictured as abusers. A similar implication of *abusive* use was observed previously in Ahmet's letter addressed to Giorgos's and Pavlos's in the Milliyet daily. This reminds us of the strong influence of newspaper articles in shaping discourse. Safa argues that Romioi glared at their own people who spoke in Turkish. The comments from *Mihail* on this article are interesting:

> "In those days, mothers would not hold their children's hands on a walk. They would cross one arm over the child's shoulder and cover his mouth by the palm. They were afraid of an incidence in case the child called out 'mama' or spoke Romioi. They would be walked all over immediately. We still remember the events of September 6–7. Glare at or stare down Turkish speakers? Nonsense. No Romioi would dare that!!" (Mihail, Istanbul).

Two days later, Payami Safa's article "The easiest shortcut" is published in his column at Milliyet on July 5, 1958:

> "I did not have a chance to listen to the 'Zamboglu Quartet'[274] on the radio.so I wouldn't know if they play any Greek tunes. Some readers and a very observant friend shared their discomfort, perhaps mistaking some Italian songs as Greek, which I had briefly mentioned before. A very kind and sincere letter from Mr. Zamboglu shortly before the Eid convinced me that their quartet had never played a Greek song – because the reputable artist is a Galatasaray alumni and his loyalty is something that should not be doubted. I hereby apologize for my delay in rectifying this misunderstanding, upon his request. Nevertheless, complaints about Romioi customers singing collectively in

---

274 *Mihail* informs about the band: The lead in the Zamboglu Quartet, Alexander Zamboglu was a friend of my father, who played the guitar delightfully. Their Quartet used to play South American tunes called *kukurrui*, that were very fashionable then. Since they were quite popular, they were given a weekly slot at the local Istanbul radio where they played for 15 minutes every week" (Mihail, Istanbul).

Greek at some casinos are not uncommon. One of our readers was dining at a water-front club at the Bosphorus when a group of Romioi guests spread across a few tables started a Greek march in unison, which caused a chaos. Our reader reminded the manager that such behavior was not appropriate and asked the unruly guests to be quieted. The manager responded saying the patrons were tourists generating revenue for the country, and if they complied with the request, they would hurt that revenue source. He added they did not even have a right to interfere in that manner. When the manager was told that the inconsiderate group was not tourists but local Romioi that could easily be verified, he submitted, and the enthusiastic crowd was quieted. There is a simple shortcut to ensure that these club owners, many of whom are Romioi, do prevent such arrogances without being reminded: By completely discontinuing any dealings with those establishments owned by Romioi whose loyalty to this land cannot be verified by certainty. The only way to oppress those who are not one of us, is to sever their economic lifelines. Once they see that the native patrons are diminishing, they will either embark upon donations, contributions and start supporting our national causes in every way or go bankrupt and bail out of this country."

As Safa mentioned, a letter from "one of his readers" claimed that Zamboglu quartet were playing Greek songs and later Safa wrote a letter in his column about this topic. *Mihail* is a firsthand witness:

"I was aware of it then, because the guy (Alexander Zamboglu) came to our house, shaking with fear, babbling 'he wrote all these things!'. Then he composed a very courteous response, saying 'Sir, we never play Greek songs, we are not that crowd, I am a graduate of Galatasaray myself!' and such. . . quite apologetically I should say. He was terrified." (Mihail, Istanbul).

Safa started his article of 5 July 1958 by writing, "I had not listened Zamboglu quartet in the radios". Form this, we understand that he wrote the article about a band he did not listen to, but became aware of after a letter from his "reader". The "others", Zamboglu quartet, were obliged to prove, convince Safa that they did not sing Greek songs and "vindicate themselves". The only advantage of Zamboglu quartet was that they were the alumni of the same school with Safa, Galatasaray High School. Even though in his article Safa states that he believed them because they graduated from the same reputable school, yet he added a statement to the effect that "it their loyalty to Turkey should not be doubted". Such a statement is functional in insuring himself against possible criticism that may rise in the future, and in keeping suspicion over the Romioi alive. Following this statement, Safa continues his article by relaying another gossip from his "reader". Again, his selection of words draws attention. He claims the Romioi dining along Bosphorus were not singing Greek songs, but Greek *anthems*. But "a reader" 'intervenes' and the group is silenced. Since a club is a place where people typically sing songs, the problem is not the songs, but the language of songs. The

article comes to the conclusion by defining how members of an ethnic/religious identity, that is, the Romioi, must behave, and what the "true" Turks must do., if they behave otherwise.

Mihail's comments on Safa's statement of "establishments owned by Romioi whose loyalty to this land cannot be verified by certainty" as follows: "I would like to draw your attention. He/she might be loyal, but what if we are not convinced of this loyalty?" Again, the obligation of proof is the responsibility of "others". After stating the problem, Safa proposes a solution by saying that, "The solution is to sever their economic lifelines which are their sources of income". He uses analogies such as lifeline, implying life and survival. Publishing such an article with such analogies against an ethnic identity in a newspaper, is an example of making minorities a target, and a hate crime. Therefore, it is very dangerous. The target of language-based discrimination was not French or German, but languages such as Greek, Armenian, Ladino, languages of the minorities living in Turkey. These minority groups are expected to become assimilated and transform their identities.

Following this part which I tried to analyze historical background of Greek/Romioi, its conceptualizations by the people and limits of it, I can move on to the section in which I deal with religious rituals as one of the integral ingredients of the Romioi Orthodox identity.

Religion-rituals: *"We understood that we were minorities that way", "characteristics of being Romioi"*

What are the meanings of religion and rituals? Which processes are covered, which functions are fulfilled and how does identity relate to Romioi Orthodox faith? As these questions do not have a single answer, a one-dimensional analysis would not address its complex context and meaning. Moreover, it gets more complicated for a minority group's religious rituals within a major society, when its population is also gradually decreasing. Examples of this complexity include interviewee *Angelos*'s statement *"identity is formed with religion, yet in practice, the rituals outweigh the essence of religion. They are an important part of my identity"*, or *Maya*'s definition of Orthodoxy being "*an attribute of our existence, personality and of being Romioi*" and *Vangelis*'s comments "*I associate the preservation of customs and traditions with our own subsistence*".

In this section, I am going to discuss the questions above, and the strong connection between identity and rituals, the differences of rituals and their role in forming solidarity and borders.

"Internal" – "external" borders

The issues related to interpretation of rituals mentioned during interviews can be summarized as organizing life around church, the importance of rituals in terms of person and society, and all of these fluctuations in the historical process and borders towards Turkish/Muslims or Greeks. In the following section, I will examine these borders by giving weight to ethnographic information.

Unbreakable bonds

> "All of Istanbul neighborhoods, including Sisli, Kurtulus and Samatya, are established around a church. The same goes for all of Greece as well as Anatolia. The communities are established around a church. That's how Romioi are organized – around the church. The church does have a religious aspect but a social one as well" (Hercules, Athens).

Hercules emphasizes organizing life around the church and the role of churches in Istanbul in the formation of neighborhoods. The clustering around churches that is emphasized by *Millas* could also be seen at Buondelmento's map, which was drawn in 15th century, and is known as the first map of Istanbul (see section *The Memory of the City*). Byzantium and art historian Semavi Eyice points to large empty spaces on the map that have not been settled in, farther from the settlements surrounding churches and monasteries.[275] Eyice notes that after 1453, people of different origins formed their own separate neighborhoods.[276] Referring to the map drawn by Schneider, art historian Zafer Karaca also notes the formation of settlement around religious buildings after 1453. He states that, during Istanbul's re-habitation, the Romioi Orthodox community, those who were already residing in the city as well as the new immigrants, settled around their own religious structures. Historical connection of churches' social influence is a commonly raised point in interviews, similar to the historical essence of the church being the central point of settlements.[277] *Maya* explains this influence as follows:

"You know the church, the Patriarch, has been the leader of the Romioi community since the Ottoman period. Church is a social phenomenon, especially for the Romioi, because they communicate their issues to the Patriarch through

---

275 Semavi Eyice, "Tarih İçinde İstanbul ve Şehrin Gelişmesi", *Atatürk Konferansları TTK.* 1958, p. 71.

276 Eyice, "İstanbul'un Mahalle ve Semt Adları Hakkında Bir Deneme", *Türkiyat Mecmuası, XIV*. 199–216, 1965, p. 215.

277 Zafer Karaca, *İstanbul'da Tanzimat Öncesi Rum Ortodoks Kiliseleri,* Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2008, pp. 31–32.

the church. That is, the church is the first step to resolving problems. It's been the custom since the Ottomans, that church is the answer to all your problems. Apparently, it longer serves this function, but then it was perceived as a social meeting point" (Maya, Istanbul).

Along with their social gathering and sharing functions, churches became important means for solidarity in the Romioi Orthodox society with the church-based charities such as associations for the poor and soup-kitchens. This sharing and solidarity reminds us of Durkheim's idea of society. According to Durkheim, society exists and lives only in and through individuals. He premises that "if the idea of society is extinguished in individuals' minds, and if the beliefs, traditions and aspirations of the collectivity can no longer be felt and shared by individuals, the society will die".[278] As it can be seen, Durkheim, in a similar way, correlates the existence of the idea of society and religion with individuals' shared mental or sensual experiences. One of the issues that emerged in the interviews was the congregation members' rigor in participating in rituals and association meetings after the demographic decline. Therefore, the concept of society can continue to exist only with the participating individuals.

Participation in rituals had an important role in transferring religion to next generations, even though the number of youth in the congregation was not too high. *Derkon Metropolitan Apostolos Daniilidis* explains the importance of rituals as follow:

> "The rituals have a special place in the Orthodox community and the Church. If they don't already reinforce solidarity, these rituals add a favorable aspect. An actively participated baptism, or a well-attended wedding rather than conjectural celebrations, are experiences that continue in accordance with traditions (. . .) Religion has both a conjectural and a practical aspect". (Derkon Metropolitan, Istanbul)

In the anecdote above, the conjectural and practical aspects mentioned by the Metropolitan ensure that religion/culture is taught and transferred to next generations. Besides the functions of churches likes these, charities held an important place in Romioi Orthodox society. *Derkon Metropolitan Apostolos Daniilidis* explains the social support function of these relief organizations or charities with the example of Kinali summer camp for the orphans:

> "The camp was established to boost the morale of the impoverished children, so they would not feel alienated, and would be reintroduced to society through the camp, where they could connect with their peers and make new friends. It still operates, but the

---

278 Emile Durkheim, *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, trans. Karen E. Fields, The Free Press, New York, 1995, p. 351.

community was larger then, and we could provide more care" (Derkon Metropololitan, Istanbul).

As stated by the Metropolitan, while the number of supporters has decreased because of the smaller size of the community, this caused the remaining supporters to join the charity meetings more willingly and come together after the ceremonies. *Maya* explains that as follow:

> "Now its more intense... Since there are only a few of us left and we are scattered, we gather after the sermon, have some tea or coffee and chat. 'So, what's up, did your folks call? What about her, any news? How are the grandchildren?' Since the churches' income is limited now, they can't help a lot. At least we care about each other and try to find a solution by networking, 'let's ask so and so, maybe they can help' and so on" (Maya, Istanbul).

Interviewee *Lambos*[279] points out the solidarity aspect emphasized above and the place of churches in Romioi Orthodox society throughout the following statements: "*The only places where you practice and sustain those rituals and do not feel alone, are these religious institutions. Even a lonely single woman meets a few people on Sundays*". He describes the importance of religious institutions as being "*a tradition of many many years*" and emphasizes that it is the church that coerces the schools to be opened. He cites the newly discovered letter from the 1750s, in which the Patriarch states "*You should study, I will excommunicate those who refuse to do so*". He describes the church as follows: "*it is not the religion, but it is what reinforces the philanthropic, social, cultural aspects and improves your strength especially when you are a minority*".

In addition to the philanthropic side of religion, another aspect that came fore during the interviews was its differentiation function. *Keti*[280] details this aspect as follow:

> "The Byzantine empire was a theocratic one. Then during the Ottoman period, since ethnos had not surfaced yet, you would differentiate yourself by your religion. This is pretty important as the emphasis was only on the religion then – like the Orthodox community or the Muslim community. I am a child of those days, but see, there is a first-degree relationship between Orthodox and Romioi identities" (Keti, Athens).

We should dwell on the "ethno-religious" aspect that *Keti* mentioned with regard to differentiation, so it would be useful to recall the ethnicity and ethnic

---

279 *Lambos*: Male. Mid-forties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Istanbul. The interviews were made in Istanbul in 2011 and 2012.

280 *Keti*: Female. Mid-thirties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Athens. The interviews were made in Athens 2010.

group concepts. Sociologist Dominique Schnappner emphasizes that ethnic-religious devotion becomes a problem by universalism that is a heritage from the Enlightenment and nation-state. According to him, politics was separated from ethnics and religion in principal, during the formation of the political order, which bases citizenship on the principle of universality. He points out that this situation imposes reinterpretation of the meanings of all of the pre-existing identities and relationships.[281] Historian Samim Akgönül emphasizes that the bond between religious identity and minority identity could be found in two places: the first one is the relationships within a group, and the second, relationship between the majority and minorities. Akgönül states that the first field, which covers the bonds between ethnic identity and religious identity, is known very well owing to the Schnapper's insights. According to Schnapper, the "vertical" dimension of religion, which is directed to superior existence, becomes increasingly the "horizontal" dimension, which represents the ideal of solidarity.[282]

Barth who is one of the most influential theorists in ethnic group definitions sees ethnicity as a dimension of social organization. He takes ethnicity as one of the forms of social organization with processual emphasis, not as natural, primary and consistent structure. Social actors form ethnic groups when they refer to their ethnic identities to identify and categorize themselves and others for purpose of interaction.[283] Hence Barth, who emphasizes that ethnicity is a polarization process between "us" and "others", points out the ways in which people define their allegiance to the shared culture. According to him, what enables ethnic groups is not the content of these definitions but the function, since ethnic boundary determination and maintenance is constituted by using those definitions. Therefore, the culture of the group is formed a result of those boundaries, not vice versa.[284] This understanding, that ethnicity is a product of social interaction, renders the "internal" – "external" boundaries and processes of exclusion even more important.

Believing in or accepting the existence of an ethnic group, is related to a perception of common "ancestors" and a common past. This perception could be valid and strong because it also evokes feelings of solidarity similar to that in a family or kinship. Religion is the other factor that increases this strength.

---

281 Dominique Schnapper, *Öteki ile İlişki,* trans. Ayşegül Sönmezay, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005, pp. 67–70.

282 Akgönül, *Azınlık, Türk Bağlamında Azınlık Kavramına Çapraz Bakışlar,* trans. Deniz Töreli Esnault ve Deniz Akgönül, Bgst Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011, pp. 48–49.

283 Barth, ibid, pp. 10–15.

284 Ibid, pp.15–25.

Sociologist Herbert Gans uses "ethno-religious" characterization for some ethnic groups in USA, because of the tight bonds between ethnic and religious acculturation. According to him, Greeks, Armenians and other Orthodox groups in East Europe are also ethno-religious groups.[285]

As mentioned above in the anecdote of the interviewee *Keti*, both interviews and literature infer that the tight bonds with roots, past and religion, which are the basic components of the *ethno-religion* identity design, become visible in rituals. Social scientist Méropi Anastassiadou notes that the Romioi of Istanbul were heir to a very old and multilayered culture and says that there are two main historical elements that formed that cultural identity: Byzantium and Christianity. Anastassiadou underlines that the most influential element that determined the Romioi Orthodox identity was religion, adding that simply looking at the newspapers printed in Romioi would be sufficient to observe this. He also determined that religion based social activities, such as christening celebrations, ceremonies, memorial services, not only continued, but increased at the same time.[286] Millas concludes with a similar deduction, that Orthodoxy comes from Byzantium with its chants, ceremonies, language and history. He says that this tradition of religion and language is the heritage of modern Orthodox.[287] Interviewee *Xanthus* points out to the heritage that was the basis in defining religion. "*When I say Romioi Orthodox, I mean Greek Orthodox. Arabs are also Romioi Orthodox. The Romioi are associated with the Eastern Orthodox Church, a new religion which was built on Greek customs and traditions*". As *Xanthus* underlines, the past is the critical factor in defining Romioi Orthodox religion; being an Arab does not matter because the pattern is the same.

Similarly, *Mihail*, another interviewee, describes the role of Orthodoxy in uniting different communities, while he views Christianity and Orthodoxy as the most important elements of the Romioi identity:

> "We say Greek, Greco, Hellen, Romioi but we don't call an ancient Greek a pagan, or those who worship the twelve Gods of Olympus a Romioi. When we think of the Eastern Roman Empire, we refer to the Empire defined within the rules Constantine preached after he embraced Christianity. The Eastern Roman Empire is an empire, it does not

---

285 Herbert Gans, "Symbolic Ethnicity and Symbolic Religiosity: Towards a Comparison of Ethnic and Religious Acculturation", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, no. 4 (XVII), 577–592, 1979, p. 581.

286 Méropi Anastassiadou, "İstanbul Rumlarının Kültürel Varlığı: Değerlendirme ve Gelişme Tahayyülleri", trans. Ayşe Özil, in *İstanbul Rumları - Bugün ve Yarın,* İstos Yayın, Istanbul, 2012, pp. 200–204.

287 Millas, ibid, p. 133.

include only the Greek but the entire Balkan nations, and even more. Orthodoxy is the element that connects them" (Mihail, Istanbul).

Another interviewee *Orestis* explains Orthodoxy which connects different origins in the anecdote above, as follow:

> "Especially in Turkey, a Romioi would have to go to church to show or confirm that he is a Romioi. . . So, I guess it would be incorrect to differentiate between being a Romioi and an Orthodox, particularly in Turkey and especially in the so called *tough years*. What I remember is from the 1970's, it may be different to someone else. It was an unbreakable connection that one felt all the time" (Orestis, Athens).

Orestis, who characterizes the bond between Romioi and Orthodoxy as unbreakable, emphasizes that especially in the political context, this bond was felt even stronger in times when being a member of this identity was more difficult. Common beliefs and traditions shared by members of a group can have different meanings in times when there is pressure from majority groups or authorities. In this layer of interpretation, the need for associating with an identity, feeling like belonging to it, and expressing it could be stronger. In a sense, this is a coping mechanism related to exclusion and oppression. People try to overcome being weaker than the majority. Therefore, there arises a feeling of solidarity, and this creates confidence. On the other hand, the solidarity concept also evokes the borders in some respect. Let us look at those borders.

Example for boundaries: *"The worst thing you could have done, was to marry a Turk"*

As we discussed in the previous chapter, in minority groups the existence of churches and rituals cannot be analyzed in relation to religion only. If the religion of the minority is different from that of the majority, some lines that have a characteristic of border could appear, especially due to fear of assimilation. Although these borders have been really tight in the past and are relatively relaxed today, they become visible mostly in marriages. Interviewee *Angelos* points to the difficulties of interfaith marriages in his time – early 1990s, and how those who married were alienated. He demonstrates the influence of rituals on identity and their importance in life by how they determined who one would marry:

> "Our family experience places us in a specific culture and part of a certain history. . . First of all, can I share these with this person? Certainly, I will share some things, that's my modern identity, but how about the more traditional aspects of my identity? I know I can't share those. This is my identity. Others have managed it, and they did well, but there are plenty like me. The particulars of my family affected that – a family right in the middle of the community, very conscious of their identity" (Angelos, Athens).

In the expression above, a concern about shared rituals related to family, culture and history is prominent. This close association could cause religion to function also as an effective external border. *Angelos* explains this external border with the following statement: "*One of the worst things you could have done was to marry a Turk*". The "*worst thing*", here, forms an external boundary because it could disrupt the transmission of culture through religious rituals.

Anthropologist Mary Douglas interprets rituals as an attempt to create and maintain a particular culture, a particular set of assumptions by which experience is controlled. She defines culture as a series of interrelated structures covering the whole of knowledge, social forms, values, cosmology and through which all experience is mediated. According to Douglas, rituals enact the form of social relations, portray them and enable people to know their own societies by a visible statement.[288] Marrying someone from another religion can be seen as an obstacle for the continuation of Romioi Orthodox identity, because it raises the question of what the next generation's religion would be, hence how they would define themselves. Therefore, by forming an external boundary, interfaith marriages could carry a sanction that might even lead to exclusion from society.

Characterization of marriage with a Turk, especially a Turkish man, as "*the worst thing*" contains issues[289] such as identity borders between "self" and "other", "cultural transmission", "the role of women, the nature of family and the proper relationship between men and women".[290] Then the attempt to control for the sexuality of women also means the control of boundaries between communities.[291] Social scientists Anastasia Karakasidou and Georgios Agelopoulos, who examine the notion of purity of nation, the role of women both as the biological reproducers and cultural transmitters of the nation and the relationship between those mentioned above and nationalism, draw attention in case of intermarriage the mother is responsible for cultural upbringing of a child, although the patriarchal society gives the "ownership" of the child to his/her father's community.[292]

---

288 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, Routledge, London and New York, 2002, p. 129.

289 Discussions in this subject have been included in the *Migration* chapter.

290 Henrietta Moore, *Feminism and Anthropology,* Polity Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. 128.

291 Ayşe Aybil Göker, *Being '*Cypriot*' in North London: Strategies, Experiences and Contestations*, for the degree of Doctor of Anthropology, University College of London, 2007, p. 180.

292 Ibid, p. 204. Göker's sources of quotation: Karakasidou, Anastasia, "Women of the Family, Women of the Nation: National Enculturation Among Slavic Speakers in Northwestern Greece", Women's Studies International Forum 19:1/2, 1996, p. 99–109. Agelopoulos, Georgios, "Mothers of the Nation: Gender and Ethnicity in Greek Macedonia", *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: A critical Review. Workshop IV, Ethnicity,*

Nationalist ideology that consider women as the bearer of culture, at the same time, accounts the necessity to control this power by cultural strategies.[293] The control is felt in the definition of ideal marriage. The narratives of "idealized marriages" portray the boundaries which separate the "us" from the "others", while forming the disadvantages of marriage with someone of "others".[294]

Douglas points out that each culture must have own dirt and defilement notions which are contrasted with its positive structure which should not be negated.[295] Douglas emphasized that the idea of society is a strong image and this image has a dorm with its external borders and confines this image has a form, external boundaries, internal structure.[296] The most dangerous pollution occurs once something goes out and turn back again into the system.[297] If we were to express the alienation of those who marry Muslims in Douglas's terminology, the re-entry of those who once crossed the border is prevented, because such marriages could mean the corruption or contamination of the society.

However, interfaith marriage in a steadily declining population has other aspects beyond Douglas' analysis. This materializes more of as a concern about future, rather than a contamination of the culture or "proper passing down of culture". The statement of *Vangelis*[298] below reflects a deep concern about the present and the future of Romioi Orthodox.

> "The declining population somewhat makes it more difficult to live with customs and rituals. Interfaith marriages inhibit the survival of customs and rituals, which is quite typical; interfaith marriages increase as the minority population declines. Perhaps it may help to eliminate the former grudges, but I am still concerned about how to secure our future. In a way, we will leave it to chance" (Vangelis, Istanbul).

One of the topics raised during the interviews was the increase in interfaith marriages, although it had been rare in the past; and now, there were even cases of Muslim women marrying Romioi Orthodox men, which was almost unheard of before. However, in the case of the latter, if the woman does not know or

---

　　Culture an Identity Bhachu and Wetering (eds.), University of Amsterdam Institute for Migrant and Ethnic Studies, 1993, pp. 45–72)].

293　Göker, ibid, p. 181.

294　Ibid, p. 201.

295　Douglas, ibid, p. 160.

296　Ibid, p. 115.

297　Ibid, p. 155.

298　*Vangelis*: Male. Mid-forties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Istanbul. At one point they think about leaving as a family, but later they waived. The interviews were made in Istanbul in 2011 and 2012.

learn Greek, the transmission of culture to children would be a problem. While external borders could arise around marriage to a Turk or Muslim, it is remarkable that "internal" borders can also form with a same-religion marriage to someone in Greece.

"We are not one of them!!"

In this section I will refer to the distant feelings for rituals in Greece. However, I believe that it would be proper to first examine how the rituals were performed in Turkey during the *tough years*. *Nadia*'s[299] childhood memories of Easter in the mid-1960s are different from her experience in 2011 when she came to Istanbul from Athens for Easter:

> "When we intended to walk home from church holding our candles, my father would warn us 'put them off, girls' or we would hold them really low if we were riding home, so they would not be seen from the outside. . . So, they would not know. (...) I was in Istanbul during Easter this year and went to church. I left the church holding my candle, I wanted to take it to where I stayed. There was a young fellow, in his twenties, who turned around and said, 'Happy Easter' and I just froze. I looked back at him, smiled and said, 'Thank you!' We came a long way from 'put them off, girls, be careful, hide your candles' to casually walking out now, holding my candle. They did not even know what to say then – 'May your Easter be.. umm, you know.. happy'" (Nadia, Athens).

Nadia explains that the reason her Easter was celebrated by a stranger was related with the demographic decline and describes how she feels about this change:

> "An unexpected but a delightful feeling. . . yet with a little bitterness in me, I thought 'why you have never said that 30 years ago and made me leave?' Of course, the young man was not even born then, but oh well..." (Nadia, Athens).

One of the topics discussed during the interviews was the altering of ceremonial times depending on the political situation. For example, in 1950s and 1960s, the Holy Saturday Night Mass was delivered in the mornings, instead of midnight. *Stratos* explains this change as follows:

> "We were just timid... in our neighborhood (Yenikoy) it was held at 5 am." (Akis), and because we felt rather scared at midnight, they moved the mass time to either early in the morning, or early evening to prevent trouble" (Stratos, Athens).

Hercules however, says that the reason was not to avoid drawing attention, but the prohibition by the Turkish state:

---

299 *Nadia*: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Athens. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010 and 2011.

"Our generation knows it as the morning mass, but that was because the Turkish government had prohibited such events from being held at night. It was not our choice to avoid unnecessary attention. I guess they were irritated thinking 'what on earth are these people doing in the middle of the night" (Hercules, Athens).

Damos[300] who lives in Athens sets forth the difference between Istanbul in 1960s–1970s and today (2011) by saying that nowadays "*religious freedom is extensive*". He expresses the differences between the Holy Saturday Evening Mass in the past and now, with the following words:

"It was impossible to carry candles back home then. At least a few children would tag along and blew the candles out chanting 'infidels, infidels'. That's why the mass was held at daylight not in the evening. Now everyone walks back holding candles and nobody is intimidated" (Damos, Athens).

The main issue mentioned during interviews was that the performance of some practices, such as going home with candles, ringing bells, procession with epitaph (epitafios), were dependent on the state of relations between Greece and Turkey at that time (the Cyprus issue); hence the uneasiness of the past did not exist nowadays.

Hercules points out that while the difference from Muslims is apparent with their different religion and language, interestingly a vague border line appears by the fractionalization between the Istanbul Romioi and Greeks, even though they share the same language and religion. The Istanbulite-Romioi identity materializes along these borders in Greece. He cites the following striking example:

"The Greek minority in Istanbul has a distinction in our language – we call ourselves the Romioi. When we say Greek, we mean the Greek in Greece. When one says 'Yiannis got married' it is understood that he married to a Romioi. We spell it out if the spouse is Greek, that's different, not customary. If the marriage is with someone from Athens, it is clearly stated" (Hercules, Athens).

Hercules describes the significance of Easter rituals to the Romioi of Istanbul in terms of one of the "*cultural shocks*" he felt after he moved to Athens from Istanbul, and details it as follows:

"We were watching the Easter celebrations at midnight, broadcast by the Syntagma channel. There is a famous hymn that people typically start at midnight, and the

---

300 *Damos*: Male. Mid-sixties. He graduated from Romioi high school, in Istanbul. His wife *Theodora* is a Romioi of Carsamba (Fatih). They migrated to Athens when they were thirty years old due to business difficulties stemming from the tension in the Turkish-Greek relationships. Interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

archpriest comes out with a candle. Everyone lights their candle from that, then from one another, and that's how it spreads across. It is a beautiful scene. If you were to watch from a hilltop, you could see how the light expands. That's how we used to do it, and that's how it happened that night as well – with a minor exception. They were waiting for the President. There was a band outside the church, playing the national anthem, waiting for the President. Then the President arrived, and Jesus was resurrected. So, if the president is late, Jesus can't be resurrected! And out of the blue, it's the national anthem! I am not religious, but it had an aesthetic to it back then. A ceremony that has been held for two thousand years. . . what does it have to do with the national anthem" (Hercules, Athens).

Hercules explains his feelings about how a religious ceremony held for two thousand years was transformed by additions such as the national anthem, a band, and the arrival of President with the following words: "*Something different is going on here, and we don't feel like we belong*". These words illustrate that the revised version of the ceremony is an identity border, and therefore demonstrate the relationship between rituals and identity. He describes the ceremony in Athens as:

> "Ridiculous, or tragic. Actually, it just feels absurd, it's unacceptable and a little unnerving at the same time".

He mentions that this feeling is shared among the Romioi and wonders "*I don't know what my sons would do because they didn't grow up in Istanbul*". Such a question dramatically highlights the connection between rituals and the Istanbulite Romioi identity.

Another example for the borders that appear for rituals is what *Xanthus* thinks about the hymns in Athens, who used to sing with the church choir as a student in Istanbul:

> "As I said, I am not that religious or anything... But I do enjoy listening to the Muslim call to prayer as well, if recited by a talent. I remember when I was a student at the Science Academy, there would be lovely calls to prayer recited in the afternoons, at about 5 pm. (. . .) I can't participate with the churches here, I can only join the choirs that come from Turkey and perform at the churches here. I am not a musician but the local ones here sound like an ode, even though they take it very seriously" (Xanthus, Athens).

Similarly, *Hercules* describes the difference among hymns as disruptive and explains this as follows:

> "There is a difference with the key, and it feels discordant to listen to the hymns, it's cacophonous. It really bothers me.." (Hercules Athens).

The feelings of interviewee *Dimitris* at a funeral in Athens point to a similar border as previously described about the hymns. *Dimitris,* who lives in Istanbul, explains how he felt like a stranger at the funeral of his uncle who had migrated to Athens many years ago:

> "I did not experience anything that made me feel like I was attending a funeral service. I found it very odd (. . .) They were the same prayers and hymns that I know by heart, being the child of a priest. However, because of the different keys, tones or the melody, it didn't feel like a funeral at all. There are certain rituals, along with the hymns and the melodies that you're accustomed to and take comfort in, but when you can't find them, the whole concept just does not meet your need" (Dimitris, Istanbul).

Interviewee *Dimitris* describes the strangeness felt by those who had migrated to Athens, in regard to religious rituals in the following words:

> "Why is immigration or population exchange bad? Because you're uprooted. The immigrants feel like somehow, they have been ripped out of their soil and can't take root. Re-planting just doesn't work for some.." (Dimitris, Istanbul).

In the expression of *Dimitris* above, implicit references such as "as a source of identity between man and place, a homogenized and naturally occurring bond" and "arboreal[301] approximations like taking rooted as a sign of belongingness" make us to think that rituals gain a meaning by establishing roots and life bonds with a certain place.

To summarize theoretical discussions dealt with in this part: With regards to the religious ritual-belongingness connection of Istanbul Romioi Orthodox, religious rituals emerge as a reflection of identity, in other words as an *ethno-religion*. Herein as we discussed earlier, you would recall that identity is shaped and contested through many factors such as ethnic origin, class, place etc. Identity is relative stance, claim and positioning during lifecourse.[302] It emerges from experiences and it depends on the relationships with others.[303] If it is an

---

301 Liisa Malkki, "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorilizing of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees", in Gupta and Ferguson (eds.) *Culture, Power, Place*, Exploration in Critical Anthropology, Duke University Press, Durham, 1997

302 Rogers Brubaker, "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (28), 2005, pp. 1–19; Stuart Hall, "Culture, Community, Nation", *Cultural Studies*, 7(3), 1993, pp. 349–363; Yael Navaro-Yashin, "De-ethnicising the Ethnography of Cyprus: Political", in Papadakis, Peristianis and Welz (eds.), *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History and an Island in Conflict*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2006;

303 Moore, ibid and Michael Jackson, *Things as They Are: New Directions in Phenomenological Anthropology*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1996.

identity of a minority, the way others perceive it and the way State approaches to that particular identity become more decisive.

With respect to earlier discussion, the primary reason that *Xanthus*, a Romioi from Istanbul, was alluded and not considered as a Turk even if he gave consent, is that religion was at the core of the culture that Turkish State, following the nationalist principles, chose to protect during its establishment. Thus *Xanthus*, as a member of a minority that was not designated by the state for protection, or as an outsider to an imaginary community, would always be a foreigner who was permitted to stay, and a local who has to give much more than a Turkish-Muslim. Thus, the role adhered to him required him to be more diligent in fulfilling his citizenship obligations yet be invisible and silent in terms of pretension of his civic rights.

The necessity to be silent also comes up in the use of language. Since speaking Romioi/Greek means protecting and maintaining the Romioi identity, speaking in Romioi becomes a target, a means for repression. In addition to being a part of identity, the use of language also constructs the identity. Therefore, restrictions on the use of language, in other words, silence in public realm or speaking in a low voice and being careful about the topics spoken about, also get integrated to the identity. Other dimensions that were integrated into the identity of the Romioi of Istanbul were Turkish words used in Romioi and speaking Romioi with a Turkish syntax. This distinction comes up with regard to the differences with the Greeks of Athens. One other distinction was the rituals.

While the aforementioned border between the identity of the Romioi of Istanbul and Turkish/Muslims is apparent between the different religions, that boundaries with the Orthodox in Greece surfaces in the interpretation of rituals. The minority status of having a different religion from the majority enhances functions of religion and rituals in forming, transmitting and interpreting the Romioi Orthodox identity. The meaning attributed to the rituals that form the Romioi Orthodox identity changes further in difficult times, and as a result of the decline in the population. The continuity of customs and rituals is perceived as one's own continued existence. Due to the critical role of rituals in the Istanbul's Romioi Orthodox identity, and the meaning attributed to them, the Romioi "*fail to take root*" and the feeling of alienation emerges with unfamiliar rituals. In the next section I will examine migration, the issue that creates the feeling of "*failing to take root in*" new a new land.

Chapter 4 Migration

"They left in tears, nobody really wanted to leave. Because home is where you were born. So, what if you are a Muslim and I am a Christian? Nobody asked me, to begin with. I did not choose to be a Romioi, I was born one. What do you mean by saying 'You're a citizen, Speak Turkish?' I did not want to leave, so I did not leave. But when my sister and nephews left, I was left alone, so in a way, I was forced to leave. My sister's husband co-owned a pastry shop with a Turkish partner. I myself had a Turkish business partner and we had no problems. We are friends to this day. But there was a problem at my brother in law's work. My nephew Eleftherios was 19 or 20 years old, when one day they walked in and said 'are you aware what Yücel is saying about Eleftherios? He says they will gut him like a fish'. So they started feeling anxious. They did not leave because they would be financially better off in Greece, they left because they were scared" (Takis, Istanbul).

The owner of those words, *Takis*, while emphasizing he did not leave Istanbul voluntarily or for economic reasons, defines homeland with reference to the place a person was born in. Such a definition for homeland addresses unity. His expressions also include an emphasis on people's inability to choose their family, and a critique on the restriction of the use of language.

In 1937 when *Takis* was seven, his father passed away and he started to work in Tokatlıyan Hotel's pastry shop during his adolescent years. His mother was a house cleaner and his sister, a tailor. He worked at Tokatlıyan Hotel's pastry shop for many years. During those days that pastry shop was like a school. He learned the art of baking from an Austrian pastry chef and he became a chef also. He made the 12-layer wedding cake for Atatürk's adopted children Ülkü. It is interesting that while he was talking about how his sister had to leave upon the threats against his nephew, which forced him to leave as well, he also emphasized that he did not leave. This phrase makes one think that the concept of place becomes obscure with migration.

"When my sister left, I was left alone... Do you know that we still speak Turkish in Greece when we are with the other Romioi? Nobody cares there, on the contrary, they ask us at the store: 'Ah, did you bring the air from there?' Our origins are Byzantine... They say, once our population reached 200,000, but now it is 2,000. I often wonder how nice it would be if 50,000 Romioi still lived in Istanbul. Atatürk was an intelligent man, he did not include the Romioi of Istanbul in the population exchange. On the contrary, they wiped out the Romioi community [through forced migration] in '42, '55, '64 and '74. . .[304]" (Takis, Istanbul).

---

304 Interviewee *Takis* refers to the following dates with the numbers: Wealth Tax in 1942, September 6–7 events in 1955, deportations in 1964 after Seyrusefain Agreement was

Even if on the basis of *Takis*'s words it could be claimed that the concept of place has transformed with migration, his focus on his roots in Byzantine and Istanbul is clear. Turkish functioned as a part of being a Romioi in Athens' Faliro neighborhood. And, he described the decline in the population of the Romioi living in Istanbul in waves with the word "*wiped out*".

Decision to migrate: *"They left in tears"*

In this part, I am going to focus on migration problematic with regards to origin, homeland and belongingness issues of those who migrated. I am going to try to trace the effects of migration on identity, pursuit of continuity, and the ways they experienced being an Istanbulite for both those who continued to live in Istanbul, and those who migrated to Athens. In this section, I will discuss the question of migration/forced migration following the prominent emotions that became integral parts of the identity, such as fear, decision to migrate/abandon home, settling in Athens, alienation and homesickness – starting with the insecure environment that prevailed. It is relatively easy to define the involuntary relocation experience of the Romioi in 1964: Forced migration or deportation. However, for other periods it is not possible to draw clear lines between voluntary/involuntary migration and forced migration.

Since migration involves abandonment, inevitably for the emigrants the place they left behind, and the concept of homeland becomes problematic. Therefore, it contains an emotional rollercoaster and contradictions related to "returning home and attachment to land".[305] However, even if it is difficult to make a clear-cut distinction between migration and forced migration, latter "is particularly poignant, since severance is abrupt and forced".[306] Therefore, while analyzing the migration issue, which is nearly as old as human history, it is critical to examine "who moves, when, how and under which circumstances".[307]

---

revoked, and Cyprus in 1974. These periods are discussed in detail in the section on *Being Romioi Orthodox*.

305 Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts,1997.

306 Laila Abu-Lughod, "Palestinians: Exiles at Home and Abroad", *Current Sociology* 36 (2), Summer, 61–69, 1988, p. 61.

307 Avtar Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*, Routledge, London and New York 1996, p. 182.

"Voluntary"- involuntary migration

In his work titled *Reflections on Exile*, Edward Said, a scholar on comparative literature and an activist, stresses the possibility of choice and return, and states that anyone prevented from returning home is an exile.[308] Laila Abu-Lughod, an anthropologist, highlights the difference between a "voluntary need-pushed migration" and a "sudden involuntary severance from one's 'native' place".[309] Minoo Alinia, a sociologist, describes involuntary migrants as those who "have no right or possibility to return and/or there does not exist any 'native country' to return to". Alinia highlights that the question of returning is first of all about the option to keep the bond between past and present alive and the continuity of self, rather than about going back to one's "roots". Alinia, who stresses that the choice in both voluntary or involuntary migration is not absolute, argues that voluntary migrations are voluntary only to the extent of the individuals' decisions are framed within socio-economic status and the possibilities that they give.[310]

On the basis of such a conceptualization, it is not easy to define migration of Romioi of Istanbul as *voluntary migration,* since their reasons to migrate were not based solely on economic concerns. Moreover, the criteria of having an option and/or right to return included in *involuntary migration* was not plausible for the Romioi who migrated from Istanbul, since even if it was legally possible, there were still psychological obstacles to returning. Therefore, how should migration, other than forced migration, be defined? It is beneficial to focus on migration experience of the Istanbul Romioi, which was further complicated through intermingled categories and labels, by detailing the decision-making processes. *Dimitris* describes the process leading to migration as follows:

> "First, they took away your job, then destroyed your peace at home, like in '64 using the Cyprus events as an excuse. Deportations, day in and out, damaged the social family concept. Consider a family, parents and two or three children. Let's say the mother has Greek citizenship, and she had to leave. What choices did the others have then? Other family members who were Turkish citizens also had to follow her. The deportations of '64 were the biggest drain, a hemorrhage for the community – then again in '74 with

---

308 Edward Said, *Reflections on Exile: and Other Essays,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2000, p. 181

309 Abu-Lughod, ibid, p. 61.

310 Minoo Alinia, S*paces of Diasporas, Kurdish Identities, Experiences of Otherness and Politics of Belonging*, Göteborg Studies in Sociology No 22, Department of Sociology, Göteborg University, 2004, pp. 80–82.

the events in Cyprus. I remember we were at Buyukada that year. We used to cover the windows with blue or red papers to dim the lights – not just us, everyone did that, but the unease was heavier for us. We are talking about Cyprus, not Ukraine or another distant land. Hence, there was a breaking point then, a contraction started. I believe the last wave of this contraction happened in the period just before the events of '80s. You were either a right-winger or left. If you were a right-winger the leftists would hurt you, and vice versa, but not another group. However, if you were a minority or a non-Muslim, then both wings attacked the same, for example, they smashed your storefront or demanded extortion" (Dimitris, Istanbul).

In the anecdote above, the term hemorrhage, which was used to describe obligation of families to migrate in 1964, is a biological reference to body. Such a phrase indicates how deeply the aforementioned deportations affected the society. In the following years, especially in the aftermath of events in Cyprus in 1974, tension and anxiety escalated. Interviewees emphasized that shops owned by minorities were considered a common threat both by the Leftist and the Rightist movements during the political clashes prior to 1980. Nevertheless, while discussing the friendships formed during university years, interviewees also pointed out that especially the leftist students have sympathized with and help them. They gave details of some examples when leftist students supported them. However, being 'supported' spans a wide spectrum from a disadvantageous position to a position of being under pressure and tension.

The interviews imply that the main motivation for migration was to escape stress. A decision to migrate or actually doing it, were not shared with even the closest friends. *Takis* describes this situation as such:

"I was tired of hearing the same thing... I would run into a friend and he would say 'Takis, you know Giorgos's gone, right?' as if it was good news. 'He's gone, she's gone'. . . Later, many started leaving without a word. Secretly. We went fishing with my friend Mihail on Wednesday, then I saw him at the church in Sunday. I arrived at work on Monday and they said, 'oh by the way, Mihail is gone.' Seriously? This can't be real! But it was. My friend never mentioned a single word" (Takis, Istanbul).

Migration without informing even the close friends indicates how difficult such a decision was. This situation makes us think that they might have kept the decision to themselves to avoid emotional moments and the possibility of changing their minds. Departures continued, one after another. Those who left also affected the others who stayed. It was as if both sides lost a piece of their Romioi-Istanbul culture. Migration is the most important reason of socio-cultural weakening and loss of strength, and especially of feeling insecure. Because every person is a knot in the socio-cultural lattice, and every lost knot implies weakening and vanishing of the fabric.

Those who leave, leave behind their homes, hometowns, friends and family. On the other hand, just because they have not moved does not mean those who stayed remained at the same place, because the sensual meaning of the City, space/location has been disturbed. Interviewee *Angelos* describes the atmosphere as she talks about her migration:

> "We always lived in Istanbul knowing that one day we might have to leave. It was a given. We didn't talk about it, we just knew it. 'Everybody is leaving' was a frequently heard statement then. As you might know, the *Apoyevmatini* was our newspaper in which the obituaries were printed all the time. We used to buy it to find out who had passed away. It was like this during that time – and who wants to live in an environment like that?" (Angelos, Athens).

Angelos left when he was 22 at the beginning of 1990s and moved to Athens. He often visited Turkey. He does not feel that he left completely, but more like as if he is living in two places. It is important how *Angelos* is always either in Athens or Istanbul, regardless of her physical location. Belonging both here and there is akin to living both inside and outside simultaneously. This is interesting since it implies that even if a physical detachment was experienced, it is still possible to mentally and emotionally experience a "location-in-movement".[311] As it is discussed in the following part, sense of place "is always socially constructed"[312] and therefore it is contextual.

The Romioi population in Istanbul had already been declining with the previous waves of migrations at the time interviewee *Angelos* lived in Istanbul. Therefore, the knowledge ingrained in him was that he would certainly have to migrate one day. However, it was different in previous years. Interviewee *Hercules* describes the former situation, during the interview in Athens:

> "We didn't think about it as much then. Not in the 50's... Not even after September 6–7. The economy was good, we recovered, and got over the trauma. But of course, the Wealth Tax was a big shock – the biggest of all. The deportations were actually mandatory migrations. They would deport fifteen thousand people in one move... And there follows another fifteen thousand, and then they are all gone" (Hercules, Athens).

While he describes the Wealth Tax to be the biggest shock, others consider September 6–7 events as the most important breaking point, which made them

---

311 Elena L. Delgado and Rolando J. Romero, "Local Histories and Global designs: An Interview with Walter Mignolo", *Discourse*, 22(3), 7–33, Fall 2000, Wayne State University Press, ,p. 15.

312 Alinia, ibid, p. 120.

clash with the public, not the legislation. Interviewee *Akis*[313] defines September 6–7 events as a reflection of the desire of "*Turkey to be the country for Turks only ever since the republic was first established*", and states:

> "The Kurdish people are now suffering from what we went through. Before us, it was the Armenians, and for a while the Laz.[314] They always tried to remove a fraction. That's why the events of September 6–7 happened – to drive us out. Apparently, we were not very smart, and we stayed. I was lucky that I didn't witness those things as I was in Kınalıada. Our police captain and the guards got on the ferry deck, bearing arms, and did not let the outsiders, those who performed those horrible acts, off board. After that however, our friends who lived through the September 6–7 events became more reluctant, they were afraid" (Akis, Athens).

Stratos, Akis's classmate, is one of the people who lived through that scare in Fener. *Stratos* describes that day as follows:

> "I went through a lot. Our house happened to be in Fener, and they barged into our home. I was about 10 then. We were really afraid, though we were not harmed but they looted all our possessions. I mean, I lived through many of these lootings, and it left a bad taste in my mouth. It was not our neighbors though, we had never seen any of those people before. They were mean, brutal. They would steal whatever they could get their hands on, take the valuables and smash and break what they could not carry. They cut up our precious rugs into small bits. My mother took a few pieces and kept them as memento" (Stratos, Athens).

After interviewee *Stratos* graduated from high school, he left Istanbul for Athens in 1963, followed by his family later. His mother brought a piece of the carpet that looters had cut up. During September 6–7, *Stratos*'s father's shop had been attacked as well. "*They attacked my father's shop and they ruined it. You would have had to set up shop from scratch. . ., from scratch.*" The attacks against *Stratos*'s home and his father's shop when he was ten years old were a threat to their lives. Her mother was devastated that she to leave, since she knew she would miss the place she was leaving behind, her home. The very act of bringing along a piece of that carpet could be interpreted as an attempt to maintain the organic and sensual bond with the place that she was abandoning.

In her work titled *The Emotional Self* in which she analyzes effects of emotions on shaping perceptions and subjectivity of self, anthropologist Deborah Lupton highlights the role of objects as repositories of and cues to emotions.[315] She

---

313 *Akis*: Male. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. He is from Yenikoy. He migrated to Athens. His wife is *Cleo*, Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

314 People native to the Black Sea coastal regions of Turkey and Georgia.

315 Deborah Lupton, *The Emotional Self, a Sociocultural Exploration*, Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, 1998, p. 2.

points out that strong emotions and personal turning points in the lives of their personal biographies often occur in the context of the home, and the objects that people take with them when they move to a new house provide a feeling of grounding and a sense of home.[316]

The piece of carpet which interviewee *Stratos's* mother brought along is like a symbol to help her remember both Istanbul, her home, and what happened there. In a sense, the piece of carpet contains "an emotional and historical sediment."[317] In addition to being a piece of Istanbul, the *City*, it is also a piece, an object, which both reminds her of their forceful removal from their home and serves as an evidence of those events.

Despite what happened on September 6–7, evidently people tried to move on and continue with their lives. *Akis* describes this as follows:

"There was a rawness after '55 though it gradually faded away. . . but the tide turned once again in '63. People would assemble in front of Romioi shops and try to turn away patrons saying, 'don't walk in, this is an infidel's store' and such" (Akis, Athens).

Both interviewee *Akis's* father and his uncle used to be fishermen. So, he did not have a business inherited from his father. He went to Athens since he did not see a future for himself in Istanbul. His family stayed back in Istanbul until 1972–1973, but then they also left. Neither *Stratos's* family whose home and shop were attacked, nor *Akis's* family left immediately after September 6–7. Even though they did not affect migration as much as the deportations in 1964, the scars left by September 6–7 were deep. *Takis* describes the scarring as follows:

"September 6–7 was a huge disaster, and we were very scared. The fear came in waves, people started talking in a few days saying, 'they will slaughter us again tonight'. And so, folks started to leave for Greece" (Takis, Athens).

In the days following September 6–7, fearing that the events would repeat was striking as it demonstrates the spectrum of collective fear and continuity of psychological violence.

Judith Herman, known with her works on trauma, emphasizes that following a traumatic event, it is observed that human system of self-preservation seems to go permanent alert, as if danger might return any moment.[318] As Renos Papadopolous, a psychologist studying forced migration and trauma, indicates,

---

316 Ibid, p. 159.

317 Nadia Seremetakis, *The Senses Still, Perception and Memory as Material Culture in Modernity*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1994, p. 7.

318 Judith L. Herman, *Trauma and Recovery,* Basic Book, New York, 1997, p. 35.

trauma experience is highly correlated with "anticipating/waiting", and the period of "what if . . . happens?" is possibly the most traumatic and tormenting process.[319] We could say that this was influential on the migrations from Istanbul. Sensing the possibility of facing the threats again, and thinking the same events will repeat, had a major impact on migration. The possibility of danger increased, and departures accelerated when the subsequent deportations in 1964 were followed with the Cyprus anguish. There were different reasons behind decision to leave or to stay. *Nadia* who lives in Athens, states these reasons as follows:

> "I think. . . that there were plenty and maybe conflicting drives. Some said 'I will live through this here, I won't go, I won't give up. I make a good living here, I am not even asking for more. . . After all, what else can they do to me? Not much'. Of course, this applied to those without daughters or young children. Then there were others: 'We have a daughter coming of age, let's move, it will be. . . you know, better'. (. . .) That is, financially either you were doing so poorly that you couldn't make the move even if you wanted, or you were so well off that you couldn't just take the risk. You couldn't leave in either case. There was also the emotional side of it; yes, the fear was there, but they did not have young children. So, the would say 'we managed so far, we will make it' or 'no, why should we leave? We will stay and resist; we were born here, we grew up here... It's our thing'" (Nadia, Athens).

Interviewee *Nadia* describes the causes of staying and leaving, in general terms, as fear, economic situation, age and gender of children and emotional reasons. Among these, the phrase that "*we have a daughter coming of age, let's move, it will be. . . you know, better*" is important in terms of the target of threat and as it addresses the image of 'other'.

Millas, in his thesis study reviewing nearly 450 works in Turkish and Greek literature, indicates that in Turkish literature Greek/Romioi women are either represented as good and they become Muslim/Turk at the end, or they are often portrayed as bad and immoral (prostitutes, etc.).[320] In addition to these literary

---

319 Renos Papadopoulos, "Refugee Families: Issues of Systemic Supervision", *Journal of Family Therapy* 23, 405–422, 2001, p. 413.

320 It will be suggestive to exemplify these representations. Millas indicates that in almost all of twenty-one novels and two Elenastory books written by Halide Edip Adıvar there are references to Greek/Romioi, and ten of twenty-eight Romioi women are hardly described, eighteen of them are portrayed as very negative persons, those women are often characterized as prostitutes or 'easy' maids who are not to be liked (Millas, *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki", Ulusual Kimlikte Yunan İmajı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2000, p. 52). Millas points out that five of the nine Romioi women in the novels of Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu are prostitutes and that three women are young girls who have sex with the Turks. These women do not treat Turkish men well, they betray and abandon, and at odd moments they steal from them, or cause

works, similar representation in the popular movies and television programs in creating an image of Greek/Romioi women manifests itself in the anxiety expressed by the interviewee. To position the Romioi women as "bad and immoral" is in a way to justify the attack to the 'woman of other'. The fact that the female body is open to be reshaped and attacked is closely related to nationalist policies.

The relationship between nationalism and gender is important because "power, control and sovereignty are not only related to the state and nation, but also to the relationship between gender and nation".[321] Indeed, if the nation is an imagined community, this imagining must also have a gender dimensions[322] – since the descriptions of nations cannot be made without images or metaphors, nor can they be done without gender.[323] On the other hand, nationalism is also a gendered concept, because socially constructed ideas of femininity and masculinity shape the political participation of men and women in nation building.[324]

Anthropologist Nükhet Sirman points out that gender and nationalism are mutually interdependent processes that create one another. She emphasizes the

---

them to die (Ibid pp. 55–56). Millas evaluates Tarık Buğra's novels that have *Romioi* characters: "Sexuality is important in Turkish-Romioi relationships. Romioi women always fall in love with 'calm and dignified' Turks. They cannot resist the sexual attraction of the Turk; they 'flirt' with them. Romioi men have inadequate and incomplete aspects" (Ibid, p.71). While Romiois are represented in this manner, there are different representations of foreigners such as French or English. It can be argued that in the literary works, films or TV series, a French servant or nanny, and the Romioi maid did not receive the same meaning; while the former is characterized as positive as the representative of an emulated culture, the latter was portrayed as one of "us" who is marginalized. Recommendations for reading in this regard: Hülya Adak, *Otobiyografik Benliğin Çok-Karakterliliği: Halide Edibin İlk Romanlarında Toplumsal Cinsiyet*, Elif Gözdaşoğlu Küçükalioğlu, *Imagi-nation of Gendered Nationalism: The Representation of Women as Gendered National Subjects in Ottoman-Turkish Novels (1908–1938)* Bilkent University.

321 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Guest Editor's Introduction: The Awkward Relationship: Gender and Natioanalism", *Nations and Nationalism* 6(4), 491–494, 2000, p. 491.

322 Glenda Sluga, "Female and National Self Determination: A Gender Re-reading of the Apogee of Nationalism", *Nations and Nationalism* 6(4), 495–521, 2000, p. 495.

323 Silke Wenk, "Gendered Representations of the Nation's Past and Future," in Blom, Hagemann and Hall (eds.), *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the Long Nineteenth Century*, Berg, Oxford, New York 2000, p. 63.

324 Sikata Banerjee, "Gender and Nationalism: The Masculinization of Hinduism and Female Political Participation in India", *Women's Studies International Forum* 26(2), 167–179, 2003, pp. 167–169.

importance of tracing the relationship between the perceptions of nation and gender in relation to mutual construction and identification. Since a nation defines its women and men differently than other nations, it creates both its own nature and the gender relations.[325]

As Nira Yuval-Davis, who is well known for his work in the field of women and nationalism, argues that "womenhood" is a relational category. Yuval-Davis examined the contribution of gender relations to some basic dimensions of nationalist projects in her book *Gender and Nation,* and concluded that afore-mentioned dimensions include national reproduction, national culture, national citizenship and wars.[326] Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias, in *Women, Nation, State,* suggest that women's national importance is based on their reproductive roles which include biological and ideological reproduction, reproduction or ethnic or national boundaries (with the restriction of sexual or marital relations), the transmission of culture and the participation in national struggles.[327] The nationalist view that sees women as the agents of cultural transmission also puts the burden of protecting this heritage on women, because they see women as bearers of "traditions" and as the reservoirs of culture, customs and language.[328] The importance of this "central" role of women is especially apparent in their becoming the targets for stereotyping and offensive acts, as well as their exclusion in case of Muslim-Christian inter-faith marriages. For this reason, one can argue that those who have teenage girls were more anxious and decided to migrate.

In this section analyzing the process of deciding whether to go or stay, we must also focus on those who did not migrate, or in other words, who stayed. It is important to know why they stayed back, why they did not leave. However, there is a disturbing aspect to this point: There is an implicit emphasis that staying was the unusual and unexpected choice of action.

---

325 Nükhet Sirman, "Kadınların Milliyeti", in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, pp. 226–227.

326 Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*, Sage Publications, London, 1997, pp. 1–3.

327 Floya Anthias and Nira Yuval-Davis, *Women, Nation, State,* The Macmillan Press, London, 1989, p. 7.

328 Georgios Agelopoulos, "Mothers of the Nation: Gender and Ethnicity in Greek Macedonia", *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: A Critical Review, Workshop IV, Ethnicity, Culture and Identity*, The Netherlands Universities Institute for Coordination of Research in Social Sciences, 1993, p. 9.

Those who left – Those who stayed

Phoebe,[329] who lives in Athens, has not been to Istanbul, the *City*, ever since she left with her family when she was eight years old, because of the fear she felt. She describes the Romioi living in Istanbul as "*brave*". *Miltos,* also migrated at the end of the 70's, stresses how hard it was to stay, and he describes who stayed in Istanbul as "*they must be heroes*". Staying meant to continually take the risk of being attacked, to put up with the psychological attacks of the powerful, and in a sense to accept physical destruction. *Dimitris*, who lives in Istanbul, tells the decision-making process and leaving as follows:

> "We also had a migration attempt in 1980, because there was no one left in the family but us. No uncles or brothers, we were the only family left. Greece was galloping towards the European Union then, and those who had already migrated kept inviting us – 'its heavenly here, come on already'".

Dimitris and his family decided to move to Greece in June 1980. They went abroad for the first time. On their arrival, they saw that the conditions were not quite the same as they were told, they came back to Istanbul after a few months. A place to stay in Athens turned out to be a major problem:

> "Of course, everybody invites you, it's good for a few days, but then you start disturbing their family life. Another thing is to keep the family together. We were also offered places to stay separately until we got on our feet, one with an aunt, another with the grandmother, all over the place. My mother said 'it's not going to happen. Either we stay together, or we go back to Istanbul'".

Dimitris, who explained their reasons to leave as the Right-Left conflict in Turkey at the time and the promise of a better education in Greece, adds that emigrants lived "*in a country where the future is darker and less certain, particularly for Greece, when they looked into 30 years ahead*" and he gives his aunt's "*unrest*" as an example via Easter:

> "See, I celebrate Easter Eve with three hundred people here and I explained many times how much I enjoy it. It's customary to bring candles home from church, light them up, place a cross at the door. She can't do it at Faliro for security concerns, even though he stays at his aunt's that's only a few blocks away from the church. They're afraid of theft or

---

329 *Phoebe*: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. She is from Tarabya and Buyukada; lives in Athens. The interviews were held in Athens in November 2010 and November 2011. She migrated with her family when she was 10. She met her husband *Zenos* (Romioi of Istanbul) in Athens and got married. *Phoebe* has never been able to come to Istanbul because of emotional reasons since the beginning of the 1960s.

vandalism. I can do it in Istanbul, which is considered to be an unsafe, risky place. So, I guess certain things are fate. You have to be patient, persistent. (..) So they left and then what, are they in peace? No. Of course, I am telling you all of this sincerely and openly, but they all would say 'oh no, were fine!', even my own aunt. There is nothing that stings more than hearing my aunt on the Easter Eve saying she would 'stay home and watch it on the television', when my mother calls her to celebrate her Easter as she gets ready for to church. They left but they paid the price. They went to bed hungry. Many of the Romioi who migrated from Istanbul lived through that. They went hungry, broke. That's why I want to stay here and grow my roots. I don't expect a positive discrimination here and I will not take a negative one. I just want to live like an ordinary citizen, by the virtue of my, ID" (Dimitris, Istanbul).

When interviewee *Dimitris* tells about how they stayed back, he uses intense references to religious connotations such as "fate, patience, perseverance". Likewise, it is striking how he evaluates the feelings of his aunt, who lives in Athens, over Easter, to explain why he is happy to have stayed. This needs a closer look.

Dimitris's emphasis that Istanbul, then defined as insecure and risky, is now safer than Athens could be interpreted as a closure of an ambiguity in the past that has been created by the attempted migration. This is actually the result of a comparison made today, looking back. Regardless of their reasons for staying, those who chose not to leave however, are also subject to the pressure of the environment, which was regarded as insecure, because now they have to live with a "what if?" Still, there is a sense of relief validating the correctness of their decision to stay, upon realizing that those who left are not as safe and prosperous in today's economic conjuncture as they thought they would be. At the same time, there is a sense of resentment and criticism as well, that can be observed in phrases like "*if you had looked after us, we would have come too*" or "*you left 'us' alone here, you abandoned us, but you are lonely too*", or "*'we' are celebrating Easter here with three hundred people, you are celebrating it alone*". In addition to the earlier Romioi identity components, the experiences of staying/migrating were also added to the formation of "*we*". A kind of empathy, a unity, brought about by sharing a common "destiny" is added to the layers of the group identity. Being a group, clamping tight, is a kind of existence or survival strategy. Such comradery is a very important link for the psychological strength of people who feel abandoned.

One of the important issues that *Dimitris* emphasizes was being able to become an "ordinary" citizen. "*I am a first-class citizen*" and "*I want to live in accordance with the ID I have*" are claims for his civil rights, or what they should be, and at the same time a critique of their absence. In other words, it is emphasized that

they are not quite accepted or regarded as citizens. However, what a citizen needs are his/her rights to be not arbitrary. Traces of tensions with respect to citizen-state are hidden in modernity, nationalism and the nation-state process, as discussed in the previous section. As sociologist Haldun Gülalp puts it, although the nation-states define their national communities in different ways, ethnic or religious identity lies at the core of this definition, implicitly and or explicitly. The identity also affects conduct of the state regarding its citizens.[330] The cultural theorist and sociologist Stuart Hall and political scientist David Held draw attention to the need to elaborate the processes that determine the results – the "double focus" of citizenship – equal rights and equal practices. Thus, equal rights arise not only for equal rights to cast votes, but also for the conditions of political understanding, involvement of collective decision-making process and settings of the political agenda which make the vote meaningful.[331]

It is a democratic obligation of a state to provide equal rights to decision-making processes and agenda-setting. As a citizen, it is a cause of tension to live with the feeling that their rights can be revoked any time if they are considered to be "out of compliance" with the core elements of national identity. A life of insecurity, constant ups and downs had a widespread effect on people and the Romioi community. So, people migrated. Usually the first and last stop was Athens. Those who stayed lost their closest relatives and friends with these departures. This tiring situation naturally would not end with migration for the people exhausted with the 'burden' of their identity. The cost of immigration was heavy on the people. While those who stayed back felt the weight and sorrow of their reduced numbers, those who left were faced with the struggle for a new life.

Those who went to Athens had two elements, which could potentially unite them with Greeks in Athens: language and religion. In addition to this, the presence of the Romioi who had formerly migrated from Istanbul was also an important support in terms of settlement, employment and companionship. These factors facilitated adaptation in Athens, but they were not miracles. As İlay Romain Örs argues in his work on the Romioi of Istanbul in Athens, while the Romioi and the Greek shared the basic dimensions of identity such as language, religion and ethnicity, the Romioi in Athens had different cultural identities.[332]

330　Haldun Gülalp, "Introduction: Citizenship vs. Nationality", in Gülalp (ed.), *Citizenship and Ethnic Conflict, Challenging the nation-state,* Routledge, New York, 2006, p. 2.

331　Stuart Hall and David Held, "Citizens and Citizenship", in Hall and Jacques (eds.), *New Times: Changing Face of Politics in the 1990's*, Lawrence & Wishart Ltd, London, 1989. p. 185.

332　Örs, ibid, p. 212.

Before moving on to the resettlement issues, it will be appropriate to discuss the psychological environment prior to the departure for those who have left Istanbul and migrated to Athens.

Fear-worry: *"Always a fear, an uneasiness. . ."*

"Always a fear, an uneasiness. . . It happened a lot during the Cyprus events.[333] Our neighborhood was all Turkish, there were no Romioi. During the blackouts,[334] they stoned and flashed lights through our house. It was a very scary night. I can never forget it, especially the fear in my mother's eyes. We were not crazy to leave our dear home, why should we? But we were very scared..." (Elena, Athens).

There is an important debate on what it means and where it leads people, when they are constantly in fear that something will happen and to realize that it is not an individual concern, but a result of collective hostility. For this reason, it is first necessary to define anxiety and fear.

Although anxiety have different meanings depending on the context or theoretical perspective in which it is used, it generally can be described as an uneasiness or worry caused by anticipation of danger. Fear is roughly a strong emotional response to a perceived threat. According to these definitions, the distinction between fear and anxiety appears to be the presence of an object, a thing, in fear. Psychologist Stanley Rachman, known for his theoretical and clinical work on anxiety disorders, described anxiety as "a tense unsettling anticipation of a threatening, but formless event; a feeling of uneasy suspense", while fear is an emotional reaction to an identifiable threat. According to him, while the rise and decline of fear are limited with time and space, anxiety is more persistent and tends to spread in time.[335] Sara Ahmed, Cultural Studies Theorist, emphasized that emotions determine proximity to others in his work *The Cultural Politics of Emotion,* and describes emotions as "the very 'flesh' of time".[336]

According to Ahmed, fear, like pain, has an unpleasant intensity, and when fear is experienced, the unpleasantness is also linked to the future. Fear involves an *anticipation* of hurt and injury, so there is already a move to the future. Ahmad states that the fear projects us from the present into future. It is the reaction to

---

333 The Cypriot issue is detailed in the footnotes, in the section titled *Anthropological Journey*.

334 The interviewee is referring to the blackout nights in 1974.

335 Stanley J. Rachman, *Anxiety,* Psychology Press Ltd, New York, 2004, p. 3.

336 Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion,* Edinburg University Press, Edinburg, 2004, pp. 52, 201.

what is approaching than what is present. Ahmed, who also examined the relationship between fear and body, indicates that fear involves a physical retraction and shrinkage. The shrinkage is significant as it shows that emotions function to alter the bodily space so as to make it compatible with the social space. This results in the restriction of the movement of some bodies, and the free movement of others in public space. Ahmed points that some people claim more of the public space because of the non-uniform reactions to fear in the public arena.[337] Uneasiness in the areas of *contact zone* with the "other", in other words, outside the churches, schools and associations that are the "inner" spaces of the Romioi, and Ahmad's "analysis of spatial politics of fear, in other words, restrictions of the mobility in public space",[338] will be discussed in anecdotes in the following section, *Place and Memory*. It was the attacks to a more intimate area, that is, inside the home that further intensified the uneasiness felt in the public space and lead to migration. As anthropologist Aksu Bora emphasizes, our home is our world, our first universe. It's a real cosmos.[339]

During September 6–7 events, the Romioi of Istanbul were attacked in their homes where they most comfortably felt safe, along with their parents or acquaintances. The fear in the face of a direct threat to their most intimate spaces, combined with other dreadful past experiences left deep psychological scars on the Romioi of Istanbul. This situation widened the span of fear and loaded other peoples' past fears onto the person. Thus, the feeling that "this *City*, where they have lived together with Turks and other minorities for centuries, and their homes are no longer safe for the Romioi" was formed, or once more reinforced. This widened and deepened fear, in other words, a fear that became a collective fear, was very influential on people. Under such an emotional pressure, people could abruptly decide to migrate upon a single comment they hear, without an apparent or specific reason.

Timon's[340] departure is an example. *Timon* migrated to Athens in 1973. His mother and sister followed later:

"I was not necessarily an advocate of leaving. One day I met an old classmate from St. Joseph[341] at the ferry. We hadn't seen each other for almost ten years. He

---

337 Ibid, pp. 65–70.

338 Ibid, p. 15.

339 Aksu Bora, "Rüyası Ömrümüzün Çünkü Eşyaya Siner", in Alkan (ed.), *Cins Cins Mekân*, Varlık Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, p. 63.

340 *Timon*: Male. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. He is from Kadikoy. He had to go by leaving his parents. Then he lost his father, brought his mother and sister to Athens. His wife *Dimitra* is Romioi of Cihangir. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010.

341 It is a private French high school founded in 1870 and located in Kadikoy, Istanbul.

used to live in Moda. Do you know what his first words to me were? *'Are you still here?!'* And I asked him '*What do you mean? Why do you ask that?*' Then he said *'after St. Joseph I went to Canada. Now I am back to collect my parents. It's over for you, for us.'* Things went downhill from there. . . I went to my father and said *'dad, that's the talk in town'* so we decided to move. We came here in 1973. My father could not come with us, and later he died there" (Timon, Athens).

Many of the Romioi of Istanbul, like *Timon,* had to leave their parents behind. This was undoubtedly a difficult decision. They had to make such a decision, because they did not see a safe future anymore when they lived day to day, always fearing that they might be at risk any given moment just because they were Romioi. Another example of this situation was *Joanna*'s grandmother. *Joanna* points out that her grandmother came to their house every day with the newspaper: *"She just said 'read' – she did not speak much Turkish. Let's see what the papers say today for us, for the Romioi".* This anecdote summarizes the common concern of many Romioi and the dimension of fear stemming from uncertainty; and this fear is like a part of identity.

We now know that the concept of identity is closely related to the prejudices, fears, and insecurities that are formed or reinforced in the process of interaction with the State, the majority society and other groups. It is a process that is both based on innate references and is shaped by experiences. It is a multifaceted process that includes abstract and concrete bonds, such as security, love and friendship that reflect how someone perceives, is perceived, and is identified. For *Joanna*'s grandmother, how they were seen and represented by the media in the Turkish society, where they lived as a minority, was important. Because, especially in the *tough years*, it was a matter of security to daily monitor weather or not they were being seen as they belonged "there". This pursuit, pointing to a deep security concern, is also the foundation of survival strategies that require anticipating the attitudes they would be exposed to. At this point, the role of the media in creating the "other" should be briefly mentioned.

Anderson says that in the 18th century of Europe, the structure of two forms of imagining – the novels and the newspaper – were the technical means of 're-presenting', what *kind* of imagined community the nation is.[342] Thus, the media that serves or could serve the creation or exclusion of the "other" also has a function in the formation of the "fictitious community" as well as the "unwanted community".

---

342 Anderson, ibid, pp. 24–25.

In this respect, Turkish media has quite "rich" historical examples. Because of this rich history, the first thing that the people who were not in this fictitious community looked for was what was said about them. Thus, either anxiety, or confidence would emerge or intensify, and then attitudes and behaviors would be adjusted accordingly. Such a situation tangibly shows that the "minority" position is determined according to what the majority thinks about them. It also means an important power relation, a dominance, which places the majority in a privileged and superior position against the "minority". This reminds us of theorist Antonio Gramsci's understanding of the power relations and the concrete ways resulting from those relations that the subalterns and subordinated people live.[343] Subaltern refers to communities that are not represented in the structure of the hegemonic groups in general terms, and which are objectified communities, not subjects. According to Gramsci, the main character of subaltern culture derives from their being 'historically on the defensive'. Their subordination and subalternity determine their perceptions of the world.[344]

It is not the information produced by the subaltern that is circulated through newspaper news. The message of power, in other words of the sovereign, is produced, and then this "information" becomes the source of the power of sovereign. This cycle signifies a mutually inclusive structure between the knowledge-dominant / power-force. It can be argued that this is equivalent to the information-power-force relationship that Michel Foucault points to. At this point it will be useful to elaborate on the relationship in question.

Power is everywhere: *"We have concrete fears inside . . ."*

Foucault notes that he regards the power mechanism as a form of capillary existence, in which the sovereign power reaches to the seeds and bodies of individuals, penetrates their attitudes, discourses, learning, and everyday life.[345] Stating that the power mechanisms and strategies have never been studied much in history, Foucault points out that instead, people who held power were analyzed and that this is the history of anecdotes of the kings and commanders. Another neglected matter has been the relationship between power and knowledge, and

---

343 Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci,* International Publishers, New York, 1971.

344 Kate Crehan, *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology,* Pluto Press, London, Sterling Virginia, 2002, pp. 98–100.

345 Michel Foucault, "Entretien sur la prison: le livre et sa méthode," (entretien avec J.-J. Brochier), *Magazine Littéraire*, no 101, (Juin 1975), pp. 27–33.

how they affect one another. Foucault attempts to make appear a perpetual articulation of power over knowledge and knowledge about power. The exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and conversely, knowledge brings about effects of power. In other words, it is not possible that power is exercised without knowing, it is not possible that knowledge does not generate power.[346] Foucault draws attention to the direction in which power produces subjectivity and defines power as "the multiplicity of power relations which are inherent in the domain in which they are exercised and constitute their organization".[347] Therefore;

> "Power is everywhere ready and proud (. . .) This is because it is produced at every instant, at every point, or moreover in every relation between one point and another. Power is everywhere: not that it engulfs everything, but that it comes from everywhere".[348]

Foucault argues that power is not an institution, it is not a structure, but it is a complex situation in a society given that forms everything that participates in its exercise and subjects.[349] When we return to the position that Foucault determines in his conception of power that the attitudes of the "minority" are shaped according to what majority thinks about them, the power mechanism in question determines the dissemination of information through the media and the discourse of establishing majority and minority entities. With these discourses that influence the daily use of public space, the majority can become ready for manipulation while the minorities are withdrawn. It is not difficult to predict the result of the reflection of the power mechanism. With the emotional and sensuous newspapers and radio news that the listeners or readers may be able to reason with, the collective delusions are clearly visible in the events of September 6–7 where violence has taken place.

Joanna's father, who lives in Sisli, Istanbul, had a barber shop in Pangalti and was attacked during the events of September 6–7. In the following years, the business got worse with public exhortations like "*do not patronize the infidels' shops*". She describes their departure as "*it was not after a major event, but just like everyone else, my family also anticipated difficulties ahead and we just packed and left.*" Interviewees commonly pointed out that such foresight and intuition were associated with the minority identity. *Miltos* describes this as follows:

---

346 Ibid, 27–33.
347 Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité 1, La volonté de savoir*, Gallimard, 1976, pp. 121–122.
348 Ibid, p. 122.
349 Ibid, p. 123.

> "We carry indelible fears. It is a unique experience to live as a minority, it builds certain skills. You can always find yourself in jeopardy. If you're a minority, you have to think ahead about potential obstacles and how to overcome them" (Miltos, Athens).

As *Miltos* emphasizes, being a minority has a significant influence on the formation of personality. One has to have a strategy at all times. This necessity corresponds to reacting tactically to an environment defined by the strategies of power structures, as suggested by the social scientist Michel de Certeau.[350] Interviewee *Miltos* says that this pre-planning is not a habit for the Greeks:

> "That's where we differ from the Greek. We try to predict the future and anticipate what can happen. When you don't live as a minority, the Government does the thinking and planning for you; you don't have to worry" (Miltos, Athens).

Here we are talking about the consequences of being "having a state" and "stateless", that is, a collective belonging that is not organized by an organized power, or is less powerful, as being a "foreigner" within the State. In a sense, the State is a mechanism that decides on behalf of a person. If there are no mechanisms like this, then the person is on his own, and he in a sense creates a mechanism with tactics, always holding that he is alone. It becomes necessary to be particularly careful, especially in the public sphere, for the people whose loyalty is constantly challenged because of their minority status, which leads to an intense concern for the individual and therefore the society. *Elena* describes as follows:

> "Always a hesitation, an anxiety. . . We worried constantly. We could not speak in our own language, otherwise they would stare down on us" (Elena, Athens).

Leonidas recalls that when they slipped and spoke out loud in Romioi, their mothers would warn them "*quiet, they will hear you!*". *Elena* habitually reverts to this muteness when she travels to Turkey. "*I passed this down to my child, 'don't talk, tone it down'. . .*"

Trying to be quiet and invisible in the public arena suggests that the individual is facing "insignificance", feels politically oppressed, at least restricted in his self-realization, and therefore his identity is threatened. Public domain sharing depends on verbal, face-to-face, that is versatile, deep and real communication. By prohibiting the language, those in the minority are prevented from sharing the public space; because a satisfying communication between people

---

350 Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life,* University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984.

and groups can only be achieved by internalizing differences without being assimilated. A consequence of this restriction on sharing is alienation.[351]

This muteness and alienation is far from being fulfilling, neither intellectually and emotionally. It is not possible to plan for the long term in such an environment. In this sense, it is not easy for the Romioi youth to plan their future. As a matter of fact, an unfortunate experience at ITU's [352] Department of Mechanical Engineering confirmed for *Zenos*[353] that he was not welcome there. He decided to drop out after this incident, even though he had chosen to study at the ITU over Robert College due to their impeccable academic staff, having been accepted by all three institutions after graduating from Zografion High School.[354] The incident that persuaded him to leave is arresting in the way it demonstrates how fast the message of the powerful will strike, when delivered using the twist of language and especially humor:

> "It was just before Eid-al-adha (Muslim feast of sacrifice). Actually, we were quite at ease at school, we did not have any issues. The students expelled from the military academy were placed with multiple colleges and some ended up in our class. One day while they were talking among themselves about the inflated prices of sacrificial animals, one of them turned around to face me and said, 'I wonder if we should slaughter a Romioi this year instead?'" (Zenos, Athens)

Another interviewee, *Miltos*, said about his departure: "*I wanted and decided to leave when I realized I was an unwanted man*". Deciding to leave for being "unwanted" and doing it is an experience that can shake the foundations of cultural and subjective belonging. "Desired" and "unwanted" positions are those that indicate power/ownership/sovereignty. "Owner" does not want "the other". If the "other" sees himself as "unwanted", being "owned" is in a sense accepted, even though this acceptance is a necessity. The increasing difficulty of being a Greek, feeling different, alienation, processes of exclusion and the perception of being "unwanted" exacerbated by historical events have triggered migration.

---

351 "Alienation is the name of adaptations in which the flow of human and social life cannot solve the nature outside of themselves, cannot understand and are directed by the power(s) which they are helpless against and submit that they cannot have influence on those power(s)" (Sibel Özbudun, George Markus and Temel Demirer, *Yabancılaşma ve . . .* Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, Ankara, 2007, p. 45).

352 It refers to Istanbul Technical University.

353 *Zenos*: Male. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010 and 2011. He has never been able to come to Istanbul because of emotional reasons, since the beginning of the 1960s.

354 It is private Romioi High School.

Inability to return: *"What if something had happened to that heaven?"*

An individual's life is deeply affected and altered by immigration. What they actually experience is an uprooting from the place of their bitter-sweet days in living and sharing. It's such a disengagement that it could be traumatic enough to prevent a return "there". *Zenos* and *Phoebe* are examples of this situation. They left Istanbul at different ages, then they met one other in Athens and got married. Neither could dare going back to Istanbul, not even once, ever since they left. While *Zenos* explains that he loves and misses Istanbul very much and he gets excited when he sees the city on television, he doesn't know how he would feel if he actually went back there, and that it scares him. *Phoebe* shares her vacillating memories of swimming in the waters of the Bosphorus in front of their home in Tarabya, which she left when she was eight, and the red childhood dress that her grandmother decorated with the star and crescent from cotton, after cutting it up, on September 6th, 1955:

> "I can't even begin to describe Istanbul, it meant heaven to me. And Athens means freedom. We were forced to decide between heaven and freedom (. . .) I can't go, I am terrified. I am really afraid thinking 'What if something happens to me?' What scares me more than that though, is thinking 'what if something happened to my heaven?'" (Phoebe, Athens).

Phoebe's inability to come back to Istanbul could be interpreted as an effort to protect the heaven image, in other words the only thing that remained from her past. Identifying Istanbul as "heaven" and Athens as liberty is remarkable. While "heaven" refers to religion, liberty is a term that appeared during the Enlightenment era. Here, the placement of Istanbul-Athens and heaven-liberty at opposite sides reminds us of the religion and modernity dilemma. The image of "heaven" refers to infinite happiness and fantasy. Childhood memories are assumed to be related to an individual's past; hence her description of Istanbul, the place of her childhood memories, with the concept of "heaven", which refers to a future existence and holiness, is remarkable. In the conceptualization of faith, "heaven" is usually a place where good people can reach. The fear seems to be related to losing this strong sensory image, and not coming to Istanbul is an effort to preserve this image. In a sense, the determination of "heaven" is a statement of wish, to not lose the spatial belonging based on their existence, "roots". Heaven is the name of houses, property, place/country lived in, liberty, honorable citizenship, and friendships that they once had, and the name of security which all of these are formed in together; the place where they all were realized

is Istanbul. Hence the fear is related to all of these. Another interviewee *Orestis* analyses this fear as follows:

> "Unfortunately, there are many like that, and I know a few of them personally. I often meet an old class mate, and no matter what I say, however many times I repeat 'come, things have changed', it doesn't change a thing. It is both horrible and very sad at the same time. It's their own responsibility that they can't overcome this trauma, but it is heartbreaking nevertheless. It surprises me as well, that 40 or 50 years have gone by and they still say 'no, I am not going there, I don't want to remember again, ever'. Many can't take that first step, it just doesn't work remotely, from a distance. It's a concept in psychoanalysis as well, that you need to go back to the place of trauma, to overcome it. You can't beat it by not going back" (Orestis, Athens).

Not willing to remember indicates deep emotions, unresolved issues that still affect an individual. Interviewee *Angelos* dramatically describes the characteristics of this fear and its persistence to date.

> "Even after 15 or 20 years, people refrain from actively participating in Romioi community meetings if there is a discussion on Turkey; they don't want to talk. I know some people who were afraid to attend the session when the professor's book was being introduced. 'What if there is someone from the consulate, or what if they inform on me to Turks, denounce me?' When we told them 'that's no longer your business, what do you care? You live here now, they revoked your citizenship' their response was 'you never know.' They are so terrorized. The fear has become a part of their identity (...) One should not let himself be in this situation, but there are people who can never overcome this trauma. It's so severe that I believe it's actually a social issue for the Romioi. I mean, this is a serious identity crisis for the Romioi of Turkish origin. But nobody pressed the issue so far and so it is not resolved. The trauma is not defeated. We just continue living with our Post Traumatic Stress Disorder .." (Angelos, Athens).

This trauma, described by interviewee *Angelos* as a part of Romioi identity and an important identity problem, has a collective quality. Collective traumas are experiences shared by a certain group and related to this group's identity. The perception of threat felt in the past continues despite the change in anxiety due to living space and conditions, and this determines the individuals' attitudes.

It could be concluded that with migration people did not lose only their houses and property, but they also lost churches, schools, coffeehouses, patisseries which carried elements of their cultural lives; in other words, they lost a set of things that they had built their identity on. Hence it feels as if they lost all cultural texture, which contained all patterns of their lives, where they lived, breathed and existed. Another issue that made the loss even bigger was what awaited them in the new place they went to. Struggle for survival would not end with migration,

but continues in another way, wherever they went. In the next section, I will try to illustrate the effects of migration on the identities of those settled in Athens.

Settling in Athens: *"They never liked us, not at all"* – *"Mythos"*

> "Initially they called us the *Turkosposori* (Turkish Seed), they never liked us, not at all. However, since 99% of those from Anatolia were hardworking, skilled, and educated people of a different culture, they gradually rose to the top. Then they started to appreciate us. Now they respect us: 'You're from Anatolia'..." (Xanthus, Athens).

Xanthus emphasizes that, contrary to what was initially believed, early on they were not welcomed, and they encountered major bureaucratic obstacles in Greece, and they were kept waiting for years for residence permits or citizenship.

Acceptance – recognition

Restrictions and negative characterizations have a history dating back to the population exchange. As pointed by anthropologist Renée Hirschon, the major problems, costs, and threats posed by the settlement of large numbers of people with the exchange lead to hostility and rejection. According to her, this reaction created identity issues among individuals as a common reaction in many similar cases. She points out the uses of pejorative names such as 'Turkish seed' (tourkosporoi), 'baptized in yogurt' (yiaourtovaptismenoi) or 'orientals' (anatolites).[355] The sphere of influence of exchange was not limited to stereotyping, or Greece.

Hirschon indicates that the view that the exchange altered the ethnic composition of Greece by creating a more homogeneous society has been persistent and also had a direct impact on the current refugee settlement policies. She underlines that this view oversimplifies the situation and masks a more complex truth. Hirschon draws attention that although they all were Orthodox Christian, the population migrated to Greece included highly diversified subgroups, and a homogeneous community could not be formed because they were differentiated by wealth, language and regional cultural patterns. According to her, while adapting to the new conditions, continuity with the past has been achieved through different ways. Therefore, in the long run, the existence of social and

---

355 Renée Hirschon, "Consequences of the Lausanne Concention: An Overview", in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsary Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004, p. 19.

cultural divisions persists and gets even stronger in certain times (e.g. during the civil war).[356]

On the other hand, during the interview *Hercules* drew attention to a widely held belief that Romioi immigrants were excluded, called it a myth and evaluated this as follows:

> *"*Not true. This is not correct. What is correct is that the immigrants and exchangees of 1923 caused an immense chaos, because one million people arrived into a country of five million. That is a very big number. It turned into a mess, and there were some reactions. Some of those newcomers did not speak Greek either, they would speak in Turkish. It was a shock both for them and the Greeks. 'Not only we lost our jobs to these foreigners, but they don't even speak Greek'. There was an exclusion like that at the time, like the labeling as the Turkish seed, but we did not witness something like that when we arrived. Maybe there were a few outliers, but it was not a common attitude. On the contrary, the Greek government offered them loans, provided pensions and the like. Even those who did not deserve, received pensions. Greece treated them well. The Greek people treated them well too, so the exclusion is a myth. Nobody called the latter arrivals Turkish seed, I never heard it. That's the former generation". (Hercules, Athens)

The forms of adumbrating of exclusion in the daily practices are important where you went. This is usually revealed through various statements from daily language beyond the comments "*why did you come?*" or "*you could have stayed*". Those forms of revealing are strengthened by the support of body language. This always includes the emphasis of "otherness" and is often concentrated on the most sensitive point and converted into a discourse. Here, as in Foucault's understanding, discourse is meant to refer to a structure related to knowledge and hegemony that produces meaning and determines the nature of behavior. Social scientists Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, in their joint work *Hegemony & Socialist Strategy*, base their discussion on subject and discourse, while forming their discourse theory.

They use "subjects" in the sense of "subject positions" in a discursive structure. Hence subjects cannot be the origin of social relations, and all experience depends on precise discursive conditions. They emphasize that every subject position is discursive position, and the opposite is impossible.[357] By following Laclau and Mouffe it could be claimed that a discourse constituted subjects, which becomes evident in the statement of "Turkosposori". The emphasis on "Turkosposori", the Turkish seed, is important as it implies being an appendage

---

356 Ibid, p. 19.

357 Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony & Socialist Strategy, Towards a Radical Democratic Politics,* Verso, London, New York, 1996, p. 115.

of an undesirable mass. It gets more dreadful with expressions like "baptized with yogurt" referring to an invalid baptism, one of the most important rituals in Romioi Orthodox identity. In a sense, this creates a social pressure as it increases the "unwanted" notion when loaded with "corrupt", "filthy" and "contaminated" accents.

The state of being "unwanted" is reflected in multiple ways in the daily language and daily life. It would be appropriate to clarify this by examples from interviews. During the interview, *Joanna* who migrated to Athens in 1972, points to the difficulties in everyday life:

> "Life was not easy. When we arrived, initially they did not want us here, they called us the Turkish seed. The former generation of immigrants had it even worse. They made fun of us, because some of our Romioi words were borrowed from Turkish. Take for example, when my father went to the post office asking for stamps, they laughed at his face: 'What is a stamp? We call it gramatosimo here'" (Joanna, Athens).

Similarly, *Nadia*, who came to Athens in 1974 when she was 21, associates her difficulties with language and alienation:

> "Primarily, it is the language and that you are a foreigner. You are not considered a Greek. You're not even exactly a Turk either. We didn't speak proper Greek in Istanbul, we spoke Romioi. I stayed at the college dorms when I first arrived, and they always made fun of me. Often, I could not pronounce correctly even if I tried. For example, I would say 'haeniii' instead of 'honey' or use some Turkish words that the Romioi included in their vocabulary, but were not known to, or used by the Greek. The mocking was intolerable early on. Then, as I deliberately started to avoid it, it gradually became engraved in my subconscious. Now I speak Greek fluently and can't even speak Romioi anymore" (Nadia, Athens).

Restricting language and mocking about accents or misuse of words force people to make a choice. It could be claimed that while restricting Greek/Romioi language in Turkey meant "You are either a Turk or not", mocking with their Greek/Romioi language in Athens could mean "I know you're not from here, fix your speech". The first is related to ethnic identity, the second is more related to spatial identity. *Nadia* talks about her spatial displacement, describing how she left Istanbul, settled in Athens and later brought her family over:

> "I graduated from Zapion Girls High School and worked there for 3 years (...) There were 28 girls in my graduation class, and I think 21 or 22 had come here. All my girlfriends are long lost now". (Nadia, Athens)

When almost all of *Nadia*'s friends moved to Greece, she felt lonely. Her family opposed to her moving to Athens. She told her family that she would go to London to study English. She stayed in London for 3–4 months. In the meantime,

she found a job, worked and saved money. Then she went to Athens instead of returning to Istanbul. She stayed with her friend and found a job and worked. Then she returned to Istanbul in 1974 and said to her parents, "I am not staying here, it is over, I am going to Athens". She prepared her documents and went to Athens. One year later her father passed away. She took her younger brother along to persuade her mother who was determined not to leave Istanbul. The two children tried to establish a life. After a while her mother came to Athens as well.

Another problem for *Nadia* were the complications during her departures from Greece due to her Turkish passport. Therefore, she decided to take Greek citizenship and she did.

> "Though it was with great difficulty, because I had married then and I could have applied for the Greek passport within a year. But I refused to do so for emotional reasons, and said 'no, I will keep my Turkish passport'. That's when the complications started as Turkey did not allow dual citizenship then" (Nadia, Athens).

The bureaucratic obstacles were among the leading difficulties during the struggle for resettlement. These obstacles also carried an emotional aspect because they forced people to make a choice for citizenship, which then aggravated migration trauma. Another interviewee *Angelos* associates their situation with that of the "illegal immigrants" that is lately on the front burner for Greece:

> "Just like the illegal immigrants coming to Greece. For a period of time, until they become legal and things turn to normal, they feel rather invisible. Indeed, the system does ignore them in a way; their existence is not acknowledged. We lived through such a period as well. The Greek government would not issue visas, so we would stay back. It was such an absurd policy" (Angelos, Athens).

Interviewee *Angelos* relates bureaucratic obstacles with alienation and exclusion. However, there are some opposing views as well. For instance, *Hercules* states that linguistic differences could not be considered as exclusion and he describes alienation as follows:

> "It was immediately apparent. Our accents gave us away; and perhaps it bothered us, the Romioi, but no one told us not to speak. They might have had a giggle if the accent sounded funny. It's the same thing for a Cretan or a Cypriot. For example, I find the Cypriot accent rather amusing, I chuckle. But, I don't think this is exclusion, now is it? Amusing, but not alienating. It would be exclusion if you denied them a job or would not rent your apartment to them. The Romioi of Istanbul who claim otherwise, say so only to Turks so they look more congenial" (Hercules, Athens).

The effort to look congenial or amicable, and to whom it was directed is an important point. If there were no exclusion but the discourse was still directed to Turks, it could be claimed that this discourse included reproach for "we were

actually one of you and you excluded us. You did not want us because we are Greek/Romioi, but we are also not welcome here" and it is a call to empathy. In fact, the descriptions related to the feeling or the concept of exclusion involves different experiences. Interviewee *Akis* explains the bureaucratic obstacles he faced by relating to the discourse of "well, they can always go back".[358] Only now, he says, that they are mockingly told "welcome, please do come in" since there isn't much of a minority left.

> "They are openly mocking us. Because then, while they did not want us here, they also wanted to get us exiled (by Turkey) altogether. It was not enough that we had come. So, they had an agreement with our smart politicians" (Akis, Athens).

When *Akis* wanted to marry *Cleo*,[359] also a Romioi from Istanbul, Greek authorities demanded a document to prove that they were not already married in Turkey. Even if they had married in Turkey, Greek authorities would not accept this marriage and mandate re-marriage in Greece. Either way, Greek governmental agencies demanded the document to prove their marital status from Turkish Embassy. *Akis* describes how his requests for documents ended up with his [Turkish] citizenship being revoked:

> "Our politicians were quite smart; we had to go to the Embassy to receive these papers. Then we would be told 'you need to go back and do your military service.' - 'I don't want to return, I don't want to do the military service, I am still a student' - 'We need your signature then, you need to affirm that you will not do your military service'. Then they would get it through the parliament and have our Turkish citizenship revoked. It's all documented, they wanted to eradicate us. (. . .) In fact, they harmed us badly. We lost our citizenship by this treaty. What if there were some, who planned to go back one day? Maybe not too many, but there were some. But then, we were denied the Greek citizenship; I did not have a Greek passport and I would travel abroad on a 'laisser passer'. Right after I received my Greek passport in 1989, the first thing I did was to go to Istanbul" (Akis, Athens).

The first place *Akis* went, who lived for years without an identity card or passport, was the *City* where he was born and raised, namely Istanbul when he received his Greek passport and identity card. *Akis* needed a document to continue living in Athens and the requirement for that at the time was to drop his Turkish citizenship.

---

358 Ferda Balancar, Azınlıklara 'dönün' demek kolay ama. . .", Agos, Istanbul March 8, 2012.

359 *Cleo*: Female. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. She is from Cihangir. Her husband is *Akis*, Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

Interviewee *Orestis* describes his arrival in early 1990s, what he lived through, and how his citizenship was revoked:

"After graduating from high school, I went abroad to study. It was not a difficult period for me, it was something I was looking forward to (. . .) Sometimes when we arrive here we are reminded of the hard times, we read about how poorly the early Romioi immigrants were treated. I didn't experience anything like that. I was a student after all, I was mostly inside the campus and there were many foreigners then, from Syria, Palestine etc., so nobody cared much. At the time, the leftist movement in Greece was strong and very promising – that things would change. Socialism was everywhere, on the graffiti. . . there were slogans supporting our Turkish socialist brothers, and the proletariat. It was a very different environment. When I returned (to Greece), I went through hell, like many others. I tried to obtain a student visa, but it didn't work. Then suddenly, on a 'beautiful' morning, my Turkish citizenship was revoked. I didn't mind it much then, but now it stings. (..) They were looking for an *excuse*, and once they found it you were expelled immediately, because it did not have a legal basis. There is nothing in international law that dictates citizenships to be revoked for evading draft or avoiding military service. It's not that I had denounced my citizenship and applied for it to be revoked. . . Perhaps there were handful who did so, in order to get a Greek passport, but that would be very few" (Orestis, Athens).

Unlike what the previous immigrants to Athens indicate, *Orestis* stated that he did not have a difficulty related to language in the 1990s when he came, since there were many foreigners as university students.

A "new" place, a "new" life: *"We are lost in the crowd. . ."*

One of the difficulties mentioned during interviews was the feeling of strangeness about arrival at an unfamiliar place. Those, who were taken from a vital climate where they belonged, where they had established a balance, where they were literate in and the bearers and producers of culture, had difficulties to perceive and adapt to the new place where they went to. The primary concerns around the initial uncertainty were the ground rules of the new environment, in other words, how to live, how to behave, how to re-establish their own hierarchy upon arrival. Even if they were a minority in Istanbul, the structures that had been formed there by the strong ties of being "us" as a minority, have dissolved by immigration.

The prevailing uncertainty and feeling lost in a new environment in Athens was a prominent state. Interviewee *Leonidas* explains this as follows:

"Being a minority has both pros and cons. The good thing was, everybody knew each other. Whenever we went for a walk at Beyoglu, my father would raise his fedora hat

-they were quite popular then- every fifty yards to greet someone. We came here and got lost in a crowd. We disappeared." (Leonidas, Athens).

Leonidas describes himself as lost in Athens. By lost he means losing "the solidarity of the social network" formed by acquaintances.[360] Hence, feeling "lost" in this manner can lead to feeling alienated. *Pandelis*[361] describes people in Athens as "*strange*", by which he means very different.

> "They created a havoc for us because of Makarios[362]. He caused the most damage, both for us and the Turks. The Turkish were right. We came here, and no one knew us. I told my wife 'unfortunately, this is not a place to live in, because they are a totally different people' (. . .) Granted, Turkish people are very compassionate. I experienced it a lot, first hand. If you treated them a cup of coffee, they would remember that for decades. I love Turkey, and the Turkish. . . they are a unique people" (Pandelis, Athens).

This interpretation makes us think that they were avoiding the heavy and risky situation of being in opposition, by legitimizing what had happened. *Pandelis* who left Turkey in 1964 came to Athens alone. First, he rented a house with two rooms. His son and wife came later. *Pandelis* did not know anybody in Athens, and nobody knew him. Therefore, he identifies this place, where "quite different" people live as he says, as too negative to live in. Before migration *Pandelis*[363] learned art of couture from a famous tailor when he lived in Istanbul. He became a well-known tailor in Istanbul and Ankara. He now dresses well-known people in Athens as well. It is noteworthy how *Pandelis* did not mention any unpleasant

---

360 Roger Zetter, "The Greek-Cypriot Refugees: Perceptions of Return under Conditions of Protracted Exile", *International Migration Review*, 28(2), 307–322, 1994, p. 318.

361 *Pandelis*: Male. Mid-nineties. He lived in Istanbul and Ankara. He came to Athens alone. Then his wife and child came. The interview was made in Athens in 2010.

362 Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church in Cyprus and the President of the Republic of Cyprus.

363 He did not mention issues such as why he had to come. When I asked "where were you in 6–7 September" to broach the subject, he changed the subject, showed me a business cards of a Turkish colonel and a Turkish consulate official. Then he passed into other subjects. His father was a fisherman and he brought sponge to Turkey for the first time. He was a friend of the government's son, sent him lobster. He also sent him to Atatürk. Her father was called to Yalova. "*Doctor, Atatürk in turn, asking how is this work, sponge business? . . . And my father's motorist Atatürk footstep. It has done a lot to me* ". When I asked about Easter, he wanted to correct the mistake of the sacrifice by showing the Turkish text that he prepared for the celebration of the Feast of the Sacrifice: "*I congratulate your sacrifice feast, I wish for you and all the Turkish nation happiness.*"

memories and stressed that he used to dress the senior military personnel and bureaucrats in Ankara and proudly cited the memory of his father meeting Atatürk, and when asked about memories of Easter, he replied "*ask me Eid-al-Adha*". His preference seems to indicate a deep silence. A question asked by a bureaucrat while living in Turkey sheds light on the reasons for this silence:

> "He was a customer at the store. I went by him and he ordered coffee. Then he asked me 'promise that you will reply honestly: Do you like Turkey or Greece better?' 'I don't deny that Greece is my mother – would you deny your mother? My father is Turkey. And they are divorced. I love my mother. But I love my father too. You know why? Because all my inheritance is with my father, my vested interest lies on my father's side'" (Pandelis, Athens).

"*Greece or Turkey?*" question includes an interrogation when it comes from a bureaucrat. This kind of question-answer exemplifies that they are constantly seen as unreliable people and hence they need to create a strategic attitude towards it. This situation seems to be the base of an internalized functional silence. This silence necessitates examining the mother-father reference and Greece-Turkey dilemma in the answer more closely.

This dilemma is not simple; it forms individuals and societies, and at the same time it points a power relationship related to gender roles. His description of Turkey as a father is important. In one sense, he is giving due credit that can be summarized as "he is the father, so can be both loving and strict at the same". However, it is remarkable that it shows the construction of authority beyond giving credit. The communication with it, actually, is suited to the relationship between full sovereign and the "other". Although being "chosen", having been "invited for coffee by the sovereign" points that he is the son of that father, the way he was questioned with a demand for promise of honesty indicates an ambiguous position in the relationship.

Divorce analogy in mother-father, Greece-Turkey dilemma is also important. The father is strong, the whole system is at his service and he can use violence. He divorces the mother and the child takes shelter in the mother. Children must do with less and consent to what they have. However, the father is still loved, and respected. The child is ready to fall into father's arms and forget what happened whenever the father wants. Because this is the lesser of two evils and being closer to him is a survival strategy. This would provide endurance, strength to survive. The opposite means dealing with the absence of a father or feeling not loved, and this is not easy.

On the other hand, it is necessary to form a new life and add a positive value to this life, wipe the state clean, and break with the past from one's own

perspective. However, in either case, this new life is constructed over the sensorial base of past. As such a "new" life begins at a "new" home where the "spirit" of past, which either follows them wherever they go, or which they do not want to leave behind. In a sense these "new" lives, which involve many places, people, and traditions of the past, are also sanctuaries of the past. This is a structure that reflects Istanbul origins or roots. Architect Vasso Stelaku, who works on the population exchange, draws attention to the time perception of those who have been cut off from their roots. Individuals and immigrants who are cut off from their roots take shelter in "a narrow present".[364] Stelaku emphasizes that memories, experiences and life styles of refugees, their known past to which they cling obsessively. According to him, the reasons of this obsession are: to perceive the present time as a temporary stage; their refusal to identify themselves in a present, which is complicated, unfamiliar, and uncontrolled; their conscious efforts to maintain their history, and to rebuild their identity. Besides the remembering process, Stelaku claims that refugees try to adapt their symbols to the new environment in the host country, and by this way they reclaim their past through replicating their culture. As a result, one of the characteristics of refugee communities is the preservation of the past. They usually do that by reproducing a similar environment to the one they have formed for generations at homeland, in new place they arrived.[365]

When they arrived at the more rural life of Athens from bourgeois quarters of Istanbul, a relatively more developed city, the city accepts them, but does not embrace them. They are aware that they can be understood by immigrants like themselves who also came from Istanbul, but not by others. New friendships and gatherings make them feel that they have a place in Athens, while causing the negative memories they experienced in Turkey to fade. The rate of fading increases the reasons to further secure their lives in the new house, new place.

Social mechanisms such as Federations and Associations are important tools to deal with alienation. Being an Istanbulite is a commonality that draws people together. Although the definition of being Istanbulite varies from person to person or from time to time, it is the name of a place where remarkable memories of childhood and youth are accumulated. Getting together in associations

---

364 Vasso Stelaku – the source of the quotation: Kevin Lynch, *What time is this place?* MIT Press Media, 1972, p. 132. Stelaku, "Space, Place and Identity: Memory and Religion in Two Cappadocian Greek", in Hirschon (ed.), in *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsary Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004, p. 179.

365 Ibid, pp. 179–180.

and coffeehouses, sharing with each other their migration experiences and the
feelings of strangeness towards the new place are one of the most basic strategies
to deal with traumatic situation that they are in. This is also a new "us", a new
identity situation. In one sense, "us" as "minority" in Istanbul is a reflection of
the construction of Istanbulite "us" in Athens. Istanbul becomes the "symbolic
anchor"[366] of the new identity.

The most favored conversations are undoubtedly on the memories during the
routine of getting together with people from Istanbul, both the acquaintances,
friends they already know or the new people they meet. By getting together the
old memories are refreshed. In this sense, this is a place to heal. By being a sep-
arate group in Athens, just like in Istanbul, a different identity continues; this
new identity constructed in Athens is essentially based on being Istanbulite. In
other words, for the Romioi of Istanbul, the glue holding this different identity
together within a majority is to be from Istanbul. After this section on reset-
tlement, I will examine friendship and neighbor relations, which bring out the
longing and are tightly connected with resettlement issue.

Friendship, neighbors: *"I would not trade them for anyone, no one . . ."*

> "I have been here thirty years, I have a wide circle, but all my friends are in Turkey.
> I haven't made a single friend here. The community here is, you know different. We share
> the same religion, the same language but the Greek have an entirely different grasp of
> the world, that totally contradicts with our customs and traditions" (Leonidas, Athens).

Interviewee *Leonidas* tells that the people in Athens were fair-weather friends, he
could not make any new real friends, those who he tried to befriend wanted to
benefit from him, adolescents did not respect the elderly, and the youth wished
to move out to their own houses. The difference, which *Leonidas* expresses as the
"understanding style" and "our traditions", includes being an Istanbulite. They
missed Istanbul because their habits and circles of life were formed in Istanbul.
He is looking for his past relations and he longs for them. By memorializing
these relationships and emphasizing their absence in Athens, he says both "*I
do not want to belong to this culture*", "*we have the same traditions with you*",
and "*this is the cost of what happened for us*". He describes all of them through

---

366 Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, *Culture, Power, Place, Explorations in Critical
     Anthropology – Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference,* Duke
     University Press, London, 1997, p. 39.

friendship. The scope of this friendship he referred to is not limited to these mentioned. At this point, detailing the concept of friendship will be useful.

To be a friend: *"I thought that I could not become friends with a Turkish child"*

Social scientist Sandra M. Lynch, in her book named *Philosophy and Friendship*, discusses the practices of friendship in the modern world. She indicates that there are major differences between the concepts of friendship accepted in ancient times and today even if there are significant continuities. She starts the analysis with the question of how friendship is perceived nowadays by getting help from etymology. She emphasizes that the word 'friend' was derived from the Old English words of *freon* that means free, and *freo* that means 'love'; and those denotations involve two aspects of the modern English term. First, friendship is an emotional bond and this emotional attachment between friends is a mutual and reciprocal one. The second aspect that the etymology of the word reveals is that friendship is a voluntary relationship. In other words, it is established and ended freely.[367] Anthropologist Yehudi Cohen, who challenges whether friendship is a voluntary relationship based on free choice, points out that even if there is an element of choice, in fact, it is a relationship subject to pre-arrangements in many contexts. She emphasizes that ending a friendship includes important social sanctions and a series of pains.[368]

Most of the anthropologists and sociologists place friendship and kinship in opposite sides with regard to their voluntary and involuntary aspects.[369] Sociologist Graham Allan, in his study named "*Kinship and Friendship in Modern Britain*" examines the relation of friendship and the solidarity bonds, obligations and commitments of kinship. He says that, in the context of west, the kinship between two people does not reflect the actual *content* of the relationship.[370] Whereas, since a friendship is formed and progresses only by social communication the reasons that *bring people together* and the reasons that *keeps*

---

367 Sandra M. Lynch, *Philosophy and Friendship*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2005, p. 4.

368 Yehudi A Cohen, *Social Structure and Personality: A Casebook*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1961, p. 356.

369 Sandra Bell and Simon Coleman, *The Anthropology of Friendship*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 1999, p. 6.

370 Graham Allan, *Kinship and Friendship in Modern Britain,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996, p. 84.

them together may not be the same.[371] Anthropologist Julian Pitt Rivers states that friendship and kinship are positioned usually in opposite sides, however she mentions that the reality is the other way around. According to him, friendship is an invention of soi-disant "civilized societies" in which the organization principle based on kinship system is abandoned.[372] At this point, the questions "how friendship differs from, say, 'comradeship' or extended collaboration?"[373] and, "whether friendship is a cultural artefact, a social arrangement or a set of universal needs"[374] become crucial. Besides the questions mentioned above, as anthropologists Paul Durrenberger and Gisli Pàlsson state, in context of a stateless, loosely-knit society, friendship constitutes an important social institution and it can further complicate the situation.[375] In addition to all these, another factor that makes the issue even harder is the intense feelings in a friendship. Then, it would be meaningful to ask at what level conflicting wishes, desires and interests prevent friendship, and whether a balance is possible or not.[376] It will be useful to expand these questions by giving examples from interviews.

Leonidas's wife *Elena* disagrees with him, who admitted that he could not make any friends in Athens. She says that she made very good friends in Athens; after all, one can only have one or two best friends in life, then she gives her father's friend as an example.

> "My father had a friend at *St. Joseph* (High School). They exchanged letters till the very end. He is Turkish, named *Kadir*. I think he is still alive, they kept writing to each other until recently. There were some very strong friendships then" (Elena, Athens).

It should be pointed that the key aspect of the Turkish friend mentioned is where he differs from other "strange" Turks, namely from the un-urbanized. Interviewee *Hercules* also points out that the Romioi were not "close" to those Istanbulite Turks who came to Istanbul later and held jobs such as doorman and

---

371 William K. Rawlins, *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course.*: Transaction Publishers, New Jersey, 1992, p. 2.

372 Julian Pitt-Rivers, "The Kith and the Kin", in Goody (ed.), *The Character of Kinship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne, 1973, pp. 89–90.

373 Bell and Coleman, ibid, p. 2.

374 Robert Paine, "In Search of Friendship: An Explanatory Analysis in 'Middle-Class' Culture", *Man* (4), 505–524, 1969, p. 506.

375 Durrenberger, Paul and Palsson, Gisli, "Friendship in the Absence of States", in Bell and Coleman (eds.), *The Anthropology of Friendship*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 1999, p. 72.

376 Lynch, ibid. The mentioned question is one of the major problematic of Lynch's work.

porter. It is an important factor that the Turkish friend of *Elena*'s father belongs to a "distinguished" environment, a graduate of St. Joseph High School, so he was shaped within the elite Istanbul culture.

Sharing a similar past and life styles seems to be a determinant in making and keeping friends. Another example for such an attachment is the relationship of *Timon* with his old classmates. A former diplomat of Turkey was *Timon*'s friend from St. Joseph where they used to sit side by side in the classroom.

> "We did not have a chance to meet for many years during his visits here. Thanks to him, now I have been meeting with my former classmates for the last 4–5 years. He said, 'we're meeting' I said, 'why didn't you let me know' 'He asked 'would you come?' I said, 'you don't even need to ask'. I go to these meetings every year. They keep asking me if I travel there just for that meeting. Yes, I do, just for that" (Timon, Athens).

Timon misses his homeboys whom he played ball with on the undeveloped lands in Yeldegirmeni, Kadikoy.

> "My old homeboy was at his summer house in Bodrum, and we kept calling each other. He has neighbors, some professors at Ankara University, and they couldn't believe that *Tuncay* (name of Timon's friend) had a friend in Greece and every Eid they call each other to celebrate. He ended up calling me, saying they would not believe him and perhaps I could convince them. I talked to them for a while. Imagine how I felt, these are my childhood friends, I won't trade them for anyone. You see how emotional I get just talking about it..." (Timon, Athens).

Interviewee *Timon*'s memories of his childhood, high school years, and friends that he could not talk about without tearing up, illustrate a deep longing. Such affectionate attachments and strong ties are now in the past for him, back with his community and school. This cozy bond can rise above other identity categories such as religion and language. A close relationship between a Turk and a Romioi, and their mutual phone calls during feasts, is bewildering for Turkish friends of *Timon*'s friend *Tuncay*. This also proves how political environment affects people's perception, and at the same time, that a balance can be achieved in the intense emotional friendship between *Timon* and *Tuncay* in spite of everything. Even though he made new friends at his job and other environments in Greece, he misses the warm relationship with his friends from the neighborhood and school. Therefore, the feeling of loss created by immigration gets intensified.

Besides friendship, neighborhood relationships are also missed, which are among the warm bonds which brings different identities closer, even ties them together. In fact, "neighborhood is an extension of individual's private life".[377]

---

377 Vassilis Colonas, "Housing and the Architectural Expression of Asia Minor Greeks

Leonidas identifies Istanbul, which was "heaven /beautiful happy country", at that time, as a big family:

> "Romioi or Muslim, our neighbors and us were like a family, since everyone knew one other's religion, customs and traditions" (Leonidas, Athens).

Leonidas who lived in Beyoglu-Istanbul and now lives in Athens, longingly remembers the close knit neighborhood formed irrespective of residents' Turkish or Romioi origins, and the family like warmth. The neighbors knew each other's traditions, even though they had different religions. *Leonidas*'s wife *Elena* also describes the interactions during feasts and Easters as a reflection of this intimacy. "*My grandmother offered bread even to her yoghurt seller; she gave out Easter eggs and yeast bread to everyone*". While *Elena*'s grandmother who lived in Moda shared her home made Easter dishes with her neighbors, her Muslim neighbors reciprocated in the same manner at Eid al Fitr and Eid al Adha. Interviewee *Akis* tells about the Eids:

> "I grew up in Yenikoy, which had two neighborhoods at the time, the upper and the lower section. We lived in the lower section and we were the only Christians there. All our feasts and celebrations were mixed up, Muslim or Christian holidays - we celebrated all of it together. We would go to the mosque to get candy at Eid al Fitr – hard candy was a rarity then.." (Akis, Athens).

Stratos who lived in Fener, and *Talea*[378] who lived in Tarlabasi say that their neighbors shared with them the sacrificial meat during Eid Al Adha, and even more, that they were given the best pieces. Besides Easter and feasts, neighbors pitched in at hard times as well. *Joanna* explains as follow:

> "My brother fell ill with diphtheria. My aunt would not let me close – 'don't come over, I have children'. When they arrived to collect us for quarantine, the Turkish lady hid me. She had two children of her own. Later she visited my mother as well saying 'madam, please let me know if you need anything'. My mother's own sister did not offer that" (Joanna, Istanbul).

Before and After 1923", in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004, p. 177.

378 *Talea*: Female. Mid-fifties. After finishing high school and university in Istanbul, she started to work and left Istanbul with his mother towards the end of 1970s and went to Athens, in his own expression, because of the *discrimination* and *general atmosphere*. Interviews were made in Athens and Istanbul in 2011.

Joanna's neighbors were also her friends. To value a friend goes beyond just thinking about him or her it also includes doing certain things.[379] Therefore, *Hanife* and her daughter *Hülya,* landlords at Sisli, who saved her from quarantine that her aunt did not do this for her, are unforgettable for *Joanna*. She was good friends with *Hülya* who was older than her by 6–7 years. *Hülya* helped with her homework and gave popular magazines to read.

> "She was a very nice girl, we had a great time. They were our landlords. We would get in mischief as children, like my brother would go into their yard and cut the flowers. *Hanife* would get upset though she would not say anything to us. She was a sweet woman. Her husband would get a little bit angrier than her, but he would never come knocking at our door to say, 'don't do it again'. They were nice, courteous people. We got along very well" (Joanna, Athens).

It was important to interact with the non-Romioi through friendships and neighbor relations, even though they felt obliged to behave cautiously at public spaces, on the streets, at shops, gardens and at school. In Athens interviewee *Damos* evaluates this as follow:

> "The streets meant a different world to us then. You had to be alert at all times (…) We lived in Turkey, we were born and raised there. We had such a wonderful time with our Turkish friends, both through the good and the hard days. We have amazing memories. We went to their weddings, we shared their difficult times too, attended their funerals. We became quite intimate with this people called Turkish. These are unforgettable. While our paths diverged when they went to their mosque and us to our church, it would merge again right after" (Damos, Athens).

Interviewee *Damos* offers the following views on the generation gap and the importance of intimacy between the Romioi and Turks:

> "We need to view the Romioi in Istanbul in two categories. Most of the Romioi we lived together with did not have a lot of social interactions with the Turks. They were more reserved at home; a Turk would not visit their house or vice versa. This was one group of the Romioi at the time. Then there was the other group who lived like us, open to both the Romioi and the Turkish. During high school and college, we would dine together with our school mates, boys and girls, we would go out together in the evenings and visit each other's homes. We treated them differently as individuals and as a society, and apart from the politics. We joined their lives, and they joined ours. Our fathers were more distant, they were not engaged in anything beyond greetings on the street or exchanging 'how do you do's. Unlike us, they would not have any house visits, or attend weddings or circumcision parties" (Damos, Athens).

---

379 Michael Stocker, "Values and Purposes: The Limits of Teleology and the Ends of Friendship", *The Journal of Philosophy* LXXVIII (12), 747–765, 1981, p. 761.

Damos is from Fener, while his wife *Theodora*[380] is from Fatih, Carsamba. They both graduated from Istanbul University. *Damos*'s mother is a tailor and his father is a fisherman. University years and the period after his military service are full of friendship memories. *Damos*'s general evaluation for the 1960s and 1970s, his teenager and youth periods, where he is categorizing the Romioi in two groups, aligns with *Hercules*'s comments. He explains this as follows:

> "Reading *Sait Faik* (well known Turkish author) would always take me by surprise. He wrote about the Romioi living intermingled with Turks that sounded nothing like the ones I knew. The Romioi I knew never had any Turkish guests at home. I mean, their interaction was limited to the neighborhood or their work places, but they would not socialize as a family. If you look at the Turkish novels, you would come across a lot of Romioi, hundreds of them, but there is only one in which a Turk walks into a Romioi house. It's a novel by *Ahmet Mithat* called 'Only Seventeen Years Old' that has a scene where the Romioi meets a Turk inside the house. Only in that one. Apart from that, all interactions take place outside of homes. However, it's different in *Sait Faik*'s writings. I realized only much much later, that I am a Romioi of a certain type. There are the Romioi of Beyoglu, Galata and perhaps Sisli. But then there is Samatya… and the Romioi that *Sait Faik* knew" (Hercules, Athens).

Millas indicates that the Romioi met with people from certain locations and underlines that they did not interact very much with the Romioi of other neighborhoods. *Nadia* emphasizes that they usually met with people within their own cycles, mostly Romioi; and they tried to keep a low profile in public:

> "Let's keep a low profile - that was it. Of course, my parents got along well with the local butcher or the storekeeper. They had Turkish friends as well, for instance, my father's lawyer was Turkish. But in general, we spent time mostly with the Romioi family who lived upstairs, our extended family and so on, not much with the Turkish acquaintances. I am not sure if this was because of the Romioi community, or the pressures from the Turkish government. I guess the push was from both sides. On the other hand, there was the older generation who had heard about the events of 1922 from their parents, and the Wealth Tax stuff of '44 (…) Certain things happened afterwards, one at a time" (Nadia, Athens).

Nadia lists the reasons for the reserved, self-contained life as the unique structure of the Romioi society, the pressures from the state, and the memories of unpleasant events that passed down from generation to generation. Indeed, it

---

380 *Theodora*: Female. Mid-sixties. Thier grandfather migrated from Kayseri to Istanbul many years ago. She graduated high school from Romioi school, finished high school in Istanbul. Interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

is not exactly possible to clearly identify the reasons for this self-containment and the cause-effect relationship, because it is contextual. The self-containment can become more visible at times, depending on the political environment. Narratives are also shaped accordingly. During the *though years*, the public sphere was where the Romioi felt more anxious or extremely cautious. *Orestis* describes this as follows: "*unfortunately I don't remember feeling comfortable in public during the tough years. Only among us, within our community*". *Serkan* has a special place in his memories, who lived in the same building, but they could not make friends:

> "There was a boy about my age, who would always smile at me. I guess he wanted to play. But I was a little timid, perhaps scared. Unfortunately, I thought I couldn't play with or befriend a Turkish kid. (...) I think the biggest harm of the deep-state was this. They created such a (destructive) environment that people were brainwashed and perceived the other as enemy. When the Turkish government was hostile towards me and my family, it implied that I could not be friends with *Serkan*. Perhaps that's how I perceived it as a child (...) I wish I could find that boy now..." (Orestis, Athens).

Interviewee *Orestis* wishes to find *Serkan* whom he could not befriend as a child, could not play with, nor reciprocate his smile; the neighbor kid in their Tarlabaşı apartment building where they lived in mid-1970s. In an environment where Turkish and Romioi identities are positioned as "enemies", he would not dare to befriend *Serkan* who (or whose family) might have stared down or uttered unkind words. He fondly remembers their friendly neighbor *Sakine,* saying; "*although we occasionally argued, they were one of us, we lived in the same house; I loved them*". He often wonders the whereabouts of the family that comforted him, *Melek* who would invite them to "*watch the Eurovision on TV*" and her strongly-built husband, *Yılmaz* who would assure them "*just let me know if anyone bothers you*". Those are the rare but beautiful memories of those times, which are different form his mother's. *Orestis*'s mother worked as a maid for the family of a Romioi doctor. He explains the difference as follows:

> "My mother told us many times: When a Muslim family invited the Romioi doctor's family for the fast-breaking dinner, they added 'make sure you bring along the helping girl'. The Romioi would never invite the maid along with the family. My mother never forgets this and so lives with a wonderful memory (...) It's not that people don't have nice memories, I guess I was a little unlucky that I lived during a difficult time" (Orestis, Athens).

Interviewee *Orestis* was eleven years old in 1974 and in his childhood memory, being a Romioi was not a good thing:

"At times, we would try to remain out of sight, worrying 'what now, what will happen by the morning', and such. It was awful, take for example, the Cyprus war (. . .) Of course we had to go to school, but it was not possible to be cheerful when you were a Romioi in such a stressful environment. Even though not everybody was hostile, it was a dreadful atmosphere. There are always beautiful people, they will behave graciously and brightly welcome you, but in general it was not that easy in those days" (Orestis, Athens).

In 1990s, *Orestis* went back to Turkey, where his former citizenship has been revoked, to work as a foreign teacher at the high school that he graduated from. He lived in Istanbul for five years before returning to Athens. His Turkish and Romioi friends and the warm bonds established in those years in Istanbul did not erase all the bad memories, however helped to heal the trauma.

Staying friends: *"He/she is Romioi; he/she is Romioi too. . ."*

There are times when the friendship and neighborhood relationships are tested, and people are confined in a certain category instead of being a friend or neighbor. One of these tough times was September 6–7. What *Damos* and *Theodora* tell about those days is quite dramatic:

Theodora was eight years old in 1955. They lived in Carsamba section of Fatih. They felt that "the atmosphere was very tense", days before the event. Mounted policemen patrolled, and *Theodora* loved the sound of horseshoes on cobbled streets, so she would run to the window when she heard them and watched the mounted policemen in admiration. That night, there were her parents, her maternal grandparents and her sickly grandfather at home.

"A car drove by our street shortly before 9 pm, draped with a large Turkish flag, with 5 or 6 people inside (. . .) They went by blowing the horn, shoutings were herd from inside the car 'either split or die'. Our street filled up at once... where had they come from? (We learned later that it was an organized action.) And they kept shouting, waving flags and Cyprus maps, 'Death to the Romioi, death to Makarious'. We were taken aback, we never expected something like that.." (Theodora, Athens).

Theodora's Turkish neighbor called out to her mother: "Kathina, Kathina turn on the lights; fly the flag!"

"They had an understanding that they would not attack the houses whose the lights were on and were flying the flag, as they would be Turkish houses. Of course, the Romioi were not aware of this. We turned on the lights and my father rushed upstairs to fly the Turkish flag off the balcony, came back down, locked and bolted the door. . . and we waited. My mother in her housedress, my father in pajamas, and I.. we just goofily stood there, waiting (. . .) They started breaking into the houses" (Theodora, Athens).

Theodora's uncle was a doctor and lived downstairs from them, hence almost everyone in the neighborhood knew their family. The old lady suffering from hypertension across the street, *Ayşe,* frequently visited them for have her blood pressure checked. *Theodora*'s uncle had treated her daughter *Zehra,* who was married to a military officer and lived in Topkapi. When the news broke, she asked her husband's help *"go and check on my mother, you know how she snoops into anything and everything that's not her business, go to Carsamba and take a look"*. She was right to worry, because her mother *Ayşe* was pointing all Romioi houses to the attackers saying *"here, they are Romioi… this house too, and this…"*.

Meanwhile *Theodora* and her family were waiting at home:

> "It was a chaotic, terrifying night. We were upstairs when they started banging on our door. My father looked out the window and told my mother, 'let me go downstairs and see what they want'. He could not make it to the door, 20 or 30 people broke in. There was a marble landing at the entrance, then you would take 5–6 steps to get inside. They walked in, while my mother and I waited on top of the staircase listening to the indistinct noises coming from downstairs. A few minutes later it was silent.. 'oh dear!' said my mother, 'I am afraid they took your father away..'"

When *Ayşe's* son in law arrived at the neighborhood in his uniform, his mother in law *Ayşe* answered the door saying "let me be, and go to the doctor's house, they broke in. save him, because he healed your wife, he saved her from a certain death". *Theodora* described what happened at home after the attackers' noises quieted:

> "We went downstairs to find my father bolting the door. Then he secured it with a large wooden beam. In his fear and excitement, he could not even respond to our questions about what had happened. Eventually we went back upstairs, still asking 'what just happened there?..'"

Her father who was still shaken with the experience could not tell anything to his wife and daughter. They learned what happened only the next day.

The long-time grocer *Yalçın*'s father *İsmet,* was also a grocer in Carsamba. *Theodora* knew them since the days of her grandfather. During the events of 6–7 September, *Yalçın* pointed every Romioi's house to the attackers, and he lead the looters. He was brought to court after the events and spent a few months in jail. His father *İsmet* had a stroke and died while visiting his son in jail. *İsmet* was a very nice, beloved person. *Theodora* thinks he could not bear the burden as he thought "how could my son do that?" and that his grief caused the stroke.

The lower district in Fener where a lot of Romioi lived, was "luckier" during September 6–7:

"In the lower district[381], the grocer *Nuri* saved the entire neighborhood. He was a great person (. . .) *Nuri* used to run the small grocery store with his two sons. There were Romioi houses across from his store, and along the rows on the side. They have been neighbors for over fifty, maybe a hundred years. He was elderly too. During the events he stepped out to the street with his sons, and said 'all of these houses are mine, don't you go in any on them'. They did not break into any of those houses".

The memories of interviewee *Damos* of his neighbors during September 6–7 are similarly dramatic:

"My mother was born and raised at Edirnekapi. Theodora's father also lived in the same neighborhood. She was a tailor. She was removed from school at early ages and worked as an apprentice. Mostly Muslims lived in Edirnekapi. They were all his customers, he was very well known. I remember him, and my mother used to have lovely conversations when I was young. My mother was a little too social, she would be paying visits to everyone and inviting friends home 'come on over, have some tea', she was quite intimate. My maternal grandmother died on September 5, and the funeral was held on the 6th. The neighbors who actually knew my mother very well, stopped the procession by the church in her neighborhood. (..) They demanded the casket to be opened. (. . .) They knew my mother, these were the people who lived in the same meighborhood. So, they looked into the casket, and allowed the procession to continue. Just like that. Of course, these things brand you, leave a scar" (Damos, Athens).

Damos believes his grandmother's casket was opened and checked by his mother's neighbors on the way to church, because it was September 6 that day. He is certain that the neighbors knew what would happen in the evening on September 6. He thinks that the neighbors wanted to check the casket because they believed that the Romioi learned about the plans as well, and were delivering weapons to the church, as a precaution.

Despite everything they went through, eventually they were forgotten. *Damos* explains this as follows:

"After all, the neighborliness and years of friendship won. All is forgotten. My mother continued meeting with these women. Perhaps it was considered a one off, impulsive incident and it was let go. We also resolved to saying, 'they were deceived too, they did certain things in ignorance (. . .) what else could they have done under the circumstances?' However, it certainly was not painless".

Damos's words about their neighbors' attitude – "*they were deceived, they did certain things in ignorance*" – appears to be "objectivizing and neutralizing the past

---

381 Down neighbourhood refers to the down neighbourhood in Carsamba, the closer part to Phanar Greek Orthodox College (Fener Romioi Male High School).

to keep friendship going".[382] Indeed, forgetting was not that easy. *Damos* states that these memories were indelible:

> "Those who stayed rebuilt their homes, reconstructed their offices. (…) Some forgot, wanted to forget, but could not.."

It appears that trying to forget was a survival strategy. Interviewee *Theodora* explains this strategy as follow:

> "Otherwise you can't move on, you can't live. You either walk away from all of this or forget. Otherwise you can't survive.."

Accepting and affirming the differences holds a key importance in friendship. In fact, the friendship or neighborhood relations are "possible as a voluntary relation between individuals, who recognize that they are different despite the common things shared".[383] In the political context, being different from the majority, namely perceiving this difference as a threat, and the intense disinformation, made the Romioi targets of the attack on September 6–7. After the attack, it was up to them again to forget the negative memories.

Being the locus of all these friendships, neighbor relationships and bittersweet memories, Istanbul also happens to be where people experienced the key events in their lives. *Theodora* explains the significance of the *City* in her life:

> "One can not easily leave the place he or she was born, raised, lived in… No way. We can't forget Istanbul; we were born there; we grew up, got married, and had children there – 30 years! (…) The roots run very deep. Not possible. Unforgettable" (Theodora, Athens).

While interviewee *Theodora* alternates between her memories of her high school and college friends, her marriage, the births of her children and the traumatic events, Istanbul, as a place, is the focal point of all her experiences.

In this section, I tried to discuss the effect of migration from Istanbul both on those who stayed and those who left, in reference to the psychological basis before migration. Besides the exiles in 1964, the main reasons of migration are listed as unease, fear and anxiety; hence they migrated to avoid the stress. Another source of tension was the Romioi becoming increasingly introverted and withdrawn and always being on the defense, which required to constantly create strategies, because of the negative stereotypes circulated via newspapers; in a sense this transforms the

---

382 Quoted from Bourdieu (Göker, ibid, p. 24. Göker's quotation source: Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988, p. 7).

383 Lynch, ibid, p. 74.

"minority" into subaltern against majority. This kind of a situation has the potential of gradually alienating those who were not antisocial or withdrawn.

The uncertainty of the future and the tension created by the possibility of events reoccurring are determinants for migration. Another conclusion is that the decision to migrate was difficult, and that migration problematizes the identity and space concepts for both those who left, and those who stayed. It is a feeling of loss to leaving a place where major events and strong emotions were experienced in terms of individuals' life stories.

The compeller factors in the process of accepting and being accepted in a new place, Athens, the major immigrant receiving city, are identified as the issue of citizenship and "the feeling of strangeness". Another aspect is the dissolving "us" bonds of being minority in Istanbul, as described with the words "*whether or not we exist, is insignificant here*". Within the "new" life, talking about "old" life or the days in Istanbul, helped dealing with this dissolution, and so a new state of "us" was formed. Being from Istanbul is a kind of myth, which refers to the past of "ancestors, forefathers", family elders and their own, and which is used to give a meaning to the present.

The identification of childhood and friendships with the *City*, Istanbul, the place – with its all positive or negative memories and phantasms – made Istanbul the fundamental mainstay of belonging. They got used to the life in Athens, namely in the "new" living space, with people who had same language and religion, but different traditions. In their own words: "*life goes on*".

Is the source of thinking "we are not like them" or "feeling of strangeness" felt by the Romioi migrated from Istanbul to Athens a different habitus? It seems that for the people who came from Istanbul, their *habitus*[384] based on being Istanbulite, encouraged them to reproduce their position. Although each individual can share and find meaning in this habitus differently, Istanbul functioned almost as the framework.

In the next section, I will discuss this framework. I will examine the dynamics of a location turn into a place loaded with meanings and symbols, the relation of this meaning, which is formed in time and is fluid, with the sense of belonging, and the place it takes in memory.

---

384 The term was borrowed from French theorist Pierre Bourdieu. It simply refers to an internalized structure or set of structures that determines how an individual acts in and reacts to the world. His approach argues that 'through the 'habitus', the structure which has produced it governs practice (. . .) because the habitus is an endless capacity to engender products – thoughts, perceptions, expressions, actions – whose limits are set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production (Bourdieu, ibid, 1998, p. 95).

Chapter 5 Place and Memory

"They ask me 'is it Greece or Turkey, which is your country, your homeland?' Then I reply 'I have no country, I have a home, and it is Istanbul. Its governor could be Giorgos or Niyazi, I don't care at all'. Why, Istanbul? Because if I were to write poetry, I would write Istanbul. If I made music, I would use the tunes of the islands, the breeze passing through the pines, or the waves beating the Bosphorus shores. If I could paint, I would paint Istanbul. Istanbul is my way of life, my lifestyle. If I went to Athens, perhaps I would find a different way of life there. It might be nice, but not what I am used to. My children grew up in Athens, yet as soon as they arrived, they immediately adjusted here! ... When the Greeks come here, they adore and fall in love with certain things, and belittle others, repelled by them. 'Well, the streets are full of stray cats and dogs!' So, what about it? What is wrong about that? I got so used to it, I would feel lost without them. There are seven or eight dogs living around here, they are very cute. They tilt their heads when I talk to them. That's the way it is. 'There is garbage everywhere!' Yes, there is, but there is the Bosphorus as well. The Islands. The Hagia Sophia and Suleymaniye. There is the Fatih Sultan Mehmet mosque, the Obelisk, Sultanahmet Square, the Fish Market, taverns of Kumkapi, the city walls. . . That is, there is a part of me everywhere" (Mihail, Istanbul).

Mihail's definition of Istanbul addresses the symbolism and meaning of Istanbul, the *City*. He emphasizes the influence of the *City*'s governors, regardless of who they are, on people. *Mihail* describes Istanbul as inspirational and defines it as the main theme of arts such as poetry, music and painting. The description of concrete forms of the city such as the churches, mosques, monuments, and halls as parts of him suggests a deep sensual bond with the space. *Mihail* states that his own way of life was established in relation to Istanbul, where he was born and raised. He distinguishes it from the life style in Athens where he migrated. His attachment of priority to Istanbul shows an emphasis on the influence this place of his birth, childhood and youth had on the way his life was formed. Along with this, his emphasis on how his children adapted even though they were not born and raised in Istanbul, reminds a glorification and sanctification of the city. In a sense, the city has an attraction and an aura regardless of whether one was born, raised or accumulated memories there. However, it should not be forgotten that *Mihail*'s children grew up in Athens with the memories of their Istanbulite father, and they arrived Istanbul bringing those memories along. With these memoirs and the historical background of the *City*, it seems that a halo of Istanbul had already been formed and intensified prior to their arrival. All this proves the role of the stories/memories in transforming a location into a place/space laden

with meaning and symbols, and their powerful influence on the memory. In this context, I will try to explore the meaning of Istanbul as a *space,* and its place in the memory, following the theoretical approaches to space and place concepts in this section.

Place

Space and place are words that are widely used without much thought or doubt about their meanings. This makes these words overloaded. The political geographer John Agnew highlights the complexity of the terms space and place, citing the Oxford English Dictionary as an example: the definition of 'space' takes about two pages, and 'place' three and a half pages.[385] The wide variety of use and interpretation requires a closer look at these concepts.

Space – place

Stuart Elden, known for his work on political theory and studies on area-space-place, states the difficulty of defining the terms are because of their many different uses and not problematizing the determinations. Starting from the origins of the words, Elden states that the word 'space' was derived from the Latin word *spatium,* which means a distance or a stretch, and yet it refers to a fixed distance. He adds that in the late Middle Ages, some writers started to use the term as more to a container as a synonym of *locus,* or place. In later years, thinkers such as Descartes stretched the meaning and described space in three dimensions, length, breadth and depth. Thus, the world expressed in Cartesian coordinates (x, y and z) is accessible, understandable and controllable through science. At the same time, this leads to the perception of the location as static, fixed and merely a container.[386]

Similar to the concept of space, the concept of place can be overly abstract or quantitative. In other words, there are different perspectives such as positivist approaches that see place as part of geometric space, and approaches that emphasize its process aspects. However, in all these approaches, how space and place are positioned relative to each other stands out as an important point. Agnew criticizes the approaches that view space and place opposite to each

---

385 John Agnew, *Handbook of Geographical Knowledge,* Sage, London, 2011, p. 29.
386 Stuart Elden, "Space", in Kitchen and Thrift (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Elsevier, Oxford, 2009, p. 262.

other, also noting the longevity of this conceptualization. He states that sometimes the two terms, space and place, are not clearly distinguished from one another analytically and thus their meanings change, making "place" as a meta-concept connecting particular stories to specific places.[387] However, place has a meaning beyond being the location where stories happen. Marxist thinker Henri Lefebvre contributes considerably to the space-place in his work, *La production de l'espace*[388] dated 1974, as a phenomenon that is produced and reproduced.[389] Lefebvre indicates that the term of the 'social space' is sounded strange when the word of space is understood strictly geometrically, in which case it evokes an empty area.[390] Lefebvre does not consider these concepts as objective and passive, and he underlines that it is constructed, coded, recoded, and used through a range of practices.[391] These practices are not limited to material structures, but also include the daily interactions of persons or groups. It can be said that his most important contribution to the conceptualization of Marxist/New Marxist approaches to space was to reveal unequal relations by discussing how the space is experienced.

Thinking about power in social relations makes it necessary to problematize the concept of space.[392] As theorist Robert Sack emphasizes, acknowledging

---

387 Agnew, ibid, pp. 2–3.

388 The book was first published by Éditions Anthropos in France in 1974. English translated version was published in 1991 with title of *The Production of Space*. Elden states that Lefebvre's use of the term *espace* in French, arguably carries wider resonances than the English 'space' (Elden, ibid, p. 266).

389 According to Elden, most of the Lefebvre's thoughts about space based on readings of German scholars' works such as Ernst Cassirer and Martin Heidegger with a deep attachment to Marxism. Lefebvre claims that space should be thought as physical and material like architecture, towns, and nature. Elden indicates that this is space as we perceive it in the world around us, and Lefebvre calls it 'spatial practice'. In a similar way, he describes this space as world's organic and physical space (Ibid, p. 265). Lefebvre's contribution to space and place theories is not limited by the term of *spatial practice*. The other two elements of his theoretical approach are expressed in terms of *representations of space* and *representational space*. Term of *representations of space* called by Lefebvre refers to conceptualized space, the space of scientists, planners, urbaners, as of a certain type of artist – all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived. The *space*, defined as *representational space* by him, is a space as directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols (Lefebvre, *The Production of Space,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1991, pp. 33–39).

390 Ibid, p. 1.

391 Elden, ibid, p. 266.

392 Ibid, p. 267.

whether one belongs somewhere or not, is an attempt to control people at a certain time, by controlling an area.[393] One of these controls is the forced migration. Hence, displacement by forced migration, or the privileges or restraints in the use of a public sphere, reveal the close connection between space, power and identity.

Social scientist Doreen Massey, known for her work on gender and globalization, recognizes space as a never-ending occurrence. She argues that the identities of the subjects and the identities of places are constructed through interrelations, which not only challenges the notion of the authenticities of the past, but also maintains the possibility of change in the future.[394]

We have mentioned that it is necessary to understand the concept of space and place in terms of experiential understanding in order to grasp these concepts. In *Space and Place*, the pioneer on humanistic geography, Yi-Fu Tuan lists the points to be emphasized to explain aforementioned concepts as: the ways in which people think and feel about the space, how they establish attachment to home, the neighborhood and the nation as places, and how feelings about space and place are affected in time.[395] Similarly, the humanistic geographer Edward Relph defines place as an inescapable dimension of human life and experience,[396] while Sack also defines space, home, and the world as a framework that people use in their lives to integrate perspectives, forces, and selves.[397]

Geography theorist Tim Cresswell underlines the connection and the link between people and place by describing place as a way of seeing, knowing and understanding the world. Since the terms of *space*, *landscape*, and *place* are highly interrelated, each definition is contested. According to him, place is how we make the world meaningful and the way we experience the world; that is, it is self-made; produced, maintained and contested.[398] Referring to Cresswell, Agnew outlines the three fundamental aspects of the place as a 'meaningful location': Location, locale and sense of place. While location corresponds to a fixed

---

393 Robert D. Sack, *Homo Geographicus,* John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1997, pp. 2–3.

394 Doreen B. Massey, *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time,* Hettner Lecture, Dept. of Geography, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, 1999, p. 288.

395 Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place, the Perspective of Experience*, The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1977.

396 Edward Relph, *Place and Placelessness,* Pion, London, 1976, p. 9.

397 Sack, ibid, p. 58.

398 Tim Cresswell, *Place: A Short Introduction*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Oxford, Victoria, 2004, pp. 8–12.

coordinate on the Earth; 'locale' means a material settings, which is shaped by the social relations and direction of the lives of individuals, it always has a concrete form; and the 'sense of place' implies a subjective and emotional attachment people have to place.[399]

In the light of the above concepts, it will be useful to look closely at the spatial meaning of the *City* of Istanbul.

Istanbul

If we were to base the location on Cresswell's descriptions (Latitude: 41 ° 1 '7 K, longitude: 28 ° 57' 53 °C), Istanbul, the *City,* might not have a significance beyond a geographical location. The location of the *City*, and its strait, hills, buildings, streets and squares, are the tangible and concrete forms. These de facto visuals transform into a meaningful locale, a place, with emotional attachments and affections[400] associated with them. Emotion is literally and figuratively a motion.[401] The world is made up of billions of happy or unhappy encounters, and these encounters represent a multitudinous of intersections of thought and body.[402] What *Mihail* has to say about Istanbul shows the ways in which a location transforms into a *place* and how one develops an affection for that place:

> "Where did you spend your childhood? When and where did you hold hands with your first sweetheart? When did you look deep in her eyes? In which elementary or secondary school did you have a crush on your teacher? Which teacher made you fall in love with reading? Where did all these happen? These are important "(Mihail, Istanbul).

Mihail defines homeland as the place where he spent his childhood and built memories of his youth. From an adult point of view, childhood has an aura of

---

399 Ibid, p.7 (Cresswell's quotation source is Agnew's work: *The United States in the World Economy,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).

400 Nigel J. Thrift, in his study of politics of affect, emphasizes that there is no stable definition of affect. Thrift lists approaches to understanding as follows: The neo-evolutionist approach which claims that emotional expression is universal and that it is the product of evolution; psychoanalytic approach which evaluates the affect as positive or negative biological differentiation; hermeneutic approach which evaluates affect as a set of embodied practices that produce visible conduct; Spinoza and Deleuze's approach which sees affect as interaction capacity with relation emphasis (Thrift, "Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect", *Geografiska Annaler B* 86, 57–78, 2004, pp. 59–64).

401 Ibid, p. 60.

402 Thrift, "Steps to an Ecology of Place", in Massey, Allen and Sarre (eds.), *Human Geography Today*, Blackwell, Cambridge, 1999, p. 302.

magic.[403] The *aura* of childhood and youth[404] is closely related to the fact that they are in the past. As the current experiences and meaning of life becomes more obscure, difficult to define or cope with, people reach out to memories of greater certainty for support. Such a situation resembles looking at life like a photo album. The photographic theorist Susan Sontag expresses this as: "everybody in its natural state was made up of a series of ghostly images superimposed in layers to infinity ".[405] The very moment in life is subjected to another meaning by recalling these images out of time. Meaning is closely related to the autobiographies, such as where the people fell in love, where they went to school, and where the graves of loved ones are.[406] All these memories that *Mihail* has emphasized are rooted in Istanbul, the *City*.

In this context, anthropologist Lisa Malkki's findings are very meaningful. According to Malkki, the metaphorical concept of having roots involves intimate linkage between people and space, and more and more people identify themselves in reference to 'homeland', 'cultures' and 'origins' from which they are displaced,[407] because the sense of continuity is rooted in sites and become persists in the *place*.[408] As *Mihail* interprets, there is a long-established bond, such as the legendary Andeus, which has a tight grip on the foot, land, root, in other words, between Istanbul and the Romioi. In the myth, Hercules can only destroy Andeus once he frees him from the earth; both the strength and the weakness are related to senses of place. Likewise, "affects are becomings: sometimes they weaken us in so far as they diminish our power to act and decompose our relationships, sometimes they make us stronger in so far as they increase our

---

403 Nick Yapp, *Decades of the 20th Century*, Photographs' copyright 1998 Getty Images, Tandem Verlag 1998, English and French, printed in Turkish, trans. Sema Bulutsuz, Literatür Yayıncılık, Istanbul, 2005, p. 324.

404 The word *aura* has been used in the context referred to by theorist Walter Benjamin. *Aura* comes from the Hebrew word for light and is defined by Benjamin as an experience of distance and a mist of nostalgia, which does not allow for owning the desired object (Svetlana Boym, *Future of Nostalgia,* Basic Books, New York, 2001, p. 45).

405 Sontag quoted from French writer Honoré de Balzac. Sontag states that "primitive people fear that the camera will rob them of some part of their being. In the memoir he published in 1900, at the end of a very long life, Nadar reports that Balzac had a similar "vague dread" of being photographed" (Sontag, *On the Photography*, Rosetta Books, New York, p. 123).

406 Tim Cresswell, "Place", in Kitchen and Thrift (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Elsevier, Oxford 2009, p. 169.

407 Malkki, ibid, p. 52.

408 Nora, ibid, p. 7.

power and make us enter into a more vast or superior individual".[409] With such intense connections and past, the *City* becomes a root, a place in which people position themselves, and find meaning.

Mihail's use of the phrase "*there is a part of me everywhere*" in describing the material forms, buildings and streets of Istanbul, also highlights this meaning and emotion. Affections and emotions can be seen as personal and social concepts, but social scientist Steve Pile says that social cannot be reduced to personal and vice versa; because emotion and affection are parts of our psychodynamism related to space and place.[410] In his study of the dialectic of the individual and of the world, focusing on the concepts of meaning, identity, and power, Pile points out the impact of this relationship on two areas: The City and the Body. He argues that the streets become a map of visible and invisible relations of meaning, identity and power into which the subject is placed.[411] Examples of Pile's map of the subject are the words "*the streets were strange to us, you had to be alert*," when they were talking about places other than the "*churches, schools and associations*" where interviewee said they felt like "home". I will discuss the persistence of the mapping of the place in this way, under the heading *Memory* in the following section. But before that, I think it is time to discuss the concepts of "*home-like*" places, as referred to by the interviewees, and the sanctification of places.

"Sacred" place

Istanbul has gathering places that are designed to evoke a strong religious consciousness or to evoke a certain sacredness such as churches, monasteries and pilgrims, and they have important places in the life of the society. Sacred qualification refers to a situation different from ordinary or everyday realities, experiences, or feelings. It refers to an invisible, "supreme" situation. However, it can be argued that the sacred qualification includes some abstract sentences for power and glory, but also embodies such expressions as object, space and ritual. Sanctification requires "reconciliation" between people/groups, even though the value is ambiguous or relative, since it is a value attribution.

---

409 Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet. *Dialogues II,* Continuum, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, Columbia University Press, New York, 2007, p. 60.

410 Steve Pile, "Emotions and Affect in Recent Human Geography", *Transactions*, Royal Geographical Society, 2009, p. 13.

411 Pile, *The Body and the City, Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity,* Routledge, London, New York 1996, p. 245.

Sanctification: "We are from here, we have been here for thousands of years"

The following words from the interviewee *Orestis* highlight the sanctification dynamics of Istanbul:

> "At the least, its historical significance is very important for a Greek or a Romioi, even if things were a bit mixed up in the past, for example when it was not very clear who were Romioi, who were Hellenic or of another origin. Wouldn't you agree that, it's not that inconceivable to at least feel and be considered the heir to a cultural heritage, in a society that speaks and writes in Romioi or Greek? It is not very different for a Greek than it is for a Turk who develops an affinity and feels the same heritage with a Caucasian from Turkmenistan who speaks Turkish. Certainly, Istanbul has a much stronger connection for the Romioi; 'we are from here, we are the Romioi of Istanbul, we have been here for a thousand years'. The sanctity lies both with the Patriarchate and the Hagia Sophia, the most significant temple of all times. (. . .) Any Romioi Orthodox would know this. Indeed, among our spiritual places, Istanbul ranks immediately after Jerusalem, owing to Jesus, and the like in Israel and Palestine. People visit Jerusalem, Israel and Palestine for pilgrimage, but Istanbul is also very significant in this ritual, both ethnically and religiously. Even if it is not a holy city, it is monumental, at least from a historical perspective, to a Romioi, a Greek, to anyone who considers themselves an heir to this heritage" (Orestis, Athens).

In interviewee *Orestis*'s interpretation, the relation between the divine thought and the concepts of historical heritage, ethnicity, language, space, and root is striking. Indeed, the idea of divinity and inheritance is related to the conception that there is a fixed connection between identity, place and culture. As the anthropologists Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson emphasize, the relationship between identity and place is multifaceted and complex.[412] Therefore, place bounded insights are inadequate and problematic. At this point it will be useful to discuss the concept of cultural heritage. Because the analysis of the politics of heritage construction will lead to the categorization of the cultural heritage as well as the deliberate processes related to quotidian life, emergent identities and their representation with landscape.[413]

Political scientist Millas points out the two aspects of the word '*legacy*'. One is like ancestors or predecessors what is *actually* handed down from the past, the other is *believed* (or *imagined*) to be handed down from the past. Millas points out that *the real and believed* heritages are rarely complementary to each other, but in fact in a controversial relationship. In order to explain the concept of

---

412 Gupta and Ferguson, ibid, pp. 1–6.
413 Julie Scott and Tom Selwyn, *Thinking Through Tourism*, Berg, New York, 2010, p. 8.

legacy, Millas follows the claims of Greece to be a Byzantine and Ancient Greece heir and the articulation of Christianity to Greekness. He argues that during the 'age of revolutions' and on the eve of the Greek war of independence (in the years between 1780 and 1830), Grecophone intellectuals living in Western Europe and influenced by the French Revolution state that they favored a radical attitude towards the Ottoman Ruler and the Conservative Patriarchate of spatial. As for the national/ethnic identity in this period, he draws the underlining of the question whether we are Romiois (in the sense of Byzantine), Greeks (in the way the westerners call it) or Hellenes or Orthodox Christians. He states that the predominant myth of 19th century Greek historiography indicates that after centuries of 'Turkish yoke', the glorious Ancient Greeks won their independence. According to him, Ancient Greece was declared a new 'light' of Christianity in an ideological construction, and the term 'helleno-christianity' was invented. Greekness was closely associated to the Greek Orthodox Church and its legacy, to the Greek language and to an imagined common root.[414]

As it can be seen from the example of the above Ancient Greek articulation to Christianity, it would be appropriate to look at the concept of heritage as today's fiction, not as an entity from the past. Because the past is not a static, archaic residue, but rather it is an inherited artefact which has significant affect in the present through the interplay of popular and officially attributed meanings.[415] For this reason, the meanings attributed to the past illuminate the perception of identity.

The effect of these attributions to the "Greek" identity reminds us of the anthropologist Michael Herzfeld's conceptualizations.[416] According to him, there is a tension between the attitudes of the community in accordance with the expectations of westerners about modern Greece and the inward judgments. Herzfeld argues that cultural identity is based on *cultural intimacy*, which acts as a glue and assurance of common sociality. State propaganda and official national memory rise on this cultural intimacy.[417] In *The Shadow of the Sacred*

---

414 Millas, "Ethnic Identity and Nation Building: On Byzantine and Ottoman Historical Legacy", *The EU and the Historical Legacy in the Balkans,* University Centre St-Ignatius, Antwerp, 2006, pp. 1–4.

415 Lynn Meskell, *Archeology Under Fire Nationalizm, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East,* Routledge, London, New York, 1998, p. 4.

416 Michael Herzfeld, *A place in History, Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town,* Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1991.

417 Herzfeld, *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State,* Routledge, New York, 1997, pp. 1–37.

Rock,[418] the anthropologist Roxane Caftanzoglou says that the reconstruction of the city of Athens as pure Hellen after its determination as the capital of the new nation at the same time includes Greece's confrontation with the unsettling evidence of Greece's Ottoman heritage along with local vernacular forms. An additional task for national scholars in the management of archaeological remains and in the construction of national cultural identity of Greece has been to

---

418 Roxane Caftanzoglou, "The Shadow of the Sacred Rock", in Bender and Winer (eds.), *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 2001. In her work on the use and representation of site just below the Acropolis (Anafiotica), Caftanzoglou draws attention to discourses containing unequal authority between archaeological ground directors and the inhabitants who lived there since 1860. The settlement in Anafiotika was founded by immigrant construction workers from the Cyclades island group in 1860s. This region is currently within the archeological borders. Because the houses and their inhabitants have been considered as illegal, they have always lived under the threat of demolition and relocation; and this threat was materialized between 1930s and 1970s. Now there are nearly forty-five people living there who are middle-aged to elderly and mostly retired and the majority of them are descendant of those who settled here in the early 1900s. For the archaeological study between 1936 and 1939, eleven houses were acquired and most of them were demolished. During 1960s in the period of dictatorship the area was expropriated by the Ministry of Culture and archeological excavation begun. In 1977, inhabitants nearest to the Sacred Rock of Acropolis were asked to evacuate their homes. However, a circular path around the base is reserved and authorities indicated that the reserved area could function as a 'bridge' between the monument and the modern city. Now, the Rock and settlement is separated from each other by iron fence. However, in Anafiotika every work to be done on houses is subject to the permission from what they call 'The Archaeology'. These constraints ensure the preservation of vernacular architectural form of settlement. Anafiotika, currently faces the issue of reaching the end of social reproduction as a spatially bounded and based on the people living there. This lead to a reaction from residents in the form of reinforcing the symbolic boundaries. A counter-discourse of time and space, and history, based on shared collective and individual memories that helps to develop and maintain a distinct cultural identity is created. In Anafiots' rhetoric, the bond they have with the individual life-related stories is dominant and there are claims that the locals are better informed than archaeologists. The other symbolic source in the stories is religion. The attributes of collective solidarity, hospitality, equality, cleanliness and the saying 'we are all poor' are presented as the constant communal identity of the Anafiots. By defining themselves as culturally opposed to metropolitan way of life as a re-declaration of the symbolic boundaries of their sense of difference and negotiating the position of an essentialized 'other' constructed in official discourse and turning this "otherness" into positive self-enhancing values (Ibid, pp. 22–32).

convince sceptical Western audiences that the new state can fulfill its guardian role as the heir to the glorious past and thus claim indigenous control over Greece and Greek identity. This approach is related to the place of the Acropolis in the Western imagination.[419] The attempt of "wiping out some traces in memories, the rewriting and reconstruction of past and present"[420] has been realized in accordance with this imagination.

The erasing of the Ottoman traces and the emphasis on Hellenic elements rather than Romeic ones reflects this imagination and fiction during the archaeological handling of the temples of the Hephaistos in the Athens Parthenon and Athens Agora in Athens. As Herzfeld points out, classical Hellenism is appropriate for representation to outside, that is, against the great powers that helped independence, while *romiosyni* represents *self-recognition*.[421] These two structures (the Parthenon and the Temple of Hephaistos) that had been converted into churches in the Middle Ages, were transformed into classical temples again in the 19th century in accordance with the European philhellenic ideals of Ancient Greece.[422] The situation that conjured up imagination was the subject of Rotonda, which opposed the state to church in Thessaloniki.[423]

The Greek Ministry of Culture decided to limit church services in Rotonda, which is a heritage of Rome at the center of the city of Thessaloniki, to three times in a year. The church objected arguing that this was a violation of freedom to worship. After the restoration in Thessaloniki, one of the rhetoric of Rotonda's

---

419 Ibid, pp. 21–24.

420 Peter Loizos, "Intercommunal Killing in Cyprus", *Man*, (23), 639–653, 1988, p. 646.

421 Herzfeld, *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987, pp. 102–103.

422 Yannis Hamilakis and Eleana Yalouri, "Antiquities as Symbolic Capital in Modern Greek Society", *Antiquity 70*, 117–129, 1996, p. 121.

423 Anthropologist Charles Stewart explores this controversial process. Rotonda, a Roman temple built in the beginning of the 4th century possibly as a mausoleum, was transformed into a Christian church, then turned into a mosque, then once again a church, then transformed into a Macedonian museum and attached to the Byzantine Antiquity Directorate. The restoration of the building and its surroundings, which take place with EU funding, is also on the UNESCO's international heritage monument. Stewart says that Rotonda is a Roman work, not a Byzantine, and therefore has the potential to remind the Greek subjugation that one of the reasons for this could be a secular museum. According to him, if Rotonda was built by the Ancient Greeks, it would be more difficult to resist the idea of conserving it as secular antiquity (Stewart, "Who Owns the Rotonda? Church vs. State in Greece", *Anthropology Today* 14 (5), 3–9, 1998, pp. 3–5).

inauguration as a museum and its use as a concert area was the rumors that Rotonda would be turned into a mosque or a Center for Islamic Studies. While the demonstrators took the streets of Thessaloniki and demanded that the Rotonda re-open as a church of St. George, about a month later, in June 1996, the Turkish Minister of Culture plans to convert the church of Hagia Sophia in Trabzon from a museum into a mosque were revealed.[424] All of the above examples demonstrate that the distinction between the *believed* and *actual* legacy by Millas can remain in theory and that the boundaries are blurred.

After questioning the "sanctification" over the examples that reflect the selected legacy and past for spatial arrangements from Athens and Thessaloniki, I can move on to the sacred places of the Romioi in Istanbul. The Patriarchate comes first among these places. Interviewee *Keti* describes this aspect as follows:

> "Turkey is where Christianity was born, and Istanbul has a first-degree association with the Romioi Orthodoxy. The Romioi Patriarchate in Istanbul is the highest entity representing the Orthodox community in the world, just like Vatican – and I don't mean this in a negative context. You know Vatican is legally also a country that has one citizen, the Pope. This is not what I am referring to. . . First of all, you can't just erase an entire history of hundreds of years" (Keti, Athens).

Keti emphasizes that centuries-old history of a church in Istanbul and the presence of the Patriarchate directly refer to the Byzantine Empire.

> "Again, I am not referring in an invasive context, just from a historical perspective. There was a different empire here prior to the Ottomans; it dissolved and disappeared, and a new empire was built over it" (Keti, Athens).

Keti underlines the importance of Turkey in Christianity and interprets the source of the sanctity as the Patriarchate being in Istanbul. *Keti* felt the need to emphasize that she did not mean to convey her interpretation in a "*bad context*" or "*invasive context*", and this is significant as it shows how the common discourses that have been going on about the Patriarchate[425] affected people. Establishing the Patriarchate as sacred, and the place of the sacred as Istanbul, becomes important in defining themselves. But such a sense is not an opinion shared by all the interviewee.

Interviewee *Miltos*, who migrated to Athens in the late 70's, say he does not understand why the Patriarchate is considered sacred, and asserts that the

---

424 Ibid, p. 7.
425 For those discourses also see Cengiz Aktar, ibid.

Romioi community was forced to stay in Istanbul during the exchange only to ensure the Patriarchate would remain there.

> "I think it was a big mistake. Why did they exclude the Romioi of Istanbul in the Treaty of Lausanne? Because of the Patriarchate. The Patriarchate is nothing more than a building. Why were we forced to live there just because of a building? It's unreasonable, nonsense, and I think it was a big mistake. If we were Greek too, of Greek origin, it would have been better if we had left as well. Neither the infamous events of September 6–7 nor the Wealth Tax would have happened then, and we would not have been held responsible for the Cyprus events. All those wasted people... Now there is a notion of visiting Istanbul like a pilgrimage. I think this is baloney, what do you mean, 'pilgrimage to Istanbul'? They visit the Patriarchate and churches. There are quite many churches here, it's so absurd" (Miltos, Athens).

The emphasis in interviewee *Miltos*'s narrative is that physical places, buildings, and concrete forms of the *City* do not have a symbolic meaning. For this reason, according to him, it is meaningless to interpret visits to these churches as "*pilgrimage*". *Miltos*'s references to the events of September 6–7 when the Romioi suffered a lot and the Welfare Tax, suggest that even if he had once attributed symbolic meanings to these places, these events changed the meaning of these places for him. This also suggests that the concept of place and the perception of what is sacred and what is not, are closely related to the political processes.

In the above anecdote, it is necessary to look closely at the concepts of travel/pilgrimage to Istanbul, where *Miltos* refers to as "notion of pilgrimage". As it is known, there are associative and reminding powers of sacred places, rituals and the accounts of them. In this respect, it is important to analyze participating in religious rituals of the Romiois living in Istanbul or Athens in relation to identification and the way of perceive and experience the sacred, because, "during rituals, metaphors of space are activated and participants experience complex emotions and feel revitalization".[426] In this sense, it can be argued that Istanbul has acquired a sacred quality as a place/space to which these missed feelings are affixed.

Is visiting Istanbul a pilgrimage or journey, or both? As anthropologists Victor and Edith Turner emphasize, the defining contexts of such a separation are more important than whether it is categorized as pilgrimage or touristic visit.[427] The situation also requires that the journey itself be analyzed as well. Travels are

---

426 Setha M. Low and Denise Lawrence-Zuniga, *The Anthropology of Space Place*, Blackwell Publishing, Maldon, Oxford, Victoria, Berlin, 2003, p. 14.

427 Victor Turner and Edith Turner, *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1978, p. 20.

made to numerous places, often for multiple reasons. Therefore, the meanings underlying concepts like "pilgrim" and "tourist" are different. In the postmodern world, as the anthropologists Ellen Badone and Sharon Roseman argue, it is no longer tenable rigid dichotomies between tourism and pilgrimage. The key to distinction is what the travelers embrace in regard to beliefs and motivations about journeys to religious shrines.[428] So, the question of whether it is possible to clearly identify what these motivations are, or may be, is meaningful. Tourism, pilgrimage or travel means moving physically from one place to another in time and space, but its spiritual positioning is controversial and contextual. If travel is intended with a sacred goal, or to sacred place, then it would have a pilgrimage feature. In this sense, with the symbolism focused on Istanbul and especially on the Patriarchate, it is possible to describe travels here as "pilgrimage" from the believers' point of view.

While there are some who find it meaningless to qualify the churches in the *City* as sacred, and do not consider visits as pilgrimage, it is more commonly thought that the sanctity of the *city* continues. However, the common theme in the talks about travel was not pilgrimage to the *city*, but rather returning to the *hometown*, to the place of memories. The *City* is the place where people's memories are centered upon in their life stories, which could lead to the sanctification of the city. One of such places is the cemetery.

Cemeteries: "A meeting place in Istanbul, a foreign concept in Athens"

In Athens, interviewees *Damos* and *Theodora* talk about the cemeteries as follows:

"When we go to Istanbul, the first visit after the hotel is to the cemetery, then we will do whatever we please. It is a necessity. When we lived in Istanbul, the cemetery was a social gathering place. When we visited the cemeteries then, we would meet our friends, one in Kurtulus, one in Kadikoy. Like going to a coffee house, a cafe. We would both commemorate the dead and take the opportunity to meet each other. Commemorating meant preserving our respect to our parents as if they were still with us, showing that we did not forget them. That's how we viewed it. But there is more to it. . . Next to my mother's, is the grave of a classmate of mine. We were in elementary school; one day we walked out together, 2 days later we learned that she had passed away. She could not survive the measles, she was just 9 or 10. When I see this grave next to my mother's, it takes me back to those school days; I can feel the air, I can almost see my classmates. We tour the entire cemetery when go there in Istanbul, noting the people we knew – 'oh she was

---

428 Ellen Badone and Sharon R Roseman, "Approaches to the Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism", in Badone and Roseman (eds.), *Intersecting Journeys the Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Chicago, 2004, pp. 1–3.

my neighbor, he was my teacher, our pharmacist, the grocer'. . . all those images come
to life" (Theodora-Damos, Athens).

Although cemeteries are primarily thought of as places reminiscent of death,
they are also places that evoke emotions about the past, people from the past, and
feelings about the past. It can be argued that they function as dynamic *memory
places* due to their associative orientation. Foucault describes cemeteries as a
heterotopia, a place in culture that contains all the other aspects represented,
contested and inverted.[429] Cemeteries are places with multiple aspects, meanings
and cultural symbols. They show how people/groups generally approach change,
more specifically the beginning of live, its duration, and death.[430] In this aspect,
they (cemeteries) can be considered as places where death becomes materialized.
On the other hand, while cemeteries look like static material structures, they
are also dynamic places because of their associative effects on people, in terms
of their interactions with their family and other people and finding meaning in
existence and life. Thus, cemeteries are places that are used and experienced,
as much as they are material arrangements in a locality. Furthermore, the most
important aspect that makes this location a place, is memory. It was the memory
of this group identity, which led *Theodora* and *Damos* to visit the cemetery the
day after they arrived in Istanbul.

Theodora's parents' graves are not in Istanbul, where they spent most of their
lives, but in Peleponnes, Greece. However, they do not feel anything when they
visit that cemetery in Peloponnes. She explains this as follows:

"It doesn't say anything to me. Foreign. Except for my parents, everything is foreign.
Whereas the other side tells my entire life story. This being the case, how can I not look
forward to going to Istanbul and spend some time there?" (Theodora, Athens).

Hercules notes that those who have been forced to leave Istanbul have been
saddened that they were also abandoning their cemeteries:

"We, the Istanbulite, have our cemeteries there. It is actually heartbreaking. Leaving
their cemeteries behind was hard for those people; it was hard for my parents because
my brother's grave is there. It was an unreal feeling to abandon that grave when we left
Istanbul. It has to do with being native. Quite interestingly, for some reason people who

---

429 Foucault, "Of Other Space", *Diacritics*, Spring 1986, p. 24.

430 Archaeologist and art history expert Eva Aleksandru Şarlak, in her work on the archi-
     tectural and artistic characteristics of Christian cemeteries in Istanbul, emphasizes
     the effect of death theme on religion, ritual life, mythology, art and philosophy and
     prevalence of emphasizing treasure/burial rituality in cultures (Şarlak, *İstanbul
     Nekropollerinde Sanat ve Mimarlık*, Derin Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005).

hold a grudge against the Romioi, who want to demonstrate their resentment, go and vandalize the graves. I don't quite get it, but they must have a reason. I am afraid these are quite effective acts, as it bothers people a lot" (Hercules, Athens).

Hercules's parents were shaken because leaving Istanbul also meant to leave the cemeteries. Leaving cemeteries behind can be shocking and painful when they are perceived as a final detachment from the loved ones, an eternal goodbye. Similarly, the vandalism was not about the material elements like the tombstones, but about memory, the emotional bonds with the grave. For this reason, I think it would be appropriate to examine the phenomenon of sanctification in relation to the *memory culture*.[431] Archaeologist and art historian Jan Assman defines death as "the rupture between yesterday and today, in which the choice to obliterate or preserve must be considered, is experienced in its most basic and, in a sense, primal form in death".[432] He describes death as the "primal scene of *memory culture*"[433] and it is "both the origin and the center of memory culture".[434]

Assman draws attention to two aspects of memory of the dead, commemoration, both as backward and forward remembrances. On the "retrospective" side, the image covers memories of the deceased and the time when the group lived together with its dead, and memories are kept alive in time. The "prospective" aspect is reflected in "achievement" and "fame". The hope of living on in the group memory, and incorporating ancestors into the progressive present, are part of the basic universal structures of the human life.[435] Memory of dead

---

431 The term is borrowed from Jan Assman (Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization, Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2011).

432 Ibid, p. 19.

433 Ibid, p. 19. It is needed to give information about Assman's term of *figures of memory*. He says that those figures are always based on a concrete space and time. "The substance of memories is connected to time both through the adherence to primal or outstanding events and periodic rhythm to which these memories refer." He gives the calendar of festival as an example. According to him, "festivals mirrors collectively 'experienced time' that may be secular or ecclesiastical, agricultural or military, depending on the nature of the group" (Ibid, p. 24). Assman notes that the memory culture aims to maintain social obligation and is based on the group. He indicates that the important point is the question of "what should not be forgotten" and that memory culture is linked to the "memory that forms a community " (Ibid, p. 16, Assmann's quotation source K. Schmidt, *Gedächtnis, das Gemeinschaft stiftet*, Freiburg 1985)

434 Ibid, pp. 45–47.

435 Ibid, p. 47 [Assman's quotation source, M. Fortes 1978a: "Pietas in Ancestor Woeship, dt. F. Kramer/C. Sigrist (Hrsg.)", *Gesellschaften ohne Staat I. Gleichheit und Gegenseitigkeit*, Frankfurt, 197–232].

is a characteristic example of "establishing the community" in your memory.[436] The community consolidates their identity by commemorating their deceased.[437] Because of this connection with cemeteries that are affixed to a *place* that Assman describes as universal, *Theodora* and *Damos* felt the urge to visit the cemetery the day they after arrived in Istanbul, whereas *Theodora* did not feel anything in Peleponnes, where her parents are buried. Cemeteries can also be targets of vandalism because of their sacred heritage status.

Autobiographical sanctity

While the interviewees point out to the commemorative aspects (like the cemeteries carry for the culture and group identity) to explain the sanctification of Istanbul, the emphasis is actually on the association of the *City* with their life stories:

> "It's holy in the sense that we were born and raised there. We had our friends and mates there, we had the good times and the bad. It offered such a life for us that is impossible to forget. I met a friend from college this summer, after 40 years. 40 years! She is a Romioi, she married a Turk, they live in Istanbul and have a wonderful family. (..) Her husband was also a class mate. She asked me 'do you remember how the customs of that time would not allow any intimacy? They were so strict, with curfews at 6 pm. You would tease me as the commander of the siege.' This is it. This is an integral part of my connection with this place, an unbreakable chain. Remember, I lived there for 30 years, I came here when I was 33; Theodora when she was 31. You can not erase 30 years" (Damos, Athens).

What interviewee *Damos* tells reminds us that Istanbul means their autobiographies. Even through the time spent in Athens and Istanbul are close, or even less in Istanbul, the (critical) years of more intense activity, changes and emotional turmoil such as childhood, youth and school years were spent in Istanbul. The bond established through the memories of what can be described as the most vivid and colorful years of the autobiography, is defined as unbreakable. It cannot be argued that the bond, if not entirely savaged, continues to have the same meaning over the years. If this is the case, then we are faced with the following questions: In which situations is this bond questioned, and becomes a problem? How do people see themselves in relation to this? To look for answers to these questions, we need to look at familiar-foreign or guest-native concepts and the relationship between them.

---

436 Ibid, p. 47 (Assman's quotation source: K. Schmidt 1985).
437 Ibid, p. 47.

Familiar-foreign-guest-native

"There was a security check late in the evening one day, when I was a Reserve Officer. You have an 'immunity' as an officer, the privilege of evading a pat-down by flashing your ID card. The vehicle stopped, and I handed my ID to the officer. He started reading, Dimitris. . .. then called out 'Captain, Captain, we have a foreigner here!' I gave him the stink-eye. When the Captain arrived, I told him: 'I would like to file a complaint about this police officer'. It would be OK if the ID was fake. But to assume a person is a foreigner just by his name on the ID is an offense, because someone with a Turkish Republic Armed Forces ID may not be a foreigner. This is pure ignorance (...) A few years ago I was dropping off my wife, then fiancé. The taxicab was stopped again, and the police asked to see our identifications. He inspected mine and said 'oh, Dimitris... Let him through, he's a foreigner'. I am not sure if I should be grateful for that or not. So, a foreigner would not commit a crime?... First you have to define who a foreigner is. Labeling a person with a non-Muslim name as a foreigner is absurd, a sign of ignorance. Doing that upon seeing that name on a Reserve Officer's ID, is double-ignorance! I take it as an insult. He may not be able to read Dimitris, but to label me a foreigner? You may think that to yourself, it's not a crime, but you may not say it out loud while wearing a uniform" (Dimitris, Istanbul).

Interviewee *Dimitris* notes that even today the concept of citizenship is not yet established, Romiois are not seen as citizens.

"Even the Supreme Court, the highest authority, has a 'foreigner' assessment for non-Muslims. Until it is removed, anyone who thinks differently would reflect 'come on, they are foreigners, the Supreme Court says so'. This has to be rectified top-down, first at the highest level by the Supreme Court. How can a person with identical rights, who is registered by the state, be a foreigner? Does Turkey register the foreigners as citizens as well? This can lead to many diverse questions" (Dimitris, Istanbul).

Dimitris emphasizes the widespread understanding of citizenship in Turkey. Citizenship in the minds is identified with being Turkish and Muslim. Due to this association, a Turkish citizen named *Dimitris* was not considered probable. This perception is so powerful that a public officer can portray a person as a foreigner, despite the officer uniform and the identity card shown. This shows the persistence of mental associations.

"Foreign" names

If we think about how often we say our names in everyday life and in how many different environments, we can imagine how frequently the Romioi faced being labeled a foreigner because of their names. An example would be the coffee chains where coffee cups are labeled with customer's name when the order is taken. *Dimitris*' use of a Turkish name, *Kemal Mutlu* in such places seems to be

an effort to reduce this frequency. Another example to this citizen and Turkish/ Muslim association is when the interviewee *Alessandra*, who lives in Istanbul, was asked by college students which team she supported in the Turkish-Greek national [soccer] games. It would not be very common for a professor named *Kemal*, *Hasan*, or *Ayşe* to receive such a question. A popular example would be the name contest run by the media in search of a "Turkish name" for the Brazilian soccer player Alex de Souza who played with Fenerbahçe Sports Club, when he was about to take on his Turkish citizenship, with the conviction that there could not be a Turkish citizen named "Alex".[438] This contest clearly demonstrates the common approach to citizenship. What the interviewee commonly raised was, that the issue was not such inconveniences in the everyday life, but more importantly that the official authorities – the State – defined them as foreigners. Indeed, this labeling becomes even more important when the hierarchy of state-citizen relations is taken into account. The state's stipulation of foreign is an important problem when we consider the influence of the government in generating discourse, since it would eventually make its way into the daily life.

Strangers of both places

Along with the foreigner label stemming from being Romioi, the sense of identity and space of "self" can change with forced migration. *Leonidas* of Istanbul, who lives in Athens, defines himself as an "*alien in both places*". Interviewee *Miltos* stressed the alienation he felt when he lived in Istanbul:

> "Those were very hard times for us, first the events of September 6–7, then Cyprus '63–'64, the massacred Cypriot Turks. . . The Turks in Turkey wanted to have their kins' revenge on us. Some incidents that took place in certain neighborhoods... It was not a good life.. Being startled by cries of 'damn the Romioi' while peacefully enjoying the

---

438 This striking example was given by Sibel Özbudun in her lecture in Yeditepe University. The quest for names to Alex de Souza can be illustrated as follows: "Following the announcement that Alex de Souza was applying to become a Turkish citizen, citizens declared mobilization to find a Turkish name for Alex on Twitter" http://www.cnnturk. com/2011/bilim.teknoloji/04/19/vatandas.alexe.turkce.isim.ariyor/613842.0/index. html "F.Bahçe's captain, who visited the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan with president of the club Aziz Yıldırım, asked for help from him in the transition to Turkish citizenship. The Prime Minister asked: Did you think any name, Alex? Alex did not say in the meeting, but he prefers because of his love Ali Yıldırım and Ali Koç". http://spor. milliyet.com.tr/iste-alex-in-tercih-ettigi-isim/spor/spordetay/20.04.2011/1380107/ default.htm.

> balcony on the Island... Every Romioi has similar stories to tell. We grew up as foreigners there."

The politically-driven exclusions he experienced when he lived in Istanbul created a feeling of alienation in *Miltos*. The way he reflects this by saying "we *grew up as a foreigner*" indicates the permanence of this sensation. After he had to leave Istanbul in 1978, he went back once in 2004 and he felt foreign. He says he does not understand why the Romioi would insist on living in Istanbul where they are clearly not wanted:

> "The Romioi of Istanbul who still live there say they don't want to leave, that their origins are there. I think this is a gross mistake. If we are of Greek origin, we don't belong there. Istanbul is not the Romioi's, it belongs to Turks. It is a Turkish and Muslim city. (. . .) It's sad, but true, that by the fifth day I felt so alienated that I wanted to come back" (Miltos, Athens).

There are also some who emphasize that while they felt like a foreigner when they lived there, they did not feel alienated when they went back after migration. Interviewee *Orestis*'s feelings and how he defined being a Romioi as a child in Istanbul and those when he returned in the 90s as an adult, are quite a contrast. *Orestis* describes it as follows:

> "I lived in Istanbul for the last five years. I really enjoyed it; being different, a minority, and living in a city where many religions and cultures have originated was quite nice. (. . .) But it was difficult back then. We were reluctant to speak in our language or say that were Romioi. It spanned a wide range, from the administrative offices to the taxi driver. Naturally everyone, from the neighbors to the grocer, knew about us, but it was a bit unnerving. At that time, I did not think of (the multicultural environment) as nice, on the contrary, I thought (being a minority) was bad. Very bad. I thought being different was more difficult and that we had to get away from it as soon as possible. I thought life could not go on like that, and it would be unbearable to feel and be treated like a second class, fifth class citizen. But now, being an outlier, living in Istanbul as an alien, is quite different" (Orestis, Athens).

Interviewee *Orestis* left Turkey in 1981 after high school and did not return until 1990. After the 1990s, he kept going back and forth. He lived in Istanbul between 2006 and 2011. He describes this newer experience as follows:

> "It was entirely different in the recent years. It was living in a multicultural environment where everyone respects one another, no matter how one mentally categorized some people. That was the general attitude, nobody bothered you for no reason. Of course, there are enthusiasts everywhere that may cause an incident, but I think of it as an extraordinary and a much more pleasant thing after my most recent experience. Yet, it was really bad back in those years" (Orestis, Athens).

It was not easy for *Orestis* to decide to return. He was a little bit sceptical. He started feeling a difference but was not certain whether it was something temporary. Therefore, he started visiting frequently, and when he noticed that no one was disturbing him, he was assured that the change was real. He noticed Tarlabasi, his former neighborhood in Istanbul, had changed a lot. He describes this transformation as follows:

> "My friends - not from Greece, my local friends, asked me where I grew up in Istanbul. I replied 'In Tarlabasi, come on let me give you a tour'. They said, 'no way, we wouldn't go there'. These were the Turks from Istanbul, the elite, those we call 'the White Turks". I said, 'what's wrong, let's go, I thought you wanted to see' They said, 'no, it's pretty dangerous there'. I said, 'it will be ok, I've been there 20 times, and nobody did anything. . . after all, we wouldn't carry any valuables'" (Orestis, Athens).

Even though Tarlabasi had changed, interviewee *Orestis* did not feel as an outsider. In fact, his "local" friends, the Turks have been alienated from Tarlabasi and he could not convince them to visit. He visits Tarlabasi only with his friends from Athens:

> "I went there quite often; when my close friends came, they would ask about where I grew up and where my school was, so I would take the opportunity to visit myself, and nothing ever happened."

Tarlabasi is a neighborhood where mostly non-Muslim community lived before the intensive migration of the Romioi. In addition to the migration of the Romioi of Istanbul to other countries, after 1950s, the demographic composition and semantic meaning of Tarlabasi changed as well, due to the mass internal immigration from other rural settlements in Turkey to the big cities, especially to Istanbul. When the "foreigners" (the Romioi) of the neighborhood left, Tarlabasi, where people with limited financial resources from Anatolia were now settled in, became a worrisome and "foreign" place for the native Turks of Istanbul. For *Orestis* however, who had lived there before, it was still a place that he could easily visit anytime. This suggests that *Orestis*'s sensual ties to the place continued despite the changes that the community has gone through, and these changes did not lead him to consider the neighborhood "foreign".

"Strangers" at "Home"

Another interviewee, *Akis*, who came to Istanbul after many years, likewise refers to the new residents of his old home as "foreigners", another example of spatial bonds.

Akis came back to Istanbul in 1989, 25 years after he graduated from high school and left Istanbul. The *city* had changed a lot.

> "When we went to Istanbul in '89, we wanted to visit our old neighborhoods. My wife went to her old house, and I went to mine. We wanted to go inside the homes that we grew up in (. . .) Strangers lived there now but they were not unfriendly. They welcomed us in, treated like their guests. Of course, then I went to Kinali and roamed every inch of it" (Akis, Athens).

Home is an idealized place, where meanings and attachments are most intense.[439] When *Akis* and his wife, *Cleo*, went to Istanbul, they went to their "home" where they have the closest ties with. Even though the *City* had changed, it felt familiar to him. They got a bit lost because they were driving, but they found old Istanbul unchanged. They describe it as follows:

> "It felt familiar of course, very familiar (. . .) We went to the Old City, to Fener to visit our old high school, then to Beyoglu, on to the Bosphorous, the Islands. Ulus is an unknown place to us, or Avcilar. When we lived there, Levent 3 or 4 was the edge of Istanbul, there was nothing beyond that. The Taksim-Maslak route now takes you to Istinye, through the hills (. . .) We wanted to see the Istanbul that we knew of; there were a lot changes and some places were unfamiliar, but the Old City did not change at all" (Cleo-Akis, Athens).

The changes that *Akis* mentioned also include a "familiarity". Being able to speak of change involves "knowing" the past and expressing differences in reference to this "known" original. In this sense it is a comparison of old and new. These comparisons are impressions formed on the individual by the impact of those changes. While in some cases it may become traumatic, in others the new is bundled together with the old, and the familiarity is refreshed. Interviewee *Stratos*'s comments are supportive of this:

> "Our neighborhood did not change too much. I went to the house in Fener where I had the unpleasant experiences, and it was just the same. There was a church across from us, I went there as well. I remembered my childhood. We used to play there, there were toys in the church for the children. I had many memories by the courtyard, I recalled them all. Then we went to Fener to see our old high school (. . .) Surely, we occasionally remember the bitter memories as well. and then the beautiful times we had. We also saw the newer neighborhoods, but they don't mean anything to us. Our relatives brought us to this Istinye Park. . . It's very contemporary; of course, the city grew bigger and better now. But it is the old times that we want to go back for" (Stratos, Athens).

---

439 Cresswell, ibid, p. 173.

Like *Akis*, new neighborhoods such as Ulus, or the modern shopping centers like Istinye Park did not mean anything for *Stratos* as well. These locations/neighborhoods were non-places for them. Anthropologist Marc Auge uses the term 'non-place' to refer to sites that are not actually gone but passed in transit, such as gas stations, or airports.[440] The fact that *Akis* and *Stratos* define new neighborhoods and buildings as foreign is related to them not having any experiences with those places. Thus, new districts and buildings can become like a gas station in their eyes, places experienced only with a specific purpose, not much different from one another, and therefore, they are not expected to develop a sense of place for those. Hence, these new districts are non-places and alien to them. The fact that *Akis* and his wife *Cleo* regarded the current residents living in their old homes as "strangers" and that their homes had not been destroyed were effective in maintaining the spatial ties. The purpose of visiting former neighborhoods was not a search for the authentic, but to go to somewhere familiar, a location or place where they were connected with.

In contrast, interviewee *Evi* finds the city to have changed a lot, when she returned 19 years after she left Istanbul in 1970. They used to live in the dwellings of the factory in Bomonti where her father worked. She could not find her old house because the lot had been subdivided, but her husband *Hercules* was able to find the apartment building he used to live in:

> "They added a story to the building. I wanted to go in and take a look at the apartment. . . I was curious to see how the place I remembered looked like now. But they told me, and ill-tempered lady lived there, and I felt shy and embarrassed, so I did not go in" (Hercules, Athens).

In Athens, Interviewee *Joanna*, who defines herself as haymatlos, goes back in 1982 for the first time since the 70's.

> "I am neither from there or here... I went back in 1982 as a tourist, and again three years ago. I just haven't had the chance before. I walked around with my camera on hand. The streets, the museums, they were wonderful. I want to go back again. I went to my old neighborhood, of course it is different now. I used to live on Mansur Street in Sisli, right behind the mosque. Half of us were Romioi, and there were Armenians, Jews, very few Turks. Still, we all got along very well, without any issues. We the children, played together on the streets, I did not have any issues as a child. The adults however were uneasy, they thought differently" (Joanna, Istanbul).

Joanna found her old landlady *Hanife* and her daughter *Hülya*. "*They welcomed me to their home – the house has now been replaced by an apartment building. We*

---

440 Ibid, p. 174.

spent some time, had coffee. I really love them". She says she wants to go back to Istanbul again, with her daughter.

> "I want to show her the neighborhoods that I lived in. And my old school on Mac Street in Cihangir. It is very sad that the school is in ruins now. I saw it when I visited last time and saw the pictures. When I was a student there, we were 90 kids in the 6th grade. There were a lot of us! But at the graduation, there were only 23 girls. Our class started with 90, ended with 23. The school was later closed down, in 1998" (Joanna, Istanbul).

In the "old" that is remembered, there are not only the silhouettes of the city, neighborhoods, houses and schools, but relations as well. Hence beyond the homes and schools ruined with lack of "interaction", there are also neighbors and friends with whom the ties may have been weakened or broken. Therefore, it can be argued that detachment from a place is the result of this inability to connect. Repairing detachment may or may not be possible by reconnecting; yet it is an ongoing search and discovery. It was traumatic when it was not possible to show their old "happy places" to their children because of the changes. Because if the houses, neighborhoods and schools that were a testament to their past were to go away, the witnesses of their past, hence their past, would fade away and disappear. And so, would seem their location-based existence that they kept alive by holding on to their precious memories. This is what is really upsetting, frightening, frightening and traumatic. *Dimitra*'s[441] feelings about Istanbul are exactly the same:

> "We feel sad because everything is very different now. The youngsters don't know about the things we went through, or they were not told by their parents or relatives. I walk around a lot, for shopping, or to hairdressers etc. They ask me where I'm from, they can tell I am a foreigner. Those who left after '65 or '73 would not admit they were coming from Greece or Athens when they returned to visit a few years later. They would say they were from France, or Switzerland, that they were foreigners, since it would be received negatively otherwise. Now we can openly tell them that we're coming from Athens, Greece; that we were born and raised here, but had to leave in '73, '65, or '80. 'But, why did you leave?' When we tell them why, they are appalled? They are young, they don't know. Those who are now at my father's age, were against us then, they didn't want us. We didn't have any issues with our neighbors, they liked and protected us" (Dimitra, Athens).

The fear of change is not only about those who migrate, but also about those who remain at the same time. Because they are frightened and saddened by

---

441 *Dimitra*: Female. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Romioi. She is from Cihangir. She came to Athens with her husband. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010.

the rapid decline of their "own". One of the most important aspects of this change is the "urban-rural" dilemma or the "upper and lower" class conflict. The Romiois of Istanbul who are surrounded by a city culture are complaining about the incompatibility of newcomers to urban culture. Interviewee *Keti*'s parents, whose ancestors lived in Istanbul for four of five generations, elaborates on this:

> "They can no longer recognize Istanbul. It has nothing to do with being a Romioi. The newcomers managed to totally transform this city. Normally, in other metropolitan cities like London or Paris, newcomers adopt, they get assimilated into the city's culture. I think it happened the other way in Istanbul after 1970. These people are not actually happy here; and Istanbul's former sparkle is not there anymore either. It's hard, very hard. Everyone agrees that it's a mess of identities now. For centuries, Istanbul always had a multicultural identity. When you destroy that, you take a way a natural component of the city. There are a lot of people - Jews, Armenians, Assyrians. I think the city can not tolerate a population of 15 million. My father was from the Burgaz Island; his grandmother, even his mother, used to gather lobsters by hand right off the sea. Where have all this gone?"

There is a small church by the sea in Feneryolu, just before Fenerbahce. That's where *Keti's* mother learned how to swim:

> "I heard so many stories like that. Istanbul used to be a true heaven, literally. So green, with the bluest seas, limited population, no pollution. Fruits and vegetables in abundance. They had the best of everything, one needn't go anywhere else. I grew up with these memories" (Keti, Athens).

These memories that *Keti* says she grew up with, are memories of her choice. Memory is a point in time and space. Therefore, glorification of the place and time in the stories about the past is a frequently encountered situation. Detachment from a place weakens the person and "psychological trauma is an affliction of the powerless".[442] What essentially affects people in the formation of these traumas, is the inability to return after being uprooted from the place and not knowing what to expect if and when they return. The act of returning itself is further complicated since the possibility of not recognizing the places of their childhood, their youth and where their memories rooted is a second trauma. In this context, I will address spatial memory in the next section.

---

442 Herman, ibid, p. 33.

Memory

> "They can't return... because they are human; they are happy in their minds, with happy memories neatly stored away.. and to refresh them would be traumatic. (...) Think about going back to the same place, only to discover that none of those people are there anymore; it's hard. You have to generate new memories of that place; and it is very difficult to find the strength in yourself to make that place meaningful for you again. What could help? People. Because places are more than the soil, the rocks, the houses; they involve people. And now, none of those people are there, no one you can hold on to. That's brutal. It could help if you had Turkish friends, they would pull you out. Somehow you would get a hold of something small, and gradually start turning that place into something meaningful again, a worthy place for yourself. You create new memories there; the old and the new might even meet along the way somehow. Even if they don't, you can discover yourself there" (Angelos, Athens).

Spatial meaning is a pattern composed of interactions and memories that give meaning to a space/ place. For this reason, the question of "under what conditions do them myths of home and return strengthened or weakened"[443] is significant. Seeing the districts where the Rimioi once lived, the classrooms that once were full of students, and the then crowded churches now in isolation, changed the meaning of those places. When places became un-related, or turned into a new form of relationship over time by the reduction of the Romioi population, the sense of space became more problematic.

As it is known, the construction of the place is never static, never finished but constantly being performed through practices.[444] So, these places in isolation have the potential to move them into a "foreign" position to the places where they were born and raised and built memories. For this reason, since coming to Istanbul, walking on the streets, into the buildings, and all this "the flow of movement" would also create "a flow of mind",[445] it seems like what they were afraid of was not to be able to find themselves in this motion, and become a stranger.

As interviewee *Angelos* emphasizes, a place is more than a tangible form such as stones, soil, apartments, or landscape. It is not just a place for social events either. The feeling of place is the sensation that arises from the interrelations of these material forms over time. If think of this interrelation as a "the points of

---

443 Zetter, "Reconceptualizing the Myth of Return: Continuity and Transition Amongst the Greek-Cypriot Refugees of 1974", *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12 (1), 1–22, 1999, p. 5.

444 Barbara Bender, "Introduction", in Bender and Winer (eds.), *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*, Berg, Oxford, 2001.

445 Christopher Tilley, *Phenomenology of the Landscape,* Berg, Oxford, 1994, p. 31.

intersection representing the past, the present and the future define a triangle, a shape which also emphasis the continuity between the three components".[446] The continuity will be broken if any of these three components is challenged or removed, since they also imply continuity.[447] This broken triangle represents the situation of refugees after displacement.[448] Both to return, and not being able to return, can become agonizing because of this broken continuity. It is the fear of inability to feel the place that had a meaning with memories of childhood and youth, in other words not being able to feel familiar, because "feeling alien in a place once called home is another displacement" and[449] the breaking of the "ideal triangle".[450] They cannot return because the feeling alien will shake their identity, and "identity and alienation are strictly correlative "[451] In below section, I will examine issues of returning/inability to return and memory, and starting with nostalgia, the concepts of remembering, forgetting, sensory memory, and continuity/discontinuity.

Nostalgia, homesickness

> "Do you know what nostalgia means? It comes from the words 'Nostos and Alghos', nostalgia, the ache for your birthplace. The Romioi word for delicious is polinostimo; tastes like nostos, nostimo, the wonderful taste, the taste of your birthplace" (Mihail, Istanbul).

As emphasized by interviewee *Mihail*, the owner of these words, nostalgia, which means 'the ache for your birthplace' is also related to the meaning of 'the taste of your birthplace'. Anthropologist Rebecca Bryant underlines the word's meaning, which is the longing to return, based on *nostos* –return- *alghos* –pain; she also indicates that the words *ksenitia* in Greek or *gurbet* in Turkish describe the individual being away from homeland and this causes *homesickness, sıla özlemi* in Turkish, united with feelings of nostalgia.[452]

Anthropologist Nadia Seremetakis points out the difference in meaning between *nostalgia* in English and nostalgia (*nostalghía*) in Greek. She indicates that nostalgia in English implies trivializing romantic sentimentality, and is

---

446 Zetter, ibid, p. 8.
447 Göker, ibid, p. 118.
448 Zetter, p. 8.
449 Göker, p. 140.
450 Zetter, 1999.
451 Slavoj Žižek, *Sublime Object of Ideology,* Verso, London, New York, 1989.
452 Rebecca Bryant, "Writing the Catastrophe: Nostalgia and Its Histories in Cyprus", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 26 (2008), Number 2, 399–422.

based on a concept locked in past, far from the relation with present. Seremetakis elaborates the meaning of the word through referring to the etymology of the word. The verb *nostalghó* is the composite of *nostó* and *alghó* in Greek. While the verb *nostó* means I return or I travel back to homeland, *nostós* means journey. While the verb *alghó* means I feel pain, I ache for, *álghos* refers to one's pain in soul and body, a burning pain (*kaimós*). Therefore, *nostalghía* means a desire or longing with burning pain to journey.[453] *Angelos*'s words above "*They could not return . . . you go to that place, none of those people are there anymore, it is very hard*" or *Phoebe*'s situation, that she could never dare to return to Istanbul, which she describes as the heaven she left when she was eight, overlap with the Seremetakis's definition of *nostalghía*. They could not return, because going to or coming from Istanbul, requires facing the spatial change and the change of the image in memory, and this could be a burning pain experience. On the other hand, it was also painful that they could not go as they could not face it; because the inability to return does not mean that it is not desired, and the homesickness could even multiply and continue to ache like an illness.

Comparative literature theoretician Svetlana Boym, in her study named *The Future of Nostalgia*, notes that, although it comes from two Greek words the word nostalgia did not first come out in Ancient Greece, and points out that this word could be Greek only in a nostalgic sense. According to her, this word was first used by the Swiss doctor Johannes Hofer in his medical dissertation[454] written in 1688, to define the sad mood of a person as a result of the desire for return to one's native land. Among the first victims of this diagnosed disease were students separated from their homes, servants working in France and Germany, and Swiss soldiers fighting abroad. Boym draws attention to the records of those patients that said the patients acquired "a lifeless and haggard countenance", and "indifference towards everything", and indicates that homesickness became the only obsession of the nostalgic. Boym indicates that nostalgia was akin to paranoia based on diagnostic methods of that period, the only difference being that the nostalgic person is suffering from a mania for longing rather than persecution. Nevertheless, nostalgia was acknowledged as a disease based on the knowledge in that period and classified as a curable disease that is not necessarily lethal.

---

453 Seremetakis, ibid, p. 4.
454 Boym, in his book, gives the following footnote about the mentioned thesis: "Johannes Hofer, Dissertation Medica de nostalgia (Basel, 1688). See also Carolyn Kiser Ansbach's translation into English. Bulletin of the History of Medicine, 2 (1934)" (Boym, ibid, p. 3).

Although some treatments were proposed, it was said that nothing would keep the place of returning to motherland. According to Boym, the reason of nostalgia epidemic in that period was not related to only the dislocation of space, but also with the changing conception of time. Boym who separates modern nostalgia from *nostos* in ancient Greece, namely the myth of return home, indicates that modern nostalgia is a mourning for the impossibility to return.[455] The impossibility to return for some of the Romioi who had to leave Istanbul was related to either legal or psychological obstacles. Because of this impossibility, while those who could not return mourned away from home (in Athens), the mourning increased in time and became nonstop.

As it can be seen above in Boym's approach to nostalgia concept, he discusses nostalgia with respect to the time and space concepts that change along with modernity. So indeed, it is a result of modernity that time is divided into slices as past, present and future, and the understanding of time transformed from the seasons or the cycles of production into the time measured by hours or shifts. Likewise, as stated by anthropologist Edmund Leach,[456] before the modern period the measurement of space was done with parts of human body, when distance was described, relational proximity, kinship structures could be a criterion. However, a new understanding of time and space appeared due to modernity. This major change in the perception of time also problematized the acts of remembering and forgetting. Furthermore, this is not only individual, but also has collective properties. Individual forgetting is largely involuntary; however collective forgetting is mainly deliberate and purposeful.[457] As emphasized by theoretician Ernest Renan, "to forget to get one's history wrong are essential factors in the making of a nation".[458] Then, it will be better to take a closer look at the individual and collective aspects of the feelings of forgetting, remembering and missing.

Boym indicates that there are two types of nostalgia which characterize one's perception about himself/herself and the past, home, *imagined community*. She describes those as restorative nostalgia and reflective nostalgia. She emphasizes

455 Ibid, pp. 3–8.

456 Edmund Leach, "Anthropological Aspects of language: animal categories and verbal abuse", in Lenneberg (ed.), *New Directions in the Study of Language*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachutsetts 1964.

457 David Lowenthal, "Preface", in Forty and Küchler (eds.), *The Art of Forgetting*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 2001, p. xi.

458 Ernest Renan, "What Is a Nation?", in Dahbourne and Ishay (eds.), *The Nationalism Reader*, Humanities Press, New Jersey, 1995, p. 145.

that these two types are not absolute; they are rather tendencies, two ways for understanding and longing. Restorative nostalgia focuses on *nostos*. It promises reconstruction of the lost home and closing the gaps in memory. Reflective nostalgia, on the other hand, puts emphasis on *algia*, longing and loss. According to Boym, nostalgics in the first category do not think of themselves as nostalgic, but rather they believe that their project is about truth. National and nationalistic revivals are the distinguishing feature of this type of nostalgia. On the other hand, reflective nostalgia deals with shambles, and the rust of time and history, with images of another place and time.[459] Following the concepts of Boym, practices such as the emphasis on Hellenic elements rather than Roman, and attempts to erase the Ottoman traces during the restoration of the Acropolis discussed under the title of *Sacralisation* in the previous section, can be described as *restorative nostalgia*.

However, during most of the interviews with those who had to leave Istanbul, it is observed that the emphasis focused more on *algia*. This could be interpreted that they have a *reflective nostalgia*. For those who were able to return to Istanbul, the houses which they lived in before and their schools were "either in ruins or renovated and gentrified beyond recognition". This defamiliarization and feeling distant drives them to tell their stories and to narrate the relationship between past, present and future.[460] The telling is about emphasizing what is remembered, it is also an active process that enables the forgotten to resurface. This process presents an opportunity in order to review and re-evaluate the relationship constructed between past-present-future.

At this point it would be useful to discuss the questions of how remembering and forgetting happen and whether the analytical division between individual, social, cultural and collective memory is possible or not; in other words, some theoretical support related to memory concept would help.

Individual, collective, cultural memory

In the most general sense, memory can be defined as a repository in which knowledge and experience are held. The functions of memory that can also be defined as a storage, can be roughly listed as recording, sorting and retrieving information. Remembering and forgetting are concepts related to memory. Psychologist Daniel Schacter indicates that memories practically consist of fragments of experience. He emphasizes the importance of *encoding* process – transforming

---

459 Boym, p. 41.
460 Ibid, p. 50.

something a person sees, hears, thinks, or feels into a memory. He indicates that we remember only what we have encoded, and what we encode depends on who we are.[461]

Sociologist Maurice Halbwachs is at the forefront of the theorists who provide conceptual contributions on memory. Halbwachs did not discuss memory in terms of biology, namely neurology and brain physiology, and focused on collective memory. He examined remembering based on peoples' social environments. Halbwachs suggests that individuals are able to acquire, to localize and to recall their memories through being a member of a social group, especially kinship, religious relations and class affiliations.[462] According to him, collective memory is not a given, but rather socially constructed notion, and the memory of a nation or society is the reconstruction of their past.[463] Historian Pierre Nora, in his study named *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (Sites of Memory), indicates that there could be only one reason for the constant talk about memory, and explains this reason as: "memory no longer exists". He claims that there are *sites of memory* because there are no longer any *milieu de mémoire*, the settings in which memory is a real part of everyday experience. According to Nora, if we still dwelled among our memories, we would not need to consecrate sites embodying them.[464] Nora draws attention to attempts to achieve a sense of continuity for places, monuments, events, dictionaries, and symbols which have a historical significance. Nora's premise that there is no longer memory and the concept *sites of memory* contributed greatly to the theoretical insights about memory, such as Halbwachs's definitions of collective memory and social frameworks of memory. To analyze continuity/discontinuity, "past"-"present" terms/concepts, Halbwachs's approach should be discussed, along with his suggestion of "the past is a social construction mainly, if not wholly, shaped by the concerns of the present"[465]; and this shaping should be examined closely.

---

461 Daniel L. Schacter, *Searching for Memory, The Brain, the Mind and the Past,* Basic Books, New York, 1996, p. 42, 52.

462 Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, p.36

463 Lewis A. Coser, "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877–1945", in Coser (ed.), *On Collective Memory*, Maurice Halbwachs, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1992, p. 22,33.

464 Nora, *Rethinking the French Past of Memory*, *Volume I: Conflicts and Divisions*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996, pp. 1–2.

465 Coser, ibid, p. 25.

Sociologist Lewis Coser, who suggests that with this premise of Halbwach, "questions arise whether it is in the case that the interpretation of past is always rigorously presentist" and draws attention to sociologist Barry Schwartz' approach. The fact underlined by Schwatrs is that eventually the approach of the present would lead to the suggestions that there is no continuity in history altogether. According to Schwarts, this would mean that history is seen as a set of snapshots taken at various times, from various perspectives. Instead of this, Schwarts says that the past is the always compound of persistence and change, of continuity and newness. Coser, following Schwarts, claims that collective memory has cumulative and presentist aspects. According to him, while collective memory has partial continuity, it also includes the new readings of past in terms of the present.[466]

At this point it will be better to look at conceptualizations of Assman who examines memory of communities by relating to the ways of remembering one's own past and identity issues. Assman generalizes that "collective memory is dependent on its bearers and it cannot be passed on arbitrarily". It demonstrates the group membership for those who participated in the process. According to him, collective memory is not only bound to place and time, but also to a specific identity.[467] Assman points out two memory frames that differ from each other in certain fundamental areas and calls them *communicative* memory and *cultural* memory. He describes communicative memory as individuals' memories related to recent past that are shared with contemporaries. He gives memories of one generation as the typical example. He emphasizes that it is limited by its carriers and disappear in time. He defines cultural memory, unlike communicative, as an institutionalized mnemotechnics. He points out that cultural memory is based on fixed points in the past, focuses on symbolic figures to which memory attach itself. He exemplifies the Exodus, wandering in the desert, conquest of the Promised Land, exile as *memory figures*. He suggests that "what counts for cultural memory is not factual but remembered history".[468] What is being remembered here is the past about the origins, and since religion includes references about the origins, remembering is closely related to religion, and rituals.

Social scientist Paul Connerton, in his study named 'How Societies Remember', claims that the analytical difference between *personal* and social memories makes no sense. He indicates that the way memory is organized and the way it is

---

466 Ibid, p. 26.
467 Assman, ibid, p. 25.
468 Ibid, pp. 35–38.

conveyed through means like commemorative ceremonies are important for the formation of social memory. Connerton argues that the common feature among world religions and the rites of many preliterate peoples is that: "they do not simply imply continuity with the past, rather they have explicit claim to be commemorating such a continuity".[469] According to him, what is remembered in the commemorative ceremonies is the collective variant of what he called *personal* memory. In other words, it is "a making sense of the past as a kind of collective autobiography".[470] This problematizes the stories and sensation of past.

As can be seen in the theoretical discussions above, it is not really possible to determine whether the remembered thing is related to the personal, collective, cultural or social memory, and such a distinction does not seem to be meaningful either. Because the sensation of the past is a mixture of the need for continuity and newness associated with re-evaluating the past from the view of the present, and the idea of being the extension of the past.

The sensation of past

There are some experiences that definitely cause the almost never-ending re-interpretation, re-reading of "past" from the view of "present", and one of them is migration, especially forced or unexpected migration. Migration has also the potential to create a perception of spatial/physical disengagement between "past" and "present". With the abrupt breaking off of the daily routine, the familiar life, and necessity of living somewhere else, the place left behind (Istanbul) and those days can suddenly become the "past". Although it seems like a personal *choice* to look at the past (or not), generate a distance at consciousness level, and recall memories related to the past, they could become unavoidable when they turn into a component of identity in the new place. "*If you see a few people gathered, they would definitely be talking about Istanbul. Seriously, it is something like an addiction*" says interviewee *Miltos.* At this point, it should be mentioned that the "past", Istanbul that was talked about or remembered, is not only in the memories of those people. The person remembering does so because others incite her/him to recall it and their memory comes to the aid of theirs.[471]

In the anecdote above, the talks about Istanbul when the Istanbulite Romioi come together in Athens, are described as an addiction that cannot be avoided, like a never-ending scene. As thinker Walter Benjamin said, "once you start open

---

469 Connerton, ibid, p. 48.
470 Ibid, p. 70.
471 Ibid, p. 36.

the fan of memory, you will never reach to the end of its segments".[472] Talking about Istanbul is like opening a fan where the final fold will never come.

Talking about Istanbul, in a sense, is to unite "yesterday" with "today", that is "now", by reviving memories. Thus, by repeating the memories, in a sense an internal/cognitive order is formed. It is important to note what kind of memories are discussed. Usually, the bad memories are not included. *Miltos* describes how the unpleasant memories are not talked about: "*They want to forget, so they don't mention them (. . .) usually they talk about Istanbul and the wrong politics of the day*". Excluding bad memories means turning Istanbul, hence "their own past", into a myth. Recalling the memories also establishes the basis of the "us" identity in Athens, and with repetition, identification of "self" is reinforced, and it is prevented from being lost by transmitting to new generations.

Events and experiences are not permanently engraved in people's minds. While the reality and reliability of the memory is one of the issues that continue to be relevant, it is impossible to test or prove it – because "the past is elusive and uncanny" and "yet no system of thought or branch of science provides us a full picture of human memory".[473] However, just because the narratives are envisaged or reconstructed, it does not mean they are fabricated. The narratives are not "evidences" to prove the "facts", they are social actions situated in a certain time and place, directed to specific audiences.[474] They show what is meaningful and significant for them.[475]

We already emphasized that remembering is an active process in which is meaning of past is renewed. Remembering an event or experience and the way it is remembered are closely related to feelings and thoughts. One remembers best what is colored by emotion.[476] Tastes, smells, voices, visual images, sensations about a "past" time and space are important to the process of remembering. Seremetakis examines sensations in his study named *Senses Still*. She explores sensations through the relationship of a grandmother and grandchild. She talks about a grandmother who feeds her grandchild the bread she chews to soften. In this manner, bread and saliva connect grandmother and the baby. According to her, sensory memory is neither stable nor fixed. She says that each

---

472 Boym, ibid, p. 28. (Boym's quotation source: Walter Benjamin, "Berlin Chronicle", *Reflections* in, New York, Schocken Books, 1986, p. 6).

473 Boym, ibid, p. 76 and p. 54.

474 Tonkin, ibid, p. 97.

475 David Sutton, *Remembrance of Repasts: An Anthropology of Food and Memory,* Berg, Oxford, 2001, p. 135.

476 Boym, ibid, p. 52.

smell generates its own surface and texture, but none of the smells exist alone. Seremetakis talks about smell combinations such as the house of grandmother, "garden aroma combined with the animal dung; the oregano bunch hanging over the sheep skin containing the year's cheese; blankets stored in the cabinet which combine rough wool with the humidity of the ocean; the oven exuding the smell of baking bread and the residue of ashes; the fresh bread in the oven covered with white cotton towels". In her view, this wide range is the most powerful catalyst to prevent memory from being pushed into silence.[477] As stated by Alfred Gell, smell finds meaning not only with the actual source of the smell, but also the context. Because "smells are so intimately bound up with the world, the context of a smell is not the other smells but simply the world".[478]

Social scientist Paul Stoller also emphasizes the importance of physical experience. According to him, *embodiment* points to the sentient body. This means that the world is filled with smells, sounds, sights, textures and taste, which trigger the memory.[479] Sights, sounds, taste and smells form a sensory context.[480] Seremetakis says that memory and sense are intertwined, weaved together, and memory is the horizon of experiences.[481]

Author Marcel Proust defines the recalling as an unpredictable synecdochic perception adventure in which words and sense of touch overlap.[482] One of the most striking examples of sensory memory is in Proust's much-cited book *In Search of Lost Time.* Benjamin states that "one afternoon the taste of pastry called madeleine transported him back to the past, whereas before then he has been limited to the promtings of a memory which obeyed the call of attentiveness".[483] All of these refer the wide horizon of sensory experiences and, sensory experiences finding meaning as exactly the world itself.

---

477 Seremetakis, ibid, pp. 29–30.

478 Alfred Gell, "Magic, Perfume, Dream. . .", in Lewis (ed.), *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-Cultural Studies in Symbolism*, Academic Press, London 1977, p. 27.

479 Paul Stoller, *Sensuous Scholarship,* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1997, p. 54.

480 Seremetakis, ibid, p. 37.

481 Ibid, p. 9.

482 Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time, Volume I, Swann's Way*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin, Rev. D.J. Enright, The Modern Library, New York, 1992.

483 Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, Schocken Books, New York, p.158.

Tastes and food

Social scientist Beatrice Hendrich, who focuses on sensual memory, defines tastes and food among of the most effective ways of remembering and preserving. According to her, it is normal that memory focuses on food, and in the sense of memory, the special feature of food is its sensuality. Through sensuality, it can be added to the physical memory, and thus can later revive the sensation of a specific moment or event with its smell and taste.[484]

Another idea emphasized in this study is the differentiating property of the sensory memory, in addition to its stimulating power on memories. After commenting that "*the Greeks do not know how to eat*", *Hercules* points to the importance of taste and food, and how it separates the Romioi and the Greek:

> "Taste is critical, it's the key issue on food. We are pretty snobbish when it comes to food. Take for example, that they serve olive-oil based dishes warm here; what a disgrace. When we go to a restaurant and order an olive-oil dish, we clearly instruct that it should be served cold. On the other hand, when Greeks come to our house for dinner, we serve them Turkish cuisine, and they love it. Indeed, our cooking is better, and the Greek also admit it. We are lucky that they appreciate the Romioi cuisine of Istanbul. Romioi women are known as great cooks. Baklava, for example: We warn our visitors from abroad 'do not try rice or pilaf… and definitely avoid desserts like baklava'. It's inedible, the baklava is floating in the syrup. I don't know how they manage it, but their pilaf is also horrendous. We have such a fixation about food" (Hercules, Athens).

The continuation of the cuisine, which *Millas* regards as Turkish cooking – *Istanbul cuisine* – seems to be a resistance to forgetting, that could happen as a result of the changing socio-cultural relations and the changed framework by migration. Preserving the cuisine means being an Istanbulite, therefore it is continued, and the past is remembered in this manner. The cuisine also functions as a border. A border like this that separates the Romioi of Istanbul from Greeks is used to differ from the "other" and to reinforce "itself". At the same time, this food, namely Istanbul cuisine, is liked and appreciated by Greeks as well. It can be thought that being respected in this manner is effective to overcome the feeling of weakness created by migration. The difference between cuisines of Istanbul and Athens/Greece is not only related to taste. As he states, Turkish food is also richer in quantity, and it is a matter of prestige.

---

484 Beatrice Hendrich, "Mario Levi ve Mıgırdiç Margosyan'da Yemek Hatırlama ve Hatırlama Yemekleri", in Neyzi (ed.), *Nasıl Hatırlıyoruz? Türkiye'de Bellek Çalışmaları*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011, p. 93.

"Greece lived through a period of major poverty. A lot of lives were lost during the German invasion through the World War II. We had it easier in Istanbul, we did not experience that deprivation. It must have had an impact. For example, when we arrived here in '55, the butchers were only open twice a week. They sold so little meat, that they would open shop only two days. When my father bought a chicken, we would inhale it at once. Chicken was a big thing then, we would be told in advance which day we would have chicken. So, there was a poverty like that as well. We would discuss both the quality, and quantity. We would also brag a bit about the quantity. Now it's different, of course. The Greek have been eating a lot over the last 30 years, they put on weight, fattened up – though now we're back in a crisis again. . .So, we have a past like this; there is a rich-poor gap between the Athenians and the Istanbulite" (Hercules, Athens).

Another significant area where the Romioi of Istanbul and the Greeks are different in their inherited cuisine in other words in their food memories, is the years of Second World War. The hunger experienced by Greeks in those hard times is not known to the Romioi of Istanbul. Interviewee *Evi* says that since mostly boulgur was consumed in Greece during the years of scarcity, everyone there hates it now, whereas they love it themselves. *Evi* often feels embarrassed because she did not experience the scarcity. She describes her feelings as follows:

"Sometimes you feel uncomfortable, they really went through a major poverty. They had a very difficult time between 1940 and 1950. They starved to death. Now those who are not aware that I am from Istanbul tell me 'you remember the famine, right? Oh, how much we suffered.' And they are my age. Sometimes I apologize to them, I say 'I am sorry, we did not experience that, we did not suffer, we were in Istanbul.' I feel shy about it" (Evi, Athens).

Apparently, the Greek and the Romioi who migrated after a certain period, do not have a common memory on cuisine, neither of quality, nor of the scarring experience of hunger. Therefore, they cannot share the memories or references to those years.

Sound

One of the prominent aspects of sensory memory, like taste, is sound. Hence, one of the sounds they miss is the Turkish spoken in the old times. Interviewee *Akis* explains his longing as follows:

"The way people talk changed; of course, language is a living thing and changes in time. But it changes gradually. (. . .) Now there are a lot of people who came from Anatolia. Turkish language was better back in our days, it was more pleasant. I heard an old writer speak on the radio one day, and I could not have enough of it, because it was the Turkish that we spoke. Now it's a little different. There was a big influx of outsiders to Istanbul, and so the language changed a bit. Naturally that's not what we wanted (. . .) when we

visit, it's only for a week or two, and we live a little bit in the past. Even the restaurants we eat at are not the new places" (Akis, Athens).

Phoebe who could not or dare not to return to Istanbul after she migrated, says that she was delighted to hear Turkish, and it took her to the old days. In a similar way, another interviewee *Miltos* also describes the language as "*a separate organism from people*" and adds:

> "I love Turkish. First of all, I make a living out of Turkish, I am grateful for the language. On the other hand, I get an immense pleasure from reading books in Turkish. The Turkish language is a different thing than Turks. Of course, there are the good and the bad among Turks, but Turkish does not take me back to the bad folks. Turkish is like a separate entity hovering above a person. Like a being. After all, a language is a living thing, it changes, it grows with new words" (Miltos, Athens).

Sound/language were discussed in the interviews as one of the most effective means for remembering and the continuity of identity. In a sense, they seem to rebuild the ideal triangle broken by displacement and to provide "wholeness".[485] The past is remembered through cooking Istanbul foods and speaking in Turkish syntax/words, so the break created by migration is dealt with. These also function as distinguishing symbols of Istanbulite Romioi Orthodox identity from Greeks. It is an expression of identity against Greeks, through an aspect considered to be unique to the Romioi Orthodox of Istanbul. At the same time, when the importance of food and speech in the person's life is taken into account, it also points to an emphasis on the continuity of identity.

The different sound is not only from the changes in the Turkish they used to speak. It is one of the ironies that while Istanbul was once the *City* where Romioi language was heard, where they met friends or acquaintances on the streets, now conversations in Romioi language/Greek could not be heard in Istanbul but only from tourists visiting from Greece and Turkish sellers speaking to them in Greek. Another sound commonly mentioned is that of the ferries and seagulls. Interviewee *Angelos* describes Istanbul and its sounds as follows:

> "It's a beautiful place, it inspires you, energizes you. There is an energy coming from the old times and it is reflected onto today as well. A dynamic, lively place. It's extremely attractive (. . .) The Bosphorus, the ships, Galata bridge – without which part of Istanbul would be lost for me. And the ferries... The sounds of ferries and seagulls are everything, Istanbul does not exist without them" (Angelos, Athens).

---

485 Sutton, ibid, p. 101.

It can be said that Istanbul is materialized in sensations such as the sounds of Istanbul, seagulls, streamers, Turkish, the taste and smell of foods. It looks like the memories and sensations of Istanbul are weaved together and fit into a context. Similar to the bread that the grandmother fed her grandson that formed an unbreakable bond between them in the example of theorist Seremetakis above, the smells, sounds, and images of childhood years bind people to the *City* where they grew up. Childhood years are like the navel cord between people and the *City*.

The beautiful years of my childhood – a bitter pain

Interviewee *Orestis* felt like he went back home, back to his origins, when he came to Istanbul after ten years. He relates this to having spent his childhood in this *City*:

> "We have a saying, actually it may be an international phrase as well. . . 'our homeland is our childhood'. I strongly believe in this, and I felt it deeply in Istanbul (..) As I said, they were right, your home is your childhood years. I always felt it in Istanbul, with the old movies, old singers... I don't remember any old movies or singers from Greece; which songs were popular here in the 60's when I was a child? Now I know them as an adult but they're not among my childhood memories. Turkey is. I remember actors *Türkân Şoray*, *Tarık Akan*, or the singers *Erol Evgin, Bülent Ersoy, Zeki Müren*. . . Even the songs*: '*Whichever door I knock on, it is the bitter pain facing me'. That is life, the innkeeper is always hurting. I remember songs like this when I go to Istanbul. Even the marches as a result of the brainwashes, like 'the mountaintops are foggy now, and the river keeps running' I remember singing this along as I strolled in Istanbul because it was a mandatory march to memorize at school. 'March forward, Turkey's soldiers, march!'. These are childhood memories and it would be wrong to deny them. Perhaps it didn't have to be that way, it could have been milder – but that's a different story for another time, now that we're talking about childhood memories on sounds. I still don't know any anthems here, even though I work at the school system" (Orestis, Athens).

Defining country as childhood years is meaningful. Boym draws attention to the concept of "potential space" that is formed in early childhood between the individual and his/her environment. She indicates that at the beginning, it is the space of play between the mother and the child, then cultural experience is to be located there, and this expanding field is an integral part of a person. She says that during experiences like exile, "the most missed thing is not exactly the past and homeland but rather this potential space of cultural experience that one has shared with one's friends and compatriots that is based neither on nation nor religion but on elective affinities".[486]

---

486 Boym, ibid, p. 53 (Boym's quotation for the term *potential space*: D.W. Winnicott,

Speaking of childhood years and past times and talking about those good old days are like a series of photographs frozen in time, or a photo album. The photographs of the years, which are missed and became an integral part of the person, are interpreted again and again by turning the pages of the album indefinitely.

Perhaps what is most missed during historical cataclysms and exile is not the past and the homeland exactly, but rather this potential space of cultural experience that one has shared with one's friends and compatriots that is based neither on nation nor religion but on elective affinities.

This longing and search reminds the desire or necessity for continuation. Sontag says that all photographs are a *memento mori*.[487] In this sense, it could be said that talking about old days involves acknowledging that they are not permanent and coping with that. Considering how childhood memories, which interviewee *Orestis* described as his country, the songs and artists of that time (even if the song is [the lame] *bittersweet pain)*, and even the school anthems are remembered, and how often they are talked about, it feels like these are all seen as records of and evidence that we live and exist. Therefore, it could be concluded that the bonds with memories are very strong.

Art critic John Berger indicates that memory implies a kind of redemption. He says: "what is remembered has been saved from nothingness. What is forgotten has been abandoned".[488] Recalled memories, interpreted old days and the concept of being from Istanbul based on these are also handed down from generation to generation. Because "the past only comes into being insofar as we refer to it",[489] the desire to bring the children to Istanbul, and talking to them about Istanbul is functional in terms of both revealing this past and rescuing it from nothingness. It also suggests that they try to approach positively to the difference of the place they came from and Athens.

When interviewee *Stratos* went to Istanbul twenty-five years later, his children were with him:

> "My children were born here (Athens). My younger one was at the elementary school when we visited my former high school in Fener, and they were surprised 'wow, so you studied at such a gorgeous place?'. They were very happy about the places we visited" (Stratos, Athens).

Playing and Reality, Routledge, London, 1971, p. 100).

487 Sontag, ibid, p. 10.

488 John Berger, "Uses of Photography" in Dyer (ed.), *Selected Essays*, Vintage International, Vintage Books, New York, 2001, p. 289.

489 Assman, ibid, p. 17.

These children grew up distant from their parents' past; a visit to Istanbul with the children and touring the *City* can be interpreted as a desire to reconnect firmly with the past, by showing them the city they grew up in, the glory of their school building, their invaluable history. This desire is associated with the sense of continuity. *Angelos* explains this as follows:

> "Perhaps it's something people commonly repeat – 'those were great times'. If you were to compare the data from 1920's and 1880's, you would notice that it was more than wishful thinking, there were objective evidence, which intensifies the trauma. It was not only the family house that was lost, it was also the promising society, the promising home" (Angelos, Athens).

Angelos's deduction "*the promising society is lost*" is similar to "the mourning for the impossibility of return and for the loss of an enchanted world".[490] Since migration broke the continuation between the "past" and the "future", it seems like the future now has to continue somewhere else. It is because the "past", that is "memory and recollections", and the condition that covered "today and tomorrow" is lost. This loss also includes lost hopes for the future. This can be interpreted as the impairment of both the individual and the vital continuity of the community in which the person feels that he/see is a part of. *Nadia*'s mother and cousin are examples for this.

Nadia, who left Istanbul in 1974 and settled in Athens, went to Istanbul for 2–3 months to spend the summer every year for the first three years, because her family still lived in Istanbul. The next year after she lost her father, she took along her brother to Athens to compel her mother who refused to leave Istanbul. After that, *Nadia* went back to Istanbul 10 years later for the first time, then continued visiting regularly. Her mother though, could not go to Istanbul for many years. Finally, *Nadia* went to Istanbul with her mother once.

> "My mother came with me once for four days, after perhaps 38 years or so. I thought she would be in tears, and that she would be deeply affected, but everything in her was so hardened by now that nothing happened. That was it. She wanted to do certain things but surely we could not fit all of them into four days, so we went back" (Nadia, Athens).

The way *Nadia*'s mother restrained her emotions makes us think that she had frozen and locked up her emotions to endure being away from the *City* that she did not want to leave. The so called locking up, is either an expression of longing, or a transformed anger, fury. There are some who do not want to go back to the *City* again for similar reasons, unlike others who do. For example, *Nadia*'s

---

490 Boym, ibid, p. 8.

50-year-old cousin *Ademia* does not want to have any emotional ties with the *City*. She describes her feelings to *Nadia* in the following words:

> "Why should I go there and how would I enjoy it? (..) My people used to be there. They are not there anymore. What should I do, stare at the stones?"

As known, "remembrance is a matter of emotional ties, cultural shaping, and a conscious reference to the past that overcomes the rupture".[491] The emotional closeness to the *City* involves what has essentially been placed in the space, some anxieties and reservation as well. *Ademia*, who seems to be both "homesick and sick of home"[492] she considers as home -or trying to break the bonds, could not return, because she did not want to go through "another displacement"[493] in case her treasured childhood memories, that is her spatial memory, gets damaged. She could not return because she did not want to be an "alien" to her childhood and the *City*.

One of the conclusions derived in interviews was that the feeling of strangeness to the space was felt because they experienced the public spaces partly or intermittently when they lived in Istanbul. For instance, *Angelos* and other interviewees describe churches, schools and congregational association buildings as the places in Istanbul where the Romioi Orthodox identity can be easily felt, whereas other places are defined as "*strange environments*", which leads us to think that space/place was experienced partly or intermittently. At this point we should examine the dynamics of this discontinuity, or interruption, and experiencing the public space as a strange place, because memory is closely related to the concepts of location, space/place.

Continuity-discontinuity, *"I passed this on to my children"*

One important point that came out of the interviews is that people's public space practices are not just experiences, but also transmitted arrangements. For example, *Elena* who grew up in Istanbul and migrated to Athens, always told her children to "*shut up, speak slowly*".

On the streets and in public transportation, the excessive self-restraint on the conversation topics and/or the choice of language (Greek/Romioi language) points to the status of being a "foreigner". The description of how being in a public space in Istanbul felt as "*alert and cautious as if in a place that you do*

---

491 Assman, ibid, p. 20.
492 Boym, ibid, p. xix.
493 Göker, ibid, p.118.

not belong" as mentioned during interviews, is an evidence of this. Churches, schools and associations are "their own" places/spaces for the Romioi Orthodox of Istanbul where they can meet, chat with friends and acquaintances, and feel comfortable outside their home.[494]

The statement of *Angelos* – "*Hush! became second nature for us*" – suggests that spatial regulation functions as a user guide for public space in memory. By this way, children learn how to use the space, and to what extent they can be visible. This spatial practice is firmly imprinted in children's memory. This demanding state in the past, although is weaker now, is able to keep its solid or unalterable mark in the minds of those who did not come back to Istanbul again and experience the change. Interviewee *Angelos* carried this feeling until the big earthquake in Marmara in 1999. He explains this such as:

> "Interestingly, it was only after the earthquake that I could see myself in public, that I could feel taking part in the society. After 1999. Why? I went there as a member of a non-governmental Greek organization. It was a conscious decision, since then you change roles. You are no longer a minority member, but a European Greek. The worker of a relief organization. I had a wonderful time during those tragic days, and it was a salvation for me, a therapy. It was psychotherapy, indeed. I felt accepted by the Turkish community. Why did the Turkish community accept me then? Because the roles were reversed. Now they were helpless, and I was there to help. I was also overcoming my own trauma in this manner, because you know I mentioned how one would limit themselves within the boundaries of a role. . . the trauma of continually victimizing yourself. It's both a trauma and a trap, and you could escape it by switching to another role. Furthermore, now you are helping the very people who, in theory, have mistreated you – which was absolutely not what they had in mind at all, but you realize that a different role changes the paradigm. You start thinking about Turks differently after that, very differently. I was lucky, but not a lot of people had that opportunity" (Angelos, Athens).

Angelos's emphasis on the perception of "*seeing himself as a victim*" and the other interviewee *Dimitris*'s description that most Romioi of Istanbul were "*suffering from the Stockholm syndrome*" – are related to concepts of positioning and being a subject. Therefore, it would be useful to remember the subjectification detailed in the previous chapters.

Judith Butler, who advocated Foucault's premise that "power forms the subject", suggests in her study, *The Psychic Life of Power,* that the subject is not formed passively by power/sovereign, but the formation of subject is a result of a mutual

---

494 At this point, I should emphasize that there are public spheres, which can be roughly divided into two as streets and churches-schools-associations, experienced differently and get meanings.

and complicated interaction, and that this interaction is psychic. She draws attention to the uncertainty of distinction between the power that forms the subject and the subject's "own" power, and emphasizes the importance of question of "what or who is doing the 'enacting' here? Is it power prior to the subject or that of the subject itself?".[495]

According to the scholar Louis Althusser, who discusses the concept of subject in relation to ideology, ideology is everywhere, and there is no ideology except by the subject and for subjects.[496] He suggests that "ideology interpellates individuals as subjects, because there is no ideology except for concrete subjects, and this destination for ideology is only made possible by the category of the subject and its functioning".[497] According to him, "ideology is indeed a system of representations, but in the majority of cases these representations have nothing to do with 'consciousness': they are usually images and occasionally concepts, but it is above all as structures that they impose on the vast majority of men, not via their 'consciousness' ".[498] According to Althusser, in ideology people express the *ways* they live their existence conditions, not the existence conditions themselves. Ideology is everywhere because it contains both a real and an imaginary relation; it is eternal and omnipresent.[499] As ideology is as such an organic part of every social totality and it is as if impossible to survive without these formations, says Althusser,[500] therefore, that breaking the rule may only be possible by the existence of exceptional circumstances.

Following Butler and Althusser, although it seems impossible to distinctly identify the reasons why interviewee *Angelos* does not see himself in the public space, it seems that exceptional conditions have formed that allowed him to go beyond his own existence condition which he described as being "*victim or helpless*". For *Angelos*, the exceptional conditions were formed by his shift to the supporter position after the earthquake, and therefore he felt himself "*accepted by the Turkish community*". Thus, it can be said that he was able to go out of the frame of the imposed structure. The passive position that he described as "*the*

---

495 Butler, ibid, p. 15.

496 Louis Althusser, *On the Reproduction of Capitalism, Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, Preface by Etienne Balibar, Introduction by Jacques Bidet, trans. G.M. Goshgarian, Verso, London, New York, p. 188.

497 Ibid, p. 188.

498 Althusser, *For Marx,* trans. Ben Brewster, The Penguin Press, Harmondsworth, 1969, p. 233.

499 Ibid, pp. 233–234.

500 Ibid, p. 232.

victim" was replaced by "supporter", that is, an active position, when he came to Turkey as a Greek aid agent in the 1999 earthquake. This event freed *Angelos* from the internalized passive position, which he called a trap; he who was careful to speak Romioi language/Greek in a low voice when he lived in Istanbul, and who, after five years in Athens, realized that he was still speaking in a low voice. Since this made him overcome his trauma, he became a subject in public space as well. Building on Pile's "psychoanalysis of the space"[501] approach, it can be claimed that *Angelos*'s sense of subjectivity surfaced because the place he had found for himself in the "real, imaginary and symbolic" space[502] when he lived in Istanbul before immigrating to Athens has changed.

"Let me spend my old ages in Istanbul!"

Another important topic related to the continuity mentioned in the interviews is the desire to spend one's old age in Istanbul, in the homeland. *Elena* expresses this as "*I have a dream. God willing, I would like to spend my old age in Istanbul*". They dream of spending their old ages, in other words the last stage of their lives, in Istanbul. It reminds one of a desire to fulfill oneself by choosing where to spend the last phase of their lives, having been deprived of that choice earlier. Other interviewees expressed this desire as well. *Damos* describes it as follows:

> "I don't know how much more I have to live, but if they asked me about my final years, whether I wanted a life here or in Istanbul, the latter would definitely outweigh the former. Life here is important to me too, I grew new roots here, but when you weigh them against each other, Istanbul wins. My childhood, college years, the time I served in the Military. . . when I look at the photo albums, the memories come alive" (Damos, Athens).

---

501 Pile summarizes his approach called 'psychoanalysis of the space' as follows: According to this, six psycho-geographic issues are identified. Those are: the relationship between the body and the subject's place in the world; the sense of subjectivity is played out through repression and resistance; the ways the subject, objects and spaces are constituted out of their partiality, their duplicity, their virtuality and their supposed truth; an awareness that subjects act out of their subjectivity as a situated and repeated performance; a differentiation between dissimilar psychic and social spatialities; an alertness to social sanctions, social power and the possibilities of radical politics. According to Pile, who evaluates the relation of meaning, identity and power under the light of these ideas, the subject takes place with real, imaginary and symbolic spatialities (Pile, ibid, 1996, pp. 244–245).

502 Ibid, pp. 244–245.

Although they lived longer in Athens where they had gone to long after they were born and grown up, some after having been married and having had children, *Damos* dreams about retirement in Istanbul. This expression of a dream or imagination, the desire for Istanbul as a place of old age and death, is related to the feeling of continuity associated with Istanbul.

Continuity in Istanbul

> "To be an Istanbulite, for one thing, is considered a privilege among both the Greeks and the Romioi. This is the *Şehr-i Âli*, the Sublime City and you come from a community with very old traditions. You feel somehow connected to this community and all the works of art they have been created in both recent history and in the Middle Ages, because you have been to all those churches, you've passed through all those places, you lived there, and you have memories of them. You are honored by them. Wouldn't it feel wonderful to see yourself from this perspective? (. . .) Istanbul is a beautiful place. It is a beautiful city in itself, aside from the history and the philosophy and all that. (. . .) Even though many things have changed, it is still a center of attraction that continues to be beautiful. So, it's something to be proud of. . ." (Angelos, Athens).

Interviewee *Angelos* describes the Romioi of Istanbul through space and a long. He explains the connection to Istanbul with the words "a culturally accomplished Greek feels a strong connection with Istanbul, because the whole history leads to it, his entire identity leads to it". However, he believes that this could be a healthy relationship only if not corrupted by nationalism. He explains this idea with the words "if he does not corrupt this (the connection to Istanbul) through nationalist view, because, in fact, then it would be corrupted".

Hercules is skeptical about the continuity of being an Istanbulite and associates this feeling with nationalism.

> "I understand the concept of being from Istanbul, but I have doubts about its longevity. I feel an Istanbulite myself but I limit it to a certain time span. Being an Istanbulite two generations ago, and what I am experiencing now, cannot be the same. How can we then talk about a continuity of the so called identity of 'being an Istanbulite'?" (Hercules, Athens).

Millas describes the Istanbul of his former days by saying "*perhaps we lived a bit as the mistreated people*". He notes that the former generation may not have suffered from the same. He interprets the continuity as "*something attributed as an afterthought*" "*Turkish continuation, Greek continuation. . . this is an imaginary concept; we dream of it, we want to realize it*".

Interviewee *Angelos* explains how unlikely it is to remain a "long time Istanbulite" given the continuous influx of internal immigrants:

"The Romioi who are truly Istanbulites for three or four hundred years are very few. There were always some, but very few, because it is a metropolitan city that always have, and always will, attract new people. There were two main districts left, quite artificially, when most of the Romioi society disappeared after 1923 with the exchange. Istanbul had a large population of the Romioi, who were also exceedingly qualified and wealthy. And suddenly these people lost their hinterland. Think about it in terms of the Ottoman; how Odessa, Varna, Alexandria were suddenly trapped within the borders of the Turkish Republic. A national state is a disaster, particularly for cosmopolitan societies. And it has been a disaster for everyone, not only the Romioi but for Turks as well. That's why we ended up with Orhan Pamuk's somber, melancholic Istanbul" (Angelos, Athens).

Using the term "*melancholy*" in describing current Istanbul is important. While Boym gives examples to meaning of homesickness from various languages such as German *hemweh*, French *maladie du pays*, Spanish *mal de corazon*, she notes the word "*hüzün*" (melancholy) in Turkish and defines it. According to her, melancholy is "the spiritual anguish of Sufis, whether or not it is earthly, which is transformed into a common modern longing for a lost empire and painted in the photogenic black and white of Orhan Pamuk's Istanbul". She emphasizes that Pamuk[503] describes melancholy as "a sensation of a significant local tune, a basic word for poetry, a perspective on life, the mood that the city proudly adopts or imitates", and therefore "it is a positive feeling as much as negative".[504]

Social scientist Engin Işın indicates that it was Orhan Pamuk who introduced the word "hüzün" to non-Turkish readers and discusses the claim of Pamuk that "melancholy" is the soul of Istanbul. According to Pamuk, Istanbul is the capital of a lost empire, if not a lost culture; it is full of symbols of longing, and it is a city of yearning because of this past. The melancholy is the longing for the city. Işın questions this idea of Pamuk and says that Istanbul and melancholy might be closely related.[505] According to Işın, while melancholy gives direction to Istanbul as an object of desire, it also makes it European by turning its face towards the West. In another and more explicit words, although the melancholy of Pamuk does not seem to be anti-Oriental, it still creates Orientalist influences.[506] Işın

---

503 (Boym's quotation source: Orhan Pamuk, *İstanbul Hatıralar ve Şehir*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006).

504 This quotation does not exist in Boym's book in English, but the books' translated into Turkish version includes it (Title: *Nostaljinin Geleceği*, trans. Ferit Burak Aydar, Metis Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009, p. 38–39)

505 Engin F. Işın, "Bir Şehrin Ruhu: Hüzün, Keyif, Hasret", Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli (eds.), in *İstanbul Nereye? Küresel Kent, Kültür, Avrupa*, Metis Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010, pp. 62–66.

506 Ibid, p. 70.

says that like melancholy, pleasure is also a product of the Orientalist view, and instead of pleasure, he offers using the word *joy of city,* which he thinks also includes a resistance. He says that what defined the city were not only the pleasure scenes – those sipping tea, barbecuing freshly caught fish, roaming around leisurely, playing cards, having a coffee break or gazing at the various landscapes of Bosporus, but the fun acts performed by the alienated people of the city despite the risks they were taking. As an example of this, he describes the children of the alienated "others", who were not trapped at home yet, enjoying the street life, taking a dip at the sea in the city.[507] The outsiders or "foreigners" of the city are especially those who arrived during the mass migration after 1950s.

In the light of the discussions above, on the continuity of Istanbul, Millas' deduction of "*we dream of it*" overlaps with sociologist Ayşe Öncü's[508] concept of authentic Istanbulite being a cultural and social construct, rather than an unchangeable identity. Even if it is a construct or fiction, continuity has an emotional reciprocal in individuals/groups.

Interviewee *Miltos*'s memory of his dog Max who was lost when he lived in Kurtulus, Istanbul, is an example: *Miltos*'s dog Max got lost after he went to Kadikoy crossing the Bosphorus by ferry with the dog. The story of Max crossing the strait back and finding his way home weeks later touched *Miltos*'s daughter, who was born and raised in Athens, so she named her dog in Athens after Max. *Miltos* currently lives in Athens and while he says that he does not want to go back to Istanbul, his support for the name and his enthusiasm when he tells the story point to the emotional reciprocity of continuity. Another example is *Takis* who lives in Athens in winters and in Istanbul in summers. He, while returning to Athens, takes a branch from the sardine on the balcony of his house on the island with him and plants it in Athens, and in May, when he comes back from Athens, he brings along a branch from the same plant and this time he plants it in his home in Istanbul. All of these are anecdotes suggesting the effect of the continuity concept on peoples' behavior. The concept of continuity also includes the question of what we need to understand about the beginnings.

Social scientist Connerton describes the beginning with the suggestion that "all beginnings contain an element of recollection". According to him, "the absolutely new is inconceivable". He explains the reason as the need to base a new

---

507 Ibid, pp. 73–75.

508 Ayşe Öncü, "Istanbulites and Others: The Cultural Cosmology of Being Middle Class in the Era of Globalism", in Keyder (ed.), *Istanbul Between the Global and the Local*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, 1999, pp. 95–121.

experience on a prior context in order to ensure that they are intelligible.[509] It could be argued then, that talking about the old days in Athens or in Istanbul, or the strong conviction about the continuity of being an Istanbulite are related to this context, that is the acceptance of immigration and the new space by reason.

At the end of this section on spatial memory, it would be useful to summarize the discussions so far. The concepts of place and space have a wide range of use and meaning, and their acceptance needs to be problematized. Approaches that treat concepts in contrast to one another, and geographical measures, static or dormant approaches, lead to the passive perception of concepts and at the same time give rise to conflicts and contradictions. Yet, the concept of space can only be understood by emphasizing interactivity and meaning. However, space should not be seen as preconstructed frameworks for human experiences. It is important to approach the concept in a manner that reveals unequal relations in forming experiences. This approach also necessitates a perception of space in which the subjects are interactively established with their identities.

All these theoretical discussions remind the importance of the sense of space of the entity. For, even though it varies by the autobiographies of people, the sense of emotion and affection for a space creates a connection with the identity and the body in relation to space, subjectivity and power. In the attempt of the Istanbul Greek / Romioi Orthodox community to take up the spatial dimension of everyday life and ritual practices, Istanbul is not a ready or static frame of reference with "churches, schools and associations" or "streets", but rather as "familiar or known." The spatial sensation seems to be the space of a never-ending formation that changes or contradicts over time. This leads us to the concept of memory.

Recalling the theoretical discussions detailed in the memory section: people turn their feelings and experiences into memories in connection with past experiences, knowledge and needs. However, the formation of the individual memory is only possible through a social framework. Memories of people can be formed and remembered through this frame, that is, by membership in a society. This collective memory is a social construction. The fiction aspect of the memory, though it seems to be in the context of the "present", is not merely a connection of present to the past. The past, as emphasized earlier, is a mixture of continuity and change. Istanbul is the place where the "past", which the Romioi of Istanbul talk about among themselves, and their memories are locked in. Time

---

509 Connerton, ibid, p. 6.

on the other hand is their own experiences and their parents' narratives. It can be argued that for the Greek Orthodox society of Istanbul, especially for those who migrated to Athens, memories about Istanbul come forward as a structure that unites them both in social and time dimensions.

Epilogue

In concluding this book based on my doctorate thesis, I am going to make a general assessment by recalling theoretical discussions included in the earlier chapters, findings and anecdotes from interviewees. First, it is helpful to remember the problematic. I explored concepts of migration, space, place, memory and identification drawing from the experiences of Istanbulite Romiois/Greeks and through the notion of being minority. The primary problematic addressed in this book revolves around the meaning of these concepts, the functions they serve, and how they interact with identity for minorities who have experienced ruptures like mass migrations. Other concepts such as place and memory are addressed through the way in which minorities create meaningful connections around spaces, identity and memory as evidenced by spatial arrangements and how space in general and in Istanbul specifically is rendered sacred.

As indicated in the chapter on *Being Romioi Orthodox*, most important components of the Romioi Orthodox society's identity (that traces back to the common heritage based on Ottoman and Byzantine for which the background was reviewed in chapter *The Memory of the City,* appeared to be around the borders of language (Greek/Romioi) and religion/rituals. I am going to elaborate these findings in the subheadings below with regard to memory spatialized in Istanbul and problematized with migration.

Roots, sacred-social

One of the points emphasized in in-depth interviews is that regardless of origin,[510] time of settlement in Istanbul, being religious or not, people associate their Romioi Orthodox identity with the Byzantine. This should not lead to the conclusion that all interviewees have established this connection or claim that their "roots" are based on Byzantium. The past that interviewees refer to does not include just Byzantium but also the Ottoman Period. The connections with the Byzantine history are expressed in different forms. While some interviewees

---

510 The word origin refers to being from the regions like Epirus, Pontus, Cappadocia and Aegean Islands. Since 1453, as discussed in the Memory of the city chapter, the city received immigrants from different regions of the Ottoman Empire sometimes through housing measures, and sometimes due to the desire for better work and living conditions.

describe this connection more as a feeling, others have emphasized that while they understand they are descendants of Byzantine, they do not feel it. Some others have pointed out that they are not the continuation of Byzantium, but only their religious teachings are based on Byzantine, and there is only a connection in this sense.

According to the literature search and the ethnographic work I have done, the dynamics that are closely related to Byzantine, which are expressed in different forms in the interviews, are the Romioi Orthodox religious rituals and memory transferred through these rituals. History of Byzantine is intertwined with Christianity and Romioi Orthodox identity. Hence, rituals are shaped around the relationship between history and religion. The Romioi Orthodox teachings are based on the Councils and the religious rituals are practiced in accordance with the works written by Vasilios from Kayseri, Chrysostomos and Iakovos in the years 300–400 AC.

Within aforementioned memory, the year 1453 (the conquest/fall of Istanbul) does seem to imply a transformation rather than a break. The Charter[511] presented by Mehmet II was a determinant in this transformation. Accordingly, all Orthodox people[512] gathered under the religious authority of the Patriarchate and religious practices continued as it was in the past. This practice suggests that the Romioi Orthodox people who fell under the rule of people of another religion could maintain a certain continuity in their religious rituals. At the same time, the Patriarch, who was also designated as the Head of [Orthodox] Nation, gained administrative powers such as tax collection and judiciary authority, which he did not have before. The effect of transformation was the "church-centered" life for a long time, even until today to a certain extent. Another effect was the addition of Ottoman coexistence experience onto the Romioi Orthodox identity.

As one of the leading findings of this study, I have come to the conclusion on the ritual-identity with in-depth interviews and observant participations, that identity is concurrently formed with religion, and rituals were much more important than religion itself in this formation. To elaborate further, the link between being an Orthodox and a Romioi is regarded as unbreakable and Orthodoxy is

---

511 Detailed information about the contents of the Charter and the way it was handed is included in the chapter titled *The Memory of the City*. Briefly, the Charter presented to Patriarch Gennadios by Sultan Mehmet II, states that, the Romioi customs, such as marriages and burials, would be performed like before according to the practices and procedures of the Romioi church.

512 These are all Orthodox peoples in the Ottoman lands. Could be listed as Greek, Bulgarian, Slavic, and Ulah.

seen as a characteristic of existence, personality and being a Romioi. The reasons for the establishment of such an existential connection are also attributed to history. From 1453 onwards, in a country where the majority religion was Muslim, the granting of the right to live (or coexist) through the Orthodoxy and being a Romioi, which created an entity united with the church, reflects this connection. The continuation of customs and traditions in the identity formed with such a memory, finds meaning as the continuation of existence, and whether or not they were believers or found some aspects of religion and rituals meaningless, people still want to go to church. Another finding in this regard is the unity of sacred and social observed in the Greek Orthodox religious rituals in Istanbul, in which the social aspect was more dominant. The Churches were considered similar to the Cem Houses (the sacred gathering places of Alevis in Turkey) and found meaning both as the space of the faith, and a space that brings together people and offers them the pleasure of being with their own kind.

After reiterating above the outline of my conclusions on ritual-identity connection as rituals established in the past dating back to the Byzantine, reshaping of identity with rituals, church centered life and coexistence of social and sacred, it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that these findings are defined as the difference from Orthodoxy and rituals in Greece. According to in-depth interviews held in Athens and Istanbul, the difference manifests itself in the disparity in the willingness to participate and find meaning by the Romiois from Istanbul living in Athens in religious rituals. Regarding the difference with Greece, the conclusion that since customs and traditions represent the identity of the Romioi of Istanbul, they were celebrated more enthusiastically in Istanbul, which can be seen in the expressions such as: "*doesn't care when in Greece*" and "*not obliged to preserve anything!*" A ritual of religious practices in Greece that the Romioi found odd was relevant to Easter. The Easter have been celebrated for two thousand years, however the ceremonies in Greece that included uncustomary items like a band, the anthem and participation of the President, made it clear that the altered state of the ceremony is an identity border, expressed in words like "*something else is going on here, that is not who we are.*" Another element that determines the connection of identity with ritual elements in Greece is the Easter yeast bread. The comment of "*the Greeks do not know how to eat*", upon expressing that in Athens they could only eat the Easter bread baked by bakeries from Istanbul, serves as the continuation of the Romioi Orthodox identity and the boundary in separating themselves from the Greek.

Other examples for differences in the Romioi Orthodox and Greek identities include justifying the lesser willingness to attend church in Athens as "*it does not represent us*", or saying the hymns there "*sound cacophonous*" and the memorial

ceremonies as "*don't feel the same*" as well as being characterized as a "*foreigner*", and inferring from this that they "*can not take roots*" here. These borders reflect the memory spatialized in Istanbul. Immigration is one of the most important breaking points in this memory.

Should we go or not?

As discussed in the first chapter, the mass migration caused by the 1923 Population Exchange Treaty had a decisive influence in shaping the economic, political and social structure of Turkey and the social fabric. One of the most significant impacts of the exchange that created a more homogeneous society in Turkey -from a religion perspective, on the Romioi of Istanbul was the insecure environment created by the introduction of population exchange as a method in dealing with minorities. Another result was to position the Western Thrace Turks and the Istanbul Romioi as "hostage nations" in the disputes between Greece and Turkey. The Romioi of Istanbul and the Turks of Western Thrace found themselves in the midst of the controversy between Ankara and Athens for many years. Both peoples were positioned as objects, not as historical subjects in their countries. Due to the frequency of disagreements, this position was of importance in further elevating insecurity, doubt and unease.

The detailed findings about the causes of migration in the literature review were also supported by in-depth interviews I had in Athens and Istanbul. Accordingly, the reasons for the diminished Romioi population today were the "chain of events" within a period of ten years that are the Welfare Tax, events of September 6–7, 1964 and the year 1974. The process in question is exemplified by expressions such as "*minotiries lived through very dark times here*", and defining the resulting state as "*they wiped us out*".

Among the reasons listed above, the Cypriot issue seems to be the most important in terms of the anxiety it created and its influence on migration. The people who call themselves Hellen in Cyprus are defined as Romioi in Turkey. With this equilibrium and the great "support" of the media, the Romoi living in Istanbul has been included in the "other" or "enemy" category. Examples such as "*Turks in Turkey wanted to get the revenge of their kins in Cyprus on us, even though we had nothing to do with that*" and "*We were ruined by that island*" clearly demonstrate the impact of Cyprus. Another example of the longevity of Cypriot Romioi / Hellenic and Romioi of Istanbul association is that event closest friends could easily say "*your people*" when talking about Cyprius.

The most prominent issue that came out during in-depth interviews I held in Athens and Istanbul was the difficulty of deciding to immigrate. Some examples

that show the agony in deciding to migrate include families leaving without notice to even their closest friends, and taking along objects that would be reminiscent of terrible memories (such as a piece of the rug shredded by the attackers at their home duinrg September 6–7.).

Most of the interviewees identified the reasons for their migration as fear, unease, insecurity and discrimination.[513] The most arresting point has been the resulting permanent fear permeating the identity and becoming an integral part of it. This situation, which is tangibly expressed as "*we have indelible fears*", is regarded as a new identity, different from that of a Greek, derived from being a minority in Turkey and as a result of this experience, becoming a person able to anticipate the future.

Another finding on immigration was that, when they lived in Istanbul (roughly 1970's and 1980's), some of the interviewees had a deeply ingrained understanding that one day they would have to migrate or forced to migrate. The *"second nature"* definition, which is so dominant in identity like this, was not observed during the interviews with others who lived in Istanbul earlier, and migrated in the 1950s or 1060s. This finding reveals the difference of having spent the years of childhood and youth in Istanbul among the diminished Romioi population.

Another aspect that revealed the connection of identity with migration was the shared emotions or "common fate" brought about by living amongst those who stayed in Istanbul became added onto the "us" identity of Istanbulite Romioi. On the other hand, what got attached to the Istanbulite Romioi identity in Athens was the "us" that was shaped by the common experience of migrating from Istanbul. One component of this "us" was the Turkish language.

Romioi / Greek in Istanbul, Turkish in Athens

One of the highlights of the interviews held in Athens was that the Romioi, who were under pressure about speaking in Greek/Romioi in Istanbul, frequently spoke in Turkish among themselves in Athens. The evaluation of an interviewee living in Istanbul is striking: He says "*when I speak Turkish in Greece, it is to*

---

513 One of the reasons for migration that is known to have been influential especially by late 1970s, even though interviewees did not single out as their specific reason to migrate, was that Greece has already started negotiations for EU membership and the level of income has increased to multiples of the level in Turkey. In addition to the economic advantages, the political turmoil and conflict environment in Turkey was another cause.

show that I do speak Turkish as well, or at least that I also carry that culture; whereas here, you want to speak in Romioi because you do not want to give up your own culture" and interprets this as "*we do all we can to show that we carry both cultures*". Both Greek/Romioi and Turkish languages are integral parts of the identity of Romioi of Istanbul.

On the other hand, it was observed that speaking Turkish in the place of migration is important not only because it is a part of the identity of the Romioi of Istanbul, but also because it has a strong reference to Istanbul, the place of memories. In other words, Turkish is related to feeling and continuing the Istanbulite Romioi identity. This close connection of the language and identity is also felt in how the Romioi of Istanbul use language. In addition to the vocabulary choices, such as Turkish terms "akide, aksamcis, akçes, hafifis" which the Greeks do not use, using a mixed syntax where verbs with Turkish roots are conjugated by Greek grammar such as "vazgectisa, binevo"[514] are examples of the close connection with memory.

However, in the in-depth interviews, it was observed that impacts of discourses that are imbedded in the memory through "Citizen, Speak Turkish!" campaigns are still felt. An example would be the following statements: "*I speak Romioi, and I speak loudly. For example, if we were in a taxicab, my wife would still prompt me 'speak in Turkish!' She still could not overcome that uneasiness.*"

In today's Istanbul, on the streets or in public transportation the "Turkish" ear is not as "sensitive" to Greek/Romioi as it used to be. Furthermore, Romioi is now so unfamiliar that youngesters would approach and politely ask: "*What language are you speaking in?*" Nevertheless, it is remarkable to note the permanency of the discomfort that the very same interviewee feels when Romioi is spoken, especially when loudly.

This discomfort is emphasized in various anecdotes in in-depth interviews in Athens as it is in Istanbul. This suppression of language that turned into trauma can be seen in the following examples: "*Sometimes we would forget and talk out loud in the streets. Our mothers would warn us: Shush now, be quiet! I continued doing this here (in Athens) to my daughter!*" and "*Hush had become the second nature for us, and after I came to Greece, 5–6 years had to pass before I could speak loudly*".[515]

Even though it had to be 5–6 years for the interviewee, the effects of suppression, such as "*speaking politely, not being loud, not being noisy, keeping a low*

---

514 Means respectively, "*I give up*" and "*I am riding*".
515 What is meant by loud here is *not in a low voice, normal tone*.

profile" during the process of going to a normal tone, have been emphasized as an identity feature. Another example of this oppression is the initial reaction of Istanbulite Romioi defining the Greek tourists in Istanbul speaking in Greek "out loud" (not low, but a normal tone) as being "*rude, indecent, frightening, disrespectful*".

In addition to speaking Greek/Romioi with a low voice, which is discussed as a situation particular to the Istanbulite Romioi identity, there were also an external-internal, public-private limitations observed in statements like "*I would speak differently outside than home*" and "*the difficulties and the pressures forced us to not reveal what we felt*". My conclusion following the meetings in Istanbul and Athens is that clear spatial distinctions and restrictions on the use of language have a resilient influence on identity.

"Sacred" Memory of the space/*City*

It has been observed that the *City* has become a place laden with meanings and symbols, in other words, the process of sanctification of the city, has been shaped through several different aspects. The leading aspect is the historical background. Literature-based determinations of the sanctification dynamics of the *City* in relation to the past were elaborated in the section entitled *The Memory of the City*.[516]

In the identity of the Romioi of Istanbul, the city's definition as *the homeland* has been the main factor in the perception of the *City* as sacred. It seems that the qualification of homeland comes to play in terms of the place of birth and childhood, and lifestyles: examples to support this assessment include the definition of birth place pointing to its uniqueness, as in "*home is where you are born*", or referring to childhood and experiences such as "*our home and country is our childhood*" and "*Istanbul is a life style, and it's my life style.*" Istanbul stands out as a framework, which people experience in a manner to establish their perspectives and their own ways of integrating their own entities.

In this context, despite the major change the *City* had gone through especially after 1950s with internal immigrations from various places in Anatolia

---

516 The myth about the *City*'s establishment based on divine signs and ancestry by Byzas, its designation as the capital by Emperor Constantine and celebration of its dedication with ceremonies and determining a birthday for the *City*, and that Constantinople also bearing the name *Theotokopolis (City of the Mother of God)*, hence exaltation with Mother Mary - the Mother of God, and other factors are detailed in the Memory of the City chapter.

and significant reduction in the non-muslim population, the *City* is still per-
ceived as an entity and there is a strong connection with it. It is emphasized
that while in the past the *City* could turn immigrants into Istanbulites in a few
generations, the new immigrants could not become Istanbulites since the migra-
tion that started in 1950 was a mass movement and very sudden. "*What could
Istanbul have done?*" shows that the *City* is perceived as an entity, and the ties
established with this entity. Another example is listing the *City's* material forms
such as churches, mosques, Bosphorus, the Islands, etc. noting *"there is a part
of me everywhere"*, hence describing the material forms as an extention of their
bodies, which clearly show how concrete images transform into spaces through
meaning and emotional bonds. Another important point in the spatial meaning
of the city emerged as the cemeteries. The cemeteries they visited as soon as they
arrived from Athens were not only a reminder of their past, and the people in
their past, but also experiential places where people living in distant places of
Istanbul came together.

However, in addition to being a special place where people's life stories cross
paths, Istanbul also has layers of other meanings. Explaining these layers of
meanings is possible by viewing the space as relationships. Hence, place is not
an objective and passive phenomenon, as it can also be understood from the
statements "*grew up as a foreigner*" or "*streets were strange to us, we should always
be on alert*". Giving a meaning to a space is subject to construction and recon-
struction processes. Therefore, spatial meanings such as religion should also
be examined in terms of political context, power relations and memory. These
insights are also reflected in the prominent findings of the in-depth interviews
in Istanbul and Athens.

The experience of the public space as "*strange, cautious and alert*" in the
interviews was one of the emphasized issues that left its mark in memory, even
though the former intensity has been lessened quite a lot nowadays. While
religious, education and support centers such as churches, schools and associ-
ations were the inner-public spaces in which identity can be formed, felt and
easily expressed, a wide area of other spaces outside of these that range from
the "streets", to public transportation to government offices are characterized as
external-public spaces that need caution. Like a natural gravitational field, the
inner-public spaces that are considered more like their own homes, represent
their past and their common memory. These areas have meaning both as the
enabler and a symbol of continuity. The term "continuity" is not one without
conflicts or an unchangeable subsistence.

In these inner-public spaces that are now more isolated due to the greatly
decreased population, the real-imagined and today-past are experienced

simultaneously. Another finding that emphasizes the importance of relativity in interpreting private-public spaces that hold a special place in memories is hidden in the fact that some of the immigrants can not return to Istanbul. "*My people are no longer there, what should I do, stare at the stones?*" or "*Istanbul used to be my heaven, what if something happened to it?*" These examples reveal the existence of a spatial meaning and a major pattern of interactions and memories that give meaning to a space.

"And curtain! Well, let's not say that. . ."

An interviewee who likened the Romioi of Istanbul to a theater play whose spectators increase year after year, comments that "we should not be the last leading actors of this play", reflecting his concerns about the future pointing out to the gradually decreasing population, even if all other problems are overcome. Although people feel more comfortable performing rituals today, he still expresses a cautious optimism saying: "*It's not that easy to rise to the bait any more (referring to the agitated crowds in the past), but I cannot help thinking that it all may happen again.*"

One of the emphases about the current times was, that there was a gradual softening in the widespread attitude that has been shaped by the oppression, defined as "*oppressed and victim psychology*", typically reflected by "*not resisting nor claiming rights*". Another observation was that experiencing "*it is not customary to offer your opinion or express what you feel*" for years, resulted in the Romioi of Istanbul to habitually refrain from openly expressing their opinions even among themselves. Being able to stay away from this mentality that can be exemplified by the statement "*you should be able to understand what people mean by their body language and the look in their eyes*" was sometimes explained as "*it was being a leftist that saved me*". Considering the "*very dark years*" that the Romioi lived through, it is not at all surprising to see the inability to express opinion or claim rights, as a result of the democratization of the Turkish society, has multiplied among the Romioi.

Another emphasized topic was that certain subjects that were taboos in the past could be freely talked about now. An example would be the interviewee who was able to respond to a former acquaintance he knew from the "Turkish" society, when she said "*you went and now this place is ruined*", openly as "*we did not leave on our own will, you kicked us out*"; and adds "*it's great to be able to say that, because before we just couln't.*" The discourses that romanticize minorities as a color in society are perceived as "*being insincere and underestimating the experiences through the history*". An example: "*What does it mean that 'you were*

a color"! I keep telling whomever will listen that '55 was real, '64 was real. They happened in my time, even 'Citizen speak Turkish' was in my time. What are you talking about? We did not leave!"

Despite progress towards democratization, the current attitude towards some words, such as Byzantine or ecumenical, is still remarkable. An example would be the dual language posters of an exhibition on the ships at Yenikapi, which was labeled "Ships of Byzantium" in English but "Old Ships of Yenikapi" in Turkish, about which the interviewee expressed his anguish as: *"They could not write Byzantium. They were afraid! I can't believe it!"* While the first label reflects Istanbul's outward "marketing strategy", the latter is an attitude towards the "internal market" and reflects hypocrisy.

General evaluation

First of all, the first thing I need to stress is that the "data" discussed in detail in various parts of my work and the findings presented in the above sections can not be generalized and may not be valid for the entire Romioi society of Istanbul.

The second issue that needs to be emphasized in relation to this work is concerned with "objectivity" and "impartiality". It is not possible to say that this work – or any other work in social studies – is "neutral". Scientists interpret and attribute meanings to the reality in the world from a specific socio-cultural environment. They tend to focus on a matter, identify approaches, obtain data and interpret them with their subjective and socio-cultural baggage. Hence, if objectivity is understood as complete impartiality, such objectivity is not possible.

Since there could not be a complete objectivity in social sciences, I have used various methods in order to be able to achieve objectivity by establishing pluralistic structures. At different stages of the study, I tried to create a collaboration that would involve interviewees in the ethnography, and compensate for possible bias by sharing information from former interviews and observations. As can be seen party in the first part of the book and mainly in the later parts, I conveyed the opinions of people with different views directly in their own words. My goal here is to draw attention to the plurality of Romioi Orthodox identities with their own voices. I had established another goal as to analyze the identity by focusing on the authenticity of historical contexts. In this context, I feel the need to elaborate on the historical nature of the findings and the present situation a little more.

The first point that we should not underestimate is that some of the above observations are not shared by the younger generation, namely "born after the mid-1970s, especially after the 1980s". The main reasons for this are the

improvements that can be listed as: The removal of mandatory visas for Greek citizens by the Özal Government in 1984; prospects on the resolution of frozen assets; the legal provisions on the reform process after the EU Helsinki Summit in 1999; democratization packages and the relatively more positive attitude of political power towards minorities. Hence, expressions such as "fear that has become an integral part of the identity, knowing that they would migrate one day that has become a second nature, uneasiness about speaking in Romioi in the external-public arena, sharp distinction between internal and external public areas" are the cases that the younger generations heard from their elders, but have not experienced themselves, so do not share the same feelings. The phrases "*we do not feel like that because we are free*" and "*they still have it*" are examples of this. Whereas it is observed that while they admit to feel safer due to the current conjuncture, the former generation who lived through the *chain of events* are still cautious, as expressed in statements like *"there is still not a guarantee, it can come tumbling down anytime"* and *"after all, there is still a question at the back of our minds"*. Findings on the rituals and religion such as "identity is formed together with religion, where rituals play a prominent role" and "sacred social unity" are shared by the younger generation as well. After pointing to the differences and similarities in the interpretations of findings by the younger generation in Istanbul, I can move on to "tomorrow".

The presentations delivered in the academic conference in 2006 called *Meeting in Istanbul: Today and Tomorrow*, where the current problems of the Romioi living in Istanbul were analyzed and possible solutions discussed, were published by Istos publishing house in June 2012. In the preface, the publisher evaluates the six years since the conference, which brought together -for the first time, scientists studying the Romioi community and minorities in general, spokespeople and representatives of the Romioi community, and the "immigrants" themselves. It was stated in the preface that despite the Law of Foundations and some progress on the organization of community institutions, a democratic internal functioning within the minority is not fully achieved and serious problems in the education system continue. Likewise, it is emphasized that the closed nature of the minority community has not been overcome, and the nationalist prejudices solidified in the State continue. The following statements in the publisher's preface are noteworthy:

> "We are not willing to be content with nostalgia. We are opposed to the nostalgicization of the Romioi and other 'minority' communities, acceptance of them as an 'inheritence', and a pleasant sound from 'the good old days'. We are also opposed to turning the Greeks into a charming folkloric element independent of the political and social reality of Turkey as we are against nationalist exclusion" (Istos 2012: 7–9).

In this study, I tried to draw attention to two main issues while analyzing the problem on four axes of migration, space, memory and ritual: The meaning/image of being different, and citizenship. The second-class citizen or non-citizen status, which the Romioi and other minorities have been suffering from for many years, is an agenda of Turkey with the constitutional amendment, by which the concept of citizenship is also discussed in detail. The other issue, the perception of the difference is so closely related to prejudices that, it will be determined by how the new constitution will work in practice, irrespective of how comprehensive the definition of citizenship becomes. This is because the inclusion of non-Muslims/minorities in the "other" category and not being considered as citizens, were processes that nourished each other. Making an inclusive citizen definition in terms of ethnic identity, religious beliefs and sexual orientations is already a democratic necessity. However, in practice, there is a need for an intense empathy drive to change the mentality to ensure the validity of such a definition. The emotional distinction between empathy and the approach of "embracing" or "tolerating" the implicit, and often explicit, sovereignty relationship should be clarified. As the interviewee *Maya* stated, "tolerance is a favor. We do not want the favor of citizenship; we want our legal rights as a citizen. Tolerance means accepting that you have a shortcoming, but they overlook it. That they are a higher being and are overlooking your flaws." Empathy on the other hand, by its most general definition, is an attempt to understand and internalize the feelings of another and the state the other person is in, and does not include the sovereignty relationship that tolerance does. The intense empathy drive must include many practices that will raise awareness in this sense, such as correcting the explicit or implicit discriminatory tone in the discourses of politicians,[517] replacing hostile or ethnocentric texts in the school-books. However, the practice I would like to draw attention to here is the popular culture products such as TV series.

One of the points highlighted in the interviews I conducted in Athens was that in addition to the earthquake of 1999 in Marmara and Athens, the television series have been the most important factor in bringing the two peoples closer. This was expressed as "*the series also brought us closer, created a*

---

517 Interviewee *Maya*, during the interview in 2012, gave the following example for politician's discourse referring to the word "*despite*"; During the funeral ceremony of national soccer player Lefter Kucukandoniyadis who played in Fenerbahce Football Club, Egemen Bagis, the minister of the period who was also interested in minority issues said: "*He proudly wore the national uniform, despite being a Romioi*"..

warmth". In Greece, Turkish series are broadcast every evening with Greek subtitles, and Turkish TV can be watched via satellite. These series, mostly shot in Istanbul, both help the immigrants "revive their Turkish" and provide an opportunity to talk to their children about the *City* they were born and raised in and create sharing moments. The series called *The Foreign Groom* is known as the most prominent one. Anthropologist Tayfun Atay emphasizes that the series was a blow to our minds preconditioned by Yeşilçam's[518] sexist and ethnocentric view with Byzantine princesses falling in love with brave Turkish warriors and converting to Islam to marry them, and made significant contributions by causing a mutation in the paternal/anti-Hellenic cultural genes.[519] The first thing that needs to be done to break down the widely held prejudices and create empathy is to create visibility into these prejudices by associating with positive characters in the scenarios. Instead of treating minority characters as a folkloric element or a color, it is important to try to create awareness on this issue through credible leading or secondary characters such as teachers and doctors.

I believe the academic community has a lot to do on this matter. Naturally, what can be done will be limited through scholarly work that are usually confined in a narrow field and reach only a specific audience. Therefore, scientists and academicians can effectively use social media or create meeting opportunities such as conferences, to draw the attention of producers and consumers of such popular culture products.

Universities are places where information is produced, transmitted, and where research is conducted. But this is only one aspect; a more important function is their contribution to the critical thought. Higher education – undergraduate, graduate and particulary doctorate studies – should be viewed as generating critical thinking, rather than as pragmatic benefits such as professions and stepstones. In this sense, while I would like to briefly describe my suggested work in the light of this thesis as studies that focus on intersections of inequalities such as ethnicity, gender, social class that would reveal the differentiating factors, that is the power relations, I will also emphasize the importance of an ethnograic study on academic education, which is not immune to unequal and

---

518 It refers to the Turkish movie art and industry.

519 Tayfun Atay's Radikal daily news 20/05/2012 dated, Dostum Takis! Erkeğiz Biz!.. http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalYazar&ArticleID=1088512 &Yazar=TAYFUN-ATAY&CategoryID=41 21/05/2012.

authoritarian relations I believe anthropology, known by its emphasis on the subortdinated and inequality of relationships, can have significant contributions in creating new approaches, by sponsoring important studies that will provide insight into this issue and sharing these works on a larger area outside the academic world.

Last word

In this study, I aimed to present the identity-ritual relationship for the Romioi Orthodox of Istanbul along with its turbulent historical background. This relationship also sheds light on how a minority is perceived and positioned by the nation-state. The concept of nation-state has unbreakable ties to nationalism. The experience of transitioning from the Ottoman system to the nation-state has been agonizing. Nation-state and modernity were harsh experiences in Turkey – as in many other places, and difference was perceived as danger. Turkish identity, that is Turkish language and Sunni Muslim religion, was fictitiously built on a myht of roots extending both to Central Asia, as well the ancient peoples of Anatolia, such as the Hittites. In the context of the new homogeneous identity, the Romioi, Armenians and other Christians and Jews were also excluded as being "others". It is not possible to erase history, nor necessary. The relationship established with the past must be in a questioning manner, not in the style of dignification or making insignificant.

Today, the Romioi of Istanbul do not consist only of the Greek/Romioi speaking people. The Arabic-speaking Orthodox people of Antakya origin, who have roles in the continuation of schools, are articulated in this identity. The questions by Kostas Gavroglou in the conference are critical on this issue: *"Are we doing something that will help them preserve their customs and traditions? Or is our only concern how they will become Romioi like us?"* In the Romioi community of Istanbul, which has suffered many years of injustice and assimilationist politics, it is important to approach the "inward" and "outward" discriminatory attitudes for "breaking away from the domination of horror and escaping inertia". In the objections and oppositions against discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, religion, language and sexual orientation and hate crimes, finding a common ground on the platform of claiming rights where unity and support are the most needed, such as the Romioi supporting Kurdish language or males supporting LGBT (Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered), will help to democratize the minds and politics. As humanist-Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch's

says in his slogan: "A human being is a human being only by being human to (another) human being[520]". In this context, I can summarize my primary objective of this thesis as *an attempt to understand the human being, by conveing my understanding in their own voices, to create an awareness and empathy.*

---

520 Tanıl Bora, Radikal Gazetesi, 10/06/2012 dated, Akil Adamlar, Kim Bunlar http://www.radikal.com.tr/yazarlar/tanil_bora/akil_adamlar___kim_bunlar-1090659.

Bibliography

Abrahams, Roger D. "Ordinary and Extraordinary Experience", in Turner and Bruner (eds.), *Anthropology of Experience*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1986.

Abu-Lughod, Laila. "Palestinians: Exiles at Home and Abroad", *Current Sociology* 36(2), Summer, 61–69, 1998.

Adanır, Fikret. "Bulgaristan, Yunanistan ve Türkiye Üçgeninde Ulus İnşası ve Nüfus Değişimi", in Zürcher (ed.), *İmparatorlukta Cumhuriyete Türkiye'de Etnik Çatışma*, içinde, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011.

Agelopoulos, Georgios. "Mothers of the Nation: Gender and Ethnicity in Greek Macedonia", *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: A Critical Review, Workshop IV, Ethnicity, Culture and Identity*, The Netherlands Universities Institute for Coordination of Research in Social Sciences, 1993.

Agnew, John. *Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, Sage, London, 2011.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Edinburg University Press, Edinburg, 2004.

Akgönül, Samim. *Türkiye Rumları,* trans. Ceylan Gürman, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2007.

Akgönül, Samim. *Azınlık, Türk Bağlamında Azınlık Kavramına Çapraz Bakışlar*, trans. Deniz Töreli Esnault ve Deniz Akgönül, Bgst Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011.

Aktar, Ayhan. *Türk Milliyetçiliği, Gayrimüslimler ve Ekonomik Dönüşüm,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006.

Aktar, Ayhan. "Nüfusun Homojenleştirilmesi ve Ekonominin Türkleştirilmesi Sürecinde Bir Aşama: Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi, 1923–1924", in Hirschon (ed.), *Ege'yi Geçerken, 1923 Türk-Yunan Nüfus Mübadelesi*, trans. Müfide Pekin and Ertuğ Altınay, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2007.

Aktar, Ayhan. *Varlık Vergisi ve "Türkleştirme" Politikaları,* İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010.

Aktar, Cengiz. *Tarihi, Siyasi, Dini ve Hukuki açıdan Ekümenik Patrikhane*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011.

Alexandris, Alexis. *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations 1918–1974*, Center for Asia Minor Studies, Athens, 1992.

Alexandris, Alexis. "The Greek Census of Anatolia and Thrace (1910–1912): A Contribution to Ottoman Historical Demography", in Gondicas and Issawi

(eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, The Darwin Press, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

Alexandris, Alexis. "Religion or Ethnicity: The Identity Issue of the Minorities in Greece and Turkey", in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004.

Alexandris, Alexis. "Lozan Konferansı ve İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi'nin Ekümenik Boyutu: 10 Ocak 1923 Tarihli Tutanağın Önemi", trans. Efi Servou, in Aktar (ed.), *Tarihi, Siyasi, Dini ve Hukuki açıdan Ekümenik Patrikhane*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011.

Alinia, Minoo. *Spaces of Diasporas, Kurdish Identities, Experiences of Otherness and Politics of Belonging*, Göteborg Studies in Sociology No 22, Department of Sociology, Göteborg University, 2004.

Allan, Graham. *Kinship and Friendship in Modern Britain*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.

Alonso, Ana Maria. "The Politics of Space, Time and Substance: State Formation and Ethnicity", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 379–405, 1994.

Althusser, Louis. *For Marx*, trans. Ben Brewster, The Penguin Press, Harmondsworth, 1969.

Althusser, Louis. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism, Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, Preface by Etienne Balibar, Introduction by Jacques Bidet, trans. G.M. Goshgarian, Verso, London, New York, 2014.

Anastassiadou, Méropi. "İstanbul Rumlarının Kültürel Varlığı: Değerlendirme ve Gelişme Tahayyülleri", trans. Ayşe Özil, in *İstanbul Rumları - Bugün ve Yarın*, İstos Yayın, Istanbul, 2012.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London, New York, 2006.

Anthias, Floya and Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Women, Nation, State*, The Macmillan Press, London, 1989.

Arı, Kemal. *Büyük Mübadele Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç (1923–1925)*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul, 1995.

Assman, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization, Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2011.

Atay, Tayfun. "Sosyal Antropoloji'de Yöntem ve Etik Sorunu: Klasik Etnografi'den Diyalojik Etnografi'ye Doğru", in Lordoğlu (ed.), *İnsan, Toplum, Bilim 4. Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler*, Kongresi Bildiriler, Kavram Yayınları, Istanbul, 1996.

Aydın, Süavi. *Kültür-Kimlik Modelleri Açısından Türk Tarih Yazımı*, for the degree of Doctor of Anthropology, Hacettepe Universitesi, 1997.

Badone, Ellen and Roseman, Sharon R. "Approaches to the Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism", in Badone and Roseman (eds.), *Intersecting Journeys he Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Chicago, 2004.

Balancar, Ferda. "Azınlıklara 'dönün' demek kolay ama. . .", Agos, Istanbul March 8, 2012.

Bali, Rıfat. *Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni (1923–1945)*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005.

Balibar, Etienne. "Is There a 'Neo-Racism'?", in Balibar and Wallerstein (eds.), *Race, Nation, Class – Ambiguous Identities*, trans. Chris Turner, Verso, London, New York, 1991.Banerjee, Sikata. "Gender and Nationalism: The Masculinization of Hinduism and Female Political Participation in India", *Women's Studies International Forum* 26(2), 167–179, 2003.

Banerjee, Sikata. "Gender and Nationalism: The Masculinization of Hinduism and Female Political Participation in India", *Women's Studies International Forum* 26(2), 167–179, 2003.

Barth, Fredrik. "Introduction" *in Ethnic Groups and Boundaries, the Social Organization of Culture Difference*, Waveland Press, Long Grove, 1969.

Behar, Ruth. *The Vulnerable Observer*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1996.

Belge, Murat. "Önsöz/Preface", in *Bizans - Bir Ortaçağ İmparatorluğunun Şaşırtıcı Yaşamı*, author Judith Herrin, trans. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010.

Bell, Sandra and Coleman, Simon. *The Anthropology of Friendship*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 1999.

Bender, Barbara. "Introduction", in Bender and Winer (eds.), *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*, Berg, 2001.

Benhabib, Seyla. *The Rights of Others – Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2004.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, Schocken Books, New York, 2007.

Berger, John. "Uses of Photography", in Dyer (ed.), *Selected Essays*, Vintage International, Vintage Books, New York, 2001.

Birkalan, Hande. "Gecekondu, Hayat Hikayeleri ve Evler: Halkbilim ve Etnografide Saha Çalışması ve Refleksif Yazın Üzerine Bir Deneme", *Folklor/ Edebiyat VI*, no. XXII, 2000.

Bora, Aksu. "Rüyası Ömrümüzün Çünkü Eşyaya Siner", in Alkan (ed.), *Cins Cins Mekân*, Varlık Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Boura, Catherine. "The Greek Millet in Turkish Politics: Greeks in the Ottoman Parliament (1908–1918)", in Gondicas and Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, The Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

Boym, Svetlana. *Future of Nostalgia*, Basic Books, New York, 2001.

Boym, Svetlana. *Nostaljinin Geleceği*, trans. Ferit Burak Aydar, Metis Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Bozdoğan, Sibel and Kasaba, Reşat. *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997.

Brah, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*, Routledge, London and New York, 1996.

Brubaker, Rogers. "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, 1–19, 2005.

Bryant, Rebecca. "Writing the Catastrophe: Nostalgia and Its Histories in Cyprus", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 26(2), 2008, 399–422.

Butler, Judith. *The Psychic Life of Power, Theories in Subjection*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1997.

Caftanzoglou, Roxane. "The Shadow of the Sacred Rock", in Bender and Winer (eds.), *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 2001.

Cassirer, Ernst. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, trans. Ralph Manheim, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 1955.

Çelebi, Evliya. *Günümüz Türkçesiyle Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi: İstanbul*, Vol. 1. Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011.

Charbonniers, Georges. *Conversation with Claude Lévi Strauss*, trans. John and Doreen Weightman, Cape Editions, London,1969.

Chomsky, Noam. *Language and Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

Clark, Bruce. *Twice a Stranger, the Mass Expulsions that Forged Modern Greece and Turkey*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006.

Clifford James. "On Ethnographic Authority", *Representations* 1(2), 118–146, 1983.

Clifford James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MAssachusetts, 1988.

Clifford James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1997.

Clifford James and Marcus, George E. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, University of California Press, Santa Cruz, 1986.

Clogg, Richard. *A Concise History of Greece*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

Cohen, Yehudi A. *Social Structure and Personality: A Casebook*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1961.

Colonas, Vassilis. "Housing and the Architectural Expression of Asia Minor Greeks Before and After 1923", in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004.

Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

Cormak, Robin. "Sanat Bize Tarih Kitaplarıyla Aynı Öyküyü mü Anlatır?" in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, içinde, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010.

Coser, Lewis A. "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877–1945", in Coser (ed.), *On Collective Memory*, Maurice Halbwachs, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1992.

Crehan, Kate. *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*, Pluto Press, London, Sterling Virginia, 2002.

Cresswell, Tim. *Place: A Short Introduction*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Oxford, Victoria 2004.

Cresswell, Tim. "Place", in Kitchen and Thrift (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Elsevier, Oxford, 2009.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984.

De Villehardouin Geoffroi. *Memoirs of the Crusades, Villehardouin's Chronicle*, trans. Sir Frank Marzials, Rhys (ed.), Everyman's Library, E.P. Dutton & Co, digitized in 2008.

Delaney, Carol. "Father State, Motherland, and the Birth of Modern Turkey", in Yanagisako and Delaney (eds.), *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*, Routledge, New York, 1995.

Delemen, İnci. "Bizantion: Koloni - Kent – Başkent", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010.

Deleuze Gilles and Parnet Claire. *Dialogues II, Continuum*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, Columbia University Press, New York, 2007.

Delgado Elena L. and Romero, Rolando J. "Local Histories and Global designs: An Interview with Walter Mignolo", *Discourse*, 22(3), 7–33, Fall 2000, Wayne State University Press.

Dellaloğlu, Besim F. *Benjaminia: Dil, Tarih ve Coğrafya*, Versus Kitap, Istanbul, 2008.

Demirel, Işıl. *Çanakkale Yahudi Cemaati ile Gayrimüslim Politikaların İzinde*, Yeditepe University unpublished MA thesis, Istanbul, 2010.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains – Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876–1909*, I.B. Tauris, London, New York, 1999.

Deringil, Selim. *Simgeden Millete - II. Abdülhamid'den Mustafa Kemal'e Devlet ve Millet*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger*, Routledge, London and New York, 2002.

Durkheim, Emile. *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, trans. Karen E. Fields, The Free Press, New York, 1995.

Durrenberger, Paul and Palsson, Gisli, "Friendship in the Absence of States", in Bell and Coleman (eds.), *The Anthropology of Friendship*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 1999.

Duru, Orhan. "Sunu/Preface", in *Bizans'ın Gizli Tarihi*, author Prokopius, trans. Orhan Duru, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, Istanbul, 1999.

Elden, Stuart. "Space", in Kitchen and Thrift (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Elsevier, Oxford, 2009.

Eyice, Semavi. "Tarih İçinde İstanbul ve Şehrin Gelişmesi", *Atatürk Konferansları TTK.* 1958.

Eyice, Semavi. "İstanbul'un Mahalle ve Semt Adları Hakkında Bir Deneme", *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, *XIV*, 199–216, 1965.

Foucault, Michel. "Entretien sur la prison: le livre et sa method", (entretien avec J.-J. Brochier), *Magazine Littéraire*, no 101, (Juin 1975).

Foucault, Michel. *Histoire de la sexualité 1, La volonté de savoir*, Gallimard, 1976.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Space", *Diacritics*, Spring 1986.

Frazer, James. *The Golden Bough*, Temple of Earth Publishing, 1922.

Freely, John. *İstanbul, the Imperial City*, Penguin Books, London, 1998.

Gans, Herbert. "Symbolic Ethnicity and Symbolic Religiosity: Towards a Comparison of Ethnic and Religious Acculturation", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, no. 4 (XVII), 577–592, 1979.

Gell, Alfred. "Magic, Perfume, Dream. . .", in Lewis (ed.), *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-Cultural Studies in Symbolism*, Academic Press, London, 1977.

Gellner, Ernest. *Encounter with Nationalism*, Blackwell, 1994.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2006.

Gombrich, Ernst H. *The Story of Art*, Phaidon Press, London, 1995.

Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, Salkımsöğüt Yayınları, Ankara, 2010.

Göker, Ayşe Aybil. *Being 'Cypriot' in North London: Strategies, Experiences and Contestations*, for the degree of Doctor of Anthropology, University College of London, 2007.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, International Publishers, New York, 1971.

Gupta, Akhil and Ferguson James. *Culture, Power, Place, Explorations in Critical Anthropology - Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference*, Duke University Press, London, 1997.

Gülalp, Haldun. "Introduction: Citizenship vs. Nationality", in Gülalp (ed.), *Citizenship and Ethnic Conflict, Challenging the Nation-State*, Routledge, New York, 2006.

Güven, Dilek. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Azınlık Politikaları ve Stratejileri Bağlamında 6–7 Eylül Olayları*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006.

Güvenç, Bozkurt. *İnsan ve Kültür*, Remzi Kitabevi, Istanbul, 2002.

Hall, Stuart. "Culture, Community, Nation", *Cultural Studies* 7(3), 349–363, 1993.

Hall, Stuart and Held, David. "Citizens and Citizenship", in Hall and Jacques (eds.), *New Times: Changing Face of Politics in the 1990's*, Lawrence & Wishart Ltd, London, 1989.

Hamilakis, Yannis and Yalouri, Eleana. "Antiquities as Symbolic Capital in Modern Greek society", *Antiquity 70*, 117–129, 1996.

Haviland, William A, Prins Harald E.L., McBride Bunny, Walrath Dana, *Cultural Anthropology, The Human Challenge*, Wadsworth Cengage Learning, Belmont, 2011.

Hendrich, Beatrice. "Mario Levi ve Mıgırdiç Margosyan'da Yemek Hatırlama ve Hatırlama Yemekleri", in Neyzi (ed.), *Nasıl Hatırlıyoruz? Türkiye'de Bellek Çalışmaları*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, Istanbul, 2011.

Heraclides, Alexis. *Yunanistan ve "Doğu'dan Gelen Tehlike" Türkiye, Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Çıkmazlar ve Çözüm Yolları*, trans. Mihalis Vasilyadis and Herkül Millas, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2003.

Herman, Judith L. *Trauma and Recovery*, Basic Book, New York, 1997.

Herrin, Judith. *Byzantium – The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2008.

Herzfeld, Michael. *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*, Routledge, New York, 1977.

Herzfeld, Michael. *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

Herzfeld, Michael. *A Place in History, Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1991.

Heyd, Uriel. *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gokalp*, Luzac, London, 1950.

Hirschon, Renée. "Consequences of the Lausanne Convention: An Overview", in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780, Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *On the Edge of the New Century*, interviewer Antonia Politi, trans. Allan Cameron, The New Press, New York, 2000.

Hür, Ayşe. "İkonoklazma", in *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 4, Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, Istanbul, 1994.

İnalcık, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire, the Classical Age 1300–1600*, Phoenix, London, 1994.

Işın, Engin F. "Bir Şehrin Ruhu: Hüzün, Keyif, Hasret", in Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli (eds.), *İstanbul Nereye? Küresel Kent, Kültür, Avrupa*, Metis Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010.

Jackson, Michael. *Things as They Are: New Directions in Phenomenological Anthropology*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1996.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. "Guest Editor's Introduction: The Awkward Relationship: Gender and Natioanalism", *Nations and Nationalism* 6(4), 491–494, 2000.

Karaca, Zafer. *İstanbul'da Tanzimat Öncesi Rum Ortodoks Kiliseleri*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2008.

Kasaba, Reşat. "Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities", in Bozdoğan and Kasaba (eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997.

Kertzer, David. *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 1988.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Memalik-i Osmaniye'den Avrupa Birliği'ne*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2007.

Keyder, Çağlar. "Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s", in Bozdoğan and Kasaba (eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997.

Kitromilides, Paschalis. "The Vision of Freedom on Greek Society", *Journal of Hellenic Diaspora* 19(1), 5–29, 1993.

Kordatos, Yannis. *Bizans'ın Son Günleri*, trans. Muzaffer Baca, Alkım, Istanbul, 2006.

Krautheimer, Richard. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1965.

Kritovulos. *Kritovulos Tarihi 1451–1467*, trans. Ari Çokona, Heyamola Yayınları, Istanbul, 2012.

Kuban, Doğan. *Istanbul an Urban History, Byzantion, Constantinopolis*, The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey, Istanbul, 1996.

Kuban, Doğan. "Konstantinopolis -İstanbul'un Destansı Tarihi", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010.

Kuçuradi, İoanna. *Etik.* Türk Felsefe Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1988.

Laclau, Ernesto and Mouffe, Chantal. *Hegemony & Socialist Strategy, towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, Verso, London, New York, 1996.

Leach, Edmund. "Anthropological Aspects of Language: Animal Categories and Verbal Abuse", in Lenneberg (ed.), *New Directions in the Study of Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachutsetts, 1964.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1991.

Lemerle, Paul. *A History of Byzantium*, trans. Antony Matthew, A Sun Book- Walker and Company New York, 1964.

Loizos, Peter. "Intercommunal Killing in Cyprus", *Man* 23, 639–653, 1988.

Low, Setha M. and Lawrence-Zuniga, Denise. *The Anthropology of Space Place, Locating Culture*, Blackwell Publishing, Maldon, Oxford, Victoria, Berlin, 2003.

Lowenthal, David. "Preface", in Forty and Küchler (eds.), *The Art of Forgetting*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 2001.

Lupton, Deborah. *The Emotional Self, a Sociocultural Exploration*, Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, 1998.

Lynch, Sandra M. *Philosophy and Friendship*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2005.

Macar, Elçin. *Cumhuriyet Döneminde İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesi*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2004.

Magdalino, Paul. *Studies on the History and Topography of Byzantine Constantinople*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, Ashgate, 2007.

Magdalino, Paul. "Bir Dinin ve İmparatorluğun Başkenti Olarak Konstantinopolis", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010.

Malkki, Liisa. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorilizing of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees", in Gupta and Ferguson (eds.), *Culture, Power, Place, Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, Duke University Press, 1997.

Mandelbaum, David G. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2012.

Mango, Cyril. *Byzantium, the Empire of New Rome*, Charles Scribner's Sons New York, 1980.

Mardin, Şerif. "Projects as Methodology, Some Thoughts on Modern Turkish Social Science", in Bozdoğan and Kasaba (eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997.

Mardin, Şerif. *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010.

Massey, Doreen B. *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time*, Dept. of Geography, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, 1999.

Meskell, Lynn. *Archeology Under Fire Nationalizm, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London, New York, 1998.

Millas, Herkül *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki", Ulusual Kimlikte Yunan İmajı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2000.

Millas, Herkül. *Geçmişten Bugüne Yunanlılar Dil, Din ve Kimlikleri*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2004.

Millas, Herkül. "Ethnic Identity and Nation Building: On Byzantine and Ottoman Historical Legacy", *The EU and the Historical Legacy in the Balkans*, University Centre St-Ignatius, Antwerp, 2006.

Moore, Henrietta. *Feminism and Anthropology*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1998.

Myerhoff, Barbara. "Life Not Death in Venice: Its Second Life", in Turner and Bruner (eds.), *Anthropology of Experience*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1986.

Navaro-Yashin, Yael. "De-ethnicising the Ethnography of Cyprus: Political", in Y. Papadakis, N. Peristianis and G. Welz (eds.), *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History and an Island in Conflict*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2006.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power, the Topkapi Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries,* The Architectural History Foundation, New York, and The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, 1991.

Necipoğlu, Nevra. "Osmanlı Fethinin Arifesinde Konstantinopolis", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi, Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010,

Neyzi, Leyla. "Object or Subject? The Paradox of 'Youth' in Turkey", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 33, 411–432, August 2001.

Neyzi, Leyla. "Remembering to Forget: Sabbateanism, National Identity, and Subjectivity in Turkey", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44(1), 137–158, Jan. 2002.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire", *Representations* 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter, Spring 1989, 7–24.

Nora, Pierre. *Rethinking the French Past of Memory, Volume I: Conflicts and Divisions*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Columbia University Press, 1996.

Open the Social Sciences, *Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1996,

Oran, Baskın. *Türkiye'de Azınlıklar: Kavramlar, Lozan, İç mevzuat, İçtihat, Uygulama,* Tesev Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005.

Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010.

Ortaylı, İlber. *İstanbul'dan Sayfalar*, Turkuvaz Kitapçılık Yayıncılık, Istanbul, 2008.

Öncü, Ayşe. "Istanbulites and Others: The Cultural Cosmology of Being Middle Class in the Era of Globalism", in Çağlar Keyder (ed.), *Istanbul between the Global and the Local*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, 1999.

Örs, İlay Romain. *The Last of the Cosmopolitans? Rum Polites of Istanbul in Athens: Exploring the Identity of the City*' for the degree of Doctor of

Philosopy in the subject of Anthropology and Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University, May 1996.

Özbudun, Sibel, Markus, George and Demirer, Temel. *Yabancılaşma ve . . .* Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, Ankara, 2007.

Özdoğan, Mehmet. "Tarihöncesi Dönemlerin İstanbul'u", in *Bizantion'dan İstanbul'a Bir Başkentin 8000 Yılı*, Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, Istanbul, 2010.

Öztürkmen, Arzu. *Türkiye'de Folklor ve Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Paine, Robert. "In Search of Friendship: An Explanatory Analysis in 'Middle-Class' Culture", *Man*, 4, 505–524, 1969.

Papadopoulos, Renos. "Refugee Families: Issues of Systemic Supervision", *Journal of Family Theraphy* 23, 405–422, 2001.

Phillips, Anne. "Dealing with Difference: A Politics of Ideas, or a Politics of Presence", in Benhabib (ed.), *Democracy and Difference, Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1996.

Pile, Steve. *The Body and the City, Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity*, Routledge, London, New York, 1996.

Pile, Steve. "Emotions and Affect in Recent Human Geography", *Transactions*, Royal Geographical Society, 2009.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "The Kith and the Kin", in Goody (ed.), *The Character of Kinship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne, 1973.

Proust, Marcel. *In Search of Lost Time, Volume I, Swann's Way*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin, Rev. D.J. Enright, The Modern Library, New York, 1992.

Rachman, Stanley J. *Anxiety*, Psychology Press Ltd, New York, 2004.

Rawlins, William K. *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course*, Transaction Publishers, New Jersey, 1992.

Relph, Edward. *Place and Placelessness*, Pion, London, 1976.

Renan, Ernest. "What Is a Nation?", in Dahbourne and Ishay (eds.), *The Nationalism Reader*, Humanities Press, New Jersey, 1995.

Runciman, Steven. *A History of the Crusades*,Volume III, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, 1951.

Runciman, Steven. *The Fall of Constantinople 1453*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1965.

Sack, Robert D. *Homo Geographicus*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1997.

Said, Edward. *Reflections on Exile: and Other Essays*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2000.

Şarlak, Eva Aleksandru. *İstanbul Nekropollerinde Sanat ve Mimarlık*, Derin Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005.

Schacter, Daniel L. *Searching for Memory, The Brain, the Mind and the Past*, Basic Books, New York, 1996.

Schnapper, Dominique. *Öteki ile İlişki*, trans. Ayşegül Sönmezay, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2005.

Scott, Julie and Selwyn, Tom. *Thinking Through Tourism*, Berg, New York, 2010.

Seremetakis, Nadia. *The Senses Still, Perception and Memory as Material Culture in Modernity*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1994.

Sontag, Susan. *On the Photography*, Rosetta Books, New York, 2005.

Sirman, Nükhet. "Kadınların Milliyeti", in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Sluga, Glenda. "Female and National Self Determination: A Gender Re-reading of the Apogee of nationalism", *Nations and Nationalism* 6(4), 495–521, 2000.

Smith, Anthony. *National Identity*, Penguin Books, London, 1991.

Stelaku, Vasso. "Space, Place and Identity: Memory and Religion in Two Cappadocian Greek", in Hirschon (ed.), *Crossing the Aegean, an Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey*, Berghan Books, New York, Oxford, 2004.

Stewart, Charles. "Who Owns the Rotonda? Church vs. State in Greece", *Anthropology Today* 14(5), 3–9, 1998.

Stocker, Michael. "Values and Purposes: The Limits of Teleology and the Ends of Friendship", *The Journal of Philosophy* LXXVIII (12), 747–765, 1981.

Stoller, Paul. *Sensuous Scholarship.* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1997.

Straub, Johannes A. *Constantine as Koiēoe Epiekopoe.* Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 1967.

Sutton, David. *Remembrance of Repasts: An Anthropology of Food and Memory*, Berg, Oxford, 2001.

Tachau, Frank. "Language and Politics: Turkish Language Reform", *The Review of Politics* 26(2) (April), 191–204, 1964.

Thrift, Nigel J. "Steps to an Ecology of Place", in Massey, Allen and Sarre (eds.), *Human Geography Today*, Blackwell, Cambridge, 1999.

Thrift, Nigel J. "Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect", *Geografiska Annaler B* 86, 57–78, 2004.

Tilley, Christopher. *Phenomenology of the Landscape*, Berg, Oxford, 1994.

Tonkin, Elizabeth. *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1991.

Tuan, Yi-Fu, *Space and Place the Perspective of Experience.* The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1977.

Turner, Victor and Turner, Edith. *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1978.

Tümertekin, Erol. *İstanbul İnsan ve Mekân*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Tyler, Stephen. "Postmodern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document", in Clifford and Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, University of California Press, Santa Cruz, 1986.

Veremis, Thanos. "The Hellenic Kingdom and the Ottoman Greeks: The Experiment of the 'Society of Constantinople'", in Gondicas and Issawi (eds.), *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism*, The Darwin Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1999.

Volkan, Vamık. *Cyprus – War and Adaptation, a Psychoanalytic History of Two Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, University Press of Virginia, Charlotsville, 1979.

Yapp, Nick. *Decades of the 20th Century*, Photographs' copyright 1998 Getty Images, Tandem Verlag, 1998, English and French, printed in Turkish, trans. Sema Bulutsuz, Literatür Yayıncılık, Istanbul, 2005.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Constantinople, Istanbul's Historical Heritage*, trans. Sally M. Schreiber, Uta Hoffmann, Ellen Loeffler, Tandem Verlag, 2005.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Türk Metinlerinde Konstantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, trans. Şirin Tekeli, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2009.

Yıldırım, Onur. *Türk-Yunan Mübadelesi'nin Öteki Yüzü: Diplomasi ve Göç*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2006.

Yıldız, Ahmet. "*Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene", Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919–1938)*, İletişim Yayınları, Istanbul, 2010.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation*, Sage Publications, London, 1997.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Ideological Tensions of Capitalism: Universalism versus Racism and Sexism", in Balibar and Wallerstein (eds.), *Race, Nation, Class Ambiguous Identities*, Verso, London, New York, 1991.

Weiner, Wolfgang Müller. *Bizans'tan Osmanlı'ya İstanbul Limanları*, trans. Erol Özbek, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul, 1994.

Weiner, Wolfgang Müller. *İstanbul'un Tarihsel Topografyası 17. Yüzyıl Başlarına Kadar Byzantion-Konstantinopolis – İstanbul*, trans. Ülker Sayın, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Istanbul, 2001.

Wenk, Silke. "Gendered Representations of the Nation's Past and Future," in Blom, Hagemann and Hall (eds.), *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the Long Nineteenth Century*, Berg, Oxford, New York, 2000.

Zetter, Roger. "The Greek-Cypriot Refugees: Perceptions of Return under Conditions of Protracted Exile", *International Migration Review* 28(2), 307–322, 1994.

Zetter, Roger. "Reconceptualizing the Myth of Return: Continuity and Transition Amongst the Greek-Cypriot Refugees of 1974", *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12(1), 1–22, 1999.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Sublime Object of Ideology*, Verso, London, New York, 1989.

http://atina.be.mfa.gov.tr 13/08/2012

(www.aaa.net.org, 25.06.2012).

(www.theasa.org, 25.06.2012).

http://www.babynames.org.uk/greek-baby-names.htm

http://www.babynameworld.com/greek.asp

http://graecorthodoxa.hypotheses.org/1061 05/09/2011

15/8/2011 (www.azinlikca.net).

http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalYazar&ArticleID=1088 512&Yazar=TAYFUN-ATAY&CategoryID=41 21/05/2012.

Tanıl Bora, Radikal Gazetesi, 10/06/2012 tarihli, Akil Adamlar, Kim Bunlar başlıklı yazısı http://www.radikal.com.tr/yazarlar/tanil_bora/akil_adamlar___kim_bunlar-1090659

Appendix

Fieldwork

Spreadsheet of interviews and interviewees, based on year, gender and age.

Tab. 1: Age of interviewees

Age	Istanbul	Athens	Total
|> 80	1	2	3
> 60	9	17	26
45–60	16	16	32
30–45	2	4	6
15–30	7	0	7
Total	35	39	74

Tab. 2: Number of interviews per year

Year	Istanbul	Athens	Total
2012	34	0	34
2011	14	25	39
2010	10	32	42
2009	2	0	2
Total	60	57	117

Tab. 3: Gender of interviewees

Gender	Istanbul	Athens	Total
Female	18	17	35
Male	17	22	39
Total	35	39	74

Interviewees

Akis: Male. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. He is from Yenikoy. He migrated to Athens. His wife is *Cleo*, Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

Angelos: Male in his forties; an Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Athens. The interviews took place in 2011 in Athens.

Basilia: Female in her fifties; an Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Istanbul. The interviews took place in 2011 in Athens.

Cleo: Female. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. She is from Cihangir. Her husband is Akis, Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

Damos: Male. Mid-sixties. He graduated from Romioi high school, in Istanbul. His wife *Theodora* is a Romioi of Carsamba (Fatih). Interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

Dimitra: Female. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Romioi. She is from Cihangir. She came to Athens with her husband. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010.

Dimitris: Male, in his 40s, Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Istanbul. The interviews took place at various dates in 2010 and 2011 in Istanbul.

Elena. Female. Mid-fifties. She migrated to Athens with her family at the beginning of 1970s. Her husband *Leonidas* is also Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010.

Evi (Millas): Female. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Athens. The interview was made in Athens in 2011.

Hercules (Millas): Male. Late-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Athens. The interview was made in Athens in 2011.

Iason: Male, around age 30, Istanbulite Romioi. After completing his high school education in a Romioi high school in Turkey, he migrated to Athens. The interviews took place in 2010 and 2011 in Athens.

Joanna: Female. Mid-fiftees. Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010 and 2011.

Keti: Female. Mid-thirties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Athens. The interviews were made in Athens 2010.

Lambos: Male. Mid-forties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Istanbul. The interviews were made in Istanbul in 2011 and 2012.

Leonidas: Male. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Athens. The interviews were made in 2010 in Athens.

Letha: Female in her 50s, a Romioi of Istanbul who lives in Istanbul. Our interviews took place in Istanbul in 2012.

Maya: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Istanbul. The interviews were made in Istanbul in 2012.

Mihail: Male around age 60, a *Romioi* of Istanbul, He migrated to Athens but after a number of years returned to Istanbul. Our interviews took place between August and December 2011.

Miltos: Male, in his 60s, Istanbulite Romioi and from Kurtulus/Tatavla. He migrated to Athens in 1978. The interviews took place in Athens in November 2010 and November 2011.

Nadia: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. She lives in Athens. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010 and 2011.

Orestis: Male in his forties; an Istanbulite Romioi who lives in Athens. The interviews took place in 2011 in Athens.

Pandelis: Male. Mid-nineties. He lived in Istanbul and Ankara. He came to Athens alone. Then his wife and child came. The interview was made in Athens in 2010.

Phoebe: Female. Mid-fifties. Romioi of Istanbul. She is from Tarabya and Buyukada; lives in Athens. The interviews were held in Athens in November 2010 and November 2011. She migrated with her family when she was 10.

Takis: Man. 70 ages. Romioi of Istanbul. He migrated to Athens but lives both in Athens and Istanbul for a while. The interviews were conducted in Istanbul in September 2011.

Talea: Female. Mid-fifties. After finishing high school and university in Istanbul, she started to work and left Istanbul with his mother towards the end of 1970s and went to Athens. Interviews were made in Athens and Istanbul in 2011.

Theodora: Female. Mid-sixties. Their grandfather migrated from Kayseri to Istanbul many years ago. She graduated high school from Romioi school, finished high school in Istanbul. Interviews were made in Athens in 2011.

Timon: Male. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. He is from Kadikoy. His wife *Dimitra* is Romioi of Cihangir. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010.

Vangelis: Male. Mid-forties. Romioi of Istanbul. He lives in Istanbul. At one point they think about leaving as a family, but later they waived. The interviews were made in Istanbul in 2011 and 2012.

Xanthus: Male, Romioi of Istanbul, in his 60s, who lives in Athens. The interviews took place in Athens in 2010 and 2011.

Zenos: Male. Mid-sixties. Romioi of Istanbul. The interviews were made in Athens in 2010 and 2011. He has never been able to come to Istanbul because of emotional reasons, since the beginning of the 1960's.