

LOOKING AT THE HOUSE FROM INSIDE:

THE PROCESSES OF CONSTRUCTING GROUP IDENTITY AMONGST GREEK - CYPRIOTS

Eva Keller

Abstract

This article discusses Turkish-Greek-Cypriot relations from a social anthropological point of view. More precisely, it discusses the processes by which Greek-Cypriots construct collective identity as Cypriots involving the exclusion of the Turks from mainland Turkey and the inclusion of the Turkish-Cypriots into the group defined as insiders. I argue that these processes leading to the construction of social boundaries are based on culturally shared notions such as religion and the house which are discussed in detail. Those (the Turks) who violate Greek-Cypriot cultural notions are perceived as outsiders, while those (the Turkish-Cypriots) who do not, are regarded as insiders. I argue further that it is misleading to use the concept of ethnicity as a general and universal frame of reference in the analysis of collective identity.

Introduction

From a social anthropological point of view,¹ the literature on Cyprus and particularly, on the Cyprus Problem is very poor.² Except for two articles by Peristiany (1965, 1968), the anthropology of Cyprus only started in the mid-1970s (Loizos, 1976). As far as I am aware, there is to this day only a handful of anthropological studies³ – notably by Loizos – but most of them do not touch on the relationship between Greek and Turkish-Cypriots and mainland Turks⁴ which is the topic of this article.⁵ Most studies on the Cyprus Problem deal with the situation on the island from a historical or a political perspective, but very little research has been done on the perception of the people concerned themselves. This is true not only for Cyprus, but for the leader-focused study of so-called ethnic conflicts and ethnicity in general. There have been surprisingly few 'bottom-up' studies. Cyprus is an illustrative example of this fact.

Is a Turk a Turk?

Since the political events in the 1960s and 1974 which led to the division of Cyprus and to the violent separation of Greek and Turkish-Cypriots, the issue of bicomunal relations has been central to the political and social discourse on the Cyprus Problem. The relationship between Greek and Turkish-Cypriots on the one hand and the relationship between all Cypriots and the mainland Turks on the other, has become a crucial part of the Greek-Cypriots' sense of identity. Therefore, it is important to them to make general statements about their view of both Turks and Turkish-Cypriots.

Although many Greek-Cypriots refer to both mainland Turks and Turkish-Cypriots as '*i turci*', there could not be a greater difference between the two groups of people from the Greek-Cypriots' point of view. With the exception of some young people, Greek-Cypriots very sharply and decisively distinguish between Turkish-Cypriots on the one hand and Turks from mainland Turkey on the other.

The Turkish-Cypriots are referred to as '*diki mas*' – literally: *ours* – a term used for insiders of all kinds. For the Greek-Cypriots, the 'inside' is the most sacred realm and symbolizes the good in general. The family and the house have the strongest inside quality possible, but the dichotomy between *in* and *outside* runs through all important notions of Greek-Cypriot culture and acquires meaning on many different levels depending on the context. Cyprus itself has an inner quality opposed to the foreign outside which only causes trouble.

In contrast to the Turkish-Cypriots, the mainland Turks are called '*xeni*,' literally: *foreigners* (or: '*afte ap' exo*' = those from outside). '*Xeni*' is used to refer to many different kinds of outsiders including foreign invaders, tourists and visitors in one's house. The dichotomy between '*diki mas*' and '*xeni*' in Greece and Cyprus is ubiquitous and can hardly be overemphasized.⁶ It is about *in* and exclusion and therefore about identity on many different levels.

Greek-Cypriots from very diverse social backgrounds are in amazing agreement about Turkish-Cypriots and mainland Turks respectively. I could not detect any significant difference between either refugees and non-refugees, men and women or between people who used to live in mixed villages as opposed to those from exclusively Greek-Cypriot places. Nor does political position or education seem to influence the Greek-Cypriots' perception of the Turkish-Cypriots or mainland Turks.

The only difference is produced by age whereby I define three age groups based on personal experience and the lack of it respectively. The first age group consists of those people who can personally remember the time before intercommunal violence flared up in the 1960s; the second group contains people whose first memories stem from exactly that time and the third one consists of people who are too young to personally remember the time before the division of Cyprus in 1974. I will

describe the three groups in turn.

First age group: people with personal experiences and memories of the Turkish-Cypriots before the troubles started in the 1960s *always* stress how well they used to get on with them recalling their relationship as one characteristic of good neighbours and friends. Not only did Turkish- and Greek-Cypriots get on very well *before* the problems started, people belonging to the first age group remember, they also helped each other during times of political conflict in the 1960s. Greek-Cypriots used to hide their Turkish-Cypriot neighbours and friends from Greek-Cypriot extremists and vice versa. The Turkish-Cypriots were good people one could trust. The Greek-Cypriots of this first age group perceive the Turkish-Cypriots as sharing with them mentality, character, standard of civilization, way of life and most of culture (except for religion and language). The people of the first age group remember the Turkish-Cypriots as 'Osman,' 'Abdullah' and 'Mechmet' they had played with as children. For this generation the events in the 1960s are exceptional and therefore do not challenge their overall perception of harmonious intercommunal relations between Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots.⁷

In sharp contrast to this view of the Turkish-Cypriots, the mainland Turks are considered the epitome of the *outsider*. They are thought of as the antithesis to culture as such. The Turks are perceived as uncivilized barbarians, brutal and backwards, violent and uneducated. In short they are bad people fundamentally different in character and culture from both Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots.

Second age group: people who were born in the 1960s remember things somewhat differently. Intercommunal violence broke out in December 1963 and lasted for almost a year. It flared up again in 1967. Even though these people were only a few years old at the time, they remember the events and emotions very clearly. And these memories are amongst the first ones they have. However, despite personal memories of fear and insecurity, the people of this second age group are very much aware that it used to be different. They stress as much as older people the overall harmonious and friendly relationship between Turkish- and Greek-Cypriots. But they seem to be in two minds about their feelings. On the one hand, they acknowledge the fact that there did not use to be any conflict between Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots. This they have heard from their parents and other older people and therefore they feel that the Turkish-Cypriots must have been good people. On the other hand, they personally remember being afraid or not being able to enter certain Turkish-Cypriot areas during times of turmoil in the 1960s. Therefore they lack the trust in the Turkish-Cypriots the older generation has.

In regard to the mainland Turks, they share the view of the first age group a hundred percent.

Third age group: people born in the 1970s have no personal memory whatsoever of the time when Turkish- and Greek-Cypriots used to live together. Although

young people lack first hand experience with the Turkish-Cypriots, they are given a very different kind of 'experience' by state education. From a very early age on they are exposed to extensive teaching about the invasion of Cyprus by Turkey and the traumatic consequences of it. '*I do not forget and I struggle*' (*'Den xechnii ke agonizume'*) is not just a slogan, but an entire campaign by the authorities of education (for a detailed analysis see Maratheftis 1989) in an apparently very successful effort to make sure that future generations will not accept the *status quo* of a divided homeland and to give the young members of society a substitute for real experience; to give them 'experience' which they cannot possibly have due to their young age. Unfortunately, this 'secondary experience' only concerns the conflictual part of the relationship between Greeks and Turks and it is ideologically saturated. But it turns into a kind of quasi-real experience. People who are clearly too young to actually remember anything about the Turkish-Cypriots or the war, the invasion and the flight recall these things in a lively manner as if they had been present themselves.

Some of the people belonging to this youngest age group have absolutely no trust in either Turks or Turkish-Cypriots and lump them together into one category, because to them a Turk is a Turk after all. And Turk basically means 'enemy' or savage. This is something, older people would never do. However, I want to emphasize that not *all* young people think along these lines. Many of them join in the general chorus proclaiming the essential difference between Turks and Turkish-Cypriots and the similarity between all Cypriots, be they Turkish or Greek.

This is the way Greek-Cypriots perceive of Turkish-Cypriots and Turks respectively. But on what grounds do they do so? What are the processes which underlie this reasoning about identity and otherness? Why do Greek-Cypriots distinguish so sharply between two groups of people who share many attributes such as language, religion and origin? In order to answer these questions I now turn to discuss two notions – religion and the house⁸ – which are both fundamental to Greek-Cypriot culture and to the processes of inclusion and exclusion defining group identity and belonging. The processes leading to the view of the Turkish-Cypriots as insiders – '*diki mas*' – are illustrated by means of the notion of religion. The opposite, the exclusion of the Turks from mainland Turkey – their construction as '*xeni*' – is shown looking at the house.

I want to make it clear from the beginning that I am only discussing one aspect of Greek-Cypriot identity: their identity as Cypriots as opposed to outsiders from Turkey, Greece or elsewhere. I am aware that there are many co-existing layers of collective identity – as Europeans, as Greeks, as Cypriots, as *Pafites* (from Paphos) – which are based on different criteria and sometimes contradict each other.

Inclusion of Turkish-Cypriots: The Notion of Religion

Greek-Cypriots across age groups, political positions and educational backgrounds agree that religion is no obstacle for two communities to harmoniously live together. One woman for example remembered that for forty years the sexton of the Orthodox church in their mixed village was a Turkish-Cypriot, i.e., a Muslim. The fact that someone believes in a different religion than one's own is not seen as being of much importance. What counts is the person, regardless of their creed and faith. Not once have I heard the opposite. Let me quote a friend of mine:

"I once heard a most wise statement from my mother I have never read in any book. She said about a Turkish-Cypriot who had died: 'God may make him happy in his faith.' The Turkish-Cypriot was a friend of the family, and if someone is a good person then we say in Greek 'God may make him happy' which means God may make him happy in the life after death. This wish we only make for good people. And this has made a great impression on me, what my mother had said, 'in his faith' which means, may God make him happy in accordance to what he believed and not in accordance to what we believe. This statement I find very wise."

The importance of religion within Greek-Cypriot culture is certainly well known to the readers of a journal like this, so there is no need to go into details here. What I want to draw attention to is the fact that the Greek-Cypriots' notion of religion is not only very important *within* their culture, but also for their construction of social boundaries. Although the Turkish-Cypriots were and are Muslims, the Greek-Cypriots consider them *insiders* because of their religious attitude. This might seem contradictory at first, but it is not. I will illustrate my point by quoting a 45-year-old woman I interviewed who was particularly eloquent on the issue of religion in regard to the Turkish-Cypriots:

"The Turkish-Cypriots were like us, they were very good. They were 'diki mas'. There was one Turkish-Cypriot in our village . . . this man . . . it had been raining since the morning, slowly, slowly, and in the afternoon it was raining very heavily and the river rose, but he had not reckoned with this ... and as he came to the river there was a lot of water . . . and he sent his goats and his donkey into the river, and his cows and he said: 'Holy Panagia, help me to cross the river.' And there was something like a gust of air, he told us, and it took him out of the river, and he went to thank her, he went to the church, and he told us about it when he later came to the kafenion . . . you know, they believed very strongly! They believed more than us! And his wife went, too, and she had a bath beforehand, she said that one must take a bath immediately before one enters the church in order to be clean, and she took off her shoes in front of the church and she worshipped the icons, she filled all candles with oil . . . and this man (the one who had been saved) said that at night, not always, but mostly, he saw a light. . . and that it entered the church through the door. This he always saw and he said that it was the Panagia. This is how much

they believed. They believed very much! We, however, believe, but . . . does it ever happen that you take a bath and then immediately go to church? Ourselves, we have a bath in the morning and go to church in the evening, don't we? But one has to take a bath and to go clean, of all sins, a woman should not have her period, you know. Nowadays we go, but they (the Turkish-Cypriot women) did not; it is a sin to go to the crucifix inside the church when you are menstruating, it is a holy place. We nowadays go, but the Turkish-Cypriot women did not, nor into the mosque. They didn't go (when they were menstruating), and when they went into the mosque or the church they took off their shoes."

In another conversation she added that the Turkish-Cypriots used to fast more properly according to their own religion than the Greek-Cypriots according to theirs. Giving them credit for their religiousness as such, she also claimed having seen Turkish-Cypriot refugees who came to the South for a short visit" – on one of those rare occasions when they get permission to do so – crossing themselves, going down on their knees and praying to Allah to help them to come back home.

These statements, and many others I have not quoted here, point to the religiously motivated definition of the Turkish-Cypriots as insiders. To be devout and to practice one's religion properly qualifies a person as a social being. The Turkish-Cypriots are perceived as '*diki mas*' because they behaved in religiously appropriate ways and thus shared the value of *religion as such* with the Greek-Cypriots.⁹ They are considered insiders because they did not violate the Greek-Cypriots' notion of religion.

The Greek-Cypriots also employ the notion of religion in order to illustrate the opposite: the exclusion of the mainland Turks, particularly by claiming that the Turks have destroyed holy and ancestral places such as churches and cemeteries and thus have violated religious values. The most important aspect leading to the view of the Turks as the epitome of the *outsider*, however, is the house to which I now turn.

Exclusion of Turks: The House

Perhaps the most important notion in Cyprus is that of the house.¹⁰ Just how much the house means in Cyprus can hardly be overemphasized. It is crucial to any understanding of Greek-Cypriot culture. The house is a materialisation of the values of Greek-Cypriot culture. It embodies and symbolizes all crucial aspects such as the family, religion and the concept of '*inside versus outside*'? This is also true for the notion of the family which is not only intimately linked but in many ways synonymous with the house.¹¹ The house is much more than just accommodation for Greek-Cypriots. It is the materialized symbol of the success of a family. Having one's own house is tantamount to having achieved a most central and highly valued goal in life.

In general, the dowry house has remained the ideal for most Greek-Cypriots, despite the economic difficulties involved. Houses are strongly associated with women in Cyprus¹² who are responsible for both its cleanness and its inner spiritual purity. The actual construction of the dowry house often parallels the growth of the family itself and a married couple's efforts to equip their daughter(s) for life. The purpose of and the most important goal in life, the well-being of one's children, is at least partially fulfilled when a daughter can be given a house.

Having the significance of one's house in mind, it becomes clear that the loss of it is one of the most tragic things that can happen to a Greek-Cypriot person. Houses are irreplaceable. Nothing is quite like home, and by this Greek-Cypriots literally mean their house they got from their parents or built themselves. The refugees are "*mourning for . . . a pattern of meaning*" (Loizos 1977b: 8-9). The loss of the house means much more than its material loss. A friend of mine, a refugee, sent me her visiting card after I had left Cyprus which reads:

Το σπίτι μου είναι στην Κυρύνεια. Εκεί ζω. Μένω τώρα.

My house/home is in Kyrenia. There I live. Presently I stay at. . . .

For the refugees, the loss of their houses and the fact that there is hardly any hope that they will ever return is one of the most difficult consequences of war they have to face. For Greek-Cypriots, the loss of their houses is the ultimate proof that the mainland Turks are indeed bad people and that they have no culture at all. Having expelled the Greek-Cypriots from their houses is the most inexcusable crime they have committed in the course and after the war in 1974. Because by taking away the houses from the Greek-Cypriots, the Turks have attacked and deprived them of one of the most important values of Cypriot culture: one's own house. It is hard for Cypriot people to imagine something more barbarian and cruel.

Not only have the Turks deprived the Greek-Cypriots of their right to live in their houses, they also neglect, willingly destroy or even sell them, the Greek-Cypriots are unconvinced, which is as unforgivable as the destruction of holy and ancestral sites violating religious and familial values. The Turks are also accused of attacking the house's most sacred realm: its interior. This is presented as characteristic behaviour of Turkish people. They are said to break in other people's houses and to behave violently inside the house against their own family. All of this violates the Greek-Cypriot notion of the house and the sacredness of the interior in general, be it the interior of the house, of the family or of Cyprus herself. Thus, people who do this sort of thing cannot be but *outsiders*. When asked about their view of the Turks, people immediately say: "*They are bad, they have taken our houses.*"

Conclusions

Greek-Cypriots reason about both Turkish-Cypriots and mainland Turks on the basis of their own culturally shared notions of which I have discussed, religion and the house. In respect to the Turks this leads to their exclusion, while in respect to the Turkish-Cypriots this leads to them being represented as insiders.

The mainland Turks are perceived as outsiders *not* because they are Muslims or because they speak another language or because they are of different origin – all of these things they share with the Turkish-Cypriots – or because of any other attribute, but because they violate the Greek-Cypriots' culturally shared values such as the house.

The Turkish-Cypriots, in contrast, are considered insiders because they do *not* violate the Greek-Cypriots' cultural values such as religion. That is why they belong to the inner side of the boundary erected against *outsiders*. In other words: from a grassroots perspective, the Cyprus Problem is not an *ethnic* issue.

One might argue that the Greek-Cypriots' view of the Turks, the Turkish-Cypriots and themselves simply reproduces the official Greek-Cypriot state ideology (as for example Maratheftis does in his unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1989:54/280.) Although this is unfortunately true, I would like to turn the tables and argue that just as much as people internalize what they are told in schools as elsewhere, the officially acknowledged (State and Church) ideology (*'the Turkish-Cypriots are good, the Turks are bad'*) must make use of culturally anchored notions in order to be acceptable and persuasive to the bearers of the Greek-Cypriot culture. It is not a one-way process whereby those in power promote a particular ideology and those without merely reproduce it, rather, it is a dialectic relationship between the two. A glance at the book entitled *'I do not forget and I struggle'* which is part of the curriculum of Greek-Cypriot primary schools (see above) makes clear just how much the official ideology employs cultural notions such as religion and the house. The book is full of references to destroyed holy sites and lost houses.

Theoretical Considerations: The Concept of Ethnicity

Drawing more general conclusions from the Cypriot example, there are two points I wish to make. First, I want to question the usefulness of the theoretical concept of ethnicity for understanding Cypriot collective identity.

After an era of essentialism, the study of ethnicity has been dominated by the situationalist theory introduced by Barth (1969). The core of the situationalists' approach is their insight that there are no objective criteria defining ethnic groups as assumed by essentialism. Rather, ethnic groups are always defined by subjective criteria regarded significant by the concerned people themselves. Thus bound-

aries separating one group of people from another have come to be seen as being socially constructed and defined.

Furthermore, recent studies by social anthropologists (Elwert 1989, Linnekin and Poyer 1990, Astutui 1995) have shown that collective identity does not necessarily need to be based on the notion of *ethnicity* as most scientists maintain.

"Although writers since Barth have acknowledged that ethnic boundaries do not necessarily rely on any measurable cultural content, most continue to hold that ethnic identity is a fundamental and universal reality of social life."
(Linnekin and Poyer 1990:3)

The preoccupation with and naturalization of ethnic groups and ethnicity is to a certain extent a result of Western science portraying the ethnic factor as *the* universally relevant criterion for collective identity (Elwert 1989: 26). Though it is true that many groups of people do in fact (or have learnt to) refer to ethnic ties in their self-definition, this is not true for all so-called ethnic groups. To some people, ethnic origin is simply irrelevant or at least not primary (see, e.g. Astutui 1995). Ethnicity is not the criterion by which they categorize the world around them. Group identity may for example be based on different kinds of locality, on social institutions such as generation, age or marriage classes, on material culture, a particular way of subsistence economy or on particular activities.¹³ In other words: not all groups of people referred to as ethnic groups base their identity as a group on ethnicity. Ethnicity is *"the Western ... theory of group identity"*, it is *"a biological model of identity"* (Linnekin and Poyer 1990: 2,12). It seems to be universal that human beings differentiate between *in* and *outsiders* and thereby construct group identity based on *in* and exclusion, but on what grounds varies considerably and is not necessarily based on ethnicity.

Nevertheless, and quite surprisingly, the terminology referring to the notion of the *ethnos* has survived, sometimes in inverted commas. The Greek term *ethnos* refers to people or a nation (but not to a nation-state which is called a '*kratos*,' Just 1989) and is based on the notion of shared blood and descent (Just 1989: 77). Originally, *ethos* used to be an anti-term referring to any humans or even animals outside of 'Greek' normality (Chapman, McDonald and Tonkin 1989:12). The modern concept of the *ethnos*, of the Greek nation linked by blood from ancient to modern times, was only established along with the ideology of hellenism in the 19th century (Just 1989). However, it is the modern notion of the *ethnos* which the academic terminology is based upon. In the sense that *ethnos* has always referred to a perceptual, a cognitive-emotional rather than a political unity, it is an appropriate term to describe 'ethnic groups'. In the modern academic sense, however, denoting a people sharing the essence of blood in their self-definition, it is highly inappropriate as a *general* term to describe people with a collective identity. But this is exactly how ethnicity is being used in the academic literature, namely as a synonym for collec-

tive identity (Linnekin and Poyer 1990). Neither does it seem to me to be meaningful to analytically distinguish between ethnic groups and other groups with a collective identity, because doing so only underpins the putative universality of ethnicity. After all, ethnic as well as non-ethnic groups are groups with a collective identity, and it is only *our* emphasis which picks out the ethnic factor. Therefore, the terms 'ethnicity' and 'ethnic group' are misnomers of the *overall* phenomena they describe.

Despite the fact that the Cyprus problem is always talked and thought of as an *ethnic* problem, the case of Cyprus illustrates very nicely that collective identity (as Cypriots in this case) is not necessarily the same as ethnicity. Cyprus is a counter-example to the claim that ethnicity is *the* universally relevant criterion for group identity. It is true that most Greek-Cypriots also stress the notion of the *ethnos* referring to their primordial ties to the ancient Greeks of which their language and religion is only the most obvious evidence. It is true that they have an ethnic identity as Greeks. But this is not all there is to it, and it does not automatically imply that they categorize *in* and *outsiders*, that they construct social boundaries along *ethnic* lines, for they clearly do not always as I have tried to show. In terms of identity as Cypriots, neither the inclusion of the Turkish-Cypriots nor the exclusion of the mainland Turks is based on ethnic factors, but on cultural notions such as the house or religion as discussed above. Turkish and Greek-Cypriots are not regarded as one *ethnic* group neither by analysts nor by Greek-Cypriots themselves. Nevertheless, they sense a collective identity as Cypriots different to that of *outsiders* either from Greece or Turkey or elsewhere. In other words the Greek-Cypriots' sense of ethnicity, of being Greeks says little about their sense of identity as Cypriots. The Turkish-Cypriots are not just outsiders one gets on well with, they are very clearly and emphatically classified as '*diki mas,*' insiders. It is not on the basis of their ethnicity (which they undoubtedly have), it is on the basis of their own cultural values such as the house or religion that Greek-Cypriots define social boundaries in the context of their identity as Cypriots.

Secondly, although situationalists have broken with the tradition of essentialism in the 1970s, they have not challenged the idea that ethnic groups are defined by particular *features* insiders have and *outsiders* lack,¹⁴ only for the essentialists, there is a limited set of features regarded as objective and naturally dividing the world's ethnic groups, while for situationalists, the list of possible significant criteria leading to the construction of social boundaries is open-ended and subjective. However, it is precisely this focus on *features* which I have *not* found to be relevant for the Greek-Cypriots' construction of identity as Cypriots.

Reading the academic literature on ethnicity, one would expect to hear Greek-Cypriots say about Turkish-Cypriots and Turks: '*They are Muslims, they speak Turkish, they originate from Turkey, therefore, they are outsiders*'. Never have I heard anything like this. Neither Turkish-Cypriots nor mainland Turks are consi-

dered *insiders* and *outsiders* respectively on the grounds of any particular *features* they have or lack. Both Turkish-Cypriots and Turks are Muslims, both speak Turkish as their mother tongue and both are descendents of the Ottomans. Nevertheless, the Greek-Cypriots consider the Turks and the Turkish-Cypriots two distinct, completely incompatible groups. The Greek-Cypriots perceive the Turkish-Cypriots as *insiders* because they do not violate the Greek-Cypriots' culturally relevant notions such as religion and the house as the Turks do.

Αδερφική Νότα

Μεχμέτ σε Λυπήθηκα

Όταν τραβούσες το λουρί σφικτά

Πισθάγγονα, υια να με δέσεις.

Όταν σκληρά με κτύπησες στο κούτελλο

Με τις γροθιές σου.

Το βλέμμα μου σε τρόμαξε, θημάρμαι,

Πήρε τη δύναμη σου και τηω έπνιξε,

Μες στο πικρό παράπονο μου.

Με κοίταξες νευρικά, με ναρκωμένη

σκέψη,

Κι έξαλλος ξαναλάκτισες τα σπασμένα

Πλευρά μου.

Πόωεσα, μα δεν οργίστηκα Μεχμέτ,

Τα κάκρυα μου ήταν για σένα.

Δεν ήμουν σκλάβος σου...

Η σκλαβιά βάραινε και σένα,

Στην ίδια αγορά μας Ξεπουλήσανε,

Μεχμέτ

Αρτέμης Αντωνίου 1974

Brotherly Note

Mehmet I pitied you

When you tightened the belt

to strap my hands behind

my back.

When you strongly hit my forehead

with your fists.

My look frightened you, I remember,

it took your strength and drowned it

in my bitter complaint.

You looked at me nervously,

with numb thoughts, and frantically,

you once again kicked on

my broken ribs.

I was in pain, but I did not get angry,

Mehmet, my tears were for you.

I was not your slave. . .

Slavery burdened you too, they sold

us in the same market,

Mehmet

Artemis Antoniou 1974 (my translation)

Notes

1. I wish to thank Peter Loizos for encouraging me to write this article and for commenting on an earlier draft of it.

2. P.M. Kitromilides, (1995). This was also confirmed by two Cypriot social researchers (personal communication).

3. Argyrou, (1993); Attalides, (1976, 1977); Beckingham, (1957); Hadjipavlou - Trigeorgis, (1994); King and Ladbury, (1982); Kyrris, (1977); Loizos, (1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1976, 1977a, 1977b, 1978 (1976), 1981, 1988); Maratheftis, (1989) (unpublished); Markides, (1974); Markides et al. (1978); Peristiany, (1965, 1968, 1976, 1992); Roussou, (1985, 1986); Sant Cassia, (1982); Stamatakis, (1994) (unpublished).

4. Exceptions are Beckingham, (1957), Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, (1994), King and Ladbury, (1982), Kyrris, (1977) and Stamatakis, (1994).

5. This article is based on my dissertation in Social Anthropology (*'Looking at the house from inside. The processes of constructing group-consciousness amongst Greek-Cypriots'*) which is based on six months fieldwork between November 1995 and April 1996 in the town of Paphos.

6. For a discussion of the concept of 'inside versus outside' so prevalent in Mediterranean societies, see Peristiany, (1965) and an updated discussion of this concept by Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, (1992). See also Dubisch, (1993).

7. One might argue that these memories of the past- particularly of the 1960s onwards - are rose-tinted, because surely there were Greek-Cypriot nationalists wanting to cleanse Cyprus from *all* Turks including Turkish-Cypriot. It is, however, not my intention to assess my informants' statements and present views in terms of historical correctness. Rather, I am interested in understanding their reasoning about *in* and *outsiders*.

8. In my dissertation, I also analysed the notion of the family including ritual kinship, of work and of food in addition to the two notions discussed here.

9. The mainland Turks on the other hand are seen as religious fanatics who precisely through their fanaticism have moved far away from proper religious behaviour.

10. The central significance of the house in a variety of cultures very different from that of Cyprus, is documented in Carsten and Hugh-Jones' collection *About the House* (1995).

11. The Greek word for family, *ikoyenia*, literally translates as "house lineage" (lossifides 1991: 140) or "the people who originate from the same house" (Du Boulay 1986:141). For a discussion of the meaning of the family in Cyprus, see Loizos, (1975a, 1981); Peristiany, (1965, 1968, 1976).

12. See, for example, Pavlides and Hesser/Du Boulay/Dubisch in Dubisch (1986); and Du Boulay/Iossifides in: Loizos and Papataxiarchis (1991).

13. For a brief overview of a number of case studies showing this for the African continent, see (in German) Elwert (1989: 26-31). For the Pacific see Linnekin and Poyer (1990).

14. Compare, for example, Horowitz's "inclusive conception of ethnicity that embraces differences identified by color, language, religion, or some other *attribute* of common origin" (1985: 41, emphasis added).

Bibliography

Argyrou, Vassos, (1993). "Under a Spell. The Strategic Use of Magic in a Greek Cypriot Society." In *The American Ethnologist*. May 1993, vol. 20, no 2: 256-71.

Astuti, Rita, (1995). *People of the Sea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Attalides, Michael, (1976). "Changing Configurations of Greek Cypriot Kinship." In: Peristiany (ed.). *Kinship and modernization in Mediterranean society*. Rome: Centre for Mediterranean Studies.

Attalides, Michael, (1977). "Forms of Peasant Incorporation in Cyprus During the Last Century." In Gellner, Ernest and Waterbury, John (eds.) *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

Barth, Fredrik, (1969). Introduction. In Barth, F. (ed.) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organisation of Cultural Difference*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.

Beckingham, C.T., (1957). "The Turks of Cyprus." In *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. vol. 87, part II: 165-74.

Carsten, Janet and Hugh-Jones, Stephan, (1995). Introduction: About the house - Levi-Strauss and beyond. In: Carsten and Hugh-Jones (eds.) *About the House. Levi-Strauss and Beyond*. Cambridge: CUP.

Chapman, Malcolm, McDonald, Maryon and Tonkin, Elizabeth, (1989). Introduction. In Tonkin, McDonald and Chapman (eds.) (1989). *History and Ethnicity*. London: Routledge.

Du Boulay, Juliet, (1986). "Women - Images of Their Nature and Destiny in Rural Greece." In Dubisch (ed.). *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Du Boulay, Juliet, (1991). "Cosmos and Gender in Village Greece." In Loizos and Papataxiarchis (eds.) *Contested Identities. Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Dubisch, Jill, (1986). "Culture Enters through the Kitchen: Women, Food and Social Boundaries in Rural Greece." In Dubisch (ed.) *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Dubisch, Jill, (1993). "Foreign Chickens and Other Outsiders: Gender and Community in Greece." In *American Ethnologist*, May 1993, vol. 20, no. 2: 272-287.

Elwert, Georg, (1989). "Nationalismus, Ethnizität und Nativismus -" über die Bildung von Wir-Gruppen. In Waldmann and Elwert (eds.) *Ethnizität im Wandel*. Saarbrücken, Fort Lauderdale: breitenbach.

Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, Maria, (1994). "Der Mensch im Zypernkonglikt." In: Liebe, Klaus (ed.) (1994) *Zypern. Der "vergessene" europäische Konflikt*. Köln: Romiosini.

Horowitz, Donald L., (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Iossifides, Marina A., (1991). "Sisters in Christ: Metaphors of Kinship among Greek Nuns." In: Loizos and Papataxiarchis (eds.) *Contested Identities. Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Just, Roger, (1989). "Triumph of the Ethnos." In Tonkin, McDonald, Chapman (eds.) *History and Ethnicity*. London and New York: Routledge.

King, Russel and Ladbury, Sarah, (1982). "The Cultural Reconstruction of Political Reality: Greek and Turkish Cyprus Since 1974." In: *Anthropological Quarterly* 55: 1-16.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M., (1955). *World Bibliographies. Cyprus*. Oxford: Clio Press.

Kyrris, Costas, (1977). *Peaceful Co-existence in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1959) and After Independence: An Outline*. Nicosia.

Linnekin, Jocelyn and Poyer, Lin, (1990). Introduction. In: Linnekin and Poyer (eds.): *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Loizos, Peter, (1974). "The Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1970." In Davies, F. (ed.) *Choice and Change*. LSE Monographs no. 50. London: Athone Press.

Loizos, Peter, (1975a). *The Greek Gift. Politics in a Cypriot Village*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Loizos, Peter, (1975b). "Changes in Property Transfer among Greek Cypriot Villagers." In *Man* 10(4): 503-523.

Loizos, Peter, (1976). "Notes on Future Anthropological Research on Cyprus. In Dimen and Friedl 1976 (eds.) *Regional Variation in Modern Greece and Cyprus: Toward a Perspective on the Ethnography of Greece*. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, vol. 268: 355-61.

Loizos, Peter, (1977a). "Politics and Patronage in a Cypriot Village, 1920-1970." In *Ge/Iner and Waterbury (eds.) Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

Loizos, Peter, (1977b). "Argaki: the Uprooting of a Cypriot Village." In *Attalides 1977: Cyprus Review*. Nicosia.

Loizos, Peter, (1978 (1976)). "An Alternative Analysis:" In *Cyprus*. Published by the Minority Rights Group. Report no. 30.

Loizos, Peter, (1981). *The Heart Grown Bitter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Loizos, Peter, (1988). "Intercommunal Killing in Cyprus." In *Man* 23: 639-53.

Loizos, Peter and Papataxiarchis, Evthymios, (1991). Introduction. In Loizos and Papataxiarchis (eds.) *Contested Identities. Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece*. Princeton and New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Maratheftis, Antonios, I., (1989). (unpublished Ph.D. thesis): '*Den ksechno*', *I do not forget: The Greek Cypriot refugee experience is oral narrative*. The University of Texas at Austin.

Markides, Kyriacos, (1974). "Social Change in the Rise and Decline of Social Movements: The Case of Cyprus." In *American Ethnologist* i,ol. 1, no 2, May 1974: 309-330.

Markides, Kyriacos C.; Nikita, Eleni S.; Rangou, Elengo N., (1978). *Social Change in a Cypriot Village*. Nicosia: Zavallis Press.

Pavlidis Eleftherios and Hesser Jana, (1986). "Women's Roles and House Form and Decoration in Eressos, Greece." In Dubisch (ed.) *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Peristiany, J.G., (1965). "Honour and Shame in a Cypriot Village." In Peristiany (ed.): *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Peristiany, J.G., (1968). "Introduction to a Cyprus Highland Village." In: Peristiany, J.G. (ed.) *Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology*. Paris, the Hague: Mouton and Co.

Peristiany, J.G., (1976). "Anthropological, Sociological, and Geographical Fieldwork in Cyprus." In: Dimen and Friedl, (1976) (eds.) *Regional Variation in*

Modern Greece and Cyprus: Towards a Perspective on the Ethnography of Greece. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, vol. 268:345-354.

Peristiany, J.G., (1992). "The sophron - a secular saint? Wisdom and the wise in a Cypriot community." In Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers (ed.) *Honor and Grace in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peristiany, J.G. and Pitt-Rivers, J., (1992). Introduction. In Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers (eds.) *Honor and Grace in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roussou, Maria, (1985). "Systeme dotal et identite feminine dans la campagne cypriote." In Piauxt, Colette (ed.) *Familles et biens en Grece et a Chypre*. Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Roussou, Maria, (1986). "War in Cyprus: Patriarchy and the Penelope Myth." In Ridd and Callaway (eds.) *Caught Up in Conflict. Women's Responses to Political Strife*. London: MacMillan.

Sant Cassia, Paul, (1982). "Property in Greek Cypriot Marriage Strategies, 1920-1980." In *Man*, vol. 17, no. 1: 643-663

Stamatakis, Nicholas A., (1994). *History, Language and National Rituals: The Construction of Modern Greek-Cypriot Identity*. State University of New York. (unpublished Ph.D. thesis).

Greek Titles:

Δεν ξεχνώ και αγωνίζομαι, 1993 (1992). Για τη Γ' και Δ' τάξη του Δημοτικού Σχολείου: Λευκωσία: Υπουργείο Παιδείας Κύπρου.