

Memory and



ARCHITECTURE



Edited by Eleni Bastéa

chapter eight
Storied Cities

Literary Memories of
Thessaloniki and Istanbul

ELENI BASTÉA

I am beginning to believe that we know everything, that all history, including the history of each family, is part of us, such that, when we hear any secret revealed . . . our lives are made suddenly clearer to us, as the unnatural heaviness of unspoken truth is dispersed. For perhaps we are like stones; our own history and the history of the world embedded in us, we hold a sorrow deep within and cannot weep until that history is sung.

—Susan Griffin, *A Chorus of Stones*, 1992

On the Memory of Place

Societies guard and control their memories and the transmission of their histories: they invent traditions, imagine communities, construct their sites of memory. I have been trying to understand how societies record and transmit the history of the built environment. Is it true that stones, buildings, and streets hold within themselves the history of a place and its people? And

if that history is indeed embedded in the stones, is it revealed to the current inhabitants and visitors?¹

Studies on the sites of memory (*Les lieux de mémoire*) have begun to define how states construct places of national memory—both literally and figuratively—in order to forge a sense of common history, culture, and purpose. Imposed by the government or the intellectual elite, national invented traditions and places of commemoration have thus been used to support the aims of the nation-state, both on the cultural and political fronts.² What I aim to bring into the study of memory and place is the focus on the individual actor—writer, architect, local inhabitant—who is inevitably part of the larger nation-building myth, but who is also able to resist or question this myth.

I have chosen to focus on Greece and Turkey in part because of my own cultural attachment to the region and knowledge of its history and architecture. Both places share a common architectural heritage that dates back to the periods of the Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman Empires. They also followed surprisingly similar steps in adapting Western architectural designs to the local building conditions in order to modernize their cities and create distinct national identities. While respecting the unique perspectives, important differences, and local cultural heritage of each region, I am interested in studying how individuals have come to view their local architectural heritage, a heritage that reflects a rich historical and cultural amalgam. I do not aim to reconstruct an idealized, romanticized past, but rather, to forge a foundation that helps engender an informed, current dialogue for the present and the future. I am also trying to visualize a locus for comparative studies of modern Greece and Turkey, and more broadly, Southeastern Europe, a direction whose significance reaches far beyond the academic stage set.³

In this chapter I will concentrate on the role of literature in describing and engendering the memory of place. Specifically, I will examine representative literary works on the cities of Thessaloniki and Istanbul. Both Thessaloniki and Istanbul are marked by long and uninterrupted urban histories. Until the early twentieth century, both cities were inhabited by a multiethnic population that left its mark on both the built and the cultural landscape of each city. Thessaloniki was incorporated into the Greek kingdom in 1912. Istanbul became part of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. Since then, both have been fairly homogeneous ethnically, each proudly showcasing its nation's achievements.

In part as a result of the parallel nation-building projects, few contemporary literary works about Istanbul and Thessaloniki reflect each city's complex historical past, concentrating, instead, on the ethnic homogeneity of the present. In addition to the inevitable impact of contemporary foreign currents on local literary production, other reasons for this evident historical amnesia may be attributed to the writers' personal childhood memories, and to the successful nation-building project of each country that was constructed on the premise of ethnic and cultural homogeneity. Can we find a reflection of their past histories in the postliberation literature of each city?

Thessaloniki

Thessaloniki is the second largest city in Greece, with a population of approximately 750,000. Founded in the fourth century B.C.E., it served as a major administrative and commercial center during the Byzantine and Ottoman periods. An important port, with extensive railway connections with central Europe and Istanbul, Thessaloniki became the second largest city in the Ottoman Empire, and its "window on Europe." In 1912, the Greek army succeeded in capturing Thessaloniki and the surrounding regions from the Ottomans and incorporating them into the Greek kingdom.

Let us take a closer look at the city's population in 1913, as reflected on that year's census by the new Greek administration. Of the 157,889 inhabitants, 61,439 (38.91 percent) were Jews, 45,867 (29.05 percent) were Muslims, and 39,956 (23.31 percent) were Orthodox Christians.⁴ There were also French, English, and Italian merchants. Newspapers were produced in Spanish, Greek, Turkish, Armenian, Serbian, Vlach, and French and continued to be published in these languages well after 1912. Thessaloniki was the center of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization and the center of activities of the Young Turk movement (Committee on Union and Progress), whose aim was to modernize the Ottoman Empire. It was also the birthplace of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938), founder of the Turkish Republic.⁵

Most Jewish families lived in the flat, downtown area, while the Muslim population lived in the Upper Town, and the Christians lived in some of the downtown sections, near the churches, and along the Byzantine-era city walls to the east. Architecture reflected not only the inhabitants' diverse backgrounds



FIG. 8.1. *Thessaloniki Harbor. Photo by Mark Forte, 1990.*

and socioeconomic standing, but also contemporary stylistic influences. Traditional Balkan domestic architecture coexisted with the international neo-classicism of most new governmental buildings. Roman remains; early Christian basilicas; late-Byzantine churches, synagogues, and mosques; covered bazaars; and Turkish baths revealed the city's complex historical past and accommodated the spiritual and secular lives of its people.⁶

In 1917, five years after the incorporation of Thessaloniki into the Greek state, a major fire destroyed most of the tightly built downtown area, dealing a major blow to the prominent Jewish community living there. The Greek government ignored the preexisting patterns of land use and undertook the redesign of the downtown according to the latest methods in modern town planning. The spatial modernization of Thessaloniki was intended to cement the Greek presence in the city and signal a new beginning. A planning committee headed by the French architect Ernest Hébrard completely redesigned the downtown area, introducing a central north-south civic axis that linked the Upper Town with the sea. Hébrard envisioned Thessaloniki as an international city of the future, capable of being connected with all points of the



FIG. 8.2. *Thessaloniki, Fountain Square. Notice the Roman Arch of Galerius in the background, surrounded by modern apartment buildings. The fountain is a reconstruction of the one originally built in 1889, containing some parts from the original structure. Photo by Eleni Bastéa, 2000.*

globe by means of advanced communication systems. Although this vision may not be obvious on the plan, the regular blocks and broad boulevards clearly reflect planning principles inspired by Baron Georges Haussmann's planning for Paris (1853–1870), the City Beautiful movement, and contemporary colonial designs.⁷

The implementation of Hébrard's design proceeded slowly, as it had to consider the rights of landowners, the accommodation of newly found antiquities, and the extraordinary political and military events that followed World War I. Between 1919 and 1922 the Greek army was leading an expansionist campaign in Asia Minor, in an attempt to incorporate Smyrna (Izmir) and its surrounding areas into the Greek state. This campaign proved disastrous for Greece, indelibly inscribed in Greek memory and history books as the fall of Smyrna and the Asia Minor Catastrophe. From the Turkish perspective, the



FIG. 8.3. *Alaca Imaret Mosque area, Thessaloniki. The fifteenth-century mosque is now used for art exhibits and cultural events. Notice the lone house (now destroyed) from the late Ottoman period and the surrounding apartment buildings from the 1960s and 1970s. Photo by Mark Forte, 2000.*

liberation of Izmir led to a successful end of the War of Independence and the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. Greece and Turkey signed a peace settlement with the European powers, the Treaty of Lausanne (July 24, 1923), which stipulated the compulsory exchange of minority populations between the two countries. More than 1.2 million Christian Greeks from the former Ottoman Empire immigrated to Greece, and about 380,000 Muslim Turks left Greece and settled in Turkey.⁸ Thessaloniki experienced drastic demographic changes: most of the Muslims left their homes and immigrated to Turkey, while approximately 92,000 Christian newcomers had to be resettled in the capital of the New Lands.⁹

Immediately after 1922 we witness the unfolding of a wide-ranging cultural crusade with three primary goals: 1. the cultural integration of refugees (a highly diverse group in and of themselves) in the Greek state;

2. the incorporation of northern Greece into an uninterrupted Greek historical narrative that stretched back to the time of Aristotle and Alexander the Great; and 3. the vigorous cultivation of the area's economic, agricultural, and artistic resources. The establishment of the University of Thessaloniki in 1926 and the institution of the annual Thessaloniki International Fair, also in 1926, signaled the progressive intellectual and commercial forces dominating the newly acquired territories.¹⁰

Let us now examine the role of literature in this national reconstruction project.

According to the general state objectives at the time, the new literature that was written in and about Thessaloniki after 1922 was expected to incorporate the city into the contemporary Greek imagination and express the new experiences that were specific to the region. Whereas the architects reshaped Thessaloniki into a modern Greek city, the writers, most newcomers to Thessaloniki themselves, were charged with composing new literary landscapes about Greek Thessaloniki. Did the new literary works engage in the national effort to hellenize Thessaloniki? Were the energetic and rather successful efforts of the state and local authorities to "cultivate" Thessaloniki, both commercially and culturally, reflected on the written page?

Some of the literature in the 1920s did, indeed, refer to Thessaloniki as "the bride of the Thermaic Gulf," an imaginary city in the manner of the poet Constantine Cavafy's Alexandria.¹¹ Soon, however, the tone changed, as we can see by examining a major literary movement that flourished between 1930 and 1940 and became known as the School of Thessaloniki.

The School of Thessaloniki represented the work of a fairly close-knit group of writers who lived in Thessaloniki, though they were not necessarily *from* Thessaloniki. They published mainly works of experimental prose, and produced the modernist literary journal *Makedonikes Imeres* [Macedonian Days] (1932–1939). Best known among its members were Stelios Xefloudas (1898–1984), Alkiviadis Giannopoulos (1896–1981), Giorgos Delios (1894–1980), Petros Spandonidis (1890–1964; first editor-in-chief of *Macedonian Days*), Nikos G. Pentzikis (1908–1992), and the women Anthoula Stathopoulou-Vafopoulou (wife of the poet Yorgos Vafopoulos) and Zoi Karelli (Pentzikis's sister).

Considering its name, one might have expected that the School of Thessaloniki produced works filled with specific references to the local urban and social environment. In fact, exactly the opposite was true. Beginning with

the first work to be associated with the School of Thessaloniki, Xefloudas's *Ta tetradia tou Pavlou Foteinou* [The Notebooks of Pavlos Foteinos] (1930), the movement became known for its *lack* of place specificity, local color, and recognizable social and historical settings. What emerged, rather, was a gloomy, introverted, and troubled relationship of the writers to their environment. Their works reflected the authors' *private* sense of loss and rootlessness, ignoring the nationalist propaganda described earlier. In a poem by Spandonidis titled "Saloniki! Saloniki!" that was published in *Macedonian Days* (September 1932), the city is described as "chaos city." The speaker, as a citizen of "chaos city," has a chaos within himself, as well.¹²

Instead of local references, we find most of the works permeated by a strong sense of cosmopolitanism. Their characters travel to Italy, France, and other foreign, exotic places. This is due in part to the fact that many of these authors had lived abroad for a period of time. Furthermore, the orientation of the School of Thessaloniki was decidedly modernist and open to foreign currents. *Macedonian Days* was the first journal in Greece to publish Kafka in translation. It also published translations of works by Rainer Maria Rilke, Thomas Mann, André Malraux, Marcel Proust, Katherine Mansfield, Virginia Woolf, as well as works by Turkish, Bulgarian, and Albanian authors.¹³

What characterized the School of Thessaloniki was the search for one's self and the cultivation of one's inner world. This was articulated in the long interior monologues of the School's experimental novels. Athenian writers attributed this concentration on the "inner man" to the geography and climate of Thessaloniki, with its foggy, cloudy days, and rainy skies. Indeed, some of the works from the late 1930s present Thessaloniki as a place of trial, pain, illness, and disillusionment.¹⁴

As a native of Thessaloniki myself, I can attest to the gloomy predilection born out of the climate. What I found puzzling in reviewing the work of the School of Thessaloniki, however, is the absence of any references to the city's sites and multiethnic society. Despite the destruction from the 1917 fire, Thessaloniki had retained a strong architectural color that reflected its long and rich history. And while most of the Muslims had departed by 1923, the legacy of the Ottoman past was and still is apparent throughout the city. Furthermore, the Jewish community continued to maintain a strong presence in the city, despite the catastrophic effects of the fire.

It is possible that Greek writers refrained from writing about "old Thessaloniki" because the city was not "Greek" enough, precisely because

of its strong multiethnic, pre-1923 profile. As Hercules Millas has pointed out in his work on Turkish novels, Turkish nationalist writers systematically discredited Pera—the most Westernized neighborhood of Istanbul—as a debased place, whereas the antinationalists systematically wrote about Pera in a positive way.¹⁵

Although writers may have been influenced by the state's nationalist propaganda in selecting appropriate settings for their novels, their own childhood memories of place must have also played a role in their literary creations. For example, Yorgos Ioannou, a younger member of the School of Thessaloniki, described a different city. Born in Thessaloniki in 1927, of refugee parents from eastern Thrace, Ioannou became the city's chronicler. He wrote about Thessaloniki's infamous neighborhoods, its Byzantine past, the German occupation, and the expulsion of the Jews. He criticized the provincialism of Thessaloniki and the arrogance of Athens. He titled one of his essay collections *I protevousa ton prosfygon* [Refugee Capital] (1984).¹⁶ The term stuck on the city, working-class Thessaloniki, "mother of the poor." Most of his essays were narrated through the eyes of a young man, intent on rescuing the profound and ephemeral moments of his life from the wells of forgetfulness. "I liken my own body to this city," he wrote. "It is, after all, my birthplace."¹⁷



I have pursued this thread of inquiry regarding regional literary production in Thessaloniki in order to examine the following, much broader question: How does built space enter into our personal and historical consciousness? My assumption has been that studying representative literary works will provide us with a rich and articulate reflection of the built environment on the memories of the writers. Although we do not expect a published work to represent directly the thoughts of "the man on the street," it should introduce us to the general sentiments of the time. Why, then, did a whole generation of writers remain oblivious to the physical testimonies of the past, while their successors, Ioannou and his followers, never tired of recording the life of their struggling city? Why do buildings reveal their past to some of us and not to others?

We can begin to address these questions by examining the role of memory in writing. Recent research on memory supports what we all know from

personal experience: our most vivid memories come from our childhood. Moreover, we cannot recall past events and experiences without the help of a narrative structure. This narrative structure—a connecting glue made up of family stories, school events, national myths—helps us to make sense of the isolated events and experiences stored in our mind. Our memories would remain an amorphous mass were we not able to give them form, shaping them into a coherent narrative. Images and events stored in our memory are not etched in stone, as was previously believed, but are subject to a selective, continuous recasting that reflects our current experiences and preoccupations.¹⁸ Memory of place, I believe, works in a similar fashion. We revisit our earlier experiences, adjust them, edit them, alter them, or suppress them. We experience architecture through our body but we process and narrate that experience through our mind.

These findings help explain the absence of place-specific references in the literature of the School of Thessaloniki. As some of the writers were not originally from Thessaloniki, they could not conjure nostalgic images of their childhood in that city. For those who were born and raised there, the years between 1912 and 1922 brought such drastic disruptions of the political, demographic, and economic fabric that a return to the city of their childhood might have been utterly impossible, if not unbearable. Perhaps the destruction of everything familiar drove them to willful forgetfulness. Perhaps they sought refuge in the international currents of modernism. Cosmopolitanism became their surrogate country.

Yorgos Ioannou was about thirty years younger than most other members of the School of Thessaloniki. As he came of age, the family and national narratives that help us make sense of our surroundings were stronger and more coherent. Although a son of refugees, like most of the Greeks in Thessaloniki, he could claim his roots in that city and draw from his memories in his writings.

Istanbul

Istanbul, capital of the Ottoman Empire, underwent major modernization projects in the nineteenth century, stemming from the Tanzimat reforms and the triumph of the sultan Mahmud II over the conservative opposition. Since the 1830s, European visitors could reach the city by steamship. The first



FIG. 8.4. *A view of old Istanbul from the mouths of the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn. Photo by Mark Forte, 1998.*

bridge across the Golden Horn was built in 1838. The European railroad extending to Istanbul was begun in the early 1870s, and the underground tunnel joining Galata to Pera was completed in 1873. Electric lighting was introduced in 1912 and electric streetcars and telephones in 1913 and 1914.¹⁹

In 1908, the city was occupied by the army of the Young Turks, who deposed sultan Abdül Hamid II. During the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) Istanbul was nearly captured by the Bulgarians. Throughout World War I the city was under a blockade. At the conclusion of the Armistice (1918), Istanbul was placed under British, French, and Italian occupation, which lasted until 1923. With the victory of the Nationalists under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the sultanate was abolished in 1922. After the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne, in 1923, Istanbul was evacuated by the Allies. On October 29, 1923, Ankara was proclaimed the capital of the new Turkish Republic.²⁰ Today, Istanbul is a continually expanding modern metropolis of approximately ten million inhabitants.

As with Greece, the Turkish Republic began its own nation-building project, which would now serve an ethnically homogeneous population.²¹



FIG. 8.5. *Istanbul, view toward the sea, overlooking fifteenth-century Ottoman baths, Sultanahmet area. Photo by Mark Forte, 1998.*

Whereas before the war, one out of every five persons living in present-day Turkey was non-Muslim, after the war, only one out of forty persons was non-Muslim.²² As the theoretician of Turkish nationalism Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924) argued: “Nation is a group composed of men and women who have gone through the same education, who have received the same acquisitions in language, religion, morality and aesthetics. . . . Men want to live together, not with those who carry the same blood in their veins, but with those who share the same language and the same faith.”²³

How, then, were these dramatic political, demographic, and economic changes reflected on the urban literature about Istanbul? Throughout the twentieth century, Istanbul has been the setting of numerous novels, memoirs, and semiautobiographic works of fiction. Among them are the memoirs of Halide Edib (Adivar), *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib* (1928);²⁴ Aziz Nesin’s *Istanbul Boy* (1966);²⁵ Irfan Orga’s *Portrait of a Turkish Family* (1950);²⁶ and Maria Iordanidou’s *Loxandra* (1963);²⁷ the novels by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Huzur* (1949),²⁸



FIG. 8.6.

Istanbul, the “Bahçekapı” area, at the intersection of Hamidiye and Mimar Kemalettin Avenues, located between Eminönü and Sirkeci, on the historical peninsula. Notice that the city’s Western architecture character is also interwoven with Turkey’s national history. The ornate domed building to the left (along Hamidiye Avenue) is the “Fourth Vakıf Hani”—Office Building for the Ministry of Endowments (Vakıf Administration). The architect, Kemalettin Bey, after whom one of the streets is named, was the leading designer of the Ottoman revivalist “National Style,” which flourished after the Young Turk revolution of 1909. The long construction dates of the building (1916–1926) coincided with Istanbul’s occupation, the War of Independence, and, finally, the Republic. Its main façade is along Hamidiye Avenue, named after Sultan Abdül Hamid (reigned 1876–1909), whose tomb is on the other side of the avenue across from the Vakıf Building. Photo by Mark Forte, 1998.



FIG. 8.7.

Late Ottoman-era houses in the predominantly Greek neighborhood of Fener, Istanbul, with the Greek School, built in the 1880s, in the distance. The row houses along the street follow the nineteenth-century typology in Fener and the adjacent Balat districts, where the Greek and Jewish populations lived. Photo by Mark Forte, 1998.

a Proustian reconstruction of Istanbul; and Latife Tekin, *Berji Kristin: Tales from the Garbage Hills* (1984)²⁹ about the castoffs of modern urban life; and the book of poems by İlhan Berk, *Galata* (1985).³⁰

Most of the earlier autobiographical works make references to the city's history and to the ethnically diverse population of Istanbul in the early twentieth century. Here, however, I would like to concentrate on *Kara Kitap* [The

Black Book] (1990; English translation 1994), a long and erudite detective novel by Orhan Pamuk.³¹ Orhan Pamuk, who was born in 1952, is today one of Turkey's best-known authors. His work has been widely reviewed and translated, and has been compared with the works of Italo Calvino, Umberto Eco, Jorge Luis Borges, and Gabriel García Márquez. *The Black Book* is frequently cited as *the* contemporary novel about Istanbul. Not only is it full of architectural descriptions of buildings, street corners, and neighborhoods, but also it is permeated by the urban aura of the city, alternately a *flâneur's* paradise and hell. Pamuk said in an interview with *Publishers Weekly* (1994) that his aim was "to write a huge, richly textured narrative that would capture the schizophrenic angst of Istanbul, a city straddling two continents."³²

The story is narrated in the third person from the point of view of Galip, a young lawyer whose wife, Rüya, has left him. Galip suspects that Rüya has left him for his older cousin Jelal, a popular journalist with a weekly newspaper column. In fact, every other chapter in *The Black Book* is one of Jelal's published columns of first-person essays relating reminiscences and ruminations about Istanbul. Galip studies these old columns with the fervor of a detective looking for clues of the crime, convinced that the columns contain the key to Jelal and Rüya's disappearance. What propels the plot and intensifies the tension in the protagonists' experiences is the dual pull of modernity and nostalgia. Modernity is identified with the eagerness to belong to the West, while nostalgia is reflected in the poignant childhood reminiscences embedded in the physical landscape of the city. This tension between modernity and nostalgia is not limited to the personal realm, but rather, becomes a reflection of the city's complex and enigmatic spatial physiognomy.

The Black Book is a labyrinthine novel, leading the reader down numerous paths that may or may not provide clues for the apparent mystery that holds the plot together. Yet the physical reference points in this four-hundred-page volume are all focused on Istanbul, and the European side of Istanbul at that. "By the time he was out on the street once again," Pamuk writes, "Galip had eliminated some of the clues and given prominence to others: They could not be outside of the city since Jelal could not live anywhere but in Istanbul. They couldn't be on the Anatolian side, across the Bosphorus, seeing how it wasn't 'historical' enough to suit him."³³ That there may be a broader country extending beyond the fashionable, historical Istanbul is not obvious here. Nor do we find any references to the earlier inhabitants, the rich multiethnic population that made Istanbul one of the most truly cosmopolitan cities in



FIG. 8.8. *The Alaca Imaret Mosque casts a shadow on the facing apartment buildings (author's neighborhood), Thessaloniki. Photo by Eleni Bastéa, 2000.*

the world in the early twentieth century. Fashionable in its postmodern stylistic sensibility, replete with references to Eastern and Western writings, *The Black Book* is self-consciously directed to an international, bookish audience. It is a rich cartography of space and literature, but not of history. It ignores the fact that the built environment is also history's palimpsest.

I have selected to focus on *The Black Book* by Orhan Pamuk and on the School of Thessaloniki because these works represent polarized viewpoints on history and the built environment, and not because they are representative of national approaches. Clearly, the positions of the characters do not necessarily reflect the authors' positions. Nevertheless, I consider the protagonists' particular views on place and history to be representative of at least one segment of the Greek and Turkish populations, a particular segment upon which each author decided to shine his literary light.



FIG. 8.9.
*Akropoleos Street,
 Upper Town,
 Thessaloniki. Photo
 by Mark Forte, 1982.*



I began studying novels about cities on either side of the Aegean because I was looking for the voices of the departed. I wanted to see if the common histories of these lands, their Byzantine and Ottoman pasts, have left their traces in the modern countries' literatures and national consciousness. Although there are writers on both sides of the Aegean who explore history and the built environment in varying degrees, others ignore the echoes of past residents in their stories. Out of the complex matrix of overlapping historical and geographic lines, many writers carve out their own familiar space, their own mental or real neighborhood that they visit and revisit as a refuge from the ghosts of the departed. Perhaps it is a case of historical amnesia, a form of self-preservation.

A marked success of each state's nationalist project. I believe that the selective historical and spatial awareness depicted in the literature discussed here does not reflect only one author's view of a city. It allows us to understand also how some of the inhabitants may view that same city.

As an architectural historian I had long assumed that buildings, street corners, and cities communicate their history to us—visitors, scholars, inhabitants. However, as I reflect on this material and on my own early memories of architecture, I have come to realize that sensitivity to built form does not in and of itself presuppose a historical understanding of that form. Buildings do not reveal their past to us any more than families reveal their own past to strangers. Embedded in our built environment, the histories of those who came before us will remain locked in oblivion, until we become ready to decipher them with care and compassion.



Notes

The epigraph is from Susan Griffin, *A Chorus of Stones* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 8.

1. I presented earlier versions of this chapter at the fifty-fourth annual meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, Toronto, Ontario (Apr. 2001), and at the Comparative Literature colloquium at Washington University in St. Louis (Oct. 1999). I am indebted to Engin Akarlı, Esra Akcan, Mark Forte, Hercules Millas, and Müfide Pekin for their comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank my former colleagues at Washington University, Randolph Pope and Robert Hegel, for offering me an interim academic home in comparative literature, as I undertook my forays into literature, memory, and place.
2. Pierre Nora, "From *Lieux de mémoire* to Realms of Memory," in *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, vol. 1, under the direction of Pierre Nora, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, English-language edition ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), xxiii–xxiv; John Gillis, introduction to *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John Gillis (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994).
3. For the possible influence of the memory of place on two prominent modern architects from Greece and Turkey, respectively, see Eleni Bastéa, "Dimitris Pikionis and Sedad Eldem: Parallel Reflections of Vernacular and National Architecture," in *The Usable Past: Greek Metahistories*, eds. K. S. Brown and Yannis Hamilakis (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, division of Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 147–69.

4. Vasilis Dimitriadis, *Topographia tis Thessalonikis kata tin epochi tis Tourkokratias, 1430–1912* [Topography of Thessaloniki during the Turkish Rule, 1430–1912] (Thessaloniki: Society for Macedonian Studies, 1983), 463–64.
5. Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis, introduction to *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*, eds. Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis (Oxford: Berg, 1997), 13–14.
6. Eleni Bastéa, “Thessaloniki,” in *Encyclopedia of Vernacular Architecture of the World*, vol. 2, ed. Paul Oliver (London: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1491–92.
7. Alexandra Karademou Yerolympos, *I anoikodomisi tis Thessalonikis meta tin pirkagia tou 1917* [The Replanning of Thessaloniki after the Fire of 1917] (Thessaloniki: Municipality of Thessaloniki, 1985). See also Alexandra Karademou Yerolympos, *Metaxi Anatonis kai Dysis: Voreioelladikes poleis stin periodo ton othomanikon metarrythmiseon* [Between the East and the West: Northern Greek Cities during the Period of Ottoman Reforms] (Thessaloniki: Trochalia, 1997).
8. Richard Clogg, *A Concise History of Modern Greece* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 101.
9. Agis Anastasiadis and Panos Stathakopoulos, “The Physiognomy of Upper Town in History, City Planning, and Architectural Typology” [in Greek], in *I Thessaloniki meta to 1912* [Thessaloniki after 1912] (conference proceedings, Thessaloniki, Nov. 1–3, 1985) (Thessaloniki: Municipality of Thessaloniki, 1986), 525.
10. Peter Mackridge, “Cultivating New Lands: The Consolidation of Territorial Gains in Greek Macedonia through Literature, 1912–1940,” in *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*, eds. Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis (Oxford: Berg, 1997) 176.
11. *Ibid.*, 178.
12. *Ibid.*, 180.
13. *Ibid.*, 182.
14. *Ibid.*, 179–86; Nikos Karatzas, ed., *Oi pezographoi tis Thessalonikis, 1930–1980* [The Fiction Writers of Thessaloniki, 1930–1980] (Thessaloniki: Epilogi, 1982); Roderick Beaton, *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
15. Hercules Millas, “The Exchange of Populations in Turkish Literature: The Undertone of Texts,” in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, vol. 12, ed. Renée Hirschon, *Studies in Forced Migration* (Oxford and New York: Berghan Books, 2003), 221–33. See also Iraklis Millas, *Eikones Ellinon kai Tourkon* [Representations of Greeks and Turks] (Athens: Alexandria, 2001).

16. Yorgos Ioannou, *I protevousa ton prosfygon* [Refugee Capital] (Athens: Kedros, 1984). English trans. by Fred A. Reed, *Refugee Capital* (Athens: Kedros, 1997).
17. Yorgos Ioannou, *To diko mas aimas* [Our Own Blood] (Athens: Kedros, 1978), 183.
18. Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989) and Daniel L. Schacter, *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past* (New York: Basic Books, 1996).
19. Zeynep Çelik, *The Remaking of Istanbul: Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1986).
20. Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).
21. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, eds., *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997).
22. Çağlar Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey: A Study in Capitalist Development* (London: Verso Books, 1987), 79, cited in Ayhan Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation, Turkifying the Economy: The Turkish Experience of Population Exchange Reconsidered," in *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, vol. 12, ed. Renée Hirschon, Studies in Forced Migration (Oxford and New York: Berghan Books, 2003), 81.
23. Ziya Gökalp, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*, ed. and trans. Niyazi Berkes (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 137, cited in Aktar, "Homogenising the Nation, Turkifying the Economy," n. 23.
24. Halide Edib (Adivar), *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halidé Edib* (1928; Westport, Conn.: Hyperion, 1981).
25. Aziz Nesin, *Istanbul Boy*, trans. Joseph S. Jacobson. Multivolume (Austin, Tex.: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, 1977–1990).
26. Irfan Orga, *Portrait of a Turkish Family* (London: Eland, 1950).
27. Maria Iordanidou, *Loxandra* (Athens: Hestia, 1963). Turkish ed.: Maria Yordanidu, *Loksandra: İstanbul düşü*, trans. Osman Bleda (Istanbul: Marenostrum series of Belge Yayınları, 1995).
28. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Huzur* (Istanbul: Renzi Kitabevi, 1949).
29. Latife Tekin, *Berji Kristin: Tales from the Garbage Hills*, trans. Ruth Christie and Salih Paker (London: Marion Boyars, 1993; Turkish ed. 1984).
30. İlhan Berk, *Galata* (Istanbul: Adam, 1985).
31. Orhan Pamuk, *Kara Kitap* (Istanbul: Can Yayınları Ltd., 1990). *The Black Book*, trans. Güneli Gün (London: Faber and Faber, 1994).
32. Interview with Orhan Pamuk, *Publishers Weekly* 241, no. 51 (Dec. 19, 1994): 36 (2).
33. *Ibid.*, 193.