Introduction

Everyday Coexistence in the Post-Ottoman Space

REBECCA BRYANT

> *In 1974 they started tormenting us, for instance we'd pick our apples and they'd come and take them right out of our hands. Because we had property we held on as long as we could, we didn't want to leave, but finally we were afraid of being killed and had to flee.… We weren't able to live there, all night we would stand by the windows waiting to see if they were going to kill us.… When we went to visit [in 2003, after the checkpoints dividing the island opened], they met us with drums as though nothing had happened. In any case the older elderly people were good, we used to get along with them. We would eat and drink together.*
>
> —Turkish Cypriot, aged 89, twice displaced from
> a mixed village in Limassol district, Cyprus

In a sophisticated portrayal of the conflict in Cyprus in the 1960s, Turkish Cypriot director Derviş Zaim's feature film *Shadows and Faces* (Zaim 2010) shows the degeneration of relations in one mixed village into intercommunal violence. Zaim is himself a displaced person, and he based his film on his extended family's experiences of the conflict and on information gathered from oral sources. Like anthropologist Tone Bringa's documentary *We Are All Neighbours* (Bringa 1993), filmed at the beginning of the Yugoslav War and showing in real time the division of a village into warring factions, Zaim's film emphasizes the anticipation of violence and attempts to show that many people, under the right circumstances, could become killers. The film also shows, however, an aspect of that cycle of violence that I often recorded in interviews with Turkish Cypriots displaced during the period: namely, an emphasis on fear but also very often the mention of "old people" who tried to hold things together.

The epigraph above highlights this, as the speaker, displaced twice over the period of a decade, emphasizes that "the older elderly people were good, we used to get along with them." He uses the phrase *eski yaşlı insanlar,* the "older elderly people," to indicate not relative age today, but rather that these were people who were already mature, perhaps in late middle age, by the time of the occurrences he describes. In Zaim's film as well, the degeneration into violence is provoked by the actions of a few hotheaded youths, even as the older men and women of the village try to maintain calm and where possible to use relations or connections with police and paramilitaries to prevent the violence from spreading to their own streets. Zaim shows how the more mature members of each community engaged in everyday forms of diplomacy that wove the fragile quotidian fabric of village life. Similarly, in Bringa's documentary Croatian and Muslim women continue to visit and drink coffee together even as their region is on the brink of war. While Bringa's documentary shows how encroaching violence forces neighbors to take sides, Zaim's historical feature film demonstrates how the devolution into violence may be triggered by a few rash actions that create mistrust and hostility and rend the fabric of village life.

Moreover, both the epigraph above and the two films make reference to commensality, a theme often invoked by those who lived in mixed villages. In my own interviews with both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots who lived in mixed villages, I often heard that "we would eat and drink together" or "we attended each other's weddings" (see Bryant 2010, 2012; also Argyrou 1996). Since commensality is not mentioned in reference to intra-group contact, its invocation already marks this as inter-group contact, implying the unexpected or exceptional. In this circumstance, the invocation of commensality implies a difference overcome through the ritual practice of breaking bread. Women visited each other for coffee, though such rituals were circumscribed by proximity and therefore tended to be limited by the composition of neighborhoods. Meals were shared at weddings, and men drank together in the coffeehouses, although very few accounts speak of sharing food at home, and even more rarely eating together during religious holidays or funerals. Indeed, these instances of commensality appear in many cases to bear resemblance to the "gastronomic diplomacy" discussed by Costas Constantinou (1996) as an important method and ritual for keeping the peace that has been employed throughout the world and throughout human history.

The "shared spaces" of the volume's title are those places where persons of different faiths and ethnic groups lived and worked side by side, where they felt under some moral obligation to attend each other's wed-

dings and festivals. "Shared spaces" may be religious sites with meaning for more than one confessional group; the market, mine, or other site of economic activity; or the common space of the mixed village or urban neighborhood.

Shared spaces may be characterized by political, economic, or social cooperation or antagonism. The everyday cooperative practices that enable the sharing of space may entail friendship or simple pragmatic accommodation. While these were obviously "places" endowed with specific historical and social meanings to the persons who lived in them, we refer to them here as "spaces" to indicate simple geographical closeness, where it was precisely the meanings of those spaces as places that so often became a source of antagonism and conflict (see Hayden and Bowman this volume). Beginning in the nineteenth century, the spread of nationalisms throughout the Ottoman Empire led to everyday ways of (re)claiming spaces, through renaming sites and streets, destroying and building monuments, and other territorial practices. Throughout Southeast Europe and the Middle East, many former spaces of interaction are now sites of past violence and are marked by the absence of groups who had once lived there. Post-Ottoman spaces are today palimpsests of the social memory of violence, where persons attempt to live together under the shadow of past coexistence and the conflict that rended it.

We know that coexistence in pre-nationalist Southeast Europe involved more than simply living side by side, and that there were rituals of accommodation that simultaneously defined and crossed boundaries. But we piece together this past from fragments of information, and ones that today are heavily laden with the ideological baggage of ongoing conflicts—as in cases such as Cyprus—or unresolved histories, such as in Bosnia, Turkey, and other case examples included in this volume. In such instances, "living together" has significant historical and political implications. Ideology, in turn, gives shape to memory, either nostalgically tinting the past with a rosy glow or painting it as an era of constant conflict.

"Coexistence" is a term that acquires special relevance and meaning when it is no longer possible. The search for an "Ottoman model" for coexistence, for instance, begins retrospectively, after the disintegration of the empire in the wake of Balkan and Arab nationalisms and the ethnic cleansing of Anatolia.[1] Similarly for South Asia, where a literature has emerged in recent decades that explores the events leading to Partition and Hindu-Muslim tensions today that have resulted in periodic riots. While these and other similar literatures are in some ways case-specific—for instance, "the riot" as a concept does not exist for the Ottoman and post-Ottoman literature[2]—what they share is an attempt to understand

the forces that drive us apart by looking at those forces that in the past have held us together. Much as nostalgia emerges from irretrievable loss, so "peaceful coexistence" emerges from violence that appears irreparable. This is, no doubt, why discussions of coexistence often struggle against the rosy tinge that often envelops nostalgic images of the past.[3]

If many people in Southeast Europe and the Middle East today mourn past pluralism, it is in the wake and under the influence of that pluralism's destruction. The post-Ottoman space is one where the Ottoman *millet* system that defined difference along religious lines became the basis for the peculiar binding of nationalism and religion in the post-Ottoman period (see, e.g., Grigoriadis 2012; Leustean 2014; Yosmaoğlu 2014). It is also a space that experienced the twentieth century's first massive displacement, movement, and exchanges of peoples, as nation-states attempted to homogenize populations within newly drawn borders. That homogenization was never complete, leaving minority "remainders"—Muslims in Greek Thrace, Orthodox and Armenians in Turkey—who also served as reminders of the violence that had destroyed previous ways of living together and reduced substantial populations to non-threatening numbers. The post-Ottoman space, then, is defined both by the legacy of pluralism and by the enduring puzzle of its violent dissolution.

As I discuss in more detail below, the multi-religious, multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire was a state organized around the management and appreciation of difference. As a result of these arrangements and their violent splintering into nation-states, *coexistence* has acquired a special meaning in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman context to refer to everyday, horizontal relations among persons belonging to different ethnic or confessional groups. One common assumption in the historical literature is that something that might be called coexistence existed and was operative before the divisions produced by nationalist ideologies and nation-state projects. As a result, "coexistence" has become the conceptual and historical background against which violence unfolds.

Indeed, much of the literature to date conceptually exploring coexistence within the anthropology of the region has primarily addressed the extent to which some form of conflict was or was not latent in the intercommunal quiet of the pre-nationalist everyday.[4] The spectrum from antagonism to amity has been especially well represented by two contributors to this volume, Robert Hayden and Glenn Bowman. Hayden refers to the "robustness of boundaries" between religious groups, seen in "differences such as in naming, kinship terminology, marital endogamy, places and methods of burial, diet, dress, education, and perhaps preferred methods of gaining a livelihood" (Hayden and Walker 2013:

401). Moreover, in the model of "antagonistic tolerance" that Hayden has developed with numerous co-authors, he argues that "there is 'tolerance' in the Lockean sense, of enduring the presence of the other but not embracing it, so long as one group is clearly dominant over others" (Ibid.: 402). Hayden claims that such tolerance perdures as long as one group has clear dominance over another, and he argues for a *longue durée* perspective that will allow us to situate moments of peaceful interaction within the long-term relations of dominance between groups (especially Hayden and Walker 2013; Tanyeri-Erdemir, Hayden, and Erdemir 2014; Hayden this volume).

Bowman, on the other hand, taking issue with "Hayden's concept of the incommensurability of cultures," instead stresses "moments of apparent amity" (Bowman 2013: 2) and the variety of ways in which "boundaries are variously reinforced, opened, and transgressed" (Ibid.: 13). Bowman emphasizes the porosity of popular religious practice that allows it to be suffused with non-orthodox elements, including those of other faiths, when they appear to be efficacious. While Hayden argues that Bowman's work is commensurate with his own thesis in that it shows a recognition of religious difference and is synchronic but may change over time (see Hayden this volume), Bowman views their positions as fundamentally incompatible. Indeed, in this debate, those who take the stronger "difference" position and see quotidian antagonism have been equated with identitarian, nationalist ideologues, or the "clash of civilizations" perspective,[5] while those who make arguments for the importance of commonalities are often accused of wishful thinking, of projecting their own desires onto the pasts of others.[6] This debate is representative of a continuing conceptual deadlock within the literature regarding what difference has meant in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman contexts.

Moreover, at least three methodological problems await the researcher attempting to examine coexistence, especially past coexistence affected by conflict. The first is the simple dearth of sources, since coexistence represents the practices of everyday life that rarely find their way into the records, as opposed to the "events" that construct archives and define historical study.[7] As Nicholas Doumanis in his own examination of pre-nationalist intercommunality remarks, "Intercommunality was designed to produce the kind of history that Hegel likened to a blank page. It militated against the possibility of 'events,' which are the grist of conventional history writing" (Doumanis 2012: 2). This does not mean that we are without records: for instance, the literature on the Ottoman neighborhood uses court documents of formal and informal conflict resolution to assess living together as a way of maintaining communal

peace (*sulh*). While such history has only minimal means for under-standing perceptions of difference or the texture of relationships, it does help us to understand the mechanisms by which *sulh* was maintained. Through its "uneventfulness," then, coexistence is by nature self-effacing, though I argue below that there is much to learn from the practices that accomplish its historical disappearance.

The second is the danger of projecting present categories and con-cerns onto the past, or attempting to define coexistence through the lens of concepts used today such as multiculturalism. Doumanis, for instance, claims that the problem of different groups living together, or the problem of difference per se, is one created in Western Europe and spread to other parts of the world during the era of Western colonial-ism.[8] Aron Rodrigue has argued that the problem of difference emerged with post-Enlightenment ideas of majority/minority, and their inflection in a public sphere, where otherness must be "accommodated" (Rodrigue 1996). Indeed, our own contemporary inability to conceptualize differ-ence beyond "identity" and its presumed boundaries continually returns us to the problem of "reconciling" such cultural identities—a problem represented most clearly in the "clash of civilizations" literature, which presumes the irreconcilability of cultural identities.[9] Indeed, "identity" has perhaps been the most troublesome concept for understanding co-existence, as it demands reification where there may be none,[10] and in popular literature "peace" is often equated with having the same "iden-tity"—even where the presumption of such an identity is clearly a result of power relations that occlude minority claims.[11]

In a similar vein, current popular nostalgia for a multicultural past may mask denial of the ways in which that multiculturalism was destroyed. Focusing on one neighborhood in Istanbul, Amy Mills shows that the "disguising power of nostalgia," viewed in a landscape dotted with the remnants of Greeks, Armenians, and Jews, occludes how those com-munities ceased to exist in the present (Mills 2011: 190). In his contri-bution to this volume, Aris Anagnostopoulos shows how it was actually the disappearance of Muslims from Iraklio in Crete that made it possible to become nostalgic about a multicultural past (see also Kasbarian this volume). In this sense, as Mills comments, the moral values of tolerance and cosmopolitanism work to disguise power, presenting "elite … visions of history that paradoxically refer to minorities even while they obscure minority perspectives of history" (Ibid.). In her study of plurality in con-temporary Poland, Agnieszka Pasieka (2014) refers to this highly ideal-ized and nostalgic view of a "lost paradise" and past "harmony" as the "multiculturalization" of the past, which she believes disguises the ten-sions of actual living together. Concomitantly, such nostalgia may draw

attention away from current discriminatory practices against minorities, many of whom are immigrants. As Nora Lafi observes,

> Mediterranean cities do not seem to be sponsoring the invention of a new cosmopolitan ideal. The present situation, in which uses of cosmopolitanism are more often ideological decoys than genuine innovations in terms of governance of diversity, draws on a limited vision of the cosmopolitan past of some cities of the region. (Lafi 2013: 331–32)

Rather than engaging fully with a cosmopolitan ideal, in which many residents of especially port cities in the past saw themselves as "citizens of the world" (Driessen 2005), this popular nostalgia instead is used to valorize one's own tolerance and in Turkey has been part and parcel of a neo-Ottoman revival (see Onar 2009).

A third problem, which follows from the first two, is recognizing "coexistence" when one sees it. For instance, is coexistence simply noninterference, or is it a way of actively managing difference? Does coexistence require common goods or aims? Does it include or exclude violence? What we can say with some certainty is that coexistence is a form of sociality, a way of living together and defining belonging and the meaning of its boundaries. Clearly, for the process of living together, and for anyone wishing to study this process, what is important is both the porosity or impassibility of those boundaries, as well as how we understand the implications of what they contain.

Various authors in this collection tackle this latter problem through terms that speak to other affective or experiential facets of living with difference and negotiating boundaries. Deniz Duru uses "conviviality" to describe the ways in which place may be created for those who live in it through the norms and patterns of a shared lifestyle that actively values pluralism and that they consider to be different from the norms of the larger society. This analysis emphasizes the self-conscious making of pluralism, using the Spanish *convivència,* or "a shared life," which has been recently taken up as policy by local governments in Spain (see Heil 2014) and has been described as "an exercise of negotiation that assumes difference as a basic fact of life and the need to make room for dialog among all members of society, respect for one another, and sharing the public social sphere" (Suárez-Navaz 2004: 191f).

Contrary to the term "coexistence," which appears to imply passively "existing" together, terms such as conviviality emphasize the performative nature of boundary-crossing and the conscious or self-conscious value attached to living with difference. While Duru describes the role of conviviality in making Burgaz Island in Istanbul a place defined by its plurality,

Deborah Starr shows how what she calls a "Levantine idiom" defined by identity fluidity may be performatively produced. Both these chapters call attention to the relationship between plurality and place-making, "an urban localism characterized by diversity" (Starr this volume). Being a Burgazlı or a Levantine was also a matter of self-consciously making one's own neighborhood or local identity through the performance of pluralism.

Other authors think with ideas of cohabitation or co-presence, concepts that describe sharing space especially in urban environments, as something that may require not the sort of active social interaction described by Duru and Starr but rather inattention or giving way. Sylvaine Bulle describes this as "a mode of living together based on an indifference toward communitarianism and respect for private life" (Bulle this volume). This is the form of coexistence in which we "live and let live," or when in urban spaces we share trains and sidewalks with persons who may be identifiably Other. As Bowman points out, this form of sharing puts emphasis on space rather than place: while the former may be defined by simple "civil inattention" (Goffman 1971), the latter is defined by "giving ground" (Bowman this volume). As Bulle suggests, however, such encounters may also create a foundation for mutual engagement and civic action. Describing these as "communities of confidence," Bulle employs Simmel's idea of "the stranger," someone who has general but not specific similarities to us, as a way to understand this ability to share space. Anita Bakshi's chapter similarly gives us insight into such "communities of confidence" in the marketplace of central Nicosia, a place defined by intercommunal interaction distinct from the primarily monocommunal interaction of the neighborhood. However, Bakshi employs Simmel's stranger also to warn that such everyday interactions usually are not capable on their own of surviving incidents of intercommunal violence.

"Coexistence," then, implies recognition of boundaries but also acknowledges that such boundaries are negotiable and that they allow us in some sense still to live together. While recognizing the limitations of coexistence as a term, we use it here as an umbrella for understanding ways of living with acknowledged difference. We qualify this here, however, as "everyday coexistence," the form of coexistence produced through proximity, to distinguish it from the legal, political, and discursive forms of coexistence that imply the "living together" of millets or ethnic groups within the empire or nation. As I discuss below, geography plays an important role in the ways that modes of living together are negotiated and enacted, especially in the form of what I refer to as multi-scalar sovereignty, experienced as territoriality or territorialization in the enactment of local relations.

In what follows, then, I draw upon chapters in this volume and the literature on Ottoman and post-Ottoman coexistence to think about the negotiations of everyday life in the post-Ottoman space. Building on this discussion, I then argue that the anthropology and history of the region would benefit from greater conceptual engagement with theories of sovereignty and everyday diplomacy in its studies of everyday interactions involving the proximity of persons understood to be different. As I discuss below, the norms of hospitality and neighborliness that guide interactions in the settings under discussion in this volume are both formalized and embedded within multiple scales of sovereign domain. And while anthropology has long examined the rituals and exchanges of war and peace, there has been little attempt to incorporate recent literature on what Costas Constantinou calls "homo-diplomacy" into the study of quotidian relations (Constantinou 2006). Below I discuss studies of coexistence in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman space in order to make a case for more attention to the role of territoriality, sovereignty, and everyday diplomacy in local socialities.

I then turn to a discussion of the volume's chapters in order to argue for a particular way of understanding everyday coexistence that I believe helps clear some of the conceptual muddle that currently befuddles the field. Bracketing discussions of antagonism or amity, I instead describe everyday coexistence as the labor of peace, including the sorts of conflict resolution mechanisms that maintained *sulh,* as well as the constant, everyday practices of accommodating each other that maintained *huzur.* While *sulh* tends to be used to refer to peace as that which contrasts with conflict, *huzur* refers to peace as tranquility and calm, the sort of peace that is broken not by violence but by the daily disruptions and tensions of the neighborhood—making too much noise, or disrespecting one's neighbors. "*Sulh* might occur in any *mahalle* or village," notes historian Ronald Jennings, "and the negotiation of *sulh* was a neighborly process, not a formal legal procedure" (Jennings 1978: 148). While *sulh* might be seen as a type of informal conflict resolution, the maintenance of *huzur* in the neighborhood is achieved both through the rituals of sociality and through the management of tension in everyday interaction and exchange (see also Ring 2006).

The Historiography of Ottoman Coexistence

In the wake of war and social upheaval, certain symbols have acquired the cache of representing "peaceful coexistence." One of the most famous of these is the Mostar Bridge. During the Yugoslav war it became

symbolic of the savageness that rends peoples, and after the war was reconstructed with the express purpose of demonstrating "that the connections between Bosnia's people were being rebuilt, too" (Hayden 2007: 108; see also Hromadžić this volume). As Hayden emphasizes, the bridge was celebrated as a symbol of reunification even as Muslims and Croats in the city were keeping to their own sides of the river. Similarly in Cyprus, images of minaret and church bell tower side-by-side were used by the government of the Republic of Cyprus after 1974 to represent a new discourse of peaceful coexistence that had supposedly been shattered by Turkey's invasion and division of the island.

However, Mete Hatay (2011) has shown that minarets and bell towers in the island proliferated in the age of nationalisms, as a competitive way of imprinting one's ethnic presence on the landscape. Moreover, this discourse of peaceful coexistence intentionally occludes the conflict period between 1963–74 (Constantinou and Papadakis 2001) when Turkish Cypriots were disproportionately the victims. In a similar way, nostalgia for multiculturalism in Turkey occludes the way that multiculturalism was destroyed, although Doumanis (2012: 2) urges us not entirely to dismiss the content of nostalgia for this reason.

What is clear, however, is that in the post-Ottoman context, discourses of peaceful coexistence imply a selective archeology of cultural ruins. This region, stamped by pogroms, large-scale population movements, erasures, and reinscriptions, is one in which past coexistence is hidden under conceptual accretions and in which present coexistence is troubled by conflict histories. Moreover, "coexistence" as discourse has often become a tool for denial. In Cyprus and Bosnia, for instance, past coexistence is often invoked as a way to avoid apportioning blame for violence in the (recent) conflicts. This may involve denying the suffering of particular victims, or it may be a way of deflecting blame from oneself—for instance, by scapegoating nationalist "agitators" or "extremists" and deflecting blame from the general population who have, it is claimed, "always gotten along together." In order to avoid these conceptual problems, I find it useful to return to the origins of the concept of peaceful coexistence and its entry into the study of Ottoman and post-Ottoman societies.

The term "peaceful coexistence" first emerged in the context of the Cold War to refer to Soviet policy toward non-communist states and was a central part of Soviet propaganda that set up a contrast with the conflictual foreign policy of the capitalist West. Indeed, it is in the post-1920 period that coexistence acquires academic relevance as a term to explain how nations or groups may live side by side without conflict. "Peaceful coexistence," then, originally emerges as a diplomatic term that assumes hard boundaries around collective entities and calls for noninterference

between those entities. It was effectively an international term, not one applied to domestic issues, and in that sense is about horizontal, rather than vertical, relations between different social orders. However, as one early discussion notes, what distinguishes "peaceful coexistence" from "peace" per se is not only that it is the coexistence of different social orders but also that an active and strong implementation of peaceful coexistence would imply "the strengthening of contacts in the interest of aims which can be mutually formulated and settled" (Kende 1968: 362–63).

In the twentieth-century literature on the Ottoman Empire and its successor states, a state-based literature that focuses on an Ottoman "model of tolerance" that allowed religious practice relatively unimpeded has opened up to encompass social histories of how groups in the empire "coexisted," or lived together in relatively non-conflictual ways for centuries.[12] The main focus of this literature is the operation of the *millet* system, which divided Ottoman society by faith and gave considerable, although hierarchical, freedoms to Christians and Jews that allowed them to practice their religions, be judged in civil cases under their own laws, and be represented by their own religious leaders. A significant part of the literature on tolerance examines the ways and the extent the Ottomans tolerated other religious groups under their rule.

While in the nationalist literatures of many former Ottoman subjects—especially in Southeast Europe—the Ottoman period was one of oppression, it is clear that during the Ottomans' long reign there were various periods when non-Muslims enjoyed greater freedoms than religious minorities in Europe. Indeed, one Ottoman historian makes the claim that the generosity of freedoms granted to non-Muslims under the *millet* system eventually led to that system's downfall:

> If the Ottomans had done what other occupiers elsewhere did and forced those living under their occupation to change their religion, they would never have experienced the minority problem that weakened them in the last century of the Ottoman Empire. Instead the Ottomans protected the rights of Greek Orthodox, Armenians, and Jews to live their own lives with little interaction with the Ottoman ruling class, under the guidance of their own religious leaders, with their own languages and customs, their own schools, courts, orphanages, hospitals, etc., as long as they paid the required taxes and maintained the security and order of the empire. (Shaw 1985: 1003)[13]

The vast literature in English, Turkish, and various languages of the former empire that addresses the question of non-Muslims under Ottoman rule has been concerned with understanding what freedoms were

realized in practice (e.g., Greene 2002; Jennings 1993); how the Otto-
mans perceived non-Muslims (e.g., Barkey 2005; Masters 2004); what
tolerance meant for the operation and longevity of the empire (e.g., Bar-
key 2007); and how those freedoms may have expanded or contracted
in different periods (e.g., Greene 2002; Baer 2011). Because of its focus
on state practice, "coexistence" as a question emerges when one begins
to ask how Ottoman doctrines and practices of tolerance affected the
ways that individuals interacted in daily life, perhaps especially in re-
mote parts of the empire and at times when the state was not palpably
present. Moreover, in discussions of the dissolution of that coexistence,
a not insignificant part of the literature has focused on the ways that the
millet system laid the ground for the strong merging of ethnic and reli-
gious identity that we find in many of the Ottoman successor states (e.g.,
Grigoriadis 2012; Hirschon 2010; Masters 2004).

For the Ottoman context, then, studies of toleration have primarily
focused on the structure of the empire and the operation of the *mil-
let* system. Studies of coexistence, on the other hand, examine the
person-to-person interactions enabled, shaped, and impeded by such
understandings of difference and their legal and political implementa-
tion. Moreover, while "toleration" implies living with or tolerating beliefs
or practices that one finds wrong or disagreeable for social, economic, or
political reasons, historiographically "coexistence" implies a nonhierar-
chical form of everyday interaction that is adopted as a manner of living.
Historiographically, the primary distinction between these emphases
appears to be that while "toleration" assumes that difference is perceived
negatively, "coexistence" attempts to interrogate understandings of dif-
ference and boundaries, including indifference to difference.

It is perhaps to be expected that while studies by anthropologists have
focused primarily on coexistence and shared spaces, especially shared
religious sites,[14] historians until recently have turned much of their at-
tention to the question of toleration. While tolerance, in this literature, is
primarily a strategy of empire, coexistence, as Ussama Makdisi recently
commented, is "more difficult to gage, to describe, and to get at through
the available sources than is the practice and politics of toleration, es-
pecially when the sources present history from the imperial center and
from those at the pinnacle of power in this center" (Baer, Makdisi, and
Shryock 2009: 929). While Marc Baer takes issue with "coexistence" as
an appropriate term to describe what was, during the Ottoman period,
a set of relationships determined by hierarchy, we may turn to Karen
Barkey's important work on the *longue durée* of Ottoman toleration for
observations on the connection between the vertical relationship of tol-
eration and the horizontal relationship of coexistence:

> In the Ottoman Empire, because religious identity determined a person's legal and political status, boundaries and belonging were essential; ethnic and religious peace could be maintained by both respecting boundaries and allowing movement across them. (Barkey 2008: 118)

Although her focus is the contribution of toleration to the durability of the empire, and therefore concentrates on state-society relations, she notes that Ottoman understandings of difference had a systemic quality:

> The Ottoman understanding—similar to the Roman conception—was that difference was tolerated because it had something to contribute. That is, difference added to the empire; it did not detract from it, and therefore, it was commended. Toleration had a systemic quality; maintaining peace and order was good for imperial life, and diversity contributed to imperial welfare. (Barkey 2008: 110–11)

Such an imperial understanding of difference, she argues, trickled down into the relationships of everyday life.

Similarly, Aron Rodrigue argues that "the static 'mosaic' view, which posits building blocks for Middle Eastern society, in which each group is defined and fixed permanently by its religion or ethnicity, is not particularly useful analytically." Rather,

> one can reinterpret the mosaic notion more dynamically, not stressing "minority/majority" or "ruler/ruled," but instead emphasizing the recognition of "difference" and, in fact, the near lack of any political will to transform the "difference" into "sameness." This is not the same as pluralism. The "difference" each group was ascribed, or ascribed to itself in its self-representation, was not articulated on the basis of rights. Rather, nothing in the political system of the Ottoman Empire called for different groups to merge into one. The difference was a given and accepted as such. (Rodrigue 1996)

By most historical accounts, then, the Ottoman Empire was a political space in which difference was recognized and salient in daily life. The hardness of boundaries and the extent to which they mattered clearly differed between village and town, between center and periphery, and between different periods of Ottoman rule. Periods when the rules governing the dress and comportment of religious minorities were lax were often followed by periods when they were more strictly enforced (Barkey 2008: 110–11). Historians have shown that during certain periods zealous sultans instituted campaigns of conversion (Baer 2011),

while in other periods some of their subjects may have infringed the boundaries of their religious community in order to provoke their own martyrdom (Mazower 2005: 159–70). While we can understand practices and infringements of the rules governing religious difference from court records, eyewitness reports, and the records of travelers, we still lack sufficient means to understand how those who lived at the time perceived these differences. This presents a challenge for those wishing to comprehend coexistence as an everyday practice, as well as for those who wish to think about the necessary social conditions for long-term coexistence.

The "Neighbor's Right"

One of the few lenses we have for understanding the texture of intercommunal relations is provided by an indigenous term for sociality-in-proximity. Throughout much of the former Ottoman space, coexistence is encapsulated under the name of "neighborliness," what in Turkey and the Balkans is known as *komşuluk,* a conventional form of everyday interaction that acknowledges the need to accommodate and negotiate difference in the interests of local solidarity (Bringa 1995; Baskar 2012; Valtchinova 2012).[15] In reference to the concept as it is understood in Bulgaria, Galia Valtchinova comments that *komşuluk*

> has become a cultural category embracing the complex of rules and implicit knowledge about how to live together, side by side, without losing one's religious identity.… If this ensemble of conventional attitudes and forms of sociality was supposed to ensure peaceful cohabitation in everyday life, it also allowed a safe distance between them. Often regarded as a "traditional" guarantee of religious peace, the *komşuluk* works through informal codes that are not well adapted to the modern categories of identity, belonging, or citizenship. (2012: 77)

Certain chapters in this volume (especially Dietzel on Cypriot rural land ownership) demonstrate the circumstances under which such conceptions of neighborhood may be shaken or destroyed, although "neighborliness" remains a reference point for ideas of the moral community.

Komşuluk describes a form of everyday life that implies interaction and interdependency while bracketing the affective. One may not love one's neighbors, but one normally needs to get along with them. Even more than this, however, in the Ottoman period the *mahalle* or neighborhood was an administrative unit in which persons were made legally

responsible for each other and for maintaining the peace. As Barkey notes above, maintaining peace and order, what the Ottomans called *sulh* (Tamdoğan 2008), was an imperial priority. Moreover, the extensive literature on the Ottoman *mahalle* shows us the legal means by which persons were made responsible for each other. Neighborhoods were jointly assessed for taxes, but they were also made jointly responsible for crimes. Harboring a criminal often resulted in collective punishment. But similarly, one relied on one's neighbors for statements of one's character, as in cases found in local courts where persons wrongly accused of crimes such as theft and prostitution were found innocent on the basis of statements of their good character made by their neighbors.

Indeed, from the early Ottoman period until its end, we find accounts of how neighbors acted as "guarantors" (*kefil*) of each other's character.[16] This was only possible, however, through close attention to the behavior of others and care in one's own actions and comportment. Some historians have called this an "auto-control mechanism" (Özcan 2001; Özsoy 1998; Yılmaz 2013), and all conclude that records show the neighborhood as an important social and legal unit. "It would not be wrong," says one historian, "to define the neighborhood community as one that has become a unity sharing a common fate, and with common rights and responsibilities" (Özcan 2001). Fikret Yılmaz, for instance, uses court records from Edremit to argue that the neighborhood was one in which

> apart from the civil neighbor relationship it was in fact a control mechanism and a chain of persons who were guarantors for each other and therefore responsible to a degree for each other's behavior, in other words even more than a civil neighborhood, it had become a relationship of official duty, or at least we see that this is how the state had set it up. (Yılmaz, Gürkan, and Gratien 2013; also Yılmaz 1999/2000)

In other words, there seems to be agreement that "peace [*huzur*] in the neighborhood was the principle thing. There was no discrimination between Muslims and non-Muslims in that regard" (Özsoy 1998).

Moreover, persons tended to be identified based on their neighborhoods, as in "Fatma from Baştepe Mahallesi," or "Ali from Beşpınar Mahallesi." In the period before surnames and identity documents, identity was determined through oral information and witness statements given by those who knew the person best, i.e., neighbors. When necessary, "People who know the person would be asked questions such as, 'Who knows Rabia, and how do they know her? Does she have her wits about her?' in other words, 'Is she someone honorable who won't bring harm to anyone, or isn't she?'" (Tamdoğan-Abel 2002: 68). Such statements had

the effect not only of making neighbors morally accountable but also morally responsible for each other. The neighborhood, in other words, appears to have been understood as a moral community from which one also derived one's identity.

In this sense, then, neighborliness becomes a moral imperative, and one that continued to be written about in the ethics manuals (*ahlak kitapları*) of the nineteenth century that were part of late Ottoman public culture and education.[17] Indeed, these manuals often discuss what was known as the "neighbor's right" (*komşu hakkı*), a right to aid and respect. In the various hadiths concerning the neighbor, neighbors are usually seen as having a combination of basic "rights": the "neighbor's right," which includes non-Muslims; the "Muslim's right"; and the "kinship right." Some neighbors may have only the first of these, while others may have two or more. "What is interesting in the ethics manuals of the Ottoman period," notes one historian, "is their advice to tolerate the faults of neighbors" (Tamdoğan Abel 2002: 68). Advice includes cultivating the virtues of patience and speaking in public about the virtues of one's neighbors, not about their shortcomings. Moreover, "another facet of the discourse of neighborly relations in Ottoman ethics manuals is that they do not establish a religious separation: the neighbor 'even if he is an infidel is still a neighbor and has the neighbor's right'" (Ibid.).

While the language of the "neighbor's right" may have disappeared today, there are many indications that the moral imperative of neighborhood remains important in the post-Ottoman space. As one young Turkish Cypriot who had a dispute with his English neighbor over access to his property commented to me, "He made me go to court, and now he won't speak to me. But we're neighbors! If something happens, your neighbor's there for you. Neighbors may be more important than family." Anthropologist Cornelia Sorabji noted a similar sense of duty among Muslims in Sarajevo in the 1980s and remarks, "The call of *komšiluk* is not heard through a cost/benefit filter but as a duty with religious overtones, a duty that is sometimes pleasurable and profitable, sometimes painful and testing, but never a neutrally moral choice" (Sorabji 2008: 104). The sense of duty rather than affection comes to the fore in these interactions: "In *komšiluk* painful feelings are put aside in the interests of the religiously sanctioned residential community" (Ibid.: 106; see also Henig 2012).

What emerges clearly from these descriptions is a mutual constitution of person and place, where the social person emerges through the milieu of the neighborhood, while the character of the neighborhood appears through the constitution of its community. The capacity of neighborhoods collectively to ban individuals who would sully their reputation

(Çetin 2014) or the care to counsel one's neighbors are instances of the ways in which neighborhood and personhood are mutually constituting.

At the same time, this mutual constitution of person and place occurs within the context of *mahalles* that often were monoreligious. While this was not uniformly the case, and in large cities there were many mixed neighborhoods, it was the tendency for a *mahalle* to emerge around a central religious structure—a mosque, church, or synagogue—and for the neighborhood to take its name from that structure (Açık 2014; Tamdoğan 2008). Moreover, religious leaders often played important roles in these neighborhoods apart from conducting religious services, such as representing their neighborhood communities before the state. This might include making complaints about insufficient water supply and roads on behalf of their parishioners or acting as agents for registering births, deaths, marriages, and divorces (Açık 2014; Hızlı N.D.; Kazıcı 1982). Imams also acted as tax collectors, assessing the ability of their constituents to pay (Behar 2003: 6). On the other hand, neighborhoods tended not to be divided by occupation or social class, and "in intramural Istanbul, large mansions of *pashas* and *beys* neighboring the shanty lodgings of beggars (*se'ele*) or of street-porters … were quite a common occurrence" (Ibid.: 5). The *mahalle,* then, may be taken as a social unit that for the most part was not divided by class; was often, though not always, divided by religion; and where protection of the *mahalle,* its honor, and its reputation were of central importance.

Given the political importance ascribed to the sociality of *komşuluk,* it should not be surprising that it occupies a significant role in post-Ottoman nostalgia for lost pluralism. In that nostalgia, there is a tendency to blur scale, equating the existence of certain neighborhoods where persons of different religions lived side by side, sharing the responsibilities of the *mahalle,* with the "peaceful" existence of religious and ethnic minorities within the Empire. In other words, the "fact" that religious minorities existed in the Empire for the most part without persecution—in other words, under a regime of tolerance—seems to blend with narratives of mixed neighborhoods, making the claim that "we are all neighbors" applicable even to larger political entities.

In contrast to this blurring of scale, the relatively self-contained nature of the *mahalle* and the intertwining of personhood and place point us to another feature of living together that I wish to emphasize here: what I have earlier called "the labor of peace." To speak of labor is to emphasize agonism rather than antagonism, and accommodation rather than amity. It is to recognize that neighborliness is not only about living with the Other but is equally importantly about the ways that one becomes a person in the other's eyes. It is also to recognize that the intertwining

of Other and Self entails a ritualized sociality and forms of exchange that simultaneously bind persons and families together and create their difference. In coming to that point, I will first discuss two other features of Ottoman social structure that are important for our considerations: what I will call here "multi-scalar sovereignty," and the performativity of neighborliness. While the former concerns the type of territoriality produced through the neighborhood, the latter concerns the production of self within the context of the neighborhood. As we will see, both facets are important for thinking about the dissolution of neighborhood relations and the possibilities for living together after violence.

"To Be Master of One's Own Home"

The common Turkish saying, *kendi evinin efendisi olmak* (to be master of one's own home) has resonances with the English saying, "a man's home is his castle." Both phrases imply the sovereignty of the home, because while *komşuluk* requires interdependence, it also requires respecting the "sovereignty" of the other by not making too much noise, not blocking their passage, not picking the fruit from their trees. In the English saying, the image of a castle invokes sovereignty in the form of a king, but the phrase is more commonly used to signal the separation of public and private, or the noninterference of the state in private life. This noninterference is invoked by the walls of the castle, within which each man is his own king.

Rather than stressing the castle with its implications of walls and boundaries, the Turkish saying emphasizes the sovereign as "master" or "lord." In Turkish, to be an *efendi* or master is not only to be in control but equally to be someone deserving of respect, a realized person. Indeed, the word *efendi* comes originally from the ancient Greek *authentes*, which has connotations of self-realization or agency. This is a self-realization, though, that happens within the context of place-making, the context in which one is known and acquires the respect that makes one "master."

Moreover, in both cases the idea of "home" may be used metaphorically, to refer not only to a house, but also to a larger unit, especially the nation-state. Indeed, we often find that international relations compares relationships between countries to those of neighbors. States have "neighborhood policies," while the doctrine of noninterference resembles the advice above that neighbors avoid too much curiosity about the other's home. In writings on plural societies, "the neighbor" often comes to stand for the Other, the non-ruling ethnic or religious group sharing a

political space (Zizek, Santner and Reinhard 2013). The tendency to use the neighbor as a scale-free abstraction (compare Candea 2012) reflects similar tendencies in the study of hospitality, where Candea argues that the analogization of hospitality in the home to that in the nation is "tying together into causal chains entities of radically different sizes (individuals, nations, doors, villages, etc.)" (Candea 2012: S35; see also Herzfeld 1987).[18] By using "the neighbor" to stand for a country, an ethnic group, and at the same time the person next door, the focus is on ethics (especially Levinas and Derrida's response) while sidelining the problems of scalar sovereignty.

Indeed, hospitality is the practice in which the scales of sovereignty embedded in discourses of neighborliness both emerge and are blurred. Put simply, although one owes hospitality to one's neighbors, in actual practice the neighbor emerges as the one who does not need hospitality. This becomes clear in ethnographic examples where various scales of "neighborliness" are employed. For instance, when I conducted research in Cyprus between 2003 and 2005 on the opening of the border that divides the island, I spent about nine months living in a town in northern Cyprus that had a mixed Turkish-Greek population before 1963. After the division of the island in 1974 and the flight of Greek Cypriots to the island's south, Turkish Cypriots originally from the town who had fled in 1963 returned, later to be joined by displaced Turkish Cypriots from the island's southern region and a small number of persons resettled from rural Turkey. A decade or so after the division, foreigners of various stripes, though mostly from the U.K. and Germany, also began to settle in the town. I rented a small apartment in a larger house in a neighborhood of Turkish Cypriots who had been displaced from the island's south. Many of my neighbors were also relatives or came from neighboring villages in the south.

The neighbor who lived opposite our house was a woman around fifty years of age whose husband ran the neighborhood coffee shop. While Şengül sometimes helped him, she mostly baked at home and sold her pastries to local shops. As a result, she was one of two or three female neighbors who were always home. Moreover, during the times that they were at home, their doors were always open, as is common in villages throughout the Eastern Mediterranean and Southeast Europe, where the open door implies both that neighbors are welcome and also that one has nothing to hide (see Henig 2012). Neighbors would step in and out, call to each other, occasionally stop by for coffee. While technically the rules of hospitality remained in place, as for instance the practice of always offering something to drink or eat, in practice hospitality became a referential discourse, something to which one could gesture and

at the same time flout. In other words, neighbors do not occupy the category of "guests," and they may joke together about the formalities of hospitality. Similarly, Catherine Allerton (2012) notes how in Mangarrai relatives and neighbors may jokingly "become guests" at formal events, taking their places as guests because the formalities of the occasion demand it but at the same time recognizing that their intimacy with the hosts makes "becoming guests" a performance. Conversely, in the Turkish context, the moment when one ceases to be a guest and becomes an intimate treated with a more relaxed hospitality may be marked by the comment, *yabancı değilsin artık* (you are not a stranger/foreigner anymore).

Guests, then, come in many shapes and sizes, some more intimate than others. Neighbors, however, are hardly ever seen as guests, and certainly not as "strangers." Moreover, the open door puts the norms and rules of hospitality in abeyance. The neighbor's home is porous, although it is not "one's own." This indiscernability of the open door is both a form of community and a way of shaping oneself in the neighbor's eyes: one has nothing to hide, and one displays this honorable openness. To close the door is to hide, to retreat into private life. Given the traditional significance of the neighbor's testimony in the Ottoman neighborhood, it should not be surprising that neighbors are the primary persons in whose eyes reputation is formed. We will return to this consideration in a moment.

In contrast to the intimate hospitality of the neighborhood stands the formal hospitality of the host-guest relationship.[19] It is the host-guest relationship that appears to be what A.M. Hocart had in mind when he observed that the original form of sovereignty is a hospitality event (Hocart 1957; also Candea and Da Col 2012: S7). While all hospitality depends upon the home and its sovereignty, the host-guest relationship also harbors another element: the guest is expected eventually to leave. In the town where I conducted research after the border opening in Cyprus this element of sovereignty became especially contested in that displaced Turkish Cypriots were living in formerly Greek Cypriot houses. With the opening, the owners of those houses returned to visit them, although in the absence of a political solution to the island's division were not able to reclaim them. As a result, those persons with original title deeds to the houses were put in the role of guests being served coffee and lemonade in houses that they claimed as their own. The ambiguity of ownership and the pain of past conflict, then, were mediated through the rituals of hospitality: as good hosts, my neighbors said, "Of course we served them coffee! I wouldn't behave badly to someone who's a guest in my home." And as good guests, the Greek Cypriot visitors eventually would leave.

In these encounters, the threshold materializes sovereignty, the point at which a stranger knocks or calls out even when the door is open. The open door is for the neighborhood, allowing the sovereignty of home to blend with the sovereignty of the community and signaling the mutual interpenetration of person and place. The open door symbolically blurs the space between inside and outside, between the house and the street, enabling everyday forms of negotiated interaction. Not only does one have nothing to hide from one's neighbors, but those neighbors also cannot pass without greeting. Unlike hospitality, then, it is a practice of moral exchange and interdependency that entails the everyday diplomacy of pleasantries, greetings, and often the exchange of important information in the form of gossip. I saw this in the ways that displaced Greek Cypriots mourned for their lost homes, not as structures but as parts of networks and neighborhoods.[20] In their descriptions of home, what stands out are the paths between houses, the closeness of relatives, and the openness to fields and to others.

Both neighborliness and hospitality, then, are defined by closeness and distance, by boundary-making that depends upon the threshold of the home. But whereas hospitality depends upon the strict definition of the threshold as boundary between "ours" and "theirs," neighborliness in practice has depended on a blurring of that boundary and on forms of everyday diplomacy. When I refer to "everyday diplomacy" I mean not simply the negotiation of common terms or interests. Rather, I refer to the diplomat as emissary, someone who enters the space of the Other and addresses that Other in a common language. Thinking of diplomacy in this way opens up the possibility also to understand what Constantinou calls the "transformative potential of diplomacy," in other words, "the experience of new or expanding space, opening up possibilities and promising alternative ways of relating to others" (Constantinou 2006: 352; see also Constantinou 1996). Diplomacy, then, involves according respect to the Other but also the potential for self-transformation.

Taking a term from the language of diplomacy, I propose to think of everyday coexistence in post-Ottoman spaces as a labor of peace that relies upon a constructive ambiguity of the boundaries of belonging. By "labor of peace" I have in mind the everyday management of both sociality and tension that is most clearly seen in the neighborhood as a social unit. Sociality is managed through forms of symbolic and material exchange, from exchanging labor in fields to attendance at weddings and funerals. In remembering their lives together, both Turkish and Greek Cypriots from the same time independently recalled the neighborhood system in which families would take turns making *halloumi,* a local cheese and staple of the Cypriot diet.

The labor of peace, however, also depends on both managing conflict and maintaining tensions. The local management of conflict is well known as a subject from the anthropological literature on dispute resolution (e.g., Nader 1991; Roberts 1979/2013; Starr 1978) and should be understood as what the Ottomans referred to as maintaining *sulh.* In places such as Cyprus, traditions of local dispute management created conflicts with British colonial rulers, who wished to replace them with formal judiciary practices.[21] As one such administrator observed, under the Ottoman system "it was enough that a man was known as an evil-doer to the people generally, and that there was reasonable cause to believe him guilty of certain offences."[22] At the time of the British arrival, then, the sociolegal practices of the *mahalle* appear to have been in full force, and the multitude of complaints by British police regarding informal dispute resolution practices indicates that they continued until well into the twentieth century.

Apart from the resolution of disputes, however, the labor of peace also entailed what I have referred to as maintaining tensions. In her discussion of everyday coexistence in Karachi, Laura Ring observes that it is in women's bearing of tension, rather than men's discharging of it, that peace is maintained. In Ring's rendering, this "ethic of suspense" linked

> generalized reciprocity with the ability to bear in tension, or hold in suspense, contradictory principles of social organization (nation and ethnic group, hierarchy and equality).... [T]reating stranger-neighbors as kin depended not on sentiments of love and attachment but on the willingness and ability to bear the tension of contradictory categories of belonging.... Social, cultural, and intergroup tension is thus managed via the bodies and subjectivities of women. (Ring 2006: 179)

Ring's sensitive study focuses specifically on the ways that women's bodies bear tension because men's bodies are presumed to be violent, incapable of tension and subject to exploding under it.

I cannot engage here with Ring's analysis of the gendered nature of this practice, which is certainly not specific to her field location but may nevertheless not be universally applicable. My own research indicates that while women may disproportionately "bear tension" in this way, the management of contradiction and ambiguity is an intrinsic part of living together. I choose to refer to this process as "constructive ambiguity," a term taken from diplomacy, where it means the use of ambiguous language to deal with sensitive issues about which parties would otherwise remain irreconcilable.

In diplomacy, constructive ambiguity is the practice of setting aside those issues that cause conflict and moving to those issues about which agreement can be reached. In doing so, the hope is that eventually a new state of affairs will allow the parties to overcome previously irreconcilable differences. This in effect allows each side to claim that it has not conceded the point while allowing negotiations to proceed beyond it. One summary of the strategy notes, "Ambiguities make sure that, on the one hand, the parties retain their own individual perceptions as to 'how things should proceed' and that, on the other, one common language is adopted, which both parties may later equally use" (Pehar 2001: 170). Language, in this case, acts as a type of boundary defining the possibility or impossibility of negotiation.

I use the term for what it brings to understanding the everyday negotiation of what Ring calls "tension." "Constructive ambiguity" is a process by which we agree to see differently on a particular issue while not letting that disagreement stand in the way of peace. It is a process of allowing certain boundaries to remain in place while finding common ground where it is possible. It does not deny difference; in fact, it recognizes difference in its refusal to confront it. It does not efface difference but rather denies that difference must be an insurmountable obstacle to sociality and peace. Constructive ambiguity brackets difference, allowing us to retain it while continuing with the everyday process of living.

Just as neighborliness makes the threshold porous, so in everyday life we may recognize, but at the same time bracket, the everyday differences that define boundaries in order to make those boundaries permeable. This is usually done in the interest of some larger cause perceived to be more important—what Kende, in his definition of strong peaceful coexistence, described as "the strengthening of contacts in the interest of aims which can be mutually formulated and settled." That cause may be the need to work together in the fields or marketplace, or simply the belief that the Other, despite Otherness, still subscribes to the moral code of neighborliness that protects the peace of a village. My Turkish Cypriot neighbor commented that "neighbors may be more important than family." And while in a struggle over land access the young Turkish Cypriot was willing to suspend difference in the interest of a higher moral code, his English neighbor saw the fence between them as a legal boundary defining his rights rather than a moral threshold defining his responsibilities.

I have suggested that we may usefully see the coexistence expressed in *komşuluk* as a constructive ambiguity of the boundaries of belonging, and I have also suggested that seeing it in this way may allow us insight into the everyday diplomacy of coexistence without necessitating insight

into the affective realm, which is difficult to document in retrospect. Where that coexistence begins to break down, or where it may be difficult to repair, is where such ambiguity is no longer encouraged or feasible. Moreover, it should not be surprising that this occurs with the rise of demands for nation-state sovereignty, as we see that it was precisely in the demands for freedom of ethnic and religious minorities within the Ottoman Empire, as well as the Ottoman attempts to claw back against the empire's disintegration, that the scale of nation-state sovereignty penetrates the sovereignty of the neighborhood. Village and street-names are "nationalized," while national and religious symbols come to dominate local landscapes. In his contribution to this volume, Robert Hayden describes the changes in what he calls "religioscapes" with the advent of nationalist demands. Such changes included the building or destruction of minarets, as well as the size of mosques and churches.

I suggest that the tendency to blend scale in discussions of home or neighborhood is also an indication of multi-scalar sovereignty—the sovereignty of the home, of the *mahalle*, of the church, all of which have their own sovereign thresholds. In the past, crossing into another neighborhood was not very different from crossing the threshold of a home and entailed scrutiny, as well as rituals of hospitality (see Çetin 2014; Tamdoğan-Abel 2002). Crossing the threshold of a church or mosque was to step into the sovereign realm of faith, something one usually would not do if one did not "belong." These embedded sovereignties were made possible when the state and realm were perceived to belong to a dynasty but not to a "people." Although the Ottoman Empire was a Muslim Sunni state, the state was not equivalent to territory but rather imposed upon it and thereby encompassing all that lived within it. As a result, multi-scalar sovereignties present us with ambiguities and incompleteness in a way that is materialized in the threshold but that disappears with the homogenization of space in the nation-state era. Commenting on the ambiguities inherent in what I have called here multi-scalar sovereignties, Shryock remarks,

> the underlying problem is one of sovereignty over a space whose incompleteness, both as a physical and a sovereign space, must be perpetually managed in ways that encourage interaction with outsiders. Bad guests and hosts come in many dramatic forms, but even before they drop the millstone or sever the hand that greets them, they are first of all people who refuse to accept the proper role of host or guest. This refusal is most likely to occur when guest and host cannot agree on who controls the space of interaction, who is sovereign, who be-

longs, and who owes or should offer respect.… Shifts in scale compound these disagreements and create new ones. (Shryock 2012: S30)

One such scalar shift is when the space of the neighborhood, with its own intimate sovereignty, is overlaid by the exclusive territorial claims of the nation-state—claims that are often also in conflict with others.

Using the contributions to this volume, I would like to think about what the labor of peace and the constructive ambiguity that it entails would mean in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman context. What is helpful about the term "constructive ambiguity" is that it makes reference to a form of everyday diplomacy, to a way of acknowledging both difference and a common set of moral concerns that have priority over that difference. It also allows us to think with more specificity about the conditions under which such ambiguity is no longer possible, and about what happens when it is lost. In addition, it may enable us to identify why it is so difficult to recover such forms of everyday diplomacy in post-conflict interaction.

Everyday Diplomacy in the Post-Ottoman Space

My attempt to clear away some conceptual brush by referring to coexistence as a labor of peace, and more specifically one supported by the constructive ambiguity of the boundaries of belonging, is also in consonance with other works that have similarly struggled with how to conceptualize the meaning and perception of boundaries in the Ottoman and post-Ottoman space. Exploring the porosity of boundaries at the local level, Doumanis argues that intercommunality, as he calls it, was produced in the quotidian negotiations of daily life:

> Ottoman mixed communities did not meld into one organic unit. However … where such distinct units lived cheek by jowl it was also essential that boundaries shifted whenever dictated by necessity and social norms, and in order to promote an atmosphere of civility and cordiality. (Doumanis 2012: 65)

The everyday creation of community in this way is confirmed for other cases, such as Anja Peleikis's study of Lebanon, where she argues,

> shared local identity was not a given simply because of the fact that Christians and Muslims used to live in the same place. On the con-

trary, social relations across confessional borders had to be confirmed, created and reproduced again and again through the diverse everyday practice of neighborhood relations, mutual assistance in agriculture, and attendance at religious rituals of the confessional "Other." (Peleikis 2006: 134)

Community, then, may not be assumed but must be constantly reaffirmed and reproduced, emphasizing the conscious effort or labor involved. Laura Ring, in her discussion of everyday coexistence in contemporary Karachi, described a similar process of insisting on difference while at the same time complicating it: "[t]he repeated insertion of the particular—the insistent invocation of the complexity and ambiguity of social identity—was critical to the very possibility of 'sharing the shade' or *ham sayagi,* the Urdu term for 'neighborhood'" (2006: 4).

The performance of coexistence also often entailed ritualized and even exaggerated expressions of community solidarity, expressed retrospectively in nostalgia for having attended each other's weddings. Doumanis notes,

[b]ehaving '*as if*' they were one community was fundamental to intercommunality. Being *like* a community without *being* a community promoted solidarity for the purposes of social order and security, while at the same time ensuring that the distinctions remained intact. The purpose of loving one's neighbour was to keep that neighbour firmly at bay. (2012: 78)

Here Doumanis appears to fall into the identitarian trap he has tried to avoid, by effectively saying that such everyday constructions of community are simulacra rather than essence. In Deniz Duru's chapter in this volume, we see how such self-conscious valuing of plurality may construct the sense of community as community and of place as place.

Moreover, if we return to my earlier invocations of neighborliness and thresholds, we can see how "social order and security" may constitute a higher moral order that calls for constructive ambiguity of boundaries. Leaving one's door open signals both that the home is one's own and also that its threshold is porous. It is also, as certain authors in this volume make clear, a site of performativity. Opening one's door is also a way of constructing oneself in the neighbor's eyes, of displaying that one has nothing to hide. Moreover, one of the most important aspects of hospitality is the rehashing of it afterwards—what one served, how the guest behaved, what this indicates. Hospitality, then, is not only an event but is simultaneously a discourse on an event. In this sense, the moral dis-

course of hospitality also shapes the moral practice of its performance: to be a good host is to be one not primarily in the eyes of one's guest but in the eyes of one's own community. Similarly with neighborliness: while people such as my own Turkish Cypriot neighbor often perceive the interdependence of neighborliness as something born of necessity, not to help one's neighbor is also to risk the talk of other neighbors.

The argument that everyday coexistence may be as much about the rules of social life as it is about individual relationships—as much about morality as affection and as much about performance as essence—is also in consonance with Ashutosh Varshney's empirical study (2003) of cities in India where ethnic conflict has occurred, and his well-argued claim that intercommunal civil associations are more effective in controlling violence than are individual relationships. "If vibrant organizations serving the economic, cultural and social needs of the two communities exist," Varshney claims, "the support for communal peace not only tends to be strong but it can also be more solidly expressed" (Ibid.: 10). In cities, his study shows, formal networks are important for facilitating what informal networks and relationships may be able to achieve in villages: namely, spaces for negotiating common goods that in turn make what might otherwise be exclusive demands into inclusive ones.

The chapters in this volume suggest that living together is a labor of peace that entails an everyday diplomacy, requires the blurring but not the dissolution of boundaries, and includes the potential for self-transformation. Chapters discuss the simultaneous exclusiveness and inclusiveness of boundaries symbolized by the threshold; the performative aspect of everyday coexistence; and the forms of common civility necessary to enable diversity within the same space. Together, the chapters help us to understand the "constructive ambiguity" that pervades everyday interactions, as well as the moments when such ambiguity or "civil inattention" (Goffman 1971) may no longer be possible.

In her discussion of the Ermou marketplace of Nicosia in this volume, Anita Bakshi, referring to Georg Simmel's now classic observations regarding the stranger, remarks that persons from the other group were both near and remote, defined by difference. However, within the space of the marketplace it was possible also to complicate and blur such borders through the recognition of individuals in face-to-face interactions:

> The shared realm provided by the Ermou streets allowed for the recognition of specific differences—the elements that begin to form the outlines of individuals, distinguishing them from the group as a whole. These outlines may remain hazy. They need not be deep friendships, and indeed they probably often were not, but they do help to create

> a public life in which the individual can operate comfortably. … This
> allowed for a particular habitus to emerge, one constituted by the re-
> petitive nature of interactions and facilitated by the stable pattern of
> streets and intersections. (this volume, p. 120)

The city, with its separate Greek and Turkish neighborhoods, included
sites of exclusion as well as nodes of integration. Indeed, it was the draw-
ing of boundaries that made neighborliness across those boundaries
possible.

Similarly, Irene Dietzel shows how the complex land use and land
ownership patterns of Ottoman Cyprus encouraged the interdependence
and solidarity of village life. As may be seen elsewhere in the Mediterra-
nean, multiple ownership in land, including rights to water and trees, as
well as the complexities of farming in a parched climate, lent themselves
to forms of cooperation and solidarity that began to disappear with the
"rationalization" of land rights under the British administration and the
"modernization" of land use in the mid-twentieth century. However, Aris
Anagnostopoulos also reminds us in his own chapter that our concep-
tualization of such coexistence is also predetermined by its end, empha-
sizing ethno-religious cooperation before later conflict while covering
over other forms of exclusion (class, gender, age, etc.) that were present
during such periods of "peaceful coexistence." Bakshi gives the example
of women excluded from certain marketplace spaces, while Deniz Du-
ru's chapter describing interreligious interaction in Burgazadası, Istan-
bul, reminds us that such cross-ethnic or cross-faith interactions may be
based on their own class, ideological, or gendered exclusions.

Sossie Kasbarian's discussion of the Armenian community in Turkey
today is one where individuals think "in terms of clearly defined spheres
and the need to transgress and move from one to the other." (this vol-
ume, p. 223). However, Kasbarian emphasizes that these spheres are
defined not only by religious, ethnic or other identities but also by
different historical narratives that must be accommodated. "When
contemplating coexistence," Kasbarian remarks, "the coexistence of dif-
ferent narratives is at least as essential as physical coexistence" (this
volume, p. 222).

Robert Hayden argues in this volume and elsewhere that examples
such as Kasbarian's show that "'peaceful coexistence' is not so much a
condition that can be disrupted, as a manifestation of relations at times
when the dominance of one group over another is so firmly established
that it need not be imposed, and cannot be much countered" (this vol-
ume, p. 62). In other words, any "peaceful coexistence" with a dominated
minority is only temporary and is bound to change when power rela-

tions do. He shows this through the physical domination of the landscape during the Ottoman period and attempts to erase signs of that domination in Ottoman successor states.

Other chapters, however, suggest that what may be important is not the "reality" of coexistence but rather its performance, in other words, the ways in which a constructive ambiguity of the boundaries of belonging is (self-)consciously constructed. While Duru's chapter shows the way that residents of the Istanbul island of Burgaz self-consciously value and construct plurality as part of the island's identity, Deborah Starr highlights the performativity of coexistence through discussion of what she calls the "Levantine idiom" in Togo Mizrahi's Alexandria films. Produced at a moment when Egypt was experiencing a rise of a new Arab/Islamic nationalism that excluded, for instance, the large Jewish community of which Mizrahi was a member, Mizrahi's farces use cross-dressing, class-hopping, and hints of homosexuality to emphasize the performative and fluid nature of (Levantine) identity. The "Levantine aesthetics" of the films is one in which "the performance of identity is fluid and mutable, embracing vagueness and porousness of the boundaries of identity" (this volume, p. 136). However, Starr emphasizes that the inclusiveness of this Levantine aesthetic is not "natural" but is explicitly depicted as something performed, an inclusivity that is both self-consciously and repetitively created.

Azra Hromadžić, in her study of a mixed Mostar gymnasium, returns to performativity when she shows how language "purism" in a mixed space is performed by youth often confused by what counts as "their" national language. "Youth," notes Hromadžić,

> are … called to accept, appreciate, welcome and act out this "authentic" difference—the essence of cultural hermaneutics—in exchange for acceptance into the larger transborder nation and *domovina*'s (homeland's) recognition. As a result, language performance acts as a social ethics and cultural technology for successes and failures of national and individual dreams. (this volume, p. 193)

As she demonstrates, however, this ideology of cultural purity is also mapped onto territory, thus creating the presumption of "incommensurability of mutually hostile, spatially segregated ethnicities which are treated as rooted, bounded, homogeneous, and mutually hostile" (this volume, p. 193).

Both Sylvaine Bulle and Glenn Bowman's chapters use Erving Goffman to think about contiguity—what Bulle calls "co-presence"—in contexts that are potentially conflictual. In the context of a divided Jerusa-

lem, Bulle describes the ephemeral "temporary communities of confidence" that emerge even in and around a security wall. Pizza deliveries, marketplaces, and tramways all provide spaces for interactions that are characterized by what Goffman called "civil inattention," a form of public civility that allows heterogeneous public spaces to function. Temporary communities of confidence "are created within situations where people simply come together, and are not affirmations of belonging," Bulle notes (this volume, pp. 248–9).

Bowman discusses this as "giving ground," what Bulle refers to as a basic civility in urban space:

> Viewed not from the perspective of an ideal model of coexistence but rather from its actual practice, we see that small acts of respect for the Other—the exercise or not of domination, of courtesy, of civility—may be able to construct a livable space, creating a place for people, while at the same time helping to build a shared life. (Bulle this volume, p. 252)

However, as Bowman notes, such forms of ordinary civility are enabled by "spaces" but impeded by "places." In other words, civility is possible only when one community does not make an exclusive claim to a site.

Taken together, the papers in this volume provide new insight into the everyday practices of living together in contexts fraught with conflict histories that include discrimination, displacement, and division. Authors here stress the importance of boundaries that define forms of neighborliness and cooperation, and the everyday diplomacy that allows those boundaries to remain constructively ambiguous. They describe, as well, the quotidian performances of coexistence, which comply with standardized notions of the civil and the cosmopolitan. And they explore the political potential of contiguity and civility for creating spaces defined by robust forms of living together.

Notes

1. On the way that a discourse of coexistence occludes the manner that coexistence was destroyed in Turkey, see Mills (2011) and Onar (2009).
2. On "the riot" and the post-conflict everyday, see Das (2007); Jeganathan (1997); Mehta (2002); and Mehta and Chatterji (2001).
3. See, for instance, the discussion of such nostalgic visions in Doumanis 2012: 2–19.
4. For a debate that outlines many of the stakes, see Robert Hayden's 2002 *Current Anthropology* article, including responses (Hayden 2002), as well as articles in Bowman (2012) that respond to Hayden's thesis.

5. See Glenn Bowman and Dionigi Albera on Robert Hayden's antagonistic tolerance thesis (Bowman 2012; Albera 2012).
6. See Robert Hayden on Stef Jansen and others, as well as replies (Hayden 2007).
7. On the "eventful-ness" of history, see Pandey (2006) and Lubkemann (2008).
8. Doumanis remarks, for instance, "Whereas Ottomans presupposed that cultural difference within society was a given, Westerners tended to proceed from a diametrically opposite position, seeing societal homogeneity as normative and the Babel-like conditions in the Near East as symptomatic of societal degeneration" (Doumanis 2012: 18).
9. On the problem of the "clash of civilization" literature as it relates to the study of multiculturalism, see Mills (2011); Barkey (2005); and Baer, Makdisi, and Shryock (2009).
10. On the problems of identity as a concept in the social sciences, see the important article by Brubaker and Cooper (2000).
11. In Cyprus, for instance, Greek Cypriot nationalists beginning in the 1950s advanced the thesis that Turkish Cypriots were really converted Orthodox and therefore Greek "by blood." Since 1974, the Republic of Cyprus has officially claimed that Cypriots lived "like brothers" before the 1974 Turkish invasion and division of the island. The Left, in turn, has supported "Cypriotism," the claim that Cypriots are "really all the same" and that they were divided by nationalist elements. While this thesis has gained support from left-wing Turkish Cypriots when it is future-oriented and refers to an inclusive, civic patriotism, Turkish Cypriots have tended to give it considerably less support when it is used to refer to "identity."
12. Classic texts that discuss Ottoman tolerance include those by Inalcik (1973), Lewis (1961), and Shaw (1976), as well as one more recently by Ortaylı (2003). For a collection that draws together works on both tolerance and coexistence in the Ottoman domains, see Karpat (2010).
13. This and all other translations from Turkish in the text are my own.
14. There is, indeed, a significant body of anthropological work on shared shrines that constitutes a large part of the ethnographic work on the sharing of space in Southeast Europe and the Middle East. For more on the subject, see recent works by Albera and Couroucli (2012); Barkan and Barkey (2015); Bigelow (2010); Bowman (2012a); and Hayden and Walker (2013).
15. In the Balkan context, the discussion of *komšilik* has centered primarily on the question of whether or not those relations were antagonistic in the context of the Balkan wars. The term, which comes from the Turkish *komşuluk,* not only means "neighborhood" rather than "neighborliness," but it also appears specifically to have acquired the meaning of living with plurality. Nevertheless, as I discuss below, the term appears to have retained in the Balkans some of the normative and affective dimensions of the more general "neighborliness," which applies to all forms of living in proximity.
16. For a discussion of the contested way in which this system was destroyed by British colonial rule in Cyprus, see chapter two in Bryant (2004).

17. On ethics manuals in the late Ottoman period, particularly their use in education, see Fortna (2002).
18. Also, Andrew Shryock remarks, "Hospitality, as Bedouin describe it, is a quality of persons and households, of tribal and ethnic groups, and even of nation-states. At any of these levels of significance, failure to provide *karam* [hospitality] suggests low character and weakness, qualities that attract moral criticism" (Shryock 2012: S20).
19. Herzfeld has referred to the often aggressive hospitality of the region, as well as the suspension of hostility that contains the ever-present possibility of its degeneration, as "courtesy-as-menace." He remarks that these encounters have a "fragile, nervous force" that he suggests derives from their formality. "It is formality, not the simple act of giving, that creates the ambivalence and tension that is so prominent in the literature about Southern Europe, my own contributions included" (Herzfeld 2012: S214).
20. For more detail, see Bryant (2010).
21. I document this in a previous work (Bryant 2004), in which I devote a chapter to the transition from the Ottoman to the British legal systems. Complaints of the loss of authority by village elders are multitude, and British administrators received numerous letters vociferating against the centralized nature of the new system and the refusal to accept the word of village elders as binding to convict. In 1895, the Bishop of Kition, for instance, reported that "the people wish restrictions to be put on persons of bad character, on persons whom the Mukhtar [headman] and Ayas [Turkish *ağa* = elder] of a village may say are of bad character. Such persons might be restricted by being confined to certain localities" (*Parliamentary Papers, 1887–1895,* quoted in Bryant 2004).
22. *Parliamentary Papers, 1887–1895*: 51.

References

Açık, Turan. 2014. "Mahalle ve Camii: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Mahalle Tipleri Hakkında Trabzon Üzerinden bir Değerlendirme" [Neighborhood and mosque: An assessment of neighborhood types in the Ottoman Empire based on Trabzon]. *OTAM* 35: 1–39.

Albera, Dionigi. 2008. "'Why Are You Mixing What Cannot Be Mixed?': Shared Devotions in the Monotheisms." *History and Anthropology* 19(1): 37–59.

———. 2012. "Combining Practices and Beliefs: Pilgrims at Marian Shrines." In *Sharing the Sacra: The Politics and Pragmatics of Intercommunal Relations around Holy Places,* ed. G. Bowman, 10–24. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Albera, Dionigi, and Maria Couroucli, eds. 2012. *Sharing Sacred Spaces in the Mediterranean: Christians, Muslims, and Jews in Shrines and Sanctuaries.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Allerton, Catherine. 2012. "Making Guests, Making 'Liveliness': The Transformative Substances and Sounds of Manggarai Hospitality." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.): S49–S62.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1981. "Gastro-politics in Hindu South Asia." *American Ethnologist*: 494–511.

Argyrou, Vassos. 1996. *Tradition and Modernity in the Mediterranean: The Wedding as Symbolic Struggle.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baer, Marc. 2011. *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Barkan, Elazar, and Karen Barkey. 2015. *Choreographies of Shared Sacred Sites: Religion, Politics, and Conflict Resolution.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Barkey, Karen. 2005. "Islam and Toleration: Studying the Ottoman Imperial Model." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 19(1/2): 5–19.

———. 2008. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baskar, Bojan. 2012. "*Komšiluk* and Taking Care of the Neighbor's Shrine in Bosnia-Herzegovina." In *Sharing Sacred Spaces,* ed. Albera and Couroucli, 51–68.

Behar, Cem. 2003. *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul: Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap Ilyas Mahalle.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Bigelow, Anna. 2010. *Sharing the Sacred: Practicing Pluralism in Muslim North India.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowman, Glenn. 1993. "Nationalizing the Sacred: Shrines and Shifting Identities in the Israeli-Occupied Territories." *Man* 28(3): 431–60.

———. ed. 2012a. *Sharing the Sacra: The Politics and Pragmatics of Intercommunal Relations around Holy Places.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

———. 2012b. "Introduction: Sharing the Sacra." In *Sharing the Sacra,* ed. Bowman, 1–9.

———. 2012c. "Identification and Identity Formations around Sacred Shrines in West Bank Palestine and Western Macedonia." In *Sharing Sacred Spaces,* ed. Albera and Couroucli, 10–28.

Braude, Benjamin, and Bernard Lewis, eds. 1982. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society,* 2 vol. New York: Holmes & Meier.

Bringa, Tone, Debbie Christie, and Granada Television. 1993. *We Are All Neighbours.* London: Granada Television Productions.

Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond 'Identity'." *Theory and Society* 29: 1–47.

Bryant, Rebecca. 2004. *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus.* London: I. B. Tauris.

———. 2010. *The Past in Pieces: Belonging in the New Cyprus.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Candea, Matei. 2012. "*Derrida en Corse:* Hospitality as Scale-Free Abstraction." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.): S34–S48.

Candea, Matei, and Giovanni de Col. 2012. "The Return to Hospitality." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18 (N.S.): S1–S19.

Çetin, Cemal. 2014. "Osmanlı Toplumunda Mahalleden İhraç Kararları ve Tatbiki: Konya Örneği (1645–1750)" [Neighborhood expulsion decisions and their implementation in Ottoman society: The Konya example (1645–1750)]. *History Studies* 6(6): 43–70.

Chau, Adam Yuet. 2008. "The Sensorial Production of the Social." *Ethnos* 73(4): 485–504.

Constantinou, Costas M. 1996. *On the Way to Diplomacy.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Constantinou, Costas M. and Yiannis Papadakis. 2001. "The Cypriot State(s) *in situ*: Cross-ethnic Contact and the Discourse of Recognition." *Global Society* 15(2): 125–48.

———. 2006. "On Homo-Diplomacy." *Space and Culture* 9: 351–364.

Das, Veena. 2007. *Life and Words: Violence and Descent into the Ordinary.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Doumanis, Nicholas. 2012. *Before the Nation: Muslim-Christian Coexistence and its Destruction in Late-Ottoman Anatolia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Driessen, Hank. 2005. "Mediterranean Port Cities: Cosmopolitanism Reconsidered." *History and Anthropology* 16: 129–141.

Ergenç, Özer. 1984. "Osmanlı Şehrindeki 'Mahalle'nin İşlev ve Nitelikleri Üzerine" [The function and qualities of the "neighborhood" in the Ottoman city]. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 4: 69–78.

Fortna, Benjamin. 2002. *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fuhrmann, Malte. 2003. "Cosmopolitan Imperialists and the Ottoman Port Cities: Conflicting Logics in the Urban Social Fabric." *Cahiers de la Méditeranée* 67.

Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order.* New York: Basic Books.

Greene, Molly. 2002. *A Shared World: Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Grigoriadis, Ioannis N. 2012. *Instilling Religion in Greek and Turkish Nationalism: A "Sacred Synthesis."* New York: Palgrave.

Hadjiprokopiou, Panos. 2012. "Haunted by the Past and the Ambivalences of the Present: Immigrations and Thessalonica's Second Path to Cosmopolitanism." In *Post-Cosmopolitan Cities: Explorations of Urban Coexistence,* ed. Caroline Humphrey and Vera Skvirskaja, 194–216. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Halpern, Jodi, and Harvey M. Weinstein. 2004. "Rehumanizing the Other: Empathy and Reconciliation." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26(3): 561–583.

Hatay, Mete. 2011. "Coexistence or Domination? The Minaret and Belltower in Historical Perspective." Paper presented at the conference *Shared Spaces and their Dissolution: Practices of Coexistence in Cyprus and Elsewhere,* 14 October 2011, Nicosia, Cyprus.

Hayden, Robert. 2002. "Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites in South Asia and the Balkans." *Current Anthropology* 43(2): 205–31.

———. 2007. "Moral Vision and Impaired Insight: The Imagining of Other Peoples' Communities in Bosnia." *Current Anthropology* 48(1): 105–31.

Hayden, Robert M., and Timothy D. Walker. 2013. "Intersecting Religioscapes: A Comparative Approach to Trajectories of Change, Scale, and Competitive Sharing of Religious Spaces." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81(2): 399–426.

Henig, David. 2012. "'Knocking on my Neighbour's door: On Metamorphoses of Sociality in Rural Bosnia." *Critique of Anthropology* 32(1): 3–19.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1987. "'As In Your Own House': Hospitality, Ethnography, and the Stereotype of Mediterranean Society." In *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean,* ed. D. Gilmore, 75–89. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

———. 2012. "Afterword: Reciprocating the Hospitality of These Pages." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.): S210–S217.

Hirschon, Renee. 2010. "Dismantling the Millet: Religion and National Identity in Contemporary Greece." In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey,* ed. A. Aktar, N. Kızıyürek, and U. Özkırımlı. London: Palgrave.

Hızlı, Mefail. N.D. "Osmanlı Mahalle İmamlarının Performanslarına Dair" [Regarding the performances of Ottoman neighborhood Imams]. *Tesam Akademi Dergisi*: 41–51.

Hocart, A.M. 1952. "The Divinity of the Guest." In *The Life-Giving Myth and Other Essays,* 78–86. London: Methuen.

Humphrey, Caroline. 2012. "Hospitality and Tone: Holding Patterns for Strangeness in Rural Mongolia." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.): S63–S75.

İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin. 2004. *A Culture of Peaceful Coexistence: Early Islamic and Ottoman Turkish Examples.* Istanbul: Research Centre for Islamic History.

İnalcık, Halil. 1973. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600.* London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.

Jeganathan, Pradeep. 1997. "After a Riot: Anthropological Locations of Violence in an Urban Sri Lankan Community." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Department of Anthropology.

Jennings, Ronald C. 1978. "Kadi, Court and Legal Procedure in the 17th century Ottoman Kayseri." *Studia Islamica* 48: 133–72.

———. 1993. *Christian and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571–1640.* New York University Studies in Near Eastern Civilization XVIII. New York: University Press.

Karpat, Kemal H. 2010. *The Ottoman Mosaic: Exploring Models for Peace by Re-Exploring the Past.* Seattle, WA: Cune Press.

Kazıcı, Ziya. 1982. "Osmanlılarda Mahalle İmamlarının Bazı Görevleri" [Some duties of neighborhood Imams among the Ottomans]. *İslam Medeniyeti Mecmuası* 5(3).

Kende, Istvan. 1968. "Peaceful Co-Existence: Its Interpretation and Misinterpretation." *Journal of Peace Research* 5(4): 352–64.

Lafi, Nora. 2013. "Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism and its Contemporary Revivals: A Critical Approach." *New Geographies* 5: 325–33.

Lerner, Warren. 1964. "The Historical Origins of the Soviet Doctrine of Peaceful Coexistence." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 29: 865–70.

Leustean, Lucian N., ed. 2014. *Orthodox Christianity and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Southeastern Europe.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Lewis, Bernard. 1961. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lubkemann, Stephen C. 2008. *Culture in Chaos: An Anthropology of the Social Condition in War.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marsden, Magnus. 2012. "Fatal Embrace: Trading in Hospitality on the Frontiers of South and Central Asia." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.): S117–S130.

Masters, Bruce. 2004. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazower, Mark. 2005. *Salonica, City of Ghosts: Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430–1950.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Mehta, Deepak. 2002. "Writing the Riot: Between the Historiography and Ethnography of Communal Violence in India." In *History and the Present,* ed. P. Chatterjee and A. Ghosh, 209–41. New Delhi: Permanent Black.

Mehta, Deepak, and Roma Chatterji. 2001. "Boundaries, Names, Alterities: A Case Study of a 'Communal Riot' in Dharavi, Bombay." In *Remaking a World: Violence, Social Suffering, and Recovery,* ed. V. Das, A. Kleinman, M. Lock, M. Ramphele, and P. Reynolds, 201–49. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mills, Amy. 2008. "The Place of Locality for Identity in the Nation: Minority Narratives of Cosmopolitan Istanbul." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40(3): 383–401.

———. 2011. "The Ottoman Legacy: Urban Geographies, National Imaginaries, and Global Discourses of Tolerance." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 31(1): 183–95.

Mills, Amy, James A. Reilly, and Christine Philliou. 2011. "The Ottoman Empire from Present to Past: Memory and Ideology in Turkey and the Arab World." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 31(1): 133–36.

Nader, Laura. 1991. *Harmony Ideology: Justice and Control in a Zapotec Mountain Village.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Onar, Nora Fisher. 2009. "Echoes of a Universalism Lost: Rival Representations of the Ottomans in Today's Turkey." *Middle Eastern Studies* 45(2): 229–41.

Ortaylı, İlber. 2002. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Millet Sistemi" [The millet system in the Ottoman Empire]. *Türkler* X. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.

———. 2003. *Osmanlı Barışı* [The Ottoman peace]. Istanbul: Uçar Matbaası.

Özcan, Tahsin. 2001. "Osmanlı Mahallesi Sosyal Kontrol ve Kefalet Sistemi" [The social control and guarantee system of the Ottoman neighborhood]. *Marife* 1.

Özsoy, Osman. 1998. "Osmanlı Toplumunda Mahalleliler Arası Münasebetler" [Relations between neighbors in Ottoman society]. Tarih Dergisi, December 1998: 59–62. http://www.osar.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=240352.

Pandey, Gyanendra. 2006. *Routine Violence: Nations, Fragments, Histories.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pasieka, Agnieszka. 2014. "Neighbors: About the Multiculturalization of the Polish Past." *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 28(1): 225–51.

Pehar, Dražen. 2001. "Use of Ambiguities in Peace Agreements." In *Language and Diplomacy,* ed. Jovan Kurbalija and Hannah Slavik, 163–200. Malta: DiploProjects.

Peleikis, Anja. 2006. "The Making and Unmaking of Memories: The Case of a Multi-Confessional Village in Lebanon." In *Memory and Violence in the Middle East and North Africa,* ed. U. Makdisi and P. A. Silverstein, p. 133–150. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Philliou, Christine. 2008. "The Paradox of Perceptions: Interpreting the Ottoman Past through the National Present." *Middle Eastern Studies* 44: 661–75.

Ring, Laura. 2006. *Zenana: Everyday Peace in a Karachi Apartment Building.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Roberts, Simon. 1979/2013. *Order and Dispute: An Introduction to Legal Anthropology.* New Orleans, LA: Quid Pro Books.

Rodrigue, Aron. 1996. "Difference and Tolerance in the Ottoman Empire: Interview by Nancy Reynolds." *Stanford Electronic Humanities Review* 5(1), special issue, "Contested Polities." http://web.stanford.edu/group/SHR/5-1/text/rodrigue.html.

Sampson, Steven L. 2003. "From Reconciliation to Coexistence." *Public Culture* 15(1): 181–86.

Shaw, Stanford. 1976. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1985. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Azınlıklar" [Minorities in the Ottoman Empire]. *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* [Encyclopedia of Turkey from the Tanzimat to the Republic]. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Shryock, Andrew. 2004. "The New Jordanian Hospitality: House, Host, and Guest in the Culture of Public Display." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46: 35–62.

———. 2012. "Breaking Hospitality Apart: Bad Guests, Bad Hosts, and the Problem of Sovereignty." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.): S20–S33.

Singh, Bhrigupati. 2011. "Agonistic Intimacy and Moral Aspiration in Popular Hinduism: A Study in the Political Theology of the Neighbor." *American Ethnologist* 38(3): 430–50.

Sorabji, Cornelia. 2008. "Bosnian Neighbourhoods Revisited: Tolerance, Commitment and *Komšiluk* in Sarajevo." In *On the Margins of Religion,* ed. F. Pine and J. de Pina-Cabral, 97–114. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Starr, Deborah. 2005. "Recuperating Cosmopolitan Alexandria: Circulation of Narratives and Narratives of Circulation." *Cities* 22(3): 217–28.

Starr, June. 1978. *Dispute and Settlement in Rural Turkey: An Ethnography of Law.* Leiden: Brill.

Stefansson, Anders H. 2010. "Coffee after Cleansing? Co-existence, Co-operation, and Communication in Post-Conflict Bosnia and Herzgovina." *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 57: 62–76.

Stewart, Charles. 1999. "Syncretism and Its Synonyms: Reflections on Cultural Mixture." *Diacritics* 3: 40–62.

Suárez-Navaz, Liliana. 2004. *Reordering the Mediterranean: Boundaries and Citizenship in Southern Europe.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Tamdoğan, Işık. 2008. "*Sulh* and the 18th Century Ottoman Courts of Üsküdar and Adana." *Islamic Law and Society* 15: 55–83.

Tamdoğan-Abel, Işık. 2002. "Osmanlı Döneminden Günümüz Türkiye'sine 'Bizim mahalle'" ["Our neighborhood" from the Ottoman Period to present-day Turkey] *İstanbul Dergisi* 40: 66–70. http://www.os-ar.com/modules.php?name=Encyclopedia&op=content&tid=501674.

Tanyeri-Erdemir, Tuğba, Robert M. Hayden and Aykan Erdemir. 2014. "The Iconostatis in the Republic Mosque: Transformed Religious Sites as Artifacts of Intersecting Religioscapes." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46(2): 489–512.

Varshney, Ashutosh. 2003. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Yavuz, Hakan. 1998. "Turkish Identity and Foreign Policy in Flux: The Rise of Neo-Ottomanism." *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 12(7): 19–41.

Yılmaz, Fikret. 1999/2000. "XVI. yüzyılda Osmanlı toplumunda mahremiyetin sınırlarına dair" [On the limits of privacy in nineteenth-century Ottoman society]. *Toplum ve Bilim* 83: 92–110.

Yılmaz, Fikret, Emrah Safa Gürkan, and Chris Gratien. 2013. "Osmanlı'da Mahremiyetin Sınırları" [Limits of privacy among the Ottomans]. Ottoman History Podcast, No. 129 (9 November 2013) http://www.ottomanhistorypodcast.com/2013/11/private-public-sphere-ottoman-empire.html.

Yosmaoğlu, Ipek. 2014. *Blood Ties: Religion, Violence, and the Politics of Nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia, 1878–1908.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Zaim, Derviş. 2010. *Gölgeler ve Suretler* [Shadows and Faces]. Istanbul: Maraton Filmcilik.

Zarinebaf, Fariba. 2012. "Intercommunal Life in Istanbul During the Eighteenth Century." *Review of Middle East Studies* 46(1): 79–85.

Zizek, Slavoj, Eric L. Santner and Kenneth Reinhard. 2013. *The Neighbor: Three Inquiries in Political Theory, with a new Preface.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.