Chapter 7: (Un)Making boundaries

In exploring this corpus, I started from the most intriguing question about the roles played by the five relevant languages in establishing identification and belonging in Georgia's Greek community. This exploration posed a number of analytical tasks for the remainder of the analysis. The end of the Soviet Union as a (if not *the*) major turning point in the lives of my consultants came up in the analysis of the complex relationship between Russian and Georgian and was discussed in the previous Chapter. The breakup of the Soviet Family and the resulting dissolution of my consultants' families through emigration, for its part, demands an exploration of the situation in Greece in terms of changing frames of identification and belonging. This also emerges from how consultants speak about Standard Modern Greek, and will be explored in detail in Section A. of this Chapter.

The situation in Ts'alk'a and the boundaries drawn and contested there have come up in how consultants speak about the heritage variety Urum, and in how consultants in Ts'alk'a speak about "being left behind" when a substantial part of their community and family emigrated. Rather than only discussing this in the context of the post-Soviet transformations, in Section B. I will focus on the processes of boundary-making and contestation these transformations entail. That consultants frequently position themselves as Good Georgian Citizens raises the question where and how, if at all, boundaries are drawn between Greeks and Georgians. The analysis in Section C. will outline how my consultants' Belonging to Georgia creates a complex borderscape (cf. Brambilla 2015), in which boundaries may be blurred to the point of dissolution, while in other contexts they are perceived as remaining "uncrossable". Taken together with the analysis in Section D. of Religion and Ancestry as omnirelevant devices that consultants use to structure their social world (cf. Fitzgerald et al. 2009; Fitzgerald / Rintel 2013), the analysis in this Chapter will bring us one step closer to a context-sensitive theory of the (un)making of boundaries.

Note that while an exploration of differentiation *within* the community would be of interest,[1] I will limit this analysis to what I have already explored

1 Consultants' gender, for instance, appeared to play a role a number of times in whether they would address Nika Loladze or myself more often (cf. Chapter 4). Male consultants were a little more likely to have had personal experience of migration at the time of the

in terms of evaluating the respective "other" heritage variety (cf. Chapter 5). As I have done in the previous Chapters, I will as a matter of course continue pointing out internal differentiation in terms of settlement spaces, heritage variety, education, experience of migration etc. as and when they are important for the analysis.

Note also that while I focus in this chapter on the "big" collective categories like identification as Greek or Belonging to Georgia and on the relevance given to Ancestry and Religion by my consultants, these are certainly not the only social categories made relevant by consultants in drawing and contesting boundaries. These categories were focused in the interviews because we were interested in "the life of Greeks in Georgia" and due to some pointed questions on my part. Consultants frequently and sometimes at length made other social categories relevant, positioning themselves in terms of their family or professional roles, for instance.

A. Greece: Dealing with boundaries drawn by Others

In the previous Chapter we saw that the end of the Soviet Union led to the massive emigration of (not only) Greeks from Georgia, reducing their numbers from roughly 100,000 in 1989 to 5,500 in 2014 (Geostat, 2013, 2016), and quite drastically changing the demographics of particularly the rural locales from which they departed. In this Section, I will discuss the challenges to identification faced by the emigrants in Greece and Cyprus – as narrated by them and by consultants without personal experience of migration.[2] While migration poses challenges to any *émigrée*, emigration to Greece and Cyprus

interview (10 of 22 male consultants, 45.5%) than female consultants (11 of 27 female consultants, 40.7%). However, regarding their answers and positionings, gender does not appear to play a decisive role. In terms of dealing with emigrating family members, for instance, gender does not predict whether someone will tell us about this having caused her or him pain (though no male consultant told us about crying in this context, they do talk about it being painful). In terms of explaining the decision not to emigrate themselves, consultants of all genders tell us about their close emotional ties to Georgia and/or about deciding to stay or return because of their children or ailing parents (i.e. it is not the case that care work keeps only female consultants from emigrating). There is, however, one reason given only by female consultants: seven tell us that they either came back or stayed due to their husband not wanting to leave.

2 As outlined in Chapter 2, these difficulties are in no way restricted to the post-Soviet Greek "co-ethnic" migration, cf. also Hess (2010); Panagiotidis (2019), and contributions in Čapo Žmegač et al. (2010).

confronted members of Georgia's Greek population with challenges to their core identification: the discourses linking national affiliation with Ancestry and Religion – historically so potent in terms of the life and fate of their imagined community – were suddenly challenged by the expectation that a "real Greek" should speak SMG. I am particularly interested in the boundary drawn by the Greek societal majority, which consultants have to cope with communicatively in our interview conversations.

Even though not all of my consultants have personal experience of migration (21 consultants, 43%), the situation in Greece is frequently discussed, with and without my prompting. If the Soviet Union in many ways functions as the historical point of comparison, Greece is the contemporary point of comparison, even for those consultants who have not left Georgia or who have returned. In exploring this issue, I will not dwell so much on the difficult experiences my consultants have had – at times of blatant discrimination – but rather on how they communicatively come to terms with these experiences in relating them to me. Here, the Resilience introduced in the last Chapter plays an important role, as does the struggle over a Redefinition of categories, ascriptions and evaluations.

First, however, I will explore how post-Soviet Greek immigrants, including those from Georgia, are labeled in Greece. This is an *external identification* (cf. Jenkins, 1994; Tabouret-Keller, 1997) and one with which most consultants do not align themselves. On the contrary, they speak of being labeled forcefully and counter to their self-identification. The most common label are versions of *rosopóntioi* 'Russian-Pontic' (SMG), given either in Russian or SMG, categorizing the individual so-labeled as an "Asia Minor Greek from Russia" or a "Russian Asia Minor Greek". This label is a complex one. At first glance, it comprises two geographical categories "Pontos" and "Russia", tracing a geographical trajectory from the South-Eastern coast of the Black Sea to "Russia" – the latter either referring to the contemporary Russian nation state or *pars pro toto* for the Soviet Union. As exemplified in excerpt 24 below (Section I.), this is in fact mostly taken to refer to the former, and thereby perceived as an incorrect attribution. Secondly, *pontiakí* 'Pontic' (SMG) in Greece also refers to those displaced Asia Minor Greeks who came to Greece as part of the population exchange following the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 (cf. Chapter 2). Greeks from post-Soviet states are thus labeled as what might loosely be translated as "Russian Asia Minor Greek refugees". While some of my consultants refer to their community as *pontiytsy* 'Pontics' in Russian and express pride in this label as it traces their

Table 7.1: Being accepted as "genuine Greeks" in Greece

	yes		no		nuanced		unsure		no answer		total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Urum urban	0	0	5	45.5	3	27.3	1	9.1	2	18.2	11	100
Urum rural	2	16.6	4	33.3	4	33.3	0	0	2	16.6	12	100
Pontic urban	0	0	6	60	2	20	1	10	1	0	10	100
Pontic rural	3	18.5	10	62.5	1	6.25	1	6.25	1	6.25	16	100
Total	5	10.2	25	51	10	20.4	3	6.1	6	12.2	49	100

provenance,[3] the same consultants consider "being Pontic" a part of "being Greek". In how they talk about being categorized as "(Russian-)Pontic" in Greece they make it clear, however, that this label is used towards people perceived to be "not truly Greek", thereby negating the self-identification of the persons thus categorized and denying them "Greek" category membership. This is borne out by the informal conversations we had in Thessaloniki and Athens in 2014 with "Greek Greek" consultants and acquaintances: all of them considered "(Russian-)Pontic" to be a pejorative term. The literature on the subject provides further evidence (cf. Kaurinkoski, 2010; Sideri, 2006; Hionidou, 2012).

The fact that Georgian and other post-Soviet Greeks are labeled in such a way, already indicates the type of difficulties these individuals faced in being accepted as Greeks in Greece. Table 7.1 gives my consultants' answers to the question: *schitayut li v gretsii gruzinskikh grekov nastoyashchimi grekami* "Do they consider Georgian Greeks to be genuine Greeks in Greece?" This is, of course, a very direct and closed question, intended to get an explicit statement and to be the starting point for further explanation. I asked this question after carefully exploring the topic of Greek emigration with a number of open questions – unless, of course, consultants had already brought up the topic themselves. A clear "yes" answer was given very rarely, by 3 Pontic and 2 Urum Greeks (10.2% of the whole sample), notably only in rural areas. "No" is the answer most often given, by 25 consultants (51%) in total. Interestingly, Pontic Greeks answer "no" more often than Urum Greeks: a

3 NP for instance tells me *my nastoyashchye pontyitsy* "we are genuine Pontics" (NP, 15:32).

total of 16 Pontic Greeks (61.5% of all Pontic Greeks) were very clear in their answer, compared to a total of 9 (39%) Urum Greek consultants.[4]

Both in rural Kvemo Kartli and in urban Tbilisi, Urum Greeks were a little more likely to give a nuanced answer to this question than Pontic Greeks. These nuanced answers can be further split into two subsets: rural Urum Greeks in particular (3) talk about a change over time, i.e. things having "gotten better" since they or their family members first arrived in Greece. This is usually explained by the rising levels of competence in SMG among both first- and second-generation Georgian Greek immigrants to Greece, or those who were children when their parents emigrated with them. Crucially, the importance of competence in SMG does not only affect Urum Greeks in Greece. IA's Pontic Greek niece, for instance, tells us about not wanting her mother to speak Russian with her in her Greek school for fear of being bullied by her classmates (IA, 0:32:35-0:33:00). We are told that her younger sister need not live with this fear of persecution due to the combined factors of her competence in SMG and shifting attitudes among the Greek societal majority. The other variety of "nuanced" answers stated that it depended on the education of the "Greek Greek" interlocutor – and in some cases also on the education and demeanor of the "Georgian Greek" (cf. Section II. below). The three consultants stating they were "unsure" did not have any personal experience of migration to Greece and explained their answer with a lack of information.

For the other answers, when we take the migration experiences of consultants into account, the picture becomes a little more complex. Of the five consultants answering "yes", four have lived and worked in Greece. The same holds for seven of the ten consultants who draw a differentiated picture. The "no" response, however, is not predicted by a consultant's personal experience of migration. Only 10 of the 25 consultants answering that Georgian Greeks were not accepted as "Greeks" in Greece have personal experience of migration. This underlines the importance of the communicative networks existing between those members of Georgia's Greek community who emigrated and those who remained in or have since returned to Georgia. Returnees' accounts of their experiences are a key source of information on life in Greece for those

4 Note that this does not match the "commonsensical" expectation that Pontic Greeks might have faced fewer negative experiences in Greece due to their competence in Pontic Greek easing linguistic assimilation. It is possible, however, that Georgian Pontic Greeks did face fewer difficulties in Greece than Urum Greeks, but that my Pontic Greek consultants answered on the basis of their perception of the community's (non)acceptance as a whole, rather than their own and family members' experiences.

who have not experienced it themselves, as explored in detail in Loladze (2019).

As mentioned above, the "Greek Greek" discourse on the importance of Language for national affiliation emerges quite strongly in some of the interviews, for instance in the conversation with LP (cf. Section III.). He tells us that the attribute *turkofonos* "turkophone" was used pejoratively against him in a court case by the judge himself (excerpt 28). The experiences my consultants share in the interviews are corroborated by accounts in the academic literature on post-Soviet Greek immigrants to Greece and Cyprus (cf. Hionidou, 2012; Kaurinkoski, 2010; Sideri, 2006; Zoumpalidis, 2016), as well as in a recent poll stressing the importance of speaking the national language in order to be accepted as "truly Greek" (Stokes, 2017).

Consultants also talk about having to deal with a different challenge, namely whether or not their Ancestry suffices for them to be recognized as Greek. As we have seen in the previous Chapters, this point emerges from many interviews. The question underlying this struggle is whether Citizenship and Language, or Ancestry and Religion are more important for being Greek. This is a fruitful topic for the analysis of boundary (un)making, as it shows how the definition of the central category-bound attribute is negotiated and contested, and how individuals or larger collectives are included or excluded from membership in the social category Greek. Consultants vary greatly in how they cope with this boundary question, both in terms of how they dealt with it in interactions in Greece and in talking about it in our interviews, where they attribute varying degrees of strength and durability to this central boundary.

In the following, I will look at three ways in which consultants deal with this challenge in our conversations. The first involves subtly ridiculing the challenge and thereby "playing it down" (Section I.). The second aligns itself with what consultants perceive to be the "Greek Greek" position (Section II.), and the third redefines what it means to be Greek (Section III.), at times quite brutally, mirroring the aggression directed at the narrator.

I. Being categorized as "Different" in Greece

I will now start the exploration of how consultants deal with being "wrongly" categorized as "different" in Greece, by taking a closer look at how OP, the Pontic Greek man from Batumi (cf. excerpt 16), ridicules this categorization. OP starts talking about not being accepted in Greece without me having asked

about it. When I ask him why Greeks emigrated, he explains extensively that it was for economic reasons and that his family situation meant he could not leave Georgia for good. He also states that his two adult children will have to decide for themselves and concludes that even though life "there" in Greece might be "not bad", life in Georgia would offer them "more comfort". He goes on to contrast this feeling of belonging with being othered in Greece:

(24) They consider us to be strangers (OP, 0:30:56-0:31:36)

1	OP:	*°h tam im vsë-taki °h vy znaete kak by nas my ne*
		there them nevertheless you_PL know_2PL as if us we not
2		*govorili chto my greki e:: to së (xxx) no my (-) nas oni*
		said_PL that we Greeks that this (xxx) but we us they
3		*vsë ravno schitayut gru_e chuzhimi (–)*
		everything equal count_they Geor_ strangers
4	NL:	*[pravda]*
		truth
5	CH:	[hm]
6	OP:	*chuzhimi*
		strangers
7	NL:	mhm
8	OP:	*°h nu (-) a i za a za glaza govoryat russkie (-)*
		well and and behind and behind eyes say_they Russians
9		*[((laughs))]*
10	CH:	[((laughs))]
11	NL:	[((chuckles))]
12	OP:	*a ya govoryu (—) nu nado zhe bylo (-) da (-) vsyu e:*
		and I say_I well necessary again was yes whole
13		*zhizn' prozhil e:: v etom v: gru_ e: (-) e nu (-) v sovetskom*
		life lived_M in this in Geor_ well in Soviet
14		*[soyuze]*
		Union
15	NL:	*[da]*
		yes
16	OP:	*da °h i:: e u menya v pasporte bylo napisano grek (-) ya*
		yes and at me in passport was written Greek_M I
17		*znal chto ya grek [°h]*
		knew_M that I Greek_M
18	CH:	[hm]
19	OP:	*a ya priekhal e shchas v gretsiyu °h okazyvaetsya ya*
		and I came_M now to Greece appears I
20		*uznal chto ya russkiy [((laughs))]*
		found_out_M that I Russian_M

21	CH:	[((laughs))]
22	NL:	[((chuckles))]
23	OP:	<< *smiling* > *vot tak (-) paradoks* >
		well so paradox
24	CH:	((chuckles))
25	OP:	*paradoks*
		paradox

1	OP:	there to them anyway, you know how they would, we wouldn't say that
2		we're Greeks and all that but all the same they consider us to be Geor_
3		strangers
4	NL:	[really?]
5	CH:	[hm]
6	OP:	strangers
7	NL:	mhm
8	OP:	well, and behind our back they say Russians [((laughs))]
10	CH:	[((laughs))]
11	NL:	[((chuckles))]
12	OP:	and I say well, you don't say! right? all my life I lived in this Geor_
13		well in the Soviet Union
15	NL:	[yes]
16	OP:	right? and in my passport was written Greek, I knew that I'm Greek
18	CH:	[hm]
19	OP:	but when I came now to Greece I found out that I'm Russian
20		[((laughs))]
21	CH:	[((laughs))]
22	NL:	[((chuckles))]
23	OP:	<< *smiling* > there you have it, a paradox >
24	CH:	((chuckles))
25	OP:	paradox

Having just before spoken about how "comfortable" life is in Georgia, OP needs a few starts in order to contrast it with things *tam* "there" (1). One of them is the mitigation that "we" – in this case broadly comprising "Georgian Greeks – did not boastfully proclaim being "Greek" (1-2), thereby dispelling any potential doubts about "our" demeanor. He then turns to the perspective taken by "them", here referring to "Greeks in Greece": *nas oni vsë ravno schitayut gru_e chuzhimi* "all the same they consider us Geo_ strangers" (2-3). The false start *gru_e*, which would have led to an utterance of *gruziny*, 'Georgians' is notable in that other consultants also tell us of being categorized as "Georgians", wrongly in their view.[5] The target word *chuzhimi* "strangers"

5 For instance LP in excerpt 28 below. They also tell us that "Georgians" have a bad reputation in Greece for all sorts of (organized) criminality; cf. also IP's and LP's

appears to surprise NL, who asks for confirmation (4), and is repeated by OP (6), affirming his statement. The experience of being considered a "stranger" in Greece, a country associated with "Greekness", would alone be enough to pose a challenge to self-identification as "Greek". OP goes on to describe an even stronger challenge: *a za glaza govoryat russkie* "and behind our backs they say Russians" (8). The perception of this as surprisingly incorrect and (intentionally) insulting is acknowledged by all three of us laughing (9-11).

OP positions himself as dealing with the insult through humor and, importantly, by not being moved by it – differing markedly from how LP narrates his reaction in Section III.. This is interactively achieved by a metacommunicative ironic exclamation *nu nado zhe bylo* "well, you don't say!" (12). He goes on to reference the Soviet documentation of its subjects' national affiliation in their internal passports (12-16).[6] He explains that he had lived his *vsyu zhizn'* "whole life" (12-13) in a space he starts to refer to as "Georgia" but then corrects himself to call "Soviet Union" (13-14). During this "long time", he carried a document, namely his passport, stating his national affiliation as *grek* "Greek" (16). He draws his knowledge about his national affiliation from this official document in the sequences captured in this excerpt: *ya znal chto ya grek* "I knew that I was Greek" (16-17). Importantly, in this account OP's national affiliation is not something he could choose or that might be somehow in doubt, since an official document like a passport is not subject to interpretation, but rather serves as "proof" of its holder's belonging. This unquestionable and secure knowledge is contrasted, however, with his "arrival" many years later in Greece, where he suddenly found out that his national affiliation had supposedly changed *okazyvaetsya ya uznal chto ya russkiy* "it turns out, I found out that I'm Russian" (19-20). That someone with official documents is made to "suddenly find out" about his "real affiliation" at such a late state in life, is established sarcastically as ridiculous. This is again acknowledged by all three of us laughing (20-22) and repeatedly evaluated as *paradoks* "a paradox" by OP (23, 25).

Bearing in mind that up to this point in the interview I had not yet asked about his evaluation of the acceptance of Georgian Greeks in Greece, this experience of being othered emerges as a very strong reason in answering my earlier question about his motives for returning to Georgia. The Resilience

accounts in the following Sections. Note that this is in line with popular discourse in Georgia, with one common joke alleging that Mikheil Saakashvili's 2004 police reform was so "successful" because "all the Georgian criminals left" for Western Europe.

6 Cf. Chapter 2; Arel (2006); Brubaker (1996); Slezkine (1994); Suny (1993).

already uncovered in Chapter 6 here takes the form of interactively framing his negative experience in a way that leaves his interlocutors with only one possible evaluation: that the categorization and behavior he attributes to the out-group is "laughable". The attack thereby loses its force, leaving the narrator in a position of strength, having not allowed his confidence to be swayed.

The social boundary emerging in excerpt 24 is one drawn by the "Greek Greek" out-group. Importantly, only by drawing this boundary do they become an out-group, rather than a potential locus of belonging for OP and his community. This is done by their categorizing OP's in-group as "strangers" and "Russians". While the former might be interpreted as a category dissolving over time, the latter category is set up in this excerpt as not only incorrect but also durable: a "Russian" is unlikely to change into a "Greek" in this view. OP's way of dealing with this boundary is twofold: firstly, by returning to Georgia which he had described as a place where he feels he belongs, and secondly by playing down the boundary in the interview situation through ridicule.

We then go on to discuss his migration trajectory, which saw him work in Greece as a sailor for months or a year at a time before coming back to spend time with his wife and children. A little later I ask whether it is necessary to speak SMG in order to consider oneself Greek. By way of an answer he explains how his definition of what it means to "be Greek" was fundamentally questioned by his experiences in Greece.

(25) What does it mean to be Greek? (OP, 0:42:33-0:43:18)[7]

1	OP:	*vy znaete chto (-) posle togo kak ya priekhal v gretsiyu* you_2PL know_2PL that after that how I came_M to Greece
2		*ya mnogo ponyal (–) chto (—) a chto takoe grek* I much understood_M what and what such Greek_M
3	NL:	mhm
4	OP:	*chto takoe grek °h my ran'she dumali tak znaete °h eto* what such Greek we earlier thought_PL so know_2PL this
5		*krov' tam tuda-syuda da* blood there there-here yes
6	CH:	hm
7	OP:	*khotya (-) a potom ya kogda poekhal v gretsiyu (-) da i ne* although but then I when went_M to Greece yes and not
8		*tol'ko gretsiyu tam po vsey evrope [°h]* only Greece there by whole Europe

7 In this excerpt, utterances in SMG are underlined.

9	NL:	[mhm]
10	OP:	*tam-zhe kak (-) e: lyudi e:: i drugoy natsional'nosti no* there how people and other nationality but
11		*rozhdënnye uzhe v gre[tsii] oni schitayutsya grekami* born_PL already in Greece they considered_they Greeks
12	NL:	*[mhm] da* yes
13	CH:	[hm]
14	OP:	*[tam] bylo napisano ellin nu tam my zna_ e_ellin da* there was written Greek well there we kno_ Greek yes
15	CH:	*da* yes
16	OP:	*ellada ellada ellin [da]* Greece Greece Greek yes
17	NL:	*[da]* yes
18	CH:	hm (–)
19	OP:	*negr (-) grek (–) tam arab grek (-) uzkoglazye nu kitaets* Negro Greek there Arab Greek narrow-eyed well Chinese
20		*grek (–) a kak ya posle etogo ne mogu skazat' chto vot* Greek and how I after this not can_I to_say that there
21		*[takoe]* such
22	CH:	[mhm]
23	OP:	*razlichie nu i poetomu (-) no esli ty khochesh' sebya* difference well and therefore but if you_2SG want_2SG self
24		*schitat' grekom schitay tak* to_count Greek count_2SG so

1	OP:	you know after I came to Greece I understood a lot about what a Greek
2		is
3	NL:	mhm
4	OP:	what is a Greek, we thought earlier, you know, it's this blood that goes
5		here back and forth, right?
6	CH:	hm
7	OP:	but later, when I went to Greece, right, and not only to Greece but all
8		over Europe [°h]
9	NL:	[mhm]
10	OP:	how is it there? people who have another nationality but were born in
11		[Greece], they are considered Greeks
12	NL:	[mhm] yes
13	CH:	[hm]
14	OP:	there was written Greek, well, there we kno_ Greek, right?
15	CH:	yes

16 OP: Greece Greece Greek [right?]
17 NL: [yes]
18 CH: hm
19 OP: a Black guy – Greek, there an Arab is Greek, narrow eyed, well,
20 Chinese is Greek and how could I after that, I can't say that there is
21 [such]
22 CH: [mhm]
23 OP: a difference and that therefore, but if you want to consider yourself
24 Greek, consider yourself so

OP opens his answer by referring to his understanding having been influenced, perhaps even changed, by the time he spent in Greece (1-2). He describes this understanding as extensive: *ya mnogo ponyal* "I understood a lot" about *chto takoe grek* "what is a Greek", which he repeats (2-4). Subsequent to this opening, he tells us how his in-group had *ran'she* "earlier" considered this question, namely as one of *krov'* "blood" (5) moving *tuda-syuda* "back and forth" (5). This movement of the blood is emphasized by him tracing lines on his left forearm with his right index finger. This underscores the immediate corporeal availability of "blood" as a marker of belonging. Identification as Greek is thereby established as depending on "Greek blood", i.e. Greek Ancestry. He contrasts this "simple" and "accessible" understanding with a space where things are very different, namely "Greece" (7) and *tam po vsey evrope* "there all over Europe" (8).

He orients our expectation with the rhetorical question *tam-zhe kak* "how is it there?" (10) and answers with the general statement that it is not *natsional'nosti* "nationality" that determines whether somebody might be considered as Greek but their place of birth (10-11). Like in excerpt 24, OP draws on official documentation in order to ascertain the categorization as "Greek" (14). While *tam bylo napisano ellin* "there was written Greek" (14) is ambiguous in terms of specifying where exactly "Greek" was written, the conversation preceding this excerpt points to *tam* 'there' referring to official documentation like passports or identity cards. He repeats both "Greek" and "Greece" in SMG, clarifying for the non-SMG speakers NL and myself the connection or possibly the derivation of the term *ellin* 'Greek' from *ellada* 'Greece' (14-16). OP then proceeds to illustrate the generalization with a list of examples, which are uniformly presented: by stating a category followed by the attributed Greek government's official classification as *grek* "Greek" (19-20).[8] As with FD in excerpt 12, the list comprises individual people

8 This is a textbook example of how generalizations are established and "proven" through three-item lists, as discussed for instance in Roth (2005).

who are constructed as instantiations of various "groups" perceived to be "incongruous" with OP's initial "simple" definition of belonging determined by ancestry. The list comprises a "black guy", as an instance of perceived phenotypical difference, an "Arab", as an instance of perceived religious difference, and finally a "Chinese". The last is initially introduced by a phenotypical feature perceived to be different before the category label is invoked. The "Chinese" person is thereby marked both by their perceived phenotypical difference and by being perceived as hailing from "far away". All three examples are thus constructed by OP as "unlikely Greeks", or extreme cases as per Pomerantz (1986). This especially since these three instances are perceived as categories belonging by ancestry to spaces OP had previously dismissed as "civilized" points of comparison in excerpt 16 (cf. Chapter 6). This is notable due to how much emphasis OP puts on "Greek civilization" as the "founding civilization of Europe" in preceding sequences of the interview. Furthermore, the list does not include an example of someone whose national affiliation would have been afforded by the immediate interview context – "Georgian Greek" or "post-Soviet Greek", "Georgian", or "German". Neither does it include an example of a person from the post-Soviet or European space, which OP had previously characterized as "closer" in terms of "culture".

In the following, OP returns to my question and states that *posle etogo* "after this" (20) he is unable to tell what the *razlichie* "difference" (23) would be. He therefore positions himself as someone unable to pass judgment on somebody's identification as Greek, since his heuristic for decision-making – ancestry – is portrayed as having been unhinged by the citizenship policies of contemporary Greece and Europe. He then answers the question by locating the decision in the individual: *no esli ty khochesh' sebya schitat' grekom schitay tak* "but if you want to consider yourself Greek, consider yourself so" (23-24). He thereby adopts for himself the seemingly *laissez faire* attitude he had just attributed to the contemporary Greek state. The boundary which the "Greek Greek" out-group is positioned as having established in excerpt 24 between "Greeks" and "Russians" is thereby described as dissolving to the point of non-existence, resulting in the category "Greek" being seemingly "arbitrary" and in category membership depending on the individual's autonomous self-identification.

Importantly, while "what we thought earlier" is portrayed as "simple" and perhaps a little "backwards", it at least provides – according to OP – a clear definition of who belongs and who does not. His difficulty in coming to terms with multi-ethnic citizenship in contemporary Greece might be explained as a tidemark of Soviet governance. As outlined in Chapter 2, this relied on

every one of its subjects being doubly categorized (and in many cases thereby doubly governed): as a member *qua* birth of a certain "nationality" and as a "Soviet citizen". From such a perspective, it may be possible to acquire Greek citizenship but never Greek nationality. And since (at least in principle) contemporary European nation states conflate their subjects' "nationality" and "citizenship", they are thereby seen as committing a category mistake.

This different conceptualization might not have been such a relevant problem for OP had he not been offensively categorized as "Russian" himself and thereby denied identification as part of a collective he believes he "rightfully" belongs to by virtue of his Greek Ancestry. Note that this conceptual difference is not made explicit by OP, who only speaks of "nationality" and "being Greek". It is, however, made very explicit by IP and his friend TV in a small Pontic village, as we will see in the following Section. It is also at the heart of the excerpts explored in Section III., although not explicitly in these terms.

II. Relating "Nation" and "Citizenship"

Like excerpt 17 (Chapter 6), the following excerpt 26 is a long one, this time because IP devotes a substantial amount of conversational energy to explaining exactly what he sees as the conceptual differences behind the difficulties his in-group experienced in Greece. Overall, he positions Greece as "more advanced" on a continuum of progress than the post-Soviet space, where people "hold on to out-dated notions" – something he deplores. While he and his friend TV continually position themselves as closer to the "Greek Greek" type of "progress", they nevertheless remain deeply rooted in the Georgian post-Soviet space, as evident in both their exasperation and word choice. This excerpt is therefore not only important because a consultant explains the conceptual traces he perceives the Soviet Union to have left in the minds of his community; it is also a poignant example of a consultant positioning himself as maintaining a different position from that which he attributes to his in-group.

About two minutes before excerpt 26, I ask whether Georgian Greeks are accepted as "genuine Greeks" in Greece. IP denies this, and states that it is a general rule the world over, thereby Normalizing this denial of belonging. TV supports him a little later, explaining that people in Western Germany also initially did not accept those from Eastern Germany as "real Germans" after the GDR came to an end. Both agree that this has something to do

with "communism" "changing" its subjects. According to them, there were additional difficulties, however, with *bezhentsy* "refugees" arriving in much greater numbers *kak eti murav'i* "like ants" (IP, 0:46:36) and bringing "chaos" and "criminality" with them. Importantly, the category "refugees" is not restricted to post-Soviet "Greeks" but comprises all post-Soviet immigrants to Greece, which according to them were numerous.

In establishing their language competence, I list the languages I caught from the preceding conversation as "Russian", "Georgian", and "Pontic" (IP, 0:48:41). I use the label *pontiyskiy* 'Pontic' like IP and TV had both done previously in the conversation, for example in excerpt 4 (cf. Chapter 5), where IP positions "Pontic" as closer to "Ancient Greek" than SMG. Some 40 minutes later, however, I am corrected for using this label and IP asserts that "Pontic" and "Greek" are basically the same language (IP, 0:48:50). He goes on to suggest that the "slight differences" in the language varieties may have been the starting point of the difficulties in Greece with them being considered "Greeks but somehow different Greeks", "Greeks" who were raised to be "Russian citizens" (IP, 0:49:10-0:49:22). Note how defining "Pontic" a little differently in different sequences of the same interview allows IP to emphasize different aspects of his community's belonging and thereby to position them differently. Whereas in excerpt 4 he focused on his in-group's historical trajectory and their link to "Ancient Greece" and "Byzantium", he now problematizes the Soviet traces in his community's definitions of "nation" and "citizenship", and discusses how these definitions are at odds with the ones used in contemporary Greece. This time, Language is not taken to be crucial and differences between the two varieties are downplayed, so as to exclude the possibility that they might play a role in the differing conceptualizations of "nation" and "citizenship".[9]

(26) Relating nation and citizenship (IP, 0:49:22-0:51:02)

1	IP:	*i vo-pervykh chto ya ponyal eto ya davno* and firstly what I understood_M this I long_ago
2		*ponyal* understood_M
3	CH:	hm

9 Importantly, these nuances are not captured in the way most studies on *language attitude* have traditionally been carried out, with the exception of those focusing on the discursive function of these attitude expressions, as for instance in Potter / Wetherell (1987) (cf. the discussion in the beginning of Chapter 5).

4	IP:	*°h a vot nashi naprimer do sikh por ne ponyali*
		and well our for_example till these times not understood_PL
5		*etogo*
		this
6	CH:	hm
7	IP:	*eto mnogie poka*
		this many so_far
8	CH:	*da*
		yes
9	IP:	*°h (—) zhivësh' (–) v gosudarstve (-) ty prinyal*
		live_2SG in state you accepted_M
10		*grazhdanstvo (–) ty stanovish'sya chlenom etogo gosudarstva (-)*
		citizenship you become_2SG member of_this state
11	CH:	hm
12	IP:	*eto (–) [ochen'] ochen' normal'no ochen' pravil'no ochen' tak i*
		this very very normally very correctly very so and
13		*dolzhno bylo byt'*
		should was_N to_be
14	TV:	*[normal'no]*
		normally
15	CH:	*[da]*
		yes
16	TV:	*[tak i dolzhno] byt'*
		so and should to_be
17	IP:	*a my srazu tuda uekhali my govorim my greki*
		and we at_once to_there went_PL we say_we we Greeks
18	CH:	hm
19	IP:	*na nas smotreli ochen' (-) udivlënno nu i chto chto ty*
		at us looked_PL very surprised well and what that you
20		*grek [ty ne nash]*
		Greek_M you not our
21	CH:	[((chuckles))]
22	NL:	[((chuckles))]
23	IP:	*ty drugogo gosudarstva grek °h russo-poslannyy*
		you of_other state Greek_M Russian-sent
24		*russko-poddannyy*
		Russian-subject
25	CH:	[hm]
26	NL:	*[da]*
		yes
27	IP:	*a my obizhalis' (-) kak eto*
		and we took_offence_PL how this
28	CH:	hm

29	IP:	*ya grek priekhal v gretsiyu a mne govorish' ty russo_*
		I Greek came_M to Greece and me tell_2SG you
30		*russko-poddannyy*
		Russian-subject
31	CH:	hm
32	IP:	*m:y [zakhoteli chto my srazu]*
		we wanted_PL that we at_once
33	TV:	*[ponyatie natsii i grazhdanstva u nikh uzhe]*
		concept nation and citizenship at them already
34	IP:	*[ty grek] davay ty grek*
		you Greek_M go_on_2SG you Greek
35	CH:	*[<< smiling > da >]*
		yes
36	CH:	*[da]*
		yes
37	TV:	*[v evro]pe drugoy u nas*
		in Europe different at us
38	IP:	*a vot (-) a vot tam p p po-drugomu [tam pravil'no*
		and here (-) and here there differently there correctly
39		*postavleny veshchi (–) tam negr zhivët]*
		arranged things there Negro lives
40	TV:	*[tonkie momenty kak govorit ((first name)) vostok delo tonkoe*
		delicate moments how says ((first name)) East matter delicate
41		*nu]*
		well
42	IP:	*dopustim negr zazhil tam da (–) prinyal e:*
		assume_we Negro lived_M there yes accepted_M
43	CH:	hm
44	IP:	*prozhil pyat' desyat' let i on prinyal poddanstvo on*
		lived_M five ten years and he accepted_PL citizenship he
45		*uzhe grek*
		already Greek_M
46	CH:	[hm]
47	NL:	*[da]*
		yes
48	IP:	*°h tam ne smotryat imenno na natsiyu*
		there not look_they namely on nation
49	CH:	hm
50	IP:	*tam smotryat na grazhdanstvo*
		there look_they on citizenship
51	TV:	*da*
		yes

52 IP: *o natsii rechi netu °h a u nas poka eto derzhitsya*
about nation speech is_not and at us so_far this holds
53 *[shovinisticheskie]*
chauvinistic
54 TV: *[da]*
yes
55 IP: *[ponyatiya]*
notions
56 NL: *[da da]*
yes yes
57 TV: *da*
yes
58 IP: *natsii*
of_nation
59 TV: *da*
yes
60 CH: hm
61 IP: *vot eto ponimaesh' eto eto [dolzhen byt' period °h]*
well this understand_2SG this this should_M to_be period
62 TV: *[nu so vremenem eto uydët eto]*
well with time this will_go this
63 CH: *da*
yes
64 IP: *[period chtob eto chelovek ponyal]*
period so_that this person understood_M
65 TV: *[uzhe pervyy shag uzhe sdelan chtob] v pasporte uzhe ne*
already first step already done_M so_that in passport already not
66 *pishut natsional'nost' nichego pervyy shag sdelan da (xxx)*
write_they nationality nothing first step done_M yes
67 IP: *shagi z_ [sdelany]*
steps done
68 CH: *[da]*
yes
69 IP: *nO (-) e: poka [izmenitsya eto ne tak skoro chtob dopustim]*
but still will_change this not so soon so_that assume_we
70 TV: *[izmenitsya eto i tak dolzhno byt' eto]*
will_change this and so should to_be this
71 CH: [hm]
72 IP: *[my] ne govorili o natsii govorili tol'ko o grazhdanstve*
we not spoke_PL about nation spoke_PL only about citizenship
73 TV: *o grazhdanstve*
about citizenship

74	IP:	*potomu chto (-) poka etot (-) sovetskaya etot (–) derzhitsya [sidit eto*
		because that still this Soviet this holds sits this
75		*°h (-) shovinizm sidit]*
		(-) chauvinism sits
76	TV:	*[sidit sidit sidit sidit tem bolee chto]*
		sits sits sits sits that more that
77	IP:	*(—) °h khot' eto ne zametno mozhet [e:] obizhaetsya*
		even_though this not noticeable might takes_offence
78		*kto-to drugoy esli skazhu (x) sidit eto pravda*
		somebody other if will_say_I sits this truth
79	TV:	*[mhm] pravda*
		truth
80	IP:	*tak i [est']*
		so and is
81	NL:	*da*
		yes
82	TV:	*eto pravda*
		this truth

1	IP:	and firstly, what I understood, this I've understood long ago
3	CH:	hm
4	IP:	but our people for example, until now they haven't understood this
6	CH:	hm
7	IP:	there's still many there
8	CH:	yes
9	IP:	you live in a state, you took the citizenship, you become a member of
10		that state
11	CH:	hm
12	IP:	this is [very] very normal, very correct and very much how it should be
14	TV:	[normal]
15	CH:	[yes]
16	TV:	[like it should] be
17	IP:	but we went there and immediately said we're Greeks
18	CH:	hm
19	IP:	they looked at us very surprised, well so what that you're Greek? [Your
20		not one of ours,]
21	CH:	[((chuckles))]
22	NL:	[((chuckles))]
23	IP:	you're Greek of a different state, Russian-sent, a Russian citizen
25	CH:	[hm]
26	NL:	[yes]
27	IP:	but we were offended, how is this possible?
28	CH:	hm
29	IP:	I'm Greek, I came to Greece and you tell me you're a Russian subject

31	CH:	hm
32	IP:	we [wanted that we immediately]
33	TV:	[their concept of nation and citizenship is already]
34	IP:	[you're Greek,] come on, you're Greek
35	CH:	[<< *smiling* > yes >]
36	CH:	[yes]
37	TV:	[in Euro]pe it's different, we have
38	IP:	and it's like but there it's different, [everything is in order there, there
39		lives a black guy]
40	TV:	[these are delicate moments like ((first name)) says, the East is a
41		delicate matter, well]
42	IP:	let's say a black guy lived there, right, he took
43	CH:	hm
44	IP:	he lived five or ten years and he accepted citizenship, he's already
45		Greek
46	CH:	[hm]
47	NL:	[yes]
48	IP:	there they don't look at nationality
49	CH:	hm
50	IP:	there they look at citizenship
51	TV:	yes
52	IP:	there's no talk of the nation, but we have, so far this holds the
53		[chauvinistic]
54	TP:	[yes]
55	IP:	[notions]
56	NL:	[yes, yes]
57	TV:	yes
58	IP:	of the nation
59	TV:	yes
60	CH:	hm
61	IP:	you understand, [this should be the time]
62	TP:	[well, with time this will go]
63	CH:	yes
64	IP:	[the time that a person would understand this]
65	TP:	[the first step has been taken, that] in the passport they already don't
66		write anything about nationality, the first step is done, yes
67	IP:	steps [have been taken]
68	CH:	[yes]
69	IP:	but still [it will not change so soon that, let's say]
70	TP:	[it will change and that's how it should be]
71	CH:	[hm]
72	IP:	[we] didn't speak about nation anymore, we only spoke about
73		citizenship
73	TP:	about citizenship

74	IP:	because so far, this Soviet (thing), this holds, [it sits, this chauvinism
75		sits]
76	TP:	[it sits, it sits, it sits, it sits, especially since]
77	IP:	even though it's not noticeable, [maybe] somebody else will be
78		offended if I say (that) it sits, it's the truth
79	TV:	[mhm] true
80	IP:	that's how it is
81	NL:	yes
82	TV:	it's the truth

Excerpt 26 can be divided into four parts: the first establishing the concept of "citizenship" (1-16), the second giving a generalized example of how the in-group was "too fast" in demanding acceptance as "Greek" (17-34), the third offering a more detailed description of how "citizenship" is handled "there" (33-52), and a fourth contrasting this to "here" where "chauvinism" and a certain "backwardness" characterize how "nation" and "citizenship" are related (52-82). I will examine these in turn.

IP starts by distancing himself from his community by explaining that he "understood" (1-2) something which *nashi naprimer do sikh por ne ponyali etogo* "our (people) for example still have not understood this" (4-5). Note that by referring to those who "do not understand" as *nashi* "our (people)" he positions himself as part of this community, no matter how much he later distances himself from their views. In lines 9-10 he states what he perceives to be the General Rule of how belonging to a state is determined: by living there and "accepting" that state's citizenship *ty stanovish'sya chlenom etogo gosudarstva* "you become a member of this state". The generalization is achieved by the generic present tense as well as the generic second person singular. It is thus the time spent on a state's territory and officially "accepting" both the rights and obligations it bestows on its citizens that govern belonging to said state. He goes on to very positively evaluate this General Rule: he evaluates it as "very normal", "very correct", and finally "very much how it should be" (12-13). In this, he is supported by TV, who backs up IP's evaluation by repeating it in line 16.

This is subsequently not only contrasted with the Georgian Greek conceptualization of what being Greek entails but also shown to clash in a generalized story. IP portrays his in-group as not paying attention to the time one has to spend living in a certain place for belonging: *a my srazu tuda uekhali my govorim my greki* "but we immediately upon going there say we are Greeks" (17). Note that the attribution of this behavior does not cohere with how OP describes their in-group's demeanor in Greece in excerpt 24

above. This immediate identification is described as "surprising" for the "Greek Greeks", who are portrayed as unconvinced by this claim to "Greekness" and quoted: *nu i chto chto ty grek* "well, so what that you're Greek?" (19-20). IP ascribes to them a distinction between "our Greeks" (20), which is a category not immediately available to newcomers, and "Greeks from other states", which in the case of IP's in-group is further categorized as "Russian citizen" (24). Note that IP and TV do not perceive the categorization "Russian" to be wrong, let alone offensive. On the contrary, "Russian" is used as a *pars pro toto* category label referring to "Soviet citizens". The adherence to the General Rule ascribed to the "Greek Greek" out-group is, however, narrated as being highly offensive to IP's in-group – who he continues to refer to as *my* 'we', thereby not distancing himself from them completely (27). IP cites a generalized quote of his in-group members, which echoes how OP relates his story of being othered in excerpt 24: *ya grek priekhal v gretsiyu a mne govorish' ty [...] russko-poddannyy* "I'm Greek, I came to Greece, and you tell me, you're a Russian citizen?" (29-30). For his in-group, their Ancestry-based claim to Greek category membership should have been sufficient for them to be welcomed as such, instead of having their "Russian" citizenship pointed out (32-34). It is TV who, in supporting IP's account, indicates that the concepts of "nation" and "citizenship" *u nikh* 'at them' "at their place" (33), clarified as referring to "Europe" in line 37, is *uzhe* "already" (33) *drugoy* "different" (37). This clarifies the concepts at stake and establishes the compared spaces as "Europe" and the much more ambiguous *u nas* 'at us' "at our place". In the following, this personalized version of "here" is used to ambiguously refer to both "Georgia" and the "post-Soviet space".

TV's contribution enables IP to further expound on these concepts. He begins with the evaluation *tam pravil'no postavleny veshchi* "everything is in order there" (38-39), repeating his evaluation of the General Rule for Citizenship (9-10) and preparing us for his explanations. While he, too, begins to illustrate the General Rule with an example involving a "black guy" (39), TV flags this subject as potentially difficult by pointing out that these are *tonkie momenty* "delicate moments", since *vostok delo tonkoe* "the East is a delicate matter" (40). By positioning themselves as "from the East" and thereby also situating the space in which the interview is taking place, he draws attention to his perception that this is a space where matters of ancestry are so central that questioning their use to categorize people is a

"delicate matter".[10] By showing himself to be aware of the precariousness of the moment, TV creates greater proximity among the interlocutors, enabling his friend to discuss these "delicate matters" "openly" and without fear of offending an interlocutor (cf. Höfler 2018b). The "offensive" nature of this topic, as perceived by both TV and IP, is taken up and made explicit later (line 77-78, and subsequent to the excerpt). Unperturbed, IP continues with his example, repeating the initial scenario of a "black guy living there" (42). He starts to say that the protagonist of his story "accepted" – probably citizenship –, but stops himself to first specify the time this person had lived "there" as *pyat' desyat' let* "five, ten years" before *on prinyal poddanstvo* "he accepted citizenship" (44). Time spent in Greece is thus stated to be the important variable, and it has to be a considerable amount of time, which contrasts with the "immediate" demand for recognition he attributes to his in-group (17, 32-34). With this official recognition of Citizenship, the process of national integration is both finalized and complete: *on uzhe grek* "he is already Greek" (44-45), i.e. there is nothing to distinguish the protagonist of this story from any other "Greek citizen" – his ancestry notwithstanding. This is reinforced by how IP sums up his example, contrasting what is "looked at" ("citizenship", 50) and what is not ("nation", 48) in two sentences of identical syntactical structure.

Another closing statement *o natsii rechi netu* "there's no talk of the nation" (52) prepares to contrast this "progressive" space with how it is *u nas* 'at our place' "here". This latter is characterized by IP as "holding on" (52) to *shovinisticheskie ponyatiya natsii* "chauvinistic notions of the nation" (53-58), in which he is supported by TV and NL through repeated utterances of agreement. In the following, there are three sequences where IP expresses his frustration at "things moving too slowly" while TV almost simultaneously tries to console him by pointing out the changes he perceives as having already taken place (61-62, 64-66, 69-70). I will examine these in turn.

The first two are closely related by the point IP makes, voicing his frustration that *eto dolzhen byt' period* "this should be the time" (61) *period chtob eto chelovek ponyal* "the time that a person would understand this" (64). He thereby characterizes the present day as a time of gradual "progress" in terms of privileging Citizenship over Nation – the latter defined as hereditary in the (post-)Soviet context. TV's comforting contribution also spans the two sequences, which are interspersed by an affirmation on my part (63). Just

10 It is precisely this centrality of ancestry that will allow me to argue for its *omnirelevance* in section D..

as IP first refers explicitly to the temporal dimension, TV does the same by generally stating that "this" – the "chauvinistic notions" – would "go away" given time (62). In his second contribution, he gives an example, namely that *v pasporte uzhe ne pishut natsionalnost' nichego* "in the passport they already don't write the nationality at all" (65-66). While for OP this practice offered "evidence" of his "true" national affiliation, TV conversely cites its abolition as a positive "first step" (65) towards instating CITIZENSHIP as the relevant category for belonging. He reinforces his confidence by repeating *pervyy shag sdelan* "the first step has been taken" (66). This is also expressed in his repetition of the temporal adverb *uzhe* 'already' three times in line 65, ensuring that the "progress" he perceives is not lost on his hearers.

IP concedes that *shagi [...] sdelany* "steps have been taken" (67), but immediately voices more concern: *nO (-) e: poka* "bUt (-) e: still" (69). At this point TV chimes in again and strengthens his previous contribution by voicing the firm conviction that *izmenitsya eto* "this will change" and evaluating such change as "how it should be" (70). IP's concern is that it will be *ne tak skoro* "not so soon" (69) that *my ne govorili o natsii govorili tol'ko o grazhdanstve* "we would not speak about the nation, we would speak only about citizenship" (72-73), thereby repeating the desired state of affairs he has previously attested to "already" holding in Greece (48-50). TV affirms the desideratum by repeating *o grazhdanstve* "about citizenship" (73). IP goes on to trace the "chauvinism" he perceives to be at the root of the "backwardness" he attributes to the place where "we" define belonging back to the Soviet Union (74). This is described as "holding back" and somehow firmly "sitting" (74-75), which is affirmed by TV repeating *sidit* "it sits" four times (76). Where exactly this "Soviet chauvinism", i.e. the primacy of ancestry-based "nationality", is perceived to be located remains unclear. Still, its "sitting" and "holding back" portrays it less like a conceptual difficulty and more as incorporated in a similar way to how OP had spoken about "blood" being an immediately available bodily marker of national membership.

Towards the end of this excerpt, IP softens his previous very clear assertion that "Soviet chauvinism" somehow "holds back" the "progress" he sees implemented in "Europe", by conceding that it might be *ne zametno* "not noticeable" (77). IP now also attends to the precariousness already pointed to by TV in line 40, where he characterized as "delicate" in "the East" (77-78). The risk of causing offence notwithstanding, he confirms the "truth" of his explanations (78) and closes his statement with a clear *tak i est'* "that's how it is" (80). In this, he is supported by NL (81) and, as always, by TV who confirms the "truthfulness" of IP's elucidation (79, 82).

Following this excerpt, IP goes on to deplore and give examples for how paying attention to people's "nationality", sometimes also clearly explicated as "ancestry", is still problematic in contemporary Georgia. He assures us that he never experiences any difficulties himself because *sredi gruzinov ya kak gruzin zhivu* "among Georgians I live like a Georgian" (IP, 0:51:14), but that other minorities (he mentions Armenians) have their Ancestry held against them far too regularly. His position on this is very clear: *o natsii govorit' voobshche nel'zya* "one absolutely mustn't speak about the nation" (IP, 0:51:44), "nation" again understood in the Soviet sense as based on ancestry. As in the excerpt above, TV does his best to calm him and expresses confidence that the "progress" they both desire will come at the latest with the change of generations.[11]

To summarize excerpt 26, IP and TV expound on what they understand the concepts of "nation" and "citizenship" to entail "there" in Europe – instantiated by Greece in their examples – and "here", and how these concepts differ in both spaces. Overall, "Europe" is the space characterized as Progressive, which is established through the frequent use of the temporal adverb *uzhe* "already", juxtaposed to *poka* "still" or *ne tak skoro* "not so soon". It is perceived as a space that has "moved on" from an Ancestry-based model of belonging, to one of Citizenship. The latter is acquired through spending time in a place – and over time presumably coming to share the values and obligations necessary to be eligible for Citizenship. This is described as unconnected to whether or not one has ancestral ties to Greece, rendering it more egalitarian and thus perhaps better suited to a multicultural society – even though neither friend brings up globalization explicitly. The space of comparison is characterized as slower in "letting go" of an Ancestry-based concept of belonging, much to IP's frustration. Both establish this "holding on" as a trace of the Soviet understanding of the "nation". And while scholars of the post-Soviet space and Western Europe alike would probably take issue with the "progressive" politics attributed to Greece and Europe, they would very much agree with the assessment that many national(ist) struggles in the post-Soviet space were structured by how national categories were maintained in the Soviet Union (cf. Chapter 2).

Notably, the space "here" is established through the use of *u nas* 'at our place' and the things *my* 'we' do, and is only once referred to as "the East" and characterized as "post-Soviet". It thereby remains much more ambiguous

11 This is a point commonly made in Georgia, where I have been told many times that it would take 40 years – one generation – for "real change" to take hold.

than the space *tam* 'there', which is established through direct reference as "Greece" or "Europe". Furthermore, the spatial deictics show an unusual distribution, allowing a closer analysis of IP's and TV's positions. Instead of juxtaposing *tam* 'there' with the equally abstract spatial deictic *zdes'* 'here', it is juxtaposed with *u nas* 'at our place', which is not just a geographical designation but an explicitly social spatial reference. By evaluating things "in our society" as "moving too slowly", both IP and TV position themselves as "one step ahead" of their community. They continue, however, to root themselves firmly in their Georgian, post-Soviet community through the spatial and personal deictics they use and also, perhaps, through the frustration they express.

There are, then, two very different boundaries made relevant in excerpt 26. The first is the boundary portrayed as defining what is necessary in Greece in order to gain access to membership in the category Greek. This is described as a temporal issue, with social membership gained through the time spent living in Greece. The boundary is thus permeable, and importantly one that "everyone" can cross, given the necessary patience. The second boundary is established by IP and TV themselves in differentiating between "progressive Europe" and the "backwards post-Soviet space". The difference is portrayed to lie in the conceptualization of belonging: *qua* Ancestry or *qua* Citizenship. This boundary is also permeable, in this case by adopting a different understanding of the nature of belonging. Notably, rather than "crossing the line" individually, IP and TV wish to "erase the boundary", as it were, by changing how their community conceptualizes belonging. Especially in TV's more optimistic view, this boundary change is also understood as involving the passage of time, in this case with generational change.

III. Contesting the category "Greek"

In Section I., OP expressed his bewilderment at being categorized as "Russian" in Greece and dealt with it in the interview situation by subtly ridiculing the incorrect categorization and those who imposed it. IP and TV in the previous Section positioned themselves as very much agreeing with the "European Greek" view and deploring the "slow progress" made in the post-Soviet space in terms of changing how Nation and Citizenship are conceptualized. These methods could be interpreted as "playing down an incorrect categorization" (OP) or, on the contrary, "embracing" it (IP and TV). Either way, the categorization itself is not fundamentally contested. Although in OP's case

one might argue to that effect, it remains a rather subtle and unaggressive challenge, delivered calmly and from a position of perceived strength. I now turn to a very different way of coping with a categorization perceived as incorrect and offensive, namely to contest it outright.

This contestation revolves around the question of defining the central attribute for membership in the category GREEK, as well as around who has the prerogative to establish the definition. To begin approaching this complex let us consider the answer VE, a 77-year-old Urum Greek woman living in Tbilisi, gives concerning the acceptance of Georgian Greeks in Greece:

(27) They're not Greeks at all (VE, 0:16:13-0:16:25)

1	VE:	*net (-) oni oni nas ne priznayut (-) oni govoryat (-) e::* no they they us not acknowledge_they they say_they
2		*(–) my ne khristianie (-) e ne ne greki (-) a my schitaem oni* we not Christians not not Greeks and we count_we they
3		*voobshche ne greki* absolutely not Greeks

'no, they, they don't acknowledge us, they say, we're not Christians, not Greeks, and we consider they are not Greeks at all!'

VE first negates my question without any hesitation (1). She then alleges that the out-group assesses her community as *ne khristianie* "not Christians" (1-2), corrects herself and states the out-group position as considering her community to be *ne greki* "not Greeks" (2). This is contrasted with the position she ascribes to her in-group: *a my schitaem oni voobshche ne greki* "and we think they are not Greeks at all!" (2-3). This very clear "reply" and the conviction with which she expresses it is greeted by NL and myself with laughter. VE thus not only discounts the GREEKNESS of the "Greek Greek" out-group, she also questions and takes away their prerogative to define what being GREEK is about. Her "false start" in lines 1-2 is later shown to be not so "false" after all, as we learn that she considers being CHRISTIAN the most important criterion for being GREEK. In the conversation following excerpt 27, VE argues that her in-group more closely observes what she perceives to be the rules of her religious community, like praying and attending church regularly, compared to the "Greek Greek" out-group. NL and I unfortunately only follow up on the "not being considered Greek" part and ask what her community is considered to be instead, which VE answers curtly with *turki* "Turks" (VE, 0:16:54), alluding to their heritage variety Urum.

I will now take a closer look at how LP makes use of the categories ANCESTRY and RELIGION in order to challenge the primacy of LANGUAGE and

to forcefully ascertain his self-identification as Greek by discounting that of the "Greek Greek" out-group. I want to be transparent at this point about excerpt 28 being my own use of an "extreme case" as per Pomerantz (1986) (cf. Chapter 3). While about half of my consultants state that they were not accepted as Greeks in Greece, others also describe quite positive experiences or draw a nuanced picture, as another look at Table 7.1 reminds us. Nor is LP in any way representative of all the denials to the question of acceptance, as apparent from the two previous Sections. However, this excerpt shows just how far the importance of Ancestry can be taken by a consultant who narrates having been denied recognition of his self-identification. Thus, I am here employing the device my consultants frequently use when constructing a General Rule, namely to take an "extreme" example to show how Greek category membership may be related more generally to Ancestry, Religion and Language.

At the very beginning of the interview, LP declares himself to be a *chistokrovnyy grek* "pure-blooded Greek" (LP, 0:04:27) already at the very beginning of the interview. When I ask him about Georgian Greeks being accepted in Greece, he denies, which I follow up with *pochemu* "why?" The following is his answer, with omitted turns marked by [...].

(28) We are pure-blooded Greeks (LP, 0:27:34-0:29:58)[12]

1	LP:	*potomu chto gruzinskie greki govoryat (–) oni chistye greki* because that Georgian Greeks say_they they pure Greeks
2		*[kotorye] kotorye chetyresta let tam: izvinite ne khochu* who who four_hundred years there excuse_2PL not want_I
3		*skazat'* to_say
4	CH:	[hm] hm
5	LP:	*°hh m vnutri salonikakh vse oni stali khristianinami a my* inside Thessaloniki all they became_PL Christians but we
6		*net* not
7	CH:	hm (–)
8	LP:	*oni ne dumayut chto my s russkimi vmeste priekhali syuda* they not think_they that we with Russians together came_PL here
9	NL:	hm
10	LP:	*eti zemli kupili* these lands bought_PL
11	CH:	hm

12 Utterances in Standard Modern Greek are underlined in this excerpt.

12	LP:	*svoyu veru ne poteryali kotorye v_v_ veru poteryali oni sami*
		own faith not lost_PL who faith lost_PL they themselves
13		*poteryali*
		lost_PL
14	CH:	hm (—)
15	LP:	*pust' eto ochen' khorosho znayut*
		let_2SG this very well know_they
16	CH:	[hm]
17	NL:	[hm]
18	LP:	*°hhhh my chistokrovnye greki*
		we pure-blooded Greeks
19	CH:	hm (-)
20	LP:	*nu chto yazyk poteryali yazyk poteryali potomu chto*
		well what language lost_PL language lost_PL because that
21		*khristianstvo ne [poteryali]*
		Christianity not lost_PL
22	CH:	[hm] [hm (–)]
23	NL:	*da da*
		yes yes
24	LP:	*oni mne ga:_ oni govoryat chto vy::: (–) gruzinskie greki*
		they me they say_they that you_2PL Georgian Greeks
25		*[govoryu] (-) da (–) gruzinskie greki potomu chto my v gruzii*
		say_I yes Georgian Greeks because that we in Georgia
26		*zhili*
		lived_PL
27	CH:	hm (–)
28	LP:	*no zhe i my greki (—)*
		but same and we Greeks
29	NL:	[hm]
30	LP:	*[net] govorit vy ni greki turkofonos po-grecheski [(xx)]*
		no says you_2PL not Greeks turkophone in_Greek
31		*vy turki*
		you_2PL Turks
32	CH:	*[da] hm (1)*
		yes
33	LP:	*e:: ya tozhe razozlilsya eto proizoshël v sude*
		I also became_angry_M this happened_M at court
34	LP:	[...]
35	LP:	*tak tak tak turkofonos (–) ty govorit mafioz (-) ya govoryu*
		so so so turkophone you_2SG says mafioso I say_I
36		*slushay mafioz govoryu za dvadtsat' pyat' evro rabotaet °h*
		listen_2SG mafioso say_I for twenty five euro works
37	CH:	((chuckles)) (—)

38	LP:	*nu ochen' tupoy narod (-)*
		well very stupid nation
39	CH:	hm (1)
40	LP:	*voobshem tupye narody takie tupye narody ya nigde ne videl*
		generally stupid nations such stupid nations I nowhere not saw_M
41	LP:	[...]
42	LP:	*govoryu khorosho ya mafioz [dal'she chto] (–) vot bumagi chto ya*
		say_I well I mafioso further what here papers that I
43		*grek ya ne khochu poekhat' obratno v svoyu e: rodinu gde*
		Greek I not want_I to_go back to own homeland where
44		*ya rodilsya*
		I was_born_M
45	NL:	[((chuckles))] hm
46	LP:	*ya khochu zdes' zhit'*
		I want here to_live
47	CH:	hm
48	LP:	*ya zhe grek ne imeyu pravo*
		I same Greek not have_I right
49	NL:	hm (-)
50	LP:	*albantsy-malbantsy govoryu turki vse zdes'*
		Albanians-Malbanians say_I Turks all here
51	CH:	hm
52	LP:	*nam nel'zya zdes' zhit'*
		us forbidden here to_live
53	CH:	hm (1)
54	LP:	*govorit (—) net govorit ty vizovyy rezhim*
		says no says you_2SG visa regime
55	LP:	[...]
56	LP:	*vsë ravno deportirovali*
		all same deported_PL
57	CH:	hm
58	LP:	*kogda mne skazali chto ty (–) [turkofonos] vy ne*
		when me told_PL that you_2SG turkophone you_2PL not
59		*greki °h (–) nu izvinite za vyrazheniya ya tozhe skazal chto*
		Greeks well excuse_2PL for expression I also said_M that
60		*esli my ne greki chetyresta let s vashei [mamoi] i*
		if we not Greeks fourhundred years with your_2PL mother and
61		*dochku (-) perespali turki vnutri gretsii govoryu vy*
		daughter slept_with_PL Turks inside Greece say_I you_2PL
62		*stali greki a my net*
		became_2PL Greeks but we not
63	NL:	[((chuckles))] [((chuckles))]
64	CH:	((chuckles))

65	LP:	*nam nichego ne trogali (-) u nas trebovali °h yazyk ili* us nothing not touched_PL at us demanded_PL language or
66		*vera (–)* faith
67	CH:	hm
68	LP:	*my pereshli v gruziyu yazyk poteryali (-)* we moved_PL to Georgia language lost_PL

1	LP:	because (you're) Georgian Greeks, they say, they are pure Greeks [who]
2		who for four-hundred years there, excuse me, I don't want to say it
4	CH:	[hm] hm
5	LP:	inside Thessaloniki they all became Christians, but we did not
7	CH:	hm
8	LP:	they don't think that we came here together with the Russians
9	NL:	hm
10	LP:	bought these lands
11	CH:	hm
12	LP:	did not lose our faith, who lost the faith, they themselves lost it
14	CH:	hm
15	LP:	let them know this very well
16	CH:	[hm]
17	NL:	[hm]
18	LP:	we are pure-blooded Greeks
19	CH:	hm (-)
20	LP:	so what, we lost the language, we lost the language because we did not
21		lose Christianity
22	CH:	[hm] [hm]
23	NL:	yes yes
24	LP:	to me they sa_ they say that you're Georgian Greeks [I say] yes,
25		Georgian Greeks because we lived in Georgia
27	CH:	hm
28	LP:	but we're still Greeks
29	NL:	[hm]
30	LP:	[no] he says you're not Greeks turkophone in Greek, you're Turks
32	CH:	[yes] hm
33	LP:	I also got angry, this happened in court
34	LP:	[...]
35	LP:	so, so, so turkophone, you, he says, are a mafioso, I say, listen, a
36		mafioso, I say, works for twenty five Euros?
37	CH:	((chuckles))
38	LP:	well, this is a very stupid nation
39	CH:	hm
40	LP:	nations in general are stupid but such a stupid nation I've never seen
41		anywhere

41	LP:	[...]
42	LP:	I say, alright, I'm a mafioso, [what next?] here are the papers that I'm
43		Greek, I don't want to go back to my homeland where I was born
45	NL:	[((chuckles))] hm
46	LP:	I want to live here
47	CH:	hm
48	LP:	I'm Greek, don't I have the right?
49	NL:	hm
50	LP:	Albanians-Malbanians, I say, Turks, they're all here
51	CH:	hm
52	LP:	but we are not allowed to live here?
53	CH:	hm
54	LP:	he says, no, he says, you (overstayed) visa conditions
55	LP:	[...]
56	LP:	they deported me anyway
57	CH:	hm
58	LP:	when they told me that you, [turkophone], you're not Greeks, well
59		excuse the expression, I also said that, if we're not Greeks, for four
60		hundred years Turks slept with your [mother] and daughter inside of
61		Greece, I say, you became Greek and we did not?
63	NL:	[((chuckles))] [((chuckles))]
64	CH:	((chuckles))
65	LP:	nobody touched us, from us they demanded language or faith
67	CH:	hm
68	LP:	we went to Georgia and lost the language

LP answers my question as to why Georgian Greeks were not accepted as "genuine Greeks" in Greece by reporting that they are "said" to be *gruzinskie greki* "Georgian Greeks" (1). This apparently entails an ascription of "impurity", since he goes on to ascribe to the "Greek Greek" out-group the contrasting self-assessment of being *chistye greki* "pure Greeks" (1). He makes an attempt at questioning this "purity" by referring with *chetyresta let* "four hundred years" (2) to the Ottoman Empire, a reference we have already witnessed IP achieve a little more explicitly in excerpt 3 (cf. Chapter 5). LP then stops himself with a meta-communicative comment stating *ne khochu skazat'* "I don't want to say" (2-3). Still, he continues with the ascribed "self-"assessment of the out-group, who over this long period of time "became Christians" *vnutri salonikakh* "in Thessaloniki" (5). Thessaloniki remained under Ottoman rule until 1912, i.e. roughly a century longer than LP's ancestors, who according to his earlier narrative left Anatolia and moved to Ts'alk'a around 1828. He ascribes to the out-group the view that they would have remained "Christians" during that time *a my net* "but not

us" (5-6). At this point, he does not question anyone's "Christianity", but he does question the reasoning that challenges his in-group's "Christianity" and claims that his in-group maintained their faith under difficult conditions. His argumentative line might thus be summarized as "if they managed to stay Christian, why shouldn't we?".

He goes on to portray the out-group as "not believing" (8) everything he portrays his in-group, the "Georgian Greeks", to have achieved: coming to what is contemporary Georgia "with the Russians" (8) – this is also a temporal reference to their time of migration to Georgia –, "buy[ing] these lands" (10), and finally "not los[ing] their faith" (12). Having already narrated his community's historical trajectory previously, he can be sure we already know this story. Nevertheless, retelling it in this context turns the purpose of his in-group's movement from "escaping the Turks" to "preserving the faith". The primacy of the latter is strengthened by his accusation: *oni sami poteryali* "they themselves lost it" (12-13). He portrays the out-group of being aware of this: *pust' eto ochen' khorosho znayut* "and they know this very well" (15), before repeating and thus strengthening what he told us previously: *my chistokrovnye greki* "we're pure-blooded Greeks" (18).[13] He thereby picks up on the contrast between "Georgian Greeks" and "pure Greeks" in line 1 and – having already asserted his in-group's "Christianity" – further asserts his in-group's "purity".

After establishing his community's claim to being Greek by asserting that their Religion and Ancestry comply with what he perceives to be the central category-bound predicates, he goes on to address the more complicated point for heritage Urum Greek speakers like himself: Language. He does this by playing down its importance, starting his concession of having "lost the language" with *nu chto* "so what?" (20). This "shortcoming" is further justified by repeating that his in-group did not loose "Christianity" (20-21), thereby referring to the previously mentioned mythical "choice" between language and religion (LP, 0:06:23-0:06:38) (cf. Chapter 5). Having justified the language he speaks, he then picks up the label "Georgian Greek" again. This is now part of what appears to be a generalized narration, in which he reports a dialogue having taken place, wherein more than one person – *oni* 'they' – labeled his in-group *gruzinskie greki* "Georgian Greeks" (24). Rather than questioning his interlocutors' own "purity" or "religious faithfulness", he portrays himself has having calmly affirmed the label and explained it

13 Note that in Russian most collocations involving *chistokrovnyy* revolve around thoroughbred horses or pedigreed dogs.

with his community's having lived in Georgia (25-26). The label is thereby changed from one denoting "impurity" – as alluded to in line 1 – to one referencing the geographical location where LP's community has preserved said "purity" of Ancestry and Religion. He reaffirms that this does not in any way question their identification by stating: *no zhe i my greki* "but we are also Greeks" (28).

This identification is, however, challenged by the narrated interlocutor, who now no longer appears in the plural. The interlocutor is cited as clearly stating *vy ne greki* "you're not Greeks" and then referring to their language use as the reason to deny them this belonging: *turkofonos [...] vy turki* "turkophone [...] you're Turks" (30-31). Language, namely speaking a Turkish variety, is thereby asserted by LP's interlocutor as the central category-bound activity that defines category membership. This results in the assertion that LP's community's national affiliation is not Greek but rather Turkish. Considering that in leading up to this narration LP had already discounted the relevance of Language for Greekness, this is not only an "incorrect" categorization, it is further based on "incorrect" reasoning and finally considered to be offensive, due to the perceived "historical antagonism" between Muslim Turkey and Christian Greece.[14] He expresses feeling offended in line 33: *ya tozhe razozlilsya* "I also lost my cool", which is a strong way of describing his "getting angry" as escalating immediately and including some loss of control over one's actions. He further situates the conversation as having taken place "in court" (33). This changes the nature of the story from a generalized one to a singular event that is portrayed as particularly poignant. It also changes the quality of the offense: it can no longer be understood in terms of a "street altercation", for instance, in which an "ordinary" – albeit ill-intentioned and ignorant – person is cast as the perpetrator. Most importantly, such an "ordinary person" would hold no power to define or interpret the category Greek in a legally meaningful way and does not represent the "official view". All this changes when it is an official of the Greek state – apparently the judge at LP's deportation hearing. This person first of all holds the power to interpret

14 Especially in an interview given in Georgia and to a team including a Georgian researcher, this antagonism does not have to be explicated, as it is presumed to be common knowledge. In the case of LP, he talks about this antagonism about ten minutes later in the interview, when he attributes the negatively evaluated behavior of the Ach'arian out-group to their "Turkish blood" (LP, 0:37:14-0:38:00). Note that had LP's interlocutor stayed with labeling him as Georgian, this would have been perceived as still "incorrect" but much less offensive, since Greeks and Georgians are considered to share the same Religion, as will be discussed later in this Chapter.

Greek category membership in a legally binding way, in this story set up in terms of deciding whether LP is "Greek enough" to avoid deportation. In order to make his decision, this person should also be knowledgeable about the "official" criteria for inclusion and exclusion from the category Greek, and uphold the law "objectively", i.e. not to use what LP perceives as a derogatory term with no legal significance. Finally, being an official of the Greek government, this person has to comply with and carry out the government's position. Construed in this way, it is not an individual challenging LP's Greek category membership and offensively mis-categorizing him as Turkish, but rather the Greek state. My question about recognition, then, is not answered on the level of everyday interactions but on the level of the highest authority, which clearly and powerfully rejects "Georgian Greeks" in the person of LP.

This is not the end of the offense in LP's narration, however. Having explained the visa-related issue (34), LP regains the gist of his story in line 35: *tak tak tak turkofonos* "so, so, so, turkophone". He proceeds with another allegation he ascribes to the judge, namely categorizing LP as playing a part in organized crime: *ty govorit mafioz* "you, he says, are a mafioso" (35). Note that this is the first time that the informal second person singular is used in the excerpt, marking also a shift from the category "Turkish Georgian Greeks" to LP personally. Thus, he alone is alleged to participate in organized crime, even though one might argue that his ascribed category membership likely played a role in the accusation, as discussed earlier. Similarly to lines 25-26, LP portrays himself as capable of dealing with the accusation, this time by ridiculing it. He says that he answered by asking whether a "mafioso" would work for 25 Euros a day (35-36), the implication being that someone with ties to organized crime would not have to hold down such a low-paying job. He proceeds with a meta-communicative comment on the "stupidity" of the "Greek people" (38), which he characterizes as "even more stupid" than all the other "stupid nations" (40). This is sequentially most closely related to the allegation of being a "mafioso", but can also be read as a comment on being categorized as "Turkish" earlier – the judge having, in LP's view, demonstrated little intellectual prowess in either case.

LP proceeds to explain how he was employed (41), before returning again to the story in court. He concedes being a "mafioso" (42), in order to return to the topic he is most interested in: *vot bumagi chto ya grek* "here are the papers that I'm a Greek" (42-43). He thereby also refers to the official documentation as "proof" of his Greek category membership. In the following, he explicitly positions himself as someone who does not wish to return to his "homeland"

gde ya rodilsya "where I was born" (43-44) and states clearly: *ya khochu zdes' zhit'* "I want to live here" (46). This is followed with: *ya zhe grek ne imeyu pravo* "I – a Greek – don't have the right?" (48). He thus asserts his national affiliation – ignoring the challenges he narrates as having been posed just moments before – and poses a rhetorical question. He goes on to expand on his grievances of not being able to live as a "Greek" in the Greek nation state by listing people of "non-Greek" national affiliation, who, according to him, find it easier to obtain permission to live in Greece. These are *albantsy-malbantsy* "Albanians-Malbanians", in this context an overtly pejorative partial reduplication, and *turki* "Turks" (50). Following his account, it is completely incomprehensible to first incorrectly categorize him as Turkish instead of recognizing him as Greek, and to then take him to court for overstaying his visa whereas "all other Turks" appearantly face much less difficulty. He voices his frustration with another (rhetorical) question that closes his account on his being Greek: *nam nel'zya zdes' zhit'* "we are not allowed to live here?" (52). The judge does not take the question to be a rhetorical one, as LP tells us *net govorit* "no, he says" (54) and relates how the judge upheld the visa conditions, with which LP apparently had not complied. LP then recounts having tried to comply with the official regulations and shown all his documents (55), which still did not keep him from being deported (56).

Having finished his story, LP picks up the offensive label *turkofonos* "turkophone" from line 30 again, together with the denial of recognition *vy ne greki* "you're not Greeks" (58). Following a meta-communicative comment excusing what he is about to say (59), he finally launches into a contest of what it means to be Greek by voicing what he had stopped himself from saying in lines 2-3. Importantly, he starts this with *esli my ne greki* "if we're not Greeks" (60), thereby clarifying that the following challenge is a response to his community not being recognized as Greek. The implication is that if his in-group fails to meet the criteria for the category Greek, similarly stringent criteria must be applied in determining the category membership of all other claimants. Language being a criterion his community is said to have "failed", he chooses not Religion but Ancestry and more specifically "purity" as the criterion for comparison. This "purity" he assesses as having been compromised by "Greek Greeks" having sexual intercourse with "Turks" for the already mentioned time span of "four hundred years" *vnutri gretsii* "inside of Greece" (60-61). Notably, it is the "Greek Greek women" who – personified as "your mother and daughter" (60-61) – are being portrayed as having had sexual intercourse with "Turkish men". The narration leaves it

unclear whether or not this is alleged to have been consensual on the part of these women. In this image, women embody not only "the nation" but also its "purity", in common with patriarchal imagery of the nation the world over (cf. Alonso 1994; Seifert 2003; Thiele et al. 2010). "Greek Greek men" are not mentioned, and by being "left out of the picture" displayed as "not strong enough" to "protect their property" – both in the tangible form of female bodies and in the more abstract form of "national territory". The either "violated" or "sexually treacherous" female body is therefore not only an image of "racial impurity" but also one of male weakness. "Greece" is thereby portrayed as "doubly violated": by the ("treacherous") sexual act and by the fact that it happened on "her territory". LP's attack on the "purity" of the "Greek Greeks" is closed by the rhetorical question: *govoryu vy stali greki a my net* "I say, you became Greeks but we didn't?" (61-62). This repeats the position he had attributed to the out-group in lines 5-6, this time as a rhetorical question and much more strongly due to everything he has related in the preceding 55 lines. He picks up on the "ancestral purity" he has already claimed for his in-group in line 18 and reinforces his in-group's claim on it by stating: *nam nichego ne trogali* "nothing touched us" (65), retaining the body-related imagery of lines (61-62). He then repeats how his in-group had preserved said "purity" in his view: by choosing Religion over Language and moving to Georgia (65-68). The two points he had narrated as being held against his community – their heritage language and moving to Georgia – are thus portrayed as indispensable to "preserving" the two features he takes to be crucial for Greek category membership: Religion and, above all, Ancestry. Following the excerpt, LP excuses himself again and explains how "they" had "hurt his heart" with the insult, which NL shows that he understands.

Importantly, until line 60 LP only ever asserts his and/or his community's being Greek by preserving what he defines as the prerequisites for category membership and therefore legitimate claims to belonging and residing in Greece: Religion and Ancestry. It is only when he narrates being denied the visa and insulted by an official of the Greek government who labeled him as Turkish that he portrays himself as "losing control" and starts his attack. Thus, it is only after being othered and denied identification in what he perceives to be "the most insulting way" that he narrates himself as having "returned the insult". Still, from the structure of excerpt 28, this attack is foreshadowed by how he sets up his account in the first six lines, which would not be intelligible otherwise.

Telling us the story of how he defended himself does not, of course, change anything about his deportation. As he tells us later, his attack comes after he had already seen the "reject" stamp on his passport, i.e. he had "nothing to lose". Therefore, similar to telling the story in the interview, "speaking his mind" in court also changed nothing. However, it appears very important to him to "set the record straight" in this way both in the situation and in the interview. In the latter context it might appear less necessary, since we had shown ourselves to be very much aligned with his narrations of his community's trajectory, and never questioned their being Greek. Still, it appears crucial to LP that we understand his exact reasons for discounting the Greek category membership of "Greek Greeks" – that they failed to "keep themselves pure" and away from Turkish bodies. This is visible in that he alludes to the accusation already in lines 1-3, but only "permits" himself to fully verbalize it about a minute later, in lines 60-62. Like VE in excerpt 27 he challenges the "Greek Greek's" Greekness, in his case by asserting that if anybody is to be categorized as Turkish it would have to be the out-group, an official representative of which first voiced the offensive categorization. His defensive device is to question the out-group's criteria for Greek category membership (having lived in Greece, speaking SMG) and to propose and communicatively enforce a different set of mandatory attributes (ancestry and religion), showing his community to be superior in complying with them. This is, therefore, another struggle over the prerogative of defining the category Greek, with both sides attempting to contract what it means to be Greek and with LP attempting an inversion of hierarchies (cf. Wimmer, 2013) to position his community as Better Greeks. In the situation, the definition held by the judge and invested with great institutional power prevailed. Crucially, as in the case of OP's alienation discussed in Section I. above, this struggle is the result of the perception of exclusion by a government LP had previously considered "his own" by virtue of his ancestral ties to the category Greek. "Setting the record straight" in the interview and expounding on how the category is to be filled instead, is thus a way of "dealing with past injustice" as per Czyżewsky et al. (1995, p. 78) and as already discussed regarding excerpt 20 (cf. Chapter 6).

IV. Preliminary summary

This Section has explored how consultants interactively deal with experiences that challenge their self-identification as Greek in Greece. The fact that about

half of my consultants speak about not being accepted in Greece underlines the relevance of this topic in how they establish their identification and belonging. Crucially, *krov'* "blood", i.e. Ancestry remains a fundamental point of reference in all the excerpts explored in detail in this Section, although consultants evaluate it quite differently.

For OP in Section I. and LP in Section III., it is problematic that their Greek Ancestry is not recognized as sufficient for being Greek, although to different extents. Contrarily, IP and TV position themselves as frustrated by the slow "progress" made in the post-Soviet space in abolishing ancestry-based concepts of belonging and introducing Citizenship as the relevant category instead. They therefore do not at all dispute the boundary set by the "Greek Greek" out-group. The change they seek rather involves changing the conceptualization of their own community to fit the "European" model, which would eventually lead to a blurring of this particular boundary. It is important to note that, in focusing on this conceptual difference, IP and TV could portray themselves as having already crossed this boundary individually; however, neither seems interested in doing so, opting instead to position themselves as being "one step ahead" on a continuum of "progress". As such, conceptualizing the boundary as a line to be crossed is not appropriate for this case.

Consultants who dispute the boundary in Sections I. and III. accomplish this by questioning the category-bound predicates and activities that enable the drawing of these boundaries. What we thus see is less a struggle to belong – by being "model Greeks" for example, i.e. trying their best to emulate views, definitions and categories of the Greek societal majority – but rather a struggle about how these categories are to be filled. In Section I., OP shows how the category system, as he perceives it, includes and excludes the wrong people (excluding him and including people without ancestral ties to Greece) and thereby questions its rationale. VE and LP both forcefully deny that "Greek Greeks" have the prerogative to define the category Greek – as implied in the wording of my question – and instead claim this prerogative for themselves. The boundary thus remains untouched but the sides are reversed, at least for the duration of our interview in Georgia. Crucially, they do not attack these categories immediately. Especially in LP's case, it is quite evident that he only lashes out after having had all his attempts at proving his belonging rejected. It is thus a very strong defense mechanism, only invoked when there appears to be no other way of being included. Notably, outside of the interview context neither OP nor LP achieved a change in how the category Greek was defined in Greece, with the out-group remaining in the powerful

position of determining where to draw the boundary. In OP's case, he also does not report that anything like that had been his aim: in a way he "turned away" from the boundary he encountered, and returned to Georgia where his belonging is not questioned.

B. Ts'alk'a: Struggling to belong

Moving back to Georgia, I will now take a closer look at what some consultants perceive to be an ongoing dispute in Ts'alk'a. From the outside, this is best described as a conflict with economic roots (cf. Chapter 2), which came to be framed in *groupist* terms (cf. Brubaker 2002). While this conflict concerns only some consultants, it is important for three reasons. Firstly, because some consultants portray it as posing a challenge to their belonging to a place they and their ancestors have for almost two centuries considered "their home" and "their land". Secondly, the differences perceived and the boundaries drawn in speaking about these conflicts highlight ascriptions and evaluations of what it means to be Greek and Georgian. These complement and sustain the analysis above, since they also highlight the importance of Religion for national affiliation and the time spent in a place for belonging. Thirdly, the contest over these categories provides the context for evaluations made by consultants from Ts'alk'a, for instance about the "importance" of their heritage language Urum (cf. Chapter 5), which would otherwise remain unintelligible. That is to say, we can see here how Place plays an important role in my consultants' experiences and how these experiences inform their views on a number of topics.

As previously, I will focus on the perceptions of difference and the boundary-making they entail, rather than on "what really happened".[15] There is a notable disparity in the sample regarding knowledge about the internal migration to Kvemo Kartli from the highlands of Svaneti and Ach'ara in the sample. Similarly to Urum Greeks being mostly unaware of Pontic Greek deportations after the Second World War, most Pontic Greek consultants know very little about this internal migration. Our five Pontic Greek consultants from the district of Tetrits'q'aro are the exception, of course. All of them, however, deny that there were ever any difficulties with internal migrants in their villages. Most Urum Greek consultants knew what I was referring to when I posed the question *mozhete li vy rasskazat'*

15 Cf. the introduction and further reading in Chapter 2.

chto-nibud' o gruzinakh kotorye priekhali zhit' v tsalke iz adzharii i svaneti "could you talk a little bit about the Georgians who came to live in Ts'alk'a from Ach'ara and Svaneti?" Among my Urum Greek consultants from both urban Tbilisi and rural Ts'alk'a, almost half (11, 47.7%) state that there had been "some difficulties" *ran'she* "earlier" but that things had "calmed down" considerably and were "fine" now. Four consultants (17.4%) state that there were "never any problems", two of them from Tbilisi and two living in Ts'alk'a. Three (13%) gave no answer. Four consultants (17.4%) state that the difficulties are ongoing, three of whom live in Ts'alk'a and one in Tbilisi. While I will mostly use excerpts from these latter four interviews to illustrate the differences and boundaries in question, other consultants in Ts'alk'a also perceive the same differences and draw the same boundaries, albeit less explicitly and not with the same verve. Hence, like excerpt 28 in Section A., these should be considered "extreme cases" that I analyze in order to explicate the boundaries more clearly.[16]

The grievances and conflicts mentioned by all Urum Greek consultants primarily result from economic difficulties, with "newcomers" being portrayed as unceremoniously "just taking" houses left behind by emigrating Greeks, either entering without permission or subsequently refusing to pay rent, for instance. These types of conflict are described as having on occasion turned violent, especially among "young men". Consultants living in Ts'alk'a go further in differentiating the out-group from their own community and describe the "newcomers" as somehow "less civilized": turning houses – which "Greeks had built with their own hands" – into "cowsheds", letting their cattle roam "everywhere"; in short as "careless" about what consultants perceive to be "basic rules of cleanliness".[17] These issues are mentioned in passing in many interviews. Our conversation with SC on the side of the village green offers a substantial collection. At one point, it was interrupted by his friend FD calling a young boy, who self-identified as "Ach'arian", over to us and explaining to him at length how he was to walk on the paved path instead of on the grass.[18]

16 Notably, while the boundary loses some of its relevance for those consultants who evaluate the conflictual times as a thing of the past, the categories and their associated negative ascriptions often remain.

17 EM refers to this in excerpt 31 below, albeit without explicating the behavior she perceives to be deviant.

18 Previous to this interview, Nika Loladze and I had also not cared about walking on the paved path, since it was not the shortest way across the village green. Having found

The above already describes differences between "Georgian Greeks" and "newcomers". Remarkably, the latter are – by and large – not categorized as "Georgians" by my consultants, even though both "Svans" and "Ach'arians" self-identify as such and are categorized as such by the Georgian nation state.[19] This differentiation remains relevant to a consultant who does not perceive any persisting difficulties. When I ask ME the above-mentioned question, she first tells us at length about the conflicts in the beginning but that they calmed down after "people started living together" (ME, 0:38:16-0:44:18) – again pointing out Time as the relevant factor. I proceed to ask *i kak sosushchestvuyut seychas v tsalke greki i gruziny* "and how do Greeks and Georgians live together now in Ts'alk'a?" to which she answers: *khorosho greki i gruziny vsegda khorosho sosushchestvovali* "good, Greeks and Georgians have always lived well together" (ME, 0:44:19-0:44:32). So, even though my first question had mentioned "Georgians [...] from Svaneti and Ach'ara", ME apparently understood this as referring to "Svans" and "Ach'arians", perhaps also to the category of "newcomers", which we will encounter below. Her later answer that "Greeks and Georgians" had always lived well together makes clear that – at least in the later sequence – for her "Svans" and "Ach'arians" are categories not encompassed in the category "Georgian", contrary to the official categorization. The following excerpt from the interview with LP also establishes differences between "Georgians" and "newcomers":

(29) We're happy to live with Georgians (LP, 0:53:10-0:53:42)

1	LP:	*ya v gruzii rodilsya [s etim] gor[zhus']*
		I in Georgia was_born_M with this pride_myself_I
2	NL:	[hm]
3	CH:	[hm]
4	LP:	*°hh chto u menya takie ponyatie gostepriimstvo*
		that at me such understanding hospitality
5	NL:	hm
6	LP:	*e:: druzhba (-)*
		friendship
7	CH:	[hm] (–)
8	LP:	*lyubit' drug druga (-) otsenivat' lyudey*
		to_love each other to_appreciate people

out how much of a symbol of "basic civilization" it represented to some members of the older Greek generation in Ts'alk'a, we thereafter walked on the path.

19 The official categorization, which coincides with their self-identification, sees "Svans" as "ethnic Georgians" who speak Svan, a Kartvelian language related to but distinct from Georgian. "Ach'arians", also categorized as "ethnic Georgians", had converted to Islam in the centuries their territory was governed by the Ottoman Empire.

9	CH:	hm
10	LP:	*eto ot nikh ya [nauchilsya]*
		this from them I learned_M
11	CH:	[hm]
12	NL:	hm (1)
13	LP:	*potomu chto ochen' khoroshie lyudi*
		because that very good people
14	CH:	hm (2)
15	LP:	*my rady °h [s gruzinami zhit']*
		we glad with Georgians to_live
16	CH:	[((chuckles))] [((chuckles))]
17	NL:	[((chuckles))]
18	LP:	[((chuckles))]
19	CH:	<< *smiling* > *khorosho* >
		well
20	LP:	<< *smiling* > *gruziny nam* > *((clears throat)) (1) i otets i*
		Georgians us and father and
21		*brat i vsë (-)*
		brother and all
22	NL:	hm
23	LP:	*a chto zdes' chto priezzhie [schitayut] sebya gruzinami*
		but that here what newcomers consider_they themselves Georgians
24		*(—) my ikh ne uvazhaem*
		we them not respect_we

1	LP:	I was born in Georgia, I'm proud
2	NL:	[hm]
3	CH:	[hm]
4	LP:	that I have this understanding of hospitality
5	NL:	hm
6	LP:	friendship
7	CH:	[hm] (–)
8	LP:	to love each other, to appreciate people
9	CH:	hm
10	LP:	I learned this from them
11	CH:	[hm]
12	NL:	hm (1)
13	LP:	because they are very good people
14	CH:	hm (2)
15	LP:	we're happy to live with Georgians
16	CH:	[((chuckles))] [((chuckles))]
17	NL:	[((chuckles))]
18	LP:	[((chuckles))]
19	CH:	<< *smiling* > alright >

20 LP: << *smiling* > Georgians > ((clears throat)) (1) are father, brother and
21 everything to us
22 NL: hm
23 LP: but these newcomers here, they consider themselves Georgians, we
24 don't respect them

Excerpt 29 is how LP answers the question whether he can think of situations in which he might "feel Georgian". He first repeats having been born in Georgia (1), a fact he had already stated numerous times in the interview. He then voices his "pride" (1) in his understanding of "hospitality" (4), "friendship" (6), "loving each other", and "appreciating people" (8). He goes on to explain his personal relation to these attributes: *eto ot nikh ya nauchilsya* "I learned this from them" (10), "them" referring here to "Georgians". Especially the first two attributes in his list, "hospitality" and "friendship", are frequently attributed to "Georgians" in particular or "Caucasians" in general, not only in the interview corpus. LP evaluates "Georgians" as *ochen' khoroshie lyudi* "very good people" (13) and expresses the "joy" of his in-group to be able to live "with Georgians" (15). He closes his exposition of positive ascriptions to "Georgians" by stating: *gruziny nam [...] i otets i brat i vsë* "Georgians [...] are father, brother and everything to us" (20-21). This is another family metaphor[20], this time likening "Georgians" both to a "guiding father" – the one "having taught" him and his community the positive attributes listed in lines 4-8 – and to a sibling, an "equal" in harmonious conviviality, as alluded to in line 15.

This positive picture of "hospitality", "friendship" and "love" is then contrasted with *priezzhie* "newcomers" (23), a reference to the internal migrants from Svaneti and Ach'ara. Notably, by being "newcomers" they are also "strangers", perhaps even "intruders" in the harmonious living situation of "Greeks" and "Georgians" that LP had established in the first 21 lines. They further *schitayut sebya gruzinami* "consider themselves Georgians" (23). By not categorizing them as "Georgians" himself but attributing this self-identification to the "newcomers", LP opens up the possibility of questioning said self-identification and perhaps evaluating it as "not really true". This is also a reference to his previous categorization of the out-group as "not Georgian" due to their "Turkish blood" (LP, 0:37:14) and to his evaluation that "Muslim" and "Georgian" are mutually exclusive categories (LP, 0:40:40). His in-group is then portrayed as not recognizing the out-group's self-identification: *my ikh ne uvazhaem* "we don't respect them" (23-24).

20 Cf. the exploration of the Soviet Union as Family metaphor in Chapter 6.

This allows the interpretation that his in-group – by living harmoniously with "real Georgians" – are somehow capable of distinguishing between "Georgians" and "impostors", and categorizing the "newcomers" as the latter. He then goes on to give examples furthering his evaluation of the out-group as "very stupid" and never returns to the topic of "feeling Georgian".

In excerpt 29, then, LP not only positions himself – and by extension his community – as sharing important and positive attributes with "Georgians": this same commonality is used to refer to the differences he perceives *vis-à-vis* the "newcomers", which enables him to withhold his "respect" and to then proceed to draw a strong boundary following the excerpt. Having established that consultants distinguish between Georgians on the one hand and Svans and Ach'arians on the other,[21] I will now examine what the perceived differences are, what boundaries are drawn and how they reflect on my consultants' self-identification. To this end, I will first complete the discussion of Urum as heritage variety, and then look at it from a boundary perspective.

Excerpt 2 in Chapter 5 points to the biggest difference consultants in Ts'alk'a perceive between Ach'arians and Georgians, namely the former having given up their religious affiliation to Orthodox Christianity, which is taken to be paramount for category membership as Georgian. Ach'arians thus lost this membership by converting to Islam and thereby becoming so fundamentally different that they can no longer be considered Georgians. This establishes a difference not only between Ach'arians and Georgians, but crucially also between Orthodox Greeks and Muslim Ach'arians. The latter are said to have made the "wrong choice" in giving up their religious affiliation, hence losing their national affiliation, instead of changing their language. This is also the difference LP underscores as the fundamental one.

In the interview with EM, she too picks up on the religious differences between her in-group and the "Ach'arian" out-group. For her, however, Language is not something as marginal as it is for DP, but should coincide with a person's religious (and national) affiliation:

(30) Categories "are mixed up" (EM, 0:39:33-0:40:01)

1	EM:	*musul'man govorit na gruzinskom a ya khristianka na turetskom* Muslim speaks on Georgian and I Christian_F on Turkish
2	NL:	[((chuckles))]

21 Many consultants in Ts'alk'a also perceive differences between the categories Svan and Ach'arian beyond their place of origin, which I cannot detail here.

3	CH:	*[((laughs))] [da]* yes
4	EM:	*[eto] eto razve zakonno spravedlivo* this this really lawfully justly

1	EM:	a Muslim speaks Georgian and I, a Christian, Turkish
2	NL:	[((chuckles))]
3	CH:	[((laughs))] [yes]
4	EM:	how is this lawful? just?

Immediately preceding this excerpt, I had asked EM whether her heritage variety Urum is "important" to her. She denies this, saying she would prefer not to speak the language at all. In line 1, she describes the language situation in Ts'alk'a by pairing the religious affiliation "Muslim" with the language "Georgian", and "Christian" with "Turkish". From our almost 40 minutes of conversation up to this point, it is already clear that Christianity and Islam are two very important categories for EM, which she perceives for the most part as mutually-conflictual. She has also already made clear that both categories Georgian and Greek are for her characterized by Christianity. Line 1, therefore, describes a perceived mismatch, due to a "Muslim" speaking the "Christian" language "Georgian", while a "Christian Greek" speaks the "Muslim" language "Turkish". NL and myself acknowledge this "mismatch" by voicing amusement (2-3). EM evaluates this "mismatch" by posing a rhetorical question about the "lawfulness" and "justness" of this situation (4), thereby expressing that she does not take this state of affairs to be correct. For EM, then, it is not just the case that national and religious affiliation are inextricably tied together; Language is coded for religious affiliation as well. Hence, the problem she perceives in speaking her heritage variety Urum is not only that it does not match her national affiliation, but also, if not more importantly, that it does not match her religious affiliation.

This perceived mismatch appears to be more relevant in rural Ts'alk'a than in urban Tbilisi, since it is tied to a conflict about the "right to ownership of the land", which is conceptualized as involving more than legal property titles. Thus, immediately following excerpt 30 EM goes on to tell us how "they" had told her that she is "Turkish" due to her ancestors' provenance. This is something she already tells us right at the beginning of the interview and returns to frequently over the course of our conversation, highlighting its relevance to her. I will now examine two excerpts in more detail to show how this contest is implicated in EM's sense of identification and belonging.

(31) They say this is their land (EM, 0:00:45-0:01:43)

1	EM:	*greki priekhali (-) iz turtsii my priekhali*
		Greeks came_PL from Turkey we came_PL
2	CH:	mhm
3	EM:	*iz turtsii oni priekhali (-) °h a vot tepereshniy:: narod (-)*
		from Turkey they came_PL and here current folk
4		*dazhe nas osuzhdayut chto eti priezzhie syuda eti*
		even us condemn_they that these newcomers to_here these
5	CH:	mhm
6	EM:	*adzhartsy (–) mnogie (1.3) my govorili chto vy pochemu*
		Ach'arians many we told_PL that you_PL why
7		*stali musul'manami da my khristianye (–) pochemu eto vot*
		became_PL Muslims yes we Christians why this here
8		*tak delaete eto narushaete eto*
		so do_2PL this break_2PL this
9	CH:	[mhm]
10	EM:	*[vot] tak eto vot tak oni nam govoryat chto (-) vy iz*
		here so this here so they us tell_they what you_2PL from
11		*turtsii priekhali (-) eto zemlya nasha my [gruziny]*
		Turkey came_PL this land ours we Georgians
12	CH:	[mhm]
13	NL:	[hm] mhm
14	CH:	*mhm (–) da*
		yes
15	EM:	*vot a:: my ne vinovatyy chto my byli v turtsii pravil'no*
		here but we not guilty that we were in Turkey correctly
16	NL:	*da oni*
		yes they
17	EM:	*my v turtsii my byli pod i::gom turkov*
		we in Turkey we were under yoke of_Turks
18	CH:	mhm
19	EM:	[...]
20	EM:	*i oni zadevayut nas uzhe chto*
		and they offend_they us already that
21	EM kat:	*es sheni mits'a aris me kartveli var da shen (-)*
		this your_2SG land is I Georgian am and you_2SG
22		*turketidan mokhvedi*
		Turkey_from came_2SG
23	NL:	mhm
24	EM:	*vot tak (–) po-gruzinski ya khorosho ne znayu*
		here so Georgian I well not know_I
25	CH:	*((laughs)) ya tozhe ne mogu [((xxx)) ((chuckles))]*
		I also not can_I
26	EM:	*[ya grechanka] nu koe-kak ne mogu [tak]*
		I Greek_F well somehow not can_I so

27	NL:	[hm]
28	EM:	*dopustim eto delat'* suppose_we this to_do
29	CH:	*[mhm] [da]* yes
30	EM:	*[vy]yti na chistuyu vodu* go_out on clean water

1	EM:	Greeks came, we came from Turkey
2	CH:	mhm
3	EM:	they came from Turkey and now the people present here even condemn
4		us, these newcomers, these
5	CH:	mhm
6	EM:	Ach'arians, there are many, we said, why did you become Muslims,
7		right? we're Christians, why do you do this, break this, like this?
9	CH:	[mhm]
10	EM:	like this and like this, they say to us, you came from Turkey, this is our
11		land, we're [Georgians]
12	CH:	[mhm]
13	NL:	[hm] mhm
14	CH:	mhm yes
15	EM:	but we're not guilty that we were in Turkey, right?
16	NL:	yes they
17	EM:	in Turkey we were under the yoke of Turks
18	CH:	mhm
19	EM:	[...]
20	EM:	and they offend us like
21	EM kat:	this is your land? I'm Georgian and you came from Turkey!
23	NL:	mhm
24	EM:	like this, I don't speak Georgian so well
25	CH:	((laughs)) I also can't [((xxx)) ((chuckles))]
26	EM:	[I'm Greek], well somehow I can't
27	NL:	[hm]
28	EM:	let's say, do this
29	CH:	[mhm] [yes]
30	EM:	get out onto open water

Excerpt 31 is part of EM's answer to my opening question asking "how Greeks came to Georgia". She states a rough time period and then gives the point of origin as *iz turtsii* "from Turkey" and positions "Greeks" as her in-group by referring to the people arriving from Turkey as *my* "we" (1). EM then repeats the migratory movement in the identically structured sentence: *iz turtsii oni priekhali* "they came from Turkey", this time referring to the migrants as *oni* "they" (3). She goes on to portray this provenance as a source

of conflicts in Ts'alk'a (3-11). Since this is at the very beginning of the interview, EM first has to establish who the "other side" is, the out-group in this conflict. She achieves this through a progression of labels and ascriptions, beginning with *tepereshniy narod* "current people" (3), who are described as *dazhe nas osuzhdayut* "they even condemn us" (3-4), presumably in a way that problematizes her community's provenance. Her next label *eti priezzhie* "these newcomers" (4) positions them, like LP did in excerpt 29, as unfamiliar with the region and as potential "intruders". With *eti adzhartsy* "these Ach'arians" (4-6) she categorizes them according to their provenance as "from Ach'ara", using a label that she expects to be intelligible to the two outsiders NL and myself. This label also alludes to ascriptions and concomitant evaluations that might be shared in the broader Georgian discourse on "Ach'arians", for instance the perception that they are still "predominantly Muslims" (7). In line 6, she quantifies their presence in Ts'alk'a as *mnogie* "many", thereby alerting her interlocutors to her perception of the conflict she is about to describe as relevant enough to be the topic of what is her first contribution in the interview.

EM goes on to narrate the general attitude of her in-group towards "these newcomers" in the form of a generalized citation, consisting of two questions (6-8). The first challenges the out-group's religious affiliation: *vy pochemu stali musul'manami* "why did you become Muslims?" (6-7) and is immediately contrasted with a statement of the in-group's religious affiliation *my khristianye* "we're Christians" (7). This contrast and thus the problem of religious affiliation is apparently so relevant for EM that she puts it first in her list of grievances about the out-group. It also presupposes knowledge of "the fact" that the Georgian-speaking "Ach'arians" were "once Christians", which we have already seen DP voice in excerpt 2 (cf. Chapter 5) and which plays a role in wider Georgian discourse about "Ach'arian Muslims". The second generalized question concerns activities attributed by EM's in-group to the out-group, namely "doing things" – presumably somehow differently to how they are expected to be done – and "breaking things" (7-8). These accusations are presented as "commonsensical" enough to warrant no explanation or justification. Importantly, this applies both to the out-group's religious affiliation and to the destructive behavior attributed to them.

The generalized conversation is then narrated to go on with the out-group not changing their religious affiliation or their behavior, or even explaining either, but claiming ownership of the land: *vy iz turtsii priekhali (-) eto zemlya nasha my gruziny* "you came from Turkey, this is our land, we're Georgians" (10-11). The out-group is thereby portrayed as denying EM's community the

ownership of the land, due to their "being from Turkey". The out-group is said to claim ownership by virtue of their "being Georgian" and thus the issue becomes not one of legal ownership, but of "right to ownership" through national affiliation. Notably, in this argument the link to a national territory takes precedence over other potential modes of establishing Belonging, such as religious affiliation or property titles. From this perspective, EM's in-group is thus categorized as "being Turkish", in stark contrast to how EM categorizes her community. In the interview situation, EM shifts responsibility for their time in "Turkey" away from her community and demands our support for this statement with *pravil'no* 'correctly' "right?" (15), which NL provides in line 16. EM goes on to describe her in-group's circumstances in "Turkey" with the metaphor frequently used by consultants in this context *my byli pod igom turkov* "we were under the Turks' yoke" (17). She thereby not only argues that her community's situation was "not their fault" but also positions them as "victims of the Turks" and thereby not "Turks" themselves.

Whereas in line 4 the out-group is portrayed as "condemning" EM's in-group, this is augmented in line 20 as "offending" them. EM repeats the reproach, this time in Georgian: *es sheni mits'a aris me kartveli var da shen turketidan mokhvedi* "this is your land? I'm Georgian and you came from Turkey" (21-22).[22] Repeating the quote she attributes to the out-group strengthens the accusation, and doing so in Georgian allows her to position herself as speaking at least some Georgian and therefore as properly understanding the accusation. It also enables her to make the limitation of her Georgian competence a topic in our conversation and to use it as an explanation of why she does not adroitly defend her community in the generalized exchange she narrates (24-30). This is achieved by first stating that she does not speak Georgian well (24), which is acknowledged by my laughing concession of my own shortcomings in this language (25). EM then reasserts her "being Greek" (26) but mitigates that she is "somehow unable" (26-28) to *vyyti na chistuyu vodu* "go out onto open water" (30). Note that the idiomatic Russian target phrase in line 30 would be *vyvesti na chistuyu vodu* "bring something to light", i.e. "expose something", which EM does not use in its idiomatic context but rather in the context of her not speaking Georgian

22 Note that in repeating the reproach from lines 10-11 in Georgian, *sheni* 'your' in *es sheni mits'a aris* "this is your land" was possibly intended as *chemi* 'my', making the repetition more similar to the Russian sentence in this excerpt and her other frequent repetitions of this attack she attributes to the "Ach'arian" out-group. Her Georgian is noticeably accented, fitting her self-assessment in line 24.

"fluently" enough to assert and argue for her status as "Greek" in Georgian.[23] The linguistic difficulties apparent here between the internal migrants who speak almost exclusively Georgian and the Georgian Greek population of Ts'alk'a who (especially in the older generation) are more comfortable speaking Russian or their heritage variety Urum, are mentioned in some but not all interviews in the region.

Note that even though EM positions herself in excerpt 31 as not quite able to verbally defend herself due to not speaking Georgian well enough, this is not her position in other contexts of the interview. Furthermore, as she narrates the story in excerpt 31, it is her in-group who starts asking questions which might very well be perceived to be offensive by the out-group. So, even though she does not present them as such, but rather as so "commonsensical" as to warrant no justification, the out-group is first put into the position of defending itself, which in her narration they accomplish by denying EM's in-group the "right to the land".

Let us now turn to an excerpt in which EM portrays herself as asserting clearly "whose land" she perceives the region of Ts'alk'a to be. When I ask her which place she considers to be her "homeland" she answers: *eta moya gruziya* "this [homeland] is my Georgia". She goes on to refer again to the struggle she perceives to be taking place in Ts'alk'a:

(32) This is our land (EM, 0:41:54-0:42:05)

1	EM:	*my rodilis' zdes' eta nasha ya skazala*
		we were_born_PL here this our I said_F
2	CH:	mhm
3	EM:	*oni govoryat vot eta nasha gruziya vot eta °h nasha zemlya ya*
		they say_they here this our Georgia here this our land I
4		*skazala vasha zemlya khulo*
		said_F your land Khulo
5	CH:	[mhm]
6	NL:	[((chuckles))]
7	EM:	*tam rodilis' °h ya rodilas' zdes' (-)*
		there were_born_PL I was_born_F here

1	EM:	we were born here, this is ours, I said
2	CH:	mhm
3	EM:	they say, this is our Georgia, this here is our land, I said, your land is
4		Khulo

23 Many thanks to Elena Novozhilova for her native Russian and linguistic competence in helping me decipher this sequence.

5 CH: [mhm]
6 NL: [((chuckles))]
7 EM: you were born there, I was born here

Her claim to "having the right" to the land centers heavily on being born "here". She first states *my rodilis' zdes'* "we were born here". To her it logically follows that *eta nasha* "this is ours", with *zemlya* 'land' omitted but contextually clear (1). She reports that she "said" this (1) – referring either to her having already repeatedly stated it in the interview or in conversation with members of the out-group. EM then relates what *oni govoryat* "they say", citing the out-group's reasoning as: *eta nasha gruziya eta nasha zemlya* "this is our Georgia, this is our land" (3). This time, EM reports herself as ready to defend herself: *ya skazala vasha zemlya khulo* "I said, your land is Khulo" (3-4). She thus not only answers back, but furthermore rejects the out-group's claim to potentially "all the land in Georgia" by restricting their claim to Khulo, the Ach'arian district from which some of the internal migrants relocated. This repartee is acknowledged by NL with a chuckle (6). EM closes this sequence by reaffirming that for her, the issue is the place of birth: *tam rodilis' °h ya rodilas' zdes'* "you were born there, I was born here" (7).

This struggle over rightful ownership of the land in Ts'alk'a appears in other interviews as well. DP, for instance, tells us of frequently being told by "Ach'arians" to "go to Greece" (DP, 0:09:57). While this does not position her as "Turkish" but as "Greek", she still attributes to the out-group a denial of her right to live and own land in Ts'alk'a. For consultants who mention ownership disputes, the land is rightfully "theirs" not only by virtue of being born there, as EM reasons, but also because they bought it or were settled there (accounts differ) as Orthodox Christian Greeks. This religious affiliation ties them even more strongly to this land, which through its conceptualization as Georgian becomes one that ought to be kept and tilled by Orthodox Christians. EM herself also emphasizes this point, when she repeatedly argues *eto khristianskiy rayon* "this is a Christian district" (EM, 0:10:30, 0:12:59). So, in her eyes Muslim Ach'arians were not only breaking the law by seizing formerly Greek-owned land, they were also violating the religious affiliation of the normatively Christian Land. Furthermore, national belonging is seen as so closely linked to religious affiliation that a Muslim Ach'arian cannot really claim access to the category Georgian.

The attitude attributed by EM and others to the Muslim Ach'arian outgroup is unsurprisingly at odds with this interpretation. The citations put in their mouths, usually in generalized stories, frame belonging in terms of linguistic affiliation and, through this, traceable provenance, as we have seen in excerpt 31. According to this view, an individual with a Turkish migration background who still speaks Turkish cannot possibly be a Christian, nor make a claim to Georgian Land. Having "always" lived in what is today part of Georgian national territory and speaking Georgian – and never having given up that language –, however, would support said claim to Georgian Land. Remarkably, the "others" are both times constructed to be somehow Turkish, either due to their heritage language or their religious affiliation. This is the challenge to being Greek, in short, that a few consultants perceive to be ongoing in Ts'alk'a and most of their community members I interviewed perceive as having settled down. As this is the only contemporary challenge to Greek category membership in Georgia that is reported in the interviews, it might help explain why for some consultants in Ts'alk'a their heritage variety Urum is perceived as a problematic feature in the contest over Belonging to Ts'alk'a, especially since it is precisely their Belonging to Georgia that is very relevant, as the following Section will show.

C. Belonging to Georgia and blurring boundaries

I will now explore three issues in more detail: firstly, my consultants' rootedness in Georgia as their "homeland", secondly how I tried – largely unsuccessfully – to find practices in which Georgian Greeks would see themselves as differing from "Georgians", and thirdly differences between consultants in how "traversable" a boundary they perceive Ancestry to be. Before looking at examples of how Ancestry and Religion can be viewed as "uncrossable" boundaries in Section D., this section will focus on exploring instances of blurred boundaries, multiple belongings, and being irreducibly rooted in Georgia.

In addition to being Greek, Belonging to Georgia emerges as the other important point of identification in the interviews. This has already been discussed in terms of meeting requirements for Citizenship, including topics like language competence (cf. Chapter 5), or the avoidance of questioning political decisions about institutional changes (cf. Chapter 6). However, consultants also frequently frame belonging in emotive terms that go well beyond instrumental considerations. Recall MP, who in excerpt 14 (Chapter 5) refers

to Georgia as "my country" – not "my country of citizenship" – and talks about "wanting to speak Georgian", not in order to cope with administrative procedures but as a way of expressing a deeper sense of belonging. Recall also AM's indignation at the rising nationalism in the 1990s that she perceives as, at the time, challenging her belonging to Georgia in excerpt 20 (cf. Chapter 6). An emotive framing of belonging is also found in consultants' emphasis on experiences shared by "everyone" in newly-independent Georgia, as discussed in Chapter 6 and aptly summarized by LV as: *spokoyno nikto ne zhil* "calmly, nobody lived" (LV, 0:10:33). It is further found in OP's "turning back" from a Greece he experienced as alienating to a Georgia he considers "home" (cf. SectionA.).

It will thus come as no surprise that that when I ask them which place they consider to be their *rodina* "homeland",[24] most of my consultants answer "Georgia" or give a more specific location within Georgia. This breaks down into 34 consultants who indicate "Georgia" (69.4%) and nine who give a more specific location (18.4%).[25] ZI is the only consultant who in answering this question explains that Greece is his "historical homeland". The only consultant who states that she is "unsure" is VD, a 21-year-old Pontic Greek woman, who spent most of her formative years in Greece but returned for her university education and to live with her grandmother. In four interviews I did not ask this question. Although I did not prompt consultants to elaborate on their answer, many do. In doing so, they most strongly emphasize their "homeland" being the place where they were born and grew up. Recall how DG spoke about not wanting to leave Georgia due to having taken her "first steps" there (cf. Chapter 6), even though she feels incredibly lonely in rural Tetrits'q'aro. Especially in Ts'alk'a, consultants might also highlight their connection to the *zemlya* 'land' (cf. Section B.), while others underscore the long time they have lived in Georgia as making them a part of it. Three male consultants state their readiness to "fight for Georgia" should the need arise, the 2008 war against Russia apparently still fresh in their memory. SM, a 23-year-old Pontic Greek who had returned from Georgian military service not very long before our interview, emphasizes his readiness not only to fight but also to "die for Georgia" more than once during our conversation (SM, 0:24:22, 0:34:00).

24 *Kakoe mesto rassmatrivaete kak rodinu* "which place do you consider to be your homeland?"

25 Consultants specifically mentioned Batumi (3) and Ts'alk'a (2), with Tbilisi, Iraga, Tetrits'q'aro, and Tsikhisjvari each mentioned once.

Portraying themselves as firmly rooted in and belonging to Georgia, roughly half of my consultants position themselves in our interviews as not wanting to leave Georgia.[26] Since our conversations took place in 2013-14, some time after the global financial crisis and once Georgia's economic and institutional situation had stabilized considerably, economic considerations certainly also played a role in their decisions – and consultants frequently spoke about the topic in these terms. These complexities and "good reasons for staying" notwithstanding, consultants also underscore their feeling of Belonging to Georgia in these sequences. AM, for instance, makes it very clear that she does not want to leave at all (AM, 0:20:58-0:21:57), using the discourse marker *chestno govorya* "honestly speaking" as a device to both manage my expectations and create greater proximity, thus allowing her to address a topic thereby positioned as potentially difficult (cf. Höfler, 2018b). When I ask her why she did not leave, her first answer is to mitigate and express her uncertainty, before launching into a longer explanation centered on "having roots" in Georgia due to the long time her family has lived "here": *zdes' svoy dom korni (-) roditeli (-) kladbishche* "here is my house, my roots, my parents, the cemetery". Having introduced this with *chestno govorya ya voobshche ne khochu nikuda uezzhat'* "honestly speaking, I really don't want to go anywhere at all" at the start, she closes it with the almost identical *chestno govorya ya ne khochu uezzhat' nikuda* "honestly speaking, I don't want to go anywhere". The things she lists as "rooting" her in Georgia are her parents – who decided against emigration – as well as her house and the cemetery, which provides a physical link to her ancestors. Ancestors and their tillable land itself (especially in Ts'alk'a) are also mentioned by other consultants as reasons for not leaving, for coming back, or for why their emigrant family members long to return to Georgia. SC, who spends some of his time in Greece and some in Georgia, asserts that he cannot do without Georgia: *menya tyanet syuda* "it pulls me here" (SC, 0:06:19). Asked whether she could imagine leaving Georgia under any circumstances, ME denies this:

(33) I've survived so much (ME, 0:37:35)

1	ME:	*ya sto'lko perenesla v gruzii chto ya naverno otsyuda [ne*
		I so_much survived_F in Georgia that I probably from_here not
2		*uekhala by nikuda]*
		went_F would nowhere

26 The other half were unsure, or had wanted to leave but this was prevented by personal or institutional difficulties.

3	NL:	*[da] [konechno]*
		yes of_course
4	CH:	*[((chuckles))] [khorosho ((chuckles)) da]*
		good yes
5	NL:	*[posle vsego chto vy perezhili]*
		after all what you_2PL went_through_PL
6	ME:	*[vot ya nikogda nikogda] ne dumala chto ya kuda-to*
		well I never never not thought_F that I somewhere
7		*uedu nikogda*
		will_go_I never

1	ME:	I survived so much in Georgia that I would probably [not go anywhere
2		from here]
3	NL:	[yes] [of course]
4	CH:	[((chuckles))] [alright ((chuckles)) yes]
5	NL:	[after everything that you've been through]
6	ME:	[well, I never, never] thought that I would go somewhere, never

ME first asserts *ya stol'ko perenesla v gruzii* "I have survived so much in Georgia" (1) that she would *naverno* "probably" (1) not go *nikuda* "anywhere" (2). She thereby suggests that the scenario described in my question is nearly inconceivable, with *stol'ko* "so much" estimating the amount of the hardship she experienced as very high. Even though *naverno* 'probably' opens the possibility of considering emigration as an option, she firstly makes it clear that her difficult experiences were not reason enough to leave even at the time she was enduring them, implying they give even less cause for emigration now that they are over. Secondly, these hardships might be interpreted as having established a further and deeper connection between her and "Georgia", making it even harder to leave. Her statement is acknowledged by both NL and myself (3-4), with NL repeating and thereby confirming that there was much to "go through" (5). ME then closes this sequence by reaffirming that she never thought about "going anywhere" (6). She reinforces this by repeating *nikogda* "never" three times, so as not to leave the slightest trace of doubt in the minds of her interlocutors. The possibility of her emigrating is thereby now positioned as not having crossed her mind "ever". This attests as much to ME's Resilience in coping with great hardship (cf. Chapter 6) – as to her sense of attachment to Georgia, which is strong enough to have even endured civil war unshaken.

Having explored my consultants' Belonging to Georgia, I will now explore whether they perceive any differences between themselves and the "Georgian" societal majority. Towards the end of the interviews, I posed

a number of questions probing whether consultants perceive differences between "how things are done" in their community and in Georgia generally. I specifically asked them to describe differences in religious practices and "traditions and customs", allowing them to interpret the latter as they saw fit. My consultants consider the autocephalous Georgian Orthodox and Greek Orthodox churches to be fundamentally "the same". The most mentioned difference concerns the calendars: the Georgian Orthodox church follows the Julian calendar, whereas the Greek Orthodox Church follows the Gregorian calendar. Whenever this difference is stated, consultants also assert that they take it to be a minor, even superficial one. They frequently mention the church's Orthodoxy as the most crucial and uniting factor. As AK puts it after explaining that her in-group and "Georgians" celebrate the same holidays:

(34) We have the same bible (AK, 0:47:57-0:48:04)

1	AK:	*pravoslavnye oni pravoslavnye my nikakoy raznitsy tam netu*
		Orthodox they Orthodox we any difference there not_is
2		*odna u nas bibliya*
		one at us Bible
		'they are Orthodox, we are Orthodox, there is no difference there at all, we have the same Bible'

In excerpt 34, AK closes her explication of similarities between "Georgian" and "Greek" religious practices by emphasizing that both "groups", which I had established in asking that question, are "Orthodox". This is achieved by repeating the fronting of *pravoslavnye* "Orthodox" in both instances, creating emphasis through both word order and repetition. Therefore, there is "no difference" between them, evidenced by their recourse to the same foundational scripture: *odna u nas bibliya* "we have the same Bible" (2). This answer's focus on what is perceived to be the essence of their faith is also apparent in another frequently heard sentence: *vera u nas odna* 'faith at us one' "our faith is the same" (for instance EM, 0:48:30).

Interestingly, this is quite often voiced in conjunction with statements about other cultural practices being similar, as in the case of LT who asserts *u nas odinakovaya vera vospitanie obryady* "we have the same faith, upbringing, rites" (LT, 0:10:40). Regarding "other cultural customs", however, not all of my consultants would agree with LT. Ten consultants (20.4%) state that they perceive some differences in this respect, although half of them could not come up with any examples. The others mention differences in food, dances or marriage customs, none of which are presented as "core" practices in any

way.[27] Consultants frequently attribute this perceived "sameness" to the time their community has spent living in Georgia (for instance IS, 0:45:47). MP takes this a step further in the following excerpt:

(35) I dance the Georgian way (MP, 0:40:57-0:41:25)

1	CH:	*i sushchestvuyut li kakie-libo drugie kul'turnye osobennosti*
		and exist_they whether any other cultural peculiarities
2		*(-) e mezhdu: grekami*
		between Greeks
3	MP:	*grekami i gruzinami [da]*
		Greeks and Georgians yes
4	CH:	*[da]*
		yes
5	NL:	[mhm]
6	MP:	*(3) ya znaesh' skazhu chto net (-) pochemu net °h ya to chto*
		I know_2SG will_say_I that no why no I that what
7		*zdes' v gruzii zhivu [kak] gruzin tak i ya gruzin*
		here in Georgia live_I how Georgian_M so and I Georgian_M
8		*vot tak (ya s etim zhivu)*
		well so I with this live_I
9	CH:	*[mhm] da*
		yes
10	NL:	*da*
		yes
11	MP:	*po-drugomu ne bylo ya grets:_ po-grecheski ne znayu*
		differently not was I Gree_ the_Greek_way not know_I
12		*tantsevat' ne znayu po-grecheski nichego ne [znayu]*
		to_dance not know_I the_Greek_way nothing not know_I
13	NL:	*[da]*
		yes
14	MP:	*[tak chto] po-gruzinski potantsuyu po [((chuckles))]*
		so that the_Georgian_way will_dance_I in
15	CH:	[((chuckles))] [((laughs))]
16	NL:	[((chuckles))]

1	CH:	and are there any other cultural peculiarities between Greeks
3	MP:	between Greeks and Georgians? [yes]
4	CH:	[yes]

27 Notably, when I started to ask about these "differences", a number of consultants first understood me as referring to differences between "Georgian Greeks" and "Greek Greeks" or between "Georgia" and "Greece" in general. This also suggests that such "differences" are perceived, if at all, as minimal.

5	NL:	[mhm]
6	MP:	I, you know, will say no, why not? I live here in Georgia like a
7		Georgian, so I am Georgian so (I live with this)
9	CH:	[mhm] yes
10	NL:	yes
11	MP:	it wasn't differently, I Gree_ the Greek way I can't, I don't know the
12		Greek way to dance, I don't know anything
13	NL:	[yes]
14	MP:	so I'll dance the Georgian way [((chuckles))]
15	CH:	[((chuckles))] [((laughs))]
16	NL:	[((chuckles))]

At the beginning of excerpt 35, MP supports me in establishing that my question is whether there are any "cultural differences" between "Georgian Greeks" and "Georgians" (1-3). MP had earlier ruled out the possibility of any "religious differences" with the normative statement that they "should not exist". He now also denies the existence of other differences, and explains that *zdes' v gruzii zhivu kak gruzin* "here in Georgia I live like a Georgian" (7). This comparison of his lifestyle with that of a "Georgian" is then taken a step further: *tak i ya gruzin* "so I am also Georgian" (7). He thereby not only equates the way he lives with how a "Georgian" would, but asserts his membership in that category. While my question had set up two different categories, MP here establishes the boundary as a permeable one, crossable by "living like" a member of the other category. He provides an example as "proof", namely that he cannot dance *po-grecheski* "the Greek way" (11-12). He strengthens this by repeating *ne znayu* "I don't know (how to)" three times. In line 14 he tells us his solution to this "problem" – since he presumably finds it necessary to dance on social occasions: *tak chto po-gruzinski potantsuyu* "so I'll dance the Georgian way". This satisfactorily closes the sequence with all three of us voicing amusement (14-16).

Crucially, this is not a case of a boundary dissolving between the categories Greek and Georgian, exemplified in different ways of dancing. This is a highly salient example, since both the "Greek" and the "Georgian" way of dancing are perceived to be distinctive and highly elaborate each in its own way, not just by MP. Instead, by positioning himself as "incapable" of dancing "the Greek way", MP resorts to the way of dancing that is contextually more readily available, namely "the Georgian way". Therefore, this is not a case of liminality, with perhaps a new way of dancing that combines "Greek" and "Georgian" elements, but a case of individual assimilation. Based on how MP first answers the question (6), we can assume that he adduces his own example in order to make a more general statement about the community.

Table 7.2: Feeling as "Greek", "Georgian", or both

	Greek		more Georgian		both		no answer		total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Urum urban	2	18.2	0	0	7	63.6	2	18.2	11	100
Urum rural	8	66.6	1	8.3	2	16.6	1	8.3	12	100
Pontic urban	4	40	2	20	4	40	0	0	10	100
Pontic rural	8	50	0	0	5	31.3	3	18.5	16	100
Total	22	45	3	6.1	18	36.7	6	12.2	49	100

However, while MP positions himself in excerpt 35 as Georgian, this holds only for the very specific context of speaking about "cultural differences", not for others in which he positions himself unequivocally and only as Greek. In order to tease out these subtleties, I asked consultants towards the end of the interview whether they could think of situations in which they would "feel especially Greek".[28] After exploring these situations, I would then ask about situations in which they might "feel especially Georgian", followed by a similar exploration of these situations. These are very direct questions aimed precisely at probing their identification with these two categories. They were intended to complement the analysis of categories and identifications emerging from the open questions and were quite helpful in establishing the primacy of Ancestry in how many – but not all – consultants trace their belonging, as will be further discussed in section D..

Consultants' positionings in the context of these two questions are given in Table 7.2. The categories were derived as follows: those consultants who could think only of situations where they felt "Greek" and denied feeling "Georgian" in any situation were put in the category "Greek". Those who found situations for feeling both "Greek" and "Georgian" are given under "both". Those consultants who had difficulties finding a situation in which they would feel "especially Greek" and stated that given the choice, they would consider themselves to be either "more Georgian" or "Georgian" are to be found under "more Georgian".

Notably, while 22 (45%) of consultants stated they could only ever "feel Greek", a combined tally of those who identified situations for both, and those who expressed "feeling more Georgian", amounts to almost the same:

28 The question I asked was: *est' situatsii v kotorykh vy chustvuete sebya osobenno grekami* "are there situations in which you feel especially Greek?"

21 consultants (42.8%). For both Pontic and Urum Greeks, consultants living in cities were more likely to consider themselves as belonging multiply. Importantly, all those consultants who answered that they could only ever "feel Greek" interpreted this question as somehow connected to their Greek Ancestry. For instance, MP, who in excerpt 35 tells us that he "is Georgian" by virtue of living in Georgia, and who calls Georgia "his country" in excerpt 14, denied "feeling Georgian" in the context of these questions because for him, these were questions about ancestry rather than individual choice. I will explore this complex in greater detail in Section D. below and now focus on those who talk about belonging multiply.

Consultants who reported situations for both "feeling Greek" and "feeling Georgian" clearly did not interpret these questions as prompting an "either-or" answer – and some consultants' explanations may be fairly interpreted as preempting and/or refusing the restriction to only one category. The following excerpt is taken from the interview with MC, a 34-year-old Urum Greek professional living in Tbilisi. Excerpt 36 is her answer to Nika Loladze's question, which language is "currently the most important" to her.

(36) Everything in me is Georgian (MC, 0:37:56-0:38:13)[29]

1	MC:	*kartuli ra tkma unda (–) arts imas e berdzeni var vambob*
		Georgian what say should not_even this Greek am say_I
2		*ubralod ekhla ra_ dav_ itsi ra kartveli var ar*
		simply now know_2SG what Georgian am no
3		*[met'q'vian]*
		say_they
4	NL:	[mhm]
5	MC:	*debili khar ranairi kartveli khar kho mara*
		stupid are_2SG what_kind_of Georgian are_2SG yes but
6	NL:	mhm
7	MC:	*q'oveltvis vapiksireb ro erovnebit var berdzeni [mara*
		always highlight_I that nationality_with am Greek but
8		*ai] is raghatsa rats aris is [mtlianad] kartulia*
		look_here that something since is it wholly Georgian_is
9		*chemshi*
		me_in
10	NL:	[mhm] [mhm]

1	MC:	Georgian, of course, even though I'm Greek I say, you know, if I said I
2		am a Georgian, they won't [say to me]

29 This interview was conducted in Georgian.

4 NL: [mhm]
5 MC: are you stupid, what kind of Georgian are you but
6 NL: mhm
7 MC: I always highlight that my nationality is Greek [but there is something]
8 inside me that is entirely Georgian
10 NL: [mhm] [mhm]

MC answers the question very clearly with *kartuli ra tkma unda* "Georgian of course", which she strengthens by stating that this is the case "even though" she is "Greek" (1). She goes on to explain that if she positioned herself as "being Georgian" by uttering *kartveli var* "I'm Georgian", this would be accepted: *ar met'q'vian debili khar ranairi kartveli khar* "they won't say to me are you stupid, what kind of Georgian are you?" (5).[30] She explains how she *q'oveltvis* "always" underscores how she belongs in more than one way: *erovnebit var berdzeni* "by nationality I am Greek" (7), while at the same time *is raghatsa rats aris is mtlianad kartulia chemshi* "there is something in me that is entirely Georgian" (8-9). Crucially, this is not a way of playing down her Greek category membership in the sense of reducing it to a trace of her ancestry. This becomes apparent shortly after this excerpt, when NL asks her about situations in which she might "feel Greek". She expresses "great pride" in the "Greek cultural achievements" and closes her explanation with: *ai orive mkhare meamaq'eba khvdebi esets kartulits da berdznulits* "so, I'm proud of both sides, you understand? the Georgian and the Greek" (MC, 0:39:09). She thereby positions herself unambiguously as belonging multiply, being both Greek and Georgian.

This is expressed similarly by AK, who actually voices the image of "rootedness" I have already used often, also analyzed in Sideri (2006).

(37) I'm a Greek Georgian (AK, 0:30:01)

1 AK: *ya raz zhivu zdes' uzhe stol'ko let ya tozhe schitayus'*
I as live_I here already so_many years I also consider_myself_I
2 *korennaya gruzinka << chuckling > uzhe > grecheskoy*
rooted Georgian_F already Greek_F
3 *gruzinkoy kak govoryat*
Georgian_F how say_they
'since I've lived here already so many years, I also consider myself already a native Georgian, a Greek Georgian as they say'

30 Note that *debili* 'stupid' is one of the less aggressive ways of expressing one's doubt in the soundness of the interlocutor's reasoning in Georgian.

As we have already seen in a number of other excerpts, AK cites the time she has spent living in Georgia *stol'ko let* "so many years" (1) as a reason to consider herself to be a *korennaya gruzinka* 'rooted Georgian' "native Georgian" (2).[31] Again, this is not perceived to counter her Greekness, which she clarifies by labeling herself *grecheskoy gruzinkoy* "Greek Georgian" (2-3). This is verified as an existing category, i.e. not something she came up with herself, by citing an unspecific general public with *kak govoryat* "as they say" (3). Greek Georgian is thus established as a "known" and therefore valid category encompassing both categories she perceives herself to be a member of. Importantly, this membership is not portrayed as challenged in Georgia, but instead affirmed through the use of a label she attributes to the societal majority. As in excerpt 17 analyzed in Chapter 6, AK Normalizes her experiences – here her identification – as "nothing out of the ordinary".

Consultants thus consider themselves as Belonging to Georgia by virtue of it being their "homeland", through their Georgian Citizenship, and by "being rooted" through physical and emotional ties in Georgia. They further consider the categories Greek and Georgian to be very similar in what many consider to be a very important part of their identification, namely Orthodox Christianity, as well as in Greeks having assimilated to "Georgian customs" over the time their community has lived there. This is, then, an instance of a boundary that might have been more relevant in the past but has lost much of its relevance today, thereby becoming permeable or even disappearing in certain contexts. For over a third of consultants, this implies self-identification as both Greek and Georgian that goes far deeper than citizenship.

D. Irreducible differences? "Religion" and "Ancestry"

In this final part of the analysis, I will focus on two attributes that are used with some frequency to establish "insurmountable" boundaries in the interview corpus: Religion and Ancestry. As with the other parts of the analysis, this does not hold for all consultants, nor do I claim it to be any more representative for self-identifying members of Georgia's Greek community than other parts of the analysis. Both Religion and Ancestry emerge, however, as somehow omnirelevant in many interviews.

31 Cf. the discussion of the Soviet policies around *korenizatsiya* 'putting down roots' "nativization" in Chapter 2 and in Maisuradze (2015a).

Table 7.3: Is it acceptable to marry a person who is not "Greek"?

	yes		Muslims difficult		no Muslims		only Orthod.		better not		no answer	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
U urb	2	18.2	0	0	1	9.1	3	27.3	1	9.1	4	36.4
U rur	4	33.3	1	8.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3
P urb	5	50	1	10	3	30	1	10	0	0	0	0
P rur	6	37.5	4	25	5	31.25	0	0	0	0	1	6.25
Total	17	34.7	6	12.2	13	26.4	5	10.2	2	4	6	12.2

We have seen in this Chapter how Religion is used both to explain the fundamental similarities between Greeks and Georgians (cf. Section C.) and to position Ach'arians as fundamentally different from Georgians and therefore also from their fellow Orthodox Greeks (cf. Section B.). Religion and Ancestry also play an important role in arguing for Language being not as important a marker of national identification by some consultants, as discussed in Chapter 5 and Section A. above. To avoid relying on this, I asked my consultants about the acceptability of "exogamous marriages". The precise question was: *schitaete li vy priemlemym brak greka s chelovekom drugoy natsional'nosti* "do you consider marriage of a Greek with a person from another nationality to be acceptable?". If they answered affirmatively, the follow-up question would be *i s musul'maninom* "and with a Muslim?" The answers are summarized in Table 7.3.

The endpoints of the "acceptability continuum" are consultants giving a clear "yes" answer on the one hand and those answering what might be summarized as "only Orthodox" or "better not" on the other. About a third of all consultants consider it completely acceptable if a "Greek" person marries someone they would not categorize as "Greek", regardless of that person's religious affiliation. Notably, consultants' age does not correlate with a "yes" answer – even though some of the younger consultants position themselves as "more progressive" by stating that it might pose a problem "for older people". Most consultants stating "yes" tell us that it would be up to the people in question, in variations of *serdtsu ne prikazhesh'* "you don't command the heart" (SC, 0:58:15) or *bog odin* "God is one" (NP, 0:28:32). Overall, Pontic Greeks in the corpus appear to be a little more open than Urum Greeks to marriages with "non-Greeks". Interestingly, urban Urum Greek consultants appear to be the most focused on "Greek marriage", with

four of them (36.4%) answering "better not" or "only Orthodox". Note that the latter also excludes any other "Christian" denominations like members of the "Armenian Apostolic Church" or "Catholics" – which were usually only brought up in the conversation because I was perceived to be "Catholic" due to my German nationality.[32] Crucially, the problem with "marrying a non-Greek" is established as hinging on that person's religious affiliation, instead of on their national affiliation – which my question had established as a possibility – or any other feature of their personality. This is, of course, also apparent in those answers that find a marriage with "Muslims" to be "difficult" or that outrightly reject this possibility. This sometimes occurs prior to me asking, as in the case of the interview with EC, which I discuss in detail in Höfler (2018b). Some consultants expressed surprise that I would even raise such a possibility, or responded with a curt *ne mozhet byt'* "it cannot be" (LV, 0:22:47). While I did not ask consultants for their reasons, those who went on to justify their rejection usually referred to the "practical difficulties" such a trans-religious marriage would entail. Numbering 19 consultants (38.7%), those skeptical of marriage to a person with "Muslim" background take up the largest portion in the sample. Adding the five consultants who answered "only Orthodox" – an even stricter criterion of religious affiliation – the number rises to 24 consultants (48.9%), almost half of the sample.

These marriage preferences again suggest that for many consultants Religion is an omnirelevant device in the more expansive sense introduced in Chapter 5 (cf. Sacks, 1992). Since it is ultimately the analyst who has to decide whether or not to attribute omnirelevance to a sequence, this is done sparingly in MCA literature, mainly in order to analyze interlocutors' orientation to things very clearly referenced within the interactional context (Fitzgerald et al., 2009; Fitzgerald / Rintel, 2013). However, having seen how consultants make use of Religion as a device to order their social world, the concept of omnirelevance offers a deeper understanding of how consultants categorize people as falling unambiguously into one of two broad categories: Christian or Muslim. This emerged across contexts, as consultants spoke about their provenance in the Ottoman Empire; their language use both individually and as a community; their belonging to and in Georgia – also and especially in Ts'alk'a, where this belonging and self-identification is

32 In the conversation with DP and FP in Ts'alk'a, a lively discussion ensued over the question of whether "Catholics" could be considered "real Christians" or not. It was settled by NL pointing out that "Catholics also go to church", which was evaluated as sufficient "proof" of "Christianity" (DP, 0:33:06-0:34:31).

sometimes contested; their struggle to be recognized in Greece; the blurring of boundaries with "Georgians" that is partly based on a perception of shared religious affiliation; and finally their marriage preferences. In all of these contexts, not only do consultants ascribe very different – mostly opposing – attributes to these categories, they also orient very differently towards individuals to whom they attribute different category memberships. Finally these categories are afforded very different degrees of internal differentiation: while Christians appear in a number of religious and national denominations, this is drastically reduced with regard to Muslims who are in many instances simply positioned as a homogeneous out-group.[33] The repeated reference to their community's Orthodox Christianity, then, emerges as an important narrative legitimizing my consultants' self-identification and tracing their story through the centuries, i.e. it is a tidemark deeply enmeshed in who they portray themselves to be (cf. Green 2009).

The other fundamental point of identification I suggest treating as omnirelevant is Ancestry, which has emerged in this role time and again in the analysis, especially in terms of negating the importance of Language for their self-identification and of struggling – to different degrees of involvement – for recognition in Greece. Ancestry has also come up, perhaps unexpectedly, in the results given in Table 7.2, exploring the answers given to whether consultants could find situations in which they would feel "especially Georgian". 22 consultants (45%) said they could only "be Greek" in the context of these questions, despite in other contexts positioning themselves as Belonging to Georgia in deeper ways than Citizenship.[34]

Importantly, the question is taken by many consultants who state they "could not be Georgian" to be a question about their Ancestry and not about their individual feeling of belonging. EC, for instance, explains for a whole minute what might be summarized by one of her utterances: *ya ne gruzinka kak ya mogu gruzinkoy chuvstvovat'* "I'm not Georgian, how could I feel like a Georgian?" (EC, 0:50:21). "Feeling Georgian" is therefore impossible for someone who "is Greek". This evaluation is shared by most consultants who answer similarly. Thus NP asserts: *ya grekom rodilsya grekom umru* "I was born Greek, I will die Greek" (NP, 0:25:14) – suggesting Ancestry as the

33 On out-group homogenization cf. Dijk (1987); Roth (2005); Tajfel (1981); Wodak et al. (2009).

34 Cf. the discussion of excerpts 14 in Chapter 5 and 35 in Section C..

crucial point in this context.[35] Recall also SC's joke about a person "having to be born Greek" in order to take pride in it (excerpt 7 in Chapter 5). A further case in point is the interview with IP and TV, who deplore the continued reliance on Ancestry as an attribute determining someone's belonging "here" in the post-Soviet space, with TV establishing this question as "a delicate matter" (excerpt 26 in Section A.).

Analyzing Ancestry as an omnirelevant device is made further plausible by the fact that a number of consultants refer to their categorization as "Greek" in their Soviet passport in contexts ranging from language use through negative experiences in Greece and on to questions about "feeling Georgian". In the latter context, I was also told that consultants "would never change their surname", i.e. change a "Greek surname" to a "Georgian surname" so as to pass as Georgian. Some attribute the practice of surname-changing to "other minorities" in Georgia or to "Georgians" in Greece and evaluate it negatively as a "betrayal", committed in order to gain advantages by passing as a member of the respective societal majority (cf. Hewitt, 1989; Sideri, 2006). Ancestry might therefore be analyzed as yet another trace (cf. Green 2009) of the Soviet way of evaluating behavior in terms of its "adequacy" to one's national affiliation – which was based exclusively on ancestry and could only be changed by children in "mixed marriages" (cf. Arel, 2003; Brubaker, 1996; Slezkine, 1994; Suny, 1993).

Thus, while I had intended the question to be about emotional attachment, these answers point to the undiminished importance of Ancestry for some of my consultants today. In most everyday contexts, this might be conceptualized as a "thin line on the ground" that can be "stepped over", blurring the boundary between Greeks and Georgians to the point of disappearance. In other contexts, like the one apparently established by my question, it is instead perceived to be "uncrossable" since trying to pass as "Georgian" would betray both "Georgians" and "Greeks".

As they have emerged to be of varying but usually high levels of importance in most of the conversational contexts we have looked at, I therefore propose to treat both Religion and Ancestry as omnirelevant devices. As such, consultants use them to order their social world and to make it intelligible to themselves and the outsider in the context of our interview conversation.

35 Only one consultant, AL, explains this less in terms of "being born that way", i.e. Ancestry, but in terms of not being well versed enough in "Georgian traditions" to claim membership in that category.