

Greek-Orthodox Diasporic Glocality and Translocality in Germany and Great Britain

Dr Georgios E. Trantas
Aston University
georgios.trantas@ymail.com
g.trantas@aston.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Migration does not take place in a vacuum, nor is the formation of communities thereof a mere collection of individuals; particularly when taking into account one of the main transferrable cultural determinants of identity and self-perception, i.e. group religiosity. The latter makes its aesthetic manifestation in the public sphere and hence, migration gives rise to religioscapes, which are identifiable by their visible markers in the form of architecture and religious art. The same applies to the Greek-Orthodox migrant communities of Germany and Great Britain. Both were established in the mid-twentieth century when the main bulk of their demographic presence in the corresponding countries took place. The formation of their communities occurred clearly before globality ushered in the contemporary, parallel, glocal, translocal and cultural relativisation that is facilitated by increased mobility and advanced means of communication. Yet, this paper argues that both the glocal and translocal conceptual frameworks apply to the case studies of interest. Evidence of this is particularly traceable in their corresponding religioscapes' markers, which are permeated by aesthetic priorities and main influences, emergent patterns of predominant featured themes and tendencies that attest to glocality and translocality. Notably, not only are their places of worship containers of their immortalized narratives, they also contribute to the perpetuation of their distinct mutability. This phenomenon of aesthetic adaptation in accordance with the accumulated social experience, highlights the emergent patterns of a glocal and translocal sense of *being* and *belonging* that gave rise to the distinct hybrid identity amalgams thereof.

KEYWORDS

Greek Orthodox; religioscapes; migration; translocality; glocality; Germany; Great Britain.

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to discuss the diasporic, glocal and translocal character of the Greek Orthodox religioscapes of Germany and Great Britain in line with the findings of the research project *GO Religioscapes*.¹ The latter, in passing, examines and compares the above-mentioned case studies, so as to shed light on their collective migratory and integration narratives as those emerge from their religiocultural aesthetics. As the churches have appropriated and simultaneously co-shaped the social experience of their communities, they have been influenced and adapted accordingly. Features and themes, both architectural and iconographical, comprise symbolic constellations that ultimately contain figures of memory (Assmann and Czaplika, 1995). Drawing from the analysis of the primary research material that has been accumulated within the bounds of *GO Religioscapes*, this paper identifies the conceptual frameworks of globality-glocality and translocality as applicable in the case studies examined here, even though their migrant community and religioscapes' formation predates the contemporary typological identifiers of the theoretical perspectives thereof.

Taking into account the central role of the church in the formation of these communities, its contribution to their social and cultural life and how closely-knit community and church evolved, it would not be off the mark to consider church and diasporic community coterminous, particularly in the early stages of establishment and integration that took place between the late 1950s and early 1970s. And indeed, it would be accurate to describe them as religioscapes. The latter found their material expression via their element, their churches, which in turn, being communicants of the migratory narrative, absorbed it and illustrated it aesthetically.

Although they were formed before globality ensued, the Greek Orthodox religioscapes of Germany and Great Britain demonstrated glocal qualities and attributes subsequent to their reterritorialisation. As ethnoscapes, and in further sub-categorisation as religioscapes, they comprise those distinctive elements that render them theoretically such; yet they are also permeated diachronically by sociocultural mutability, which is distinctive of diasporic translocal formations. Locality, however, is of the essence here, because considering the limitations of mobility – due to income, profession, class, but also legal restrictions pertaining to the sovereign state's border policies of the time before the founding of the European Union (EU) – those communities were by and large anchored in-place. Inevitably, they developed special ties with their localities while preserving their memorial and narrative attachment to those of the homeland, which enabled the eventual development of distinct, translocal self-perceptions of *being* and *belonging*.

The methodological approach of choice was a qualitative empirical research conducted in Germany and Great Britain in 2018-19. There, I visited twenty-eight and twenty-six places of worship respectively and collected visual data in the form of images. The sample was representative of the object of research; i.e. it comprised churches that have appropriated as well as co-shaped the migratory narrative of Greek Orthodox religioscapes that were

¹ This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 789827. Please visit the corresponding European Commission website for details: <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/789827>.

established between the late 1950s and early 1970s. The body of primary data constitutes of iconographical and architectural images and was examined via semiotic visual analysis, further broken down to thematic analysis. Through the taxonomic analytical process, patterns of thematic categories and subcategories emerged out of the visual material, pertaining to self-perception and identity within the framework of migratory grand narratives.

Among others, out of symbolic constellations and the significations of ethnicity, nationality, culture and religiosity, it has been possible to confirm that the objects of research constitute *par excellence* Diasporas, as well as glocal and translocal religioscapes, even though they predate globalisation and the dynamic thereof. More to the point, it has been validated that their heterotopic configurations are not only the containers of their migratory narratives, but they also bear aesthetic witness to their mutability and their relationship with locality and space – both sacred and profane – as a central element of their identity perceptions.

Relgioscapes – The Case Studies

With the emergence of increased population movement and the deterritorialised flows followed by reterritorialisation and community formations in the context of globalisation – that is, ‘the compression of the world’ (Robertson, 2012, 205), Appadurai offered a way out of the dated centre-periphery models as he identified the disjunctures between the economic, the cultural and the political milieu. In this light, via his theorisation where he distinguished between dimensions of global cultural flow, he suggested that ethnoscapes should be defined as ‘the landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live’ (1990, 297). This neologism is an attempt to address the aforementioned global shifts that ensue with migration and the subsequent group reconstitutions and reconfigurations that give rise to group identity reviews, influenced among others by reconstructed collective narratives of a sense of belonging: Location, history and memory, as well as ethnicity and culture do not suffice to provide the previous certainties that were drawn from the assumptions on homogeneity (Appadurai, 1996).

Building upon these theoretical foundations, Elizabeth McAlister went a step further and in addition to Appadurai’s -scapes, i.e. ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes (Appadurai, 1990), she produced the definition of religioscapes as ‘the subjective religious maps – and attendant theologies – of immigrant, or diasporic, or transnational communities who are also in global flow and flux’ (McAlister, 2005, 251). And it is within the framework of globality that glocality occurs, in other words, the latter as an aspect of the former, with globality comprising a plurality of localities (Beyer, 2013). In turn, those localities that emanate from globality, hence glocalities, are permeated by religious diversity, being less susceptible to the homogenising secularist currents that the classical sociologists expected (Roudometof, 2008).

When examined against the backdrop of globality, it is fair to say that religioscapes indeed adhere to the corresponding state of flux that increased mobility bestows on them. Following migration people relocate, reterritorialise, and tend to co-shape their immediate built environment of their host location as this movement does not transpire in a vacuum. This also pertains to their

religious aesthetics, considering that migration is not devoid of cultural and religious practices, beliefs and values, which ultimately constitute the connecting tissue between those who form a community (Hayden and Walker, 2013). By extension, the community's religiocultural identifiers will most likely seek an expression in the public sphere and in that way, by being present in the built environment with its own buildings, artefacts, places of worship and pilgrimage, the religiocultural community asserts itself spatially. It thus demarcates its area while emerging as a religioscape physically, and in that sense, 'the religioscape, then, is a social space marked by physical icons, from small shrines to large complexes of them, or even sacred cities' (ibid. 408).

It should, however, be underlined that the premise of mobility and the corresponding state of flux does not apply to the religioscapes being studied here. Those were formed, for the most part, between the 1950s and 1970s, with the 1960s being the period of greater influx. At the time, before globalisation in its contemporary form ensued, the many options of expatriation and settlement, particularly across Europe and between the European Union Member States for EU nationals, were not available to them in the context of full state sovereignty as opposed to pooled sovereignty.

As regards the case studies and the religioscapes of interest, one might ask 'why them?' The main reason would be that, as far as Eastern Orthodox intra-European migration is concerned, both religioscapes of interest were de- and reterritorialised in Great Britain and Germany already since the late 1950's and 1960s, unlike any other sizeable analogous cases that typically emerged later on. This allowed them a significant window of opportunity, decades, in order to establish themselves in their host countries and develop their own migratory narratives, which could in turn be made religioculturally visible in the public sphere. In addition, in both cases their churches had a central role in community life from the outset, and in doing so they both co-shaped the migratory narrative as well as appropriated the collective community experience. The diasporic identity amalgam that emerged from this long-lasting process was aesthetically encoded in the places of worship of those religioscapes.

Greek-Cypriot migration to the UK pre-existed the period of interest, as it can be traced back to the early twentieth century, although it was sparse then. As stated above, the influx was mostly notable in the 1950s-1970s. Political factors, such as the turbulence on the island at the time of British rule and the struggle for independence, followed by instability, social unrest and the culmination of a perfect storm in the 1974 Turkish invasion and occupation thereafter, rendered Britain a destination country, mostly because of employment opportunities and the 'colonial connection' (Finnis, 2013; Josephides, 1987, 43). Moreover, the British economy was flourishing in the 1950s and 1960s, which rendered it all the more appealing, and the Greek-Cypriots became part of that period's New Commonwealth migration (Anthias, 1992).

In addition to being colonial migrants, therefore their migratory experience was not impervious to the dynamic of colonialist relations, they were lacking in language skills, educational and professional qualifications, and they were not accustomed to the native British social structures and culture. More to the point, they were mostly of a rural background and

adhered to traditional Greek-Cypriot family values. In addition, their post-war sense of identity was permeated by an anti-colonialist, anti-British sentiment. Further, they were culturally as well as physically visible in areas – predominantly London – where their demographic presence was high (Ibid.). Indicatively, their population in the boroughs of the city in 1971 and 1981 respectively was as follows:

“London Borough	1971	1981
Haringey	11,865	11,671
Islington	7,300	4,643
Enfield	4,020	9,240
Hackney	3,985	4,067
Southwark	3,310	3,238
Camden	2,850	1,837
Barnet	2,640	3,906
Lambeth	2,265	1,871
Lewisham	-	2,136”

(Anthias, 1992: 8)

Outside London, in 1971 Cypriot born communities comprised: Birmingham (1030), Manchester (490), Bristol (375), Liverpool (345) (Ibid.).

According to other sources, prior to the Second World War the Greek-Cypriot population was estimated to about 8,000, whereas in 1966 they amounted to approximately 110,000 and above 200,000 in the early 1980s. London became the hub of Greek-owned shipping industry between 1940 and 1970 with a corresponding rise in the numbers of Greek employees in those firms, as well as in the banking and insurance sectors, shipping agencies, companies and shipyards. From 1,800 people in 1955, the Greek population increased to 4,100 in 1964 and 8,000 in 1973 according to the Greek Consulate in London (Charlafti, 2006).

Religion, i.e. Greek Orthodoxy, is highly regarded and constitutes a valued element of the Greek-Cypriot collective sense of identity. Ethnic and religious traditions and festivals are maintained and by extension so is the articulation of religiosity in the public sphere. Notably, the Greek-Orthodox Church has had a presence in Great Britain much earlier than sizeable communities were formed. It dates back to the settlement of a Greek community in Soho, year 1676. Indicatively, the London cathedral of Aghia Sophia in Moscow Road, Bayswater, was built in 1879 (Anthias, 1992; Kardasis and Charlafti, 2006).

The entirety of the Greek-Orthodox community, comprising Greeks and Greek-Cypriots, entailed the establishment of a plethora of parishes in Great Britain. In addition to those erected as Greek-Orthodox Churches by design (in London, Manchester, Liverpool, Cardiff and Birmingham), between 1950 and 1980 another twenty were established in London, and by the year 2000 the Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain comprised 125 churches, chapels and monasteries in its jurisdiction; notwithstanding the few exceptions of Churches that were built as Greek-Orthodox, in their vast majority places of worship have been converted from Anglican, Roman Catholic, etc. (Charlafti, 2006). In that respect, the Greek-Orthodox migrant communities embodied corresponding religioscapes, to which their parish constituted the central point

of reference. Coming from an analogous cultural background, with the Greek-Cypriots being in addition accustomed to the church-led institution of ethnarchy (Trantas, 2018), the church signified a familiar value-system and culture, and it is worth noting that it was already established in Great Britain since 1922 – when the Greek demographic presence was sparse – therefore it preceded them; not to mention that it typically hosted and partook in the communal activities and sociocultural life of the Greek-Orthodox religioscapes (Trantas 2019).

As regards the Greek migrant communities of Germany, as stated earlier, those were formed between the late 1950s and early 1960s, when West Germany was experiencing a notable labour deficit that could only be mitigated by the influx of foreign workforce. The solution to this was to sign bilateral agreements that would secure the continuation of industrial productivity by hiring foreign guest-workers, i.e. *Gastarbeiter*, a term that denoted the limited rights and their temporary place in German society (Tseligka, 2020). Between 1960 and 1973 the recruitment of *Gastarbeiter* was by and large unobstructed, with 1968-69 being an exception to this, due to a recession that saw the refusal of work permit extensions by the West German government (ibid).

While West Germany was experiencing its economic miracle (Ger.: *Wirtschaftswunder*), Greece was struggling with poverty and unemployment. Suffice it to mention that the country was devastated by two successive wars: The Second World War, followed by the civil war that ended on 30 August 1949. The damages to the human capital, the means of production and the infrastructure played a decisive role in obliterating the foundations of an already weak economy. Having idle population to fend for, Greece signed a *Gastarbeiter* agreement on 30 March 1960, being thus the third country to do so and advertised immigration as a solution to poverty and unemployment (Trantas and Tseligka, 2016). By 1974, more than two million Greeks emigrated periodically with three quarters of them to West Germany – the estimate includes their family members as well – whereas according to more conservative estimates they amounted to 620,000 (Trantas and Tseligka, 2016; Kitroeff, 2006). Of course this type of migration was temporary, as were the corresponding employment contracts, hence a significant percentage was repatriated. Locations of greater Greek *Gastarbeiter* demographic concentration would be the industrial cities of Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Dortmund, Munich, Hanover, Hamburg, etc. (Kitroeff, 2006).

The Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Germany was founded already on 5 February 1963, that is, in the early stages of the Greek *Gastarbeiter* influx. This is of importance as the latter had not yet properly formed communities nor did they constitute a visible religioscape as of yet. Moreover, their transitory status encouraged them to view the institution of the church as a refuge in the host- and a linkage to the home-country. In fact the Metropolis, making use of its institutional legitimacy and its excellent relations with the state, helped facilitate the guest-workers' integration (Trantas and Tseligka, 2016; Trantas, 2019). Initially, when founded in 1963 it was named Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Germany and Exarchate of Holland and Denmark, but following subsequent jurisdictional restructures across Europe, as of 12 August 1969, via the publication of a Patriarchal Synodical Tome issued by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, it was

named Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Germany and Exarchate of Central Europe (Fragkoulakis, 2018).

Emergent Conceptual Themes and Patterns

Sacred Space

From the examination of raw data and the taxonomic process, some major concepts emerge as applicable broad categorisations in both case studies, one of which being the creation of sacred space and its theoretical variants. In both case studies, evidence clearly shows that the creation of sacred space is a *sine qua non* as it is coterminous with the established community that, via its material religiocultural presence in the public sphere, finds its embodiment as *religioscape*.

Mircea Eliade has provided the authoritative definition of the notion of sacred space, upon which several variants have been built in order to better address aspects of the phenomenon. The crux here is the homogeneity and heterogeneity of space. Believers experience this difference but non-believers may observe and appreciate it as well. Sacred space constitutes an interruption from the worldly domain; it is demarcated through the believer's experience of the mundane as amorphous and formless, as opposed to its sacred antipode. The latter is manifest as a hierophany and therefore as an ontological spatial reference of a different order and an epicentre in its own right (Eliade, 1957).

One need not be religious to appreciate spatial heterogeneity – or non-homogeneity as Eliade calls it – as a social, religious or cultural phenomenon, for conceptualisations and perceptions of such forms of otherness and uniqueness are rife in the secular domain as well; there exist places that one might hold as exceptional, 'sacred', thus demonstrating a 'crypto-religious behaviour' in that respect (Eliade, 1957, 24). Hence, the church can be appreciated as sacred spatial interruption, regardless of the observer's convictions, and one can experience the crossing from the profane to the religious and vice versa by crossing the doorstep of a church, the point of communication between two domains, otherwise clearly distinct from one another (*ibid.*).

To the *religioscapes* of both case studies, sacred space is a central, existential feature that denotes and declares establishment. Hierophany or theophany is required for the emergence of a spatial heterogeneity as such, one that bestows and/or allows the attribution of qualitative differentiation. Yet, that is not to say that there should necessarily have to be a divine, sacred sign to indicate this; such manifestations can be man-made as well. 'When no sign manifests itself, it is provoked. For example, a sort of evocation is performed' (*ibid.*, 27). Lidov makes a distinction as regards the means via which sacred space is created, and in so doing he makes an apposite addition to the vocabulary thereof. He introduces the term *hierotopy* (Gr.: *ιεροτοπία*), which derives from the Greek root words *hieros* (*ιερός*), that is, sacred, and *topos* (*τόπος*), i.e. place, and defines hierotopy as the 'creation of sacred spaces regarded as a special form of creativity, and a field of historical research which reveals and analyses the particular examples of that creativity' (2006, 32). Lidov distinguishes that way between the miraculous or the participation

of the divine in the creation of sacred space and that which is man-made: The Eliadian hierophany necessitates the mystical whereas hierotopy is attributed to the human factor. Typically, in both case studies examined here, hierotopy would be the suitable term of description, for the Eliadian evocation is performed via the sacralisation of a newly-built or the conversion of an existing church. What is important here is that it is not just the creation of sacred space that is being realised, but rather, the establishment of a *heterotopia* (Foucault, 1984) in a broader sense, given that the church and its adjacent, complementary structure(s), serve broader purposes and needs, beyond those of spirituality and worship.

The heterotopias that have been examined in this case, emerged out of their communities' necessity for an ethnically, linguistically, religiously and culturally homogeneous refuge, a safe space so to speak, where they could exist and function *differently* and be at home; there, spatial identity is transcended and reconfigured according to the terms and conditions of the community, *mutatis mutandis*, and co-shaped by the common migratory narrative of each religiouscape. In short, it would be pertinent to consider the sacred spaces of the examined religiouscapes as heterotopias as well, as they are 'counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted' (Foucault, 1984). The religiouscapes scrutinised here, by and large meet the criteria that qualify them as heterotopias as they meet Foucault's corresponding principles: Namely, they adhere to a pananthropic social phenomenon; they have different, determined functions while still being linked to society; they are permeated by heterochrony as they abide by a different temporal perception, both historically and theologically; attendance and adherence to them is not analogous to any public space, for they are sacred places of worship while the profane is located outside; and, they are meant to provide structure and order, and in that sense be othered from the ill constructed, worldly, profane space (ibid.).

Their presence is manifest through the materiality of the places of worship, their aesthetics, artefacts, symbols and their differentiation from the established religion or non-religion – depending on the overarching aesthetics and existing symbolic constellations of other religious creeds, if any, in the surrounding area. A noteworthy element in the emergent pattern of themes such as that of, now, established heterotopias would be that one observes the presence of infrasecular geographies, which 'are characterized by the contemporaneous cohabitation and competition between multiple forms of belief and non-belief, as well as by the hidden layers of a collective "religious subconscious" which underpins contemporary Western European societies, no matter how secularized' (Della Dora, 2018, 45). In that respect, the multilayered character of such localities is better described as it reflects the contemporaneous cohabitation of a panorama of different religiocultural communities (ibid.).

Diasporic Spatial Affirmation

The above, *mutatis mutandis* applies to the present case studies as well, with some distinct patterns being identifiable. Spatial religiocultural transformations

have transpired almost exclusively between Christian denominations, or less frequently via conversion from secular spaces to sacred. In fact, traces of the coexistence of heterodoxy in the same sacred space are almost always preserved. Further evidence of this infrasecularity in the broader public sphere would be the erection of Orthodox Churches that constitute a statement of the religious amidst the secular or in parallel coexistence with another religion. This is more frequent in Germany, where Roman Catholic and Protestant churches share the urban/suburban horizon with the Orthodox dome, whereas in Great Britain the availability of defunct heterodox buildings is much higher, hence the need for places of worship for conversion is covered. The mutability of the Christian sacred space allows it to reveal its historicity and reflect the infrasecular narrative of each particular religiouscape. This is inherently so, as the hierotopy is permeated by dynamism and it is thus possible to reflect the influence of a complex of meanings by way of materiality. By not being static over time, it is subject to alterations, modifications and ultimately adaptations to the exigencies and particularities of the time, in short, to power, whether that might be divine, social, or personal (Kilde, 2008).

Another broad emergent theme would be the diasporic character of those religiouscapes and their attributes and qualities the set them apart from the broader theorisation of Diasporas, as was the case with their theorisation as religiouscapes above, with some features being overlapping and interchangeable between those themes and their theoretical frameworks. To be sure, Diasporas do share common features, such as, in brief: Dispersal, often traumatic; expansion for primarily economic reasons and trade; collective memory of the homeland that encompasses mythical elements; idealisation and commitment to its well-being; impetus for return; unitary consciousness of ethnic distinctiveness and homogeneity; uneasiness with the host society; solidarity with co-ethnic members irrespective of country of residence; pluralistic, tolerant and constructive attitude in the host country. Of course neither this outline is exhaustive nor do Diasporas have to meet all the above criteria in order to be regarded as such (Cohen, 1996). In the contemporary context of mobility, cyberspace and relativisation of territoriality, the shared imagination of what constitutes a coherent, collectively shared self-image, cultural artefacts are central in the co-shaping of the perceived diasporic group identity. However, it is typical of Diasporas to mutate in the lapse of time, while their cultural core withstands the test of time, as does their community, which ultimately attests to their diasporic qualities (Cohen, 1996).

It is essential to stress that to speak of an Orthodox Diaspora as if it were a unitary, coherent group of religiouscapes would be an erroneous generalisation. With ethnicity, nationality and cultural heritage by and large determining adherence, one observes that it is corresponding structures that contribute to the unity of such communities, such as religiocultural centres and institutions that secure the preservation and perpetuation of the communities' particularities and identity attributes (Hämmerli, 2010). Such institutions differ and vary among Orthodox communities such as Greeks, Russians, etc. as they express different narratives and memories, homeland references, and advocate different national interests. Among them, the Greeks fit Cohen's model better as they have a long, well-established diasporic history, heritage and culture (Ibid.).

Both case studies are unaffected by the sparse, symbolic presence of very few pre-existing structures and small-scale communities in Britain and Germany, which were created by wealthy Greek tradesmen who expanded their businesses in the 18th and 19th centuries and did not constitute foundations for the establishment of Greek-Orthodox diasporic communities in the mid-20th century as there is no continuity between them. In the case of Britain, the Greek-Orthodox churches – inherited from the above-mentioned communities – especially in London, functioned as a reference point for community life, but still, as they expanded and consolidated their presence in both countries, they established their own religious markers and arks of migratory narratives, i.e. their churches.

With reference to Cohen's model, they variably meet most criteria. Traumatic dispersal applies in the sense that their expatriation was a necessary evil. Greek-Cypriots migrated due to poverty or flight from conflict, while Greeks because of poverty, unemployment but also political/ideological problems. The mythical dimension and glorification of the homeland is identifiable in both cases as well, with the Greek-Cypriots including references to mainland Greece, the 'National Centre' (Trantas, 1998). Still, there is ambivalence in this, as the myth persists parallel to an acute awareness of the homeland's shortcomings, disappointments and traumas that led to migration. In that sense the element of idealisation does not apply to the present, but to the remote past and the distinct ancestry. Accordingly, the commitment to the prosperity of the homeland is not as notable, as is the commitment to higher, national causes that extend to duty a propos the past, national symbols and geographical national integrity and sovereignty. This can in part be attributed to the fact that both cases demonstrate a strong, long-lasting consciousness of ethnicity, 'based on a sense of distinctiveness, a common history and the belief in a common fate' (Cohen, 1996, 515), one of Cohen's Diaspora features. Still, this is not an exclusivist mindset, as the attitudes that emanate from this research are largely pervaded by frequently and consistently expressed tolerance and pluralism, without any trace of insecurity or fear of cultural erosion.

At the same time, only few features of Cohen's model do not apply, namely: No collectively approbated return movement as such has ever transpired. The *Gastarbeiter* that returned to Greece when their work contracts expired did not do so happily and eagerly, but they had no legal choice other than repatriation. Another non-applicable feature would be that of a troubled relationship with the host societies. At the initial stages there existed variable integration difficulties pertaining to acceptance but by no means have they constituted an integration obstacle or a solid rejectionist basis. Finally, communication, linkages and solidarity with co-ethnic diasporic communities elsewhere in the world are weak and loose, and there is no evidence of a unitary international self-perception of close kinship, as the countries of residence and origin seem to be the most significant determinants of being and belonging.

To be sure, by contemporary criteria and standards the understanding of Diasporas as predicated upon the notion of a centre might be considered anachronistic. It may also be considered as ideologically biased and static, grounded on a nineteenth-century historiographical theorisation that revolves round the axis of the nation-state. More to the point, an analytical approach as

such does not take into account the dynamic of historical, social and cultural mutability. Yet, the very concept of Diaspora is admittedly not conceivable without a centre, from which the dispersal originated. Analytical approaches should take the above parameters into account, deal with Diasporas as distinct communities and be revised and refined accordingly (Kitromilides, 2008).

Because the foundation of the communities examined here predates globalisation, their heterogeneity and particularity required a venue and framework in order to exist and be expressed. The easy choice for that was the church, which, in being heterotopic, constituted the obvious space for the communication of ethnic, national, cultural and of course religious identity traits. This tendency was further reinforced by the sociopolitical context of the time. State and society were understood as coterminous – a nation-state, literally – and the state was the container of a presumably homogeneous society. Moreover, national societies tend to preserve their essentialist identity perception that is grounded on the tautology of state and society. In that respect, the existence of heterogeneous groupings in an otherwise homogeneous national society was considered an exception, if not a threat (Beck, 1998).

At this point it would also be helpful to remind that the conditions of increased mobility that have been prevalent alongside the emergence and consolidation of globality, do not apply in the present case studies, as already stated. The founding of the communities and religioscapes thereof, transpired in an international environment of state sovereignty that predated the EU and the freedom of movement and settlement and hence the relativisation of national borders, which in turn render the religioscapes formation analogously flux. Not to mention the luxury of quickly booking affordable flights from the comfort of one's home; the elimination of distance, an indication of the shrinking world, should not be taken for granted. To the Greek-Orthodox religioscapes that were formed in Germany and Great Britain between the 1950s and 1970s and were by and large anchored in place, such options were inconceivable. Their appreciation of space and distance alone, was filtered through a much narrower experiential perception and understanding of the world. Likewise the extent and limits of the familiar space were narrow; this form of familiarity with space at a micro-level, i.e. the village or town of origin, *mutatis mutandis* constituted their perceived world altogether. For the most part, primarily because of the lack of means, they spent their lives in their regions and never travelled to a major city, never experienced urbanity, let alone travel abroad. Hence, they tended to identify more with their particular place of origin at a first level than with the country, which applies to both case studies.

Glocal and Translocal Sense of Being and Belonging

The same class limitations, owed to income, profession, etc. hindered extensive, regular travel for leisure and familiarisation with the host country. By extension they identified life in the latter with the specific place of work and residence, where their religioscape was also established, i.e. their host city. The research data shows that the collectively experienced de- and reterritorialisation was initially understood in a binary way: A mutually

exclusive appreciation of spatial belonging, where spatiality was perceived as an antithesis between home and host city, due to the trauma of departure, migration and loss of status. This was eventually followed by a dual, non-mutually-exclusive, appreciation of spatial belonging when adaptation and integration ensued. And then, when they consolidated their place in the host society, a distinct spatial sense of belonging emerged in both cases, that of two mutually complementary homes: The once perceived as host, became home and was thereafter in organic symbiosis with the ancestral home in their collective psyches. This is identifiable in both case studies as one observes the infusion of formerly alien elements in their heterotopias and hierotopias, including spatial references, which transpired in the lapse of time.

This phenomenon can be attributed to glocalisation, even though the population movement in focus preceded globalisation, as the same theoretical principles concerning the global/local *problématique* are comparatively applicable. Not unlike globalisation's naïve expectation of cultural homogenisation, it was expected of immigrant groups to emulate and endorse the host culture in full in order to be thought of as members of the host society. This did not happen with the religioscapes of interest here: They adopted several cultural elements but preserved their own at the same time, ultimately producing a unique amalgam, which applies in both case studies and is reflected by their religioscapes' markers and significations.

These amalgams of reterritorialisation and integration came to be out of a fusion between the pre-existing, inherited identity attributes and particularities, and the appropriated ones, within a glocal context. The difference with glocality as an aspect of globality (Robertson, 2012) is that in this case locality has been the primary spatial demarcation of *belonging*, either in the home or the host country and an essential identifier of *being*, as it denotes where *being* is physically pinpointed and materially realised. Generally, the premises of 'who' and 'where' are inevitably interlinked as they determine each other, depending on circumstances, but insofar as migration is factored in, it follows that synthesis and adaptation ensue; this could translate to a divergence or a convergence of collective personifications and self-personifications, i.e. to being and further to belonging. *Being* and *belonging* can be defined as 'the perception of adherence to the social institution process as prescribed and conditioned by the latter, and to that end, the framework, requirements and provisions of collective self-articulation which formulate identity, and the extent to which this is coterminous with other analogous collective self-articulations' (Trantas, 2018, 13).

However, the ideational and imaginary dimension of being (Castoriadis, 1987, 1996) transcends such constraints, yet, both the ideational and the material dimension co-exist: Interdependent, mutually influential and indivisible, they are expressed through one another. One of the means to that expression, the central one among others, is the church as container and ark of the religioscape's memory, historicity and migratory narrative. There, in a *par excellence* heterotopic configuration, where materially is of this world but at the same time represents the cosmos and transcends the this-worldly, it is not only materiality and immateriality that are reconciled, but also spatialities. As stated, in Great Britain spatial references to both the place of origin and the host are for the most part – almost exclusively, exceptions notwithstanding – implicit in the church aesthetics. In Germany though, such references are

rife in both forms, explicitly and implicitly. Thereby, the statement of *belonging somewhere* is bolder and more direct.

Be that as it may, in both cases localities are being reconciled via the transcendence of distance – made possible by the atopic character of the ideational dimension of space (Ramfos, 1995). The latter, as a notion, a memory, ultimately an element or the very topic of a broader narrative becomes transferrable, and further, a depictable reference in the church – a religiocultural citation. This fusion of references to spatialities is in its own right a manifestation of a unique glocal identity amalgam as experienced and perceived by the respective religioscapes. It emerged out of the sociocultural interactions and fermentations thereof within the given spatial and temporal context, and it emerges from the present research that, unsurprisingly, those amalgams are constantly under-construction as they continue to perpetuate, endorse, adopt, adapt and reject various elements while still preserving a particularity that is uniquely traceable back to them.

Day-to-day living involves activities and interaction within and outside the domain of the migrant community. These, take part within a given predominant and overarching social, cultural, economic and political context and are imprinted in the collective, communicative memory (Assmann and Czaplicka, 1995). In turn they co-shape the sense of being. More to the point, as this transpires locally or regionally for the most part, the spatial reference will be inevitably imprinted as well; living takes place *somewhere*. On the other hand, cultural memory plays an equally formative role. Cultural memory extends beyond and above the day-to-day and its temporal length and breadth is determined by figures of memory, as it boils down to unchangeable fixed points, i.e. fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance) (*ibid.*, 129). In short, connotations and denotations of glocality are either manifest or featured in both case studies and, indeed, they are drawn from both their communicative and cultural memories.

Had the classical sociologists been right, those religioscapes would probably never have come to be, since modernisation and westernisation would eventually eliminate distinctive cultural traditions. This has not been the case, as the normative power of economic development did not entail such a far-reaching cultural change that would render traditions and particularities obsolete (Inglehart and Baker, 2000). Change did ensue, in the form of a distancing from the absolutisation of traditional values within the context of post-industrial societies. Instead, cultural zones of distinctive value systems emerge and move to parallel trajectories (*ibid.*).

This by and large applies to the religioscapes of interest here; they integrated fully in their host societies and became an integral part of them. If anything, this is attested by the implicit and explicit veneration of the once host – and now equally home – culture: The location, the city, its landmarks, language, religious tradition, national holidays, social structures, etc. But they did not assimilate. Instead, what primarily emerges from the data is the mutability of identity alongside the pervasive traditional elements and the overarching conviction within those religioscapes that their twofold cultures are not mutually exclusive.

It should be noted that the above-mentioned phenomenon emerged neither out of the temporalisation and spatialisation of universalism, nor out of the particularisation of the global. Likewise, it could not be categorised as a pluralisation of religion in light of glocalisation (Beyer, 2013), for the already stated reasons concerning the pre-globality era. Still, effects similar to those of glocalisation may apply. For example the importance of geographic points of reference as well as the distinction between heartland and Diaspora constitute important analytical features: The heartland represents a constant of authenticity and stability as opposed to the Diaspora variable, which stands for erosion and dislocation (ibid.). However, it should be noted that these perceptions were particularly commonplace in the early stages of reterritorialisation and integration in both cases, but in the lapse of time they faded.

The difference with the globality-glocality tandem is that the cases in focus have been formed under circumstances that favoured the dynamic of translocality, which 'deliberately confuses the boundaries of the local in an effort to capture the increasingly complicated nature of spatial processes and identities as place-based rather than exclusively mobile, uprooted or travelling' (Oakes and Schein, 2006b, 20). Again, as is the case with the notion of glocality, translocality as experienced by the case studies here, should not be confused with the contemporary understanding of translocal networks that are being enabled and rendered functional via the utilisation of the communication technologies. The translocality of these religioscapes boils down to *being* – and by extension *belonging* – to more than one place, to identify 'with more than one location' (Oakes and Schein, 2006a, xiii). Hence, translocality here is clearly not meant as mobility and communication capacity that defy geographical distance; rather, the term touches on the duality of spatial belonging that came to be organically, in line with the mutability of identity. This form of conceptualisation finds applicability in that it is informed by the role of materiality, infrastructure and the built environment as an object of analysis, considering that regardless of the degree of mobility, fixed-in-place structures as such constitute moorings for migrants and their communities (Assmuth et al., 2018). Furthermore, translocality entails dual or even multiple spatial affiliations and allows for the reconstitution of identity in an environment away from the place of origin on the one hand, while on the other, identity practices that have been transferred from elsewhere might be reproduced (Mandaville, 1999). In short, it holds true for the case studies of interest that the translocal conceptual perspective is applicable, considering that the translocal space, where 'new forms of (post)national identity are constituted' (Mandaville, 2002, 204) has been in part embodied by their religioscapes' materiality and structures.

Conclusion

It is a *sine qua non* that the case studies examined here perceived themselves – and continue to do so nowadays – as homogeneous ethnoreligious, cultural entities. They held the attributes of their collective self-image as indispensable and in practice transferrable within the context of migration. At the same time, both case studies found pre-existing religious structures and institutions that grew along their communities, and as

religioscapes they found venues to express their particularities. In turn, their markers and containers of their collective migratory narratives hosted but also co-shaped the latter and eventually became almost tautological with one another. This, in fact, is visually identifiable, as they bear the aesthetic, translocal and glocal evidence of the historicity, self-perception and mutability of those diasporic religioscapes.

To be sure, their de- and reterritorialisation, establishment and integration transpired in an international environment that differs significantly from the contemporary. Particularly as regards mobility, freedom of movement and establishment abroad, in short, possibilities and options that might almost be taken for granted nowadays, did not apply in their time of migration. In that sense, considering that as diasporic communities they predate the focus of the theoretical framework on religioscapes, glocality and translocality, which is concerned primarily with the effects of globality, this paper repositions the focal point on the conditions of their migratory collective experience.

There is no doubt that their hierotopies and heterotopias constituted central ethno-religious points of reference, coterminous with spatial affirmation and establishment in-place. To them, a spatial sense of belonging was essential and the material manifestation of it was the church, as it encompasses a constellation of symbolisms and significations, including spatial ones. Both case studies constitute diasporic religioscapes *par excellence*; further, their places of worship unquestionably qualify as heterotopias and hierotopies, while at the same time their typologies correspond very well with Cohen's Diaspora model. Yet, meeting those criteria entails an original spatial point of reference; this applies to both case studies, with the most notable variation between them being the way that this manifests itself.

From the body of data, three phases of diasporic translocality are distinguishable in the religioscapes of interest. Initially, spatial belonging was experienced as mutually exclusive; in the second phase duality succeeded exclusivism, indicative of integration and selective appropriation; the third phase, of mutual complementarity, marked the emergence of a novel spatial synthesis of belonging. Essentially, the hybrid amalgams of the Greek Orthodox religioscapes of Germany and Great Britain can be attributed to glocal and translocal mutability, where the preservation of original cultural elements and the absorption of new ones from the host countries, in conjunction with localities as points of reference, enabled the reconstitution of identity as attested by their heterotopias and hierotopies.

References

- Anthias, F. (1992) *Ethnicity, Class, Gender and Migration: Greek-Cypriots in Britain*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Appadurai, A. (1990) 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy', *Theory Culture Society*, vol. 7, no. 2-3, pp. 295-310.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) 'Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology' in Appadurai, A. (ed.) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 48-65.
- Assmann, J. and Czaplicka, J. (1995) 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, vol. 65, pp. 125-133.
- Assmuth, L., Hakkarainen, M., Lulle, A. and Siim, P.M. (2018) 'Children in Translocal Families' in Assmuth, L., Hakkarainen, M., Lulle, A. and Siim, P.M. (eds.) *Translocal Childhoods and Family Mobility in East and North Europe*, Studies in Childhood and Youth, Cham, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3-6.
- Beck, U. (1998) *Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung*, Fünfte Auflage, Frankfurt-am-Main, Suhrkamp.
- Beyer, P. (2013) *Religion in the Context of Globalisation: Essays on Concept, Form, and Political Implication*, London, Routledge.
- Castoriadis, C. (1987) *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, Blamey, K. (trans.), Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Castoriadis, C. (1996) *La montée de l'insignifiance, les carrefours du labyrinthe*, Paris, Seuil.
- Charlafti, T. (2006) 'Ēnōmeno Vasileio kai Irlandia' in Chasiotis, I.K., Katsiardi-Hering, O. and Ampatzi, E.A. (eds) *Hē Hellēnes stē Diaspora, 15^{os} – 21^{os} ai* [Greeks in Diaspora, 15th – 21st Century], Athens, Hellenic Parliament, pp. 95-105.
- Cohen, R. (1996) 'Diasporas and the State: From Victims to Challengers', *International Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 507–520.
- Della Dora, V. (2018) 'Infrasecular Geographies: Making, Unmaking and Remaking Sacred Space', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 44–71.
- Eliade, M. (1957) *The Sacred and the Profane*, Trask, W.R. (trans), New York, Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Finnis, K. (2013) 'Creating a "New Space": Code-Switching among British-born Greek-Cypriots in London', *Pragmatics and Society*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 137-157.
- Foucault, Michel (1984) 'Des espaces autres, Conference au Cercle d'études architecturales, 14 mars 1967', *Architecture/Mouvement/Continuité*, vol. 5, pp. 46-49, Available at [1libertaire.free.fr/Foucault12.html](http://libertaire.free.fr/Foucault12.html).
- Fragkoulakis, G. (2018) *Emeis stē Germania* [We in Germany], Hannover, Saitis.
- Hämmerli, M. (2010) 'Orthodox Diaspora? A Sociological and Theological Problematisation of a Stock Phrase', *International journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 97-115.
- Hayden, R.M. and Walker, T.D. (2013) 'Intersecting Religioscapes: A Comparative Approach to Trajectories of Change, Scale, and

- Competitive Sharing of Religious Spaces', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 399–426.
- Josephides, Sasha (1987) 'Associations amongst the Greek Cypriot Population in Britain', in Rex, J., Joly, D. and Wilpert, C. (eds) *Immigrant Associations in Europe*, Aldershot, Gower, pp. 42-61.
- Kardasis V. and Charlafti, T. (2006) 'Anazētōntas tis Chōres tēs Epaggelias: O Apodēmos Hellēnismos apo ta mesa tou 19^{ou} Aiōna ōs ton B' Pagkosmio Polemo' [Seeking the Promised Lands: Diasporic Hellenism from the mid-19th Century to WWII] in Chasiotis, I.K., Katsiardi-Hering, O. and Ampatzi, E.A. (eds) *Hē Hellēnes stē Diaspora, 15^{os} – 21^{os} ai*, Athens, Hellenic Parliament, pp. 51-73.
- Kilde, J.H. (2008) *Sacred Power, Sacred Space: An Introduction to Christian Architecture and Worship*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Kitroeff, A. (2006) 'Hē Metapolemikē Metanasteusē' [Post-War Migration] in Chasiotis, I.K., Olga Katsiardi-Hering, O. and Ampatzi, E.A. (eds) *Hē Hellēnes stē Diaspora, 15^{os} – 21^{os} ai*, Athens, Hellenic Parliament, pp. 75-91.
- Kitromilides, P.M. (2008) 'Diaspora, Identity, and Nation-Building' in Rozen, M. (ed) *Homelands and Diasporas: Greeks, Jews and Their Migrations*, London, I.B.Tauris & Co, pp. 323-331.
- Lidov, A. (2006) 'Hierotopy. The Creation of Sacred Spaces as a Form of Creativity and Subject of Cultural History' in Lidov, A. (ed.) *Hierotopy. Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, Moscow, Progress-Tradition, pp. 32-58.
- Mandaville, P.G. (1999) 'Territory and Translocality: Discrepant Idioms of Political Identity', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp.653-673.
- Mandaville, P.G. (2002) 'Reading the State from Elsewhere: Towards an Anthropology of the Postnational', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 199-207.
- McAlister, E. (2005) 'Globalization and the Religious Production of Space', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 249-255.
- Oakes, T. and Schein, L. (2006a) 'Preface', in Oakes, T. and Schein, L. (eds) *Translocal China: Linkages, Identities and the Re-imagining of Space*, London, Routledge, pp. xii-xiii.
- Oakes, T. and Schein, L. (eds) (2006b) *Translocal China: Linkages, Identities and the Re-imagining of Space*, London, Routledge.
- Ramfos, S. (1995) *Triōdion: Topos Hyperouranios – Hē Palinōdia tou Papadiamantē – Meletē Thanatou* [Triodion: Locus Supernal – The Tergiversation of Papadiamantis – Study of Death], Athens, Ammos Publications.
- Robertson, R. (2012) 'Globalisation or Glocalisation?', *Journal of International Communication*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 191-208.
- Roudometof, V. (2008) 'Greek Orthodoxy, Territoriality, and Globality: Religious Responses and Institutional Disputes', *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 67-91.
- Trantas, G.E. (2018) *Being and Belonging: A Comparative Examination of the Greek and Cypriot Orthodox Churches' Attitudes to 'Europeanisation' in Early 21st Century*, Erfurter Studien zur Kulturgeschichte des Orthodoxen Christentums, Band 16, Frankfurt-am-Main, Peter Lang.

- Trantas, G.E. (2019) 'Greek-Orthodox Religioscapes as Domains of Migratory Integration and Hybridisation in Germany and Great Britain: A Comparative Study', *Politics and Religion Journal*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 309-332.
- Trantas, G.E. and Tseligka, E.D. (2016) 'Where the Byzantinesque Meets the Urbanesque: Architectural and Hagiographic Elements of Greek Orthodox Urban Reterritorialisation in Germany', *Zeitschrift Für Balkanologie*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 241–260.
- Tseligka, E.D. (2020) *From Gastarbeiter to European Expatriates: Greek Migrant Communities in Germany and their Socio-political Integration*, Oxford, Peter Lang.