STATE IMPOSED PLACE NAME CHANGE IN TURKEY

AND THE RESPONSE OF GIRESUN RESIDENTS

by

Daniel Fields

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Sabancı University
June 2013

STATE IMPOSED PLACE NAME CHANGE IN TURKEY

AND THE RESPONSE OF GIRESUN RESIDENTS

APPROVED BY:

Cemil Koçak .....

(Thesis Supervisor)

Leyla Neyzi .....

Akşin Somel .....

DATE OF APPROVAL.....

STATE IMPOSED PLACE NAME CHANGE IN TURKEY
AND THE RESPONSE OF GIRESUN RESIDENTS

Daniel Fields

Turkish Studies M.A. Thesis, 2013

Prof. Dr. Cemil Koçak

Keyword: Place Names, Toponymical Change, Giresun, Turkey

Abstract: In 1913, the Ottoman state began attempting to systematically impose new place names across the territory under its control. Although the intensity of the efforts varied greatly, place name change would continue through the end of the Ottoman Empire and on into the Republic of Turkey. By 1968, when a volume containing all the changes was published by the Interior Ministry, roughly thirty percent of settlement names in Turkey had been changed. Renaming continued sporadically until the 1990s.

This thesis inquires into these attempts at name change in Turkey with a focus on how people responded to the changes in their everyday lives. The value of place names as formulated in human and cultural geography is explored in order to determine why people may have rejected or accepted the state imposed names. Place name change, rather than being approached solely as a nation-building project motivated by Turkification, is also considered as being a technique of governmentality. This thesis does not refer to the changes as one project or policy that lasted from 1913 throughout the better part of the century, as does previous studies; rather, they are seen a series of attempts that did not always have the same rationale. In order to understand how people responded to the changes, this thesis relies on fieldwork carried out in the Eastern Black Sea Province of Giresun.

TÜRKİYE'DE YER ADLARININ DEVLET TARAFINDAN EMPOZE EDİLEREK DEĞİŞTİRİLMESİ VE GİRESUN HALKININ TEPKİSİ

Daniel Fields

Türkiye Çalışmaları M.A. Tezi, 2013

Prof. Dr. Cemil Koçak

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yer Adları, Toponimik Değişikleri, Giresun, Türkiye

Özet: 1913 yılında Osmanlı Devleti, sistemli olarak, egemenliği altında olan topraklara yeni yer adlarını vermeye başlamıştır. Yer adlarının değiştirilmesi Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun sonuna kadar ve Cumhuriyet kurulduktan sonra da devam edecektir. 1968 yılına gelindiğinde, İçişleri Bakanlığı tarafından bütün yeni köy isimlerini içeren bir cilt yayınlandığında, Türkiye'nin köylerinin yaklaşık yüzde otuzunun isimleri değiştirilmiştir. Yeni yer adları 1990'lara kadar gelişigüzel bir şekilde verilmeye devam edilmiştir.

Bu tez, Türkiye'de yer ismi değiştirme çabalarını ele almakta, ve insanların bu değişiklere verdiği tepkilere odaklanmaktadır. Yerel nüfusun devlet tarafından empoze edilen yer adlarını reddetmelerinin veya kabul etmelerinin saiklerini anlamak açısından beşeri ve kültürel coğrafya tarafından biçimlendirilen yer adlarının önemini araştırmaktadır. Yer adlarının değiştirilmesi, yalnızca Türkleştirme'ye sebep olan bir ulus-devlet yaratma projesi olarak algılanmanın yanı sıra, yönetselliğin bir tekniği olarak da kabul edilir. Daha önce yapılan çalışmalardan farklı olarak, bu tez yer adlarının değiştirilmesine 1913'ten başlayıp yaklaşık yüzyıl süren tek bir proje ya da siyaset olarak bakmıyor. Aksine, bu duruma bir teşebbüsler silsilesi olarak bakılıyor. İnsanların ne tür tepkiler gösterdiklerini anlamak adına bu tez Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesinin Giresun İlinde yapılan saha çalışmalarına dayanmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a great debt of gratitude to many people that guided me and offered assistance and moral support throughout the preparation of this thesis. My thesis advisor, Cemil Koçak deserves my continuing thanks for the instruction he provided.

The insights of Professors Leyla Neyzi and Banu Karaca were very useful as I began my work on toponyms in Turkey, and to them I am very grateful.

I also thank my parents, Steven and Lisa Fields, who have supported me at every step of my academic career. Without their continual support, this thesis would not have been possible.

My fellow graduate students in the Turkish Studies and History Departments at Sabancı University, especially Paul Benjamin Osterlund and Tuğçe Kayaal, deserve special thanks for their moral support throughout our time together at Sabancı.

My research in Giresun would not have been possible without the help of many people. Esra Ansel, Hakan Tunç, Semih Patan, Ali Tirali, and Bülent Tirali offered much needed assistance, contact information, and useful insights during my fieldwork preparation. In Giresun and the surrounding areas, Cem Feridunoğlu, Gökhan Üstün, and Heves Nefesoğlu Bozbağ proved invaluable to my research and their hospitality and generosity is greatly appreciated. The efforts of those in Şebinkarahisar and Doğankent who went out of their way to help me have contributed enormously to this thesis, and I thank them for their help. I am also deeply grateful to all the Giresun residents who were willing to discuss not just place name change with me, but a multitude of subjects that greatly added to my knowledge of the region.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

When looking at a map of Turkey, the thousands of place names seem to present a uniform identity. From the western borders with Greece and Bulgaria to the eastern and southern borders with Georgia, Armenia, Iran, Iraq, and Syria, the map is full of towns, and villages sporting names that appear to be "purely" Turkish.[1] Names such as Beautiful Garden, White Spring, and New Village are found in abundance. The rather bland quality of many of the place names across Turkey, places that have often been inhabited for centuries, gives little or no hint to the historical fabric. On the contrary, maps of the Turkish Republic exhibit a very homogenous, often de-historicized character, even though many of these places did not always exhibit such homogeneity. The "Turkishness" of the Turkish toponymical order is no accident, but rather the product of state efforts of varying intensity over the last century to rid the country of its "foreign" toponymes.[2] Such a situation is not unique to Turkey, as many other nation-states have sought to project power by excluding foreign elements and unsavory ideologies. Indeed, most of Turkey's neighboring countries have undertaken their own attempts at changing place names.

The scant critical literature over toponymical change in Turkey overwhelmingly presents it as a "project of Turkification" carried out by the bureaucrats in Turkey against the wishes of a mostly unreceptive populace. However, the term Turkification is not

[1] Although etymology is clearly an important issue when dealing with toponyms, this thesis makes little attempt to comment on etymology. When the term Turkish is used to refer to place names, it simply denotes names that appear to be Turkish or are commonly accepted as being Turkish, without taking into account the actual linguistic origin.

[2] I will discuss the term "foreign" in more detail in Chapter Two, but in general I will use it to mean people, names, languages, etc., not considered to have a proper place in the Ottoman/Turkish polity, those not "Turkish" enough.

sufficient to describe name change in Turkey. Undoubtedly, the term is useful since most of the place names that were targeted were non-Turkish and were changed, either through translation or through selecting entirely new names, to Turkish ones, thereby resulting in the "Turkishness" of official maps. This is the most obvious characteristic of place name change in Turkey, but it does not cover all aspects. Another supposed feature of this "project" is that it was a bureaucratic one carried out systematically. In the same way that the concept of Turkification is useful in analyzing the toponymical order in Turkey, the term "bureaucratic project" also has its utility. However, I argue that referring to place name change in Turkey as a single project carried out by a monolithic bureaucracy that began in 1915 and continued up until the 1990s assigns an excessive amount of agency to a bureaucracy which often did not carry out the work of name change in a precise or systematic manner. Indeed, there is evidence that the bureaucrats themselves were often confused as to which name to use in official documents after name change had occurred. Therefore, referring to place name change in Turkey as one consistent "policy" with one guiding ideology, although convenient, does not accurately reflect the reality of the issue.

Before looking at how name change has been carried out in Turkey, a theoretical grounding is needed in the value of place names and negotiations of power that may influence how the changes are carried out as well as how people may respond to them. Whereas previous looks at the issue have a theoretical base in nationalism and nation-state building, they are lacking a coherent discussion of the inherent value of place names; namely, what type of values are attached to places and place names and where these values lie.[3] With this in mind, I have borrowed from theories in cultural and human geography in order to provide a framework for the value of place names. Furthermore, the roots of all attempts at place name change in Turkey have previously been located within a specific nation-state building paradigm. Such an approach does not take into account the fact that the first concerted, if not effectual, attempts at place name change actually began in 1913, when the creation of the Turkish Republic was not a foregone conclusion. As such, I will take a closer look at the ideological currents that influenced the officials behind the initial

[3]Although İbrahim Kuran does include a short discussion on the value of place names in the introduction to his thesis, there is little attempt on his part to refer to this discussion later in the thesis, thereby detracting from its relevancy.

attempts at place name change. By doing this, my goal is to step outside the presumption that all attempts at place name change in Turkey are part of one, continual process of state-building as defined by the "Kemalist victors" who actually established the nation-state.

In the first chapter of this thesis I seek to provide an understanding of the inherent importance of place name, a discussion that needs to serve as the basis for any investigations of the "success" of toponymical change. This will be accompanied by a discussion on notions of power, authority, and governmentality involved in name change. In the second chapter, I lay out the possible goals of changing the name of a place. Why are place names changed, not just in Turkey but also in other countries, and who are these changes being directed at? The reasons behind such changes are many, and they can often overlap with each other. In this chapter, I also offer brief comparisons with other states that have gone about altering their toponymical order.

In the second part of this thesis I will move on to a more local exploration of the issue in an attempt to determine the "success" or "failure" of place name change. In order to provide a more focused approach to toponymical change, I conducted research in the province of Giresun in the eastern Black Sea region of Turkey. In choosing this region, which is commonly assumed to be one of the more nationalist areas in the country, I wanted to explore how regional differences may have played a role in how people respond to place name changes. The third chapter provides a general outline of how place name changes were carried out in Turkey, focusing on the mechanisms behind the changes as well as the nature of the altered names in Giresun and how they were reflected in both official documents and one local newspaper. In the fourth chapter I will discuss my research in Giresun which consisted primarily of interviews and more informal conversations with local residents. My main research goal while in the province was to observe the extent to which the government names have been accepted or rejected by locals and then seek out the possible reasons for these responses by focusing on any patterns that may emerge in the types of names that are accepted or rejected.

Existing Literature

Although place names, and place name changes specifically, have enjoyed a great deal of attention in other contexts, critical and comprehensive discussions of how place name change has been carried out in Turkey and the responses to it have been very few. This is not to say that toponymes in Turkey have garnered a lack of attention. On the contrary, a large number of works have dealt with the issue, but many of them are written from a firmly nationalist standpoint in which the overarching concerns seem to be that of proving the "Turkishness" of Anatolia. In 1928, for example, a work entitled "Place Names in Anatolia Belonging to Turks," was published.[4] Not all such works, however, were written from a nationalist standpoint. In 1935, Paul Wittek wrote an article dealing with Byzantine place names that had been appropriated by Turkish peoples once they began arriving in Anatolia.[5] In 1945, İ. Refet Işıtman wrote an article over Turkish village names, and similar works continued to be written over the course of the next several decades.[6] A more recent look at place names in eastern Anatolia has a decidely Armenian nationalist and state-centered slant to it, and any scholarly attempts on the part of the author are overshadowed by the rather dubious goal of "proving" through etymology who the "rightful owners" of eastern Turkey are:

[4] H. Nihal and A. Naci, "Anadolu'da Türklere Aid Yer İsimleri" *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 2 (1926): 243-259.

[5] Paul Wittek, "Von der Byzantinischen zur Türkischen Toponymie" *Byzantion* 10, (1935): 11-64.

[6] İ. Refet Işıtman, "Köy Adları Üzerine Bir İnceleme," *Türk Dili Belleten* 3, no. 1-3 (1945): 52-61.

> "Toponyms are not only linguistic facts, but also accurate and objective historical evidence. The ancient Armenian place names are explicit and emphatic linguistic evidence, which reveal the entire truth about the true native owners of the Armenian Highland. This is why the protection, maintenance and restoration of Armenian toponyms [has] invaluable strategic significance today."[7]

Unfortunately, most of the work on toponymes, especially in eastern Anatolia, is written from a similar type of either Turkish or Armenian nationalist perspective. But over the last few years, more critical and scholarly approaches to name change in Turkey have been undertaken, approaches that are not confined to nationalistic ideologies, although the number of such works is small. In fact, there are only two such comprehensive looks at place name change in Turkey, an article by Kerem Öktem and a master's thesis written by İbrahim Kuran at Boğaziçi University.[8] Others, such as Sevan Nişanyan who has created an impressive catalog of old and new names in Turkey, have also carried out research on this topic, but there is still relatively little critical analysis.[9] The focus of some of the works is uncovering previous names, a task requiring painstaking research and one that is easily subject to nationalist whims, although Nişanyan's work is free of such nationalist constraints. As for the works of Öktem and Kuran, both benefit from extensive research, especially Kuran's thesis which attempts to deal with the entirety of place name change in Turkey and is coupled with fieldwork in Batman and Diyarbakır, two provinces in southeastern Turkey. My own research has benefitted greatly from both of these works. Indeed, Kerem Öktem's article was something of a jumping off point for me when I first

---

[7] Lusine Shahakyan, *Turkification of the Toponyms of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey* (Montreal: Arod Books, 2010), 26.

[8]Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint: Demographic Engineering and the Change of Toponymes in Republican Turkey," *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 7, (2008). http://ejts.revues.org/2243. Accessed April 12, 2013; İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey: An Anthropological Perspective on Spatio-Tempral Politics" (MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History, 2010).

[9] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar: Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye'de Değiştirilen Yer Adları* (Istanbul: TESEV Yayınları, 2011); Harun Tunçel, "Türkiye'de İsmi Değiştirilen Köyler," *Fırat University Journal of Social Science* 10, no. 2 (2000); Murat Koraltürk, "Milliyetçi Bir Refleks: Yer Adların Türkleştirilmesi," *Toplumsal Tarihi* 117, (2003). Joost Jongerden has also written about place name changes in Turkey in "Crafting Space, Making People: The Spatial Design of Nation in Modern Turkey," *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 10, (2009), but his discussion of the topic is based largely on Kerem Öktem's article.

became interested in toponyms in Turkey. As I will refer to both of these works throughout my thesis, I want to briefly discuss them and explain why a reappraisal of name change is warranted.

In "The Nation's Imprint: Demographic Engineering and Toponymical Change in Republican Turkey," Öktem lays out four waves of place name change. The period from 1915-1922 is identified as the first wave, when "toponymical engineering" and demographic engineering occurred simultaneously. Öktem explains that toponymical change "began in earnest in 1915," the same year that the deportation law which led to the displacement of over one million Syriac Christians, Armenians, and Kurds. During this phase, some of the villages that had been emptied of their previous inhabitants were quickly renamed and then repopulated with Muslim refugees from the Balkans.[10] Despite these early attempts, Öktem argues that "this was not yet the high-tide of toponymic engineering, but rather a spontaneous initiative by military commanders, local administrators, and Parliamentarians, competing to outdo each other in proving their nationalist credentials."[11] The second wave, which Öktem refers to as "preparing the infrastructure," lasts from 1922 until 1950. This "infrastructure" is taken to be institutions such as the Turkish Linguistic Society and the Turkish History Society. The publication of the "Names of Our Villages in the New Territorial Division," the first of a series of directories that would compile the names of all settlement areas in Turkey, is also understood as being part of this infrastructure. Öktem then claims that by the end of World War I place name change had become a "top priority," witnessed by the fact that the General Directorate of Provincial Administration had ordered governors to identify all foreign place names in their respective provinces.[12] The description of this second wave is concluded with the statement that

> "the years of the early Republic, then, saw the preparation of the 'scientific policy' promised in the founding moments of modern Turkey and the emergence of

[10] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 19.

[11] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 26.

[12] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 32.

> the bureaucratic and legal infrastructure that would make this policy possible. Its execution, however, had to wait ironically for the advent of democracy."[13]

It is this "advent of democracy," or the 1950 elections, which is assigned as the end of the second wave and the beginning of the third wave. This period is characterized by the Expert Commission for Name Change, a body which Öktem claims was formed in 1957 at the behest of the General Directorate for Provincial Administration. This commission met three times a week, poring over maps and deciding which names needed to be changed and then suggested new, Turkish names to the provincial councils. Öktem notes that "local resistance" in these elected, local councils seemed to have prevented the commission from carrying out its goals. However, in 1959, the authority to rename was transferred to appointees of the Interior Ministry rather than elected officials. This prompts Öktem to remark that place name change at this point became "a project of the bureaucratic elites that would be continued irrespective of the political party in government." But immediately after this claim the author notes contradictorily that "the process was "decelerated further by a lack of support for the name-change strategy on the side of the government" since "it could be suggested that its conservative elites, known for their desire to revert the language reform, were not as fervently committed to the Turkification of toponymes, and certainly all but enthusiastic of its secularist tendencies."[14] The Commission would be able to resume its work in full after the 1960 coup d'état, when "the renaming policy [was] reinforced by the military-appointed care-taker government." In 1968, the Commission was able to present the results of name change when the volume "Our Villages" (*Köylerimiz*) was published. In this directory, more than 12,000 new village names were introduced, a number which comprised some thirty percent of villages in Turkey. After the publication of this work, the Commission ceased to operate until 1973, when it went to work renaming geographical areas and settlements that were smaller than villages.[15] This wave is characterized by Öktem as being a period that "hosts the most momentous changes to Turkey's toponymy, with the grip of the Commission getting ever

[13] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 33.

[14] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 38-39.

[15] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 43.

tighter and reaching out ever further, into hamlets, alms, pastures, mountains and rivers." It is at this point that Öktem crystallizes what he views as a pattern in toponymical change in Turkey in which

> "democratically elected governments even if they do not always stop the practice of renaming, are remarkably less inclined to support and facilitate the Commission's work. Considered in this light, the Turkification of Turkey's time and space emerges as a policy of bureaucratic elites that lingered on during democratic periods and was imbued with renewed vehemence during the interludes of military rule."[16]

As with the second wave, Öktem ends the third wave with the year of a regime change. The Symposium on Turkish Place Names was held which, along with the Kurdish insurgency in the southeastern Turkey which led to mass evacuations and the relocation and renaming of villages, makes up what Öktem considers as the fourth wave and the second instance of demographic engineering overlapping with toponymical engineering. However, it is noted that in this wave the "zealous bureaucrats" had a "Turkish-Islamic rather than Turkish-secularist vision."[17] However, no evidence is given that such a vision had any effect on the renamings. The "role of the bureaucratic apparatus in the execution of the toponymical policy" is taken to be the "most striking insight" of a process which, in its last stage, was able to achieve a "'toponymical cleansing' of the surviving pockets of linguistic diversity."[18]

These aspects of name change as laid out in Kerem Öktem's article are the defining ones in a "project" lasting from 1915 until the 1980s. Such a description is problematic, however. Discussing place name change in Turkey as one "campaign" or "project" with specific waves leads to an understanding of the topic which ignores the various nuances that define the nature of attempts at place name change. Simply because name changes in Turkey have been carried out by the state and its bureaucrats does not mean it was one project in which those directing it were operating under the single goal of Turkification. An approach that conceptualizes government imposed name changes in Turkey in relation

[16] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 49.

[17] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 62.

[18] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 62-63.

to socio-political events of the time without viewing it as one project or policy and without reverting to the assumption that the overarching goal was always Turkification is therefore needed.

Even if place name change in Turkey is to be understood as a monolithic project of Turkification, there are other problems with the periodization as formulated in "The Nation's Imprint." The transition dates for the waves seem to be chosen in a perfunctory manner. Although a specific reason is given for choosing 1915 as the beginning, there is little explanation as to why the first wave ends in 1922. But this is problematic as concerted efforts at name change actually began in 1913, efforts I will discuss in more detail in Chapter Three. Furthermore, Öktem's explanation that the first wave coincided with demographic engineering does not necessarily make this period unique, as intensive efforts at reorganizing the population structure in Turkey was still occurring well after 1922.[19] Finally, two of the examples of name change debates that Öktem uses in his discussion to prove the "emotive and less rigorous approach" of the first wave as compared to later waves actually date from the *second* wave. The second wave itself is then purported to last until 1950, when the Democrat Party and Adnan Menderes came to power. Once again, the reason for the transition here is unclear as there is no significant variation in how name changes were implemented. The year 1957, however, which is said to mark the creation of the "Expert Commission" would seem to be a more appropriate transition between waves. Regime change also becomes the dividing line between the third and fourth waves. Instead of focusing on the characteristics of name change itself, Öktem has instead followed a rather classic periodization of Turkish politics since the foundation of the Republic, a period consisting of the founding years, the transition to democracy, the 1960 coup, and then the 1980 coup. Although it is claimed that the "most striking insight" into toponymical change is that it was a project of "bureaucratic elites that would be continued irrespective of the political party in government," this is not reflected in the dating of the waves themselves, which is based on regime change.

[19] Uğur Ümit Üngör, *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 122-165.

In Öktem's concluding remarks, the claim is put forth that more democratic governments, such as those of Menderes and Özal, "were reluctant to comply with the Turkification strategy and embarrassed by its excesses. It was the bureaucracy and technocratic elites that took it on themselves to elevate the toponymic strategy to the level of state policy."[20] However, there is no evidence given to support this claim. It is true that in 1978 the Expert Commission was disbanded, but I have been unable to find any evidence pointing to any sense of embarrassment on the part of the government. It is "suggested" that the Democrat Party and its "conservative elites" were not in favor of name change, but no evidence is provided of this either. If the project is to be described as a bureaucratic one by which democratically elected officials were embarrassed, then an investigation into how the political and civil bureaucracy operated during the period in which Menderes and the so-called "conservative elites" were in power must be included.[21] Overall, however, despite some claims outlined about which I find problematic and deserving of another look, "The Nation's Imprint" is a concise and useful investigation of place name change in Turkey which benefits from both primary sources in the form of internal government memos and other official documents as well as secondary sources, even though some of the conclusions drawn from the available sources will be questioned in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Written two years after "The Nation's Imprint," İbrahim Kuran's thesis, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey: An Anthropological Perspective on Spatio-Temporal Politics," covers an impressive amount of ground. Early on in his work, Kuran accepts Öktem's four wave periodization and finds it "proper and practical," although Kuran chooses not to adopt it himself.[22] Place name changes are discussed in their entirety, but the thesis focuses specifically on the period 1957-1978, when the Expert Commission was most active. Kuran shows how the Turkish state "attempted to efface the divergent and

[20] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 64.

[21] For a succinct look at the development of the bureacracy in Turkey, see Metin Heper, "Bürokrasi,"in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* 2 (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1984).

[22] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 32.

mixed temporalities, while establishing the hegemony of Turkish modernization."[23] Whereas Öktem's article had already discussed place name change in relation to the effacement of diversity, the focus on modernization in Kuran's thesis is more novel. Kuran also discusses governmentality, but in his thesis it is only extended as far as the nationalization of territory, a limitation which ignores some of the wider themes of governmentality. But thanks to Kuran's work, we have a much more thorough description of the bureaucratic mechanisms created to carry out place name change, although as I will later show, there are some problems in the periodization of these mechanisms as well as their nature. Furthermore, the fieldwork that Kuran conducted in Diyarbakır and Batman adds a fascinating insight as to how local populations responded to the changes. Kuran, in explaining why he chose to carry out such research, notes that Öktem's "ethnographic endeavors are very limited. In other words, he does not pay enough attention to the appropriation and contestation of the policy from below."[24] I agree with this statement, and would link Öktem's choice of periodization to this state-centered approach, an approach which makes Kuran's acceptance of this periodization rather puzzling. However, it should be noted that Öktem himself recognizes that his work is limited in that it is "state-centered and hence focuses on policies and actions of government agencies" and that it does not accommodate the "experience of the communities that have been written out of the official narrative."[25] As such, Öktem is clearly aware of the importance of ethnographic research such as Kuran's, research that demonstrates, unsurprisingly, that the government imposed Turkish place names were not widely accepted or appropriated by the largely Kurdish population around Diyarbakır and Batman.

As in "The Nation's Imprint," place name change in Kuran's thesis is positioned as an "entrenched bureaucratic project," but one which failed to "penetrate into the everyday lives of the local people" and that was "external to the sociocultural spaces of the locals."[26] However, fieldwork in Batman and Diyarbakır should not be used as a general guide to

[23] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 50.

[24] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 15.

[25] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 69.

[26] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 152.

understand other responses to place names in Turkey. Although locals in Diyarbakır and Batman may continue to use the "old names," that does not preclude the possibility that people in other parts of Turkey, such as the Black Sea region, would have been as adamant in rejecting the government imposed place names. Another aspect of his thesis that I find problematic involve the intentions of the author. One of the goals Kuran sets for his thesis is "to rescue the facets of memory that correspond to the mixed, divergent temporalities from the domination of the homogenized spatiotemporal regime of national history." Such a goal is foreshadowed in the thesis's abstract in which Kuran notes that his study "uncovers fragments of memory suppressed under the standardized-Turkified place names." Any researcher who ascribes to him or herself the task of "rescuing" memory should perhaps reevaluate the goals of the research in terms of what is actually possible. Whether or not the "facets of memory" have even been reduced to a level that would require their "rescue" in the first place is one question, and whether such lofty goals should play a role in scholarly research is another. I am not criticizing attempts to listen to and relate the stories of groups that may have been marginalized in nationalist projects, but I am criticizing the role researchers see themselves as playing in this process. If the memories of the old place names have not been lost, how is it possible to rescue or uncover them, and for who and what purposes are they being rescued? Diana K. Allen, in discussing her interviews with Palestinian refugees, notes a similar concern about what scholars "are actually doing when we record narratives of violence or try to bring these subaltern histories into view" and surmises that

> "it seems to suggest that the very people who purport to be trying to alleviate the sufferings of the community – activists, scholars, researchers, etc. – may also be the ones who are minting and circulating this currency of symbolic violence. By documenting histories of violence and suffering in marginalized communities are we facilitating real change in people's lives?"[27]

[27] Diana K. Allen, "The Politics of Witness: Remembering and Forgetting 1948 in Shatila Camp," in *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the claims of memory*, eds. Lila Abu Lughod and Ahmad Sa'di (New York: Columia University Press, 2007), 278.

Such questions should be asked before attempting to rescue anything, and it is important to be aware not just of the role of the researcher and of the possible boundaries that come with the role, but of what types of results or goals are involved.[28]

Whereas the existing literature describes place name change in Turkey as a project that carries with it the same ideology throughout the better part of the 20th century, in this thesis I seek to avoid this paradigm. Sevan Nişanyan, another researcher who has carried out detailed studies of place names in Turkey, does mention the changing socio-political contexts, but does not discuss them in great detail.[29] It is certain that place name change in Turkey was often about "Turkification," that it was carried out mostly by bureaucrats, and that it played an important role in state-building attempts. Less clear, however, are the specific circumstances that have influenced different attempts at place name change throughout the approximately ninety years that such changes have been carried out. Even less understood is how ordinary people responded to the changes. Although it is impossible to uncover what people thought about place name changes that were made a century ago, it is possible to gauge people's responses to more recent attempts through fieldwork such as that conducted by Kuran.

What I hope to accomplish in this thesis is an accurate re-evaluation of the nature of place name change in Turkey. I will respond to the previously mentioned issues that I have found problematic and through both ethnographic research based on fieldwork in Giresun and historical research based on archival as well as secondary material, I will offer a different, more nuanced understanding of the issue that goes beyond that of place name change being a project of Turkification carried out by the bureaucrats of a state that were acting within a shared ideology of Turkish nationalism. Whereas Turkification is clearly one of the major motivating factors, a guiding principle in this regard has been my wariness in assigning neat, ideological motives to actors, even if they are members of what appears to be a monolithic bureaucracy of a nation-state. Caution is especially needed

[28] Although his goal of "rescuing memory" is, I feel, problematic, Kuran does include a very thoughtful discussion on his role as a non-Kurdish speaking Turkish researcher in a largely Kurdish region and the limits that may come with it. İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 101.

[29] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar,* 58.

when we consider that the period being dealt with includes the better part of a century in which the governments of Turkey, including the bureaucracy, did not operate within the same paradigm. But before beginning the discussion on place name changes in Turkey, it is important to discuss three of the terms that are used throughout my thesis. These terms may obvious and thus not requiring definition. However, as is often the case with words or terms whose meanings are taken to be universal, this is not necessarily the case.

Terms

Place Names: In this thesis, the term "place name" is generally used to refer to the official name of towns, villages, cities, sub-provinces, provinces, and regions within the space that is now the Republic of Turkey. These places (a term itself whose meaning has been debated by geographers)[30] may in fact have many names, so using the term "place name change" or "toponymical change" without touching upon the possibility of multiple names, or toponyms, is problematic. Since it is not uncommon for towns in Turkey to have different names, when I discuss names being changed I refer solely to the state's decision to begin using a new name for a specific town, city, or region at the expense of the older name which had been used officially up until that point. I will also use the terms "place names" or "toponyms" to refer not only to places with politically defined boundaries such as towns, provinces, etc. but also to geographic features, such as rivers, pastures, mountains, and plains. However, most of the examples given in this thesis refer to places with more or less well-defined political boundaries as these are the places that were targeted most by official place name change in Turkey.

Old names and new names: In most of the current literature on the subject, these terms are used with little regard for the possible meanings and connotations behind them. The term "old name" would seem to imply that what is being referred to is a name that has fallen out

[30] For a discussion on the terms "places" and "regions" see Jonathan M. Smith, "Ramifications of Region and Senses of Place" in *Concepts in Human Geography*, eds. Carville Earle, Kent Matthewson, and Martin S. Kenter (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1996), 189-211.

of usage, whereas the term “new name” would refer to the name that is in currency. However, I want to underline that when I use the terms old names and new names, I refer only to the names as they are officially used by the state. As such, I am making no claims as to the name that is in currency, but simply differentiating between the previous official name and the current official name of places, the names that once appeared on the government’s maps, signs, and other official communications and the names that now appear on maps and signs. As such, the term “old name” is used to refer to the name that is now no longer the official name, whereas “new name” is used to refer to the current official name. No claims or assumptions regarding the actual use of the names are being made; the terms are used solely for purposes of differentiation and clarity.

CHAPTER I

THE VALUE OF PLACE NAMES AND THE POWER OF THE STATE TO CHANGE THEM

While discussing toponymical change and how people respond to these changes in their everyday lives, the importance that is ascribed to place names must be considered. Without a theoretical grounding in this issue, analyzing why a state seeks to change place names and how people react to these changes would be missing a very important component. Of course, there is so single theory that explains the value, inherent or acquired, of place names. The people who have lived in a town their whole lives may attach different meanings to the name of a street, a park, or the town itself than someone who has recently immigrated to the town, or someone just passing through for whom the name would be little more than a word on a sign or map. Likewise, the governing body of the town, and to a greater extent the government of the state of which the town is a part, would have other reasons for being concerned with the same street, park, or town itself and by what proper name each is known. In order to discuss the full impact that place name changes may have on people and why governing bodies may seek to change these names in the first place, a look at the value of place names themselves is needed.

Regarding the name of a place, Michel de Certeau notes in *The Practice of Everyday Life* that "a whole series of comparisons would be necessary to account for the magical powers proper names enjoy."[31] But what types of comparisons should be included and what could these "magical powers" be? In everyday life, the name of a city, town, village, pasture, or river obviously has value for the people who live in the area, but where

[31] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 104.

does this importance lie? As noted by several scholars working with geographic names in Turkey, proper names can give important clues for a place's history.[32] For them and others who have written on the subject, the value of place names lies, at least partially, in the history of a place. One scholar has claimed that place names in Turkey can be divided into two main groups, with the first group of names denoting natural or physical characteristics of the locality, while the second group contains names relating to personal ties, feelings, ancestries, etc. or ethnic groups and cultural identities.[33] Of course, there are numerous subgroups under these two divisions, and discovering the identities that are being referenced is often difficult. Sevan Nişanyan provides examples of place names in Turkey that can be traced back at least four-thousand years, such as Malatya, Midyat, and Siirt. Obviously, such ancient names are not etymologically rooted in Turkish, but rather stem from Assyrian, Hittite, or other languages once spoken in Anatolia. For example, toponymes in Turkey that end in 'sun' or 'son' (Giresun, Samsun, Avason) are almost certainly not Turkish, as their ending comes from the common Greek suffix "ssos," that was often added to names which had pre-Greek, Indo-European etymologies.[34] The point here is not to focus on whether or not such places names are Turkish, but rather to point to the histories, meanings, etc. that are often bundled within a place's name, as these count among the "magical powers" that to which Certeau refers.

Whatever histories may be suggested by names, it is often not clear whose history is being referenced. Indeed, struggles regarding the possession of history are often played out in the field of toponymy. A resident of Diyarbakır in southeastern Turkey explains what he considers to be the value of different names of the city and the problems associated with attempts at removing a name, or names, from a place:

> "...and I realized that there are hundreds of people there [Diyarbakır] who take the title of Amedi, Amidi [which are historical names of Diyarbakır] in their

[32] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar*, 23 ; Harun Tunçel, "Türkiye'de İsmi Değiştirilen Köyler," 24; Hilmi Karaboran, "Türkiye'de Mevkii Adları," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri* (Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984), 109.

[33] Hilmi Karaboran, "Türkiye'de Mevkii Adları," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 109.

[34] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar*, 22.

> nicknames. And think that, in some day, somebody has arrived and told you that this place is now Diyarbakır. All the pseudonyms were then wiped out at once. Not only places, but also people have been buried in history through the renaming of places. For instance, it is written as Seyfettin-i Amidi on the grave stone, that this man has appropriated the place as his title. Now, someone has erased this man from history, because there is neither Amid nor Amed anymore. This is a terrible split of consciousness..."[35]

For this resident, the value of *one* of the names of a place is very personal since people have used the city's name as part of their own. This is not surprising, as in Turkey it is common for a person's last name to reference the place their family is from "originally." In the Ottoman Empire, names or titles referencing a town or city of origin were even more common. In this case, the resident is convinced that through toponymical change, "people have been buried in history." Whether or not this is actually true, the value of the name of Amed to this resident is clear.

History is only one of many different aspects to consider in discussing how and why people can attach meaning to toponyms. The onomastic model theory, developed by two Czech linguists, identifies four questions which are said to express "all possible human relationships" with a name. The first question is "where/where from" and this refers to names that denote the place's location and the background of its residents. The next question is "who/what" and deals with place names that reference the occupations and status of the residents. The third question is "what like" and seeks to uncover the character of a place as displayed in its name. The last question is "whose," as place names can contain claims of ownership of the place as well as the residents."[36] These four questions are perhaps deceptively simple at first glance. However, each question could have more than one answer. Catherine Nash, a cultural geographer, touches upon the first and fourth questions by noting that toponyms can "suggest partial narratives of settlement, displacement, migration, possession, loss and authority." She goes on to explain that names have "poetics and politics" but that this "only begins to trace their diverse registers

[35] Interview by İbrahim Kuran in "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 106-107.

[36] Jaroslav David, "Commemorative Place Names – Their Specificity and Problems," *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 59, no.4 (December 2011): 215.

of meaning."[37] In Turkey, concepts such as loss and possession can indeed be reflected by place names. An obvious example is that of Istanbul, which can be said to reference possession or authority from a Muslim Turkish standpoint. On the other hand, another name by which the city has been known, Constantinople, can reference displacement and loss from an Orthodox Greek standpoint. T-shirts and other consumer items emblazoned with the phrase "Istanbul 1453" are a striking, if perhaps disconcerting, example of the authority and possession that can be implied by a place's name. On the other hand, it is not uncommon for those identifying with a Greek-Byzantine heritage to only refer to the city as Constantinople, thereby reflecting the Byzantines' loss of the city. I am not suggesting that such notions are behind every utterance of these two names of the city, but they are examples of the "registers of meaning" that can lie behind place names.

These registers, just like the answers to the questions of the onomastic model theory, are probably quite numerous, even endless. Steven Feld, in his discussion on place names in Papua New Guinea, notes that "there is considerable variation in how names hold and unleash significance." In the context of Papua New Guinea, Feld is even able to suggest a type of hierarchy regarding different place name types. Furthermore, he explains that "names are deeply linked to the embodied sensation of places."[38] Of course, whatever types of value the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea find in their place names is not replicated everywhere, and the different social and economic structures of Papua New Guinea and the late Ottoman Empire/Turkish Republic are vast enough that senses of space are likely entirely different. As I am not an anthropologist or a linguist, I am not able to construct a hierarchy regarding types of place names in Turkey, but I do believe that the points raised by Feld here are useful nonetheless in arriving at a general impression of the possible different values of place names that will guide how they are conceptualized throughout this work.

---

[37] Kathy Prendergast and Nash, Catherine. "Mapping emotions again" in *Landing: eight collaborative projects between artists and geographers*, eds. F. Driver, C. Nash, K. Prendergast, and I. Swenson (Egham: Royal Holloway, University of London, 2002), 48.

[38] Steven Feld, "Waterfalls of Song: An Acoustemology of Place Resounding in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea," in *Senses of Place*, eds. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996), 113.

Place names can also be used in a denigrating manner. An example of this is provided by Karen I. Blu, an anthropologist working among the Lumbees, a Native American group living in the states of North and South Carolina. Between the Lumbees and other locals, the name "Scuffletown" is a "fictitious name" used by both to conjure up negative images describing where the "other" lives.[39] Although perhaps not in ways that are as obvious or anecdotal, negative connotations are often attached to place names for a number of reasons. For example, the name of my own hometown is Red Oak, which is a reference to the red oak tree which is said to have existed when the town was still an unincorporated settlement in what was known officially as Indian Territory. This tree was used as the location for public whippings of "outlaws," a connotation that is not exactly pleasant. When a place name has such connotations, they may not be consciously called up every time the name is spoken, but they are nonetheless present, and it is likely that such meanings have an effect on the way people think of particular places. In Turkey, many villages and towns with names that were considered undesirable were officially changed in an attempt to erase whatever negative baggage they brought with them.

The Effect of Place

Toponymes, then, have layers of meanings. Of course, it is not simply the name that is the root of the meaning, but the place itself. The value of a place and the value of the name of a place are bound up together, so it is useful to also consider the value of place. As noted by Gillian Rose, "'place' is one of the most theoretically and politically pressing issues facing us today." There are many aspects of 'place,' but Rose here chooses to focus on "a sense of place," a term used specifically by geographers to refer to, among other things, the personal feelings that are attached to a particular space. In this sense, places are

[39] Karen I. Blu, "'Where do you stay at?' homeplace and community among the Lumbee" in *Senses of Place*, 204.

"infused with meaning and feeling."[40] However, this sense of place is not only defined by personal feeling, but also by social circumstances in that "places are interpreted from particular social positions and for particular social reasons." Rose also notes that sense of place may be heightened if that place is under threat. In Giresun, the first attempts at place name change began when the region was under threat, specifically the threat of Russian occupation. This sense of place would then likely have some effect on how people respond to place names, as these place names often reference, in Nash's words "diverse registers of meanings." Even if the names are newly ascribed, there are instances in which these toponyms could tap into these registers. For example, when residents of Giresun on the Black Sea coast were facing the Russian invasion in 1916, it is *possible* that they would have been more amenable to toponymical change that attempted to erase any "foreign" traces and promote an Islamic-Turkish identity. On the other hand, as Kuran has demonstrated in his thesis, there are situations in which the new toponyms may convey no meaning at all and may never be appropriated by the people living in or near the place whose name has been changed.[41]

Migration is also understood to have a profound effect on sense of place. Consider, for example, the different attachments one who was born and raised in a place may feel to that place and the attachments felt by one who immigrated there. The different circumstances under which people have immigrated to a place can also help determine how someone responds to a place, and, as an extension, to its name. Rose notes that

> "if that decision to move is not taken freely, migrants may feel little attachment to their new home. Not belonging is perhaps felt especially acute by refugees and exiles who did not leave their homes voluntarily. Moreover, migrants may not be made to feel welcome in their new homes, and this may be a reason for developing a feeling of hostility towards a place."[42]

As such, in analyzing the first attempts at place name change in Turkey, forced removal, migration, and resettlement are important aspects that must be included in the discussion.

---

[40] Gillian Rose, "Place and identity: a sense of place," in *A Place in the World?: Places, Cultures, and Globalization*, eds. Doreen Massey and Pat Jess (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 88-89.

[41] İbrahim Kuran, The Practive of Renaming Places in Turkey," 104.

[42] Gillian Rose, "Place and identity," 89.

With this brief introduction to the value of place names and the effect of place on them, I would like to examine the claim that place name change in Turkey has "destroyed the meanings of the former, obfuscated historical connections…but failed to replace [them] with an alternative sense of meaning."[43] This claim is problematic in two ways: first, it assumes that the power to change names, if such a power does exist, rests solely with the state's bureaucrats so that as soon as a decision is made in Ankara, the heritage of a place, as referenced by its name, is somehow lost. Previous research has also claimed that "the recurring waves of toponymical engineering were exceptionally destructive."[44] Before making such claims, an awareness of the value of place names as well as how power is negotiated between the state, its bureaucrats, and its citizens would have been warranted. Also, if a name does have a historical connection, which is not always the case, it is likely that the number of people aware of this meaning would be limited to local residents, and that such a historical connection would not be lost unless the locals themselves were prepared, or even eager, to forget whatever history that was referenced by the toponym. The forced removal of populations is also among the factors that could lead to the loss of such a historical connection, but a decision made by the government to change a place name does not necessarily destroy meanings or erase history. However, circumstances such as forced removal of populations and a willingness to forget, circumstances that have indeed been present at different times in Turkey, do allow room for histories to be erased.

Even when a willingness to forget or demographic engineering is not present, it is likely that when new names are put on official maps, many people, namely those not familiar with the place in question, use these names and have no idea of the previous name or any meaning it may have had. However, these "non-locals" would probably not have been aware of any "obfuscated historical connection" of the previous name anyway. As already mentioned, many names in Turkey are thousands of years old. As such, even the people living in a place may have no idea as to what the original meaning of the name may have been, although there are numerous legends associated with towns and cities across

[43] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 65.

[44] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 65.

Turkey and how they received their names.[45] Such names have likely gone through a process similar to the one described by cartographer Tim Robinson:

> "as language changes course like a river over the centuries, sometimes a placename gets left behind, beached, far from the flood of meaning. Then another meander of the river reaches it, interpreting it perhaps in another way, revivifying it…Eventually, the original meaning may be forever irrecoverable, or it may only be accessible to the learned. Locally, or at a personal level, it is still a name, a pointer, a misdirection, perhaps, of the place."[46]

For example, if the name of Kadahor, a town in the province of Giresun, had not been changed to Gültepe (Rose Hill), how likely is it that anybody else other than local residents would have known that Kadahor comes from the Greek Katoxora which translates roughly to "the lower village?" Perhaps the percentage of locals themselves who know the meaning today is also small. If we consider that the chances of such an awareness may often be small, then those working on place name change, not just in Turkey but elsewhere, should be careful not to assume that a government is able to "destroy meanings" as this implies that the meaning of the "old" name would have been understood by people not from there or not living in the place in question. As for the people who do live there and are aware of any meanings or historical connections of the toponym, then it would take more than a government's decision to erase the name before these meanings would disappear.

With this in mind, I would caution against assuming that names in Turkey, even the supposedly "authentic" names that were targeted by place name change, always carry with them powerful meanings and historical connections, for such characteristics of place names can often be lost. However, this is not to detract from the importance of place names. Anthropologist Charles O. Frake explains that when one hears a proper place name, it is not necessarily important to know the meaning of the name itself, or what it once meant. Speaking of England specifically, he explains that the meanings names have or once had are not of great importance. What is important is that "English place names must be *English*. They may never be 'foreign.' England is not a place for the likes of a 'Palo Alto,'

---

[45] Mehmet Önder, *Efsane ve hikâyeleriyle Anadolu şehir adları*, (Istanbul: Defne Yayınları, 1969).

[46] Tim Robinson, quoted in Catherine Nash, "Irish Placenames: Post-Colonial Locations," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* 24, no. 4 (1999): 474.

a 'Los Gatos,' or a 'Santa Cruz.'" Residents of towns in England that have names that appear to be "foreign" often tell stories "proving" that the name of their town is actually English. For example, the town Great Hautbois becomes not a French name referring to a forest since locals claim it is actually a derivation of old English words referring to a meadow.[47]

In Turkey, the situation is similar as names that appear to be non-Turkish are often "Turkified" through a story or legend that situates the name firmly in a Turkish identity. I have heard many Turkish people explain that the name Istanbul is not a variation of the Greek phrase, *eis tin polin*, an ancient Greek phrase meaning "to the city," but actually a variation of the word Islambol, referring to the city's Islamic nature.[48] During the Symposium on Turkish Place Names that was held in Ankara in 1984, one critic voiced the concern that some names were changed because they seemed "foreign" but were in fact Turkish.[49] In other cases, however, the non-Turkish origin of at least some place names is accepted. Many residents of Kayseri, for example, will tell you that the name of their city is derived from the older name Caesarea. The common explanation for the origin of the name Giresun is also based on an understanding that the city was founded by non-Turkish speakers, as the name is said to come from Kerassos, Kerasounta, or Kirasiyon, all variations of the Greek word for cherry, a name supposedly bestowed because of the numerous cherry orchards around Giresun.[50] The Greek origin of the name of Giresun is even explained in great detail in *Aksu*, the journal published by Giresun's *Halkevi*.[51] These names, despite their rather obvious "foreign" etymology, were never the object of

[47] Charles O. Frake, "Pleasant Places, Past Times, and Sheltered Identity in Rural East Anglia," in *Senses of Place,* 238-240.

[48] For other examples of "folk etymology" in Turkey, see İbrahim Aksu, "The Sultan's Journey and other Turkish Placename Stories," *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 51, no. 3-4 (December 2003): 163-192.

[49] H. Hilmi Karaboran, "Türkiye'de Mevkii Adları," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri,* 144.

[50] Mehmet Önder, *Efsane ve hikâyeleriyle Anadolu şehir adları,* 74-75; Sevan Nişanyan, *Adını Unutan Ülke,* 155.

[51] "Giresun Hakkında Tarih Kayitler," *Aksu Dergisi* 2, no. 1, (1933): 6-7.

concerted efforts at name change, although, as will be discussed later, one attempt was made to change the name of Giresun.

After reading through much of the theoretical literature on toponyms, I find it doubtful that place name change overwhelmingly leads to, in Öktem's words, a loss of "the sense of societal awareness of diversity and multicultural sociability."[52] As I stated in the introduction to this thesis, the official Turkish toponymical order is quite homogenous as a result of government imposed place changes. In this regard, there does seem to be a tangible "loss" of something, but I do not agree that it is necessarily a societal awareness of multiculturalism that is being destroyed. And in a contradiction to Öktem's claims regarding the losses engendered by name change, İbrahim Kuran concludes that "it is safe to suggest that the new place names cannot intrude into everydayness of the locals, as they have been formulated from above."[53] If the names are not able to penetrate into everyday speech, then what is actually being lost? Perhaps not as much as initially appears. But the claim that the new names have been rejected is not accurate, as new place names have been, at least in some situations, accepted by locals. And although many of the new names applied by the government were indeed devoid of any "alternative sense of meaning," this was not always the case. Some of the names imposed by the government did indeed have some type of meaning, meanings that may very well have been appreciated and hence appropriated by people choosing to use the new name. Of course, those same meanings may have been completely rejected by locals, as witnessed through the fieldwork that İbrahim Kuran carried out in the provinces of Batman and Diyarbakır in southeastern Turkey. One resident of the region, speaking of his village, notes that "the new name of our village is Elmabahçe (the apple garden); its real name is Tizyan. There is everything, but no apple tree in our village."[54]

When reading such testimony, it is easy to be led towards a value judgment on the government imposed place names because of the assumed, inherently better and more appropriate character of the old names. However, and as has already been hinted, naming

[52] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 65-66.

[53] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 24.

[54] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 104.

in itself is about power, so there always lurks the possibility that the "original" name of a place, Tizyan in the case of Elmabahçe, is actually the result of a previous power struggle in which one group was able to impose its own "sense of space" over a place through domination of others. In undertaking a critical look at toponymical change in Turkey, it is important not to assume that the names which the government decided to change necessarily reflected diversity or multiculturalism. Sevan Nişanyan also resorts to making such authoritative value judgements when discussing place name change in Turkey as he seeks to "assess the damage" of the villages whose names have "fallen victim" to the government's policies.[55] In many cases, such as in the examples of Giresun and Kayseri in which the non-Turkish origin of the name seems to be somewhat widely recognized, there may exist some sort of "multicultrual sociability" embedded in the name, but this sense of diversity imparted by the "old" names is something that should not be taken for granted.

As this discussion has shown, the value of place names, and place itself, lies among many different layers of meaning. Some of these layers may be closer to the surface and relatively easy to understand, even for non-locals. However, other layers may be more hidden, containing meanings that are not easily accessible by even locals themselves. However, at the same time, I have argued that some of the scholarship on Turkish place names has, in a somewhat nostalgic manner, taken for granted that the meanings of the "old" names were accessible and that these names imparted a sense of cosmopolitanism dating from the Ottoman period. In this construction, the nationalist bureacrats of the Turkish Republic, acting under the same ideological influences from 1915 up until the 1990s, "erased" this apparent multiculturalism from the map through their efforts at Turkification. Such arguments undervalue place names by assuming that the government would be able to perform such an erasure. The claim that "the knowledge of the old place names has largely dissipated" because "residents know the old name of their village" but that such "knowledge is likely to stretch further afield" is not completely valid because the knowledge of the old names has not largely dissipated, at least not everywhere.[56] As far as the lack of knowledge regarding old names stretching "further afield," caution is needed

[55] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar*, 49; 60.

[56] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 66.

before assuming that the registers of meaning behind place names were ever accessible to those outside the immediate vicinity of these places. If I were to examine a map of Turkey and come across the name Tizyan, would I be able to attach any meaning or significance to the name without being aware of the history of the village? Probably not, as the only people who could be able to attach such significance to the name are the people who live in or near the people, the very ones who, as Kuran has shown, have not accepted the new name of Elmabahçe anyway. In this case, the knowledge of the old names has not dissipated. In fact, the "old" names are actually not old at all, but still being used by locals. I should underline that my claims here should not be interpreted as a defense or rationalization of state imposed place name changes. Rather, I have tried to show why caution is needed in discussing what is actually "lost" when a name is officially changed.

(Re)Naming as Power

I have explained how some previous arguments on name change in Turkey have undervalued the role toponyms can play. At the same time, however, they are also overvalued in the assumption that the meaning of the "old" toponyms automatically had connotations of a multicultural past. Furthermore, the privileged nature that the old names enjoy in the current scholarship, as if they are inherently better or more authentic, ignores the fact that bestowing names is almost always about power. In the words of the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan, **"**naming is power – the creative power to call something into being, to render the invisible visible, to impart a certain character to things."[57]As such, there always lurks the possibility that names have come into common usage through the suppression and silencing of other groups that may have laid claim to a place through a different name. Mark Monmonier explains that

[57] Yi-Fu Tuan, "Language and the Making of Place: A Narrative Descriptive Approach," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81, no. 4 (December 1991): 688.

> "feuding neighbors, especially close neighbors with a history of intense animosity aggravated by differences in language and religion, fight over toponyms as well as borders. And when one group forcibly displaces the other, changing the names of places and geographic features seems a logical strategy for consolidating its grip on new territory."[58]

Such fights have often left their mark on the toponymical order of Anatolia. The city known today officially as Şanlıurfa was once simply Urfa. Previously, it was Edessa, a name bestowed on the existing settlement by Seleucus I Nicator in 304 BCE. Before this, it would have had an older indigenous name, as the practice of replacing names with Greek or Latin ones was quite common. A native of Antioch (today's Antakya), writing in the 4th Century, explains that the "Greek names which were imposed upon them [existing settlements] by the will of their founder, nevertheless have not lost the old appellations in the Assyrian tongue which the original settlers gave them."[59]

As explained by one of the Diyarbakır residents interviewed by Kuran, the city has also been known by the name Amed or Amidi, among other variations. However, the "official" Ottoman name of the city was Diyar-i Bekir, a name that was then "Turkified" by the Republic's bureaucrats. But even if the city had not been subjected to official name change in the Republic and Diyar-i Bekir was still the name that appeared on current maps today, this would still be, at least on some level, a de-facto negation of the pasts of those groups who know the city as Amed or Amidi. An even older, Armenian name for the settlement is Dikranagerd, in reference to the Armenian King Dikran who once ruled the region. Diyarbakır is only one of many examples of settlements in Turkey having more than one toponym. As Sevan Nişanyan reminds his readers, Istanbul's Armenian name is Bolis and its Greek name is Constantinopolis. The Zaza name of Nazımiye, a town in today's province of Tunceli, is Kıslê or Qıslê.[60] Nazımiye, was also known by at least one other name, that of Kızılkilise, or red church, a name that was changed in 1915, when the

[58] Mark Monmonier, *From Squaw Tit to Whorehouse Meadow: How Maps Name, Claim, and Inflame* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 106.

[59] Ammianus Marcellinus, quoted in Amir Harrak, "The Ancient Name of Edessa," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51, no. 3 (July 1992): 210.

[60] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar*, 35.

town became, at least officially, Nazımiye.[61] The fact that these names do not appear on official maps is, to some extent, a negation of the Armenian heritage of Istanbul as well as the Zaza heritage of Nazımiye. As such, using any single, proper name for a place often carries with it the risk of privileging one past, one identity, one "register of meaning" over another. Although anthropologist Steven Feld notes that "naming strengthens the naturalness of a place, the tacitness of its sensately felt dimensions in thought and action," it can also detract from the naturalness of a place. In Turkey, official renaming over the last century has done this, but as I have shown through the previous examples, such problems are often associated with naming and renaming.

In other cases, some of the "authentic" names carry such problematic, even reprehensible, meanings that criticizing the changes as "erasing history" become more difficult. For example, the subprovince of Karıpazarı (Wife Market) in Çankırı, a province northeast of Ankara, was changed to Orta (Middle). The village of Kızöldüren (Girl Killer) in Amasya was officially changed to Kızgüldüren (lit. the one that makes the girl smile) in 1955.[62] It is difficult to mourn any loss of meanings associated with such names. Once again, this should not be construed as an apologetic analysis or a rationalization of place name change in Republican Turkey, but rather a critique of the way the names that were changed are privileged in the existing literature as representing something that they often did not, a mistake that hinders a critically accurate understanding of toponymical change.

While discussing the "effacement of mixed, divergent temporal regimes," İbrahim Kuran relates the supposedly "notorious" case of a village in the province of Çorum known as Şanlıosman (Glorious Osman). Kuran explains that "the village had been named

[61] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 33. Although Kuran claims the name was changed to Nazımiye in 1915 following Enver Pasha's instructions, Sevan Nişanyan claims it was changed sometime in the late 19th century in honor of Sultan Abdülhamit's daughter Nazime, whereas the official website of the subprovince of Nazımiye states the name was changed in 1911 on the advice of the district governor Balıkesirli Mehmet Vehbi who wanted to honor the Sultan's grandson Nazım. The latter explanation seems to be the most accurate.

[62] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar*, 60; Sevan Nişanyan, "Index Anatolicus: Türkiye Yerleşim Birimleri Envanteri," http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?lv=2&y=K%C4%B1z%C3%B6ld%C3%BCren&t=&srt=x&u=1&ua0.

Kanlıosman by the authorities in the past."[63] However, the author fails to mention by what authorities this name was changed. Kanlısoman (Bloody Osman) was actually the name of the village as it first entered into the Republic's records. As such, the village must have had its name changed sometime during the Ottoman period. As for the previous name of the village, the only source I have been able to find identifies it as Abbasağa Köyü.[64] In any case, it was not the officials of the Republic who decided upon the name Kanlıosman. Kuran then claims that Şanlıosman was chosen as a new name because of the "reactionary stance of the locals" against the old name. Although Kuran fails to include any dates or sources whatsoever throughout his discussion of this village, I discovered that Şanlıosman was chosen as the new name in 1956 and published in one of the Official Gazettes of that year in which several other names were changed.[65] Kuran goes on to explain that in 2006, "after the confrontations….the villagers asked to change the village name to Yenikışla by stating 'biz ne kanlı ne de şanlı bir isim istiyoruz' (we want neither a bloody nor a glorious name)." Kuran uses this as an example of the "exclusion and marginalization" of Alevis and then claims that "since the early Republican era, the Alevis and their traditions have been evaluated as heterodox…"[66] While the Alevis have indeed been considered heterodox, this is hardly a Republican development as Alevis had been persecuted throughout the Ottoman era. However, this is ignored in the same manner that the fact that the village received the name of "Bloody Osman" sometime in the Ottoman period is also ignored. In this way, the very complicated and multi-layered history of this particular village's name, one in which any "original" name is very difficult to pinpoint, is oversimplified so that it can be fit into a certain dichotomy that is perpetuated in most of the secondary literature on place name change in Turkey. In this dichotomy, which consists of a cosmopolitan, Ottoman past versus a homogenous, Republican present, the "old" names are automatically valued due to their supposed authenticity, disregarding when or

[63] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 109.

[64] "Alevi köye Sunni ismi," last modified February 17, 2007, http://www.aleviforum.com/showthread.php/26815-Alevi-k%C3%B6ye-S%C3%BCnni-ismi.

[65] Resmi Gazete. July 3, 1956.

[66] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 110.

how these names came about in the first place. Furthermore, the name that was apparently chosen by the villagers is also ignored. Yenikışla, or New Barracks, hardly seems to be a name that would reflect the town's history any more appropriately than Şanlıosman or Kanlıosman.

Considering the various identities referenced by the name of a place and attempts at altering these identities leads to another area of analysis which has not been discussed in the existing literature in toponymical change in Turkey. Nişanyan, reflecting on the Armenian name of Istanbul and the Zaza name of Nazımiye, explains that the "Turkish state does not have the authority to change the Zaza names."[67] However, it bears discussion what "authority" the state possesses to change any name at all, be they Turkish, Armenian, or Zaza and where, if it does exist, this authority lies.

Authority in Toponymical Change

Although it may be taken for granted that bureaucrats, using the authority "given" to them by the state which they are supposed to serve, are the ones who have defined the toponymical order of Turkey, such an assumption is problematic as notions of power and authority are not considered. Unfortunately, such considerations are lacking in the critical literature on place name change in Turkey. In the following discussion, I will situate the government's attempts at place name change within notions of power and authority. Of course, It is impossible to use words like power and authority without pairing them with at least some discussion of what these words mean. There are of course different theories as to how these concepts should be defined and how they interact with each other, but I want to briefly lay out an understanding of power and authority that has guided my approach to this thesis. It is important to note that discussions of power are often prefaced with a warning not to conceive of power as a force that exists on its own, waiting to be seized by governments or opposition parties or protestors. Arendt and others have argued that power

[67] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Coğrafyalar*, 35.

does not exist in this way, that it is not a tangible "something" that is always held by someone or some group. Power is, at the risk of oversimplifying, the product of various social interactions and is not embedded in any person or institution. However, it is difficult to move past the paradigm of power existing on its own, as a capacity that is always held by an individual, a body of individuals, or an institution, even if one is familiar with discussions that posit otherwise.

In his formulation of power, John Allen names two specific relational ties that allow power to be established. One of these is instrumental, that is, power that is exercised *over* people and used to obtain leverage. The other tie is associational, whereby power "acts more like a collective medium enabling things to get done or facilitate some common aim." Here, power is not used *over* people but *with* them.[68] Such a distinction will help in conceptualizing name change in Turkey as well as in explaining how power has operated differently in specific contexts. In situations where local residents were not accepting of or even hostile to the changes, then instrumental power would have been involved. This is the type of power that is assumed to have accompanied name change in Turkey by most scholars. İbrahim Kuran has successfully proven that this has been the case with toponymical changes around Batman and Diyarbakır, but it should not be supposed that associational power could not also have been at play in other instances. In many cases, local residents may have been accepting of the changes, even desirous of them. In these cases, the "power to change place names" should be viewed not as instrumental power, but as associational power which may have facilitated some common aim.

A few words should also be said about the concept of authority. It is essentially an instrumental act in that authority is exercised over someone. But as Allen notes, unlike domination, submission is not the only possible option in response to authority. Those who claim authority should justify it to those who are conditionally accepting the use of power over them.[69] However, it is important to keep in mind that power is not only exercised through authority. For example, governments are able to impose order on populations not only through their receipt of a grant of authority, but in a myriad of other ways. Indeed,

[68] John Allen, *Lost Geographies of Power* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 5.

[69] John Allen, *Lost Geographies of Power*, 6.

power may also be exercised through "seduction or manipulation or inducement, even coercion…"[70] With this in mind, the "experts" who made up the commissions tasked with changing places names in Turkey were perhaps not employing only their professional "expertise" when assigning the new, official names to places, but may have also been engaging in "all manner of seductive or persuasive acts to win people over which [had] absolutely nothing to do with people conceding authority to them."[71] In such a construction, the Expert Commission becomes a part of the "'regimes of conduct,' a domain populated by the multiform projects, programmes and plans that attempt to make a difference in the way in which we live by a swarm of experts, specialists, advisers and empowerers."[72] Whether or not people have granted the Turkish state authority to intervene in their everyday lives through toponymical change, it is clear that in many cases the state's bureaucrats were quite confident that they did indeed have such authority. Speaking in 1984 at the Symposium on Turkish Place Names, Cemil Arif Alagöz, the president of the Turkish Geographical Society, noted the importance of selecting new names carefully and specifically in order not to have to change the names again later.[73] Although he does display some caution in his insistence on the need to choose names carefully, the confidence that names can be chosen by the government and applied and even re-chosen and reapplied is telling.

In applying the idea of "regimes of conduct" to the Expert Commission and place-name change, there is perhaps a presupposition that place name change attempts in Turkey were actually trying to bring about a difference in the way people live. In considering the merits and demerits of such a presupposition, we arrive back at the question of goals, and the rationale behind toponymical change, subjects that will be discussed in the second chapter of this thesis. Previous literature has focused on the ideology behind place name

[70] John Allen, *Lost Geographies of Power*, 143.

[71] John Allen, *Lost Geographies of Power*, 144.

[72]Mitchell Dean, "Foucault, government, and the enfolding of authority," in *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, eds. Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 211.

[73] Cemil Arif Alagöz, "Yer Adları Üzerine," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri,* 22.

change, namely, Turkish nationalism, and this has undoubtedly played a huge role. However, aside from ideology as the driving factor, other aspects of place name change should be considered.

Topography and Governmentality

The study of what is referred to as "governmentality" is useful in conceptualizing how states seek to project their influence. This term is used by Jonathan Xavier Inda in referring to the "corpus of political, social, and cultural analysis" that was produced after Foucault's work on government.[74] Inda names three analytical themes that are present in the study of governmentality, and they are all relevant to the topic of toponymical change. The first theme consists of reasons and involves "rationalities of government." Within this theme, Inda points out two main concerns of scholars of governmentality. The first concern deals with the different forms of knowledge that are relied upon by these rationalities of government, such as medicine, public policy, and economics.[75] Nikolas Rose reminds us that "government has both fostered and depended upon the vocation of "experts of truth" and the functioning of their concepts of normality and pathology, danger and risk, social order and social control, and the judgments and devices which such concepts have inhabited."[76] In seeking out the "truth," then, governments often rely on people whose "expertise" engenders rationality, the "regimes of conduct" which were explored by Rose. The other main concern of scholars in the realm of reasons consists of the "problem-oriented nature of political reasons."[77] Here, government authority is primarily concerned with problems that need addressing, such as crime, natural disasters, or even, as in the

[74] Jonathan Xavier Inda, "Analytics of the Modern: An Introduction," in *Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics*, ed. Jonathan Xavier Inda (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 8.

[75] Jonathan Xavier Inda, "Analytics of the Modern," 9-10.

[76] Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 30.

[77] Jonathan Xavier Inda, "Analytics of the Modern," 8.

topic of this thesis, "foreign" place names. Scholars working on these questions are interested specifically in how certain events or objects are conceived of and formulated by intellectuals, analysts, doctors, and other authorities as problems that need to be solved.

The second analytical theme in the study of governmentality is "technics," which refers to the mechanisms through which governments seek to "shape, normalize and instrumentalize the conduct, thought, decisions and aspirations of others in order to achieve the objectives they consider desirable."[78] Extending this understanding of governmentality to the topic at hand, I posit that name change should, at least in some cases, be considered a technic of the state. The first lists of place names that were to be changed, lists that will be discussed in detail in the third chapter, were "mundane tools" that represented and "made visible" the toponymical order of the late Ottoman Empire, thereby rendering it "possible for thought to act upon reality."[79] In the same regard, the following remarks made by Salih Orcan, the Director of the Office of Cartography, in 1984 at the Symposium on Turkish Place Names also shows how place name change can be used as a "technic" of governmentality. Orcan noted that "problems occurring in the standardization of geographic names have negatively affected the works of geographers, cartographers, statisticians, census-takers and planners."[80] Here, the concern seems not so much about ideology and Turkification, but the efficiency in which "experts of truth" are able to function. The theme of technics, then, is recognition of government's "belief that reality can be managed better or more effectively and thus achieved desired ends."[81]

The last analytical theme as relayed by Inda is that of "subjects", which is perhaps the most important in understanding the Turkish state's attempts at place name change. This theme deals with how government seeks to influence or alter its subjects. In exploring this theme, I find it useful to include the following passage from Mitchell Dean:

---

[78] Peter Miller and Nikolas Rose, "Governing Economic Life," *Economy and Society* 19, no. 1 (1990): 8.

[79] Jonathan Xavier Inda, "Analytics of the Modern," 9.

[80] Salih Orcan, "Toponominin Milli ve Milletlerarası Önemi," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 56.

[81] Jonathan Xavier Inda, "Analytics of the Modern," 10.

> "What forms of person, self and identity are presupposed by different practices of governments and what sorts of transformations do these practices seek? What statuses capacities, attributes and orientations are assumed of those who exercise authority (from politicians and bureaucrats to professionals and therapists) and those who are to be governed (workers, consumers, pupils and social welfare recipients)? What forms of conduct are expected of them? What duties and rights do they have? How are these capacities and attributes to be fostered? How are these duties enforced and rights ensured? How are certain aspects of conduct problematized? How are they then to be reformed? How are certain individuals and populations made to identify with certain groups, to become virtuous and active citizens, and so on?"[82]

Among these questions raised by Dean, the last one is, at least for this discussion, the most salient. By changing the names of places, states have often sought to bring about identification with a larger group. In this context, the attempts of the Turkish state to change place names should not be seen entirely as a project of "Turkification" which would position it as an independent phenomenon specifically unique to Turkey. Rather, when framed in the study of governmentality, it becomes a technology of the state that was employed to solve what, in the eyes of many bureaucrats, intellectuals, and state experts, was a problem. As to what exactly that problem was, a comprehensive explanation cannot be limited to ideology. Indeed, if the goal of place name change is limited to ideology, i.e. Turkification, then considering it as a technology of governmentality would be problematic, if not inappropriate, as these technologies are generally used in reference to solutions of more practical problems, such as poverty, economic stagnation, and epidemics. However, when all aspects of toponymical change in Turkey are taken into consideration, a picture emerges in which a multitude of reasoning and strategies may often lie behind place name change. Separating these reasons and strategies and the "problems" they were responding to is difficult, especially as previous studies as well as my own have been able to find little evidence in the form of official documents as to the state's rationality behind specific attempts at place name change. In the evidence that does exist, the explanations are limited to the apparent need to "Turkify" non-Turkish toponymes. However, this is usually the extent to which any rationale is specified, a problem which has limited our understanding of government imposed place name changes.

[82] Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (London: Sage Publications, 1999), 32.

In the next chapter, I will seek to contextualize the alteration of toponyms in Turkey, looking to the examples of other states that have used place name change as a technic of governmentality and discussing possible rationales of the state.

CHAPTER II

RATIONALES, GOALS, AND AUDIENCES

The possible goals of the state in toponymical change and how these goals may have changed over time is another aspect which has not been sufficiently addressed. Turkification has been described as the main goal of toponymical change, and indeed this is stated as the aim in official documents regarding place name change, but it is not a comprehensive enough explanation. Before dealing with this topic in the contexts of late Ottoman and Republican Turkey, I will inquire as to the general reasons why any state would take upon itself the task of changing place names. In the previous chapter I discussed how governmentality is useful in analyzing place name change, and in this chapter I will tie governmentality as well as other motivational factors into specific examples of place name changes, not just in Turkey but in other states as well. Others have provided a theoretical discussion of nation-state building and modernization that is informative, but I feel that these discussions have been too general as they do not coherently link specific examples of toponymical change with nation-state building. Furthermore, the "project" is discussed solely within the framework of building the modern nation-state, ignoring the fact that the earliest attempts at comprehensive place name change were carried out in a period in which the nature of the state that would become the Turkish Republic was far from being a foregone conclusion. There are of course a number of reasons as to why state officials should want to intervene in the toponymical order of the territory it controls, and these are often linked to techniques of nation building. However, this should not be posited as the only reason behind attempts at name change. As such, a brief investigation will be made as to how toponymical change fits into the nation-building project while keeping in mind that this is not the only environment in which such changes occur. In order to accomplish this, the following

chapter first deals broadly with government imposed toponymical change and the reasons and ideologies behind it, followed by a look at how toponymical change was carried out in other contexts, before identifying four potential "audiences" or "targets" of the various attempts at place name change in Turkey while showing that the goals of the state and the implementation of the changes did not remain stagnant throughout.

Place Name Change as Nation-State Building

As İbrahim Kuran notes in his thesis, and as many other critics of nationalism have discussed, the idea of a homeland is of paramount importance in fostering a sense of belonging to the nation. I should note that the concept of nationalism and nation-state building as employed in this thesis rests upon the premise, formulated comprehensively by Benedict Anderson and now widely accepted, that nationalism and "the nation" are socially constructed phenomena. The often contrived nature of nationalism lends itself to the fabrication of symbols that are meant to foster a sense of shared identity among individuals, thereby making them members of the "imagined community." As so much has been written on nationalism, I will not summarize the arguments and theories surrounding this ideology. However, some discussion is obviously warranted as to how nationalism plays a role in building nation-states since interfering in the toponymical order has often been part of these processes.

Creating a national territory with well-defined borders is an essential part of building a nation-state as it serves to separate the "us" from "them." In this way, insiders and outsiders are created. Another important step is constructing or strengthening a national history with founding fathers, glorious battles in which the nation was victorious, and a pure language that has been spoken since time immemorial. To help proliferate and commemorate all of these, monuments are built, holidays are declared, and textbooks are printed. Education in this way then becomes a tool to serve the nation-state. İsmet Parlak has explored how the Turkish Ministry of Education sought to instill a sense of Turkish nationalism in students through the creation of a nationalist curriculum. The primary goal

of the curriculum was to ensure that children loved their "nation" and their "homeland." Among the other goals was that all students obtain a sense of "national feeling."[83] Raising children with a "nationalist mindset and heart" and "lifting the souls of Turkish children with the excitement of the nation" through secular education were also primary concerns.[84] However, it is important to note that this type of nation-building, one based on radical secularism and nationalism and containing its own "Turkish History Thesis," was not present when place-name change first began in the Ottoman Empire.

In his thesis, Kuran positions the ideological underpinnings of toponymical change directly in this type of state-building, one in which the "Turkish ethnicity lies beyond the boundaries by reaching the steps of Central Asia in the official narrations of the Turkish History Thesis, and forgetting the recent past, as the new Turkish state eagerly broke with the Ottoman traces." All of these processes, Kuran notes, "play[ed] pivotal roles in the construction of the Turkish national identity"[85] This is true, but these processes did not actually begin to play a key role in nation-state building until the 1930s, by which time attempts at place name change had already been underway for almost two decades. As such, to immerse the rationale of place name change solely in such a framework and refer to it as one single "policy" or "project" is to ignore the political and ideological circumstances under which place name change began, circumstances that will be discussed later in the chapter.

Although toponymical change can clearly serve the interests of the nation state in helping to construct a sense of inclusiveness as well as exclusiveness, I would like to turn to specific examples of place-name change in other contexts. By focusing solely on the Turkish example, there is the risk of falling back onto stereotypes of Turkish exceptionalism in which the country is unique because of how its leaders constructed the nation-state. Indeed, it has been explicitly argued that the Turkish example is "unique in that it is one of the most comprehensive and long-lasting examples of nationalist social

[83] İsmet Parlak, *Kemalist İdeolojide Eğitim* (Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi, 2005), 171-178.

[84] İsmet Parlak, *Kemalist İdeolojide Eğitim*, 180.

[85] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Place Names in Turkey," 10.

engineering."[86] Furthermore, literature on place name change in Turkey has referred to the "vehemence" in which renaming was carried out.[87] In order to gauge this "vehemence," a comparison to other renaming attempts is needed.

State Imposed Toponymical Change in Other Contexts

In the introductory comments to this thesis, I noted that states neighboring Turkey have also undertaken their own attempts at renaming.[88] Armenia is one of these examples. Arseny Saparov explains that name changes began occurring in Armenia in the 1920s, but that in 1933 a special commission was appointed by the Central Executive Committee of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic to determine "correct" place names. The Geographic Commission of the Armenian Academy of Science would then either approve or reject the names chosen by the commission. The changes had to go through several more stages of approval before they were finally approved and implemented, with the central Soviet government in Moscow having ultimate control over renaming. However, in the period 1920-1934, Saparov notes that no more than eighty places were targeted by renaming. This relatively low number is attributed to the "ideas of internationalism [that] were particularly strong among Armenia's communist leaders."[89] Of these, most of the

[86] Kerem Öktem, "Creating the Turk's Homeland: Modernization, Nationalism, and Geography in Southeast Turkey in the late 19th and 20th Centuries," Paper for the Socrates Kokkalis Graduate Workshop 2003, The City: Urban Culture, Architecture and Society, 3

[87] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 49.

[88] Works dealing with state-imposed place names in Europe include Maoz Azaryahu, "The Purge of Bismarck and Saladin: The Renaming of Streets in East Berlin and Haifa, a Comparative Study in Culture-Planning," *Poetics Today* 13, no. 2 (Summer, 1992): 351-367; Maoz Azaryahu, "Street Names and Political Identity: The Case of East Berlin," *Journal of Contemporary History* 21, no. 4 (Oct. 1986): 581-604; RDK Hermann, "The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-Conquest of Hawai'i," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 18, no. 1 (Mar 1999): 76-102; Laura Sakaja and Jelena Stanic, "Other(ing), self(portraying), negotiating: the spatial codification of values in Zagreb's city-text," *Cultural Geographies* 18 (August 4, 2011): 495-516.

[89] Arseny Saparov, "The Alteration of Place Names and Construction of National Identity in Soviet Armenia," in *Cahiers du Monde russe* 44, no. 1 (January-March 2003): 185-186.

names that were changed were of a religious nature, with names referencing both Islam and Christianity being replaced by names that were more amenable to the Soviet officials. Names that reflected "feudal relationships" were also changed. From 1945 to 1950, a large number of place names were renamed along with a massive influx of Armenians, accompanied by migration of Azerbaijanis. In total some 100,000 people were "voluntarily resettled." From 1950 until the late 1960s, there were very few renamings, but in 1968, in an "attempt of the local authorities to accommodate the resurgence of Armenian nationalism," a significant increase in place name change occurred.[90] Saparov claims that another increase in place name change ten years later, in 1978, was also an attempt at appeasement with Armenian nationalists who were angry that a draft of an Armenian constitution made no mention of the local languages of the republic.

By 1988, roughly sixty percent of the place names in Armenian had been officially renamed.[91] This is considerably higher than the percentage of renamed places in Turkey, which is around thirty-five percent.[92] One of the most interesting characteristics of place name changes in Soviet Armenia that emerges from Saparov's study is that name changes almost always reflected demographic change. When, for example, one region was emptied of Azerbaijanis, Azerbaijani place names were given Russian or Armenian names based on the language of the population that remained there or that was resettled there. In other cases, according to Saparov, Turkic or Azerbaijani names were imposed on regions that were populated by Azerbaijanis.[93] In the Armenian example, the Soviet authorities behind toponymical change were not trying to construct a nation-state in the same manner as those behind toponymical change in Turkey. Although nationalism clearly played a role in the processes as outlined by Saparov, in such situations officials seemed to have only grudgingly changed place names to appease Armenian nationalists. Other changes were focused on ensuring that Armenian topography more accurately reflected official ideology as toponymes with religions or feudal references were altered. Rather than being directed

[90] Arseny Saparov, "The Alteration of Place Names," 188.

[91] Arseny Saparov, "The Alteration of Place Names," 190-191.

[92] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Place Names in Turkey," 51.

[93] Arseny Saparov, "The Alteration of Place Names," 197.

by an overarching ideological goal of transforming the topography to reflect a certain national identity, the Soviet institutions and authorities that carried out place name change in Armenia operated with various strategic goals in mind, thereby positioning toponymical change more firmly as a technique of governmentality rather than as being an inevitable part of vehement nation building.

The Bulgarian state has also attempted to intensively alter place names in its territory. In 1934, the year Damien Velchev-Kimon Georgiev's government was installed after a coup, concerted efforts at changing Turkish place names were initiated. In the first year alone, two-thirds of all Turkish place names in Bulgaria had been changed through ministerial orders. These changes were apparently carried out unopposed by the public. This was part of a process in which Turks in Bulgaria were encouraged or forced to leave Bulgaria or forced to assimilate into the Bulgarian nation-state.[94] Although Turkey's eastern neighbor Armenia was also conducting toponymical change during the same period, a comparison between the Bulgarian example and the Armenian example as outlined by these two scholars seems to present two different sides of the same process. In Bulgaria, with the complete removal of Turkish place names, the goal was clearly an erasure of Turkish identity, a goal which would continue at varying levels of intensity throughout the 20th century. In Armenia, on the other hand, due to the nature of the political structure of which it was part, no clear ethnic or national motives were present on the part of the officials behind the changes. Although a more comprehensive comparison between place name alterations in the states of Bulgaria and Armenia is not appropriate here, the rough outline I have provided shows that toponymical change in the region has been carried out under quite different circumstances amid a range of ideologies and state rationales.

Other episodes of name change represent entirely different types of goals. In the United States, federal as well as various state governments have taken it upon themselves to rid themselves of offensive toponyms. In 1962, the Domestic Names Committee approved a policy seeking to remove the word "nigger" from geographic names. In 1995,

[94] Milena Mahon, "The Turkish minority under Communist Bulgaria – politics of ethnicity and power," *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 1 no. 2 (1999): 153-154.

Minnesota required that all counties remove the word "squaw" from place names by mid-1996. Out of twenty such places, seventeen places had their names officially changed to reflect the new requirement while two counties resisted, "citing the argument of historical continuity or, cynically perhaps, holding out against what they perceived to be 'politically correct.'" By 1999 however, Minnesota was officially free of the offending toponym. Montana, Maine, South Dakota, and California are some of the other states that have dealt with the use of the word "squaw" in toponymes. Throughout these changes, objections were often raised on the grounds of "historical continuity," but the consensus among many was that in most cases such continuity should be sacrificed to "social sensitivity."[95] The examples given in the previous chapter of the Turkish villages of Karıpazarı and Kızöldüren would seem to fall into this category of name changing. Indeed, there are other examples of such toponymes being changed in Turkey, ones which have nothing to do with Turkification.

Concerns of standardization have also influenced name change policies. In 1967, just one year before the Turkish Interior Ministry published its comprehensive Köylerimiz which purported to list every village name in Turkey along with their "old" and "new" names, the United Nations held its first Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names. This conference was intended to promote the work of "geographers, cartographers, and linguists [who] have long wanted to bring some semblance of order" to the millions of placenames" that "constitute a veritable Tower of Babel." Since then, six more of these conferences have been held and the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names has held twenty meetings in which 50 to 75 specialists on geographic names have met to provide advice to the conferences. The main goal of these proceedings has been the "univocity," or the need for a single term to be used in designating a place, thereby eliminating "parallel toponyms" or "alternate placenames."[96] As the following discussion on audiences will show, place name change in Turkey also exhibits different rationales, a variety which renders the term "Turkification" unsatisfactory as the sole explanation.

---

[95] Thomas J. Gasque, "Structure and Controversy: What Names Authorities Adjudicate," *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 48, no. 3-4 (September-December 2000): 201-202.

[96] Henri Dorion, "Should All Unofficial Placenames Be Eliminated?" *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 48, no. 3-4, (September-December 2000): 250-251.

Audiences

In analyzing the motivations of the various Turkish officials that were involved in place name change, one of the more salient factors to keep in mind is the imagined audience. To what group or groups were the name changes directed at? I will consider four possible "audiences" or "targets" at which toponymical engineering was likely directed. Of course, bureaucrats never stated explicitly who or what the changes were seeking to affect, but after examining the nature of the changes that have taken place, I have identified the following groups as being present to some extent in the mindset of those involved in place name change. The first audience that Turkish governments most definitely had in mind when changing place names was "the nation" whose toponymical as well as demographical order needed to be free of any "foreign" elements. The second and perhaps the most obvious audience were the people living in or around the place whose name was being changed. Ostensibly, these would have been the people most affected by changes in the toponymical order. A third likely audience, or perhaps beneficiary, is the state itself, the governing body and institutions of Turkey that have sought legitimacy through the toponymical order. Finally, I will suggest a fourth possible audience as being "others" who were not allowed a space inside the boundaries of Turkey. These four audiences were not conceptualized in the same way throughout the changes, nor were they targeted equally. They also did not occupy the same level of importance for the bureaucrats and politicians involved in the name-changing process. I will consider these four audiences separately, and reflect on the likelihood of toponymical engineering's "success" with each group. However, I do not claim that these four groups are completely separate from each other. Indeed, overlaps abound. The reason I focus on these groups is that I consider this division to be quite useful in conceptualizing the possible goals of the state in the name changing process as well as the different reactions to them.

Toponymical Change for "the Nation"

As the initiator of the first concerted efforts at toponymical change in the space which would become the nation-state of Turkey, the Committee of Union and Progress was concerned with the creation of a "nation." However, the nation that was envisioned was not the nation that would come to be constructed by those commonly referred to as Kemalists. Whereas I do not want to focus too heavily on the ideologies of the "Kemalists" or their predecessors, the "Young Turks," it is useful to look at strains of thought shared by those in power in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, the period referred to by Kerem Öktem as the "first overlap" in demographic and toponymical engineering. It is only after an understanding of these ideological currents is reached that we can begin to approach why and how "the nation" would have been an audience and how overtures to it in the form of toponymical engineering changed throughout Republican history.

The effort to create a "fatherland" out of the remains of the Ottoman Empire has been the subject of a large body of literature. Much of this work focuses on the nationalism of the "founding fathers" of the Turkish state and their ideas as to who should be included or excluded from the new state. Despite being excluded from most of the literature on place name change in Turkey, a discussion of the manner in which Turkish nationalism defined itself against the discursive "other" must be included, so without delving into a comprehensive history of the development of Turkish nationalism, I would like to look at what the Committee of Union and Progress and their successors, the politicians and bureaucrats that would govern the Republic of Turkey, thought about "the nation" and who would be considered part of it.

The notion of who should or should not belong to the Ottoman state and its successor was not a static, well-defined one. From the late 19th century until the end of Turkish resistance and the foundation of the Republic, different groups within the empire/nation-state had different ideas regarding this matter, and these ideas were subject to change. As we will see, the Balkan Wars played a role in these ideological changes, but

perhaps not to the extent that is commonly claimed. Examining such theories is necessary in order to approach the beginnings of name change in the late Ottoman Empire, as well as under what ideological conditions it continued into the Republic.

In trying to ensure the existence of their empire, Ottoman political actors and intellectuals were concerned with who was or who could be Ottoman subjects/citizens. The idea of a "unity of the elements," or "*İttihad-ı Anasır*" was one such theory. For those supporting such a framework, commonly referred to as Ottomanism, the ideal Ottoman state would be one in which everyone within the borders of the empire would be bound together by feelings of patriotism and loyalty to the Ottoman state. In this ideal, neither religious affiliation nor ethnic background would serve as a basis of belonging. Armenian Christians, Muslim Albanians, Jews, and Anatolian Muslim Turks would all be Ottoman citizens, ruled over by a Sultan who, while Muslim, would theoretically protect the rights of all Ottoman citizens. To this effect, a citizenship law in 1869 ascribed citizen status to all Ottoman subjects. As Hasan Kayalı notes, the 1876 constitution was a "consummation, as well as a test, of the Young Ottomans' notion of Ottomanism."[97] Such a framework for Ottoman identity was seen as the best bet for calming the various restive communities in the Balkans in the wake of nationalist uprisings that had led to increasing Ottoman territorial losses. It was an attempt to provide much needed legitimization, a problem that most 19th century monarchies faced.

The question of who subscribed to the idea of a "*İttihad-ı Anasır*" is more difficult than defining what the "unity of elements" was. Erik J. Zürcher claims that "by the early twentieth century, sincere belief in a 'Union of the (ethnic) Elements' (*İttihad-ı Anasır*) was probably limited to some Greek, Arab and Albanian intellectuals and the 'Liberal' group led by Prince Sabahattin."[98] This is not to say that others in the empire had already become Turkish ethno-nationalists, but rather that the appeal of the "Unity of the Elements" had become limited to some peripheral actors. Indeed, according to Zürcher's

[97] Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 24.

[98] Erik J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation-Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2010), 147-148.

reading of Kâzım Karabekir's memoirs, the organizers of the 1908 revolution did not automatically allow non-Muslims into the planning of the event, but they did allow non-Turkish Muslims.[99]

If, as Zürcher claims, by the early twentieth century only a few groups still clung to the idea of an Ottoman empire in which people of all religions and all ethnic backgrounds were loyal to the state, then what was the reason behind this lack of support for an *İttihad-ı Anasır*? The answer to this lies with other theories or ideas as to the ideal nature of the Ottoman state, of which several existed. Whereas *İttihad-ı Anasır* sought to include all subjects in the Ottoman Empire, other formulations had different bases of inclusion. One of these included what has been termed Pan-Islamism, which is often explained as being a solution that sought to unify Muslims in order to rally to the defense of the Ottoman Empire.[100] Pan-Islamism in this sense was less of a sweeping and coherent ideolgy held by much of the elite and more akin to a tactical move by some, despite the usual portrayal of Abdülhamid II by nationalist historians as being a fanatical pan-Islamist who sought to extend the control of the Ottoman Empire over much of the world's Muslim population. On the contrary, as Selim Deringil notes, a theme of Abdülhamid's reign was that "Ottomanism would undergo a shift in emphasis to become more Islamic in tone and nuance..."[101] Greater emphasis on the Islamic nature of the Ottoman state was thus a defense mechanism as an increasing number of territories were being lost. And in this Islamic order of affairs, the highest position would be accorded to Turks.[102]

---

[99] Erik J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation-Building*, 148.

[100] For a critique on the how the term pan-Islamism is employed, see Adeeb Khalid, "Pan-Islamism in practice: The rhetoric of Muslim unity and its uses" in *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy*, ed. Elisabeth Özdalga (London ; New York : RoutledgeCurzon, 2005), 201-224.

[101] Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998), 46.

[102] Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 170.

The nineteenth century also saw the injection of nationalism into the mindset of some Ottoman officials.[103] These nationalist sentiments, or proto-nationalist sentiments in some cases, had to be contained within the ideology of Ottomanism until the end of the empire. For example, around the time that Yusuf Akçura published his *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* in 1905, cultural Turkism was flourishing, even though it was not possible for officials to openly express these ideas.[104] Such an espousal of Turkism would have to wait until the CUP had gained control of the Ottoman state. But even then, as claimed by Erik Zürcher, "the political and military leaders…were guided not by Ottomanism, not by Turkism, and not by Islamism" but rather by a "peculiar brand of Ottoman-Muslim nationalism, which was to a very high degree reactive."[105] However, the three previously mentioned ideologies or strains of thought were "tools to be used to strengthen the position of the Ottoman Muslims (as was Westernization), not ends in themselves."[106] I would qualify that this "peculiar brand of Ottoman-Muslim nationalism" was actually one in which it was understood that Turks would be the leaders. Hanioğlu deftly explains how the Russo-Japanese War allowed the Young Turks to inject race theories, as they could then "rearrange the hierarchical assignments," assignments in which, according to European theorists, the "Asiatic" races, including Turks, were at the bottom of the ladder. This, along with Great Power intervention into the empire, allowed nationalist sentiments to flourish among the Ottoman elite. This would continue until 1906, by which time most of the CUP's propaganda had a very nationalist slant in which Turkish symbolism was used heavily, leading some non-Turkish CUP members, such as Ibrahim Temo, to lean toward their "own" nationalisms.[107]

Although the Balkan Wars are commonly treated as the moment in which the dominant political ideology in the Ottoman Empire became Turkish nationalism, it is clear

---

[103] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 51.

[104] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, 145.

[105] Erik J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy*, 230.

[106] Erik J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy*, 231.

[107] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *Young Turks in Opposition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 210.

that several years before the Balkan Wars much of the CUP had definitely turned away from the classical idea of Ottomanism as an *İttihad-ı Anasır* and had instead come to embrace a more ethnocentric Turkish nationalism, calling upon pan-Islamic or other strains of thought when necessary to shore up their sometimes precarious legitimacy. However, even if their role has been exagerrated, the Balkan Wars clearly were important in shaping the outlook of many of the leaders within the CUP. Indeed, many of the organization's most important members hailed from the Balkans, with fully half of them being born and raised in areas that were lost by the Ottomans during the period 1911 to 1913.[108] By the end of this traumatic conflict, the empire had lost eighty-percent of its European lands and roughly 4.2 million people. Approximately 800,000 people were uprooted, with half of that number being Muslims who often followed the retreating Ottoman armies. Many of them died on the journey, but thousands flooded into Istanbul, waiting to be resettled by the Ottoman government.[109] It was in this environment that the first systematic, if abortive, attempts at toponymical change in Turkey began.

One does not have to search very long to find references to the loss of the Balkan territories and the trauma associated with it in writings of the period. Yusuf Akçura, in his exhortation to Turks published on April 17, 1913 entitled "For Edirne," urges his compatriots to cry and mourn for Edirne, which had recently been taken by the Bulgarian army, and "not to smile until Turkism smiles."[110] In Ömer Seyfettin's story "Flags of Liberty (*Hürriyet Bayrakları*)," first published in December 1913, after the end of the Balkan Wars, the anger at the perceived traitorous behavior of the non-Muslim inhabitants of the Balkans is exhibited in a highly nationalistic fashion. The supposed fallacy of the *İttihad-ı Anasır* idea is also spelled out for the reader. At one point, after witnessing a parade in the Ottoman Balkans celebrating the second anniversary of the restoration of the

[108] Erik Zürcher, The Young Turk Legacy, 118.

[109] Erik-Jan Zürcher, "Greek and Turkish Refugees and Deportees 1912-1924," Turkology Update, Leiden Project Working Papers Archive, Department of Turkish Studies, Universiteit Leiden (January 2003), 1.

[110] Ümit Kurt, *'Türk'ün Büyük, Biçare Irkı:' Türk Yurdu'nda Milliyetçiliğin Esasları, 1911-1916* (Istanbul: İletişim, 2012), 167.

Ottoman Constitution, the narrator explains to a fellow officer who believes in the classical idea of Ottomanism that it was impossible to form one nation of out many, as there would be too much confusion. To the narrator, such a scheme would be like trying to add pears, apples, and chestnuts in an attempt to arrive at a cohesive number. In the same vein, combining all the different nations in the Ottoman Empire and referring to them as an Ottoman nation would be a huge mistake. The story ends with the officers' discovery that what they had assumed to be the red Turkish flags of a distant Bulgarian village celebrating the anniversary of the revolution are in fact nothing more than red peppers that had been hung up to dry. The hostility of the Bulgarians toward the Ottoman officers is apparent, and the Ottomanist-inclined officer is devastated when he realizes that his nationalist counterpart was indeed correct in his conviction that the various "nations" of the Ottoman Empire could never form one unified state.[111]

Although the story was written in 1910, before the outbreak of the Balkan Wars, the fact that it was published in the journal *Türk Yurdu* after the wars had ended is telling. Whereas the author, Ömer Seyfeddin, clearly had Turkist leanings before the outbreak of war, the anger felt by Muslim Turks after the Balkan Wars would have likely led to such stories' increased popularity and as such increased readership in the journal. Ömer Seyfeddin's *Hürriyet Bayrakları* was only one of many stories published during and after the war, and many of these stories were much more alarmist and full of hate for the "enemies" of Turks, namely Bulgarians, Greeks, Slavs, and Serbs, as well as cries for the Sultan to do his duty and protect the "Turkish soul" and prevent the rest of the empire, especially Istanbul, from falling into enemy hands.[112]

I have included these examples in an attempt to show the mindset of intellectuals who were actively writing and publishing at the time of the Balkan Wars. It was in this atmosphere that the first attempts at changing non-Turkish place names in the Ottoman Empire was made, and if such writings reflect the mood of the average Muslim Turk, then

---

[111] Hülya Argunşah, ed. *Ömer Seyfettin: Bütün Eserleri: Hikayeleri 1,* (Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1999) 229-237.

[112] For a critical look at this literature, see Ümit Kurt, *'Türk'ün Büyük, Biçare Irkı*,' 66-173.

it is not hard to imagine instances in which these early place name changes may have been welcomed. In any case, the writers of such inflammatory stories published during and after the Balkan Wars almost certainly would have been pleased by the work, however halting or incomplete, of the commissions formed in 1913 to change the names of villages that were not Turkish or that were "contrary to national decency."[113]

The CUP government began changing the names of some villages evacuated due to the Deportation Law announced on May 27, 1915. At the same, Balkan Muslims, fleeing the horrors of the Balkan Wars, were seeking refuge in the Ottoman Empire. The government dealt with this massive influx of refugees by settling them in villages that had been abandoned or forcibly evacuated. Enver Pasha, in a directive he issued, was particularly eager to initiate the name-changing of places whose names "belong[ed] to non-Muslim nations such as Armenian, Greek, or Bulgarian…"[114] Renaming towns and villages which had been emptied of their previous inhabitants and were now home to largely Muslim populations can be seen as rooted in ideological Turkification, but it can also be viewed more practically as an attempt to ensure that newly arriving refugees, suffering from the traumas of war and migration, would be less likely to identify with their former homelands which had been lost to the Ottoman Empire. The new arrivals needed to be incorporated into Anatolia, and changing the names of places can be viewed as one of the ways in which the state sought to achieve this. Although there is no specific evidence that a desire to make the new refuges feel at home played a role in name change in the late Ottoman Empire and early Turkish Republic, I believe that a useful comparison can be made to another example of Turkification. In 1974-1976, as the Turkish Cypriot authorities were resettling Turkish refuges from the southern part of the island, among the official goals was

> "to reassure Turkish Cypriots that their accommodation was secure and that they could afford to feel at home in their new Turkish villages. However, for the settlers

[113] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları* (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2002), 20.

[114] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 20.

> themselves, part of feeling 'at home' was the desire to adopt the name of the southern village whence they had come - a desire that was not always granted."[115]

Viewed as an attempt to make refugees "feel at home," this would be an example of associational power that was described in the previous chapter. Renaming thereby becomes "a collective medium" aimed at stability. One the other hand, as seen in the example of Cyprus, refugee wishes to have the village in which they were resettled adopt their previous home were sometimes denied, an example of instrumental power, the type that current literature on toponymical change in Turkey overwhelmingly assumes to have been employed. However, as the Cypriot example hints, both types of power can be present in renaming. The circumstances surrounding the earliest such changes in the late Ottoman and early Republican states seem to have certainly facilitated the employment of both instrumental and associational power on the part of the government.

Although Enver Pasha's telegrams urged the removal of names "belonging to non-Muslim nations," even after these early attempts at renaming in the late Ottoman Empire there is evidence to suggest that claims which attribute nationalist vehemence to every instance of renaming are problematic. In 1919, Mustafa Kemal declared that "one must not imagine that there is only one type of nation among Muslim elements within these boundaries…These are the national boundaries of brother nations united in all their aims and living in a mixed state." Özkırımlı and Sofos attribute such an inclusive tone to the desire of the Turkish nationalists to gain the support of the diverse groups of the Ottoman Empire for the nationalist struggle, which is why in the Amasya circular the words "Turk" or "Turkishness" were not mentioned at all.[116] These types of sentiments seem to exhibit a more inclusive type of Turkish nationalism. However, only a year after Mustafa Kemal's speech, there exists evidence of a very different ideological strain on the part of Hüseyin Avni Alparslan, a soldier who took part in the defense of the Eastern Black Sea regions when the Russian army invaded in 1916. In 1920, he wrote "if we want to be in control of

---

[115] Sarah Ladbury and Russell King, "Settlement Renaming in Turkish Cyprus," *Geography* 73, no. 4 (October 1988): 366.

[116] Umut Özkırımlı and Spyros A. Sofos**,** *Tormented By History : Nationalism in Greece and Turkey,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 163.

our country let us make the names of even the smallest villages Turkish. Not Armenian, not Urum, not Arabic."[117]

This would be the type of mindset that eventually gained precedence. Four years after Mustafa Kemal made his relatively inclusive speech, Rıza Nur, remarking on the ongoing treaty discussions in Lausanne, noted in 1924 that "the lesson to be drawn from this [the discussions of the rights of minorities] : disposing of people of different races, languages, and religions in our country is the most fundamental…the most vital issue."[118] In the same vein, İsmet İnönü remarked in a speech in 1925 that "in this monolithic nation, foreign cultures must dissolve. There cannot be different civilizations within this national body."[119] Mustafa Kemal himself declared during a speech in Adana in 1923 that "Armenians have no rights in this prosperous country. The country is yours; it belongs to the Turks. This country belonged to the Turks throughout history; thus it is the land of the Turks and it will belong to the Turks forever."[120] In this context, place name change can indeed be viewed as a project of Turkification.

However, there are some aspects of toponymical change in Turkey that would seem to suggest that, at least at first glance, "Turkification" was not the goal. In the 1960s, part of what Kerem Öktem refers to as the third wave of toponymical engineering, many village names containing the word "Türk" were changed in order to exclude the ethnic reference.[121] Surprisingly, Öktem, Kuran, Koraltürk and others who have written on place name change fail to mention this fact in their studies on place name change. This omission becomes more significant with the fact that during the Sypmosium on Turkish Place Names of 1984, an event analyzed extensively by Kuran as well as by Öktem, the practice of removing the term "Türk" from place names was heavily criticized. For example,

[117] Tirebolulu Hüseyin Avni Alparslan, quoted in Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarihi Yazıları*, 23.

[118] Umut Özkırımlı and Spyros A. Sofos**,** *Tormented By History*, 162.

[119] Umut Özkırımlı and Spyros A. Sofos**,** *Tormented By History*, 164.

[120] Fatma Ulgen, "Reading Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on the Armenian genocide of 1915," *Patterns of Prejudice* 44, no. 4 (2010): 390.

[121] Sevan Nişanyan, Index Anatolicus, http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?. Accessed May 30, 2012.

Adana's Türkşükrüye became Eskikent, Manisa's Türkyenice became Belenyenice, and Türksöğütlü and Türkeşen in Kars became Söğütlü and Yiğitkonağı, respectively.[122] Sevan Nişanyan does note these changes and explains that the rationale behind some of the changes was that the term *Türk* often referred to villages nearby which were non-Turkish.[123] For example, the village of Türkbakacak had its counterpart in the village of Çerkezbakacak.[124] However, this was not the case in all instances. Furthermore, if this was the only reason for removing the term *Türk*, changing the "other" names, such as Çerkezbakacak, while leaving names like Türkbakacak untouched would have also presumably been a "solution." Nişanyan then mentions that in the 1980s, amidst a changing ideological atmosphere, a portion of these village names would be restored.[125] Unfortunately, this is the only attempt at explaining this rather paradoxical instance within the process of "Turkifying" the geography of the Turkish Republic. It is plausible that the rationale behind these changes was, as Nişanyan claims, due to their reference to nearby villages which had "counter" names referring to a non-Turkish heritage. However, as I have been able to find no more information regarding the removal of the term *Türk* from place names, I will only be able to conjecture. Perhaps the state's bureaucrats realized that the existence of place names containing *Türk* implicitly recognized the existence of "others" in the sense that the term may have been used by residents to distinguish themselves from others in the area who were not Muslim. This is what Nişanyan implies, and I agree that this probably played a role. However, if this is the case, then how would one explain the thousands upon thousands of families that took surnames containing the word *Türk* in them? This would also seem to implicitly recognize the existence of non-Turks in the country. In any case, the removal of *Türk* from dozens of place names over the course of the 1960s appears to flatly contradict that place name change was always about Turkification. These changes should probably be viewed as attempt at normalizing

[122] Mehmet Eröz, "Sosyolojik Yönden Türk Yer Adları," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 44.

[123] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Çoğrafyalar,* 58.

[124] Sevan Nişanyan, "Index Antolicus," http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?y=t%C3%BCrkbakacak&t=&lv=1&u=1&ua=0. Accessed May 30, 2012.

[125] Sevan Nişanyan, *Hayali Çoğrafyalar,* 58.

Turkishness rather than creating it. However, the participants of the 1984 symposium that criticized the practice were confident that it was a mistake. In any case, the removal of the word *Türk* from place names, followed by the later restoration of this word in some cases, highlights the differences in opinions and rationales that have been present in place name change in Turkey.

The Symposium on Turkish Place Names, while exhibiting differences of opinions and strategies that were present throughout the various place name changes in Turkey, also highlights some obvious continuities. Echoes of Mustafa Kemal, Rıza Nur, and İsmet İnönü can be found in some of the speeches presented during the symposium. In his opening speech for the symposium, Kemal Gökçe, the Undersecretary for the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, noted that the changing of place names had gained importance as part of the process of transforming a "piece of land" into a fatherland (*vatan*). As such, the presence of non-Turkish names was a "problem" for Undersecretary Gökçe that needed to be solved.[126] Such statements bear similarities to ones made seven decades previously by Enver Pasha in his directives for changing place names which "belong[ed] to non-Muslim nations…"[127] The desire to fashion "pieces of land" into a fatherland is a prime motivation behind place name change in Turkey, from the first concerted efforts beginning around 1915 up to the Symposium on Turkish Place Names in 1984 and afterwards. The Turkish nation was considered by state officials to be the rightful owners of the land. As such, "foreign" place names, as traces of the non-Turks who lived there, needed to be removed. However, the "nation" was not the only audience that shaped the goals of name change in Turkey.

[126] Kemal Gökçe, "Açılış Konuşması," in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 7.

[127] Kerem Oktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 20.

Toponymical Change for Locals

The people actually living in or near a place which has had its name officially changed by the state would seem to be the ones most affected by the change, especially if one of the goals of the state includes the appropriation of the new names by locals. Although Turkification should not be understood as the only goal of toponymical change, it clearly was a concern of the government. However, there has been little attempt to explore exactly who or what was supposed to be Turkified. Although I do not wish to claim that the government always expected that local residents would accept and use the newly imposed names, the fact that locals were considered at different times and in different ways throughout place name change is certain. Although there is very little evidence of bureaucrats' assumptions as to how locals would actually respond to the change, the logical assumption would be that bureaucrats, in most cases at least, hoped that the new names would be accepted and appropriated by the people living in and around the places which were being given new names. I have already discussed the ways in which people respond to place names, but in what ways was the Turkish government hoping to affect local populations through toponymical change?

There are two obvious possibilities. First, by imposing new names over the old names, officials may have expected the names to actually be adopted. In correspondence from 1921, not long after attempts at toponymical change had begun, there is evidence that not only were locals expected to use the new names, but that those imposing the changes thought that the new names would benefit the local population.[128] There are also documents that suggest that, more than half a century later, officials were still concerned with the actual adoption of the new names by the population. In 1977 a short volume entitled *New Natural Place Names* (*Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları*) was published by the Interior Ministry, and in the introduction there is one sentence that suggests an expectation that the new names would actually be accepted and used. The goal in publishing the volume is

[128] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 23.

stated as being the "use and diffusion of the Turkified natural place names."[129] I will discuss this volume in more detail in the next chapter, but the previous quote is telling. And although a clear distinction must be drawn between geographic place names and settlement names in terms of how people view these toponyms, the fact that there was a governmental desire for people to actually use the new, government imposed geographical names suggests that the same concern would have been present for settlement names, just as there was in 1921.

The second possibility is that the government was not necessarily concerned with whether or not the names would be adopted. In this case, the response of locals would not have played much of a role in the decision-making of officials involved in toponymical change. Indeed, it is hard to imagine that any but the most idealistic bureacrat would believe that Kurdish speaking regions would be receptive of the new Turkish toponymes and use them instead of Kurdish place-names.[130] Rather, it is likely that the concern instead layed with ensuring a standardized, Turkified, and ideologically appropriate toponymical order that would be reproduced in offical publications such as textbooks and maps. This order perhaps would have been perceived as benefitting the nation more than locals, but its presumed beneficiaries would not have been limited to these two groups.

In this discussion, it is instructive to return to the themes of governmentality that I explained in the previous chapter, namely that of "subjects" which deals with the desired behavior that governments seek of its subjects or citizens. In altering the toponomy of Turkey, what was the government seeking of its subjects? A look at some of the specific instances of place name change will show that the expected response was not always the same. According to a document dated November 22, 1922, a decision was made to change some names which had nothing to do with an Ottoman or Turkish identity. For example, the villages of Çanlı and Ayandon in Sinop were changed to Osmanlı and Türkeli,

[129] T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı (Interior Ministry of the Republic of Turkey), *Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları* (Ankara: İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü), 4.

[130] This, of course, is not to claim that all the place names that were changd in Kurdish speaking regions were actually Kurdish. Indeed, the etymology of those regions' place names are often among the most varied.

respectively. Makriyali was changed to Kemalpaşa, Ağros was changed to Atabey. [131] Also in 1922, Izmir's Kirmasti/Kermaste was changed to Mustafakemalpaşa.[132] The overt political or ideological nature of the new names is clear. The village name of Çanlı, referencing the bells of a church, was an obvious target of name changing. Although it is of course Turkish, the underlying reference to Christianity was deemed inappropriate. As for the other four original village names, the eytmyologies are Greek, so they were also clear targets of efforts to "Turkify" the toponymical order.

In analyzing such changes and the reasonging behind them, it is useful to take into account the specific historical context. November 1922 was shortly after the Greek army had been driven from Anatolia. The Great Fire of Izmir as well as the evacuation of large numbers of Greeks had ocurred just two months before this document on place name changes was issued. As such, these villages, which display Greek names or in some cases Turkish names that point to a Christian identity, had likely been emptied of some or all of their Christian inhabitants.The renaming of these villages was thereby used as an occasion by the Parliament to revel in the victory of the Turkish armies by giving new, politically and ideologically charged names to places whose previous names were not acceptable to the Turkish nationalists in control. Indeed, military victories were specificially mentioned as suitable inspiration for new place names.[133] Such changes can be seen as having been directed at not just locals, but other audiences as well.

Sixty years after these name changes took place, towns and villages were still receiving new names, but a look at the the types of changes being made in the 1980s show that a clear shift has taken place. Joost Jongerden notes that names seemingly lacking in any political or ideological meaning such as Gümüştaş, Ovabağ, Halkapınar, and Ağaçsever were used in the renaming of Kurdish villages after 1984. Jongerden ascribes these as "arbitrary, effectively de-historicized references to a general category from nature,

[131] Murat Koraltürk, "Milliyetçi Bir Refleks," 99.

[132] Sevan Nişanyan, Index Anatolicus, http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?y=mustafakemalpa%C5%9Fa&t=&lv=1&u=1&ua=0.

[133] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 21.

evoking, if anything, an unspecified sense of timelessness."[134] It is worth asking why the state did not employ renaming techniques similar to the politically charged ones of 1922 mentioned above, instead attempting to "de-historicize" the towns in question.

In 1922, the nationalist Turkish government was, at the risk of dramatizing, fighting for its survival. The Parliament which voted for the village name changes in Sinop and Izmit had not yet established its hegemony over all the terriotry which would soon be included in the Turkish Republic. Anyone professing political loyalties to any group or body other than the Turkish Grand National Assembly or, in the words of Sofos and Özkırımlı, anybody "unwilling to swallow the bait the regime presented them," was viewed as a threat.[135] As such, rather than simply trying to "de-historicize" the towns, as Jongerden claims toponymical change in the 1980s was often about, it is clear that during the Greek-Turkish war the focus was on imposing a "Turkish history" on towns which displayed traces of a Greek/Christian heritage in their names. In this cases, it is possible that the changes were accepted and that the new names were appropriated by the mostly Muslim Turkish populations that were left. Why then, were the same techniques not displayed in the 1980s? Perhaps such de-historicized names were the result of the state's realization that names such as Kemalpaşa, Türkeli, or "Tunç Eli" (Tunceli) would have stood little chance of being internalized by the local inhabitants. Names evoking natural beauty and other physical characteristics were perhaps viewed as useful tactics in ensuring the success of the name changes. On the other hand, as I mentioned earlier, perhaps such changes were never directed at locals in the first place, but were actually implemented to benefit the state.

[134] Joost Jongerden, "Crafting Space, Making People: The Spatial Design of Nation in Modern Turkey," *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 10, (2009): 11.

[135] Umut Özkırımlı and Spros A. Sofos, *Tormented by History*, 162.

Toponymical Change for the State

Günay Göksu Özdoğan has claimed that "a prevalence of 'state' over the 'nation' in state ideology- that is, the preference for a nation subservient to the state – in the Turkish case seems to offer a key starting point" in answering why a 'civil patriotism' did not evolve in Turkey.[136] I would extend the importance of this state over nation argument to the topic of this thesis. Whereas the "nation," the imagined community of Turks who were supposed to be the "rightful owners" of the country, was perceived as being beneficiaries of the project of place name change, there is evidence that the state carried out name changes not just for the nation, but also for itself.

In the directives issued early on in the state's attempts to alter the toponymical order, the overwhelming concern appears to be on the immediacy with which non-Muslim place names must be removed.[137] The Chief of the General Staff of the Nationalist government during the Greek-Turkish war noted in a circular to the Interior Ministry that the local population was too enraged after the invasion of the Greek army to refer to their towns using non-Turkish names. However, the Interior Minister felt that such a rapid change of place names in the region might interfere with military communications, thereby hampering the ability of the state to defend itself and carry out offensive maneuvers. As such, the Interior Minister promised that change would be carried out rapidly, but that any changes would be "examined scientifically."[138] This exchange invites focus on two important points. First, attention should be drawn to the disagreement over the process of name change. The Chief of the General Staff's eagerness to quickly rid the land of all foreign, especially Greek, place names is somewhat tempered by the relative caution of the Interior Minister. These are not ideological differences, as all the evidence shows that

[136] Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "Turkish Nationalism Reconsidered: The 'Heaviness' of Statist Patriotism in Nation-Building," in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, eds. Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızılyürek, and Umut Özkırımlı (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 47.

[137] Fuat Dündar, *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskân Politakası* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008), 82.

[138] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 22-24.

members of the nationalist government all agreed on the need to Turkify the toponymical order. These are tactical differences, with bureaucrats, academics, or advisors sometimes urging caution in the name of science. As such, the tendency to refer to the toponymical change in Turkey as a project of a monolithic state and its nationalist bureaucrats should be tempered by the fact that there were often disagreements within the state as to what lengths toponymical change should be taken. Jongerden's claim that "the work of renaming those rural settlements considered to have non-Turkish names was done…with a thorough precision" illustrates this tendency.[139] Secondly, I want to draw attention to whose interests ultimately seem to prevail in the discussion. Whereas the Chief of the General Staff wanted to change place names for the [Turkish] population, the Interior Minister focused on "the historical circumstances and the geographical works" that should be consulted before changes occur. His caution can be linked to the fear that military communications during a time of war would be disrupted, thereby illustrating, to once again borrow Özdoğan's phrase, "a prevalence of 'state' over the 'nation' in state ideology."

Evidence of the state's prevalence over the nation is not limited to the period of the Greek-Turkish War, but can also be found in the 1984 symposium. In his speech at the symposium, Nail Tan, the Minister of the Office of National Folklore Research, notes that in the Ottoman Empire "importance was not given to nationalist thought."As such, there are places in Turkey that do not have Turkish names. Tan argues that using these non-Turkish place names, such as Cappadocia, Lycia, and Bithynia, in teaching Turkish geography amounts to a "disregarding of the Turkish Republic."[140] As already discussed, geography was used in Republican curriculums to inculcate a sense of nationalism in young schoolchildren. More tellingly, Tan goes on to note that it is the state that considers the land as a homeland, without actually mentioning the people who live on the land.[141] This appropriation of Anatolia's land by the state can be seen as an attempt to project the

[139] Joost Jongerden, "Crafting Space, Making People," 15.

[140] Nail Tan, "Türkiye'de Yer Adları Verilirken Veya Değiştirilirken Neler Esas Alınmalıdır?" in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 280.

[141] "…bu devletin vatan saydığı toprakların yabancı yer adlarıyla dolu olması düşünülemez." Nail Tan, "Türkiye'de Yer Adları Verilirken Veya Değiştirilirken Neler Esas Alınmalıdır?" in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 280.

power and sovereignty of the state. The "lands" that Tan refer to are "a source of power to be harnessed by the nation-state and reinforces by the nationalist ideology for its legitimacy."[142] And in the eyes of the bureaucrats of the state from the 1950s on, ensuring that the toponymical order of Turkey was completely Turkish was an important step in harnessing this power. With a more "Turkish" geography, the legitimacy of the Turkish state would be strengthened against any who may have dared question this legitimacy in the first place. Rather than derive any meaning or sense of belonging from "an educated awareness of the rich heritage of history and human cultural geography," citizens of the Turkish state were "expected to share a common bond largely through loyalty to the state and its national symbols depicted by the ruling cadres."[143] To this I would add that citizens were also expected to share this common bond through a Turkish toponymical order, an order which would ideally leave no room for any non-Turkish, non-Muslim identities. As will be shown in the next section, those who were not part of the "Turkish nation," those who did not claim a Turkish or Muslim identity, rather than being ignored, were also a target audience for place name change in Turkey.

Toponymical Change for the "Other"

Thus far, the audiences or targets of place name change that I have discussed have been ones that are considered as having a legitimate place in the Turkish nation-state. From local residents, to the abstract "nation," to the state itself, all of these layers are "Turkish" and constitute the nation-state. However, place name change in Turkey cannot be fully understood without considering a fourth audience, one composed of "others." By this term, I refer to anyone who is not considered by the Turkish state as having a legitimate place in the Turkish Republic, a designation which has changed in meaning throughout Republican history. On this subject, a passage by Ayhan Aktar is worth quoting in full:

[142] Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "Turkish Nationalism Reconsidered," 53.

[143] Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "Turkish Nationalism Reconsidered," 60.

> "…the non-Muslim minorities who had been living in Anatolia for centuries under the protective umbrella of the Ottoman regime…were logically included in the category of 'others.' If examined carefully, it will be noticed that these two processes are two different sides of the same coin. Consequently, and according to the Kemalists' conception of nationalism, in order to extend the scope of the category of 'us,' every person living in the country was declared to be a Turk! However, when this could not be implemented for structural reasons in the cases of non-Muslim minorities, the non-Muslim minorities in Turkey were in practice discriminated against and classified as 'minorities' or 'foreigners.'"[144]

In the first attempts at toponymical engineering, the "foreigner" was obvious. Overwhelmingly, this role was played by Greeks or Armenians. Writings of nationalists at the time are full of pejorative references to non-Muslim, non-Turk inhabitants of the Ottoman/Turkish state who are portrayed as having no place within the community, either due to their language, their religion, or their traitorous character. In nationalist discourse, foreigners in the service of "imperialist" powers could often be found plotting to steal the Turk's rightful homeland. For most Turkish nationalists, the danger posed by "foreigners" was clear. The state took it upon itself to eliminate this danger, and a number of measures can be viewed as part of this effort.

On of the most obvious of these efforts was the May 27, 1915 declaration of the Committee of Union and Progress mandating the deportation of "those opposing the government in times of war." Many of the villages that had been evacuated due to the deportation law were quickly given new names by the government. [145] The 1923 Greek-Turkish population exchange is a reflection of the desires of both governments to rid their states of "foreigners" who did not belong to the imagined "national culture." There are many other examples of the desire of the Turkish state to rid Turkey of "foreign" influence. But aside from physical removal of "foreigners" or their neutralization, the Turkish government used toponymical engineering as a way to strengthen claims that the lands controlled by the Turkish state were indeed "Turkish" and that foreigners or foreign governments had no place in them. If "foreigners" were to have no place in the Turkish

---

[144] Ayhan Aktar, "'Turkification' Policies in the Early Republican Era" in *Turkish Literature and Cultural Memory: "Multiculturalism" as a Literary Theme after 1980*, ed. C. Duft (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 30.

[145] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 19.

Republic, then non-Turkish place names also had no place. Concrete evidence of this mentality can be found in a speech made in 1921 by Yasin Bey, a member of parliament from Antep. Yasin Bey requested that the name "Rumkale" quickly be removed from a village in Antep and that it be renamed Halfeti since there was "not a single *Rum* there." Furthermore, Yasin Bey explained that it was not appropriate for a place to carry the name of a nationality that "wants to attack our honor, our existence, and our future like dogs."[146] Interestingly, the name Rumkale was brought up again some sixty years later in the 1984 symposium on Turkish place names. Cemal Arif Alagöz points out that the term "Rum" does not refer to "the country of the Rums" but to the Roman Empire. As such, Rum Kale in Halfeti has nothing to do with "Rums" as its name comes from the fact that it is a castle from the Roman period.[147] The difference between the two arguments is interesting. Yasin Bey, speaking in 1921, sought to demonize Greeks, who he thought were connected in some way to the history of Rumkale/Halfeti, by having any mention of them removed from the toponymical order. The intentions of Alagöz, on the other hand, were to show that Greeks never had anything to do with Halfeti as the term referred to the Roman Empire which, "has become history, it brought to an end by the Ottoman Padishah Fatih Sultan Mehmet."[148]

Toponymical change in Turkey has thus often been used to send a message to the "other," those who once may have had a place in the Ottoman Empire but were not considered to hold the right to occupy that same position in the Turkish Republic. But attention was also given to actual foreigners, such as the international press and other governments. To illustrate this point, I will turn once again to the 1984 Symposium on Turkish Place Names. Salih Orcan, the director of the Turkish Cartography Office, declared that one of the agreed upon reasons for Turkifying place names was to correct "objectionable" measures by the foreign press which often purport that foreign place

[146] Murat Koraltürk, "Milliyetçi Bir Refleks," 98.

[147] Cemal Arif Alagöz, "Yer Adları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler" in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 23.

[148] Cemal Arif Alagöz, "Yer Adları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler", 23.

names exist in Turkey.[149] Orcan also laid out the need for Turkey to play an active role in international studies on the topic of toponymes. Interestingly, he connects the importance of toponymes to the Turkish History Thesis, which was at that time enjoying a brief resurgence.[150]

In a similar vein, Mehmet Eröz, a professor of Economics at Istanbul University, noted at the Symposium that there were many people wanting to remove "us" from Eastern Anatolia, and in order to prove the "Turkishness" of the region, many place names have been changed.[151] Eröz went on to criticize the fact that many "pure Turkish" place names have been changed, which could eventually lead to the erasure of the evidence of the "Turkish wave" in Turkey. From the speeches by Orcan and Eröz, the preoccupation with showing Turkey as Turkish to other countries, namely, countries or powers supposedly wishing to rid Eastern Anatolia of the Turkish presence, is striking. In some cases, the Turkish state looked to justify its own process of nationalizing place names by using examples from other countries. As Cemal Arif Alagöz noted at the symposium, "the Armenians changed *our* historical Revan to Yerevan." And after noting that the Russians changed the name of Akmescid in the Crimea to Simferopol and that the Greeks changed Dedeağaç into Aleksandropolis, he concludes that "there will certainly be places names that we will change."[152] For Alagöz then, it was perfectly natural for Turkey to impose a Turkish toponymical order on its own territories since its neighbors had done the same.

By focusing on these four groups, it becomes clear that several strategies and goals on the part of the state have been present at different times during attempts to alter

---

[149] Salih Orcan, "Çoğrafi Adların Standardizasyonu Yönünden Toponominin Milli ve Milletlerarası Önemi" in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 60. "Yabancı basında, Türkiye'de var olduğu gösterilen yabancı adların ve diğer adların sakıncalı açıklamalarının düzeltilmesini sağlaycak, uluslararası girişimlerde bulunmak."

[150] For a succinct summary of the Turkish History Thesis, see Suavi Aydın, "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative" in *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle*, 36-46.

[151] Mehmet Eröz, "Sosyolojik Yönden Türk Yer Adları, in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri,* 44.

[152] Cemal Arif Alagöz, "Yer Adları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler" in *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 22.

Turkey's toponymical order. Whereas one of the results is an almost completely Turkified map at the expense of one that once contained many non-Turkish names, this does not mean that every administration acted within the same set rules and with the same set of goals in mind. In order to more thoroughly explore this claim, in the next chapter I will sketch how name changes were carried out in the province of Giresun and the governmental mechanisms, or "technics," that drove the changes.

CHAPTER III

RENAMING GIRESUN

Today, the province (*il*) of Giresun is composed of the administrative district of Giresun proper (merkez), fifteen subprovinces (*ilçe)* in which are included seventeen municipalities (*belde*), 531 villages (*köy*), and 226 neighborhoods or quarters (*mahalle*). Of course, this has not always been the administrative structure of Giresun, which has undergone numerous changes throughout its history. According to a summary of its administration in the 1973 Giresun Provincial Almanac, it was part of the province of Trabzon until 1920, at which point it became an "independent governorship" (*müstakil mutasarrıflık*), before becoming its own province with the proclamation of the Republic. Until 1933, the province was made up of Giresun proper (*merkez*) and the subprovinces of Tirebolu and Görele. Included in these subprovinces were the three districts (*bucak*) of Bulancak, Keşap, and Espiye. In 1933 Şebinkarahisar lost its status as a province and became a subprovince of Giresun along with its subprovince of Alucra. In 1934 Bulancak became a subprovince, followed by Keşap in 1945, Espiye in 1957, Dereli in 1958, and Eynesil in 1960.[153] In 1987 Piraziz and Yağlıdere became subprovinces, followed by Çanakçı, Güce, Doğankent, and Çamoluk in 1990.[154]

[153] Giresun Valiliği (Giresun Governorship), *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Giresun İl Yıllığı* (Ankara, 1973), 45.

[154]Giresun İl Özel İdaresi, http://www.giresunilozelidare.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=256&Itemid=115. Accessed May 16, 2013.

First Attempts

These subprovinces, districts, towns, and villages of Giresun, as in other provinces across Turkey, have experienced various attempts at place name change over the course of the last century. Official efforts to impose new names on the toponymical order of the eastern Black Sea region began in 1913, when the Interior Ministry (*Dahiliye Nezareti*) ordered that a list of all the villages in the province of Rize be compiled. Those villages whose names were "contrary to national sentiment" were to be renamed. However, progress was apparently slow because in October of 1915, the Interior Ministry published a memo explaining in more detail what places were deserving of new names. A few months later, in January 1916, Enver Pasha issued a mandate which laid out specific rules that were to be followed in the name changing process. First, all province, town, village, mountain, and river names that were Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian or any other name that did not belong to "Islamic peoples" were to be translated to Turkish. This was to be carried out by civil and military officials in each region who would convene and decide what names should be changed. Lists would be drawn up and then the Interior Ministry would approve or reject the changes. As for the nature of the new names, if possible, they were to reflect diligence and military victories. In war zones, the new names would reflect the specific history of the area in question. If such a name was not able to be found, the names of "virtuous" individuals that had "been in the service of the country" were to be considered as possible candidates, as were the names of any products or goods by which the region was known. Geographical features were also to be taken in consideration. Furthermore, Enver Pasha instructed those in charge of the changes to bear in mind the fact that if the new names did not resemble the old names at all, then it was possible that there would be confusion and that people would revert to the old names. As such, those in charge of selecting new names were to use caution, selecting names such as Erikli for Ereğli and Velibolu for Gelibolu.[155]

[155] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 20-22.

By July 1916, more comprehensive lists from all over the empire had been sent to the Interior Ministry. In the district of Giresun proper, six out of fifteen neighborhoods and eleven out of forty-six village names were to be changed, as well as the name Giresun itself. The sub-district of Keşap was to be renamed Yuvacık, and twenty-seven of its sixty-seven village names were also to receive new toponymes. Fourteen out of thirty-nine villages in Bulancak were to be renamed, along with ten more in the sub-district of Piraziz. The name of the district Tirebolu was to be renamed Akçayurd. The names of four of Tirebolu's six neighborhoods and thirty-three of its fifty-seven villages were to be changed to better reflect the "national spirit," as were the names of thirty of the fifty-two villages in the sub-district of Espiye. Espiye itself was to be renamed Yeni Pazar. In the district of Görele, two of the three existing neighborhoods and thirty-one of its fifty-seven villages were to receive new names. In total, 156 villages and twelve neighborhoods were to receive new toponymes. Despite the apparent precision in these lists, the name changes were not carried out effectively due to several reasons, among them the Interior Ministry's failure to immediately approve them as well as the Russian invasion of the region. It was this invasion that Hüseyin Avni Alparslan, the soldier mentioned in the previous chapter who advocated place name change, fought to repel. By 1916, the Russian army had advanced as far as the Harşıt Stream, a river which, along with the sub-district it lent its name to, was to be renamed Büyüksu at this time, along with six of its thirteen villages.[156] Although only a few of the new names imposed in 1916 are still used officially today, but later attempts by Republican governments would be more thorough.

Even though most of the recommended name changes in these first attempts at toponymical change were not implemented, I find it instructive to consider the nature of these early changes in order to position them within the ideological strains that were current at the time. These lists are mostly ignored by other literature on place name change due to this apparent lack of implementation, but since they represent the first comprehensive attempts at place name change in the polity that would later become the Republic of Turkey, these lists should be examined closely in order to understand the types of concerns that were motivating those involved in name change.

[156] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 22-23.

Probably one of the more striking examples of these early attempts was the decision to change the name of Giresun to İttihad, a reference to the Union of Committee and Progress (*İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*). In the center of Giresun, the name of the neighborhood Sultan Selim was unchanged, while the names of the neighborhoods Çınarlar İslam and Çınarlar Rum were to be changed, respectively, to Birinci Çınarlar and İkinci Çınarlar. The neighborhood Ermeni was to be renamed Garbi. Kokara, a suspiciously Greek sounding name for a neighborhood in the heart of Giresun, was to receive the new name Rıfa'tlı.[157] As for the makeup of the population, estimates from 1914 show that in Giresun there were a total of forty-four "Rum" villages along with six villages that were inhabited by Georgians. In total, there were 2,268 Armenians, and 1,872 of these lived in the neighborhood Ermeni. However, by the time the list of new names were sent out in 1916, all of the Armenian residents of Ermeni had disappeared, victims, presumably, of the Armenian Genocide.[158]

With the example of the Giresun neighborhood of Ermeni in mind, I want to discuss specifically in what ways the Armenian genocide may have affected place name change and locals' responses to the changes. Çağlar Keyder explains that "what touched the masses directly…was the expulsion, deportation, massacre, and exchange of the Greek and Armenian subjects of the Empire." These events were "laden with embarrassment and shame, covered up in official discourse as much as in the national psyche."[159] Among the ways in which they were covered up were attempts at renaming places with names like the neighborhoods of Ermeni and Çınarlar Rum. In the second chapter of this thesis, I posited that new place names may have had a greater chance of being accepted when they were preceded or accompanied by a willingness to forget. In this case, it is possible that residents of Giresun would have accepted the name change of the neighborhood Ermeni to Garbi after its Armenian inhabitants had been forced to leave. In the aftermath of a

[157] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 23-24.

[158] Fuat Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi: İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği (1913-1918)* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2008), 160.

[159] Çağlar Keyder, "Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s," in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press 1997), 43.

traumatic event which saw the removal of almost 2,000 Armenians from the neighborhood, a willingness to forget the event may have played a role in shaping responses to the new name. One Giresun native, informed me that nobody is quite sure where in fact Ermeni Mahallesi was located, since neither that name nor the name it received in 1916, Garbi, are in use today. In this case, the names Ermeni and Garbi would have suggested precisely the type of "partial narrative of settlement, displacement, migration, possession, loss and authority" that was referenced in the first chapter.

There are several other noteworthy examples in this specific round of attempted name change. In Keşap, the name of the village Küçükahmed İslam was unaltered, whereas the villages of Küçükahmed Rum and Frenk were to become Büyükahmed and Türk İli, respectively. The village name of Gül-zâr-ı İslam was apparently deemed appropriate, as no attempt was made to change it, but Gül-zâr-ı Rum was to become Çemenzâr. The villages of Saraycık Rum and Saraycık İslam were to be renamed Saraycık and Saraylar. Also in Keşap, the village name of Barçaçakırlısı was to become Türkmenliçakırlısı. In Bulancak, the village of Osmaniye was to become Türkmen. In Görele, however, in an apparent contradiction from the decision to change Osmaniye to Türkmen, the village of Heri was changed to Osmanlı.[160] In the first example, the goal seems to have been a negation of an Ottoman connection in favor of an ethnic identity. This would reflect what is taken to be the dominant ideology of the time, a move from Ottomanism to a more ethnic Turkish identity. In case of Heri/Osmanlı, however, the result seems to be an exclusively Ottoman identity at the expense of the apparently non-Turkish, perhaps Greek (*Rum*) character implied by the name Heri. The village, which is now included in the subprovince of Eynesil, is known officially today as Kekiktepe.

In these early attempts at name change, there emerge some patterns which would be reversed during later attempts. In 1916, there appear to be efforts to maintain and promote and Islamic-Ottoman legacy. The neighborhood of Sultan Selim, for example, was not targeted. In this case, the reference to Ottoman glory was apparently deemed appropriate. On the other hand, the example of the village of Osmaniye, which was to become

[160] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 25-26; 28-29; 35.

Türkmen, would seem to suggest a more ethnically based policy of name change at the expense of the Ottoman legacy. And just as some names referring to an Islamic identity were left untouched, others such as the neighborhood of Çınarlar İslam were altered to exclude the religious reference by dropping the word Islam. However, one pattern that is identifiably consistent is the erasure of any reference to a Christian-Greek or Christian-Armenian identity; in this there are no deviations. Akçakilise (Köselerakçakilise) was renamed Arslancık, for example, and this change seems to be one of the implemented in 1916 that have "stuck" – Arslancık is still the name of the village today. Other names that were changed im 1916 and actually implemented include Cibril Rum, which was renamed Aşağı Cibril in 1916; today it is known simply as Cibril. In Keşap, the village of Saraycık Rum was renamed Saraycık, the name which is still used today. Çarşu-yı Rum was renamed Kumyalı, which is also the current name of the neighborhood. There are a considerable number of such examples in Giresun alone, part of a pattern that would continue over the course of the next several decades, with thousands of towns and villages across Turkey with names containing any overtly Christian, Greek, or Armenian references receiving new toponyms more amenable to official ideologies. Through such changes, all four of the audiences discussed in the previous chapter would have been affected. The "nation" would have been expected to benefit through the removal of references to a Christian identity, one which had become increasingly suspect after the Balkan Wars. Likewise, locals were perhaps expected to erase the memory of their non-Muslim neighbors who lived in villages and neighborhoods like Ermeni and Akçakilise, and the state was able to strengthen its own ideological positions and project power over those now considered "foreigners," in this case Greek and Armenian Christians who were being deprived of any legitimate place they once occupied in the Ottoman state.

Of this first round of name change in 1916, only a few of the 168 new village and neighborhood names chosen by the government are still in official use today. Of course, of these 168 new names, many of them would later be renamed again by later Republican governments. Other names that were left alone in 1916 would also later be officially changed. For the most part, however, these changes would come much later, as after 1916 Giresun's toponymy would be more or less ignored by the central government for the next

half a century. Some changes were carried out, but none which seem to reflect any type of pattern or wave as discussed in Kerem Öktem's "The Nation's Imprint."

In other parts of Turkey, however, place name changes continued to be made, occasionally in a somewhat systematic fashion. İbrahim Kuran notes that *Halkevleri* (People's Houses) "carried the operations of the renaming in the mid-1930s" and that their principal goal was the "effacement of non-Turkish cultures."[161] However, there is no evidence that the Giresun *Halkevi* was involved in place name change. After examining issues of the Giresun *Halkevi*'s *Aksu Gazetesi* from 1933 to 1945, I have found no mention of Turkifying the toponymy of Giresun. On the other hand, *Aksu*'s writers occasionally made references to the non-Turkish, non-Islamic past of Giresun. In 1933 for example, as previously mentioned, rather than trying to prove a Turkish etymology of the name Giresun itself as some would later do, the Greek roots of the name are discussed.[162] This is not to say that the representatives of the *Halkevi* did not seek to provide a Turkish history where possible. Not long after the discussion on the etymology of the name Giresun was published, an attempt was made to discover the meaning of the name Gicora, a village in the subprovince of Alucra. The name is claimed to come from the Turkish word *göç*, or migration, and as such the claim is made that Gicora was orignally founded by Turks.[163] Whether or not such an explanation is correct, in the 1960s the name Gicora was apparently suspicious enough that it was decided to rename the village Doludere, as this is the new name of the village that is listed in *Köylerimiz* in 1968.[164] A few months after visiting Gicora, representatives of the local People's House surveyed the village of Akyoma, but this time they noted that the villagers were not sure how the village received

[161] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 44.

[162] "Giresun Hakkında Tarih Kayitler," *Aksu Dergisi* 2, no. 1 (1933): 6-7.

[163] A Süreyya, "Bir Köy Tetkiki," *Aksu Dergisi* 3-6 (1934), 29. "Köyün tarihçesi hakkında esaslı bir bilgi derleyemedim. Fakat , arazisinin diğer köylere nazaran daha otlak ve ormanlı bulunmasında, rağbeti ifade eden 'Göç' isminin verilmiş olması köyün eskiden Türkler tarafından kurulmuş olduğunu hatıra getirmektedir. Bu köy topraklarında geçen sene Romalılara ait eski para bulunarak vekalete gönderilmiştir. Paranın bulunduğu yerde eskiden "Danza" adı verilen bir kasabanın bulunduğu söylenmektedir."

[164] T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı, (Interior Ministry of the Republic of Turkey), İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü, *Köylerimiz* (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1968), 191.

its name or what it means.[165] In February 1937 the *Halkevi* carried out another village survey for Zilköy in Alucra. The author explains that the name Zil (bell) supposedly referred to the bells of a church that was once located on a hill above the village. The author even notes that locals refer to the village as *çana zil* in an even more explicit acknowledgement of the presence of the church and its bells (*çan*) which once could be heard all over the area.[166] No mention is made of any attempt or need to change to the name of Zilköy to reflect a more appropriately Turkish identity. However, by 1968, Zilköy had received the new name of Aktepe.[167]

Just as Giresun's *Halkevi* seems to have had little or no intent to recommend new names for villages in the province, the central government itself seems to have taken a hands-off approach to the issue in Giresun from the foundation of the Republic up until the late 1950s. I have found one mention of name change in 1930, when Kulakkaya became Yavuzkemal on the "desire of the villagers." However, since the author that relays this information also claims that every other incident of place name change in the subprovince of Dereli was carried out with the blessing of the residents, the accuracy of the claim seems questionable.[168] The next example of place name change that I have been able to confirm is from 1945, and it does not involve place name change per se, but the need to find a new name a settlement after it broke off from another. In this year, the village of Yeşilkaya was formed after it separated from the village of Hatipli. The original village would then be called Çivriz, before finally coming to be known officially as Yıldız in 1957.[169] After this time name change in Giresun as well as in the rest of Turkey began to pick up speed, so an explanation needs to be offered as to how name change was actually carried out after this point.

---

[165] "Köy Tetkiki," *Aksu Dergisi* 9, (June 1934), 11.

[166] "Köy Tetkiki: Alucra'nın Zil Köyü," *Aksu Dergisi* 13 (February 1937), 11.

[167] T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı, *Köylerimiz*, 29.

[168] Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, (Ankara: Utku Yayıncılık, 1991), 31.

[169] "Köyümüzün Tarihçesi," http://dereliyesilkayakoyu.com/haber_detay.asp?haberID=1. Accessed May 17, 2013; Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 29.

Institutional Structures Behind Toponymical Changes

After these first attempts at place name change on a wide scale, there does not appear to have been such comprehensive efforts for several decades. Other than a few incidents, such as when toponymes in the province of Artvin were Turkified in 1925 on the decision of its Provincial Council or the decision to change many of Istanbul's street names in 1927, toponymical change as a whole was far from systematic.[170] Öktem notes that a number of places in southeastern Turkey were renamed in 1936.[171] But after taking into account the number of changes, it is not possible to conclude that the government prioritized toponymical change on a wide scale until the late 1950s when the situation began to change.

In the "The Nation's Imprint," Öktem states that the "Expert Commission on Place Name Changes" was established in October 1957, and a document from October 19, 1957 is used as the source. In the footnote, Öktem writes that "the members of the Commission were appointed with a 'Decree of the Council of Ministers dated 19/10/1957 and numbered 4/9595.'" This document, however, actually refers to the payment that would be given to those working outside of normal hours to Turkify places with "foreign names."[172] The document mentions nothing about the establishment of the commission or the appointment of members to it and its wording points to an earlier date for the beginning of systematic attempts at place name change. In fact, similar wording appears in documents from 1958 and 1963.[173] İbrahim Kuran states that the Expert Commission was actually formed in

[170] Harun Tunçel, "Türkiye'de İsmi Değiştirilen Köyler," 27; Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 30.

[171] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 31.

[172] BCA 30..18.1.2./147.53..19. October 19, 1957. "Yabancı ad taşıyan yerleşme yerlerinin adlarının Türkçeleştirilmesi hususundaki çalışmalarda mesai saatleri dışında çalışan memurlara verilecek ücret."

[173] BCA 30..18.1.2/148.7..17. February 7, 1958; BCA 30..18.1.2/168.6..6. January 28, 1963.

1956 and began meeting regularly in March of 1957, and that "the principal aim of the Commission was declared as being 'to investigate non-Turkish place names."[174] The inexplicability of this claim regards the source, which Kuran cites as the *Resmi Gazete* of October 19, 1957, the same date as Öktem's source. However, the *Resmi Gazete* published on that date contains no reference at all to the Turkification of place names. The supposed number of this issue of the Official Gazette is given as 4/9595, which is also incorrect. The actual number of that date's *Resmi Gazete* is 9736. However, the number of the document cited by Öktem is 4/9595.

Clearly, there is a serious problem here in the citation of sources as well as the conclusions being drawn from them. In the preface of *Köylerimiz*, which was published in 1968, the work of the "Commission on Foreign Name Change" (*Yabancı Adları Değiştirme Komisyonu*) is referred to, but no mention is made of an "Expert Commission for Name Change" (*Ad Değiştirme İhtisas Kurulu*), which is the wording used by both Öktem and Kuran to describe the commission as it was founded in 1956/1957. Considering that *Köylerimiz* is the first major publication dealing with name change, it is unlikely that its preface would be mistaken in its terminology. My assumption is that both Öktem and Kuran are basing their terminology and timeline on the introduction of the *New Natural Place Names* (*Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları*) published by the Interior Ministry in 1977, the introduction of which states that "the Turkification of non-Turkish settlement names and geographical names began in 1940" and that this process was considered important for the "national well-being."[175] However, due to the "extraordinary circumstances" brought about by World War II, these attempts were brought to a halt. Then, in 1952, various government ministries held a meeting in which the need for a more "scientific" approach to name change was discussed. However, no "positive" steps were taken. Four years later, in 1956, representatives from universities, ministries, and other agencies held a meeting in which the independent "Expert Commission on Name Change" (*Ad Değiştirme İhtisas Kurulu*) was established. Then, after the October 19, 1957 Decree Number 4/9595 which specified

[174] İbrahim Kuran, The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 39.

[175] *Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları*, 3. "Türkçe olmayan yerleşme yerleri ile tabii yer adlarının Türkçeleştirilmesi, mill varlığımızla yakından ilgili görülerek 1940 yılında çalışmalara başlanmış..."

the wages for those working on the commission outside normal office hours, the Expert Commission began regular and efficient operations on March 1, 1957. In 1959, with a change to the existing decree, the authority to change place names was taken away from the Provincial General Council (*İl Genel Meclisi*) and granted to Provincal Standing Councils (*İl Daimi Encümenleri*). Through this move, according to the introduction, the "speed and efficiency" of the work was increased. At the beginning the commission met twice a week, but then began meeting three times a week outside normal office hours in order to "investigate non-Turkish settlement names." The introduction also notes that the commission had to stop its work after December 1, 1970 when wages to government officials were halted. After four years, the commission returned to work on December 9, 1975, meeting once a week in the afternoon in order to continue the Turkification of place names.[176]

The few paragraphs that constitute this introduction were written by Remzi Ataman, who was the Branch Manager of the Provincial Administration (*İller İdaresi Şube Müdürü*) and they seem to form the basic foundation for Kuran's timeline of the bureacratic intricacies behind official place name change. Indeed, Kuran uses Ataman's justification regarding the "speed and efficiency" to explain why the authority to change place names was handed over to standing councils. In describing this same change, Kerem Öktem notes that

> "despite the systematic work of the Commission, however, local resistance in the Provincial Councils seems to have slowed down the process, as the name changes had to be confirmed by elected Councils rather than by Ankara appointed governors. In order to accelerate the process, the Commission prompted the General Directorate to initialise an amendment of the Provincial Administration Act."

Öktem then explains that "this was now a project of the bureaucratic elites that would be continued irrespective of the political party in governments."[177] However, no sources are given for the claim that the work was indeed systematic up to that point or that there was resistance in the Provincial Councils. Nor is any proof offered that it was the commission that was instrumental in passing the amendment in question. And the work of the

[176] *Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları*, 3.

[177] Kerem Öktem, "The Nation's Imprint," par. 38.

commission would not be "continued irrespective of" the government. As far as Ataman's version of events, more caution should be taken before accepting as fact a government official's introduction, written some twenty years after the "Expert Commission" was first supposedly established. It is my inclination that Ataman's primary goal was not to offer an accurate description of how place name change in Turkey was actually being carried out, but rather to justify and add importance to the volume he had helped prepare and that included among its goals the "use and diffusion of the Turkified natural place names." The reason given that such a volume had not been published before then is that difficulties beyond their control, such as World War II or a halt in the payment of wages, had prevented it. If the task of renaming was given such precedence, it is difficult to understand why World War II would have halted the work, especially considering that Turkey was not an active participant and did not officially join the Allies until seven months before the end of the war.

Although there are no archival documents before October 19,1957 that refer to the establishment of a commission dedicated to place name change, it is clear that that October 19,1957 does not mark the foundation of the "Expert Commission on Place Name Change" as claimed by Öktem. Kuran sets 1956 as the year of establishment and March 1957 as the beginning of regular meetings but does not offer reliable citations. In 2007, the Chamber of Maps and Cadastre Engineers (Harita ve Kadastro Mühendisleri Odası) held a conference in which a paper was presented that dealt with geographic names in Turkey. In this paper, 1952 is given as the date of foundation of the Expert Commission on Name Change and notes that the commission continued its work until 1978, although not always in a systematic fashion.[178] I have not been able to find any other evidence regarding 1952 as the year that the commission was formed, but as the paper presented by the Chamber of Maps

[178] Paper presented at the conference of the Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği, Harita ve Kadastro Mühendisleri Odası (Union of Chambers of Turkish Architects and Engineers), www.hkmo.org.tr/resimler/ekler/HB5F_05d886123a54de3_ek.doc. Accessed April 23, 2013. "Ad Değiştirme İhtisas Kurulu, İçişleri Bakanlığı bünyesinde 1952 yılında kurulmuş ve belediyelerin sorumluluğunda bulunan yollar, parklar ve caddeler/sokaklar haricindeki idari birimlerin, yerleşim yerlerinin ve doğal coğrafi özelliklerin adlarının standartlaştırılması konusunda yetkili kılınmıştır. Düzenli bir biçimde olmasa da, üniversitelerden ve resmi kurumlardan uzmanların oluşturduğu bu kurul 1978 yılına kadar çalışmıştır."

and Cadastre Engineers is much more detailed and well-researched than the introduction to 1977's *Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları* which lists 1956 as the year of foundation, 1952 is perhaps more accurate. However, there are no other sources other than the ones already discussed that confirm either 1952 or 1956 as the date of the commission's foundation. As such, it is impossible to assign a definite date to the establishment of the "Expert Commission" or any similarly named body tasked with Turkifying place names. The sources that have been cited and miscited in other studies do not allow for such a precise dating, and the most reliable source that I have found gives 1952 as the date of foundation, although this too may not be completely reliable. It appears that scholars working on this issue have been too eager to provide a definite date for the beginning of the "systematic" approach to name change in Turkey. Indeed, Kuran structures his thesis around this framework, with the years 1957-1978 forming the systematic years of toponymic change in Turkey, with the pre-1957 period forming the "infrastructure" of the "policy" as laid out by Öktem. However, the systematic nature of place name change in Turkey is definitely called into question by the lack of a definite foundation date for the body that was apparently created to carry out the changes.

The name of the body or bodies tasked with renaming places also deserves some attention. As already noted, the earliest official mention of systematic place name change is in 1957 and contains no reference to a formal body, but is rather concerned with the wages of those working outside office hours to change "foreign names." In the July 10, 1964 *Resmi Gazete*, for example, in which dozens of new subdistrict (*bucak*) names are listed, the justification for the changes is given as section two of Provincial Administration Law No. 5442, which deals with the formation or redistricting of provinces, subprovinces, and disctricts as well as the changing of their names. How the names have been chosen is not specified, and there is no mention of any commission. As I already mentioned, the title assigned in the preface to 1968's *Köylerimiz* to the body that was involved in the toponymical changes was the "Commission on Foreign Name Change" (*Yabancı Adları Değiştirme Komisyonu*).The earliest reference to the "Expert Commission on Name Change" that I have been able to find in official documents is from June 29, 1975. In the *Resmi Gazete* from this date, fourteen mountains in the province of Bolu were renamed "according to Nato standards" and the body that changed them given the title "Expert

Commission on Name Change." The list itself is interesting, as several of the examples clearly involve standardization instead of Turkification. For example, Unluk Tepe became Yukarı Unluk Tepe (Upper Unluk Hill), two hills both referred to as Kuztepe received the new names of Batı Kuztepe (West Kuztepe) and Doğu Kuztepe (East Kuztepe). One hill by the name of Erenler Tepe became Büyük Erenler Tepe (Greater Erener Hill). These are just a few examples that show it is hasty to dismiss governmental claims dealing with the standardization goals of place name change rather than simply Turkification.[179] However, it should be noted that, in a more ideological decision and clearly not related to standardization, Manastır Tepe, also in Bolu was renamed Gelincik Tepe.

The term "Expert Commission on Name Change" is used again in *Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları* in 1977, and then it appears again in the February 21, 1983 *Resmi Gazete*, when the commission was to be reconstituted after being dissolved for a time.[180] The "Expert Commission on Place Name Change" is also mentioned on the website of the Interior Ministry under the section dealing with the General Directorate of Provincial Administration (*İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü*) and the creation of the Fifth Branch. Among one of the responsibilities assigned to the branch was the spokesmanship of the Expert Commission on Place Name Change (*Ad Değiştime İhtisas Kurulu*).[181] This branch was created in 1971, but I have been unable to find any document produced at the time of its creation dealing with its duties. As such, it is unclear if the wording of "Expert Commission on Name Change" was used in 1971, or if this is only the later language that was used in writing the short history of the General Directorate of Provincial Administration for the website of the Turkish Grand National Assembly. In the February 21, 1983 *Resmi Gazete*, the commission is given the title "Board of Experts on Name

[179] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," 50. "Furthermore, the Turkification of place names was justified through the standardization endeavors…"

[180] "'Ad Değiştirme Uzmanlar Kurulu Kuruluş Görev ve Çalışma İlke ve Usulleri Hakkında Yönetmelik"-in yürürlüğe konulması: İçişleri Bakanlığının 14/12/1962 tarihli ve 968 sayılı yazısı üzerine, 5442 sayılı İl İdaresi Kanunun değişik 2 nci maddesinin D fıkrasına göre. Bakanlar Kurulunca 10/1/1983 tarihinde kararlaştırılmıştır." Resmi Gazete. February 21, 1983.

[181] Türkiye Cumhuriyeti İçişleri Bakanlığı, İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü, http://www.icisleri.gov.tr/default.icisleri_2.aspx?id=680. Accessed on May 17, 2013.

Change" (*Ad Değiştirme Uzmanlar Kurulu*). Kuran discusses this in his work and lists the responsibilities and guidelines of the board, as laid out in the *Resmi Gazete*, in his appendix. However, what neither Kuran nor Öktem note is that the board was then dissolved by the Ministry of the Interior on December 27, 1985 and then confirmed by the ministers on January 1, 1986. The decision, numbered 86/10314, carries the signature of President Kenan Evren and Prime Minister Turgut Özal.[182] This marks the definitive end of the body or bodies that were referred to at different times as the "Commission on Foreign Name Change," the "Expert Commission on Name Change," and the "Board of Experts on Name Change." Considering that they included many different people and operated, sometimes sporadically, over the course of roughly thirty years under varying conditions, it would be a mistake to refer to toponymical change in Turkey as one "policy" as Kuran does many times throughout his thesis or as a "project," with "waves" which is the terminology preferred by Öktem.

Implementing the Changes

Although the manner in which the new names were implemented would shed needed light on place name change in Turkey, there is unfortunately little evidence regarding this. Many of the changes were published in the Official Gazette, but many were not. As to changes in Giresun, I have only been able to find a few examples in the Official Gazette, thereby leaving questions as to how the changes were actually communicated and implemented. In this regard, 1968's *Köylerimiz* is by far the most important resource. Unfortunately, it does not list when specific changes were made, so in many cases it is only possible to ascertain whether individual changes were made before 1968 or after. In Giresun, the vast majority were made before 1968, so the focus here will be on this period. I have searched archival material as well as the Official Gazette and local newspapers trying to find references to name change in the province. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss some of the examples I have found.

[182] Resmi Gazete. Febrary 14, 1986.

In *Köylerimiz*, a total of 142 Giresun villages are listed with both an old and new name. According to Harun Tunçel, a total of 167 villages had received new names as of the year 2000. Sevan Nişanyan puts the number at 189. The actual number is even higher. Other than the attempted name changes of the Committee of Union and Progress in 1913-1916, I have been unable to find much concrete evidence of name change in Giresun until the 1960s. In most of the archival documents that mention any Giresun village, hardly any new names are used until after *Köylerimiz* was published in 1968. One of the few cases before 1968 I have been able to find in which a new, government imposed name is used is a 1965 document regarding the relocation of the residents of a village which had been affected by a landslide. In the document, a village in today's subprovince of Çamoluk by the name of Zodoma is followed by its new name of Çakılkaya in parentheses. This is how the village is referred to throughout the document.[183] However, in an issue of the *Resmi Gazete* from one year later, only the name of Zodoma is used, with no mention of Çakılkaya.[184]

One type of place name change in Giresun that is very difficult to trace is the removal of village status from settlements. There are several examples of villages, some of them with apparently non-Turkish names, that have been subsumed into neighboring villages, thereby becoming a neighborhood and not necessarily warranting inclusion into 1968's *Köylerimiz* or in official maps of the Turkish Republic. In 1946 the village of Vanazıt, a name which does not appear to be Turkish, was split into two, with part of it becoming the village of Yoliçi and part of it becoming the neighborhood of Fındıklı. However, the village name was still being used in 1959, when the decision was made to inlude the village within the borders of the municipality of Keşap, which today is a sub-province.[185] Furthermore, the name of Vanazıt was being used in official documents almost twenty-five years after the original name change, as the April 22, 1970 *Resmi Gazete* deals with the will and heirs of a deceased resident of Vanazıt.[186] However, the

[183] BCA 30..18.1.2/190.70..17. December 4, 1965.

[184] Resmi Gazete. March 28, 1966.

[185] BCA 30..11.1.0/275.13..12. May 5, 1959.

[186] Resmi Gazete. April 22, 1970.

name Vanazıt is not included in the 1968 publication of *Köylerimiz* as the village as a whole was not simply renamed, but divided into a separate village and neighborhood with two different names, and then included in another subdistrict. Situations like this are common and render the task of uncovering all the place name changes in Giresun quite difficult. Sevan Nişanyan's impressive catalog of changed place names in Turkey, *Adını Unutan Ülke*, while very extensive, often leaves out such changes since they are difficult to pinpoint. I have included a table of all the place name changes in Giresun that I have been able to confirm, but there are undoubtedly other neighborhoods or small villages that have been subsumed by a settlement of another name.

There are numerous other examples of villages in Giresun being referred to in official documents by their previous name rather than their new, government imposed name. There are also cases in which, even well after a new name is imposed, the old name is included in parantheses. In a document from 1973 that determined that border between a village in Erzincan and a village in Giresun, the old names of all the villages and administrative districts are included. Specifically, the new name of Çamoluk, now a subprovince, is followed by its old name of Mindeval. And the new name of a village in Çamoluk, Pınarlı, is accompanied by its old name of Pağnik, which is roughly the Armenian equivalent of Pınarlı.[187]

The valley known as Harşıt is an interesting case-study in name change. Harşıt is the name of a stream that rises in the mountains of the province of Gümüşhane and flows through the region before emptying into the Black Sea. The ethnology of this name is debated. The stream, Harşit Çayı, has an important historical event associated with it, the *Harşit Çayı Savunması*, or the Defense of Harşit Stream, in which Turkish forces battled the Russian army that was advancing westward along the Black Sea Coast. This region has long been organized into a separate administrative unit, and it was known as Kürtün-i zîr, or Lower Kürtün.[188] Kürtün is still the name of a subprovince of Gümüşhane, located

[187] BCA 30..11.1.0/393.40..19. August 7, 1973.

[188] Ayhan Yüksel, "Harşit ve Kürtün Nahiyeleri Nüfusu," Harşit Vadisi İnternet Gazetesi, http://www.harsitvadisi.com/Ayhan-Yuksel/74/Harsit-ve-Kurtun-Nahiyeleri-Nufusu.html. Accessed May 16, 2013.

farther south and at a higher altitude. Kürtün-i Zîr therefore refers to the lower geographical location of this valley region relative to Kürtün-i Bala, or Upper Kürtün, the previous name of Gümüşhane's Kürtün. In 1554, the area was referred to as *Nahiye-i Haşrid.*[189] Eventually Harşid, or Harşıt, became the name by which the region was known. In 1916, Enver Paşa ordered this name to be changed to Büyüksu, but this change, like most of the other place name changes at this time, was never implemented.[190] The administrative center of the region was a town known as Manastırbükü. In the July 10, 1964 *Resmi Gazete*, the name of the subdistrict of Harşıt was officially changed to Doğankent, even though a *Resmi Gazete* just one month later still refers to the area as Harşit.[191] According to Ayhan Yüksel, the name Doğankent was chosen to commemorate the construction of a nearby dam.[192] The 1967 Giresun Province Almanac also still lists Harşıt as the name of the subdistrict.[193] The Giresun subdistrict of Mindaval was also changed in July 1964, officially becoming Çamoluk. However, like Harşit, the name Mindaval was still being used in official documents after the change.[194] By the time *Köylerimiz* was published in 1968, the central town in the region, Manastırbükü, had also received the official name of Doğankent. Finally, in 1977, with the publication of *Tabii Yer Adları*, the name of the stream was changed from Harşıt Çayı to Doğankent Çayı. Even though after 1977 the name Harşıt had been officially removed from both the region and river, it would still continue to be used in official documents. And in the October 9th, 1980 Official Gazette, the name Harşıt is used several times in an announcement dealing with the Tirebolu Forestry Department.[195] It is interesting to note that this was not even a month after the September 12 military coup, as the coup is often understood in the existing literature to mark an intensification of the renaming efforts.

---

[189] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun Kırsalın İdari ve Sosyal Tarihi*, (Giresun: Giresun Belediyesi Yayınları, 2005), 280.

[190] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 187.

[191] Resmi Gazete. July 10, 1964; Resmi Gazete. August 15, 1964.

[192] Ayhan Yüksel, *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*, 187.

[193] *Giresun İl Yıllığı 1967*, 28.

[194] Resmi Gazete. August 22, 1964.

[195] Resmi Gazete. October 9, 1980.

Doğankent itself, which gained the status of subprovince (*ilçe*) in 1990, is currently made up of five *mahalle*s (neighborhoods) and nine villages. The names of three of the five *mahalle*s, Doğankent, Süttaşı, and Sadaklı, which make up the administrative center of the subprovince, are the product of official name change. The other two *mahalle*s are new ones that were created from existing ones in 2010. Of the nine settlements possessing village status, four have undergone official name change. Kanyaş was renamed Güvenlik, Kuzan became Söğütağzı, Şadı was changed to Çatalağaç, and Kargaköy is now known as Oyraca, although this village was in the subprovince of Tirebolu when its name was changed. Of the other five villages, one was aptly named Yeniköy when two smaller settlements, İslam and Yerlice, were combined.

As this discussion has shown, tracing place name change can be a somewhat tedious process as the most comprehensive official record of the changes is from 1968 and many changes are actually left out of the volume. Therefore, a multitude of sources must be relied upon, and even then constructing a fully comprehensive record of toponymical changes is nearly impossible, but a picture of name change does emerge which shows that the process was not always systematic. Official records were not kept of each name change, some names were changed more than once, and even well after new names were implemented bureaucrats would still refer to villages by using their old names. Such characteristics, instead of exhibiting "vehemence," point to a much less systematic and monolithic approach the alteration of the Turkish toponymical order. Aside from official records, I have also looked at local newspapers in an attempt to better understand how the name changes were reflected in the press. I had expected to find at least a few announcements of specific name changes, as I had posited that this may have been one of the ways in which name changes were communicated to the public. However, this does not seem to be the case as I was unable to find any example of such announcements, but I did come across several articles which I believe cast some light on name change in Turkey.

Reflecting the Changes: Giresun's *Gündüz* Newspaper

After 1968, the new, government imposed place names began to appear in Giresun's newspapers, including *Gündüz*, which was one of the most widely-read in the province. However, the old names of the villages were also still being used, sometimes being included in parentheses after the new name as in official documents. In other cases, only the old names are used. On January 11, 1969, *Gündüz* ran a short story about a house fire in Harşıt/Doğankent.[196] The name of the sub-district had been changed almost five years before, but the newspaper still used the old name in its headline. In the story itself, the new name Doğankent is used followed by Harşıt in parentheses. And the name of the village where the house was located is referred to only as Söğütağzı; the old name of Kuzan is not mentioned at all. In a similar example, an article from January 23, 1969 refers to the village of Erdoğan, but does not include its old name of Sasu.[197] On Febraury 11, a few words were written about a new school to be built in Harşıt.[198] In the article itself, however, only the name Doğankent is used, unlike the story dealing with the burned house in which Harşıt was included in parentheses. In looking through these examples, I initially posited that they pointed to a gradual shift towards using the new names, such as Doğankent and Erdoğan. But on March 5, 1969, one of the major headlines in *Gündüz* was "Another murder committed in Harşıt." In the story, the writer refers specifically to the sub-district (*bucak*) of Harşıt, leaving out any mention of the name Doğankent.[199] Clearly, this particular newspaper had no clear policy on the use of the new, government imposed place names.

The incoherent response to toponymical change on the part of *Gündüz* would continue on for the next several months, although there are some signs that use of the new names were beginning to gain momentum. On March 15, 1969, in a story dealing with yet

[196] "Harşıt'ta bir şahsın evi yakıldı," *Gündüz*, January 11, 1969.

[197] "Erdoğan Köyü Ortaokul Yaptırma ve Yaşatma Cemiyeti Tüzüğü," *Gündüz*, January 23, 1969.

[198] "Harşıt'a Ortaokul binası yapılacak," *Gündüz*, February 11, 1969.

[199] "Harşıtta yeni bir cinayet işlendi," *Gündüz*, March 5, 1969.

another murder, only the old name of Engüz is used for the village officially known as Dokuztepe.[200] Three days later only Dokuztepe is used, as it is in an article from April 9.[201] By this point, I was beginning to detect signs that a shift to the new names seemed to have been completed. On April 19, however, the old name of Konacık is used first, followed by the new name of Duroğlu in parantheses.[202] Finally, in an apparent victory for the government imposed names, the old names begin to disappear from the press. On May 12, only Duroğlu is used in an article, whereas on May 24 the name of Doğankent is preferred over Harşıt, which makes no appearance at all.[203] From this point onward, it seems that the editors and writers of at least one Giresun newspaper finally adopted the new names in their articles, although there are some relapses. The first few months of 1969 can be seen as forming a transition period in which both the central government and newspapers struggled to deal with the toponymical changes that were being carried out in Giresun. The lack of a definite break between "old" and "new" in the official realm foreshadow a much more fluid reaction to place name change among the residents of Giresun.

[200] "Keşap'taki Olayda Ölenlerin İsimleri Tesbit Edildi," *Gündüz*, March 15, 1969.

[201] "Keşap cinayetinin duruşması başlıyor, *Gündüz*, March 18, 1969; "Keşap'ta hırsızlık," *Gündüz*, April 9, 1969.

[202] "Giresun Merkez Konacık (Duroğlu) ve Yenicehisar Köyleri Kur'an Kursunu Kalkındırma ve Yaşatma Derneği Başkanlığından," *Gündüz*, April 19, 1969.

[203] "Bir Kamyonda bulunan dört tabancaya sahip çıkan olmadı," *Gündüz*, May 12, 1969; "Alucra ve Doğankent Belediyelerine 20'şer bin lira yardımda bulundu," *Gündüz*, May 24, 1969.

CHAPTER IV

LOCAL RESPONSES TO PLACE NAME CHANGE IN GIRESUN

Most residents of Giresun have definitely not forgotten the old names of the villages and neighborhoods that received government imposed toponymes during the Republic. For the most part, this reality was expected after exploring the literature on theories surrounding place names and what they mean to people. As I have shown through examples from the Resmi Gazete and other official documents, even bureaucrats themselves used the old names after the new names were officially imposed. Although claims that the state was able to "achieve toponymical cleansing" have already been brought into doubt by Kuran's thesis, my research in Giresun has uncovered a response to toponymical change that is different from those outlined both by Öktem, who posits that old names have been largely forgotten, and Kuran, whose research has shown that the new names have been rejected outright. In conversations with many Giresun residents during a week of fieldwork in the province, I was able to observe both the enduring power of the old names as well as examples in which the new names have found their way into everyday life.

A few miles south of Giresun is a small village that was once known officially as Kabaköy. In the 1990s, after the dissolution of the body that had been involved in name change of the previous decades, it was changed to Gürköy. The previous name, which translates roughly as "rude village," was apparently thought to be unpleasant. Gürköy, however, means "abundant village" or "plentiful village." I was able to visit this area and talk with an elderly woman who has lived here all of her life. When I asked her if people used the name Gürköy she informed me that people have indeed adopted the new name. She noted that she "very rarely hears" the old name being used in the immediate vicinity

and that it annoys the village's mayor when people do use it. As far as she knew, it was the mayor who had decided on the new name, a change that to her was completely logical due to the unpleasant connotation of the previous name. As to where the previous name came from, the woman noted that her father-in-law used to claim that the village's name was actually Kabakköy and that it had received this name because *kabak* (squash) was once grown in the village. Whether or not this is actually how the village came to be known as Kabaköy, the woman as well as another resident of the area both agreed that the name was changed because Kabaköy was a negative name that could be considered offensive to the residents. In this case, the state can be seen as having employed associational power, not instrumental power in which changes are carried out despite the wishes of the local populace, to bestow a more positive name on the village. The residents of Gürköy that I spoke with were not angered or annoyed by the new name as were many of the people that were interviewed by İbrahim Kuran. Indeed, at least one resident found the new name more appealing and has chosen to adopt it in daily life. Perhaps other residents of Gürköy were indeed opposed to the change and still insist on Kabaköy in their everyday interactions, but I did not encounter anyone who was opposed. Just as the contexts of southeastern Turkey and the eastern Black Sea are very different, so too have been the responses to official name change.

Not far from Gürköy is the municipality of Duroğlu, to which a small collection of nearby houses, hazelnut groves, and a few factories grouped together in five different neighborhoods, or *mahalle*s, are attached. This area was once known officially as the village of Paya. This was changed to Konacık sometime before the 1967 Giresun Province Almanac was published, as in the list of subdistricts Paya is listed after Konacık in parantheses, denoting it as the old name.[204] Both old and new name are also included in 1968's *Köylerimiz.* In 1998, Konacık became the town or municipality (*belde*) of Duroğlu. I met with seven older residents of Duroğlu at the local coffee house and we discussed the name changes that had been witnessed in the region. There was some confusion as to whether or not Konacık was still actually a village in its own right, or if it had become a neighborhood of Duroğlu, or if it even still had official status at all. One resident said that

[204] *Giresun İl Yıllığı 1967*, 28.

was born in Paya before its name was changed to Konacık stated that he still referred to the entire area as Paya and then showed me his identification card (*nüfus cüzdanı*) in which Paya was written as the place of birth. From what I gathered from these conversations, the name Konacık is rarely used by the residents, whereas Duroğlu has made its way into everyday speech. Among these men, however, Paya is still the preferred toponym. I asked why the name was changed from Paya, and one man told me that it was because the government at that time went about changing all the "meaningless" village names in Turkey.

While in Duroğlu I took the opportunity to ask about other villages in the area which have undergone official name change. Unlike the woman in Gürköy who said she preferred to use the new name rather than Kabaköy, the men gathered at the coffee house said they still used the name Kabaköy, although they all knew its new official name was Gürköy. Another village in the area, located on top of one of the many steep hills on which tea and hazelnuts are grown, carries the official name of Çağlayan. Up until the 1960s, however, it was known officially as Ezedin. Although I was unable to speak to any residents of this village, I did ask the woman I met in Gürköy as well as the men at the coffee house about it. The Gürköy resident knew both its old name and new name, but when speaking in general about the area she casually referred to it as Ezedin. The men at the coffee shop also knew it as Ezedin, and one of them even offered that it was a Greek (*Rumca*) name. One younger resident of Duroğlu, who I assumed to be in his early twenties, knew the village by both Çağlayan and Ezedin. None of them, however, could offer any explanation as to what Ezedin meant, although one claimed that the name Paya probably comes from the verb *pay etmek*, or "to share." As to whether this is an example of common folk etymology or an explanation constructed on the spot to satisfy the foreign researcher, I am not sure.

From this collection of conversations, I began to develop an understanding of how people in Giresun have responded to changes in place names in which there is a fluidity between old, unofficial names and the new, official ones. None of the people I spoke with seemed especially disturbed by the new names. Indeed, at least some residents prefer the new names. Unlike the residents of Diyarbakır and Batman interviewed by Kuran, place

name change has penetrated into the everyday lives of Giresun's residents, even elderly ones. On the other hand, the old names are definitely not being forgotten, with residents possessing a fairly broad knowledge of the old and new names of villages nearby. It appears that even younger residents are aware of the older names, although I should note that since the majority of my conversations were with older people, I was not able to gain a comprehensive understanding of how local youth have responded to official name change in this particular area.

In Giresun's city center, I had the opportunity to discuss place name change with people who have roots in other villages. Indeed, like many cities, most of the residents of Giresun have backgrounds that are connected to the nearby villages in some way. I spent a couple of hours talking with an advisor to the deputy mayor of the Giresun municipality and a man who has an encyclopedic knowledge of the area. This person, whom I will refer to as Murat, knew the old names of many of Giresun's villages and explained that most of them are still commonly used. He told me that his mother is from Fındıklı, the official name of a neighborhood (*mahalle*) in the subprovince of Keşap. His mother, when asked where she is from, always replies "*Vanazıtlıyım*," or "I'm from Vanazıt," which is the old name of the settlement. When I asked if his mother would correct people, including himself, when they used the new name of the village instead of the old name, he said no. As such, she has accepted the new name to some extent while not adopting it herself.

One of the most interesting parts of this conversation came when we began discussing the village of Erköy in Keşap. Unfortunately I was not able to visit the village, but the assistant mayor's advisor informed me that the village is still sometimes known as Ermeniköy, which was its official name up until sometime before 1946. He explained that although its Armenian residents were removed in 1915, the surrounding Turkish population continued to know it as the "Armenian village," or Ermeniköy. I was told that even today if one goes to Keşap and asks any shopkeeper for Erköy, there might be some hesitation followed by the remark "oh you're going to Ermeniköy." Upon noting my surprise at this situation, Murat explained what he sees as the reason behind the continued use of the name Ermeniköy. He said that up until 1915 Ermeniköy's residents were Armenians, but that the residents of the neighboring villages were Turkish. As such, the

name Ermeniköy lives on in the daily speech of the surrounding area. However, Mesut gave an example of another village in Keşap, that of Armutlu, where the situation was different. This area, according to him, once had few Turks in the vicinity, and was completely resettled with Muslim refugees from the Balkans after the forced removal of the Armenians in 1915. As such, few people in the immediate vicinity remained that knew the village's previous name, which Murat claimed was not Armutlu but a Greek name that he has not yet been able to uncover.[205] No old name is listed for Armutlu in the 1968 edition of *Köylerimiz*, and I have been unable to find any reference to any previous name of the village in any other sources. There is a reference to yet another Ermeniköy which was renamed Armudculu in 1916, but this particular village was in Espiye, whereas the Armutlu to which Murat referred is in another subprovince. District borders have undergone numerous changes since 1916, and there is the possibility that it could be the same village. However, as I stated in the previous chapter, there are undoubtedly some instances of place name change that have escaped attention either by not being officially recorded, or through more complicated situations such as when a village officially becomes a neighborhood that is attached to another village or town and, rather than having its name officially changed, is subsumed by its new political unit.

Along the coastal highway in Espiye is a place known officially as Gülburnu, a name implemented sometime before 1968. However, I was told by both Mesut and another Giresun resident, the head of the Department of Foreign Languages at Giresun University, that practically everybody still uses the old name of Zefre, with Gülburnu being used primarily by visitors to the region. In other cases, the new names have been more successful in finding their way into everyday local speech. I was informed that although most people probably know that Eğircen is the old name of the village Yünlüce, the new

[205] Conversation with the author, May 9, 2013. "Şimdi mesela Erköy var, Keşap'ta. Mesela bugünkü, gittiğinizde, Keşap'ta Erköy dediğinizde pek şey yapmazlar, ama Ermeniköy dediğinizde bilinir. Köy Ermeni köyü, ciddi anlamda, şey var, bir Ermeni kilisesi var, 1980'lere kadar okul olarak kullanılmış....buradan bu insanlar (Ermeniler) gittikten sonra, buraya iskan yapılmış. Bu iskanla birlikte, köy uzun süredir Ermeniköy diye bilinir....Erköy ismi daha tamamen şeyi yapamadılar [benimseyememişler]...Keşap'a gidip, herhangi bir esnafa sorduğunuzda, 'ya Erköy'e gideceğim,' 'haa sen Ermeniköy'e gideceğin' derler. Çünkü tamamen nüfusu Ermeni olan bir köydü."

name is what is used today. However, Mesut was quick to point out that even if the new name of a place is used, its old name is rarely forgotten.[206]

Throughout my conversations with people in Giresun, I asked if they knew the meanings of the old names. Very rarely was this knowledge present. There were sometimes vague notions as to the "foreign" root of the old name, but this was usually the extent of any such insight. I have already referred to studies on place names which have posited that the meanings of a name are not always necessary to impart meaning. The original meaning of London, for example, is not important in everyday life, whereas an attempt to change the name would be unthinkable. My research in Giresun has shown such claims to be valid. Therefore, analyzing name change in Turkey by referring to the loss of a supposedly cosmopolitan awareness implied by the old names is, at least in some cases, inaccurate.

My time in the subprovince of Doğankent, whose history of name change I have already discussed, provided more comprehensive insights into toponymical change in the area as well as reactions to them. I spent two days in the administrative center of the subprovince, a town of about three-thousand people which carries the same name. While in Doğankent, I tried to avoid the more structured nature of an interview as I had realized in my previous conversations with people that this was not the best setting in which to actually uncover what names were being used casually in everyday speech. For example, my fellow passengers on the journey to the town, who I assumed to be residents of the region, all said Doğankent as their destination as they were paying the fare. The *dolmuş* driver, on the other hand, while speaking on the phone to a friend who may have been another *dolmuş* driver, mentioned the word Harşıt a few times. When we approached the road to Arslancık, a village which was once known as Köselerakçakilise, or simply Akçakilise, only the new name was used. In fact, during my time there I never once heard the name Köselerakçakilise being used.

[206] Conversation with the author, May 9, 2013. "İnsanlar Eğircen diye kullanmıyor, Yünlüce kullanıyorlar…ama Eğircen olarak ta biliniyor...Gülburnu gibi değil. Ama şu bir realite…insanlar yeni isimleri kullansalar da eski isimler unutmuyorlar…yaşlılar daha çok eski isimleri kullanıyorlar."

Most of my conversations in the town itself took place in a local market which acts a sort of local meeting place as many residents congregate there. I first spoke with the owner of the shop and his son. I was curious as to how the town itself is actually referred to, and the market's owner, a man in his fifties, told me that he usually says Doğankent and that it is used quite often by other locals. His son, whom I will refer to as Ahmet, has also adopted the name Doğankent, which is perhaps expected since he was born well after the name was officially changed. As such, he grew up seeing Doğankent on maps, road signs, and the entrance to his school. One person at the market, an employee of Forestry Department, explained that although younger people may use the name Doğankent, most elderly people still prefer Harşıt.[207] The way in which people refer to their place of origin may vary according to different towns in the region. I was told that a youth in Giresun's city center may reply "I'm from Doğankent" when asked where he or she is from, but if the same question is asked in Tirebolu, a town much closer to Doğankent, the reply may be "I'm from Harşıt.[208] But even farther afield, the old name is still used. The son of the market owner related an experience he had had recently in Trabzon. While speaking with a local who had asked where he was from, Ahmet said "I'm from Doğankent." This answer was not entirely conclusive for this particular Trabzon resident, who then asked "don't you mean Harşıt," an assumption that Ahmet then confirmed.[209]

As for the stream that flows through the region, everybody agreed that its name is Harşıt and that it is never referred to as Doğankent Çayı, which has been the official name since 1977. Even the signs bearing the name of the stream on bridges read Harşıt Çayı, not Doğankent, whereas the signs referring to the town or subprovince contain only the name Doğankent. The stream known officially as Özlüce Deresi is referred to as Gelevera Deresi

[207] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Yeni jenerasyon...bu isim verildikten sonra, seksenlerde doksanlarda doğanlar artık Doğankent diyor... ama yaşlılar....Doğankent diye bilmez...Harşıt dediğiniz zaman, o zaman anlıyor tam olarak."

[208] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Giresun merkezde bir gence nerelisin diye sorduğunda, 'Dogankentliyim' diyebilir ama Tirebolu'da ayni şey sorarsanız bu sefer size 'Dogankentliyim' demeyebilir, 'Harşıtlıyım' der. Yani yere de gore değişiyor..."

[209] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Trabzon'daydım ben. 'Nerelisin' diye bir adam sordu bana. 'Doğankentliyim' dedim. Düşündü 'Harşıt olmasın' dedi. 'Ahh evet' dedim."

by signs at bridges crossing the stream. I asked several people if they even knew that the Gelevera stream had been officially renamed in the 1970s, and the answer was always no. Considering that one of the most well-known folk songs of the region is called "Gelevera Deresi," it is not surprising that the new name was never adopted. What I did find surprising was that signs all over Giresun bearing the names of geographical features still use the old names at the expense of the new, official names that appear on maps. Clearly, some names will not be erased from history. As one resident told me, "as long as the [Harşıt] stream flows through the region," it will be difficult for the name to ever be forgotten, and that even though the name Harşıt may not appear on official maps, it is still on signs since that is the only name people by which people know the stream. [210]

In Doğankent, I was fortunate to become acquainted with a retired teacher who is the administrator for a website that deals with local news, events, and history. This individual has an impressive breadth of knowledge regarding the history of the region and was more than happy to discuss a few issues with me. Before I visited the town, I had come across this website as well as a survey asking for visitors to the site to vote on whether or not they thought Doğankent should be renamed Harşıt. As such, I was very interested to hear what he thought on this subject and to learn about the procedures that would be involved in such a transition. He informed me that there is indeed a campaign to have the name changed, and that most people are in support. He said that an opinion poll will be taken. After this, the municipality will send the request to the governor of Giresun. If it is approved by the governor's office, it will then be sent to the Interior Ministry. If approval is granted by the ministry, then Doğankent will be officially renamed Harşıt. [211] I

[210] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013 "Bu dere buradan aktiği sürecede zor... resmi belgelerde Doğankent Çayı diye gözükse de, karayollarında tabelalarda hala Harşıt diye geçiyor."

[211] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Onun için de son günlerde bir çalışma var, tekrar Harşıta dönmek için bir çalışma var...Şimdi bunun olabilmesi için bir kamuoyu olacak, kamuoyu oluştuktan sonra burada, yerel yönetim, yani ...belediye, bununla ilgili bir karar alacak. Diyecek ki 'Biz, Dogankent isminin tekrar Harşıt'a dönmesini istiyoruz' diye, sivil toplum kuruluşlarıyla beraber...valiliğe gidecek, vali İçişleri Bakanlığına tekflif gönderecek, İçişleri Bakanlığı valiliğinin onaylamış olduğu, Giresun İl İdaresinin onaylamış olduğu..karar doğrultusunda eski isime dönecek. Bunun haricinde dönme

asked whether there would be people opposed to the change and was assured that there would not be, but was then cautioned that it was a long and slow process.[212] Although the name Doğankent has entered into common usage, with people often referring to the town with the new name, the old name is still spoken enough that everybody in the subprovince itself as well as many in other regions know where Harşıt is. In fact, it so common that people are confident that the subprovince will eventually be officially reunited with its old name with no opposition. If the change is applied, it will affect both the subprovince and the town itself, as subprovinces are known by the name of their administrative center. I also inquired as to the other villages in Doğankent whose names have been changed and learned that there are also efforts underway to have the old names of villages returned, but that the first order of business was to have the name of the subprovince changed. After that, they would seek to have village names changed. The retired teacher emphasized that he is from the village of Şadı, and that he never uses the new name of Çatalağaç. If anybody questions his use of the name Şadı, he said that he proffers his identification card on which Şadı is written as place of birth, not Çatalağaç.[213] After this, he noted that the names should "return to the original" and that every government could not change place names as it pleased.[214]

The Mayor of Doğankent Municipality also shared her thoughts with me on the subject of the subprovince and the town regaining their old name. While she said that she definitely supported the efforts, there are apparently some who are concerned by all the administrative hassles that will follow. For example, new road signs will have to be made, as well as new invoices, letterheads, and any other official paperwork containing the name

---

şanslaro yok. Ama iş belediyeden başliyor. Kararı belediye alacak, belediye bir üste gönderecek.''

[212] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "...süreç yavaş işler, çünkü tek iş o değil, meclis toplayacak, meclis karar verecek..."

[213] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "İlçe alalım ki köyü de alalım, önce ilçe alalım…Şadı için çalışmamız var. Ben Şadılıyım. Hala da her yerde söylerim 'ben Şadılıyım' diye. Çatalağaç'ı hiç kullanmam. Ben Şadılıyım. İtiraz edene nüfus cüzdanımı gösteririm 'Buyrun kardeşim ben Şadılıyım.'''

[214] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Öze dönsun, her gelen hükümet bunu değiştirmez."

of the town and subprovince. She explained that the transition period could entail some confusion by pointing to a nearby invoice and noting that if the change does go through, documents such as invoices which have to be in numbered order, cannot just be thrown out immediately. Instead, there will probably be a transition period of a few months while the current stock of invoices and other documents are depleted and new stationary is printed. Despite such difficulties, the mayor explained that she supports the efforts. As a mayor, she often travels to other parts of Turkey, where she tells people she is from Doğankent. But even people in other regions of the country, especially those older than fifty, still know the area as Harşıt.[215] I offered that perhaps this was due to the historical importance assigned to the *Harşıt Çayı Savunması*, the battle that I referred to in the previous chapter, and the mayor agreed that this was possible. The identity of the region is still linked to its old name even though the new name is used often in everyday speech. In this way, the name Harşıt can be linked to the "embodied" nature of a place, as claimed by Feld in his discussion on place names of the Kaluli people in Papua New Guinea.

While the name Harşıt clearly has value for the region's inhabitants, it does not have a specific meaning that is widely accessible, and in my conversations with people in the market, there was some difference of opinion regarding the etymology of the name. One person allowed that it was Greek (*Rumca*), whereas another resident assured us that it was actually a name that was given to the region by Chepni Turks.[216] As for other villages

[215] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Şehirlerarası tabelalar da dahil olmak üzere her şey değişeceğine, vergi dairesi değişeceğine, kurumun isimleri de değişeceğine…işte harşıt diyelim, deyip te iki dakkida, yani sürecin…çok geniş, kapsamlı. Türkiye'nin haritasında bile Doğankent Harşıt olacak ilçe olarak…Peki bu nasıl değişecek? Komple bunlar yapılmayacak. İşte bir örnek veriyorum, bir fatura. Bu fatura bittikten sonra yeni fatura Harşıt diye bastıracak. Yani bunu atıp çöpe yenisi olmaycak...ama normal şartlarda, ben Harşıt olmasından yanayım...Ben Doğankentliyim diyorum, şöyle, Harşıt benim yaşımdan daha üstün insanların kullandığı [isim]...ama ben Belediye Başkan olduğum için Türkiye'nin her yerinde işim oluyor, geziyorum, dolaşıyorum, kimse Doğankent bilmiyor, herkes Harşıt biliyor,belli bir yaşın üstü. Başka yerlerde insanlar Doğankent bilmiyor, Harşıt olarak biliyor...'eski adı Harşıt' dediğinizde 'ha tamam' diye herkes biliyor yani."

[216] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "…eski Rum isim, Rum memleketi olduğu için, daha fazla isimler Rum ismi." ; "Manastırbükü Rum ismi ama Harşıt Rum ismi değil."

in the area, one person relayed an interesting, if perhaps fanciful, explanation of the names of Şadı, Kanyaş, and Dandı, claiming they are all names bestowed by three Turkish brothers who founded the villages.[217] The owner of the market, who is from Kanyaş, told a different story regarding the name. He explained that the people of the town had experienced many difficulties and that *kan* (blood) and *yaş* (tears) refer to these troubles.[218] It is noteworthy that all these examples of folk etmyology prescribe an explicitly Turkish etymology to the names. Unlike Giresun or Tirebolu, the etymologies of which are widely accepted as "foreign," these villages are considered by the locals to have a distinct Turkish history. Nobody, however, was able to explain the reasoning behind the new names, inluding that of Güvenlik (safety, security). One person from this village, the Foresty Department employee that I mentioned earlier, said that he has asked many older residents in an attempt to discover if there were evere any deeper meanings behind the new names, but that nobody was able to offer any explanation. Despite the fact that all of the "old" names in the region are actually still being used, there is at least one name that has fallen out of common usage. What is today the town of Doğankent was actually the village of Manastırbükü. Whereas older people may know the name, it is never used anymore, unlike Harşıt. Indeed, the father of the market's owner offered that not only is it not in use, there are few people left that even know the name.[219] Since the old names of other villages in the area are still used, it worth considering why Manastırbükü is not. Although it is widely known that the region was once home to Greek and Armenian Christians, perhaps in this case the name Manastırbükü was too obvious in its reference to a Christian identity to remain in usage. One resident claimed that the reason it is not in use is connected to the

[217]Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Üç kardeş geliyor...buraya ilk yerleşeceği zamanlarda, üç kardeş geliyor, bunlar hayvanlarını her birisi ayrı bir yere götürüyor, orada büyütmeye çalışıyorlar...her yılda buluşuyorlar, işte 'senin hayvan nasıl senin nasıl' falan...birisi 'benim hayvanım ot yiyip doydu, kandı artık' diyor. Kandı kandı kandı diye diye değişiyor Dandı ismi geliyor. Şadı'daki diyor ki 'benim hayvanım o kadar güzel yedi ki, doydu ki, şaduman oldu, çok güzel oldu,' şaduman'dan gelme Şadı ismi. Kanyaş, benim köyüm, işte o da diyor ki 'benim ki ne iyi ne kötü, ne kan ne yaş.'"

[218] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "çok eziyet çekmişler…insanlar çok gözyaşı dökmüşler, yani kanla yaş…oradan Kanyaş ismi, öyle diyorlar, kan yaşı ağladı."

[219] Conversation with the author, May 11, 2013. "Yok yok bilinmiyor hatta, bilen az kaldı."

fact that Manastırbükü technically does not exist anymore because it was subsumed into the growing municipality of Doğankent. However, this is not a satisfactory explanation since *Our Villages* (*Köylerimiz*) lists Doğankent as the new name of Manastırbükü, meaning that it was not incorporated into Doğankent as a separate neighborhood, as was Paya/Konacık in Duroğlu. One possible explanation is that residents allowed the name Manastırbükü to be forgotten due to its overt reference to a Christian past. Of course, not all such names have been forgotten, as witnessed by the example of Ermeniköy/Erköy in Keşap.

During my last day of fieldwork in Giresun, I visited the subprovince of Şebinkarahisar, which is a considerable distance south of Giresun, near the border with Sivas. The geography here is much different, with transportation between villages being easier as there are no steep hills and valleys as there are in the regions nearer to the coast. I first visited the offices of the local government, or *kaymakamlik*, as I had a contact who works in the Social Services Department. In this office were several people, ranging in ages from what I assumed to be mid-twenties to late fifties. When we started speaking about my research, everybody present began naming examples with which they were most familiar. As in the other subprovinces of Giresun, it is safe to say that the old names have not been forgotten in Şebinkarahisar. My contact, however, a young man in his early twenties and a native of Şebinkarahisar, was not able to specifically match the old names with the new names since he always refers to the villages by the new names. He had heard most of the old names, but said he never uses them. Another employee, whom I judged to be around thirty-five years old, had accurate knowledge of many of the old names, but, like her younger colleague, normally uses the new names in everyday speech. Perhaps their status as government employees influences their choice of which names to use, just as Doğankent's mayor first tells people she is from Doğankent although she supports efforts to reclaim the name Harşıt. I asked about the village of Çağlayan, whose old name is İsrail, as this name had struck me as rather peculiar. The people in the office assured me that the village's old name was not İsrail, but İsiril. In fact, they had never even heard the name İsrail in connection with this village. However, this is the spelling of the village as it appears in both *Our Villages* and the *Giresun Provincial Almanac*. The people in the office were doubtful of this until I showed them a book that I had with me, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda*

Giresun Kırsalın İdari ve Sosyal Tarihi by Mehmet Fatsa, in which the village's name is written as İsrail. They were surprised, but insisted that everybody pronounced the village's old name as İsiril.

I was eventually introduced to a retired teacher, a man who is considered to be the town's local historian. In discussing place name changes with him and three other Şebinkarahisar residents, the old name of Çağlayan once again became the topic of conversation. Whereas this retired teacher knew that the name was once pronounced İsrail, the other three residents were surprised, noting that they only ever knew the village as İsiril. The teacher then explained that "the younger generation" refers to the village as Çağlayan, whereas older residents use İsiril. When I asked how the village received the name İsrail, he assured me that it has nothing to do with the state of Israel, an assumption which of course I had not made to begin with, but in fact referred to the founder of the village who was a member of the Bektashi order. However, of the people that I spoke with about this village, this retired teacher was the only one that had any knowledge of the "original" name of the village and its meaning. In any case, it is interesting that the name has changed in pronunciation over the years to become İsiril instead of İsrail, especially since this was the only example that I encountered of a village's name being pronounced significantly different from its spelling in *Köylerimiz* or other sources. This example has importance for our understanding of place name change in Turkey for it shows the ways in which old names can become separated from their original meaning, even changing significantly in pronunciation over time. To recall cartographer Tim Robinson's quote which I relayed in the first chapter, the case of Israil/Çağlayan is one in which the "placename [has been] left behind, beached, far from the flood of meaning." Of the dozen or so individuals that I asked about Çağlayan's old name, only one knew that it was actually İsrail instead of İsiril and was able to offer an explanation of the source of the name.

In some cases, the new names of villages can tap into registers of meanings that are even more accesible to locals than the old names. For example, in Şebinkarahisar there is a village called Yedikardeş (Seven Brothers). Its old name is Darabel (or Durabel, Derabul), and this name seems to be fairly widely known since everybody in Görkem's office knew

both the old and new name. However, nobody was able to offer any clue as to what this old name means. The new name, on the other hand, does have meaning as it is said that the town's seven neighborhoods were founded by seven brothers. This story was passed on to me by the retired teacher as well as a young taxi driver. I was not able to establish when this name first started being used or how it came to be chosen. One person offered that a local council had nominated the name and that the central government had accepted the nomination, but I have been unable to find any other sources regarding the name of Yedikardeş. The only concrete fact is that the name was officially changed before 1968 as it is listed in *Köylerimiz.* It is of course possible that the name was chosen at random by the government, and that the story of the seven brothers developed as a way to explain the new name. This scenario, however, seems unlikely. Another possibility is that the name was chosen before 1959, when there was still some room for local input regarding place name change. However the name was chosen, this example shows that the new names are not always without meaning. And although old name of Darabel has not been forgotten, it does not possess an easily accessible meaning as does Yedikardeş. Unfortunately, my time in Şebinkarahisar was limited and I was not able to go to this village, a visit which may have offered more insight into this particular example of government imposed place names. But the case of Yedikardeş, as with Çağlayan, highlights the caution required when discussing the value of old and new place names.

As with people living in Duroğlu, the ways in which the inhabitants of Doğankent and Şebinkarahisar have responded to name change cannot be categorized neatly. The majority of the old names have definitley not been forgotten as they are used often by residents, especially by those that are older but also even by younger inhabitants. At the same time, the new names have not been rejected. People may introduce themselves as being either from Harşıt or from Doğankent, and sometimes these self-identifications may change based on the region. At least some names, however, while not being completely forgotten, have fallen out of usage. The names Manastırbükü and Köselerakçakilise are not used anymore in everyday speech, not even by older residents that, in the case of Manastırbükü, were alive when the name was first officially changed. Although İbrahim Kuran claims in his concluding paragraph that "the renaming policy did not penetrate into

the everyday lives of the local people," this is clearly not the case in Giresun.[220] On the other hand, contrary to Öktem's claim that renaming in Turkey has "successfully submerged what İnalcık called the 'archaeology' of the *longue durée*," many of the old names are still being used.[221] Their meanings may have been forgotten, but this is not necessarily a result of place name change since, as was discussed in the first chapter, the original meanings of names are often lost through the years, resulting in a toponym that, although it may have great value for those that use it in everyday life, is detached from its original meaning.

[220] İbrahim Kuran, "The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey," p. 152

[221] Kerem Öktem, ''The Nation's Imprint,'' par. 65.

CONCLUSION

Rather than focusing narrowly on the Turkification aspect of toponymical change in Turkey, in this thesis I have examined other factors involved. Although the net result of place name changes is a toponymic order that is overwhelmingly Turkish, referring to the changes as a single "project" of "policy" that was driven solely by an ideology of Turkification overshadows the reality of how and why place name changes were conceived and implemented. Previous research into the issue, by not taking into account theories surrounding place names and the types of meanings that may be attached to them under different circumstances, has resorted to sometimes faulty assumptions regarding how people react to name change. Generalizations regarding the "destruction" of the old toponymic order or the outright rejection of the new names do not accurately portray how people in Turkey have responded. The responses are invariably related to the meaning of a place's name, which can often only be accessed through multiple layers that may vary from person to person. Many different factors, such as migration or conflict, can play important roles in the construction of these meanings. Place names can thus have a range of positive or negative connotations which affect how people respond to attempts to change them. Furthermore, the original meaning of a name may be completely lost or changed over time, rendering it unimportant to residents in their everyday lives. This is not to detract from the value of a name, but simply meant to point out the problems involved in reading too much into a name's original meaning.

There is also a sense of nostalgia for the supposed authenticity of the old names and what they represent. While the majority of place names that were changed undoubtedly had, and continue to have, value for residents, to refer to them as reflections of multiculturalism is to ignore that bestowing a name on a place is often about power and as such different groups have long sought to leave their mark on the toponymical order of

places. The period stretching from the late 1950s until 1968 marks the most systematic of these efforts in Turkey. However, this does not render all the old names inherently better, nor does it mean that the Turkish state's attempts to change names have been especially "vehement" as many other states have been involved in similar efforts. The fact that the old names lingered on in official communications long after they were replaced also calls into question the intensive and systematic nature of the "policy."

For the government officials involved, altering the toponymy of a particular territory is a way through which some desired affect is achieved. It is a technique of governmentality that may seek to address what the state views as a problem. In the case of Turkey and many other countries, that problem has often been the "foreignness" of toponymes. This foreignness can either be linked to linguistic reasons in which the offending toponym is of a different language than that used by the state, or it may be connected to other ideological reasons whereby the meaning of the word is considered inappropriate or in some way contrary to "national interests." In this respect, place name change has indeed been about Turkification. However, these are not the only "problems" governments have tried to solve through toponymical change. Standardization, in line with UN guidelines set in 1967, has often been among the goals of the various Turkish administrations involved in place name change, but it has been largely ignored in favor of the Turkification paradigm. Indeed, perhaps it is not a coincidence that the first major publication listing the old and new names was released just one year after the United Nations conference on place names. Ridding the country of embarrassing toponyms has also been one of the elements of name change in Turkey, just as it has in other countries such as the United States.

In Giresun, the majority of old names have not been forgotten and are often still used in daily speech, especially by older residents but also by younger ones. But the reality of place name change in this province appears to be one in which the new names have not been rejected. On the contrary, they have often penetrated into the "everydayness" of people. Just as civil servants often included the old names along with the new names in official documents, local newspapers also did not have a specific policy on the use of old and new names. While most residents cannot be said to have eagerly accepted the new

names, some residents of at least one village find its new name more appealing. A fluid, negotiated response to name change is what I observed during my time in Giresun, with residents sometimes using both old and new name in the same sentence. Some toponyms, however, do appear to have been forgotten or will be forgotten in a generation or two. Old names like Manastırbükü, Ermeni Mahallesi, and Köselerakçakilise are no longer in use. These place names have indeed been erased, but it is not only the will of the government that has led to the erasure, but a willingness to forget on the part of the residents, one of the responses to trauma that can often affect how people construct senses of place and, as a result, how they attach meaning to place names. In such cases, the power of the government to change names can be viewed as associational because the new names that were chosen appear to have been appropriated by residents. Despite these and other instances in which names have largely been forgotten, erasure or destruction are not terms that can be used to accurately describe the net result of place name changes. Although a glance at an official map points to a certain amount of success on the part of the government, the names on the map often do not match the names that are being used. In instances where the state has employed overt instrumental power to impose new names, many Giresun residents, although they may have accepted the new names to a certain extent, have not appropriated them and continue to use the old names in their everyday lives.

TABLE 1: PLACE NAME CHANGES LISTED IN THE 1968 *KÖYLERİMİZ* (OUR VILLAGES) PUBLISHED BY THE INTERIOR MINISTRY[222]

Previous Names	**Government Imposed Names**	**Giresun Subprovince**
A		
Akyoma	Akçalı	Merkez (Giresun Proper)
Alağıdere	Gürağaç	Güce
Alevre (Alivera)	Beylerce	Alucra
Alınyomabâlâ	Yukarı Alınlı	Merkez
Alınyomacami	Camili	Merkez
Allu	Günügüzel	Alucra
Anna (Arına)	Yeniyol	Şebinkarahisar
Aşağı Zapa (Aşağı Zağpa)	Sarpkaya	Çamoluk
Avluca Akkaya	Akkaya	Espiye
Avlucaericek	Ericek	Espiye
Avlucayeniköy	Yeniköy	Espiye
B		
Bada	Özlü	Tirebolu
Balcana (Balcan)	Altınçevre	Şebinkarahisar
Beşir	Beşirli	Görele
Biğe	Suboyu	Şebinkarahisar
Biladis	Dönençay	Şebinkarahisar
Boğalıbâlâ (Boğalı Bâlâ)	Yukarı Boğalı	Tirebolu
Boğalızır (Boğalı Zir)	Boğalı	Görele
Boynuyoğunbâlâ	Yukarı Boynuyoğun	Tirebolu
Boynuyoğunzir (Boynuyoğun Zir)	Aşağı Boynuyoğun	Tirebolu
C		
Cengeriş (Gengeriş)	Kılıçtutan	Çamoluk
Cimide	Karlıbel[223]	Görele

[222] The first listed name is the name that appears in *Köylerimiz*. In some cases, I have included in parantheses alternate spellings of the name as found in other sources or as told to me by residents.

Cindebol (Gindebol, Gindebul)	Bereketli	Alucra
Cingiren (Cingiran)	Yolbaşı[224]	Keşap
Cücköy (Cüç, Güç)	Tekkaya	Şebinkarahisar
Ç		
Çakmanus	Yeşilyurt	Alucra
Çatakaralıkuz (Çatak Aralıkoz)	Çatak	Görele
Çatakkırıklı (Çatak Kırıklı)	Çatakkırı	Görele
Çivriz (before this, the village was known as Hatipli)[225]	Yıldız	Dereli
Çivrişun (Civrişon)	Kavaklıdere	Alucra
Çürükeynesil	Sağlık[226]	Görele
D		
Dandiköy (Dandı)	Süttaşı	Doğankent
Darabul (Tarabul)	Yedikardeş[227]	Şebinkarahisar
Davaha (Davaxa)	Akçiçek	Alucra
Dereli	Akkaya (1954) [228]	Dereli

[223] Bilir, *Geçmişten Günümüze Tüm Yönleriyle Görele*, (Simurg Yayınları: İstanbul, 2001), 240.

[224] This appears to be a mistake. According to locals, the village of Cingiren was made up different neighborhoods which took different names after Cingiren was separated into two villages. It seems that Cingiren proper became Yolağzı, whereas Buna, the other neighborhood, became Yolbaşı.

[225] According to one source, the name Yıldız was chosen by the residents in 1957. However, the author makes this claim about most of the villages in Dereli, so it seems caution is required on this issue. Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 29.

[226] Ali Bilir, *Geçmişten Günümüze Tüm Yönleriyle Görele*, 222. Bilir quotes Sağlık's mayor, Hüseyin Yayla, on the subject of the new name: "Our village's old name was Çürük Eynesil. The name Sağlık was given as a response to this." *Çürük* in Turkish means corrupt or rotten.

[227] According to a retired teacher whom I met in Şebinkarahisar, the name Yedikardeş comes from the seven brothers who supposedly founded the seven neighborhoods of the village.

[228] Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, (Ankara: Sanem Matbaası, 1991), 26

E		
Egeköy (Ege)	Taşdikmen (Current: Ege)	Görele
Eğircen	Yünlüce	Keşap
Emeksen	Güllüce (Göllüce, 1967)	Yağlıdere
Emeksan	Yazlık	Keşap
Engüz (Engüzlü)	Dokuztepe	Keşap
Eşküne (Eşgüne)	Demirözü	Alucra
Ezet	Akıncı	Merkez
F		
Fasya	Kabaktepe	Alucra
Feregüz (Feroz)	Güzyurdu	Dereli
Feruz (Feriz, Firuzlu)	Alataş	Keşap
Feykaş (Feykas)	Gürbulak	Alucra
Fol	Yuvacık	Çamoluk
G		
Galköy (Gal)	Pelitli	Çamoluk
Gedehor (Godehor, Kedexor)	Şaplıca	Şebinkarahisar
Gegraz (Geğrez, Geğraz, Geyraz)[229]	Bahçeli	Dereli
Gelvariz (Gelvaris)	İnegölü (Current: Hacıhasan)	Alucra
Gengene[230]	Alancık	Dereli
Gicora	Doludere	Alucra
Gölve	Ocaktaşı	Şebinkarahisar
Gönyan	Akdarı	Yağlıdere
Gönyanyazlık	Yazlık	Yağlıdere
Görene	Aydınyayla	Alucra
Görene	Yakınca	Şebinkarahisar
Göreze (Goretse Maden)	Konak	Şebinkarahisar
Gücese	Pınarlar	Dereli
Gürcülü	Esenli	Görele

[229] According to one source, the name Bahçeli was chosen by the residents of the village in a referendum in 1961. Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 27.

[230] Also according to Tatar, the name Alancık was chosen by the residents of the village in a referendum in 1961. Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 27.

H		
Hahavla (Hanavala, Xaxavla)	Sarıyer	Şebinkarahisar
Henegi (Haneği, Xanege)	Sultankonağı	Şebinkarahisar
Hanzar	Topçam	Alucra
Hapu	Yükselen	Alucra
Harami	Altınpınar	Keşap
Harava	Tuğlacık	Yağlıdere
Hasankef (Hasankafir)	Karakoç	Keşap
Havarna	Elmacık	Alucra
Heri	Kekiktepe	Eynesil
I		
Isola (İsola, Esola)	Güneygören	Şebinkarahisar
İ		
İlimsu	Suyurdu	Alucra
İmatlı (Matlı)	İnanca	Görele
İregür (Üreğir[231])	Karademir	Tirebolu
İsrail (İsiril)	Çağlayan	Şebinkarahisar
İsrail	Kovanpınar	Tirebolu
İstireği (İstirefli)	Gürpınar (Gülpınar, 1967)	Şebinkarahisar
J (none)		
K		
Kaleibedrema (Kale Bedrema)	Örenkaya (Örnekkaya, 1967)	Tirebolu
Kanyaş	Güvenlik	Doğankent
Karaburunkuşçulu	Kuşçulu	Görele
Karagevezit (Karagevezid)	Toplukonak	Şebinkarahisar
Karaşenşe (Kara Şehinşe)	Ekecek	Şebinkarahisar
Kelete	Deregözü	Çanakçı
Keşimbur	Konaklı	Alucra
Keylik (Keylaka)	Evcili	Şebinkarahisar
Kezanç	Kayalı	Şebinkarahisar
Kızıllarakçakilise	Alaca (Current: Ortaköy)	Yağlıdere

[231] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun Kırsalın İdari ve Sosyal Tarihi*, (Giresun: Giresun Belediyesi Yayınları, 2005), 220.

Kilyarı	Işıklı	Tirebolu
Koculu	Yarımca	Eynesil
Köselerakçakilise[232]	Arslancık	Tirebolu
Kuleköy	Erentepe	Eynesil
Kulpar (Gülyarı)[233]	Giyimli	Güce
Kuvancak	Kovancık	Tirebolu
Kuzan	Söğütağzı	Doğankent
L (none)		
M		
Mağdala (Mağdele)	Hisarkaya	Bulancak
Mamenli	Çorapçılar	Eynesil
Manastır (Manastır-ı İslam)	Çalkaya	Espiye
Manastır	Gökçetaş	Şebinkarahisar
Manastırbükü	Doğankent	Doğankent
Manuzara	Karadikmen	Çamoluk
Meğri	Başyurt (Current: Çamlıyayla)	Alucra
Melence (Melense)	Konuklu (Konaklı, 1967)	Dereli
Mencilis	Çamlıca	Keşap
Mencoba (Mançaba)	Dereköy	Eynesil
Mezmek*	İğdecik	Alucra
Misnilon (Mismolon)*	Gökçebel	Alucra
Muhara (Muxara)	Örencik	Şebinkarahisar
Mutaa (Mutafa)	Usluca	Çamoluk
Münük	Kaynar	Çamoluk
N		
Nefsiaralıkuz	Aralıkoz	Görele
Nefsiishaklı	İshaklı	Eynesil
Nefsikaraburun	Karaburun	Görele
Nefsikırıklı	Kırıklı	Görele

[232] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun*, 230. According to Fatsa, Akçakilise was part of the village of Köseler. This explains why in other sources the name of the village is written as Akçakilise or Köseler.

[233] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun*, 293.

O		
Okçaviran	Okçaören	Çamoluk
Ortacamiîbâlâ	Yukarı Ortacami	Tirebolu
Ortaçamlıbelen (Ortacamibelen, Karakaya[234])	Belen	Tirebolu
Ortacamizir (Ortacamii Zir)	Ortacami	Tirebolu
Ortazapa (Orta Zağpa)	Bayır	Çamoluk
Ö		
Öregel (Üregil)	Diler	Şebinkarahisar
P		
Pağnik	Pınarlı	Çamoluk
Panlu	Akyapı	Çamoluk
Parak	Babapınar	Alucra
Pardu (Pardo)	Daldibi	Çamoluk
Paya	Konacık (Currently Duroğlu Beldesi)	Merkez
Q, R (none)		
S		
Sadağlı	Sadaklı	Doğankent
Sadegöre	Bakımlı	Çanakçı
Sakarya	Arıdurak	Espiye
Sasu	Erdoğan	Bulancak
Semail (Samail, Samayil)	Yüce	Dereli
Ş		
Şadıköy (Şadi)	Çatalağaç	Doğankent
Şıhlar	Yavuzkemal	Dereli
Şıhmusa	Şeyhmusa	Bulancak

[234] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 294.

T		
Talipköy	Günece	Yağlıdere
Tepeyoma	Tepecik (Talipli, 1967)	Bulancak
Teştik	Çamoluk	Çamoluk
Titrik[235] (Titirbey, Titirik)	Taşlıca	Dereli
Tönük	Baltaşı	Şebinkarahisar
Törnük	Günyüzü	Kürtün, Gümüşhane (was part of Doğankent until 1991).
U (none)		
Ü		
Üsküne (İskona)	Uğurca	Şebinkarahisar
V		
Vakfikızıllar (Kızıllar)	Koçlu	Yağlıdere
Valıt (Valit, Valid)	Karadere	Keşap
Valıtçakırlı (Valit Çakırlı, Valid Çakırlısı)	Çakırlı (Separated from Valıt in 1930[236])	Keşap
W, X (none)		
Y		
Yanus (Yanos)	Subaşı	Alucra
Yomrahisar (also Meryemana)[237]	Hisar	Dereli
Yukarı Köseli	Belen	Eynesil
Yukarı Zapa (Yukarı Zağpa)	Gürçalı	Çamoluk
Z		
Zarabut	Taşçılar	Çamoluk

[235] Changed in 1957. Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 31.

[236] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 149. According to Fatsa, the villages of Töngel and Yünlüce were also once originally part of Valıt-Çakırlı.

[237] Tatar claims that the name Hisar was chosen by the village residents in 1957. Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 28.

Zefre (Zevre)	Gülburnu	Espiye
Zendin	Dokuzkonak	Tirebolu
Zıhar	Çakmak (Current: Fevziçakmak)	Alucra
Ziberi	Akbudak	Şebinkarahisar
Zilköy	Aktepe	Alucra
Zodama (Zodoma, Zodanma)	Çakılkaya	Çamoluk
Zunköy	Boyluca	Alucra

TABLE 2: PLACE NAMES CHANGED BEFORE 1968
BUT NOT INCLUDED IN *KÖYLERİMİZ*[238]

Previous Names	**Government Imposed or New Names**	**Giresun Subprovince**
Ahiçukuru	Tekke	Yağlıdere
Ahurcuk	Ahırcık	Şebinkarahisar
Alakilise	Köklüce	Alucra
Armenoxori (Ermeniköyü)	Erköy	Keşap
Aşağı Vanazıt (Venazid)	Fındıklı	Keşap
Averak	Hacıahmetoğlu (pre 1928)	Çamoluk
Ayvansil	Küçüklü	Bulancak
Bendehor (Bendexor, Bendehur)	Aydere, Eren, Kaleyanı, and Yenimahalle[239]	Piraziz
Bildor	Çamlıbel	Şebinkarahisar
Buna	Yolbaşı	Keşap
Camiyanı	Yağlıdere (subprovince)	Yağlıdere
Darı	Kemaliye	Merkez
Danişmend	Danışman	Tirebolu
Devge	Ünlüce (1965) [240]	Görele
Domaçlı	Doğancı	Tirebolu
Dona (Tona)	Yeşilyurt	Şebinkarahisar
Ekservende (Ekserandu)[241]	Soğuksu Mahallesi	Bulancak
Ermeni	Şeyhmusa (pre 1928), Ataköy (2000)	Bulancak
Ezedin	Çağlayan (Now part of Duroğlu)	Merkez
Etir	Ovacık	Şebinkarahisar
Firenk[242]	Sütlüce	Dereli
Gebekilise	Çağlayan	Yağlıdere
Gedükalibeğlu[243]	Alibey Köyü	Bulancak

[238] Although most of these names are government imposed, some of the changes here occurred more independently of the central government, sometimes through a decision of the village/town's residents or through other means.

[239] According to a resident of Piraziz who was born in Bendehor, the town was split into four separate *mahalle*s: Ayıkaşı (currently Aydere), Eren, Yenimahalle, and Kaleyanı.

[240] Ali Bilir, *Geçmişten Günümüze Tüm Yönleriyle Görele*, (Simurg Yayınları: İstanbul, 2001), 236. According to Bilir, Devge became Ünlüce by a municipal decision.

[241] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 490.

[242] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 116.

Gelcese	Yeşilkaya	Şebinkarahisar
Göceli	Kemaliye	Eynesil
Gülef	Yediveren (Currently Çavuşlu)	Görele
Hacılı	Koyunhamza	Görele
Hacıvıran	Hacıören	Çamoluk
Hatipli[244]	Yeşilkaya (1945)	Dereli
Hınzari (Xınzari)	Kayacık	Çamoluk
Hüsep	Yusufeli (pre 1928)	Çamoluk
İhsaniye	Ezeltere	Bulancak
Karaisa[245]	Tepeköy	Yağlıdere
Karakoç (Emene)[246]	Yaslıbahçe	Bulancak
Kökeç	Kemaliye	Tirebolu
Kulakkaya	Yavuzkemal (1930)[247]	Dereli
Kuşalan (Kuşdoğan[248])	Kuşluhan	Bulancak
Kutlulu	Madenköy[249]	Piraziz
Meydancık[250]	Alınca	Merkez
Nefsiakköy	Akköy	Bulancak
Ordut (Ardut)	Doğanyuva	Şebinkarahisar
Pelitcik[251] (Kozbuku[252])	Üçtepe	Yağlıdere
Rumtepe	Alidede	Piraziz
Saraca	Güney	Piraziz
Saymuhal	Dereçiftlik	Merkez

[243] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 498.

[244] Hatipli is actually the name of a village which was renamed Çivriz. The villages known officially today as Yeşilkaya and Yıldız were then formed from neighborhoods of this village.

[245] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun*, 249.

[246] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun*, 360. "Karakoca nâm-ı diğer Emene."

[247] Nurettin Tatar, *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*, 31.

[248] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 136.

[249] Madenköy was then divided in the 1990s, becoming the villages of Yunusemre and Esentepe. See Sevan Nişanyan, Index Anatolicus, http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?y=maden+k%C3%B6y&t=giresun&lv=1&u=1&ua=0. Accessed May 16, 2013.

[250] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun*, 372.

[251] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 136.

[252] Sevan Nişanyan, Index Anatolicus, http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?y=%C3%BC%C3%A7tepe&t=giresun&lv=1&srt=x&u=1&ua=0. Accessed May 16, 2013.

Toğdulu[253]	Yuva	Dereli
Tülhamit[254]	Mesudiye	Merkez
Ülper	Ürper	Merkez
Vanazıt (Venazid)	Fındıklı (after separating from the village of Yoliçi)	Keşap
Vartana	Köroğlu	Çamoluk

[253] Mehmet Fatsa, *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun,* 428-429. "Yuva nâm-ı diğer Toğdulu."

[254] The only reference I have been able to find of this village's old name is in the 1973 Giresun Province Almanac (p. 48). The spelling Tülhamit seems odd and is perhaps a typographical error, but I have been unable to find any other information on Mesudiye's previous name. The 1967 Almanac, for example, gives no old name for Mesudiye.

TABLE 3: CHANGES MADE AFTER 1968

Previous Names	**Government Imposed Names**	**Giresun Subprovince**
Aşağı Sığırlık	Gülpınar	Görele
Bayramşah	Kirazlı	Keşap
Çandırçalış	Çağlayan	Merkez
Civil	Esenyurt	Görele
Civil	Yalıköy	Tirebolu
Gedikli (Melikli)	Çaldağ (municipality, 1993)	Merkez
Iklıkçı	Güzelköy	Dereli
İnköy	İstiklal	Tirebolu
Kabaköy	Gürköy	Merkez
Kadehor	Ortamahalle (Current: Gültepe)	Görele
Karaköy	Gündoğdu	Şebinkarahisar
Kargaköy	Oyraca	Doğankent
Keçiköy	Güzelyurt	Espiye
Kızılcainek	Sarayköy	Çanakçı
Kızılcainek	Yeşilyurt Mahallesi (part of Akköy)	Dereli
Kızılev	Aydındere (1987)	Bulancak
Kozköy	Dikmen (Current: Soğukpınar)	Espiye
Köpekli	Şahinler	Şebinkarahisar
Kuşkaya	Geçitköy (pre 1973)	Keşap
Kuzcaköy	Çanakçı (pre 1973)	Çanakçı
Sayca	Dereboyu	Görele
Yukarı Sığırlık	Soğukpınar	Görele
Yumrucaktaş	Yumurcaktaş	Şebinkarahisar

TABLE 4: NATURAL PLACE NAMES, 1977[255]

Previous Names	**Government Imposed Names**	**Giresun Subprovince**
Ayvasil Burnu	Ayvalı Burnu	Bulancak
Gelevar Deresi (Gelevera Deresi)	Özlüce Deresi	Espiye
Harşit Deresi	Doğankent Çayı	Doğankent
Kilise Burnu	Kılıç Burnu	Tirebolu
Kisdek Dağı	Yastık Dağı	Çanakçı

[255] *Yeni Tabiî Yer Adları*, İçişleri Bakanlığı

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aksu, İbrahim. "The Sultan's Journey and other Turkish Placename Stories." *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 51, no.3-4 (2003): 163-192.

Aktar, Ayhan. "'Turkification' Policies in the Early Republican Era." In *Turkish Literature and Cultural Memory: "Multiculturalism"as a Literary Theme after 1980*, edited by Catharina Dufft, 29-62.Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009.

Alagöz, Cemal Arif. "Türkiye Yer Adları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler." In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 11-23. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984.

Allen, Diana K. "The Politics of Witness: Remembering and Forgetting 1948 in Shatila Camp." In *Palestine, 1948, and the claims of memory*, edited by Lila Abu Lughod and Ahmad Sa'di, 253-282. New York: Columia University Press, 2007.

Allen, John. *Lost Geographies of Power*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Aydın, Suavi. "The Use and Abuse of Archaeology and Anthropology in Formulating the Turkish Nationalist Narrative," In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızılyürek, and Umut Özkırımlı, 36-46.New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Azaryahu, Maoz. "The Purge of Bismarck and Saladin: The Renaming of Streets in East Berlin and Haifa, a Comparative Study in Culture-Planning." *Poetics Today* 13, no. 2 (1992): 351-367

Azaryahu, Maoz. "Street Names and Political Identity: The Case of East Berlin." *Journal of Contemporary History* 21, no. 4 (1986): 581-604.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

David, Jaroslav. "Commemorative Place Names – Their Specificity and Problems." *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 59, no. 4 (2011): 214-228.

Dean, Mitchell. "Foucault, government, and the enfolding of authority." In *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, 209-229. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Dean, Mitchell. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage Publications, 1999.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well-protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909.* London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998.

Dorion, Henri. "Should All Unofficial Placenames Be Eliminated?" *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 48, no 3-4, (2000): 249-255.

Dündar, Fuat. *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskan Politikası (1913-1918).* İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.

Dündar, Fuat. *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi: İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği (1913- 1918).* İstanbul: İletişim, 2008.

Eröz, Mehmet. "Sosyolojik Yönden Türk Yer Adları." In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 43-53. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984.

Fatsa, Mehmet. *XV. Ve XVI. Yüzyılda Giresun Kırsalın İdari ve Sosyal Tarihi*. Giresun: Giresun Belediyesi Yayınları, 2005.

Feld, Steven. "Waterfalls of Song: An Acoustemology of Place Resounding in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea." In *Senses of Place*, edited by Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso. 91-135. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996.

Frake, Charles O. "Pleasant Places, Past Times, and Sheltered Identity in Rural East Anglia," in *Senses of Place*, edited by. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso, 229-257. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996.

Gasque, Thomas J. "Structure and Controversy: What Names Authorities Adjudicate," *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 48, no. 3-4 (2000): 199-206.

Gökçe, Kemal. Açılıs Konuşması. In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 7-8. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984..

Gökçeer, Fikri. Açılış Konuşması. In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 1-5. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *The Young Turks in Opposition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Harrak, Amir. "The Ancient Name of Edessa." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51, no. 3 (1992): 209-214.

Heper, Metin. “Bürokrasi.” In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* 2. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1984.

Herman, RDK. “The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-Conquest of Hawai’i.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 18, no. 1 (1999): 76-102.

Inda, Jonathan Xavier “Analytics of the Modern: An Introduction.” In *Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics*, edited by Jonathan Xavier Inda, 1-20. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Işıtman, İ. Refet. “Köy Adları Üzerine Bir İnceleme,” in *Türk Dili Belleten* 3, no. 1-3, (1945): 52-61.

Jongerden, Joost. “Crafting Space, Making People: The Spatial Design of Nation in Modern Turkey.” *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 10, (2009): 2-20. http://ejts.revues.org/4014.

Karaboran, H. Hilmi. “Türkiye’de Mevkii Adları.” In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 97-145. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984.

Kayalı, Hasan. *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Keyder, Çağlar. “Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s.” In *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, edited by Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, 37-51. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997.

Khalid, Adeeb. “Pan-Islamism in practice: The rhetoric of Muslim unity and its uses.” In *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy*, edited by Elisabeth Özdalga, 201-224. London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005.

Koraltürk, Murat. “Milliyetçi Bir Refleks: Yer Adlarının Türkleştirilmesi.” *Toplumsal Tarihi*, 117 (2003): 98-99.

Kuran, İbrahim. “The Practice of Renaming Places in Turkey: An Anthropological Perspective on Spatio-Temporal Politics.” MA Thesis. Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History, Boğaziçi University, 2010.

Kurt, Ümit. *‘Türk’ün Büyük, Biçare Irkı:’ Türk Yurdu’nda Milliyetçiliğin Esasları, 1911-1916*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012.

Ladbury, Sarah and Russell King. “Settlement Renaming in Turkish Cyprus.” *Geography* 73, no. 4 (1988): 363-367.

Mahon, Milena. "The Turkish minority under Communist Bulgaria – politics of ethnicity and power." *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 1, no. 2, (1999): 149-162.

Miller, Peter and Nikolas Rose. "Governing Economic Life." *Economy and Society* 19, no. 1 (1990): 1-31.

Monmonier, Mark. *From Squaw Tit to Whorehouse Meadow: How Maps Name, Claim, and Inflame*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Nash, Catherine. "Irish Placenames: Post-Colonial Locations." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* 24, no. 4 (1999): 457-480.

Nihal, H and A. Naci. "Anadolu'da Türklere Aid Yer İsimleri." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 2 (1926): 243-259.

Nişanyan, Sevan. *Adını Unutan Ülke: Türkiye'de Adı Değiştirilen Yerler Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2010.

Nişanyan, Sevan. *Hayali Coğrafyalar: Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye'de Değiştirilen Yeradları*. İstanbul: Tesev Yayınları, 2011.

Nişanyan, Sevan. "Index Anatolicus: Türkiye Yerleşim Birimleri Envanteri." http://www.nisanyanmap.com/?

Öktem, Kerem. "Creating the Turk's Homeland." Paper presented for the Socrates Kokkalis Graduate Workshop 2003 The City: Urban Culture, Architecture and Society, 2003. http://arsiv.setav.org/ups/dosya/13204.pdf.

Öktem, Kerem. "The Nation's Imprint: Demographic Engineering and the Change of Toponymes in Republican Turkey." *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 7, (2008). http://ejts.revues.org/2243.

Önder, Mehmet. *Efsane ve hikâyeleriyle Anadolu şehir adları.* Istanbul: Defne Yayınları, 1969.

Orcan, Salih. "Çoğrafi Adların Standardizasyonu Yönünden Toponominin Milli ve Milletlerarası Önemi." In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 55-62. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984.

Özdoğan, Günay Goksu. "Turkish Nationalism Reconsidered: The 'Heaviness' of Statist Patriotism in Nation-Building." In *Nationalism in the Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, edited by Ayhan Aktar, Niyazi Kızılyürek and Umut Özkırımlı, 47-60. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Özkırımlı, Umut and Spryos A. Sofos. *Tormented By History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Parlak, İsmet. *Kemalist İdeolojide Eğitim*. Ankara:Turhan Kitabevi, 2005.

Prendergast, Kathy and Catherine Nash. "Mapping emotions again." In *Landing: eight collaborative projects between artists and geographers*, edited by Felix Driver, Catherine Nash, Kathy Prendergast, and Ingrid Swenson. Egham: Royal Holloway, University of London, 2002.

Rose, Gillian. "Place and identity: a sense of place," in *A Place in the World?: Places, Cultures, and Globalization*, edited by. Doreen Massey and Pat Jess, 88-132. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Rose, Nikolas. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Sakaja, Laura and Jelena Stanic. "Other(ing), self(portraying), negotiating: the spatial codification of values in Zagreb's city-text." *Cultural Geographies* 18 (2011): 495-516.

Saparov, Arseny. "The Alteration of Place Names and Construction of National Identity in Soviet Armenia," in *Cahiers du Monde russe* 44, no. 1 (2003): 179-198.

Shahakyan, Lusine. *Turkification of the Toponyms of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey*. Montreal: Arod Books, 2010.

Seyfettin, Ömer. "Hürriyet Bayrakları." In *Ömer Seyfettin: Bütün Eserleri: Hikayeleri 1*, edited by Hülya Argunşah, 229-237. Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1999.

Tan, Nail. "Türkiye'de Yer Adları Verilirken ve Değiştirilirken Neler Esas Alınmalıdır?" In *Türk Yer Adları Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, 279-283. Ankara: Başbakanlık, 1984.

Tatar, Nurettin. *Bütün Yonleriyle Dereli*. Ankara: Utku Yayıncılık, 1991.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. "Language and the Making of Place: A Narrative Descriptive Approach." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 81, no. 4 (1991): 684-696.

Tunçel, Harun. "Türkiye'de İsmi Değiştirilen Köyler." *Fırat University Journal of Social Science* 10, no. 2 (2000): 23-24.

Ulgen, Fatma. "Reading Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on the Armenian genocide of 1915," *Patterns of Prejudice* 44, no. 4 (2010): 369-391.

Üngör, Uğur Ümit. *The Making of Modern Turkey : Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Wittek, Paul. "Von der Byzantinischen zur Türkischen Toponymie." *Byzantion* 10, (1935): 11-64.

Yüksel, Ayhan. *Giresun Tarih Yazıları*. Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2002.

Zürcher, Erik-Jan. "Greek and Turkish Refugees and Deportees 1912-1924," *Turkology Update*, Leiden Project, Working Papers Archive, Dept. of Turkish Studies, Universiteit Leiden, Jan. 2003: 1-7. http://www.transanatolie.com/english/turkey/turks/ottomans/ejz18.pdf

Zürcher, Erik J. *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation-Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*. New York: I.B. Tauris, 2010.

ARCHIVAL AND OTHER OFFICIAL SOURCES

Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivleri, BCA. Ankara

Bakanlar Kurulu Kararları Kataloğu

30..18.1.2./147.53..19. Oct. 19, 1957.
30..18.1.2/148.7..17. Feb. 7, 1958.
30..11.1.0/275.13..12. May 5, 1959.
30..18.1.2/168.6..6. Jan. 28, 1963.
30..18.1.2/190.70..17. Dec. 4, 1965.
30..11.1.0/393.40..19. Aug. 7, 1973.

Başbakanlık Mevzuatı Geliştirme ve Yayın Genel Müdürlüğü

T.C. Resmi Gazete. Accessed from: www.resmigazete.gov.tr

Resmi Gazete, Jul. 3, 1956.
Resmi Gazete. Jul. 10, 1964;
Resmi Gazete. Aug. 15, 1964.
Resmi Gazete. Aug. 22, 1964.
Resmi Gazete. Mar. 28, 1966.
Resmi Gazete. Apr. 22, 1970.
Resmi Gazete. Oct. 9, 1980.
Resmi Gazete. Feb. 21, 1983.
Resmi Gazete. Feb. 14, 1986.

Giresun İl Özel İdaresi

"İlin Genel Tanımı."
http://www.giresunilozelidare.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=256&Itemid=115.

Giresun Valiliği

Giresun İl Yıllığı. Ankara: Güzel İstanbul Matbaası, 1967.

Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Giresun İl Yıllığı. Ankara. 1973.

İçişleri Bakanlığı,

İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü.
http://www.icisleri.gov.tr/default.icisleri_2.aspx?id=680.

Köylerimiz (1 Mart 1968 Gününe Kadar), İçişleri Bakanlığı İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü Seri: II, Sayı: 3, Ankara, 1968.

Yeni Tabii Yer Adları 1977, Yeni, Eski ve İllere Göre Dizileri. İller İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları Seri: III, Sayı: 1, Ankara, 1977.