Locally Confined Territorial Stigmatization:
The Case of "Gypsy" Stigma
*

Özlem Akkaya - Egemen Yılgür
Yeditepe University - Beykoz University

Abstract

Wacquant (2008) argues that the city has become the scene of novel patterns of segregating and stigmatizing ethnic or class groups on a territorial basis in developed countries in the post-industrial era. Drawing on the insights he offers, this study examined the existence of a similar mechanism of urban territorial stigmatization in Turkey, yet as a "developing country." It compared the cases of territorial stigmatization in two urban quarters of İstanbul: Nişantaşı Teneke and Rumelikavağı Kayadere. A secondary analysis of the available data about these quarters collected by the authors during their recent field studies and also during some archive research, albeit to a more limited degree, revealed that the "Gypsy" stigma attached to them has largely determined their formation and trajectory in interaction with their socio-historical contingencies. It also showed that unlike the cases reported by Wacquant (2008) as regards to developed countries, these stigmatized urban districts in Turkey are not simply the outcome of the process of deindustrialization that accompanies neoliberalism but that their history goes back to the late 19th century. Accordingly, the authors introduced a more nuanced sub-term to handle the aforementioned socio-spatial phenomenon: locally confined territorial stigmatization.

Keywords: *Territorial stigmatization, marginalization, discrimination, "Gypsy" stigma, segregation*

Yerel Düzeyle Sınırlı Mekânsal Damgalama: "Çingene" Damgası Örneği
*

Özlem Akkaya - Egemen Yılgür
Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beykoz Üniversitesi

Öz

Wacquant'a göre (2008) post-endüstriyel dönemde gelişmiş ülkelerin kentlerinde, etnik ya da sınıfsal grupların mekânsal temelde ayrıştırılmaları ve damgalanmalarının yeni örüntüleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Onun öngörülerinden hareketle, bu çalışmada bu kez "gelişmekte olan bir ülke" olarak Türkiye'de kentsel mekânsal damgalama olgusu ile benzerlik gösteren bir mekanizmanın varlığı inceleme konusu yapılmıştır. Çalışma kapsamında İstanbul'un iki mahallesindeki mekânsal damgalama örnekleri karşılaştırılmıştır: Nişantaşı Teneke ve Rumelikavağı Kayadere. Yazarların yakın dönemlerde gerçekleştirdikleri saha çalışmalarında ve daha kısıtlı bir düzeyde olsa da bazı arşiv araştırmalarında mahalleler hakkında topladıkları verilerin ikincil analizi, bu mahallelerin "Çingenelik"le damgalanmasının, oluşumlarını ve yörüngelerini sosyo-tarihsel olumsallıklarıyla etkileşim içinde büyük ölçüde belirlemiş olduğunu açığa çıkarmıştır. Aynı zamanda çalışmada ortaya konulan bulgular, Wacquant'ın (2008) ele aldığı gelişmiş ülkelerdeki örneklerden farklı olarak, Türkiye'deki bu damgalanmış kentsel yerleşim alanlarının basitçe neoliberalizme eşlik eden sanayisizleşme sürecinin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkmadıklarını ve bu mahallelerin tarihinin geç 19. yüzyıla uzandığını göstermiştir. Sonuç olarak yazarlar, söz konusu sosyo-mekânsal fenomenin ele alınabileceği daha nüanslı bir alt-terim önermişlerdir: yerel düzeyle sınırlı mekânsal damgalama.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Mekânsal damgalama, marjinalleşme, ayrımcılık, "Çingene" damgası, ayrışma*

Introduction: territorial stigmatization in the post-industrial society

The concept of territorial stigmatization developed by Loïc Wacquant (2008) provides crucial analytical opportunities to scholars. The adoption of the mechanism indicated by this concept as an explanatory model for a specific form of urban poverty concentrated in socially marginalized areas reveals the diversity in the field and encourages theoretical attempts to improve the concept to a more nuanced level. In this paper, we discuss its suitability to handle two local neighborhoods carrying the "Gypsy" stigma, which emerged in the last quarter of the 19th century Ottoman capital and which demonstrate certain distinctions from the cases studied by Wacquant (2008) as regards to the post-industrial era.

Wacquant's (2008) widely-cited study *Urban Outcasts* is the outcome of a decade long theoretical and empirical inquiry on the causes, forms, and consequences of urban poverty in the United States and Western Europe in the post-Fordist/post-Keynesian era. Wacquant (2008) started this daring endeavor first by focusing on the instances of "polarization from below," (p. 259) as he names the rebellious protests that occasionally emanated from the stigmatized urban areas of developed countries like France, Britain, and the USA throughout the 1980s and 1990s. The mainstream media in the West mainly regarded these protests as the materialization of an ethnicity-based unrest. However, what first caught a suspicious eye as regards to them was that their participants were not as ethnically homogeneous as the mainstream media suggested. Although their participants expressed open objection to ethnic discrimination, and although it was purportedly ethnic discrimination that turned their disquiet into massive resentment in each particular case, something more than mere ethnic resentment did actually mobilize them, as their activities and slogans implied (Wacquant, 2008, p. 23).

Wacquant (2008) argues that these protests were, in fact, a reaction to the processes of mass unemployment, deproletarianization, and socio-spatial relegation characterizing the post-Fordist/post-Keynesian era, as well as a reaction to the stigma accompanying them, a stigma which is related not only to an ethnic but also to a territorial identity (pp. 24-25). According to him, the city of the post-industrial period in developed countries has been the scene of the materialization of a new regime of urban poverty in the form of socio-spatial relegation and exclusionary closure, both in practice and in perception. This phenomenon is mainly the outcome of the forces of

deindustrialization and of the withering away of the welfare state from the urban core, and it implies the reconfiguration of the urban space along novel lines of polarization that differ from those observed in the Keynesian period (Wacquant, 2008, pp. 2-3).

People living in stigmatized urban areas, those carrying the burden of "advanced marginality" as Wacquant (2008, p. 3) defines them, are exempted from access to many socio-economic and cultural opportunities on the basis of their group characteristics like race, ethnicity, language, place of origin, social background, and descent. They are deemed redundant by the post-Fordist reorganization of the economy and deprived of the benefits of the welfare state, accordingly (Wacquant, 2008, p. 169).

These socio-spatial formations, "situated at the very bottom of the material and symbolic hierarchy of places that make up the metropolis," as Wacquant (2013, p. 3) writes, take different names in each particular society in North America, Western Europe and South America. They are called "ghetto"[1] in the United States, "*banlieue*" in France, "*degi-adati*" in Italy, "*problemomrade*" in Sweden, "*favela*" in Brazil, and "*villamiseria*" in Argentina, to name but a few. However, they share a striking commonality: Not only from an outsider's but also from an insider's perspective, they are known to be "lawless zones," "problem estates," "no-go areas," and "wild districts." They are thought to be characterized by a sheer lack of a sense of security and order not only in actual but also in perceived terms (Wacquant, 2013, p. 1). Indeed, this general perception, communicated across various media, contributes powerfully to constructing their reality (Wacquant, 2008, p. 1) and reinforces the stigma the inhabitants of these neighborhoods are condemned to carry.

Furthermore, this territorial stigma has a "nationalized and democratized character" in that the names of such stigmatized lots are spread by the mass media, politicians, and scholars, so that the image of "no-go areas" becomes a part of ordinary citizens' daily discourse in addition to that of the political and cultural elite (Wacquant, Slater, and Pereria, 2014, p. 1273). Another related mechanism is the racialization of their inhabitants through the overemphasis of their selected features or the creation of a distorted

---

[1] Wacquant (2012) elaborated a conceptual model whereby he established the notion of ghetto as a clearly-delineated analytical instrument to limit its occasional uses in social sciences and to distinguish it from similar urban phenomena such as ethnic clusters.

image to signify their neighborhoods in which the "exotic" and the "darker" elements that constitute the local demography are made more salient. While the exaggeration of cultural differences implies an assumed divergence from the dominant societal norms, the class positioning of the inhabitants of these areas becomes almost invisible. The living conditions in these stigmatized districts incite negative feelings and reactions among their residents, which, in turn, provides a seemingly legitimate excuse for the aggrandizement of the penal apparatus of the state and its employment in most brutal ways (Wacquant, Slater, and Pereira, p. 1274).

As Wacquant (2008) demonstrates, the experiences of the inhabitants of stigmatized urban areas in France and the USA bear important similarities. In the former case, to live in the *banlieue* has been associated with confinement into a restricted space, much as in a "trap," not only by the mainstream media and by outsiders but also by its inhabitants themselves. Most particularly, since they come across distrust by employers as soon as they mention where they live, this territorial discrimination hampers their job seeking (Wacquant, 2008, p. 174), especially in the formal sector, and, in turn, contributes to the solidification of local unemployment in the *banlieue*. Thus, they are usually forced to reticence and try to hide their residence addresses in their interactions with the outside world (Wacquant, 2007, p. 68). Territorial stigmatization has an effect on their interactions not only with employers but also with representatives from the state apparatuses, like the police, the courts and the local bureaucracy, which almost immediately change their way of conduct and procedures against those coming from stigmatized districts (Wacquant, 2008, p. 174).

In a similar vein, people from the American ghetto are automatically presumed to be socially unworthy and morally inferior in the dominant culture. In turn, like those from the French *banlieue,* they are aware that living in a stigmatized part of the metropolis imposes a handicap on them in the labor market. Thus, in their everyday interactions with the outside, they deny belonging to the ghetto community and try to put a distance between themselves and the stigmatized area's derogatory images that abound within the mainstream (Wacquant, 2008, pp. 175-76).

Even so, Wacquant (2008) suggests that urban marginalization does not follow the same pattern in each developed society. It rather emerges as a peculiar outcome of the historical intersection of the forces of racial/ethnic domination, class inequality and state action and/or indifference in a country. That is why it is necessary to embed the specific forms that this urban

socio-spatial phenomenon takes in the historical matrix of class, state and space characterizing each society (Wacquant, 2008, p. 2).

In this regard, the structures and mechanisms of urban marginalization in the French and American cases show significant divergences despite the commonalities in the life-experiences and demographic profiles of their inhabitants (Wacquant, 2008). Among all other things, they differ in the nature of segregation, poverty, and isolation experienced. What is at stake is not merely a quantitative difference but more than that: The *banlieue* in France has not arisen from the same criteria of social classification as the American ghetto (Wacquant, 2008, pp. 145-50). According to Wacquant (2008), the most fundamental difference between the French *banlieue* and the black ghetto in the USA is actually related to the nature of the stigma they are associated with: While it is essentially residential in the former, it is in-separably spatial and racial in the latter (p. 181).

When they were first erected in the early 1960s, French *banlieues* were expected to accommodate the members of lower social classes, like repatri-ates from formerly French Algeria, displaced inhabitants of the suburban shanty-towns of the previous decade, and immigrant workers and their families. Initially, they were considered great projects welcoming people enthusiastically and giving them inspiration and hope for their future. In almost a decade, however, as middle class families abandoned *banlieues*, this optimistic view gradually began to be replaced by images of disintegration and fear, especially with the accompanying rise of unemployment among their inhabitants. By the end of the 20th century, this pressure of stigmatiza-tion had increased sharply as a result of the proliferation of discourses about the assumed importation of the American style ghetto to France with all the problems it was identified with. In fact, the *banlieue* was designated as the "cell of Arab poverty and disorder," in some way referring to the "ethniciza-tion" of the French urban space (Wacquant 2008, pp. 170-71).

Although the French *banlieue* has assumed the characteristics of an eth-nicity-based area of confinement in recent years, the form of stigmatization accompanying it more or less reflects its territorial nature, and it is typified by a fundamentally heterogeneous population whose isolation is somehow mitigated by the presence of public institutions caring for the needs of the urban poor (Wacquant, 2008, p. 5). On the other hand, in the US case, the communal black ghetto of the mid-20th century had been a compact and self-enclosed socio-spatial entity in which black people from all classes live as a community bound together by institutions specific to themselves and to

their place of settlement (Wacquant, 2008 p. 3). However, in the neoliberal period, with the withdrawal of the labor market and the welfare state from the urban core, accompanied by more brutal deployment of the repressive state apparatuses, the communal ghetto was replaced by a novel territorial and organizational configuration, the "hyperghetto," (Wacquant, 2008, pp. 3-5), characterized by double segregation depending on both race and class. Therefore, Wacquant (2008) concludes that compared to the French *banlieue*, not only is the American ghetto a more homogeneous environment in ethnical and demographic terms, but it is also characterized by weaker levels of state penetration and, correspondingly, by more extreme levels of physical and social insecurity (pp. 197-98).

These analytical and conceptual tools developed by Wacquant have inspired many scholars to handle the contemporary socio-spatial exclusion of Roma[2] and of other communities classified as "Gypsy," from a wider theoretical perspective.

Some of these directly use the conceptual tool set developed by Wacquant to examine the contemporary experiences of territorial stigmatization of Roma. To illustrate, Powell and Lever (2017) have adopted Wacquant's frames of "ghettoization" and of "advanced marginality" to analyze the deepening stigmatization of the Eastern European Roma in the post-communist period. They maintain that the "loss of the economic function" in the era caused similar transformations to those that occurred in the American ghetto as a result of the process of deindustrialization (Powell and Lever, p. 690-91).[3] In this regard, Vincze (2013) argues that the development of advanced marginality in the Roma context began in the 2000s. According to him, the deteriorating living standards in working class settlements as a result of the depression in the communist economy in the 1980s and the following restructuring of the housing sphere in the 1990s triggered this phenomenon (p. 220). Along those lines, Stejskalova (2013) checks the suitability of the concept of ghetto as coined by Wacquant to define the "socially

---

[2] The term "Roma" refers to the self-identification of a particular peripatetic or former-peripatetic ethnic group, including Romani speakers and their descendants who have lost their ancestral language in time (Matras, 2004a).

[3] Powell (2013) has preferably utilized the notion of ghetto rather than the more complex one of "advantaged marginality" as an analytical tool to handle the stigmatization and marginalization of "Gypsy-travellers" in urban settlement sites in the UK (p. 119).

excluded Roma areas" in Czech cities, the inhabitants of which largely lost their opportunities to work in industry after the collapse of the old regime. She points out that the non-Roma majority developed strong anti-Roma prejudices and stereotypes, and, thus, the perception of Roma as "criminals, parasites and the welfare-dependent" became prevalent (Stejskalova, 2013, p. 9). Filcak and Steger (2014) also draw parallels between the cases of hyperghettoization that Wacquant (2008) discusses and the alienated and marginalized Roma communities in Slovakia: The local settlements (*osada*) not only demonstrate many characteristics of Wacquant's ghetto but also have started to evoke the notion of hyperghetto, in their view (Filcak and Steger, 2014, p. 5). Still, Walach (2015) argues that the "socially excluded neighborhoods" in Czech cities cannot be considered as completely identical with the cases exemplifying Wacquant's notion of advanced marginality (pp. 141-142). The identity discourses developed by the inhabitants of these stigmatized areas in the Czech Republic have rather a mixed nature and reflect diverse strategies (Walach, 2015, p. 171). The presence of representational strategies characterizing both the ghetto (namely defensive strategies and a strong sense of belonging) and the clusters of advanced marginality (namely strategies of rejection and a powerful temptation to escape) rather locate these neighborhoods at the intersection of the two categories (Walach, 2015, p. 182).

Some authors enrich Wacquant's conceptual framework regarding urban territorial stigmatization with the insights from many other constructs formulated in social sciences in order to comprehend the diverse patterns of socio-economic and cultural inequality accompanying neoliberalism. For example, in one study, Cames (2013) combines the concepts of Agamben's "bio-political camp" and of Wacquant's ghetto and hyperghetto, and, in this context, discusses the deterioration of the living conditions of Roma in the post-communist era: They have been the earliest victims of the abandonment of the "full-employment" and "job-security" policies in Eastern Europe, and migration to the west has not provided them with any better job opportunities than "low-wage daily labor" and "begging" (Cames, 2013, p. 5-6). Besides, similar to the stigmatized urban black districts Wacquant (2008) discusses, the retreat of the state's welfare apparatus from Romani settlements has contributed to the hyperghettoization of these spaces, (Cames, 2013, p. 16). Similarly, Marinaro (2017) develops a hybrid frame, a synthesis of Wacquant's terminology regarding urban confinement and the notion of informality, to conceptualize Roma camps in Italy (p. 547), and

holds that the formalization of these camps strengthens the process of their ghettoization (p. 557).

There are also studies that draw on Wacquant's related theoretical insights in their examination of the instances of territorial stigmatization experienced by Roma and other peripatetic communities in Turkey. Akkan et al (2017) introduce a new concept, "the Romanization of poverty," replacing the generic terms used by surrounding populations to classify and to stigmatize peripatetics in the Turkish context, namely "*Çingene*" or "*Kıpti*," (Turkish equivalents of "Gypsy") with a "politically correct one," Roma.[4] They studied how Roma neighborhoods changed within the neoliberal transformation of the Turkish economy in the 1980s, adopting the conceptual framework that centered on the notion of "new poverty," coined by Buğra and Keyder (2003), to distinguish more recent informal settlements inhabited by Kurds or Roma from the earlier ones, which appeared relatively more advantageous. According to the authors, modern Roma neighborhoods have been turned into hyperghettos with their socially marginalized status (Akkan et al, 2017, p. 78). In a similar manner, Gezgin (2016) evaluates the data collected in a field research in one of the oldest Roma settlements in Çanakkale by utilizing the analytical frame formulated by Wacquant, and points at the relation between neoliberal policies and advanced marginality (p. 190).

The studies mentioned above make an undeniable contribution to the related field of research. However, at least for the cases this paper examines, the attachment of the "Gypsy" stigma to a given space is a phenomenon not solely triggered by contemporary socio-economic and political developments involving the adoption of neoliberal policies amongst others. Rather their formation can be traced back to the late 19th century. In fact, Wacquant et al (2014) do not argue that the "topography of disrepute" (p. 219) is a completely novel phenomenon. Still, the authors of this paper believe that the differences between the recently developing cases of territorial stigmatization and those coming from the past deserve critical scrutiny, if one desires to get a more nuanced understanding of the phenomenon and to avoid

---

[4] Although they argue that they do not consider "Roma" as an "umbrella term," their classification of non-Roma peripatetics as Roma (Akkan et al, 2011) actually reflects a recent policy adopted by various European institutions to redefine the term in this manner. For a convincing criticism of this approach, see Marushiakova and Popov (2011).

the trap of pinpointing neoliberalism as the merely reason for any social ills, without regard to their historical and local contingencies.

"Gypsy" stigma: tribal or territorial?

In his illuminating study *Stigma*, Ervin Goffman (1963) analyzes the situation of those who are unable to conform to the standards deemed normal by society. He defines "stigma" as an attribute, behavior, or reputation that is socially discrediting in a particular way. Stigma causes an individual to be conceived by others as an undesirable and repellent stereotype rather than as normal (Goffman, 1963, p. 3). He argues that stigmatization also involves dehumanization; that is, a stigmatized individual is not accepted as fully human, and thereby faces various discriminatory practices and ideologies (Goffman, 1963, p. 3).

Among immediately or potentially visible stigmatized attributes, Goffman (1963) lists the "tribal stigma of race, nation, and religion," which is transmitted by lineage and affects all the members of the related group and hence can be characterized as collective or group stigma (p. 4). The "Gypsy" stigma is a long-standing example of this tribal stigma.

In one study where they examined the development of the "Gypsy" stigma in the European context, Lucassen, Willems and Cottar (1998) highlight its socio-historically constructed nature and provide insights to the process of the ethnicization of "Gypsy" communities by outsiders. In a more recent study, Willems and Lucassen (2000) argue that people who adopt a distinct way of life, characterized by a combination of self-employment and traveling with the family, which is itself a work unit, would probably be labeled as "Gypsy" or named with another stigmatizing term. Thus, the actual basis of this apparently tribal stigmatization has been the practicing of a specific "itinerant profession" and the obvious display of a "travelling way of life" as a family (Willems and Lucassen, 2000, p. 262).

Indeed, for Lucassen (1991), the creation and popularization of unfavorable assumptions about a group (stigma) and the attachment of a given stigma to individual communities (labeling) are different aspects of the stigmatization process (pp. 80-81). Thus, the question of which groups "deserve" to be labeled with a given stigma is rather a matter of historical struggle and negotiation. On the other hand, he admits that the process of stigmatization can trigger the formation of a group identity and could pro-

vide a basis for developing ethnic consciousness (Lucassen, 1991, p. 80). Related to this, not only have the word "Gypsy" and its equivalents in other languages been utilized by members of surrounding populations, as agents of "symbolic violence" in the Bourdeisian sense of term, to stigmatize peripatetic groups, but also, in many cases, the members of thereby-stigmatized communities have themselves positively affirmed these terms as a means of self-identification (Okely, 2002[1983], p. 4; Okely, 2014, pp. 78-79). Similarly, while the Turkish word "*Çingene*" is a highly pejorative exonym used to denominate local peripatetics such as Roma, Loms, Doms, and Abdals, some individual members of these communities have adopted the word in their self-definitions in a very enthusiastic manner. A former bureaucrat, Mustafa Aksu (2006) who publicly declared his "*Çingene*" identity after his retirement, obviously exemplifies this attitude as an individual case.

This does not mean to deny that the "Gypsy" stigma usually causes one to be condemned to a very limited social space in the sense of having extremely restricted opportunities for self-development and self-determination in almost every realm of life. People stigmatized as "Gypsy" suffer various forms of discrimination and isolation, particularly in employment, settlement, health, education, and politics. They are often prevented from enjoying their civil, political, and social rights as full-fledged citizens. Thus, they are pressured to hide their group identity from the public sphere, especially when seeking employment in the formal sector (Aksu, 2006). Even if they accept assimilation into the dominant culture, the "Gypsy" stigma as inscribed on their bodies almost always signifies their deviation from the norm, unless they are unexceptionally lucky, so to speak, to the extent that their physical complexion does not imply "Gypsiness" to the members of the surrounding populations. Their appearance may make them feel both noticed and simultaneously invisible or dismissable, thereby throwing them back into their group identity, as Iris Marion Young (1990, p. 14) discusses.

Current reports from Turkey about people carrying the "Gypsy" stigma demonstrate that the ones who are able to work full-time and to receive accompanying social security benefits constitute a small minority among them. Most are employed on a temporary basis in the informal sector

(Anon, 2008, p. 86).[5] Instances of "Gypsy" stigma-related discrimination abound in Turkey, indeed. As quoted in a study drawn up by a non-governmental organization, an interviewee from Erzurum states:

> Employers are concerned about where you live. If you disclose to them that you live in the neighborhood *Sanayi* (known to be a "Gypsy" quarter in the city), then you have no chance to get employed. Once I applied for a job, but when the employer learned where I live, he did not recruit me. (Anon, 2008, p. 86)

Another interviewee from Akıncılar (a neighborhood in Adana designated as a "Gypsy" settlement) admits that he gets off the bus at the stop before Akıncılar since he is worried that his friends might learn where he actually resides (Anon, 2008, p. 86). Similarly, a person from Çorlu, Tekirdağ mentions that when he worked as a headwaiter in a restaurant in the city, the other waiters complained about him to the employer that they did not want to work under the supervision of a "Gypsy." Then he was left no choice but to resign (Anon, 2008, p. 86). A woman from the same district in Tekirdağ states that his daughter once made a successful application for a position, but as soon as the employer found out that she was a "Gypsy," he refused to hire her (Anon, 2008, p. 86). A much more explicit instance of such discrimination is as follows: The annual report of a major textile company in Turkey openly stated that the board of the company decided not to employ the Romani (Anon, 2008, p. 87).

"Gypsy" (which is commonly translated as "*Çingene*" into Turkish but a more correct translation could arguably be "*Kıpti*"[6]) has been traditionally

---

[5] Fleeming et al (2000) argue that informal economic activities are unregulated but not prohibited by the state (pp. 387-388). In a similar vein, Castells and Portes (1991) define informal activities as the production of socially legitimate/licit commodities and services without state regulation (p. 15). For a summary of diverse theoretical standpoints (dualist, structural, legalist etc.) regarding the use of the formal-informal dichotomy, see Katalin (2015) and Chen (2012).

[6] "*Kıpti*" could be said to be the Ottoman equivalent of the term "Gypsy," considering the etymological and semantic aspects of both terms. The particular uses of these terms reflect the common mythical assumptions of surrounding populations about the so-called Egyptian origins, not only of Roma but also of other peripatetic communities in Europe and Asia Minor. For a detailed linguistic and historical analysis of the relation between these terms, see Matras (2015, pp. 20-23), Ginio (2004, p. 131), and Soulis (1961). For a detailed historiography of the term "*Kıpti*," particularly as regards to its use in census records and

deployed to classify and, to a certain degree, to stigmatize peripatetic groups.[7] In the 18th century, when European scholars revealed the possible Indian origins of the Romani language, many authors began to distinguish various peripatetic communities, including Roma, from others for whom there was no obvious sign for such an ancestral link, and accordingly, it has then become a widespread attitude among scholars to classify the former as "Gypsy" and the latter as "Gypsy-like."[8] Nevertheless, in everyday life, surrounding non-peripatetics generally continued indiscriminately to call both categories of people "Gypsy."[9] Still, there is an on-going debate on the scope and definition of the term. According to Matras (2004), a linguist and one of the most prominent Romani studies scholars, the term "Gypsy" refers to two separate entities in its contemporary use. While "Gypsy I" denotes a social phenomenon, that is, any peripatetic community irrespective of its ethnic features such as mother-language, "Gypsy II" is the indicator of Romani speaking communities (Matras, 2004, p. 53); and the generic and stigmatized use of the term actually takes place in the sphere of "Gypsy I."[10]

In fact, "*Çingene*" and "*Kıpti,*" albeit the latter to a lesser degree, have been in Turkey for classifying diverse peripatetic communities. Yet only some of these, such as Roma,[11] Doms,[12] and Loms,[13] have possible Indian origins according to various linguistic, historical and recently-conducted

---

identification cards to classify peripatetic groups in the late Ottoman era, see Yılgür (2018a).

[7] Indeed, various generic terms are deployed to name peripatetic communities around the world, such as *Jat* in Afghanistan, and *Hwach* or *Chaien* in Korea (Rao, 1987, p. 7), to give a few examples.

[8] For a detailed account of the historical development of this paradigm as regards to the "discovery" of the Indian roots of the Romani language, see Matras (2004), Okely (2002[1983]), Willems and Lucassen (2000), and also Willems (1998).

[9] The case of Irish travelers also exemplifies this situation (Kearns, 1977, p. 538).

[10] However, there are also studies dealing with the "Gypsy" stigma as a phenomenon largely associated with the "Gypsy II" population, such as Powell (2008), Widmann (2007), and Kligman (2001).

[11] For linguistic, historical and genetic studies on the Indian origins of Roma, see Grellman (1787), De Goeje (1886), Matras (2004), and Sinigerska et al (2006).

[12] For linguistic and historical studies on the Indian origins of Doms, see Matras (1999), Matras (2004a), and Hancock (2003).

[13] For linguistic and historical studies on the Indian origins and the ethno-social features of Loms, see Matras (2004a), Hancock (2003), Scala (2014), and Marushiakova and Popov (2016).

genetic studies,[14] whereas some do not, at least in part, like Abdals[15] and Tahtacis (Yılgür, 2017, p. 3).[16]

Admittedly, the Ottoman state frequently registered peripatetics, including Teber/Abdals and Tahtacis as "*Kıpti*" from the earliest census in the 19th century (1831) onwards and usually held them exempt from the military service (Karpat, 1985, p. 67).[17] On the other hand, interestingly enough, in a petition submitted by the representatives from certain Abdal and Tahtaci communities in Antalya in the last quarter of the 19th century, the petitioners adopted the term "*Kıpti*" to identify themselves, asking to maintain their exemption from the military service against the rising pressure from the state authorities.[18]

---

[14] Surdu and Kovats (2015) are obviously critical of the reliability of genetic studies in this regard.

[15] The term "Abdal" is actually an exonym used by the surrounding populations in Asia Minor and Central Asia to denominate peripatetics. In Sinkiang, Uyghurs call former-peripatetic Eynus "Abdal" in a highly pejorative manner. For details, see Tietze and Ladstatter (1994) quoted by Johanson (2001, p. 22). In Turkey, non-peripatetics use it to denominate primarily Teber/Tebercis (drummers), the most visible group in Central Anatolia, but not in an exclusionary manner. Some Dom groups have also been classified as such. For details, see Yalman (1977, p. 18), Yıldırım (2011, p. 29), and Yılgür (2017, pp. 10-11). As many central Anatolian non-peripatetics utilize the term in a less stigmatizing manner compared to the word "*Çingene*," it has also been a tool of self-identification, to a certain degree (Yılgür, 2017). For a detailed account of Teber/Abdals and their secret lexicon, see Yıldırım (2012), Erkan (2011), Yalman (1977), Caferoğlu (1950), and Caferoğlu (1946).

[16] For an ethnological account of Tahtacis, see Roux (1987), and for rare collections of Tahtacis' secret lexicon, see Caferoğlu (1954).

[17] Karal (1997 [1943]) published the official summary of the census dated 1831. It is not possible to assume an overall consistency for the terminology used in the registration of peripatetics in the census. The census clerks registered Abdals as a separate group in Aksaray and Tarsus (Karal, 1997[1943], p. 114, 176). In İçel, however, Abdals and Tahtacis were registered in the same category as "*Kıptis*" (Karal, 1997[1943], p. 115), but it is not clear whether "*Kıpti*" was also used as a local name for a particular peripatetic group or not (Karal, 1997[1943], p. 116). In Antalya, the clerks clearly had a notion of "*Kıpti*" as an overarching category. According to them, the terms "Abdal" and "Tahtaci" were local denotations for "*Kıbtis*:" "Livai mezkur kazaların ifrazattan Tahtacı ve abdal *tabir eyledikleri kıptiler*" (Karal, 1997[1943], p. 122). In fact, they registered local peripatetics as "*Kıpti*" without referring to any local exonyms, in some locations such as Taşköprü and Çıldır (Karal, 1997[1943], p. 109, 179).

[18] The original petition dated January 29, 1873 read as follows: "*Kulları Antalya'da mine'l-kadîm Kıbtî Abdal ve Tahtacı tâifesinden olduğımız hâlde redîf binbaşısı mukaddem virdiği (1)*

As already discussed above, generic terms reflect the ethnicity-based image that surrounding populations adopt to signify the assumed homogeneity of peripatetic communities. The use of such an image, however, varies according to the relative demographical density of individual peripatetic communities in particular regions. In Turkey, Roma are the most visible in Thrace and in some Aegean locations, Doms in Mesopotamia, Loms in Northern Turkey, Abdals in Central Anatolia, and Tahtacis in rural areas of the Mediterranean and Aegean regions (Yılgür, 2017). In Thrace, the public image of *"Çingene"* almost exclusively denotes Roma people.[19] However, the basic constitutive elements of this image, that is, accent, physical complexion, occupational orientation and the like, differ in the regions where non-Roma peripatetics are the most visible (Yılgür, 2016a, p. 106-107). Thus, the public image of peripatetics largely reflects, albeit in a distorted way, the ethno-social features of the most visible group in each locality. Nevertheless, it is not possible to overlook the influence of the Roma image in the mainstream on the local representations of *"Çingene,"* which ironically allows some non-Roma former peripatetics to sustain their anonymity in big cities.

The concept of peripatetic designates the kind of communities whose strategies of survival basically depend on spatial mobility and commercialism in economic terms and on endogamy in social terms (Rao, 1987, p. 3). Historically, most of those communities were forced to abandon their established ways of subsistence as the consumer demand for the artifacts of traditional craftsmanship declined along with the process of industrialization.

---

aşîret nâmı inâdında musirr olarak kur'a keşîdesiyle asker almak üzere tâifemizi tazyîk ile habse ilka (2) itdirdi biz… Kıbtîyiz efganımızı dinlemiyorlar." See The Ottoman Archives of the Prime Minister's Office [BOA], The Council of State [ŞD], 609.40.4.1.1, also quoted by Yılgür, 2018a, p. 221.

[19] This phenomenon is also observable in the East European context. Marushiakova and Popov (2011) adopt the popular definition of the terms, such as "Cigáni," "Cikáni," "Cyganie," "Čigonai," "Čigāni," "Cigany," and "Ţigani," as "a clearly defined and distinctive ethnic community, whose ancestors had migrated from the Indian subcontinent to Europe more than a millennium ago," (p. 87), thereby declaring their support to the scholarly use of "Gypsy II" by Matras (2004), mentioned above. Nevertheless, theirs could be regarded as the use of an otherwise generic term to denote the most visible peripatetic community in a particular region, that is, Roma in Eastern Europe. In fact, Marushiakova and Popov (2016) also employ the word "Gypsy" in a wider context as an umbrella term meant to encompass various communities with Indian origins, such as Roma, Doms, and Loms (pp. 1-5).

Actually, Lucassen (1998) raises an objection to the assumption about "Gypsies" being "the passive victims of modernization." Instead, they have been able to adapt to changing socio-economic environments and to benefit from the new opportunities brought about by the industrial revolution (Lucassen, 1998, p. 154). Salo (1987, 1982, 1986), Jabbur (1995), Williams et al (1982), Gmelch (1982), and Rao (2009) also studied the effects of devastating socio-economic crises that urged peripatetics to develop new survival strategies in many different cases. In this regard, Gmelch (1986, p. 309) and Salo (1986) refer to the inadequacy of the concept of "peripatetic" to encompass all these communities due to its assumption that nomadism is a defining feature of them. In fact, although there are some groups sustaining their nomadic way of life in the modern era (Lucassen, 1998, p. 154), a considerable portion of former peripatetics adopted a more sedentary life. Accordingly, Yılgür (2016a) has introduced a new concept, "late-peripatetic," to define the former peripatetics that, having confronted the necessity of adopting new survival strategies suitable for industrial capitalism, migrated to cities en masse, or to towns and villages albeit in relatively smaller numbers, and established several communities there where they more or less retained a sense of cultural identity and, related to this, faced stigmatization in the mainstream. In time, their descendants began to cohabitate with others in these communities, mostly with those, who, despite not having peripatetic origins, similarly responded to the dissolution of their traditional social structures by migrating to the city in large numbers. Still, irrespective of their social backgrounds, all suffer from the devastating effects of the "Gypsy" stigma (Yılgür, 2016a). To say it otherwise, an urban quarter stigmatized as "Gypsy," or a so-called "*Çingene mahallesi*" in Turkish, indiscriminately resigns its residents to a limited social existence: that is, they face typical discriminative discourses and practices, regardless of whether they come from a peripatetic or non-peripatetic origin, which suggests that the "Gypsy" stigma in the city is largely (re)produced on a residential basis.

Illustratively, Ismetpasha is an urban quarter in Ankara, Turkey's capital, that hosts both late-peripatetic communities (such as Boshas/the Lom from the Black Sea coast and Abdals from Konya, a city close to Ankara) and non-peripatetic ones (mainly Kurds from Siirt and Urfa in Southeastern Turkey) (Bozkurt, 2006, p. 314). It provides a striking example of the direct association of urban poverty with the "Gypsy" stigma from an outsider's view. Some Kurdish children from the quarter (namely, the off-spring of those non-peripatetic Kurdish families who moved to Ismetpasha from Haymana,

a provincial district in Ankara) contribute to their family incomes by selling petty items in the city center. People coming across these children in the city generally perceive them as "Gypsy" (Bozkurt, 2006, p. 316). Besides the inscription of poverty on these children's bodies, the fact that they reside in Ismetpasha, a quarter known to be a "Gypsy" settlement by the mainstream culture, is automatically accepted as an indication of their so-called "Gypsy" identity (Bozkurt, 2006, p. 296).

The cases we reconsider below from a comparative perspective also illuminate the particular socio-historical forms of the stigmatization of a given urban space in a country not located at the center of the world capitalism, Turkey. From our perspective, the main difference between the urban quarters Wacquant (2008) has studied as the instances of the crystallization of a new form of poverty and segregation in the post-industrial city of the neoliberal period and those we examine in this paper is as follows: The latter survived for a prolonged historical period dating back to the late 19th century. Therefore, the existence of these urban socio-spatial formations could not be simply considered as outcomes of the processes of deindustrialization, deproletarianization, and of the withering away of the welfare state in the neoliberal period.[20]

By the late 19th century, the repercussions of Turkey's integration into the world capitalism through various political and structural reforms effectuated on behalf of "catching up with the modern world" had already become manifest in the city. To give a representative figure about the deepening of Turkey's incorporation into the modern world in the 1800s, the volume of Anatolia's imports and exports increased by around 12 to 15 times throughout the century (Pamuk, 2005, p. 20). Challenged by rather cheaper products from European industries with high labor productivity, local manufacturers in the Ottoman Empire were only able to survive as long as the labor, under the threat of open unemployment in the urban core, complied with working for lower earnings. Actually, a few initiatives for establishing industrial

---

[20] Indeed, changes in the welfare regime, local industries, and employment opportunities in formal and informal sectors all influenced the stigmatized areas of cities in Turkey, to a considerable degree, in addition to several urban renewal projects that were effectuated in the 2000s. However, this issue deserves a highly focused scholarly attention that, unfortunately, extends beyond the scope of this study. We plan to develop an explanatory model for the neoliberal transformation of stigmatized urban neighbourhoods in the Turkish context in a future study.

plants were observed in Anatolia towards the late 19th century, but they remained weak and developed quite slowly and sporadically since the state's authority to increase import duties had already been curtailed by free trade agreements with various European powers. Indeed, as Pamuk (2005) argues, the long-established weight of low-paid and labor intensive industrial sectors in the Turkish economy has its roots in this unequal pattern of integration into world capitalism in the 19th century (p. 21).[21]

Another development with a long-standing formative influence on Turkey's economic, social and cultural structure was the migration of millions of Muslims to Anatolia from the Balkans, Crimea, Caucasia and the Aegean Islands, namely the lands the Ottomans lost to European powers, and to the newly established nation states there throughout the 19th century. It is estimated that the overall population who moved at that time to those parts of the Empire that are inside today's Turkey was nearly five million (Pamuk, 2005, p. 142). To illustrate, Karpat (2002) states that the number of those who had to flee from their former lands following the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-78 was no less than one and a half million, and nearly one million of them were resettled in the Ottoman territory between 1877 and 1890 (p. 663). Initially, they were temporally located in dervish lodges, mosques, and previously abandoned barracks in and around the city center; then they were permanently relocated by the state authorities to various parts of İstanbul as well as to other cities in Eastern Thrace and Anatolia (Arslan, 2008, pp. 86-95; İpek, 1999, pp. 58-68). Among them were also peripatetic families, some of which established new quarters in İstanbul that came to be associated with the "Gypsy" stigma in time. As time wore on, others who had been deterritorialized by the Balkan Wars and by the Turkish-Greek Population Exchange in 1923-24 joined among the dwellers of these quarters.[22]

---

[21] In fact, there were also some exceptional historical cases in this regard. Some local industries like tobacco manufacturing in several Ottoman towns, such as Drama, Kavala, Serez, and Xanthi, which are inside today's Greece, provided high-wage employment opportunities at that period. This was essentially an export-based industry in which raw tobacco leaves were semi-processed and packed. Along with Greeks, Jews, and Turks, late-peripatetic Roma also participated in this local labor force (Yılgür, 2016a).

[22] For the influence of the modern waves of migration to Ottoman cities on the formation and development of the quarters associated with the "Gypsy" stigma, see Yılgür (2016a) and Gürboğa (2016).

In the 1950s, Turkey lived through another massive wave of migration, this time from agricultural to urban areas, with the intensification of its integration into the world capitalist system after the Second World War. Over a million people abandoned their lands and moved permanently to cities in order to exploit the employment opportunities newly developing industries offered, resulting in an annual increase in the population of large cities by nearly 10% throughout the decade (Zürcher, 2004, p. 226). However, as the capacity of the urban industry remained incapable of absorbing this huge mass of unskilled labor, most migrants ended up working in temporary jobs in the informal sector without receiving almost any social security benefits. To make matters worse, since the state largely remained indifferent to their needs for shelter, they either established new informal settlements of "*gecekondus*" (literally denoting shelters built secretly at night) in and around the city center or settled in already stigmatized urban quarters (Zürcher, 2004, p. 226).

The two cases we reexamine below, namely Nişantaşı Teneke and Rumelikavağı Kayadere, are the kind of urban socio-spatial formations the "Gypsy" stigma of which has its roots in the massive wave of migration from the Balkans and Thrace to the imperial capital, İstanbul, towards the end of the 19th century. Their demographic profiles were also largely influenced by the patterns of rural-to-urban migration observed after the Second World War. At first glance, one could observe striking historical commonalities in the life-experiences of their inhabitants-basically in terms of being attributed a group stigma regardless of whether they have peripatetic origins or not, and, hence, of being imprisoned in a narrow social existence and deemed redundant for the national economy-thereby pointing at the residential premises of the "Gypsy" stigma in the urban space. However, a more attentive reading of the available data about them that we collected previously demonstrates their historical, economic, demographic, and geographical contingencies and indicates the need for further studies that examine urban territorial stigmatization in Turkey from a historically informed and comparative perspective.

Methodology

In developing a comparative outlook into those historical forms of urban poverty in Turkey that have been accompanied by the "Gypsy" stigma, we

reuse the data we collected for our previous individual studies which had different focuses of interest. That is, we offer a secondary analysis of the available data collected in recent field and archive research about these quarters, yet with research questions distinct from those of the original works.

One of the previous studies that we reexamined is a comprehensive fieldwork conducted between 2005 and 2008 (Yılgür, 2012) of Nişantaşı Teneke. Nişantaşı Teneke was a quarter that existed on the European side of İstanbul between the last quarter of the 19th century and the last quarter of the 20th century. As this previous research conspicuously demonstrated, with all the symptoms of absolute poverty it was condemned to carry, this quarter created a sharp contrast to the elite urban settlement beside which it was historically located. Illustratively, the historical name of the quarter, *teneke* (translated as "tinplate" into English) implied that its inhabitants lived in shacks made of tinplates and waste wood. Today, however, it exhibits the typical features of a middle class urban district, and, in fact, the sources and consequences of its transformation from a "*teneke mahalle*" (tin can neighborhood) (Yılgür, 2018b) to a middle-class settlement was the interest of the research. Semi-structured in-depth interviewing of its previous and current inhabitants, configured around the themes of economic activities, gender relations, social stratification, cultural rituals, educational and religious practices, and important historical developments in the district, was employed as the main method in the study, in addition to the data collected through the archival work in newspapers and official records, which played an important role in grounding the work on a firm historical perspective. Interviewees were selected by the co-author from among the three categories of people: the residents of the neighborhood, the residents of the high-profiled elite settlement in Nişantaşı, and the residents of similar stigmatized neighborhoods like Kuştepe in the same district, Şişli (Yılgür, 2012, p. 22).

In recent times, we revisited the area before conducting archive research in the Ottoman State Archives. According to the archives, Nişantaşı Teneke was located in the territory of Balmumcu Farm, an agricultural land that belonged to the private treasury of the Ottoman Sultanate (*Hazine-i Hassa*) and was rented out to individual families for agricultural purposes. The archival records dated 1888, 1892, 1901, and 1904 include sociodemographic data about those settled in and around the farm and, thus, provide great analytical opportunities to evaluate the trajectory of the neighborhood from a long-term perspective (Yılgür, 2018b; Yılgür, 2016a).

The second set of data reused in this study comes from fieldwork conducted over a three-month period in 2005 in Kayadere quarter in Rumelikavağı, Sarıyer, which is a lower middle-class settlement on the European side of İstanbul. Unlike Nişantaşı Teneke, Kayadere has still survived since the late 19th century as a stigmatized and segregated settlement in Rumelikavağı; yet it is one that is not very visible to outsiders to the area in which it resides. The fieldwork similarly benefited from semi-structured interviews with current inhabitants of the quarter and basically examined the ways they culturally identify themselves and their community as a coping strategy to challenge and negotiate the "Gypsy" stigma with which they are associated. It also questioned what the discourses of identity that they have adopted imply for the possibility of resolving their stigmatization-related problems through the politics of recognition.

We, as primary researchers reusing our own data, are aware of the key ethical and practical issues that the employment of a secondary analysis in a qualitative study gives rise to. The main ethical issue in a secondary analysis considers how consent was obtained in the original research. Having been aware that it is not usually feasible to seek additional consent from subjects in a possible secondary analysis, we obtained our interviewees' consent as covering this possibility as well as the original research, which is actually consistent with the professional guidelines on ethical practice in sociology (British Sociological Association, 2002, p. 3).

Besides this ethical concern, the main practical issue considers where the primary analysis stops and the secondary analysis starts. It is rather a difficult task to ascertain whether the analysis is new and distinct enough to qualify as secondary. We are of the opinion that there are no ready-made solutions for this problem except to say that our effort to develop a comparative outlook with a focus rather different than the primary research, that is, on the residential and historically contingent nature of the "Gypsy" stigma in the city, enables us to more appropriately define this work as secondary.

Another practical problem considers whether the data is suitable for a secondary analysis, which depends on the match between the purpose of the analysis and the nature and the quality of the original data sets. Since we conducted less tightly structured interviews in our primary research projects, we were able to collect richer and more varied data then.

Also, we believe that the use of the secondary analysis does not necessarily preclude the collection of primary data. In addition to reusing the qualitative data from these previous works, this study benefits from five

semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted in May 2018 with those in-habitants of Rumelikavağı not living in Kayadere, whose actual names are not disclosed for the purpose of privacy.

The interviews were structured around the themes of the significant historical developments, main economic activities, and the nature of socio-cultural relations in Rumelikavağı as well as the changes in its demographic profile. The reason for the use of this additional research is two-fold. First, unlike the original one, this study particularly focuses on the effects of the waves of migration, observed in the late 19th century and after the Second World War, respectively, on the nature and extent of the "Gypsy" stigma with which Kayadere quarter has historically been associated. Second, in the original study, no primary interviews were conducted with those inhabitants of Rumelikavağı who reside outside Kayadere since its main focus was on how the residents of Kayadere cope with the "Gypsy" stigma they are identified with. On the other hand, to display the relational quality of the group stigma attached more clearly, in this study, we agreed to carry out primary interviews with so-called non-"Gypsy" inhabitants of Rumelikavağı.

Also, the archival research regarding Rumelikavağı provides us limited but effective data to shed light on the initial phases of the neighborhood's development. Some archival records from 1892 include information about the socio-demographic profile of hovel/shack dwellers all around the city except for a few suburban and inner city clusters.[23] The officials drawing up the records mentioned Kayadere and the five founding families who had already settled in the location by 1892. The records also referred to their occupations, their places of origin, and the number of their family members.

Research Findings

Nişantaşı Teneke

Having been located in the city center in İstanbul, Nişantaşı Teneke was among the earliest instances of stigmatized neighborhoods in Turkey. It was established towards the end of the 19th century by a group of late-peripatetic families identified as "Gypsy" by outsiders (Yılgür, 2012, p. 49). Escaping

---

[23] See BOA, The Municipality of İstanbul [İŞE], 2.30.1.13.

the Russian army, which occupied Thrace during the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-1878, they migrated to İstanbul as refugees. They were composed of eight families from Lovech (*Lofça*), a former Ottoman territory which is inside Bulgaria today; the majority of them earned their living as porters (*hammal*s) and initially stayed in one of the temporary immigrant settlements, *Akarat-ı Seniyye*,[24] in Beşiktaş (Yılgür, 2016b, pp. 188-192), but the government evicted them from there along with other immigrants at the end of 1883.[25] Shortly after, they built eight new houses in a relatively empty lot of Balmumcu Farm, which was located around the local quarries (*Taşocağı*) then, an area unexpectedly very close to today's Nişantaşı (Yılgür, 2016b).

There are no references to the ethnic profile of these founding families in the archives. Indeed, by that period, the Ottoman state had made changes in its population management policy and intended to register all Muslims in the same category irrespective of their ethnicity (Karpat, 1985). The state officials registered all immigrants, including peripatetics who had been otherwise officially designated as "*Kıpti*" until then, in the umbrella category of the time, "*Muhâcir*,"[26] (denoting the then-current immigrants from the Balkans) at least at the beginning of the massive wave of migration following the war. They also developed a new policy for local "Gypsies:" They would no longer be registered as "*Kıpti*" but rather on the basis of their religious affiliations, except for a small non-Muslim minority whose religious affiliation was not counted in the census records.[27] However, a comparison be-

---

[24] These terraced houses located between Maçka and Beşiktaş, which were built by famous Armenian architect Sarkis Balyan, actually belonged to *Hazine-i Hassa*. For a detailed account of *Akarat-ı Seniyye*, see Batur (1999).

[25] The original archives dated 1883, August 19 read as follows: "*muhâcirîn sâkin olan mahallerde gidecek olanlardan mâadâ muhâcir kalmamış hükmünde (4) ve hele Beşiktaş'da kâin Akarât-ı Hümâyûnları derûnunda bulunan muhâcirînden kezâlik gidecek (5) olanlardan başkası kâmilen çıkarılub*" See BOA, Yıldız Palace [Y], Retail Documents [PRK], Petitions to the Commissions [KOM], 4.20.5.1.15.

[26] The original archives dated 1882, February 15 read as follows: "*Mahallât arasında hânelerde sâkin olan muhâcirîn müteehhil defterine kayd olunması tabîî ise de (1) esâmîleri hâmişine muhâcir oldukları şerh virilecekdir...*" See BOA, ŞD, 695.29.8.3.3.

[27] The original archives dated 1903, January 12 read as follows: "*Kıbtîlerin İslâm olanlarının cemâat-i Müslime ve Hıristîyân (2) bulunanlarının mensûb oldukları cemâat-i gayr-i Müslime efrâdından add idilerek (3) sicillât ve tezâkirde ona göre icrâ-yı muâmelât olunması evvelce vâki' olan (4) istîzân üzerine Şûrâ-yı Devlet Tanzîmât dâiresinden kaleme alınan 16 Kânûn-ı Sânî sene 301 (28 Ocak 1886) (5) târîhlü mazbatada gösterilmiş olduğundan Müslim Kıbtîlerin tezâkir-i*"

tween the occupations of the founders of the refugee settlement in Nişantaşı and of the Ottoman subjects registered as "*Kıpti*" in and around Lovech in the 19th century records is obviously convincing about the former's peripatetic backgrounds, since in Lovech and around it, porters almost exclusively came from peripatetics, that is, from Roma (Yılgür, 2016b, pp. 186-188; Selçuk, 2013, pp. 173-320).

A comparison of the archival records dated 1888, 1892, 1901, 1904, with of some additional yet less systematic archival documents unfolds the subsequent historical trajectory of the neighborhood. In 1888, there were just 24 households, including 17 immigrants from Bulgarian cities, the majority of whom were probably of peripatetic origins (Lovech: 9, Haskovo [Hasköy]: 3, Stara Zagora [Eski Zağra]: 2, Sevliovo [Selvi]: 1, Varna: 1, Uncertain: 1), in *Taşocağı* region of Balmumcu Farm. This fact implies that the formation of the neighborhood by the Lovechian founders provided other newcomers with a port of refuge and shelter. The number of Balkan-origin residents not only gradually but consistently increased then; it became 44 in 1892, 82 in 1901, and 83 in 1904.

The housing opportunities provided by the emerging neighborhood were by no means exclusively reserved for immigrants. They also welcomed family groups from various Anatolian cities. Kurdish families, the majority of whom were from Şirvan/Siirt, a city in Eastern Anatolia, constituted the second most populous group until the late 1920s. The earliest three Kurdish households arrived in the neighborhood between 1888 and 1892. Then their number grew to 17 in 1901 and to 20 in 1903. Some of them were agricultural workers (*rencber*s) who sought employment in the agricultural lands around Balmumcu Farm, whereas others were low ranking functionaries, largely servants, who worked in mansions, palaces and government institutions around the location (Yılgür, 2018b).

In the beginning of the 20th century, there was actually a considerable socio-cultural diversity among the residents of Nişantaşı Teneke. However, outsiders continued to perceive it as a "Gypsy" settlement into the end of the 1940s (Yılgür, 2012, p. 141). This perception was generated by the residents of the surrounding, upper-income settlements, who were namely the

---

Osmaniyelerinin (6) mezheb hânelerine Müslim yazılması ve gayr-i Müslim olanlar hakkında da ona göre (7) muâmele îfâsı lüzûmi …" See BOA, The Ministry of Internal Affairs [DH], The Office of Secretary [MKT], 632.19.1.2.30, also quoted by Yılgür, 2018a, p. 285.

Ottoman administrative elite and the bourgeoisie that lived in Nişantaşı. We can trace this historical perception back to some literary works by those who happened to live in the location or were in contact with the residents of the area. To illustrate, in *Sonuncu Kadeh*, [The Last Glass], one of the most important works by the famous Turkish novelist Refik Halit Karay (1994[1965]), the protagonist defines the region as a "*Çingene mahallesi*" (a Gypsy quarter) with a careful description of its exact location, shortly after a trip around Nişantaşı in the 1910s (pp. 156-157). In a similar manner, an interview with one of the former Nişantaşı residents who left the area in the beginning of the 1950s reflects the stigmatized perception about the neighborhood. The interviewee believes that it was an exclusively "Gypsy town:" "That place completely belonged to the poor… What we call a *teneke mahallesi*… More precisely, completely, *teneke mahallesi* is a place where 'Çingenes' live" (Yılgür, 2013, 42-43).

During that period, most inhabitants of the quarter had been able to work only in informal jobs with acutely low levels of income, thereby being trapped into a vicious circle of extreme poverty (Yılgür, 2012, pp. 91-149). Although the influence of the "Gypsy" stigma on its residents' individual life trajectories was clearly noticeable in the past, today there appears a significant difference between this settlement and the contemporary cases of advanced marginality in developed countries. While the latter instances of territorial stigmatization have a nationalized (Wacquant et al, 2014, p. 1273) character, those who actually attached the "Gypsy" stigma to the quarter of Nişantaşı Teneke were the residents of the surrounding settlements, confining its representation in pejorative terms in the public sphere to some rare literary texts.

Indeed, the visibility of late-peripatetics, as Yılgür denominates them (2016a), faded away in Nişantaşı Teneke as an increasing mass of non-peripatetic families migrated to the region from various parts of Turkey, particularly Kurds, with the urbanization that gained momentum in the 1950s. The particular significance of Nişantaşı Teneke for our discussion is that it demonstrates the dynamic, historically situated nature of the stigma attached to an urban socio-spatial entity. The changing configuration of the quarter's population after the 1950s was accompanied by a gradual disappearance of the "Gypsy" stigma that originally characterized it. Then, the quarter began to be perceived as a settlement for those at lower income levels, without any particular group stigma attached. The "Gypsy" stigma became something about the history of neighborhood, having nothing to do

with its contemporary presence. A short story by Saadet Timur Ulçugür (1974) where the neighborhood was defined as a former "Gypsy town" (p. 349) actually reflected the changing categories of perception regarding the area.

From the 1950s onwards, some of its inhabitants, including Balkanian immigrants, the majority of whom were probably former peripatetics, moved up and expanded their chances of subsistence as they started to exploit the growing educational opportunities in the city and to get employed as regular, and to a degree, white-collar workers. Most of them were assimilated into the mainstream, and ridding themselves of the embodied signifiers of the "Gypsy" stigma, preferred to stay in the quarter. They have lost their prominence since their earlier communal identity began to dissolve (Yılgür, 2012, pp. 149-173). On the other hand, those peripatetic-origin families of the quarter who were not able to adapt themselves to the changing patterns of incorporation to the urban core in the second half of the 20th century chose to move to other similarly stigmatized settlements around such as Kuştepe.

Rumelikavağı Kayadere

Rumelikavağı is a historical town located on the northern European side of the Bosporus, in İstanbul, somewhat away from the city center. In Ottoman times, the area served as a customs checkpoint for ships and vessels traveling through the Bosporus. It also functioned as a military fortification at that period. On the other hand, historically, the area bore the characteristics of a village-type settlement whose inhabitants mostly engaged in vegetable production (Balcı, 2006, p. 125).

Similar to Nişantaşı Teneke, upon the occupation of Thrace by the Russian army in 1877-1878, Rumelikavağı became one of the destinations designated by the state for settling refugees. Immigrants to the region were composed of both peripatetic and non-peripatetic families from the Balkans. The poorest immigrant families among them established small clusters of hovels both inside Rumelikavağı and around it, in such towns as Sarıyer and Kireçburnu.[28] In 1894, there were 16 immigrant families who had constructed

---

[28] The original archives dated 1908, December 3 read as follows: "*Sarıyârda ve Kirecburnunda ve Kavâkda ve mahall-i sâirede perâkende bir hâlde bulunan (1) barakaların…*" See BOA, ŞD,

hovels in the area located in Çayırdere Street in Rumelikavağı.[29] By 1899, the number of the households in the neighborhood jumped to 28, including 14 Balkanians but also other immigrants and some of the local poor (Ergin, 1995, pp. 3898-99).

During the First World War, some Muslim non-peripatetic families who fled from the Russian Army advancing on the Black Sea coast moved to Rumelikavağı (B. S., personal communication, 12 May 2018). The migration from the Black Sea particularly accelerated after the 1950s onwards (B. Ö., personal communication, 10 May 2018), resulting in a change in the demographic composition of the neighborhood in favor of non-peripatetic Muslim families. Since then, the population in the town also became much more homogeneous in religious terms, especially after many of its Greek residents were expelled from Turkey by the government over the escalation of the Cyprus problem with Greece in 1964 (B. C., personal communication, 28 May 2015).

Most Muslim families from the Black Sea historically earned their living as fishermen. Fishing was their traditional occupation before their migration, but remained so because Rumelikavağı was geographically insulated from the city center for a rather long time period. In fact, outsiders were banned from visiting the town, which had been designated as a military zone until 1960 (Balcı, 2006, p. 123). To illustrate, the first public bus service between Rumelikavağı and the city center started as late as 1964. This left the residents few options other than earning their bread from the sea in their new settlement (B.A., personal communication, 15 May 2018). Today, Rumelikavağı is home to a population of around 3,725 according to the 2013 census statistics.

The economy of the town still depends on the fishing industry, for the most part (A.S., personal communication, 5 May 2018). The town also hosts many fish restaurants attracting both foreign and domestic visitors. Kurdish people, who moved to İstanbul fleeing from the ongoing civil war between the Turkish army and the Kurdish paramilitary PKK in Eastern and South-

---

2749.40.1.20. Indeed, today a small territory composed of a few streets in the centre of Sarıyer is denominated as "*Muhacir Mahallesi*," a local idiom indicating the earliest founders' immigrant origins (Balcı, 1999, pp. 163-178).

[29] The original archives dated 1894, May 1 read as follows: "*Çayırdere mevki'nde bir numrolı fundalığın… ahîren muhâcirîn-i merkume on altı hâneye bâliğ olarak.*" See BOA, DH, MKT, 137.31.8.1.25.

eastern Turkey since the 1990s, are employed in these restaurants, mostly as waiters. The restaurant owners, most of whom are the descendants of those who migrated there from the Black Sea coast, generally hesitate to employ people from the so-called "Gypsy" quarter of the town, Kayadere, even in low-paid positions. In turn, most inhabitants of Kayadere earn their living by gathering mussels from the sea and trading them both in the domestic and in the international market (A. A., personal communication, 20 May 2018).

Mussel-gathering had traditionally been practiced by the Greek community in Rumelikavağı. After their deportation by the state authorities in 1964, families from Kayadere took it up as almost their communal type of occupation. Until the 1960s, some families, probably the earliest founders, from Kayadere had also engaged in basketmaking, a typical occupation of many peripatetic groups. Now, however, basketmaking as a way of subsistence is totally non-existent in the district (B. C., personal communication, 28 May 2018).

As the previous research demonstrated, people stigmatized as "Gypsy" there live in a rather insulated part of the town away from its center (Akkaya, 2011, p. 127). The area is officially called Kayadere; however, those inhabitants of Rumelikavağı living outside Kayadere usually call it the "Gypsy quarter" (*Çingene mahallesi*). Today, 30 to 35 households comprising around 450 people reside in the area, which "carries the distinguishing features of a shanty town" (Akkaya, 2011, p. 127):

> Disordered and muddy pathways, which are so narrow that they do not allow more than two people stand side by side, separate these houses from one another. The drainage system has broken in various places, and drain water spreads over the main street in the quarter. The organization of the settlement does not follow any plan. There are also a few dwellings made of plastic or tinplate with no connection to the central electricity or sewer system. (Akkaya, 2011, p. 127)

According to an official record, dated 1892, the earliest settlers in Kayadere quarter were five peripatetic families comprising 38 individuals. They were basketmakers (*sebetci*s) who had lived in Âsitâne (a traditional name used to denote the Ottoman capital) before their arrival to Kayadere, as stated in the record. One household head was registered as "*Kıbtî*" in the record. However, as already discussed above, in that period, the state used to classify peripatetic and non-peripatetic Muslims in the same category and did not register peripatetics as "*Kıpti*" (Yılgür, 2018a); so according to the

census report dated 1897, there were officially no Muslim "*Kıptis*" in İstanbul (Güran, 1997, p. 25). Thus, the particular record regarding that household head in Kayadere might have reflected not a general policy but a local practice of denomination.

According to the General Directorate of Land Registry and Cadastre (2018), today there are five parcels on the area, located between Maslak, Feneryolu, and Haber Streets. Except for the most central parcel, 946/2, they are still registered as empty terrains, implying that the constructions there have been informally built (see Figure 1 below). The records state that on the parcel 946/2, there are five wooden houses, each with an individual garden, which were most probably established by the earliest founders, that is, the basketmakers. Interestingly enough, one of the interviewees claimed that the few "lucky" ones who hold official certificates of land registry in Kayadere had possible "Egyptian" origins (A.A., personal communication, 20 May 2018). It is very probable that the registration of one of the founding household heads as "*Kıbtî*" in the record dated 1892 provided a base for this assumption.

Figure 1. Parcels in Kayadere today (Source: https://parselsorgu.tkgm.gov.tr)

Although the founders of the hovel cluster in Kayadere were local peripatetics, the basketmakers, the oral interviews also indicated that some of the Balkan-origin residents of the aforementioned settlements around Rumelikavağı moved over time to the newly forming cluster in Kayadere (B. C., personal communication, 28 May 2018). Today, a considerable portion of the settlers in the area are the descendants of these Balkanian immigrants, the majority of whom were probably former peripatetics.

Some descendants of the migrants from the Black Sea coast with non-peripatetic origins also live in this segregated part of the town. Being composed of only ten families, they do not constitute an immediately visible demographic element in there, though. Other residents of the town ascribe this deviation from the norm to individual characteristics like drug addiction or alcoholism. In turn, these internal "outcasts" of Rumelikavağı, as they might be called, consider themselves a part of the community, the same stigmatized quarter, Kayadere, as the case of one interviewee whose family migrated to Rumelikavağı from the Black Sea coast in the 1950s clearly illustrated in the original research. An interviewee from outside Kayadere was quoted to say the following about him: "He became darkened because of poverty and of drinking. Then he ended up in the 'Gypsy' quarter. He is not 'Gypsy,' indeed" (Akkaya, 2011, p. 130). He himself stated that he got "oxidized" as everyone else who settled in there did. Therefore, he was not able to escape from that quarter. On the other hand, he said, "Neither I nor my wife visits our own relatives. Whenever we have a problem, we ask help from that woman" (referring to an elderly female inhabitant of Kayadere with peripatetic origins) (Akkaya, 2011, p. 130).

As a whole, outsiders do not designate Rumelikavağı as a "Gypsy" settlement. Likewise, it is not generally known in the mainstream that a so-called "Gypsy" quarter has actually existed in there for more than a century (A.S., personal communication, 6 May 2018). As it was also implied by the interviews conducted for this study, in the case of Rumelikavağı, territorial segregation as accompanied by the "Gypsy" stigma is endogenous to the town itself, presumably for two main reasons, which we believe deserve to be substantiated by further ethnographic studies about the town, if one's aim is to gain a more rigorous understanding about the historical forms of urban poverty in İstanbul: First, demographically speaking, families with non-peripatetic origins have constituted an overwhelming majority in the town since the second half of the

20th century, rendering the descendants of the peripatetic communities who settled in there in the late 19th century almost invisible from the outsider's view. The second reason is that Rumelikavağı more or less retains the characteristics of a self-contained economy, as also pointed at by the interviewees, despite the development of its social, economic, and cultural ties to the city center in recent years. Due to its rather low level of socio-economic interaction with the outside, the "Gypsy" stigma in Rumelikavağı is experienced as a pattern of segregation among the inhabitants of the town itself, without much effect on the outsider's view of the town.

Conclusion

This study explores the particular socio-historical forms the phenomenon of territorial stigmatization that characterizes the urban experience of post-industrial society in developed societies assumes in Turkey as a part of the developing world. In the light of the approach developed by Wacquant (2008) to the reconfigured patterns of segregation and inequality in the urban space in the neoliberal period, it reevaluates the previously collected ethnographic and archival data about two urban quarters of İstanbul, Nişantaşı Teneke and Rumelikavağı Kayadere, which have historically been repositories for the so-called "Gypsy" as a stigmatized socio-cultural belonging.

"Gypsy" appeared as a generic word deployed to designate, and, hence, to socially exclude peripatetic groups of people. However, our reinterpretation of the qualitative data about these quarters basically shows that the tribal stigma traditionally associated with the presumed "Gypsy" identity is rather (re)produced on a residential basis as capitalist relations of production determine the trajectory of the urban economy. That is, if an urban spatial entity is designated as a "Gypsy" settlement within the dominant cultural imagery, its inhabitants, regardless of whether they come from peripatetic origins or not, are indiscriminately held subject to typical exclusionary and segregationist practices and ideologies. As this study demonstrates, members of Kurdish, Albanian or Turkish communities with non-peripatetic origins can face as much discrimination as late-peripatetics, such as Roma, Abdals (Tebers) and Boshas (Loms), and they

can be equally perceived in the "Gypsy" stereotype only because they are consigned into the same stigmatized settlement.

We also show that the extent to which territorial identity is a constituent of the "Gypsy" stigma depends on the historical trajectory that the demographic composition of a so-called "Gypsy" quarter follows. To be more precise, we suggested that if those with peripatetic origins continue to constitute the demographic majority in the quarter, late-settlers could not usually hold themselves exempt from being perceived in the typical "Gypsy" stereotype. On the other hand, if late-settlers become the dominant demographic element in time, the "Gypsy" stigma attached to the quarter exhibits a tendency to fade away, revealing the historically situated nature of the segregationist identification of an urban territory as "Gypsy."

The historical case of Nişantaşı Teneke allows one to keep track of the dynamic path a stigmatized urban quarter might follow. Together with Rumelikavağı, Nişantaşı Teneke also brings out the relationship between the share of late-peripatetics in the demographic composition of an urban quarter and the degree of segregation its inhabitants confront in their interactions with the outside. Furthermore, the Rumelikavağı case reveals that the form and the extent of a town's social, cultural, and economic incorporation to the city center has a significant effect on the way territorial segregation as based on the "Gypsy" stigma is lived through by its inhabitants. In a lower middle-class settlement with meager connections to the urban core, Rumelikavağı, territorial stigmatization manifests itself as a phenomenon endogenous to the town itself, without many repercussions on the outsiders' view of it.

This study suggested that these instances of territorial segregation based on the "Gypsy" stigma emerged in the Turkish urban space much before the neoliberal era. Their formation was linked to the long-standing significance of the informal sector in the national economy of Turkey, as a country located at the periphery of the world capitalist system. The phenomenon of the marginalized and territorially segregated mass of the urban poor, an off-spring of deindustrialization and of the withdrawal of the welfare state from the urban core in developed countries, has been a constitutive part of the urban social life in Turkey for a much longer time period dating back to as far as the late 19th century.

As we discussed above, Turkey's level of industrialization historically lagged much behind that in developed nations as a result of the way it

incorporated capitalism. To put it in other words, the bitter effects of deindustrialization on society that have come into question rather recently in the developed world, have had a much more sustained existence in Turkey. In fact, since the beginning of its interaction with world capitalism, the masses of the urban poor were largely unable to find their place in the industrial growth. The most disadvantaged ones among them including late-peripatetics were left almost no alternatives other than being compelled to work at the lowest layers of the informal sector, thereby encountering dehumanization at each step they took to free themselves from being imprisoned in the a residential-cum-tribal stigma of "Gypsy."

Admittedly, the similarities between the cases of territorial segregation in the developed countries studied by Wacquant (2008) and those examined by us cannot be ignored. However, it has to be emphasized that the territorial "Gypsy" stigma that emerged in the late-Ottoman city had a less "nationalized" and less "democratized" character. It was primarily the residents of the surrounding settlements with non-peripatetic origins who generated and perpetuated the territorial "Gypsy" stigma in our cases. And their image as "Gypsy quarters" remained confined to a local level, thanks to the relative inadequacy of mass-media in the era, but also to the distinctiveness of the socio-spatial phenomenon itself; that is, it was less widespread and less visible in comparison with the contemporary cases of the hyperghetto or the *banlieue* examined by Wacquant (2008). Thus, it makes sense to deem the mechanism observed in these cases dating back to the late Ottoman city as a subcategory of territorial stigmatization, that is, locally confined territorial stigmatization, in order to emphasize its distinct character.

Last but not least, we are of the opinion that the results of our secondary analysis of the available ethnographic and archival data about these two urban quarters need to be supported by further work and cannot be accepted as conclusive otherwise. Still, we hope that further historically informed, comparative analyses of the interrelation between the "Gypsy" stigma and urban territorial segregation in Turkey, like ours, might be helpful in designing such fieldwork by offering hypotheses to prove or to falsify.

References
List of sources
Archival Sources

BOA, DH, MKT, 632.19.1.2.30.

BOA, DH, MKT, 137.31.8.1.25.

BOA, İŞE, 2.30.1.13.

BOA, ŞD, 609.40.4.1.17.

BOA, ŞD, 695.29.8.3.3.

BOA, ŞD, 2749.40.1.20.

BOA, Y, PRK, KOM, 4.20.5.1.15.

Secondary Sources

Akkan, B. E., Deniz, M. B. & Ertan, M. (2017). The Romanization of poverty: spatial stigmatization of Roma neighborhoods in Turkey. *Romani Studies. 27*(1), 73-93.

Akkan, B. E., Deniz, M. B. & Ertan, M. (2011). *Poverty and social exclusion of Roma in Turkey*. İstanbul: Edirne Roma Association, Bogazici University Social Policy Forum, Anadolu Kültür.

Akkaya, Ö. (2011). Çingeneler: Başka bir dünyanın insanları. *Global Media Journal Turkish Edition. 1*(2), 121-136. Accessed on June 6, 2018 from http://globalmediajournaltr.yeditepe.edu.tr/makaleler/GMJ_2._sayi_Bahar_2011/pdf/Akkaya.pdf

Anon (2008). Eşitsiz vatandaşlık: Türkiye Çingenelerinin karşılaştığı hak ihlalleri. In E. Uzpeder, S. Danova / Roussinova, S. Özçelik & S. Gökçen (Eds.), *Biz buradayız: Türkiye'de Romanlar, ayrımcı uygulamalar ve hak mücadelesi* (pp. 53 - 108). İstanbul: Helsinki Citizens Assembly, European Roma Rights Center, EDROM.

Arslan, S. (2008). *Balkan Savaşları sonrası Rumeli'den Türk göçleri ve Osmanlı Devleti'nde iskânları* (Unpublished MA thesis), Trakya University Institute of Social Sciences, Edirne.

Balcı, İ. (2006). *Sarıyer: Aşiyan'dan Kısırkaya'ya*. İstanbul: İlkbiz Yayınevi.

Balcı, İ. (1999). *Simas'tan Sarıyer'e*. İstanbul: Günlük Ticaret Matbaası.

Batur, A. (1999). Akaretler. In N. Akbayar (Ed.), *Beşiktaş past and present* (pp. 119-121). İstanbul: Beşiktaş Belediyesi.

Bozkurt, T. (2006). Poşalar örneğinde etnisite ve toplumsal cinsiyet ilişkisi. In C. Suvari, A. Yıldırım, T. Bozkurt & M. İlker (Eds.), *Artakanlar* (pp. 283-355). İstanbul: E.

Buğra, A. & Keyder, Ç. (2003). *New poverty and changing welfare regime of Turkey: Report prepared for the United Nations Development Program*. Ankara: UNDP.

Caferoğlu, A. (1954). Pallacı, Tahtacı ve Çepni dillerine dair. *Türkiyat Mecmuası. 11*, 41-56.

Caferoğlu, A. (1950). Eskişehir ağızları üzerine bir deneme. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi. 4*(1-2), 15-33.

Caferoğlu, A. (1946). Kırşehir vilayetinin bugünkü etnik teşekkülüne dair notlar. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi. 2*(1-2), 79-96.

Cames, R. (2013). Government by expulsion: The Roma camp, citizenship, and the state. Paper presented at Resourceful Cities Research Committee, Sociology of Urban and Regional Development, International Sociological Association, Berlin, August 29-31, 2013. Accessed on November 10, 2018 from https://www.academia.edu/5618161/Government_by_Expulsion_The_Roma_Camp_Citizenship_and_the_State

Castells, M. & Portes, A. (1991). World underneath: The origins, dynamics, and effects of informal economy. In A. Portes, M. Castells & L. A. Benton (Eds.), *The informal economy studies in advanced and less developed countries* (pp. 11-40). Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Chen, M. A. (2012). *The informal economy: Definitions, theories and policies*. Cambridge: WIEGO.

De Goeje, M. J. (1886). A contribution to the history of the Gypsies. In D. MacRitchie (Ed.), *Accounts of the Gypsies of India* (pp. 1-60). London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

Ergin, O. N. (1995). *Mecelle-i umur-ı belediyye*. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı.

Erkan, S. (2011). Köçek tipinin uluslararası kökeni üzerine bir deneme. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Türkoloji Dergisi*. 18(1), 223-240.

Fleeming, M. H, Roman, J. & Farrell, G. (2000). The shadow economy. *Journal of International Affairs Editorial Board*. *53*(2), 387-409.

Filcak, R. & Steger, T. (2014). Ghettos in Slovakia. The environmental exclusion of the Roma minority. *Analyse & Kritik*. *2*, 1-22.

Gezgin, E. (2016). *Damgalanan mekânda yaşam: Bir kentin "ötekisi" olmak*. Ankara: Phoenix.

Ginio, E. (2004). Neither Muslim nor Zimmis: The Gypsies (Roma) in the Ottoman state. *Romani Studies*. *14*(2), 117-144.

Gmelch, S. B. (1986). Groups that don't want in: Gypsies and other artisan trader, and entertainer minorities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. *15*, 307-330.

Gmelch, S. B. (1982). Gypsies in British cities: Problems and government response. *Urban Anthropology*. *11*(3/4), 347-376.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Grellman, H. M. G. (1787). *Dissertation on the Gypsies being an historical enquiry concerning the manner of life, economy, customs, and conditions of these people in Europe, and their origin*. London: G. BIGG.

Güran, T. (1997). *Osmanlı Devleti'nin ilk istatistik yıllığı 1897*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

Gürboğa, N. (2016). Türk-Yunan nüfus mübadelesi ve devletin mübadil Romanlara ilişkin söylem ve politikaları. *Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. *9*(1), 109-140.

Hancock, I. (2003). On Romany origins and identity-questions for discussion. In A. Marsh & E. Strand (Eds.), *Gypsies and the problem of identities: Contextual, con-*

structed and contested (pp. 69-93). İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute in İstanbul.

İpek, N. (1999). *Rumeli'den Anadolu'ya Türk göçleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Jabbur, J. S. (1995). *The Bedouins and the desert: Aspects of nomadic life in the Arab East*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Johanson, L. (2001). *Discoveries on the Turkic linguistic map*. Stockholm: Svenska Forskningsinstitutet i İstanbul.

Karay, R. H. (1994[1965]). *Sonuncu kadeh*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.

Karpat, K. (2002). *Studies on Ottoman social and political history*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

Karpat. K. (2003). *Ottoman population 1830-1914: Demographic and social characteristics*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Katalin, G. (2015). The informal economy: Conceptual background and theoretical framework. In *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue* (pp. 57-71). Tirgu Mureş: Arhipelag XXI Press.

Kazgan, G. (1999). *Kuştepe araştırması*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Kearns, Kevin. C. (1977). Irish tinkers: An itinerant population in transition. *Annals of Association of American Geographers*. *67*(4), 538-548.

Kligman, G. (2001). On the social construction of "otherness:" Identifying "the Roma" in post-socialist communities. *Review of Sociology*. *7*(2), 61-78.

Ladstätter, O. & Andreas T. (1994). *Die Abdal (Äynu) in Xinjiang*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Lucassen, L. (1991). The power of definition. Stigmatization, minoritization and ethnicity illustrated by the history of Gypsies in the Netherlands. *Journal of Social Science*. *27*, 80-91.

Lucassen, L., Willem, W. & Cottaar, A. (1998). *Gypsies and other itinerant groups: A socio-historical approach*. London: Macmillan Press.

Lucassen, L. (1998). The clink of the hammer was heard from daybreak till dawn: Gypsy occupations in Western Europe. In L. Lucassen, W. Willem & A. Cottaar (Eds.), *Gypsies and other itinerant groups: A socio-historical approach* (pp. 153-173). London: Macmillan Press.

Marinaro, I. C. (2017). The informal faces of the (neo-)ghetto: state confinement, formalization and multidimensional informalities in Italy's Roma camps. *International Sociology*. *32*(4), 545-562.

Marushiakova, E. & Popov, V. (2016). *Gypsies in Central Asia and Caucasus*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marushiakova, E. & Popov, V. (2011). Between exoticization and marginalization: Current problems of Gypsy studies. *BEHEMOTH A Journal on Civilization*. *4*(1), 86-105.

Matras, Y. (2015). *The Romani Gypsies*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Matras, Y. (2004). The role of language in mystifying and demystifying Gypsy identity. In N. Saul & S. Tebbutt (Eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances* (pp. 1-20). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Matras, Y. (2004a). *Romani: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Y. (1999). The state of present-day Romani in Jerusalem. *Mediterranean Language Review*. *11*, 1-58.

Okely, J. (2014). Recycled (mis)representations: Gypsies, travelers or Roma treated as objects, rarely subjects. *People, Place and Policy*. *8*(1), 65-85.

Okely, J. (2002[1983]). *The traveler-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pamuk, Ş. (2005). *Osmanlı ekonomisinde bağımlılık ve büyüme 1820-1913*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.

Powell, R. & Lever, J. (2017). Europe's perennial "outsiders:" A processual approach to Roma stigmatization and ghettoization. *Current Sociology*. *65*(5), 680-699.

Powell, R. (2013). Loïc Wacquant's "ghetto" and ethnic minority segregation the UK: The neglected case of Gypsy-travelers. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. *37*(1), 115-34.

Powell, R. (2008). Understanding the stigmatization of Gypsies: Power and the dialectics of (dis)identification. *Housing, Theory, and Society*. *25*(2), 87-109.

Rao, A. (2009). Peripatetic peoples and lifestyles in South Asia. In B. Brower, & B. R. Johnston (Eds.), *Disappearing peoples? Indigenous groups and ethnic minorities in South and Central Asia* (pp. 53-72). California: Left Coast Press.

Rao, A. (1987). The concept of peripatetics: an introduction. In A. Rao (Ed.), *The other nomads: Peripatetic minorities in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 1-32). Köln: Böhlau.

Roux, J. P. (1987). The Tahtaci of Anatolia. In A. Rao (Ed.), *The other nomads: Peripatetic minorities in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 229-246). Köln: Böhlau.

Salo, M. (1987). The Gypsy niche in North America: some ecological perspectives on the exploitation of social environments. In A. Rao (Ed.), *The other nomads: Peripatetic minorities in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 89-110). Köln, Viyana: Böhlau.

Salo, M. (1986). Peripatetic adaptation in historical perspective. *Nomadic Peoples*. *21/22*, 7-36.

Salo, M. (1982). Roma niches: Economic and social organization in urban new England. *Urban Anthropology*. *11*(3/4), 273-313.

Scala, A. (2014). The mixed language of Armenian Bosha (Lomavren) and its inflectional morphology: Some considerations in light of Armenian dialectal variation. *Annali del Dipartimento di Studi Letterari, Linguistici e Comparati Sezione Linguistica*. *3*, 233-250.

Selçuk, H. (2013). *Tuna boyunda bir Osmanlı kenti: Vidin*. Konya: Çizgi.

Sinigerska, I., Chandler, D., Vaghjiani, V., Hassanova, I., Gooding, R., Morrone, A., Kremensky, I. & Kalaydjieva, L. (2006). Founder mutation causing infantile gm1-gangliosidosis in the Gypsy population. *Molecular Genetics and Metabolism*. *88*, 93-95.

Soulis, G. C. (1961). The Gypsies in the Byzantine Empire and the Balkans in the late middle ages. *Dumbarton Oaks Paper*. *15*, 141-165.

Stejskalova, M. (2013). Can we speak of ghetto in Czech cities? *Slovo*. *25*(2), 3-17.

Surdu, M. & Kovats, M. (2015). Roma identity as an expert-political construction. *Social Inclusion*. *3*(5), 5-18.

The General Directorate of Land Registry and Cadaster (2018). Parsel sorgulama. Accessed on November 28, 2018 from https://parselsorgu.tkgm.gov.tr

Vincze, E. (2013). Socio-spatial marginality of Roma as a form of intersectional injustice. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Sociologia*. *58*(LVIII), 217-243.

Wacquant, L., Slater, T. & Pereira, V. B. (2014). Territorial stigmatization in action. *Environment and Planning A*. *46*(6), 1270-1280.

Wacquant, L. (2013). Class, ethnicity and state in the making of marginality: revisiting territories of urban relegation. Accessed on October 15, 2014 from http://loicwacquant.net/assets/Papers/REVISITINGURBANOUTCASTS-Danish-article-version.pdf

Wacquant, L. (2012). A janus-faced institution of ethno-racial closure: A sociological specification of the ghetto. In R. Hutchison & B. D. Haynes (Eds.), *The ghetto: Contemporary global issues and controversies* (pp. 1-32). Colorado: Westview Press.

Wacquant, L. (2008). *Urban outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity.

Wacquant, L. (2007). Territorial stigmatization in the age of advanced marginality. *Thesis Eleven. 91*, 16-22.

Walach, V. (2015). Advanced marginalization or ghettoization? An analysis of a Czech socially excluded neighborhood in terms of inhabitants' representations. In K. Nedbalkova, K. S. Janku, S. Ficova, J. Novotna & D. P. Mark (Eds.), *Doing research, making science: The memory of Roma workers* (pp. 141-188). Brno: Centre for the Study of Democracy and Culture.

Widmann, P. (2007). The campaign against the restless: Criminal biology and the stigmatization of the Gypsies, 1890-1960. In R. Stauber & R. Vago (Eds.), *The Roma a minority in Europe: Historical, political and social perspectives* (pp. 19-30). Budapest: Central European University Press.

Willems, W. & Lucassen, L. (2000). Gypsies in the diaspora? The pitfalls of a biblical concept. *Histoire Sociale / Social History*. *6*, 251-269.

Willem, W. (1998). Ethnicity as a death-trap: The history of Gypsy studies. In L. Lucassen, W. Willems & A. Cottaar (Eds.), *Gypsies and other itinerant groups: A socio-historical approach* (pp. 17-34). London: Macmillan Press.

Williams, P., Lerch, O. & Lerch, M. (1982). The invisibility of the Kalderash of Paris: Some aspects of the economic activity and settlement patterns of the Kalderash Rom of the Paris suburbs. *Urban Anthropology*. *11*(3/4), 315-346.

Yalman, A. R. (1977 [1931]). *Cenupta Türkmen oymakları I-II*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Yıldırım, F. (2012). *Abdal gizli dili: İnceleme-sözlük*. Adana: Karahan Kitabevi.

Yılgür, E. (2018a). Son dönem Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda devlet ve Çingeneler: Vergi, askerlik ve adlandırma meseleleri. *MSGSÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. *2*(18), 267-303.

Yılgür, E. (2018b). Teneke mahallesi in the late Ottoman capital: A socio-spatial ground for the co-inhabitation of Roma immigrants and local poor. *Romani Studies*. *28*(2), 157-194.

Yılgür, E. (2017). Türkiye'de peripatetik topluluklar: Jenerik terimler ve öz-etnik kategorizasyon biçimleri. *Nişantaşı Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. *5*(1), 1-25.

Yılgür, E. (2016a). *Roman tütün işçileri*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Yılgür, E. (2016b). Lofça Muhacirler Mahallesi: Kentsel mekânın yeniden üretimi ekseninde peripatetik toplumsal organizasyon biçimleri. *Modus Operandi*. *4*, 177-210.

Yılgür, E. (2013). Nişantaşı Teneke Mahallesi: Mekânsal dönüşümün algısal ve sosyolojik arka planı. *MSGSÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 8*, 31-47.

Yılgür, E. (2012). *Nişantaşı Teneke Mahallesi: Teneke mahalle yoksulluğundan orta sınıf yerleşimine.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University.

Zürcher, E. J. (2004). *Turkey: A modern history*. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co.

Özlem Akkaya graduated from the Political Science and International Relations of Bogazici University in 2005. She accomplished her MA and PhD Degrees in the history of the Turkish Republic from Bogazici University. She is currently a member at the Visual Communication and Design Department of Yeditepe University.

Özlem Akkaya 2005'te Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü'nden mezun oldu. Yüksek lisans ve doktora derecelerini Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nden aldı. Halen Yeditepe Üniversitesi Görsel İletişim Tasarım Bölümü'nün akademik kadrosundadır.

E-mail: ozlemakkaya@outlook.com.tr

Egemen Yılgür graduated from the Public Administration Department of Istanbul University in 2005. He accomplished his MA and PhD degrees in sociology from Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University. He is currently a member at the Political Science and International Relations Department of Beykoz University.

Egemen Yılgür 2005'te İstanbul Üniversitesi Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü'nden mezun oldu. Yüksek lisans ve doktora derecelerini Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü'nden aldı. Halen Beykoz Üniversitesi Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü'nün akademik kadrosundadır.
E-mail: tegemen1523@yahoo.com