GEORGIOS E. TRANTAS

GREEK ORTHODOX RELIGIOSCAPES AS DOMAINS OF INTRA-EUROPEAN MIGRANT INTEGRATION AND EUROPEANISATION

Georgios E. Trantas
VID Specialized University, Stavanger, Norway.
E-mail: georgios.trantas@ymail.com, georgios.trantas@vid.no

Abstract: This article is an attempt to contribute to the discourse regarding the Europeanisation process from an alternative perspective: that of religiocultural aesthetics. Namely, stemming from the H2020 research project titled 'Go Religioscapes' and the empirical qualitative research thereof, the main lines of reasoning as well as the main argument of this paper is that a hybrid, collective European identity is possible and that this hybridity can be cultivated within the context of intra-European migrant religioscapes. With Christianity being a historically and culturally consolidated common denominator among European peoples, religiocultural adherence, in a broader context, can be utilised as a unifying factor in a post-secular sense. The osmosis of heterodox religious aesthetics is indicative of a harmonious symbiosis between denominations and further of the emergence of a new aesthetic – and symbolic constellations thereof, which in turn function as memorialisation of a hybrid identity narrative. Given that Christianity transcends nationality, it can function as an organic cultural bond between European peoples, as attested by the emergent thematic patterns that are identifiable in the Greek Orthodox migrant religioscapes of Great Britain and Germany. They have indeed developed unique identity strands that encompass inclusive particularities, identifiable at a symbolic religious level.

Key words: Greek Orthodoxy, church, religioscapes, migration, hybridity, Europeanisation, Europeanness, integration.

1. Introduction

The case studies examined in this paper are those of the Greek Orthodox migrant communities and the religioscapes thereof in Germany and Great Britain. Between the late 1950s and early 1970s, the formation of the aforementioned communities gave rise to the emergence of corresponding religioscapes. In both cases, the institution of the church constituted – for the most part it still does – the central reference point of the community. Community and church grew and evolved together while sharing the experience of migration, i.e. de- and reterritorialisation and integration. They shaped their narrative together, drawing from their common social experiences, and variably continue to do so (Trantas, 2019a).

The crucial element in the tautology – which is positioned in the etymology of the term 'ekklesia' that also means 'church'– between church and *ekklesia* is that their joint narrative found its aesthetic expression in the materiality of the Greek Orthodox migrant communities' places of worship that by and large constitute containers of those narratives, both because that was imposed by the circumstances and as a conscious choice. The term is meant here as community assembly and gathering. The phenomenon of religious aesthetic hybridity – not dogmatic syncretism – is indicative of interdenominational coexistence that transpired in both case studies; Roman Catholic, Anglican and Protestant churches have hosted Greek Orthodox parishes over the years and several such churches have been converted to Greek Orthodox in the lapse of time. In those buildings the coexistence of denominational symbolic as well as architectural elements, is easily observable. What is more, the appropriation of local elements, the commemoration of the religioscapes' localities and their local churches, which adhere to different Christian denominations, is not uncommon even in newly-built Greek Orthodox places of worship.

The central argument of this paper concerning both case studies of this research project is that the religioscapes examined demonstrate a typology of hybrid self-perception and ultimately of collective identity that is identifiable in religious aesthetics as well. Moreover, their hybridity and mutability as religioscapes is indicative of a transformative process, which, in the lapse of time, gives rise to a distinctive sense of belonging, an additional, distinct layer of identity that complements the local and national one. Namely, the emergent post-national layer of identity where Christianity functions as connecting tissue between home and host communities despite denominational dissimilarities, has the potential to ease – if not facilitate – the way towards endorsing Europeanness and hence the Europeanisation process. The latter is meant here as a

sociocultural process where religion is central in the perception of identity, being a major common civilisational identifier in the public sphere of all Member States of the European Union (EU).

As regards the operationalisation of the 'GO Religioscapes' project, I conducted a qualitative empirical research in Germany and Great Britain between October 2018 and July 2019, where I visited twenty-eight Greek Orthodox places of worship in Germany and twenty-six in Great Britain, where I gathered visual data. In its entirety, the body of primary data amounts to 8,890 image files (jpg format), which have been examined by way of semiotic visual analysis. This, essentially, means that a taxonomic analytical procedure has been applied in order for thematic areas to emerge out of the dataset. Those patterns that are relevant to the present paper crystallised out of the significations that pertain to belonging; more specifically, symbolic constellations of signifiers that point to hybrid identity perceptions in terms of locality and translocality, ethnicity, nationality and religious aesthetic hybridity combined. Ultimately, the emergent patterns of significations point to a post-national identity layer that is attributed to integration and constitutes a step towards a broader sense of belonging – potentially of Europeanness.

2. Integration, Europeanisation

Given that integration is a key-term in this study, it would be helpful to begin with an attempt to define it. The scholarly debate hosts a panspermia of standpoints, depending often on the discipline and the focal point of the study, but it would be fair to say that there is no single predominant definition, certainly not one that is generally endorsed and accepted, partly because the concept is neither free of controversy (Craig 2015), nor of the entrapments of ideology one might add. Be that as it may, a definition as such is not completely elusive, particularly since the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) provides via its glossary an all-purpose definition that *mutatis mutandis* covers several aspects of what integration may mean, being described as "the two-way process of mutual adaptation between migrants and the societies in which they live, whereby migrants are incorporated into the social, economic, cultural and political life of the receiving community. It entails a set of joint responsibilities for migrants and communities, and incorporates other related notions such as social inclusion and social cohesion" (IOM 2019, 106).

Still, the IOM acknowledges that the interpretation of the term varies, depending on the context and the country. Even though there are clear references to core-values, respected by both the migrants and any given host-country, the IOM does not steer clear from a rather functionalist approach as it focuses on the practical, tangible perhaps,

aspects of integration that pertain to labour, education, health etc., while references to the cultural aspect remain fuzzy and very much open to interpretation (IOM Online). The matter of cultural integration appears to be problematic in its framing and often a cause for controversy, considering that central elements of cultural identity, such as "traditions, values, mores and behaviour" (IOM, 2019, 12) are easier applied to assimilationist concepts, which self-evidently bear negative connotations due to their exclusionist principles. It would not be erroneous to maintain that the incorporation of culture in such attempts is easier when dealing with intra-European migration and integration, specifically in the context of the EU, for, at least the civilisational commonalities and compatibility between states and peoples – their particularities notwithstanding – render this discussion more feasible. Hence, in this light, integration can be defined as "the dynamic, multi-actor process of mutual engagement that facilitates effective participation by all members of a diverse society in the economic, political, social and cultural life, and fosters a shared and inclusive sense of belonging" (Ponzo et. al. 2013, 24).

This *sense of belonging* is of the essence here (Trantas 2018), because for a model of European Integration, also known as Europeanisation, above and beyond the domain of governance, structures, policies and the convergence thereof, a common 'we' is essential; a 'we' that can weather crises and challenges, moving in essence from the exclusionist, national ethnocentric to the inclusive, supranational Eurocentric model of belonging. And in turn, that 'we' requires a commonly shared sense of Europeanness. Concerning the European Integration process or Euro–peanisation, definitions tend towards a systematised conceptualisation that is predominantly structural and institutional, referring to practices of policies and governance. To Radaelli, for instance, even though Euro–peanisation admittedly connotes several meanings of historical and cultural significance, ultimately, when examined from a systematised political perspective it "consists of processes of a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and sub-national) discourse, political structures and public policies" (Radaelli 2004, 3).

Likewise, Featherstone also concedes that the meaning of Europeanisation extends well beyond the constraints of integration and convergence, yet at the same time he points out that in a maximalist sense, the broader historical-cultural theorisation of the term as regards the implicit structural change therein, identifies with Europe. On the other hand, in a minimalist sense, the interpretation of Europeanisation entails, rather, the political aspect of the European Union (Featherstone 2003). Generally, according to Featherstone, Europeanisation encompasses

the aspects of history, cultural diffusion, institutional as well as political adaptation, with the two former constituting maximalist interpretations of Europeanisation, which are loosely and remotely linked to the operation of the EU; whereas the minimalist interpretations of institutional and political adaptation constitute central dimensions of the way the EU operates (Ibid.). However, it is precisely the historical background of Europeanisation and the potential for trans-cultural diffusion that are of interest here; because those dimensions are elemental to the organic emergence of an EU identity, which in its core could not be anything other than European.

The significance of an identity construct as such is underlined by the fact that it constitutes a research theme of the European Commission's agenda since the 1990s and the 5th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (European Commission 2012). Moreover, a shared identity can function as a vehicle towards cooperation between societies, nationally as well as supranationally. By the same token, a type of European identity, "a strengthened sense of being a European" (Ciaglia, Fuest and Heinemann 2018, 8), would help foster trust, solidarity and cooperation in line with Europeanisation. The consequences of the neglected aspect of identity have been repeatedly evident in the distinct lack of solidarity between Member States and their peoples amidst successive crises that met the EU: the debt crisis, the refugee crisis and Brexit (Ibid.: 11).

Admittedly, to create a European identity is easier said than done, among others, because in any process where a collective self is demarcated, however much inclusive, parallel exclusionist dynamics are inevitable. Still, I hold the development of a European *selfness* as essential to the success of Europeanisation. Unlike the commonplace dictionary definition of egoism and selfishness, *selfness* here is meant as the opposite of otherness, as *selfhood and consciousness of identity that emanates from a perceived collective self-image of relative civilisational and cultural homogeneity and/or kinship.* Clearly, of course, the distinctive features of selfness determine its boundaries, whether geographical, civilisational, cultural, etc. By extension, where selfness ends otherness begins, but this is not necessarily an exclusionist definition, as there can be no 'self' without the 'other' and vice versa.

3. Religion and European Selfness

Without a doubt, differences and particularities aside, one common cultural denominator that could constitute a constituent element of European selfness would be religion. To be sure, Western Europe underwent a "seemingly irreversible secularisation process" (Casanova 2006, 23), yet the emergence of the European Union and the process of

European Integration has given rise to the question concerning a possible European identity and the role and place of Christianity in it. Grace Davie observes that religious belief has taken a more individual form, of "believing without belonging" (Ibid.), with religious belief being uncoupled from church attendance. Within this context, large numbers of Europeans still identify as Christians, which, to Danièle Hervieu-Léger constitutes a form of "belonging without believing" (Ibid., 24). Both interpretations are indicative of the complexity of how group religiosity and identity are intertwined, even when believing is nominal and merely helps determine group adherence. Casanova suggests that if the European Integration process is to be successful, the EU should look beyond secular neutrality and endorse post-secularism, and thereby allow room for Christianity – and by extension collective memory and identity perception – to be more present and visible in the public sphere (Ibid., 39).

Checkel and Katzenstein have identified this vacuum as well. Their observation that "European economic and political integration has proceeded in a technocratic fashion" (2009, 2) still holds true and this one-sided approach has been at the expense of constructing a shared identity. Identities comprise an array of symbolic representations, memories, and of course social practices, values and norms, shared by the majority of those that constitute a group of people. Inevitably, religion partakes in this amalgam and what is more, it has become increasingly politicised and by many Europeans it is intuitively perceived as a determinant of cultural and civilisational boundaries (Ibid.). The polysemy of the concept of Europeanness notwithstanding, by looking into Europe's past one can identify some common denominators in what comprises Europe, with Christianity being one of its fundamental cultural elements. The gestation of the humanist European identity through Europe's long history can be reduced for practical reasons to four essential foundations, i.e. "Greek culture, Roman jurisprudence, Christianity, and the political legacy of the Germanic peoples" (Vergara 2007, 16). More to the point, the ideal of a supranational Europe as a *mutatis mutandis* unitary cultural entity has persevered through the ages due to "a cultural ethos that has strongly impregnated the individual and collective consciousness of its peoples" (Ibid., 19).

Among others, it is religion that contributes to the emergence of a European selfness, which in turn would bestow legitimacy to the EU as it would help give rise to a European demos, regardless if a number of scholars argue against the necessity of a popular legitimation as such. Moreover, the role of religion towards the construction of a broadly perceived European unitary identity has been neglected despite the fact that the origins of the European Integration project can be traced back to the Christian Democratic founders of the EU. Amidst the secularisation that was subsequent to the Christian Democratic generation, identity construction by way of religious symbolism continued, albeit not as

visibly. But this is no coincidence, considering that symbolic instances of a European polity had already been embedded into the Carolingian iconography (Nelsen and Guth 2016).

It is, then, no coincidence that religion is regarded as a means towards establishing social cohesion, and hence Grace Davie's aforementioned formula of "believing without belonging" (1990, 455) can be inverted to "belonging without believing" (Hervieu-Léger, 2006, 48). Religion, being an element of shared memory, intuitively contributes to the construction and reproduction of collective identity perception regardless of church attendance, belief or non-belief. Aesthetics in the public sphere play a decisive role in that respect as they reflect the Judeo-Christian cultural context in which institutions and values evolved. Attitudes, ultimately cultures, have been co-shaped in given religious and historical contexts across Europe; state, politics, ethics, citizenship, social and political structures, etc., are still susceptible to that influence (Ibid.). I am not arguing of course that in this context emerges a homogeneous European identity – nor is it necessary. Yet, Europeanisation has presented the societies of the EU Member States with the opportunity to develop European integrational identities alongside the national ones. In accordance with Spohn's multilayered constellation model, regional, national, European civilisational and integrational layers of identity coexist and complement one another, in a process of constant dialogue and interaction, being thus constantly under construction (Spohn 2005).

It would not be out of place to consider the memorialisation of religion a phenomenon that transpires in Western societies, which, due to their tendency for change that inevitably leads to a distancing from tradition, seek to compensate for their 'cultural memory loss'. In doing so, they render religion part of their heritage and embed it in their collective memory. What is important here is that this heritage – acknowledged by the EU's official texts, e.g. the Treaty of Lisbon – exerts influence on collective cultural choices (Hervieu-Léger 2006). Moreover, the encompassing European identity is constantly under construction, both spatially and culturally, but it is worth noting that a constant in this process is that the overarching model of Europeanness is Western-centric, as the Eastern flank of Europe was rendered peripheral while the relevance of the West was heavily pronounced (Spohn 2005). Obvious differences in the trajectories of states, their structures, political socialisation and national identities, as those evolved in the lapse of time while undergoing dissimilar fermentations in light of distinct geopolitical and cultural circumstances, have been embedded in the respective collective memories and affect both the national as well as the European collective perception of identity; therein rest inequalities, antitheses and imbalances (ibid.). However, memory and the memorialisation of identity elements, such as religion, are not bearers of the absolute historical truth – who/what is anyway? – and in being in a relative state of flux, or at least

subject to some change, it is possible for memory to adapt, allow room for hybridity and be of use in the construction of inclusive, hybrid identity models.

4. Religioscapes and the Glocal Aesthetics of Hybrid Identity Perception

Hybridity is the crux of the matter here, particularly as regards migrant religioscapes, but the notion is more broadly applicable to memory formation. In the EU where freedom of movement and residence is a cornerstone of citizenship (Marzocci 2020), the formation of glocal cultural clusters or communities can be taken for granted. Religioscapes, i.e. "subjective religious maps – and attendant theologies – of immigrant, or diasporic, or transnational communities who are [...] in global flow and flux" (McAlister 2005, 251), may well function as testing ground of interdenominational and intercultural osmosis, and further as an intermediate identity layer towards Europeanisation – the main argument of this paper.

McAlister's authoritative definition of religioscapes is indeed founded upon the dynamics of mobility and globality, i.e. "the compression of the world" (Robertson 2012, 205) that has by and large resulted in the emergence of broadly defined ethnoscapes, which comprise "the landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live" (Appadurai 1990, 297). An identifiable aspect of such spatial configurations would be their glocal character, especially since glocality occurs as a simultaneous process of globalisation, namely as a plurality of glocalities where religious diversity is prominent (Beyer 2013; Roudometof 2013; 2018). Migrant religioscapes exemplify this emergent typology.

Glocal community formation in the form of religioscapes is typically visible in the public sphere. *Mutatis mutandis* homogeneous religiocultural configurations as such, are characterised by the desire to claim and demarcate their space, which undergoes an aesthetic transformation in accordance with the cultural identity and heritage of the group. The latter, seeks to modify its built environment, and, this applies to religion as well. Religious beliefs and practices find ways of expression through symbols, artefacts, buildings, places of worship and generally through religion's materiality, thereby spatially demarcating the religioscape's physical presence: "The religioscape, then, is a social space marked by physical icons, from small shrines to large complexes of them, or even sacred cities" (Hayden and Walker 2013, 408).

In examining the spatiality of religiocultural migrant formations, one observes the emergence of *lieux de mémoire.* Sites of memory embody memorial consciousness, typically, through the materiality of the past, which is institutionalised for the most part in Western societies where

there is a break between old and new, traditional and modern (Nora 1989). This materiality relies on symbolic constellations to draw meaning and legitimacy, a principle largely applicable to Europeanisation and its collective consciousness construct as well. Symbolisms reflect social, cultural and political change, of which they constitute codifications. They denote and connote sovereignty, belonging, otherness and adherence, among others, and all in all they bestow meaning and substance (Foret 2009).

"Culture is public because meaning is" (Geertz 1973, 12); in that sense, from a semiotic, anthropological perspective, religious and sacred symbols represent and convey a collective ethos and a worldview – ultimately, aspects that comprise cultural physiognomy. The centrality and significance of symbols is clearly identifiable in Geertz's definition of religion, for, they constitute the material expression of the aforementioned ethos and worldview: " (1) a system of symbols which acts to (2) establish powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in men by (3) formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and (4) clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that (5) the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic" (Ibid., 90).

Symbols stand for meaning, irrespective of religion, hence, a cross or a crescent perform an analogous function: they link the ontological, cosmological dimension to aesthetics and morality (Ibid.).

By way of symbols, tradition lives on. Tradition is a transgenerational legacy that imparts legitimacy, continuity, but also obligations of the present and future to the past, where tradition stems from. "The act of re-transmission – the passing of an eternal torch to future generations – reduces past, present, and future to the same idealised and timeless state; it erases temporal difference and, thus, agency" (Engler 2005, 373). Through this temporal compression the past undergoes a process of constant reconfiguration due to the flux and ever-changing circumstances and exigencies of any given present. In the same vein, it is also worth mentioning that the timelessness of any imagined community does not only function as a means towards submerging the individual to the group identity and, ultimately, the perpetuation of the former via the latter; the convergence of the past with the present of a community imparts and germinates meaning to the present and future alike (Engler and Grieve 2005).

In passing, it should be mentioned that adaptability is not uncommon in the Byzantine religious aesthetic, i.e. in the iconographical and architectural tradition. The phenomenon dates back to the early Christian times in the Hellenic peninsula and the antagonistic intersection of religioscapes, where the expansion of Christianity resulted in the expropriation of materials previously belonging to pagan temples and sanctuaries. By contrast, in the Ottoman times (1453–1830) the Hellenic

aesthetic element is introduced into the Orthodox religious art by way of illustration of notable figures of the antiquity (Makrides 2009). Examples of traces of adaptability are also detectable in the Orthodox architecture, not least in the innovative appropriation of pagan artefacts and the rather liberal interpretation of canonical restrictions, judging by the depiction of imaginary entities, in instances of twelfth-century Orthodox art and architecture for example (Maguire 1999). In practice, the principle of 'economia' has been applied to the materiality of Orthodoxy, albeit variably. Location, available building materials, climate etc., together with the style and taste of the architect, co-shaped building practices across time. The constant that determines the architectural standards would be that the liturgical and theological needs must be served by the building. Yet, all in all, the dynamic character of the Byzantine aesthetic tradition is clearly observable (Ousterhout 1999). More to the point, the social, cultural, economic and political circumstances of any given time and place, tend to find an outlet of expression, directly or indirectly, through religious materiality (Trantas and Tseligka 2016). And although the above-mentioned mutability and adaptability is limited in the neo-Byzantine model that is predominant in contemporary, domestic Greek Orthodox examples, being permeated by a high degree of homogeneity and replication, this is not the case with the places of worship of the Greek-Orthodox religioscapes abroad, in the Diaspora (Trantas 2019a).

There, and specifically in Germany and Great Britain, manifestations of relativisation, mutability, hybridity, inclusiveness and aesthetic syncretism are rife in the Greek Orthodox religioscapes. At this point it would be helpful to identify those thematic categories that emerged out of the data analysis and mention a few examples. Themes with references to locality are identifiable in both case studies, and, in fact, this is typically evident in a glocal context. The same *mutatis mutandis* applies to manifestations of an interdenominational symbiosis, which take various forms architecturally and symbolically. Further, it is also worth noting the emergent theme of public communication, which again is evident at a symbolic level in the public sphere, with the religious aesthetics being overall means of communication in their own right.

Explicit references to locality clearly demonstrate spatial patterns of belonging. Those are primarily illustrated in several frescoes and icons in Germany, in churches such as those of Apostle Paul in Nurnberg, Apostle Andreas in Düsseldorf, St John in Brühl, etc., where the broader location of the parish, namely the city, is immortalised and venerated in the form of frescoes. Therein, the heart of the religioscapes, the Orthodox Church, stands in the urban setting and its ekistic, administrative and commercial landmarks, clearly including the churches of the other Christian denominations in the overall depiction. A similar example would be that of the church of the Holy Cross in Mannheim, where, in a distinct icon the city's landmarks and migrants' workplaces are clearly commemorated.

However, in the aforementioned examples, it is not only the appropriation of the city that is aesthetically immortalised and embedded in the collective narrative of the community; instances such as that of St John in Brühl where the saint is depicted as a patron, epitomise spatial appropriation by the community and the endorsement of the city as home. The latter is also identifiable in Great Britain, where location is typically commemorated in a different form, that is, in written. Banners in churches bear the name of the parish and that of the city, frequently in a bilingual manner. That is the case for instance, in the Greek Orthodox communities of Sts Nicholas and Xenophon in Leicester, St Athanasios in Cambridge, Holy Trinity and St Luke in Birmingham, etc.

Especially in Great Britain, the availability of Anglican churches that are no longer in use is such that there has been no need to build new churches; conversion to Orthodox – architecturally and aesthetically within reason and in accordance with limitations – is typically the solution. More to the point, in their vast majority those buildings are listed, as they constitute British cultural heritage, hence they are being preserved by the denominations that they host. The same has transpired in a lesser degree in Germany over the years. All in all, in both cases the symbiosis of Christian denominations under the same roof, especially during the early years of migrant community and Greek Orthodox religioscape formations, has been proven productive as regards integration. Stepping out of their denominational comfort zone, the body of the faithful initially saw church attendance in unfamiliar places of worship as a type of necessity, but being exposed for lengthy periods of time to, formerly heterodox, moderately converted churches, they grew fond of them as their communities established themselves as religioscapes. It would not be out of place to say that they now view their churches as part of their particularity. A few indicative architectural examples of that mutability and hybridity that attests to a harmonious symbiosis, would be the churches of All Saints in London, St Basil and St Paisios in Lincoln, St Athanasius in Cambridge, St Spyridon in Great Yarmouth, or Archangel Michael and St Demetrios in Aachen, Life-giving Source in Wuppertal, St Nicholas in Hamburg, etc.

The heterodox symbiosis is not exhausted in the many examples of architectural features. An aspect that epitomises the phenomenon thereof would be the veneration of commonly accepted saints and religious figures; pre-schismatic saints who evangelised Western Europe in general and the countries of interest in particular. Several of them are featured in frescoes and icons and are celebrated when applicable. Saints of the British Isles such as Ss Aidan, Chad, Oswin, etc. or Ss Ansgar, Boniface, Ursula of Germany constitute examples as such. In addition, bilingual references to saints in the churches as well as outdoors are commonplace, adding thus another facet to the constituent elements of the perceived identity.

Recognising the inherent limitations imposed on article length, even though there remains an array of significations and emergent thematic categories still untouched, it would perhaps be essential to mention the obvious symbolic constellation: that of flags. The latter are typically located on the outside of any given church, being thus purveyors of meaning, not only to the church attendants and community members, but also to the church's surrounding area and its inhabitants. Flying the appropriate flags might be considered a formality, but it is a meaningful one nonetheless. The typology that emerges out of the data analysis shows that by definition churches demonstrate a multifaceted sense of *being* and therefore of *belonging* via flags. In Germany this is done by hoisting the German, the Greek, the Byzantine and the EU flag. In Great Britain, the flag assortment somewhat differs, as the row of flagpoles flies the Cypriot, Greek, Byzantine, British and EU flags. However, ever since the British departure from the EU, euphemistically known as Brexit, the EU flags are normally removed. Still, what this flag assortment stands for, beyond the institutional formality, is several layers of identity, combined together, with the central meaning of post-national hybridity being conveyed. Of course the layer of Europeanness is maintained in the Greek Orthodox religioscapes of Germany at a symbolic level, and it will be interesting to observe how this difference plays out in the future, when the British departure is completed and digested.

Of course, as stated already, the examples above emanate from the religioscapes that were formed in the late 1950s and onwards. This means that one has to take into account the limited mobility of the time that enhanced the closeness of the community members in a context of precariousness and uncertainty as regards the status of the migrants; particularly so, when referring to the pre-Maastricht period and the freedom of movement within the EU. As a result, the uncertainty and insecurity that was more pronounced and widespread among community members in the past functioned as a motivation to rally round the church, which was a constant among variables and a familiar institution that was linked to the homeland. But still, even though that degree of uncertainty has been lifted, both due to European Integration as well as because of naturalisation in the host-country, the church continues to be relevant in community life, and what is more, it still co-shapes the collective identity perception (Trantas and Tseligka 2016). Moreover, it receives new members that make use of the freedom of movement and the dynamic of globalisation, while glocality is simultaneously at work. In that respect the church continues to edify and take part in the integration of newcomers, in line with its decades-long practice in both countries, while at the same time it remains relevant to the previous migrant generations (Trantas, 2019b).

5. Conclusion

Both the concepts of integration and Europeanisation are rather elusive as regards their definition and clarity. Yet that does not mean to say that it is not possible to arrive at a consensus as regards their essential composition, which necessitates a common and inclusive sense of belonging that stems from a shared identity perception. In other words, a strengthened sense of European selfness, the opposite of otherness, that is founded upon Europe's common cultural denominators, with religion being inevitably prominent among them. It is no coincidence that despite Europe's secularisation, Europeans feel a sense of belonging that is based on Christianity's symbolic cultural connotations of a pervasive cultural ethos, rather than on spirituality. Be that as it may, and however much intuitive, this imparts a degree of legitimacy to Europeanisation.

Christianity is omnipresent and stands prominent in the European public sphere through its materiality and structures that ultimately constitute means of religious and cultural memorialisation, apart from constituting cultural heritage. The latter tends to contribute to the shaping of the collective memory, *ergo* self-determination, and in that way it infuses the constantly-under-construction collective identity perception with its own ethos. Moreover, Christianity still constitutes a common European cultural denominator despite the denominational differences between countries and societies.

In light of the notable mobility across the EU, which has given rise to the formation and expansion of intra-European migrant religioscapes, the religiocultural layer of identity gains increased significance, as it is potentially formative of an emergent post-national identity that can in turn constitute a basis for a European one. From the 'GO Religioscapes' project it appears that the heterodox symbiosis can be productive in that respect, as it facilitates organic expressions of aesthetic mutability and hybridity that emerge out the migratory and integrational social experience. The corresponding evidence attests to dynamic particularities that are subject to change. New conceptual associations are formed within the religious environment where the cultural osmosis renders inclusive multilayered identity perceptions possible. And indeed, the realisation of a post-national identity, essential for the emergence of a European one, is rendered possible.

available at the corresponding URL of the European Commission:
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/789827.

References:

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Theory Culture Society* 7, 2-3: 295-310.

Beyer, Peter. 2013. *Religion in the Context of Globalisation: Essays on Concept, Form, and Political Implication.* London: Routledge.

Casanova, José. 2006. "Religion, European Secular Identities and European Integration" In *Religion in the New Europe*, edited by Krzysztof Michalski, 23-42. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. and Katzenstein, Peter J. 2009. "The Politicization of European Identities" In *European Identity*, edited by Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein, 1-28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ciaglia, Sarah, Fuest, Clemens and Heinemann, Friedrich. 2018. *What a feeling?! How to promote 'European Identity'.* EconPol Policy Report 9.

Craig, Gary. 2015. *Migration and Integration: A local and Experiential Perspective.* Iris Working Paper Series No. 7. University of Birmingham.

Davie, Grace. 1990. "Believing without Belonging: Is this the future of Religion in Britain?" *Social Compass* 37, 4: 455-469.

Engler, Steven and Grieve, Gregory P. 2005. "Illuminating the Half-Life of Tradition: Legitimation, Agency, and Counter-Hegemonies" In *Historicising "Tradition" in the Study of Religion*, edited by Steven Engler and Gregory P. Grieve, 1-18. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Engler, Steven. 2005. "Afterword: Tradition's Legacy" In *Historicising "Tradition" in the Study of Religion*, edited by Steven Engler and Gregory P. Grieve, 357-378. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

European Commission. 2012. *The development of European Identity/Identities: Unfinished Business.* Brussels: Directorate-General for Research and Innovation.

Featherstone, Kevin. 2003. "Introduction: In the Name of Europe" In *The Politics of Europeanization*, edited by Kevin Featherstone and Claudio M. Radaelli, 3-22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foret, François. 2009. "Symbolic Dimensions of EU Legitimization." *Media, Culture and Society* 31, 2: 313-324.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

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

Hervieu-Léger, Danièle. 2006. "The role of Religion in Establishing Social Cohesion" In *Religion in the New Europe*, edited by Krzysztof Michalski, 45-63. Budapest: Central European University Press.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). 2019. *International Migration Law. No. 34 – Glossary on Migration.* Geneva: IOM – UN Migration.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). Online. IOM and Migrant Integration. Accessed June 22, 2020. iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/What-We-Do/docs/IOM-DMM-Factsheet-LHD-Migrant-Integration.pdf.

Maguire, Henry. 1999. "The Profane Aesthetic in Byzantine Art and Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 53: 189-205.

Makrides, Vasilios N. 2009. *Hellenic Temples and Christian Churches: A Concise History of the Religious Cultures of Greece from Antiquity to the Present.* New York NY: New York University Press.

Marzocchi, Ottavio. 2020. "Free movement of persons." Fact Sheets on the European Union – European Parliament. Accessed September 17, 2020. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/147/free-movement-of-persons.

McAlister, Elizabeth. 2005. "Globalization and the Religious Production of Space." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44, 3: 249-255.

Nelsen, Brent F. and Guth, James L. 2016. "Religion and the Creation of European Identity: The Message of the Flags." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 14, 1: 80-88. DOI: 10.1080/15570274.2016.1145476.

Nora, Pierre. 1989. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations*, *Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory* 26: 7-24.

Ousterhout, Robert. 1996. "An Apologia for Byzantine Architecture." *Gesta* 35, 1: 21-33.

Ponzo, I., Gidley, B., Roman, E., Tarantino, F., Pastore, F. and Jensen, O. 2013. *Researching Functioning Policy Practices in Local Integration in Europe: A Conceptual and Methodological Discussion Paper,* Turin, ITCILO.

Radaelli, Claudio M. 2004. "Europeanisation: Solution or Problem?" *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 8, 16: 1-23. http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.htm.

Robertson, Roland. 2012. "Globalisation or Glocalisation?" *Journal of International Communication* 18, 2: 191-208.

Roudometof, Victor. 2013. "The Glocalizations of Eastern Orthodox Christianity." *European Journal of Social Theory* 16, 2: 226-245.

Roudometof, Victor. 2018. "Glocal Religions: An Introduction." *Religions* 9, 10: 294. DOI: 10.3390/rel9100294.

Spohn, Willfried. 2005. "National Identities and Collective Memory in an Enlarged Europe" In *Collective Memory and European Identity: The Effects of Integration and Enlargement*, edited by Klaus Eder and Willfried Spohn, 1-16. London: Routledge.

Trantas, Georgios E. 2018. *Being and Belonging: A Comparative Examination of the Greek and Cypriot Orthodox Churches' Attitudes to 'Europeanisation' in Early 21st Century.* Erfurter Studien zur Kulturgeschichte des Orthodoxen Christentums, Band 16. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

Trantas, Georgios E. 2019a. "Greek-Orthodox Religioscapes as Domains of Migratory Integration and Hybridisation in Germany and Great Britain: A Comparative Study." *Politics and Religion Journal* 13, 2: 309-332.

Trantas, Georgios E. 2019b. "Intra-European Mobility, Emigration and New Dynamics within Greek-Orthodox Religioscapes." *University of Oxford, SEESOX Diaspora Working Paper Series.* Paper No. 4.

Trantas, Georgios E. and Tseligka, Eleni D. 2016. "Where the Byzantinesque Meets the Urbanesque: Architectural and Hagiographic Elements of Greek Orthodox Urban Reterritorialisation in Germany," *Zeitschrift Für Balkanologie* 52, 2: 241–260.

Vergara, Javier. 2007. "The History of Europe and its Constituent Countries: Considerations in Favour of the New Europe." *Journal of Social Science Education* 6, 1: 15-22.