UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Haunted Modernities: Linguistic and Cultural Change in Ottoman Turkey

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Comparative Literature

by

Monica Marie Katiboğlu

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Nasrin Rahimieh, Chair
Associate Professor Nergis Ertürk
Professor Jane Newman
Professor Ngugi wa Thiong'o

2017

DEDICATION

To
my family

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It goes without saying that I am forever grateful to my family whose love and words of encouragement and enthusiasm throughout this process was always an invaluable source of inspiration.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Monica Marie Katiboğlu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Comparative Literature; University of California, Irvine, 2017.

M.A. Comparative Literature, University of California, Irvine, 2012.

M.A. French Literature, University of California, Irvine, 2011.

M.A. French Literature, California State University, Long Beach, 2006.

B.S. Management Science, University of California, San Diego, 2003.

PUBLICATIONS

Katiboğlu, Monica. "*Mai ve Siyah* Romanında Dil Ötesi Uygulama." *Siyah Endişe*. İstanbul: İletişim Press, 2017. Forthcoming.

Katiboğlu, Monica. "Constructing the Orient: Pierre Loti's Reinterpretations in *Aziyadé*." In: *French Orientalism: Culture, Politics and the Imagined Other*. Eds. Desmond Hosford and Chong Wojtkowski. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010: 124-40.

SELECTED AWARDS & FELLOWSHIPS

Institute of Turkish Studies, Dissertation Writing Grant, 2015-2016.

School of Humanities, Humanities Graduate Student Research and Travel Grant, University of California, Irvine, 2014.

Institute of Turkish Studies, Summer Language Study Grant, 2014.

School of Humanities, Summer Language Study Award, University of California, Irvine, 2014.

Best Teaching Assistant Award, Department of European Studies & Languages, University of California, Irvine, 2014.

University of California Regents Fellowship, University of California, Irvine, 2009 - 2010.

Graduate Student Fellowship in Turkish Literature, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey, 2006-2008.

Graduate Dean's List of University Scholars and Artists, California State University, Long Beach, 2006.

Student Life and Development Academic Travel Grant, California State University, Long Beach, 2006.

Phi Beta Delta International Honors Award, California State University, Long Beach, 2005.

SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Middle East Studies Association, "Edebiyat-ı Cedide on Modern Language: A Case Against Linguistic Purification," Panel: Language and Identity, Washington D.C., (Nov. 2017).

Siyah Endişe: Bir Asır Sonu Anlatısı Olarak Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil Edebiyatı, "*Mai ve Siyah* Romanında Dil Ötesi Uygulama (Translingual Practice)," Panel: Mai ve Siyah Deneyimi, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey, (April 2016).

AATT Pre-Conference in Turkish and Turkic Studies, "Translingual Practice in Edebiyat-ı Cedide (New Literature)," Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., (Nov. 2014).

Literature of Mobilities, "Emine Özdamar's "Grandfather Tongue" and the Challenge to Atatürk's Reforms: Connecting Past and Present," University of California, Irvine, (March 2012).

French Orientalism: Culture, Politics and the Imagined Other, "L'Orient de Pierre Loti," City University of New York, New York, (April 2006).

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Department of English

Teaching Assistant. Critical Reading and Rhetoric. Instructor of Record. University of California, Irvine, (Three Quarters) 2014-2015.

Department of European Languages and Studies

Teaching Assistant. *Of Harlots and Harems: Desire in the French Orient.* University of California, Irvine, (One Quarter) 2014.

Teaching Assistant. *Language of Love?* University of California, Irvine, (One Quarter) 2013.

Teaching Assistant. Fundamentals of French. Instructor of Record. University of California, Irvine, (Ten Quarters) 2010 - 2014.

LANGUAGES

Turkish
French
Ottoman Turkish
Arabic (reading with dictionary)
Persian (reading with dictionary)
German (reading with dictionary)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association
Middle East Studies Association

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Haunted Modernities: Linguistic and Cultural Change in Ottoman Turkey

By

Monica Marie Katiboğlu

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature

University of California, Irvine, 2017

Professor Nasrin Rahimieh, Chair

This dissertation examines processes of translation (in the broad sense) in an earlier moment of global modernization in an avant-garde Ottoman Turkish literary movement, Edebiyat-ı Cedide ("New Literature"). Noted for its experimentation with words and narrative stylistics and for ushering in a new way of representing reality, I argue that Edebiyat-ı Cedide innovation is at once connected to Ottoman and European literary practices, yet at the same time different from them. My theoretical framework draws on theories of interlingual and cultural translation to help me analyze how meanings are invented in, not transferred to, the local environment. Paradigms of European influence, which prevail in the conceptualization of this significant literary movement, neglect to account for the ways in which Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors try to come to terms with the asymmetrical relations of power between global languages. This issue necessarily involves the question of time in language. In particular, how do Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors deal with the specter of the European linguistic other as representing the present and as a reference of superiority and the specter of Arabic and Persian as intimate linguistic others as represented as belonging to the past?

The first chapter examines Edebiyat-ı Cedide discourse on language highlighting the ways in which the authors legitimized neologisms and innovative syntax in Edebiyat-ı Cedide fiction.

Chapters 2 and 3 shifts the focus from discourse to fiction. Chapter 2 examines the role of the narrator (and the protagonist as the narrator's double) in cultural translation attending to rhetoric on Ottoman tradition and innovative writing. The third chapter analyzes the employment of translingual vocabulary (in particular, established terms with reinscribed meaning) and narrative devices and how these terms and devices produce interiority in Edebiyat-ı Cedide psychological narratives.

Introduction:
Edebiyat-ı Cedide, Or, Tracing the Contours of a Movement

This dissertation focuses on a chapter of Turkish literary history, entitled Edebiyat-ı Cedide (New

Literature), and counters the dominant tendency to classify it as a byproduct of Westernization.

Also referred to as *Servet-i Fünun* ("Wealth of Science"), the title of an avant-garde literary

journal in which the writers associated with Edebiyat-ı Cedide disseminated their ideas and

fiction between 1896 and 1901, this literary movement is noted for its experimentation with

words and narrative stylistics and for ushering in a new way of representing reality. Like the

Tanzimat literary period ("Reorganization," 1860-1896)[1] which preceded it, Edebiyat-ı Cedide is

part of late-Ottoman cultural history and the impetus to modernize literary form and language.

While Tanzimat literature attempted to harmonize European form with Ottoman-Turkish

sensibilities, Edebiyat-ı Cedide literature aimed at breaking free from Ottoman tradition and

Islamic epistemology in its attempt to articulate an alternative modernity. In this way, Edebiyat-ı

Cedide fundamentally altered the modern aesthetic foundation from which modern Turkish

literature emerged. This dissertation offers a comprehensive analysis of how this alternative

modernity was understood and shaped by the major voices of Edebiyat-ı Cedide. I argue that

Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers crafted their language and literary style through a complex negotiation

---

[1] The Tanzimat literary period emerged in the wake of political and social reforms beginning with the Gülhane
Rescript in 1839. In the mid-nineteenth century, Ottoman intellectuals saw European forms of literature as the
necessary vehicle for producing desired social changes in the empire. Thus, they initiated the assimilation process of
European texts through translation and adaptation resulting in the generation of the Ottoman Turkish novel. It is
important to note that, as Jale Parla asserts, Tanzimat authors negotiated between "the absolute, a priori, deductive
authority of Islamic tradition and the positivist, empirical and materialist worldview of European secularism" in
writing the new forms of literature (20). See her monograph *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik
Temelleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1990. For an in-depth overview of the Tanzimat literary period, see Ahmet
Evin. *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1983, Robert Finn. *The
Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: ISIS Yayımcılık, 1984, and Berna Moran. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir
Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

and translation between multiple languages and histories. The modernity that emerges from this process needs to be more carefully studied and understood.

Servet-i Fünun, founded as a scientific journal in 1891, began its literary focus in 1896 when poet, novelist and critic Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem (1847-1914) and the journal's proprietor Ahmet İhsan Takgöz (Ekrem's former student at Mekteb-i Mülkiye, or "School of Administration") agreed to shift the weekly periodical's focus to literature. Although Ekrem was not fully part of the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement, his impact on it cannot be underestimated. For the Edebiyat-ı Cedide group, Ekrem's significance was above all else formative. They adopted his new critical ideas on literature as articulated in *Talîm-i Edebiyyât* ("The Teaching of Literature," 1882), which conceptualized politically disinterested literature in his equivalent of "art for art's sake" and foregrounded the psychological dimension of literature.[2] In this way, Ekrem's book registers a radical shift in Ottoman Turkish rhetoric that made the emergence of Edebiyat-ı Cedide possible. Moreover, Ekrem was instrumental in starting the new movement in literature by appointing poet Tevfik Fikret, Ekrem's former student at Galatasaray Sultânîsi ("Imperial School of Galatasaray"), editor in chief of *Servet-i Fünun*, and under Tevfik Fikret's direction, the journal soon became vital in literature and literary criticism. Before banding together at *Servet-i Fünun*, Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers published their work in various periodicals, and enthusiastic about their employment of language and style, they closely followed each other's publications.[3] Once Tevfik Fikret took the helm of the journal in 1896, these other like-minded writers soon joined *Servet-i Fünun* and established the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement. The

---

[2] According to Mehmet Rauf's memoires, the Edebiyat-ı Cedide group regarded Ekrem's literary language and style as uninspiring. See Mehmet Rauf. *Edebi Hatıralar*. Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2008.

[3] Some of the most striking examples are the work of Cenap Şahabettin in poetry and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil and Mehmet Rauf in prose. For detailed accounts see Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın. *Edebiyat Anıları*. Ed. Rauf Mutluay. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1975. and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Kırk Yıl*. Ed. Nur Özmel Akın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014. and Mehmet Rauf. *Edebi Hatıralar*. Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2008.

poetry, serial novels, short stories and criticism published by Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers brought

considerable attention to the avant-garde journal. Some of the chief ambitions of the journal

included enlightening Ottomans on sciences and knowledge circulating in western Europe in the

form of translations, news items, and photographs which appeared in the journal along with

Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing. Despite their attempt to avoid the strict censorship of the time, the

journal was temporarily shutdown in 1901 by Abdülhamit II (reign 1876-1909) for publishing

"Hukuk ve Edebiyat" (Law and Literature), translated from French by Edebiyat-ı Cedide

journalist, critic and prose writer Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın. Inasmuch as the *Servet-i Fünun* journal

resumed publication six weeks later, it ceased to function as the main media organ for the

Edebiyat-ı Cedide group, whose members, discouraged by censorship, seemed to disperse

silently. Eventually, however, the writers returned their focus to writing, producing significant

criticism, memoirs, and compilations of poems and serialized novels published previously in

Servet-i Fünun. The movement persisted but lost the momentum it enjoyed during the brief

period at *Servet-i Fünun*.[4] Even if short-lived, the movement had far-reaching effects in modern

Turkish literature by establishing its very aesthetic foundations.

 Criticism of Edebiyat-ı Cedide has largely remained ambivalent: both celebrating it for

successfully "Westernizing" Turkish literature and reprimanding it for being detached from

"Turkish" history.[5] This ambivalence that marks Turkish criticism on Edebiyat-ı Cedide is

---

[4] The principles of Edebiyat-ı Cedide survived in Fecr-i Ati ("Dawn of the Future"), a movement that thrived in 1909-1912, even if the movement emerged in opposition to Edebiyat-ı Cedide. But the Milli Edebiyat ("National Literature") movement of 1911-1923 harshly criticized the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement, shifting the dominant principles from art for art's sake to art for society's sake and firmly rejecting employment of Arabic and Persian in Turkish literature.

[5] Most notably, this ambivalence informs Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's criticism of Edebiyat-ı Cedide, particularly in his collection of critical articles on literature and culture *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler.* 1969 Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005. In Chapter 2 I discuss this ambivalence in more detail in Tanpınar's characterization of Edebiyat-ı Cedide novels. As I demonstrate in Chapter 3, Berna Moran's criticism bears the traces of this ambivalence in his prominent work *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. Other important critics on Edebiyat-ı Cedide have

symptomatic of Turkish criticism in general being torn between two extremes resulting from a

rift introduced into Ottoman culture by the Tanzimat state-sponsored reforms of the nineteenth

century. As Turkish cultural and literary critic Nurdan Gürbilek understands these two extremes:

> The first one assumes that what is original is elsewhere ("outside," namely in the West) while the second insists that we do have an authentic literature and a genuine native thought but in order to appreciate it we have to leave aside all those lifeless imitations and snobbish efforts related with the West. The first one, accompanied by an unconditional admiration for the foreign model, devaluates its object by reducing it to an import, while the second takes sides with a true self that was almost crushed by the foreign ideal, waiting for the right moment when oppressed tradition, the repressed past, or the autonomous inner world will speak with a language completely its own.[6]

Speaking of the violence that takes place in the process of modernization, Gürbilek insists that

the nationalist fantasy of returning to ourselves, as apparent in Turkish criticism, "disregards the

fact that this self is already shaped by the other" (624). Gürbilek's insightful study of the dualities

of originals and imitations that impact modern literature in Turkey gestures to problems of

translation between European and non-European languages. My interest in Edebiyat-ı Cedide

concerns how the self is shaped by the other in a complex process of adaptation, assimilation and

domestication that is fought out on the terrain of language.

In modern Turkish literary criticism, the Edebiyat-ı Cedide literary movement has often

been defined as a literary period under the name Servet-i Fünun after the journal in which the

writers published between 1896 and 1901. My focus on the literary movement rather than the

period underscores the fundamental characteristics of the avant-garde writers' common pursuit of

artistic writing free of conventional use of language and form and the ways in which they

---

attempted to overcome this ambivalence but nevertheless continue to draw uncritically on paradigms of European influence in their conceptualization of Edebiyat-ı Cedide. For instance, see Bilge Ercilasun. *Servet-i Fünun'da Edebi Tenkit*. 3rd ed. Ankara: Akçağ, 2012 and Fazıl Gökçek. *Dekadanlar: Bir Tartışmanın Hikayesi*. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.

[6] Nürdan Gürbilek. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness and the Turkish Novel." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. 102:2/3 (2003): 599-628. 600-601.

4

participate in the dialogical construction of global modernity. They set out to produce what they themselves had come to call "Edebiyat-ı Cedide," or New Literature, as distinct from Ottoman tradition and comparable to contemporary western European literature. What for them constitutes this newness in literature and what about it is significant?

The term "Edebiyat-ı Cedide" must be closely examined in a global context to apprehend "global relations of force" experienced in Ottoman Turkish and that marks the movement's name. In his study of Hindi and Urdu languages and literatures of the nineteenth century, Aamir Mufti argues that global processes of assimilation of diverse textualities into the now universal category of *literature* with its Latinate etymology and genealogy is only partially concealed by the vernacular term "adab" to signify new literariness.[7] In the Ottoman context, the term "edebiyat," a derivation of the Arabic term "adab" ("edeb" in Turkish) with its connotation of good breeding, courtesy and urbanity,[8] was first employed by Tanzimat intellectuals like İbrahim Şinasi and Namık Kemal in the second half of the nineteenth century to construct a hypothetical equivalence with the French term "littérature." If the term "edebiyat" references new literariness in the European sense, the question remains: why were Ottomans compelled to coin the tautological title by adding the adjective "cedide," also signaling newness, modern? The formation of the title Edebiyat-ı Cedide provides clues to further apprehend the tensions involved in the processes of assimilation and modernization of language and literature. Meditating almost four decades later on the historical context of the literary movement's name, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil states:

> Edebiyat-ı Cedide?.. Bu isim de nereden çıkmıştı? Bunu hiçbir zaman layıkıyla izah edemedim. Bu bir istihzadan çıkmıştı. Edebiyat-ı Cedide, sonraları edebiyat tarihiyle iştigal edenlerin Tanzimat Edebiyatı dedikleri Şinasi ve Namık Kemal mektebinin unvanı idi ve Recaizade ile Abdülhak Hamit'in yürüttükleri hareket-i edebiyeye izafe edilmişti.

---

[7] Aamir Mufti. "Orientalism and the Institution of World Literatures." *Critical Inquiry*. 36 (2010): 458-493. 461.

[8] F. Gabrieli. "Adab." in: Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. Eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 17 June 2017 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0293

Güya yeniliğe bir kati hat tayin edilebilirmiş, artık o Edebiyat-ı Cedide'den sonra başka bir teceddüt hareketine mesağ yokmuş gibi gene ondan inşiab eden, onun ancak tersim ettiği bir geniş yola korkusuzca dalan zümreye gülünç bir unvan vermek istendi. Kim bilir hangi muhalif tarafından ortaya "Yeni Edebiyat-ı Cedide" alayı fırlatıldı ve artık bunu bütün muhalifler dillerine doladılar. Yeni Edebiyat-ı Cedide dediler, kollarından tutup kaldırdılar, gene attılar ve bu atış kaldırış arasında yeni sıfatı kendiliğinden düştü, ortada bir Edebiyat-ı Cedide kaldı, bu unvanı onun banileri addedilenler de kabul ettiler ve öylece bütün varlığında zamanın gelecek yeniliklerine pek tabii bir tekâmül nazarı ile bakan Edebiyat-ı Cedide bu unvanla kısa, fakat dolgun ömrünü yaşadı.[9]

Edebiyat-ı Cedide?.. Where did this name come from? I have never been able to adequately explain this. It emerged out of sarcasm. Edebiyat-ı Cedide was the title of [İbrahim] Şinasi and Namık Kemal's school of thought, which later those occupied with literary history called Tanzimat Literature, and included the literary movement put into force by Recaizade [Mahmut Ekrem] and Abdülhak Hamit. As if newness could be determined by only one definitive line, as if there were no permission after that Edebiyat-ı Cedide [Tanzimat Literature] for a different movement of renewal, they wanted to give an absurd title to the group that broke away from it and nevertheless courageously plunged into the wide path that they charted. Some adversary mockingly came up with "Yeni Edebiyat-ı Cedide" [New New Literature], which then was bandied about by all adversaries. They called it Yeni Edebiyat-ı Cedide, they cast [the term "Yeni" ("New")] aside, they called it Yeni Edebiyat-ı Cedide, they picked [the term] up by the arm, and again cast it aside, and the new adjective ["Yeni" ("New")] fell away by itself amidst this casting aside and retrieving so that only Edebiyat-ı Cedide remained. The founding group members accepted this title and it was thusly that in its entire existence Edebiyat-ı Cedide, looking at future innovations as a very natural evolution, lived a short, but full life with this title.

In other words, the name Edebiyat-ı Cedide emerged out of the need to distinguish the modern literature that the avant-garde members carved out from the previous generation of literati. Halit Ziya's account of the movement's name highlights problems of cross-cultural transactions between and across diverse languages at the turn of the twentieth century.

In my reading of Edebiyat-ı Cedide, my contention is that translation must be understood as two interconnected processes: interlingual translation (the circulation of meaning between languages) and translation as modernization in non-European languages and literatures. These two interconnected processes of translation constitute "translative writing." Lydia Liu's model of

---

[9] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Kırk Yıl*. Ed. Nur Özmel Akın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014. 628-629.

translingual practice, or global circulations of meaning, sharpens my understanding of translation

operating in the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement by helping me reconsider the role of translation at

significant moments of cross-cultural encounter. As the Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers mastered the

French language much better than their Tanzimat precursors, they engaged in translative writing

that intensified in Ottoman Turkish the circulation of words, ideas, concepts, categories,

discourses and modes of representation. To better understand how meanings circulate between

languages, I find useful Liu's theory of translingual practice, which she defines as "the process by

which new words, meanings, discourses, and modes of representation arise, circulate, and acquire

legitimacy within the host language due to, or in spite of, the latter's contact/collision with the

guest language."[10] Indeed, meanings are not transferred when concepts travel from one language

to another; as Liu contends, they are invented within the local environment. No longer a neutral

event indifferent to contending interests of political struggles, translation "becomes the very site

of such struggles where the guest language is forced to encounter the host language, where

irreducible differences between them are fought out, authorities invoked or challenged,

ambiguities dissolved or created . . . until new meanings emerge in the host language itself."[11]

Paradigms of influence that inform theories of Westernization neglect how words, ideas

and concepts travel from place to place and they mask much more complex tensions involved in

the process of circulation and legitimation. Liu's work problematizes paradigms of influence with

the notion of coauthorship as an integral process of meaning making in non-European languages.

"The circulation of meaning involves a great deal of coauthorship and struggle among dominant

and dominated groups over the meanings and distribution of universal values and civilizational

---

[10] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity—China, 1900-1937.*
Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 26.
[11] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity—China, 1900-1937.*
Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 26.

resources. In order for the process of circulation to take place at all, the agents of translation on each side start by hypothesizing an exchange of equivalent meanings, even if the hypothesis itself is born of a structure of unequal exchange and linguistic currency."[12] Embedded within this understanding of translation as exchange is a power relationship between "dominated" and "dominant" languages; yet, this relationship is never in one direction only.

How must we apprehend moments of intense modernization of language and literature within this framework of translation as communication and exchange? My main argument is that from the avant-garde Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors' translative writing practices, which entail intense negotiations between multiple languages and histories as part of the translingual practice, there emerges innovation at once connected to Ottoman and European literary practices and at the same time different from them. To fully delineate the nature of this difference, I draw on the concept of "surplus meaning" as deployed by Liu. She uses this term to signify meaning created in translation that cannot be traced back exclusively to either foreign influence or to local tradition, even if it is profoundly connected to both.[13]

Liu's model considers how meaning travels from language to language with the understanding that meaning never travels "innocently." But in this process of circulation, what happens to the non-European language when translation is a means of modernization? To help me answer questions concerning modernization and comparison at work in the Edebiyat-ı Cedide translingual practices, I engage Rey Chow's theoretical work on cultural translation.[14] For

---

[12] Lydia H. Liu. "The Question of Meaning-Value in the Political Economy of the Sign." *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. Ed. Lydia H. Liu. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999. 21
[13] Throughout this dissertation, I use the word "tradition" with the understanding that tradition is unfixed, and undergoes a kind of translation in the process of passing from one generation to the next.
[14] In particular, I draw on Rey Chow's essay "Translator, Traitor; Translator, Mourner (or, Dreaming of Intercultural Equivalence)" in her collection of essays *Not Like a Native Speaker: On Languaging as a Postcolonial Experience*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014.

instance, how does a culture discursively construct its own language and literary traditions as different, deficient, or backward? In earlier moments of global modernization, Chow argues, narratives in non-European regions of the world are caught up in an act of cultural reflexivity, in which instead of some far off exotic other (as it is seen in European fiction), one's own culture becomes the object of scorn and estrangement. Viewing the narrator as an arbiter of values in cross-cultural writing between uneven languages, Chow compares this reflexive rendering of indigenous tradition to translation. This kind of translation reverses the established conception of the original as privileged, because there first, and translation, whose value is determined by how well it reflects the original, as inferior. In Chow's model of cultural translation that takes place in non-European societies, the original (indigenous culture, language, literacy) is rendered inferior to the translation, which establishes itself as modern. Because of the fundamental unevenness among the world statuses of different languages, the task of this translator/narrator is not faithfulness to the original but betrayal.[15] In the process of transcribing the scene, the translator/narrator underwrites it in another code or language, the language of modernization, in which the original scene takes on a new kind of legibility as it is disparaged and devalued. Characterized by a determination to abolish tradition in the impetus to modernize, this narrative consciousness enacts translation which amounts to mourning. I draw on both Liu and Chow's models for the ways in which they analyze the historical conditions that make translingual practice possible and for the emphasis that they place on comparison as part of this practice.

Understanding Edebiyat-ı Cedide through the lens of translative writing makes it possible to meaningfully account for the ways in which Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors tried to come to terms

---

[15] Chow has pointed out elsewhere that etymologically the word translation is linked to "tradition" and "betrayal." See Rey Chow. "Film as Ethnography: or, Translation Between Cultures in the Postcolonial World." *The Rey Chow Reader*. Ed. Paul Bowman. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

with the asymmetrical relations of power between global languages and the effects of such

relations. Their treatises and fiction point to intense negotiation with the understanding of

European languages and literatures as a reference of superiority and traditional Ottoman writing

practices, which drew heavily on Arabic and Persian, as part of their history that increasingly

became suppressed as a result of the Ottoman encounter with Europe. Although the Ottoman

Empire was never colonized by Europe, to maintain its sovereignty against an increasingly more

powerful Europe, it became gradually more drawn to Europe and European ideas, particularly

beginning in the nineteenth century. These dynamics suggest that Ottoman Turkish of the time is

asymmetrical vis-à-vis European languages and thus open to the concept of cultural translation as

modernization as defined by Chow. During the nineteenth century, Ottoman intellectuals and

writers adapted some of the linguistic and literary norms to make them correspond to European

expectations and criteria for evaluation. However, the process was not reciprocal. While the

Ottoman Empire was not subject to European colonization, nevertheless it experienced the type

of assimilation of non-European languages and literatures Aamir Mufti understands as

Orientalism[16] that functioned as a "colonization of the linguistic outside."[17] In this way, Ottoman

Turkish could be said to be haunted by the European other. But we must also take into account

that Ottoman Turkish is haunted from within by Arabic and Persian as intimate others that

beginning in the Tanzimat era were represented as belonging to the past. As Edebiyat-ı Cedide

attempts to break free from Ottoman tradition, aspects of the suppressed past emerge in the form

of archaic words in their writing. It is this double haunting that marks Ottoman Turkish

modernity.

---

[16] Aamir Mufti. "Orientalism and the Institution of World Literatures." *Critical Inquiry*. 36 (2010): 458-493. 489.

[17] Nergis Ertürk. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. xiii.

In light of the double haunting manifest in Edebiyat-ı Cedide, addressing questions of specters of the past operating in the present becomes a primary focus of this dissertation. We might understand the emergence of the suppressed past as symptoms of a kind of mourning, described by Freud as a complex process of detaching from a loved object. From Freud's seminal essays "Mourning and Melancholia" and "Recollection, Repetition, and Working Through," French philosopher Paul Ricœur conceptualizes "working through" as the very process of translation, either as interlingual or intercultural transaction. Central to Ricœur's hermeneutic paradigm of translation as a labor is the work of mourning and the work of remembering/forgetting. If, as Chow argues, abruptly breaking from one's own tradition amounts to mourning, then related processes like remembering and forgetting must be considered as an integral component in translation that is modernization. Betraying tradition in order to modernize is characteristic of societies outside of Euro-America that have been forced to "live lives comparatively by virtue of experiencing some form of colonization or subjection enforced by the specter of imperialism."[18] Yet, traces of the past, even though suppressed, continue to shape the present in unexpected ways. In the mutual negotiation between the past and the present, as specialist of Asian modernity Harry Harootunian postulates, the past and the present coexist as uneven temporalities, even if the latter is suppressed, injured, or forgotten.

My analysis of Edebiyat-ı Cedide's translative writing aims to reveal how Edebiyat-ı Cedide engages in the power struggle among global languages. Both Liu and Chow's research on cross-cultural writing in Chinese at the turn of the twentieth century has enlightened our understanding of the problems of translation between asymmetrical languages in earlier processes

---

[18] Harry Harutoonian. "Some Thoughts on Comparability and the Space-Time Problem." *boundary 2*. 32.2 (2005): 23-52. 47.

of global modernization. The goal of this dissertation is to deepen our understanding of these processes by shedding light on the Ottoman Turkish experience.

My dissertation is composed of three chapters. Chapter 1 examines Edebiyat-ı Cedide discourse on language, particularly concerning neologisms and syntax employed in their writing, set in the broader context of Ottoman linguistic modernization beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. As Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers legitimize processes of translation in their articles, their discourse exposes problems of comparison and value as an integral part of modernity. Taking Lydia Liu and Harry Harutoonian's theoretical models as my starting point, I argue that Edebiyat-ı Cedide discourse on language and literature illuminates the process of interaction that helps universalize the modern by rewriting and reinventing it in translation. My analysis reveals the processes through which Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers drew on archaic Arabic and Persian words to create new meanings in Ottoman Turkish. These innovations appeared against the prevailing trends toward simplification and vernacularization of Turkish that was intended to distinguish it from the high Ottoman literary language which was composed of Turkish, Arabic and Persian vocabulary and grammatical structures. To attain commensurability and comparability with European (primarily French) literatures and languages, Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors coined neologisms and neologistic constructions to represent and replace foreign (mostly French) words, ideas and concepts. These newly minted words, which drew on forgotten aspects of the Ottoman tradition, produced a ghostly presence that haunts Edebiyat-ı Cedide.

If Edebiyat-ı Cedide used journals as a space to legitimize the new literary movement, we can understand their fiction as consciously engaged in problems of translation in a moment of shared and contested modernization. Chapters 2 and 3 trace the rhetoric of the narrator that intersect in these problems and the employment of translingual narrative devices in prose fiction. As such, the analysis of Edebiyat-ı Cedide poetry falls outside of the scope of this dissertation.

In Chapter 2, I examine how Edebiyat-ı Cedide novels produce a "language of modernization" that aims to render tradition (European difference) obsolete in attempts to gain equal footing with Europe in Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's *Mai ve Siyah* ("Blue and Black," 1886-87) and Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın's novel *Hayal İçinde* ("Inside Imagination," 1898). Both novels have stakes in the modernization of Ottoman language and literature, not only from the narrator's standpoint, but also the protagonist's. The narrator's focus revolves around the process of rendering Ottoman literary conventions as inadequate while forging new writing through linguistic and cultural translation. Yet, both novels expose acute anxiety over this process of modernization that is left unresolved, which also produces meaning.

My third chapter shifts the focus to vocabulary and narrative devices that shape the perception of modern subjectivity in two novels representative of Edebiyat-ı Cedide: Mehmet Rauf's novel *Eylül* ("September," 1900) and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel *Aşk-ı Memnu* ("Forbidden Love," 1900). I examine how Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers imagined the individual and the ways in which translingual modes of representation help them to do so. As registering the interiority of the individual was their primary focus, Halit Ziya and Mehmet Rauf experimented with forms of narration and figurative writing that include free indirect discourse, and interior monologue as a means of remapping the inner world of subjects. The focus on interiority and subjectivity underscores another form of translating, in this case the category of self into a universal vision of the human and the tensions therein.

Chapter 1
Ghosts and Circulation of Meaning: Edebiyat-ı Cedide Discourses on Literary Modernity

In form and style, the Edebiyat-ı Cedide ("New Literature") literary movement, while a brief historical moment (1896-1901), fundamentally changed the aesthetic foundations of modern Turkish literature through translational practices, a complex process of adaptation, assimilation, and invention of meanings. At a significant moment of cultural encounter with Europe (largely French), Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers endowed the narrative voice with a self-reflective interiority, creating new representations of subjectivity in response to modernity through sentence structure and vocabulary. They regarded words, grammatical structures, and other linguistic elements as transmitters of experiences of modernity.

The principle concern of Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors remained consistently anchored in the invention of a new literary language in reaction to the nineteenth-century Ottoman project of linguistic modernization whose aim was to simplify the composite nature of Ottoman Turkish. The Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers countered these efforts by cultivating an aesthetic literary language (what they termed "sanatkârâne," or "artistic") which provoked controversy. Yet the proponents of the avant-garde literary language defended and continued to promote their views in *Servet-i Fünun* and other contemporary Ottoman periodicals. Most controversial was Edebiyat-ı Cedide's employment of language as a means of reshaping Ottoman literature. My interest lies in their use of *Servet-i Fünun* as a space in which to legitimize the production of global translatability, or, to borrow from Lydia Liu, "the historical making of hypothetical equivalences between

languages."[19] To that end, the overarching questions I seek to answer in this chapter include: What are Ottoman engagements with problems of comparison, translation, and value? What do these engagements tell us about the ways in which Ottomans participated in the dialogical construction of global modernity in an earlier moment of a shared and contested process of modernization? How did Edebiyat-ı Cedide discursively construct "modernity" and how did the avant-garde movement interpret its own moment of unfolding?

Edebiyat-ı Cedide discourse on language and literature, as reflected in *Servet-i Fünun* and other journals of the time, serves as a fertile archive for questions of grammar, neologisms and literary style. In articles spanning several years, Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers frequently concern themselves with Ottoman language as literary value and its ability to accurately and effectively represent reality. I examine how reciprocity of meaning is produced and circulated at this significant moment of intensified translation of western European languages. I also analyze how they grappled with problems of translation in the struggle over meanings and exchange-value, what for them constituted a "modern" language constructed within a structure of unequal power. Although the problems with which they engage seem consistently self-referential, their discourse is thoroughly immersed in and contingent on comparison. I argue that in its discourse on language, Edebiyat-ı Cedide sheds light on the process of interaction that helps universalize the modern by rewriting and reinventing it in translation.

Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing, directed at forging artistic writing with the power of conveying complex emotional states of the individual, incorporated Arabic and Persian lexicon and grammatical structures to represent and replace French words, ideas, and categories. Lydia Liu's

---

[19] Lydia H. Liu. "Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the Nineteenth Century." *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. Ed. Lydia Liu. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999. 137.

model of translation helps me understand how European words, ideas etc. travel to a non-European language. Yet, my study of Edebiyat-ı Cedide requires me to address their frequent use of (oftentimes archaic) Arabic and Persian in coining words and expressions meant to represent new ideas and perspectives in a historical moment of vernacularization that aimed to suppress non-Turkish linguistic elements. I understand the reemergence of Arabic and Persian as symptomatic of revenant ghosts of the Ottoman tradition and history that, as a result of contact with Europe, had to be experienced as the past, while Europe is experienced as an "always already present."[20] Thus the model of translation between European and non-European languages, which consistently privileges space in its focus on movements crossing linguistic borders, must account for the spatiotemporal relationship at work in translation. For, even as Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors consciously attempted to extensively break free from traditional Ottoman forms of writing in their effort to produce modern literature, the past "continue[s] to erupt as so many indices of time with forgotten and/or unfinished potentialities."[21] In Edebiyat-ı Cedide discourses, these potentialities are met with ambiguity; for, the revenant ghost is at once celebrated for its potentiality for reformation and rearticulation and viewed as something that must be overcome. In order to comprehend the negotiations between the past and present apparent in Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing and their attempt to deal with these negotiations in their discourses, my study draws on Harry Harootunian's conception of comparative practice grounded on a space-time correspondence. For Harootunian, this comparative practice accounts for the "larger spectrality of societies deeply involved in fashioning a modernity coeval with Euro-America yet whose difference is dramatized by the revenant, the past and the premodern culture

---

[20] Rey Chow. "The Old/New Question of Comparison in Literary Studies: A Post-European Perspective." *ELH*. 71.2 (Summer, 2004): 289-311. 306.

[21] Rey Chow. "The Old/New Question of Comparison in Literary Studies: A Post-European Perspective." *ELH*. 71.2 (Summer, 2004): 289-311. 306.

of reference, which appear as ghosts that have not yet died but have become repressed excess"

and that "haunt and disturb the historical present."[22] This chapter examines the ways in which the

Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement comes to grips with the haunting from the outside (Europe) and the

inside (Ottoman tradition) in their engagement in global circulations of meaning.

Modernizing Language: The Suppression and Release of Internal Linguistic Others

The Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement was largely concerned with forging a literature expressed in an

aesthetic language and detached from politics, exemplified in their equivalent of "art for art's

sake" or "sanat için sanat" principle. Their approach to invigorating language consisted of

experimental innovation with words and style that, in certain important ways, opposed the project

of linguistic modernization that had begun to intensify in the Tanzimat literary period

("Reorganization," 1860-1896). And yet, Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers did not view themselves as

entirely separate from Tanzimat literature, particularly in the Tanzimat's efforts to "catch up to

the West." But their differing approaches to language and literature generated tension and debate.

Edebiyat-ı Cedide's understanding of modern language and literature is best apprehended in the

broader historical context.

The nineteenth-century Ottoman project of linguistic modernization emerged from the

simultaneous intensification of communications and the rise of an Ottoman Turkish journalistic

movement.[23] The earliest stage of simplification began in the eighteenth century in the form of

---

[22] Harry Harutoonian. "Some Thoughts on Comparability and the Space-Time Problem." *boundary 2*. 32.2 (2005): 23-52. 47.

[23] I draw on Nergis Ertürk's significant analysis of the modernization of Ottoman Turkish in light of phonocentrism in her monograph *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. See in particular pages 31-45. Also see her article "Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey." *Boundary 2*. 37.2 (2010): 155-185.

lexicographic and grammatical movements and translation projects of Islamic texts in order to

better facilitate state communication. But it was decisively the journalistic movement of the

nineteenth century that "succeeded in establishing as a standard of written language a form of

Turkish close to spoken Turkish."[24] The rise of journalism accelerated significantly after the

Tanzimat reforms with the aim of Ottoman unification and social reform that became a major

preoccupation for the state. As a series of edicts beginning in 1839, the Tanzimat reforms were

intended to modernize the Ottoman state through an adoption of concepts in part imported from

Europe and the United States.[25] In this process, Ottoman intellectuals recognized the need to

reform, or to "ameliorate," their written language by simplifying and popularizing it to effectively

disseminate knowledge beyond bureaucrats and literati. The changes implemented in written

language in essence set out to negate centuries of Ottoman assimilation of Arabic and Persian

texts, which had developed into a written language composed of Turkish, Arabic and Persian

lexicon and grammatical structures.

Since the fourteenth century, Ottoman Turkish had been the high written language of the

elite, including bureaucrats and literati. Although both written and spoken languages incorporated

Arabic and Persian vocabulary and grammatical structures, written Ottoman Turkish of the elite

drew on Arabic and Persian to such an extent that by the sixteenth century the written language

had diverged significantly from the vernacular.[26] Saliha Paker and İhsan Fazlıoğlu have both

incisively argued that the development of elite Ottoman Turkish involved assimilation and

appropriation of Arabic and Persian texts through translative practices. Paker terms this process

---

[24] Şerif Mardin. "Some Notes on an Early Phase in the Modernization of Communications in Turkey." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 3.3 (1961): 250-271. 252.

[25] See Şükrü Hanioğlu. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

[26] Hayati Develi. *Osmanlı'nın Dili*. 6th ed. Istanbul: Kesit, 2013. 62. And Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 12.

"Ottoman interculture" and describes it as "a hypothetical site where poet-translators operated in the overlap of Turkish, Persian and Arabic cultures."[27] Ottoman interculture, as Paker convincingly asserts, became an "autonomous literary culture system" that "evolved from hybridization."[28] Thus by the sixteenth century Arabic and Persian grammatical structures and lexicon could no longer be understood as borrowed linguistic elements but as belonging to the Ottoman language. Examining Ottoman translative practices of scientific and philosophical texts into Turkish from the early Ottoman period to the Tanzimat, Fazlıoğlu posits that the Arabic language represented a quasi-symbolic apparatus for the mediation of truth ("hakikat").[29] Through hybridization of Turkish, Arabic and Persian vocabulary and grammar, there emerged a composite written language and literary culture system.[30] As elite writing came to differentiate itself from Turkish spoken by the commoners, Turkish (the common language or "lisan-ı basit") was deemed harsh ("sert") and vulgar ("kaba"). Following the Tanzimat reforms of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman state sponsored projects of translation from European languages which also coincided with the rise of Ottoman print capitalism and contributed to the standardization and simplification of Ottoman Turkish and the effort to eliminate the gap between written and spoken language.[31] As a result, written language was no longer a quasi-symbolic

---

[27] Saliha Paker. "Translation as *Terceme* and *Nazire*: Culture-bound Concepts and their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation History." *Crosscultural Transgressions*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002. 120.

[28] Saliha Paker. "Translation as *Terceme* and *Nazire*: Culture-bound Concepts and their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation History." *Crosscultural Transgressions*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002. 138.

[29] İhsan Fazlıoğlu. "Osmanlı Döneminde 'Bilim' Alanındaki Türkçe Telif ve Tercüme Eserlerinin Türkçe Oluş Nedenleri ve Bu Eserlerin Dil Bilincinin Oluşmasındaki Yeri ve Önemi." *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları*. 3 (March 2003): 151-184.

[30] Saliha Paker. "Translation as Terceme and Nazire Culture-bound Concepts and their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation." *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002.

[31] Şerif Mardin. "Some Notes on an Early Phase in the Modernization of Communications in Turkey." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 3.3 (1961): 250-271.

apparatus for, as Nergis Ertürk argues, "the mediation of the truth of a universal higher ontological reality, writing was now an arbitrary representational medium for the transmission of a variety of different and sometimes conflicting messages."[32] The shift in the function of Arabic and Persian in Turkish required a recoding of these languages according to a new politics of identity and the assertion of the autonomy of Turkish.

The simplification of Ottoman Turkish was launched in earnest in the Tanzimat era under an initial precept to render official communication free of ornate circumlocutions of literary Ottoman Turkish that had permeated Ottoman writing practices.[33] But it is important to understand that the modernization of Ottoman Turkish disintegrated Ottoman interculture by the late nineteenth century.[34] I propose to understand this process as the systematic suppression of intimate linguistic others as a prerequisite for asserting the Turkish vernacular as the national and unifying language.[35]

Instrumental in this process were socially engaged Tanzimat intellectuals including İbrahim Şinasi (1826-1871), a pioneer in journalism, theater and poetry, Namık Kemal (1840-1888), poet and celebrated as the first novelist in Ottoman Turkish, and the poet and translator Ziya Paşa (1829-1880),[36] all of whom wrote in and/or promoted the use of simple Turkish in

---

[32] Nergis Ertürk. "Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey." *Boundary 2*. 37.2 (2010): 155-185. 161.

[33] Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 80.

[34] Saliha Paker. "On the Poetic Practices of 'a singularly uninventive people' and the Anxiety of Imitation: A Critical Re-appraisal in Terms of Translation, Creative Mediation and 'Originality.'" *Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey*. Ed. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker and John Milton. Benjamins Translation Library. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015. 47.

[35] Although the most intense and widespread suppression of Arabic and Persian in Turkish manifested in the Turkish alphabet and language reforms of the 1920s and 1930s, it must be emphasized that Ottoman Turkish of the late nineteenth century had already undergone significant changes in language. These changes that the linguistic modernization of the nineteenth century brought about made the subsequent Turkish language reforms possible.

[36] Ziya Paşa is most noteworthy for his piece "Şiir ve İnşa" (1868) in *Hürriyet* in which he persuasively argues for simple language and strongly criticizes traditional Ottoman language and education for its emphasis on Arabic.

writing.[37] Another prominent voice, journalist, novelist and translator Ahmet Midhat (1844-1912), commonly viewed as a significant transitional figure of Turkish literature, was also an eminent proponent of simplifying and popularizing the Ottoman written language and saw simplified Ottoman language (or, plain Turkish) as the principle condition of Ottoman advancement on the world stage. As a prolific writer, with nearly two hundred works in prose alone, Ahmet Midhat was an outstanding author of the late nineteenth century who recoded what was traditionally viewed as "vulgar Turkish" as the new language of progress for Turkish-speaking Ottomans. His articles advocating linguistic simplification register a reversal of sorts of Arabic and Persian, recoding them from intimate other to foreign. By underscoring its many "foreign" elements, he discursively rendered traditional Ottoman language as incomprehensible, and thus incapable of progress. In an article published in *Basiret* in 1871, Ahmet Midhat contends that neither Arabic nor Persian could be justifiably described as the indigenous languages of the Ottoman Empire. He asks his readers to imagine reading aloud the finest traditional Ottoman poem to an Arab from Najd, a Persian from Shiraz, and a Turk from Turkmenistan, and declares that, as an illustration of the sheer artificiality of the Ottoman written language, the poem would not be intelligible for any one of these listeners. He further argues that since no Ottoman except an elite few could understand the poem, it would remain beyond the reach of ordinary speakers of Turkish. Thus, he advocates for a new national language or, "millet lisanı."

Yet, the process of constructing a written national language that Ahmet Midhat deploys involves a paradoxical process of rendering Arabic and Persian vocabulary and grammatical structures foreign to Turkish while inventing a Turkish grammar through the medium of Arabic grammar books. In another article published the same year in *Dağarcık* titled "Osmanlıcanın

---

[37] Although Namık Kemal advocated simple Turkish in writing, his first novel *İntibah* ("Awakening," 1876) drew on traditional Ottoman metaphorical language, which I discuss in Chapter 2.

Islahı" ("Ottoman Language Reformation"), Ahmet Midhat registers the project of linguistic

modernization as that which universalizes the Ottoman language through translative processes to

eliminate the gap between written Ottoman and spoken Turkish. It is thus that Ahmet Midhat

recodes language:

> Fransız lisanının bizim Türkçeden şimdi elimizde bulunanı kadar dahi zengin olmadığı ve
> bütün bütün Yunan ve Latin ve Cermen lügatlerinden ibaret iken, bi'l-ıslah yalnız Fransız
> milletine değil elyevm umum dünyaya lisan-ı umumi olduğu halde, bizim Osmanlı lisanı
> yine Osmanlı millet için lisan-ı umumi halini kesp edememek sureti mümkün değil teslim
> olunamaz.[38]

> Although with reforms the French language, which is through and through composed of
> Greek, Latin, and German words, is not richer than our current state of Turkish, it is not
> only a universal language for the French nation but at present for the world; it is not
> acceptable for our Ottoman language to not gain a universal language status for the
> Ottoman nation.[39]

The term universal ("umumi") refers both to the Turkish speaking public and as a medium

capable of competing on a global scale. Along with other prominent Tanzimat intellectuals,

Ahmet Midhat identifies the linguistic gap between the elite and the common public as the main

hindrance to progress and the dissemination of knowledge. "İnsan dilsiz yaşayamaz. Milletimizin

terakkisini istersek her ferdinin bülbül gibi şakıması için kendilerine kolaylık göstermeliyiz."

[People cannot live without language. If we want our nation to progress, we must make it easy for

every individual to sing loudly like a bird.] In other words, the simplification of Turkish leading

to perfect comprehensibility is the very condition of Ottoman progress.

Even if the project of creating a national language for Ahmet Midhat consistently

indicates French as the frame of reference for a universal language, the medium for attaining

universal status intrinsically involves Arabic. Ahmet Midhat sees a critical step to making

---

[38] Quoted in Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu
Basımevi, 1960. 126.

[39] All translations from Turkish in this dissertation are mine.

Ottoman universal as a process of translating Arabic and Persian grammatical structures into their Turkish counterparts. For instance, Ahmet Midhat suggests that instead of drawing on rules not inherent to Turkish like "filan-ı mezkur" ("the aforementioned so and so"), Ottomans must write "mezkur filan," which eliminates the Persian compound formation. He continues to offer other examples. Instead of "a'mal-i hayriyye" ("good wishes"), he suggests "hayırlı a'mal," again, eliminating the Persian compound structure and also the Arabic feminine form. Further simplifying the expression, he posits "hayırlı emeller," which exchanges the Arabic plural form for the Turkish plural. Ahmet Midhat thus exemplifies the process of modernizing the Ottoman language as a process of translating from Arabic and Persian grammatical structures into Turkish. According to Ahmet Midhat, this process would eliminate the need for Ottomans to learn Arabic and Persian grammar, displacing them from the Ottoman collective memory.

Listing numerous forms of Arabic grammar, Ahmet Midhat underscores the abundant structures Ottomans had unnecessarily and impractically incorporated from Arabic and illustrates how they can be put in the service of reforming Ottoman Turkish: "Nahivden . . . sıfat, mevsuf ve muzaf, muzafü'n'ileyh ve sairleri terkedildikten sonra bize lazımlı hiçbir şey kalmaz. Yalnız Türkçe için bir nahva ihtiyaç kalır. Bundan sonra kendimiz için bir de mantık tanzim edebiliriz."[40] [After relinquishing [Arabic] grammar . . . and the likes of sıfat [adjective], mevsuf [substantive qualified by an adjective], muzaf [a noun or verbal noun that is governed or modified by another noun or pronoun], muzafü'n'ileyh [possessive construction] etc., we will not need anything else except for a grammar for Turkish. And then we will be able to organize logic for ourselves.] Yet Ahmet Midhat does not believe this sufficient for the creation of a universal Ottoman language grammar. He states that for several years Ottomans attempted to create a

---

[40] Quoted in Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 128.

grammar of their language. However, according to Ahmet Midhat, since Ottoman libraries

contained only Arabic grammar books, the Ottoman endeavor bore no results.

Inasmuch as the creation of a Turkish grammar is contingent on translating grammatical

structures from Persian and Arabic, this process must paradoxically engage in the transmission of

linguistic knowledge from Arabic. Ahmet Midhat acknowledges that components of grammar

like "mantık" ("logic"), "meani" ("semantics"), "bedi'" ("the science of the figures of speech and

embellishment in rhetoric"), and "beyan" ("discourse") would still need to be read in Arabic. Yet,

Ahmet Midhat writes tongue in cheek: "Halbuki bir lisanın mantıkı, meanisi, bedii, beyanı diğer

bir lisandan tahsil edilmekte olan garabet caba kalır."[41] [However, the strangeness of producing a

language's logic, semantics, the science of embellishment in rhetoric, and discourse from another

language would remain gratis.] This ironic statement underlines Ahmet Midhat's discomfort with

producing knowledge of Turkish through the medium of Arabic—because at the time Ottoman

sources on language grammar existed in Arabic, not Turkish.[42] Thus the project of creating a

Turkish grammar exposes Turkish as continuing to be dependent on Arabic for its own linguistic

modernization.

Against the backdrop of the movement to simplify and popularize written language,

Edebiyat-ı Cedide shifted the vision of linguistic modernization for a brief historical moment at

the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For the avant-garde group modernizing

language was not an enterprise of codifying Turkish as an instrument for the dissemination of

knowledge; instead, it was an endeavor of generating an aesthetic literary language that draws on

---

[41] Quoted in Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 128.

[42] According to Şerif Mardin, no Turkish grammar rules existed prior to the linguistic modernization project of the mid-nineteenth century because Turkish conformed to Arabic rules. See Şerif Mardin. "Some Notes on an Early Phase in the Modernization of Communications in Turkey." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 3.3 (1961): 250-271. 264.

the linguistic strengths of Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Thus, the project of "reforming" language as Tanzimat intellectuals like Ahmet Midhat proposed and implemented was problematic for the Edebiyat-ı Cedide group for its "purifying" processes that threaten to erase newly discovered words, the very components of a literary language they imagined as comparable to French.

Recently it has been suggested that Tanzimat writers like Ahmet Midhat and Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers had similar ambitions for Ottoman Turkish literature but by different means.[43] But it must be emphasized that their approaches to linguistic modernization were varied. For Ahmet Midhat, progress was a product of effectively disseminating knowledge to a wide Turkish-speaking readership. He saw literature as a means of raising the general public's level of education and culture to a higher level and acclimating them to a new way of life.[44] To achieve this, Ahmet Midhat reasoned, the populace must have a reading comprehension. In contrast, the proponents of Edebiyat-ı Cedide and "art for art's sake," viewed language not as a vehicle for education, but as an artistic instrument. In order to have literary value, a work needed to demonstrate artistic ("sanatkârca") language and style.[45]

The Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement's literary and linguistic values contrasted sharply with those of writers who upheld linguistic simplification like Ahmet Midhat. In his article "Dekadanlar" ("The Decadents") published in *Sabah* on 1 March 1897, which incited what would be known in Turkish historiography as "the Decadent debate," Ahmet Midhat faulted Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers for producing incomprehensible language comprised of Arabic and Persian:

> "Harhara-i meakırdan bir havf-ı ezrak ile müstahif olanlar per ü bali küşade bir merkeb-i rande-bada maddiyyet-i beşeriyyeleri barını ihmalden ictinab etmelidirler." Nasıl def'ate'n anlıyabildiniz mi? Bir daha mı okumak istiyorsunuz? Nafile yorulmayınız.

---

[43] See Fazıl Gökçek. *Dekadanlar: Bir Tartışmanın Hikayesi*. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.

[44] Fazıl Gökçek. *Dekadanlar: Bir Tartışmanın Hikayesi*. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007. 39.

[45] Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 232. Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers debated the literary value of novels, including French novels. They concluded that the novels of their contemporary French writer Georges Ohnet, for instance, could not be categorized as literature.

Birkaç defa daha okusanız yine kolayca anlıyamazsınız. Tefehhümü tehsil maksadıyle yazılmamıştır ki kolayca anlayabilesiniz. Bunun sadece tercemesi "makara hırıltısından pek korkanlar yelkenli gemiye binmekten ictinab etmelidirler" demekten ibarettir.[46]

"Those excessively indulging after abstinence with azure-affright of incessant creaking should refrain from negligently taking shelter in an opened wing vessel of wind-plane epidermal-material." Did you get all that? Do you want to reread it? Don't bother. Even if you read it a few times you won't understand it easily. It was not written with the intention of being easily comprehensible. Translating it [into simple Turkish] is simply "Those very afraid of incessant creaking should avoid boarding ships with sails."

Meant to mock Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing, Ahmet Midhat accuses Edebiyat-ı Cedide of regressing to the traditional Ottoman writing style, essentially undoing the simplification and popularization process of language that took place for nearly half a century. Criticizing Edebiyat-ı Cedide's literary language for being accessible to only an erudite minority, Ahmet Midhat argues that their written language does not reflect Turkish, nor could it truly be Arabic or Persian. Indeed, Ahmet Midhat claims their writing is essentially replicating written French using Turkish, Arabic and Persian words. Yet, this suggests that their writing does not recuperate traditional Ottoman writing because it differentiates itself from it. For, unlike writing of the past, Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing harbors the specter of the French that gestures to the superior position French occupied as a frame of reference in Ottoman Turkish at the turn of the century.[47] At the same time, Ottoman Turkish is haunted by Arabic and Persian as internal others that needed to be suppressed. If Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers drew on Arabic and Persian as traditional Ottoman poets had done, as Ahmet Midhat insists, the translated French meanings that circulate beneath these words points to the complex tensions among languages and histories in cross-cultural exchange to which I will return below. In the meantime, I turn to Edebiyat-ı Cedide's response to the Ottoman

---

[46] Quoted in Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 209.

[47] This is not to say that French was not a frame of reference in Tanzimat writing. But Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing magnified this relationship in the intensification of translational writing.

project of linguistic modernization as articulated by leading figures of Edebiyat-ı Cedide Tevfik Fikret (1867-1915) and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil (1866-1945), who seek to delineate what constitutes a modern aesthetic language within a structure of unequal power relations. If the project of linguistic modernization involved the suppression of Arabic and Persian in written language, the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement might best be understood as "releasing" them (the very aspect that caused Ahmet Midhat discomfort). I understand the release of Arabic and Persian words and grammatical structures as uncanny in the sense of an emergence of the once familiar but now unfamiliar. Tevfik Fikret and Halit Ziya's discourses on Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing convey the tensions implicated in this release at this particular historical moment of intensified transaction. For drawing on Arabic and Persian was not an attempt to restore the increasingly disintegrating (because increasingly suppressed) Ottoman interculture, but to construct linguistic modernity in translation.

A pivotal figure of modern literature, Tevfik Fikret is renowned, along with Cenap Şahabettin (1870-1934), for revolutionizing Ottoman Turkish poetry in form and content, and he emphasized the importance of euphony in poetic language for depicting photographic scenes and transmitting meaning.[48] Indeed, Tevfik Fikret invigorated poetry by constructing verses not in accordance to the grammatical rules of traditional poetry but according to the musicality of sentences and newly coined expressions. As he voiced repeatedly, he favored "simple" ("sade") writing—without, he stresses, stooping to "banality" ("adilik")—that nonetheless makes reflective use of Arabic and Persian words and neologistic compound expressions because, for

---

[48] It is important to note, however, that Tevfik Fikret remained more conservative than Cenap Şahabettin in the use of Arabic and Persian vocabulary. This difference between the two poets is even more pronounced in the employment of archaic and obscure terms. Even so, as Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar observes, the language in some of Tevfik Fikret's poems is "stubbornly high-flown." See Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. "Fikret Hakkında." *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. 1969 Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.

Tevfik Fikret, simple writing does not mean using language stripped of these two languages, which he finds necessary for literary expression. In his article "Tasfiye-i Lisan" ("Purification of Language"), published in *Servet-i Fünun* in 1899, Tevfik Fikret meditates on the purification movement of Ottoman Turkish, weighing in on its advantages and disadvantages. But ultimately, he advocates the use of Arabic and Persian because they serve as intimate source languages that enrich Ottoman Turkish literary language. This conclusion rests on his idea of cultural-historical proximity of others to the self: erasing Arabic and Persian would necessitate the replacement of words and grammar with central Asian Turkish words (Turkic languages untouched by Arabic and Persian), which he views as more distant than Arabic and Persian to Ottoman Turkish. The argument for purifying Ottoman Turkish of these intimate others proves fallacious for him.

Tevfik Fikret posits that hundreds of years of drawing on Arabic and Persian have left Ottoman Turkish in a state of resembling an "indecisive ghost" ("heyula-yi mütereddid") that has not yet been able to become individually distinguished ("taayyül edememiş") from other languages. But he seems ambivalent about the need to distinguish Ottoman Turkish, in particular as a measure of forging a Turkish-Muslim identity politics. On the one hand uniting the Turkish speaking peoples in the empire under a Turkish language appeals to him. On the other hand, he opposes the purification of Ottoman Turkish. Instead of purging language of foreign elements, Tevfik Fikret appeals for its regulation: "Bir lisanın safiyeti, mükemmeliyeti kelimelerinin azlığında, çokluğunda değil mazbutiyetindedir; bizimki gibi henüz kaideleri konulmamış, lügatleri zapt olunmamış bir lisanı tasfiye için iptida bu iki noksanı ikmal etmek lazım gelir." [A language's purity, its perfection is not found in the number of words it has. Instead, it is found in its correctness. In order to begin purifying a language like ours, first it needs to make up for its shortcomings like its lack of rules and unrestrained words.] In his quest for creating a literary language, as he explains in another article, Tevfik Fikret explains that this language should be

refined, profound, transparent, and present itself as affective and reflective.[49] This kind of

language demands correctness in its use, which includes the correct use of new words and

expressions as formed from Arabic and Persian.[50] Other voices outside the Edebiyat-ı Cedide

movement also identified correct writing as vital. For instance, Ali Kemal (1867-1922) posited

that in order to write Turkish correctly, one must know Arabic. Drawing a neat parallel between

two disparate histories, he viewed Arabic and Persian as source languages for Turkish, just as

Greek and Latin were source languages for French.[51]

For literary purposes, Tevfik Fikret reasons, all words in the Ottoman language should be

employed based on their unique meaning, not merely their putative linguistic origins. He further

stipulates: "Yerinde isti'mal edilmek şartıyla her kelimenin ayrı kuvveti, ayrı tabiatı, ruhu

vardır." [Provided that [words] are used correctly, every word has its unique power, nature, and

essence.][52] In other words, even though synonyms for Turkish words in Arabic and Persian exist,

each word must be used to draw on the word's particular strength and nuance. Erasing an Arabic

or Persian word from the Ottoman lexicon on the grounds that the Turkish synonym exists,

asserts Tevfik Fikret, depletes the Ottoman language's agility. Thus, instead of purifying

("tasfiye") Ottoman Turkish, as was the inclination of the movement for linguistic simplification,

it would impoverish ("fakirleşme") Ottoman Turkish. Understanding language as a vehicle for

transmitting thoughts and emotions, Tevfik Fikret draws a causal correlation between signified

---

[49] Tevfik Fikret. "Musahabe-i Edebiyye." *Servet-i Fünun*. 283. (1312/1896). In fact, here, Tevfik Fikret quotes Ahmet Cemil, the protagonist of Halit Ziya's novel *Mai ve Siyah* ("Blue and Black"), a significant novel that I examine in Chapter 2.

[50] Tevfik Fikret's concern for correctness echoes various language debates including correct spelling. For instance, when Recaizade Ekrem's novel *Araba Sevdası* ("The Carriage Affair") was serialized in *Servet-i Fünun*, an argument erupted over the correct spelling of "Araba." Some argued that the representation of the initial A sound is "Alif," others argued it is "Ayin."

[51] See "Latince, Rumca ve Fransızca—Arabi, Farsi ve Türkçe" *İkdam*. 25 Şubat 1313 (1897).

[52] Tevfik Fikret. "Tasfiye-i Lisan" *Servet-i Fünun*. 422 (1315/1899).

("mana," or meaning) and signifier ("lafız," or word). For instance, he argues that a simple ("basit") signified requires that the signifier ("lafız") be simple ("sade"): "Esasen, ifadenin sadeliği, vuzuhu fikrin sade ve vuzuh olmasından ileri gelmez mi?" [Essentially, isn't a clear and plain idea the result of the plainness and clarity of expression?] This points to his understanding of language as a generator of meaning where the signifier has authority over the signified.[53]

Bearing in mind this relationship between the signifier and signified, we might conclude that Tevfik Fikret sees the value of translative writing as not derived solely from a putative original. Thus, Tevfik Fikret's concern that purification processes of simplifying language destroy the "advantages" ("istifadeler") born of linguistic "expansion" ("tevessü") takes on a new significance for Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing. This expansion of language involves the coining of new words and expressions, and piecing together of language(s) in translation. And what he finds striking in the Edebiyat-ı Cedide style of description and narration techniques (specifically as that of Halit Ziya) is that they have successfully expanded the aesthetic quality of Ottoman Turkish, projecting the appearance of an autonomous language.[54]

Prominent novelist Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil registers the tensions in the release of Arabic and Persian in ways that depart somewhat from Tevfik Fikret. For Halit Ziya's interest lies in the transmission of complex ideas in nuanced language. With this in mind, it comes as no surprise that he strongly opposes linguistic purification and defends Edebiyat-ı Cedide's employment of Arabic and Persian. In his article, "Karilerime Mektuplar" ("Letters to My Readers," 1899), Halit Ziya meditates on language as a fluid entity connected to other accents, idiom and histories, and

---

[53] It is interesting to note that translation privileges the signified, not the signifier. Rey Chow understands this as indicating the establishment of translation on the inequality between languages. Does Tevfik Fikret's understanding attempt to reverse this relationship?

[54] This despite his struggle of overcoming western Europe as the reference of superiority. This is most notable when, after reading Kipling, he laments that Ottoman Turkish literature is "sick" ("hasta"). See Tevfik Fikret. "Muhasabe-i Edebiyye: Bir Mülahaza." Servet-i Fünun. 429. (1315/1899).

valorizes Arabic and Persian for their "translatability," or, their ability to translate words, ideas, concepts from European languages in Ottoman Turkish aesthetic writing.

All the ink spilled on debating the direction in which Ottoman Turkish should be propelled, as Halit Ziya sees it, obscures "truths" ("hakikat") about the language's history. Halit Ziya argues that before there can be "tasfiye-i lisan" ("language purification") there must be "terbiye-i lisan" ("language education"). Likening language to a body of water, Halit Ziya situates Ottoman Turkish in historical flows and contacts:

> Lisan öyle bir göle kabil teşbihtir ki ona küçük küçük ırmaklar mansıp olsun ve ondan yine birçok küçük küçük ırmaklar tevlit etsin; böyle daima bir med ü cezr harekâtına tabi olsun. Bu teşbihi takip ederek lisanların yahut yalnız Osmanlıcanın tekevvün ve tevellüdü izah edilmek lazım gelirse denebilir ki bu gölün en saf ve mücella sularının nokta-ı temevvücü İstanbul'dur: o mini mini ırmaklar her biri sine-i memleketin bir noktasından tebean ederek söz ile söz ile, güzergahında bütün bulanıklıklarını kaybederek kesp safvet ve nezahet ede ede, bu gölü doyurmuşlardır, hala doyuruyorlar; bunlara ta uzaklardan; İran'dan, Hicaz'dan, mazera-ı Kafkas'tan, hatta Garp'tan hedaya emvacını getirerek iltihak eden ırmaklar da var. Bu göl her taraftan gelen bu emvac hedayayı alır, ona daha başka bir revnak, daha şeffaf bir safvet verir; sonra istiab havsalasının fazlasından yine küçük küçük ırmaklar peyda olur; bunlar o saf menbadan aldıkları sularla güzergahlarını sulayarak, mecralarında pak mevcelerinin kuvve-i namiyesini bırakarak bütün memlekete dağılır, milletin şiddet ataş irfanı teskin eder. Bu göl sine-i memleketin guya azim bir ciğeridir ki med ü cezrinin daima bir cevelan dem ile lisan-ı milleti besler.[55]

> Language is comparable to a lake with many small streams flowing into it, and from it still many small streams are created; thus, it always follows a tidal movement. Following this comparison, if it is necessary to explain the genesis and birth of languages, or at least of the Ottoman language about which it could be said that this lake's purest and brightest waters' point of undulation is Istanbul. Each one of those little tiny streams filled this lake with words by orienting toward a point of the land's center, on their way acquiring purity and cleanliness and losing all their cloudiness. And they continue filling the lake. There are streams that bring gifts of ripples from faraway places, from Iran, Hijaz, Caucasia, even from the West. This lake receives gifts of ripples coming from all sides as they offer it a different brightness, a more transparent pureness. Then other small streams appear from the surplus. Irrigating their trajectory with the water taken from that pure source, in their watercourse, releasing the clean ripples' power of growth, these small streams spread out over the entire country and quench the nation's intense thirst for knowledge. This lake appears like the country's great lungs that nourishes the nation's language with the continuous ebb and flows of its traveling breath.

---

[55] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. "Karilerime Mektuplar." *Servet-i Fünun*. 428 (1315/1899).

In emphasizing the fluidity of the Ottoman language and the porousness of geographical borders, Halit Ziya constructs the Istanbul dialect as the center of language. Rather than promoting the bourgeoning notion of a putative linguistic unity, as nationalist ideology insists, Halit Ziya imagines language as continuously in contact with other languages. Thus, for Halit Ziya, comparison of languages, and by extension literatures, is less an endeavor to secure national linguistic borders in terms of its purity (i.e., a pure Turkish language) than it is to forge a history of Ottoman Turkish in universal terms as "watered by many streams." Even though in Halit Ziya's account Ottoman Turkish absorbs words from other languages, in the process of acquiring elements from other languages Ottoman Turkish transforms, clarifies, and becomes a means of transmitting knowledge from the center to the peripheries of the empire. In Halit Ziya's metaphor of the various streams feeding into Ottoman Turkish, we can detect anxiety about the method of arriving at a standard language. Ultimately, he promotes the Istanbul dialect as the most suitable medium for literary expression because he views it as enriched by a multitude of accents, dialects, words, and idiom.

In his conceptualization of the literary language, Halit Ziya objects to the purging of "foreign" words and grammatical structures, which he tellingly terms "gifts," that Ottoman Turkish absorbed for its destructiveness to aesthetic language:

> Deniyor ki: fazla lugaat-ı Arabiyye vü Farisiyyeyi atalım. Mesela "gök" varken "sema" niçin kalsın? "Sema"yı kaldırıyoruz "semavat, sümüv, semavi" bittabi' beraber gidecek; biraz münakkaş biraz müzeyyen bir cümle arasında "sehari-i semavat, sümüv-i cenab, nazar-ı semavi" diyemeyeceğiz; "göklerin kırları, öz ululuğu, gök bakış" diyeceğiz. Nahoş! Fakat zarar yok, madem ki "sema"yı ortadan kaldırdılar, yerine "gök" diktiler, bu büyük bir muvaffakıyyet sayılacak.

> They say: let's throw out excessive Arabic and Persian words. For instance, when there is "gök" [Turkish word meaning sky] why should "sema" [Arabic word meaning sky] remain [in Ottoman Turkish]? If we remove "sema" then naturally "semavat" [skies, heavens], "sümüv" [eminence] and "semavi" [celestial] will go with it. Then we will not be able to say "sehari-i semavat" [early morning skies], "sümüv-i cenab" [majesty of eminence] or "nazar-ı semavi" [celestial glance] in a somewhat ornamented, somewhat

embellished sentence. Instead, we will have to say "göklerin kırları" [grey skies] "öz ululuğu" [pure eminence] and "gök bakış" [heaven glance]. Very unpleasant! But that's alright, since they did away with "sema" and in its place erected "gök," they will see this as a great victory.

It is worth noting that the debate over language foregrounds the aesthetic function of words which he sees diminished in the replacement of an Arabic word with a native Turkish word. Even if the expressions above seem replaceable by plain Turkish (after all, he does provide translations), Halit Ziya points to other components of Ottoman Turkish that have no obvious replacements. Pointing to the long history of poetic language in Ottoman Turkish, Halit Ziya implies that Arabic and Persian words and grammar forms enriched it in the past, and now adds a dexterity for translating newness in unprecedented ways:

> Fazla lugaat-ı Arabiyye vü Farsiyyeyi atmaktan bahsolununca insan derhal cevab-ı muvafakat itasına müsaraat ediyor, fakat bakınız tatbikatında bizden ne mühim feda-karlıklar isteniyor, bunları nasıl feda ederiz, ya Rab?.. Fazlaları atalım, lakin evvel-i emirde hangileri fazladır, bugün hepimizin kullandığımız lisanda neler fazla geliyor da atılmaya lüzum görülüyor. Onu tayin edelim. Arapların sigalarını almışız; "vusul, vasıl, muvasala, isal, istisal" diyoruz, bunları atıp yerine ne koyacağız? Maksada bununla mı ulaşılacak? Acemlerin vasf-ı terkibilerini almışız, dünyada hiçbir lisanda mevcud olmayan sühuletle türlü zaraif-i fikriyye vücuda getiriyoruz, tefsir-i manasına cümleler yetişemeyecek terkipler yapıyoruz, türlü dil-aşub, revnak-tıraz, nükte-perver, şaşaa-dar tabirler icat ediyoruz; bunları bırakıp ne yapacağız? Acemlerin Arapların edevatını almışız; bunlar lisana öyle yapışmış ki ecza-yi mütemmimesinden olmuş, bunları sökmeye kalkışmak ağzımızın dişlerini sökmek kabilinden bir teşebbüs-i hatar-nak değil midir?

> When discussing the purge of excessive Arabic and Persian words people struggle to give an immediate acceptable answer. Yet look what grave sacrifices they want from us in its execution. Dear God, how can we sacrifice them? Let's throw out the excessive words; however, first let's designate which words are excessive, what seems excessive in the language we use today that requires us to throw them out. Arabic moods were included into our language. We say "vusul" [arrival] "vasıl" [joining] "muvasala" [communication] and "isal" [causing to attain] "istisal" [an uprooting]. [If we purge Arabic moods] what are we going to replace them with? Is it thus that the objective will be met? Persian adjective compounds were included into our language. Now we are bringing into existence [in language] various elegant ideas with facility that does not exist in any other language in the world. We are creating compound expressions [whose meaning] sentences interpreting them cannot convey. We are inventing various sparkling expressions that render the heart, [exhibit] splendid style, nourish subtle points. How can we just cast these [newly invented expressions] aside? Persian and Arabic devices were included into our language. They

33

adhered to our language like complementary chemicals. To attempt purging these things would be a perilous undertaking comparable to ripping the teeth out of our mouths, no?

If linguistic purification calls for the erasure of Arabic and Persian linguistic elements from Ottoman Turkish, then it would also purge the new words and compound expressions that Halit Ziya extols. Not only does Halit Ziya legitimize the use of Arabic and Persian based on deep historical connections with Ottoman language, but he emphasizes their power in generating new expressions formed in translation. Even if the purpose of doing so is forming hypothetical reciprocity of meanings (what he terms elegant ideas), Halit Ziya points to the dexterity and potentialities of the words themselves that underscore the superiority of Ottoman Turkish bolstered with Arabic and Persian.

As we can ascertain from Halit Ziya and Tevfik Fikret's objection to linguistic purification, or the systematic suppression of intimate linguistic others that are Arabic and Persian, the negation of their presence in language threatened Edebiyat-ı Cedide's practice of linguistic innovation as a means for transmitting new ideas. Thus, the release of increasingly suppressed linguistic elements happens in translation as part of a process that simultaneously highlights their presence in Ottoman Turkish and inscribes new meaning to them. For Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers were rewriting Arabic and Persian words in translation and drawing on certain terms already established to approximate European ideas, concepts and words. I contend that we cannot comprehend this process of release as separate from global circulations of meaning.

Circumscribing Modern Literariness: Transmitting Modernity Through the Medium of Doubly Haunted Lexicon

The process of circulating neologisms and neologistic constructions did not only take place in the realm of literature. Integral to this process of circulation and legitimation were periodicals, particularly the *Servet-i Fünun*, which provided as a complementary space for writers to cite newly coined words from literature, analyze them, and theorize their value. Many Edebiyat-ı Cedide coinages circulated, got included into dictionaries, and even endured the Turkish language reforms of the early Republican period in Turkish national history. Still other coinages were introduced into Ottoman Turkish but failed to circulate. We might attribute this to the highly experimental endeavor to create an aesthetic language comparable to western European languages and, therefore, is part of the historical making of hypothetical equivalences between these languages that establishes them as commensurable. New words and compounds formed under such circumstances, as Lydia Liu posits, "tend to be makeshift inventions in the beginning and become more or less fixed through repeated use or come to be supplemented by the preferred hypothetical equivalences of a later generation."[56]

As neologisms and their constructions are invented simultaneously to represent and replace foreign words, they are determined by Ottoman Turkish and foreign "locked in linguistic tension," to cite Lydia Liu, until new meanings emerge in the local environment.[57] My point is not that all neologisms or neologistic constructions were invented in response to a particular

---

[56] Lydia H. Liu. "Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the Nineteenth Century." *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. ed. Lydia H. Liu. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999. 137.
[57] Lydia H. Liu. Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900-1937. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 40.

foreign word, idea, concept or category. But the vast majority of words and expressions coined by the Edebiyat-ı Cedide group were invented as a result of contact with western European languages and literatures as Edebiyat-ı Cedide carved out a literary movement. Neologistic imagination occupies the zone of hypothetical equivalence and forms the very ground for change, "a change that cannot be reduced to an essentialist understanding of modernity, for that which is untraditional is not necessarily Western and that which is called modern is not necessarily"[58] un-Turkish.

In their journal articles and essays, Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers direct much of their attention to neologistic constructions coined by the group members, revealing their preoccupation with and awareness of the power of language in shaping the perception of reality. The abundance of neologisms points to a far-reaching revolutionary process that fundamentally changed the Ottoman Turkish linguistic landscape at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century. Assessing the impact of Edebiyat-ı Cedide's passion for linguistic invention on Turkish, later in his life shortly after the establishment of the Turkish Republic Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil wrote: "Yeni yeni şekiller, kelimeler, hiç işitilmemiş, alışılmamış terkipler bulmak hevesi aralarında adeta bir müsabaka açarak, birinden diğerine hatta nazımdan nesre bulaşan bir sari illet oldu."[59] [It became an illness that nearly created a competition between [Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers] to find completely new forms and words, and never-heard-of-before, extraordinary compound expressions that spread from one [writer] to another, even from poetry to prose.] Yet, Halit Ziya argues that this "illness" was more beneficial for language than harmful

---

[58] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900-1937.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 40.

[59] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Sanata Dair.* Eds. Sacit Ayhan and Levent Ali Çanaklı. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014. 632.

because experimental coinages brought modern Turkish into existence. These coined words and expressions do not simply reflect external reality but have a performative force.[60]

Yet, oftentimes their neologisms and syntactical stylistics struck Ottomans as strange ("garip"), attracting criticism from the proponents of purifying Ottoman Turkish like Ahmet Midhat and later early Republican literary critics such as Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901-1962) for being artificial and disconnected from the common people ("halk"). The term "garip," used to disparage Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing, extends into Ottoman rhetorical terminology, and, with its Arabic roots, signifies being away from one's homeland; unique; rare; unknown, ambiguous, and obscure.[61] As a condition of categorizing words as "garip" in Ottoman rhetoric, the words must be difficult to pronounce, archaic ("mehcûr," in the sense of once in currency but now forgotten), have ambiguous meanings, or originate from a foreign land.[62] In the context of Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing, coined new words and expressions were oftentimes formed of archaic words with ascribed new meanings. It is my contention that this perceived strangeness must be understood as a manifestation of a double haunting of Ottoman Turkish that Edebiyat-ı Cedide discloses: the European linguistic other that signifies supremacy and the Arabic and Persian other that evokes intimacy. It is these specters that haunt the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement as it reshapes Ottoman Turkish literature and language. This particular invocation of modernity that emerges from translation zones must contend with time, in Harry Harootunian's sense, in global circulations of meaning. The question thus becomes how does time intersect with language. After contact with Europe, as Rey Chow observed, non-European societies around the globe are "caught between

---

[60] As per speech-act theory, words are speech that act. See, for example, J. Hillis Miller. *Speech Acts in Literature*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001. 1-5.

[61] Hüseyin Elmalı and Şükrü Arslan. "Garip." *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. vol 13. Istanbul: ISAM, 1996. 374.

[62] Hüseyin Elmalı and Şükrü Arslan. "Garip." *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. vol 13. Istanbul: ISAM, 1996. 374.

this 'always already' present that is Europe, on the one hand, and the histories and traditions [they] must now live as [their] pasts, on the other."[63] But these pasts, for Harootunian, erupt into the present as suppressed indices of time with forgotten and unfinished potentialities. Harootunian's comparative model takes into account the mutual negotiation between past and present that materialize as a revenant in the present. Yet, this revenant, a ghostly apparition, that haunts the present "appears less as a repetition of the past than as a reminder of an intention that points to the future."[64] The experiences of translating western European modernity "dramatize a different kind of haunting and the unscheduled migration of ghosts of what have been past, now forgotten, that will insist on coexisting with the new in the present of everyday life . . . [T]hese ghosts of a surviving past—the premodern culture of reference—return from a place out of time or a different temporality to haunt and disturb the historical present, to trouble the stable boundaries between past and present, subject and object, interior and exterior."[65] That Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing, replete with new words and expressions, recalled traditional Ottoman poetry (as we saw from Ahmet Midhat above), which Ottoman writers strived to leave behind, attests to the past disturbing the present.[66] This non-synchronous temporality necessarily adds another significant layer to Liu's model of translation in which the foreign and the native languages are locked into tension in the circulation of meaning.

---

[63] Rey Chow. "The Old/New Question of Comparison in Literary Studies: A Post-European Perspective." *ELH*. 71.2 (Summer, 2004): 289-311. 305.

[64] Harry Harootunian. "Some Thoughts on Comparability and the Space-Time Problem." *boundary 2*. 32.2 (2005): 23-52. 47.

[65] Harry Harootunian. "Some Thoughts on Comparability and the Space-Time Problem." *boundary 2*. 32.2 (2005): 23-52. 47.

[66] Critics have regarded the Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers' change in position on Arabic and Persian that can be detected in their thought after the alphabet and language reforms of the 1920s and 1930s as ceding to the national effort to produce a Turkish language free of Arabic and Persian. I would argue that the revenant continued haunting the Edebiyat-ı Cedide group, particularly as seen in articles by Halit Ziya, who, later in his life, would attempt to neutralize his lasting discomfort by insisting that in their coinages they were but apprentices of the master Ottoman divan poets. As I have argued above, their employment of Arabic and Persian significantly departed from traditional linguistic conventions.

In their voluminous critical essays dedicated to language, Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers'
attention focused almost exclusively on legitimizing their employment of compound adjectives to
coin new words and phrases in attempts to suppress the strangeness that these terms evoked. We
must understand this attempt as a response to the double haunting manifested in their writing.
The arguments they advanced in response to critiques of their linguistic practices such as that of
the journalist, critic and prose writer Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın (1875-1957) in his article "Parlak
Tabirler" ("Bright Expressions") published in *Sabah* daily in 1898 exemplify the ways in which
Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers attempted to come to terms with the presence of Europe, on the one
hand, and the past, on the other. As I explain in further depth in Chapter 2, Hüseyin Cahit is most
notable in Turkish literary history as an outspoken critic who steadfastly defended the Edebiyat-ı
Cedide movement.[67] In this article, he justifies the introduction and circulation of Edebiyat-ı
Cedide coinages in literature that ignited much reproval.

To frame his analysis of Edebiyat-ı Cedide neologistic constructions, Hüseyin Cahit first
establishes their comparability to the contemporary French vocabulary and idiom: "Fransa
dekadan üdebanın harflerde, kelimelerde renk ve koku tahayyül ettikleri, bazılarını pırlanta,
bazılarını safir ve yakut ayarında buldukları gibi acaba bu zatlar da bizim anlayamayacağımız,
iştirak edemeyeceğimiz bir nezaket-i hisse malikiyetle Türkçemizde dahi böyle marazi garabetler
icadına mı kıyam ediyorlardı?"[68] [Just as French decadent writers imagined color and scent in
letters and words and found some of them as valuable as diamonds, some of them as sapphires

---

[67] The consensus in Turkish literary criticism is that Hüseyin Cahit wrote in a much simpler Ottoman Turkish
compared to the more ornate language of his contemporaries like Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. This could be, in part, because
he himself claimed to have no in-depth knowledge of Arabic and Persian. Yet, he knew them well enough to draw on
them in forming new expressions in his novel, *Hayal İçinde* ("Inside Imagination), which I analyze in Chapter 2. In
his memoire, he reminds his reader that the Ottomans had a habit of inscribing meaning onto Arabic words
unintended by the Arabs. See Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın. *Edebiyat Anıları*. ed. Rauf Mutluay. Istanbul: Türkiye İş
Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1975. 39 and 161.
[68] Hüseyin Cahit [Yalçın]. "Parlak Tabirler." *Sabah*. 13 Ağustos 1314 (1898).

and some of them as rubies, I wonder if they were also setting to invent strange ailing things possessing refined sentiments that we cannot understand and in which we cannot participate in Turkish.] Hüseyin Cahit's tongue-in-cheek critique is leveled at Ahmet Midhat's assertion that Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing was degenerate. If Hüseyin Cahit describes French words as "strange" and "ailing" ("maraz," or "ill") he does so ironically with the intention of negating such criticisms advanced toward Edebiyat-ı Cedide words and expressions. His emphasis on Edebiyat-ı Cedide's participation ("iştirak") in contemporary literature in France points to language as a ground on which commensurability is negotiated. It is on this ground that Hüseyin Cahit analyzes four "bright expressions" ("parlak tabirler," the title of his article) invented by Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers that received criticism: "lerze-i siyah" ("black-shiver"); "nazlı bir hatt-ı istifham" ("a coquettish query-line"); "leyl-i müzab" ("melted-night"); and "ebyazıyyet-i sadefiyye" ("pearl-white," feminine).[69]

What might seem "strange" and "ill" about these new expressions is their experimental way of producing affect. Differentiating Edebiyat-ı Cedide from traditional Ottoman literary sensibilities, a rhetorical strategy for delimiting their literature as modern, Hüseyin Cahit argues that these expressions invoke the poet/writer's experience as unique observer of the external material world. He sets them against traditional Ottoman use of formulaic poetic expressions borrowed from Arabic and Persian:

> . . . ne kadar hazır cümle parçaları vardır ki mübtediler için bitmez tükenmez bir sermayedir. Bunlar yan yana dizilince görürsünüz ki ya bir tulu, ya bir gurub tasviri meydana çıkmıştır! Halbuki içinde muharririnin kendisine mahsus hiçbir teessürü, hiçbir hissi yoktur. İşte yazı yazacağımız, yahut başkalarının yazdığı şeyleri muaheze edeceğimiz zaman Arabi, Farisi kelimelerden müteşekkil ahenkdar, parlak fakat—mahallinde değilse bittabi kof—terkiplere aldanmamalı, mana-i maksuda bihak delalet eden sıfatlara, terkiplere ehemmiyet vermeliyiz. Çünkü asıl haiz-i kıymet olanlar

---

[69] I translate the compound expressions using a hyphen to combine the English words in order to maintain the composition effect in English.

bunlardır. Ahenkdar, parlak birçok Arabi ve Farisi kelimeleri muhaza yan yana getirmekle bir eser edebi yazılmış olamaz.

> . . . there are so many set phrases that are a never-ending stock for novices. If you line them up side by side, you would see a description of either a sunrise or a sunset! However, they lack emotion and convey no sentiment particular to the writer. Now when we reprimand writing, we should not be deceived by the use of compound expressions composed of harmonious, pretty—but empty if not used correctly—Arabic and Persian words. We should value compounds and adjectives that correctly and intentionally generate meaning. A literary work cannot be written by simply stringing together harmonious and pretty Arabic and Persian words.

Hüseyin Cahit places the question of literary value on the writer's capacity to convey his perspective and intention through innovative use of language rather than drawing on deceptively appealing stock phrases and images. He illustrates this through one of the expressions analyzed in his article, "leyl-i müzab" ("melted-night"), used by Cenap Şahabettin in his travel writings *Hac Mektupları* ("Mecca Letters").[70] The passage as Hüseyin Cahit quotes it reads: "Gece, siyah ve muzlim bir gece bütün bütün hulul etmişti; zulmet umumiyyeye yalnız ecram-ı semaviye nahif ve lerzan bir tabaka gubar-ı münevver döküyordu; zirimizde deniz sanki bir leyl-i müzab, etrafımızda hava sanki bir buhar zulmet idi." [The night, the night appeared completely black and gloomy; only the heavenly bodies were spilling out a fragile and flickering stratum of illuminated dust into the complete darkness; beneath us the sea was like a melted-night and the air around us a dark vapor.] For Hüseyin Cahit, "leyl-i müzab" is used to show the darkness of the sea as the writer's ship departs in the night. If the night represents darkness, as convention had it, a melted night represents the darkest of darkness. Rejecting this expression as inaccurate, Hüseyin Cahit argues, is to deny the possibility that the night could be experienced with such intensity, causing the writer to feel the dreadful darkness and its violence ("şedide"). This expression stands out as

---

[70]As published in *Servet-i Fünun* and quoted by Hüseyin Cahit. Cenap Şahabettin's "letters" were compiled and published in book form as *Hac Yolunda* ("On the way to Mecca") in 1909.

unfamiliar and new (the term "strikes the mind," he tells us) that accurately foregrounds the writer's unique experience of the frightening darkness.

In the example above, Hüseyin Cahit argues that "leyl-i müzab" is not a strange but a "bright" ("parlak," with connotations of successful, clever) expression because of its precision: the adjective "melted" accurately informs its noun, "night," foregrounding the experience of the poet/writer as unique observer and responder of the frightening darkness. Defining the function of an adjective ("sıfat") in relation to a noun ("isim"), Hüseyin Cahit contends that the adjective's value ("kıymet") must be based on its ability to inform the noun's state ("hal") and quality ("şan") of being. If the adjective does not reflect or weakens what the author wants to show of the noun's state and quality, then the adjective is "incorrect" ("yanlış") and "ugly" ("çirkin"). The emphasis Hüseyin Cahit places on an adjective's accuracy is meant to contrast the adjective's importance according to traditional rhetoric as "euphonic" ("mülayim," from "mülayemet") and "fluent" ("selis," from "selaset"). It is important to note that in traditional rhetoric, "mülayemet" and "selaset," subcategories of "fesahat" ("fasaha" in Arabic meaning "clarity"), draw on physiological and phonetic criteria for attaining the perfection of clarity in speech.[71] For Hüseyin Cahit, the adjective's clarity lies not in its euphony and fluency but in its ability to show the noun's state and quality because the correctly employed adjective breathes life ("ruh vermiş") into the expression. Thus, the adjective in compound expressions becomes the ground of commensurability on which two disparate systems of aesthetics are negotiated in Ottoman Turkish.

---

[71] See Grunebaum, G.E. von. "Faṣāḥa." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Second Edition. Ed. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_2307 and M Orhan Okay. "Selaset." *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. vol 36. Istanbul: ISAM, 2009. 359.

Taking as his starting point Hüseyin Cahit's discussion of adjective compounds and their role in modernizing literature as outlined in "Parlak Tabirler," Ottoman bureaucrat, writer, and poet Süleyman Nazif (1869-1927) emphasizes their capacity to transmit both obvious and hidden signification. Like Hüseyin Cahit, in the article "Sıfatlar, Mevsuflar ve Taklit" ("Adjectives, Modifiers and Imitation"), published in *Servet-i Fünun* under the penname İbrahim Cehdi, Süleyman Nazif defends Edebiyat-ı Cedide coinage and circulation of expressions, particularly those that uncover new aspects of objects.

In contemplating the logical relationship between adjectives and modifiers, Süleyman Nazif describes the need for neologisms in direct relation to the discovery of a "hidden quality in an object": "Bir şeyin nevii arasındaki mevki ve mahiyeti ne vakit anlaşılır, daha doğrusu ne vakit ruh o şeyde bir hassa-ı hafiyenin vücudunu keşfederse o vakit yeni bir kelime ihtira ve terkip, yeni bir sıfat içtihat ve tertip olunur. Bu bir haz, bir zevk, bir arzu değil; bir lüzum, bir vazife, bir ihtiyaçtır."[72] [Whenever an object's locality and true nature is understood among its kind, or rather, whenever the existence of a hidden quality in an object is discovered then a new word is invented and put into compound form, a new adjective is strived for and composed. This is not a pleasure, an amusement or a desire; this is a necessity, an obligation and a need.] For Süleyman Nazif, the hidden existence of an object is revealed when the adjective precisely represents the writer/poet's perception of the object. He elucidates this concept and its importance in modernizing language:

> Lisanı bir iskelet gibi mahasininden tecrid ile mütalaa eden sarfıyun "sıfat, bir şeyin hal ve şanını beyan eden kelimedir" yolundaki tarifleri doğru, fakat nakıstır. Her şeyin bir hal ve şanı olduğu gibi nazari o şeye taalluk eden ruhunda bir tarz-ı has telakkisi vardır. Sıfatlar bu iki ciheti cami olmaz, hele vicdaniyatı tasvir de ikincisinin hakkı tamamıyla verilmezse yazılan şeyler efkâr ve ihtisasatı serair ve infialatiyle nakl ve tebliğ etmekten ziyade ondan evvel görülen, düşünülen, söylenilen—ve vasıfa ki ekseriya başkalarının

---

[72] İbrahim Cehdi. "Sıfatlar, Mevsuflar ve Taklit." *Servet-i Fünun*. 403 (1314/1898).

gördüklerine, söylediklerine benzetilmeye çalışılan—şeyler gibi karie amik bir his kelal ve taab verir.

> Grammarians study language like a structure in isolation from beautiful features. Their definition "the adjective is a word that makes known a thing's state and quality of being" is true but deficient. Just as all things have a state and quality, they also have a particular style of interpretation that abstractly attaches the spirit to that thing. Adjectives do not unite these two sides. Above all if the description of its conscience is not given to the latter its complete right, instead of communicating and transferring written things with indignations and secrets of thoughts and sentiments, things that have been seen, thought and said already—and qualities of things that generally writers have tried to copy from what others saw and said—would give the reader a profound sense of lassitude and fatigue.

In delimiting the function of the adjective, he identifies the evocation of the poet's soul ("ruh," or "perception") as an additional function of the adjective beyond its ability to inform the noun's state ("hal") and quality ("şan") of being. In this way, new compound expressions such as educator and poet Süleyman Nesip's "ömr-i tarumar" ("scattered-life") is perceptive and legitimate because it conveys the writer's interpretation of life in light of a person overwhelmed by a thousand inconsistent desires.

If Süleyman Nazif places emphasis on the adjective's ability to reveal the poet's perception of objects, it is because this aspect neutralizes anxiety over imitation. Contrary to criticisms of Edebiyat-ı Cedide adjective expressions as strange because translated from French, Süleyman Nazif argues that these expressions were invented without imitating literary masters of any other "nation" ("kavim," or "people"). Underpinning his logic is the conception that language free from traditional conventions is capable of revealing the unique perspective of the external world that every individual possesses. In this way, multiple descriptions of an object by different writers will always generate new expressions. "Ahval değiştikçe yeni hisler, yeni fikirler, yeni emeller peyda olur; ve bu teessürat-ı vicdaniye inkişaf etmek için 'bir şeyin hal ve şanını beyan eden' kelimelerin yenilerine ve daha şümullarına arz-ı iftikar eder." [As circumstances change,

new feelings, new ideas, new desires emerge. This conscience of affect presents the needs of discovering new words in depth that 'make known a thing's state and quality of being.']

Writing on neologisms as a symbol of modern literature, medical doctor, poet and travel writer most recognized for his use of neologisms in the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement, Cenap Şahabettin actively wrote underscoring their precision and clarity and insisted that their abundance indicated the advancement of Ottoman civilization. Versed in Arabic, Persian and Turkish, Cenap was particularly fond of the Persian adjective compound because of its ability to combine abstract ideas and forge unconventional associations. Much like a word collector, Cenap kept journals of obscure words and compounds, many of them Persian, and aspired to publish them elucidating their meanings in a dictionary.[73] In "Yeni Tabirat" ("New Expressions"), Cenap Şahabettin focuses on a particular category of adjective in legitimizing Edebiyat-ı Cedide compound expressions: color. His writing attests to his interest in pushing the limits of language and in this endeavor color occupies an important place. We might understand Cenap's ideas on language as interacting with the French Symbolist movement that was also circulating in other global languages.[74] Repudiating inherited positivist paradigms that make the objective realm the source of knowledge, Symbolists placed emphasis on the senses and sensory experiences. Cenap explores color as adjective in compound expressions for its pliability in evoking abstract ideas to help him overturn formulaic linguistic codes of traditional poetry. In his response to Ottoman criticism of neologistic expressions using color, Cenap writes:

> Bir şair, hakikatte mülevven ve müşekkel bir şeyin tasvir-i levn ve şeklinden dolayı, hiçbir zaman muaheze olunamaz. Ve hatta bir şair için—infialat ve vicdaniyat gibi—

---

[73] Unfortunately, Cenap died before completing his dictionary. For more biographical information, see İnci Erginün. *Cenap Şahabettin*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989. and Hasan Akay. *Cenab Şahabeddin: Şair, Don Juan, Derviş*. Istanbul: Şule Yayınları, 2015.

[74] According to some scholars, the Symbolist movement secures its place in history as "the most global of all literary events." See Anna Balakian. *The Symbolist Movement in the Literature of European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984.

hakikatte levn ve şekilden beri şeyleri telvin ve teşkile bile müsağ vardır: pek köhne olan "baht-ı siyah" tabiri nedir? "Baht"ın hakikatte rengi var mıdır?... Bir gün mutlaka yazılacak olan "tehevvür-i hunin," "fütur birenk," "muhabbet-i gülgun" tabiratı, yahut bugün yazılan "yeşil rüya," "mai hülya," "havf-ı siyah" tabirleri gerek lafzen, gerek hayalen "baht-ı siyah" terkibinden kusurlu mudur?[75]

A poet cannot ever be reprimanded for describing the color and shape of variegated and figurate things. Furthermore, there has been allowance for a poet—just as indignation and conscience—to color and shape things as it is from its color and shape: what about the quite worn out expression "baht-ı siyah" ["black fortune," meaning ill fortune]?…Are the expressions that will certainly be written one day "tehevvür-i hunin" ["bloody-fury"], "fütur birenk" ["colorless languor"], "muhabbet-i gülgun" ["rose-colored love"], or the expressions written today "yeşil rüya" ["green dream"], "mai hülya" ["blue daydream"], "havf-ı siyah" ["black fear"] more defective both in words and in imagination than the compound "baht-ı siyah" ["black fortune"]?

In its conventional use, color as adjective modifies a noun, a grammatical relationship in which the noun carries the importance. But in these expressions, the relationship between adjective and noun is reversed. Since color has no prescribed signified, it neglects to modify its object and in its stead the color returns to itself and stands out in isolation.[76] Thus color leads sensory overtones to abstraction. Yet, these Edebiyat-ı Cedide expressions that Cenap cites produced sensory imagery that had real effects. For instance, the expression "havf-ı siyah" ("black-fear," a combination of the archaic Arabic "havf" and the Persian "siyah") created a new imagination of such a violent fear that when Tevfik Fikret introduced it in his poetry it was first met with fierce disapproval.[77] However, it gained favor anyway.

Cenap places the importance of compounds with color as adjective because they privilege subjectivity over objectivity with precision; he emphasizes that the new expressions signify a totality of meaning in just one sign. Explicating the new expressions "yeşil rüya" ("green dream") and "mai rüya," ("blue daydream") he writes:

---

[75] Cenap Şahabettin. "Yeni Tabirat." *Servet-i Fünun*. 331 (1313/1897).

[76] Françoise Meltzer. "Color as Cognition in Symbolist Verse." *Critical Inquiry*. 5.2 (Winter, 1978): 253-273. 254.

[77] Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 181.

Henüz tezehhür etmemiş bir bahar-ı sebzin ile memlu, bütün berk ve çimenle mestur, bütün bir hadaret-i mütemevvice ile mahdud bir rüya görürseniz…bu rüyayı—karii yormamak, usandırmamak için—yalnız bir kelime, yalnız bir sıfatla anlatmanız iktiza ederse ne dersiniz?... Biz 'yeşil rüya' diyoruz. . . bütün deryadan, bütün semadan ibaret kebud ve namahdud bir hülyaya dalarsanız, bu hülyayı yalnız bir lafz ile, bir işaretle ifham için ne yaparsınız?... Biz "mai rüya" terkibini buluyoruz ve bütün o alemlerde göze çarpan umumi bir hassayı mefhum-ı külliye izafe ederek bir lafzın mealini külliyet ve müphemiyetten kurtarıyoruz…serapa yeşil bir alem içinde idim, denildiği zaman ne anlaşılıyorsa "serapa yeşil bir rüya içinde idim" denildiği zamanda onun hayali anlaşılır. Bunu, ıtnap ve imlale düşmeksizin, başka türlü anlatmak mümkün değildir. Bugün rüya ve hülyanın—alem hariciye nispetle müphem ve mutedil—bir rengi, bir şekli, bir manzarası olduğu fennen ve felsefen muhakkaktır.

If you have a dream full of a green spring that has yet to bloom, covered completely with leaves and grass, bounded with undulant greenness… what would you say of this dream—not to tire or bore your reader—if it is necessary to explain it in just one word, with just one adjective? We say a "yeşil rüya" ["green dream"] . . . If you become absorbed in a boundless azure daydream consisting of the entire sea and the entire sky, and to explain this daydream in just one word, just one sign, what would you do?... We find the compound "mai rüya" ["blue dream"] and rescue a word's total meaning from imprecision by attributing a total concept to the striking universal quality in those realms. Whatever is understood when one says I was in a totally green world, its image is understood when one says, "I was in a totally green world." Without prolixity and becoming tiresome, there is no other way to express this. Today it is scientifically and philosophically certain that dreams and daydreams—indefinite and moderate in comparison to the external world—have color, shape and perspective.

If these compound expressions using color were designed to transform signs into abstractions for the sake of evoking image or sensory experience, they did so as a means of contemplating "emotion" ("his"), "thought" ("fikir") and "spirit" ("ruh"), which Cenap takes for the ultimate objective of the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement.

The process of inventing new expressions involves piecing together linguistic fragments to translate new ideas. Of this process, Cenap writes: "Şair onları kendi hissiyat fikriye ve teamülat samimiyesine göre toplar, dağıtır; mecbur olursa bir müsemmayı anlatmak için birkaç ismi hurd u haş ederek aksam-ı tarmardan yeni bir cüz-i lisan çıkarır."[78] [The poet collects and

---

[78] Cenap Şahabettin. "Yeni Tabirat." *Servet-i Fünun*. 331 (1313/1897).

distributes [words] according to his own sentimental thoughts and sincere practices; if necessary to explain a noun [müsemma, or that bearing a name], by smashing into pieces a few nouns, he will produce a new linguistic fragment from the scattered parts.] While he notes that the new expressions must not contradict "the laws of the language," he condones rupture as a means of creating new concepts from old words.

Manifest in Edebiyat-ı Cedide expressions is a process of acquiring value for participating in rewriting modernity in Ottoman Turkish. Quoting the high ranking bureaucrat H. Nazım (penname for Ahmet Reşit Bey), Cenap writes: "medeniyet ilerledikçe efkar-ı edebiyenin de tenevvü ve tevessüyü, efkar-ı edebiyenin nevi ve vüsatı arttıkça işgal hariciyesi demek olan kelimat ve terkipatın tekasür ve televvünü tabiidir."[79] [As civilization advances, the idea of literature diversifies and expands and as literature's variety and capacity increases, it is natural that words and compounds signifying its external referents proliferate and become multicolored.] In a different article, "Esalib-i Ezmine" ("Styles of the Times"), Cenap indicates that the expansion of Ottoman literature must be carried out in translation: "İnsan, yeni keşfettiği manzara tasvir için yeni kelimeler, yeni cümleler, yeni üsluplar, yeni hayaller aramaya mecburdur."[80] [People are obligated to seek new words, new sentences, new styles and new imagination to describe the newly discovered perspective.]

These new sentences and style of which Cenap writes became significant as Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers moved to create artistic sentences marked by clarity and fluency. Identifying Ottoman Turkish sentences as monotonous, these writers innovatively experimented in their sentence structures, which according to Levend, differentiated them from Tanzimat writers.[81] If

---

[79] Cenap Şahabettin. "Yeni Elfaz." *Servet-i Fünun*. 333 (1313/1897).

[80] Cenap Şahabettin. "Esalib-i Ezmine." *Servet-i Fünun*. 291 (1312/1896).

[81] Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 182.

Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers were accused of coining strange neologisms, they were also accused of producing strange sentence structures. In an extensive article defending the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement, Süleyman Nesip (1866-1917) records critics' complaints about Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing for their apparent ignorance of Ottoman Turkish "sarf" ("grammar") and "nahiv" ("syntax") rules. Süleyman Nesip writes: "fakat onlar o sakat, o garip cümleler arasında o kadar samimi, o kadar garizi bedialar ibraz ediyorlar ki insan hayran oluyor. Tahminime göre o sakat o garip cümleler henüz bizde söylenmeyen bazı manayı beyan etmek, veyahut bazı efkâr-ı mevcutedi yeni ve daha ceyyid bir tarz ile söylemek için bizzarure tabiat-ı ifadeyi cebretmelerinden neşet ediyor."[82] [yet, among those broken, those strange sentences they display such sincere, such natural fanciful expressions that one is filled with amazement. I surmise those broken, those strange sentences originate from their being compelled by the nature of expression to express meaning that is not yet said with us, or to say certain existing thoughts in a new and more excellent manner.] Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers experimented with sentence structure, for instance, by introducing fragmented sentences and composing sentences that begin with "evet" ("yes") for emphasis. Like neologisms, sentence structure was to transmit new representations of sentiments and thoughts.

As a distinctive figure of prose and prose poetry, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil stands out as particularly innovative and influential in the experimentation of sentence structure. One prominent device that Halit Ziya employs is the conjunction "ve" ("and"), which provides an interesting example of a grammatical structure in tension between foreign and Ottoman Turkish. This conjunction served as a contested word in the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. Tanzimat writers drew on the Arabic conjunction, but

---

[82] Süleyman Nesip. "İki Söz Daha." *Servet-i Fünun*. 374 (1314/1898).

Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers, by employing the conjunction "ve" at the beginning of or abundantly in a sentence, not only succeeded in ascribing new meanings to it, but also in altering the sentence structure of Ottoman Turkish.[83] The use of these syntactical strategies served to capture more complex aspects of the interior of the poet and of characters.[84] Mete-Yuva understands Halit Ziya's use of "ve" as linking a series of ideas, using it as a mark of hesitation, showing a multiplicity of choices, and after a fragmented sentence, regaining it with "ve," signifying a point of no return.[85]

Edebiyat-ı Cedide discourses on neologisms and sentence structure reveal a negotiation between past and present that inform the rewriting and reinventing of universal modernity in Ottoman Turkish. The creation of an aesthetic language involved translating the European conception of aesthetics and modern literature. Thus, the process of how words come to represent the new literariness must be examined. As a process of Edebiyat-ı Cedide engagement in translation that is the circulation of meaning, the question of how a sign is made into an equivalent of a nonequivalent in Ottoman Turkish becomes significant. Acts of creating concepts from Ottoman and European concepts are significant in that "they introduce a level of mediated reality or change" that emerges from processes of equating them.[86] One significant example of

---

[83] Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 186.

[84] Literary scholar Gül Mete-Yuva understands Halit Ziya's use of "ve" as recalling Flaubert and Maupassant's use of "et" in French. To draw a comparison, she offers the following citation of Marcel Proust's analysis of Flaubert's "et": "La conjonction 'et' n'a nullement dans Flaubert l'objet que la grammaire lui assigne. Elle marque une phrase dans une mesure rythmique et devise un tableau. En effet, partout où on mettrait 'et,' Flaubert le supprime. C'est le modèle et la coupe de tant de phrases admirables. (…) En revanche, là où personne n'aurait l'idée d'en user, Flaubert l'emploie. C'est comme l'indication qu'une autre partie du tableau commence, que la vague refluante, de nouveau va se reformer." See Gül Mete-Yuva. *La Litterature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006.

[85] Mete-Yuva notes that the Milli Edebiyatı ("National Literature") movement that followed the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement rejected the use of "ve" because they regarded it Western. They observed an absence of "ve" in old Turkish texts. Rejecting "ve" as not belonging to Turkish national language, they avoided its use. See Gül Mete-Yuva. *La Litterature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006.

[86] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 40.

how a word of Ottoman Turkish origin whose meaning is shifted to stand for or approximate a European concept (or genre, in this case) is Halit Ziya's proposition of supplanting the French word for novel ("roman"), which circulated in Ottoman Turkish in the nineteenth century, with "hikaye."[87] In the introduction to his critical essay entitled *Hikaye* ("The Novel," serialized in *Hizmet* between 1887 and 1888), Halit Ziya reveals his politics of translingual practice as one that works to approximate Ottoman language and histories to those of French while appearing to preserve the Ottoman: "Edebiyat-ı Osmanide mahzarı olduğu mevki-i mühimi ihraz edemeyen aksam-ı edebiyattan biri de ecnebi bir kelime altında zikr etmekten ise Osmanlı lisanına hürmeten 'hikaye' namına vereceğimiz kısm-ı edebidir."[88] [Instead of employing a foreign word to explain a kind of literature, whose presence could not acquire an important place in Ottoman literature, we will call this kind of literature 'hikaye' out of respect for the Ottoman language.] On the one hand, Halit Ziya is dismayed by the perceived lack of an Ottoman novel tradition as it existed in Europe. While on the other hand, even though he regards the traditional Ottoman "hikaye" genre as insufficient in comparison to the novel, he nevertheless identifies a comparability within it.

Historically, the Ottoman Turkish word "hikaye" with its Arabic etymology had been used to describe a traditional Ottoman narrative form composed of prose and rhyme beginning in the fifteenth century. It was recited by an "aşık" ("minstrel") accompanied by a musical instrument in public meeting places, coffeehouses, festivals and private houses since the once nomadic Turkish groups conformed to sedentary life in the fifteenth century.[89] According to İlhan

---

[87] While "hikaye" as Halit Ziya proposes here circulated, succeeding generations preferred "roman," which is still in use. However, "hikaye" continues to be used to signify the short story and novella genre.

[88] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Hikaye*. Ed. Nur Gürani Arslan. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1997. 20.

[89] İlhan Başgöz. "Turkish Folk Stories about the Lives of Minstrels." *The Journal of American Folklore*. 65.258 (1952): 331-339. 331. The predecessor of the aşık, the ozan, prevailed in nomadic life reciting destan (epics) from the eleventh century. Fuad Köprülü understands the "meddah" common story-teller as a kind of "hikaye" story-teller. See Fuad Köprülü. "Türklerde Halk Hikayeciliğine Ait Bazı Maddeler." *Edebiyat Araştırmalar*. 4th ed. Vol. 1. Ankara: Akçağ, 2004. 317-56.

Başgöz's illuminating studies on folklore, the subject of the "hikaye" genre includes stories of heroism and love stories in which the hero consistently achieves victories on account of the beauty of his songs or to magic power. Inasmuch as the genre draws on imagination and fantasy, the characters are designed to represent real people and the story is crafted to treat contemporary issues. But when the characters and geographical locations are not real, they are taken as representations of their true existence at some time in the past or in some unknown location. The "hikaye" teller, conventionally professes himself as the mere transmitter of the story (as opposed to the story's "author"), must be able to reshape the story in each telling without injuring the traditional framework.[90]

The transmission of stories shifted from oral narratives to written narratives with the intensification of print communications and the translation of Europeans novels, many through the medium of French, in the nineteenth century. The first Ottoman Turkish translations consisted of Yusuf Kamil Paşa's (1808-1876) translation of Fénelon's didactic novel *Les Adventures de Télémaque* (1699) in 1859 and Victor Hugo's novel *Les Miserables* (1862) in 1862; Vakanüvis Ahmet Lutfi's (1816-1907) translation of Daneil Defoe's novel *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) from the Arabic in 1864; Emin Sıddık's translation of Jacques-Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* (1788) in 1870, among others.[91] In the second half of the nineteenth century, the first generation of novel writers in Ottoman Turkish like Ahmet Midhat and Namık Kemal found in the "hikaye" genre some kind of comparability with the "roman" genre, allowing them to write their own interpretation of novels through the "hikaye" (or "meddah," a particular category of "hikaye") narrating voice. Yet, Namık Kemal's comparison of the two genres in "Mukaddime-i

---

[90] İlhan Başgöz. "Turkish Hikaye Telling Tradition in Azerbaijan, Iran." *The Journal of American Folklore*. 83.330 (1970): 391-405. 397-98.

[91] Mustafa Nihat Özün. *Türkçede Roman*. 1936. Reprint. 3rd ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2015. 147-182.

Celal" ("Introduction to Celalettin Harzemşah," 1884-1885) reveals a sharp discord between their meanings:

> Romandan maksat güzeran etmemişse bile güzeran imkan dahilinde olan bir vakayı ahlak ve adat ve hissiyat ve ihtimalata müteallik her türlü tafsilatıyla beraber tasvir etmektir . . . Halbuki bizim hikayeler tılsım ile define bulmak, bir yerde denize batıp sonra müellifin hokkasından çıkmak, ah ile yanmak, külüng ile dağ yarmak gibi bütün bütün tabiat ve hakikatin haricinde birer mevzua müstenit ve suret-i tasvir-i ahlak ve tafsil-i adat ve teşrih-i hissiyat gibi şerait-i adabın kaffesinden mahrum olduğu için roman değil, koca karı masala nevindendir.[92]

> The purpose of the novel is to describe an event, whose occurrence is possible even if it has not taken place, together with a detailed explanation concerning morals, sentiments, and probabilities . . . However, our stories are based on subjects that lie altogether outside the realm of nature and reality, such as discovering treasure with magic spells, sinking somewhere in the sea then emerging from the writer's inkwell, burning up with a sigh, cutting through a mountain with a pick. They are not of the novel genre because they lack all the conditions of literature such as the way to describe morals, detail customs and examine sentiments. They are of old wives' tales.

For both Namık Kemal and Halit Ziya, "roman" and "hikaye" are unequal genres of narrative; however, Halit Ziya discursively forms a hypothetical equivalence between the two words by imagining a "new style hikaye." This division amounts to reorganizing Ottoman textuality according to a temporal schema in which tradition must belong to the past. The new and the old forms of narrative are simultaneously produced as such. When Halit Ziya articulates that by refusing to use the foreign word "roman" and instead using the word "hikaye" out of respect for Ottoman Turkish, in effect he legitimizes the assimilation of a centuries-old tradition to another kind of textuality.[93] Thus "hikaye" becomes a signifier of a new literariness in tension with traditional Ottoman narrative.

---

[92] Namık Kemal. "Mukaddime-i Celal." *Celaleddin Harzemşah*. Türk Tiyatro Serisi. Ed. Oğuz Öcal. Ankara: Akçağ, 2005. 39.

[93] It is worth pointing out that Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers scrupulously avoided the use of borrowed European words in their writing.

Attempting to overcome this tension, Halit Ziya temporally splits "hikaye" between the "old-style" and the "new-style," which he imagines the former as belonging to the past and the latter as approximating the European novel form belonging to the present. What he terms the "new-style hikaye" does not signify all novels; it refers specifically to a category of realism. Apprehending the contemporary realist novel as the most significant literary genre in Europe, Halit Ziya explains that the novelist ("hikayenüvis") in Europe is exalted to the greatness of a philosopher and a scientist. Moreover, the status of the novelist is greater than that of the poet, for, Halit Ziya reasons, while the poet describes the human heart, the novelist brings to light the entire human condition. This provides the blueprints for modern literariness. For, the "new-style hikaye" writer, according to Halit Ziya,

> kalb-i beşerin en mutena hissiyatı, cemiyet-i insaniyenin en mühim ahvali hikayelerde mizan-ı tedkikten çekiliyor. Hikayeler öyle bir mirat-ı hayat-ı beşer addolunuyor ki fenn-i menafiü'r-ruh mesailinin en mühimlerine cay-ı tedkik oluyor. Meydana gerçekten insanlar, birer kalbe malik ademler çıkarıyor, yaşatıyor, ahval-i beşeriyeyi her halinde her suretinde irae ediyor.

> withdraws from judgmental investigation of the human heart's most refined sentiments and human society's most important conditions in novels. Novels are deemed mirrors of human life such that the most important issues of the science of psychology are given room for careful investigation. [The novelist] shows the states of the human in every situation and case, reveals real people who possess a heart, and gives them life.

Modern literariness, for Halit Ziya, is marked by an objective exploration of the psychological realm of characters that one could imagine as a living being.

The "old-style hikaye" for Halit Ziya includes Tanzimat novels for the way in which they draw on the traditional Ottoman "hikaye" art of narration. We might understand Halit Ziya's contempt for such novels as grounded in a discomfort concerning the conspicuous temporal unevenness in Tanzimat novels in which the past continues to disrupt the present. Specifically, Halit Ziya points to Ahmet Midhat's understanding of the novel as incapable of exceeding the "old-style hikaye" narrative. The danger in his understanding, Halit Ziya argues, is that the

traditional style "hikaye," based entirely on fantasy, is insufficient for the serious, knowledgeable

contemporary Ottoman reader. Until now, he says, the translated novels from European

languages in Ottoman Turkish have largely consisted of adventure stories that lack serious

thought, thus making it impossible for the advancement of the Ottoman novel and, one could add,

for "hikaye" to meaningfully reciprocate "roman."[94] A capable ("muktedir," also "powerful")

writer in Ottoman Turkish could change the genre ("tarz") of the once beloved "hikaye" one

hundred years prior. Halit Ziya's rhetoric frames the "old-style hikaye," much like the tale

("masal"), as belonging to the realm of the past for having no literary value ("kıymet-i edebiye").

If Halit Ziya's discourse on "hikaye" circumscribes the modern novel and the traditional

narrative, "hikaye" becomes the very site on which Ottoman and French histories collide and

form new meanings in Ottoman Turkish.

The most conspicuous struggle to establish an Ottoman Turkish literature comparable to

French literature occurs in Edebiyat-ı Cedide novelist Mehmet Rauf's (1875-1931) curiously

titled article, "Romanlara Dair: Bizde Hikaye" ("On Novels [Roman]: The Novel [Hikaye] with

Us"), which appeared in *Servet-i Fünun* a decade after the publication of Halit Ziya's critical

essay *Hikaye*. Mehmet Rauf sets out to define "hikaye" because, he insists, Ottomans do not yet

know its meaning.[95] Preferring the meaning as "novel" only, his discourse on "hikaye" ultimately

suppresses its traditional meaning. Inasmuch as Halit Ziya before him tried to overcome the

tension between the two meanings embedded in "hikaye," Mehmet Rauf does not deem it

---

[94] In her study on Halit Ziya's essay *Hikaye*, Jennifer Noyon points out that when he wrote *Hikaye*, there were 15 novels written in Ottoman Turkish. See Jennifer Noyon. "Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's *Hikaye* (*the Novel*) and Westernization in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Intersections in Turkish Literature: Essays in Honor of James Stewart-Robinson*. Ed. Walter Andrews. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001. 138.

[95] Mehmet Rauf. "Romanlara Dair: Bizde Hikaye." *Servet-i Fünun*. 344 (1313/1897).

necessary to make reference to the traditional meaning. Nevertheless, the spectral presence of the past meaning returns to haunt the translated meaning.

As the title intimates, "roman" and "hikaye" seem to function as unequal terms, even if their meanings overlap. For the title constitutes two independent clauses, in which the first meaning of novel is universal ("On novels") and the second particular ("the novel with us"). This suggests that "hikaye" relies on "roman" for its meaning, and that "roman" defines the identity of "hikaye." As a part of the legitimization process of the formation of modern literature, which "hikaye" embodies, Mehmet Rauf evokes Emile Zola as a figure of authority for ascribing to these novels meaning as value. In circumscribing the successful Ottoman novel, he imagines Zola as an Ottoman Turkish speaker able to evaluate their novels:

> Böylece birkaç senedir yazılan hikayelerimiz tetkik edilirse daima bir terakki ile beraber şu zahir olur ki muharrirlerimiz o mahud şeraita bazı kere külliyen menafi hareket ettikleri halde kamilen tevfik hareket edip hatta muvafık olanlar kadar güzel eserler meydana getirmişler; . . . bugün şöyle bir ümid-i muvaffakiyet veren yeni muharrirlerimizin asarını bilfarz Zola nokta-i nazarından bir tetkik etsek o usula külliyen muvafık ancak üç dört parçaya rast geliriz ki o kadar şayan-ı ehemmiyet olmayabilir; Fakat Zola Türkçe bilseydi de bütün yazılan eserleri okusaydı, o üç dört parçanın haricinde daha ne güzellerini bulurdu. Hele Daudet'nin, Maupassant'nın, Bourget'nin hikayeleri gibi şuh ve asabi hikayelere nakillerimiz daha ziyade meyl ederek pek güzel numunelerini meydana getirmişlerdir.

> Upon examining our novels [hikaye], which are being written as such for the last couple years, we find steady advancement. Although our writers started out [writing novels] in accordance with, sometimes completely conforming to the so well-known laws [of traditional Ottoman writing], they created excellent works. Our new writers . . . give hope of success today. If we examine their work from the point of view of Zola, we would encounter at most three or four pieces completely suitable to that method that it may not be worthy of significance. However, if Zola knew Turkish and read all [Turkish] works, he would find great things beyond those three or four pieces. Above all, our novelists [nakil] produced excellent examples by inclining more toward unreserved and neurological novels [hikaye] like the novels of Daudet, Maupassant and Bourget.

Mehmet Rauf references the hybridity of the Tanzimat novels for blending traditional Ottoman narrative style with the European novel. But it is the new generation of realist writers that gives

him hope of successfully assimilating the novel in the European sense. Imagining Zola as a Turkish speaker reveals the desire to view the self from the perspective of the other.

Mehmet Rauf identifies the current issue for Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers as: How to effectively engage the European novel in Ottoman Turkish. He explains that some Ottoman writers are still searching for what he calls a favorable ("müsait") subject-matter ("zemin") for novel writing to take place. He writes:

> Bence nakillerimiz o kadar zengin bir saha-ı tasvir ve hikaye üzerindedirler ki hayretle ne yapacaklarını bilemiyorlar. Gençte zekasına pek itimadım olan bir muhibim, mahza bu hususa sırf zihn ettiğinden, "bizde hikaye yazılamaz." demişti. –çünkü?.. –çünkü zemin yok, vaka yok… Ah, zemin, vaka… Lakin ortada bundan başka ne var? Bunları görecek kadar, bunların ruhuna hulul edip tasvir edecek kadar kuvvet ve cesaret olduktan sonra… Bir alem, bir hayat ki hiçbir şeyi yazılmaz; zengin bir teraküm anasır, öyle bir tehalüf adat ki hiç tetkik olunmamış, yazılmamış, yazılmamış… Ah bir Zola olsaydı, bir Zola olsaydı da bir Rougon Macquart külliyeti vücuda getirseydi; o zaman zeki arkadaşım benim sükut tasdikkaranem, zavallı "evet!"imle beraber görürdü ki hikaye nüvisliği ihya edecek bir hikayat içinde yaşanıyor; yalnız Zola değil, garbın bütün hikaye nüvisleri gelseydiler de hepsi mesela Fransa'daki romanlar kadar roman yazsaydılar bir o kadar daha yazılacak şey kalırdı. Bugün edebiyatımızda roman namına yazılan eserlerden de bu istinbat olunamaz mı? Bunlardan istidlalen daha yazılacak ne kadar hikayeler olduğu şimdiden görülmüyor mu?

> I believe that our novelists [nakil] are standing on such a rich area of description and novel/story [hikaye] that from astonishment they don't know what to do. A good friend of mine whose mind I trusted in my youth, once said on this subject matter out of sheer reasoning: "we cannot write novels." Because…? Because there is no subject-matter, no events [to write about]. Alas, subject-matter, events… But what else is there? Once we have the power and courage to see these things, to penetrate the soul of these things and describe them… A world, a life that doesn't get written; a rich piling up of elements, such a discordancy of practices that have never been investigated, never been written, never been written… If only a Zola were here, if only a Zola were here and brought into existence a Rougon Macquart cycle, then my clever friend would have seen what seemed as my silent confirmation and my wretched "yes" and that novel [hikaye] writers are living inside stories [hikayat] to reinvigorate. Not just Zola, if all novel [hikaye] writers of the West came [to Istanbul] and all of them wrote novels [roman] as they are written in France, there would still remain so much to write about. Can this not bring to light a hidden matter concerning works being written today in our literature called "roman"? Can we not see now how many novels [hikaye] are yet to be written by deduction of all this?

In accordance to Halit Ziya's understanding of modernity in literature, Mehmet Rauf points to an analysis of the psychological aspects of the human mind as the ground on which Ottoman prose writings possess the ability to engage the new novel writing practice. This process circumscribes the meaning of "hikaye" and makes it known as modern novels that analyze the human condition in ways not yet done in European novels.

Chapter 2
Translating Ottoman Literary Legacies into the Language of Modernization

This chapter examines how Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors negotiate in fiction the double haunting of

the European linguistic other and the Arabic and Persian intimate other that I have outlined in

Chapter 1. This negotiation, which involves a coming to terms with ambiguities, contradictions

and other tensions, plays out in the narrators' rhetoric in Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel *Mai ve*

Siyah ("Blue and Black," 1896-97) and Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın's novel *Hayal İçinde* ("Inside

Imagination," 1898). In the style of a künstlerroman ("artist's novel"), both novels treat the theme

of writing in cross-cultural contacts: the protagonist of *Mai ve Siyah* is a modern poet and that of

Hayal İçinde is a realist novelist and journalist. As young men engaged in changing language and

literature in Ottoman Turkish to be comparable to French, their work registers epistemic shifts.

The struggle to attain a certain degree of commensurability of Ottoman Turkish with French

happens in translation as a process of negotiating among multiple languages and histories. In this

negotiation, aspects of Ottoman Turkish different from European languages become suppressed

and new meanings emerge in Ottoman Turkish. The question becomes how these changes take

place on the terrain of language in fiction.

I argue that the processes of linguistic modernization that happen in fiction involve the

"work of translation," which, following Paul Ricœur, necessarily includes the "work of

mourning" and the "work of remembering."[96] This "work" gives us insights into the way the

narrator and the protagonist struggle with detaching from tradition (because understood as

---

[96] Ricœur explains in an interview that in his own work on narrative, he makes a rapprochement of Freud's concepts in "Mourning and Melancholia" and "Recollection, Repetition, and Working Through." In Ricœur's words, he "grafts" his theme of narrative onto Freud's idea of the "work of mourning." See Richard Kearney, Anne Bernard Kearney, Fabrizio Turoldo. "A Conversation with Paul Ricœur." *Symposium*. 9.2 (Autumn 2005): 361-373.

belonging to the past) as they attempt to modernize language that is nevertheless informed by forgotten and unfinished potentialities of the past. In both novels, the protagonists, who serve as the narrators' double, are caught up in an effort to detach from certain aspects of Ottoman literary tradition in the impulse to modernize. But as they do so, they draw on other aspects of tradition, such as conventional language, and reinvent them. Inseparable from this process of erosion and loss of tradition is a creativity (or, "surplus meaning" and other unexpected potentialities) that emerges at the intersection of mourning and remembering that occurs in cultural translation.

Mai ve Siyah: Translation as Exchange

The first novel of the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement in Turkish literature, *Mai ve Siyah* ("Blue and Black"), was written by Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil and serialized in the *Servet-i Fünun* periodical between 1896 and 1897. At the time of publication, the novel garnered as many ardent enthusiasts as it did hostile enemies for its profuse use of foreign cultural and linguistic elements from western Europe (mostly France). Later cultural nationalists invested in nation building in the early Republican period (post-1922) criticized Halit Ziya for imagining characters without Turkish "essence" and for failing to write national novels.[97] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, one of the most influential literary historians and cultural critics of the twentieth century, described Edebiyat-ı Cedide novels as ushering in foreignness.[98] Nonetheless, the place of Halit Ziya's novel in modern Turkish literature is indisputably significant. According to Tanpınar, the novel (in the European sense) in modern Turkish literature emerges from Halit Ziya's pen with *Mai ve*

---

[97] For a detailed overview of Turkish cultural nationalists on Edebiyat-ı Cedide, see Orhan Koçak. "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152.

[98] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. "Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil." *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. 1969 Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.

Siyah.[99] Thus the critical discourse on Halit Ziya's novel reveals a certain uneasiness over the ways in which it forms new meanings in cross-cultural contact and its rejection of tradition. This chapter traces *Mai ve Siyah*'s involvement in cultural translation as a process of modernizing language and literature.

At the level of the plot, *Mai ve Siyah* signals the transition from Islamic epistemology to European systems of knowledge production. The protagonist, Ahmet Cemil, a sentimental individual, strives to write innovative poetry that completely breaks free from centuries-old forms and linguistic conventions. His tenets of a new Ottoman Turkish language and literature suggest a longing for the passing of an old literary system intimately connected to Arabic and Persian language and culture. Yet, this quest for a new language and poetry is met with competing interests. As the Ottoman Empire was already fully integrated into the capitalist system of modernity, new forms of economic success emerge and awaken ambitions in the individual. Ahmet Cemil comes from a modest family and dreams of elevating his social class by becoming a successful poet not through securing for himself a place in the Ottoman governing body, but by publishing new poetry in literary journals made possible by print capitalism. But after losing his father at 19, Ahmet Cemil becomes responsible for financially supporting his mother and younger sister, İkbal. To this end, Ahmet Cemil secures work for himself as a journalist at a printing house and he also tutors children of wealthy families for supplemental income. When the son of the owner of the printing house asks for İkbal's hand in marriage, Ahmet Cemil tacitly agrees to it even though he does not hold his future brother-in-law in high esteem. For, he reasons, familial ties could benefit him and help him achieve his literary goals more quickly. In the meantime, Ahmet Cemil continues to work on his innovative poetry and one day, at his close

---

[99] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. "Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil." *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005. 284. "Bizde asıl romancılık Halit Ziya ile başlar."

friend Hüseyin Nazmi's house, he falls in love with Hüseyin Nazmi's sister and believes that her feelings reciprocate his. Now he sees his book of poetry and his new love, Lamia, as interconnected and can make it possible for him to finish his poetry. After the completion of his book of poems, Ahmet Cemil reads from it to literary guests at a dinner organized by Hüseyin Nazmi and for an evanescent moment it seems as though Ahmet Cemil has achieved his dreams. Then the young poet learns that Raci, one of the guests and colleague of Ahmet Cemil, has published a vicious article that denigrates his poetry. Thus, Raci, who is represented as an antagonist figure, partially thwarts Ahmet Cemil's success. This disappointment does not entirely dash Ahmet Cemil's hopes for achieving literary success. But when he is faced with even more devastating reality when his sister dies after being struck by her husband and when he learns soon thereafter that Hüseyin Nazmi has promised Lamia's hand to someone else, he loses all hope. Ahmet Cemil burns his book of poetry and, almost ironically, in a moment of personal defeat, voluntarily sends himself into exile in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

My analysis of *Mai ve Siyah* attends to the narrator's rhetoric and how it shapes the interpretation of the novel as a work centered on the intellectual development of Ahmet Cemil, a disillusioned poet caught between a duality of imagination and reality.[100] The degree of sympathy with which the narrator treats his protagonist must not be overlooked, particularly in view that the narrator shares the same stakes as his protagonist in forging a modern Ottoman Turkish language and literature. What interests me here is how Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel participates in translation as a process of rewriting modernity. Little attention has been paid to the role of the narrator, who is instrumental in this process. I read the narrator of *Mai ve Siyah* as invested in

---

[100] See Robert Finn's analysis of *Mai ve Siyah* in Robert Finn. "A Disillusioned Poet." *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: ISIS Yayımcılık, 1984. My analysis departs from that of Finn, who views Ahmet Cemil's disillusionment and even "failure" as a result of being "committed intellectually to an alien system" (116). This view denies the complex processes of translation as modernization.

value-making in cross-cultural interpretation concerning the new generation of literati as they struggle for legitimacy and authority. According to the logic of the text, the new poet requires a modern language and literature, indeed, a new literacy, radically different from that which existed already. Following Rey Chow's theoretical concept of cultural translation as modernization in narratives in non-European regions of the world, I read *Mai ve Siyah* as translating Ottoman literacies into "the language of modernization." The narrator of *Mai ve Siyah*, in an impulse to attain commensurability with Europe, translates the traditional Ottoman culture (or, what we may conceive of as a kind of "original" here) into regressive terms and privileges Enlightenment modernity and progress. The narrator thus sets the terms with which the novel is to be evaluated and interpreted. Yet the protagonist is also instrumental as a literary figure of the new generation bent on modernizing language and literature. The novel, though, exposes incongruities in this process of modernization with which Ahmet Cemil grapples.

Mai ve Siyah, and Edebiyat-ı Cedide literature in general, could be said to carve out a new Turkish subjectivity of the late Ottoman era as contingent on a new language and literature. As the novel centers on Ahmet Cemil's perception of his interior self and his interpretation of the external world, his subjective relation to the world serves as the object of the narration. Throughout the novel, Ahmet Cemil struggles in vain to climb out of his modest social origins and to join the bourgeoisie. Becoming a famous poet and marrying his wealthy friend's beautiful sister become the means to attain a new class standing. His objective to become an eminent poet, to be known by all, points to the emergence of a new kind of poet and a new identity within a dynamic and changing cultural and political climate. These desires cannot be understood separately from Ahmet Cemil's education, which is carefully documented in the novel.

Even though Ahmet Cemil's intellectual education does not stand outside of the legacies of Ottoman interculture, its documentation only serves to legitimize complete rupture with

Ottoman tradition for its inability to satisfy the new poet. Both the narrator's and the protagonist's disdain for the past tradition places Ahmet Cemil in a relation of superiority to Ottoman poets of the past. In a flashback scene recalling reading together with his father in the evenings at home, we glimpse Ahmet Cemil's initiation into literary life. The passage begins with a nostalgic reflection of their family life before Ahmet Cemil tragically loses his father, echoed in the explicative interjection "How happy they were back then!"[101] During these evenings, after his father, a lawyer who represents a "foreign legal system,"[102] had finished reading legal books and writing legal documents and Ahmet Cemil had completed his lessons, the narrator explains, their next "occupation" ("iş," or "job") was reading Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi's *Mesnevi*:

> Babasının *Mesnevi-i Şerife* pek merakı vardır; keyfemettefak bir yeri açılır, her yeri cazib olan bu kitabın bir mebhası okunur, Ahmet Cemil'in küçük yaşından beri bütün hatavat-ı tehsiline rehber olan bu baba o vakit oğluna ders verir; Bir nükteyi anlatmak, bir mazmunu tefsir etmek için saatlerce yorulur; bu genç dimağı bir gonca-i nev-şüküfte gibi nazik parmaklarla açmaya çalışır (36, 1914).

> He was very curious about his father's *Mesnevi* [spiritual couplets]; they would open it at an indiscriminate place and read a section from this book whose every part was compelling. At such times his father, who showed the way at every step of Ahmet Cemil's education from a young age, would give a lesson to his son. He would speak for hours to explain a witticism or interpret an image. He would try to open up with delicate fingers this young mind like a newly blossomed rosebud.

At the beginning of his introduction into literature, the young protagonist is captivated by Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi's *Mesnevi*, a poetic collection of stories written in Persian couplets containing spiritual insights. That the Mesnevi is an essential oeuvre in Ottoman literature and the starting point of Ahmet Cemil's keen interest in poetry seems quite natural in the Ottoman context. This particularly in light of the powerful influence it held on Ottoman poetry from the

---

[101] Tellingly, Orhan Koçak explains in a footnote that the nostalgic story of the father (what he calls "the happy days," or "mutlu günler") belongs to mythic time. I return to this below. See his essay "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152. 130.

[102] Orhan Koçak. "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152. 136.

thirteenth century until the nineteenth century.[103] However, this kind of enjoyable evening of

knowledge transfer—in the narrator's terms, "soirée" (müsamere)—soon takes an inferior

position to the European style education when Ahmet Cemil is withdrawn from his neighborhood

school and sent to Askerî Rüştiye, a school founded on secular European-style instruction that

prepares boys for Ottoman bureaucratic posts. To the replacement of traditional spiritual

epistemology with the secular European, the narrator quips, "But what can we do? The child must

be prepared for life" (36, 1914). Thus, the novel naturalizes the necessity of European knowledge

for success in the Empire, nullifying the efficacy of the Ottoman education for the new (modern)

individual.

    As can be expected, it is at the European-style school that Ahmet Cemil meets Hüseyin

Nazmi, the son of a wealthy family, and is introduced to European literature. Ahmet Cemil and

Nazmi Hüseyin soon discover that they share a deep passion for reading literature. But they do

not read literature only for pleasure; they pursue poetic language that describes sentiments

without restraints of Ottoman convention for their own objectives in literature. Even though what

they seek remains ineffable in the narrative for some time, the narrator already begins recoding

Ottoman poetry conventions as no longer capable of clearly transmitting sentiments. For the two

young poets, their point of entry into poetry is Fuzuli, Baki, Nef'i, Nabi, and Nedim, the great

Ottoman divan poets of the past. But they are unable to find in these poets what they are looking

for because, as the narrator explains, the "decorative language" ("haşmet-i lisan") of divan poetry

"veils ideas" ("fikirlerini örttü") and "suffocates emotions" ("hislerini bunaltı"). They are

deceived by the musicality of the poetic language, and moreover the poetry "does not make their

souls flutter as they had wished" ("ruhlarını istedikleri gibi titretmekten uzak kaldı").

---

[103] Walter G. Andrews, Najaat Black, and Mehmet Kalpaklı, eds. and trans. *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997. 118-119.

Disappointed with the great Ottoman poets, and even cross at reading in general, the two friends'

passion for reading reignites only when they happen upon a volume of French poetry at a

bookstore in the trendy district Beyoğlu. They are so impressed by it that, as a radical gesture of

modernization, they immediately destroy their copies of Ottoman Turkish literary works:

> Bugünden itibaren bütün müsveddeler yakıldı; Bir harf bile bırakmadılar. Bütün o tulû
> tasvirleri, verem kızlar ağzından söylenme neşideler, pejmürde çiçeklere hitabeler,
> çocuğunun mezarında ağlayan valideler, Fuzuli'ye, Baki'ye, Nedim'e nazirelerle beraber
> yakıldı; tahmisler, tesdisler parçalandı; her şeyden evvel okumak, duygularını terbiye
> etmek lazım olacağını anladılar (54, 1914).

> After that day, all manuscripts were burned; they didn't leave even one letter. All of those
> depictions of sunrises, poetry from the voice of tubercular girls, addresses to wilted
> flowers, mothers crying at their children's graves, Fuzuli, Baki, Nedim together with
> nazires [parallel poems] were burned; quintuplets, six-lined ghazels were torn to pieces;
> they understood that above all it was necessary to read, to educate their sentiments.

In this passage, the characters' act of violence aligns with the narrator's rhetorical violence—

reducing centuries' worth of literary history to a parody comprised of decay (the wilted flowers),

illness and death—in their efforts to annihilate indigenous culture. They want to erase all traces

of their literary tradition (they did not leave even one letter visible on the burned pages) along

with any emotional connection to it. The act of burning pages from Ottoman history provides the

catalyst for them to educate themselves anew in European literature through the medium of

French. On the surface, it seems as though the two aspiring poets succeed in extinguishing their

literary past. For the remainder of the novel, they are preoccupied with studying European

literature and forging a "new" Ottoman Turkish literature.

This kind of narrative consciousness might well suggest that within the novel European

literature is always understood as superior to Ottoman Turkish literature. But the novel does not

posit all periods of European literature as having potential to lead to Ottoman literary progress,

which, for Edebiyat-ı Cedide, constitutes an aesthetic language capable of transmitting

subjectivity free of Ottoman poetic conventions. Armed with tomes of literary history, the two young poets study European literature in the classic, linear fashion beginning with the ancient Greek epics, Iliad and Odyssey. Rather than brimming with enthusiasm, boredom consumes them, causing them to give up on reading half way through the texts. This pattern of reading only fragments of texts continues as they make their way "yawning" ("esneye esneye") through centuries of literature, always with an urgency—a feeling of "haste" ("acele")—to arrive at contemporary literature, or literature of "the time closer" ("daha yakın zamanlar") to their own era. Since only contemporary European literature is capable of arousing the young poets' sentiments, we must understand the novel as rejecting the argument for Ottomans to follow the historical progression of European literature that inform narratives of Westernization.[104]

Contemporary European literature mediates Ahmet Cemil's poetry. At first, he is unable to articulate exactly what he wants to write about. After immersing himself in French poetry, Ahmet Cemil articulates his intentions to Hüseyin Nazmi:

> Bir şey yazmak, o tahassüsatın içinden bir şey çıkarmak istiyorum ama bir kere ne yazmak istediğimi tayin edebilsem . . . Bak şu semaya, ne görüyorsun, bir derya-yı mina . . . Sonra, bak ayağımızın altındaki toprağa, ne buluyorsun? Camit bir reng-i muzlim . . . İşte öyle bir şey yazmak istiyorum ki . . . mai ve siyah olsun (49-50, 2016).

> I want to write something and take something out from inside those feelings but if only I knew what . . . Look at that sky, what do you see, a sea of blueness . . . Now, look at the earth beneath our feet, what do you find? A frozen, completely black color . . . Well I want to write something like that . . . that is blue and black.

---

[104] In the "Classics Debate" during the 1890s, Ahmet Midhat and like-minded voices argues that Ottomans must first translate European masterpieces of the Classical era and emulate them. See Saliha Paker. "Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and its Practice: The 1897 'Classics Debate' as a Focus for Examining Change." *Translating Others*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006. and Ramazan Kaplan. *Klasikler Tartışması*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1998.

When Ahmet Cemil finally feels ready to write, he empties out Hüseyin Nazmi's library borrowing the works of all the poets that came after Lamartine, Hugo, Musset: all the Parnassians, Symbolists, and Decadents, the most contemporary European movements in aesthetics. In his tiny room in Süleymaniye, he reads them all and admires their finesse and the delicacy of the art of descriptions and expressions. Comparing the contemporary poets to Romantic poets starting with Hugo, he thinks to himself: "He had glasses over his eyes that exaggerated objects and reality" and found him "unrealistic" ("hakikatin fevkinde"). Lamartine, he thinks, "was so burdened with poetry that he was crushed" and he declares Musset: "Lover, poet but a child!" It is important to note that although these Romantic poets wrote in an aesthetic language that both the narrator and his protagonist find appealing, Hugo, Lamartine and Musset do not inspire Ahmet Cemil's own ideas about modern poetry, which explicitly distances him from Tanzimat writers.[105] Rather, his self-claimed affinities are aligned with the Parnassians, Symbolists and Decadents. It is only after reading them that he begins working in earnest on his own book of poems, itself engaged in cultural translation.

Ahmet Cemil's interest in European literature leads him to believe that Ottoman Turkish language and poetry must be radically renewed in order to be comparable to contemporary European language and literature. Echoing the nature of the Ottoman literary scene at the time, the novel positions his ideas that he articulates in, to borrow from Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, a "manifesto" (or, "beyanname")[106] in a context of contesting visions of language and literature.

---

[105] It is well documented that Romantic literature inspired Tanzimat writers. See Nurdan Gürbilek. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. 102.2/3 (Spring/Summer 2003): 599-628. and Jale Parla. *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. 1990. Reprint. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014.

[106] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. "Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil." *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005. 288. "Hakikatte *Mai ve Siyah*, Edebiyat-ı Cedide'nin teklifleri kadar protestolarıyla da devrini veren beyannamesidir."

Given that the novel opens with a scene in which Ahmet Cemil delivers his manifesto, we must understand Ahmet Cemil's ideas on language as not only the guiding principle for the new generation of Ottoman poets, as Tanpınar understands it,[107] but also his objective to achieve in the course of the novel.

The opening scene in which Ahmet Cemil puts forth his manifesto depicts a group of men of letters working at the same printing house where Ahmet Cemil is employed. This scene is notable for the objective distance the narrator maintains, even toward Ahmet Cemil. As the men have just finished feasting in celebration of their newspaper's (*Mir'at-i Şuun*, or "Mirror of Events") tenth year, they are gathered at a table in disarray. The narrative begins with objects on the table including a saltshaker tipped over, wine-stained fez hats, napkins thrown about, and a glass on the floor that no one bothered to pick up. Then the narrative shifts from objects to the men's conversation, portraying them as out of sync with each other in terms of ideas and language:

> Herkes söylüyor, hiç kimse dinlemiyordu. Bi-ahenk, bi-vezin aletlerden mürekkep bir garibe-i musikiye gibi mukaddimesiz, müntehasız sözleri kırık, dökük muhavereler, çok içilmiş, çok yenmiş zamanlara mahsus bir adem-i ıttırad-ı efkâr, bir cereyan-ı serseri-i lisan… (5-6, 1914).

> Everyone was speaking, no one was listening. Like a strange music composed of unharmonious and unmeasured instruments, incoherent conversations without introduction or conclusion, an absent rhythm of thoughts, a current of meaningless language particular to times when one drinks and eats too much…

As others have pointed out, the opening scene is marked by excess: the men have drunk and eaten too much.[108] In this passage, their language, too, points to excess. The word employed to describe

---

[107] Agâh Sırrı Levend agrees with Tanpınar. See Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960.

[108] See Gül Mete-Yuva. *La littérature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006. 236.

their language, "serseri," means both meaningless and idle. We might posit the excess in language as its failure to produce meaning; their excessive language is incomprehensible. More importantly, the meaningless language of the men provides a sharp contrast with Ahmet Cemil's articulate monologue on language that lends him authority.

In the context of competing visions of language and literature, the stakes of Ahmet Cemil's authority gain increased significance. After describing the men's idle talk, the narrator describes three men as they debate Hüseyin Nazmi's poetic style, and one of them, Raci, objects to Hüseyin Nazmi's views of literature for denying the possibility of other kinds of writing. While the other men do not necessarily share Raci's views, they nonetheless engage him in jest, calling Hüseyin Nazmi a monopolist on literature. The negative portrayal of Hüseyin Nazmi demands his defense, which comes from Ahmet Cemil. Thus, the debate exposes the two poles of thought on literature that inform the entire novel: the proponent of adopting European poetry Hüseyin Nazmi and the proponent of the continuation of traditional poetry, Raci. Criticizing Raci for not seeing the value of Hüseyin Nazmi's poetry and instead valorizing poetry of a bygone era, Ahmet Cemil claims that Raci prefers to see poetry "in stasis" ("sabit noktada") just as the divan poets left it. As an indication of Ahmet Cemil's superiority to Raci, Ahmet Cemil exposes his rival as oblivious to history by arguing that the great divan poets of the elite Ottoman literary tradition obscured Ottoman Turkish language with artificial decor:

> Şiirin nasıl bir yol kat' ettiğini anlamıyorsunuz. Fuzuli'nin şi'r-i safına ma'raz-ı tecelli olan o lisan-ı pakın üzerine san'at gibi, ziynet gibi iki dahiye-i uzmayı taslit etmişler; lisanda onlardan başka bir şey bırakmamışlar, öyle şeyler söylenmiş ki sahiblerine şair demekten ise kuyumcu denebilir. Bir ucundan tutulsa da silkilse taş parçalarından başka bir şey dökülmeyecek. Lisanı bir kütle-i camide gibi barid, bi-ruh bir hale getirmişler; Baki'ler, Nedim'ler.. o peri-i dehanın nasiyelerine bir nur-ı ilahi koyduğu adamlar, bu lisandan, bu camid kütleden ne çıkarabileceklerinde mütehayyir kalmışlar; lisanı—üstünü örten bar-ı sakil-i tezyinat altında zaif, sarı, hemen gayri mer'i, belki na-bud denebilecek bir hale gelen o şahid-i fikri—Veysi'lerine, Nergisi'lerin eline vermişler; o güzel Türkçeye muamma söyletmişler. Dört yüz sene emekle lisanın üzerine yığılan o vahiyet-ı hevai zamanla yavaş yavaş savruldu (13, 1914).

You don't understand how poetry developed. They brought great evils like art, like decoration to Fuzuli's pristine language, which is manifest in his pure and sincere poetry. They didn't leave anything other than these [evils] in language. Such things were said that the writer could be called a jeweler instead of a poet. If [poetry] is taken by the end and shaken out, nothing but stones will fall free. They turned language into a cold and soulless entity like a frozen body; Poets like Baki and Nedim… men blessed with great intelligence were confused about what they could make of this language, this lifeless body. Language—a soul that became weak, pale, under the burden that covered it with decoration and excessive art and couldn't be seen anymore, even could be said to not exist—was handed to poets like Veysi and Nergisi. That beautiful Turkish was made into a mystery. Turkish was slowly led astray with the meaningless idle time that piled up on the language with four hundred years of labor.

Inasmuch as Ahmet Cemil renders foreign Ottoman conventional employments of linguistic formulas, he speaks of the conventional use of language as dazzling stones that deceive and hinder Ottoman progress. This legitimizes his manifesto that calls for a full divorce from Ottoman conventions. However, if, as Ahmet Cemil suggests, language is a body, then suppressing tradition could be likened to a body with missing parts: dismembered, injured. I quote here the much-cited passage in which Ahmet Cemil, again in quoted monologue, calls for a new language, one capable of returning Ottoman Turkish to its wholeness:

Bilseniz, şiirin nasıl bir lisana muhtaç olduğunu bilseniz! Öyle bir lisan ki… neye teşbih edeyim, bilmem?... Bir ruh-ı mütekellim kadar beliğ olsun, bütün kederlerimize, neşvelerimize, düşüncelerimize, o kalbin bin türlü inceliklerine, fikrin bin çeşit derinliklerine, heyecanlara, tehevvürlere tercüman olsun; bir lisan ki bizimle beraber gurubun ahzan-ı elvanına dalsın düşünsün. Bir lisan ki ruhumuzla beraber bir matemin eşk-riz-i ye'si olsun. Bir lisan ki heyecan-ı asabımıza refakat ederek çırpınsın… haniya bir kemanın telinde zapt olunamaz, anlaşılamaz, bir kaide altına alınamaz nağmeler olur ki ruhu titretir… Haniya bir sabah zamanı incilâ-yı fecrden evvel afaka hafif bir imtizac olan ile dağılmış sisler olur ki üzerlerinde tersim olunamaz, tayin edilemez renkler uçar; nazarlara buseler serper… Haniya bazı gözler olur ki bir ufk-ı bi-intiha-yı siyaha açılmış kadar ölçülmez, ka'r-ı na-yab-ı umkuna vukuf kabil olamaz, derinlikleri vardır ki hissiyatı masseder… İşte bir lisan istiyoruz ki onda o nağmeler, o renkler, o derinlikler olsun. Fırtınalarla gürlesin, dalgalarla yuvarlansın, rüzgârlarla savrulsun; sonra müteverrim bir kızın fıraşına düşsün ağlasın, bir çocuğun mehd-i naz-perverine eğilsin gülsün, bir gencin nur-i nigah-ı şebabına saklansın parlasın. Bir lisan… oh! Saçma söylüyorum, zannedeceksiniz, bir lisan ki sanki serapa bir insan olsun (15, 1914).

If you only knew what kind of language poetry needs, if you only knew. It needs a language that…to what can I compare it?…is as fluent as a speaking soul, is the translator of all our destinies, our merriment, our thoughts, the heart's thousand type of subtleties, the thought's thousand kinds of profoundness, excitement and transformations; a language that loses itself in thought together with us at the sunset's sorrowful colors. A language that sheds mournful tears of despair together with our souls. A language that flutters as it accompanies our excitement. You know how there are melodies that evade a violin's strings, that can't be understood, or can't be regulated by rules, that make the soul flutter? You know how in the morning before the brightness of dawn there is dispersed fog that lightly blends with the horizon with which unpaintable, unidentifiable colors fly . . . You know how there are some eyes whose limits can't be measured like the black endless horizon, whose depths can't be known like a bottomless abyss, and that has a profoundness that absorbs sentiments… We want a language that has those melodies, those colors, those depths. May it roar with storms, may it roll with waves, may it be fanned by winds; Then, may it fall by the side of a tubercular girl's bed and weep, may it stoop over a child's cradle and laugh, may it shine on a youth's bright gaze and take refuge there. Oh! You will think that I am speaking nonsense, a language that is like a person from head to toe.

If the modern language is to be an aesthetic totality, as it is described here, what becomes of the mutilated (injured) Ottoman linguistic and literary legacy? Those who continue the divan literary tradition after the Tanzimat era are represented in the novel by Raci. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar understands Raci as Ahmet Cemil's opposing figure in the novel. He argues that while the narrative depicts Ahmet Cemil as an exemplary representative of the new generation, it portrays Raci as "drunk, immoral, handicapped with the bad legacy of old literature, and far from responsibility [mesuliyet]."[109] Admittedly, Turkish nationalism that prevailed during his time informs Tanpınar's critique of Raci. The narrator of the novel, however, is more interested in privileging Ahmet Cemil's literary objectives at the expense of Raci's.

Unquestionably, Raci is the object of the narrator's scorn. When Raci writes a negative review of Ahmet Cemil's poetry, even though it is published anonymously, his identity is easily understood because he uses "démodé" ("köhne") language and techniques, not only in his poetry,

---

[109] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005. 289.

but also in his articles, which the narrator finds "disgraceful" ("müstehcen"). What is more, his knowledge of Arabic is grossly inadequate:

> Bir gün mesela Ahmet Cemil'in bir makalesinde yanlış bir cümle-i izafiye bulduğu için bir hafta alay geçer. Pek ziyade kaide-şinaslıkla müftehirdir; Arapça, Acemce pek iyi bilmek iddiasındadır da bir kere bir ceride-i Arabiyenin üç satırını tercüme edememişti. (19, 2016).

> For instance, because one day he [Raci] found an incorrect nominal annexation in one of Ahmet Cemil's articles, he made fun of him for one week. Mostly [Raci] was praised for formalism; while he claims to know Arabic and Persian very well, one time he couldn't translate three lines from an Arabic newspaper.

Thus, the narrator not only invalidates Raci's standing in literature as the inheritor of the Ottoman divan literary tradition, but he discredits him as a traditional poet for lacking crucial knowledge of Arabic. Raci, then, is reduced to an imposter, incapable of carrying on the divan legacy. Even though Raci is consistently disparaged, Ahmet Cemil insists on Raci's presence every time the threat of his absence arises; for instance, when his brother-in-law, the owner of the printing press, threatens to "sweep him away" for being unnecessary, or at Ahmet Cemil's poetry reading organized by Hüseyin Nazmi. If we are to accept that Raci represents a vision of literature rooted in tradition, we might comprehend this insistence on Raci's presence in terms of being unable to fully detach from an increasingly suppressed tradition, which Ahmet Cemil himself takes part. Detaching from tradition, though, constitutes the work of translation operating in this novel, not only a process in the narrator's rhetoric, but also in the protagonist's labor on language.

The Work of Translation

In *Mai ve Siyah* the new Ottoman Turkish language—as Ahmet Cemil envisions it—is the object of intense labor and exchange in translation and translative writing. This aesthetic language

becomes possible through translation and translingual practices, which reflect the orientation of the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement itself. Much like Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers, Ahmet Cemil looks for beauty in fine taste and technique with an "art for art's sake" philosophy.[110] This language is strictly poetic, contrary to the utilitarian language staunchly defended by Tanzimat writers such as Ahmet Midhat.

Translation had been a question in the late nineteenth-century Ottoman Turkish novel, even for figures like Ahmet Midhat who advocated conservative modernity. Ahmet Midhat had treated the topic of translation in his novel *Felatun Bey ile Rakım Efendi* ("Felatun Bey and Rakım Efendi," 1876), but Halit Ziya demonstrates a radical departure from it in *Mai ve Siyah*. Midhat's successful protagonist, Rakım Efendi, is engaged in translation and language instruction just as Ahmet Cemil is in *Mai ve Siyah*. In Midhat's early novel, the Ottoman Turkish language is, as Nergis Ertürk observes, an important object of labor and exchange.[111] On the one hand, both characters work very hard. Midhat's narrator jests that Rakım Efendi is a "work machine" ("iş makinesi") as he explains that Rakım works 17 hours a day translating and writing for newspapers and teaching foreigners (two English girls and one Circassian slave girl) Ottoman Turkish language and literature. Likewise, Ahmet Cemil attends high school, translates in the evenings, tutors a wealthy family's child in reading and writing, and eventually works at a printing house. While Rakım economically profits from his labor such that he is able to purchase "the best" French and Turkish books to fill his library and still have money remaining, Ahmet Cemil, not able to overcome his financial problems, must borrow books from his wealthy friend Hüseyin Nazmi. While Rakım's translation activity seems indiscriminate (the narrator explains

---

[110] Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1960. 178.

[111] Nergis Ertürk. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 54.

that he translates *all* books written in French), Ahmet Cemil is interested in translating only elite French poetry, which he deems the only kind of literature capable of invigorating the Ottoman Turkish literary language. But ultimately, Ahmet Cemil falls short of reaching his goals while Rakım Efendi's success abounds. The different approaches to linguistic labor and the dissimilar results generated from it for Rakım Efendi and Ahmet Cemil register the shift in the perception of the relationship between European languages and Ottoman Turkish brought about by processes of translation as modernization in the nineteenth century. Rakım Efendi has no doubt about the superiority of Ottoman Turkish over European languages;[112] Ahmet Cemil, in contrast, finding Ottoman Turkish deficient, labors simultaneously to create an aesthetic language comparable to French and to detach from Ottoman tradition.

Since the opening of *Mai ve Siyah* is the scene in which Ahmet Cemil confidently puts forth his manifesto of the new Turkish language, the narration gives the illusion that he will succeed as a poet leading Ottomans to achieve equal footing with Europe. However, Ahmet Cemil's labor on language ultimately fails to secure him his lofty dreams—fame for creating an invigorated new Ottoman Turkish idiom for the modern poet and simultaneously formulating new poetry esteemed by Istanbul's literary circles. According to Halit Ziya in his memoirs, "failure" was his primary intention for Ahmet Cemil. He states that he intended to write a novel centered on Ahmet Cemil's melancholia induced by his terrible fall from the heights of his dreams.[113] Perhaps this points to one reason that loss prevails in *Mai ve Siyah*.

---

[112] As argued by Jale Parla, Tanzimat writers Ahmet Midhat, Namık Kemal, Recaizade Ekrem and Nabizade Nazım never doubted Islamic culture's superiority. See Jale Parla. *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1990. 36.

[113] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Kırk Yıl*. Ed. Nur Özmel Akın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2008. 700-701. For a discussion in English concerning Halit Ziya's planning of *Mai ve Siyah*, see Robert P. Finn. *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1984. 116.

But loss takes on a greater significance in the novel. In the impulse to suppress differences with western Europe, as Chow argues, the narrator abolishes his own tradition, which amounts to mourning. In *Mai ve Siyah*, not only the narrator, but the protagonist, too, is engaged in the project of modernization which requires a detachment from tradition. But just as in Chow's reading of Ba Jin's novel *Jia* ("Family," 1931), mourning emerges in the novel not as a direct result of translation, but as part of the very scene of translation. Thus, it is not a coincidence that translation in *Mai ve Siyah* is intimately connected to mourning, albeit in various forms.

Paul Ricœur also views mourning as a fundamental aspect of translation. Drawing on Freud's theory of working through, Ricœur understands translation in terms of a continuous work of memory and work of mourning.[114] Although Ricœur's model does not consider the power relations in translation, I read his theory of working through in translation alongside Lydia Liu's perceptive understanding of power relations between languages.[115] In *Mai ve Siyah*, Ahmet Cemil's perpetual work in translation and translative writing is indicative of a melancholic relationship to his past and traditions that are imperiled by the narrative of modernization.

A significant moment in the novel stages a discontinuity in the narrative between tradition and modernity incited by the untimely death of Ahmet Cemil's father, which comes as a terrible blow to Ahmet Cemil both emotionally and economically and negatively effects the young poet throughout the novel. If the time of the father in the novel belongs to a "happy" mythical time, as Orhan Koçak asserts, the time following his death makes up the historical present fraught with

---

[114] Paul Ricœur. *On Translation*. Trans. Eileen Brennan. New York: Routledge, 2006.

[115] Liu writes: "In thinking about translatability between historical languages, one cannot but consider the actual power relations that dictate the degree and magnitude of sacrifice that one language must make in order to achieve some level of commensurability with the other." See Lydia Liu. "The Question of Meaning-Value in the Political Economy of the Sign." *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. Ed. Lydia Liu. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999. 34-35.

melancholy.[116] The narrative replaces the happy days with a series of personal loss for Ahmet

Cemil. But even in mourning the loss of his father and the mythical time of happiness, Ahmet

Cemil discovers potentialities in the work of translation. When his father was alive, Ahmet Cemil

could engage in leisure activities like reading French literature instead of doing schoolwork. But

faced with the loss of the family's only economic provider and his mother's desperate words—

"when are you going to graduate from high school?"—he realizes that he has no other choice but

to enter the "struggle of earning a living" ("geçim mücadelesi"). Faced with the challenge, new

desires awaken in Ahmet Cemil: desires of enjoying a bourgeois life like Hüseyin Nazmi's and

earning a living through writing, which he believes will also help him attain his literary

objectives. Accordingly, Ahmet Cemil follows Hüseyin Nazmi's advice about working outside of

school time as a "translator" ("mütercim") or a "teacher" ("hoca"). Translation thus offers Ahmet

Cemil a financial solution, but not without raising the question of what could be translated, which

the narrator describes as discerning "translatable things" ("tercüme olunabilmek şeyler"). To find

the answer, they scan Hüseyin Nazmi's library, and soon become engrossed in reading the type of

French that could inspire Ahmet Cemil's own innovative work in Ottoman Turkish. Aware of the

significance of the two poets' discrimination of translatable texts, the narrator makes a value

judgment that belies his own investment in their endeavor: "fikirleri hep yüksekten uçuyordu; *en

mühim eserlerden* ayrılamıyorlardı" (62, 2016, my emphasis). [Their ideas were always flying

high; they could not part from *the most important* works]. Here the narrator underscores the

significance of "translatable things": work composed with sophisticated style is valuable for its

---

[116] Orhan Koçak. "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152. 130.

capability of invigorating Ottoman Turkish, which purposely denies all other European works such value.[117]

Believing that a text can simultaneously have economic exchangeability and mediate an aesthetic language in Ottoman Turkish comparable to French, Ahmet Cemil decides on translating Alphonse de Lamartine's semi-autobiographical novel *Raphaël*, written in poetic prose. As the novel's narrator reports on Ahmet Cemil's translation activity between French and Ottoman Turkish, the narrator registers the historical transition from Ottoman translation practices to European modes that privilege fidelity to the original text, as a condition of progress. Thus, faithful translations of selected texts can be understood as the force that propels the Ottoman into European greatness while appearing to preserve Ottoman Turkish.[118] Following the European concept of "faithfulness to the original" ("aslına tamamen mutabık kalarak"), Ahmet Cemil "translates word by word" ("birer birer tercüme") always maintaining the same sequence of nouns and their "modifiers" ("silsile-i terakib") and "style of copulas" ("tarz-ı revabıt"):

> Bazen kelimeler için sadık bir muadil-i sadık arayarak, bazen bulduğu lügatlerin ahengini altında üstünde bulunan kelimelerle hüsn-i mücaverette bulamadığı için bir müradif düşünerek, aslında bir imtizac-ı tabii ile irtifak eden küçük küçük cümel-i muterizeyi ibare-i mütercemenin neresine sokuşturmak lazım geleceğinde tahayyür ederek, bir dakika evvel yazdığı iki kelimeyi dört satır aşağıya koymayı daha münasip bularak, önündeki kağıtta yazdığından ziyadesini çizerek, bir asi kelimenin arkasından uzun müddetlerle koşarak devam etti; belki bir sahife tercüme etti, fakat ne taab-ı fikir-suz!.. (63-64, 2016).

> He continued; sometimes he searched for faithful equivalents for words. Sometimes he looked for synonyms for words for which he could not always readily find a good location [in his translation] without affecting the melodic arrangement of words. Astonished at

---

[117] The narrator's position on "translatable" European literature gestures to the literary debates of the time. Which European authors were suitable for translation, which time periods should be translated etc. were questions at the center of such debates. See Saliha Paker. "Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and its Practice: The 1897 'Classics Debate' as a Focus for Examining Change." *Translating Others*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006.

[118] The concept of translating the non-European into European greatness while preserving the indigenous language I borrow from Shaden Tageldin as she put forth in *Disarming Words: Empire and the Seductions of Translation in Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

how he needed to work in small parentheses in the translation that correspond to the natural harmony in the original, he found it more appropriate to move two words that he just wrote two minutes ago down four lines, and crossed out more than he wrote on the page in front of him. For long periods of time he ran after a rebellious word. Maybe he translated only one page, but what a devastating fatigue.

This approach to translation stands in stark contrast to the Ottoman paradigm for translation.

The Ottoman practice of translation centered on adaptation and imitation that valorized originality, and, as Saliha Paker points out, it followed an "imperialist strategy."[119] Based on her analysis of the literary debates in the 1890s, Saliha Paker distinguishes the difference between the current understanding of translation, or "çeviri" in Turkish, and the Ottoman understanding of it, or "terceme." Terceme, a concept of translation that existed for five hundred years in the Ottoman tradition, operated in "Ottoman interculture," as described in Chapter 1.[120] Walter Andrews also notes that Ottoman poets almost always avoided direct translation from other poets. Rather, they wrote parallel poems, or nazire, whether as a form of response to a poem in Persian or in Ottoman Turkish.[121] The objective was not to translate from Persian into Ottoman Turkish, thus to cite Andrews effacing borders rather than enforcing them, as would be the case in direct translation.[122] It was not until the turn of the twentieth century that Ottoman intellectuals and writers identified fidelity to the original source text as the path to progress, privileging the

---

[119] See Saliha Paker. "Ottoman Conception of Translation and its Practice: The 1897 'Classics Debate' as a Focus for Examining Change." *Translating Others*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006.

[120] Saliha Paker. "Translation as *Terceme* and *Nazire*: Culture-bound Concepts and their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation History." *Crosscultural Transgressions*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002. 120.

[121] See Walter Andrews. "Starting Over Again: Some Suggestions for Rethinking Ottoman Divan Poetry in the Context of Translation and Transmission." Ed. Saliha Paker. *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2002. 24-25.

[122] Walter Andrews. "Starting Over Again: Some Suggestions for Rethinking Ottoman Divan Poetry in the Context of Translation and Transmission." Ed. Saliha Paker. *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2002. 33.

European practice of translation, which embodies the current word "çeviri."[123] Thus, following

Paker's distinction, Ahmet Cemil's translation strategy marks a transition from creative

adaptation and imitation to fidelity.[124] There is also a symbolic passing of the Ottoman mode of

translation in the two friends' burning of all nazires they have in their libraries. This transition is

not marked without ambivalences.

Translating Lamartine proves far too labor intensive for immediate payment, forcing

Ahmet Cemil to abandon the prospect of invigorating Ottoman Turkish through direct translation

of literature in exchange for capital. Instead he opts for an easier path to financial gain.[125] Indeed,

regarding his translation of Lamartine "lifeless" ("ruhsuz") and "colorless" ("renksiz"), Ahmet

Cemil finds himself agreeing to translate a popular French novel—*Hırsızın Kızı* ("The Thief's

Daughter")—for a local printing house. Both the narrator and the protagonist lament this

unfavorable undertaking: "Lamartine'den, Musset'den sonra *Hırsızın Kızı*! İşte hulyalarının

sonu!" (81, 2012) [After Lamartine and Musset *Hırsızın Kızı*! Now this is the end of his reveries!]

The narrator, constructing Lamartine's work and the popular novel as polar opposites, describes

the latter in terms of deficiency: Popular French novels have no "excellence of expression"

("meziyet-i ifade") or "elegance of thought" ("zarafet-i fikriye"). But their translations are

marketable and come easier to Ahmet Cemil. In fact, the volume of translation he is able to

---

[123] Saliha Paker argues that "çeviri" must be understood as a modern nation-building process and a concomitant ideological revolution which aimed at a political and cultural break from the Ottoman past. See "Translation as *Terceme* and *Nazire*" page 127.

[124] Although the word "çeviri" does not appear in the Turkish language until after the Turkish language reforms of the 1920s and 1930s, the meaning of "terceme" is shifted to approximate the meaning of the European word "translation" in *Mai ve Siyah*.

[125] Others have noted Ahmet Cemil's choice of an easier way to make money. See, Jale Parla. *Türk Romanında Yazar ve Başkalaşım*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012. Zeynep Uysal. *Metruk Ev: Halit Ziya Romanında Modern Osmanlı Bireyi*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014. 218.

accomplish in a short period of time leads him to imagine rapidly enhancing his financial

situation, although not without tormenting him:

> Damarlarının içinde bir bestekâr kanının cevelanını duyduğu halde ekmek yemek için gecesinin sekiz saatini murdar çalgılı kahvehanelerde müstekreh muganniyelere dem-kârlık etmekle geçiren biçare bir kemancı gibi meşime-i dehası türlü bedayi-i asar perverişine kabiliyet gösteren bu genç batakhanelerde bitmez tükenmez hırsız muhaverelerini tercüme ettikçe kalbi nefretinden şişerdi (81-82, 2012).

> Although he felt the blood of a composer traveling through his veins, in order to eat bread, he spent 8 hours of his night like a violinist working in filthy music coffee houses with disgusting women singers. This young man, whose soul had the ability to create various rare and beautiful novelties, translated endless dialogues among thieves in dens of vice which filled his heart with hatred.

In Ahmet Cemil's repulsion by the sterile language and unsophisticated ideas of novels that were

in demand, the narrative disparages the transmission of European mass culture for its

shortcomings. For translating mass culture falls short in aiding Ahmet Cemil in his quest for

creating a new aesthetic language. While the narrator reveals in this passage his belief that Ahmet

Cemil is fully capable of inventing poetry and aesthetic language through translation, his adverse

economic situation makes achieving this much more difficult. According to Jale Parla, Ahmet

Cemil fails to achieve his goals in literature because he betrays poetry.[126] Indeed, faced with

difficulty—for instance, the difficulty of translating Lamartine—Ahmet Cemil looks for easier

material. But taking into account the narrator's rhetoric, we must acknowledge that Ahmet

Cemil's unfortunate circumstances lead to his inability to completely achieve his lofty goals. In

fact, they serve as obstacles of which Ahmet Cemil is all too aware. Translating popular novels,

which he does not even consider literature, allows for quicker payment for his labor. But he

---

[126] Jale Parla. *Türk Romanında Yazar ve Başkalaşım*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012. 64.

translates these novels on the condition of anonymity, revealing the shame he feels for betraying his own ideals.

The work of translation for Ahmet Cemil never remains limited to merely a labor of monetary exchange. It is also a labor of reading foreign texts and expanding his understanding of his own language through the mediation of another's by constructing hypothetical equivalences between them. In a significant reading scene, Ahmet Cemil and Hüseyin Nazmi attempt to forge a comparable language through translation to suppress the perceived inequality of signifiers of nuanced emotional states between Ottoman Turkish and French. In this scene, which captures a significant moment in Ahmet Cemil's intellectual development, the narration reveals arriving at an Ottoman Turkish language, comparable to European languages, as a process of negotiation between multiple languages and histories. Even though the Ottoman literary practices are disparaged in the novel, they nevertheless resurface in the negotiation process. I argue that this resurfacing, albeit in different forms, must be understood as the work of translation.

Ahmet Cemil's encounter with French literature immediately initiates the occasion for translation into Ottoman Turkish that involves remembering and detaching from Ottoman interculture. In fact, when he first sees the title of a French book of poetry, Edmond Haraucourt's "L'âme nue," in a bookstore in Beyoğlu, Ahmet Cemil impulsively translates aloud "in a language particular to himself" ("kendine mahsus lisan ile") as "Ruh-ı Üryan" (56, 2012). The language particular to Ahmet Cemil, a phrase that the narrator frequently articulates in the novel, here constitutes a Persian compound, a grammatical feature that was favored in elite Ottoman Turkish prior to the simplification trend. Additionally, its appeal in this particular scene might be that the Persian compound allows the French word order to remain intact in Ottoman Turkish, providing the illusion of reciprocity. Together with Hüseyin Nazmi, Ahmet Cemil decides to read this French book of poetry at a carefully selected scenic spot suitable for poetry reading: Taksim

82

Garden overlooking Bosphorous seawater. As they look at the book of French poetry in admiration, they are "puzzled" ("mütehayyir") as to where they might begin reading it. Suddenly deciding to randomly open the book and read the poem they happen upon, the first (and in this critical scene the only) French poem that they read and translate is "Makber" ("Grave"), a poem of mourning. The symbolic force of mourning as captured in the poem recurs toward the end of the novel when Ahmet Cemil articulates his own sentiments as he grapples with a series of losses (his father, his sister, metaphorically his beloved, and finally his ideals and poetry) and reflects on them.[127]

The two young poets' translation of "Makber" reveals a process of forming hypothetical equivalences between French and Ottoman Turkish that draw on Arabic and Persian to create nuanced meanings. After Ahmet Cemil reads the poem aloud in the original, their eyes study the "foreign words." The poem affects both young poets; Ahmet Cemil feels as if his entire "inner being" ("hüviyet-i maneviye") melted under the gloom of the poem's aura of mourning. Entranced by the musicality and meaning of each French word, Hüseyin Nazmi complains that translating the poem into their own language, while necessary to render the French poem intelligible, turns the poem "cold like a vocal composition that has lost its melody" (47, 2016). As if to overcome the coldness of mental translation, in turns they orally translate and retranslate the poem; first Hüseyin Nazmi offers his translation of the poem in plain Turkish. Ahmet Cemil opposes his friend's translation, particularly his choice of "lerzişdar ediyor" ("causing to quiver") saying:

> Sanki niçin "titretiyor" demiyorsun? Yahut Türkçede mutlaka bir şey ilave etmek lazımsa "lerziş-dar-ı haşyet ediyor" de ki kelimenin son heca-yı medidi birden inkıta edivermesin.

---

[127] Orhan Koçak reads this scene as an announcement of the Western ideal that will ultimately be missed and thus mourned. See Orhan Koçak. "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152.

Bak, şu üçünü kıtayı "hepsi uyuyor" diye tercüme ne fena düşecek; bana kalırsa aynı tarz-ı terkibi muhafaza ederek tercüme etmeli, fakat biraz başlangıcı süsleyerek: "hepsi habide-i sükûn" . . . (48, 2016)

So why aren't you saying "titretiyor" [causing to quiver]? Or if it is absolutely necessary to add something in Turkish say "lerziş-dar-ı haşyet ediyor" [causing to quiver with fear] so that the word's final long syllable doesn't suddenly cease. Look, in this third quatrain I think the translation "hepsi uyuyor" [all are sleeping] is ill suited. In my opinion, it should still be translated preserving the style, but somewhat decorating the beginning: "hepsi habide-i sükûn" [all calmly slept] . . .

Ahmet Cemil questions Hüseyin Nazmi's choice of "lerzişdar ediyor," a Persian noun with the Turkish auxiliary verb, instead of "titretiyor," a plain Turkish verb. Yet, finding the plain Turkish verb insufficient, Ahmet Cemil suggests using the Persian "lerzişdar" and the Arabic "haşyet" in Persian compound with the Turkish auxiliary verb combining the three languages that formed the Ottoman interculture. Likewise, Ahmet Cemil identifies "uyuyor," a plain Turkish verb, as lacking in sophistication. This time, he suggests "habide," a Persian word, and "sükûn," an Arabic word, leaving out the addition of a Turkish word, to construct the illusion of commensurability with French. In essence, their process of translation demonstrates that, more so for Ahmet Cemil than for Hüseyin Nazmi, plain Turkish is insufficient to capture the complexity of emotions articulated in the French poem. Throughout the novel Ahmet Cemil's theoretical assertions on language reveal his penchant for avant-gardism that departs from the moderate modernism of Hüseyin Nazmi. In this scene of translation, in which the young poets' ideas on language have yet to fully take shape, the narrative underlines that Ahmet Cemil consistently draws on Arabic and Persian in unconventional ways to reciprocate affect and subjectivity in French. Yet, even if their first attempt at forging reciprocity with French seems possible through Arabic and Persian, they still find the French referents for nuanced sentiments and rhythms superior and thus their project gets abandoned for a short time.

Through the work of translation, Ahmet Cemil articulates his own theory of the new aesthetic language, in which words must attain a certain scientific precision and respect rules of sound harmony. As we know from his manifesto on language, Ahmed Cemil aspires to create a new sophisticated language comparable to French literary language. As I pointed out in Chapter 1, historically, Ottoman Turkish language diverged into common speech ("avam") and high Ottoman language ("havas"), which was heavily inflected with Arabic and Persian words and grammatical structures.[128] Arabic was considered cultured while Turkish was deemed vulgar. Since the vernacularization movement was already well underway in the 1890s, it should be understood that Ahmet Cemil's theory of the new Ottoman Turkish language responds to the loss of the Ottoman elite writing. However, his theory is less about restoring an "original" writing practice than it is about remembering it, even reinventing it.

Even though the perceived incommensurability between French and Ottoman Turkish cause the young poets to abandon translating "Makber"—the coldness of translation causes them to shiver in silence, we are told—the process of working through translation immediately prompts Ahmet Cemil to overcome this problem through writing. Thus, he articulates his plan of writing innovative poetry, which he adumbrates as "mai ve siyah," or "blue and black," also echoing the title of the novel. The narrator intimates that these colors resonate tensions between the poet's lofty "blue" dreams and ideals and his "black" melancholic sentiments of loss. Ahmet Cemil's poetry, which is the primary generator of the language that makes new meanings possible, might be understood as translative writing, negotiating meanings through multiple languages in radically innovative ways. Understanding Ahmet Cemil's poetry as translative writing is particularly compelling in the light of Raci's reaction to Ahmet Cemil's reading at

---

[128]Agah Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1960. 231.

Hüseyin Nazmi's poetry reading dinner party. The novel suggests that traditional Ottoman poetic language and the new aesthetic language are incompatible. Steeped in traditional Ottoman poetry, Raci cannot apprehend Ahmet Cemil's poetry. Upon hearing Ahmet Cemil recite his poetry, Raci remarks softly: "Bu yolda şeyleri anlamak için galiba Frenkçe bilmek lazım imiş!" (225, 2016) [Apparently, it is necessary to know French in order to understand the things on this track!]

Over the course of the novel, Ahmet Cemil intellectually labors over inventing poetry "unlike anything ever seen" ("görülmüş olan şeylerin hiçbirine benzemesin"), implying the need to detach from traditional Ottoman literary practices, on the one hand, and exceeding French, on the other hand. Yet, even if his poetry is new, it is profoundly connected to both literary traditions. In his introduction of Ahmet Cemil's poetry before the reading, Hüseyin Nazmi describes it as a bouquet made up of flowers that blossomed in the East's ("Şark") sunshine from seeds that were gathered in the West ("Garp"). Contemporary French poetry and Ottoman Turkish dictionaries mediate Ahmet Cemil's innovative poetry. Symptomatic of translingual exchange between asymmetrical languages, in the process of writing poetry, Ahmet Cemil finds Ottoman Turkish deficient. Instead of employing French loanwords, Ahmet Cemil engages in the work of remembering forgotten/lost Ottoman words by studying Ottoman Turkish lexicon. He uncovers words with nuanced meanings that he imagines suppressing differences between the French and the Ottoman Turkish:

> Bir aralık lehçeyi dar buldu. Yeni fikirler için yeni kelimeler lazım olduğunda musır idi. "Eski kelimeler altında fikirlerin tazeliği görülemez. Nazar-ı dikkatten firar eder." derdi, lügat kitaplarına sarıldı, sahifeleri çevirdikçe öyle şeyler buldu ki hayret etti. Bunlar ne için kamus köşelerinde unutulmuş? Ne güzel şeyler keşfetti! Kimisinin bir fikriyle hüsn-i tetabukuna, bazısının mevcutlara rüchanına, bir kısmının da na-şenideliğine firifte olarak bunlara temellük etmek istedi. Kendi kendisine: "Beni lügat-perdazlıkla itham edeceklermiş. Anlamayanlar etsin . . . havsala-i kamusun alabildiği kadar lügat-ı garibiye bir yere tıkmakla benim yapacağım şey arasındaki fark-ı sanatı elbette anlayanlar olur." derdi. (149-150, 2016)

At one point, he found the idiom inadequate. He insisted that new ideas require new words. He said, "The freshness of ideas under old words is invisible. It escapes notice from the careful eye." He took to dictionaries and as he turned the pages he discovered things that astonished him. Why were these things forgotten in the pages of dictionaries? What wonderful things he discovered! Plunging into the words relevant to ideas, the words superior to current words, and the newness of a portion of them, he wanted to take possession of them. He said to himself: "They will accuse me of fabricating language. Let those who don't understand do so . . . Certainly, there will be people who understand the artistic difference between scribes of the olden days who collected words strange enough to not fit in dictionaries and what I am about to do."

The work of remembering in translingual practice for Ahmet Cemil is not only a process of detaching from Ottoman tradition, but also a process of making new meaning through cross-cultural contacts. Uncovering lost Ottoman words, Ahmet Cemil reinvents them as equivalents to French words, ideas and concepts, which are construed as different from those in Ottoman Turkish. The lost words are renewed, indeed reinvented, by elaborating on their meanings; thus, the new is informed by the traces of the lost past. As Judith Butler asserts of the relationship to loss in another context, "this past is not actually past in the sense of 'over,' since it continues as an animating absence in the present, one that makes itself known precisely in and through the survival of anachronism itself."[129]

To create his innovative poetry, in addition to constructing new meanings with forgotten Ottoman words comparable to French, Ahmet Cemil attempts to forge a new art of articulating meaning through sound. The poet likens "sound" ("seda") in poetic language to an "instrument" ("musikar") in music; as he composes his poems, he always reads them aloud and listens attentively to the melody of the words. Explaining the emotional difference between synonyms, Ahmet Cemil highlights the phonetic meaning of words:

Bence kelimelerin mana-yı mevzularından başka bir de—nasıl tabir edeyim—mana-yı sedası vardır. Bilmem herkes hisseder mi? Fakat ben mesela naliş kelimesinin eda-yı mahzunanesini, pervaz kelimesinin meyl-i tayeranını, feryat kelimesinin aheng-i sine-

[129] Judith Butler. "Afterword: After Loss, What Then?" Eds. David L. Eng and David Kazanjian. *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. 468.

çakini pek iyi duyuyorum… İnsanda bu zevk-i sem' olduktan sonra mesela "bahr-i sükun-perver" diyemez, bahr kelimesinin o bir harekede tecemmü eden üç kuvvetli harfinden hususiyle sonundaki ra'nın tesadümünden hasıl olan şiddet-i tesavvut ister ki bu kelime bir şiddet-i mana tasvirinde kulanılsın: Mesela bahr-i huruşan, yahut bahr-i pür-huruş. Sanki bahr kelimesi de o sıfatla beraber taşıyor, şişiyor, değil mi? Buna mukabil "derya-yı sakin" derim, çünkü derya kelimesi de sakin; onda da bir sükun-ı mahsus var ki sıfatı sıfatın manasından ziyade izah ediyor… (111, 2016)

In my view, other than their known meaning, words also have —how can I express it— sound meaning. I don't know, does everyone sense this? But I perceive very well the sad tone of the word naliş [moaning], the inclination to flight of the word pervaz [flight], and the ferocious musicality of the word feryat [scream for help]. Once a person has this pleasure of perception, for instance, he/she can't say "bahr-i sükun-perver" [soothing sea]. The severity of the sound clash caused by the three strong letters, especially the final r, combined by the vowel mark ['a' in the Ottoman script] of the word bahr [sea] requires that this word be used in an intense description. For example, "bahr-i huruşan" [frenetic sea] or "bahr-i pür-huruş" [turbulent sea]… it's as if the word "bahr" is exuberating and swelling together with the adjective, right? In contrast, I would say "derya-yı sakin" [calm sea] because the word "derya" [sea] is calm; it has a tranquility that explains the adjective more than the meaning of the adjective.

According to Ahmet Cemil's theory of sound, the combination of words in Persian compound attains greater precision in Ottoman Turkish, strengthening their aesthetic quality. As each word carries its unique meaning in sound evoking specific associations, particularly in the case of synonyms, they enrich the new literary language. The words articulated in this passage are of Arabic and Persian roots, at once revealing Ahmet Cemil's emotional attachment to them and indicating that Ottoman Turkish devoid of Arabic and Persian words would be weak.[130] In view of the multiple languages involved in this negotiation process, we might conclude that Ahmet Cemil's strategy in creating a new literary language is not untouched by power struggle among global languages.

---

[130] As explained in Chapter One, this resonates with the debate on vernacularization of Ottoman Turkish and purging of Arabic and Persian words during the 1890s. Tevfik Fikret, among other members of the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement, objected on the grounds that Turkish would be significantly weaker without Arabic and Persian. See Agah Sırrı Levend. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1960. 205-236.

A different form of struggle for legitimacy and authority takes place between Ahmet Cemil and Hüseyin Nazmi, who appear to be both working toward the same objective of constructing the new literary language. But the narrator depicts the "freshness" ("tazelik") of Hüseyin Nazmi's poetry as "moderate" ("itidal") and "tranquil" ("sükun"). Inasmuch as Hüseyin Nazmi's moderate techniques earn him respect from prominent men of letters of various literary interests, which explains why even supporters of Ottoman divan poetry are present at the poetry reading. And yet his "freshness" pales in comparison with Ahmet Cemil's literary language. But these literati cannot comprehend Ahmet Cemil's work. The radical avant-garde quality of his poetry also leads to Raci's negative review. Registering this as a sign of his failure and simultaneously faced with a succession of losses, Ahmet Cemil destroys his own poetry and departs for self-imposed exile far away from Istanbul in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Not surprisingly, this moment in the narrative is saturated with symbolism of utter loss. For instance, as Ahmet Cemil decides to leave Istanbul, he recalls a line from his own translation of the poem "Makber" ("Grave"): "Mezaristanım başka bir hengam-ı hayatın kuva-yı gaibesiyle memlu, fakat henüz silsile-i emvatım reside-i hatime olmadı" (337, 2016). [My cemetery is filled with devastated powers of a once clamoring of life, only the succession of my dead is not over yet]. In free indirect discourse, Ahmet Cemil asks: "Bu silsilenin tamamen reside-i hatime olması için yalnız kendisi mi kalmıştı? İşte o da gidiyor, o da, o da o kuva-yı gaibe-i hayata iltihak edecek" (337, 2016). [Was the end of this procession left up to him? Well, he is going, too, he too, he shall also join the devastated powers.] Envisioning himself as part of this procession, Ahmet Cemil becomes an exile in the periphery of the Ottoman Empire.

The struggle for authority between Ahmet Cemil and Hüseyin Nazmi reaches a climax in the novel when the former learns that the latter has accepted a post in western Europe. The hope of going to Europe always functions as the ultimate destination for the two poets enthralled with

contemporary French literature. But this news becomes the tipping point for Ahmet Cemil, who

is already in angst over personal loss, as it causes Ahmet Cemil to reject Europe. Turning to a

map to locate a place of exile for himself, Ahmet Cemil seeks seclusion: "Gözleri bir aralık

arkadaşının gidebileceği yerleri dolaştı, sonra indi, kendisine bir hayat-ı sakite ihzar edecek

yerlere baktı, 'Öyle bir yer ki piş ü pesinde, yemin ve yesarında çöl; yabis, üryan, medit bir çöl

olsun…' diyordu" (337, 2016). [His eyes wandered to the places to which his friend could be

going, then they lowered, he looked at places that would bring him peace, and said "A place that

is desert in front and back, right and left; let it be a dry, bare, eternal desert."] The map

symbolizes emotional space for Ahmet Cemil, reflecting his "high" dreams of residing in Europe,

a privileged place for literary progress, and the relative-to-Europe "low" Arab provinces (his eyes

had to lower to locate the provinces after gazing at Europe), a place of melancholic solitude. As

Ahmet Cemil contemplates the map in front of him, he thinks of his destination: "Burada gayri

müteharrik, saatlerin geçtiğinden bi-haber bir tecerrüd-i nefs içinde duruyordu; uzaktan bir

hayalin zemzeme-i müphemesi gibi bellisiz bir neşidenin vehm-i sem'iyle titredi…" (338, 2016).

[Here he would be in complete isolation in which he would be motionless, and would not notice

the passing hours; he trembled with the delusion of hearing an indiscriminant verse like a melody

of a ghost from afar.] Ahmet Cemil's fantasy of the indiscriminant verse sung by a distant ghost

calls to his mind an Arab beggar (a figure of the revenant) that would pass through his

neighborhood:

> Bir Arap sail vardı ki haftada bir gün öğleyin ile ikindi arasında Süleymaniye'nin bu
> tenha sokağından Ahmet Cemil'in güftesini zaptedemediği bir neşide-i naliş-karla
> geçerdi. O evde bulunduğu zaman başka bir cihanın başka bir tarzda yaratılmış bir
> mahlukuna mahsus, fevkaladeliğinde bir vahşet-i latife, bir garabet-i müsekkire
> hissolunan bu sesten bütün kalbinde hissedilip de mahiyeti kabiliyet-i tahlilden firar eden
> hissiyat bir aheng-i hem-avaz ile uyanır; şi'r-i gayri mazbut hayatının bir tercüman-ı
> fasihi gibi gelen bu neşidenin esir-i bediiyetini kaçırmamak için sahibini görmek
> istemeyerek dinlerdi. (338, 2016).

There was an Arab beggar that would pass by his deserted street of Süleymaniye once a week between noon and mid-afternoon with a poignant song whose words Ahmet Cemil could not grasp. When [Ahmet Cemil] was home, he would wake up with the melody of [the beggar's] voice that he felt in his entire heart together with sentiments that escape any possibility of analysis. This voice seemed particular to a different world and produced the sense of a pleasant savagery in his foreignness and an intoxicating strangeness. He listened without wanting to see the man behind the voice so as not miss the song's aesthetic effect that seemed like a lucid translation of ungraspable poems of life.

In the beggar's melancholic tone and melody, Ahmet Cemil finds something inspiring that allows him to continue experiencing poetry, materializing as that which cannot be translated (the "ungraspable," the "unanalyzable," as Ahmet Cemil articulates it). Yet, meaning is transferred nonetheless. On the ship that takes Ahmet Cemil to the Arab lands in the darkness of the night, his memory of the Arab beggar's piercing song surfaces as a ghostly appearance once again: "bellisiz bir lisanla zir-i nigahında zulmetlerin ib'ad-ı bi-nihayesine doğru serilerek onu davet ediyordu" (351, 2016). [an imperceptible language and gloom were inviting him as they spread out toward eternal distances.] In the transregional space of open waters, a barely audible foreign language resonates his deep suffering.

"Untranslatable" Words

Mai ve Siyah thematizes translingual negotiations between Ottoman Turkish, Arabic, Persian and French, but its afterlife also becomes the focus of another level of translation and linguistic negotiation from Ottoman Turkish into a modern Turkish imagined as commensurable with European languages.

A decade after the Turkish alphabet reform of 1928, which transformed the writing

system from the Ottoman script (composed of the Arabic and Persian scripts) to a Latin script,[131]

Halit Ziya felt pressure to translate his own novels in order to maintain their readability. Indeed,

the new generation, no longer able to access material in Ottoman Turkish, remained cut off from

Halit Ziya's novels. Apart from transliterating from Ottoman to Latin script, much of Halit Ziya's

effort went into translating, or simplifying, his neologistic constructions that drew on Arabic and

Persian words. In the preface to the 1938 edition of *Mai ve Siyah*, Halit Ziya explains his strategy

in simplifying his language. "Terkipleri ve kelimeleri değiştirirken bunların hayale ait olan

vasıflarını açık lisan ile muhafaza ettim."[132] [When changing compounds and words I conserved

their qualities belonging to images with clear language.] However, Halit Ziya notes that he could

not translate two compounds in particular: "'Baran-ı elmas' 'baran-ı dürr-i siyah' terkiplerini,

sonra hikayenin kahramanı şairin kendi şivesinde kullandığı tabir ve terkipleri bıraktım. Bunlara

dokunmak mümkün değildi." [I left alone the compounds 'baran-ı elmas' [diamond-rain] 'baran-ı

dürr-i siyah' [black-pearl-rain] and the terms and compounds that the story's poet/hero used in

his own accent. It was not possible to touch these expressions.] Explaining his reasoning for

leaving expressions untranslated, Halit Ziya continues:

> Kitapta kalan lügatleri yeni nesilden menus bulmayanlar olabilir, fakat itikadımca yenilik, lisanını, yenisi kadar eskisini de bilmemek değildir. Hiç bir millette hiç bir münevver genç yoktur ki kendi lisanının geçmişine vakıf olmasın.[133]

> Some from the new generation may find words in the book unfamiliar. However, it is my belief that modernity doesn't mean being blind to language, [we must know] the old [style] as much as the new. May there be no young intellectual in any nation that does not know the history of his/her own language.

---

[131] For the history of the Turkish language reforms, see Geoffrey Lewis. *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

[132] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. "Birkaç Söz." *Mai ve Siyah*. 1896. Istanbul: Hilmi Kitabevi, 1938. v.

[133] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. "Birkaç Söz." *Mai ve Siyah*. 1896. Istanbul: Hilmi Kitabevi, 1938. v-vi.

Given that Halit Ziya construes the neologistic compounds baran-ı elmas and baran-ı dürr-i siyah as "untouchable," I argue that they are in fact "untranslatable," in Emily Apter's usage, which she understands "not as pure difference in opposition to the always translatable, but as the linguistic form of creative failure."[134] These compounds resist translation just as they resist erasure from Turkish, for they were non-circulating neologisms. In addition, or as a result, they resist nationalization by maintaining their plurilinguistic composition. As old Persian and Arabic words are assigned new meaning, the two neologistic compounds already carry the hallmarks of the "genuine Untranslatable," according to Apter's delineation.[135]

Significantly, the two neologistic compounds baran-ı elmas ("diamond-rain") and baran-ı dürr-i siyah ("black-pearl-rain") frame *Mai ve Siyah*, marking Ahmet Cemil's lofty hopes and ideals in the beginning and their subsequent loss toward the end. The narrator explains that baran-ı elmas is an expression invented by Ahmet Cemil, serving in the novel as a hypothetical equivalence of the title of Emile Waldteufel's waltz "Pluie de diamants." At first the music piece is unidentifiable for Ahmet Cemil:

> Bu çalınan şeye aşina çıkıyordu, neydi?. Neydi?.. Her vakit bahçeye hemen her gelişinde dinlediği bir şey. O vakit aklına geldi. Valedtuyfel'in bu meşhur valsini ne vakit dinlese bütün şükufe-i hayali inkişaf ederdi. Onun ismini kendine mahsus şive ile tercüme etmişti: Baran-ı elmas! Ne güzel, ne hulyalar getiren, nasıl rüya alemleri açan bir isim. (25, 1914).

> The thing being played seemed familiar to him, what was it? What was it? It was the thing he listened to every time he went to the garden. At that moment, it came to his mind. Whenever he listened to Waldteufel's famous waltz all his flowering imagination would become manifest. He translated its name according to his own accent: baran-ı elmas [diamond-rain]! How beautiful was this name that brought forth imaginings and opened up a realm of dreams.

---

[134] Emily Apter. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. New York: Verso, 2013. eBook. While Apter's concern lies in Continental philosophy, I find her understanding of words that resist translation useful in thinking about Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's neologistic constructions that he insists are untouchable.

[135] Emily Apter. "Untranslatables: A World System." *New Literary History*. 39.3 (2008): 581-598. 587.

The novel omits the French title of the waltz allowing Ahmet Cemil's expression to supplant it. But Ahmet Cemil's expression, far from merely signifying the waltz's title, constitutes surplus meaning such that it far exceeds the French. It is invented to transmit the poet's hopes and ideals, rendering his internal experience of them intelligible.

The extent of Ahmet Cemil's internal experience as represented by baran-ı elmas is so great that an entire chapter of the novel is devoted to the exploration of its signification. Ahmet Cemil has just left his printing house colleagues with the intention of thinking in solitude. As long as the protagonist is in their company, the narrative keeps an objective distance from him. But thereafter, often through free indirect discourse, the narration reveals the protagonist's intoxication and intense excitement while admiring the stars in the dark blue sky:

> Bakınız, işte gözlerinin önünde gördüğü bu şeyler, bala-yı nigahında açılan bu semada temmuzun şu leyl-i harına mahsus bir buğuyla örtülü zannolunan bu telatum-zar-ı kebud içinde titriyormuş, dalgalanıyormuş kıyas edilen bütün bu la-yuad nücum, bunlar bir baran-ı elmas değil mi? (25, 1914)

> Look, these things that he sees in front of his eyes, all these countless stars that seem to undulate, twinkle in this blue garden of waves that appear veiled with a mist particular to the burning nights of July in the sky that opens up above, these are a baran-ı elmas, right?

The definition of baran-ı elmas is not limited, though, to his experience of admiring the stars, which he sees as a rain of diamonds pouring from the sky and gushing from the earth. "Onun alemi işte yavaş yavaş açılan beyninin içinde mai bir sema, o mai semanın içinde birçok hande-riz nücum-ı ümmidden ibaretti. Orada da bir baran-ı elmas" (28, 1914). [The blue sky inside of his brain that was slowly expanding, that blue sky was made up of smiling stars of hope. There, too, is a baran-ı elmas.] The definition extends to Ahmet Cemil's very mind as the place of a baran-ı elmas resonating his "blue hopes" ("mai hayaller"), or, the hopes of becoming famous for writing innovative poetry.

As Turkish literary scholar Mehmet Kaplan observes, Halit Ziya meticulously creates an artistic (or, "sanatkârâne") style, not only to animate the poet protagonist, but also to constitute a poetic prose novel.[136] The musicality of baran-ı elmas, argues Kaplan, informs the linguistic rhythm that dances both with Waldteufel's waltz and with Ahmet Cemil's intoxication as he contemplates his surroundings in excitement. Drawing attention to the musicality of baran-ı elmas, Kaplan points out its importance as a leitmotif throughout the passages that delineate the expression's meaning for Ahmet Cemil. For instance, the "s," "r," and "-an" sounds that structure Ahmet Cemil's invented term resonate in several other words used to describe its meaning: sema, sarı, sükun, sakit; har, kenar, zir, zar; açılan, akan, nalan, feveran.[137] The importance of the musicality of the neologistic compound and its reverberations in the paragraphs constituting the expression's very definition offer insight into why Halit Ziya refused to translate it into the Turkish "elmas yağmuru." Part of its untranslatability lies in the impossibility of carrying over of the expression's harmony.

While baran-ı elmas is extensively present throughout the novel, baran-ı dürr-i siyah ("black-pearl-rain"), the opposing yet complimentary neologistic construction of baran-ı elmas, only appears in the final pages of the novel. On the ship that takes Ahmet Cemil to the Arab provinces, Ahmet Cemil gazes sorrowfully into the darkness:

> Ahmet Cemil işte şu saçlarının arasında üşüterek geçen rüzgârın, kanatlarını çırpa çırpa, bu siyahlıkları semalardan denizlere döktüğünü hissediyor, görüyor, onların feşafiş-i sukutunu işitiyordu. Kendi kendisine, içinden, hep şahsi üslubunun tabirlerini tekrar ederek: Sanki bir baran-ı dürr-i siyah! diyordu. (398, 2012).

> Ahmet Cemil felt the wind, giving off a chill as it passed through his hair, saw it blowing this blackness from the skies to the seas as it fluttered its wings, and heard it rustle as it

---

[136] Mehmet Kaplan. "Mai ve Siyah Romanının Üslubu Hakkında." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*. 19 (1971): 51-72. Kaplan points out the similarity between Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel *Mai ve Siyah* (1886) and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's novel *Huzur* (1948) as they are both "a poet's novel" written in an artistic style.

[137] For a complete discussion, see Mehmet Kaplan pages 66-67.

fell. To himself, from within, he said repeatedly in his personal style of description: It's as
if it is a baran-ı dürr-i siyah!

This construction reminds Ahmet Cemil of the night in Tepebaşı Garden: "Ah! Biçare hayat-ı

pejmürde!.. Mai bir gece ile siyah bir gece arasında geçen şu biçare ömr-i ber-heva!.. Bir baran-ı

elmas altında inkişaf ederek simdi bir baran-ı dürr-i siyahın altında gömülen o ezhar-ı fersude-i

amal!.." (351, 2016). [Ah! Hopeless battered crushed life!.. This unfortunate, ill-starred existence

spent between a blue night and a black night!.. Those flowers of ambition developed under a

baran-ı elmas and buried under a baran-ı dürr-i siyah!..] Here, the voice of the narrator and the

poet seem to merge, as literary critic Gül Mete-Yuva observes, as they appear to "cry for each

other"[138] over loss of Ahmet Cemil's ideals. The poet experiences the loss of his ideals through

violent acts to suppress them: burning his book of poetry and leaving for self-imposed exile. Yet,

he nonetheless continues to "write" innovative poetry: formulating poetic descriptions of his

melancholic state on his journey into exile, encapsulated by the neologistic compound baran-ı

dürr-i siyah.

Hayal İçinde: **Translating the Ottoman Literary Archive**

Critics agree that as journalist, fiction writer, translator and politician, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın

(1875-1957) played an important role in shaping Turkish modernity. He is mostly recognized for

his polemical journalistic writings in which he defended the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement and

advocated European values. In his early articles, Hüseyin Cahit openly disparaged Ottoman

cultural ties with Arab sciences, and advanced the notion that Arab legacies belonged to the

realm of "old" knowledge, thus necessitating the Ottoman Turk's wholesale detachment from

---

[138] Gül Mete-Yuva. *La littérature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006. 239.

it.[139] With self-proclaimed affinities with European languages and literatures, Hüseyin Cahit asserted that his cultural ties were exclusively with Europe, particularly France, and that he had none with "the East."[140] These statements inform his politics of translingual practice; his fiction, including short stories and novels, which remain surprisingly understudied, exhibits problems of uneven translingual exchange in Edebiyat-ı Cedide literature. *Hayal İçinde* ("Inside Imagination"), serialized in the *Servet-i Fünun* journal in 1898, lays bare the ways in which Ottoman Turkish sacrificed its own literary tradition in order to attain some degree of equivalence with European languages and literatures. In order to apprehend sacrifices that happen in cross-writing between Ottoman Turkish and French, I look to the rhetoric of the realist narrator, who has a stake in registering the real and the unreal that leads this narrator to betray his own tradition. In *Hayal İçinde*, the narrator recodes (translates) Ottoman literary tropes, particularly the lover and beloved relationship, into a dysfunctional kind of language for its reliance on the unreal. The conventions associated with this trope constituted the very essence of Ottoman lyric poetry that endured for centuries. In the schema of cultural translation, the realist novel *Hayal İçinde* is translation, informed by the language of modernization, and the original is the Ottoman poetry archive and its metaphorical language.

The role of lover is performed by the protagonist, Nezih, a third-year high school student at the elite school Mekteb-i Mülkiye ("School of Administration"), who aspires to be a prominent journalist and writer of realist novels. The events of the narrative take place over the course of one year, during which Nezih wrestles with drawing a distinctive line between external reality and what his own imagination constructs as a love relationship to a newly found beloved. The

---

[139] See Hüseyin Cahit. "Arabdan İstifade Edeceğimiz Ulum." *Tarik* 27 Teşrinisani 1314/December 9,1898.

[140] Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın. *Edebi Hatıralar*. İstanbul: Akşam Kitaphanesi, 1935. 32.

story begins when Nezih visits Istanbul's trendy entertainment spot Tepebaşı Garden for the first time with his friends when he notices three beautiful young women, daughters of the Diyapulo family, sitting at a table in close proximity. One of the Diyapulo sisters' blond hair and blue eyes set her apart from the others and, because of her perceived Europeanness, she becomes the object of Nezih's desire. Even though Nezih professes his disbelief in love, he is unable to inhibit his strong urge to return to the garden for another glimpse of his beloved. From this point on, the plot turns on Nezih's obsessive struggle to catch sight of the object of his love and to gather information about her from acquaintances and those who know her family. However, the knowledge he acquires shifts. For instance, Nezih learns that her name is Alis, but subsequently he learns her name is İzmaro and he is never able to fully ascertain her real name. Nevertheless, Nezih uses the name İzmaro to refer to the woman that consumes his thoughts and actions as he becomes consumed with the very type of lover/beloved relationship he passionately rejects at the outset of the novel. But when Nezih believes that his entire experience of love is founded on his imagination rather than reality, he views his love for İzmaro and his attraction to the garden with skepticism. Even if the narrator lauds Nezih for his ability to distinguish reality from the unreal, the story does not end with an optimistic outlook for Nezih, who is representative of the future Ottoman elite. The language of modernization that renders the lover and beloved tropes of Ottoman poetry dysfunctional abandons Nezih in an in-between space in which he mourns an irretrievable past (or, the ruins of Ottoman poetic symbols) and has no confidence in the future (without them).

My reading of *Hayal İçinde* examines the ways in which the narrator translates the conventions of Ottoman literary tradition in favor of a realism that stands out from the Ottoman norms. In pursuit of a perception of reality as distinct from traditional perception of the world that informed Ottoman literary conventions, the narrator translates the literary tropes into the

language of modernization, which can be understood as the recoding of tradition that makes it intelligible only in terms of its futility.

Traditional Ottoman literary conventions aided writers in crafting the first novels in Ottoman Turkish and thus continued to shape the Ottoman perception of reality. Hüseyin Cahit's novel criticizes the use of these conventions in the Ottoman Turkish novel, but not without drawing on them himself. For, *Hayal İçinde* opens with a description of Tepebaşı Garden evoking two influential Ottoman Turkish novels, Namık Kemal's *İntibah* ("Awakening," 1876) and Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem's *Araba Sevdası* ("The Carriage Affair," 1896), both of which open with a description of an Ottoman garden in which the protagonist meets his beloved. The gardens in these novels represent actual trendy gardens in Istanbul that appeal to those interested in European (mostly French) language and culture during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Underlying this evocation of the Ottoman garden is the garden as a trope of Ottoman poetry.[141] According to the literary critic Walter Andrews, the garden of Ottoman poetry is representative of an ecosystem that "interconnects the material and spiritual, the this-worldly and that-worldly, human (socio-cultural) ecology and natural ecology."[142] This interweaving of the physical and the spiritual in the symbolic meaning of the garden in the Ottoman poetic tradition is the cultural literacy that the narrator of *Hayal İçinde* seeks to displace.

Following Rey Chow's view that cultural translation in non-European regions of the world works to abolish tradition and leads to mourning, I ask whether it also leads to a compulsion to reprocess the grief over a lost (or injured) tradition as part of the effort to create commensurability with Europe. It is possible to understand Hüseyin Cahit's novel as reprocessing

---

[141] Walter G. Andrews. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985. 158.
[142] Walter G. Andrews. "Ottoman Love: Preface to a Theory of Emotional Ecology." *A History of Emotions: 1200-1800*. New York: Routledge, 2012. 33.

Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem's novel for its displacement of Ottoman poetic symbols. Ekrem's description of the Ottoman garden in his novel *Araba Sevdası* is a translation of Namık Kemal's description in his novel *İntibah* (1876).[143] Namık Kemal's novel, identified by critics as the first literary novel in Ottoman Turkish, echoes the interconnectedness of the material and the spiritual characteristic of Ottoman lyric poetry. The opening scene describes a garden (Çamlıca Garden) in Istanbul that draws heavily on Ottoman poetic tropes showcasing a certain tension between deeply embedded symbols of Ottoman divan poetry and realist fiction. Highly critical of Ottoman divan poetry, Namık Kemal prefaces each chapter with a couplet from divan poetry that anticipates the chapter's plot and serves to demonstrate the insufficiency of metaphorical language for exploring a young man's awakening to love in the garden.[144] Guiding the reader through the description of the garden, the narrator pauses to complain that he cannot forget tropes of divan poetry: "Sebebi hayalat-ı şarkiye ile kesret-i itilaf mıdır nedir? Ben gülden bahsettikçe bülbülü bir türlü unutamam. Vakıa güle aşık olduğunu bilirim" (2-3). [Is it because of my solid familiarity with eastern imagery? When I speak of the rose, in no way can I forget the nightingale. It is true that I know the nightingale is in love with the rose.] Employing the conventions and language of Ottoman lyric tradition,[145] the narrator as observer becomes completely enmeshed with the scene, and the garden, as Nergis Ertürk argues, is constructed to reflect otherworldly reality.[146]

---

[143] I am inspired by Nergis Ertürk's invaluable study of *Araba Sevdası* and *İntibah*. See Nergis Ertürk. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 57-69.

[144] For his discussion of Namık Kemal on Ottoman divan poetry, see Laurent Mignon. *Elifbalar Sevdası*. Ankara: Hece Yayınları, 2003. 85-87.

[145] See Ahmet Ö. Evin. *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1983. Robert P. Finn. *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1984. İnci Enginün. "Turkish Literature and Self-Identity: From Ottoman to Modern Turkish." *Ottoman Past and Today's Turkey*. Ed. Kemal Karpat. Boston: Brill, 2000.

[146] Nergis Ertürk. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 59.

Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem's novel *Araba Sevdası* (1896), celebrated as the first modern

novel in Ottoman Turkish, opens with a scene of Çamlıca Garden that differentiates itself from

Namık Kemal's description of the garden. No longer infused with the scene, the narrator is a

distant observer. The objective narrative begins with a detailed and lengthy description of the

garden's location and history, delineating its exterior and finally the interior of the garden. The

narrator translates the religious/mystical garden of Namık Kemal into a garden "freed from the

conventions of classical rhetoric and no longer the symbol of an other-worldly space."[147] The

narrator's depiction of the protagonist, Bihruz, an insufficiently educated dandy, is steeped in

irony, as is his treatment of the symbols of Ottoman literary tradition. As Nergis Ertürk observes,

the beloved is a prostitute; "the public is a mannerless crowd; the pool is no longer the havuz of

Ottoman poetry, or the lac of French Romanticism, but a 'muddy and yellowish pool.'"[148]

Like the narrator of *Araba Sevdası*, the narrator of *Hayal İçinde* strips symbols of

Ottoman lyric poetry of their meaning through translation, not by ironically translating them, but

by displacing their meaning altogether. The narrator of *Hayal İçinde* describes the garden with an

objective distance in simplified language, not the language of divan poetry as seen in Namık

Kemal's description. Yet, unlike the elaborate descriptions of the garden in *İntibah* and *Araba*

Sevdası, the succinct description of the garden in *Hayal İçinde* displaces or omits any mention of

the main features of the poetic garden such as the rose and nightingale. Instead of the rose, the

symbol of the beloved, the narrator speaks of a rose festival: "Bir pazar günüydü. Saat dokuzu

henüz geçmiş iken Tepebaşı Bahçesi, bugünkü Gül Yordusu münasebetiyle, kalabalık olmaya

başlıyordu" (21, 2012). [It was a Sunday. When the hour was just past 9 o'clock, Tepebaşı

---

[147] Nergis Ertürk. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 59.
[148] Nergis Ertürk. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 61.

Garden began to draw a crowd due to the day's Rose Festival.] Stripped of its erstwhile significance in Ottoman lyric poetry, the rose acquires a new meaning as a temporal marker that frames the story.

Once the protagonist, Nezih, is introduced in the story, the narrative information is focalized through his perspective as a realist writer. The description of the garden in *Hayal İçinde* begins from the interior, not the garden's exterior as it does in both *İntibah* and *Araba Sevdası*. While the protagonist of *Araba Sevdası* is introduced as already part of the garden scene (we are told that a stylish young man displaying his brand name coat is seated in a strategic spot surveying everyone entering and leaving the garden),[149] the protagonist of *Hayal İçinde* is introduced as he enters through the garden's gates and scans the garden for a place to sit. The narrator underscores Nezih's unfamiliarity with the garden, suggesting that he is not yet acquainted with the pleasures of the garden and of love, which already differentiates Nezih from the dandy character type. Entering the garden for the first time, Nezih feels foreign and embarrassed ("sıkılmış") for being subjected ("maruz") to the inspecting gaze of the entire crowd. "…bir muharrir olduğunu, buradaki adamların hepsine yüksekten bakması lazım geleceğini beyhude yere düşünmüş, mahcub ve hayran, yürümüştü" (24, 2012). […being a writer, he had vainly thought that he would necessarily look down on all the men at the garden. Instead, he walked on, sheepish and in admiration.] Nezih, ill prepared for the garden in which young men gather in stylish European clothing, becomes self-conscious for wearing his high school uniform and a slightly deformed fez hat. Nevertheless, the narrator's treatment of the protagonist is unlike that of *Araba Sevdası*, who adopts an ironic distance from the stylish

---

[149] Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem. *Araba Sevdası*. Ed. Sabahattin Çağın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2013. 18-19.

dandy.[150] What facilitates the narrator's sympathies with Nezih is the latter's belonging to the new generation of the Turkish intellectuals.[151]

The site of encounter with the beloved and the place in which the protagonist awakens to love, the garden's function in *Hayal İçinde* seems to resemble those in *Intibah* and *Araba Sevdası*. However, Ali and Bihruz, the protagonists of *İntibah* and *Araba Sevdası*, respectively, demonstrate no (or very little) awareness of the extent with which Ottoman poetic symbols inform their experience of love as a type of narration. In the beginning of *Hayal İçinde*, Nezih, too, is unable to see the effect that tradition has on his perception of reality. As soon as Nezih and his friends take a seat at a table, Nezih's friend and cousin point out the notorious Diyapulo sisters. Nezih's response at his first glance of the women is "Sahih, pek güzel şeyler!" (25, 2012) [Truly, they are beautiful things!] The alluring Diyapulos, the magnificent crowd, and orchestra greatly influence Nezih's perception of the garden. Under this spell, Nezih already begins to exercise his imagination and imbue the scene with meaning. However, the narrator, bent on showing objective reality, undercuts Nezih's representation: "Nezih tozlu taflanları, susuzluktan sararmış çiçekleri, nimkumlu yolları hep harikulade buluyor, her adım başında dalgın bir tavır ile: Cidden latif, hakikaten güzel yer! takdirlerini israf ediyordu" (31, 2012). [Nezih marveled at all the dusty cherry laurels, discolored and desiccated flowers, and the paths halfway covered in dirt, and at every step, maintaining a preoccupied expression, he threw away compliments: "It's really delightful, truly the place is beautiful!"]

---

[150] The absurd protagonist of *Araba Sevdası*, Bihruz, is an over-Westernized Ottoman. See Şerif Mardin. *Religion, Society and Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Syracuse Universty Press, 2006. Felatun Bey of Ahmet Midhat's novel *Felatun Bey ile Rakım Efendi* ("Felatun Bey and Rakım Efendi," 1875) has been understood by critics as an archetypal figure representing the wrong way to Westernize. *Hayal İçinde* refrains from passing judgment on how one Westernizes.

[151] Others have noted Nezih's close resemblance to the author. See Gökhan Tunç. "Preface." *Hayal İçinde*. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2012. Nihayet Arslan. *Türk Romanının Oluşumu: Dış Gerçeklik Açısından Bir İnceleme*. Ankara: Phoenix, 2007. Faruk Huyugüzel. *Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın'ın Hayatı, Hikaye ve Romanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Ankara: Kültür ve Türizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1982.

Nezih's understanding of love is heavily mediated by contemporary French discourses on love and the lover/poet's fondness for the beloved in Ottoman poetic conventions. While the former receives acknowledgement in Nezih's dialogue with other characters, the latter manifests itself in what we might call the protagonist's unconscious performance of the conventions. From the outset of the novel, the narrator underscores Nezih's conviction that the representation of love in fiction is hyperbolic—and therefore it is always unrealistic. In a scene at Nezih's high school, when a classmate overhears Nezih talking at length about the Diyapulo sisters he had seen the previous day at Tepebaşı Garden, he asks Nezih whether he has fallen in love with one of them. Nezih quips: "Aşk bir hulyadır gözüm, buna aldananlar da budaladır" (36, 2012). [Love is a dream, my dear friend, and those who are deceived by it are fools.] Speaking on the state of the representation of love, Nezih explains: "Evet, bugün romanlarda gördüğümüz gibi aşk yoktur. Öyle yanıp tutuşmalar, sevdiği kadını göremediği için deli olmalar bunlar hep romancıların uydurmasyonudur" (37, 2012). [Yes, the love that we see today in novels doesn't exist. Fits of burning desire, going crazy because [the lover] can't see the women he loves, all of these things are the invention of novelists.] Believing that novels have led people to have a false understanding of love, Nezih continues: "…romancılar da bize gösterse ki hal böyledir, o vakit şimdi biz de kendimizi aldatmaya kalkmayız, aşıklığın şartı buymuş diye *ahlara* oflara başlamayız" (38, 2012, my emphasis). […and if novelists showed us that the situation is really a certain way, then we wouldn't have to try to deceive ourselves, we wouldn't start sighing and crying because this was the condition of love.] Even if Nezih strictly speaks of novels, the "ah" that he disparages makes a specific reference to the interjection commonly used by Ottoman poets to express the lover's intense suffering caused by the inability to unite with the beloved.[152]

---

[152] İskender Pala. *Ansiklopedik Divan Şiiri Sözlüğü*. Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2004. 10-11.

The only novelists that Nezih reads are specifically French, thus situating his critique within the domain of the European novel. Yet, the terms Nezih uses to describe love consistently signal to Ottoman lyric poetry. In criticizing the novel's influence on real life, Nezih places Ottoman lyric poetry on an illusory equal footing with European novels.

To counteract the unrealistic idealizations of the beloved, Nezih questions the plausibility of the figure of the beloved and claims that all women are uniform beings. Using a French source as a seemingly sound evidence for his ideas on women, Nezih declares:

> Alfons Kar'ın Kadınlar diye bir kitabı var. Geçen gün orada okuyordum. İyi hatırımda kalmamış ama… Aşıklarla seyyahlar için diyor büyük bir musibet vardır. O da her vardıkları memleketin diğer memlekete, her sevdikleri kadının diğer kadınlara müşabih olduğunu anlamaktır diyor. Bak benim fikrim nedir: Bir kadın insanın gözü önünden kaybolunca hatırasından, kalbinden de kaybolmazsa o adam mesud olamaz. İşte ölenceye kadar bu fikri müdafaa edeceğim. Ne kadar roman, hikaye yazsam bunu isbata çalışacağım (39, 2012).

> Alphonse Karr has a book called *Women*. The other day I was reading it. I don't recall it well but… He says there is a great tribulation [that is the same] for lovers and travelers. And that is to understand that the country [travelers] arrive in resembles other countries, and every woman [lovers] love resembles other women. Look, this is my thought: a man cannot be happy if when a woman disappears from his sight she doesn't disappear from his mind and heart. I am going to defend this idea until I die. However, many novels and short stories I write, I will try to prove this.

Nezih's long discourse is met with applause from Nezih's friends, signaling their approval of his bookish ideas on love, itself a representation that is problematic. Making reference to this problem, the narrator, with a certain cognitive privilege over Nezih, explains: "Nezih bu aşk hususunda mefkud bir tecrübe üzerine müesses garib fikirleri vardı" (48, 2012). [Nezih had strange ideas on the subject of love founded on lack of experience.] The word "garib," qualifying Nezih's ideas, signals both strange and foreign. At first glance, it seems as though the narrator criticizes Nezih's understanding of love for its reliance on Alphonse Karr. Nezih claims affinity with Alphonse Karr, but at the same time he makes his connection with the French writer suspect

by not remembering his book well. Even though Nezih claims affinities with French books concerning his understanding of love, he puts forth his own idea about love that is rooted in the figure of the lover in Ottoman poetry. For, as Walter Andrews shows in his critical study on Ottoman poetry, the most persistent examples are those descriptions of the lover that picture him as suffering or insane.[153] This suggests that the narrator ultimately criticizes Nezih's "inexperienced" understanding of love, which constitutes his perception of reality, for being founded on Ottoman literary tradition, rendering this understanding "strange."

Even though Nezih knows that idealizing a woman, making her a beloved, rests on the imagination of writers of novels and divan poetry, he is eagerly willing to indulge his own imagination and play the role of the lover. Immediately after his discourse on love, Nezih returns to Tepebaşı Garden to catch sight of the Diyapulo sisters again. Yet, Nezih obstinately denies that he has any amorous feelings for one of the sisters, İzmaro, even when frequenting the garden becomes an addiction ("ihtiyaç," or "need") for him. If his addiction correlates to the garden, it is because the garden symbolizes the beloved.[154] Once he finally can no longer deny his feelings, Nezih realizes that he has betrayed his own ideal that his perception of love would be grounded on reality, not imagination:

> Ömrünün sonuna kadar muhafaza, müdafaa edeceğini iddia eylediği meslek nerde kalmıştı? İzmaro gözünün önünden kaybolunca kalbinden, hayalinden de kaybolmuyor; orada bütün bir şiddet-i samimiyyet ile yaşıyordu. Hem o kadar yaşıyordu ki Nezih daha başlamadığı bu hayat-ı müştereke-i aşıkaneyi uzaktan, hayalinden yaşamış, her türlü ihtimaliyle yaşamış, kalbini ihtiyarlatmıştı (148, 2012).

> Where was his doctrine that he claimed he would protect and defend for the rest of his life? When İzmaro disappears from his sight, she did not disappear from his heart and

---

[153] Walter G. Andrews. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985. 71.

[154] In Ottoman poetry, aspects of the garden symbolize the beloved. For instance, the rose represents the beloved's cheek and the cypress tree the beloved's slender form. See Walter G. Andrews. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985. Even if these aspects are repressed in *Hayal İçinde*, the garden is always associated with the beloved.

imagination; she lived there with intense intimacy. And she was living there so much that this mutual love life that he didn't start yet [in real life], he lived from afar in his imagination, he lived with every possibility, it aged his heart.

As they are unable to communicate with each other, for reasons I will examine below, Nezih constructs İzmaro as his beloved based on visual indicators that he believes are facts. Much of Nezih's time is spent carefully watching his beloved hoping for a glance from her indicating her affection for him. Nezih begins a mental catalogue of her gestures and assigns meaning to them:

> İbtida küçükleri, kara gözlüleri, Nezih'i gördü; hafif bir kol darbesiyle hemşiresine, Alis'e haber verdi. O da gözlerini kaldırdı. Küçük, hafif bir tekabül-i enzar; fakat bu Nezih'e ne lerzişler, ne saadetler vermedi! Sonra hafif bir kaş çatış; ihtimal ki alenen bu kadar eser-i dikkat göstermesinin cezası. Nezih her cezaya tahammül edebilirdi. O kol darbesi kendisinin tanındığını anlatıyor; ihtimal ki biraz da kıymeti haiz olarak tanındığını ümid ettiriyordu (63, 2012).

> First the young one with dark eyes saw Nezih. She let her sister Alis know with a light nudge of her arm. She [Alis] raised her eyes. Her glance met his briefly. But what shivers, what joy this glance gave Nezih! Then she lightly furrowed her brow. Probably a reproach for showing so much attention in public. Nezih could endure every reproach. That nudge explained that they recognized him. It gave him hope that a little of his worth was probably vested in their recognition.

Since İzmaro's furrowed brows become her habitual response to the sight of Nezih, he comes to describe his beloved's gesture using a neologistic construction that draws on conventional lyric language: "çîn-i iğbirar" ("displeased-curl"). In Ottoman poetry, "çîn" references the beloved's musk-scented lock of hair.[155] A play on the convention, "curl" no longer symbolizes the beloved's beautiful hair; rather, it references her eyebrow, "curled" in vexation at the sight of

---

[155] The word "çîn" literally means China, the place from which musk comes, and describes the beloved's hair as a curl. See İskender Pala. *Ansiklopedik Divan Şiiri Sözlüğü*. Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2004. 103. And see Walter Andrews, Nejaat Black, and Mehmet Kaplan, eds. *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006. 167-68.

Nezih. At the garden, when Nezih looks at İzmaro, she responds with what Nezih calls "Yine bir çîn-i iğbirar" (145, 2012). [Another displeased-curl.] Drawing on the recurring use of the term in Ottoman poetry (the term is, after all, conventional), Nezih underlines her repeated gesture as an approximate performance of a poetic beloved in his mind.

Throughout the novel, the lover and beloved relationship remains unidirectional. İzmaro's indifference to Nezih is consistent with the standard love analogies in Ottoman poetry, which, according to Walter Andrews include: the rose and the nightingale, the candle and the moth, and more generally the indifferent beloved and the lover.[156] These analogies of the lover and beloved relationship emphasize the beloved's irresponsiveness: "The nightingale approaches the rose and sings to it; the moth flies around and around the candle; the lover follows the beloved and haunts the streets of her neighborhood."[157] Following Nezih as he searches and waits for the Diyapulo sisters at Tepebaşı Garden, in Beyoğlu, on Büyükada Island[158] acquires a sense of daily routine in the story. If he is not following the women, he roams the streets or waits outside their house with the hope of catching sight of the Diyapulos. Despite Nezih's continuous effort to approach her, and his delight at her slightest gesture that he takes as indications of her affection, İzmaro seldom takes notice of him.

At a turning point in the novel, Nezih becomes conscious of her indifference toward him, which incites an internal struggle to distinguish reality from imagination. If the language of realism legitimizes what it constructs as real while it delegitimizes what is unreal, in *Hayal İçinde*, this process is played out in interrogating Nezih's perception of the real. As Nezih leaves

---

[156] Walter G. Andrews. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985. 92.
[157] Walter G. Andrews. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985. 92.
[158] The largest of the Princes' Islands in the Sea of Marmara.

the garden, he sees that İzmaro fails to look up at him, a visual indication to him that she does not reciprocate his love. "Eğer İzmaro'da Nezih için ciddi bir muhabbet bulunsa, giderken arkasından bakmaz mıydı?" (148, 2012). [If İzmaro was truly fond of Nezih, wouldn't she look up at him as he left?] In free indirect discourse, Nezih questions every signal from İzmaro that he understood as symbolizing her love for him and eventually concludes that his love relationship with her was always imaginary.

Nezih's love relationship with İzmaro now belonging to the realm of the unreal, he attempts to reject the lover and beloved trope that informed it. Later in the story, after countless scenes of Nezih following the Diyapulos, Nezih happens to catch sight of İzmaro in Beyoğlu. As she continues on her way, Nezih feels his habitual urge to follow her. But this time, suddenly, without hesitation, he says to himself: "Nafile, dedi, boş yere yorulacağım" (178). [It's no use, he said, I would only tire myself for nothing.] However, accepting the futility of imaginary love is a long process for Nezih. For, attempting to erase İzmaro from his mind by refusing to visit the garden produces in Nezih a terrible feeling of being lost in nothingness ("yokluk").

Returning to the garden after a long period of absence, the final chapter of the novel records the scene of the beloved and garden in a light that radically differs from their initial descriptions. The garden becomes a stage on which the crowd, which Nezih once admired, is portrayed as fake and laughable. The beloved, deprived of significance, is no longer considered lovable and worthy of the desire for union. Nezih is now conscious that İzmaro, rather than performing the beloved, smiles at men because she must if she is to attract a wealthy husband. Paradoxically, the final scene is the only one in which Nezih has the opportunity to communicate with İzmaro. For, when the Diyapulos arrive at the garden, there is no available table and they have no other option than to sit at the same table with Nezih and his friend Sait. In contrast to the many envisioned meetings in which Nezih and İzmaro exchange gestures of love, the situation is

109

awkward for everyone: "Bir masanın başında bir halka teşkil edilerek, mecburi bir mukarenetle ahbab gibi birlikte oturulan bu mecliste ilk kahkahalardan sonra bir sıkıntı peyda olmuştu. Ne kızlar lakırdı söylüyorlar, ne Sait ile Nezih sükutu ihlal edebiliyorlardı" (185). [Sitting in forced proximity around the table in the form of a circle like friends, after some laughs, they became clearly uncomfortable. The girls were unable to say anything and Sait and Nezih could not break the silence.] When the women become impatient with the uncomfortable silence, they begin speaking to each other in German, not French, which ensures the exclusion of Nezih and Sait from their conversation. Sait, attempting to engage Nezih in a joke about the Diyapulos, exclaims: "bilirsin ya, Türkçedir… Anlamazlar!" (185). [You know, Turkish… They don't understand it!] The two young men begin speaking in Turkish about the Diyapulos. Sait initiates the jokes with: "Lakin şu sarışının dudakları pek ince…" [But the blond's lips are so thin] to which Nezih replies "Ya sen benim yanımdakinin kulağının arkasında kalan pudrayı görsen…" [If you could only see the powder left behind the ear of the one sitting next to me.] The women respond indicating that they have been half listening to Nezih and Sait even as they carried on their own conversation in German. Judging from the women's positive reactions, Nezih and Sait continue joking, and as they continue, the women laugh more and more expressing their delight in the amusing exchange. Finally, when Nezih gets up to return home, he leaves the garden in a cheerful [şen] and contented [memnun] mood. The narrator conveys Nezih's revelation that İzmaro is not a beloved at all: "Evet, Diyapulolar işte böyle gülüşmeye, eğlenmeye yarardı. Fakat Nezih bunu anlamaya ne tecrübelerden sonra muvaffak olmuştu!" (186) [Yes, the Diyapulos were good for laughing and having fun in this way. But what things he had to go through to reach this understanding and succeed!] The narrator makes clear that Nezih's success lies in his ability to disparage his once idealized beloved. Indeed, she is no longer to be taken seriously; instead, her worth lies in his entertainment.

Inasmuch as Nezih's success is measured by his ability to reject Ottoman poetic symbols, another character in the novel is evaluated based on his inability to do so. Behçet, a friend of Nezih's brother, takes the youngest Diyapulo sister, Mari, for his beloved. But unlike Nezih, Behçet is unable to break free from understanding love through the lover/beloved trope, thus serving in the novel as an inverted mirror of Nezih. Like Nezih, he plays the role of the lover, longing for union with his beloved that always remains unaware of him. Once Nezih rejects his role as lover, he is in a position to criticize Behçet, finding Behçet's will to carry on as the lover strange ("tuhaf"), illogical ("gayr-i makul"), and worthy of scorn ("şayan-ı istihfaf"). Furthermore, Nezih apprehends the lover and beloved relationship, now represented by Behçet and Mari, in superficial terms:

> Ciddi bir muhabbet ile rabt-ı kalb etmekten uzak, müstehzi, hafif meşreb birkaç kızın herkese ibzal ettikleri birkaç tebessüme, birkaç nazar-ı teşcie aldanarak hayatı, dünyayı bundan ibaret zannetmek, her şeyi bu hiçler için feda etmek hakikatte bir delilik değil miydi? (182, 2012)

> Was it not madness in the real sense to be deceived in thinking the world and life were made up of a few mocking, wanton women that, far from tying the heart with serious love, lavishly give everyone smiles, teasing glances, and to sacrifice everything for these nothings?

Conventions define the lover as symbolically mad; but here, Nezih transmits this convention into the language of realism in the literal sense, presenting the lover as problematic. The narrator advances in the portrayal of Behçet as the lover pathetically languishing by fabricated love: "Sıcaktan, meşakkatten, ızdırabdan bozulan, siyahlaşan, çirkinleşen bu çehre ona her sualin cevabını pek vazıh olarak veriyordu" (178-79). [His countenance deteriorated, and became black and ugly from the heat, fatigue and suffering, and she was giving a very obvious answer to all his questions.] Behçet's state contrasts sharply with that of Nezih in the last scene at the garden; for, as Behçet continues to suffer and deteriorate, Nezih is able to leave the garden pleased with a

firm grasp on reality. Thus, by the end of the novel, Nezih's perception of the real converges with that of the narrator who is invested in value making consistent with the European modern.

The closing paragraphs following the last scene at the garden bring into sharper focus problems of translation between Ottoman Turkish and French in *Hayal İçinde*. The tone with which the final garden scene is described is humorous, but not without a critical gaze on Ottoman garden culture in general and Behçet and the Diyapulos in particular. The narrator's critical gaze, focalized through Nezih, finally allows the protagonist to occupy a superior position in relation to the crowd: a reversal from the very first scene at the garden in which Nezih was awestruck and awkward. But upon exiting the garden, and arrival at a bridge connecting two sides of Istanbul where the novel ends, the tone radically shifts to one of ambiguity of the Turkish intellectual as cross-cultural translator. Nezih, walking home from Tepebaşı Garden in Beyoğlu, has just stopped right in the middle of the bridge, the narrator tells us, as if an indication of his mind's "inability" ("ihzar-ı acz") to carry the weight of his thoughts. Nezih has just understood his role as a Turkish intellectual and realizes that he has responsibilities toward his "homeland" ("memleket"). But his interest in serving his homeland, which he will accomplish by writing realist novels "for all of humanity" ("bütün insaniyyet için"), is incited only by his determination to forget his past love experience with İzmaro (and thus his misperception of reality).

Before arriving at the bridge, the narrator outlines Nezih's intellectual and emotional state after realizing that the garden and beloved have lost their original meanings in the process of defining reality based on positivist knowledge. Reflecting on Nezih's experience, the narrator explains that in the beginning Nezih "tried to deceive himself" ("kendisine aldatmak istemişti") and that:

> . . . bütün nücum-ı duradur yüksekteki alemlerden ezeli bir peyam-ı muhabbet getirirken Nezih kainat-ı muhitenin cesaretbahş tebrikleri altında aşkını kendi kendisine itiraf etmiş, bu garam-ı pakizenin verdiği hak ile İzmaro'sunda aynı muhabbeti aramaya kalkmıştı.

112

İşte burada Nezih kendi kendisine bina ettiği seraçe-i ümidin yıkıldığını, kendi kendisine ısad ettiği mevkiin çöktüğünü hissetmiş, bütün bu harabelerden matemengiz, acı, adavetbahş bir ümitsizlik, bir binasiblik hain bir haşere gibi canlanarak kalbinin necib, alicenab hislerini, hayat, alem hakkındaki fikirlerini zehirlemeye başlamıştı (188, 2012).

. . . an eternal message of love was brought from all the far away stars in the high heavens. Under the encouraging felicitations of the cosmos Nezih confessed his love to himself and tried to find the same love in İzmaro with the right that this pure love gave. This is where Nezih felt the little palace of hope that he constructed and exalted by himself collapse and crumble. From all these ruins, a mournful, painful, hateful hopelessness, unhappiness emerged like a treacherous pest and began to poison his heart's noble and moral feelings and his thoughts on life and the universe.

Here, the narrator connects the material with the spiritual just as Ottoman divan poets did in the past. But, Nezih is quickly estranged from such spiritual connections and is left mourning the ruins of the past. The narrator evaluates Nezih's past experience of love, articulating that when Nezih performed the lover by following the Diyapulos around like shadows, he was "happy" ("mesud") because he was not subjected to "hesitation" ("tereddüd") and "indecision" ("kararsızlık"). "Şimdi kalbini yakan bu türlü tereddüde, bu nev kararsızlığa o vakit bigane idi" (189, 2012). [This sort of hesitation, this new indecision that burned his heart now was unfamiliar to him then.] The new problem that Nezih faces is that he feels suspended between the past that he mourns and the uncertainty he has about the future. The narrator asks: "Maziye tahassür, istikbale adem-i itimad… Nezih'in hayatı daima bu iki girdab arasında mı müteheyyic ve muzdarib olacaktı?" (189, 2012). [Longing for the past, uncertainty for the future… was Nezih's life always going to be excited and suffering between these two whirlpools?] "Girdab," meaning whirlpool, has the connotation of danger; thus, longing for the past is dangerous, just as being skeptical about the future is dangerous.

On the bridge, Nezih's gaze brings into focus Beyoğlu, with its European association, large "ugly" ("çirkin") buildings, and trendy garden to the right of the bridge and the

113

conservative Eyüp with its cemeteries and mosques at the top of the other side. As the novel

closes, the last sentence reads:

> Bu duman arasında birbirleriyle çarpışmak ister gibi sabırsızlıkla yerlerinden kımıldadıklarını gördüğü iki kıtanın, hilal ve salibin ortasında kendi tereddüdleri, kendi düşünceleriyle, biçare ve metruk, eziliyordu ve ayaklarının altında yeşil, karanlık, korkunç dalgacıklar, halledilemeyen bir muammanın müstehzi timsalleri gibi birer hatt-ı istifham teşkil ederek uzaklara, ta uzaklara koşuyorlardı (191, 2012).

> [Nezih], helpless and abandoned, was being crushed by his own hesitations and thoughts, between two continents, the crescent and the cross, that he saw impatiently stirring in their place as if they wanted to collide with each other in the smoke. And under his feet were green, dark, scary waves, like ridiculing symbols of enigma that can't be solved, forming lines of interrogation, they were each running far, very far away.

While some understand this passage as demarcating the situation of a Turkish intellectual divided

between East and West,[159] I propose to comprehend the bridge as a materialization of a kind of

"translation zone," as Lydia Liu construes the term, which is a site of political and ideological

struggles "where the guest language is forced to encounter the host language, where the

irreducible differences between them are fought out, authorities invoked or challenged,

ambiguities dissolved or created," until new meanings emerge.[160] The bridge, if understood as

poised between two languages and literacies, represents the tensions that take place in Nezih as a

translator and writer and his projection of them onto İzmaro.

The reference to "the crescent and the cross," religious symbols ascribed to the two

continents, gestures toward İzmaro as an other within. Inasmuch as İzmaro is Ottoman, her allure

stems from her perceived Europeanness (or, Frenchness). When Nezih first sees the Diyapulo

sisters, he speculates that they are either Ottoman Greek ("Rum") or French. The sisters speak

French and are said to be actresses (in the novel "aktris," a borrowed French word in Turkish)

---

[159] See Gökhan Tunç. "Preface." *Hayal İçinde*. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2012. Especially pages 10 and 15.

[160] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 27.

working at a French theater. The French word actress makes the young women even more enchanting: "Aktris… Bir genç çocuk nazarında bir kadını otuzundan ziyadeye çıkarmayan, her vakit güzel addettiren bu pür-füsun kelime Nezih'e şimdi kızları daha calib, daha latif gösteriyordu" (27, 2012). [Actress… In the eyes of a young man, this word, filled with magic, referred to a woman not more than thirty years old and always esteemed as beautiful, now made the girls even more attractive, more elegant.]

Yet, the European quality of İzmaro is the occasion for her foreignization in terms of nationality and language, posing an imaginary obstacle for communication between them that has real consequences. Up until the last scene at the garden, Nezih consistently casts doubt on the possibility that the Diyapulos have any knowledge of Turkish. Nezih understands French but lacks the fluency needed to communicate the extent of his passion. In fact, Nezih's spoken French is limited to memorized phrases that he learned from books. When Nezih gets a signal from İzmaro that he interprets to mean she is willing to accept communication with him, he searches for a common language: "Hüsn-i kabul edileceği anlaşılan ifade-i hali tehir etmemeliydi. Fakat ne suretle? Kızlar bakalım Türkçeyi iyi biliyorlar mıydı? Kendisi Fransızcayı anlar, fakat söyleyemezdi" (108, 2012). [He must not postpone responding to the expression that meant he would be kindly received. But how? Did the girls even know Turkish? He could understand French, but could not speak it.] One of the many times he is at the garden, Nezih is desperate to finally communicate with İzmaro: "Kendisini onlara kim takdim edebilirdi? Takdim olunduktan sonra, iyi beceremeyeceği Fransızca ile nasıl ve ne vakit bütün aşkını o nazik, o hafif, o müstehzi kalbe dökecekti?" (119, 2012). [Who could introduce him to them? After being introduced, how and when would he pour out all his love to that tender, that gentle, that mocking heart in French that he could barely manage?]

While the term nationality, a translated concept in Turkish, is never employed in the novel, national consciousness is evoked nonetheless. At one point in the novel, when Nezih imagines marrying İzmaro, he receives news from a friend that the Diyapulos' family is willing to marry the women to anyone, "even to a Turk" ("Türk'e de verirler"). This piece of information momentarily eliminates an obstacle to uniting with his beloved, but instead of bringing him satisfaction, it decreases her value in his eyes. He wonders why no candidates presented themselves if the family is willing to marry them to anyone, especially since Nezih witnessed many stylish men courting her at the garden. İzmaro's constructed otherness, in terms of language and nationality, then, creates a barrier preventing Nezih in his mind from ever uniting with her while it draws boundaries within the Ottoman community.

If the bridge represents a translation zone in which boundaries are drawn, it is also a place that evokes problems in writing in cross-cultural exchange. Returning to the last sentence of the novel quoted above where Nezih is in the middle of the bridge: "And under his feet were green, dark, menacing waves, like ridiculing symbols of enigma that can't be solved, forming query-lines, they were each running far, very far away." What are these lines of query that seem to escape Nezih? In the Ottoman Turkish, the neologistic expression reads "hatt-ı istifham,"[161] where "hat" can mean line, in the sense of a long mark, and it can mean writing. Each flowing wave comes to represent a dark line of writing that produces a sense of fear in Nezih for its incomprehensibility. The lines of writing are qualified by "istifham," which means question, and in a literary context can refer to rhetorical questions designed to emphasize sentiments in

---

[161] In his article "Parlak Tabirler," Hüseyin Cahit analyzed the contentious expression "nazlı bir hatt-ı istifham" ("a coquettish query-line") coined by Tevfik Fikret in his poem "Bisiklet." Hüseyin Cahit found the expression "valuable" for its ability to transmit the poet's conflicting inner experience as he observes a beautiful woman who, riding a bicycle, quickly passes him by and disappears. She both attracts him and makes him aware of her inaccessibility with her "coquettish query-line."

aesthetic writing. In the Ottoman Turkish version (1914), the novel ends in a final "istifham," (or "istifham işareti"), an oversized question mark just under the novel's final sentence.[162] Is this conspicuous punctuation mark deployed in order to put into question the entire novel? Is it to put into question Nezih as a Turkish intellectual and writer? Or is it to emphasize the sentiments of the Turkish intellectual in the translation zone, in which uncertainty for the future and mourning for the past vie with each other?

---

[162] The Turkish edition omits the question mark.

Chapter 3
Remapping Interiority: Psychological Narratives

If the Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement participated in changing the Ottoman Turkish language through processes of translation as modernization, integral to this process were other translative writing practices including translating modes of representation. In particular, Edebiyat-ı Cedide prose writers identified psychological realism as a powerful mode for the creation of narratives at the cross-roads of aesthetics and science, enabling them to simultaneously reinvent the self in aesthetic language and engage questions of modernity. These questions are most profoundly explored in Mehmet Rauf's novel *Eylül* ("September," serialized in *Servet-i Fünun* in 1900) and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel *Aşk-ı Memnu* ("Forbidden Love," serialized in *Servet-i Fünun* in 1899), novels that thematize extramarital love and its complications in order to peer inside the characters' complex states of mind. I examine the kind of problems Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers encountered as they tried to negotiate a subject position for themselves between tradition and modernity through translative writing. As an indicator of such a negotiation, I emphasize the importance of productive distortion of literary forms, narrative devices, themes and symbology and surplus meaning (meaning that cannot be neatly traced back to foreign influences or local tradition) that make change possible.

The Edebiyat-ı Cedide movement is credited with the introduction and mastery of psychological narratives in Ottoman Turkish, and the emergence of such narratives is attributed to the strict censorship of the time which encompassed journalism and fiction alike. Indeed, the psychologism of Edebiyat-ı Cedide fiction stands in stark contrast to the socially engaged narratives of the Tanzimat that overtly voiced problems of the empire. But, to claim that Edebiyat-ı Cedide fiction is politically disengaged would be to deny the politics of translative

writing.[163] In his memoir, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil reveals his impression of the political climate of the period when he was drafting *Mai ve Siyah*: "Bunu başka türlü tasavvur ederdim. O zamanın hayatından, idaresinden, memleketten teneffüs edilen zehirle dolu havadan muzdarip, mariz bir genç, hulasa devrin bütün hayalperest yeni nesli gibi bir bedbaht tasvir etmek isterdim ki ruhunun bütün acılarını haykırsın . . ."[164] [I would have imagined it [*Mai ve Siyah*] differently. I wanted to describe a youth, suffering and ill from the air full of poison that life, the regime, and the nation were breathing; in sum, unfortunate like the new generation of daydreamers of the time. I wanted him to scream all his soul's pain . . .] The conventional conceptualization of the relation between literature and politics as confined to the reflection in fiction of authors' "personal commitment to the social and political issues and struggles of their times"[165] has excluded literature engaged in psychological interpretation and its implications as political. But I argue that the Edebiyat-ı Cedide project of psychologizing literature (the objectification of the inner world through narratives) reveals this limited conceptualization as a symptom of comparative literary modernity and its translational practices. For Halit Ziya, a politically engaged narrative, even if not overtly addressing the political climate, already constitutes psychological interpretation at the level of the individual as a site on which competing theories engage in their struggle for legitimacy and authority. Taking Halit Ziya's revelation together with Cenap Şahabettin's assertion that Edebiyat-ı Cedide was essentially a movement of emotion and thought,[166] we can apprehend that

---

[163] It is important to note that Orhan Koçak argued through the lens of psychoanalysis against the characterization of Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel *Mai ve Siyah* as politically disengaged. My analysis departs somewhat from Koçak's study in that I understand Edebiyat-ı Cedide translative writing practices as politically charged. See "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152.

[164] Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Kırk Yıl*. Ed. Nur Özmel Akın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014. 700.

[165] Jacques Rancière. *The Politics of Literature*. Trans. Julie Rose. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011. 10.

[166] Edebiyat-ı Cedide, insists Cenap Şahabettin, emphasizes a philosophy of sentiments ("hissiyat") and thought ("fikir") and writing must be able to transmit them. See Cenap Şahabettin. "Yeni Tabirat." *Servet-i Fünun*. 331 (1313/1897).

they were conscious of their choices in producing psychological narratives at that particular historical moment. As Edebiyat-ı Cedide writers sought to create a language that expressed a new kind of subjectivity, their writing occasions an interiorization that became the expression of that subjectivity.

Inasmuch as Mehmet Rauf's novel *Eylül* and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novel *Aşk-ı Memnu* are arguably the first novels in Turkish to succeed in narrating the inner world of the individual in its profound depths, literary critics have denounced these novels for creating characters that reflected excessive cosmopolitanism. One of the most influential literary and cultural critics of the twentieth century, Berna Moran, criticized the characters in Edebiyat-ı Cedide novels for not being "woven with local elements" ("yerli öğelerle örülmemiştir") and stressed that "their adventures could have taken place in countries like France or England" ("bunların serüveni Fransa ya da İngiltere gibi ülkelerde yaşanmış olabilirdi").[167] This criticism evokes a deep-seated fear that the self is contaminated by the other in Edebiyat-ı Cedide writing. In the same vein, Edebiyat-ı Cedide novels have received criticism that the details of love in the story smack of influence of French novels.[168] But apprehending love in these novels with paradigms of influence masks other more important tensions at work. We might best understand love in these novels in terms of a "fetishization of love" as a global currency because love in these novels indicates the processes of commodification whereby love acquires exchange-value. In another historical context, Rey Chow asserts that "What is fetishized or commodified is precisely the 'objectivity' or public transparency of love, which progressively becomes the means with which to 'communicate' within the increasingly opaque—because outmoded—Confucian culture, and also

---

[167] Berna Moran. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. 111.

[168] Fethi Naci. *Yüz Yılın 100 Türk Romanı*. Istanbul: Kültür Yayınları, 2007. 23.

with the menacingly opaque—because foreign—world of the technological West."[169] The objectivity of love, in the Ottoman context, communicates within an increasingly changing Ottoman culture. Through this lens, love, and more so forbidden love, becomes less an imported idea than it does a means of communicating a new conceptualization of the individual.

Concepts of the individual lie at the heart of literary reform encompassed in Edebiyat-ı Cedide literature, as is the construction of modern subjects. I will explore the new meanings that came forth from the way in which Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors imagined the modern individual and how they identified the psychological vocabulary and themes to represent it. In particular, I trace how established words like "ruh" ("soul") and "hüviyet" ("identity," or "subjectivity") get reinscribed in their novels and attend to the double haunting that embody them. Reinscribing these words occurs in the process of narration and thus requires a detailed examination of significant passages in the novels. As registering the interiorization of the individual was their primary focus, these writers experimented in forms of narration and figurative writing in unprecedented ways. Mehmet Rauf and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil register the emergence of subjectivity in Ottoman culture as self-reflective through the representation of their protagonists with free indirect discourse, interior monologue, psycho-narration, or representation of consciousness in the third person, among other kinds of narrative remapping of the inner world. This foregrounding of the interior world of the subject changed the relationship between the representation and the experience of reality and thus cannot be understood as being neutral.

---

[169] Rey Chow. *Women and Chinese Modernity: The Politics of Reading between West and East*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1991. 71.

***Eylül*: The Dark Recesses of the Soul**

In Chapter 1, I examined Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil and Mehmet Rauf's employment of "hikaye" as a substitute for "roman," the French term for novel. In their discourse on modern writing, both writers insisted upon the objective psychological analysis of the human mind and sentiments as the very integral components of what could be termed a realist novel in Ottoman Turkish. They legitimized their vision of modern literature on the basis of its close association to the concept of the psyche derived from contemporary European theories of psychology. In this chapter I ask how they employed words and expressions that engaged translated knowledge of the self. It is important to note, however, that concepts of the human mind and theories of the self were already well established in Ottoman Turkish as a product of Ottoman interculture, including Islamic epistemology and ontology. But in the last quarter of the nineteenth century the Ottoman Turkish words used for such concepts had begun to acquire new meanings through translations from European languages. The initial stage of forming hypothetical equivalence between Ottoman Turkish and French in this category of knowledge began by processes of approximating the Ottoman concept of "ruh," with its Arabic etymology meaning "breath" and eventually "soul,"[170] to the French loan-word "psikoloji," a phonetic transcription of "psychologie." This approximation is apparent in the first Ottoman book about psychology in the European sense, written in 1872 by Hoca Tahsin (1812-1880), whose title draws on this French loan-word followed by its Ottoman Turkish translation: *Psikoloji, yahut İlm-i Ahval-i Ruh* ("Psychology, or

---

[170] E.E. Calverley and I.R. Netton. "Nafs." *Encyclopedia of Islam, Second Edition*. Ed. P. Bearman et al. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0833

the Science of the States of the Soul").[171] Viewing psychology as an apparatus for Ottoman modernization, Hoca Tahsin's choice of associating the French loan-word with the conventional Ottoman concept of the soul ("ruh") could not be a neutral decision.[172] Following Hoca Tahsin's book, in 1876 Yusuf Kemal published *Gayet-ul Beyan fi Hakikat-ul İnsan Yahut İlm-i Ahval-i Ruh* ("Definitive Explanation of the True Essence of Humankind or the Science of the States of the Soul"), which employs "ilm-i ahval-i ruh" to stand in for "psikoloji." As it has been pointed out elsewhere, both authors preferred "ilm-i ahval-i ruh" ("science of the states of the soul") to "ilm'ün-nefs" ("science of the self") as a hypothetical equivalence of "psychologie."[173] Thus they preferred drawing on "ruh" ("soul") instead of "nefs" ("self") in discourses on psychology.

Like other Ottomans in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Mehmet Rauf draws on the term "ruh" to form neologistic constructions to represent the inner psychological world of the individual. Mehmet Rauf, like Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, forms new meanings with "ruh" by employing it in neologistic expressions and drawing on narrative devices to render them visible and representing their "truth" in psychological narratives. "The mind becomes analyzable," insists Lydia Liu in the Chinese context, "when terms like *xinli* [psyche] and *yuwang* [desire] become translatable and when translingual modes of narration begin to reconfigure what is real and what is unreal about the human mind."[174] In the Turkish context, the terms "ruh" and

---

[171] Aydan Gulerce. "History of Psychology in Turkey as a Sign of Diverse Modernization and Global Psychologization." *Internationalizing the History of Psychology*. Ed. Adrian C. Brock. New York: New York University Press, 2006. 75-93. 78-79.

[172] Hoca Tahsin was sent to France by Reşid Paşa to study natural sciences in an effort to create a "Westernized ulema elite." For more on Hoca Tahsin's life, see Şerif Mardin. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000. 222.

[173] See Rüya Kılıç. "Türkiye'de Modern Psikolojinin Tarihi: İlm-i Ahval-i Ruh İlm'ün-nefs/Ruhiyyat." *Kebikeç*. 40. 2015: 21-36.

[174] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity—China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 132.

"hüviyet" ("subjectivity")[175] are the translingual psychological concepts that render the interiority of the individual analyzable. The translatability of words becomes possible, as Liu argues, when their meanings are constructed as hypothetical equivalence. Examining the historicity of the terms employed by Mehmet Rauf and Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil helps me probe the connotations of the individual in these writers' psychological narratives.

In meditating on the meanings of "ruh" to identify nuances of psychological states, Mehmet Rauf's main objective is to stake out the territory of the possibilities for representing psychic depth in realism. It is not a coincidence that around the same time his novel *Eylül* was serialized in *Servet-i Fünun*, Mehmet Rauf published an article in the same journal on the French novelist and critic Paul Bourget (1852-1935), who explored the representations of inner psychological life that he claimed contemporary literary currents like realism had neglected.[176] In his article, Mehmet Rauf contemplates psychological vocabulary and offers hypothetical equivalences in Ottoman Turkish in forming new compound expressions. In invoking Bourget as an authority on the psychological narrative, Mehmet Rauf claims that he discovered the meaning of "soul" ("ruh") by reading Bourget's work. Unlike Hoca Tahsin and Yusuf Kemal before him, Mehmet Rauf draws on "ruhiye" to mean "psychology," as is apparent in his translation of the title of Bourget's critical essay "Essais de psychologie contemporaine" (1885) as "Ahval-i Ruhiye-i Muasirin" (or, "States of Contemporary Psychology").[177] A few other examples of terms he uses for "psychology" include "psychological novel" as "ruhi roman" and "psychological examination" as "tetkik-i ruhi."

---

[175] The modern translation of "hüviyet" is "identity." I analyze this term below.

[176] Mehmet Rauf's article on Paul Bourget appears in issue 423 and the first segment of *Eylül* appears in issue 482 of *Servet-i Fünun*.

[177] The Turkish term "ruhbilim" (literally "soul-science") would later replace "ruhi/ruhiye" and "ruhiyyat" to signify "psychologie." But ultimately the loan-word "psikoloji" would gain favor and supplant "ruhbilim."

Finding Bourget's work particularly powerful as a scientific study of the human mind and sentiments, Mehmet Rauf explains Bourget's technique as not only representing the psychology of humankind, but objectively exposing it. This kind of analysis makes known obscure truths, a kind of realism that "disrupts the soul" by laying bare a character's inner world without the interference of an intrusive omniscient narrator: "Ruh ile o kadar meşgul olan bir muharrir—daima rahatsız edip en gizli sırlarını bile keşif ve ifşaya çalıştığından olmalı—ruhu o kadar rahatsız etmiştir ki hikayeleri bunun ziyaretinden mahrum kalmıştır denilebilir."[178] [An author who is so preoccupied with the soul disturbs it so much—it must be because he always tries disturbing [the soul] by discovering and exposing even its innermost secret—that we can say the stories are deprived of the author's presence.] What is disturbing to the soul, according to Mehmet Rauf, is the exposure of its interiority without authorial presence. Thus, it is as if the interiority is projected outward against its will since the very nature of the "innermost secrets"—that which is inaccessible to the individual, the unconscious—is its concealment.

The most interesting way of exposing the recesses of the inner world, for Mehmet Rauf, is through a meticulous analysis (a "teşrih," or "dissection" of sorts) of the effects on the psychological and emotional processes of the individual that love produces. Commenting on the ills of society, Mehmet Rauf writes:

> Ve şüphe yoktur ki bu emrazın en mühimi, en müessiri aşktır. Aşk bütün kuva ve melekat-ı vücudiyemizin bir hayal önünde ihlal etmesi demek olduğuna göre tekmil mevcudiyet-i maddiye ve maneviyemizin bu afetten zarardide olması tabiidir. Aşktır ki bir tecellisi ile bütün ruhumuzu sarsar, havas ve melekatımızı kendi seyr ve harekâtına tabi kılar. Tasvir-i ahval-ı ruhiyeye temayül eden Bourget'de işte bunun için ruhi en iyi ve en manidar safahatıyla gösteren aşkla meşgul olmuş, zamanının aşkında gördüğü bütün anat-ı ihlal ve temerruzu tedkik ve kayd etmiştir. Halbuki zamanı dimağı ve bedeni suiistimalat ile harab ve münhedim olmuş meshuf ve mahmum bir batnın zamanı olduğundan aşkın yalnız sefil ve mülevves, sefih ve mazlum taraflarını en ibtidai âlâminden en feci ihtizarlarına kadar kaydetmiştir.

---

[178] Mehmet Rauf. "Paul Bourget ve *Bir Cinayet-i Aşk.*" *Servet-i Fünun*. 423. 1315/1899.

And there is no doubt that of these diseases the most important, the most influential is love. Since love is imaginary, it infringes upon the forces and faculties of our existence. It is natural that all of our material and spiritual existence suffer injury from this catastrophe. It is love that jars our entire soul when it becomes manifest and it subjects our senses and faculties to its own conduct. Bourget, who inclines toward the description of psychological states, was for this reason occupied with love while showing the soul in his best and most meaningful pages. He analyzed and recorded moments of infringement and sickness that he saw in love during his life. However, because the era was ruined with the misuse of the mind and body by a greatly desirous and feverish generation, he recorded only the filthy, dissolute and oppressed aspects of love, from the most primitive sorrows to the most terrible agonies.

Mehmet Rauf argues that carefully examining the individual's psychological states when effected by love exposes the hidden, dark workings of the mind, thereby advancing knowledge of the realities of human interiority and its relationship to exteriority. As his article attests, Mehmet Rauf evokes Bourget to validate psychological narratives and their significance in Ottoman Turkish writing as a production of knowledge of the individual self.

By critical consensus Mehmet Rauf's novel *Eylül* holds a significant place in Turkish literary historiography as the first "psychological novel" and as Mehmet Rauf's masterpiece.[179] For Mehmet Rauf, modernizing the psychological narrative exposes the workings of the obscure aspects of the inner world through narrative stylistics. Focusing on the inaccessible aspects of the human mind, Mehmet Rauf explores repression and displacement within the broader context of psychological narratives. Darkness for Mehmet Rauf symbolized psychological content that is

---

[179] Evaluating *Eylül* decades later, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil praises it for what he terms its "sincere realism." By this he means that the realism of Mehmet Rauf's novel grounds itself in a lived experience by the author, a claim that both annuls any criticism of imitating European novels so prevalent in Turkish criticism and validates the knowledge produced in his psychological narrative. For Halit Ziya, *Eylül*'s value is "onun baştan başa samimi olmasıdır; samimi idi, zira muharrir onun bütün nescini kendi aşk ve hülya benliğinin elyafıyla dokumuş, işlemiş; denebilir ki ruhunu kitabının içine serbest bir akışla salıvermiştir. Edebi kıymetten başka muharririn şahsi hüviyeti itibarıyla dikkati calib olan bu eser öyle müstesna bir mevki tutar ki muharririn bütün diğer yazılarını ihmal etmek için bize hak verebilir . . ." [its sincerity from start to finish. It was sincere because the author wove, embroidered, the fibers of his own, personal love and imagination into the entire fabric [of his novel]. It could be said that he released his soul freely into his book. In addition to its literary value, this work, attracting attention in terms of the writer's personal identity, holds such an exceptional standing that it allows us to ignore all his other writing.] Yet, even if the hearsay about the author's own experience of forbidden love exudes a certain "authentic" aura, his experience remains extraneous when we consider the performativity of realism itself. See Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Sanata Dair*. Eds. Sacit Ayhan and Levent Ali Çanaklı. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014. 673.

not completely accessible to the self—or, aspects of the unconscious mind—like the doppelganger, repressed content, and other forces beyond one's control. If the psychological narrative represented a scientific quest for the self, Edebiyat-ı Cedide could be understood as productively distorting the psychological through aestheticization. For, as I have highlighted in Chapters 1 and 2, Edebiyat-ı Cedide authors experimented with terms used to define psychological states and emotion. Much of the psychological vocabulary employed in *Eylül* draws on symbolism, such as "zulmet-i ruh" ("soul-darkness"), "ruhunun amak-ı leyalinde" ("in a soul's deep-nights"), "zalam-ı ruh" (darkness/oppression-soul), "reng-i hazin" ("melancholic-color"), "siyah bir reng-i endişe" ("a black anxiety-color") and "reng-i husumet" ("enmity-color"). The prominence of color, as examined in Chapter 1, suggests the penchant toward laying claim to knowledge of the real and the unreal in subjectivity rather than in purely positivistic knowledge.

Mehmet Rauf's novel delves into the concept of "forbidden love" between his two main characters, Necip and Suat, and explores the hidden aspects of the individual self through focusing on the repression of sexual desire and the implications of this kind of repression as the two characters negotiate reality. As the primary focal character, Necip's introspective self-evaluation lays bare his inner life. Lengthy passages of interior monologues and psycho-narration interwoven with free indirect discourse reveal his gradual awareness of his sentiments for Suat, a woman married to his cousin and close friend Süreyya. Since Suat is the wife of his relative and close friend, she is, legality notwithstanding, morally forbidden to Necip. What sets this story apart from other novels treating forbidden love is that Suat is not the victim of a poorly arranged marriage. Süreyya treats Suat with respect. Deeply caring for her husband, Suat is a morally upright, sincere and compassionate wife, embodying the very attributes that attract Necip to her. But, Suat's deep sense of her moral obligation to Süreyya inhibits the possibilities for her

relationship with Necip to develop into a sexual relationship. Necip, a stylish, attractive young

man in his thirties has grown tired of the scene in Beyoğlu (the European district in Istanbul) and

finds relief from its superficiality in the company of Süreyya and Suat, whose relationship

represents for him unparalleled genuineness. He frequents their home, first in spring at his aunt's

family mansion ("köşk"), then during the summer at Süreyya and Suat's sea-side summer house

("yalı"), and finally again at the family's mansion in the fall. According to the typical well-heeled

family structure of the time, the father "Beyefendi" and mother "Hanımefendi" reside in the same

home with their two children and their children's spouses. However, Süreyya, restless in his

parent's home, desperately wants to rent a sea-side summer home to escape the monotony of his

family life.[180] His wife of five years, Suat, senses this and, in hopes of reviving her marriage that

has gradually lost its initial excitement, brings Süreyya's dream to fruition by securing money

from her father. But at their new sea-side home, Süreyya becomes increasingly preoccupied with

sailing and fishing, leaving his wife alone and feeling neglected. As a frequent visitor to the

couple's sea-side home, Necip fills Suat's need for companionship and a bond forms between

them through their shared passion for European music.

The concept of love, and by extension sexual desire, becomes the vehicle for depicting a

bifurcated self, split between the operations of the unconscious and conscious minds.[181] From the

outset of the novel, due to his troubling experiences with adulterous women, Necip develops a

deep aversion for marriage and strongly opposes it until Suat earns his profound admiration. As

he persistently observes Suat, he unwittingly projects onto her his own desire for an intense

---

[180] Fethi Naci observes that Süreyya resents his father for not helping him rent a house by the sea. See Fethi Naci. *Yüz Yılın 100 Türk Romanı*. Istanbul: Kültür Yayınları, 2007.

[181] This bears witness to the degree in which Mehmet Rauf and, as I will demonstrate below, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil were engaged in theories of psychology including the unconscious on the eve of Freud's introduction of psychoanalysis which would be published as *Die Traumdeutung* ("The Interpretation of Dreams") at the end of 1899.

relationship and his image of the desired wife. But his feelings, of which he is not entirely aware, create a psychological tension between his affection for Süreyya and his desire for Suat. Thus, Necip's unconscious automatically represses his desire for his cousin/friend's wife and immediately displaces it onto an acceptable figure who takes the form of an imaginary substitute bride. In this way, Necip's desire for Suat remains unarticulated in his conscious mind. After ruminating over the possibility of marriage, Necip decides to express his interest in marriage to Suat on the condition that his future bride resemble her. But he feels that something inexplicable prevents him from expressing this to Suat: "bunda bir mahzur görmemek istiyor, lakin bir türlü o kelimeleri telaffuz edemiyordu" (95). [he did not want to not see anything forbidden about this, but he just could not articulate the words.] Surprised at his inability to express his interest in marriage, Necip remains silent until an occasion for him to articulate his intention finally arises. Suat, who knows eligible women, enquires about what kind of woman he would find suitable as a bride. Again unable to articulate his thoughts, he becomes petrified. But when she insists on an answer, he feels obligated to say "Sizin gibi olsun" ("Someone like you"). Immediately upon voicing these words that had been occupying his mind for so long, he blushes without knowing the reason. Even though Necip tries to justify to Suat why he wants to marry a woman with her qualities, they both experience the sense of embarrassment ("mahcubiyet"). This sentiment resurfaces later when at dinner, Suat brings up the topic of marriage to Süreyya. Necip, again blushing without knowing the reason, thinks Suat will disclose Necip's confession to Süreyya. But instead she explains that Necip is "quite difficult to please" ("Pek müşkülpesent de…"). Suat's silence about Necip's confession engenders a sense of euphoria for a brief moment: "bir saniye bütün ruhu haz içinde kaldı" (97) [for a second his entire soul was delighted]. Even if his euphoria is framed as delight in sharing a secret with Suat, Necip essentially avoids exposure to Süreyya of his desires for someone like his wife.

Necip's inner tension between repression and revelation becomes nearly transparent to himself and ultimately, he can no longer ignore probing the meanings of such a tension. But until then the tension remains opaque to him. In moments like this, his thoughts reflect how repressed desire is revealed in language. For instance, Necip imagines Suat is addressing him when she is addressing her husband:

> "Uyuyor musun?" diye bir sesin fısıldadığını hissetti, titredi. Suat'ın hitabına başını kaldırıp bakınca bunu kendine değil, zevcinin sandalyesine eğilmiş, ona sorduğunu gördü. Bu seste öyle bir hararet-i der-aguş, öyle hatırat-ı ezvak ile lerzan bir aheng-i mahremiyet vardı ki bütün bu zevc ve zevce samimiyet ve saadetini gösteriyordu. Birbirine böyle "Sen" diye hitap etmenin bahtiyarlığını şimdi anlamış, kendine hitap ediyor zannettiği Suat'ın sesindeki hararet onu eritmiş idi. Şimdi bu hitabın kendine olmadığını anlamaktan mahzun, makhur oldu. Ah bulsaydı, kendine bu sesle, bu nazarla "Sen" diyecek kadını bulsaydı . . . "Evet, bu nazarı, bu sesi, bu kadını bulabilsem…" diye tekrar etti (82).

> He felt a voice whisper, "Are you sleeping?" and he trembled. When he looked up to Suat, he saw that she had asked not him, but her husband as she was leaning over his chair. In her voice, there was such embracing warmth, such harmony of secrecy, trembling with pleasurable memories that it showed the husband and wife's sincerity and happiness. Now he understood the fortunateness of addressing each other with "Sen" ["You," familiar]. The warmth in Suat's voice that he thought was addressing him melted him. Now he became sad, defeated in understanding that she was not addressing him after all. Ah if he could only find a woman who would say "Sen" to him with this voice and this gaze . . . He reprised, "Yes, if I can find this gaze, this voice, this woman…"

Necip's repressed desire operates at the border between his consciousness and unconsciousness in language. That Necip believes for a brief moment that Suat addresses him indicates a momentary possibility of his repressed feelings becoming known to him. Suat would not have addressed Necip with the familiar register "Sen," she would have used the formal "Siz." His misidentification indicates his longing for the kind of intimacy with her that the familiar linguistic register embodies. Once he realizes that her addressee is her husband, Necip redirects his desire to her imaginary substitute.

Necip's repressed desire threatens his conception of his self as completely knowable and points to irrational and subconscious forces beyond his control. As a marker of the internal

tension Necip experiences, the repressed content haunts Necip in the form of images and inner voices. The mirror is a device in the novel that exposes this problem in the form of a double, where "the imaginary starts to coincide with the real, provoking a shattering anxiety."[182] It is not a coincidence that the mirror occupies an important place in *Eylül* (and in *Aşk-ı Memnu*, as we will see below). In mythologies, explains Mladen Dolar, the mirror image was the immaterial double of the body and constituted the individual's essential self. Asserting that psychoanalysis agrees with this line of logic, Dolar points out that for Lacan, it is only by virtue of one's mirror reflection that one can establish oneself as an "I."

The mirror implies a split between the real and the imaginary. At one point in the story—after elevating Suat to the status of an ideal woman—Necip believes that Suat deceives her husband, which puts his perception of her into question. When the trio descends to the garden by the sea, a handsome young man across from them catches their attention. Süreyya asks Suat if she knows him and after a brief hesitation, she replies in the negative. But Necip, certain that he has seen this young man on various occasions looking carefully in the direction of the sea-side home, senses a stir in his soul: "Bir anda, o zaman bir saniyede eski Necip, şüpheli, asabi, muzlim Necip tekrar uyandı" (98). [In one moment, then, in one second the old Necip, the suspicious, irritable, dark Necip awoke again.] As he recollects Suat's seemingly harmless behaviors of late with suspicion, "the old Necip" recasts Suat as an adulterous woman. "The old Necip" contrasts "the new Necip" and marks a temporal difference between his prevailing understanding of reality. What causes Necip to be overcome by pessimism is that he imagines Suat sharing a secret with someone other than Süreyya, reducing her to "all women."

> O delikanlının nazarıyla kendilerini görüyordu; bu evvela o kadar kesif bir acılıkla
> kendini yaktı ki; "Öldürürüm" diye söylendi. Evet, kendinde o çocuğu öldürebilmek

---

[182] Mladen Dolar. "'I Shall Be with You on your Wedding-Night': Lacan and the Uncanny." *October*. 58 (autumn 1991): 5-23. 13.

kabiliyetini görüyordu, bazen bir avdet oluyordu, aynanın karşısına geçip elleriyle
şakaklarını yumruklayarak "Suat, Suat… Lakin bu nasıl mümkün olur? Ooh değildir, ben
fena, fena bir adamım…" dediği oluyordu; fakat Suat'a dikkat ettikçe onu tanıdığı gibi
değil, pek başka türlü bir kadın görüyordu. Onun sükununda, hilminde korkunç
fırtınaların rad ve berkini görür gibi oluyordu . . . (103).

He saw themselves through the eyes of the young man; this was for the first time such a
dense burning pain that he murmured, "I'll kill him." Yes, he saw in himself the ability to
kill that guy. There were times when he went back on it and went in front of the mirror,
punching his temples said "Suat, Suat… but how is this possible? Oh, it's not, I'm evil,
I'm an evil man…" But when he watched Suat he saw that she was not as he had known
her, she was a different kind of woman. In her tranquility and her gentleness, it was as if
he saw terrible storms of thunder and lightening . . .

Unable to decipher which of his perceptions of Suat is accurate (sincere woman or adulteress),

Necip struggles with his self-knowledge, questioning what is real and what is unreal. For it is his

imagination that constructs Suat as an adulteress. The mirror here forces Necip to confront his

inner self in crisis. When asking himself in the mirror how Suat could be an adulterous woman,

his reflection on her as an evil woman turns inward to himself as the evil one, capable of

besmearing the woman he idealizes and of murdering a man out of anger and jealousy.

Even after he learns of Suat's innocence, traces of Necip's inner evilness persist. But we

might understand "evil" here, particularly in view that Necip's outer identity rests on his civility

as an educated elite, as primitive impulses and drives that constitute repressed psychic content.

When Necip discovers Suat's innocence and the young man's involvement with the woman next

door, Necip races to his own quarters to experience freely his relieved and jubilant soul. Alone in

his room he re-evaluates Suat, who has now regained her elevated status, when suddenly he is

confronted with an image of himself in the mirror:

Birdenbire karşıdaki aynada kendisini gördü, mütegayyir çehresinde gözleri o kadar garip
bir nazarla bakıyordu ki durdu. Bu gözler sanki aynadan kendine "Niçin?" diye bakıyor
gibi geldi. Evet, bütün bu ateşlerin, kıskançlıkların sebebi neydi? Hem gayr-ı müesses,
gayr-ı müspet olarak? Sonra onun ismini söylerken böyle, sadece "Suat" diye söylerken
bu zevk-ı azim, bütün heyecanlar niçindi? Gözleri camid, karanlık bakıyordu. Bir an oldu
ki aynadan kendine bakan gözlerinden korkarak geri çekildi; sapsarı olmuştu (106-107).

Suddenly he saw himself in the mirror in front of him. His eyes in his altered face had such a strange look that he stopped. It appeared to him as if these eyes in the mirror were asking him "Why?" Yes, what was the reason for all his anger and jealousy? Especially when it was unfounded, unproven? And then saying her name like that, getting great pleasure from just saying "Suat," what was all this excitement about? His eyes, fixed and dark, were watching. All of a sudden, he withdrew, afraid of the eyes looking at him from the mirror. He turned ghastly pale.

The doppelganger in the mirror that threatens to reveal Necip's repressed desire for Suat represents "a sense of identity and even of reality that the subject obtains from its ego" in which it harbors "irreality, deception, and non-identity."[183] Only partially aware of this, Necip attempts to escape the terrifying gaze of his double.

Following Jacques Derrida, Karatani Kojin argues that "interiority is brought into being through a sense of the presence of one's own voice, to which one listens."[184] If the voice is that which is most immediate to the self in establishing the illusion of transparency, for Necip, the experience of listening to his own inner voice, which is polyphonic, is frightening:

> "Lakin bu sade bir hıyanet, en büyük alçaklık…" demek istiyordu. Fakat ondaki muhtelif Neciplerden biri bunu söylerken bir diğeri gülerek, "Bey tiyatro oynuyor!" derdi. Bir diğeri ikisine de bigane kalarak muhalif davranır, sade onu, saadetini, Suat'ını düşünürdü. Ve kendisi bu muhtelif şahsiyetlerin elinde oyuncak, sefil, şimdi buna, şimdi ötekine münkad ve ram olarak, iradesiz, bir şey yapmak ihtimali olmaksızın, gidiyordu. Ve korkuyordu; ara sıra kendi zulmet-i ruhuna bakıp ne hainliklere kadir olduğunu görerek kendinden korkuyordu (115).

> He wanted to say, "Yet this is simply treachery, the greatest despicableness…" But saying this one of the various Necips inside him would say laughing at the other, "The man is playacting!" Another would oppose both of them by remaining distant and would think of only her, of happiness, of Suat. And he was going as a toy, miserable in the hands of these various personalities, submissive and tame to this one, then to that one, involuntary, without the possibility of doing anything. And he was afraid; he was afraid of himself when he looked into his soul's darkness and saw what kind of treachery he was capable of.

---

[183] Samuel Weber. *Return to Freud: Jacques Lacan's Dislocation of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Michael Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 13-14.

[184] Karatani Kojin. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Ed. Brett de Bary. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993. 69.

Necip imagines the universality of the obscure aspects of the mind in comparing the exteriority and interiority of the individual. Observing the intimacy between Suat and Süreyya as they spoke softly to each other prompts Necip to question their apparent happiness and compares their appearance and inner depth with his own. His rumination of what sort of obscure things they may have hidden in their inner recesses leads to self-reflexivity as he asks himself "Evet, kim bilir sizde de neler vardır? Uyuyan yahut gizlenmiş neler vardır?" (73). ["Yes, who knows what things are inside you? What dormant or hidden things are there?"] He imagines how disgusted Suat and Süreyya would be if they were able to peer inside his mind and discover his jealousy of their happy, sincere relationship:

> Ve Necip işte kendisi de kendinden iğreniyor ve asıl onu bu muazzep ediyordu. Yine o dimağiyetin sesi yükselerek "Lakin herkesin hayatında da böyle başkalarının iğrenç bulacakları anlar vardır" demek istiyordu. Fakat onu öldüren herkesten ziyade kendisinin fenalığı idi. Kendine hürmet edememek kadar onu muazzep eden hal yoktu. Kendinden korktuğu, zulmet-i ruhundan bir tehaşi-i istikrah duyduğu zamanlar, "Ah ne mülevves bir muammayım!" diyerek kendindeki bu iki ruhu, bu bazen hep mavi ve saf, fakat ekseriya böyle hun-alud, murdar maneviyetleri düşünür, daimi bir ses olmak üzere içinde kendine "Canavar!" diye hitap eden bir vicdan bulurdu (73).

> And Necip was also disgusted with himself and [his self-disgust] was truly tormenting him. Again, the voice of those thoughts getting louder wanted to say, "But in everyone's life there are moments that others could find disgusting like this." But what was killing him was not others but his own evilness. He had no strength to even disrespect himself, which tormented him. Whenever he feared himself or felt dread-aversion[185] of his soul's darkness, he said "Ah I am such a filthy enigma!" These two souls inside him, this one sometimes always blue and innocent, but mostly he would think interiorly bloodstained, indecent as such, and he would find a conscience that was always on the brink of addressing him from within as "Monster!"

As Necip's inner voices grow louder, he cannot but listen to them, which further troubles him. Shouting "filthy enigma" and "monster," the inner voices draw his attention to hidden things within that reveal modern subjectivity as frightening.

---

[185] The terms "dread-aversion" ("tehaşi-i istikrah") form a neologistic compound.

Suat, for her part, remains unaware of her desire for Necip until an affair between them is suggested to her by Süreyya's sister immediately followed by news of Necip's illness much later in the novel. In a moment where the narrative briefly shifts to Suat's perspective, she has just received news from Süreyya that Necip has fallen ill with typhoid fever and was in the clutches of death. Distressed over the news, but preserving the appearance of tranquility, Suat is forced to process her feelings in a dream:

> . . . bir gece rüyasında Necip'i ölmüş ve kendini onun ölüsü üstünde saçlarını yoluyor gördü. Oh bu mahuf bir rüya… Namütenahi zulmetli bir gece idi; Necip ölmüş, orada yatıyordu ve o bütün vüduduyla ağlayarak 'Necip, Necip!' diye haykırıyordu. Bu feci, matem-alud bir ses, bir ağlama idi. Uyandığı zaman yüksek bir yerden düşmüş gibi vücudunu hurdahaş buldu. Fakat ağlamak hala mevcuttu, yalnız yaş çıkmıyordu, çeneleri kilitlenmiş, şakakları ateş içinde terlemişti. Birden bu terleri buz gibi hissetti; bir saniye bilmeyerek, sebebini bulamayarak ağlamak arzusuna mukavemet edemedi; o feryat, o 'Necip, Necip!' feryadı hala sürükleniyordu (142).

> . . . one night she dreamt that Necip was dead and she saw herself tearing out her hair over his dead body. Oh, this frightful dream… It was an infinitely dark night; Necip was dead, he was lying over there and she was in tears screaming with her entire body "Necip, Necip!" This was a painful voice, marked with grief, a lamentation. When she woke, she found her body fragmented as if fallen from a high place, her jaws locked shut, her temples had feverishly perspired. Suddenly her sweat felt like ice; she could not resist the desire to cry without for a second knowing or finding the reason; that scream, that "Necip, Necip!" scream was still ringing out.

The image of Suat ripping out her hair and screaming with all her might contrasts sharply with the tranquil and quiet characteristics she exhibits throughout the novel. As she is frequently reticent in her daily life, her scream might be understood as a deployment of power. Even after she wakes up, the scream echoes in her ears. Clearly, Suat's dream of herself mourning Necip's death exposes repressed sentiments for Necip of which she is not conscious. The dream content processes a turning point in Necip and Suat's relationship when Suat's servant ("dadı") returns from a visit to Süreyya's family. Suat's servant acts as a messenger, bringing Suat news from the family, particularly from her sister-in-law Hacer who enquires about the whereabouts of Necip. Learning that Necip often frequents Süreyya and Suat's sea-side home, Hacer insinuates that

135

Necip and Suat are involved in an affair and that Süreyya is blind not to recognize it. Hearing this news forces Suat to question herself and her relationship with Necip which up until that moment she considered simply a friendship. As a representative of "society," Hacer is instrumental in the story for causing Suat to begin questioning her feelings for Necip and reevaluating his intentions toward her. Suat, desperate to see Necip when she learns of his illness, cannot tell her husband that she would like to visit him for fear that her husband and others misconstrue her words and actions. Thus, her dream proves much more powerful in processing her feelings, particularly since she awakens to the possibility of love just when Necip's life is threatened.

After Necip can no longer repress his desire for Suat, he creates a narrative for himself to assuage the guilt he feels for betraying Süreyya. Through lengthy interior monologues, Necip convinces himself that he loves Suat's soul and not her body, thus apparently circumventing the feelings of guilt and betrayal. Even if he takes his narrative as truth, the unconscious produces symptoms that suggest otherwise. In an earlier scene, when Necip has not yet discovered that he loves Suat, he is particularly drawn to Suat's possessions and her hands: "Necip şemsiyeye, çarşafa, peçeye, eldivene, bu kadın şeylerindeki zarafet ve nehafete umk-ı ruhunda iştiyaklarla titreyen bir meftuniyetle bakıyor, sonra Suat'ın küçük, bir küçük kuş denilecek ellerinin şemsiyeyi tutuşundaki şiire hayran olarak perişan oluyordu" (68). [Necip was looking at the umbrella, the overgarment, the veil, the gloves, all the elegance and fineness of these female possessions with a passion that shook him with ardent desire in the depths of his soul, then, amazed at the poetic way in which she held the umbrella with little hands the size of a small bird, he became forlorn.] As Necip watches Suat sitting next to her husband, Necip addresses her in his mind, further revealing his fascination with her hands and how he ascribes meaning to them:

> Necip onların söylediklerine artık dikkat etmeyerek kendi kendine, 'Evet sizin elleriniz! Diyordu. 'Ben de onun için mi böyle vahşiyim acaba?' Sonra başını sallayarak 'Beni bu hale getiren sizin elleriniz, o sizin nescinizdeki nezakete, kadınlığa bakarak insanın

ağlamak istediği güzel kadın elleri değil mi?' diye düşünüyordu. Fakat acaba harap eden eller olduğu gibi şifa, hayat veren eller de var mıydı? (77).

Necip, not paying attention anymore to what they were saying, said to himself, "Yes, your hands!" "I wonder if it's because of them that I am wild like this." Then he nodded his head thinking, "Your hands are what got me like this, looking at that delicacy in your tissue, at your womanhood that makes a person want to cry are those beautiful woman's hands, are they not?" But I wonder if just as there are hands that ruin, there are hands that cure, give life.

As someone who is disgusted with life, Necip sees himself as a wounded man in need of a woman's caring hands to cure him. Still gazing at Suat, Necip continues asking her in his mind: "Acaba senin ellerin gibi ulvi eller bu yaraları sarabilir mi?" [I wonder if sublime hands like yours can dress these wounds.] In this interior exchange, Necip has shifted unconsciously from the formal second person to the familiar second person, again revealing his repressed desire for intimacy with her.

Once Necip realizes that he loves Suat, her imaginary substitute (or the idea of marrying someone like Suat) loses its appeal. As a mechanism of defense against guilt/taboo, Necip's unconscious transfers his desire from Suat's body to an object that represents her body, what Freud called fetishism. One day Necip enters a sea hamam and, in almost a dreamlike state, believes to catch Suat's scent in the water. The thought that she was in the water in her swimsuit before him gives him a feeling of intoxication. The same day, as Necip leaves Süreyya and Suat's sea-side house, he notices her umbrella and gloves lying on top of the piano. Bringing one of her gloves close to his face to inhale its scent, he thinks: "Oh, her zaman havada olan bu rayiha işte şimdi elinde idi; ve eldivenlerin nesci o kadar onun eli gibi nerm ve rakik idi ki sahihten onun ellerini kokluyormuş gibi geliyordu. Bir an oldu ki bunları alıp saklamak ne büyük bir saadet olduğunu acı bir hasretle düşündü ve bir cinayet yapıyor gibi titreyerek, sapsarı, bunların birini cebine soktu" (126). [Oh, this fragrance that is always in the air was now in his hands; and the fabric of the gloves was so much like her soft, slender hands that it seemed as though he were

smelling her real hands. Suddenly, he thought with a bitter longing that it would be a great fortune/happiness to keep them and he thrust one of them into his pocket, sallow, shaking as if he were committing homicide.] When smelling the glove, he imagines he is smelling her body. Necip transfers sexual meaning to her glove as the glove comes to represent her hand/body and his taking possession of her glove acquires sexual overtones, as if he has tasted carnal love.

When Suat notices that one of her gloves went missing, she becomes distraught until eventually gives up hope. In Necip's mind, however, the glove becomes the fetish object: "O pür-hayat bir el, sanki Suat'ın eli gibi geliyordu ve bunun eline malik olmak Necip'i saadetinden çıldırtıyordu" (127). [That hand full of life, it was as if it were Suat's hand and owning her hand made Necip crazy with happiness.] In this passage, we see how Necip's fetishization of Suat's glove renders him, in Freud's terms, "artful," as he negotiates reality[186] to compensate for that which is beyond his reach and forbidden to him. Literary critic Murat Belge describes the reality that confronts Necip as an ineluctable condition for fetishism: "Kadının kapalılığı, cinsiyetin yasaklanması, aşk dini, v.b., bu fetişizmi kaçınılmaz kılmaktadır."[187] [The inaccessibility of women, the prohibition of sex, love religion, etc., make this fetishism the inevitable.]

But the glove symbolizes more than simply a sexual fetish. Necip ascribes to it other meanings according to different psychological states in which he finds himself. When Necip contracts typhoid fever, Suat's glove becomes a secret talisman promising to cure his illness, reconnecting with his earlier imagining her hands capable of curing him. Yet, the glove as cure becomes evidence of the tensions within him that disturb his soul when confronted with external reality such as when Süreyya and Suat go to visit Necip at his aunt's (Süreyya's mother, or

---

[186] Sigmund Freud. "The Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defense." In: Thierry Bokanowski and Sergio Lewkowicz, eds. On Freud's "Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence." London: Karnac Books, 2009. 5.
[187] Murat Belge. *Edebiyat Üstüne Yazılar*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994. 309.

"Hanımefendi") house where he is convalescing. They find Necip surrounded by Süreyya's

mother and sister, Hacer. Süreyya's mother suggests Necip's recovery is due to a lady's glove:

> Hanımefendi, Suat'a, "Hiç, hiç değil" diye başını sallıyordu; sonra gülümseyerek: --
> Bereket versin yastığının altındaki hanım eldivenine…dedi. Suat, tayin edemediği acı bir
> his ile ezildi, Necip'in evvela sapsarı kesilerek donduğunu gördü. Necip bir şey
> söylemedi, boğuluyor gibiydi. Sade eliyle inkar eder gibi müphem bir hareket etti ve
> hanımefendi nasıl olup da eldivenin keşfolunduğunu anlatırken Hacer kolunu uzatıp
> şımarık çocuklara mahsus bir teklifsizlikle eldiveni çıkardı, elinde tutarak 'İşte' dedi
> (144).

> Hanımefendi was nodding her head at Suat, "Nothing is not nothing"; and then smiling
> she said, "Thanks to the lady's glove under his pillow…" Suat was crushed with a pain
> that she could not determine. She saw Necip first petrified as he turned yellow. Necip did
> not say anything, it was as if he were chocking. He made an ambiguous movement with
> his hand as if to deny it. As Hanımefendi was explaining how they discovered the glove,
> Hacer reached over and took the glove out with a spoiled child's informality, holding it in
> her hand she said, "Here it is."

Recognizing her own glove, Suat feels terror and delight simultaneously. The exposure of Suat's

glove as cure does more than reveal Necip's love, it also points to Necip's act of transgression

and symbolic sexual resonances.

This exposure operates as a catalyst for Necip and Suat's romance, and they must now

admit their love for each other. Yet they both attempt to dismiss the fetish. Following the

incident, Necip moves to the sea-side home for his recovery upon Süreyya's insistence. Contrary

to his fears, Necip meets a "calm" ("sakin") and "indifferent" ("manasız") Suat, which makes

him think that "she did not understand" ("anlamamış") that the glove belonged to her. Similarly,

finding Necip "respectful" ("hürmetkar") and "humble" ("mütevazı"), Suat thinks that "he did

not detect" ("fark etmemiş") that she recognized her own glove. But upon careful observation of

Suat, Necip notices that her composure had changed slightly since the incident when the glove

was exposed: "Mazi ile mukayese edince Suat'ta şimdi bir reng-i ihtiraz, bir tayin edilmez fazla

ciddiyet, bir telaşa benzeyen endişe görüyor . . . ve bu onu çok mesut ediyordu. Bu bir nev'

muaşaka gibi oluyordu" (149-150). [When he compared her to the past, he now saw in Suat a

precaution-color, an excessive seriousness that could not be determined, an anxiety that appeared like a worry . . . and this made him very happy. It was like a kind of reciprocal love.] Becoming skeptical of his initial interpretation of Suat's behavior, Necip thinks Suat might know about the glove despite appearances to the contrary. The neologistic expression "reng-i ihtiraz" ("precaution-color"), an impressionistic representation of an ambiguous emotional state, implies that the exposure of the glove may have disturbed Suat but that she may nonetheless reciprocate his love. This contradiction and ambiguity he detects in her excites him.

In the final pages of the novel the glove motif resurfaces. Süreyya has decided to leave the summer sea-side home and move back in with his family. Necip, unable to stay away from Suat, visits often, but his visits cause her distress because she is under the watchful eye of the family, especially Hacer, her jealous sister-in-law. Not able to even get a glance from Suat, Necip thinks that she no longer loves him, and, melancholically, he returns to his life that he finds horrible in Beyoğlu. But one night, Necip arrives at the family mansion extremely intoxicated. As Necip expresses his negative views of women intended for Suat's ears, Hacer reminds Necip of the owner of the lady's glove that cured him. After "a dark hesitation" ("muzlim bir tereddüt"), Necip simply replies that the lady, and by extension the glove, was but a "masal" ("fable"). Since he believes that Suat no longer loves him, Necip seems to mourn the loss of the owner of the glove, and perhaps even the glove's meaning. However, the next morning, Necip finds himself alone in the house with Suat. After caustic words on Necip's part, they are finally able to communicate their love for each other. But Necip must leave her side because they have decided to continue loving each other from afar so as not to betray Süreyya. As Necip prepares for his departure, he feels obligated to broach the issue of the glove, which he terms "keepsake" ("yadigar"):

Necip, "Bende var, ama pek zavallı bir yadigar, çalınmış…" diye o kadar mest olduğu tek eldiveni çıkardı. "Ben size bunu veremem…" Onu kalbinin üstünde o kadar taşımıştı ki hemen kalbi olmuştu. "Fakat siz bana…" diyordu; o zaman genç kadın gömleğinden bir şey çıkardı. Bu aynı eldivenin tekiydi. O da teki o zamandan beri saklamıştı; ve Necip bunu görünce o kadar mesut oldu ki eldiveni de bunu tutan eli de kaparak ağzına götürdü. Ve ilk defa olarak dudakları ona temas etti (283-284).

Necip, saying "I have one, but it is a very sad keepsake, it was stolen…" took out the single glove that made him so intoxicated. "I can't give this to you…" He had carried it over his heart so much that it became one with his heart. "But you can…"; then the young woman took something out from her shirt. It was the other glove. She had also kept it since then; and when Necip saw this it made him so happy that he took both the glove and the hand holding it and brought it to his lips. And for the first time his lips touched her.

Suat giving Necip the other glove seems to nullify Necip's transgression and the sexual overtones. Indeed, the narrator casts the exchange of the glove for a kiss as "an innocent flooding" ("bir tuğyan-ı ismet"), which recasts their romance in a platonic light. Yet, Necip continues to suffer from inner conflict. As he leaves Suat, the narrator describes Necip's state: "Necip çıkıyordu, ikisine de bundan sonraki hayatları yaşamaya değmeyecek bir zulmet gibi enindar, boş, ebr-alud bir çöl gibi geliyordu" (284). [Necip was leaving; it seemed as though from now on both of their lives were not worth living like a wailing darkness, like an empty, cloudy desert.] The outside world, symbolized in metaphorical language (the darkness, the desert), folds inward,[188] as it represents, even constitutes, Necip's inner world.

Throughout the novel, Necip struggles with affirming his selfhood as autonomous in his attempts to detach his perception of himself from the external world. The external world materializes in what he terms "the desert" and "the crowd," which are imbricated ideas that haunt him. In an earlier scene, the desert describes his inner life as experienced in Beyoğlu with superficial, adulterous women. In this scene, Necip, in the company of Suat and Süreyya,

---

[188] I understand the fold in Gilles Deleuze's sense as used in "Foldings, or the Inside of Thought (Subjectivation)" in *Foucault*. Trans. Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

observes Suat's sincerity and warmth toward her husband and realizes that his own life is devoid

of such sincerity and warmth:

> O zaman Suat'ın gözleri o nazar-ı şefkati kaybetmeksizin Necip'e döndü; ve bu nazar o kadar derin, sıcak bir muhabbet ile pür-nemdi ki Necip ruhu eriyor zannetti; bir saniye mesut bir helecanla titredi. Evet, böyle nazarla insan dünyanın öbür ucuna gider diye düşündü; çöllere gider, dağlara gider… Onun şimdi terk etmek istediği hayat, bir çölden başka ne idi? Gölgesiz, susuz, vahasız, hatta serapsız bir çöl… Evet, hatta serapsız… Mahza bazen en ehemmiyetsiz tebessümler, hatta kendine ait olmayan nazarlar bile ona bir feyezan-ı şiir verir (60-61).

> Then Suat's eyes, without losing their loving glance, turned to Necip; and her glance was so profound and very sultry with a warm affection that Necip thought his soul was melting; he shivered with a happy excitement for a second. Yes, with a glance like this, he thought, a person would go to the other end of the world; he would go to deserts, to mountains… The life that he wanted to leave behind now, was it anything other than a desert? A desert without shade, water, oasis, even without mirages… Yes, even without mirages… However, sometimes the most trivial smiles, even glances not belonging to him, inundated him with poetry.

Suat's loving glance could be understood as a mirage in that it gives Necip the illusion that she

directs it at him, when in fact she directs it at her husband. This illusion is sufficient for Necip to

believe at that moment that he could forsake the superficial life he calls "desert." For Necip, the

desert does not only exist "out there," as a description of the external world, but also exists as his

internal life without the illusion of love.

Necip's negotiation with the external world as he perceives it is shaped by "the crowd," or

non-specific people out there.[189] Intoxicated with the thought that Suat loves him, Necip stays at a

hotel near Suat and Süreyya's sea-side summer house. There, he compares his life with that of the

people around him, who have not experienced real love. One day, the hotel customers congregate

in the hotel lobby because of the September rain, forming a crowd ("kalabalık"). Withdrawing

from them, Necip settles himself into a corner that sets him apart from them: "Fakat o bir köşede,

---

[189] The crowd might best be apprehended as "landscape," in Karatani Kojin's sense of "people-as-landscape." See Karatani Kojin. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Ed. Brett de Bary. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

münzevi, tek, bütün kendi fikirlerine dalmış kaldı ve akşam otelin bütün halkı yemek vakti camlı salona geçtiği zaman o yeni hepsinden ayrı, bir kenardaki küçük bir masada yalnızdı" (171). [However, he was in a corner, recluse, alone, plunged into his own thoughts and at dinnertime when everyone at the hotel went to the room with a window, he was still separate, alone at a small table in the corner.] Even though Necip had been loved by other women, these experiences did not produce the happiness he feels after his encounter with Suat. As he imagines what might have been had he not met Suat, his thoughts become expressed in metaphorical language:

> "Bu olmasa idi demek ben de herkes gibi olacaktım; bilmeyecektim aşk ve saadet nedir, bundan gafil kalacaktım" diyordu. Etrafına bakıp "Lakin nasıl yaşıyorlar yarabbim, sevmeden, sevilmeden nasıl yaşanıyor?" diye taaccüp ediyordu. Evet, nasıl yaşamıştı? O zamana kadar kendisi nasıl yaşamıştı? Fakat hayatı nasıl bir çöldü!
> Ve bir şişe Sen Jülyen'den sonra şimdi Belori Söteren ile dolu bardağını katre katre emerek etrafına baktıkça hepsinin bir çöl, buhar-ı göl arasında pek kesif bir ufukla daralmış bir çöl gibi görünüyordu; fakat onun hayatı parlak seması altında namütenahi dalgalarını müebbet bir kaside-i perestişle sürükleyen deniz hayatı gibi pürinşirah, tarab-engiz ve lacivert idi… (172).

> "If this weren't so then I would be just like everyone else; I would not know love and happiness; I would be unaware of this" he said. He was surprised as he looked around thinking, "But how are they living, my god, how can they live without loving, without being loved?" Yes, how had he lived? How did he himself live until then? His life was a desert!
> And after a bottle of Saint Julien, now sipping a glass of Bellori, he looked around and all of them seemed like a desert, a desert narrowed between lake mist and a very dense horizon. But his life was full of freshness, elation and navy blue like sea life that was drifting along endless waves with an eternal kaside [poem] of adoration under a shining sky…

The crowd of anonymous people that Necip distinguishes himself from, because unlike them, he knows the meaning of love, morphs into a desert. But the desert, as we saw above, represents Necip's life before he experienced love with Suat, and thus a memory of the past. Contrasting the desert as past is Necip's present, a dreamlike illusion of the sea and the kaside of adoration that is eternal. It is significant that the kaside, a vital mode of Ottoman poetry that traditionally operated

as "a gift of language for material reward" in an economy of exchange,[190] was increasingly losing

its currency in the processes of modernization.[191] In Necip's conscious mind, the kaside serves as

an archive that points to a contradictory condition of modernity. For the traditional mode of

poetry is emptied of its significance as it is turned into an abstraction as a means of contemplating

modern subjectivity.

The crowd haunts Necip as the signifier of his own darkness. At another point in the story,

when worrying that if his thoughts of his cousin/friend's wife were discovered then society would

harshly criticize him, he concludes: "fakat kaçmak, bu çare-i yegane, buradaki hayat-ı sükun ve

incizabı bırakıp yine o kabus ve izdiham içine girmek…" (113). [However, to escape, this was

the only way, to leave the tranquil and attractive life here and reenter that nightmare and crowd.]

If his inner life is discovered, he would be forced to flee from Süreyya and Suat's sea-side home,

which serves like a sanctuary for him from his past. The crowd here offers him a cover to the

shame of his dark interiority exposed.

Given that the novel focuses on Necip's perspective and introspection (and at times on

that of Suat), it might appear odd, then, that in the last four paragraphs of the novel, the

psychological narration abruptly shifts to a third person narrator distinct from the characters in

order to objectively recount the way the two lovers die. The mansion catches fire; everyone but

Suat evacuates the house. Sürayya and Necip rush to the entrance calling for her. A muffled voice

is heard. While Süreyya frantically waits at the entrance, Necip cries out with wildness as he

---

[190] Walter Andrews. "Speaking of Power: The 'Ottoman Kaside.'" *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*. Eds. Stephen Sperl and Christopher Shackle. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 281-300.

[191] The relationship between poets, production and centers of power significantly changed in the Tanzimat era, which occasioned the transformation of the Ottoman kaside most notably with Namık Kemal. In his popularly titled "Freedom kaside" ("Besalet-i Osmaniyye ve hamiyyet-i insaniyye," or "The kaside on Ottoman courage and humanistic zeal"), Namık Kemal rereads traditional abstract concepts and shifts power from the sultan to the "nation" ("millet"). For a more in-depth study, see Walter G. Andrews and Mehmed Kalpaklı. "Across Chasms of Change: The Kaside in Late Ottoman and Republican Times." *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*. Eds. Stephen Sperl and Christopher Shackle. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 301-326.

leaps into the fire and parishes with Suat. Süreyya tries in vain to stop him. The question remains, why end a novel so invested in producing knowledge of the depths of the human mind in a fashion devoid of psychological perspective? Why the shift from interior perspective to exterior? The answer can be found in the resolution Necip reaches after he leaves Suat's side. As we have seen, in the above-mentioned scene, Necip determines that a life akin to the desert is not worth living. The shift in narration signals a gesture to social exteriority over subjective interiority in Necip's death.

Subjectivity in *Aşk-ı Memnu*

If Mehmet Rauf looks to expose the hidden psychological workings of the human mind by taking the soul ("ruh") as a ground for interpretation in *Eylül*, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil does so by zeroing in on subjectivity (what he terms "hüviyet")[192] in his novel *Aşk-ı Memnu* ("Forbidden Love"). Critics have cited *Aşk-ı Memnu* as a masterpiece, not just of Halit Ziya's oeuvre, but of Turkish literature writ large for its skillful representation of interiority and its unprecedented treatment of adultery with objectivity.[193] Taking the theme of forbidden love as his starting point, Halit Ziya explores the inner world of his characters drawing on scientific concepts such as determinism (heredity) and psychological concepts like split identity (doppelganger)—concepts at the forefront of critical questions concerning the individual at the turn of the century—that render his

---

[192] I will elaborate on how I am distinguishing the term from its modern usage below.

[193] I have already mentioned the celebration of Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's novels as the first example of the novel in the European sense. On this point and other merits of *Aşk-ı Memnu*, see Robert Finn. *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: ISIS Yayımcılık, 1984; Ahmet Evin. *The Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1983; and Berna Moran. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

narrative accountable to psychological reality. Halit Ziya probes these concepts in *Aşk-ı Memnu* as he questions the possibility of transparency of the self in the modern world.

For Halit Ziya, the exploration of the mind in aesthetic forms nuances the scientific concepts underpinning knowledge of the inner workings of the individual, which, for him, constitute the great enigma of life. This process of psychologizing Ottoman Turkish literature is contingent on rendering the inner world of the self transparent through language that draws on psychological vocabulary and narrative devices. The interpretation of the self, in Liu's words, "becomes the site on which competing theories and discourses wage their struggle for legitimacy and authority."[194] Significant in the psychologizing process is Halit Ziya's attack on traditional Ottoman interpretations of the individual as opaque and lacking psychological depth. As I demonstrated in Chapter 1, Halit Ziya criticized traditional Ottoman narratives for lacking psychological depth in his critical essay *Hikaye*. As Jennifer Noyon observes, this is the fundamental redirection of Ottoman aesthetic values.[195] But we must take into account that modernity and tradition are in negotiation in this novel. Even if traditional literary language, themes and forms must be experienced as the past, and, according to Halit Ziya, viewed as incapable of representing modern subjectivity, they nonetheless continue to erupt in Halit Ziya's psychological narratives. Most noteworthy is Halit Ziya's insistence on the representation of interiority as the integral device of realism. As a device rendering the individual mind transparent, Halit Ziya masterfully employs free indirect discourse. Yet, his employment of the device oftentimes recalls "meddah" oral storytelling devices, even if it does so in a distorted

---

[194] Lydia Liu. *Translingual Practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity—China, 1900-1937.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 132.

[195] Jennifer Noyon. "Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's *Hikaye* (*the Novel*) and Westernization in the Late Ottoman Empire." *Intersections in Turkish Literature: Essays in Honor of James Stewart-Robinson*. Ed. Walter Andrews. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001. 142.

manner. He also critiques the theme of suicide in traditional stories, a criticism prevalent in *Hikaye*, and rewrites the theme by drawing on psychological interpretation in *Aşk-ı Memnu*.[196] Thus we might understand distortion and rewriting as integral to the process of psychologizing tradition and forming modern narratives that necessarily involve a negotiation of modernity and tradition.

The plot of *Aşk-ı Memnu* ("Forbidden Love") centers on the psychological experiences of Bihter, a young beautiful woman of twenty-two, who commits infidelity and later suicide. The narrative follows her as she struggles to assert herself as an autonomous individual against external and internal forces beyond her control.[197] Throughout the novel Bihter attempts to understand herself and the significance of her subjectivity ("hüviyet") in relation to forces beyond her control, such as hereditary as a determining force. What is striking about Bihter is her awareness of these external and internal forces that influence her experience. Against her mother's approval, Bihter agrees to marry Adnan Bey, an affluent widower of fifty with children, not just because she believes this marriage could be an excellent opportunity for her to get revenge against her mother and sister, but also because she is enchanted by Adnan Bey's sea-side mansion ("yalı") as it appears to her from the outside and how she imagines it to be on the inside. At Adnan Bey's mansion live his two children, Nihal, an adolescent girl, and Bülent, a young boy, and Adnan Bey's nephew, Behlül, a young womanizer enthralled with European culture. Once married, Bihter makes every attempt to get along with Adnan Bey's family and housekeeping staff and to be a good wife and step-mother, but she fails to make them like her.

---

[196] I return to the theme of suicide in my analysis of *Aşk-ı Memnu* below.

[197] Nihal is also an important character in this novel. But, as Berna Moran notes, the novel is Bihter's novel if we are to consider the title of the novel. On this point, see Berna Moran. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

Even more importantly, she realizes that her marriage with Adnan Bey cannot satisfy her and she discovers sexual desire in her relationship with Behlül, which ultimately leads to her decision to commit suicide.

Bihter's understanding of herself, which shifts according to her grasp of her experience of language, is rooted in her struggle to free herself from determining forces, predominantly her mother's character that Bihter nevertheless inherits. As she seeks to understand herself, the events in the novel force her to reinterpret and shift her perception of herself. Bihter's interiority is frequently described with the word "hüviyet," which must be understood as the ground for her struggle for self-understanding against uncontrollable internal forces. To capture Bihter's subjectivity, Halit Ziya employs the philosophical term "hüviyet" differently from its modern and pre-modern use, even if the traces of these meanings endure in his use of the term. In its modern use, "hüviyet" came to mean "identity," which denoted a subject-substance, and "essence."[198] But just as Halit Ziya's employment of the term corresponds to translingual psychological concepts, it also bears traces of the word's genealogy. "Hüviyet" is a philosophical term of Arabic origin ("huwiyya") that was coined to express in Arabic the nuances of Greek philosophy,[199] and its meaning most closely corresponded to "ipseity."[200] "The ancient meaning of huwiyya refers to the peculiar characteristics of that being which is huwa, exclusively itself, rather than to a

---

[198] Şemsettin Sami's widely consulted *Kamus-ı Türki* of 1886 defines "hüviyet" as "1) mahiyet, hakikat; 2) bir adamın aranılan veya olmak iddiasında bulunduğu şahıs olması." The dictionary makes the important distinction between "hüviyet" and "mahiyet" (quiddity) that "hüviyet" is reserved for people ("şahıs").

[199] "Huwiyya" was first coined by translators of Aristotle's works into Arabic.

[200] Jacques Derrida understands "ipseity" as signifying the "power that gives itself its own law, its force of law, its self-preservation, the sovereign and reappropriating gathering of self in the simultaneity of an assemblage." See Wendy Brown. "Sovereign Hesitations." *Derrida and the Time of the Political*. Eds Suzanne Guerlac, Pheng Cheah. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009.119.

recognition, a comparison or an identification of such a being."[201] In his novel, Halit Ziya conceptualizes the modern self in terms that approximates what Étienne Balibar describes as "a political issue, a becoming or a relationship between forces that are 'internal' to their conflict."[202]

The concept of determinism allows Halit Ziya to explore the subjectivity of Bihter with objectivity. Family "history" and heredity operate as uncontrollable external forces (internalized as desire) against which Bihter struggles to assert her autonomy. The novel sets the ground for Bihter's inner conflict with a flashback scene that elucidates how Bihter's mother, Firdevs Hanım, who as a young woman was disillusioned by marriage, became an adulteress, and how this generated grave consequences. Firdevs Hanım, described as "the most privileged of flowers" ("en güzide çiçeklerinden"), is a member of the "Melih Bey Set" ("Melih Bey takımı"), a family most noted by Istanbul society for its "free" ("serbest") women. Indeed, the narrator, in a voice that echoes the voice of the "meddah," points out that the original male family member remains insignificant: "Melih Bey kimdir? Bu suale sarih bir cevap vermek külfetine lüzum görülmemiştir."[203] [Who is Melih Bey? No one ever took the trouble to offer a clear answer to this question.][204] The agency of the Melih Bey Set women is underlined by their ability to protect their inner subjectivity when marrying into another family:

> Melih Bey takımında garip bir hassa-ı isticnasiye vardır: hangi aile ile nispet peyda eylerse o aile için Melih Bey takımından olmak muhakkaktır. Melih Bey takımından bir kız—galiba bu ailenin vikaye-i esbab-ı temayüzü kadınlara müvekkel olduğundan kaderin

---

[201] A.M. Goichon. "Huwiyya." *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 23 May 2017 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_3011

[202] Étienne Balibar, Barbara Cassin and Alain de Libera. "Subject." *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*. Ed. Barbara Cassin. Princeton University Press, 2014. 1083.

[203] Halit Ziya [Uşaklıgil]. *Aşk-ı Memnu*. *Servet-i Fünun*. 413. (1314/1898). 367. Hereafter, citations from the serialized version of this novel will be parenthetically cited as SF followed by the issue number and page number.

[204] As a technique to pique the interest of the listener, "meddah" story tellers often asked questions. Ahmet Midhat is most notable for drawing on this technique in his novels and seized on it as a method for guiding his readers through the content of his stories. For an analysis of this, see Jale Parla. "The Object of Comparison." *Comparative Literature Studies*. 41.1 (2004): 116-125.

bir müsaade-i mahsusasıyla takımdan hemen bütün kız evlad çıkmıştır—bir diğer aileye intisab etmekle hüviyet-i maneviyesinin bu yeni ailenin hamire-i ruhunda mass olmamasını o hassa-i isticnasiye taht-ı emniyete alır (SF 413, 367).

The Melih Bey Set had a strange quality of appropriation: whatever family they formed a relation with was certain to become part of the Melih Bey Set. A daughter from the Melih Bey Set—presumably this family's reasons for protecting their privilege was represented by women, so almost all daughters left this set with the special permission of destiny—appropriates the quality of securing her inner-subjectivity from being absorbed into the soul of the new family's quintessence[205] when marrying into another family.

Here "hüviyet" is used to form the neologistic construction "hüviyet-i maneviye" ("intrinsic-subjectivity")[206] and identifies the interiority of the individual as something that must be protected from external forces. One significant way in which the young Firdevs Hanım safeguards her subjectivity in matrimony is by "bringing with her" her family name ("aile unvanı") when she arrives at her husband's home. In this way, in a reversal of gender roles, her husband's name gets erased, for people refer to him as "Firdevs Hanım's husband" ("Firdevs Hanım'ın beyi").

After getting married, Firdevs Hanım feels "deceived" ("aldanmış") because marriage fails to meet her expectations, a realization that causes her to resent her husband. As a "free" ("serbest") woman, Firdevs Hanım engages in extramarital affairs. After several years, one day while she is outside, suddenly, in a fit of jealousy and prompted by the need to uncover the truth, her husband enters her room and discovers letters from Firdevs Hanım's lovers. When Firdevs Hanım returns, she finds her husband collapsed on the couch ("sedir"). Shortly thereafter he dies with tears in his eyes. Bihter internalizes this dramatic moment as a young child, even though she was too young to fully grasp it at the time. The event becomes etched in her mind somewhat

---

[205] The literal meaning of "hamir" is "dough."

[206] Halit Ziya employed "hüviyet-i maneviye" ("intrinsic-subjectivity") in his earlier novel *Mai ve Siyah* together with "hüviyet-i cismaniye" ("corporeal-subjectivity") to register interiority and exteriority of the individual.

differently, as revealed later in the novel, from the way the narrator conveys it at the beginning of the novel:

> O tanılmamış baba için kalbinde derin bir muhabbeti vardı, annesine verilemeyen kalbini tamamen bu ölünün hatırasına veriyordu. Ve bu hatırayı süslerdi: Kazaen işitilmiş şeylerden, parça parça tedarik olunmuş tafsilattan babasına bir tercüme-i hal icat ediyor, sonra onu Firdevs Hanım'ın elinde işkenceler içinde yaşatıyor, her şeyden bihaber namuskar bir koca mazlumiyetiyle babasının hayat-ı izdivacına bir facia rengi veriyor, nihayet onu müthiş bir darbe ile makhurane öldürüyordu (SF 436, 319).

> She had a deep affection for the father that she had not known, and she gave her heart completely, which she could not give to her mother, to the memory of this death. And she embellished this memory: She invented a translated state for her father from things heard by chance, explanations obtained in fragments. Then she made him live in torture in the hands of Firdevs Hanım, gave her father's married life a color of tragedy with the oppression of an honorable husband unaware of anything, and finally killed him with a terrible defeating blow.

Bihter's familial world lacks love and affection; as Berna Moran observes, the mother-daughter relationship between Firdevs Hanım and Bihter is a relationship of competition filled with jealousy.[207] Bihter's distorted memory of her father and the way he dies explains why she harbors deep-seated adverse sentiments toward her mother. It also explains why Bihter's awareness that her mother's history has a determining effect on her own life. She tries to come to terms with this history as she seeks to understand herself throughout the novel.

Bihter's quest for self-knowledge is contingent on her understanding of being "Firdevs Hanım'ın kızı" ("Firdevs Hanım's daughter"), a sign to which Bihter struggles to bring transparency. Because subjectivity and language are indistinguishable for her, Bihter's quest for a transparent self is also a search for transparent signs. Bihter seeks to understand what terms mean for her by attempting to establish a clear relationship between signifieds and signifiers. Words

---

[207] Moran also rightly observes that Bihter's relationship with her mother and sister contrasts the relationship between Adnan Bey and his children, which is loving and closed off to the outside. Berna Moran. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. 93.

appear as signifiers to which Bihter tries to ascribe meaning even if these meanings seem unstable. As a way of negotiating reality, just as she attempts to understand what "Firdevs Hanım'ın kızı" means for her, Bihter also searches to understand the meaning of terms like "izdivaç" (marriage) and "aşk" (love). These words ("marriage" and "love") and the meaning she ascribes to them are connected to and contingent on her understanding of herself as her mother's daughter.

Other characters, such as Behlül, are also interested in understanding the meaning of words. But while Bihter's interest in signs is to know herself, Behlül understands signs as empty. For instance, that Behlül tries to discover the meaning of "eğlenmek" ("to have fun") sheds light on his character as someone more interested in the performance of words than truly understanding their meanings. Believing that life was a vast "comedy scene" ("sahne-i mudhike"), "Hayat onun için uzun bir eğlence idi, en ziyade eğlenebilenlere yaşamak için en ziyade haiz-i istihkak olanlar nazarıyla bakardı" (SF 423, 110). [Life for him was a prolonged amusement. He believed that those who could have the most fun deserved the most merit.] Thus, Behlül makes an effort to appear at every entertainment event to understand the significance of "having fun": "Eğlenmek… Bu kelimenin manası da Behlül'de tebeddüle uğramış idi. O hakikat halde hiçbir şeyden eğlenmezdi. Bütün eğlence yerlerine koşardı, bütün gülünecek şeyleri arardı, ihtimal herkesten ziyade gülerdi; fakat eğlenir miydi? Eğleniyor görünürdü, onun için eğlenmek, eğleniyor görünmek demekti" (SF 423, 110). [To have fun… The meaning of this word underwent a change for Behlül. In truth, he never had fun doing anything. He went to all the places of entertainment, sought out all the things to laugh at, and probably laughed more than everyone; but was he having fun? He appeared to be having fun, and for him having fun meant appearing to have fun.] Because the meaning of "eğlenmek" ("to have fun") escapes Behlül, he

opts to perform it. For Behlül, it is an empty sign to which he can ascribe his own meaning. Thus, we might infer that Behlül regards any attempt at rendering the self transparent as futile. After talking about how people liked to imitate his style, calling things like gloves, canes, perfumes unnecessary, the narrator asks: "Bu adamın hüviyet-i ahlakiyesi nasıldı?" (SF 423, 110). [What was this man's moral subjectivity like?] The narrative continues: "Bu öyle bir sual idi ki Behlül şimdiye kadar nefsine karşı bile iradına lüzum görmemiş, vakit bulmamıştı" (SF 423, 110). [This was a question that he did not find necessary, did not find the time, to put forward to his soul.]

In contrast to Behlül, Bihter's struggles to understand herself through language. As she tries to free herself from her mother's hereditary influence on her life, she struggles to understand what "marriage" ("izdivaç") signifies for her. In marriage, Bihter's unhappiness parallels her mother's unhappiness, for she is disillusioned by it just as her mother was, albeit for different reasons. Bihter's decision to marry Adnan Bey, however, is not simply for economic gain, as Finn suggests.[208] Her decision is also, and perhaps more importantly, an attempt to overcome her mother's past. For, unlike her mother, Bihter makes an effort to be a good wife and step-mother and tries hard to remain virtuous. Yet, after a year goes by Bihter is forced to admit to herself that her marriage with Adnan Bey, while suitable in terms of prestige, fails to satisfy her emerging sexual desires. She regards Adnan Bey more as a friend than as a husband because the thought of him as her husband troubles her. From the beginning of her marriage, Bihter must close her eyes when Adnan Bey kisses her so as not to see him. She respects ("hürmet") him, and even feels affection ("muhabbet") for him, "lakin onun bütün teslimiyet-i ruhuyla karısı olamıyordu" (SF 435, 303) [but she could not be his wife with all her soul]. Because she lacks desire for her husband, she cannot willfully submit her body to him. Adnan Bey, fully conscious of Bihter's

---

[208] Robert Finn. *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: ISIS Yayımcılık, 1984. 137.

disinclination for intimacy with him, forces her into a kiss. This forced intimacy triggers her to contemplate the meaning of marriage:

> Demek kendisi için izdivaç bu idi, aşk bundan ibaret olacaktı; daima, daima, ondan böyle cebiren aşk alınacaktı; ve, o, ruhunun asıl aşkını vermiş olmayacaktı; bikr ruhuna tasarruf edecek bir buse dudaklarını araştırıp bulmayacaktı, kendisini üşüten bu buselerden başka bir şey görmeyecekti, daima böyle olacaktı, daima, daima… (SF 435, 304).

> So, for her this was marriage. Love would comprise of this; always, love would always be taken by force in this way from her; and, she would not give him her soul's true love; she would not find the lips of a kiss that would save her virgin soul, she would not experience anything other than these kisses that made her feel cold, it would always be like this, always, always…

Marriage, then, signifies a relationship devoid of desire, which requires her to guard her inner self from her husband. Bihter attempts to accept "these dark things" ("şu karanlık şeyler") as the meaning of marriage for her. But, "Kendisini kocasına tamami-i hüviyetiyle vermekten meneden şeye benzer bir şey vardı ki bu evle kalbinin arasına sahte bir busenin soğukluklarını koyuyordu" (SF 435, 304) [There was something that prevented her from giving up her entire subjectivity to her husband that put a fake, cold kiss between this house and her heart.][209]

Nevertheless, Bihter's awareness of the lack of desire in her marriage does not immediately become a justification for adultery. This is because Bihter is aware of the power of heredity and its effects on her life based on her physical resemblance to her mother. All her life people remarked that Bihter resembled her mother while her older sister Peyker, who was happily married, resembled their father. "Mademki bunu söylemekte herkes müttefikti, demek hakikaten o annesine benziyordu. Bu müşabehetten korkardı. Daima kalbinde bir şey vardı ki bu müşabehet-i cismaniyenin hayatlarını da benzeteceğini zannettirir, onu titretirdi" (SF 436, 319).

---

[209] It is significant that in his Turkish (in Latin letters) edition of 1939, Halit Ziya replaces "tamami-i hüviyetiyle" ("with her entire subjectivity") with "bütün benliğiyle" ("with her entire selfhood") which indicates that he understood subjectivity and selfhood as having overlapping meanings. See *Aşk-ı Memnu*. Ed. Muharrem Kaya. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2010. 207.

154

[Seeing that everyone unanimously said this, it meant that she really resembled her mother. She was afraid of this resemblance. There was always something in her heart that supposed this physical resemblance would cause their lives to resemble, making her shiver.] She intuitively senses that her physical resemblance to her mother would extend to her life and that she would become an adulterous woman. In order to resist this possibility, Bihter struggles to repress desire for other men.

Bihter becomes aware of and struggles against repressed desire to avoid becoming "Firdevs Hanım's daughter" through psychic content that emerges from her unconscious mind. This psychic content transfers to her consciousness through fragments of memory and through her doppelganger, as conspicuously represented by her image in the mirror. Returning to Mladen Dolar's reading of Lacan, a wink from one's reflection in the mirror is sufficient to signify the doppelganger. For Halit Ziya, this phenomenon takes shape in the form of a gaze at and a reaching out to Bihter as she views her image in the mirror. From this emerges a representation of reality in psychological terms.

Bihter's interest in knowing herself is complicated by her determination to maintain autonomy from forces that push her to become like her mother. The inner struggle involving desire becomes apparent after Bihter returns home from a family picnic with Adnan Bey's household and Bihter's mother and sister's family. Once she shuts herself up in her room, the scenes from the family picnic begin to haunt her. As a gesture of isolating her interiority from all external forces, Bihter is overcome with an intense need to be completely alone in the darkness. In the darkness of her room, she catches sight of "her own shadow with the vagueness of a white cloud" ("beyaz bir bulut müphemiyetiyle kendi gölgesini gördü") in the mirror. The darkness enables Bihter to avoid discovering desire. She imagines if she lit the lamp, then

155

. . . kendisine gülümseyen bu aynanın, hususuyla o aynanın içinde kendisinin, kendi resminin yanında artık yalnız kalmayacaktı. Yalnız!... Yalnız!... Hatta, işte şimdi kendisinden de korkuyor, kendisini görürse, evet, bu karanlıkta kalmak isteyen kadın Bihter'le karşı karşıya gelirse bir tehlike vücuda gelecek, birbirlerine söylenmemek icap eden şeyleri söyleyecekler; o zaman yalnızlıktan, karanlıktan, güya bütün mevcudiyetin yokluğundan aranan şey; o uyku, o derin, tehi, ziyasız, rüyasız, uyku, bir daha avdet etmemek üzere silinecek zannediyor ve bundan korkuyordu" (SF 434, 287-288).

. . . she wouldn't be alone next to her own image, especially herself in the mirror, herself smiling at her in the mirror. Alone! Alone! Now she was afraid of herself, if she saw herself, yes, if the woman who wants to remain alone in the darkness comes face to face with Bihter a danger would happen, they would tell each other things that they must not tell each other. Then the thing she was seeking from solitude and darkness what appeared to be the absence of all existence; she thought that this sleep, this deep, empty, lightless, dreamless sleep would be erased never to return, and she was afraid of this.

The darkness prevents her from discovering knowledge about herself that is frightening. She intuits that her doppelganger in the mirror, a source of the uncanny, would make her conscious of desire that she is trying very hard to repress.

However, realizing that she wants to experience love, Bihter rejects the darkness and wants to see herself in the mirror in full light. If the darkness represents opacity (by preventing her from seeing herself in the mirror), lighting the oil lamp must be understood as an attempt to approach transparency. When Bihter suddenly decides to light an old oil lamp reflecting a multitude of colors from a stained glass cover, she catches sight of herself in the mirror. And a desire to fully see herself, to discover her body, causes her to remove all her clothing before contemplating her image in the mirror. For the first time, she views the reflection of her naked body, which seems foreign to her: "Hemen kendisini bu haliyle hiç görmemiş idi, bu yeni bir şey, başka bir vücut gibiydi. Demek Bihter işte bu idi" (SF 436, 320) [She had never before seen herself in this state, this was something new, as if it were another body. So, this was Bihter.]

Even though the image of her body pleases her, it also produces fear in her, for she senses that her image is simultaneously herself and an invisible aspect that is added to her image (what

156

Lacan calls the "object a").[210] By maintaining a certain distance from the mirror, Bihter tries to

deny the existence of her double as if to harness her nascent hallucination: "Yaklaşmaktan

korkuyordu, o kadar vuzuh ile görmek istemiyordu; biraz daha yaklaşırsa kendisiyle bu hayalin

tevemiyeti teeyyüt edecekti; uzak, uzak kalmak ve bu güzel vücudu böyle uzaktan, güya bir rüya

arasından sevmek istiyordu" (SF 436, 320). [She was afraid of approaching, she didn't want to

see herself with that much precision; If she were to approach herself [to the mirror] this

apparition's double would be confirmed; far, she wanted to stay far away and love her beautiful

body like this from afar, as if through a dream.] Yet, she seems caught between the real and the

unreal, whose boundary in this scene has become blurred. Even if Bihter tries to maintain a

distance from her double, she feels increasingly attracted to it, until finally: ". . . orada iki Bihter,

bütün zapt olunmuş aşkları inkişaf ettirecek cangüdaz bir busenin lerzişleri içinde, mahv ve harap

eden bir deraguş ile yekdiğerinin kollarına atılmaya müheyya iki vücut peyda oluyordu" (SF 436,

320). [. . . there two Bihters, two bodies appeared ready to jump into each other's arms with a

destructive embrace, in shivers of a soul-melting kiss that releases all repressed love.] In other

words, contact with Bihter's double causes the release of repressed desire. This figurative

embrace that inclines toward the erotic between Bihter and her doppelganger serves as a

metaphor for the violent desire to reconcile the tensions within her.

Fragments of memory emerge involuntarily, making evident Bihter's repressed feelings

about Behlül's sexual advances on her sister and mother that she witnessed at the family picnic.

But first, in psycho-narration, the narrator records the flow of Bihter's thoughts as she processes

her relationships with Adnan Bey's children and staff. As she thinks of each of the members of

---

[210] Lacan understands "object a" as a phantasmatic object that produces desire. For a detailed explanation of Lacan's "object a," see Mladen Dolar. "'I Shall Be with You on your Wedding-Night': Lacan and the Uncanny." *October*. 58 (autumn 1991): 5-23.

the household, she identifies them as her enemies, with the exception of her step-son Bülent.

Bihter recognizes that the bond between them exceeds the typical affection between a step-mother and step-son. Recording a transitional moment in which her unconscious mind suggests a new kind of love, the narrator disrupts the flow of Bihter's thought as she imagines Bülent: "Sonra, birden, Bülent'in arkasında, onun kahkahalı şatır çehresinin fevkinde başka bir hayal irtisam etti: Behlül!" (SF 436, 319) [Then, suddenly, behind Bülent, above his face with merry laughter appeared another apparition: Behlül!] Bihter's unconscious mind conjures up Behlül as her love interest. But she rejects this thought. She is able to admit to herself that she loves Bülent, but not Behlül. Bihter tries to dismiss Behlül from her mind: "Düşünmedi, düşünmemek istedi. Evet, ne için düşünecekti?" (SF 436, 319) [She did not think, she wanted to not think. Yes, why would she think?] Suddenly her mind recalls condensed fragments of scenes that she witnessed at the family picnic:

> Behlül hatırına geldikten sonra zihninde başka bir hatıra uyandı: Onu Peyker'in arkasında dudakları muhteris bir buse ile titreyerek hemen eğiliyor; yakıcı, ısırıcı bir buse ile Peyker'in ensesinden öpmek için orada can veriyor gördü; daha sonra çapkın bakışlarıyla hamakta Firdevs Hanım'ı sallarken gördü (SF 436, 319).

> After Behlül came to her mind another memory awakened: She saw him behind Peyker about to lean over with a covetous kiss with his lips quivering; dying there to kiss Peyker's neck with a burning, biting kiss; then she saw him with a womanizing gaze pushing Firdevs Hanım in the hammock.

Trying to stop this train of thought, Bihter attempts to get rid of Behlül's presence in her mind with an "hayali bir kelime" ("imaginary word"), which she must utter aloud: "womanizer" ("çapkın"). Because she cannot erase Behlül's image from her mind, she becomes furious. In her unconscious mind, Bihter desires to be in Peyker's place, even in Firdevs Hanım's place. Yet, Bihter adamantly tries to repress her feelings, pointing to a struggle between conscious and unconscious realms of the individual's mind.

Blurring the line between the psychological real and the unreal, the transition from dark to

light is reflected in terms of dreamlike reality: "Bihter karanlık bir rüyadan mülevven bir rüyaya

çıkmış gibiydi" (SF 436, 320). [It seemed as if Bihter went from a dark dream to a colorful

dream.] Registering the porous condition of the unconscious and conscious mind in the state

between sleep and wakefulness, the narrator records Bihter as her mind involuntarily processes

the images from the picnic earlier in the day as she falls asleep:

> Artık düşünceleri karışıyor, gözleri bulutlanıyordu . . . ta uzakta güneşlerin altında bir siyah dere koyu sularını sürükleyerek ilerliyor, kenarından beyaz bir etek savrulan bir hamak yavaş yavaş sallanıyor, havada bir top mütemadiyen gayr-i muntazam daireler çizerek bir yandan bir yana inip çıkıyor, kollarını kaldırarak bir çocuk koşuyor, öte müphem bir çehre dudaklarında haris bir buse ile eğiliyor, bunu eliyle itmek istiyor, eli kalkmıyor, başını çekiyor zannediyor, fakat çekemiyor, o haris buse orada, işte geliyor, ve, bütün bu hercümerç hayalet içinde nihayet karşıdan aynanın içinden, Bihter, o diğer Bihter dudaklarını, kollarını uzatıyor, bu Bihter'i, mukavemetsiz bir cazibe ile çekiyor, çekiyor, dudakları, kolları kilitleniyor, takatşiken, cangüdaz bir deraguş içinde ikisi beraber tavanda fenerden akan yeşil, sarı, mavi, kırmızı dalgalarla, bütün eşyasıyla oda, bütün ağaçlarıyla Göksu, hep beraber, azim bir tufan-ı kıyamet içinde bitmez tükenmez bir boşluğa yuvarlanıyorlardı… (SF 437, 336).

> Her thoughts were now blending together, clouding her eyes . . . very far away a black valley was drifting in dark waters under the sun, a hammock was slowly being rocked as a white skirt waves from the side, in the air a ball drawing irregular[211] circles is tossed up and down, a child is running raising his arms up, over there a vague face is leaning over with a greedy kiss on his lips, she wants to push this away with her hand, her hand doesn't move, she thinks she's pulling away, but she can't, that greedy kiss is there, now it's coming and in the whole imaginary crowd finally from inside the mirror, that other Bihter is reaching out with her arms and lips, pulling Bihter with a seduction that can't be resisted, her lips, her arms were locking, the two together in an exhausting, soul-melting embrace with waves of green, yellow, blue, red flowing from the lamp, the room with all its things, with all its trees,[212] Göksu, all together, were tumbling toward an endless emptiness in a great valuable flood…

Bihter's mind imbricates scenes from the picnic with scenes from her room that night through the

colors dancing in her room from the oil lamp and the sunlight at the picnic area (Göksu). The

---

[211] The Turkish simplification replaces "gayr-i muntazam" with "garip" ("strange").

[212] Earlier in the scene, the trees outside Bihter's window frighten her because their branches seem to stretch out to her like reaching arms.

continuous flow of warped images from earlier that day represented by the absence of punctuation to separate complete thoughts suggests her lack of control over recalling them and their possible meanings in her dreamlike state. Bihter's doppelganger as represented in the mirror image infiltrates her dreams.

Bihter's double is not the only figure that represents her internal tensions. Bihter's sister Peyker embodies Bihter's antithesis, the happily married woman who rejects lovers; Peyker's words echo like a refrain in Bihter's mind and function as Bihter's guilty conscious for becoming "Firdevs Hanım's daughter" by desiring other men. This echo represents a kind of blurring of the boundary between exteriority and interiority, which causes friction, not only between the two sisters, but in Bihter's inner world. At the family picnic, Behlül unsuccessfully attempts to seduce Peyker. After unequivocally rejecting Behlül, Peyker tells Bihter that she refuses to ever be unfaithful to her husband. Peyker's words echo later in Bihter's mind when she first realizes that she desires Behlül and then again later in the plot when she realizes that Behlül has left her for other women. When Bihter first hears Peyker's words echo, she is caught in a struggle to resist her mother's hereditary influence on her. Alone in her room: "Birden Peyker'in bir sözünü tahattur etti. Ne diyordu? O kocasına hıyanet etmek maksadıyla evlenmemişti. Bunu söylerken gözlerinde ne celi [ve ne]²¹³ bir mana-ı hainane vardı. Ne demek istiyordu? Başkaları, bilhassa kendisi, Bihter, kocasına hıyanet etmek maksadıyla evlenmişti, öyle mi? Bunu yapmayacaktı, mesela bir Firdevs Hanım'a benzemeyecekti" (SF 436, 319). [Suddenly she remembered Peyker's words. What was she saying? She did not marry with the objective of cheating on her husband. As she said this there was neither an obvious nor a deceitful meaning in her eyes. What did she mean by this? Others, particularly herself, Bihter, married with the objective of betraying

---

²¹³ "ve ne" was added to the revised edition. I draw on this here for clarity.

her husband, is that it? She was not going to do that, she was not going to resemble a Firdevs Hanım.] The echo, then, reminds Bihter that she wants to be able to reject lovers, just as Peyker rejects Behlül. Her determination to not become "Firdevs Hanım's daughter" requires her to repress surfacing desire for experiencing carnal love with Behlül.

The second time Bihter hears Peyker's voice echo in her mind coincides with her sitting in the darkness of Behlül's room, distressed with the knowledge that he has left her to be with another woman. The tone of Peyker's voice as Bihter hears it shifts from thought provoking words to a mocking laugh. Before hearing Peyker's voice, Bihter hears a voice from within that seems to come from a distance. In quoted speech, this voice speaks to Bihter in a "consoling language" ("tesliyet lisanı"). "O zaman bu lisan-ı tesliyetin arasında bir kahkaha-ı istihza fark ediyordu; ve bu sakit kahkahayı birisinin sesine benzetiyordu: Peyker'in…" (SF 458, 287). [Then she recognized a jeering laugh from within this consolatory language and this silent laugh sounded like someone's voice: Peyker's…"] Peyker's laugh undercuts the consoling voice Bihter hears that reassures her about her relationship with Behlül. The clash of two overlapping voices, one consolatory, the other jeering, causes Bihter to concede that Peyker made the right choice in life by choosing to marry for love instead of status. For Peyker marriage meant a loving relationship, and thus Peyker did not need to seek love elsewhere. Even though Bihter perceives no possibility of ever loving her husband, Peyker's voice reminds her that the love she seeks with Behlül is precisely what she had tried hard to avoid.

Once Bihter commits adultery, she realizes that she has become "Firdevs Hanım's daughter" and understands this term to mean a fallen woman. Bihter struggles to repress her desire for Behlül by avoiding him for several months. But then one day she finds herself alone with him in his room and succumbs to his seduction. After her first sexual encounter with Behlül,

Bihter admits to herself that: "Nihayet işte şimdi Firdevs Hanım'ın tamamen kızı olmuş idi" (SF 443, 414). [She now finally became completely Firdevs Hanım's daughter.] And this causes her to feel like a "different Bihter," which we might regard as a shift in Bihter's self-understanding in relation to the term "Firdevs Hanım's daughter." This realization disgusts her and causes her to despise her mother more than ever. Coming to terms with herself as a "fallen woman," Bihter thinks "böyle, sabahleyin, o sukutun heyecanı ferdasında kendi kendisinden iğrenirken hüviyetinin gizli derinliklerinde bir vukuf leması hissediyordu ki artık bu başlayan sukutu takip etmemek, yine o odaya, yine onun kollarına avdet etmemek mümkün değildir" (257). [Thus, in the morning, while feeling disgusted with herself for feeling excited about her next lapse into sin, she felt a flash of understanding in the hidden depths of her subjectivity that it was no longer possible for her not to pursue this lapse into sin that had begun by not returning to that room, to his arms.][214] Sensing the impossibility of ignoring her encounter with Behlül, Bihter thinks the only way to redeem the sin of becoming her mother's daughter is by experiencing "love" ("aşk") with Behlül.

In this way Bihter is willing to become "Firdevs Hanım's daughter" in order to experience "love." The meaning of love, for Bihter, is represented in the traditional mode of poetry: a "kaside." As others have pointed out, Bihter does not need to be loved (she is already loved by Adnan Bey),[215] instead she wants to love someone with her whole being: "sevmek istiyordu, hummalar içinde mecnunane bir aşk ile sevecek ve mesut olacaktı" (SF 436, 320). [she wanted to love, she would love madly with a feverish love and be happy.] "Loving madly" ("mecnunane") references an eminent traditional story that circulated in Islamic culture since the term is derived

---

[214] It is important to note that Halit Ziya employs the term "sukut," meaning "fall," which is much subtler than my translation as "lapse into sin."

[215] Gül Mete-Yuva. *La littérature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006.

162

from the archetypal ill-fated character Mecnun who becomes mad because of his love for

Leyla.[216] References to tradition serve as signposts in the territory of meaning. Significantly, the

happiest moment of Bihter and Behlül's love affair is expressed in a narrative of a traditional

form: a "kaside" (poem). When Bihter spends the night in Behlül's room, he suggests eloping

with her. At first Bihter does not comprehend this concept, but then it becomes a feasible fantasy

for her when Behlül tells her how their life would be together through the metaphorical language

of traditional Ottoman poetry:

> O zaman genç kadına bir sevda kasidesinin rüyalar içinde uyutan şiir ufuklarını açıyordu. Ummanları geçeceklerdi; aşklarını bir naz ile, neşe ile örülmüş yuva, öyle müstesna bir köşe bulacaklardı ki edebi bir baharın taravetlerine aşiyan olsun. Ağaçlarının arasında kaybolunacak korular, saf mevceleri kenarında istiğraklar içinde uyuyacak şelaleler, sevdalarının daimi bir bahar sahnesi olacaktı . . . Behlül yavaş yavaş, bu sevda şiirinin kendisini de latif bir hararet içinde saran tesiri ile mest olarak söylüyordu . . . Bir kelime ilave ederse bu kasidenin saadet rüyasını ihlal etmiş olacağından korkarak sükut ediyordu (290-291).

> Then he opened up to the young woman horizons of poetry of a love kaside that deceives in dreams. They were going to cross oceans; they were going to find an extraordinary corner, a home spun with cheer and with coquetry so that the eternal spring's bloom of youth would be their abode for their love. The choruses that were going to disappear among the trees, the waterfalls at the edges of pure waves that were going to sleep in rapture were going to be their love's perpetual scene of spring . . . Behlül spoke slowly as he too got swept up in the power of this love poetry, a pleasant fervor intoxicating him . . . Out of fear that he would transgress on this kaside's happy dream if he were to say another word, he fell silent.

The word "kaside," just as it does in *Eylül*, signifies hyperbolic love detached from reality in

narrative form that draws on, even parodies, traditional metaphorical language. Behlül's narrative

awakens false hopes that bring happiness to Bihter. Even Behlül, a character who resolutely

denounces love and poetry for being unrealistic and deceptive, gets swept up in the power of his

own narrative. But what is particularly significant for Bihter about this narrative is that it

---

[216] For a detailed study on the circulation of the romance of Leyla and Mecnun in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, see Agâh Sırrı Levend. *Arap, Fars ve Türk edebiyatlarında Leyla ve Mecnun hikayesi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1959.

provides her the illusion that this kind of love liberates her from the shame she feels in becoming her mother's daughter: "Evet, artık bahtiyar idi; artık günahlarının işte mükafatını topluyordu" (291) [Yes, now she was happy; now she was reaping compensation for her sins.] But when their secret nights together become monotonous, Behlül seeks to rekindle their love with her by returning to his former mistress in Beyoğlu. Intuiting Behlül's betrayal, Bihter understands that Behlül's narrative—the "kaside"—has unraveled, leaving her to confront herself as an adulterous woman like her mother.

If the "kaside"[217] is productively distorted in Halit Ziya's psychological narrative, themes from traditional tales get rewritten also. As mentioned above, Halit Ziya, in *Hikaye*, criticized traditional tales for ending in suicide without any critical reflection. What does this say about *Aşk-ı Memnu* and its relation to the delegitimized traditional narrative? Halit Ziya psychologizes the conventional ending of traditional tales, rendering them self-reflexive. Perhaps this is why Bihter's suicide scene is punctuated by continuous self-questioning and probing of the real.

It is important to note that in Halit Ziya's novels, as Gül Mete-Yuva observes, suicide is not an act of desperation; rather, it is a confirmation of the emergence of the individual.[218] Bihter, a woman who is capable of making her own decision to marry (and against her mother's will), and has accepted her body and sensuality, also decides to end her life.[219] When Adnan Bey's daughter Nihal faints because she has overheard an incriminating conversation between Bihter and Behlül and her father takes her to her room, Bihter imagines that Nihal will tell her father about her affair when she has regained consciousness. Bihter imagines Adnan Bey throwing her

---

[217] The term "kaside" appears in Halit Ziya's collection of short stories *Bir Şi'r-i Hayal*, published in 1914, in much the same manner.

[218] Gül Mete-Yuva. *La littérature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006. 262.

[219] Gül Mete-Yuva. *La littérature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006. 262.

out of the house, which adds another layer of her understanding of the term "Firdevs Hanım's daughter": "Demek buradan, böyle, mülevves bir alüfte zilletiyle atılacaktı; ve iki gün içinde bu vaka bütün İstanbul'a yayılacak, bu azim şehrin havasında, etrafında handeler serperek, çalkanacaktı. O zaman, Bihter için Firdevs Hanım'ın hayatı başlayacaktı . . . ve bunları kabul etmek lazım gelecekti. Bunları reddedemeyecekti. Ne salahiyetle? Firdevs Hanım'ın kızı değil miydi?" (SF 478, 160). [So, she would be thrown out of here in this way, abject like a filthy prostitute and this incident would get around to all of Istanbul within two days; in this environment, she would be agitated by laughter spreading all around her. Then the life of Firdevs Hanım would begin for Bihter . . . and she would have to accept all of this. She would not be able to reject it. On what authority could she? Was she not Firdevs Hanım's daughter?] This new meaning has no possibility of redemption (like infidelity did) for Bihter. Suicide is Bihter's means of maintaining sovereignty over herself.

It is significant that the act of committing suicide is also a quest for self-understanding and contemplation. Just before committing the act, as Mete-Yuva observes, Bihter looks for matches to light the candles in order to see herself, to understand, to take possession of her own fate.[220] Bihter thinks: "Lakin mademki ortada öldürülecek bir müttehim var, –bunu düşünürken vahşi bir tebessümle gülüyordu—bu vazifeyi o, bizzat ifa edecekti" (SF 479, 175). [But since there was an obvious guilty person to be killed—thinking this she laughed with a savage smile— she herself would carry out this duty.] She goes to her husband's study in which he keeps a handgun and locks the door. As she contemplates death, she questions herself: "Sahih, bunu yapacak mıydı? . . . En evvel mumunu yakmak istedi. Her halde karanlıkta ölmeyecekti. Kendisini bir defa daha görmeksizin ölmek…" (SF 479, 175). [Was she really going to do this? . .

---

[220] Gül Mete-Yuva. *La littérature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006. 263.

. Above all she wanted to light the candles. She certainly wasn't going to die in the dark. To die without seeing herself one more time…] Just as the mirror is significant in the scene leading to infidelity, it is critical in the scene leading to her suicide. It underscores Bihter's pursuit of self-transparency as does her probing questions about the act. Yet, unlike in the scene leading to infidelity in which she discovers repressed aspects of herself in the mirror, in the suicide scene she is prevented from contemplating herself in the mirror one last time. For her husband is trying to force open the door to get to her in order to prevent her suicide. At that moment, something within her decides to forge ahead with her suicide plan. Just as she is about to pull the trigger on the handgun pointed at herself, she asks herself in free indirect discourse: "Bu bir korkunç rüya mıydı?" (SF 479, 175). [Was this a terrifying dream?] Bihter's self-interrogation and reflection must be understood as negotiating reality as she asserts herself and liberates herself from external and internal forces beyond her control.

In Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil and Mehmet Rauf's novels, "hüviyet" and "ruh," respectively, operate in a middle zone of translation that forms the ground for change. Both concepts remap the individual's interiority as constructed in psychological narratives that engage modern conceptions of the self at the turn of the century.

Bibliography

Ali Kemal. "Latince, Rumca ve Fransızca—Arabi, Farsi ve Türkçe" *İkdam*. 25 Şubat 1313 (1897).

Andrews, Walter G. "Ottoman Love: Preface to a Theory of Emotional Ecology." *A History of Emotions: 1200-1800*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

---. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985.

---. "Speaking of Power: The 'Ottoman Kaside.'" *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*. Eds. Stephen Sperl and Christopher Shackle. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 281-300.

---. "Starting Over Again: Some Suggestions for Rethinking Ottoman Divan Poetry in the Context of Translation and Transmission." Ed. Saliha Paker. *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2002. 15-37.

Andrews, Walter G. and Mehmed Kalpaklı. "Across Chasms of Change: The Kaside in Late Ottoman and Republican Times." *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*. Eds. Stephen Sperl and Christopher Shackle. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 301-326.

Andrews, Walter G., Najaat Black, and Mehmet Kalpaklı, eds. and trans. *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.

Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. New York: Verso, 2013. eBook.

---. "Untranslatables: A World System." *New Literary History*. 39.3 (2008): 581-598.

Arslan, Nihayet. *Türk Romanının Oluşumu: Dış Gerçeklik Açısından Bir İnceleme*. Ankara: Phoenix, 2007.

Balakian, Anna. *The Symbolist Movement in the Literature of European Languages*.

    Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984.

Balibar, Étienne, Barbara Cassin and Alain de Libera. "Subject." *Dictionary of*

    Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon. Ed. Barbara Cassin. Princeton University

    Press, 2014.

Başgöz, İlhan. "Turkish Folk Stories about the Lives of Minstrels." *The Journal of American*

    Folklore. 65.258 (1952): 331-339.

---. "Turkish Hikaye Telling Tradition in Azerbaijan, Iran." *The Journal of American*

    Folklore. 83.330 (1970): 391-405.

Belge, Murat. *Edebiyat Üstüne Yazılar*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1994.

Brown, Wendy. "Sovereign Hesitations." *Derrida and the Time of the Political*. Eds Suzanne

    Guerlac, Pheng Cheah. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009.

Butler, Judith. "Afterword: After Loss, What Then?" Eds. David L. Eng and David

    Kazanjian. *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press,

    2003.

Calverley, E.E. and I.R. Netton. "Nafs." *Encyclopedia of Islam, Second Edition*. Ed. P.

    Bearman et al. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0833

Cenap Şahabettin. "Esalib-i Ezmine." *Servet-i Fünun*. 291 (1312/1896).

---. "Yeni Elfaz." *Servet-i Fünun*. 333 (1313/1897).

---. "Yeni Tabirat." *Servet-i Fünun*. 331 (1313/1897).

Chow, Rey. "Film as Ethnography: or, Translation Between Cultures in the Postcolonial

    World." *The Rey Chow Reader*. Ed. Paul Bowman. New York: Columbia University

    Press, 2010.

---. "The Old/New Question of Comparison in Literary Studies: A Post-European

Perspective." *ELH*. 71.2 (Summer, 2004): 289-311.

---. "Translator, Traitor; Translator, Mourner (or, Dreaming of Intercultural Equivalence)."

    Not Like a Native Speaker: On Languaging as a Postcolonial Experience. New York:

    Columbia University Press, 2014.

---. *Women and Chinese Modernity: The Politics of Reading between West and East*.

    Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Foldings, or the Inside of Thought (Subjectivation)." *Foucault*. Trans. Sean

    Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Develi, Hayati. *Osmanlı'nın Dili*. 6th ed. Istanbul: Kesit, 2013. 62. And Agâh Sırrı Levend.

    Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi,

    1960.

Dolar, Mladen. "'I Shall Be with You on your Wedding-Night': Lacan and the Uncanny."

    October. 58 (autumn 1991): 5-23.

Elmalı, Hüseyin and Şükrü Arslan. "Garip." *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. vol 13.

    Istanbul: ISAM, 1996.

Enginün, İnci. *Cenap Şahabettin*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989. and Hasan Akay.

    Cenab Şahabeddin: Şair, Don Juan, Derviş. Istanbul: Şule Yayınları, 2015.

---. "Turkish Literature and Self-Identity: From Ottoman to Modern Turkish." *Ottoman Past*

    and Today's Turkey. Ed. Kemal Karpat. Boston: Brill, 2000.

Ercilasun, Bilge. *Servet-i Fünun'da Edebi Tenkit*. 3rd ed. Ankara: Akçağ, 2012.

Ertürk, Nergis. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford

    University Press, 2011.

---. "Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey." *Boundary 2*. 37.2 (2010): 155-185.

Evin, Ahmet Ö. *Origins and Development of the Turkish Novel*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca

Islamica, 1983.

Fazlıoğlu, İhsan. "Osmanlı Döneminde 'Bilim' Alanındaki Türkçe Telif ve Tercüme

    Eserlerinin Türkçe Oluş Nedenleri ve Bu Eserlerin Dil Bilincinin Oluşmasındaki Yeri ve

    Önemi." *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları*. 3 (March 2003): 151-184.

Finn, Robert. *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. Istanbul: ISIS Yayımcılık, 1984.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defense." Thierry Bokanowski

    and Sergio Lewkowicz, eds. On Freud's "Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defense."

    London: Karnac Books, 2009.

Gabrieli, F. "Adab." in: Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. Eds. P. Bearman, Th.

    Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 17 June

    2017 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0293

Grunebaum, G.E. von. "Faṣāḥa." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Second Edition. Ed. P. Bearman,

    Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_2307

Goichon, A.M. "Huwiyya." *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. eds. P. Bearman, Th.

    Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 23 May

    2017 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_3011

Gökçek, Fazıl. *Dekadanlar: Bir Tartışmanın Hikayesi*. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.

Gulerce, Aydan. "History of Psychology in Turkey as a Sign of Diverse Modernization and

    Global Psychologization." *Internationalizing the History of Psychology*. Ed. Adrian C.

    Brock. New York: New York University Press, 2006. 75-93.

Gürbilek, Nürdan. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness and the Turkish Novel."

    The South Atlantic Quarterly. 102:2/3 (2003): 599-628.

Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil. *Aşk-ı Memnu*. In: *Servet-i Fünun*. 413-479 (1314-1315).

---. *Aşk-ı Memnu*. Ed. Muharrem Kaya. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2010.

---. "Birkaç Söz." *Mai ve Siyah*. 1896. Istanbul: Hilmi Kitabevi, 1938.

---. *Bir Şi'r-i Hayal*. Ed. Hülya Aslan. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2006.

---. *Hikaye*. Ed. Nur Gürani Arslan. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1997.

---. "Karilerime Mektuplar." *Servet-i Fünun*. 428 (1315/1899).

---. *Kırk Yıl*. Ed. Nur Özmel Akın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014.

---. *Mai ve Siyah*. Istanbul: Muhtar Halit Kütüphanesi, 1914.

---. *Mai ve Siyah*. Ed. Enfel Doğan. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2012.

---. *Mai ve Siyah*. Ed. N. Ahmet Özalp. Istanbul: Everest Yayınları, 2016.

---. *Sanata Dair*. Eds. Sacit Ayhan and Levent Ali Çanaklı. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014.

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

Harutoonian, Harry. "Some Thoughts on Comparability and the Space-Time Problem."
boundary 2. 32.2 (2005): 23-52.

Huyugüzel, Faruk. *Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın'ın Hayatı, Hikaye ve Romanları Üzerinde Bir
Araştırma*. Ankara: Kültür ve Türizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1982.

Hüseyin Cahit [Yalçın]. "Arabdan İstifade Edeceğimiz Ulum." *Tarik* 27 Teşrinisani
1314/December 9, 1898.

---. *Edebiyat Anıları*. Ed. Rauf Mutluay. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1975.

---. *Hayal İçinde*. Istanbul: Alem Matbaası, 1901.

---. *Hayal İçinde*. Ed. Gökhan Tunç. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2012.

---. "Parlak Tabirler." *Sabah*. 13 Ağustos 1314 (1898).

İbrahim Cehdi. "Sıfatlar, Mevsuflar ve Taklit." *Servet-i Fünun*. 403 (1314/1898).

Kaplan, Mehmet. "Mai ve Siyah Romanının Üslubu Hakkında." *İstanbul Üniversitesi*

Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi. 19 (1971): 51-72.

Kaplan, Ramazan. *Klasikler Tartışması*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı
   Yayınları, 1998.

Kearney, Richard, Anne Bernard Kearney, Fabrizio Turoldo. "A Conversation with Paul
   Ricoeur." *Symposium*. 9.2 (Autumn 2005): 361-373.

Kılıç, Rüya. "Türkiye'de Modern Psikolojinin Tarihi: İlm-i Ahval-i Ruh İlm'ün-
   nefs/Ruhiyyat." *Kebikeç*. 40. 2015: 21-36.

Koçak, Orhan. "Kaptırılmış İdeal: Mai ve Siyah üzerine Psikanalitik bir Deneme." *Toplum ve
   Bilim*. 70 (1996): 94-152.

Kojin, Karatani. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Ed. Brett de Bary. Durham: Duke
   University Press, 1993.

Köprülü, Fuad. "Türklerde Halk Hikayeciliğine Ait Bazı Maddeler." *Edebiyat Araştırmalar*.
   4th ed. Vol. 1. Ankara: Akçağ, 2004. 317-56.

Levend, Agâh Sırrı. *Arap, Fars ve Türk edebiyatlarında Leyla ve Mecnun hikayesi*. Ankara:
   Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1959.

---. *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Evreleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi,
   1960.

Lewis, Geoffrey. *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. Oxford: Oxford
   University Press, 1999.

Liu, Lydia H. "Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the
   Nineteenth Century." *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global
   Circulations*. Ed. Lydia Liu. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

---. "The Question of Meaning-Value in the Political Economy of the Sign." *Tokens of
   Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. Ed. Lydia H. Liu.

Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

---. *Translingual Practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity—China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Mardin, Şerif. *Religion, Society and Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Syracuse Universty Press, 2006.

---. "Some Notes on an Early Phase in the Modernization of Communications in Turkey." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 3.3 (1961): 250-271.

---. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Mehmet Rauf. *Edebi Hatıralar*. Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2008.

---. *Eylül*. Istanbul: Alem Matbaası, 1901.

---. *Eylül*. Ed. Sabahtin Çağın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2006.

---. "Romanlara Dair: Bizde Hikaye." *Servet-i Fünun*. 344 (1313/1897).

---. "Paul Bourget ve *Bir Cinayet-i Aşk*." *Servet-i Fünun*. 423. (1315/1899).

Meltzer, Françoise. "Color as Cognition in Symbolist Verse." *Critical Inquiry*. 5.2 (Winter, 1978): 253-273.

Mete-Yuva, Gül. *La Litterature turque et ses sources françaises*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006.

Mignon, Laurent. *Elifbalar Sevdası*. Ankara: Hece Yayınları, 2003.

Miller, J. Hillis. *Speech Acts in Literature*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. 14th Edition. Vol. 1 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

Mufti, Aamir. "Orientalism and the Institution of World Literatures." *Critical Inquiry*. 36 (2010): 458-493.

Naci, Fethi. *Yüz Yılın 100 Türk Romanı*. Istanbul: Kültür Yayınları, 2007.

Namık Kemal. "Mukaddime-i Celal." *Celaleddin Harzemşah*. Türk Tiyatro Serisi. Ed. Oğuz
    Öcal. Ankara: Akçağ, 2005.

Noyon, Jennifer. "Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's *Hikaye* (*the Novel*) and Westernization in the Late
    Ottoman Empire." *Intersections in Turkish Literature: Essays in Honor of James Stewart-*
    Robinson. Ed. Walter Andrews. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Okay, M. Orhan. "Selaset." *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. vol 36. Istanbul: ISAM,
    2009.

Özün, Mustafa Nihat. *Türkçede Roman*. 1936. Reprint. 3rd ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları,
    2015.

Paker, Saliha. "Translation as *Terceme* and *Nazire*: Culture-bound Concepts and their
    Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation History."
    Crosscultural Transgressions. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing,
    2002.

---. "On the Poetic Practices of 'a singularly uninventive people' and the Anxiety of Imitation:
    A Critical Re-appraisal in Terms of Translation, Creative Mediation and 'Originality.'"
    Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey. Ed. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker
    and John Milton. Benjamins Translation Library. Philadelphia: John Benjamins
    Publishing Company, 2015.

---. "Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and its Practice: The 1897 'Classics Debate' as a
    Focus for Examining Change." *Translating Others*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Kinderhook: St.
    Jerome Publishing, 2006.

Pala, İskender. *Ansiklopedik Divan Şiiri Sözlüğü*. Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2004.

Parla, Jale. *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. 1990. Reprint.
    Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014.

---. "The Object of Comparison." *Comparative Literature Studies*. 41.1 (2004): 116-125.

---. *Türk Romanında Yazar ve Başkalaşım*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012.

Rancière, Jacques. *The Politics of Literature*. Trans. Julie Rose. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011.

Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem. *Araba Sevdası*. Ed. Sabahattin Çağın. Istanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2013.

Ricoeur, Paul. *On Translation*. Trans. Eileen Brennan. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Süleyman Nesip. "İki Söz Daha." *Servet-i Fünun*. 374 (1314/1898).

Şemsettin Sami. *Kamus-ı Türki*. 1886

Tageldin, Shaden. *Disarming Words: Empire and the Seductions of Translation in Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. 1969 Ed. Zeynep Kerman. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.

Tevfik Fikret. "Musahabe-i Edebiyye." *Servet-i Fünun*. 283. (1312/1896).

---. "Muhasabe-i Edebiyye: Bir Mülahaza." Servet-i Fünun. 429. (1315/1899).

---. "Tasfiye-i Lisan" *Servet-i Fünun*. 422 (1315/1899).

Tunç, Gökhan. "Preface." *Hayal İçinde*. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi, 2012.

Uysal, Zeynep. *Metruk Ev: Halit Ziya Romanında Modern Osmanlı Bireyi*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014.

Weber, Samuel. *Return to Freud: Jacques Lacan's Dislocation of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Michael Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Ziya Paşa. "Şiir ve İnşa" *Hürriyet*. (1868).