QUESTS FOR IMPOSSIBLE WHOLENESS: TIME, MEMORY, AND IN-BETWEENNESS IN MARCEL PROUST'S A LA RECHERCHE DU TEMPS PERDU AND AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR'S HUZUR

by

Esen Egemen Özbek

Submitted to the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Boğaziçi University

2006

"Quests for Impossible Wholeness: Time, Memory, and In-Betweenness in Marcel Proust's A la recherche du temps perdu and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's Huzur," a thesis prepared by Esen Egemen Özbek in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree at the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History.

This thesis has been approved and accepted by:

Assoc. Prof. Duygu Köksal _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu _____

Asst. Prof. Hülya Adak _____

An Abstract of the Thesis of Esen Egemen Özbek for the degree ofMaster of Arts
from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
to be taken September 2006.

Title: QUESTS FOR IMPOSSIBLE WHOLENESS: TIME, MEMORY, AND IN-BETWEENNESS IN MARCEL PROUST'S A LA RECHERCHE DU TEMPS PERDU AND AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR'S HUZUR

This thesis scrutinizes Marcel Proust and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's conceptions of time with a particular interest in the experience of modernity. The primary sources studied in this thesis are Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* (*In Search of Lost Time*) and Tanpınar's *Huzur* (*Peace of Mind*). Moreover, in order to shed more light on Tanpınar's thought his articles are also investigated. The study incorporates literary and historical analyses to contextualize both authors' works.
The main problem of the study is to investigate the impact of the experience of modernity on temporality. For this end, this thesis, first of all, accounts the historical transformation of the perception of time. It is possible to maintain that the experience of modernity was constructed upon a specific time perception and that this experience brought with fragmentation, transitoriness, and loss of stable ground. Proust and Tanpınar's works are tried to be situated in this context.
The thesis argues that within this modern temporality dominated by transitoriness and elusiveness Proust and Tanpınar try to find a stable anchoring point that would resist the cruel order of time. The way of finding this stable point and wholeness is constructing links between the past and the present that would constitute the temporal continuity that they are in search of. However, both novels demonstrate that the quest for wholeness is an impossible one because wholeness is once broken and there is merely the memory of it. They are reconstruction of that wholeness in the aesthetic field.

Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Esen Egemen Özbek tarafından Eylül 2006'da teslim edilen tezin kısa özeti.

Başlık: İMKANSIZ BÜTÜNLÜK ARAYIŞLARI: MARCEL PROUST'UN KAYIP ZAMANIN İZİNDE VE AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR'IN HUZUR ROMANLARINDA ZAMAN, BELLEK VE ARADALIK

Bu tez Marcel Proust ve Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın zaman kavramsallaştırmalarını modernlik deneyimine özel bir vurgu bağlamında incelemektedir. Tez birincil kaynak olarak Proust'un *A la recherche du temps perdu* (*Kayıp Zamanın İzinde*) ve Tanpınar'ın *Huzur* romanlarını almaktadır. Bu eserlere ek olarak Tanpınar'ın düşüncesini daha fazla anlayabilmek için makalelerine de yer verilmiştir. Çalışma metin analizi ve tarihsel analizi birleştirmektedir.

Tezin temel problemi modernlik deneyiminin zamansallık üzerindeki etkisidir. Bu amaçla çalışma ilk olarak zaman algısının tarihsel dönüşümünü açıklamaya çalışmaktadır. Bu bağlamda modernlik deneyiminin özel bir zaman algısı üzerine kurulduğunu ve bu deneyimin beraberinde parçalanma, geçicilik ve sabit zeminin kaybını getirdiği söylenebilir. Bu tezde Proust ve Tanpınar'ın eserleri bu çerçeveye oturtulmaya çalışılmaktadır.

Tez Proust ve Tanpınar'ın geçicilik ve kayganlık tarafından belirlenen modern zamansallık içinde sabit bir nokta ve bütünlük arayışı içinde olduklarını iddia etmektedir. Bunu yapmanın yolu olarak zamansal devamlılığı sağlayacak geçmiş ile şimdi arasında bağlar kurulması ön plana çıkmaktadır. Ancak her iki eser de göstermektedir ki bu arayış imkansız bir arayıştır çünkü bütünlük ve devam bir kere kırılmış ve geriye sadece hatıraları kalmıştır. Ele alınan romanlar aranan bütünlüğün ve devamın estetik alanda yeniden kurulmalarıdır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Assoc. Prof. Duygu Köksal, my thesis advisor, for her comments and critiques that enlarged my vision throughout the study. Assoc. Prof. M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu had contributed a lot not only to my thesis with his questions but also to my academic development. I do not know how I can express my gratefulness to Asst. Prof. Hülya Adak who gave me continuous academic and psychological support for four years by sharing all of my anxieties, happinesses, and sorrows.
I want to thank to Tracy Deliismail for her comments and Kathryn Kranzler for her careful editing and encouragement. In addition, I am thankful to Necla Turunç, Kadriye Tamtekin, and especially Leyla Kılıç who cared for all of us.
My friends at the Institute, Ceren, Azer, Ali, Nurçin, Erkal, and Selin gave me their encouraging supports and provided sincere friendship.
It is hard to thank someone who is an indispensable part of myself. Helin, who showed me that life is something different than I thought, has shared her existence and mine without any hesitation and reservation. Without her emotional presence, this thesis and me would not be as we are now, complete.
Finally, I am thankful to my family members who always supported me, especially my sister Gözde who has encouraged me from miles away throughout the year.

CONTENTS

Chapter
I. INTRODUCTION……1

Preliminary Thoughts for Framing the Thesis……..1
Modernity and Time…….5
Non-Western Modernities and Time……..19

II. TIME IN PROUST……27

Marcel's Many Deaths and Time……...28
Meanings of Names……38
Becoming of an Author: Aesthetic Realm and Wholeness……44

III. TIME IN TANPINAR……..56

The Individual Quest for Wholeneess and Time……58
Cultural Continuity and Time……62
Time and Literary Work……74
Meaning of the Past on the Individual Level……..77
The Meaning of Love and the Past……84
Socio-Cultural Continuity and the Past……..91

IV. CONCLUSION……94

APPENDIX……...105
A. Brief Biography of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar……106
B. Brief Biography of Marcel Proust……108

BIBLIOGRAPHY……111

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Preliminary Thoughts for Framing the Thesis

The subject of this thesis can broadly be defined as "time" in Marcel Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* (*In Search of Lost Time*) and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Huzur* (*Peace of Mind*).[1] More specifically it tries to understand how these authors conceived and represented human existence in time. Time has always been a subject of inquiry; in terms of ontological and epistemological problems it posed, in the history of humanity. What made these two writers come forth for the present study were their relations with a particular period of and experience in history.

This period and experience was modernity. The determinant characteristics of the experience of modernity are fragmentation, instability and elusiveness. These characteristics had transformed temporality tremendously. The cyclical temporalities inherent in the previous periods depending on the existence of an ahistorical reference point for most societies were the divine; these were replaced by a linear order of time with a specific emphasis on an ever-changing present and on the future. Thus, the ways in which individuals sought to situate their temporal existences and to give meaning to their experiences were also transformed in a way that undermined any possibility of anchoring in time. In this regard, modernity, with the break with the eternal and the divine, secularized human existence and brought unprecedented

[1] For brief biographies of Tanpınar and Proust see Appendix A and B.

possibilities for human thought and actions. However, at the same time, the experience of modernity created and intensified the sense of alienation and uprootedness and the crisis of representing experiences.

Modernity dominantly came to be related with a strong emphasis on the present and on the future with its belief in progress. However, as modernity is not one-directional and holistic, it includes several inner contradictions. It is important not to overemphasize the break with the past that modernity created and upon which constructed itself. Modern consciousness, constituting itself against the past, defined itself as the most progressed mode of human existence, but dialectically it incorporated a search for a stable point where the human existence will be entirely meaningful. This stable point was imagined and conceived in many different ways, but the common characteristic in all these imagined anchoring points was that at some point in time all contingencies and tensions of history would disappear. In other words, a quest for a reference point that was immune to the destructive effects of time was inherent in the consciousness of modernity. In other words, there was always a quest for what was permanent within the passing and ephemeral. This quest was also valid in modernity's relation with the past. Although modernity constructed itself on the idea of a break with the past and strived to hide its historicity, it sought ways to articulate the past to itself because the past emerged to be one of the possible stable reference points where wholeness and concreteness of experience could be reconstructed. However, it was not in search of a past as it was, instead, modern consciousness required the reworking of the past to make it concordant with its worldview or *geist*.

Marcel Proust and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar came forth in this particular context. Although these two authors lived and wrote in completely different

historical contexts, they experienced the shock caused by modernity and strived to find ways to grasp the meaning of this experience, to represent it, and finally to reconstruct the broken wholeness. So, studying their ideas and works would provide an opportunity to understand the complexities of the experience of modernity, especially in terms of temporality. However, one should be careful about perceiving these authors as exemplary figures in the history of modern intellectuals. The value of their works is not external to them. In other words, these works cannot be read as direct representations of external realities concerning the experience of modernity. Both authors were aware of the complexities of human existence surrounding them and they achieved the cultivation of those complexities and contradictions within themselves and found sophisticated ways to express them. Instead of proposing direct solutions, they pointed to possible ways of dealing with the confusing atmosphere of modernity. While doing this they questioned the taken-for-granted principles dominating views concerning modernity and opened up new areas of thinking about human experiences of modernity.

In light of these explanations, this thesis seeks to answer a set of complicated and tricky questions that cannot be clearly answered. First of all, what is the relation between modernity and time, especially the past, in Western and non-Western contexts? What changes occurred concerning this relation throughout the history of modernity? Within which frames are the relations with the past constructed by different internal and divergent streams within modern intellectual history understandable? What is the use of studying Proust and Tanpınar in a comparative perspective? What is the interaction between these authors? What are the specific ways in which they sought to express individuals' temporal existence in modern time? And finally, what is the historical meaning of these relations?

After expressing the fundamental concerns of the study, methodological explanations must be made. This thesis could be situated within the field of intellectual history. Both Proust and Tanpınar were important figures in the history of their respective historical contexts. They had crucial effects on the intellectual milieus surrounding them. The study takes as its primary materials Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* and Tanpınar's *Huzur*. Moreover, secondary texts of the author are included in the study when necessary. Texts are closely read in terms of specific themes in order to point at different aspects of Proust and Tanpınar's conceptions of time and the past. Accordingly, the study incorporates textual analysis and literary criticism with historical analysis. Such an interdisciplinary approach is crucial for the purposes of this thesis because Proust and Tanpınar tried to grasp and express human experience in its totality. Thus, a study aiming at understanding these authors' works has to incorporate different analytical tools and combine different analytical levels in order to delve into the multi-layered and multi-dimensional textures of their novels.

Modernity and Time

Modernity broadly can be understood as a tremendous transformation process of the world, human beings and the relations among and within them. It is important to remember that it is the name given to a process that spans nearly five hundred years. This process includes various complex relations that were far from constituting a monolithic whole. The emergence of the modern world happened in a dialectical way that was defined by many potentials, restrictions, contradictions, and steps back and forth. It cannot be conceived as a linear process of progress towards a

better life, although there was a strong tendency in that direction after the Enlightenment.

Being modern "is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world – and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are."[2] As Berman puts it, modernity is a universal and ambivalent process. It unites humanity in their disunity. Within this process there is only one constant that can be pinned down it is change. This changing world "pours us all into a maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish."[3] There is a conglomerate of factors behind these incredible transformations, namely geographical discoveries and discoveries in the physical sciences, industrialization, demographic upheavals, urbanization, mass communication, nation-states, mass social movements, and the capitalist world market. At the same time these transformations lead humans to think of themselves as capable of changing the process that has transformed them and to give meaning to their experiences of modernity. These meaning-creation and taking-action processes, which Berman conceptualizes as modernism, require awareness about modernity. The emergence of this awareness did not happen overnight; instead it came into being as a culmination of various experiences and intellectual efforts.

One of the main ways of this process of becoming aware of modernity for humans was to situate their experiences and their worlds in relation to past experiences and past worlds. This effort of situating themselves was related closely to their perception and conception of time. Matei Calinescu underlines the crucial

---

[2] Marshall Berman, *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (London; New York: Verso, 1983), p. 15.

[3] Ibid., p. 15.

role of time perception in this context. "The idea of modernity could be conceived only within the framework of a specific time awareness, namely, that of *historical time*, linear and irreversible, flowing irresistibly onwards."[4] The modern perception of time signified a break with the past perceptions of time. Time during antiquity was mythical. It had a recurrent nature because human beings were separated neither from nature nor from the Gods or Goddesses.[5] Time belonging to human beings and their Gods was not bifurcated.[6] With the emergence of monotheist religions, time perceptions were deeply transformed. Along with the recurrent mythical time, a linear and unrepeatable time perception emerged. This was largely due to the eschatological understandings of these religions.[7] This understanding of time paved the way for the modern perception of time. According to Calinescu, the alteration was clearly visible during the Renaissance. "The theological concept of time did not disappear suddenly, but from then on it had to coexist in a stage of growing tension with a new awareness of the preciousness of time – the time of action, creation, discovery, and transformation."[8]

In line with this new understanding of time, Calinescu underlines that the emergence of the periodization of Western history also was realized during the early Renaissance. Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and modernity were the three eras of this history. Calinescu draws the reader's attention to the linguistic connotations of this

---

[4] Matei Calinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987), p. 13 (original emphasis).

[5] It is possible to assert that modern consciousness constructed itself against this recurrent conception of time because this conception of time would not permit the emergence of the idea of progress on a linear temporal order. Moreover, recurrent conception of time was bounded by the presence of divine existence preventing the birth of modern subject with its new subject positions. If everything was bounded to recur, there was no room for human agency or for its rational intervention in the world.

[6] Erol Köroğlu, *Upon the Threshold Between What is Gone and What is yet to Come: The Concept of Time in A. H. Tanpınar's Novels*, M.A. Thesis, 1996, pp. 3-4.

[7] Ibid., p. 10.

[8] Calinescu, pp. 19-20.

periodization where Antiquity was "associated with resplendent light, the Middle Ages became the nocturnal and oblivious 'Dark Ages,' while modernity was conceived of as a time or emergence from darkness, a time of awakening and 'renascence,' heralding a luminous future."[9] These connotations were markers of a differentiation from both antiquity and the Middle Ages. With the Renaissance, intellectuals started to situate themselves in a new historical period different from the earlier periods. However, the break away from these past periods' intellectual and cultural influence was not clearly accepted until the eighteenth century.

Calinescu from this point onwards is interested especially in the cultural and aesthetic aspects of modern existence. Accordingly, he follows the break with Antiquity and the Middle Ages in terms of the perception and evaluation of beauty. He maintains that there was a transformation in these fields that was closely related to the perception of time. "It was during the eighteenth century that the idea of beauty began to undergo the process through which it lost its aspects of transcendence and finally became a purely historical category."[10] What needs to be underlined is the emphasis on a time-bounded understanding of aesthetics instead of an ahistorical one. A work of art and its aesthetic value could only be evaluated in terms of the time within which it was produced. This tendency was clearly expressed by the Romantics. "In brief, for Stendhal the concept of romanticism embodies the notions of change, relativity, and, above all, presentness, which make its meaning coincide to a large extent with what Baudelaire would call four decades later 'la modernité.' Romanticism, simply put, is the sense of the present conveyed

[9] Ibid., p. 20.

[10] Ibid., p. 36.

artistically."[11] A work of art came to be associated much more closely with the present time. This association led to the complication of the issue at hand with the development of capitalist modernity because the present became more and more ambiguous.

The reason behind this ambiguity was the inner bifurcation of modernity. This bifurcation occurred, according to Calinescu, during the first half of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, there was "modernity as a stage in the history of Western civilization – a product of scientific and technological progress, of the industrial revolution, of the sweeping economic and social changes brought about by capitalism" and on the other hand there was "modernity as an aesthetic concept."[12] Calinescu underlines that there was a tense relationship between these two conflicting modernities instead of a break away.

The first of these modernities embodied "the doctrine of progress, the confidence in the beneficial possibilities of science and technology, the concern with time (a *measurable* time, a time that can be bought and sold and therefore has, like any other commodity, a calculable equivalent in money or in Turkish "*vakit nakittir*"), the cult of reason, and the ideal of freedom defined within the framework of an abstract humanism, but also the orientation toward pragmatism and the cult of action and success."[13] These constituted the basic tenets of the bourgeois modernity that was created and maintained by the middle class. The determinant feature of the second modernity was its disdain of this bourgeois modernity. Thus it largely

---

[11] Ibid., p. 40. Romanticism, as an intellectual movement, was, first of all, a reaction against the rationalism of the Enlightenment. Instead of reason, the romantics brought forth emotion. Furthermore, there was a stress on individual creativity and originality along with the exaltation of the nature as a transcendent realm. What is argued above was that together with romanticism the authority of classicism and neo-classicism was broken to a great extent. The romantics' stress on the individual creativity and freedom undermined the dominance of the past criteria for evaluating aesthetic beauty.

[12] Ibid., p. 41.

[13] Ibid., p. 41.

incorporated antibourgeois stances that aimed at the destruction of the first modernity.[14]

The most significant representative of the aesthetic modernity was Baudelaire because of his new and rich awareness of time. "Baudelaire means by modernity the present in its 'presentness,' in its purely instantaneous quality. Modernity, then, can be defined as the paradoxical possibility of going beyond the flow of history through the consciousness of historicity in its most concrete immediacy, in its presentness."[15] Baudelaire's understanding of modernity was important because it signified "the revolt of the present against the past."[16] Another aspect of this understanding was its undermining of realism as an aesthetically valuable literary movement. The modern artist who was in search of creating the work of art of modernity had to rely on only to his/her imagination instead of a direct representation of reality.[17]

Baudelaire's discontent with the bourgeois modernity, for Calinescu, emerges from his perception that this kind of modernity unleashes the beast within human beings who are left without any restrictions.[18] One of the possible sources for restriction was the aristocratic values and worldview, but the bourgeois modernity had undermined them to replace them with middle class values. This point, according to Calinescu, constitutes a contradiction within his line of thought. "On the one hand, he calls for a rejection of the normative past, or at least for a recognition of

---

[14] Ibid., p. 42.

[15] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[16] Ibid., p. 53. French philosopher Agacinski sheds more light on Baudelaire's relation with classicism's conception of art, "It is the timeless ideal of classicism stagnated in academicism, the ideal that believes in the endurance of models and invites only imitations of the ancients, that Baudelaire shatters with the imperative of modernity. He does not oppose the punctuality of the present to an eternal ideal; he cuts the old concept in two and affirms its duality, parallel to that of man. Art simultaneously presents the immutable and the changing, the eternal and the fleeting – what time brings and takes with it of the passing, the contingent, the circumstancial – in short, the 'modern.'" Sylvian Agacinski, *Time Passing: Modernity and Nostalgia*, trans. Jody Gladding (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), p. 71.

[17] Ibid., p. 55.

[18] Ibid., p. 56.

tradition's irrelevancy to the specific creative tasks the modern artist is faced with; on the other hand, he nostalgically evokes the loss of an aristocratic past and deplores the encroachment of a vulgar, materialistic middle-class present."[19]

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed a much-heated debate about the nature of time and its different aspects. Stephen Kern, in his study on the culture of time and space in Europe between 1880 and 1918, explains different views about time. This period is important because "from around 1880 to the outbreak of World War I a series of sweeping changes in technology and culture created distinctive new modes of thinking about and experiencing time and space."[20]

The main source of the debate dates to Newton's definition of time in 1687 as "absolute, true, and mathematical time, of itself, and from its own nature, flows equally without relation to anything external," and Kant's critique of this understanding in 1781. Kant maintained that Newton's absolute and objective time could not be experienced by human beings. He perceived time as both subjective and universal. Time was bounded by human perception and constituted the foundation of all human experience. At the same time, it was universal because it was the same for everyone.[21]

Until the late nineteenth century Newton's definition of time was dominant and there was not a serious questioning of that definition. The capitalist modern world was ordered upon this objective and homogenous time. Kern points to efforts to standardize time as markers of this tendency. The aim of these efforts was the intensification of a uniform public time. The reason behind this drive was the capitalist economic order's commodification of time, the search for strict control

---

[19] Ibid., p. 58.

[20] Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space: 1880-1918* (Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 2003), p. 1.

[21] Ibid., p. 11.

over the work force and work time, and its requirement of a unified world market. This tendency was present before this period, "but never before had the temporal precision been as exact or as pervasive as in the age of electricity."[22] This objective and homogeneous public time was thought to be the only way to experience time. However, towards the end of this century contradictory voices began to be heard. These voices, coming from novelists, psychologists, physicists, and sociologists, asserted, "individuals create as many different times as there are life styles, reference systems, and social forms."[23] The common ground of these new views was their stress on the heterogeneity of time. There was a tension between the homogeneous public time and subjective heterogeneous time. However, one should keep in mind that there was not a clear-cut break between these times. Individuals experienced these two times together.

Kern gives Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* as an example of the relationship between these two understandings of time. He states that Proust's novel takes place between the Dreyfus Affair and World War I in terms of public time, but the inner time of the narrator has little to do with that public time. Marcel tells the story of his life through his memories to which he tries to give a meaning. The novel takes place in an ambiguous time that was determined by continuous lapses in time in search of lost time.[24]

Preliminary steps towards relativity theory in physics and Durkheim's emphasis on social relativity supported the arguments concerning the heterogeneity of time. Psychiatrists and philosophers also contributed to this stream. The issue of time got even more complicated when other aspects of it were under scrutiny.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 15.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., p. 16.

Kern points out that the debate on time in this period focused mainly on two more fundamental aspects of time. The first one was on its presupposedly atomistic character. The second point of controversy emerged on the issue of its reversibility/irreversibility.

Time had long been thought of as the succession of infinitesimal and equal pieces. This meant that time was a phenomenon that could be divided and measured through mechanical devices. However, the emergence of "the theory that time is a flux and not a sum of discrete units [which] is linked with the theory that human consciousness is a stream and not a conglomeration of separate faculties or ideas" undermined the atomistic perception of time.[25]

This new view of time was related closely to William James and Henri Bergson's philosophical understandings. James emphasized the flow-like characteristic of the human conscious while criticizing David Hume and Johann Herbart's understandings of it as the sum total of discrete entities called ideas.[26] James's views resonated Bergson's approach to time and its perception by individuals. Bergson distinguished two ways of knowing. One was relative; the other was absolute. The former was an external or superficial knowledge of the object acquired through interacting with its outside aspects. This way of knowing was incomplete. However, the latter way of knowing provided individuals the best way to grasp the object because it requires "experiencing something as it is from within."[27] The only means to acquire this absolute knowledge was intuition. Bergson's ideas concerning time and his theory of duration influenced deeply the intellectual milieu of the *fin-de-siécle* and caused a wide-ranging controversy.

---

[25] Ibid., p. 24.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., p. 25.

The second aspect of time which was debated was its reversibility or irreversibility. The dominant approach to time in many contexts viewed it as irreversible. This was the taken for granted feature of time. However, this view was not to remain unquestioned. Especially two technological developments affected this period's intellectuals. They were namely the electric light and cinema. These developments led many intellectuals and writers to question the irreversibility of time. New ideas and experiments that undermined the one-way advance of time were brought forth. "In the *fin de siécle*, time's arrow did not always fly straight and true."[28]

A clear-cut result did not emerge out of these debates, but the field that included thoughts concerning time had broadened to an unprecedented degree. Atomistic, irreversible, and homogeneous public time had not lost its dominance. However, a new area of ideas related to time was constituted through their opposition to the dominant understanding of time. This accumulation of new ideas paved the way for totally new possibilities for experiencing and representing time. Moreover, these oppositional views on time embodied a critique of modernity. It is possible to argue that the second view of time emerged within a vein of thought that criticized modernity's belief in progress and reason and its ordering of the world according to the requirements of capitalism.

These were approaches to the nature of time in general. It is imperative to go over views on a specific aspect of time, the past. Not surprisingly there were controversial understandings of the past during this period. In other words, the past was an ambivalent topic. Views on time oscillated between positive and negative extremes. "For Bergson it was a source of freedom, for Freud a promise of mental

[28] Ibid., p. 29.

health, for Proust a key to paradise. Others viewed the past as a source of remorse, an excuse for resignation and inaction, a burden of guilt."[29]

Kern argues that the invention of the phonograph and the camera towards the end of the nineteenth century transformed individuals' relations with the past.[30] However, the whole nineteenth century had a problematic relation with the past. "In this period people experienced the insecurity of their culture's involvement with its past, the perturbation of the link to their own inheritance."[31] This tense relation with the past led to the intensification of intellectual activity during the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century. Many philosophers, psychiatrists, and novelists expressed their views during this period.

The crux of the debates on the past was the question of value. There were different and controversial views concerning the past's influence on the present. This influence was seen either positively or negatively.

For Wilhelm Dilthey and Henri Bergson, the past's effect on the present was a positive one. According to Dilthey, "the past is a source of knowledge and meaning. All understanding is historical because man is a historical being."[32] The way of understanding human existence is achieved through the working of memory that "enables us to integrate experience in a series of ongoing syntheses which become understandable as we interpret the past and the future in a changing present."[33]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 37.

[30] Ibid., p. 38.

[31] Richard Terdiman, *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 3.

[32] Kern, p. 45.

[33] Ibid.

Bergson also held a similar position concerning the past. He also sought the answer to the question of how individuals can reach the knowledge of their existence in time. What was at stake in his theory was not only the epistemological means to know ourselves, but ethical concerns as well. "The absolute knowledge acquired by intuition is not merely a better way of knowing reality; its is essential to living the good life in it, and our ability to integrate the past in the present is one source of our freedom."[34] For Bergson the relationship between the past and the present was crucial. His theory of duration constituted the crux of his thinking. Kern quotes Bergson in order to explain this point: " 'It is into pure duration that we plunge back, a duration in which the past, always moving on, is swelling unceasingly with a present that is absolutely new.'"[35] Obviously Bergson resisted the break of time into different parts past, present, and future.

Furthermore the great historicist systems of the nineteenth century also emphasized the ways in which the past influences present. "Comte, Hegel, Darwin, Spencer, and Marx shared the idea that philosophies, nations, social systems, or living forms become what they are as a result of progressive transformations in time, that any present form contains vestiges of all that has gone before."[36]

On the contrary, there are many intellectuals who believed that "the past can overwhelm the present."[37] Significant figures of this line of thought were Friedrich Nietzsche, Henrik Ibsen, and James Joyce. Although these thinker and writers had profound historical understandings and accepted positive aspects of the past, "their

[34] Ibid., p. 46.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., p. 51.

[37] Ibid., p. 52.

most distinctive work was a strong negative evaluation of the paralyzing and destructive action of memories, habits, and traditions."[38]

Nietzsche in his *The Use and Abuse of History* in 1874 asserted that although all humans and societies' needed meaningful relations with their pasts, he also warned his readers against overemphasizing the importance of the past. What was important was being able to forget as well as remembering. "For the acutely miserable, dwelling on history is a deliverance, a 'cloak under which their hatred of the present power and greatness masquerades as an extreme admiration of the past.'"[39] The excessive dealing with the past suffocated the dynamic powers of the present and prevented the self-assertion of individuals and societies. Henrik Ibsen incorporated these destructive effects of the past in his plays where "inheritance, a sudden disclosure about their past, or a persistent memory works upon his characters and leaves them crippled or dead."[40] The past was always among individuals, it kept living in their unconsciousness. James Joyce's character in *Ulysses* expressed it clearly, "history is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake." Accordingly one had to be careful about the relation between the past and the present. "An effort must be made to hold the present because it is always slipping away, always threatening to have its uniqueness swamped by the old patterns of the past."[41]

Another point that must be made is about a change in the direction of interest with the past. Kern argues that at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth century there was a growing interest in the personal past instead of the historical past. Historicist systems of the nineteenth century presented powerful

---

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid., p. 52.

[40] Ibid., p. 53.

[41] Ibid., p. 56.

explanation of the predermination of the present by the past. With the erosion of these historicist systems' authority in defining the relations between the past and the present, many thinkers began to investigate the personal relations between the past and the present. "By focusing on the immediate past of individuals these thinkers and artists sharpened the analyses of their philosophical studies, increased the effectiveness of their psychiatric interventions, and intensified the dramatic impact of their literary works."[42] These intellectuals opted for trying to understand the individual's reaction to a given situation instead of reaching at general broad laws of history brought by the historicist systems of the nineteenth century. Moreover, they had no control over the historical past, but they had that control over the personal past. Thus, the personal past provided a richer field full of new ways of thinking and representing the past.[43]

As a conclusion, modernity is the name given to a process including various incredible transformations that changed the world and individuals. The alteration was so quick that it was hard for individuals to give meanings to their experiences. Modernity was experienced both as the loss of ground and instability and as the emergence of new possibilities of self-realization and subjectification.

Time as a fundamental aspect of human existence also was transformed through this process. The time perception of modernity clearly differed from time perceptions of antiquity and the Middle Ages in terms of its linearity. Instead of a mythical and recurrent time, a time that was thought to move forward on a line was adopted. This new understanding of time paved the way for the emergence of the idea of modernity. In other words, with the Renaissance individuals began to realize that they were living in a new and different historical period. They questioned the

[42] Ibid., p. 63.

[43] Ibid.

authority of their ancestors upon their existence. This process was accomplished with Baudelaire because he asserted that the work of art is related to its presentness.

The nineteenth century had also witnessed the bifurcation of two streams of modernity. On the one hand, there was the bourgeois modernity, which was found upon the capitalist economic system and middle-class' values. On the other hand, there was cultural modernity, which defined itself through its rejection of the banality of the other modernity. This bifurcation influenced perceptions of time.

During the fin de siécle period, there were intense debates on the nature of time. It is possible to discern roughly between two veins of thoughts. One emanated from the Newtonian understanding of time asserting that time was homogeneous, atomistic, measurable, and objective. The second maintained, without totally ignoring Newton's formula, that time was heterogeneous, flow-like, and subjective. These debates broadened the field of possible ways of thinking about and representing time. These deviant ideas concerning time were also part and parcel of an emerging challenge against the dominant suppositions of modernity, especially its belief in progress and reason.

Non-Western Modernities and Time

Modernity in the non-Western context was experienced broadly as a double-sided anxiety of what was lost and what is yet to come in the face of the threat posed by Western modernity.

The first aspect of this threat was its denial of timeliness of societies that were not as "modernized" as the modern West. This denial was a result of Western

modernity's self-assertion as the norm of historical development.[44] Harry Harootunian, prominent Japan historian, underlined in his study on interwar Japan, "temporality was always measure from one, base time line since, it was believed, true time was kept by the modern West."[45] Nilüfer Göle, eminent Turkish sociologist, in a parallel vein, argues that the Western conception of time is ideological in its perception of the non-Western context.[46] This conception of temporality was determined first and foremost by the idea of progress on a linearly imagined time line. The modern West assumed that modernity is a synchronic and universal experienced shared by the entire world, but in reality it created a temporal hierarchy on which different societies were placed according to their "level of modernization."[47] This approach relying upon the supposed temporal lag between the Western and non-Western contexts is described as "belated modernity."[48] The emergence of classificatory efforts such as "alternative modernities,"[49] according to Harootunian were also results of the rejection of the fact that Western and non-

---

[44] It is crucial to note that Western modernity's becoming the norm of historical development was internalized and reproduced in non-Western contexts. For an account of this internalization in Turkish context , see Orhan Koçak, "Kaptırılmış İdeal: *Mai ve Siyah* Üzerine Psikanalitik Bir Deneme," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 70 (1996). It is possible to find this internalization and reproduction of the conviction of belatedness in *Huzur*, see p. 250.

[45] Harry Harootunian, *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan* (Princeton; Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2000), p. xvi.

[46] Nilüfer Göle, "Batı Dışı Modernlik: Kavram Üzerine," *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 3 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), p. 61.

[47] Ibid., p. 60.

[48] For a clear example of this approach see Gregory Jusdanis, *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature* (Minneapolis; Oxford: The University of Minnesota Press, 1991).

[49] For "alternative modernities" approach see Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, "On Alternative Modernities," *Alternative Modernities*, ed. D.P Gaonkar (Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2001).

Western societies have undergone the same global process and that these societies share the same temporality.[50]

The sense of temporal lag dominating the non-Western context resulted in time's becoming a problem in this context. Göle asserts that non-Western societies are alienated from the present within which they are living.[51] Their perception of this present is always dominated by suspicion and anxiety because their situation in the present does never seems "modern" enough vis-à-vis the modern West. This suspicion and anxiety, according to Göle, leads these societies to reconstruct themselves either in the future or in the idealized past.[52]

Another influence of the sense of "belatedness" emerges in the field of the relations with the past. Göle underlines that modernity breaks the continuity between the past and the present.[53] Furthermore, the drive towards catching up with Western countries brought with it a specific perception and interpretation of history. As mentioned above, the present is never perceived to be modern enough. When this is the case, the interpretation of the past takes a particular shape. History is interpreted as a process of failure. History always lacks elements that are believed to be the foundations of Western modernity. This interpretation is dominant on the popular level as well as in academia.[54]

The modernization process, in non-Western societies, generally was perceived to create a disruption in terms of social wholeness. Non-Western societies

---

[50] Harootunian, p. xvi. Nilüfer Göle underlines how the term "contemporaneity," literally sharing the same temporality, came to mean, in Turkey, always the future and Western modernity. Ibid., p. 61.

[51] Göle, p. 61.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] For a criticism of such an interpretation in terms of literary studies, see Nurdan Gürbilek, "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel," *South Atlantic Quarterly, Relocating the Fault Lines: Turkey beyond the East-West Divide*. 102, nos. 2 and 3 (2003).

and subjects felt as if internally divided into two. On the one hand, there was the ways and norms of organizing, interpreting, and experiencing life. These ways were specific to their histories. On the other hand, there was the Western ways and norms overcoming and replacing the former in terms of social organization and understanding the world. This dilemma resulted in duality on both socio-cultural and individuals levels. Iranian thinker and writer Daryush Shayegan coined the term "cultural schizophrenia"[55] in order to describe this experience. This experience, as will be seen later, constituted one of the cornerstones of Tanpınar's thought. For now it suffices to say that Tanpınar saw the modernization process that the Ottoman-Turkish society had undergone from the nineteenth century onwards undermine wholeness of society in terms of the way of life. However, Harootunian rightly asserts that this sense of division or doubling was not specific to the non-Western context; instead the experience of modernity "everywhere would always result in […] a 'double life.'"[56]

This sense of loss of ground and wholeness, inherent in the present of modernity, created an identity crisis for the intellectuals and writers of the non-Western societies. How could they prevent being overcome by modernity? Especially how could they resist its homogenizing drive that denied historical differences between different societies and its inherent drive towards abstracting concrete relations and meanings? In other words, there was the anxiety of being

[55] Daryush Shayegan, *Cultural Schizophrenia: Islamic Societies Confronting the West* (Syracuse; New York: Syracuse University Press, 1997).

[56] Harootunian, p. xvii. Suna Ertuğrul, eminent literary critic, in a similar vein of thought, underlines that the sense of losing ground and belatedness was inherent to the experience of modernity, "this experience of the 'loss of world' is not specifically belated modernity's problem, but belongs to the essence of modernity as such. What we call modern is essentially an experience of the loss of origin, the loss of the transcendental structure that guarantees the meaning of human sojourn on earth. The modern epoch is opened up simultaneously as the absence of origin and an attempt to ground it at the level of subjectivity. In this sense modernity is always belated vis-à-vis itself." Suna Ertuğrul, "Belated Modernity and Modernity as Belatedness in Tutunamayanlar," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *Relocating the Fault Lines: Turkey beyond the East-West Divide* (Durham: Duke University Press), 102 (2/3), p. 630.

themselves or being original.[57] Imitation and originality dichotomy was decisive for Tanpınar and he brought forth the past that contained, for him, ideal wholeness constituted by the continuity of communal bonds, of religious practices,[58] and of human experience in time, in short its identity. Turkish society had lost this wholeness and had to reconstruct it through fastening the "chain of continuity." Culture and art, especially music, were crucial realms for Tanpınar because they embodied the past. Japanese case provides similarities with Tanpınar's case,

> While older cultural models […] associated with a still available past constituted a target for modernism and its recognition that the stability of forms was being undermined by ceaseless change, they also continued to supply an arsenal of resources that could be mobilized to withstand the ruin and reification caused by capitalist modernization and the market, which already had begun to serve as an organizing principle for new social relationships, identities, and value.[59]

Although it is hard to discern Tanpınar's view in terms of capitalist modernization and market, it is possible to assert that he was a supporter material modernity with its technological innovations that would help to Turkey's material development.[60]

Tanpınar's emphasis on culture and art's potential to construct bridges between the past and the present was related to the problem of representation. He was aware that the past could not be re-experienced or resuscitated in the present as it was. Moreover, the ever-changing present of modernity would decisively undermine any effort of grasping and representing the permanent. Thus, the only way of achieving this end was the aesthetic construction of wholeness and continuity. That is

---

[57] V.S. Naipaul's *The Mimic Men* (1967) is constructed upon this dichotomy.

[58] It is significant to note that religion, for Tanpınar, was more a source of communal bonds organizing everyday life than a set of rules of a divine order. It is possible to find this understanding in *Huzur*, p. 190.

[59] Harootunian, pp. xx-xxi.

[60] For Tanpınar's views about Turkey's need for socio-economic development and his suggestions see "İş ve Program – I" and "İş ve Program – II," *Mücevherlerin Sırrı: Derlenmemiş Yazılar, Anket ve Röportajlar* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 72-79.

to say, works of art, for Tanpınar, contained the memory of a past where continuity and wholeness were not broken down.

The belief in the presence of the past in cultural and aesthetic realms[61] was crucial in terms of constructing an enduring national identity. "The memory of a prior time and lived experience supplied the material for the construction of an image of national culture seemingly devoid of all marks of unevenness in which the life of the nation is portrayed as fully achieved and enduring, decisively formed before the transformations of capitalist modernization."[62] This quotation reveals much about Tanpınar's emphasis on the idea of continuity of national spirit throughout the history. He imagined that there was an ideal national community in the past experiencing wholeness and originality. It achieved to construct a mode of living that was completely specific to its necessities and worldview. However, this community lost its wholeness and originality because of modernization. The mission of the present community was to reconstruct that wholeness through remembering. Duygu Köksal, in her study on Cemil Meriç's understanding of time and nation, underlined that imagining a Turkish past by attributing it wholeness, originality, and harmony and exalting it because of these characteristics would lead one to purify the past from its inner contradictions and prevent one from perceiving objectively its inherent ideological, economic, and political conflicts.[63] The same inclinations are also present in Tanpınar's thought.

However, as it will be shown, Tanpınar was aware of the groundlessness of his quest for a ground. The chain of continuity was once broken, what was left from

---

[61] For the role played by literature in the construction of national identities see, Jusdanis and Homi Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (London; New York: Routledge, 1990).

[62] Harootunian, p. xxv.

[63] Duygu Köksal, "Zaman, Osmanlılık ve Cemil Meriç," *Cogito*, no. 11(1997), p. 195.

the past was the mere memory of it. Fragmentation and transitoriness could not be overcome.

After this examination of the relations between the experience of modernity and time in Western and non-Western contexts with a specific interest on the emergence of modernity's perception of time and its transformation in time, this thesis tries to investigate the role played by time in both authors' works. In other words, it tries to situate Proust and Tanpınar's works within the field of modern experience of temporality. The primary concern is to show that both authors' narratives are dominated by a sense loss of wholeness that was expressed in relation to temporal field.

In the second chapter, Proust's conception of time is analyzed through his novel. The main issue of this chapter is to point at specific appearances of the problem of time in the novel. This chapter starts with Marcel's, Proust's protagonist-narrator, sense of discontinuity in time. He is unable to assure himself about the permanence of his existence without constructing relations with his past through his memory. In the next part of the chapter, the relation between temporal continuity and names that Marcel tries to construct is investigated. In the last part, Marcel's discovery of the meaning that emerges in the moments of reminiscences is related to his search for wholeness and continuity. In addition, the role played by aesthetic production for Marcel in the reconstruction process is analyzed.

In the third chapter, the study focuses on Tanpınar's ideas concerning time and individuals' temporal existences. In the first part, there is an emphasis on the individual aspect of the loss of wholeness. Then the discussion is directed towards Tanpınar's approach to the loss of wholeness in the socio-cultural level because of modernization process through which Ottoman-Turkish society had undergone. In

this part, the debate on Tanpınar's social thought is also covered. Finally, *Huzur*, as the realm where both individual and socio-cultural levels are united, is analyzed in terms of the protagonist's, Mümtaz's, efforts at creating wholeness through his love for Nuran.

In the conclusion, after studying the two authors' conceptions of time separately in the previous chapters, a comparison of their conceptions is attempted. This comparative perspective reveales that the experience of modernity had a decisive impact on both Proust and Tanpınar's understanding of time. They were in the search of an ahistorical phenomenon that would transcend the limitations and destructive aspects of time. That is to say, they were trying to overcome the transitoriness, elusiveness, and instability of the ever-changing present of modernity through personal and collective memory. Both Marcel and Mümtaz were unable to make the moments where an anchoring point had emerged permanent. Marcel achieved to understand the meaning of his reminiscences, but it happened for only a moment. Thus, it had to be reconstructed in the aesthetic realm. Tanpınar was also constructing the moments where Mümtaz sensed wholeness because this sense was disrupted in the end of the novel. Thus, *Huzur* can be read as the memory of wholeness. Furthermore, Proust and Tanpınar's employment of memory and metaphor to construct and represent wholeness shows that they situated themselves on an in-between position because both memory and metaphor rely upon the relation between two different moments and phenomena.

CHAPTER II

TIME IN PROUST

Marcel Proust constitutes one of the cornerstones of literary history. His seminal novel, *A la recherche du temps perdu*, transformed most literary conceptions. Kristeva writes that "It was this man of the nineteenth century who inaugurated the modern aesthetic, and established a completely new form of temporality."[64] The emphasis on a new type of temporality is crucial because the experience of modernity had decisive impacts on individuals' experience of time, and as mentioned above, the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries witnessed the intensification of thoughts on time and temporality. Kristeva also points to modernity's impact on time: "we live in a dislocated chronology, and there is as yet no concept that will make sense of this modern, dislocated experience of temporality."[65] In this context Proust, in his novel, where the narrator Marcel tells his life story through his memories, achieves to assemble "the shattered fragments in the form of the life of his narrator."[66] In other words, Proust constructs wholeness out of the deeply fragmented human experience of existence in modern times.

Proust does not focus only on his narrator's life, but also tries to show his readers the world in which his narrator takes part in its totality and complexity. In this sense, what still make Proust's work so important and universal is not only its literary value, but also its emphasis on problems that still keep us busy. "He is concerned to establish a world in which his readers can come and communicate as if

---

[64] Julia Kristeva, *Proust and the Sense of Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 3.

[65] Ibid., p. 4.

[66] Ibid., p. 4.

they were in a sacred place: a world where they can discover a coherence between time and space and their dreams can be realized, a place which is sadly lacking in modern reality."[67]

Most of the scholars studying Proust, including Kristeva, agree on the secondary role of time in Proust's novel and on the preeminence of searching, but they differ in terms of the object of search.[68] The reason behind this diversification is the multi-layered and complex structure of the novel that can be studied from many different perspectives and that is open to interpretation. Nevertheless, the importance of time as the primary axis upon which the search is carried out is not denied. Moreover, it is necessary to understand Proust's conception of time by situating it in its intellectual context because as Poulet writes "to the extent that he [Proust] offers us *the space of memory* as a residual area of value leading beyond the spectacle of worldly life in its drama, Proust also aligns himself with a tendency of philosophy contemporary with him: one which, from Bergson to Heidegger, in different ways but with significant points in common, seeks to understand Being by exploring the obscurities of Time."[69]

Marcel's Many Deaths and the Past

At the very beginning of the novel readers see Marcel's awakening in the middle of night and witness his meditation on the process of his awakening. The well-known scene bears the mark of his loss in time and space. "[…] when I awoke

---

[67] Ibid., p. 6.

[68] For Georges Poulet, *A la recherche du temps perdu* "is the novel of an existence in search of its essence." Walter Benjamin underscores the search for happiness. Gilles Deleuze reads the novel in terms of a search for truth.

[69] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

at midnight, not knowing where I was, I could not be sure at first who I was […]"[70] According to Georges Poulet, the opening passage is important because it points to the lack of the moment in which Marcel awakened. "If it reveals a fundamental emptiness, that is not because it needs anything from 'ahead' but because it lacks something from behind: something which *is no longer*; not something which *is not yet*."[71] Narrator Marcel has lost even his sense of his existence. The reason for this loss, for Poulet, is the loss of the past and memory.[72] Marcel faces an epistemological crisis that has determining ontological effects.

Many students of Proust emphasize the issue of knowledge in order to better understand the novel because the lack of knowledge has a close connection between Marcel and the outside world. "Knowledge of the self […] depends on an ability to find the self in the external world."[73] In the following part of the opening scene Marcel tells the reader how he came to acquire the awareness of his existence: "[…] but then the memory, not yet of the place in which I was, but of various other places where I had lived, and might now very possibly be, would come like a rope let down from heaven to draw me up out of the abyss of not-being, from which I could never have escaped by myself: in a flash I would traverse and surmount centuries of civilization, and out of a half-visualized succession of oil-lamps, followed by shirts with turned-down collars, would put together by degrees the component of my ego."[74] For Marcel, it is hard, if not impossible, to become aware of himself in the absence of a fixed and familiar scene in the outside world. This familiarity with the

---

[70] Marcel Proust, *Swann's Way,* trans. by C.K. Scott Moncrieff (Penguin Books, 1957), p. 11.

[71] Georges Poulet, "Proust", *Studies in Human Time*, trans. Elliott Coleman (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 291. (Original emphasis)

[72] Ibid., p. 291.

[73] Leo Bersani, *Marcel Proust: The Fictions of Life and of Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 21.

[74] Marcel Proust, *Swann's Way*, p. 12.

outer world can only be achieved through the intervention of the past and memory putting an external scene and peculiar points of Marcel's personal history together.[75]

However, the world poses difficulties to Marcel because the Proustian world is "a world in which things project themselves before the eyes in instantaneous images which in turn are replaced by other images belonging to other moments and other places."[76] This slippery and elusive characteristic of the outer world culminating in the sense of solitude and loss of wholeness leads "to feel oneself betrayed, without any help from them [things and beings outside of the individual], to the indeterminate power of thought, which ceaselessly imposes upon us metamorphoses, which perpetually changes us into another 'self,' and which every instant makes of us, and for us, a stranger."[77]

Accordingly, the outer world appears to be a hodgepodge of images, sensations, and thoughts hindering Marcel from projecting certitude upon it.[78] In other words, "the world is everything and nothing until a human decision fixes it, gives it meaning."[79] The meaning of the world depends on the subject's ability to extract it through memory. "Things come to have meaning when the I of the writer rediscovers the sensations underlying them, which are always linked together in at least a series of two."[80]

That is why Gilles Deleuze concentrates on deciphering as the key feature of the novel. Deleuze reads the search for the lost time as the search for truth.[81] How

---

[75] Bersani, p. 21.

[76] Poulet, p. 293.

[77] Ibid., p. 294.

[78] Ibid., p. 293.

[79] Bersani, p. 22.

[80] Kristeva, p. 5.

[81] Gilles Deleuze, *Proust ve Göstergeler*, trans. Ayşe Meral (İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2002), p. 23.

can an individual who suffers many deaths, who lacks any sense of fixed existence, conduct this search? Throughout the novel, Marcel is in close contact with the outer world and social life and tries to decipher the reality underlying the complex world of which he is a part. Understanding the outer world is possible only through a specific strategy. "This strategy consists in delving deep down into ourselves, in regaining the time of our inner lives, which has been so subtly reordered that this time now comes to seem only reality worth taking into account."[82] The meaning of life can be grasped only through the self-analysis of the subject. There is not a given meaning; instead it is related to the individual's inner world.

In this context it is possible to think that Proust tries to construct a world that is as vast as possible in order to analyze relations between Marcel and the outer world. Marcel observes things and nature, the mundane relations of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie, and love affairs. He offers the reader many sensations and thoughts focusing on these issues. This effort brings with it a conception of time. "What the narrator calls an 'enhanced' place in time – perceived by the senses, inaccessible no doubt, but as the prepositional form 'a la' indicates, always beckoning to us, remaining open and disposable as the self revolves around it – is the notion of *embodied time*. The time in which all of our sensations are reflected upon, as they tie the knot between subjectivity and the external world and recover once again the sounds that lie beneath the masks of appearance."[83]

One should be aware that Proust does not construct time and the past as a continuum. This is why Marcel is not sure of his being and needs to reconstruct it again and again. Bersani points out this issue: "he lacks a sense of duration; he has never experienced that passage of time because he cannot imagine his identity as

[82] Kristeva, p. 6.

[83] Ibid., pp. 23-24. (Original emphasis).

something accumulating and persisting in time."[84] Images coming from Marcel's past do not constitute a whole that Marcel can lean on while trying to construct familiarities between himself and the outer world. His experience of time is a discontinuity of separated moments. Moreover, as mentioned above, his experience of his being is also unstable and uncertain. Throughout the novel, Marcel is in search of stable points because the present self is far from providing him the necessary stable ground. He has an "exclusive need of saving himself […] from his cruel contingency by discovering in the past the basis of this being that he is, and yet that *he no longer is*."[85]

Memory seems to be the intermediary providing the sense of continuity, stability, and permanence in time. Remembrance for Proust "is an invitation, and appeal, which is addressed to all our being, and to which all our being ought to respond."[86] Poulet underlines both the opportunities brought by memory and their elusive feature. There are many examples of these invitations throughout the novel, but only some of them can be traced successfully until the end where they shed light on the hidden meaning behind the surface appearances. These sudden and slippery invitations reveal to Marcel that his past self and sensations were not lost and that they can show themselves to him as they are. The moment of remembrance "is a moment in which things have a form, in which they are solid, in which one knows what they are as well as one knows who one is."[87] Accordingly, Poulet clearly explains the role of the past brought by memory: "In the Proustian world, it is not God, it is simply the past which confers on the present its authentic existence."[88]

---

[84] Bersani, p. 51.

[85] Poulet, p. 296. (Original emphasis).

[86] Ibid., p. 298.

[87] Ibid., p. 300.

[88] Ibid., p. 305.

However, it is important to note that Proustian memory works momentarily and coincidentally. It brings two moments in Marcel's life, one from the past and one from the present for a magic moment, but then this intersection dissolves. Walter Benjamin implied that the Proustian involuntary memory was closer to forgetting than remembering.[89] It is impossible to regain time through voluntary efforts to remember the past.

The famous madeleine scene illustrates this point. At the beginning of the scene Marcel thinks about the dynamics of remembering and underlines the impossibility of reaching the past through intellectual activity.

> It is a labor in vain to attempt to recapture it: all the efforts of our intellect must prove futile. The past is hidden somewhere outside the realm, beyond the reach of intellect, in some material object (in the sensation which that material object will give us) which we do not suspect. And as for that object, it depends on chance whether we come upon it or not before we ourselves must die.[90]

Then he starts to tell his readers about a weird experience that he had while eating little cakes called "petites madeleines" with tea offered to him by his mother when he returned from outside. There is not a clear marker of time that would lead the reader to understand Marcel's age. He was struck by an unprecedented sensation growing within him.

> No sooner had the warm liquid, and the crumbs with it, touched my palate than a shudder ran through my whole body, and I stopped, intent upon the extraordinary changes that were taking place. An exquisite pleasure had invaded my senses, but individual, detached, with no suggestions of its origin. And at once the vicissitudes of life had become indifferent to me, its disasters innocuous, its brevity illusory – this new sensation having had on me the effect which love had of filling me with a precious essence; or rather this essence was not in me, it was myself. I had ceased now to feel mediocre, accidental, mortal.[91]

---

[89] Walter Benjamin, "The Image of Proust," *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Shocken Books, 1985), p. 202.

[90] Proust, *Swann's Way*, p. 55.

[91] Ibid., p. 56.

The sensation was so strong and full of pleasure that he asks himself about its origin and nature. He is aware that it is related to the taste of tea and cake, but he also senses that what he feels transcends the taste. He needs to discover the truth behind this sensation. "It is plain that the object of my quest, the truth, lies not in the cup but in myself."[92] He tries to re-experience the sensation through drinking again, but it is in vain. The power of the sensation evades without giving him any clue about the truth underlying it.

> I put down my cup and examine my own mind. It is for it to discover the truth. But how? What an abyss of uncertainty whenever the mind feels that some part of it has strayed beyond its own borders; when it, the seeker, is at once the dark region through which it must go seeking, where all its equipment will avail it nothing. Seek? More than that; create. It is face to face with something which does not so far exist, to which it alone can give reality and substance, which it alone can bring into the light of day.[93]

Marcel understands that what he should do is more than seeking, he has to recreate the sensation because the sensation is not something given that waits in humans' inner existence to be found as it is. He tries to do it by completely focusing on the sensation through neglecting or suppressing all other stimuli, but he cannot achieve. Then he tries another method. He lets his mind to be interested in other thoughts and sensations,

> And then for the second time I clear an empty space in front of it. I place in position before my mind's eye the still recent taste of that first mouthful, and I feel something start within me, something that leaves its resting-place and attempts to rise, something that has been embedded like an anchor at a great depth; I do not know yet what it is, but I can feel it mounting slowly; I can measure the resistance, I can hear the echo of great space traversed.
> Undoubtedly what is thus palpitating in the depths of my being must be the image, the visual memory which, being linked to that taste, has tried to follow it into my conscious mind. But its struggles are too far off, too much confused; scarcely can I perceive the colourless reflection in which are blended the uncapturable whirling medley of radiant hues,

[92] Ibid., p. 56.

[93] Ibid., p. 56.

> and I cannot distinguish its form, cannot invite it, as the one possible interpreter, to translate to me the evidence of its contemporary, its inseparable paramour, the taste of cake soaked in tea; cannot ask it to inform me what special circumstance is in question, of what period in my past life.
> Will it ultimately reach the clear surface of my consciousness, this memory, this old, dead moment which the magnetism of an identical moment has traveled so far to importune, to disturb, to raise up out of the very depths of my being? I cannot tell. Now that I feel nothing, it has stopped, has perhaps gone down again into its darkness, from which who can say whether it will ever rise? Ten times over I must essay the task, must lean down over the abyss. And each time the natural laziness which deters us from every difficult enterprise, every work of importance, has urged me to leave the thing alone, to drink my tea and to think merely of the worries of to-day and of my hopes for to-morrow, which let themselves be pondered over without effort or distress of mind.
> And suddenly the memory returns. The taste was that of the little crumb of madeleine which on Sunday mornings at Combray (because on those mornings I did not go out before church-time), when I went to say good day to her in her bedroom, my aunt Léonie used to give me, dipping it first in her own cup of real or lime-flower tea. The sight of the little madeleine had recalled nothing to my mind before I tasted it; perhaps because I had so often seen such things in the interval, without tasting them, on the trays in pastry-cooks' windows, that their image had dissociated itself from those Combray days to take its place among others more recent; perhaps because of those memories, so long abandoned and put out of mind, nothing now survived, everything was scattered; the forms of things, including that of the little scallop-shell of pastry, so richly sensual under its severe, religious folds were either obliterated or had been so long dormant as to have lost the power of expansion which would have allowed them to resume their place in my consciousness. But when from a long-distant past nothing subsists, after the people are dead, after the things are broken and scattered, still, alone, more fragile, but with more vitality, more unsubstantial, more persistent, more faithful, the smell and taste of things remain poised a long time, like souls, ready to remind us, waiting and hoping for their moment, amid the ruins of all the rest; and bear unfaltering, in the tiny and almost impalpable drop of their essence, the vast structure of recollection.[94]

This lengthy quotation gives us the clues about Proust's understanding of the relationship between the past and the present moments of an individual's life. The first feature of this relationship is its unexpectedness. The sensation hits him so suddenly that he can not even understand what it is. Then he tries to understand it.

[94] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

The understanding process attracts attention because of its indeterminate dynamic. He is not sure about the certainty of capturing the meaning of that sensation. He wonders whether he will be able to draw that meaning to the level of his consciousness or not. He is in a state of anxiety because it can easily slip away without giving its essence to him. The whole novel tells the story of Marcel's search for the inner dynamics and the meaning of this moment where past and present sensations overlap and constitute an ephemeral unity through a specific working of remembrance that gives him pleasure and makes him happy.

As mentioned above, Proust does not conceptualize time in terms of continuity. The fragmented and discontinuous nature of time constitutes the cause of anxiety that dominates the novel. The discussion about the nature of time in Proust points to divergence of him from Henri Bergson. Poulet agrees with Bersani on the discontinuity of the past in Proust and maintains that it is wrong to compare the Proustian conception of time to the Bergsonian conception of time.

> It is an easy and gentle gliding backwards that Bergson conceives the search for lost time. Loosening itself in the course of a reverie, the mind allows itself insensibly to be merged into a past whose liquid and dense substance never stops pressing in gently from all sides.[95] For Proust, on the contrary, the exploration of the past seems at the outset so tremendously difficult of achievement that it requires nothing less than the intervention of a special grace and the maximum effort on the part of him who is the subject.[96]

The effort of the subject is necessary not to remember the past, but to clear the field for mind to understanding the meaning that emerges from the juxtaposition of two moments in time. "Thought must first pierce or dissipate that whole zone of deceitful appearances which is the time of the intelligence and of the habits, chronological time, in which conventional memory disposes all that it thinks to conserve, in a

[95] It is important to note that Tanpınar's understanding of time and of the relations between different temporal regions is close to this aspect of Bergson's thought.

[96] Poulet, p. 316.

rectilinear order that masks in each case its nonentity; then, having dispersed these phantoms, it must face the true nothingness, that of oblivion."[97]

This brings us to the relational character of Proustian time and, at the same time, of writing. As mentioned above for Proust, there is a not a continuity between different moments in time. Each moment is isolated. Accordingly, only the strength of relations between different moments can create temporal wholeness. "Proustian time is constructed into an entity at once spiritual and tangible, made of relations of moments which are infinitely remote from each other but which, nevertheless, in spite of their isolation and their fragmentary character, stud with the presences the depth of temporal space and render it visible by their shining multiplicity."[98] This is how the Proustian fabric is woven through endless metaphors combining various sensations and thoughts because there was nothing certain and enduring for Proust.[99] The aim of Proust was to construct as many relations or links as possible between these isolated moments in order to fill in the blanks between them. These in-between areas are important because they constitute the possibility of the act of remembering. Memory by its nature implies distance and separation. What we call the faculty of memory is a complex set of relations between the past and the present that is subject to constant reconstruction process. Thus the meaning of the world and the self emerges within these in-between areas. "The veritable being, the essential being, is he whom one recognizes, not in the past, nor in the present, but in the rapport which binds past and present together, that is to say *between the two*."[100] Poulet's point is

[97] Ibid., pp. 316-317.

[98] Ibid., p. 317.

[99] Benjamin, p. 202.

[100] Poulet, pp. 313-314.

illuminating because it implies that Proustian subject is bounded to an in-between position constituting both anxiety and hope.

Meanings of Names

A la Recherche du Temps Perdu was also known for its parts where "society" was keenly depicted through the eyes of the narrator. This society, instead of encompassing the whole of French society during the fin de siécle period, constituted of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. The reader is taken to various scenes in which inter- and intra-relations of these segments both of French society are shown.[101] The author focuses mainly on the circle of Faubourg Saint-Germain which constituted the summit of the high aristocracy with its strict exclusiveness.

Marcel, at first, seems to be enthusiastic about participating in this "world" that appears to him as a world of mysteries and sophistication. He tries to take part in this world by constructing links with its members. With the advance of the narrative, Marcel gradually achieves to get invitations to the most exclusive meetings held at several drawing rooms, or salons. He has close connections with the most "respected" people of the time. These are aristocrats of pure "blue blood" and the higher stratum of the bourgeoisie, but Marcel is quick to realize the emptiness and senselessness of this world of fashion that he labels as "kingdom of non-existence" (*le royaume de néant)*. He distances himself psychologically from this world without phyisically isolating himself. He sarcastically undermines this "society"'s prejudices and values by emphasizing how even the most basic human communication,

[101] For a Marxist analysis of these relations in terms of class struggle with a particular attention to historical context of France under the Third Republic, see Michael Sprinker, *History and Ideology in Proust: A la recherche du temps perdu and the Third French Republic* (London; New York: Verso, 1998).

conversation is able to become so meaningless in this world.[102] Benjamin also points out that Proust destroyes the self-confident and closed structure of this world by using comedy.[103] However, there is a particular role played by the aristocracy, especially of the name Guermantes for Marcel.

Marcel's interest in the Guermantes family reveals a tendency of him that leads him to search for the hidden plane behind their individual existences. "Except for his mother and grandmother, all the people in the novel appear intellectually and morally uninteresting to Marcel as long as they do not direct his attention to something beyond themselves."[104] Marcel longs to reach this truth about people and objects. This truth seems to him to emerge only from the in-between areas where different people and objects come to be linked with other ones. Again we encounter an emphasis on relational characteristic of the truth. Marcel situates himself in an in-between position where he can discover and create connections among different people and objects. This positioning also points to the employment of metaphor as the main narrative tool in the novel.

> It is only by the discovery of a second term of reality that Marcel's needs for possession and unity can be satisfied. Metaphorical expression is … a means of assimilating the outer world to the accumulated past that makes up Marcel's inner world; and the presence of the past in the aristocracy's names, as well as in the chance experiences that re-create Marcel's own past for him, is a guarantee of permanence and unity in spite of the destructive effects of time.[105]

As Bersani points out, what attracts Marcel's attention to the Guermantes is their name, which has a special meaning for him.

---

[102] Benjamin, p. 208.

[103] Ibid., p. 209. For a similar emphasis on Proust's social criticism that relates his position to his moral premises see Edmund Wilson, "Marcel Proust," *Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870-1930* (Glasgow: Collins, 1959), pp. 141-144.

[104] Bersani, p. 148.

[105] Ibid., p. 149.

The Guermantes were the feudal landlords who controlled Combray, where they have a castle.[106] Marcel's fondness for the name Guermantes developed during his childhood. A passage where Marcel remembers his family promenading towards the Guermantes castle illustrates this point and is worth quoting at length.

> I knew that it was the residence of its proprietors, the Duc and Duchesse de Guermantes, I knew that they were real personages who did actually exist, but whenever I thought about them I pictured them to myself either in tapestry, as was the 'Coronation of Esther' which hung in our church, or else in changing, rainbow clours, as was Gilbert the Bad in his window, where he passed from cabbage green, when I was dipping my fingers in the holy water stoup, to plum blue when I had reached our row of chairs, or again altogether impalpable, like the image of Genevieve de Brabant, ancestress of the Guermantes family, which the magic lantern sent wandering over the curtains of my room or flung alof upon the ceiling – in short, always wrapped in the mystery of the Merovingian age, and bathed, as in a sunset, in the orange light which glowed from the resoundling syllable 'antes'. And if, in spite of that, they were for me, in their capacity as a duke and a duchess, real people, though of an unfamiliar kind, this ducal personality was in its turn enormously distended, immaterialized, so as to encircle and contain that Guermantes of which they were duke and duchess, all that sunlit 'Guermantes way' of our walks, the course of the Vivonne, its water-lilies and its overshadowing trees, and an endless series of hot summer afternoons. And I knew that they bore not only the titles of Duc and Duchesse de Guermantes, but that since the fourteenth century, when, after vain attempts to conquer its earlier lords in battle, they had allied themselves by marriage, and so become Counts of Combray, the first citizens, consequently, of the place, and yet the only ones among its citizens who did not reside in it – Comtes de Combray, possessing Combray, threading it on their string of names and titles, absorbing it in their personalities, and illustrating, no doubt, in themselves that strange and pious melancholy which was peculiar to Combray; proprietors of the town, though not of any particular house there; dwelling, presumably, out of doors, in the street, between heaven and earth, like that Gilbert de Guermantes, of whom I could see, in the staines glass of the apse of Saint-Hilaire, only the 'other side' in dull black lacquer, if I raised my eyes to look for him, when I was going to Camus's for a packet of salt.[107]

The name Guermantes transcended, for Marcel, its mere signifying function to become an abstract concept that he perceives together with its historical

---

[106] It is this castle with its connection to the name Guermantes that gives the third book of the novel its name *The Guermantes Way*.

[107] Proust, *Swann's Way*, pp. 202-203.

connotations. It is impossible for him to discern between the actual Duc and Duchess and their ancestors. The name provides him with endless opportunities to imagine and recreate the past that belongs to the Guermantes by referring to their ancestors. Marcel constructs a legendary past out of this lineage through his imagination and memory. The signs of this past are so integrated into his life in Combray that he is able to encounter them even while going to the grocery store. He experiences the intersection of these different temporalities in his everyday life. However, this construction of the past emanating from Marcel's imagination is so strong and so complete that it deeply influenced his first impression when he first sees Mme de Guermantes at Combray's church. "My disappointment was immense. It arose from my not having borne in mind, when I thought of Mme de Guermantes, that I was picturing her to myself in the colours of a tapestry or a painted window, as living in another century, as being of another substance than the rest of the human race."[108] This is the first function of the names. They lead to the abstraction of the past through imagination that appropriates it as a subjective field of experience. Marcel creates his own Mme de Guermantes in his imagination and the actual person can hardly be interiorized within that imagined frame.

On the other hand, the names of the aristocracy play a second role in the narrative. A fields of temporal connotations pointing towards definite figures of the past, they give Marcel certainty about time, which he lacks fundamentally. This lead him to pay special attention to genealogy as the emergence of the past. He learns parts of the Guermantes' genealogy through the Duc de Guermantes's enthusiastic knowledge of it.

> Better informed than his wife as to what their ancestors had been, M. de Guermantes had at his command memories which gave to his

[108] Ibid., p. 206.

> conversation a fine air of an ancient mansion, lacking in real masterpieces but still full of pictures, authentic, indifferent and majestic, which taken as a whole has an air of grandeur. The Prince d'Agrigente having asked why the Prince of X … had said, in speaking of the Duc d'Aumale, "my uncle," M. de Guermantes replied: "Because his mother's brother, the Duke of Württemberg, married a daughter of Louis-Philippe." … When M. de Guermantes, to explain how he was related to Mme d'Arpajon, was obliged to go back, so far and so simply, along the chain formed by the joined hands of three or five ancestresses, to Marie-Louise or Colbert, it was the same thing again: in each of these cases, a great historical event appeared only in passing, masked, distorted, reduced, in the name of a property, in the Christian names of a woman, chosen for her because she was the grand-daughter of Louis-Philippe and Marie-Amélie, considered no longer as King and Queen of France but only insofar as, in the capacity as grand-parents, they bequeathed a heritage. … Thus does the aristocracy, in its heavy structure, pierced with rare windows, admitting a scanty daylight, showing the same incapacity to soar but also the same massive and blind force as Romanesque architecture, embody all our history, immure it, beetle over it.[109]

The aristocracy as the embodiment of the past constitutes an anchor linking individuals to the past. "In the aristocracy's names, in their old-fashioned manners, in their furniture, in certain archaic turns of speech, there was a rare example of continuity between past and present."[110]

However, in order for the aristocracy to play that anchoring role, its members have to remember their past. The last Guermantes matinee shows that they are unable to continue to be the link between past and present. The Second World War led to the total transformation of the Faubourg Saint-Germain. The old order of the world depending on the exclusiveness and self-confidence of the Guermantes is gone forever. The whole social panorama of "society" is changed.

> The Faubourg Saint-Germain was like some senile dowager now, who replies only with timid smiles to the insolent servants who invade her drawing-rooms, drink her orangeade, present their mistresses to her. However, the sensation of time having slipped away and of the annihilation of a small part of my own past was conveyed to me less

[109] Marcel Proust, *The Guermantes Way*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin (New York: Vintage Books, 1982), pp. 557-558.

[110] Bersani, p. 177.

> vividly by the destruction of that coherent whole which the Guermantes drawing-room had once been than by the annihilation of even the knowledge of the thousand reasons, the thousand subtle distinctions thanks to which one man who was still to be found in that drawing-room to-day was clearly in his natural and proper place there while another, who rubbed shoulders with him, wore in these surroundings an aspect of dubious novelty. And this ignorance was not merely ignorance of society, but of politics, of everything. For memory was of shorter duration in individuals than life, and besides, the very young, who had never possessed the recollections which had vanished from the minds of their elders, now formed part of society (and with perfect legitimacy, even in the genealogical sense of the word), and the origins of the people whom they saw there being forgotten or unknown, they accepted them at the particular point of their elevation or their fall at which they found them, supposing that things had always been as they were to-day.[111]

The old world where the self-assertion of the aristocracy implied temporal continuity is no more.

Marcel's experience with the aristocracy, nevertheless, makes him construct a relationship between the aristocracy's ties with past and the work of art. "The empty spaces of my memory were covered by degrees with names which in arranging, composing themselves in relation to one another, in linking themselves to one another by increasingly numerous connexions, resembled those finished works of art in which there is not one touch that is isolated, in which every part in turn receives from the rest a justification which it confers on them in turn."[112] This resemblance leads the reader to the final stage of Marcel's search for the truth underlying the worldly appearances that are far from providing him any sound and stable basis upon which to construct unity and wholeness in time.

---

[111] Marcel Proust, *Time Regained*, trans. by C.K. Scott Moncrieff, Terence Kilmartin, and Andreas Mayor (New York: Vintage Books, 1982), pp. 1000-1001.

[112] Proust, *The Guermantes Way*, p. 558. The links and continuity provided by the names of aristocracy are different than that Marcel's personal experiences of continuity that he had through reminiscences, but the crucial point is the stress on the necessity of links and relations. Marcel's interest in these aristocratic links with the past emanates from their inherent nature. These links are inherent parts of the aristocratic existence; they are almost "natural." Marcel lacks these inherent and "natural" links with his own past and accordingly, he pays attention to them.

Becoming of an Author: Aesthetic Realm and Wholeness

Marcel's frustrations with worldly signs and appearances were accompanied by a growing interest in aesthetics. Throughout the novel he has an aesthetic understanding of the world. He tries to find an aesthetic beauty inherent in the objects and people around him. This search was related to his quest for an essence that was common to all things. This essence lay beneath the surface appearances and gave them their genuine existence. In that sense, the aesthetic realm was thought to be the "real" mode of existence of the world. Marcel's inclination towards art was the sign of the supremacy of aesthetics. Art, for Marcel, transcended the "everyday" life. He clearly expressed this view when he was about to watch, the famous opera singer Berma's performance: "What I demanded from this performance […] was something quite different from pleasure: verities pertaining to a world more real than that in which I lived."[113] Marcel had great expectations from art. However, he encountered a powerful frustration about Berma's performance. He could not find the enlightenment that art was supposed to provide. This expectation for discovering the essence of life through art appears as one of the leitmotivs of the novel. The readers see Marcel's hesitations and uncertainties about the potentials of aesthetic production and about the relations between art and life.

Moreover, his thoughts on art forced him to face the main problem of the novel, Marcel's temporal existence. He wanted to be a writer at the expense of his parents' expectations. They thought that Marcel would work for the ministry of foreign affairs. Especially his father opposed his son's inclination. However, M. de Norpois, who was a famous statesman and one of his friends, persuaded him to allow

[113] Marcel Proust, *Within a Budding Grove*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin, revised by D.J. Enright (New York: The Modern Library, 1998), p. 17.

Marcel to pursue his aesthetic ambitions. Marcel, at first, was happy about his father's decision, but this permission led him to doubts about his life because his father pointed out that his son's tastes would not change from that moment on. "The first was that (at a time when, every day, I regarded myself as standing upon the threshold of a life which was still intact and would not enter upon its course until the following morning) my existence had already begun, and that, furthermore, what was yet to follow would not differ to any extent from what had gone before. The second suspicion, which was really no more than a variant of the first, was that I was not situated somewhere outside Time, but was subject to its laws."[114]

Marcel imagined his artistic production to be the beginning of his new life. Until that moment he had felt himself as bound by time's strict rule. He had a powerful desire to become a writer, but when the opportunity to write was provided he started to question his life. Throughout the novel, Marcel complains about his lack of artistic talent and his inability to start working on his work of art. He thought that he was losing precious time that he had to use in order to focus on his work. Consequently, it can be asserted that writing and time had strained relations in the Proustian world because time was working against him with unavoidable death at the end.

However, art and time were not totally antagonistic because the appreciation of works of art necessitated time and memory. This was especially so for music. Marcel's considerations about the famous Vinteuil sonata clarify the point. "Probably what is wanting, the first time, is not comprehension but memory. For our memory, relative to the complexity of the impressions which it has to face while we are listening, is infinitesimal […] Of these multiple impressions our memory is not

[114] Ibid., p. 74.

capable of furnishing us with an immediate picture. But that picture gradually takes shape in the memory."[115] It was undeniable that works of art existed within a temporal field. Only that temporal dimension would provide memory opportunities to relate past impressions with the piece of music. In the Proustian world it was this connection between impressions and music that made appreciation of the work of art possible. Unless accompanied by reminiscences listening would not help one to discover the real meaning and value of the work. The construction of connections, for Marcel, was the only way to bring forth the true existence of the world.

Marcel's admiration for Elstir's[116] paintings emanated from this painter's ambitious search for connections. "But I was able to discern from these [Elstir's paintings] that the charm of each of them lay in a sort of metamorphosis of the objects represented, analogous to what in poetry we call metaphor, and that, if God the Father had created things by naming them, it was by taking them away their names or giving other names that Elstir created them anew."[117] Art was an endless quest for metamorphoses and metaphors that shed light on the essence for which Marcel was searching. Through these metamorphoses and metaphors the artist was able to show the aesthetic beauty of the world. "The rare moments in which we see nature as she is, poetically, were those from which Elstir's work was created."[118] Elstir was able to see the world as it was and furthermore, he was able to represent it aesthetically through repeated metaphors. These metaphors gave his paintings a

---

[115] Ibid, p. 140.

[116] Imaginary painter in the novel.

[117] Ibid., p. 566. Marcel's emphasis on names was also related to what the present writer argued in the previous section about the meaning of names. He was trying to do the same thing with Elstir in terms of names when he was interested in people and places' names because "the names which designate things correspond invariably to an intellectual notion, alien to our true impressions, and compelling us to eliminate from them everything that is not in keeping with that notion."

[118] Ibid., pp. 566-567.

"multiform and powerful unity."[119] Bersani underscores that Elstir, through metaphors, achieved to "express an individual perspective on the world; he re-creates nature as a reflection of his own inner world."[120] This unity that was created by self-reflection was what Marcel was looking for. As mentioned above, the Proustian narrative was woven through these endless processes of construction similarities and juxtapositions because these processes constituted the sole way of representing the world in its uniqueness and wholeness as the appearance of an essence. In a way, Proust's sentences were competing with Elstir's paintings.

The appearance of this wholeness did not happen only in works of art. Other environments also could represent that wholeness. The emergence of wholeness depended on the subject who was looking at these environments. Objects and humans had not this wholeness in themselves inherently, it was discovered by the observing subject. His thoughts about Swann's salon exemplified the projection of wholeness to the outer world by the subject. "It has kept in my memory, that composite, heterogeneous room, a cohesion, a unity, an individual charm that are not to be found even in the most complete, the least spoiled of the collections that the past has bequeathed to us, or the most modern, alive and stamped with the imprint of a living personality; for we alone, by our belief that they have an existence of their own, can give to certain things we see a soul which they afterwards keep and which they develop in our minds."[121] This quotation points to Marcel's emphasis on the subject's role in interpreting his/her surrounding. This process of interpretation depended on the intellectual effort of the subject. In other words, discovering the meanings of worldly objects and human beings required intellectual effort. Marcel

[119] Ibid., p. 567.

[120] Bersani, p. 208.

[121] Marcel Proust. *Within a Budding Grove*, p. 302.

strengthened his position when he expressed his ideas about the exhibition of works of art. "Our age is infected with a mania for showing things only in the environment that properly belongs to them, thereby suppressing the essential thing, the act of the mind which isolated them from that environment."[122] The essence of the work of art lay in the intellectual abstraction that was realized by the artist. Artists broke down and reconstructed the relations between objects and their appearances while producing their works. This meant that the power of a work of art emanated from the aesthetic intervention of the artist. Marcel pointed out that the happiness and pleasure that one could grasp while observing a work of art were possible in museums because the "public gallery […] symbolizes far better, by its bareness and by the absence of all irritating detail, those innermost spaces into which the artist withdrew to create it."[123] Elstir's studio is a perfect example of this self-abstraction of the artist.[124]

His admiration of Vinteuil and Elstir did not solve his dilemma about art and life. He still was questioning his decision to be a writer. He gave up his ideal to be a writer when he was with Albertine and keeping her as a captive, but he could not be sure of his decision. "In abandoning that ambition *de facto*, had I forfeited something real? Could life console me for the loss of art? Was there in art a more profound reality, in which out true personality finds an expression that is not afforded it by the activities of life?"[125] At this moment Marcel was close to perceiving the relationship between art and life as an antagonistic one excluding and destroying each other. He

---

[122] Ibid, p. 303.

[123] Ibid, p. 198.

[124] See p. 564.

[125] Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time, vol. 5, The Captive & The Fugitive*, trans. Andreas Mayor and Terence Kilmartin, revised by D.J. Enright (London: Vintage, 2000), pp. 173-174.

was searching for compensation in each other for the loss of the other. With time he sensed possible intersection points between these two realms.

> "It is conceivable that a piece of sculpture or a piece of music which gives us an emotion that we feel to be more exalted, more pure, more true, does not correspond to some definite spiritual reality, or life would be meaningless. Thus nothing resembled more closely than some such phrase of Vinteuil the peculiar pleasure which I had felt at certain moments in my life, when gazing, for instance, at the steeples of Martinville, or at certain trees along a road near Balbec, or, more simply, at the beginning of this book, when I tasted a certain cup of tea."[126]

In this quotation we see that Marcel juxtaposed a work of art and specific moments of his life and found resemblances between them. In other words, two processes, appreciating a work of art and deciphering specific moments of reminiscence that gave him pleasure and made him happy, were put together.

At the beginning of the last part of the novel, Marcel reas the Goncourt Journal and realizes his inability to observe the outer world around him, but he also is aware that his inability is not total. The problem emanates from his lack of experiencing himself as a continuous personality. "There was in me a personage who knew more or less how to look, but it was an intermittent personage, coming to life only in the presence of some general essence common to a number of things, these essences being its nourishment and its joy. Then the personage looked and listened, but at a certain depth only, without my powers of superficial observation being enhanced. […] I was interested in what had always, because it gave me specific pleasure, been more particularly the goal of my investigations: the point that was common to one being and another."[127] Marcel thinks that his ambition to discover common and hidden features is an obstacle for his artistic production process because what he reads as literature depended on observation and representation of

---

[126] Ibid, pp. 427-428.

[127] Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time, vol. 6, Time Regained*, trans. Andreas Mayor and Terence Kilmartin, revised by D.J. Enright, (London: Vintage, 2000), pp. 33-34.

the outer world. He believes that the essential characteristics of the world are to be found at a much deeper level than the level of appearances, but he is unable to manage to unite them in the form of a work of art. This leads him to question his artistic ability. Moreover, he relates his inability to the intermittency of his personage who knew how to look and listen. This point is related to the above discussion on Marcel's sense of himself as a discontinuous entity in time. Being an author, for Marcel, necessitates the continuity of the personage who knows to observe and who is able to combine observations with his/her impressions.

With these frustrations and hopelessness Marcel returned to Paris many years later from the clinic where he received treatment. World War I had transformed Paris tremendously and the people that he had known. He is like a stranger. Then he receives an invitation to the Princesse de Guermantes's reception. On his way towards the reception he steps on uneven paving stones in the Guermantes courtyard and has a powerful sense of felicity that embraces and gives him happiness similar to the madeleine scene. One of the first effects of this sensation is that it takes away all his anxiety about his literary talent and literature itself. "Just as, at the moment when I tasted the madeleine, all anxiety about the future, all intellectual doubts had disappeared, so now those that a few seconds ago had assailed me on the subject of the reality of my literary gifts, the reality even of literature, were removed as if by magic."[128] He decides to understand the meaning of this sensation of happiness, an undertaking that he has canceled in the past. Then two similar moments of sensation strike him as if they are trying to underline the importance of his mission of discovering the inhidden meaning of them. He understands that this meaning has something to do with temporal field and working of memory. "Yes: if, owing to the

[128] Ibid., p. 217.

work of oblivion, the returning memory can throw no bridge, form no connecting link between itself and the present minute, if it remains in the context of its own place and date, if it keeps its distance, its isolation in the hollow of a valley or upon the highest peak of a mountain summit, for this very reason it causes us suddenly to breathe a new air, an air which is new precisely because we have breathed in the past, that purer air which the poets have vainly tried to situate in paradise and which could induce so profound a sensation of renewal only if it had been breathed before, since the true paradises are the paradises that we have lost."[129]

The moments that provide the possibility of regaining the time are the ones forgotten. In other words, these moments are left to oblivion because intelligence has not considered them to be of particular importance. These moments incorporate in themselves keys to the past because they contain an amalgam of past impressions, sensations and present memories. This process is similar to the difference, emphasized by the author, between voluntary and involuntary memories.

When Marcel focuses on the reasons of this happiness and felicity he comes close to an answer.

> This cause I began to divine as I compared these diverse happy impressions, diverse yet with this in common, that I experienced them at the present moment and at the same time in the context of a distant moment, so that the past was made to encroach upon the present and I was made to doubt whether I was in the one or the other. The truth surely was that the being within me which had enjoyed these impressions had enjoyed them because they had in them something that was common to a day long past and to the present, because in some way they were extra-temporal, and this being made its appearance only when, through one of these identifications of the present with the past, it was likely to find itself in the one and only medium in which it could exist and enjoy the essence of things, that is to say: outside time. […] This being had only come to me, only manifested itself outside of activity and immediate enjoyment, on those rare occasions when the miracle of an analogy had made me escape from the present. And only this being had the power to perform that task which had always defeated the efforts of my

[129] Ibid, pp. 221-222.

> memory and my intellect, the power to make me discover days that were long past, the Time that was Lost.[130]

It is obvious that the regained time was the time that was transcended through coming together of the past and the present. This togetherness constituted an extra-temporal moment that was not bounded by the cruel laws of time. According to Deleuze, the relation emerging in these moments transcend a simple relation of identification between past and present moments. In these moments, the essence of the past in its existence emerges.[131] In this extraordinary in-between moment the "real" or "true" being within the narrator is re-created to enjoy the essence of life. This being also transcends the order of time that leads every human being to annihilation. This being had no reason to be intimidated by the idea of death that is symbolized by the future. The extra-temporal moment, although it was "real without being actual, ideal without being abstract," embodied the opportunity to unite with the permanent essence of all things. This union is the sole possibility for the being to constitute a permanent and whole existence.

However, Marcel was well aware of the ephemeral characteristic of that extra-temporal moment. It was just a moment that was bound to fade away as soon as it showed itself with its bright light to the eyes of the narrator. "Fragments of existence withdrawn from Time: these then were perhaps what the being three times, four times brought back to life within me had just now tasted, but the contemplation, though it was of eternity, had been fugitive."[132] The only way, for Marcel, to stabilize these magic moments was to investigate in himself, to delve into his own existence to shed light on these moments. "The task was to interpret the given

---

[130] Ibid., pp. 222-223.

[131] Deleuze, pp. 67-68.

[132] Marcel Proust. *Time Regained*, pp. 227-228.

sensations as signs of so many laws and ideas, by trying to think – that is to say, to draw forth from the shadow – what I had merely felt, by trying to convert it into its spiritual equivalent."[133] At this point Marcel turned to art. "And this method, which seemed to me the sole method, what was it but the creation of a work of art?"[134] Bersani underlines Marcel's inclination towards art, "in danger of losing his sense of himself both in a succession of discontinuous personalities and in a hostile, unfamiliar external world, Marcel comes to see the work of art as his only chance of saving himself from the deaths that make up life."[135]

However, for Marcel the creation process was problematic because the emergence of these special moments was hazardous. They were sudden shocks that hit Marcel with undeniable force. They were not bounded by his voluntary attempts of creation. This characteristic was the proof of their genuineness and reality. In other words, these encounters with the essence of things made themselves written by the artist. The artist was not free in the face of these encounters. Instead, the process of deciphering the meanings of these encounters made itself felt as an obligation. The writer had to obey this call. All he/she had in hand, in order to decipher, were impressions. Impression was important because "only the impression, however trivial its material may seem to be, however faint its traces, is a criterion of truth and deserves for that reason to be apprehended by the mind, for the mind, if it succeeds in extracting this truth, can by the impression and by nothing else be brought to a state of greater perfection and given a pure joy."[136]

---

[133] Ibid., p. 232.

[134] Ibid., p. 232.

[135] Bersani, p. 211.

[136] Marcel Proust,*Time Regained*, p. 234.

Reality, for Marcel, was constituted by two elements, "what we call reality is a certain connexion between these immediate sensations and the memories which envelop us simultaneously with them."[137] The writer had to reconstruct this connection in the work of art in order to represent that reality. Metaphor was the key that opened this door because it was constructed upon the analogy between sensations and memories and it carried that connection to the extra-temporal field. However, Marcel realized that the moments in which this connection emerged were in limited number. Accordingly, he had to incorporate other materials into his work in order to continue his research of reality. These other materials were provided by the actions of the intellect. Marcel had reservations about them because "the truths which the intellectual faculty […] gathers in the open, the truths that lie in its path in full daylight, their value may be very great, but they are like drawings with a hard outline and no perspective; they have no depth because no depths have had to be traversed in order to reach them, because they have not been re-created."[138] But he had to rely on them in order to accomplish his research. Thus, he was able to recognize the material of his work. "And then a new light, less dazzling, no doubt, than that other illumination which had made me perceive that the work of art was the sole means of rediscovering Lost Time, shone suddenly within me. And I understood that all these materials for a work of literature were simply my past life."[139]

With this conclusion the circle that started with the madeleine scene at the beginning of the novel was closed. Marcel achieved to grasp the reason behind his feeling of happiness when he had the cup of tea with madeleines. He also achieved to find the way in which he could rediscover or regain the time that was lost. The end of

[137] Ibid., pp. 245-246.

[138] Ibid., p. 257.

[139] Ibid., p. 258.

the novel was also the end of Marcel's quest to become a permanent and whole personality. This personality emerged to be Marcel, the author of his life. From that point on, the time of writing began.

CHAPTER III

TIME IN TANPINAR

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar was one of the most important writers of modern Turkish literature in the twentieth century. His literary production covered a wide range of genres. He wrote poems, short stories, novels, essays, a scenario, a study on literary history, and a biography.

He was a student of Yahya Kemal at İstanbul University and Kemal had decisive influence on his views concerning the idea of history, Turkish history and art. In terms of his stress on the Turkish past, Tanpınar was related to Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar. However, Hisar's approach was different from that of Tanpınar in that Hisar negated the present in favor of the Ottoman and Islamic past. He was able to merge himself into the past without hesitations. Tanpınar was uneasy in terms of his relation with the past. He was unable to take the past as given, he needed to rework it through modern consciousness. In this context Yahya Kemal's influence was determinant because Kemal maintained that it was necessary to rework the classical Ottoman poetry in order to conserve it. Kemal's literary production was directed to that goal.

In terms of themes he used in his works and the mode of representation he developed, Tanpınar differed from the writers of the 1920s and 1930s. In that period, when the Kemalist regime had consolidated its power and undertaken a quick and broad reformation movement, realism had been the main mode of representation in arts and literature. For most writers and literary critics, the new literature had had to complement the reform movement. Many works concentrating on the country's

conditions and on the penetration of Kemalist reforms had been produced. However, with the 1940s different voices emerged taking a critical stance vis-à-vis the reform movement. Although these criticisms could not be expressed boldly, the Kemalist reformation was seen to be falling short of transforming the country and more importantly the way this reformation was being conducted was criticized. It is possible to situate Tanpınar's works in this critical vein. He problematized the way the modernization movement was being conducted. He maintained that this process created a duality in Ottoman-Turkish society through alienating individuals both from the past and from the present.

Moreover, instead of realism's primary interest in objective relations and processes, Tanpınar focused on the subject's inner world. He tried to express the psychological and emotional worlds of individuals within their objective relations. The objective world was represented through the mediation of individuals' inner worlds. Especially time appeared to be fundamentally a subjective phenomenon.

It is possible to see in his stress on the mediation of the subject, the influences of Henri Bergson and Marcel Proust. Bergson's ideas concerning time and memory with their stress on *durée*, intuition and existence were important sources of his thought. Moreover, he incorporated elements from the Sufi worldview into his works, especially the idea of wholeness of the existence, nothingness and the circular conception of time.

Tanpınar, as in the case of Proust, focused on the idea of loss. What was lost was wholeness. Tanpınar saw the world in terms of endless fragmentations, splits, and losses. He experienced and represented the loss of wholeness mainly in two realms that were closely connected in his thought. The first one was the individual level where he focused on the breakdown of unity between human beings and the

cosmos. The second realm was the socio-cultural one. In this realm Tanpınar brought forth the split that Turkish society was undergoing in the process of modernization. According to Tanpınar, together with the Tanzimat period, society had lost its socio-cultural continuity and originality.

Time had a central place in Tanpınar's thought. On the individual level, it constituted one of the major fields in which the separation between individual and the cosmos showed itself clearly. On the socio-cultural level, time, especially as it appears in terms of the relations between the past and the present, made the loss of wholeness visible.

The Individual Quest for Wholeness and Time

In Tanpınar's thought human existence bore the mark of a primary separation. Birth had to be understood as a separation from the Existence that encompassed all the cosmos. A human being was the embodiment of that Existence, but at the same time, as a separate entity he/she experienced the loss of wholeness. In other words, being an individual meant being an isolated appearance of the Existence. Individuals during their lives struggle with the split that emerged as a result of the disintegration of unity between their individual existence and the Existence that transcended the limits of that tiny mode of individual existence. They strive to construct that unity in their lives, but this effort is bound to be in vain.

As mentioned above, time, according to Tanpınar, appears to be one of the central levels on which the separation between the individual existence and Existence shows itself clearly. Tanpınar studied time, in terms of its relation to the individual loss of wholeness, especially in his poems. The scope of this thesis does not include Tanpınar's poems, but a general overview of his conceptualization of time in his

poems is indispensable for any understanding of his general emphasis on time. Students of Tanpınar's thought agree that there were two temporal levels for him, historical and cosmic. The first one was related to the worldly existence of human beings. This level of temporality incorporated terrestrial phenomena, such as objects, culture, and matters. The second temporal level transcended the first and included subject, nature, and soul.[140] The individual had to exist between these two temporal levels. However, one should be careful not to draw a strict line between these two levels because in Tanpınar's thought cosmic time covered historical time. Historical time was an embodiment of cosmic time. Thus, it was possible for individuals to experience cosmic time in their worldly existence.

Oğuz Demiralp, in his comprehensive analysis of Tanpınar's thought, underlines that possibility by pointing out the similarities between Tanpınar and Henri Bergson's thoughts. Demiralp argues that Tanpınar, following Bergson's ideas, believed in the possibility for individuals to experience the unity that preceded the split between their existence and the Existence.[141] What made this experience possible was the continuity of the cosmic time in individual existence because this cosmic time, for Tanpınar, was "the spiritual time in which the unity of object and subject was experienced, it was hidden continuity."[142] The way in which individuals could grasp this continuity, according to Tanpınar, was introspection. Through introspection, individuals could join in the Existence that was present in them. "Inner-self," a key concept in Tanpınar's thought, was to be found on this inner level. It was this self that experienced the unity. Tanpınar's conceptualization of inner-self

---

[140] Oğuz Demiralp, *Kutup Noktası: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Üzerine Eleştirel Deneme* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001), p. 25.

[141] Ibid., p. 20.

[142] Ibid., p. 21. "*Özne-nesne birliğinin yaşandığı ruhsal vakittir, gizli sürekliliktir*." (All translations in this chapter are mine)

resembled Proust's conceptualization of a personality within his narrator who was able to discover the essence of the world. For both authors, the discovery of the transcendental existence that lies beneath all the superficial appearances was possible through introspection of the subject. In other words, the knowledge of the Existence or the essence could not be acquired through any relation with exterior phenomena. Accordingly, for Tanpınar and Proust the discovery was always a self-discovery.

Moreover, the way in which Tanpınar narrated the moments of unity resembled Proust's reminiscences. The passage from historical time to cosmic time happened in a moment. The present moment expanded to join to a broader and deeper temporality. At this intersection point individuals were freed from the harsh laws of time. Death was transcended in these moments because individual enjoyed the eternal Existence. As in the case of Proust, these moments appeared suddenly and involuntarily without the willful intervention of individuals.

According to Demiralp, Tanpınar's frequently studied poem, *Ne İçindeyim Zamanın* (*I am neither inside of Time*) constitutes one of the best examples of the togetherness of the historical and cosmic temporalities within the subject. The first stanza of the poem focuses on this togetherness: "I am neither inside/Nor totally outside of time/In the unbreakable flow/Of a monolithic and broad moment."[143] Demiralp argues that as cosmic time coveres historical one, the subject experiences essential time. This was the ideal moment of wholeness on the individual level for Tanpınar.

In Tanpınar's works a dream-like atmosphere surrounds the subjects. Reverie has an important role for him because dreams open the gate towards Existence.

---

[143] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Bütün Şiirleri*, ed. İnci Enginün (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1994), p. 19. "*Ne içindeyim zamanın,/ Ne de büsbütün dışında;/Yekpare, geniş bir anın/Parçalanmaz akışında*."

While dreaming, subjects transcend their terrestrial existences to mingle with the source of their existences. Their relation with time is totally different from their relation with it when they are awake. The dreaming subject "becomes cosmic ivy swimming in three parts of time. For him/her the past, the present, and the future constitute a memory."[144] In these moments individuals overcome the idea of death and experienced eternity.

This was the wholeness and continuity that Tanpınar longed for on the individual level. He achieved to discern specific moments of realization, but he was aware that these moments were ephemeral. It was impossible to expand them in time. They happened in one moment. So, he expressed that these moments needed to be constructed in the aesthetic field in order to become permanent.[145] The construction of the ideal wholeness in literature is common in both Proust and Tanpınar. The wholeness, which can be grasped unconsciously only for seconds, can resist the destructive effects of time and transcend it towards eternity only through the conscious working of the artist.

Tanpınar, like Proust, insisted on music and music's ability to transcend time. Music had a close connection with cosmic time because it was immaterial. It affected its listeners not through the acts of mind, but through sensations. Accordingly, it reached deeper levels of human existence. Tanpınar's relation with Dede's[146] or Eyyubi Bekir Ağa's music was similar to Marcel's admiration for Vinteuil's sonata in Proust's novel. Music's immateriality provided it the power to transcend the

---

[144] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, "Şiir ve Rüya I", *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, ed. Zeynep Kerman (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1998), p. 30. "*Benliği, kökü ve yaprağı birbirinin aynı bir ağaç, kozmik bir sarmaşık olmuş zamanın üç buudunda yüzüyor. Onun için mazi, hal, istikbal bir hatıradır*."

[145] Demiralp, p. 52.

[146] Hamammizade İsmail Dede Efendi was one of the leading Mevlevi musicians of the Ottoman Empire. He lived at the end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. He was a Mevlevi dervish and then he became *dede* (the most upper rank in Mevlevi order). Selim III and Mahmut II had supported him and he gained wide fame especially in İstanbul with his compositions.

superficial appearances of the world and to bring forth Existence. Deleuze's insistence on the importance of art's immateriality for Proust's novel is also illustrative for Tanpınar. Deleuze argues that only art can create the perfect unity between a sign and a meaning because outside the aesthetic field every sign has a material aspect in itself. Art removes this material aspect and makes the sign free for the appropriation of the subjective meaning creation processes of the artist. The essence, in the work of art, emerges from the unity of the sign and the meaning.[147]

However, music for Tanpınar had other connotations that were related to the socio-cultural level. Tanpınar's admiration for the pieces of music produced during the Ottoman Empire emanated from the wholeness that he attributed to the "Ottoman civilization". In this context, Tanpınar did something different from Proust. He inaugurated a search for a socio-cultural wholeness and continuity that he thought that the Turkish[148] society had lost after the Tanzimat period.[149] In order to understand time's place in Tanpınar's thought it is necessary to focus on this level.

Cultural Continuity and Time

In the socio-cultural sphere Tanpınar focused on the Ottoman-Turkish societies' experience of modernization. As one who had experienced the fall of the

[147] Deleuze, pp. 48-49.

[148] "Turkish," for Tanpınar, included the Seljukids, the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic. He started the history of Turkish nationhood with 1071, beginning of the invasion of Anatolia. The paramount representative of this history was the Ottoman Empire. According to Tanpınar, these societies constituted a cultural continuity in time. It is obvious that his approach excluded historical differentiations of these societies.

[149] It is also important to note that Tanpınar constructs an ideal Ottoman society because no society corresponds to human wholeness as a model. Similarly, it is hard to conceive Western societies constituting a whole. Tanpınar saw the issue of wholeness from another perspective, an aesthetic one. The general frame that he used to conceive relations between Western countries and the Ottoman Empire was based on civilization as the umbrella term under which he grouped different worldviews and cultures.

Ottoman Empire, the War of Liberation, and the construction of the Turkish Republic, Tanpınar was sensitive about the modernization issue. The reason behind the Empire's fall, for him, was its material and cultural inferiority vis-à-vis the Western countries. The Turkish Republic faced the same challenge. The new republic had to construct a modern country that would be able to resist the pressure of the Western modernity. According to Tanpınar, the problem could be solved only through the creation of a genuine modernity specific to Turkish society. In his vein of thought, the Ottoman Empire had achieved the creation of a genuine way of life, but it had been undermined by the modernization process. The Ottoman Empire, after the Tanzimat Edict of 1839, had opted for Western civilization and abandoned Eastern civilization. This drive towards Western ways of life also had been adopted by the ruling elite of the Turkish Republic. Accordingly, Tanpınar thought about this issue and underscored the necessity for modern Turkish society to face its past because he was in search of an original Turkish existence.

Ahmet Oktay argues that Tanpınar experienced a double negativity of what was collapsed and what was to be created.[150] Tanpınar was not against the attempt at modernization, but the way in which it was carried out posed problems for him. The superiority of the Western countries was obvious. Thus, the Turkish Republic, which had emerged from the remnants of the empire, had to construct a new form of life. Tanpınar's thought must be understood in this context. His thoughts should be read as his conscious intervention in the process of creating this new form of life. He was in an in-between position and he did not opt for an easy way to overcome this duality. Instead he tried to "internalize the shock created by this duality and to

[150] Ahmet Oktay, "Tanpınar: Bir Tereddütün Adamı," *Defter*, no. 23 (Spring 1995), p. 50.

reconstruct it in his individual existence."[151] This positioning provided him a space where he could reflect on Eastern and Western civilizations and on the way to take. While doing so, Tanpınar avoided reducing his discussion on East and West to an opposition between material and spiritual values.[152]

Tanpınar, like many Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals, opted for a new composition (*terkip*) between these two civilizations as the source of the new form of life that was to be created, but he had reservations about this composition because he was aware that the elements at hand were completely different from each other. The worldviews of these civilizations were so different that it was almost impossible to think about a combination. So, he tried to illuminate the historical conditions that had brought the Western civilization into its current superior position.

The answer for Tanpınar lay in the personal experience and the continuity of these personal experiences in Western civilization. Western civilization had achieved the accumulation of the knowledge that emanated from individuals' experiences and efforts. Westerners were personally involved in their affairs and this involvement led them to directly encounter and to take part in the construction of their realities.[153] This continuity inherent in Western civilization provided it the generative potential to create and re-create itself again and again. Westerners, in both the individual and social spheres, had arrived at a point where they enjoyed the possibility of being themselves. They had created social, economic and cultural codes that were specific to them and their lives. They were able to construct their wholeness because they had organized their lives according to the necessities and characteristics of their lives.

---

[151] Ibid., p. 51. (Original emphasis).

[152] A. Ömer Türkeş, "Muhafazakar Romanlarda Muhafaza Edilen Neydi?" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), p. 593.

[153] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, "Şark ile Garp Arasında Görülen Esaslı Farklar," *Yaşadığım Gibi* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2000), p. 24. First publication of the article: *Cumhuriyet*, September 6, 1960.

His holistic understanding of civilizations did not deny the idea of change. He stressed that as historical conditions change civilizations with their institutions and value judgments also change. The crucial point was the inclusion of human beings in this transformation process. In other words, transformation had to be realized with humans not at their expense. The historical developments of Western civilization, according to Tanpınar, had created its human beings.[154] Accordingly, it is possible to state that Tanpınar developed an historical understanding about the progress of civilizations instead of essentialist or ahistorical views. However, historical events had destroyed this ability for Eastern civilization that was once, similar to the Western civilization, a whole, generating new values and forms of life specific to itself. Different periods of the historical flow led to the emergence of different humans, but there was continuity between these different humans.

> They were not living a fragmented time. The past and the present were connected in their minds. As they completed each other in time, they imagined the future as the reflection of their ideas and lives to what is unknown…. Life, one and whole, was going on together with its humans…. In the years following the Tanzimat we had lost this idea of continuity and wholeness.[155]

With the loss of continuity and wholeness Turkish society underwent a schizophrenic experience.

This experience implied a self-doubt and a lack of congruity. "We always have lived divided into two in our selves. We have not believed in most of what we have done because there has always been and still is another alternative for us…. Even today, when the new has entered into our life to a great extent, we are ready to

---

[154] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, "Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan," *Yaşadığım Gibi* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2000), p. 35. First publication: *Cumhuriyet*, March 2, 1951.

[155] Ibid., p. 36. "*Onlar parçalanmış bir zamanı yaşamıyorlardı. Hal ile mazi zihinlerinde birbirine bağlıydı. Birbirlerini zaman içinde tamamladıkları için, gelecek zamanları da, kendi düşünce ve hayatlarının muayyen olmayana düşen bir aksi gibi tasavvur ediyorlardı…. Hayat, bir ve bütün, insanıyla beraber sürüp gidiyordu.... İşte Tanzimat'tan sonraki senelerde kaybettiğimiz şey bu devam ve bütünlük fikridir*."

discuss and we discuss."[156] This quote implies that there was a problem concerning forms of life belonging to the past. The modernization process had radically transformed Turkish society, but discussions continued about the process. The reason for this ongoing hesitation was the in-between position. "We support and struggle for the new, but we are tied to the old. At some periods of our lives, when we are the new individuals we feel the pressure of the old; in other periods when we are the old individuals, we feel the pressure of the new."[157] This dilemma emanated from the persistence of the past as an alternative. Tanpınar argued that modern Turkish society had degraded its self-existence through self-denial. Tanpınar employed an interesting metaphor to explain this process: "If I could dare, I would say that since the Tanzimat we have experienced a kind of Oedipus complex, the complex of a man who has killed his father unintentionally."[158] However, it might be argued that the patricide process has not been completed yet.

In our case, supposedly the dead father appears to be the past, but it is clear that the past is not dead enough to leave the scene. It is always around; it haunts the modern individual like a specter. "It is certain that the old is always around, sometimes as an oppressed, sometimes as a lost heaven, sometimes as a treasure containing our spiritual wholeness. It unfolds in front of us like a mirage and calls us to itself. When it does not do that, it makes us doubt out lives."[159] However, this dual

---

[156] Ibid., p. 37. "*Daima içimizden ikiye bölünmüş yaşadık. Bir kelime ile yaptığımızın çoğuna tam inanmadık. Çünkü bizim için bir başkası, başka türlüsü daima mevcuttu ve mevcuttur…. Bugün bile yeni, hayatımıza o kadar girdiği halde, gene bu münakaşaya hazırız ve münakaşa ediyoruz da.*"

[157] Ibid., p. 38. "*Yeninin taraftarı ve mücadelecisiyiz, fakat eskiye bağlıyız…. Hayatımızın bazı devirlerinde yeninin adamı olarak eskinin tazyikini duyuyoruz; bazı devirlerinde eskinin adamı olarak yeninin tazyiki altında yaşıyoruz.*"

[158] Ibid., p. 38. "*Cesaret edebilseydim, Tanzimat'tan beri bir nevi Oidipus kompleksi, yani bilmeden babasını öldürmüş adamın kompleksi içinde yaşıyoruz, derdim.*"

[159] Ibid., p. 39. "*Muhakkak olan bir taraf varsa, eskinin, hemen yanıbaşımızda, bazan bir mazlum, bazan kaybedilmiş bir cennet, ruh bütünlüğümüzü saklayan bir hazine gibi durması, en ufak sarsıntıda serab parıltılarıyla önümüzde açılması, bizi kendine çağırması, bunu yapmadığı zamanlarda da, hayatımızdan bizi şüphe ettirmesidir.*"

experience did not necessarily point to a disadvantage. The in-between position of Turkish society provided a historical opportunity because as some important problems were solved, the encounter with Western civilization and the past ways of life constituted a form of wealth.[160] Appreciating this potential was possible only when the remnants of the past were purified and, according to Tanpınar, the Kemalist transformation process achieved that purification. As useless aspects of the past were eliminated, the past could be seen and evaluated in a new light that would stress its peculiar historical power and characteristics. In other words, for Tanpınar, the correct understanding of the Turkish past could only be reached through a modern consciousness that would analyze it historically.

Nevertheless, neither adopting Western forms of life nor appreciating the Turkish past were enough for the emerging Turkish Republic. The main problem was how to construct the present. "The true heritage for us is neither in the past nor in the West, it is in the life that stands in front of us waiting to be disentangled."[161] Western civilization and the Turkish past were to be perceived as two sources that should be incorporated in the construction of the present. The true source of this construction was the country's realities.[162]

In light of these views, it is possible to look closer at Tanpınar's conceptualization of the relation between the past and the present. This conceptualization has been studied within the context of Turkish conservative thought. These studies have contributed to our knowledge of Tanpınar's thought, but it is important to note that it is not easy to classify his thought as conservative. The

---

[160] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, "Asıl Kaynak," *Yaşadığım Gibi* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2000), p. 40. First publication: *Ülkü*, April 16, 1943.

[161] Ibid., p. 43. "*Bizim için asıl olan miras, ne mazidedir, ne de Garp'tadır; önümüzde çözülmemiş bir yumak gibi duran hayatımızdadır.*"

[162] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

problem arises from analyzing Tanpınar's ideas from within a conservative-modernist dichotomy. Tanpınar developed a sophisticated in-between position. Accordingly, it is crucial for any reading of Tanpınar in this context to differentiate between the different layers of his argumentation concerning the past in general and the Turkish past in particular. In many ways, Tanpınar's thought was close to conservatism in terms of his stress on the cultural continuity with nationalist undertones and on the significance of the past. However, there were also important aspects of his thought that undermined this conservative position. Tanpınar was a modern intellectual who was aware of the historical development of Western modernity. He was aware of the tremendous transformation Western countries had undergone during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Modernism and conservatism are conceptions that one needs to be careful with because they are intellectual abstractions that were coined to understand certain modes of mentalities. First of all, it is important to stress the interrelations of these conceptions. Conservative thought emerged within and in a relation to modernity and its position vis-à-vis modernism cannot be conceived as anti-modernism.[163] It is important to differentiate between these two positions. Conservatism and reactionary thought stand on two different positioning in the face of modernity. "Conservatism does not try to reverse the flow of history as reactionary thought does. It refers to the past as a constituent of the present."[164] Conservative thought has a particular relationship with the notion of past, especially in terms of tradition. It aims at keeping traditions alive, but this effort does not negate the idea of change. Traditions, in conservative thought, are not exempt from transformation according to the

---

[163] Tanıl Bora and Burak Onaran, "Nostalji ve Muhafazakarlık: Mazi Cenneti," *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), p. 234.

[164] Ibid., p. 236. "*Muhafazakarlık, gericilikten/reaksiyonerlikten, 'tarihi geriye çevirmeye kalkışmamasıyla', geçmişe şimdiyi oluşturan bileşenlerden biri olarak referans vermesiyle de ayrılır.*"

necessities of the present. Conservatism, according to Bora, is traditionalism that is conscious of itself.[165]

One of the main aspects of this consciousness is its recognition of the loss of the past. Tanpınar was aware about the impossibility of any return to the past. Moreover, he did not opt for such a move. What he tried to do was re-construct that past on the aesthetic level. There was a fundamental distance between the present moment and the past. It was impossible to re-experience the past as it was and Tanpınar was totally aware of this fact. "I am looking for a world that was lost in the wisdom of people who stopped talking in the frontier of the ideal. When I am unable to reach them when I want to, I turn to poetry and literature."[166] Even the aesthetic field could not satisfy him because it intensified his desire for the past. What he got was only mirages. Tanpınar's awareness confirms Ahmet Çiğdem's point. He underscores how "conservatives understood that a nostalgic or aesthetic move towards a lost tradition grasps the image of the tradition, instead of itself."[167]

Çiğdem argues that conservative attempts to protect tradition should be understood as the invention of a tradition.[168] Bora's approach to Yahya Kemal is also illuminative for Tanpınar's position. Bora emphasizes that for Yahya Kemal the way that was to be taken in order to conserve tradition was not keeping it as it was. "It was a voluntary reconstruction of the tradition through Western methods in order to

---

[165] Tanıl Bora, "Muhafazakarlığın Değişimi ve Türk Muhafazakarlığında Bazı Yol İzleri," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no.74 (Fall 1997), p. 7.

[166] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, "İstanbul," *Beş Şehir* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1969), p. 258. "*Hepsi idealin serhaddinde susmuş bu insanların hikmetinde kaybolmuş bir dünyayı arıyorum. İstediğimde onlara erişemeyince şiire, yazıya dönüyorum.*"

[167] Ahmet Çiğdem, "Muhafazakarlık Üzerine", *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 74 (Fall 1997), p. 35. "*Kayıp bir geleneğe yönelik nostaljik ya da estetik bir tavrın, geleneğin kendisinden çok imgesine sahip çıktığını herhalde en iyi muhafazakarlar anlamıştır.*"

[168] Çiğdem, p. 35.

reproduce the essence of the tradition in modern times."[169] Tanpınar was completely aware of the expiration of the past and he expressed it openly: "Why does the past draw us like a well… It is certain that we do not love these old things for themselves. What draws us towards them was the void that they left behind them."[170] It is clear that Tanpınar constructed his thought on this void, but his attempt was not directed towards finding the past. Searching was the key activity, instead of finding.

The stress on searching constitutes a similarity between Tanpınar and Proust because both authors were aware of the impossibility of finding the lost past again. Andreas Huyssen's remark, in the context of the *fin de siécle* period's interest in memory, is illuminative to understand these authors' efforts of searching. Huyssen maintains that memory's way of working is always *recherche* rather than recuperation.[171] Hasan Bülent Kahraman emphasizes the importance of searching for Tanpınar by stating that in Tanpınar's thought the act of searching itself corresponds to finding.[172] However, Kahraman's statement about Tanpınar's being mostly in the past seems to be an overstatement. Kahraman argues,

> Tanpınar mostly is not in the present but in the past because what he tries to do is to grasp the consciousness of the past and to internalize it by using the perception field of the present. In this respect, for Tanpınar, what is the present, in other what is taken to be real, was in the original text. This means that what was in the past.[173]

---

[169] Bora, p. 23. "*Yahya Kemal'in meşrebinde, Geleneği muhafaza etmenin yolu, onu 'saklamaktan', aynen tutmaktan değil; "Garp metoduyla Şarkı yeniden kurmak"tan, Geleneğin tözünü modern zamanlarda yeniden üretmekten geçer.*"

[170] Tanpınar, "İstanbul," pp. 256-258. "*Niçin geçmiş bizi kuyu gibi çekiyor?.... Hayır muhakkak ki bu eski şeyleri kendileri için sevmiyoruz. Bizi onlara doğru çeken bıraktıkları boşluğun kendisidir.*"

[171] Andreas Huyssen, *Alacakaranlık Anıları: Bellek Yitimi Kültüründe Zamanı Belirlemek* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1999), p. 13.

[172] Hasan Bülent Kahraman, "Yitirilmemiş Zamanın Ardında: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Muhafazakar Modernliğin Estetik Düzlemi", *Doğu-Batı*, no. 11 (2000), p. 14.

[173] Ibid., p. 31. "*Tanpınar halde değil mazidedir çoğunlukla. Çünkü, yapmaya çalıştığı bugünün algılama dünyasını kullanarak mazinin bilincini kavramak ve onu içselleştirmektir ve bundan hiçbir zaman vazgeçmez. Bu anlamda bugün ve hal, yani gerçek diye kabul edilen, Tanpınar için kaynak metinde olandır. Bu da dünde, mazide olana tekabül eder.*"

This point undermines Tanpınar's emphasis on the present as the main goal for any kind of relation with the past. The reconstruction of the past always happens in the present, but this does not directly mean that the present has not a meaning in itself other than being a key to the past. Tanpınar's insistence of the realities of the country also was related to that stress on the present.

Another aspect of Tanpınar's understanding of time was his stress on the individual side of the issue. As mentioned in the first part of this chapter, Tanpınar put particular stress on the existential tragedy of the individual that was experienced in the temporal realm. "Tanpınar's interest in the past, even when he stressed the cultural or historical aspect of the issue, never placed the individual level in a secondary position."[174] The double-faced loss of wholeness could only be transcended within the existence of the individual. Tanpınar obviously had communitarian ideas that stressed the unity of the elements of the Turkish community. He aimed at the intensification of communitarian bonds where they were loosened and at their reconstruction of them where they were absent. He put particular emphasis on "us," "us" representing the Turkish national community. He mobilized all his intellectual resources and efforts for the well being of the nation.[175] Nevertheless, the individual was not neglected. Socio-cultural and historical issues were considered through the mediation of the individual.

The Tanpınarian individual suffered a double loss, as mentioned above. First of all, there was the existential split between the historical and cosmic times. Second, there was the loss of socio-cultural wholeness that divided the individual

---

[174] Nurdan Gürbilek, "Kurumuş Pınar, Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark: Ophelia, Su ve Rüyalar," *Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark: Edebiyat ve Endişe* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2004), p. 121. "*Tanpınar'ın maziye olan ilgisi kültürel ya da tarihsel bir vurgu taşıdığında bile hep şahsi masalın terimleriyle anlatılmıştır.*"

[175] Berkiz Berksoy, "Bir Entelektüel Olarak Tanpınar," *Doğu Batı*, no. 37 (2006), p. 123.

psychologically. The individual felt the shock emanating from the loss of the past in his/her existence as a wound. The pain related to this wound is a humane feeling and lamenting for the loss becomes a way of reconstructing the past. As mentioned above, the ideal wholeness would emerge within the individual through the unification of the cosmic and historical times accompanied by a genuine unification of the past and the present in the socio-cultural realm. The ideal wholeness, according to Tanpınar, was to be constructed through a two-step process that would lead to the emergence of the "inner-self."

The construction of wholeness on both levels was Tanpınar's quest, but it was a difficult, if not impossible, undertaking. Especially, combining the past and the present posed a severe challenge for him because the past was an ambivalent experience in Tanpınar's lexicon. Its meaning and content was not definite and it contained diverse and sometimes antagonistic connotations. Gürbilek reminds the students of Tanpınar of this important but neglected point that seem crucial in order to reach a sophisticated reading of Tanpınar's ideas on time. She agrees with readings of Tanpınar in the conservative context because of his emphasis on the past as a means of securing cultural continuity, which also exposes his nationalist tendencies. Nevertheless, she argues that Tanpınar, at the same time, undermined such a conservative position himself by expressing negative aspects of the past. The past, on the one hand, constitutes the ground which any construction of the present and of the inner world of the individual's needs. On the other hand, it appears to be an obstacle for this constructive attempt because of its destructive characteristic. "The past, for Tanpınar, is not only an idealized realm that invites us, but is also a dead past, an inauspicious heritage, which is remembered mostly involuntarily,

showing itself with its cruel appearance and invading inner worlds of the characters in his stories and novels."[176]

Accordingly remembering the past, which was an indispensable element in the construction of wholeness in Proust's case, became a complex issue in Tanpınar's case. The past with its permanence constituted a problem for Tanpınar. It was necessary to break up with it in order to face the present realities of human existence, but it resisted. In other words, according to Tanpınar, the individual encountered the problem of over-remembering. Individuals, in Tanpınar's world, were not always able to benefit from the positive effects of forgetting because the past, inherent in their existences, did not leave them alone.

This specter-like characteristic of the past, when considered together with Tanpınar's awareness of the impossibility of re-experiencing the past, made his quest for wholeness impossible. Gürbilek underlines Tanpınar's acknowledgment of the dead of the past and she maintains, "this acknowledgment constituted the point where conservatism and organicism (*uzviyetçilik*) were broken and where narcissism was wounded. This point also constituted the essential characteristic of Tanpınar's aesthetic, an aesthetic of loss."[177] Tanpınar, despite his endless search for the unity of the double temporal layers and for wholeness that would come with this unity, was aware of the vanity of this attempt. However, he did not quit his in-between position and faced the abyss.

> Tanpınar is one of the best if not the first of those writers who express the anxiety stemming from the fact that the magic of Haşim's "Muslim

---

[176] Gürbilek, "Kör Ayna," p. 121. "*Yalnızca bizi kendine çağıran, idealleştirilmiş bir 'mazi gülü' değil, aynı zamanda zalim çehresiyle de beliren, öykü ve roman kahramanlarının iç dünyasını istila etmiş, çoğu zaman iradi bir çabayla değil, gayri iradi olarak hatırlanan bir ölü geçmiş, bir uğursuz mirastır.*"

[177] Ibid., p. 131. "*Tanpınar'da pınar kurumuş, ayna körleşmiş, Şark ölmüş, saltanat kayığı çoktan batmıştır. Tanpınar estetiğinin temel özelliği de burada aranmalıdır. Tanpınar'da muhafazakarlığın da uzviyetçiliğin de kırıldığı, narsisizmin yara aldığı, en azından yaranın açığa çıktığı yer. Bir kayıp estetiği.*"

clock" would not fascinate our lives anymore, that what remained from the old house was only a wreckage and we have to be tenants of the new one, that all attempts for composition would end up in becoming a "freak," that the so called "inner castle" was a loss and finally what is called the self could only be a fairy tale. True, he has never stopped looking for luminous seas but he is also the one who says "darkness has a share in everything that was his authentic dream," who talks about "an uncertain darkness that converts our place suddenly into an undersea whose wholeness has been blurred under the light leaked among the dense layers of water," who points out the darkness that could not be softened by any kind of magic, the "darkness as solid as rock," a drained "deep hole," the horrible demons, secret imaginings and cruel sights in his dream, and at the end who points out the "contradicting forces, sinister thoughts and infernal feelings" of the soul. He is also far away from conservatism to the degree to say that "one whose organic harmony was broken becomes an individual," to defend that "this disquiet is what makes the real modern," and yet more, to the degree to comfortably use a concept like "borrowed personality."[178]

Time and Literary Work

As mentioned above, Tanpınar dealt with both the individual and social levels of the loss of wholeness in his novels. His aesthetic undertaking started with an acceptance of the loss and the break and was dominated by anxiety. According to Gürbilek, literature for Tanpınar was the primary means to reach the past and his aim was "to transform the loss of the past into a source nourishing art."[179] The loss of the

[178] Ibid., pp. 135-136. *Haşim'in 'Müslüman Saati'nin barındırdığı sihrin hayatımızı birdaha hiç büyüleyemeyecek olduğunu, eski evin enkazdan ibaret kaldığını, yeni evde kiracı olmaya mecbur olduğumuzu, her türlü terkip çabasının sonuçta bir 'galat-ı hilkat' olacağını, 'iç kale' denilen yerin kayıptan oluştuğunu, nihayet kendilik denen şeyin aynı zamanda bir masaldan ibaret olabileceği endişesini Türk edebiyatında ilk değilse de en iyi ifade eden yazarlardan biridir Tanpınar. Aydınlık suların peşini hiç bırakmamıştır, evet, ama 'hakiki rüyası olan her şeyde karanlığın bir hissesi' olduğunu söyleyen, 'muhitimizi birdenbire sanki kesif su tabakaları arasından sızan aydınlıkta yekpareliği bulanmış bir denizaltına çeviren şüpheli bir karanlık'tan söz eden, hiçbir tılsımın yumuşatamadığı zifiri, 'taş kadar katı karanlık'tan, suları çekilmiş bir 'siyah kuyu'dan, rüyasının korkunç ifritlerinden, gizli tasavvurlarından, zalim manzaralarından söz eden, nihayet ruhun 'mütenakis kuvvetleri'ne, meş'um düşüncelerine, cehennemi duygularına işaret eden de odur. 'Uzvi ahengi bozulan insan fert haline girer' diyebilecek, 'bu huzursuzluk, asıl moderni yapar' görüşünü savunabilecek, dahası 'ödünç şahsiyet' gibi bir kavramı rahatça kullanabilecek kadar da uzaktır muhafazakarlıktan.*

[179] Nurdan Gürbilek, "Tanpınar'da Görünmeyen", *Yer Değiştiren Gölge* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1995), p. 11. "*Geçmiş kaybını, sanatı besleyen bir kaynağa dönüştürmekti.*"

past and unity were to serve as a source of aesthetic production because Tanpınar aimed at their recreation through artistic imagination. This service did not mean that literature played a compensating role for Tanpınar. It is possible to say that, as in the case of Proust, artistic creation was the only possible way to eternalize the experience of wholeness because in the aesthetic realm, the destructive effects of time could be transcended by the artist.

Tanpınar explained his aesthetic interest in the recreation of the past in terms of Orpheus's experience.

> There is an Orpheus story at the beginning of every work of art, taking back Eurydice from the realm of death. Orpheus finds his death wife with the power of his musical instrument. In reality, the instrument and Eurydice were one and the same. Every face, every memory, every event of our life comes to us with its specific tune. In order re-live it, it is necessary to find that tune. Sometimes this tune – as a result of an external event - starts to swim at the surface. This means that the river of time wants to flow backward, the great abyss is giving back everything that it absorbed.[180]

This explanation with its Proustian undertones underscored the main motive behind Tanpınar's literary undertaking. The work of art was a means to transcend death. Through imagination the artist could transcend the boundaries of time. It is possible to state that in both authors the order of time was synonymous with death. Only the aesthetic realm had the power to resist this flow. Tanpınar wanted to use the potential of art to its limits. Not only the content of his works, but also the language that he used aimed at this aesthetic production. "His expression of the loss is a defense of aesthetic beauty. A rich, saturated and saturating language that returns everything to

---

[180] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, "Şiir ve Rüya II", *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, ed. Zeynep Kerman (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1998), pp. 34-35. Originally published in *Ülkü*, no. 57, February 1, 1944. "*Her sanat eserinin başında bir Orfeus hikayesi vardır. Ölüm diyarından sarışın Eurydice'yi geri almak. Orfeus, ölmüş olan karısını ahrette sazının kuvvetiyle bulur. Gerçekte saz ile Eurydice birdir. Her çehre, her hatıra, ömrün her vakıası bize kendi hususi nağmesiyle gelir. Onu yeniden yaşamak için bu sesi bulabilmek lazımdır. Bazen bu nağme kendiliğinden – dıştan gelen herhangi bir sebeple – satıhta yüzmeye başlar. Bu, zaman nehri tersine akmak istiyor, büyük uçurum yuttuğu her şeyi geri veriyor demektir.*"

an 'origin' that lay in the depths and that was reminiscent of a wholeness that totally covered existence."[181]

Accordingly, it would not be wrong to state that time constitutes one of the main themes in Tanpınar's novels. Jale Parla, in her study of *Mahur Beste* (*Mahur Tune*), underscores Tanpınar's double time that was mentioned above. "Tanpınar made the relationship between a 'monolithic time' without matter, language, human being, conscious and a time that accepted partition the center of his search. The novel was the narrative of the second time."[182] Parla argues that Tanpınar's main focus in *Mahur Beste, Huzur (Peace of Mind),* and *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü (The Time Regulation Institute)* was to represent the relations between cosmic and historical times.[183] This aim was a challenge for Tanpınar because the cosmic time, in his thought, transcended or preceded human existence and consciousness. In other words, Tanpınar tried to represent something unrepresentable by its conceptualization in his thought. Thus, Tanpınar's novels are dominated by an endless search. This characteristic included both negative and positive aspects. On the negative side, there is the impossibility of a possible solution. On the positive side, there is the impossibility of narrative closure emanating from the negative aspect of the process. It is this in-between position that gives his works their multi-dimensional and complex structure.

---

[181] Gürbilek, "Tanpınar'da Görünmeyen," p. 12. "*Kaybı dile getirişi bile bir 'güzel' sanat savunusudur. Her şeyi daha derindeki bir 'asıl'a iade eden, varlığı topyekun içine alan bir bütünlüğü hatırlatan; zengin, doymuş, doyuran bir dil.*"

[182] Jale Parla, "Taksim Kabul Etmiş Zamanın Aynası Roman: Mahur Beste", *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 282. "*Maddesiz, dilsiz, insansız, bilinçsiz 'yekpare zaman'la 'taksim kabul etmiş zaman' arasındaki bağlantıyı sanatının arayışı haline getirmiş Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar için roman 'taksim kabul etmiş zaman'ın anlatısıdır.*"

[183] Ibid., p. 293.

Tanpınar's novel *Huzur*[184] illustrates this double-sided search for wholeness through the protagonist Mümtaz's life experience. The main elements of the unity that Mümtaz is looking for is his personal past, his love with Nuran, the socio-cultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire, the requirements of Turkish society, and the state of the world just before World War II.

Huzur is mostly a novel of remembrance. Unlike Proust's first person narration, Tanpınar chose third person narration. The narrator of *Huzur*, it is not wrong to argue that this narrator is Tanpınar because there are several instances where the authorial voice shows itself clearly, tells the reader the life-story of Mümtaz with flashes back and forth in time.

There are three different time frames in the structure of the novel. The first is the present of the narrative, which is a day, actually the day before the outbreak of the Second World War. The second is a time when Mümtaz and Nuran were together. This time extends nearly one year before the present. And the third encompasses parts of the narrative where Mümtaz's and other characters' personal pasts are told.[185]

Meaning of the Past on the Individual Level

At the beginning of the novel, in the present of the narrative, Mümtaz is disturbed by the illness of İhsan, his elderly cousin, by the high probability of a new great war, and by his breakup with Nuran. These three anxieties lead Mümtaz to pessimism. İhsan has been suffering from pneumonia for a week and he shows no

[184] *Huzur* was Tanpınar's second novel after *Mahur Beste*. It was published first in *Cumhuriyet* starting from February 22, 1948. In 1949 it was published in book format.

[185] Quoted from Mehmet Kaplan by Erol Köroğlu in "Upon the Threshold", pp. 75-76.

sign of recovery. Mümtaz is troubled by idea of İhsan's possible death. However, the narrator informs the reader that it is not the first time that Mümtaz has experienced such an anxiety. Moreover, it is told that this anxiety constitutes one of the integral parts of Mümtaz's personality.[186]

After that remark, the narration turns back to Mümtaz's childhood in order to show the reason why that anxiety has an important role in the protagonist's life. Mümtaz's life-story started with his father's being murdered when Mümtaz was eleven years old. This death constitutes the beginning of his story in the novel. There is no information about his life before this event. His life commences with a death or loss and this loss on the personal level has a determinant effect on his future. This stress on the determinacy of the idea of death sheds light on the meaning of the past for Mümtaz. It is possible to argue that the past for Mümtaz in terms of his personal experience is not a pleasant realm that he would seek out.

Especially the burial scene is important and the narrator stresses it by saying "Mümtaz has never forgotten this scene."[187] In this scene, his father, who was shot by a Greek of Turkish nationality, is buried by their neighbors. The town where they live is about to be invaded by Greek soldiers and the people who are burying his father want to go. This event led Mümtaz to a left consciousness. When he awakens his mother tell him that they have to run away. So he obeys, but although he remembered his father's death and burial quite well, he cannot remember their escape fully. There are only some images that are far from constituting the whole picture. This is how Mümtaz experienced death.

This experience is followed by a sexual one. The next thing that he remembers is a girl who is also fleeing from the invasion. One night, Mümtaz, his

[186] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Huzur* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2002), p. 22.

[187] Ibid., p. 23.

mother, and the girl have to sleep in one bed. The girl is next to him and while sleeping she embraces him unconsciously. Mümtaz who is at the dawn of adolescence, is deeply influenced by this unknown experience, this mixture of desire and death. The sense of being one with a stranger girl astonished him. He discoveres new aspects of his existence. This sexual discovery intermingles with his father's death to construct the sense of the togetherness of pain and pleasure. However, at that moment Mümtaz is not totally aware of the loss of his father. This awareness emerges in a moment of remembrance that is similar to Marcel's becoming aware of his grandmother's death in *A la recherche du temps perdu*. For in both cases, becoming aware of the loss of a loved person requires temporal distance. Marcel and Mümtaz are not able to internalize these losses at the actual time of the event. It is only through the mediation of memory that they become aware that those people do not exist anymore.

Mümtaz, while going in a carriage, remembers his father with a pain that is beyond any pain that he has felt until then. He sees his father as he was and this sight makes him understand that he will never see him again and that he will be separated from him eternally. This shock shakes him and brings him to the verge of fainting. The girl, who is also in the carriage, holds him to prevent him from falling. This contact reminds him of the sensations of the night before and at that moment these sensations and his father's death intertwine completely to make him feel like a sinner. Mümtaz feels remorse for his father. This feeling hangs on him for years and constitutes an important part of his personality. From now on, ideas of love and death are totally intermingled to dominate his life. He will have to deal with the idea of death even when he lives the happiest period of his life with Nuran.

In the next period of his childhood, Mümtaz becomes aware of his loneliness. He is living in Antalya with his mother. There he has ambivalent experiences. First of all, he discovers life in its entirety and relief. The Mediterranean coast brings him a new experience with life that is dominated by nature. Nature brings him a sense of freedom and nourishes his imagination. But at the same time, nature reminds him his separateness. When he is wandering about the coast, he hears the call of nature saying, "why did you leave me, you became a toy of wretched suffering, come to me, meddle with my composition, you will forget everything and have the comfortable and happy sleep of matter."[188] With his mother's death, his sense of loneliness intensifies to feel that he is completely isolated from the rest of the world. With this sense in himself he went to İstanbul to live with his cousin İhsan and his family. All these traumatic events happen within two months and Mümtaz's inner world is made out of these experiences. Sensations of pain and guilt continued to haunt him throughout his life.

The past had a determining influence on the novel's characters. It constituted their inner worlds in a way that transcended their subjectivities in the present. The past, in this context, was not limited to the individual's experiences of characters. The family past was as important as the individual's experiences. The voluntary action of the subject required a struggle against the impact of the past because past experiences and sensations were so internalized that they could not be forgotten. These past experiences emerged from the depths of the individuals' unconscious suddenly and involuntarily. In this respect, individuals' relations with their pasts were perceived as positive, as in the case of Proust because, for Proust, the coming together, through involuntary memory, of two separate moments of the individual's

[188] Ibid., 31. "*Ne diye ayrıldın, sefil ıstırapların oyuncağı oldun, gel, bana dön, terkibime karış, her şeyi unutur, eşyanın rahat ve mesut uykusunu uyursun.*"

life revealed the possibility of temporal continuity of the personality. In Tanpınar's case, individuals' relations with their pasts were problematic. Tanpınar also underlines continuity, but the nature of what continued was not always salutary.

Nuran's self-monologue when she is about to accept Mümtaz's invitation is a perfect example of the effect of the past on the present. Nuran is trying to decide whether she will go to Mümtaz's house, or not. Going his house is the beginning of a new relationship for her and she is reluctant to do that because she experiences the break down of a marriage. During three days that she thinks about the issue, her grandmother's memory accompanies her. She reminds Nuran about the pain that she has suffered because of love by saying "I was loved very much, that is why I suffered. Because I loved and I was loved, everybody that needed me had also suffered. So, how could you dare to start a new love?"[189]

However, there was another voice in Nuran addressing to her heart and body. This is the voice of passion and desire embodied by Nurhayat and Talat's love affair. This voice tells her to go after her passions without any hesitation. Nuran's existence becomes the battlefield of these contradictory voices. Finally, she was able to break the rule of her grandmother on herself and decided to go. "I will not be defeated by myself whatever happens."[190] It is clear that Nuran internalizes her family lineage and their experiences as the factors that constitute her personality. She is aware that she and Mümtaz are destined to experience similar pleasures and pains of love because the existence of individuals in the present is the reappearance of past experiences. As mentioned above, Existence, according to Tanpınar, is one and

---

[189] Ibid., p. 136. "*Ben diyordu, çok sevildim, onun için böyle perişan oldum. Sevdiğim ve sevildiğim için bana muhtaç olanların hepsi bedbaht oldular. Kendi yakınında bu kadar canlı bir örnek varken, nasıl cesaret edebiliyorsun?*"

[190] Ibid., p. 140. "*Ne olursa olsun kendime mağlup olmayacağım!*"

individual existences were parts of it. Past experiences that constitute human existence in its totality are to reemerge in the present lives of individuals.

Another aspect of Tanpınar's understanding of time was his stress on two levels of temporality. The original wholeness between the Existence and individual existences was broken down with the birth. This loss of wholeness was most visible in the temporal field. Mümtaz considers this point when he is thinking about the idea of death of which the possibility of war has reminded him. He starts with the difference between the life and death cycle in nature and the meaning that humans attributed to life and death. He maintains that in human existence the "monolithic and absolute time" is divided. Humans separate life and death because they perceive everything in the reflection of their existence. Instead of joining the flow of time, they try to step out of it in order to look at it from the outside. That is why they suffer. "Since we have broken down the wholeness of nothingness and we have been contented with being piece, we have to accept this."[191]

The main defect of human fortune is the incorporation of intellect because it is through the act of intellect that "humans try to step out of time, resist the order of love, and long for stability within transformation."[192] This is the reason for the human agony. That is to say humans through their suffering pay for their conscious existence.[193] They stress their separate temporal existence vis-à-vis nothingness or Existence. By doing so they reject the idea of togetherness of life and death because dying means to transcend the limits of the intellect and to join in the eternity of Existence. Instead they insisted on their individual existence. "Since I think,

---

[191] Ibid., p. 68. "*Mademki sıfırın bütününü kırdık, adet olmaya razı olduk, bunu kabul etmek lazım.*"

[192] Ibid, p. 68. "*İnsalığın talihi aklıyla zamanın dışına fırladığı, aşkın nizamına karşı koyduğu, geniş istihalenin ortasında bir istikrar istediği için, kendiliğinden teşekkül etmiş bir şeydi.*"

[193] Ibid., p. 69.

therefore I am; since I feel, therefore I am; since I make war, therefore I am; since I suffer, therefore I am! I am miserable, I am; I am an idiot, I am!"[194]

At this point, Tanpınar took a critical stance in the face of the modern emphasis on intellectual activity and on individual existence. He contrasted the Cartesian stress on the activity of the intellect with a higher order of existence with its emphasis on intuitions and sensations. Tanpınar was also critical of the idea of modern individuality that was thought to be the measure of everything.

It is possible to further this argument through the description of Emin Bey, a Sufi dervish and reed flute player. The reader is told that the life of this humble dervish is made out of endless self-denial.[195] Moreover, this self-denial is not specific only to Emin Bey. It is possible to bind his act to the musicians of the past because what lies underneath Emin Bey's self-denial is the education of a civilization that could be prolonged to the past. His self-denial was the continuation of breeding. Emin Bey and other figures of the past "perceive their art not as an acknowledgment of their personalities, but as a way to disappear in the great wholeness."[196] Mümtaz stresses that this relation to the individuality and the world is the East, "our incurable illness and inexhaustible strength."[197] Although Emin Bey seems to be the perfect form of individual existence according to Mümtaz's worldview, he is an idealized figure. Mümtaz is totally different from Emin Bey because he is an individual who was conscious of his existence in the world and he is not willing to deny himself. He

---

[194] Ibid., p. 69. "*Mademki düşünüyorum. O halde varım, mademki duyuyorum, o halde varım, mademki harp ediyorum, o halde varım, mademki ıstırap çekiyorum, o halde varım! Sefilim varım, budalayım varım!*"

[195] Ibid., p. 260.

[196] Ibid., p. 260. "*Sanatlarını bir benliğin behemehal ikrar vasıtası olarak değil, büyük bütünde kaybolmanın tek yolu tanımışlardı.*"

[197] Ibid., p. 260. "*Hem şifasız hastalığımız, hem de tükenmez kudretimiz olan şark!*"

cannot feel the wholeness that Emin Bey seeks in his life. That is why he pays so much attention to his love with Nuran.

Underlining Mümtaz's in-between position reveals a clue about Tanpınar's position in the discussion of individuality. As mentioned above, Tanpınar was critical of modern individuality with its stress on its existence, but he did not negate it totally. On the other side of the coin, he was close to idealizing self-denial, an inherent aspect of the Sufi worldview, but he undermined that position through stressing Mümtaz's in-betweenness.

The Meaning of Love and the Past

Mümtaz and Nuran's love began with their meeting on a steamer one year before the narration's present. Although the narrator underlines that the story of their love is a simple one, the rest of the narrative undermines this assertion because Mümtaz attributes so many meanings to his love with Nuran that it comes to connote more than a simple love relationship. Through this relation with Nuran, Mümtaz witnesses the transformation of his entire world towards something transcendental and whole. He senses that with Nuran he is about to unite the fragmented pieces of his life and of the world. He perceives love as a way of constructing the wholeness that he has long lost.

However, it is important to note that these meanings belong to Mümtaz. He projects his search for wholeness onto their relationship. He tries to concentrate everything that he wants to construct his life with in Nuran's existence. He strives to attribute to the world a wholeness that it does not have inherently. Wholeness appears to be the projection of Mümtaz's inner world to the outside. That is to say,

he wants to watch himself in the external world. He wants to construct the world through his imagination. That is why he has an aesthetic perception of the world. This is also the reason why Mümtaz, throughout the novel, seeks metaphors. Metaphors imply analogies and metamorphoses. Construction of analogies is a subjective process. Thus, it is possible to argue that Mümtaz is trying to appropriate the world with its objects and subjects and then to re-create it through meaning creation processes that are specific to himself. An important aspect of this appropriation process is the dematerialization of objects and subjects. It is crucial for Mümtaz that outside matters have lost all their material features that they include because, if not, it is impossible for him to appropriate them. Time appears to be one of the central elements in his construction. Mümtaz abstracts things and humans from their original temporal contexts and places them in the temporality of his imagination. This is the appropriation of temporality.

Dematerialization processes constitute a similarity between Marcel and Mümtaz because they try to give a subjective order to the realities they experience. Especially, Deleuze's reading of Proust underlines the importance of dematerialization for Marcel.

Dematerialization is most obvious in Mümtaz's relation with Nuran. His love with Nuran provides him the ability to construct ties between the past and the present. First of all, he imagines Nuran in an obscure and subjective temporality. He projects her into the past. While they were visiting an old house in Emirgan, he imagines her in the outfit of a woman in the past. However, Nuran resists his imagination through marking the exact time in which they are living and stressing on her identity. "I am Nuran, I live in Kandilli. I live in the year 1937 and wear the

clothes of this time. I intend to change neither my clothing nor my identity."[198] Mümtaz's efforts to construct similarities between the past and the present continue to constitute a difference between the lovers, but Mümtaz is experiencing the sense of wholeness. "Mümtaz, the piece of Existence, now perceives himself to be as broad and eternal as the cosmos. He found his existence through Nuran's existence. He was living in the middle of a cosmos made by many mirrors and in these mirrors he saw Nuran who was an other reflection of himself."[199] Another process through which Mümtaz tries to overcome Nuran's materiality is to liken her to women in several paintings. Through this process he seeks to abstract her from her actual existence and to place her in his imagination.

Their relationship grows stronger day-by-day by incorporating the past, art, and space. Everything that is important for Mümtaz is concentrating on Nuran's existence. His individual search for wholeness and socio-cultural search for wholeness comes together in their love. "Nuran, for Mümtaz, with the help of the two supporters [music and the Bosphorus] that were related to her personality, has become the magical being in whose mortal existence the old, beautiful and original things were reincarnated. He has sensed her as the being who defeated time in herself and her beauty and has found in her the orders of his art and his inner world."[200] The last part of this excerpt reveals Mümtaz's search for an order through which he can construct the wholeness. As we shall see later, this search for an order constitutes a problematic issue because it implies that Mümtaz is not interested in art and people

---

[198] Ibid., p. 127. "*Ben Nuran'ım. Kandilli'de otururum. 1937 senesinde yaşıyor, aşağı yukarı zamanımın elbisesini giyiyorum.Hiçbir elbise ve hüviyet değiştirmeğe hevesim yok.*"

[199] Ibid., pp. 130-131. "*Mümtaz, oluşun bu zerresi, şimdi kendisini kainat kadar geniş, sonsuz buluyordu. Nuran'ın varlığı ile kendi varlığını bulmuştu. Bir yığın aynadan bir kainat içinde yaşıyor ve hepsinde kendisinin bir başka çehresi olan Nuran'ı görüyordu.*"

[200] Ibid., p. 207. "*Böylece Nuran, Mümtaz için, benliğine sımsıkı bağlanan bu iki yardımcının sayesinde bütün eski, güzel ve asıl şeylerin fani varlığında hayata döndüğü, yaşadığı esrarlı mahluk, zamanı kendi nefsinde ve güzelliğinde yenmiş mucizeli mevcut oluyor, onda sanatının ve iç aleminin nizamlarını buluyordu.*"

for themselves but for his personal necessities. "According to him, Nuran was the essential source of life and the mother of all realities. Thus, even when he was saturated by her, he wanted more of her. His mind did not leave her any moment, and as he plunged in her existence he reached the wholeness".[201]

During their promenades in İstanbul, they re-discover the city with the past inherent in it. The Bosphorus is especially important for them because it provides them the frame within which they can create the imagined map of their relationship. They give names to places of the Bosphorus and they related these places with the old "Turkish" music. Accordingly, "a map made of voice and imagination was getting bigger."[202] Giving names to specific places and relating them with their personal experiences and music can be read as another step in the appropriation of the world. This process was similar to what Elstir, in Proust's novel, did in his paintings. As mentioned above, Elstir creates the world anew by getting rid of the given names of things or by giving them new names. Mümtaz and Nuran also recreate the world on their own terms.

However, Nuran is not content with Mümtaz's relation with the past. She thinks that life around them requires other things. The country is economically weak and its people are poor. She expresses her thoughts to him. Mümtaz replies that he also is aware of the necessity of a move, but he underlines that such a move requires a ground, an identity. This identity is to be found in the history of the nation.[203] He maintaines that the problem the country faces had two aspects. The first one is the necessity of social development. The second one is related to relations with the past.

---

[201] Ibid., p. 163. "*Ona göre Nuran, hayatın öz kaynağı, bütün gerçeklerin annesiydi. Onun için sevgilisine en fazla doyduğu zamanlarda bile yine ona aç görünür, düşüncesi ondan bir lahza ayrılmaz, ona gömüldükçe tamamlığına ererdi.*"

[202] Ibid., p. 167. "*Sesten, hayalden bir harita gittikçe büyüyordu.*"

[203] Ibid., p. 171.

According to Mümtaz, the world of taste of Turkish society has inherent relations with the past civilization. Thus, the heritage of the past has to be re-worked. "I am not the aesthete of a fall. Maybe I am searching for something alive within this fall."[204] It is clear that there are strained points in their relation, but this does not mean that they are totally different in their relation to the past. Especially in terms of music they share a great deal.

One of the most important bridges between the past Turkish civilization and the present was represented by music. Music also constitutes a strong bond between Nuran and Mümtaz because both of them admire the old music. Music, on the one hand, had inherent relations with the individual tragedy of separation. On the other hand, it was related to the issue of cultural continuity and wholeness.

Mümtaz has an interest in the old music, but together with Nuran the meaning of the music has changed. "After knowing Nuran this art appeared to open all his doors to him. Now he found in music one of the most pure and resuscitating sources of human soul."[205] Music was a way of transcending the limitations of the temporal human existence. Music, made of voice, is closer to nature than the intellect and thus made individuals experience the wholeness that lay in their depths. The scene of *Ferahfeza* ceremony was an example of music's influence on individuals. Music fills Mümtaz with a sense of longing. He senses that he is surrounded by this intensive sensation. He questions himself about the nature of this sense of longing. "Why does this sense of longing constitute a great part of our spiritual life? Are we searching for the sea of which we are created as a drop? Are we in search of the silence of matter? Or are we, as a child of time, as a composition created in time and at same time, as a

---

[204] Ibid., p. 172. "*Ben bir çöküşün esteti değilim. Belki bu çöküşte yaşayan şeyler arıyorum.*"

[205] Ibid., p. 168. "*Nuran'la tanıştıktan sonrabu sanat onun için bütün kapılarını açmış gibiydi. Şimdi onda insan ruhunun en saf ve diriltici kaynaklarından birini buluyordu.*"

being oppressed by time, crying for passing and lost parts of ourselves? Are we trying to reach perfection, or do we complain of the cruel order of time?"[206] Music reminds him of the separation from Existence and his being captive of time because music was outside of individual time. It transcends the present of the individual to reach the eternal nothingness.

Mümtaz feels hopeless in the face of the higher order of music, but he does not try to overcome this sense of hopelessness because he is aware that this sense of hopelessness and impossibility is the source of art. He tries to intensify the sense of loneliness and distance that settled in him after his parents' deaths. He seeks to internalize these sensations in order to absolutize the pain inflicted on him by these sensations. "He knows that if he does not do that, poetry and life will not unite. Dissolution and fusion could only happen in high temperatures. Otherwise he would stay outside of the door and have to use a borrowed language."[207]

Mümtaz is living a dual life. On the one hand, there is his relation with Nuran that brings him happiness and a sense of personal wholeness. On the other hand, there is his inclination towards perceiving the world through his senses of loneliness and pain. In his mind love and the idea of death are always together. With Nuran, he thinks that he is about to defeat death. He feels he is a part of the broad life that is flowing around him. However, he is always anxious about his life. This anxiety influences the course of his life. Music with its higher order is close to his pessimistic side. "Music is not the appropriate means for love. […] Because music

---

[206] Ibid., p. 267. "*Niçin ruhi hayatımızın büyük bir kısmını bu hasret yapar? Bir katresi olarak yaratıldığımız ummanı mı arıyoruz? Maddenin sükununun peşinde miyiz? Yoksa zamanın çocuğu, onun potasında pişmiş bir terkip ve onun mazlumu olduğumuz için geçen ve kaybolan tarafımıza mı ağlıyoruz? Hakikaten bir kemalin arkasından mı gidiyoruz? Yoksa zalim zaman nizamından mı şikayet ediyoruz?*"

[207] Ibid., p. 277. "*Bunu yapamadığı takdirde şiirin hayatla birleşmeyeceğini biliyordu. O erime ve kaynaşma ancak tahammülü güç hararetlerde olabilirdi. Aksi takdirde kapının önünde kalır, ödünç alınmış bir dili kullanırdı.*"

was working beyond time. It was the order of time; it destroyed the present. However, happiness is in the present."[208]

Another aspect of music, for Mümtaz, is its relation to the past. Through the old music the past reveals its different temporalities in the present. That is to say, the old music provides individuals a key to the past because the inner worlds of individuals are constructed through the mediation of the old music. It is thought to be, by Mümtaz, something inherent in individuals' personalities.[209] "According to Mümtaz, the sight of İstanbul, our entire civilization, our dirt, and our beautiful features are all inside the music."[210] It constitutes one of the major fields that point to socio-cultural continuity. The old music is the most sophisticated embodiment of the Ottoman-Turkish civilization. They are the cornerstones of the spiritual world of the Turkish people. Forgetting that music meant, for Mümtaz, the break down of the chain of continuity: It is crucial to conserve this continuity, but all of the old songs are not to be conserved. For Mümtaz, "only works that were chosen with the taste of the present, or with the taste of the Western education, could be beautiful."[211]

---

[208] Ibid., p. 279. "*Musıki, aşk için iyi vasıta değil. […] Çünkü musıki zamanın üzerinde çalışıyordu. Musıki zamanın nizamı idi; hali yok ediyordu. Saadet ise bu gündedir.*"

[209] Ibid., p. 170.

[210] Ibid., p. 170. "*Mümtaz'a göre İstanbul peysajı, bütün medeniyetimiz, kirimiz, pasımız, güzel taraflarımız, hepsi musıkideydi.*"

[211] Ibid., p. 148. "*Daha ziyade bugünün muayyen zevkiyle, garplı terbiyenin zevkiyle seçilen eserler güzel olabilirdi.*"

Socio-Cultural Continuity and the Past

As mentioned above, in the novel Mümtaz is in the search of a double wholeness. On the one hand, he wants to construct his unity with nature, art, and the past through his love with Nuran. On the other, he wants to construct proper relations with the Ottoman-Turkish past that will help him to determine possible veins of cultural continuity and to keep that continuity. Together with his cousin İhsan he stresses on the importance of creating ways of life that were specific to Turkish society. That is to say, he is in search of a genuine communal personality (*şahsiyet*).

The construction of this communal personality depends, first of all, on the actual needs of the country. Turkey, according to İhsan, is an underdeveloped country that requires a socio-economic transformation process with a particular stress on industrial production. In addition to this need for economic reformation, Turkey was undergoing a crisis of civilization or culture. These two problems have to be solved together.

Turkey is trying to internalize Western civilization, but there is a clash between what is old and new. The acquisition of Western culture remains only on the superficial level instead of totally transforming individuals and their lives. The internalization of new forms of life is necessary, but it includes the danger of undermining the original personality of Turkish community. Life in its entirety is far from creating individuals particular to itself. The past is always around to make individuals suspect about the modern forms of life.

The economic structure of the Ottoman Empire was still dominant, according to İhsan. This structure was based mainly on the agriculture. The productive population is low; almost half of the country is not part of the production

processes.[212] The main defect is the absence of population and production programs. The country has great economic potentials but they are not incorporated into the production process. It is possible for him to adopt economic policies combining agriculture and industry and broadening the internal market. The emergence of the new individual is possible only after life is transformed totally.

Time constitutes a problematic realm in this struggle for development. Turkey needs to change its temporality and its rhythm because Turkey is backward vis-à-vis the other countries of the world and wants to catch up with them. It is impossible to let time pass and to expect to solve problems in time because time will not work in favor of Turkey.[213] Continuous willful human intervention was indispensable in order to develop the country.

Another aspect of the problem with time is the relation with the past. İhsan argues that undertaking a total socio-economic transformation requires a ground to stand upon. "We have to rely on our roots. We have to give back to our past its wholeness. Without doing that we cannot get rid of duality."[214] İhsan maintaines that if the past were not incorporated into the new composition, it would disturb people as strange. The idea of continuity, even it is an illusion, is necessary. The true challenge, for İhsan, is the construction of this idea of continuity.

Although Mümtaz shares İhsan's ideas, they differ in their perception of the idea of wholeness. İhsan is much more interested in the socio-cultural aspects of the issue, while Mümtaz is primarily interested in the search of his personal wholeness. He tries to construct this wholeness through his love with Nuran. Their love is like a heaven in the earth because Mümtaz is able to relate different fragments of his life to

---

[212] Ibid., p. 247.

[213] Ibid., p. 250.

[214] Ibid., p. 250. "*Birtakım köklere dayanma zarureti. Tarihimize bütünlüğünü iade etme zarureti. Bunu yapmazsak ikiliğin önüne geçemeyiz.*"

each other to constitute wholeness. He creates a world in which the temporal, spatial, emotional, and aesthetic realms came together to give birth to the ideal human existence on earth. However, there always is a hesitation. Mümtaz is not sure about his relations in these four realms. "Did he appropriate the old music only as an order, like many things in his life, even like the love of Nuran? Was he doing these only in his mind, by forcing his imagination?"[215] Mümtaz is sentenced to an in-between position. When he breaks up with Nuran, Mümtaz's world breaks into pieces. In addition to the pain caused by their separation, the outbreak of the Second World War and İhsan's illness intensify his distress. At the end of the novel, the reader sees Mümtaz speaking with himself and Suad's specter. He asks himself, "Will I not be able to construct the world in myself again?"[216] Then he murmures, "How strange! Nothing unites with the other. I see everything as separate." The specter replies, "Of course, they do not unite because you see the reality."[217]

---

[215] Ibid., p. 278. "*Onu da, hayatındaki birçok şey gibi, hatta o kadar çok sevdiği Nuran'ın aşkı gibi, sadece bir nizam olarak mı benimsemişti? Sadece zihninden, muhayyilesini zorla kırbaçlayarak mı bütün bunları yapıyordu?*"

[216] Ibid., p. 384. "*Dünyayı bir daha kendimde kuramayacak mıyım?*"

[217] Ibid., p. 385. " '*Ne garip! Hiçbir şey öteki ile birleşmiyor. Her şeyi ayrı ayrı görüyorum' diye söylendi. Yanındaki adam cevap verdi: Elbette birleşmez, çünkü hakikati görüyorsun.*"

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

This thesis analyzed Marcel Proust and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's conceptions of time with a particular emphasis on the historical context. Although in many studies on Tanpınar there are remarks relating him to Proust, either in terms of similarities or differences, the number of studies examining these two authors' understandings of time together in an analytical and critical frame is highly limited. Rıfat Günday's Ph.D. dissertation appears to be the sole example of such an academic undertaking.[218] In his dissertation Günday tries to analyze Proust and Tanpınar's conceptions of time as they are represented in their literary works. His approach incorporates textual analysis and philosophical considerations, but does not aim at situating both writers' works in their historical contexts. In this regard, the contextualization of these writers within a particular historical experience, the experience of modernity, is capable of raising new questions for academic inquiry. Thus, it is expected that this thesis makes a modest contribution to efforts of situating Proust and Tanpınar in a comparative perspective.

The connection that made a comparative approach to Marcel Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* (*In Search of Lost Time)* and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Huzur* (*Peace of Mind*) possible is their relations with modernity, especially the ways in which the modern temporality was experienced and represented in these novels. Obviously, there were historical differences between the ways in which Proust and Tanpınar experienced modernity, but their relations with modernity have similar and

[218] Rıfat Günday, *Problémes du Temps chez Marcel Proust et Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Marmara University, 1997).

comparable aspects. The idea of modernity emerges with a specific time consciousness. Being aware of the experience of modernity means being aware of this specific perception of temporality. The emergence of this consciousness was explained in the introduction. It is necessary to keep in mind that in this thesis modernity was perceived broadly as a continuous process of fragmentation, destabilization, and loss of ground.

According to French philosopher Sylviane Agacinski, passage can be seen as the main determinant of modern consciousness where "nothing permanent gives things any kind of anchor against time."[219] Modernity brought with it the transformation of both temporality and history, but what is more important; it broke with what is eternal. The break with the eternal embodied the "negation of being" which was, for long time, attributed permanence in time.[220] The historical time that replaced cyclical order of time was fragmented in itself and what individuals were left with was an ephemeral and elusive present. In this ephemeral present any quest for absolute was in vain.[221] However, the retreat of the eternal did not exclude the quest for permanence. "If being is only movement and thus time, the old desire for eternity can turn into only the desire for time, the desire for perseverance or for return, the power to resist death."[222] The impossibility of experiencing the present caused by modernity brought with it the impossibility of living and representing human existence in its totality and wholeness.

This impossibility constituted the main motive behind both Marcel Proust and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's novels. They focused on individuals' existence in time and

[219] Agacinski, p. 11.

[220] Ibid., p. 13.

[221] Ibid., p. 20.

[222] Ibid., p. 29.

problematized temporal existence in terms of ontology and epistemology. For both authors time was the name of an ambivalent realm. On the one hand, although fragmented by modernity, it was the sole realm in which it was possible to strive for wholeness. On the other hand, time, with its cruel order, leads humans to the end of their existence, death. Time, with its second meaning, is clear in Marcel's many deaths and Mümtaz's obsession with death. The permanence of the idea of death prevents protagonists of the novels from perceiving themselves as continuous entities in time. In every moment of their lives they have to overcome the idea of death. Remembering, that juxtaposes different moments of individuals' life, is perceived to be the only means of assuring themselves of their continuity. However, there is, for Tanpınar, another death that is totally different from the other one. This second death provides individuals the opportunity to transcend the limits of their temporal existences and to join in the Existence underlying whole universe and existences. This positive aspect of death has its sources in mystical belief systems in which Tanpınar had particular interest on.

Proust did not conceive time as a continuum. Instead, as it emerges in Marcel's many deaths, time is constituted of isolated moments experienced consecutively. Continuity can only be established through the mysterious dynamics of the involuntary memory. Only remembrance can bring together two moments of Marcel's life to remind him that his past self is not totally lost and that it is possible for this past self to reemerge in the present to prove Marcel his continuity in time. In these moments, Marcel feels as if he can transcend the contingency imposed on him by death. Moreover, in these moments Marcel succeeds in overcoming the separation between himself and the external world because in this moments the external world loses its abstractness and becomes concrete. However, grasping the meaning that

emerges in moments of remembrance is a challenge for Marcel. He cannot achieve this grasping through his voluntary efforts because these efforts incorporate the intellect that is impotent in terms of understanding the higher realm where the past and present sensations are united. The moment where the past and the present are united come with a sudden shock to Marcel's sensations, accordingly understanding the meaning of this shock depends more on intuition than intellect.

These conceptions of time in Proust have led many scholars to trace Henri Bergson's influence on him, especially in terms of the involuntary memory's role in constructing temporal connections and the preponderance of intuition over intellect. Bergson had obvious influence on Proust, but also it is important to note diverging points. First and foremost, Proust conceived time as a discontinuity, rather than an unbreakable continuity. This idea of continuity constituted the cornerstone of Bergson's theory of time asserting the togetherness of the past, the present, and the future in every instant. Moreover, Bergson imagined the search for the lost time to be an easy intuitional process that did not necessitate much effort by the individual's side. However, for Proust, grasping the underlying meaning of the lost time was a challenge. Finally, what is more important seems to be the underlying contemporaneity of Proust and Bergson because similarities in their approach to time indicate a specific period in modernity's relation with time. This specific period was discussed in the introduction, but it is important to repeat that at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth centuries there was an intensification of the debate on time and there appeared a breach between two conceptions of time. One of the branches conceived time as objective, measurable, dividable, irreversible, and homogeneous. While the other, in which Bergson and Proust were included, maintained that time was subjective, immeasurable, undividable, reversible, and

heterogeneous. However, it is important to note that these two conceptions of time did not totally exclude each other, but were intermingled.

In this context, pointing to Tanpınar's being influenced by both Bergson and Proust's ideas on time is equally important.[223] Tanpınar's thought was nourished by many sources, but Bergsonian influence is particularly important because he chose to conceive time as Bergson did. In other words, he rejected the idea of time as objective and homogeneous. This rejection had a particular connotation when Tanpınar's emphasis on the socio-cultural level where he sought wholeness is considered. In this level, the primary search of Tanpınar was a genuine communal identity that was specific to Turkish society. This identity, according to Tanpınar, could only be constructed through reconstructing socio-cultural wholeness that he attributed to the past and through tying the chain of continuity between the past and the present. This could not be achieved in the dominant temporal order of modernity that conceived time as objective and homogeneous. Tanpınar was in the search of representing the concrete human experience that was specific to Turks. In other words, Tanpınar was in search of cultural difference that would resist the homogenizing nature of modernity. In an objective and homogenous, that is to say same for everyone, temporal order it could be impossible to construct this difference.

The emphasis on the subject was a common point in both novels. That is to say both narratives focused on the inner worlds of their protagonists and they were mediated by Marcel and Mümtaz's consciousnesses. Both Proust and Tanpınar aimed at representing the world as the individual experienced it. In the first person narrative

[223] Tracing Bergson's influence on Tanpınar's conception of time remains outside of the scope of this thesis. For this issue, see Oğuz Demiralp, *Kutup Noktası: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Üzerine Eleştirel Deneme* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001); Ali İhsan Kolcu, *Zamana Düşen Çığlık: Tanpınar'ın Şiirinin Epistemolojik Temelleri & Tanpınar'ın Şiir Estetiği* (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2002), especially pp. 182-216; Erol Köroğlu, Upon the Threshold between What is Gone and What is Yet to Come: The Concept of Time in A.H. Tanpınar's Novels (M.A. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1996).

of *A la recherche du temps perdu*, what is told was the life of the narrator Marcel as he remembers it. For Benjamin this statement would be imperfect because for him, "the important thing for the remembering author is not what he experienced, but the weaving of his memory."[224] In the third person narrative of *Huzur* the narrator and the protagonist are separated. Although there are instants in the narrative where the authorial voice makes itself heard, the narrative is told through Mümtaz's consciousness. It is possible to discern this feature in the relation between the titles of the novel's chapters and their contents. The chapters are entitled following the characters of the novel, but in these chapters, instead of these characters, their role in Mümtaz's life is narrated.[225]

In both novels what makes the external meaningful is the consciousness of the protagonist. The external world with its objects and subjects does not have a meaning without the subject. It is through the meaning giving process realized by the protagonist that the external world becomes tangible and meaningful. In Marcel's world objects and subjects are elusive and slippery. They appear to Marcel for a moment in the form of images and then new ones replace them. It is impossible for Marcel to fix them. The elusive characteristic of the external world, thus, experienced as an ontological and at the same time, an epistemological problem that make Marcel feel isolated and alone, leading him to be surrounded by unhappiness and anxiety. The same feeling dominates Mümtaz's sense of himself and of the world, especially after his break up with Nuran. The present of the narration is constructed upon Mümtaz's unhappiness, hopelessness, depression, and anxiety. Everything in his life that he has cared for is destroyed. İhsan is seriously ill, Nuran

---

[224] Walter Benjamin, "The Image of Proust", *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Shocken Books, 1985), p. 202.

[225] Berna Moran, "Bir Huzursuzluğun Romanı: *Huzur,*" *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*, Vol. 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1987), p. 265.

is about to leave the city to remarry her ex-husband, and the war is about the break out. These three sources of anxiety lead to the fragmentation of Mümtaz. He is unable to sense himself as whole.[226] The moments in which he is happy and whole are narrated through his remembrance of his relationship with Nuran. Wholeness is broken and Mümtaz has only the memory of it. This memory, instead of bringing him relief, intensifies his sense of desperateness because Nuran, by leaving his life, becomes a "mythical existence" that is situated in a transcendental realm.[227]

Another aspect of the stress on the subject's inner world was related to the two authors' conceptions of time. They focus on subjective time, time that was experienced and interpreted by the subject. However, this does not mean that the objective and conventional time is totally eliminated from these novels. Instead both times, subjective and objective, are incorporated to form the temporal structure of the novels. According to Günday, "employment of conventional time and psychological time together constitutes discontinuity and continuity at the same time."[228] Through subjective time it is possible to construct the inner continuity of the protagonists, but the employment of this time creates discontinuity in terms of the objective time because Marcel and Mümtaz's stories are told through flash-backs that disrupt the order of external time.

The emphasis on subjective time is crucial for both authors because grasping the meaning of this world and constructing the wholeness that was lost is possible only within the subject. For Proust deciphering the complex meaning that lay beneath superficial appearances requires Marcel's delving into himself to regain his inner

---

[226] Tanpınar, *Huzur*, p. 46.

[227] Ibid., p. 59.

[228] Günday, p. 6. "*L'emploi ensemble du temps conventionnel et du temps psychologique au récit crée à la fois la discontinuité at la continuité*."(My translation)

time because this time appeares to be the sole reality that can be trusted.[229] The ephemeral present, where every image is replaced by other ones consecutively without giving Marcel the opportunity to fix them, undermines Marcel's sense of existence. Remembering emerges as the only means to overcome the present's elusiveness and instability. In the moments of remembering two moments of Marcel's life overlap with sensations inherent in them. The past moment is resuscitated as it was and Marcel feels as if he is an extra-temporal realm where he can perceive his existence in its purity and wholeness. He discoveres the essence that lies beneath the superficial appearances by transcending time.

In Tanpınar, the subject's return to him/herself is seen as the means of transcending the limits of historical time to unite with cosmic time. Cosmic time, which is parallel to Bergson's *durée*, is the realm where the Existence in its wholeness inhabits. Human existence is only an embodiment of this Existence, a piece of it. Cosmic time is beyond the order of historical time; it is not ephemeral or dominated by contingencies. It precedes and contains human existence and also historical time. Individuals are separated from this positive nothingness to become puppets in the hands of negative nothingness, death. They long for this transcendental wholeness, but it is impossible for them to restore the broken unity through their voluntary efforts. It shows itself for a moment and then disappears. It is like lightning that illuminates the world for a short time. In Tanpınar's thought Existence shows itself to humans in their dreams and in music because dreams and music have a different order where the unconsciousness or most natural parts of individuals emerge. Through these media individuals can have contact with

[229] Kristeva, p. 6.

Existence. In *Huzur*, this contact is obvious in the *Ferahfeza* ceremony scene where Mümtaz longs for unity with Existence.

These considerations reveal that for both authors transcending time meant discovery of an ahistorical or transhistorical phenomenon. In Proust this was essence, in Tanpınar Existence. This ahistorical phenomenon gave them the possibility of an anchoring in modernity's temporal order that was determined by instability, elusiveness, and fragmentation. This search for what was permanent within what was passing was one of the outcomes of modernity. Concreteness was eternally lost because the world was dominated by abstractions and alienations inherent in modernity. Proust's narrator-protagonist was able to find a place where he could grasp his experience in its concreteness through remembering. However, Mümtaz, in the last instance, was unable to construct wholeness that he was in search of. This difference points to a difference in interpreting both novels. While Proust's novel tells how time and wholeness are regained, Tanpınar's novel is a memory of wholeness.

Nevertheless, their quests are still for an impossible wholeness because the sense of wholeness was deprived by time from permanence. This characteristic brings with it a similitude in terms of the role aesthetic realm played in their thoughts. For Proust, stabilizing ephemeral moments of remembrance was possible only through creating a work of literature because the work of art had much power than the human life vis-à-vis time. Tanpınar aimed at reminding the sense of wholeness that was lost. In order to do that he had to reconstruct wholeness in aesthetic realm.

Moreover, their aim at representing wholeness aesthetically created a common inclination towards the employment of metaphors. Metaphors provided

their narratives a thick texture. Benjamin's words, "no one's text is more tightly woven than Marcel Proust's; to him nothing was tight or durable enough"[230] are also illuminative for Tanpınar. Additionally, metaphors had a specific importance for both authors in terms of appropriating and giving meaning to the external world. Metaphors, depending on the creation of analogies between different objects and sensations, are subjective. Marcel and Mümtaz who are trying to internalize the external world employ metaphors in order to dematerialize objects and individuals because their direct relations with them bring only frustration. Thus, they direct their efforts to reconstruct these relations through their subjective meaning giving processes. By doing this they are able to appropriate the outside world and at the same time project their inner worlds to outside. Appropriation and projection are also ways of overcoming the abstractness of the world. They also abstract the world, but in order to incorporate it in their own concreteness.

Both metaphor and memory depend on a relation between two different phenomena or moments. Instead of an identification that erased the difference, they imply distance. In other words, meaning and wholeness emerge in the relation between these moments or phenomena. This means that Proust and Tanpınar reconstruct their works on an in-between and elusive realm. Günday argued, "In *A la recherche du temps perdu* there is a rejection of living in the present in favor of living in the past through memory, in other words, to live the past in the present."[231] Previous considerations showed that Marcel, instead of living in the past, tried to reconstruct the link between the past and the present. This means that he experienced

[230] Benjamin, p. 202.

[231] Günday, p. 61. "*Dans cette oeuvre il s'agit du refus à vivre dans le present, mais de vivre dans le passé par la mémoire, c'est-à-dire de vivre le passé dans le present.*"

an in-betweenness. Similarly, Mümtaz, who was unable to construct the wholeness that he was looking for, was left in an in-between position.

Indeed, this in-betweenness and lack of wholeness constitutes what is modern in both Proust and Tanpınar. Proust was totally aware of the impossibility of reexperiencing wholeness again. The world was broken into pieces in a way that made it impossible to unite them again. Accordingly, Proust focused on the inner-world of his protagonist-narrator and narrated how Marcel experienced that turmoil instead of trying to portray the socio-cultural transformation. Tanpınar had a more complex attitude. He chose to believe in the possibility of reconstructing wholeness that was missing. This tendency is most clear in his ideas concerning the socio-cultural field with his emphasis on the necessity of reestablishing a genuine Turkish culture. In other words, Tanpınar, along with his interest in individual, paid particular attention to issues related to the community within which he lived. He tried to point at socio-cultural problems in order to transform the community. Mümtaz had also felt this responsibility of transforming the society by creating continuity and wholeness throughout the novel. However, at the end of the novel Mümtaz was defeated. This defeat is a key to understand Tanpınar's complexity. Although he wanted to believe in the possibility of wholeness, he was also aware of its impossibility. In other words, he undermines himself. The complexity and power of his thought and literary works emanate from this ambivalent position that he placed himself intentionally. He achieved to create an aesthetic whole out of fragmented, divergent, and opposite elements that made life.

APPENDIX

A. BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR[232]

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar was born in 23 June 1961 in İstanbul as the fifth of nine children of Hüseyin Fikri Efendi and Nesime Bahriye. His father was a Muslim judge (*kadı*). Accordingly, he received his primary and secondary educations in different towns, İstanbul, Sinop, Siirt, Kerkik, and Antalya, because of his father's occupation, his father was a judge. He returned to İstanbul in 1918 and he enrolled first at the School of Veterinarian and then to the Faculty of Literature at İstanbul University where Yahya Kemal was his professor. Yahya Kemal had strong influence on Tanpınar, especially in terms of his views on history and aesthetics. In 1921, he participated in the foundation of a new journal, *Dergah*. He graduated from university in 1923. Then he worked as a teacher of literature in high schools in Erzurum (1923-1925), Konya (1925-1927), and Ankara (1927-1932). In 1930 he was appointed to the *Gazi Terbiye Enstitüsü* (Gazi Education Institute) as literature teacher. Meanwhile his poems were published in *Milli Mecmua* (National Periodical) and *Hayat* (Life). He also co-founded with Ahmet Kutsi Tecer *Görüş* (Opinion).

In 1932 Tanpınar was appointed to Kadıköy High School as literature teacher. In the next year, he started as teacher of art history at *Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi* (The Academy of Fine Arts) after the death of Ahmet Haşim. In 1934, his mission in Kadıköy High School ended and he continued at the academy, where he taught, along with art history, aesthetics and mythology.

In 1938 he started to write in *Cumhuriyet* (Republic newspaper). In the following year he became a professor in the Tanzimat Literature Department of İstanbul University Faculty of Literature. Meanwhile he continued to teach in the academy. In

[232] Turan Alptekin, *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Bir Kültür, Bir İnsan* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001).

1941 he participated in Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People's Party) Congress series and in the following year he became a deputy from this party (1942-1946) and resigned from his post in the university.

In 1942 he published Namık Kemal Anthology and the next year he published *Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyaları* (Abdullah Effendi's Dreams). In 1944 *Mahur Beste* (Mahur Tune) and in 1946 *Beş Şehir* (Five Cities) were published. The same year he was appointed at inspector of the Ministry of National Education. In 1948, he became teacher of aesthetics at the Academy of Fine Arts for the second time and *Huzur* (Peace of Mind) was published in *Cumhuriyet*. The next year he became professor in the Department of New Turkish Literature at İstanbul University and he continued to teach there until the end of his life. *Huzur* was published in book format in the same year. In 1950 *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* (Those Outside of the Scene) was published in serial format. In 1954 *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (Time Regulation Institute) was published also in serial format. Tanpınar died in İstanbul on 24 January 1962.

B. BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF MARCEL PROUST[233]

Marcel (Valentin Louis Eugène Georges) Proust was on 10 July 1871 at Auteuil in the Paris suburbs. He was the son of Adrien Proust, a distinguished professor of medicine, and Jeanne-Clémence Weil. His father was Catholic and his mother was Jewish. The next year Proust's family took up residence in the fashionable boulevard Malesherbes (Paris 8e). Proust lived in the area until the last period of his life. Between 1878 and 1886 he spent his holidays with his family at Illiers (now Illiers-Combray).

Proust attended the Lycée Fontanes (renamed Lycée Condorcet in 1883) between 1882 and 1889. He was suffering from chronic asthma attacks. During his education Proust was influenced strongly by his philosophy teacher, Alphonse Darlu. He did his one-year military service in 1889-1890. Then he studied law at the Sorbonne and political science at Ecole des Sciences Politique. He received his license in law in 1893 and his license in letters in 1895.

In 1891 he co-founded a short-lived journal named *Le Banquet*. He actively contributed to this and other journals. Meanwhile, in 1894 the Dreyfus Affair began and after the publication of Zola's "J'accuse," Proust rallied to the Dreyfus cause. His literary production continued in this period. In 1895 he began a novel that he abandoned and never finished. This novel was published in 1952 as *Jean Santeuil*. In 1896 he published his first book, *Les Plaisirs et les Jours*, a collection of stories, essays and miscellaneous pieces. After 1897 Proust became increasingly enthusiastic about the work of the English writer and art historian Ruskin. In 1900 Ruskin died and Proust devoted his next few years to translating (with the help mainly of his

[233] The Cambridge Companion to Proust, ed. Richard Bales (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. xix-xxi.

mother) and annotating his selected works. In 1904 the first of Proust's translations of Ruskin, *La Bible d'Amiens*, was published. The second, *Sésame et les Lys*, was published in 1906. In 1903 Proust's father died, and then in 1906 his mother died. He was inconsolable.

In 1908 he began an essay, what is now known as *Contre Sainte-Beuve*. The next year this essay was transformed into a novel that would become *A la recherche du temps perdu* (*In Search of Lost Time*). In 1911 the novel title was *Les Intermittencies du Cœur* (*The Intermittencies of the Heart*). During 1912 Proust sought a publisher but in vain. Next year, *Du côté de chez Swann* (*Swann's Way*) was published by Grasset, at Proust's own expense. The general title of the work was changed to *A la recherche du temps perdu*. In 1914 the second volume of the novel as it then existed was being set up in proof but the outbreak of war stopped the printing presses. Between 1914 and 1918, with no possibility of publication, Prost vastly expanded his novel. The second volume, *A l'ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs* (*Within a Budding Grove*), was published in 1918 and the next year Proust was controversially awarded the *Prix Goncourt*, France's premier literary prize. The following year he was named Chevalier de la legion d'honneur. In the same year *Le Côté de Guermantes I* (*The Guermantes Way*) was published. In 1921 *Le Côté de Guermantes II* and *Sodome et Gomorrhe I* (*Sodom and Gomorrah*) were published. In 1922 *Sodome et Gomorrhe II* was published. In the same year Proust developed bronchitis, then pneumonia, and died on 18 November. The rest of his novel was published posthumously. In 1923 *Sodome et Gomorrhe III* and *La Prisonniére (The Captive*) were published. The following year *Albertine disparue* (*The Fugitive*) and in 1927, with the publication of *Le Temps retrouvé* (*Time Regained*), publication of *A*

la recherche du temps perdu ended. In 1954 a version of *Contre Sainte-Beuve* was published.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agacinski, Sylvian. *Time Passing: Modernity and Nostalgia*. Translated by Jody Gladding. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Alptekin, Turan. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Bir Kültür, Bir İnsan*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Image of Proust." *Illuminations*. Edited by Hannah Arendt. New York: Shocken Books, 1985.

Berksoy, Berkiz. "Bir Entelektüel Olarak Tanpınar." *Doğu Batı* 37 (2006).

Berman, Marshall. *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity.* London; New York: Verso, 1983.

Bersani, Leo. *Marcel Proust: The Fictions of Life and of Art.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Bhabha, Homi. *Nation and Narration*. London; New York: Routledge, 1990.

Bora, Tanıl and Burak Onaran. "Nostalji ve Muhafazakarlık: Mazi Cenneti." *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Volume 5. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları,

Bora, Tanıl. "Muhafazakarlığın Değişimi ve Türk Muhafazakarlığında Bazı Yol İzleri." *Toplum ve Bilim* 74 (Fall 1997).

Calinescu, Matei. *Five Faces of Modernity.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1987.

The Cambridge Companion to Proust. Edited by Richard Bales. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Çiğdem, Ahmet. "Muhafazakarlık Üzerine." *Toplum ve Bilim* 74 (Fall 1997).

Deleuze, Gilles. *Proust ve Göstergeler*. Translated by Ayşe Meral. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2002.

Demiralp, Oğuz. *Kutup Noktası: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Üzerine Eleştirel Deneme*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001.

Ertuğrul, Suna. "Belated Modernity and Modernity as Belatedness in Tutunamayanlar." *South Atlantic Quarterly, Relocating the Fault Lines: Turkey beyond the East-West Divide*. 102 (2/3) (2003).

Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. "On Alternative Modernities." *Alternative Modernities*. Edited by D.P. Gaonkar. Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2001.

Günday, Rıfat. *Problémes du Temps chez Marcel Proust et Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*. Ph.D. dissertation, Marmara University, 1997.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. "Kurumuş Pınar, Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark: Ophelia, Su ve Rüyalar." *Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark: Edebiyat ve Endişe.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2004.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. "Tanpınar'da Görünmeyen." *Yer Değiştiren Gölge*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1995.

Harootunian, Harry. *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Huyssen, Andreas. *Alacakaranlık Anıları: Bellek Yitimi Kültüründe Zamanı Belirlemek*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1999.

Jusdanis, Gregory. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Modernity: Inventing National Literature*. Minneapolis; Oxford: The University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Kahraman, Hasan Bülent. "Yitirilmemiş Zamanın Ardında: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Muhafazakar Modernliğin Estetik Düzlemi." *Doğu-Batı*. no. 11, (2000).

Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space: 1880-1918.* Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Kolcu, Ali İhsan. *Zamana Düşen Çığlık: Tanpınar'ın Şiirinin Epistemolojik Temelleri ve Tanpınar'ın Şiir Estetiği*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2002.

Köksal, Duygu. "Zaman, Osmanlılık ve Cemil Meriç." *Cogito*. no. 11 (1997).

Köroğlu, Erol. *Upon the Threshold Between What is Gone and What is Yet to Come: The Concept of Time in A.H. Tanpınar's Novels*. M.A. thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1996.

Kristeva, Julia. *Proust and the Sense of Time.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Moran, Berna. "Bir Huzursuzluğun Romanı: Huzur," *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*. Vol. 1. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1987.

Oktay, Ahmet. "Tanpınar: Bir Tereddütün Adamı." *Defter*. 23 (Spring 1995).

Parla, Jale. "Taksim Kabul Etmiş Zamanın Aynası Roman: Mahur Beste," *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001.

Poulet, Georges. "Proust," *Studies in Human Time*. Translated by Elliott Coleman. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Proust, Marcel. *Swann's Way*. Translated by C.K. Scott Moncrieff. Penguin Books, 1957.

Proust, Marcel. *The Captive and The Fugitive*. Translated by Andreas Mayor and Terence Kilmartin, revised by D.J. Enright. London: Vintage, 2000.

Proust, Marcel. *The Guermantes Way*. Translated by C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin. New York: Vintage Books, 1982.

Proust, Marcel. *Time Regained.* Translated by Andreas Mayor and Terence Kilmartin, revised by D.J. Enright. London: Vintage, 2000.

Proust, Marcel. *Time Regained*. Translated by C.K. Scott Moncrieff, Terence Kilmartin, and Andreas Mayor. New York: Vintage Books, 1982.

Proust, Marcel. *Within a Budding Grove*. Translated by C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin, revised by D.J. Enright. New York: The Modern Library, 1998.

Sprinker, Michael. *History and Ideology in Proust: A la recherche du temps perdu and the Third French Republic*. London; New York: Verso, 1998.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "Asıl Kaynak," *Yaşadığım Gibi*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2000.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Bütün Şiirleri*. Edited byİnci Enginün. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1994.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "İstanbul," *Beş Şehir*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1969.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "İş ve Program – I," *Mücevherlerin Sırrı: Derlenmemiş Yazılar, Anket ve Röportajlar*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "İş ve Program – II," *Mücevherlerin Sırrı: Derlenmemiş Yazılar, Anket ve Röportajlar*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan," *Yaşadığım Gibi*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2000.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "Şark ile Garp Arasında Görülen Esaslı Farklar," *Yaşadığım Gibi*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2000.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "Şiir ve Rüya I," *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. Edited by Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1998.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. "Şiir ve Rüya II," *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. Edited by Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1998.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Huzur*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2002.

Terdiman, Richard. *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis.* Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Türkeş, A. Ömer. "Muhafazakar Romanlarda Muhafaza Edilen Neydi?" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 5. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları,

Wilson, Edmund. *Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870-1930*. Glasgow: Collins, 1959.