

T.C.
FATİH UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

THE DIARIES OF VIRGINIA WOOLF AND AHMET HAMDİ
TANPINAR: CULTURE AND DISILLUSIONMENT

Ph.D. DISSERTATION

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Mohamed BAKARI

by
Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ

İstanbul, 2014

© 2014 Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ

All Rights Reserved, 2014

APPROVAL

Student: Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ
Institute: Institute of Social Sciences
Department: Comparative Literature
Thesis Subject: The Diaries of Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Culture and Disillusionment
Thesis Date: June 2014

I certify that this dissertation satisfies all the requirements as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.....
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Head of Program

This is to certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation submitted for the degree of doctor of philosophy.

.....
Assist. Prof. Dr. Agnes E. BRANDABUR
Co- Advisor

.....
Prof. Dr. Mohamed BAKARI
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mohamed BAKARI	
Assist. Prof. Dr. Agnes E. BRANDABUR	
Prof. Dr. Barry Charles THARAUD	
Prof. Dr. Mehmet İPŞİRLİ	
Prof. Dr. İbrahim YILGÖR	
Assist. Prof. Dr. Carl Jeffrey BOON	
Assist. Prof. Dr. Önder ÇETİN	

It is approved that this dissertation has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATION

1. The material included in this dissertation has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than for which it is now submitted.

2. The program of advanced study of which this dissertation is a part has been comprised of courses in Ph.D. program in Comparative Literature, including literary theory, English, Turkish, and World Literatures in genres that include autobiographical writings, narrative literature, and thematic courses such as Identity Politics and Literature and Comparative Literature.

i) Research Methods: The dissertation incorporates methods taught on both undergraduate and graduate levels during the course of study.

ii) Sources examined and cited in this dissertation include articles from scholarly journals, other articles and essays, interviews, memoirs, diaries, autobiographies, biographies, novels, and books on literature, sociology, cultural studies, history, and politics, and dissertation style of guides of Turkish and international universities as well as many relevant books published by university presses on this subject.

Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ

June 2014

ABSTRACT

Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ

June 2014

THE DIARIES OF VIRGINIA WOOLF AND AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR: CULTURE AND DISILLUSIONMENT

This dissertation investigates the real source of Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's tragedies by analyzing their diaries. Their awareness of cultural change and its effects on society led them to show their reactions in their works, in which their depression can be clearly seen. This study claims that their anxieties about social transformation were the main realities that they could not escape and thus became the central motive for their depression. Their concerns about social transformation can be best analyzed in their diaries since the diaries are full of their inner conflicts, feelings, and opinions about their surroundings, depressive moments, and their conflicts between aesthetics and politics that help us to analyze their roles as artists. I analyze Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries in terms of literary and social orientation, the question of existential authenticity, their connection with their social contexts, and the relation of their diaries to other genres. The diaries also reflect social transition in Turkey and Europe, and especially in Britain. Tanpınar's works are among the best sources that identify Turkish modernization and its impact on society. His diary brings a different interpretation to his tragedy of a changing civilization since it helps us to analyze the deepest concerns of Tanpınar and thus sheds light on him and his whole society. Woolf experienced a similar tragedy from a different cultural perspective. She emphasized that a change in human character is a sign of decadence, and she identified a twentieth-century crisis. To demonstrate that Turkish modernization was neither traditional nor truly Western but a chaotic mingling of the two, this study compares and contrasts Turkish Westernization with European modernization within the context of the Enlightenment and modernity. This dissertation makes an original contribution to understanding the position of Woolf, Tanpınar, and their works – especially their diaries – in the context of social and psychic transformation.

Keywords: Virginia Woolf, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar’la Başbaşa* [In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar], Woolf and Tanpınar’s tragedy, modernization, Westernization, modernity, the identity problem, comparative cultural studies.

ÖZET

Mustafa Ahmet DÜZDAĞ

Haziran 2014

VIRGINIA WOOLF VE AHMET HAMDİ TANPINAR’IN GÜNLÜKLERİNDE KÜLTÜR VE BUHRAN

Bu tez, Virginia Woolf ve Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar’ın yaşadığı bunalımın gerçek sebeplerini incelemektedir. Woolf ve Tanpınar, kültürel değişim ve bu değişimin toplum ve bireyler üzerindeki etkisine eserlerinde yer vermişlerdir. Bu çalışma, Woolf ve Tanpınar’ın yaşadığı bunalımın asıl sebebinin, toplumsal dönüşüm karşısında ikilemde kalmaları olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Woolf ve Tanpınar’ın günlükleri, bu tepkilerin en iyi analiz edildiği eserlerdir; bu günlüklerde yazarların iç çatışmaları, çevreleri hakkında fikir ve düşünceleri, bunalım hallerinin yanı sıra sanatçı ve yazar olarak entelektüel camia içerisindeki konumları hakkında bilgi verebilecek bir çok değerlendirme bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışma, günlükleri edebi ve sosyal açıdan değerlendirerek, bu eserlerin tutarlılığını, bir edebi tür olarak diğer nevilerden farkını, ve sosyal çevre ve durumla bağını incelemektedir. Bu günlükler, aynı zamanda Türkiye ve Avrupa’daki, özellikle de İngiltere’deki, toplumsal dönüşümü göstermesi açısından değerlendirilmiştir. Tanpınar’ın eserleri, Türk modernleşmesini ve bu modernleşmenin bireyler üzerindeki etkisini tahlil eden en önemli çalışmalar arasında yer almaktadır. Tanpınar’ın günlüğü, bu medeniyet değiştirme buhranını farklı şekilde anlamaya yardımcı olmaktadır; bu eser Tanpınar’ın en temel endişelerini analiz etmeye ve böylelikle toplumun genelinin yaşadığı bir trajediyi anlamaya ışık tutabilir. Woolf benzer bir buhranı farklı bir kültür çevresinde yaşamıştır. İnsan karakterindeki değişimin, inkıraz halinin bir sembolü olduğunu iddia ederek, yirminci yüzyılda Avrupa’nın boğuştuğu krizi tahlil etmiştir. Türk modernleşmesinin ne geleneksel ne de batılı, fakat farklı bir tarzda gerçekleştiğini göstermek için bu çalışmada, Türkiye’nin batılılaşma süreci ile Avrupa tarzı modernleşme, Aydınlanma ve modernite bağlamında karşılaştırılmıştır. Bu tez, Woolf, Tanpınar ve eserlerinin, özellikle de günlüklerinin, önemini toplumsal ve zihniyet değişimi ekseninde anlamaya katkı sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Virginia Woolf, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Virginia Woolf'un Günlükleri*, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*, toplumsal buhran, modernleşme, batılılaşıma, modernite, kimlik problemi, karşılaştırmalı kültür çalışmaları.

CONTENTS

APPROVAL.....	iii
AUTHOR DECLARATION.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
ÖZET.....	vii
CONTENTS.....	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER 1

Traditional or Marginal? Woolf and Tanpınar’s “The Texture of the Ordinary Day”	26
Diary: A Genre?.....	29
English Diaries.....	43
Virginia Woolf Writes ‘Out’	57
Diary in its Unique Form in the East and Islamic Geography.....	61
A Genre in Turkish Literature?.....	70
Tanpınar’s “Great Economy”	74

CHAPTER 2

Misrepresentation of Identity in Woolf And Tanpınar’s Diaries.....	79
Public or Private?.....	84
“There is a Little Book in them”	90
“This Diary will be Read after Me”	93
Tanpınar’s Novel Revisited.....	98
Reinterpretation of Woolf’s Novels.....	110
A Fictional Self in a Fictional Text.....	113
Editorial Interference in Woolf’s Diary.....	118
Editorial Evidence in Tanpınar’s Diary.....	121
Tanpınar’s Book of Revenge.....	125
Woolf: A “Restless Searcher”	134

CHAPTER 3

“Change of Civilization and the Inner Man”: Tanpınar as a Writer of Mental

Transformation.....	138
“Turkish Literature Begins with a Crisis of Civilization”.....	142
Tanpınar: “A Western Easterner”.....	170
“They will Return to me One Day”: Tanpınar’s Solitude.....	176
“I am an Exposed Witness and Observer”: No Country for Tanpınar.....	183

CHAPTER 4

“On December 1910 Human Character Changed” : Woolf as a Writer of Social

Transformation.....	190
“Humanity in General Falls”: Modernity as the Disenchantment of the World.....	197
“In the Midst of Chaos there was Shape”: Woolf’s Search for harmony.....	212
“Modernism’s Last Post” and European Provincializing.....	229

CONCLUSION.....	238
------------------------	------------

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	246
--------------------------	------------

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members, Prof. Dr. Mehmet İPŞİRLİ, Prof. Dr. İbrahim YILGÖR, Assist. Prof. Dr. Önder ÇETİN, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Carl Jeffrey BOON for their valuable help. I would like to express my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Agnes E. BRANDABUR, who introduced me to the broad field of world literature. I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. Barry Charles THARAUD for his constant support, invaluable guidance, and encouragement. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Mohamed BAKARI for his excellent guidance and motivation. Finally, I am thankful to my family for their endless support and patience.

INTRODUCTION

Woolf's works were just about becoming herself. In one way, she was interpreting Tanpınar's tragedy from a different culture.¹

Since his death in 1962, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar has been the subject of several studies, both academic and nonacademic. He is at the center of many discussions of modernization and its influence on social life in Turkey. Most of these discussions are based on ideological orientations: whether Tanpınar was a rightist or a leftist, conservative or liberal, for or against Westernization in Turkey. He was indeed on neither side since he was "after a Turkey that is connected with the world, progressive, and reconciled with its past."² However, many groups in Turkey exploited the ambivalent position of Tanpınar and showed him as a symbol of the resistance that they wanted to project. The publication of his diary in 2007 did not resolve the conflicts surrounding him, but rather created several new misinterpretations due to the depression expressed in his diary entries associated with poverty, loneliness, and sexual dissatisfaction. However, his tragedy stemmed from experiencing a cultural change: he was now suffering from loneliness.³ Virginia Woolf's tragedy was similar to Tanpınar's; she was, according to Selim İleri, "interpreting Tanpınar's tragedy from a different culture."⁴ However, most of the critics considered the source of her depression that led her to suicide as the

¹ Selim İleri, "Bir 'Roman' için Virginia Woolf," *Zaman*, 9 November 2008. The translations of all the quotes from the Turkish sources in this study are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

² İnci Enginün and Z. Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*, 301. Even though the writer of the *diary* is Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, I cite the editors of the diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, as the writers for two reasons: First, the editors put their names on the cover as the writers and with no indication of the editorial job. Secondly, they turned the collection of Tanpınar's diary entries into an academic study by including several comments and footnotes, which makes them writers rather than the editors. See criticism on editorial interference to Tanpınar's diary in Chapter 2 of this study. Before I started writing this dissertation, I talked to Prof. Dr. İnci Enginün, the co-editor of Tanpınar's diary. Her suggestion of a comparative study on Woolf and Tanpınar and her guidance on their diaries helped me develop my dissertation. I would like to express my gratitude to her.

³ Throughout his life, Tanpınar complained about his loneliness; we find several remarks about that in his diary, one of which reads, "The circle of alienation [sükût suikastı/halkası] is continuing and can even be considered an assassination (260). However, this study will prove that it was indeed not an alienation but "self-isolation" for it was Tanpınar himself who somewhat prepared his alienation from the people around him. See Chapter 3 for related discussion.

⁴ İleri, "Bir 'Roman' için" *Zaman*, 9 November 2008.

consequence of her unfortunate life experiences such as the trauma of early childhood sexual abuse and the constrictions imposed by the patriarchal system of thought. By analyzing their diaries, this study identifies the real source of Woolf and Tanpınar's tragedies.

In *A Study of History*, Arnold Toynbee claims that the fate of civilizations is determined by humanity's response to the challenges facing it;⁵ therefore, "civilizations die from suicide, not murder."⁶ Toynbee's assertion might be right for societies; the way that the European and the Ottoman societies responded to the challenges they faced have determined the process and the form of transformation. For European societies, the process, which started after the Renaissance, might be considered as the last and the most important phase of change, which resulted in the establishment and the consolidation of democracy and some other expected results; it also had unexpected consequences such as the waning of religious faith, disillusionment, totalitarian tyranny, genocide, and spiritual emptiness. Turkish society witnessed a drastic change from an Empire to a nation-state. The response to the challenges addressed were limited to the adoption of foreign sources. Considering the given contexts, Woolf and Tanpınar's awareness of cultural transformation caused their depression. This study claims that their concerns about social transformation were the main realities that they could not escape and thus became the central motive for their depression.

Born in 1901 in İstanbul, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar was recognized in his lifetime as a poet, a scholar, and an essayist; after his death in 1962 he began to be appreciated as a novelist and short story writer. His father was a judge so he spent his childhood in various Anatolian cities until he came back to İstanbul in 1918 for his higher education. Due to his admiration of Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, he transferred to the Department of Turkish Literature, where he not only studied major works of Divan literature but also became familiar with Western poets and intellectuals. He became a lecturer of art history in 1933 and became a professor in 1939 at İstanbul University, where he gave courses on contemporary Turkish literature. He became a

⁵ Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, Vol. 4 (London: Oxford UP, 1951), 38.

⁶ Toynbee, 63, 68, 100, 484. Toynbee repeats the same phrase several times in his *A Study of History* for defining the breakdowns of several civilizations.

congressman in 1942 as the representative of Maraş, a city in Turkey, and also as a member of the CHP (Republican People's Party). After the end of his term in parliament in 1948, he returned to his faculty position and continued working there until his death in 1962.

Considered by the Nobel laureate Orhan Pamuk as "Turkey's greatest twentieth-century novelist,"⁷ Tanpınar offers in his books "the deepest understanding of what it means to live in a rapidly Westernizing country amongst the ruins of Ottoman culture, and shows how it is, in the end, the people themselves who, through ignorance and despair, end up severing their every link with the past."⁸ Like Orhan Pamuk, several critics saw Tanpınar's works indispensable for anyone who is interested in modern Turkish society because Tanpınar drew attention in his works "to the psychological effects of the Kemalist cultural revolution of the 1920s and 1930s, [he recognized] the persistence of an Ottoman Islamic cultural legacy, and [he depicted] the individual alienated and divided by modernization."⁹

The Britain in which Virginia Woolf died was not the same nation in which Virginia Stephen was born on 25 January 1882, in the heyday of Victorian and imperial prosperity. Woolf witnessed two world wars and the collapse of a civilization, which led to her death by her own hand in 1941, as Hitler's bombs were raining down on London. Her childhood and young womanhood passed in London until the death of her father. Even though Woolf missed a formal education, her father's well-stocked library became a school to her in addition to the educational orientation of her family's upper-class social surroundings. She and her sister, Vanessa, moved to Bloomsbury, where Virginia became a member of the Bloomsbury group and married Leonard Woolf in 1912. Leonard and Virginia founded the Hogarth Press together and published numerous pamphlets and books. Mental illness affected Virginia throughout her life, although some critics claim that "Woolf became an artist because she was a neurotic, that she filled her books with

⁷ Orhan Pamuk, *Istanbul: Memories and the City* (London: Faber and faber, 2005), 225.

⁸ Pamuk, 189.

⁹ Erdağ Gökner, "Ottoman Past and Turkish Future: Ambivalence in A.H. Tanpınar's *Those outside the Scene*," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no:2 (2003), 647.

references to death and strange desires for a depersonalized union with the cosmos because she was afraid to live fully outside fiction.”¹⁰

After Virginia Woolf’s death in 1941, E.M. Forster gave a Rede lecture on Virginia Woolf, at Cambridge University. Forster, a well-known member of the Bloomsbury group, defined Woolf as “a poet, who wants to write something as near to a novel as possible [...] and] that is her problem.”¹¹ Forster’s comment defines Woolf’s poetical writing style in her novels. As seen in her novels, especially in *The Waves*, she could produce her distinctive style by holding on with one hand to poetry, but stretching herself to grasp things sometimes by leaving poetry behind. Forster in the same lecture talked about why she was a distinguished writer: “She liked writing with an intensity which few writers have attained, or even desired. Most of them write with half an eye on their royalties, half an eye on their critics, and a third half eye on improving the world, which leaves them with only half an eye for the task on which she concentrated her entire vision. She would not look elsewhere [...].”¹²

As mentioned above, Tanpınar and Woolf are often acclaimed as novelists. Through his novels, Tanpınar wanted to bring a new perspective to understanding his social milieu and to introduce new forms into Turkish literature. In her novels, Woolf showed her reaction to human insufficiency due to a paradigm shift in European societies by experimenting with new contexts and modernist techniques. Tanpınar says that he is after himself in his poetry while in his novels he is after himself, life, and people – “after people rather than myself.”¹³ Even though he writes in his diary, “my poetry is my essential,” the proceeding sentence explains why he is known as a novelist: “But the novel will bring me popularity and recognition.”¹⁴ Woolf has long been celebrated as a novelist who “broke with the aesthetics of earlier generations and challenged their values.”¹⁵ In her novels she wanted to “give the moment whole;

¹⁰ Thomas C. Caramagno, “Manic-Depressive Psychosis and Critical Approaches to Virginia Woolf’s Life and Work,” *PMLA* 103 (1988), 10.

¹¹ E.M. Forster, “Virginia Woolf,” in *The Bloomsbury Group: A Collection of Memoirs and Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 223.

¹² Forster, 224.

¹³ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2006), 352-53.

¹⁴ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 309

¹⁵ Jane de Gay, *Virginia Woolf’s Novels and the Literary Past* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 1.

whatever it includes.”¹⁶ Their novels and essays have been much analyzed; however, Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s reactions toward drastic social changes have never been studied in association with their psychological depression. For this very reason, their diaries, rather than their novels, hold great significance to show their conflicts between aesthetics and politics, as well as their inner struggle to define their roles as artists in the literary community. For Woolf, the diary was her most comfortable literary mode and “a cornerstone for her total artistic undertaking.”¹⁷ Therefore, in addition to her struggle in life and her reaction toward social conditions, her literary inclinations can be best understood through a careful analysis of her diary. Tanpınar’s diary on the other hand is full of his impressions, plans, novel and poetry drafts, his inner conflicts, his feelings and opinions about his surroundings, depressive moments, and even his sexual desire; all are recorded in the diary in passing. He made long lists of essays and books he planned to write – some of which materialized and some of which remained a projection jotted in the diary. This obviously significant characteristic of the diaries gave me the idea that the best possible texts in which Woolf and Tanpınar’s reactions as well as their depression can be analyzed are their diaries.

In *On Diary*, Philippe Lejeune defines diary as “the point where life and literature meet.”¹⁸ However, it has not often been called literature due to its lack of literary consciousness. Therefore, while the diaries of celebrated people are well known and published, personal writings of unobtrusive people mostly remain unpublished and private. The unpopularity of diary as a genre stems to some extent from the fact that there is a great variety of diary practices with various motives. While some diarists are motivated by the idea of self-exploration, others are willing to keep a record of thoughts and actions to pass down to the next generations or for other purposes. The contribution of diaries as a genre in the literary sphere is limited, then, and depends on self-motivation.

Virginia Woolf – Virginia Stephen then – started writing her early diary when she was fifteen years old. Her motive in her early diary was to record her experiences

¹⁶ Virginia Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, Vol. 3 (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 209.

¹⁷ Judy Simons, *Diaries and Journals of Literary Women from Fanny Burney to Virginia Woolf* (Iowa City: Univeersity of Iowa Press, 1990), 170.

¹⁸ Phillippe Lejeune, *On Diary* (HI: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009), 2.

of her struggle to fit into the social mold in the patriarchal system. I limit my study to Woolf's mature diaries, which she started writing when she was thirty-three years old. Her objective for taking daily notes was "to get rid of the fidgets, to have a record of my life, to provide fodder for the memoirs I intended to write, to explore writing, and to explore my many selves."¹⁹ We should also note that Woolf's narrative style began in the diary and was later fitted to her fiction.²⁰ The diary was thus a form of discovery; she took note of several subjects that she would later use in her novels: "Indeed most of life escapes, now I come to think of it; the texture of the ordinary day."²¹ Even her stream of consciousness technique, which let her capture the moment in an ordinary day, was already in her diary earlier than it appeared in her novels.

Tanpınar started keeping his diary in 1953 in Paris. His remarks in 1951 in an interview give important clues about why he decided to keep a diary: "what upsets me most is that I have not kept a diary; my only advice to my young friends is that they keep diaries. A person can produce everything out of himself, out of his life. Keeping a diary means keeping oneself in the view all the time. There is no greater economy than that."²² The editors of the diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, claim that Tanpınar was keeping his diary as an "autocue."²³ Like Woolf, Tanpınar made several remarks that might bring new interpretations to his other texts, especially his novels. Therefore, I will analyze Tanpınar's various motivations for keeping a diary in this study.

Tanpınar's various motivations for keeping a diary raise questions about the diary's similarities with and differences from other forms of personal writings, namely journals, letters, and autobiographies. While in the diary there are fresh relations of events recorded at the moment, in autobiography events are framed into a

¹⁹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 5 (New York: Penguin Books, 1985), 335.

²⁰ A remarkable example of this connection between Woolf's fiction and nonfiction works is given by H. Porter Abbott, who argues that Woolf's *Night and Day* is the moment of transformation in Woolf's style, and this transformation can be seen in her diary. (H. Porter Abbott, "Old Virginia and the Night Writer: The Origins of Woolf's Narrative Meander," in *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women's Diaries*, ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia A. Huff (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 236-51.

²¹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2 (New York: Penguin Books, 1981), 298.

²² Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 308.

²³ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 6.

unified whole with a higher expectation of publication. The similarities are in question when it comes to comparing the diary and the journal. In his *English Diaries*, Arthur Ponsonby discriminates between the concepts of journal and diary: “The word *Journal* should be reserved for the purely objective historical or scientific records, and the word *Diary* for the personal memoranda, notes, and expressions of opinion.”²⁴ Even though the terms “diary” and “journal” differ from each other in some ways, its interchangeable use proves that both contributed to the establishment of a tradition in the West and the East. Therefore, autobiographies, journals, diaries, memoirs, and even biographies should be considered as parts of a genre, all of which contributed to the development of autobiographical writing.

Even though Tanpınar and Woolf’s notes are considered and defined as diaries, they indeed hold several characteristics of journals, travel books, and other forms of personal writing. Especially in the last years of his lifetime, Tanpınar wrote in his notebook his opinions on social issues and changing political circumstances. He writes about Adnan Menderes,²⁵ the 1960 coup in Turkey,²⁶ the Democratic Party,²⁷ the role of the military in politics,²⁸ the Kurdish question,²⁹ and many other issues. While he was keeping his diary as an autocue of notes to remember for later, he was also writing journal-like entries comprised of news³⁰ and opinions. Virginia Woolf’s diary also holds some features of the journal; she writes about Jews, the Nazi regime, the Second World War, and she comments on many occurrences, most of which show her reactions to changes in society. Both Woolf and Tanpınar include entries on their travels, most of which had already been published by the writers themselves before the whole entries were published after the death of the authors. Virginia Woolf recorded her thoughts, observations, and experiences during her travels, having a reader in mind. Tanpınar, likewise, took very diligent notes on his travels, especially on his journey to Paris, and published them in a magazine several decades

²⁴ Arthur Ponsonby, *English Diaries* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1992), 5 (italics his).

²⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 102, 184, 195, 209, 219, 310.

²⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 183.

²⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 193, 217, 304, 327.

²⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 325.

²⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 267.

³⁰ In his entry, dated 10 August 1961, Tanpınar writes, “An American plane with seventy-two passengers was hijacked to Cuba” (Enginün and Kerman, 318).

before his diary entries were published as a book. We clearly see, therefore, that Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries have characteristics of various forms of personal writing.

Another important characteristic of diaries is challenged if Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries are in question: authenticity. It is a common assumption that diary is an objective account; however, in the diaries under consideration, some questions arise. Considering the period of social transition and the circumstances both Woolf and Tanpınar encountered during their lives, they may have wanted to create projected identities in their diaries, which turn these so-called true accounts into fictitious texts. This idea causes us to question whether the diarists had any concern for audience and whether there was any interference with the text during editing. If Woolf and Tanpınar took audience-oriented notes and planned the publication of their diaries, this would lead them to have some aesthetic concerns in their diary entries. Any likely literary and aesthetic motivation raises some questions about the matter of authenticity; instead of writing true accounts, Woolf and Tanpınar would incline to change their personal, supposedly true accounts, into fictional texts in which they projected misrepresented and misleading selves. Paul Bowles' remark in a letter to James Herlihy in 1966 explains why Woolf and Tanpınar may have modified their diaries. He also comments on the differences between diaries, journals, and letters:

Your mention of a journal echoes what Bill Burroughs has been telling me for years. "Keep a journal," he says. "It is the most useful thing you can do." I've always thought it would be like making faces at oneself in the mirror. Who is one writing for in a journal? If it's oneself, it's obviously a farce. If it's for publication, then it's immediately censored, while one is writing it, and is no longer strictly speaking a journal. Is there another way of looking at it? A letter, I suppose. I understand diaries and notebooks, but I don't think I understand the journal. A daily newsletter to the public?³¹

The presentation of the content and the distinguished use of language in the diaries show that Woolf and Tanpınar had intentions of publication for their diaries

³¹ Paul Bowles, *In Touch: The Letters of Paul Bowles*, ed. Jeffrey Miller (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995), 380.

even though Tanpınar's editors, Enginün and Kerman, claim otherwise. In any case, both diarists seem to have wanted their diaries to be published after death and therefore arranged their entries accordingly. Tanpınar even planned to take revenge on his contemporaries who had alienated Tanpınar from his surroundings. His sour remarks and feeling of humiliations from his friends show that he dared not to say his thoughts in his lifetime but entered them in his diary so that he could take revenge after his death. His plan did not work since the editors did not publish the diary until 2007 after keeping the entries for decades. People who were the object of his accusations and hatred in the diary had already passed away when the diary was published in 2007, more than four decades after Tanpınar's death in 1962.

Reaching different interpretations of Tanpınar's diary from the editors' prompted me to do an in-depth analysis of whether there is editorial interference in the diary. The issue of authenticity is related to occasional editorial intervention in the original manuscript as well. Initially, Leonard Woolf in *A Writer's Diary*, and later Anne Olivier Bell in *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, garbled the manuscript: Leonard Woolf made selections that "would inevitably present a distorted and unbalanced picture of his wife since it concentrated on a limited aspect of her personality and [...] its publication probably did a good deal to create or reinforce that popular journalistic image of Virginia Woolf [...]." ³² Later, Anne Olivier Bell edited the diary to include only entries from the notebook kept in London. Tanpınar's diary suffered from even greater interference by its editors: from its title, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* [In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar], to footnotes that protect Tanpınar's image, to the editors' misleading interpretations, the editors had full control of the diary. Editorial interference, especially in Tanpınar's diary, raises questions about the authenticity of the diaries. Therefore, I analyzed the authenticity of the diaries to check if the authors distorted their diaries to create images for posterity and if the editors deliberately distorted the diaries.

Related to the misinterpretation of identity, we should also mention a much-debated subject in the diaries. Since its publication in 2007, discussions of

³² Anne Olivier Bell, "Editing Virginia Woolf's Diary," in *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*, ed. James M. Haule and J.H. Stape (NY: Palgrave Publishers, 2002), 11.

Tanpınar's diary have mostly focused on Tanpınar's hatred of the people around him as well as his surprising remarks that contradict his previous comments. From Tanpınar's negative remarks about his best teacher and friend, Yahya Kemal, to his shocking statements on the Ottoman Empire, Tanpınar's paradoxical thoughts and remarks should be compared with Tanpınar's previous positive remarks about the same people and issues. However, we should admit that among the many talks, articles, and book chapters about Tanpınar's unexpected tone in his diary, it is difficult to keep academic integrity and to suggest explanations regarding only Tanpınar's ambivalent position in a drastically changing society.³³ Virginia Woolf's diary shows a similar attitude: when the first volume was published in 1975, the readers of Woolf did not find in the diary the tenderness of Clarissa Dalloway and Mrs. Ramsay, or the compassion of Mrs. Swithin. In addition to the parts in which Woolf's voice falters and irrational remarks suddenly appear, her "venomous" tone toward many people around her, including her husband, Leonard, certainly surprised her readers.

Another surprise for the readers of the diaries is about the interpretation of the novels: Woolf and Tanpınar wanted to control their readers' interpretations of their novels even after their deaths by giving guidelines in their diary entries, which are very informative and guide the reader. Therefore, as the detailed analysis in the following pages of this study proves, Woolf and Tanpınar's novels should be reinterpreted within the context of their diaries. In fact, not only the novels, but all texts written on Woolf and especially on Tanpınar, should be rewritten or revised since the diaries bring several new interpretations. In Tanpınar's diary, there are a great number of comments about the novels. The whole writing process of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* [The Time Regulation Institute],³⁴ why he left his *Mahur Beste*

³³ See the second chapter for a truly academic discussion on Tanpınar's paradoxical attitude in his diary and for some suggested explanations of it.

³⁴ *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* was initially translated into English in 2001: Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *The Time Regulation Institute*, trans. Ender Gürol (Madison: Turko Tatar, 2001). A very recent edition by Penguin Classics: *The Time Regulation Institute*, trans. Alexander Dawe and Maureen Freely (NY: Penguin Classics, 2014). About the recent Penguin edition in 2014, *The New York Times* published an article, titled "A Ramshackle Modernity," by Martin Riker on 3 January 2014. Those who can read *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* only in English, unfortunately have no access to the writing process of this masterpiece of Tanpınar. As the only English text written about Tanpınar's diary, this study aims

[Song in Mahur] incomplete, and how he brainstormed and organized his *Aydaki Kadın* [Woman on the Moon] are all given in the diary entries. Woolf's novels should be read together with her diary since there are several entries that give very important clues about how she wanted her novels to be interpreted by readers. Besides turning the diaries into texts in which borrowed identities are represented, Woolf and Tanpınar wanted to control their readers even after their deaths.

Theoretical Framework

As two writers from two different societies with different cultures are analyzed, I derive my theoretical framework for this study from comparative literature and comparative cultural studies. As Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek mentions in his book chapter "From Comparative Literature Today Toward Comparative Cultural Studies," the discipline of comparative literature "has intrinsically a content and form that facilitate the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary study of literature and culture."³⁵ The methodology for the analysis of Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries is obviously inclusive since it not only deals with the texts in terms of their literary qualities and artistic orientations, but also seeks to contribute to the interpretation of the diaries in cultural and social context. Two disciplines are given separately but with an understanding that each discipline is a specific cultural environment, a system of communication, and a linguistically and historically determined milieu. A discussion of the histories of two texts with regard to their cultural and disciplinary settings reorients the theoretical framework of this study toward comparative cultural studies.

Comparative cultural studies transcends comparative literature in the context of this study, which analyzes the texts of two writers, one of whom is considered a mainstream writer while the other is considered under the category of world or comparative literature. The distinctive features of comparative literature include the ability to understand foreign languages and the ideologies that accompany the

to give wide coverage to writing process of Tanpınar's novels, as much as Tanpınar gives explanations about them in his diary. See the fourth subsection in Chapter 4 of this study.

³⁵ Steven T.D. Zepetnek, "From Comparative Literature Today Toward Comparative Cultural Studies," in *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*, ed. Steven T.D. Zepetnek (West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003), 235.

foreign languages. George Steiner claims in his 1994 lecture at Oxford University that “comparative literature [...] [is] an exact and exacting art of reading, a style of listening to oral and written acts of language which privileges certain components in these acts. Such components are not neglected in any mode of literary study, but they are, in comparative literature, privileged.”³⁶

Therefore, I organize my discussion within a range of languages and cultures. In the case of an analysis of, say, French works, French sources and related frameworks can be discussed. Even comparative European literature might be convenient since it encompasses mainstream literatures and cultures even though there is the issue of translation. However, a comparative study between a Western text and a non-Western text might lead to ideological interpretations under the influence of various hierarchies and nationalist perspectives. Zepetnek points out that “I do not object to a comparative European literature if it constitutes method but I do object to it if it is implicitly or explicitly ideological and based on perceived or real hierarchies and by keeping to the ‘national’ agenda.”³⁷ In her *Death of a Discipline*, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has similar warnings about the Eurocentricism of comparative literature as she points out, “Comparative Literature was made up of Western European ‘nations.’”³⁸ Rather than moving her arguments to the sphere of comparative cultural studies, Spivak tends to define a new form of Comparative Literature that “will touch the older minorities: African, Asian, Hispanic. It will take in its sweep the new postcoloniality of the post-Soviet sector and the special place of Islam in today’s breaking world. Not everything for everyone, all at once.”³⁹ In the 1993 report of the American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA), Charles Bernheimer mentions Eurocentric inclinations of comparative literature and suggests the deconstruction of its dominance with cross-cultural studies:

Comparative Literature departments should play an active role in furthering the multicultural recontextualization of Anglo-American and European perspectives. This does not mean abandoning those

³⁶ George Steiner, *What is Comparative Literature?* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 9. Steiner’s inaugural lecture, which was delivered before the University of Oxford on 11 October 1994, was published in 1995.

³⁷ Zepetnek, “From Comparative Literature,” 243.

³⁸ Gayatri C. Spivak, *Death of a Discipline* (New York: Columbia UP, 2003), 8.

³⁹ Spivak, 84.

perspectives but rather questioning and resisting their dominance. This task may necessitate a significant re-evaluation both of our self-definition as scholars and of the usual standards for comparative work. It may be better, for instance, to teach a work in translation, even if you don't have access to the original language, than to neglect marginal voices because of their mediated transmission.⁴⁰

Therefore, avoiding Eurocentrism in comparing two texts involves disrupting established hierarchies while the discipline of comparative cultural studies might suggest the study of culture and literature without hierarchies.

In *The Black Atlantic*, Paul Gilroy draws attention to the Eurocentrism involved in the study of cultures and claims that “the project of cultural studies is a more or less attractive candidate for institutionalization according to the ethnic garb in which it appears. The question of whose cultures are being studied is therefore an important one, as is the issue of where the instruments which will make that study possible are going to come from.”⁴¹ As the term cultural studies, developed after the 1980s, tended to move the theoretical center of comparative literature, which had previously marginalized and excluded women, minority ethnic groups, and colonial and postcolonial writers and writings, this present study avoids falling into the emphasis that Gilroy describes and gives equal importance to both, or perhaps more importance to the less-studied culture and literature: Tanpınar and Turkish society in the following pages. There is no direct comparison between Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries nor is there direct comparison between British and Turkish societies, which might be difficult since these texts reflect the conditions of the societies they were written in.

Britain in Woolf's time was in social transition; however, it was somewhat different from the changes – or modernization – in the Ottoman Sultanate or the later Turkish Republic. Diaries are full of social and psychological analysis and therefore are valuable in terms of the portrayal of the conditions of the societies. However, the diaries give idiosyncratic characteristics of the societies, so a direct comparison of their societies through the diaries is not plausible. Therefore, this study never claims

⁴⁰ See the ACLA report on the following link: <http://www.umass.edu/complit/aclanet/Bernheim.html>

⁴¹ Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993), 5.

to directly compare the modernization processes of these societies. Instead, the connection between the societies is the Western influence on Turkey, which was enormous even though Turkish modernization did not follow the same pattern that Western societies went through.

In *A Millennium of Turkish Literature*, Talât S. Halman mentions that “in the transformation of sociopolitical structure, economic life, and culture, the men and women of letters have served not only as eloquent advocates of progress, but also as catalysts, precursors, pioneers, and creators of brave new ideas.”⁴² In my study of Woolf and Tanpınar’s works, I hold a mirror up to society and intellectual life, in which social progress and literary productions during the course of time had a direct relationship; several writers of the transitional period pioneered the direction of modernization and social change with their writings and speeches. However, we should also mention the influence of Western ideas on intellectuals of non-Western societies. Edward Said mentions this in his definition of “Traveling Theory”:

Like people and schools of criticism, ideas and theories travel – from person to person, from situation to situation, from one period to another. Cultural and intellectual life are usually nourished and often sustained by this circulation of ideas, and whether it takes the form of acknowledged or unconscious influence, creative borrowing, or wholesale appropriation, the movement of ideas and theories from one place to another is both a fact of life and a usefully enabling condition of intellectual activity.⁴³

The circulation of ideas makes a great deal of sense if the form of modernization, especially in non-Western societies, is considered. Said explains European influence in the same context: “There are particularly interesting cases of ideas and theories that move from one culture to another, as [...] when certain European ideas during the early nineteenth, or when certain European ideas about society were translated into traditional Eastern societies during the later nineteenth century.”⁴⁴ Said’s “Traveling Theory” gives a good explanation of Western influence on Eastern

⁴² Talat S. Halman. *A Millennium of Turkish Literature* (New York: Syracuse UP, 2011), 83.

⁴³ Edward W. Said, *The World, The Text, and The Critic* (London: Vintage, 1991), 226.

⁴⁴ Said, 226.

societies, and my study focuses on this rather than doing a point-by-point comparison between the societies and the literary works.

The transfer of ideas occurred surely among intellectuals. Starting from the late Ottoman scholars, and later the early Republican intellectuals, administrators had close connection with or were influenced by the European philosophers and intellectuals. The founder of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), and the Kemalists defined the revolutionary process that Turkey was going through as a Turkish Enlightenment, with a direct inspiration from the French Revolution and its philosophical fathers such as Voltaire and Diderot. Therefore, the modernization process of Turkey should be analyzed within the context of a strong influence of European thought. Tanpınar was quite influenced by European philosophers, as elaborated in the third chapter of this study. Even though Woolf's influence on Tanpınar is a minor discussion in this study, other intellectuals' impact on Tanpınar and his works proves that even Tanpınar, who was against a complete adaptation of a European system and culture and who was therefore alienated by his contemporaries, found principles for liberation in European thought.

We should also mention the significance of personal writings in the study of comparative literature. As defined below, especially in the first chapter, diaries, autobiographies, journals, travel books, and other forms of personal writing intertwined and are all used since writers may sometimes prefer to use several of these forms in their writing. As Emel Kefeli mentions in her *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat İncelemeleri* [Studies on Comparative Literature], "travel books are important for those who study comparative literature. They are considered as sources that give information about the 'foreigner.'"⁴⁵ From this perspective, my study will examine the significance of personal writings along with interdisciplinary considerations.

This study is divided into two parts: the first part, which consists of the first two chapters, Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries are analyzed in technical terms since they have never been interpreted comprehensively in terms of their authenticity, their connection with social context, and their position among other genres. The first chapter focuses on the diary as a genre to create a context within which to interpret

⁴⁵ Emel Kefeli, *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat İncelemeleri* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2000), 19.

Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries properly. I challenge the common misunderstanding that diary writing is an exclusively Western phenomenon, and I redefine diary writing within the context of Said's concept of cultural hegemony. Moreover, I disprove the supposition that non-Western societies cannot contribute to civilization since they "have no accumulating art or history"⁴⁶ by analyzing the emergence and the development of diary keeping in European and Eastern/Islamic societies. My analysis shows that the diary tradition in Eastern societies began earlier than its inception in Europe, if not in the same form and methodology. Its emergence and development throughout the centuries is important since, as diary keepers, both Woolf and Tanpınar contributed to the development of diary tradition by familiarizing themselves with well-known diarists and by following their course of action. Through a close analysis of Western and Eastern traditions of diary keeping, Woolf and Tanpınar's inspirations as well as their rhetoric in their diaries make more sense. Diary tradition, especially in Turkey and Turkish culture, has never been sufficiently analyzed; through my analysis of Tanpınar's diary, I aim to produce one of the most considerable studies about diary tradition in Turkish culture and literature.

Diary as a form of writing is defined in the first chapter of this study; its differences from, as well as its similarities to other forms of personal writing needed to be discussed since both Woolf and Tanpınar wanted their diaries to have the characteristics of autobiography, journal, and diary. After considering how other forms of writing influence diarists and diary keeping, we can assert that there are indeed not many differences between the autobiography and the diary except that while autobiographies are regarded as earnest texts, diaries are often ignored and not even considered as a genre unless they are written by celebrated diarists. The influence of other forms of writing on diary tradition is important in order to prove that there is no clear distinction between these genres. Montaigne's *Essays*, for example, has influenced diarists, including Woolf and Tanpınar. Woolf shows her admiration of and inspiration from Montaigne by defining him as "one man only": "After all, in the whole of literature, how many people have succeeded in drawing

⁴⁶ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage Books, 1994), 232.

themselves with a pen? Only Montaigne and Pepys and Rousseau perhaps. [...] this talking of oneself, following one's own vagaries, giving the whole map, weight, color, and circumference of the soul in its confusion, its variety, its imperfection – this art belonged to one man only: to Montaigne.”⁴⁷

Diary writing should also be considered within the context of selfhood, which has changed over the course of time. Many social and cultural changes can be read through the changing position of diary keeping. The increasing level of individualism, for example, directly affected the development of autobiographical writing. An examination of self within the context of the development of the diary tradition also gives clues to the changing dynamics of societies. The evolving concept of self portrayed in diaries sheds light on changing social and cultural milieu – even technology, if the invention of clocks and the arrival of paper are considered. Similarly important is how the diary improves according to the unique characteristics of societies. Even within Europe, British and French traditions of diary keeping differ: practices that became common in France in the second half of the eighteenth century were already common in England in the mid-seventeenth century. The development of diary tradition in France was affected by sectarian pluralism, and Catholic and Protestant views on diary writing also differ: Protestantism was more favorable to personal expression than Catholicism as seen in seventeenth-century England. In France, however, “the Protestant community was under threat, and the story of the group's immediate survival was more important than the work of individual salvation.”⁴⁸

As the diary tradition shows differences even in European societies, different forms and inclinations in Western and Eastern societies are to be expected. The use of the diary as preparation for confession in Europe shows the connection of religious discourse and the development of diary tradition. The predecessors of the diary in the modern sense include daily notes of medieval mystics regarding inward emotions and outward events, which were considered spiritually important. Due to cultural and religious orientation in Islamic societies, we do not see much confession, publicized or written, but rather Muslim diarists tended to keep diaries for travel

⁴⁷ Virginia Woolf, *The Common Reader* (FL: Harcourt, Inc, 1984), 56.

⁴⁸ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 75.

notes and personal opinions on events they witnessed. The Prophet Muhammad's discouragement on public exposition of sins and related Islamic teachings in the Quran had probably the most significant effects on the form and methodology of diary tradition in Islamic societies. Tanpınar's diary has never been critiqued within the context of diary tradition in Turkey; one can indeed hardly find any texts written about the diary as a genre or diary tradition in Turkish literature. Tanpınar modeled the European diary tradition by stating his inner conflicts and depressions, his hatred and love, almost everything about himself, although he might have censored some of his ideas since he planned it to be published after his death. Tanpınar's use of the European form of diary proves Tanpınar's position in the East facing West. All the literary genres except diary have been greatly analyzed with their connection to the Westernization process in Turkey. This study will be the first text that shows this connection between modernity, modernization, and the diary tradition.

The second chapter challenges a common interpretation that a diary is an objective account. Considering the period of social transition and the circumstances that both Woolf and Tanpınar encountered during their lives, they may have wanted to project an identity in their diaries, which turns these so-called true accounts into fictitious texts. This assertion requires questioning a few points, including whether the diarists had any concern for audience and if there was any editorial interference in the text. Leonard Woolf in *A Writer's Diary* and Anne Olivier Bell in the *The Diary of Virginia Woolf* edited Woolf's manuscript and took editorial liberties. In a similar view, Tanpınar's diary suffered from even greater interference by its editors: from its title, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* [In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar], to footnotes given just to protect Tanpınar's image, to the editors' misleading interpretations, to comments that help the editors to maintain full control of the diary. I will explain editors' interference, especially in Tanpınar's diary, in detail, and my study will raise questions about the authenticity of the diaries. This section also contributes to a much-debated subject: Tanpınar's negative attitudes toward the people around him as well as negative remarks about his own previous comments; and Woolf's harsh tone toward many people around her, including her husband, Leonard, which certainly surprised her readers. Perhaps the greatest contribution of this chapter as an academic study is the section where Woolf

and Tanpınar's novels are analyzed within the context of their diaries. As this study often claims, criticism of Woolf and especially Tanpınar should be reviewed or revised since the diaries bring new interpretations to almost all the texts written by Woolf and Tanpınar although it depends on the importance one assigns to the critical stance of the author. This section also claims that both Woolf and Tanpınar wanted to control their readers' interpretations of their novels even after their deaths by providing guidelines in their diaries.

The second part, which consists of the third and the fourth chapters of my study, is an analysis of social transition in Turkey and Europe, especially in Britain, through the eyes of Tanpınar and Woolf, and in the context of their diaries. The third chapter mainly focuses on Tanpınar and his interpretation of modernization. This section starts with a short discussion of tradition and modernization in Turkey, where the past was supposed to be rejected to make way for the modern. Tanpınar's understanding of modernization differs from the interpretation of mainstream Kemalist intellectuals, which made him ambivalent and an outsider. A short background on the intellectual and cultural transition in Turkey from the late Ottoman Empire to the early Republic makes clear Tanpınar's position in the changing society. Political, social, and literary movements emerged prior to the foundation of the Turkish Republic – especially Ottomanism, Westernism, Turkism, and Islamism – which greatly influenced cultural and social orientations in the early Turkish Republic. Of these movements, especially Islamism and Westernism influenced the emergence of conservatives and the Westernizers in Turkey. The conflict over the process of modernization and Westernization was mainly about different perspectives: Westernizers were in favor of a complete adaptation of Western modernity. However, the conservatives or Islamists thought European superiority was a material affair and had nothing to do with moral superiority. In the first years of the Turkish Republic, the ideas and writings of the conservative intellectuals were relegated by Kemalist writers to the margins of nationalist history as mindless, backward conservatives. Although Tanpınar was neither religious nor conservative compared to other Islamist scholars, he was isolated due to his reactions against the representations of tradition and modernization in Turkey.

Tanpınar's claim that "Turkish literature begins with a crisis of civilization"⁴⁹ is important since it shows how literature and the crisis of social change were strongly intertwined. Considering the period in which Tanpınar lived and wrote, he was at the core of this transformation of civilization and was never fully understood. During his lifetime he was either unnoticed or alienated by his contemporaries. The condition after his death in 1962 was not much different: this time he was labeled a conservative and went unnoticed until the 1990s. Tanpınar's significance stems to some extent from these ambivalent interpretations. His marginalization in his lifetime proceeded from his deliberate isolation from mainstream ideology and literature due to his antipathy to the Republican régime and intellectuals. After the 1990s there was a surge of interest in him due to changing interpretations of many concepts and principles. In the 2000s he was more popular although after the publication of his diary in 2007, the debates over his personality overshadowed his position as a literary critic and artist. Through a close analysis of his diary entries and excerpts from his other texts in Chapter 3, I discuss Turkish modernization and its influence on social and cultural transformation, identity problems, social transition, and history and tradition from Tanpınar's perspective.

The third chapter also asserts that Tanpınar was a true Westerner. By not rejecting the cultural heritage of Turkey, he was after a true form of Westernization. He always wanted to bring about the most convenient path for Westernization in Turkey. He valued Europe and European values, but he was never in favor of complete adaptation of European principles in Turkish society. By focusing on Tanpınar's diary entries related to Europe, especially in the matter of adopting European values to social life, keeping old traditions while embracing new ones, and realizing the limitation of European values, this study proves that Tanpınar was a true Westerner although he also was subject to common misinterpretations of Europe and European values. The present study is the only comprehensive text about Tanpınar's idea of Europe based upon his diary entries.

Tanpınar's complaints about his loneliness in his diary entries have been much commented on. The majority of critics interpret his complaints as his friends'

⁴⁹ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007), 104.

ignorance of Tanpınar since he writes in one entry, “the circle of ignorance continues and can even be considered as ostracism.”⁵⁰ It sounds plausible if Tanpınar’s own remarks and his alienation from his contemporaries are taken into consideration. However, I think Tanpınar’s loneliness was not only due to people’s ignorance of him but it was a self-destructive isolation. As I explain in detail in Chapter 3, on the one hand there was a group of people who were following Tanpınar and his works and showed their respect; but on the other hand there was a group of people whom Tanpınar called friends but who harshly criticized and humiliated him. He could neither walk away from them nor become close to them. He insisted on their friendship, which ended up in self-destructive isolation. Chapter 3 concludes by examining Tanpınar’s alienation in the context of his thoughts on several important concepts, such as the rightists and leftists, conservatives and liberals. He neither belonged to these groups nor held characteristics of them; he only “became a witness to and an observer of the social transformation.”⁵¹

In Chapter 3, I claim that Tanpınar was a true Westerner who sought modernization, which requires us to survey modernization in European countries. Virginia Woolf’s reaction toward the changing conditions in her society through her writing is similar to Tanpınar’s concentration on context and form. Therefore, in Chapter 4, I take a general look at European modernization, although I limit the scope to discussions of the Enlightenment and interpretations of modernity. The first pages of the chapter comment on a misconception about Woolf’s ignorance of political affairs and that her illness constrained her artistic abilities. However, my study will use her diary entries to show that she took advantage of her illness to craft her writing style and that she portrayed her own reactions toward changes in human character associated with the rapid changes in society in all her texts.

As Tanpınar organized his novels and his other writings according to social thoughts and concerns, Woolf reflected her interpretations of the dramatic social changes in the first half of the twentieth century in her novels. Her most quoted statement in her essay, *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, reads that “On or about

⁵⁰ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 260.

⁵¹ Enginün and Kerman, 332.

December 1910 human character changed.”⁵² This clearly points out that Woolf was well aware of decadence. From the perspective of Woolf and other intellectuals of the time, I will define the last phase of this change, “modernity.” By pointing out various interpretations and examples of modernity, Chapter 4 gives a comprehensive criticism of modernity and Western modernization and its profound effects on political and economic institutions as well as individuals in Turkey. Instead of making a conventional analysis of modernity, this study will focus on the universal image created by the Enlightenment. Several texts including Isaiah Berlin’s “The Counter-Enlightenment,” play a significant role in the criticism used in my study since they challenge the idea that scientific method is the only reliable method. Berlin’s emphasis on plurality and “the variety of human customs”⁵³ is important, for it explains how “otherness” is created. Ignoring that each culture expresses its own collective experience resulted in the imposition of a European model of modernization on non-Western societies, including the early Republic of Turkey. Vico, Berlin, and others’ insistence on a plurality of cultures was in opposition to the changing dynamics of Europe, especially the idea of European superiority over non-Western societies, which was developed after the French Revolution.

Criticism of Enlightenment philosophy can be seen in most of Woolf’s texts and in her modernist techniques. As Goethe wrote to Lavatar,⁵⁴ “individuum est ineffabile.”⁵⁵ The importance of individual experience was emphasized by several modernist writers including Woolf. We should point out that as modern Turkish Literature began with a crisis of civilization, the alienation of humanity that the Renaissance and Enlightenment brought with a new-world view determined

⁵² This essay was published as a pamphlet. Virginia Woolf, *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1924), 4.

⁵³ Isaiah Berlin, “The Counter-Enlightenment,” in *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*, ed. Henry Hardy (New York: Viking Press), 2.

⁵⁴ Isaiah Berlin reports that “Individuum est ineffabile” wrote to Lavater in the spirit of Hamann, whom Goethe profoundly admired.” (Berlin, “The Counter-Enlightenment,” 7)

⁵⁵ Attributed to Johann Gottfried Herder by Friededrich Meinecke “Individuum est ineffabile” means “the particular cannot be contained by a generealization.” John Paul Russo, *The Future without a Past* (Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 186. I consider this Latin epigram within the context of modernist writers’ emphasis on the significance of individual experience. It also explains the logical background of European universalism and Europe’s provincializing strategy on non-Western societies; as I will analyze in detail in Chapter 4, the form of modernization in non-Western societies was greatly affected by European universalism, and many intellectuals assumed that Europe was a unified whole and in a perfect shape.

European literature of the twentieth century. Therefore, this study considers modernism and modernist literature in relation to social change, especially the displacement of humanity from its central position. As Tanpınar commented on the crises and the most convenient form of modernization in Turkey, Woolf searched for harmony “in the midst of chaos”⁵⁶ and showed how social incident affected the emergence and the development of artistic invention. Woolf’s emphasis on individual experience should be considered as cultural and literary reactions toward the philosophy that emerged after the Enlightenment and developed throughout the twentieth century due to social change. The individual who was alienated due to twentieth-century conflicts was now at the center. Woolf and most other modernist writers attempted to render human subjectivity and “represented consciousness, perception, emotion, meaning, and the individual’s relation to society through interior monologue, stream of consciousness, tunneling, defamiliarization, rhythm, and irresolution.”⁵⁷

Woolf’s interpretation of the past is important, first, to understand what kind of aesthetics she wanted to establish, and secondly to refer to her remarks on tradition and the past so that our assertion in Chapter 3 – that Tanpınar was a true Westerner due to his ideas on the past and tradition – is clarified. I give several European writers’ remarks on the past and tradition in this part of the study; however, the main reference is to Woolf and T.S. Eliot. Tanpınar’s comments on the significance of the past finds its equivalents in the comments of these two writers. I analyze Woolf’s “Sketch of the Past” and *To the Lighthouse*, T.S. Eliot’s “Tradition and the Individual Talent,” and Woolf’s statement that “the present when backed by the past is a thousand times deeper.”⁵⁸ T.S. Eliot’s interpretation of the past is used as a parallel commentary to Tanpınar’s as Eliot writes, “the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence.”⁵⁹

Considering the attitudes of modernist writers, especially of Woolf and Eliot, we might reach an interpretation that the writers of the changing European societies,

⁵⁶ Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse* (London: Vintage Books, 2004), 154.

⁵⁷ Peter Childs, *Modernism* (NY: Routledge, 2002), 3.

⁵⁸ Virginia Woolf, “A Sketch of the Past,” in *Moments of Being*, ed. Jeanne Schulkind (Florida: Harcourt Brace, 1985), 98.

⁵⁹ T.S. Eliot, “Tradition and the Individual Talent,” in *T.S. Eliot: Selected Essays* (London: Faber and Faber, 1999), 14.

especially of Britain, were not necessarily dedicated to rejection of the past and tradition. This shows the differences of transitions between European and non-Western societies as Marshall G.S. Hodgson mentions in *The Venture of Islam*: “Modernity has necessarily created a breach with all the cultural traditions of the pre-Modern past. But as we have seen, in the West that breach with tradition is relatively mild: the West is relatively traditional in that there, all the major aspects of Modern society grow from traditions relatively continuous with an indefinite past.”⁶⁰ But the non-Western societies, which were supposed to modernize in the Western form called Westernization, “has no older roots: it is purely modern.”⁶¹

After analyzing the European form of modernization through the works of some writers, this study will provide a broader perspective on the process of Turkish modernization. I define Turkish modernization as Westernization because Turkey, from the late Ottoman Sultanate to the early Turkish Republic, was under Western influence, and all the faculties and the institutions were highly affected by the West. However, considering the gradual process of Western modernization and its relations with tradition and the past, it is questionable whether Turkish modernization was something truly Western. It was certainly not Eastern or traditional either. Although it was “Westernization,” it was not Western at all.

The last section of Chapter 3 combines several issues discussed in the study. One important aspect of modernity is its totalizing or unilateral ideology that is grounded in and associated with European cultural and moral experience. This universalized concept of modernity makes non-Western culture and aesthetics fall into an inferior position. This interpretation of modernity suggests that modernization is specifically a Western phenomenon and thus Western culture is its most essential characteristic. Culture and traditions of non-Western societies were and are indeed not compatible with the idea of modernization. Having no unique form of modernization, non-Western societies were supposed to adopt all kinds of Western dispositions no matter how inappropriate. This rigid modern-secular imagination of

⁶⁰ Marshall G.S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, Vol. 3 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977), 428.

⁶¹ Hodgson, 428.

modernity was role-modeled by the founders of the Turkish Republic and became a form of modernization in Turkey.

Woolf's reaction was toward the drastic changes within Europe. Her struggle to liberate ideologies from white, male, heterosexual, Euro-American, middle-class constructed terms was the biggest part of her struggle. Woolf's narrative style and context were a means to challenge the constructed philosophy. European modernization and social change were seen as a universal form of modernization that was therefore transferable to non-Western societies wishing to become modern. Local forms of European social transition – with its ups and downs – became the perfect model of modernization for non-Western societies. Tanpınar's depression was a response to his portrayal of this crisis of civilization.

CHAPTER 1

TRADITIONAL OR MARGINAL?: WOOLF AND TANPINAR’S “THE TEXTURE OF THE ORDINARY DAY”¹

Diary writing had already acquired a literary status in Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar’s times, justifying metadiaristic preoccupations. In this study, a comparative analysis of Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s diaries seems plausible and is undertaken. Since its publication in 1975, Woolf’s diary has been rarely studied as a literary text but rather has often been analyzed as a source of biographical information about the artist or as the raw material from which Woolf’s ‘real’ art had sprung. Her five-volume diary was, therefore, considered as the text through which scholars analyzed Woolf’s life, attitudes toward writing, and development as a writer. Tanpınar’s diary, recently published in 2007, scarcely studied and thus likely open to new interpretations, has not so far been taken as a literary text either, but as a text out of which several discussions developed. However, both Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s diaries might be considered as texts having literary value as well as sites of conflict between aesthetics and politics, inner struggle, and the definition of the role of the artist in the literary community. In this chapter, the diary will be studied as a literary text, as a genre, and in terms of its connection to European and Turkish social milieu.

The exact origins of diary-writing are not clear. Diaries were found in Japan in the early eleventh century; similarly, autobiographical texts were discovered in India in the sixteenth century and in China in the twelfth century. These diaries of the East probably did not influence the emergence of diary writing in the West; however, they are indicators of the fact that diary writing is not an exclusively Western phenomenon. Diary writing has been assumed to be more developed in the West than in Eastern societies. However, this division is not rigid since diary writing as a tradition has different characteristics in Western and Eastern societies. While diary writing in general is considered a more common practice in the West, it is in fact shaped by the idiosyncratic dynamics of the society in which it is practiced.

¹ Virginia Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 298.

Therefore, one kind of diary in one part of the world does not necessarily resemble another kind in another part of the world: holding the common characteristics of diary keeping is enough to call it a diary. Even the so-called standards of the diary depend very much on the cultural inclinations prevailing specifically in that society. Both Western and Eastern societies have their well-known diarists who have contributed to the development of the diary as a genre; they have at the same time improved and proved the *sui generis* commonalities of diary keeping, later to be inherited in that particular society. Therefore, the assertion that there was no diary tradition in Eastern societies until their encounter with the West might be a Eurocentric perspective.

This Eurocentric assumption was relevant to the idea of development. As Walter Rodney explains in his *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, the idea of development is very much “tied in with the state of the society as a whole.”² Therefore, assuming that the diary is a Western genre might result in having some stereotypical ideas on the matter. There are several discussions on this presupposition in the field of literature; Edward Said, for example, in *Culture and Imperialism* complains about how it is putatively portrayed that “the people of Africa and especially those Arabs are just there; they have no accumulating art or history that is sedimented into works.”³ Said explains this interpretation as a part of cultural hegemony in his *Orientalism*: “There is in addition the hegemony of European ideas about the Orient, themselves reiterating European superiority over Oriental backwardness, usually overriding the possibility that a more independent, or more skeptical, thinker might have had different views on the matter.”⁴ Chinua Achebe, as an answer to a Professor Hugh Trevor Roper from Oxford University, who pronounced that African history did not exist, says in *An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s “Heart of Darkness”* :

If there is something in these utterances more than youthful inexperience, more than a lack of factual knowledge, what is it? Quite simply it is the desire – one might indeed say the need – in Western psychology to set Africa up as a foil to Europe, as a place of negations

² Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (London: Bogle-L’Ouverture Publications, 1983), 6-7.

³ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 232.

⁴ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003), 7.

at once remote and vaguely familiar, in comparison with which Europe's own state of spiritual grace will be manifest.⁵

The literatures of non-Western societies have stereotypically been ignored due to their lack of so-called literary principles. Scottish orientalist, E.J.W. Gibbs (1857-1901), who was interested in Turkish language and literature, especially in Ottoman poetry, explains the failure of divan poetry with regard to its correspondence to European aesthetic values: "[...] throughout this long period, no voice has ever reached [Ottoman poetry] from outside the narrow school where it was reared; how Persian in its inception, Persian in substance it has remained down to the very end, driven back after a blind struggle to win free, baffled and helpless into the stagnant swamp a dead culture."⁶ Gibbs later explains how the coming of European values to Turkish literature made the Turks capable of expressing themselves and their culture through literature:

A voice from the Western world rings through the orient skies like the trumpet blast of Israfil; and lo, the muse of Turkey wakes from her death-like trance, and all the land is jubilant with life and song, for a new heaven and a new earth are made visible before the eyes of men. Now for the first time the ears of people are opened to hear the speech of hill and valley, and their eyes [*sic*] unsealed to read the message of cloud and wave.⁷

Gibbs clearly sets the European style as the standard form and ignores the specific characteristics of the non-Western societies. In "A Revisionist Thesis for the Esthetics of the Ottoman Gazel," Walter G. Andrews criticizes Gibbs by defining his attitude as "the most arrant racist nonsense": "Unless one can be persuaded to believe that the Turks were incapable of expressing either themselves or their culture through literature until taught to do so by Europeans, this and much more of Gibb is the most arrant racist nonsense."⁸ In order not to fall into the same error of Eurocentricism,

⁵ Achebe, "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness,'" *Massachusetts Review* 18 (1977), 783.

⁶ E.J. Gibbs, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, Vol. 5 (London: Luzac & Co., 1907), 3.

⁷ Gibbs, 3.

⁸ Walter G. Andrews, "A Revisionist Thesis for the Esthetics of the Ottoman Gazel," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 24 (1986), 3-4.

this study considers both Western and Eastern texts as possessing their inherited traits and pays attention to both.

Diary as Genre

Diary-keeping has been practiced for hundreds of years – sometimes in secret or without attracting attention – as one of the most widespread forms of writing. Far more people keep diaries than engage in any other form of writing. In fact, when it comes to taking pens and getting ready for writing, diarists cannot be said to be distinguishable from novelists, poets, or autobiographers; similar to other genres, it is the process of “transform[ing] inchoate thoughts into words on paper or screen that can potentially be shared with readers, known and unknown, and that can confer on the person who sets them down a kind of immortality [...]. It is the point where life and literature meet.”⁹ However, until recently the diary received limited critical attention; studies of life-writing tended to focus on autobiography, and the diary was often dismissed or marginalized as a sub or lesser form of autobiography.

Diary, in fact, differs from autobiography in some important aspects, as in a diary there are fresh relations of events recorded at the moment, whereas in autobiography events are framed into a unified whole with a higher expectation of publication. Memoirs and reminiscences are almost always written for publication; dated periodically and presented in a specific narrative form, they are more easily read perhaps, “with all the roughness and repetitions of diary writing eliminated but with a consequent loss of spontaneity and individuality.”¹⁰ The most important distinction might be that the overwhelming majority of diary writers do not aspire to see their words published; therefore, the diary as a literary genre exists at the margins of literature and diarists not labeled as authors.

Nevertheless, the term “diary” should be discussed since it was not used by all diarists, especially by those who wrote before the eighteenth century. Therefore, when we entitle all the daily-written texts as “diary,” it may be in fact erroneous. Writers of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries “used ‘diary,’ ‘journal,’

⁹ Phillippe Lejeune, *On Diary*, 2.

¹⁰ Arthur Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 2.

‘account book,’ and ‘diurnal’”¹¹ for describing their works even though their fundamental forms were similar or even the same. Some authors used the terms “diary” and “journal” interchangeably¹²; Samuel Pepys, for example, frequently mentioned “journal” instead of “diary”; in one of his entries, dated 23 September 1660, he writes: “My wife got up to put on her mourning to-day and to go to Church this morning. I [was] up and set down my *journall* for these 5 days past.”¹³

Apart from diarists who call their diaries “journals,” many diarists titled their autobiographical writings “journal,” perhaps as a descriptive title. However, in some rare cases, the word “diary or “journal” does not come from the writer himself of herself but from the editors or from those who found the manuscript. In this case, the title is not produced by the author but by a more recent source. That makes the distinctions between the terms more groundless because what diary or journal means to a Victorian or to a twentieth-century editor means something else to a seventeenth-century diarist. Arthur Ponsonby shows this discrimination between the concepts journal and diary in a twentieth-century interpretation: “The word *Journal* should be reserved for the purely objective historical or scientific records, and the word *Diary* for the personal memoranda, notes and expressions of opinion.”¹⁴ Even though the terms “diary” and “journal” differ from each other in some ways, its interchangeable use proves that both contributed to the establishment of a tradition in the West and the East. Therefore, autobiographies, journals, diaries, memoirs, and even biographies should be considered as parts of a genre, with all contributing to the development of autobiographical writing.¹⁵

We can discuss some distinctions between diary writing and other forms of writing. Writing distinguishingly requires a consciousness of literary capacity,

¹¹ Elaine McKay, “The Diary Network,” see <http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/publications/eras/edition-2/mckay.php#4>

¹² Elaine McKay, “The Diary Network,” see arts.monash.edu

¹³ <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4125/4125-h/4125-h.htm>. See also Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, Vol 1 (London: G. Bell and Hyman, 1971), 251 (italics mine).

¹⁴ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 5 (italics his).

¹⁵ With respect to the issues discussed in this study, it may sound fair not to draw strict lines between the various forms of autobiographical writings. Analyzing the increasing importance of selfhood, for example, through some autobiographical works – regardless of its becoming either diary or journal – contribute to the general understanding; however, the fact that “diary” is more often used compared to “journal” in the case of the representation of selfhood shows diary’s distinctive methodology and form. Several times, on the other hand, diaries contribute to discussions very similar to discussions of journals.

standing with other forms of writing – except letters probably.¹⁶ The letter, in its standard form, can contain impressions, personal confidences, and confessions and thus sounds similar to a diary; however, the consciousness of an immediate recipient causes a restraint on the writer and may lead to a kind of self-consciousness, which might be absent in a diary. Letters connect two people: the writer and the recipient. Expectation of the author of the publication of the letters may increase the consciousness in the writing process since the idea that the letters will be publicized and shared with many people might hinder an author's real intention in writing letters. A diary on the other hand can be written with no thought of publication, without the critical eye of a reader or a publisher. No attention is needed to be given to form or even to grammar, and no explanations are necessary. While there is at least the restraint of the recipient for letters, all restraints are lifted. In diary writing, no such consciousness is needed, and therefore it is open to anyone who can put pen to paper. Therefore, the diary has not been called literature even though some have literary value. However, if a diarist has some thought of publication of the diary, it turns to be an experimental board on which the writer creates a unique identity, not necessary for it to be the same as he or she is but as he or she likes it to be. Therefore, although letter writing has little or no similarity with the diary writing, Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's letters might be taken as texts providing information about both writers' opinions about their contemporaries. So, for Woolf and Tanpınar, letters and diaries are two fragments of the process of establishing identities.

Felicity A. Nusbaum mentions similar views in *Toward Conceptualizing Diary*: she explains that its marginalization and lack of attention occur because “diaries often remain unpublished documents; their length may make reading tedious and difficult; they lack the formal cohesiveness that lends itself to New Critical readings; and despite their articulation of human chronology, diaries are not classic realist texts.”¹⁷ Judy Nolte Lensink contributes to Nusbaum's assertion by pointing out that

¹⁶ I discuss the nature of letter-writing with regard to Woolf and Tanpınar's opinions about their contemporaries below since their letters hold similar characteristics with diaries in terms of intentions on establishing a pseudo-identity.

¹⁷ Felicity A. Nusbaum, “Toward Conceptualizing Diary,” in *Studies in Autobiography*, ed. James Olney (NY: Oxford UP, 1988), 130.

“diaries have traditionally been considered valuable only for their content: for what they reveal about the character of the diarist, and the social and historical period in which she or he lived.”¹⁸ Lensink observes that interest obtains only when the diarist is extraordinarily established in literature. There is harsher criticism on the status of the diary: Arthur Ponsonby stresses that it has nothing to do with art, disagreeing with Lawrence Rosenwald, who contends that it has everything to do with art.

Its lack of popularity compared to other genres might also stem from the great variety of diary-keeping practices with various motives. While some diarists are motivated by the idea of self-exploration, some others are willing to keep a record of thoughts and actions to pass down to the next generations or for other purposes. The contribution of diaries as a genre to the literary sphere is thus limited and depends on motivation – what makes one person keep a diary varies from one culture to another. Although the diary is often considered a spontaneous expression of individuality, it is in fact a cultural practice that has a background. Before examining the historical background of diary keeping and as an indicator of trends in cultural history, we should be aware that the practice of keeping diary may not be on the same level of familiarity in all cultures. While a diary may be discreet and localized and make people feel uncomfortable in some societies – such as in most of the Islamic societies as I will discuss in detail in this chapter –, it might be highly welcomed in other societies. Therefore, without considering all – at least the most important – dimensions of culture, we cannot assume the significance of diaries in a culture. Traditions vary from one society to another, and that no strict diary form exists. Moreover, how diary-keeping practices develop in a community may tell a lot about that society. For the purpose of this study, I will discuss European and Turkish traditions of diary keeping.

In his remarkable study of diary-writing, *On Diary*, Phillippe Lejeune asserts that diaries depend on the development of a collective consciousness of time as linear and measurable. He thus connects the emergence of the diary at the beginning of the early modern era to the development of clocks and calendars. Lejeune links the development of the diary to the spread of other modern cultural practices such as

¹⁸ Qtd. in Elizabeth Podnieks, *Daily Modernism: The Literary Diaries of Virginia Woolf, Antonia White, Elizabeth Smart, and Anais Nin* (NY: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2000), 4.

bookkeeping, and he rationalizes some other forms of memory. Before the fourteenth century, questions about time were given in vague terms; however, in the second half of the eighteenth century time took on a form close to the one we know now. Keeping a diary is obviously related to this revolutionary change because at about that time, between the late middle ages and the eighteenth century, the practice of keeping personal accounts developed in Europe and the mechanical clock was developed along with the annual calendar and the datebook. The ways of measuring and perceiving time changed, which made the time of everyday life more precious and irreversible. Once time was measurable, diary-keeping became more common.¹⁹ Therefore, we can see a connection between the developing techniques of time-measuring and personal journals, although not a clear-cut link.

For Britain specifically, from the mid-seventeenth century until the late eighteenth century, the development of personal writing should be considered with regard to the invention of clocks. In England during the 1660s, the invention of the technological advancement for counting time affected its emergence and its use in prose as a new paradigm. In his *Telling Time: Clocks, Diaries, and English Diurnal Form, 1660-1785*, Stuart Sherman points out how counting minutes reliably due to the new kind of clock affected the emergence of a new genre: “The new pattern of prose numbered the days. It represented itself as accumulating by consecutively dated daily installments. In England this diurnal design appears first in the manuscript diary and then, four decades later, in the daily newspaper.”²⁰ Especially in the nineteenth century, this genre was to a certain extent considered as a means for making the readers identify, perceive, and even inhabit the concept of temporality, since people were beginning to live and work according to a more specific indicator of time.²¹

The development of paper was another reason for the development of ordinary writing. During archeological digs, researchers have found tablets from the first or

¹⁹ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 57.

²⁰ Stuart Sherman, *Telling Time: Clocks, Diaries, and English Diurnal Form, 1660-1785* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), xi.

²¹ The connection between the nineteenth-century developments of clock and diary writing is important since Virginia Woolf, who was born into this atmosphere at the end of the century, tackled the question of how to find a form to capture thought, feeling, and the flux of time throughout her work and her diary, which enabled her to experiment freely.

the second century. Until around 1500, apart from those tablets, there were writings engraved on stone or metal; they were either on a durable medium, or papyrus, or on an erasable medium like tablets. Everything changed with the arrival of paper in Europe. We should not forget that paper was not the only reason for the quick development of personal journals from the Renaissance onward – even if a contributing factor – as we can see that in the Arab world where it developed during the Middle Ages but did not have the same effect. Nevertheless, paper revolutionized the system of ordinary writing in administration, commerce, and academia. Later in the mid-eighteenth century there appeared “the annual almanac calendar, which formatted blank paper by pouring it in advance into the mold of *time*.”²²

Another important matter within the context of the development of the diary is the development of selfhood. An analysis of autobiographical writings helps us understand and observe the conceptions of the self changing throughout the centuries. Many social and cultural changes can be read through a conscientious study of diaries, especially those produced after the seventeenth century, such as the rise of individualism, which was a key factor that directly affected the development of autobiographical writings. A re-examination of early modern notions of the self as they appear in life-writing will show the changing assumptions about the self in the course of centuries. In a more narrow context, a diarist’s interpretation of the self tells a lot about his or her mind map since the diarist can easily create a new self in the diary – as did Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. I will discuss the changing assumptions about the self in relation to Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s probable pseudo-identities later. The immediate subsequent lines will suffice to prove the changing position of the diary and its unique characteristics in different societies, which will draw a solid picture of diary-keeping tradition in Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s times.

Diary keeping as a common practice in a society depends on the time and social expectation of the era and milieu, and the motivations for keeping diaries vary accordingly. A diary, as the daily or periodical writings of personal experiences and impressions, is often considered different from history; however, some of the older

²² Lejeune, *On Diary*, 57 (*italics his*).

diaries were used in furnishing historians with facts and information about a period. Even though a diary is often written with a motivation of keeping a historical record and for conveying messages and opinions as an eye-witness, a diarist might fail to interpret the incident or feel unnecessary to record the event as we see in Charles Greville's entry dated 16 June 1845. He says, "[...] a good deal there is of one sort or another; but I am too sleepy now to go on with the subject."²³ Therefore, a genuine evaluation of the importance of public affairs cannot depend indisputably on a diarist's remarks.

On the other hand, historians are provided from diaries with valuable glimpses into life during the ages, especially from those written in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. Margaret Willy pleads for the use of diaries in historical research in her *English Diarists: Evelyn & Pepys* by pointing out that

[...] the public catastrophes of war, revolution or plague are constantly to be found in diaries, animating scene after scene with a sharp and present actuality. For the re-creation of a past age the diarists are perhaps our richest source of detail: not only in the major historical events and personalities they depict, but in their social background of manners and morals, contemporary tastes and fashions in recreation and dress.²⁴

For the European history of the diary we can claim that the origins are in the biographical works of ancient Rome and Greece. Therefore, the literate, well-educated people of the Renaissance and early modern Europe were supposedly appealed to eminent writers such as Suetonius or Plutarch in terms of recording a testament of their lives.²⁵ The first record of journals have some clear distinctions from the later ones. The first record in the West existed in Ancient Rome; it is considered to have been lost during the Middle Ages. They may not be regarded as

²³ Charles C.F. Greville, *The Greville Memoirs: A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852*, Vol. 2 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1885), 285.

²⁴ Margaret Willy, *English Diarists: Evelyn & Pepys* (London: Longmans & Green, 1963), 9.

²⁵ Suetonius' important surviving work, *De Vita Caesarum* [The Twelve Caesars], written in AD 121, a set of biographies of twelve successive Roman rulers and Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* or *Plutarch's Lives*, written in the late first century AD, a series of biographies of famous Greeks and Romans, most probably influenced succeeding European writers of biography and diary. Alexander Seutonium, *The Twelve Caesars* (KS: Digiread.com Books, 2007). See also <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/674>

diaries since they were sorted annually rather than recorded or published daily. Though the journal was basically a community affair, most heads of household or families are believed to have kept two types of journals: account books with a table of income and expenses; and chronicles in which minor household events were noted. Chronicles might have held some characteristics of the later personal accounts defined as diary. No diary from that period has been preserved; Lejeune comments on their disappearance thus: “when people examined their consciences, they did so mentally and never thought of writing down or keeping a record over time.”²⁶ Or considering the expensive writing materials before the development of paper, we can say that the expense of writing material influenced it as well.

The scarcity of autobiographies or diaries during the middle Ages may be at least partially attributed to the sense of change. Paul Delany, in his *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century*, mentions the “undeveloped sensitivity to change, in both their own and other’s lives, which seems to have characterized the men of that time. They were aware, for example, that the ancients were different from themselves; but the difference was mainly thought of as quantitative – the ancients were merely superior, they lived in an unhistoric, ideal realm.”²⁷ Therefore the development of a sense of interpretation of the past along with placing one person in an age should be taken among the factors of the development of humanist thought as well as the motives for keeping diaries.

Diaries were often restricted to religious communities and used as preparation for confession. Lejeune considers these texts as “a schematic accounting of sins that was erased after each confession.”²⁸ The anecdote below, dated from the seventh century, may help us to differentiate the accounts of the middle ages from the journals of the sixteenth century and to understand why personal writing did not develop until the Renaissance:

I looked even more closely at the monk in charge of the refectory, and saw with astonishment that at his belt he was carrying small tablets on which he wrote down all of his thoughts, so as to give an exact

²⁶ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 55.

²⁷ Paul Delany, *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1969), 8.

²⁸ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 55.

accounting to the abbot who was the head of the monastery. Many other monks were doing the same, and I finally learned that the father superior had ordered it.²⁹

Religious discourse and the models and the prevalence of diary writing have usually been connected. First it was all about the idea of writing one's sins down in preparation for confession, and preventing oneself from doing things one would be ashamed to tell people. Visions, revelations, and prophecies recorded in the journals were particular practices for guiding people for religious purposes. The predecessors of the diary in the modern sense included daily notes of medieval mystics regarding inward emotions and outward events, considered as spiritually important. For example, *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*³⁰ [A Parisian Journal], kept by an anonymous French priest from 1409 to 1431 and by another person until 1449, is important in terms of its spiritual concerns, but invaluable especially to the historians of the reigns of Charles VI and VII.³¹

Before discussing how the diary was considered as a literary text in the late Renaissance, we should comment on middle-age confessions and autobiographical writing. In his essay, "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity," Bakhtin suggests that different genres of life writing can be distinguished according to some expressions in confession and autobiography.³² He adds that in confession, finalization can only come from God, so the text itself cannot be completed: "Confessional self-accounting is precisely the act of noncoinciding with oneself in principle and actuality" due to "unpredetermined, risk-fraught future of the actual event of being."³³ Augustine's *Confessions*³⁴ might be considered as having offered a paradigmatic articulation of this idea though people see it in the social context of the

²⁹ Lejeune, 55.

³⁰ Anonymous, *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*, ed. Alexandre Tuetey (Quai Malquais: A Paris Chez H. Champion, 1881).

³¹ <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/306680/Journal-dun-bourgeois-de-Paris>

³² Mikhail Bakhtin, "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity," in *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, ed. Michale holquist and Vadim Liapunov, trans. Vadim Liapunov (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), 152.

³³ Bakhtin, 143.

³⁴ For a recent edition, see Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick (New York: Oxford UP, 2008).

seventeenth-century England, in the oral performances of religious testimony.³⁵ Autobiography, in contrast with confession, includes a finalizing point of view – either one’s own or another’s – within the text.³⁶

Until the late Renaissance, when the importance of the individual increased, the diary did not have much literary value. We cannot however say that it was only for depicting the daily life of a writer’s time and personality; it was often used by historians for recording the facts and events that were often unrecorded in historical and political chronicles. There are surely many examples of diaries regarded as transparent source documents or personal records, which give valuable information and which might be taken with a grain of salt. On the other hand, there were some individuals who wanted not only to record events – as seen in medieval chronicles – but also to include their opinions with hopes and fears. We can find in Renaissance journals everyday occurrences, reflections, emotional experience, and personal impressions for the most part, with some social events were recorded as well.

Diaries gradually became less a spiritual tool and travelogue and more an instrument of release. In his 1981 *New York Times* article, “Diary Writing Turns a New Leaf,” Patrick Huyghe establishes a link between the emergence of the European rebel, individuality, and the French Revolution: “the intensely introspective form of the diary that arose at about the time of the French Revolution was known as the ‘*journal intime*.’ The *journal intime* became an excruciatingly detailed examination of conscience and the emotions.”³⁷ Lejeune’s remarks that people, especially girls, have been keeping diaries since the 1780s, support French Revolution’s effect on diary keeping though his studies show that this trend, which started in the 1780s, was literally interrupted by the French Revolution, to return almost half-a-century later.³⁸ The development of the diary tradition in France was affected by sectarian pluralism; it is noteworthy that Catholic and Protestant views on diary writing differed. Protestantism was more favorable to personal expression

³⁵ See Mark Knights, “Diaries of the Seventeenth Century,” for the consideration of people in the seventeenth-century England. http://bbc.co.uk/history/british/civil_war_revolution/diaries_01.shtml

³⁶ The last remark surely reminds us of Michel Foucault’s “aesthetic of the self” interacting with the focus in Kant’s Enlightenment philosophy on the emancipation of the individual, which I discuss in Chapter 4.

³⁷ Patrick Huyghe, “Diary Writing Turns a New Leaf,” *New York Times*, 8 November 1981.

³⁸ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 135.

than Catholicism as we see in seventeenth-century England. However, in France there were no spiritual journals during the classical period, whereas there were many *livres de famille*,³⁹ memoirs, and chronicles. Lejeune's comment on this absence was related to the Protestant community under threat:

[...] the Protestant community was under constant threat, and the story of the group's immediate survival was more important than the work of individual salvation. Or because French Calvinism was not conducive to that type of practice? And because French Protestants shared with Catholics an abhorrence for pride and self-regard that precluded any written culture of the self?⁴⁰

The development of diary writing in Europe gives us some ideas about the rise of the individual and the shift in the perception of individualism.

Before narrowing the context down to English diaries and to Virginia Woolf specifically, some very important diarists of Europe should be listed since they had huge influence on the establishment of diary-keeping tradition in Europe; some characteristics grounded by these well-acclaimed diarists still prevail in today's diary-keeping – or autobiography/biography writing – forms in Europe. Even though he was not recognized as a diarist, Michel de Montaigne and his *Essays* have influenced many autobiography- and diary-writers, including Virginia Woolf. Well known for bringing essay writing into prominence as a literary genre, Montaigne should also be taken as one of the pioneers who contributed to the diary as a genre. Several of those whom Montaigne influenced are known for their autobiographies, biographies, or diaries. Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Confessions*⁴¹ (1782), William Hazlitt's *Table-Talk*⁴² (1821), Ralph Waldo Emerson's⁴³ *Self-Reliance*⁴⁴ (1836-7),

³⁹ Family register

⁴⁰ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 75.

⁴¹ See Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Confessions*, trans. J. M. Cohen (New York: Penguin Classics), 1953.

⁴² William Hazlitt, *Table-Talk or, Original Essays* (London: John Warren, Old Bond-Street, 1821).

⁴³ In his *The Western Canon*, Harold Bloom compares Emerson to Montaigne: "The only equivalent reading experience that I know is to reread endlessly in the notebooks and journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the American version of Montaigne" (Bloom, *The Western Canon* (London: Papermac, 1994), 147-8.

⁴⁴ , Ralph W. Emerson, "Self-Reliance," in *Essays* (PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Electronic Classics Series, 2001).

Stefan Zweig's *Three Masters: Balzac, Dickens, Dostoevsky*⁴⁵ (1920), Isaac Asimov's *Essays on Popular Science*⁴⁶ should be to a significant extent considered to have been influenced from Montaigne.

Virginia Woolf and her methods of diary-writing were much influenced by Montaigne.⁴⁷ In *The Common Reader* in the section titled "Montaigne," Woolf clearly shows her inspiration by Montaigne as well as the characteristics of the diary she had already started then:

After all, in the whole of literature, how many people have succeeded in drawing themselves with a pen? Only Montaigne and Pepys and Rousseau perhaps [...] this talking of oneself, following one's own vagaries, giving the whole map, weight, color, and circumference of the soul in its confusion, its variety, its imperfection – this art belonged to one man only: to Montaigne.⁴⁸

I think Woolf, as a modernist writer, was criticizing Elizabethan and Edwardian writers by praising Montaigne and his prose. She compares Sidney's *Defence of Poesie*⁴⁹ with Montaigne's *Essays*⁵⁰ in *The Common Reader*, where she comments on Sidney's prose:

[His] prose is an uninterrupted monologue, with sudden flashes of felicity and splendid phrases, which lends itself to lamentations and moralities, to long accumulations and catalogues, but is never quick, never colloquial, unable to grasp a thought closely and firmly, or to adapt itself flexibly and exactly to the chops and changes of the mind. Compared with this, Montaigne is master of an instrument which knows its own powers and limitations, and is capable of insinuating

⁴⁵ A recent Turkish translation of Zweig's *Three Masters* was published by Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. Stefan Zweig, *Üç Büyük Usta* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012).

⁴⁶ See Isaac Asimov, *Far As Human Eye Could See: Essays on Science* (New York: Doubleday, 1987).

⁴⁷ Even though some sources claim that Woolf read Montaigne's *Essays* originally in French, she mentions in *The Common Reader* that she had the translation of the *Essays*: "Here is the Navara Society in England reprinting in five volumes Cotton's translation" (Woolf, *The Common Reader*, 58).

⁴⁸ Woolf, *The Common Reader*, 56.

⁴⁹ See Philip Sidney, *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Gavin Alaxender (New York: Penguin, 2004).

⁵⁰ Michel de Montaigne, *Montaigne: Essays*, trans. John M. Cohen (New York: Penguin Books, 1993).

itself into crannies and crevices which poetry can never reach; capable of cadences different but no less beautiful; of subtleties and intensities which Elizabethan prose entirely ignores.⁵¹

As Virginia Woolf clearly refers to Montaigne's *Essays* as autobiographical texts, Montaigne himself said so to Henri III. As Sarah Bakewell records in her *How to Live: A Life of Montaigne in One Question and Twenty Attempts at an Answer*, King Henri expressed his appreciation to Montaigne, who replied, "Sir, then your Majesty must like me" because Bakewell points out "he and his books were the same."⁵² We see a similar statement in "The Preface," written by Montaigne's adoptive daughter, Marie le Jars de Gournay. Written in 1595, "The Preface" gives a very good insight into the *Essays*; as Gournay says, "the *Essays* were a match for him."⁵³

Bakewell draws attention to a point about the *Essays*, important for understanding the process of the development of self-writing; that is the statement of his inner life because "by writing so openly about his everyday observations and inner life, Montaigne was breaking a taboo. You were not supposed to record yourself in a book, only your great deeds, if you had any."⁵⁴ Montaigne was satisfied with being himself, which disturbed his readers. One of the scholars of the day, Bakewell, asks, "Who the hell wants to know what he liked?"⁵⁵ How Montaigne's *Essays* were received in different periods gives us a significant clue about the changing milieu in Europe, as his essays were much appreciated with the coming of Romanticism.

Among the other well-known European diarists is André Gide, who left a great two-volume diary beside his other works in other genres. During the production of *The Counterfeiters*,⁵⁶ he took notes in his diary about the process of the composition of his novel. He often referred to his *Journal* as his most important work. The

⁵¹ Woolf, *The Common Reader*, 56.

⁵² Sarah Bakewell, *How to Live: A Life of Montaigne in One Question and Twenty Attempts at an Answer* (London: Vintage, 2011), 223.

⁵³ Marie le Jars de Gournay, *Preface to the Essays of Michel de Montaigne* (Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998), 29.

⁵⁴ Bakewell, *A Life of Montaigne*, 223.

⁵⁵ Bakewell, 223.

⁵⁶ Originally published by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. in French as *Les Faux-Monnayeurs* in 1927. More recently, André Gide, *The Counterfeiters* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973).

outbreak of war motivated him to open his notebooks after a six-month silence; therefore, his main source of anxiety, the war's threat to European culture, is expressed in his diary. On 10 September 1939, he wrote, "Yes, all that might well disappear that cultural effort which seemed to us wonderful (and I am not speaking merely of the French effort). At the rate which we are going, there will soon not be many to feel the need of it, to understand it; not many left to notice that it is no longer understood."⁵⁷

Gide's entries on Turkey and Turkish people give some idea of twentieth-century characteristics: Unlike the diaries of previous centuries written as accounts of confessions, historical facts, and the like, Gide includes his own feelings, emotions, opinions, and even stereotypes. In his entry of 1 May 1914 he writes of his day in Istanbul:

Constantinople justifies all my prejudices and joins Venice in my personal hell. As soon as you admire some bit of architecture, the surface of a mosque, you learn (and you suspected it already) that it is Albanian or Persian. Everything was brought here, as to Venice, even more than to Venice, by sheer force or by money. Nothing sprang from the soil itself; nothing indigenous underlies the thick froth made by the friction and clash of so many races, histories, beliefs, and civilizations.

The Turkish costume is the ugliest you can imagine; and the race, to tell the truth, deserves it.

Oh Golden Horn, Bosphorus, shore of Scutari, cypresses of Eyoub! I am unable to lend my heart to the most beautiful landscape in the world if I cannot love the people that inhabit it.⁵⁸

One of the most widely read literary texts is a wartime diary written by Anne Frank, *The Diary of a Young Girl*. It is well-celebrated due to its evocation of interior life. Anne began to write her diary when she was 13, just before her family, some of her friends, and herself went to Amsterdam to hide from the Nazis. Her diary ends after her 15th birthday when Nazis invaded the hideout and took her to concentration

⁵⁷ André Gide, *Journals*, Vol. 4, 3.

⁵⁸ Gide, *Journals*, Vol. 3, 7.

camps, where she was killed. It is still considered one of the most emotional and in some ways sarcastic diaries of the twentieth century.⁵⁹

Surely, there are thousands of autobiographical works to be considered within the European framework of literature. It is important to note that every country in Europe has its unique principals and characteristics for the production of literary texts and the interpretation of genres. Therefore, talking about any ideal form of diary is not plausible; above all, its attribution to one specific country – or to Europe in general – is to ignore distinctive qualities of different cultures.

English Diaries

In most parts of the Western world, the period from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth century saw a general transition from restricted to mass literacy. Skills and some writing forms – once the preserve of a small elite or clerical group – became secularized and more common. However, this important change was not universal or consistent; the form is not applicable to all Western societies on the same level. Different European societies view the diary differently. England, for example, was a century ahead of France: practices that became common in France in the second half of the eighteenth century were already common in England in the mid-seventeenth century. As the scope of this study is British society and Virginia Woolf in the narrow context, the process of the development of the diary as a genre in England is important in its influence on Virginia Woolf.

The early modern period in England saw the emergence of and the increasing popularity of diary keeping as a personal document. Over the seventeenth century, diary-writing became a common genre. Although it is plausible to claim that some documents similar to the form of diaries already existed in England before the sixteenth century, the proof of the presence of what we call diaries – private diaries – does not exist. There were, however, instances of personal writings, as well as instances of chronicles, accounts, or reflections, which are not regarded as diaries

⁵⁹ Anne Frank, *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl*, trans. B.M. Mooyaart-Doubleday (NY: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1963). It is important to note that this diary was first published in 1947 in Holland under the title *Het Achterhuis*. According to information given in the single-page introduction to the diary, *Het Achterhuis* refers to “that part of the building which served as a hiding place for the two families who took shelter there between 1942 and 1944” (Frank, 1).

since they did not have the common characteristics of diary writing. But after the sixteenth century onwards, it improved considerably compared to its previous development.

William Matthews, in *British Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of British Diaries Written between 1442 and 1942*, estimates surviving diary manuscripts at around three hundred and sixty-three, and he catalogues most of them in his work. Around twenty of those were from the sixteenth century, some of which I discuss below. As important as examples of diaries from early modern England are, the cultural factors mentioned in this part of the study show a tradition of diary keeping in England unique to the Island and portray the mental transformation reflected in the changing attitudes of individuals practicing diary-keeping.

Two main factors influence diary- writing in the seventeenth century: First, the rise in literacy among the people. David Cressy estimates the literacy of men and women in England from 1500 to 1900 in *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. He shows that twenty percent among men and five percent among women: “during the latter part of the sixteenth century, literacy grew ten percent for men and five percent for women in the seventeenth century.”⁶⁰ Although the rise was not striking, people became acquainted with the skills to write, had more access to printed materials, and were probably influenced by the accounts of famous people of their times, which must have made keeping a personal account of one’s life popular. Surely, diaries did not improve only because of an increase in literacy; there are several other factors. Nevertheless, if it were not for increased literacy skills in the population, the development of the genre would have been somehow curtailed.

The other factor to affect diary writing was growing self-awareness, which especially increased in the course of the seventeenth century. In his introduction to *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, Roy Porter places diary keeping as a factor that reflects increasing individualism in European societies from the Renaissance period: “New cultural genres – the portrait (above all the self-

⁶⁰ David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2006), 191-202. Also see the chart in William Matthews, *British Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of British Diaries Written between 1442 and 1942* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 77.

portrait), the diary and the biography (especially the autobiography) – reveal heightened perceptions of individuality, the ego glorying in its own being.”⁶¹ This self-awareness was spread for instance by sermons on the Puritan idea of individual responsibility for salvation. William Haller, in *The Rise of Puritanism*, points out that “the diary like the autobiography, of which it was the forerunner, was the Puritan’s confessional.”⁶² He also states that “the substance of many [diaries] and the fact of their having been kept are apparent in the mass of biographical writing which rapidly accumulated as the Puritan movement progressed.”⁶³

Another agent that raised the popularity of diary writing in the seventeenth century and onwards were the conflicts experienced in the war years. As Paul Delany says in his *British Autobiography*, when people encounter great events, they feel a motivation for recording their personal participation, which serves later as a means to refresh their memories after the turmoil or the situation is over.⁶⁴ Michael Mascuch supports Delany’s opinion in his *Origins of the Individualist Self* by saying that “excellent men by their writings, in all faculties and sciences, enjoy a sort of immortality upon earth, by having their memories honored by succeeding generations who never see their faces in the flesh.”⁶⁵ During the conflict years, the number of diaries written increased noticeably. Elaine McKay exemplifies in her article titled *The Diary Network in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England* that in the civil war years of the 1640s, “the subsequent royalist rebellions during the 1650s and the Glorious Revolution brought war into the midst of England’s society,” and “those who participated as soldiers took part in events which deeply affected both their local communities and the nation as a whole [...]. Overall seventy-two diaries were written by soldiers and sailors during times of conflict which makes their professions collectively the most prolific of diary writers.”⁶⁶

Beside the factors mentioned above, Elaine McKay brings out a new reason for the growing number of diary-keeping in the seventeenth century in England. She

⁶¹ Roy Porter, introduction to *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. Roy Porter (NY: Routledge, 2002), 3.

⁶² William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (West Sussex: Columbia UP, 1957), 38.

⁶³ William Haller, 94.

⁶⁴ Delany, *British Autobiography*, 10.

⁶⁵ Michael Mascuch, *Origins of the Individualist Self* (CA: Stanford UP, 1996), 38.

⁶⁶ McKay, “The Diary Network,” (<http://arts.monash.edu.au>).

asserts that in early Modern England “a form of network existed between many of the diarists who wrote during the sixteenth, and principally seventeenth centuries.”⁶⁷ She explains that this network of community of diarists exist on many levels. She split the diary network into two sections: “First there are instances where diarists knew one another, in some cases encouraging one another, or setting an example, in diary writing. Secondly there were other diarists who did not meet or know one another personally, but mention other diarists in their diary, perhaps as an inspiration or as someone of importance.”⁶⁸ The influence of one individual upon another might have given some “encouragement to keep a personal account of one’s life.”⁶⁹ A diarist who shared his ideas or even his hobbies with his or her acquaintances may have inspired them on recording their lives on a daily basis.

As previously mentioned, the most comprehensive catalogue on early modern and modern British diaries was written by William Mathews. Titled *British Diaries* and published in 1950, it chronologically lists thousands of diaries from England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland from 1442 to 1942. A thousand of these diaries extend over a ten-year period and give a splendid opinion on the development of the diary as a tradition in Britain. Surely, there were some other diaries Mathews might have missed or whose manuscripts came out or were written after Mathews published the book in 1950.⁷⁰ According to the list compiled by Mathews, it was before the invention of the printing press that the earliest British diary was written in 1442. It is an anonymous diary with an attribution to a secretary of Thomas Becket who was keeping daily notes as “an embassy to France to marriage of Henry VI and daughter of Count of Armagnac.”⁷¹ Mathews also registers Roger Machado’s diplomatic diaries from 1489 during an embassy of the French and English to Spain. From the sixteenth century Mathews lists around forty diaries, only two of which extended for more than ten years. However, we can see some developments – if not major – of the diary-keeping compared to previous centuries.

⁶⁷ McKay, “The Diary Network.”

⁶⁸ McKay, “The Diary Network.”

⁶⁹ McKay, “The Diary Network.”

⁷⁰ Though it had reprints in 1967 and 1980 by the University of California Press, I have seen only a few changes in the editions since the book only covers a period until 1942.

⁷¹ Mathews, *British Diaries*, 1.

One of the two diaries of English sovereigns was written in the sixteenth century. It is the diary of King Edward the Sixth, who died when he was 16. Even though there were some doubts about the fact that it was written by the King himself when he was 12, J.G. Nichols, the editor of the King's diary published in 1857, mentions that it was entirely his own, apart from the introductory summary at the beginning. Arthur Ponsonby, in his *English Diaries*, draws attention to some inaccuracies with regard to dates and provides these errors for supporting the view that it was written by a boy under 12 years old. Ponsonby also notes how Henry Hallam, an English historian who lived from 1777 to 1859, had the same opinion although Hallam would like the diary not to be genuine because of "the off-hand way in which Edward refers to the execution of his uncles and the treatment of his sister. 'But,' he concludes, 'he had, I suspect, too much Tudor blood.' We have also to bear in mind that there is plenty of contemporary evidence of the boy King's extraordinary erudition."⁷² Even though the diary does not contain any clear expression of any kinds of opinion, these pithy events seem to have been recorded by a boy between the ages of 11 and 14. The burial of Henry VIII, his own coronation, the war with Scotland, the war with France, and the suppression of Kett's rebellion were all recorded in his diary.⁷³ The actual diary begins with brief and daily entries in March 1549; although there is no comment on the events, his conscientious exactness and distinctly regal tone in the entries are noteworthy and raise questions about its authenticity.

As Arthur Ponsonby mentions in his *English Diaries*, in the sixteenth century Henry Machyn's diary extends over a period of thirteen years from 1550 to 1563. The diary entries were mostly about funerals as well as the descriptions of "pageants, revels, processions, proclamations, trials and punishments."⁷⁴ About himself Machyn gives almost nothing in the diary and even sometimes refers to himself in the third person. The significance of his diary might stem from its two aspects: first, it was an early example of diary-writing with some characteristics of modern diary-keeping practice even though it was certainly not modern in terms of not giving much

⁷² Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 55.

⁷³ See <http://archie.org> for a digital copy.

⁷⁴ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 58.

information about the self. The second importance of his diary is the period it covers: Machyn lived in the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Queen Elizabeth and therefore witnessed extreme religious changes. Funerals, as already mentioned, took a considerable space in his diary with technical terms and expressions. One of these funerals was Edward VI's, elaborately discussed by Machyn: "1553. The VIII day of August was buried the noble King Edward VI; and at this burying was the greatest mourning (mone) made for him of his death as ever was heard or seen both of all sorts of people weeping and lamenting; [...]." ⁷⁵

Among the other examples of the sixteenth-century diaries is John Dee's diary, covering the period from 1577 to 1600 and including lists of visitors, business about his property, weather reports, accounts, the borrowing of money and a great deal about his changes of servants and the wages he paid them. ⁷⁶ Compared to Machyn's diary, it is more about John Dee himself has many modern diary characteristics as Virginia Woolf similarly mentions several times in her diary her correspondence with her servants. Sir Francis Walsingham's diary was recorded by Ponsonby because he was holding high office under Queen Elizabeth and thus expected to record some important negotiations. However, it consists of "nothing more than notices of his movements, the Queen's movements when [Walsingham] is in England, and occasionally other events, with memoranda for each day of all letters received and sent." ⁷⁷

Over the seventeenth century, diary-writing improved and became a genre with various functions. We cannot really talk about the modern representation of selfhood since even the usual seventeenth-century term for speech was not one's speaking to one's self but rather speaking to God. Debora Shuger considers this usage – or interpretation – as it "marks the contrast between social and supernatural, outward and inner, domains as the basic polarity organizing early modern representation of self-hood." ⁷⁸ Therefore, it is probably right to say that selfhood in the mid-seventeenth century did not suggest the modern idea of possessing a self; rather it

⁷⁵ Qtd in Ponsonby, 58.

⁷⁶ Ponsonby, 61.

⁷⁷ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 66.

⁷⁸ Debora Shuger, "Life-Writing in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Representations of the Self from Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. Patrick Coleman and et al (UK: Cambridge UP, 2000), 74.

had some references to the inability to govern the self. John Milton, for example, in his *Paradise Lost* (1667) used *self-hood* with negative connotations. Rebel angels in Book 5 of the poem are described as “self-begot, self-raised”, and in Book 3, it reads, “Self-tempted, self-deprav’d: Man falls, deceiv’d.”⁷⁹ This self-reflexivity in the poem seems to indicate “an absence of God, a state of spiritual isolation, rather than the presence of reflective enquiry.”⁸⁰

Nevertheless, its improvement was obvious as the motives were well explained by John Beadle, an Essex minister, on his so-called advice manual for keeping a diary. He explained the variety of types written in the seventeenth century:

We have our state diurnals, relating to national affairs. Tradesmen keep their shop books. Merchants their account books. Lawyers have their books of pre[c]edents. Physicians have their experiments. Some wary husbands have kept a diary of daily disbursements. Travellers a Journall of all that they have seen and hath befallen them in their way. A Christian that would be more exact hath more need and may reap much more good by such a journal as this. We are all but stewards, factors here, and must give a strict account in that great day to the high Lord of all our wayes, and of all his wayes towards us.⁸¹

A variety of motives for this rising popularity would include: “growing literacy rates and a more literate culture, changes in the education system, cheaper paper and a heightened awareness of the ‘self’[...] and the impact of the Protestant reformation.”⁸² While “the most common reason for keeping a diary in the seventeenth century was to keep an account of providence or God’s ordering of the world,”⁸³ the crises in the seventeenth-century England were seen in some of the diaries of the era. Samuel Pepys, for example, was said to have begun his diary because he knew the crisis that the nation faced at the start of 1660. In the summer of

⁷⁹ Qtd. in Stanley E. Fish, *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1998), 59.

⁸⁰ Jonathan Sawday, “Self and Selfhood in the Seventeenth Century,” in *Rewriting the Self*, ed. Roy Porter (NY: Routledge, 2002), 30.

⁸¹ Qtd. in Knights, “Diaries of the Seventieth Century.”

⁸² Knights, “Diaries.” (<http://bbc.co.uk>)

⁸³ Knights, “Diaries.”

1688, Pepys' friend John Evelyn, another important diarist, "was close to seven protestant bishops who were put on trial by the Catholic James II."⁸⁴

The diary of Samuel Pepys is mostly considered as in the first rank of English diaries. Arthur Ponsonby asserts that he fulfills all the conditions of what a diary is supposed to be, as it "is written with scrupulous regularity daily and is therefore spontaneous. Detailed narrative of public events, intimate domestic incidents and candid self-revelation all find a place in it. Such are the powers of narration and observation of the writer [...]."⁸⁵ He wrote one and a half million words between 1660 and 1669, gave an accurate and frank picture of himself and left a hugely detailed account of daily life in London, including the Great Fire of London and the plague in 1665.⁸⁶ His diary is the earliest known personal chronicle that strikes us as truly modern; he should be taken as ahead of his time, though, because diary writing in today's form did not really begin to develop until the late eighteenth century, or the age of romanticism. In particular, he took the diary beyond its position as a sole transaction to a personal account; he treated his inner and outer lives with equal respect.⁸⁷ The publication date of his diaries is important since a complete edition of Pepys's diary did not appear in print until the 1890s, during the Victorian era, a time when diary writing reached its apogee as a social habit among European and British cultural elite among whom was Virginia Woolf, with her early diary of the 1890s and mature entries at the turn of the century.

Samuel Pepys's contemporary John Evelyn kept a notable diary, which was among the most important primary sources for information about the English Restoration period. It covers more than half a century from 1640 to 1706. Evelyn's diary might be considered a memoir since he wrote intermittently at subsequent dates, with no introspection and – except for his political views – no intimate revelation of his character. He gives an autobiographical account of his early life at the very beginning of his diary,⁸⁸ and as several confusions in the dates proves that

⁸⁴ Knights, "Diaries."

⁸⁵ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 82.

⁸⁶ See Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, Vol. 1, eds. William Matthews and Robert Latham (London: G. Bell and Hyman, 1971).

⁸⁷ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 82.

⁸⁸ The diary has an uncommon beginning: Evelyn gives information about himself: "I was born at Watton, in the Country of Surrey, about twenty past two in the morning, being on Tuesday the 31st

several entries were inserted some time after the incidents were recorded. The network among the diarists, asserted by Elaine McKay and discussed above, can be seen between John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys. Both were members of the Royal Society, and more importantly they were frequently recording their correspondences and compliments for one another in their diaries.⁸⁹ However, Ponsonby restricts this correspondence with the same people and the same events they refer to. They were so completely different, Ponsonby points out, in “their method, their motive, their point of view, their manner, and their characters [...]”⁹⁰

Throughout the eighteenth century in Europe, people sought new tools for expressing themselves: Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot were among the well-known individuals who had this kind of ambition. However, it is important to note that the lack of any formal model for expressing the self might have led them to stick to older forms such as memoirs and correspondence.⁹¹ In the late eighteenth century in England, however, modern autobiography – as we recognize it today – began as we see that a self exists with its origins and its nature. Autobiography became more than writing, it became, as Michael Mascuch points out in his *Origins of the Individualist Self*, “a form of personal action, modern autobiographical practice constitutes the essential mode of individualist agency.”⁹²

Surely the most important diary in the eighteenth century in England was John Wesley’s. He kept a diary almost throughout his life for 66 years from 1725 to 1791, started when he was 22 years old and continued until his death. His motivation for keeping a diary is important in order to see the mental changes in the eighteenth century; he wrote, as Ponsonby states, “for the clearing of his own mind that he might see his life in black and white and so be in a position to judge accurately as to

and last of October, 1620, after my father had been married about seven years, and that my mother had borne him three children; two daughters and one son, about the 33[r]d year of his age, and the 23[r]d of my mother’s.” John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn* (London: M. Walter Dunne Publisher, 1901), 1.

⁸⁹ McKay, “The Diary Network.” (<http://arts.monash.edu.au>).

⁹⁰ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 96

⁹¹ During my research on autobiographical texts, I thought up the idea that lack of any specific forms of self-writing led many writers to express their opinions via various forms yet no layout was regarded as standard; considering other genres in solid forms – say, well-made theatrical productions, poems written in iambic parameters, and later the realist novels –, autobiographical writings were not regarded within a genre, but few assumptions on a standard form was proposed.

⁹² Mascuch, *Origins*, 23.

his own motives, attainments, doings, and failures.”⁹³ His changing attitude in his diary shows the changing perception of self then; that is, in his earlier years, he condemns himself with several brief notes of self-reproach, resolutions for self-discipline and spiritual exercise.⁹⁴ In his later years, the tone in his journal became self-confident, which shows his determination and austerity. His journal, which is mainly composed of Wesley’s preaching, changed accordingly, and he felt mighty in his prayers and teachings.⁹⁵

A good example of diaries which were converted into biographies is James Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*. It was an unusual work since it was originally the diary of the biography writer, not the subject of the biography.⁹⁶ Boswell had already begun keeping a journal before he met Johnson, but it was this meeting, Pat Rogers claims in his Introduction to *Life of Johnson*, “which transformed the activity from a habit into a ritual of self-expression.”⁹⁷ Boswell was a passionate note-taker, even during a meal taking out his tablets and jotting down notes. As Ponsonby points out, he often stayed up late at night writing every incident and phrases of his talk with Johnson.⁹⁸ Boswell had the intention of writing Johnson’s life from the very beginning but he was hesitant on asking Johnson about the plan. We see in the entries dated 13 April 1773 that Johnson had made some attempts to keep a journal but was never determined: “He advised me to do it. ‘The great thing to be recorded, (said he,) is the state of your own mind; and you should write down everything that you remember, for you cannot judge at first what is good or bad; and write immediately while the

⁹³ Quoted in Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 156. See *Standard Edition of Wesley’s Journal*, Vol. 1 for the original source.

⁹⁴ It is important to note that John Wesley was considered one of the leading Christian voices of the 18th century and one of the founders of the Methodist movement. In the introduction to *The Journal of John Wesley*, published by Christian Classic Ethereal Library, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes claims, “he who desires to understand the real history of the English people during the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries should read most carefully three books: George Fox’s *Journal*, John Wesley’s *Journal*, and John Henry Newman’s *Apologia pro Vita Sua*.” See <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/wesley/journal.html>

⁹⁵ Ponsonby quotes from Wesley’s diary: “I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death. I began to pray with all might for those who had in a more special manner despitefully used me and persecuted me” (Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 158).

⁹⁶ Virginia Woolf, in her *The Common Reader*, comments on Boswell’s biography of Johnson: “A bright polished mirror reflects the face of Boswell peeping between other people’s shoulder in the famous biography” (Woolf, *The Common Reader*, 58).

⁹⁷ Pat Rogers, Introduction to *Life of Johnson*, ed. John Boswell (NY: Oxford UP, 2008), xiii.

⁹⁸ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 4.

impression is fresh, for it will not be the same a week afterwards.”⁹⁹ And later on the same day Johnson mentions to Boswell “many circumstances,” which Boswell wrote down about Johnson’s early life and added that section to the former part of the biography.

In the nineteenth century, the diary was a common practice in Britain. This growing interest in the diary was because its very form became a uniquely effective vehicle for the discourse of the century. In *Time, Space and Gender in the Nineteenth-Century British Diary*, Rebecca Steinitz connects the discourse of the century and the diary’s conventions: “For men and women alike, the diary’s totalizing yet elastic temporal and spatial conventions enabled the enactment of Enlightenment observation and organization, Romantic interiority, Evangelical and secular self-improvement, Victorian domesticity, and imperial geographies and ethnographies.”¹⁰⁰ Another characteristic of diary tradition in the nineteenth century was that it framed the understanding of gender and diary because while the practice in writing fiction was rising in the nineteenth century, the diary was devolving into a feminine genre. Despite extensive proof that both men and women wrote diaries, the diary was identified as feminine. Many discussions might emerge out of the gendering of the diary, which, Steinitz points out, is “a cultural construct rather than a material practice.”¹⁰¹

Philip Anthony Spalding states in *Self-Harvest: A Study of Diaries and the Diarist* that diary-writing reached its height in terms of quality in the eighteenth century and declined in the nineteenth “under the sedative influence [...] of a social uniformity based on compulsory education and the Machine.”¹⁰² He did not give credit to the nineteenth century for the development of the diary because he and many other scholars regarded the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century developments as crucial for the origins and the development of diary-keeping, and the twentieth century represents “its modernist culminations.”¹⁰³ However, nineteenth-century

⁹⁹ Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (NY: Oxford World’s Classics, 2008), 513.

¹⁰⁰ Rebecca Steinitz, *Time, Space and Gender in the Nineteenth-Century British Diary* (NY: Palgrave Mac Millan, 2011), 2.

¹⁰¹ Steinitz, *Time, Space and Gender*, 183.

¹⁰² Philip A. Spalding, *Self-Harvest: A Study of Diaries and the Diarist* (London: Independent Press, 1949), 65.

¹⁰³ Steinitz, *Time, Space and Gender*, 2.

diaries were similar to those produced in the previous centuries. We can even claim that the essential format of these diaries had been the same since Pepys. Many major themes such as religion and travel remained important in the nineteenth century; nevertheless, as mentioned previously, the predecessors were taking these issues as occasion required. According to Rebecca Steinitz, the diary flourished in nineteenth-century Britain as never before. Bibliographies and anthologies, she reports, “document a significant increase between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the number of extant diaries. The commercial diaries with dated blank pages used by many diarists became a standard and popular stationary item.”¹⁰⁴ Besides, some of the well-known diaries of the previous centuries were republished in the nineteenth century. John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys were among those who gave “much excitement, igniting a veritable explosion of diary publication [...by] innumerable new and experienced diarists.”¹⁰⁵

Nineteenth-century diaries are significant in terms of proving several dramatic and cultural changes. The formal dimensions of the diary make it a significant tool for conveying those changes in a society. The attitude of Francis Burney, Rebecca Steinitz points out, was a good “indicator of [the] difference. When she began her diary in 1769, she addressed it to ‘Nobody’ and emphasized its secrecy; by the close of her life, in the 1830s, she was actively preparing her diaries for publication.”¹⁰⁶ Steinitz claims that this individual transformation shows cultural shifts in “privacy and commodification [...]. In the nineteenth century, privacy remained an ideal, but that ideal was in practice [...] fraught by the routine sharing of manuscript diaries and the increasing prevalence of diary publication.”¹⁰⁷

Charles Greville wrote for publication; his memoirs came out in three sets: the first volume from 1817 to 1837, the second from 1837 to 1860, and the last until 1885. He gave the ninety-three quarto notebooks to Henry Reeve, with a task that he should “print such portions of them as might be thought of public interest whenever that could be done without inconvenience to living persons.”¹⁰⁸ Therefore, it might

¹⁰⁴ Steinitz, 3.

¹⁰⁵ Steinitz, 3.

¹⁰⁶ Steinitz, 3.

¹⁰⁷ Steinitz, 3.

¹⁰⁸ Quoted in Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 272.

be considered as an objective diary with little personal and psychological interest. It has some historical benefits as well; while recording public events he mentions the causes of these incidents. Greville's diary is important for this study with regard to ideas about publication and objectivity. Virginia Woolf's and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's diaries should be considered from the aspect of whether they were written for publication or not. Creating a second identity in the diaries raises questions about the authenticity of the diaries.¹⁰⁹

Among nineteenth-century diaries, Lord Byron's diary has taken little attention so far, especially considering how his voluminous literature has been carefully examined from many aspects. He kept a journal from November 1813 to April 1814, during his journey in the Alps in 1816, and in the first two months of 1821. Arthur Ponsonby quotes Byron's motive for keeping a diary: "This journal is a relief. When I am tired – as I generally am – out comes this and down goes everything. But I can't read it over: and God knows what contradictions it may contain. If I am sincere with myself [...] every page should confute, refute and utterly abjure its predecessors."¹¹⁰ Byron's diary should be attended for it holds some modern characteristics of diary-keeping as everything is noted – his reading, writing, criticisms of the people he meets, his opinions on public events, dinners, parties, and several other details about his experiences. He did not have a regular method, which caused him not to keep a diary regularly, but it had a feature often found in modern diaries, that is, egotism.

In the late eighteenth century and Romantic period, autobiography were mainly dominated by male writers. This masculine tradition of autobiography in the nineteenth century might be defined as self-aggrandizing with its individualist models of selfhood. Female autobiography writers, on the other hand, were seeking a means of self-exploration to initially shape a literary sphere and later to challenge traditional conceptions of female identity and to have a say in political and social debates. Virginia Woolf's earlier diary that she started in the late nineteenth century should be considered within this context of making a place in society, while her mature diary was to a significant extent the site of her conflict between aesthetics and

¹⁰⁹ See Chapter 2 for a comprehensive discussion of the (mis)representation of identities in diaries.

¹¹⁰ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 264.

politics, as well as of her inner struggle and of defining her role as an artist in the literary community.

Since the specific scope of this study deals with Virginia Woolf as a diarist, I analyze diary keeping as a feminine practice. In modern times diarywriting is generally coded as a feminine practice though most of the diaries – published and unpublished – have been written by men. In the nineteenth century, diary keeping for women “was a conditioned form of writing by showing how young women’s diary writing was systematically encouraged as a form of spiritual discipline during this period, especially by the Catholic Church.”¹¹¹ As Lejeune points out in his *On Diary*, in the nineteenth century, young women who kept diaries in France were given some guidelines to follow, making their writings highly formulaic. Lejeune’s further explanation is important because throughout his research he discovered that some women writers modulated their diaries in unexpected directions and turned them into “vehicles for genuine self-discovery.”¹¹² In Lejeune’s example, in France, the decline of religiosity in the mid-nineteenth century caused women’s diaries to become more individualized and a tool for self-exploration.

Women who write diaries can be considered as contributing to the developing field of women’s history because the diary is a prime source for the exploration of women’s experience in the past. Across the course of the century – or centuries – from diary to diary, the progressive liberation of women, while usually promised in marriage at one period of time, turned to be more often an account of searching for a more personalized means of self-realization through writing or artistic activities. Critics have sought a connection between the growth of diary-making and the development of Western subjectivity and of gender identity. Taking the diary as an ordinary, silent producer of culture by creating its own logics of expression, women diarists seem to make secret spaces within a larger social world. Women’s manners of expression differ from those of men because the interests, status, and lives of the diarists do so. While male diarists established the realm of freedom through personal writing in the seventeenth century, women writers had just access in the early

¹¹¹ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 7-8.

¹¹² Lejeune, 8.

twentieth century to the literary marketplace since it was earlier restrictive in terms of accepting radical or taboo subject matter such as sexuality.

The diary has been a very significant literary space for women authors. It has let women writers convey to an audience their thoughts and feelings that were too personal or too controversial to be revealed through fiction, but which they wanted and needed to convey.¹¹³ For example, the exploration of a woman's experience in Anais Nin's diaries, which were first published in 1966, had a huge impact on women's movements and on the number of women who began keeping diaries. As Patrick Huyghe quotes from Miss Rainer, in his article in the *New York Times*, Nin "emphasized the importance of women's articulateness at this time in history and demonstrated how the diary could help them find their own expressive language."¹¹⁴ Perhaps one of the most important female diarists of the twentieth century was Virginia Woolf, who wrote about ordinary life and whose diary functioned as a record of the lifestyle of the period and acted as a domestic historical record as well as a political record.

Virginia Woolf Writes "Out"

Virginia Woolf kept a diary for 22 years and for a total of approximately 38 years if her early journals are included. Through her diary she was able to craft her personality and her writing. She discusses her social life, her writing, household matters, and the weather in her diaries. She recorded domestic events, commented on her clothing and shopping trips, recorded even what they had for dinner, gave details about some aspects of everyday life. Her suggestion that everyday life, public or private, is appropriate for novels is parallel to her inclinations of keeping diaries, for her diaries deal with the private and inner lives of people. Her concerns on individual experience lend themselves well to the diary because, as a genre, the diary is all about an individual, a person's story.

¹¹³ The fact that some diarists separate some of their life experiences from those they transfer to an audience opens up a controversial discussion on whether the diary is a fictional text or not. Diarists can express themselves through narratives as the stories of their lives, while at the same time they can change them by rewriting and reflecting their subversive desires and experiences. I will analyze Woolf and Tanpınar's diaries in this context later.

¹¹⁴ Huyghe, "Diary Writing," 4.

She started writing her diary in 1897,¹¹⁵ using it to mark her place, her difference, as a sort of a task or a duty. She refers to her daily employment as “our usual uninteresting everyday errands.”¹¹⁶ Her early diary covers some important entries in addition to remarks on what is unique about her even then, in her formative period. It shows several experiences young Virginia had such as her struggle to fit into the social mold in the patriarchal system, her anxiety, a little anger, her later depression due to Stella’s marriage and death,¹¹⁷ her breakdowns that would also cease the entries of her later diaries, finding an identity as a writer, defining who she was by what she wrote and how she wrote, descriptions of her visits to Greece, Turkey, and Italy; the death of Virginia’s father, Leslie Stephen, causing her both to stop writing the diary for a while in 1903, and later her complete madness until she resumed the diary at Christmas of 1904 with shorter, daily entries.¹¹⁸ In 1905 she began her career as a reviewer and essayist, which made her less concerned about the stated rules and on shaping language that fits her needs. “The nervous, sensitive writer persona,” Joanne C. Tidwell asserts, “that haunts and overwhelms so many of the diary entries for the rest of Woolf’s life [,] begins to make her voice heard in these diaries.”¹¹⁹

Her mature diary, the scope of this study, began at the beginning of 1915, when Woolf was 33 years old, with the last entry made four days before she drowned herself. Right after she began her diary in 1915, it was interrupted on 15 February, indicated with a headnote by the diary’s editor, Anne Oliver Bell, who calls these

¹¹⁵ About the diary Virginia Stephen began to write in 1897, then nearly fifteen, Anne Oliver Bell, the editor of the five-volume mature diaries of Woolf and the wife of Woolf’s nephew, Quentin Bell, writes in her preface: “On Sunday, 3 January 1897, Virginia Stephen, [...] began to keep a record of the new year; on 1 January 1898 she writes ‘Finis’ to ‘a volume of fairly acute life [...]’ This diary was maintained without a break until October, save for the day following the death of her recently married half-sister in July. But after that disaster it dwindled, and on 14 September she remarks on the moribund condition on her poor diary, but says ‘Never mind, we will follow the year to its end & then fling diaries & diarising into the corner—to dust & mire & moths & all creeping crawling eating destroying creatures.’” Between 1898 and 1915, Anne Bell remarks, “Virginia kept, at different times, at least five notebooks having something of the character of diaries but consisting largely of literary exercises or essays arising from events, people, and places that she observed; only in the first months of 1905 did she again keep a brief day-to-day journal.” (Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, vii.)

¹¹⁶ Qtd. in Joanne C. Tidwell, *Politics and Aesthetics in the Diary of Virginia Woolf*, (NY: Routledge, 2008), 12.

¹¹⁷ On 19 July 1897, Virginia writes that Stella dies and “it is impossible to write of” (qtd in Tidwell, 14).

¹¹⁸ Tidwell, 11-19.

¹¹⁹ Tidwell, 19-20.

six-week entries a “prelude to the main work.”¹²⁰ Why Woolf began this record “we do not know,” the headnote says; but “we do know why she stopped” it continues, “from the middle of February she plunged into madness.” It is defined as the period between two phases of Woolf’s longest breakdown. What is more important is that before the 1915 diary, Woolf’s madness was “melancholic and suicidal,” but afterwards, the madness was “aggressive and violent.”¹²¹ The peaceful six-week period before madness is described in her entry dated 29 January 1915: “Shall I say ‘nothing happened today’ as we used to do in our diaries, when they were beginning to die? It wouldn’t be true. The day is rather like a leafless tree: there are all sorts of colours in it, if you look closely. But the outline is bare enough.”¹²²

After recovering from the second phase, Woolf embraced the reality; the entries of August and September 1917 are short, which is reminiscent of those at the end of the 1897 diary after Stella’s death. The use of pronouns is rare: “Came to Asheham. Walked out from Lewes. Stopped raining for the first time since Sunday.”¹²³ Short but detailed entries show how Woolf was struggling to reinforce her sense of reality. She was noting in summary from each day’s happenings and weather, and her observations of natural phenomena. She later began a much fuller record that she, in one form or another, maintained until the end of her life in 1941. The content in her diary varies greatly: while in one page she writes about the daily accounts of the weather and the garden, in another page she mentions her troubles with the servants and meals. Her remarks on searching for mushrooms¹²⁴ is no less than her comments on her own health as well as the people she has seen and the parties she has gone to. While she sometimes writes better than an average diarist, the subject matter is sometimes as personal as anyone else’s.

Woolf’s diary has been used by many scholars for information about Woolf’s life, her attitudes toward writing, and her development as a writer. However, the diary might be considered the site of Woolf’s conflict between aesthetics and politics, as well as of her inner struggle and of defining her role as an artist in the

¹²⁰ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol.1, 3.

¹²¹ This will later be explained in the context of Woolf’s reactions toward social and political changes.

¹²² Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol.1, 30.

¹²³ Woolf, 39.

¹²⁴ Around twenty times she writes, in only August 1917, about how she looks for mushrooms.

literary community. Her diary was especially appropriate to show this struggle because as a genre the diary covers both the literary and the non-literary, fiction and nonfiction, the personal and the public. Her diary might, therefore, be regarded as her most comfortable literary mode, or “a cornerstone for her total artistic undertaking.”¹²⁵ Woolf, herself, writes about the unedited nature of her diary: “Still if it were not written rather faster than the fastest typewriting, if I stopped and took thought, it would never be written at all; & the advantage of the method is that it sweeps up accidentally several stray matters which I exclude if I hesitated, but which are the diamonds of the dustheap.”¹²⁶ The form allows her to remember everything and to write without giving privilege to certain events, though her diary occupies a sort of middle path, recounting some details of everyday life, omitting others, and recording some workings of her mind, while she deliberately left out others. The subject matter is equally varied.

Though the diary in its very nature is appropriate for showing all types of struggle that Woolf went through, why she needed to keep a diary helps us understand her concerns about life and some other subjects. It might serve several purposes; she says she keeps diaries “to get rid of the fidgets, to have a record of her life, to provide fodder for the memoirs she intended to write, to explore writing, and to explore her many selves.”¹²⁷ She might have had an idea in her mind that the diary would make a vital contribution to modernist artistic practice, with its fragmented presentation of life and time – in other words, capturing real life, as the modernist writers prioritize. That the diary expresses life without any climaxes or centers I will discuss later in this study in the context of Woolf’s modernist concerns in the diary.¹²⁸

Woolf’s diary is significant for an analysis of her early inspirations for each novel; it also illuminates how Woolf employs some literary techniques in her nonfiction, especially in her diary, similar to her fiction. In the midst of the daily concerns that she frequently discusses, she occasionally drops an image that might easily be found in one of her novels. Her portrayal of women’s daily lives – perhaps

¹²⁵ Judy Simons, *Diaries and Journals of Literary Women*, 170.

¹²⁶ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol.1, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), 233-34.

¹²⁷ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 5, 335.

¹²⁸ See chapter four for Woolf’s use of literary techniques to capture the moment.

defined as a thorough portrait of daily life for late Victorian women, mostly monotonous and shallow – is an important subject for Woolf’s fiction. Diaries already contain these subjects – some much earlier than they appear in her fiction – and might be considered important literary texts. She writes in her diary, “Indeed most of life escapes, now I come to think of it; the texture of the ordinary day.”¹²⁹ It is not awkward, then, to claim that her narrative style began in the diary and was later fitted to her fiction.¹³⁰ The diary is thus a form of discovery, like her essays and novels. On the other hand, Woolf’s novels should be re-analyzed in the light of her remarks in her diary, because a study of the diary entries can give us insight into new interpretations of the novels.

Diary in its Unique Form in the East and Islamic Geography

As discussed earlier in this study, the emergence and the development of the diary in the West have had its own form including motives and style. The diary tradition in Eastern societies does follow the same track as in the West, which does not necessarily mean that it does not have its unique principles and forms. Early in the tenth century, *Nikki* [diary] in Japanese writing tradition existed. While these diaries held similarities with the daily records kept by Chinese government officials, there were private and literary diaries that appeared and improved in the Heian Period (749-1192). Ki no Tsurayuki’s *Tosa Diary*,¹³¹ “describing the return to Kyoto of a governor of Tosa Province, was probably written in the year of 936, from notes on the voyage.”¹³² A very important diary written by Murasaki Shikibu is another early example of diary-keeping practice in the East. The *Nikki* [of Lady Murasaki]¹³³ is still considered the chief source of information about the author of *The Tale of*

¹²⁹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 298.

¹³⁰ A remarkable example of this connection between Woolf’s fiction and nonfiction works is given by H. Porter Abbott, who argues that Woolf’s *Night and Day* is the moment of transformation in Woolf’s style, and this transformation can be seen in her diary. H. Porter Abbott, “Old Virginia and the Night Writer: The Origins of Woolf’s Narrative Meander”, in *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women’s Diaries*, ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia A. Huff (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 236–51.

¹³¹ Ki No Tsurayuki, *The Tosa Diary* (VT: Tuttle Publishing, 2005).

¹³² Donald Keene, *Anthology of Japanese Literature: From the Earliest Era to the Mid-nineteenth Century* (NY: Grove Press, 1955), 82.

¹³³ Murasaki Shikibu, *Diary of Lady Murasaki* (London: Penguin Classics, 2005).

Genji.¹³⁴ Written from 978 to 1015, the diary gives a vivid and delightful portrayal of life at the court when Heian culture was at its height.¹³⁵ Besides, as Haruo Shiran reports in *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of "The Tale of Genji,"* "the description of Emperor Reizei's visit to Genji's estate corresponds almost image for image – the main residence, the boats, the costumes, the dances – with the passage in Murasaki Shikibu's diary describing Emperor Ichijo's visit to Michinaga's residence."¹³⁶

In his *Japanese Poetic Diaries*, Earl Miner marks "the frequent use of poems, the breaking away from the daily entry as a formal device, and stylistic heightening" as the "chief symptoms of Japanese diary literature from classical to modern times."¹³⁷ Miner also mentions that diaries attempt an "expression of the self" as opposed to a "search for the self."¹³⁸ Miner's account on the general characteristics of diary in Japanese literature is significant since it shows how each society has its unique form of diary-keeping practice. It is noteworthy to pay attention to "expression of the self" as the leading motive for keeping diaries in Japanese tradition, contrary to "search for self" as the essential motive of many diarists in the West.

The use of autobiographical information in fictional texts in Japanese literature and in Western literature are different. In the West, especially at the beginning of the twentieth century and onwards, a literary work is regarded as an autonomous, free production untied to its circumstances of composition, whereas in Japanese literature there is a narrow margin between truth and fiction as we see in *The Tosa Diary*, where the woman who is the narrator-diarist, comments: "I do not set down these words, nor did I compose the poem out of mere love of writing. Surely both in China and Japan[,] art is that which is created when we are unable to suppress our feelings."¹³⁹ Through the information given in the Japanese diaries, the reader might learn what has actually happens to someone and how events affect him. That shows how Japanese diaries – and even some fictional texts including *The Tale of Genji* –

¹³⁴ Murasaki Shikibu, *The Tale of Genji* (London: Penguin Classics, 2002).

¹³⁵ Keene, *Anthology of Japanese Literature*, 145.

¹³⁶ Haruo Shiran, *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of The 'Tale of Genji'* (CA: Stanford UP, 1987), 221.

¹³⁷ Earl Miner, *Japanese Poetic Diaries* (CA: University of California Press, 1969), 7.

¹³⁸ Miner, 42.

¹³⁹ Qtd in Miner, 7.

are based on actual autobiographical events. While a literary work true to its author's life sounds very Japanese, it sounds to some extent un-Western; this difference shows that each society has its unique idea of art and literature.

The emergence and the development of diary tradition in Islamic societies is important in that the main focus of this study, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, was a member of a society whose dynamics were much shaped by Islamic thought and principles.¹⁴⁰ Therefore, in order to understand his diary better we should carefully examine the emergence and the development of diary tradition in Islamic societies. After this analysis, Tanpınar's motives on keeping his diary and the form he chose to organize it will give us some ideas on his mental transformation. I deliberately mention transformation and diary-keeping practice together since Tanpınar, as an intellectual supposedly from an Islamic society, followed an atypical path from the usual diary-keeping practice in Islamic societies. Therefore, an analysis of his diary, form and context, demonstrates significant clues about the modernization and Westernization process in Turkey. He started writing his diary in 1953 when he was in Paris, which shows likely Western influence on his inception of diary-keeping. His diary is full of remarks that he did not share with his companions; his ambitions and misdeeds recorded in the diary are almost never seen in Islamic diaries.

Diary tradition in Islamic societies has a unique interpretation connected to some fundamental teachings of Islam. In "A Private Reading of André Gide's *Public Journal*," Orhan Pamuk notes on the diary tradition in Islamic societies: "Diaries have probably being kept without any Western influence in many parts of the Islamic world. For the most part the authors have kept these diaries for their own use, for recording and remembering. They were not kept with any idea for posterity [...]."¹⁴¹ George Makdisi shows the influence of Islamic teachings on diary-keeping tradition in his article, "The Diary in Islamic Geography." He mentions how he came across a fragment of an historical document treating events in Baghdad for a brief interval in the eleventh century; after deciphering the passages, he found some early details

¹⁴⁰ Born in 1901, the last years of declining Ottoman Empire, Tanpınar was a member of a society in which cultural inclinations were still much influenced by Islamic thought and teachings.

¹⁴¹ Orhan Pamuk, "A Private Reading of André Gide's *Public Journal*," *Social Research* 71, no: 3 (Fall 2004): 680.

about Ibn Aqil, a Muslim intellectual who lived from 1041 to 1119 in Baghdad.¹⁴² Makdisi values the documents because first, they provide intimate details unavailable elsewhere,¹⁴³ and more importantly for this study, they were “of importance in itself as the earliest extant diary. The fragment has 16 folios. The first item is dated the 1st of Shawwal, 460 [3 August 1068, AD] and the last the 14th of Dhu’l-Qa’da, 461 [4 September 1069, AD]. This fragment consists mostly of the diarist’s personal observations and experiences.”¹⁴⁴ After the publication of the fragment, Makdisi concluded that the autobiographical diary of Ibn Banna (1005-1079) was not “an isolated phenomenon peculiar to him alone, but was rather the product of a wide-spread practice not only in the eleventh century but also in the preceding one, with its origins hidden further back still.”¹⁴⁵ In the eleventh century, the scholar and traveler Ibn Battuta’s¹⁴⁶ account of his journey of 75 thousand miles including a pilgrimage to Mecca, was a significant text, especially well-known by Western scholars and much given as an example of a travel book written in the Islamic geography.

For a text to be considered as a diary, it needs to have dates and information about the writer; in other words, some autograph sources. Even back in the eleventh century in Islamic geography there were diaries, with who-is-who information, proving that a diary tradition existed. Ibn Aqil’s, Ibn Banna’s, and Ibn Battuta’s diaries clearly show that Islamic societies already had a diary-keeping tradition even though the motives, forms, and interpretation substantially differ from those in the West. To understand the proliferation of the autograph sources in Islamic societies and its unique interpretation, we should refer to the field of Islamic religious knowledge, including the science of Hadith. The other source is the Qur’an. Together, the Hadith and the Qur’an make up the sacred scripture of Islam.

¹⁴² George Makdisi, “The Diary in Islamic Geography,” in *History and Theory* 25, no: 2 (May 1986): 174.

¹⁴³ The intimate information given in the fragments, Makdisi reports, is “connected with the *cause celebre* of Ibn Aqil. In 1072, after five years of hiding from his hostile pursuers, Ibn ‘Aqil was to sign a retraction abjuring his ties with Mu’talim, a heretical philosophical-theological movement, as well as his veneration for the great mystic Hallaj, who was accused of heresy and crucified in 922.” (Makdisi, 173).

¹⁴⁴ Makdisi, 174.

¹⁴⁵ Makdisi, 174.

¹⁴⁶ A Muslim Moroccan explorer well known for his travels and itineraries. (For a recent Turkish translation of the diary, see *Ibn Battuta Seyahatnamesi*, 2 Vols., trans. A. Sait Aykut (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010).

A hadith is a record of deeds or words of the Prophet Muhammad. They are mostly taken as religious teachings; however, they have a methodology and a discipline, which influenced especially Muslim societies on ontological and epistemological grounds. A hadith consists of two parts: the first contains the names of the persons who transmitted the report to one another; this part is called the *isnad*, meaning the “chain of transmission” to establish the trustworthiness of the report. The second part is the statement itself, the text of substance (the *matn*) of the report. The hadith criticism consists in ascertaining the names and circumstance of transmitters in order to investigate when and where the transmitters lived, whether there were any acquaintances between the provider and the transmitter; and more importantly if they were reliable, truthful, and accurate in their transmission of the texts. It is not wrong to say that historiography owes its existence in Islam to a significant extent to the principles of this hadith criticism. Dates of birth and death were of the first importance in determining if one transmitter was contemporary with another.

George Makdisi establishes a connection between hadith criticism and diary writing. A graduate student of hadith, he exemplifies, kept notes day by day, or frequently within the month, gathering in his own town, or in his travels to the various cities of Islam. The student was interested in collecting hadiths and also in acquiring an extensive knowledge of the masters of hadith, their dates of birth and death, and as much information as possible on the course of their careers. It is therefore understandable, Makdisi claims, that “they keep notes and records which, in the course of time, developed into well-kept diaries, which some of them continued to keep after attaining the mastership.”¹⁴⁷

Hadith methodology gives us some ideas about how diary-keeping tradition might have emerged in Islamic societies: It was much earlier than the Western cultural influence on the East. As mentioned earlier, Muslim diarists tended to keep diaries which include travel notes [Al-Rihla] and personal opinions on some events. Apart from these notes, its purpose is often to encounter and record many good deeds so that it is transferred to other people. Although we do not see much confession,

¹⁴⁷ Makdisi, “The Diary in Islamic Geography,” 178.

publicized or written, because of important teachings of Islam. An incident including the Prophet's attitude gives us some clues on the lack of public confession of misdeeds:

A man from the Aslam tribe came to Abu Bakr [a senior companion and the father-in-law of the Prophet, and the first Caliph following the Prophet's death] and said to him, "I have committed adultery." Abu Bakr said to him, "Have you mentioned this to anyone else?" He said, "No." Abu Bakr said to him, "Then cover it up with the veil of Allah. Allah accepts tawba [repentance] from his slaves." His self was still unsettled, so he went to Umar ibn al-Khattab [a companion of the Prophet and the second Caliph]. He told him the same as he had said to Abu Bakr, and Umar told him the same as Abu Bakr had said to him. His self was still not settled so he went to the [Prophet] and said to him, "I have committed adultery," insistently. [The Prophet] turned away from him three times. Each time [the Prophet] turned away from him until it became too much [...].¹⁴⁸

In another hadith, Prophet Muhammad discourages public exposition of sins. Abu Hurairah reports that the Prophet said,

Every one of my followers will be forgiven except those who expose (openly) their wrongdoings. An example of this is that of a man who commits a sin at night which Allah has covered for him, and in the morning, he would say (to people): "I committed such and such sin last night," while Allah had kept it a secret. During the night Allah has covered it up but in the morning he tears up the cover provided by Allah Himself.¹⁴⁹

Surely, these principles of Islam are based on concealing the sins of one's own and of other people. The Quran says: "O ye who believe! Shun much suspicion; for lo! Some suspicion is a crime. And spy not, neither backbite one another. Would one of

¹⁴⁸ See <http://sunnah.com/bukhari> for the statements of Prophet Muhammad.

¹⁴⁹ <http://sunnah.com/bukhari>

you love to eat flesh of his dead brother? Ye abhor that (so abhor the other)! And keep your duty (to Allah). Lo! Allah is relenting, Merciful.”¹⁵⁰

If concealing sins is so much emphasized in Islam, why diary-keeping was developed is another question. As mentioned earlier, in Eastern societies, diary writing was mostly involved in incidents, travel notes, and such. However, it does not necessarily mean that there was no room for the self in the diary tradition. To see the development of this tradition in Islamic societies, we should consider the verbal statements. As we see in the Western tradition of diary-keeping, confession – though not written – played in Islamic societies a significance role in the development of the diary tradition. In the West, we see, throughout the Middle Ages, diary-keeping was restricted to religious communities, practiced as a preparation for confession. It was first all about the idea of writing one’s sins down in preparation for confession, and preventing oneself from doing things one would be ashamed to tell people. In Islamic societies, it was neither written nor publicized, but one’s admitting his or her sin to Allah. In the fortieth section of the Qur’an, Allah wills, “They say: Our Lord! Twice hast Thou made us die, and twice hast Thou made us live. Now we confess our sins. Is there any way to go out?”¹⁵¹ In Islamic understanding, one’s confessing his or her sins is considered as a requirement for the absolution. Therefore, Muslims are encouraged to be aware of how they spend their lives, to question their attitudes and behaviors. So while the tradition of confession was both oral and written in the West, it was supposed to lead to self-awareness for the members of Islamic societies. This surely affected the diary-keeping tradition and led Muslims not to keep records of their sins and misdeeds so that they are not publicized but to write their observations on the events they witnessed.

As we took Ibn Banna’s autograph manuscript as the earliest model for a diary, we can surmise some information about the early diaries written in Islamic societies of the era. It is kept according to the Islamic calendar, based on the lunar month. It deals with events and biographical notices, with some annalistic characteristics. It served its author as an historical record which he used in his other works. Though

¹⁵⁰ “The Private Apartments,” 49:12 (All the translations of the verses in Quran are by Marmaduke Pickthall, *The Glorious Qur’an* (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2002).

¹⁵¹ “The Forgiver,” 40:11.

Ibn Banna's account reached us, it was an exception; the early Islamic diaries, Makdisi concludes, were not meant to be published. "Regarding members of his own socio-religious group, [a person] recorded matters which were not meant for the eyes of members of other affiliations;"¹⁵² this completely affected the future of diary writing in Islamic tradition, among which the diary tradition in Turkish society was less popular than that in Western societies.

There were diaries written for the public, surely. In the course of time, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, we see some autobiographical texts targeted at a particular audience.¹⁵³ In Egypt, for example, Rifa'a al-Tahtawi's *A Paris Profile*¹⁵⁴ and Taha Hussein's *The Days*¹⁵⁵ are worth mentioning. Influenced by the French Enlightenment, Tahtawi "managed to make precise observations of the modern world as well as the ancient, and acquired a wide knowledge of the institutions and customs of the greatest and most flourishing society of his day."¹⁵⁶ His attitude toward the West is found in his journal, *A Paris Profile*, which he kept during his five-year stay in France, especially in Paris. He recorded the Parisian life as well as some accurate observations of the manners and customs of the modern French. Translated into Turkish shortly after its publication in Arabic and published in English also under the title of *An Imam in Paris: Al Tahtawi's Visit to France (1826-1831)*, the journal describes what Tahtawi sees in the land of "infidels."

Taha Hussein's *The Days* is a good example for twentieth-century autobiographical text written in the Islamic geography. Hussein's three-part autobiography is one of the first modern Arab literary works to be acclaimed in the West. His autobiography was controversial and therefore was demanded by some groups of clerics to be removed from the school curricula since it tarnishes the image

¹⁵² Makdisi, "The Diaries in Islamic Geography," 185.

¹⁵³ The fact that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries there were diaries for the eyes of members of other affiliation show the changing growing influence of the West on the Eastern societies, in other words the pandemic waves of Western modernity.

¹⁵⁴ Rifa'a R. Al-Tahtawi, *An Imam In Paris: Al-Tahtawi's Visit To France 1826-1831*, trans. Daniel L. Newman (London: Saqi Books, 2011).

¹⁵⁵ Taha Hussein, *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts* (Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2010).

¹⁵⁶ Albert Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, 1789-1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 70.

of Al Azhar's,¹⁵⁷ where he studied for eight years and was not satisfied with the educational level and methods offered there. Similarly, Tanpınar started writing his diary and Tahtawi kept his, Taha Hussein dictated the first volume over a period of less than ten days during a stay in a small French town called Haute-Savoie.¹⁵⁸ Hussein's arrival at Al-Azhar is the end of the first volume; the second volume, published in 1940, starts where the first part ended, in Cairo. Full of narration of difficulties Hussein encountered in the big city, this volume drew reaction due to the fact that it pays a lot of attention to the educational system at Al-Azhar, and described it as hypocritical and corrupt. He was accused of heresy; as a defense he wrote an article condemning the Azhar and its vice-chancellor and demanded freedom of speech. Written in France in 1939, this third volume shows Hussein's admiration of Western lecturers and of reformist ideas. Published in the book form in 1972, the third volume was quite much involved in political interests: he asserts no one can be politically neutral, and that this would be hypocritical. He finished his third volume and thus the autobiography with the lines "I am not one who falls for things so madly/ That I cannot help myself,/ Not even sultan is for me an [a]mir."¹⁵⁹

Although in the earlier autobiographical works in Islamic geography, personal experiences were not a part of the text but rather some information about the events and the author's opinion on them, in the course of time, especially since Islamic societies began to be under strong Western influence, the form of the diary changed and came closer to modern diaries of the West. From Ibn Aqil to Tahtawi and to Hussein, there was a clear shift in the form and context of diary-keeping, as the influence of Westernization prevailed over the Eastern customs and traditions.

¹⁵⁷ In 2010, the Minister of Education of Egypt published a press release titled, "Circulation of Information is No Luxury, But a Right for Egyptians: Will The Minister of Education Start Office By Eliminating Taha Hussein's Novel "The Days" from Curricula? See <http://www.anhri.net/en/reports/2010/pr0110.shtml>

¹⁵⁸ It seems to be a modern tradition to start keeping diaries in France, especially for those from Eastern societies. Or, it shows how Turkish and Egyptian scholars and writers were enormously influenced by the French movements, and the common ground that Turkey and Egypt share.

¹⁵⁹ Hussein, *The Days*, Vol. 3, 406.

A Genre in Turkish Literature?

Some sources of Turkish literature, especially anthologies, do not take the diary as a separate genre but rather as a subgenre subsumed under the journal. There have been several names given to the diary in Turkish. In Ottoman Turkish it was called *ruzname*, and in modern Turkish it is *günlük* or *günce*. Obviously, there is a scarcity of books on diary writing in Turkish though various practices on several types of diary keeping can be seen throughout the history of Turkish literature. It is not rare to come upon comparative analyses of journal and diary-keeping in Turkish sources since explanations of diary writing seem to be – mistakenly in my opinion – given through definitions of journal writing. One of the very few sources on diary writing in Turkish is *Türk Dili Magazine*'s special issue on the diary, published in 1962 as its 127th volume. Even though it should be taken as a source because there are few corresponding texts, this special issue in fact does not give sufficient information about diary tradition in Turkey. It starts with a three-page excerpt from Atatürk's diary, continues with the editor's note, titled "Günlük Üzerine" [On Diary]. After very general information provided, three articles come in a row, the first of which is "Günlük Üzerine"¹⁶⁰ [On Diary] by Suut Kemal Yetkin; the second is Mehmet Fuat's "Günlük Konusunda"¹⁶¹ [About Diary]; and the final article, titled "Yaşadıkça Yazılan"¹⁶² [Written according to Experiences] is by Talat S. Halman. These four essays, fourteen pages in total, are almost the only information available, written in Turkish on the diary-keeping tradition in Turkey.

The scarcity of Turkish sources on diary keeping might stem from the fact that the diary has not been taken seriously as a genre in Turkish literature, whereas journals, memoirs, travel books, chronicles, and some other forms – daily or periodical writing, published or unpublished – have found widespread coverage in Turkish literary criticism. Considering the emergence and the development of the diary tradition in Islamic societies, the vast existence of travel books and memoirs rather than diaries sounds reasonable. Diary keeping has been recently welcomed, especially in the twentieth century, now that new genres have been introduced,

¹⁶⁰ Suut Kemal Yetkin, "Günlük Üzerine," in *Türk Dili* 11, no: 127 (April 1962): 428-31.

¹⁶¹ Mehmet Fuat, "Günlük Hakkında," in *Türk Dili* 11, no: 127 (April 1962):434-35.

¹⁶² Talat S. Halman, "Yaşadıkça Yazılan," in *Türk Dili* 11, no: 127 (April 1962): 436-41.

mostly by European scholars. However, it was the diary in the modern sense which is said to have been brought to Turkey from the West. For instance, we do not see the diary as a literary text in Divan literature, but *ruznames* and chronicles were widespread. Although they are often not considered diaries, chronicles such as *Silahdar Tarihi*,¹⁶³ a book of travels like Evliya Çelebi's,¹⁶⁴ or the book of embassy by Yirmisekiz Çelebi¹⁶⁵ hold some diary characteristics. In the eighteenth-century Ottoman State there were some people who were assigned to keep records of daily events, commands, and battles. Those diary-like accounts were called *şehname*, *vekayiname*, *ruzname*, or *ruznamçe*; these were all official documents and thus hard to call diaries in the modern sense; but they openly addressed the cultural trends of the day and were written for conveying or recording information. A very good example of these accounts was the *Ruzname* [diary], kept by Selim II.'s clerk Ahmed Efendi.¹⁶⁶ It is considered a significant text since it has a great deal of information on political incidents from 1792 to 1801 as well as about the Sultan's daily life and ordinary life in Istanbul.

We should also mention that the development of tradition of diary, autobiography, and travel's book in Ottoman and Turkey was relevant to the changing conditions of the Empire. In his *Osmanlı Elçileri Gözü ile Avrupa* [Europe through the Eyes of Ottoman Ambassadors], Hasan Korkut claims that the relationship between Europe and Ottoman changed in the eighteenth century dramatically. The Ottomans realized their weakness and thus needed to know Europe more closely. Defeat in wars was the most important factor in this self-awareness therefore the first information transfer from Europe was about military and defense. This changing condition of relationship between the Ottoman and the Europe caused an increase in ambassadorship and in the number of book of embassy or travel's book¹⁶⁷. The book of embassy was even considered as a genre in Turkish literature and certainly affected the diary/autobiography tradition in Turkish literature.

¹⁶³ Fındıklılı Silahdar Mehmed, *Silahdar Tarihi*, 2 Vols. (İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası, 1928).

¹⁶⁴ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 2 Vols. (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2011).

¹⁶⁵ Yirmisekiz Mehmet Çelebi, *Paris'te Bir Osmanlı Sefiri: Yirmisekiz Mehmet Çelebi'nin Fransa Seyahatnamesi*, ed. Şevket Rado (İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2006).

¹⁶⁶ Sıratip Ahmed Efendi, *Rûznâme* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1993).

¹⁶⁷ Hasan Korkut, *Osmanlı Elçileri Gözü ile Avrupa* (İstanbul: Gökkuşbuğu, 2007), 13.

Even though the diary in the Western style came in after the Tanzimat in the 1840s, it has improved very little in its recent form, especially compared to that in the West. The first acclaimed modern diary is Ali Bey's *Seyahat Jurnalı*¹⁶⁸ [Travel's Journal]; instead of deriving a Turkish term for diary, Ali Bey borrowed the French word, *Journal*, and used that as the title of his diary.¹⁶⁹ However, the term *jurnal* did not work well, so Turkish words like *ruzname* and *hatıra defter*[daybook or diary] were used for a while. After various forms of *gün* [day] such as *gündem* [agenda], *gündelik* [daily] were tried, *günlük* [diary] remained as the common term for diary.

There would be hundreds of important autobiographical works to mention if *ruznames* and travel's books are taken into account; therefore this study precisely focuses mostly on the twentieth-century Turkish diaries with few exceptions.¹⁷⁰ Among the diary-keepers in the twentieth century was Atatürk, who kept a diary during the Anafartalar Battle; it was published in 1943 by Türk Tarih Kurumu [Turkish Historical Society]. He was an important diarist, writing daily; in his entries there is an enormous account about the Independence War and the Revolutions that he planned and put into effect. There are other diary examples in the twentieth century: Halil Halid's *The Diary of a Turk*;¹⁷¹ unpublished diaries of İbnülemin

¹⁶⁸ Though Ali Bey's travel book is considered as the first diary, it is closer to the journal form since as critics claim that he did not write his diary daily but some time later in his life by putting his diary entries together. This work can be found in second-hand booksellers: Direktör Ali Bey, *Seyahat Jurnalı* (İstanbul: A. Asaduryan Matbaası, 1896).

¹⁶⁹ In the given period, the foreign names of genres were taken without finding any equivalences; theatre (tiyatro), drama (dram), comedy (komedi), and novel (roman) are the well-know examples.

¹⁷⁰ Otherwise, there is a great variety of memoirs and travel books that deserve to be noted; one of these is *Baburnama* which may be considered as having a form similar to diary; born prince of Fergana in Transoxiana (now Uzbekistan and Tajikistan), Zahiruddin Muhammad Babur (1483-1530) was an important emperor, who expanded the boundaries of the Timurid cultural sphere and founded in 1526 the Mughal Empire of India. Some critics accept Babur's memoirs as the first and – some say the only – true autobiography in Islamic literature. See Zahiruddin Muhammad Babur, introduction to *The Baburnama: Memoirs of Babur, Prince and Emperor*, ed. Wheeler M. Thackston (NY: The Modern Library, 2002), xvii. He kept a written record of his life. His motivation for writing his memoir is worth mentioning since it may give us an idea of diary-keeping prevailing then. Even though he does not clearly express his motivation, he gives clues: "I have not written all this to complain: I have simply written the truth. I do not intend by what I have written to compliment myself: I have simply set down exactly what happened. Since I have made it a point in this history to write the truth of every matter and to set down no more than the reality of every event, as a consequence I have reported every good and evil I have seen of father and brother and set down the actuality of every fault and virtue of relative and stranger. May the reader excuse me; may the listener take me not to task" (Babur, *The Baburname*, xviii). See also archive.org for the full account.

¹⁷¹ Published in 1903, dedicated to the memory of E.W.[J] Gibb, Halil Halid's book of travel was perhaps the first English-written account by a Turk. In the preface to his book, he mentions how he was often asked by his English acquaintances "to write a book on Turkey from a Turkish point of

Mahmud Kemal İnal, kept between 1902 and 1957; Ömer Seyfettin's *Ruzname* [Diary];¹⁷² Cemal Süreyya's *Günler* [The Days]¹⁷³; Salah Birsell's *Günlük* [Diary]¹⁷⁴; Suut Kemal Yetkin's *Günlerin Götürdüğü* [What Days Have Destroyed];¹⁷⁵ Nurullah Ataç's *Günce* [Diary]; Tomris Uyar's *Gün Dökümü* [The Day's Inventory]; Nuri Pakdil's *Edebiyat Kulesi* [The Tower of Literature]; and Oğuz Atay's *Günlük* [Diary] are the best known.

All of these diaries mentioned have their unique style and methodology for giving information and reflecting the author's opinion on events. In the course of the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries in Turkey, diary writing kept up with the changing milieu; both the content and the style were much under the influence of modernization. Beşir Fuad and his writings are a good example of the social transformation and its influence on contemporary texts. He was very with his writings: from the beginning of 1887 until his suicide in February of the same year, he published 26 articles, some of which were published in *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, a best-selling journal then. He committed suicide with no prior emotional or physical clues given to anyone around him.

The reasons for his suicide may be various: as Orhan Okay points out in his book *Beşir Fuad: İlk Türk Pozitivist ve Naturalisti* [Beşir Fuad: The First Turkish Positivist and Naturalist] that he was depressed with his life and tired of everything that he was dealing with.¹⁷⁶ The importance of his suicide for this study is his diary-like account that he kept during the execution. Fuad, who "dedicated his death to science"¹⁷⁷ wrote his feeling in the process of suicide: "I have done the operation

view." He mentions how he writes with a specific purpose, that is, he says, "I thought that after all a small and lightly written volume would have a larger circle of readers, and by its help I could to some extent correct some of the mistaken ideas prevailing in England about Turkey. Therefore I began to write this little volume in the form of a book of travel, and I now bring it out under the title of *The Diary of a Turk*. By this means I have been able to talk a little on many matters connected with Turkey." Halid, *The Diary of a Turk* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1903), v-vi.

¹⁷² Some of the diary entries were published in *Türk Dili Magazine*, No: 127, 586-90.

¹⁷³ A recent edition: Cemal Süreyya, *Günler* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2013).

¹⁷⁴ First published in *Beş Sanat* [Five Arts] Magazine in 1950, selections from Birsell's diary can be found in Muzaffer Uyguner, *Salah Birsell: Yaşamı, Sanatı, Şiirleri, Günlükleri, Romanı, Denemeleri, Tarihleri ile Yapıtlarından Seçmeler* (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar, 1991).

¹⁷⁵ The first sentence of the text reads, "the day WWII ended, preparations began for the third one." Suut Kemal Yetkin, *Günlerin Götürdüğü* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1965), 1.

¹⁷⁶ Orhan Okay, *Beşir Fuad: İlk Türk Pozitivist ve Naturalisti* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2012), 82.

¹⁷⁷ In a letter to his friend from the School of Medicine, Fuad wrote before his suicide: "As a person who dedicated the most valuable time of my life and most of the faculty of my mind to the

with no pain. As it bleeds, it hurts a bit. My sister-in-law came downstairs while it bleeds; I said ‘I am writing so I have closed the door’; fortunately she has not come in. I cannot imagine a better death. I raised my hand so that it bleeds; I feel the stupor.”¹⁷⁸ Writing in the process of suicide shows the various practices of autobiographical writing as well as how transitions in social, cultural, and religious dynamics affect the act of writing.

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who began to keep a diary in Paris in 1953, was among those who projected themselves in written texts, especially in an autobiographical form. We cannot say that he was writing in the traditional diary-keeping forms of Turkey, and not at all like those in Islamic societies; he imitated the European diary tradition by mentioning his inner conflicts and depressions, his hatred and love, almost everything about himself, uncensored. It is ironic to see that Tanpınar, who was an expert in the field of Turkish Literature, old and modern, and who was aware of literary techniques, inherited and borrowed, ignored the conventional forms of diary keeping in Turkey and imitated the Western forms. That shows Tanpınar’s position in the East facing West.

Tanpınar’s “Great Economy”

In one of his published correspondences, Tanpınar says, “what upsets me most is that I have not kept a diary; my only advice to my young friends is that they keep diaries. A person can produce everything out of himself, out of his life. Keeping a diary means keeping oneself in the view all the time. There is no greater economy than that.”¹⁷⁹ The given excerpt was published in *Varlık Magazine* in 1951, two years before Tanpınar began keeping a diary. He already had a certain objective in keeping a journal before he got his plan underway. He started to keep a diary in 1953; it is important to mention the year since he was in Europe then, and he most likely felt there the increasing significance of the diary as a genre. Among the published diaries

development of science, I strongly desire my corpse to serve science as well. I recommend you display my corpse so that it benefits students.” (Okay, 84).

¹⁷⁸ Okay, 70.

¹⁷⁹ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 308.

in Europe then were Montesquieu's *Mes Pensees* [My Thoughts]¹⁸⁰ published in full in 1943; André Gide's "forbidden"¹⁸¹ *Journals*,¹⁸² the first volume of which was already published then; and more importantly Valéry's *Les Cahiers* [Notebooks]¹⁸³ became available in 1945. In all likelihood, in 1953, when Tanpınar was in Europe, he encountered those journals, especially Valéry's, and put some thought on starting one.

In his "Türk Edebiyatı'nda Cerayanlar" [Currents in Turkish Literature],¹⁸⁴ Tanpınar mentions André Gide's *Les Nourritures Terrestres* [The Fruits of the Earth]¹⁸⁵ and shows his interest in Gide and his works. It is obvious that Tanpınar read Gide's *Journal* and was influenced by him. The influence of Valéry and his works on Tanpınar was enormous. Tanpınar's closest student, Mehmet Kaplan, mentions Valéry's influence on Tanpınar's poetry. Kaplan claims that Tanpınar "conceived the importance of working wisely and consciously thanks to Valéry."¹⁸⁶ Tanpınar himself also mentions Valéry's influence several times, the most obvious of which was that in his well-known "Antalyalı Genç Kıza Mektup" [Letter to the Young Girl from Antalya]: "My sense of aesthetics improved after I knew Valéry."¹⁸⁷ Tanpınar explains the influence of Valéry on his poetry: "change Valéry's remark that 'someone who wants to write his dreams should be awake' to that 'I am after establishing the mood of dream in language with a full concentration and attendance.' This is my my interpretation of poetry."¹⁸⁸ Keeping a diary was then to keep a record of his life and to stare at himself from an "outer self."

There was already information about Tanpınar's life, his childhood, how he was raised, and his idea of poetry available in some published interviews; besides, his

¹⁸⁰ A recent edition in English: Charles de Montesquieu, *My Thoughts*, trans. Henry C. Clark (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2012).

¹⁸¹ André Gide's works were placed on the "Index of Forbidden Books" by The Roman Catholic Church in 1952.

¹⁸² André Gide began to keep a journal in 1889 when he was twenty; his diary entries were collected in three volumes, which were published by various publishing houses. See a recent edition: Andre Gide, *Journals*, 3 Vols., trans. Justin O'Brien (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2000).

¹⁸³ Published in five volumes, Valéry's notebooks have several editions. A recent edition of Valéry's full account: Paul Valéry, *Cahiers/Notebooks*, 5 Vols., trans. Paul Ryan (NY: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2001-2010).

¹⁸⁴ In Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, 117.

¹⁸⁵ André Gide, *The Fruits of the Earth* (New York: Peter Pauper Press, 1969).

¹⁸⁶ Mehmet Kaplan, *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2013), 14.

¹⁸⁷ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 351.

¹⁸⁸ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 351.

travels abroad in 1953 and 1957 were published by himself as some excerpts from his personal journals.¹⁸⁹ The rest of his notebooks and some notes taken on pieces of paper were left unpublished; among these notebooks was one dated 1953, which the editors of Tanpınar's diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, claim that Tanpınar was keeping as an "autocue."¹⁹⁰ Tanpınar began to keep his diary in 21 April 1953, in the third week after his arrival in Paris. The other two notebooks were used at the same time, starting from July on. The fourth one was kept from 1954 to 1956; the fifth was from 1956 to 1960. The first page of the last notebook was dated 26 July 1960 while the last entry was recorded thirteen days before his death.¹⁹¹

Since it was published in 2007, Tanpınar's diary has not been analyzed much although there were several discussions, mostly on his personality, because it was full of Tanpınar's remarks which disappointed his audience. In the next chapter I will give a broad analysis; therefore, I suffice to say for now that it shows how literary communities have preferred to indulge in creating a discussion on what Tanpınar says about other people rather than taking the diary as a literary work, as another text written by Tanpınar. Whereas, there are various important points in the diary such as his impressions, plans, novel and poetry drafts, his inner conflicts, his feelings and opinions about his surroundings, depressive moments, and even his sexual desires; all are recorded in the diary in passing. He made long lists of essays he planned to write and to compile in his books, some of which materialized but some remained as ideas jotted in the diary.

On the other hand, there are several remarks which might bring new interpretations to his other texts, both fiction and non-fiction. His notes on his poetry, on his characters in his novels, and his inspirations are all recorded in Tanpınar's personal account. For example, the diary shifts the idea that Tanpınar considered *Huzur*¹⁹² [A Mind at Peace¹⁹³] as his most significant text to *Saatleri Ayarlama*

¹⁸⁹ See Tanpınar, 235-85. A section titled "Paris Tesadüfleri" [Paris Happenstances] were already published in 1958, much earlier than the publication of Tanpınar's diary in 2007.

¹⁹⁰ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 6.

¹⁹¹ We have the last entries of Tanpınar thirteen days before his death and for Woolf four days before she drowned herself; having very recent accounts of them provides a good chance to analyze their insights before their deaths.

¹⁹² Serialized in *Cumhuriyet Newspaper* between 22 February and 2 June 1948, *Huzur* was published first time in book form in 1949 by Remzi Kitabevi in İstanbul. Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Huzur* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2009). All subsequent references to this book are from this edition.

*Enstitüsü*¹⁹⁴ [Time Regulation Institute¹⁹⁵]: The diary has also changed the interpretation of the major contexts in his novels from East-West conflict to economic growth and social developments. Therefore, I think most of the books and articles written on Tanpınar and his works should be rewritten or revised after the diary came out.

Another interpretation of Tanpınar's diary should be upon how it shows his depression. Some comments have been written and said about his depression portrayed in the diary: his economic condition and his opinions that women are the major focus in the diary and thus have been considered as the major factors leading him to depressive states of mind, drawing him to the edge of suicide. His diary shows us that he was short of money throughout most of his life, at least during the period he was keeping the diary. He says how poverty challenges his right to personal dignity, and destroys his personality. He says in the entry dated 8 January 1959, "I have never been that miserable, wretched, dishonored, and pitiful. My God! Please grant me 5000 liras."¹⁹⁶ About marriage and women, he gives several depressive statements in his diary: "I stick to the same dream while generations change in front of me. I wish I were married; so, the idea of individual happiness would not be a biting intention in my mind."¹⁹⁷

His economic condition and his need for a woman affected his life and caused him to feel depressed. However, the sources of Tanpınar's depression given in most of the comments are right but not the major one. The major source of his depression was the social transformation, which had a much more destructive effect on him and made him an ambivalent person, who was in the East but facing West. He lived in a transition period: he experienced the periods of the Second *Meşrutiyet* (1908-1923) [The Second Constitution] when he was seven and the foundation of the Turkish

¹⁹³ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *A Mind at Peace*, trans. Erdağ Göknar (NY: Archipelago Books, 2008).

¹⁹⁴ Serialized in *Yeni İstanbul Newspaper* between 20 June and 30 September 1954, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* was published first time in book form in 1961 by Remzi Kitabevi in İstanbul. (Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2009). All subsequent references to this book are from this edition.

¹⁹⁵ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *The Time Regulation Institute*, trans. Ender Gürol (Madison: Turko Tatar, 2001). A very recent edition by Penguin Classics: *The Time Regulation Institute*, trans. Alexander Dawe and Maureen Freely (NY: Penguin Classics, 2014).

¹⁹⁶ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 125.

¹⁹⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 62.

Republic and the revolution (1923 onwards) in his twenties. Like many others who struggled to hold traditional values but at the same time struggled to leave them behind and welcome Western cultural influence, Tanpınar, as an artist and a scholar, was well aware of this transformation and thus wrote about it but could not prevent himself from getting depressed. As Virginia Woolf's suicide is mistakenly explained by sexual abuse she experienced in her childhood, Tanpınar's depression is often associated with his poverty and sexual insatiability. However, their tragedy was similarly all about taking a stand against the epistemological break in the twentieth century.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁸ In his column in Zaman Newspaper, Selim İleri writes one sentence about the similarities between Tanpınar and Woolf. The last sentence of his article reads: "But [Woolf's] works were solely on becoming herself. In one way, she was interpreting Tanpınar's tragedy from a different culture." Selim İleri, "Bir 'Roman' için Virginia Woolf," *Zaman*, 9 November 2008.

CHAPTER 2

MISREPRESENTATION OF IDENTITY IN WOOLF AND TANPINAR'S DIARIES

The diary is taken as a more modest but more intense genre, “which sculpts life as it happens and takes up the challenge of time.”¹ It allows for change and growth, which produces a kind of freedom. Diarists, therefore, can decide by themselves on how to behave and then change the rules as they go along. Starting and stopping, writing anything desired, keeping the written text private or sharing it with intimates or publishing it all depend on the writers of the diaries. All these characteristics of diary writing, nevertheless, give diarists or the editors of the diarists some opportunities for changing the so-called objective account into a text, perhaps rather called a fiction, or into a text misrepresenting the identity of authors; instead of a direct and true account of experiences, a fictional narration of events and experiences might be given. In this section of my study, I will analyze whether Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar or the editors of their diaries turned the diaries into fictitious texts, which some entries and instructions in the preface and footnotes give clues about. This may also indicate having double or ambivalent identities in a period of social transition.

Research on diaries as fictional texts also concerns questions of audience and authenticity. Consciousness of audience indicates a writer's concern with being read by a group of people and the quality of the diary regarding artistic sensibilities. To varying degrees, both Woolf and Tanpınar expected, and in some cases planned and even oversaw, the publication of their diaries. Although each diarist's sense of audience is distinct, each is conscious of a reader, actual or imagined, and they crafted their entries accordingly.

The diary is often studied as a source of biographical information about a famous author rather than as a literary text in itself. However, analyzing Woolf's and Tanpınar's use of images, symbols, allusions, and recurring themes that convey their private thoughts and experiences might be a new approach to reading and interpreting the diaries. However, literary motivation, which most likely stems from

¹ Lejeune, *On Diary*, 173.

the diarist's intention of publication, somehow clashes with the authenticity of the document since a diary is either a spontaneously produced text or a carefully crafted one. Therefore, Paul Bowles defines keeping a journal as "making faces at oneself in the mirror," and comments, "if it's oneself, it's obviously a farce. If it's for publication, then it's immediately censored [...]"² As Bowles asserts, it obviously leads to a crisis because the definition of the diary as literature, as Elizabeth Podnieks points out in her *Daily Modernism*, "necessarily hinges on its conception as an aesthetic work; but if the diary in question is artistically motivated, it cannot be a diary per se."³ A diary might be revised and edited for the sake of audience, but then, it may not even be called a diary after all. Diaries might be welcomed for their articulation of an author's chronology, for what they reveal the character of the diarist, and for the social and historical phenomena of the time; however, its dilatory nature may make the reading less attractive and its lack of formal unity might cause the work not to be considered as a classic realist text either. Those with literary qualities on the other hand might be considered as works of art but raise questions of authenticity.

Many studies on diaries have raised theoretical distinctions between the "pure" diaries and consciously produced ones: while the former is often considered authentic the latter is considered a conscious production and even called insincere. In his *Private Chronicles*, Robert A. Fothergill comments on the likely corruption of utterance: "To endeavor to write well, to consider the formal structure of the book one is writing, to address oneself to a putative reader or think of publication, to edit or rewrite one's own entries – all these practices appear to corrupt the pure spontaneity of utterance that should mark the 'true' diary."⁴ Fothergill furthers his discussion by bringing a different perspective to the relationship between diary-writing and literary forms and claims that "the major achievements in diary-writing [...] have been produced out of a conscious respect for the diary as a literary form."⁵ While there are thousands of people who keep diaries, the diaries of artists and authors are written with a heightened consciousness of literary form, and thus those

² Bowles, *In Touch: The Letters of Paul Bowles*, 380

³ Podnieks, *Daily Modernism*, 4.

⁴ Robert A. Fothergill, *Private Chronicles* (Cambridge: Oxford UP, 1974), 40.

⁵ Fothergill, 40

diarists might be aware of the aesthetic opportunities of the diary. Lynn Z. Bloom, in the chapter titled “‘I Write for Myself and Strangers’: Private Diaries as Public Documents,” holds a similar point of view and asserts that “for a professional writer there are no private writings [...]. The writer’s mind is variably alert to the concerns of an audience and shapes the text, even letters and diaries, to accommodate these.”⁶ Bloom regards the audience-oriented considerations of authors in writing as a habit: “Once a writer, like an actor, is audience-oriented, such considerations as telling a good story, getting the sounds and the rhythm right, supplying sufficient detail for another’s understanding, can never be excluded. All writers know this; they attend to such matters through design and habit. A professional writer is never off-duty.”⁷

It is traditionally considered that diaries are private records of people’s lives. This idea of privacy is not restricted to a particular society or geographical district, but from the eighth-century Heian period in Japan to twentieth-century Western societies, diaries have often been considered secret accounts. In contrast to private, hidden diaries, autobiographies, if considered within the boundary of a separate genre are often written for a possible audience, like a novel. As discussed in the previous chapter, this distinction is not rigid but holds true in many cases. However, some texts, considered as diaries in theory and genre can be seen as autobiographies or even be read as a fictional text. Even though many scholars take the diary-like autobiographies – or autobiography-like diaries – to discuss how boundaries of genres can be blurred, my aim in this study is to draw attention to how diaries are converted into fictional texts for a specific purpose, that is, to project an identity.

We cannot say that the diary is rarely considered as a fiction and as an aesthetic work. Many critics see it as partially distinct from and partially similar to autobiography and to the novel, especially when it comes to discussing textual production and character construction. Although the diary is often considered a private text, especially compared to the journal and other personal writings, this distinction has been blurred in the meantime, and many diaries show the characteristics of journals. Arthur Ponsonby mentions that “the word *Journal* should

⁶ Lynn Z. Bloom, “‘I Write for Myself and Strangers’: Private Diaries as Public Documents,” in *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women’s Diaries*, ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and C.A. Huff (Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 24.

⁷ Bloom, 24.

be reserved for the purely objective historical or scientific records, and the word *Diary* for the personal memoranda, notes and expressions of opinion.”⁸ Ponsonby’s argument gives specific claims for each form of writing, while Thomas Mallon says that “two terms are in fact hopelessly muddled [...] perhaps because of journal’s links to the newspaper trade and diary’s to *dear*, the latter seems more intimate than the former.”⁹ Judy Simons, on the other hand, argues that writers do not in fact consider the distinctions: “Although strictly speaking ‘diary’ can be used as a generic term to cover both a daily record of engagements and more intimate writing, while ‘journal’ tends to refer more specifically to a personal chronicle, writers themselves do not always keep to such nice distinctions.”¹⁰

The historical definition of the terms gives some ideas on how there is indeed no strict dividing line. Podnieks draws attention to the Oxford English Dictionary and reports that while the term journal was first recorded in 1355-56 as “a service-book containing the day-hours: Diurnal,” the definition changed several times, first in 1540 as “a daily record of commercial transactions, entered as they occur, in order to the keeping of accounts [...] a daybook,” and in 1552, “A book containing notices concerning the daily stages of a route and other information for travelers, itinerary,” in 1565, “A record of public events or of a series of public transactions, noted down as they occur day by day or at successive dates, without historical discussions.” The notion of privacy started to appear in 1610: “A record of events or matters of personal interest kept by any one for his own use, in which entries are made day by day, or as the events occur.” The important point about the changing definition, Podnieks mentions, “is the privileging of the journal’s value over the diary” as the definition entry considers the journal “more elaborate than a diary.” And finally in 1728, the journal started to be considered as a synonym for newspaper. The Oxford Dictionary puts it as “A daily newspaper or other publication; hence, by extension, Any periodical publication containing news or dealing with matters of current interest in any particular sphere. Now often called specifically a *public journal*.”¹¹ Journal is almost two hundred years older than diary; however, the two terms are

⁸ Ponsonby, *English Diaries*, 5.

⁹ Qtd. in Podnieks, *Daily Modernism*, 14.

¹⁰ Judy Simons, *Diaries and Journals of Literary Women from Fanny Burney to Virginia Woolf*, 7.

¹¹ Podnieks, *Daily Modernism*, 14.

often used interchangeably. Even though we call the compilation of entries “the diary,” they hold some characteristics of the journal.

Especially in the last years of his lifetime, Tanpınar wrote in his notebook his opinions on the social issues regarding the changing political circumstances. He writes about Adnan Menderes,¹² the 1960 coup in Turkey,¹³ the Democrat Party,¹⁴ the role of the military in politics,¹⁵ the Kurdish question,¹⁶ and many other issues. While he was keeping his diary as an autocue in which he took some notes to remember later, he was also writing his journal-like entries comprising of news¹⁷ and his opinions. Virginia Woolf’s diary holds some features of journal; Woolf jots down on Jews, the Nazi regime, the Second World War, and comments on many occurrences, most of which show her reactions to changes in society.

In order to understand whether Woolf and Tanpınar turned their supposedly-objective accounts into fictional texts, some aspects of the diaries should be considered. The first one is the concern for audience: if Woolf and Tanpınar took audience-oriented notes and planned the publication of their diaries, this would inevitably lead them to have some aesthetic concerns in the entries. Any literary and aesthetic motivation of the writers in the diaries would result in raising doubts and questions on the matter of authenticity; because, instead of writing true accounts, Woolf and Tanpınar would incline to keep their aesthetic concerns and create fictional selves and texts about themselves. To understand how authentic the diaries are, we should observe if the diarists refer to or imply any audience and if they organize their diaries with some literary motivations.

About authenticity, two points should be considered. The first is about Tanpınar and Woolf themselves. A close analysis of the distinguished use of language and the ambivalent presentation of the content in the diaries would raise questions about authenticity because the supposedly true personal account might become a fictional text representing a fictional self. The second consideration is editorial interference

¹² Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 102, 184, 195, 209, 219, 310.

¹³ Enginün and Kerman, 183.

¹⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 193, 217, 304, 327.

¹⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 325.

¹⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 267.

¹⁷ In his entry, dated 10 August 1961, Tanpınar writes, “An American plane with seventy-two passengers was hijacked to Cuba” (Enginün and Kerman, 318).

since it is likely that the editor of a diary might study the manuscript according to his or her stereotypes or prejudices and in some cases according to the image that he or she wants to project. In that case the editor holds a great deal of power, and a distorted version of a text is possible. Analyzing the diaries of Woolf and Tanpınar in terms of whether the texts are authentic or fictitious require a close look at the editing of the texts.

Public or Private?

When it comes to discussing the idea of public audience, there is no dispute that novels and autobiographies are written for an audience. Writing for a public is not restricted to novelists and autobiography writers, for even letters have external addressees. Among all the literary genres, the diary is expected to be the only authentically written text with no regard to audience, if the writer himself or herself is not considered an interlocutor. Therefore the diary is often considered as spontaneous and unconstructed. However, not all diaries are written exclusively for private consumption. Some diaries might be publication-oriented and audience-directed because the writers are almost always self-conscious of the writing tradition. As Judy Simons notes, “by their choice of mode as written documents all diaries imply readership, even if the reader and writer are one and the same.”¹⁸ Lynn Z. Bloom explains how diaries may be written for external readership: “Very often, in either the process of composition over time, or in the revision and editing that some of the most engaging diaries undergo, these superficially private writings become unmistakably public documents, intended for an external readership.”¹⁹

We should also note that this process of adaptation of diaries for the sake of audience seems to be characteristic of many diarists who think of an audience. Some of these diarists articulate the concern for audience in their writings, but some others keep it as a mystery for the reader. Anais Nin, for example, explains the relationship of her text to her audience: “[...] nothing seems to be peculiarly mine, but pain, sorrow, triumph, struggle, vision, all flowing from some common, eternal source. I write for other people, even when I say I am alone, I am special, I am different [...]. I

¹⁸ Simons, *Diaries and Journals*, 8.

¹⁹ Bloom, “I Write for Myself,” 23.

play a thousand roles.”²⁰ The fact that there are other numerous examples like Nin show that it is a mistake to categorize under a genre composed of only private writings; most of them are in fact public documents. The importance of the presence of an audience – near, such as children, relatives, and the like, or remote, such as reading circles, and members of community that the diarist lives in – stems from the fact that audience requires accommodation and revision, which transforms this private diary into a public document.

Before commenting on Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s concern for audience, we should also note that there are various types of diaries and each one has its own unique interpretation of audience. In his *Private Chronicles*, Robert A. Fothergill mentions four types of diaries, the first of which is “journals of travel.”²¹ Considering the 1552 definition of journal by the Oxford English Dictionary as “a book [...] concerning the daily stages of a route and other information for travelers,”²² the diary of the travel type is not meant to be a spontaneous production, but a document in which some particular things are recorded in a distinctive manner.

Travel diaries are obviously intended for a reader; that raised a question as early as the seventeenth century that diaries included even then the idea of directing their thoughts to a reader. Travel diaries written with a clear intention of a reader are important for this study since Woolf and Tanpınar both have entries on their travels, most of which had already been published by the writers themselves before the whole entries were published after the death of the authors. Virginia Woolf recorded her thoughts, observations, and experiences during her travels, with a view to a reader. Tanpınar, likewise, took very diligent notes on his travels, especially on his journey to Paris, and published them in a magazine, several decades before his diary entries were published as a book.

As Fothergill notes, the second class of diaries, public journals, are unquestionably written for a public consumption. Mostly considered for the task of fulfillment of official duties, these public journals may have some personal information although they do not necessarily have to do so. The third type, Fothergill

²⁰ Bloom, 23.

²¹ Fothergill, *Private Chronicles*, 40.

²² Fothergill, 38-40.

asserts, is the journal of conscience, which was established by the Puritans and the Quakers. With their pre-established conventions, these diaries are spiritual diaries, and thus the audience-oriented motivation and publication were inevitable. The fourth type was the personal memoranda: established in the seventeenth century and developed in the eighteenth, it was “the record of things done and seen and heard.”²³ Even though the diary proper was written with the motive of reflecting daily life and individual personality, it did not “derive only or wholly from the personal memoranda. Men and women early on had begun to combine the personal memoranda with the diary of conscience, and these diaries in themselves may have contained descriptions of travels or information of historical or social value, such as those associated with public journals.”²⁴ The division of diaries into four categories proves that it is hardly possible for a diary to draw its character from a single source, but rather various combinations of sources affect the layout. The diaries of Woolf and Tanpınar have a similar combination of various sources, which make them written for a public audience and make their authenticity questionable.

The inauguration of marketable diaries perhaps started with Evelyn’s journal. Its publication in 1818 and that of Pepys in 1825 were the first published diaries and thus served as blueprints for future diaries. In the 1983 edition of *The Diary of John Evelyn*, John Bowle mentions how the diary was indeed a memoir. Evelyn’s diary is full of remarks of a crafted self. Bowle notes how Evelyn “revised his diary twice: the bound up manuscript Kalendarium, the main source, covers his life from 1620 to 1697 and continues on loose sheets until 1706; but most of it was written up from contemporary notes retrospectively [...]. The Kalendarium is thus at once an unconscious self portrait and – principally a considered memoir.”²⁵ Samuel Pepys’s diary was not as spontaneous as it was expected to be. As William Matthews points out in his *British Diaries*, Pepys was not writing his diary solely relying on personal notes but on public papers for information, and he was rereading his entries to revise them. His way of writing, Matthews claims, “was more complex than is usually assumed, and consequently that his great diary is no simple product of nature, thrown

²³ Fothergill, 39.

²⁴ Fothergill, 39.

²⁵ Qtd. in Podnieks, *Daily Modernism*, 22.

together at the end of each succeeding day. In part at least, it is a product fashioned with some care, both in its matter and its style.”²⁶

Diaries that are consciously constructed with consideration of literary style hold some similarities with novels. Fanny Burney, for example, began her diary in 1768 with an awareness of audience; she even sent some of the entries to her sister as a means of communication. Elizabeth Podnieks discusses the “startling similarity between the writing style in the diary and the techniques and subject matter of her first best-selling novel, *Evelina*. That she crafted the diary is evidenced by her method of composition.” Podnieks explains this method of composition as Burney “rather than recording events on a daily or immediate basis [,] [...] kept notes which she only later expanded and elaborated into journal entries.”²⁷ Entries written for a public audience, designed aesthetically, and to some extent revised by the diarists themselves might exploit the concept of pure diary in form and content. Those diarists who see their diaries as books or literary works may have changed the interpretation of the diary in the course of time. Many diarists, Evelyn and Pepys particularly, had some concerns for public audience and thus crafted their entries aesthetically; that has clearly changed the personal writing into a literary occupation, which allowed some diarists to use their diaries as a marketplace. Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s diaries will be studied from this aspect to understand the real motives for their composition of diaries. A discrimination between truly private diaries and diaries as public documents will shed light on whether Woolf and Tanpınar’s diaries are private or public. If these diaries are private and were written with no audience in mind, they might then be considered sincere accounts of the diarist. Otherwise, the fictional texts might have the insidious intention of establishing a different self via their personal writings.

Truly private diaries have their unique characteristics defined from a few perspectives. Lynn Z. Bloom observes that truly private diaries are “written with neither art nor artifice, they are so terse they seem coded; no reader outside the author’s immediate society or household could understand them without extra textual

²⁶ Matthews, *The English Diaries*, 34.

²⁷ Podnieks, *Daily Modernism*, 24.

information.”²⁸ In contrast, public diaries are often artfully shaped to accommodate an audience. It is obvious that Woolf’s diary can be understood by anyone who reads it, surely with some editorial strokes in the footnotes for some names and dates. Tanpınar’s diary on the other hand is more like a journal; he gives a lot of information about everything as if he were lecturing his students. Some parts in Tanpınar’s diary were published by himself before his death in magazines and newspapers, which gives clues about how audience-oriented the diary is.

Public diaries have much wider scope than private diaries. The basis of selectivity for private diaries is, as Bloom claims, “predetermined by topic [such as] the weather, accounts received, visitors, daily occurrences, the public diarist’s range of subjects is potentially infinite, generated by the writer’s response to her world, varied and variegated, including not only people and events but her reading and intellectual and philosophical speculations.”²⁹ On the other hand public diaries have a tremendous scope with enormous variety. Anais Nin, for example, characterizes her diary as “the moment when [she] relieve[s] [her] life in terms of a dream, a myth, an endless story.”³⁰ For Woolf, her diary’s wide scope remains when she is physically confined, that is, her creativity increases right after the recovery from her madness. The plurality of observations in Tanpınar’s diary is quite high; he jots down several issues from Ottoman poetry to Van Gogh’s portraits and to Western and Turkish architecture.

The fact that public diaries are broader in scope compared to private diaries means that they are more varied in form and technique. Virginia Woolf describes an ideal diary, which is also considered by many critics as the quintessential definition of the diary, especially written by women: “What sort of diary should I like mine to be? Something loose knit, & yet not slovenly, so elastic that it will embrace any thing, solemn, slight or beautiful that comes into my mind. I should like it to resemble some deep old desk, or capacious hold-all, in which one flings a mass of odds & ends without looking them through.”³¹ The broad scope of Woolf’s diary influences her to make her diary elastic and to have various forms. On the other

²⁸ Bloom, “I Write for Myself,” 25.

²⁹ Bloom, 28.

³⁰ Anais Nin, *The Diary of Anais Nin*, Vol. 1: 1931-1934 (Harcourt: Mariner Books, 1969), 89.

³¹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 266.

hand, out of five notebooks that Tanpınar left, two were in diary form. The other three were full of notes scratched all around about money, instructions about the addresses, some excerpts from his readings, and some postscripts he kept during his visits to museums. It was difficult to decode them, the editors say in the preface; it also shows what Tanpınar had in mind when he said, “keeping a diary means keeping oneself in the view all the time. There is no greater economy than that.”³²

Another important characteristic that distinguished public diaries from private diaries is the structure. While private diaries “march along chronologically, their day-by-day progress dictated by the format and textually insulated from the rest of the work. They exhibit no foreshadowing and scarcely a retrospective glance except to keep score, tallying accounts,”³³ the public diaries’ “natural time line reinforces its overall narrative structure, even though the story may be told *ad seriatim* over a period of days, weeks, years, with some elements resolved only in the course of an entire lifetime.”³⁴ Virginia Woolf’s diary has a narrative structure such that one can easily see her concerns; besides, it gives some information on her texts chronologically as if it were a hypertext to her novels and a tool for readers to reinterpret her texts. Even though many critics ignore this aspect of Woolf’s and of her diary, there is in fact a strong argument that Woolf was narrating in her diary her concern about the changes in society. Most of Tanpınar’s diary express his strong worries about the status of the changes in society. Like Woolf’s, Tanpınar’s psychology that drags him to the edge of suicide shows how Tanpınar lays out the narration in his diary.³⁵

Public diaries are considered to be self-contained and self-explanatory if the entries are read as a whole. The coherent and freestanding texts are often developed to be self-explanatory so that readers can understand diaries without any need of reference from external sources. One passage from Woolf’s diary illustrates this salient difference of public documents from private ones. Woolf writes, “On Easter Monday we went up to visit the Murrys & see Hampstead Heath.” The incident is well given by the diarist; if this were a private diary entry, the portrayal of the

³² Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 308.

³³ Bloom, “I Write for Myself,” 26.

³⁴ Bloom, 29.

³⁵ See Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 of this study for a comprehensive analysis.

incident would be enough. However, Woolf keeps writing and makes it show a dramatic scene:

Our verdict was that the crowd at close quarters is detestable; it smells; it stinks; it has neither vitality nor colour; it is a tepid mass of flesh scarcely organised into human life. How slow they walk! How passively & brutishly they lie on the grass! How little of pleasure or pain is in them! But they looked well dressed & well fed; & at a distance among the canary coloured swings & roundabouts they had the look of a picture. It was a summers day in the sun at least; we could sit on a mound & look at the little distant trickle of human beings eddying round the chief centres of gaiety & filing over the heath & spotted upon its humps. Very little noise they made; the large aeroplane that came flying so steadily over head made more noise than the whole crowd of us. Why do I say "us"? I never for a moment felt myself one of "them" Yet the sight had its charm: I liked the bladders, & the little penny sticks, & the sight of two slow elaborate dancers performing to a barrel organ in a space the size of a hearthrug.³⁶

“There is a Little Book in them”³⁷

More specific textual analysis of Woolf’s diary about her concern of audience is necessary. Woolf does not define a specific audience but addresses the issue of audience very often in her diary. She sometimes considers the reader as her older self and talks to her: “Never mind: I fancy old Virginia, putting on her spectacles to read of March 1920 will decidedly wish me to continue. Greetings! My dear ghost; & take heed that I don’t think 50 a very great age. Several good books can be written still; & here’s the bricks for a fine one.”³⁸ She tries to have an intimate relationship with her reader and give a message to herself at the age of 50.

³⁶ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 267-68.

³⁷ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 67.

³⁸ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 24.

The most important entry regarding her concern for audience is dated 20 March 1926 when she wonders what Leonard might do with the diary after her death:

But what is to become of all these diaries, I asked myself yesterday. If I die, what would Leo make of them? He would be disinclined to burn them; he could not publish them. Well, he should make up a book from them, I think; & then burn the body. I daresay there is a little book in them: if the scraps & scratches were straightened up a little. God knows.³⁹

Woolf wanted her life published to ensure her image for posterity; in one of the diary entries, she writes, “At this point it would be useful could I command the pen of some intelligent & well informed diarist, with an eye for the future; someone who could put down what were the really interesting things that Sir WM Tyrell, Camille Huysman, & the Sidney Webbs said.”⁴⁰ In another entry, she wants to establish herself as a social historian: I open this [entry], forced by a sense of what is expected by the public, to remark that Kipling died yesterday; & that the King (George 5th) is probably dying today.”⁴¹ She cares about her future literary reputation and writes, “I go on to wonder whether any one else is thinking of Carlyle’s birthday, & if so whether it gives him any pleasure; & again of the curious superstition, haunting literary people, of the value of being remembered by posterity – but I had better reign [sic] my self in.”⁴²

Desire for reputation led her to consider her casual writing to have some valuable remarks. In 1931, she again tries to give meaning to her diary by questioning the practice: “I mean what do these diaries amount to? O merely matter for a book, I think: & to read when I have a headache.”⁴³ While she still undervalues her diary and does not consider it as a piece of art, she continues to maintain the idea that there is something publishable. In 1939, she this time even thinks about writing a critical book in diary form: “I’m thinking of a critical book. Suppose I used the diary form? Would this make one free to go from book to book – or wd it be too

³⁹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 67.

⁴⁰ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 145.

⁴¹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 234.

⁴² Woolf, 342.

⁴³ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 4, (New York: Penguin Books, 1984), 24.

personal?”⁴⁴ Her wonder on the use of diary form developed and she tried to theorize the best possible use of the diary genre, to embrace and blend it in other genres that she was writing. Change of her ideas on the use of genre makes her diary a complex whole and begs some questions: Does she consider her diary art or only a text to write the “fidgets”⁴⁵ in as she initially claims? Does Woolf record real life or create a representation of reality, as her life and the created life are somehow mixed together in the diary?

For readers specifically, diary writing as a genre may mark aesthetic factors as secondary if not meaningless. However, Woolf’s position as a professional author and her ambition of being a good writer did not let her abandon aesthetic concerns, even in her personal account. She was self-conscious about the quality of her sentences she used and even sometimes commented on bad phrasing. By rereading an older volume of her diary, she admonishes herself: “By the way, on re-reading this book I resolved to write rather more carefully, & to record conversations verbatim.”⁴⁶ Her concerns over aesthetics clearly show that she had a very strong idea of audience and of publication in her mind. She explains how she wants her diary to be a work of art:

What sort of diary should I like mine to be? [...] I should like to come back, after a year or two, & find that the collection has sorted itself & refined itself & coalesced, as such deposits so mysteriously do, into a mould, transparent enough to reflect the light of our life, & yet steady, tranquil composed with the aloofness of *a work of art*.⁴⁷

A high standard of writing was incorporated into her diary. She was conscious of some sort of reader, anyway, though she questions her motives for writing her diary:

And why do I write this down? I have not even told Leonard; & whom do I tell when I tell a blank page? The truth is, I get nearer feelings in writing than in walking – I think: graze the bone; enjoy the expression; have them out of me; make them a little creditable to

⁴⁴ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 210.

⁴⁵ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 5, 335.

⁴⁶ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 251.

⁴⁷ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 266 (*italics mine*).

myself; I daresay suppress something, so that after all I'm doing what amounts to confiding. Why did Pepys write his diary after all?⁴⁸

She was very conscious of the diary tradition, read in many other diaries, and kept a standard level of quality. She incorporated some characteristics of the diaries that she read into her own diary and held a high level of aesthetic quality: "I'm letting my pen fling itself on paper like a leopard starved for blood – & I must wash & dress – so do not, in years to come, look too harshly upon this first outcry, the expression of many yet unheard."⁴⁹ In another entry she tends to improve the experience of diary writing and criticizes the entries she had written: "I don't think the first volume makes such good reading as the last; a proof that all writing, even this unpremeditated scribbling, has its form, which one learns. Is it worth going on with? The trouble is, that if one goes on a year or so more, one will feel bound on that account to continue. I wonder why I do it."⁵⁰

"This Diary will be Read after Me"⁵¹

Tanpınar does not have many references to audience in his diary. His most important remark about the publication of his diary is dated 3 December 1958: "I think this diary will be read after me. I like this feeling. People will see how I have lived."⁵² This statement of Tanpınar stirred up his students to study his diary entries and to publish them afterwards. There are a few comments on Tanpınar's statement about the publication of his diary; one of them is by the editors, Zeynep Kerman and İnci Engünün; they claim that Tanpınar's consideration does not necessarily mean that he wanted his diary to be read by the public but rather he was expecting those close to him to read his notebooks, not a public audience.⁵³ As mentioned below, this attitude of the editors might stem from how they wanted to represent Tanpınar. If Tanpınar is represented as someone who was expecting his diary to be published and publicized, this might distort the sincere opinions on everything in the diary. That

⁴⁸ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 239.

⁴⁹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 250.

⁵⁰ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 304.

⁵¹ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

⁵² Enginün and Kerman, 134.

⁵³ Enginün and Kerman, 8.

would also mean that he may have had some concerns in his mind about how he would be interpreted after his death.

Another comment on Tanpınar's idea of publication is that Tanpınar wanted his diary to be published. Hilmi Yavuz, in his article "Kırtıpıl mı değil mi? Evet, Hangi Tanpınar?" [Is he Grotty or not? Yes, Which Tanpınar?], asserts that Tanpınar's diary is not a "*journal intime*" but a "*journal extime*," that is, Tanpınar planned the publication of his diary. Yavuz further comments, "If he enjoys thinking about the publication of his diary, that feeling is very much strengthened by the revenge he would like to take on his friends who call him 'grotty.'"⁵⁴ As mentioned previously, this revenge is related to his desire for being reinterpreted after his death. That explains statements full of hatred and animosity toward his friends in his diary. On the other hand, it is not possible without a close analysis of Tanpınar's time and surroundings to understand why his friends made him feel isolated and marginalized and called him "grotty" and why Tanpınar wrote about his friends so harshly. This will be elaborated later in this study.

Tanpınar was aware of what was happening in his time; he was trying to comment on many issues; he was never reckless to comment his milieu. He says in one of the diary entries how he "wishes [he] could say all [his] thoughts before [he] dies."⁵⁵ He obviously did not write his diary with a purpose that it was going to be forgotten or burnt after his death. Therefore, his diary was one of the texts in which he wrote his opinions and thoughts for later generations. We can even say at this point that Tanpınar's diary is not much different from his other texts.

Some diary entries show that he had a reader concern in his mind. As mentioned before, Tanpınar's most important remark that shows his intention of writing for an audience is the entry dated 3 December 1958; even though he speaks of the public reception of the diary, he says his loneliness is never told in those lines: "I like this notebook. I think it will be read after me. I like the idea though. I think people will see what I have experienced. However, I am on the edge of my table. In front of me is my shining copper ash tray on the coffee table. My ash tray, coffee cup, and drafts

⁵⁴ Hilmi Yavuz, "Kırtıpıl mı değil mi? Evet, Hangi Tanpınar?," *Zaman*, 30 January 2008.

⁵⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 321.

of the novel are all in front of me. It is 10. I am home alone.”⁵⁶ Yet he contradicts this statement in another diary entry and talks about burning his notebook: “I got up early. Snuffling. I need something other than studies on poetry, the missing parts of the book, love, loneliness, and nature. I need a few more poems. If I some day finish them all, I would burn this notebook.”⁵⁷

He gives messages to readers, directly talks to them. In the early entries of his diary, on 14 August 1953, after writing his comments on how France would become again one of the most powerful countries of Europe, he says in parenthesis, “I will come back to this;”⁵⁸ or on another page he writes, “I hope I will continue tomorrow;”⁵⁹ or he closes one subject by writing “I am tired; I might continue this another day,”⁶⁰ as if he was talking to his reader. In another diary entry he announces how he will give more details about a reported incident: “Ülfet and Sevim have gone to Ankara tonight. I will elaborate on this. I have a fever, 37-8.”⁶¹ On another page he shares with his reader what seems weird to himself: “Is it not weird that the other never came to my mind?”⁶² There are some notes written either for an audience or for himself to be checked back later. While he was writing about Jean de Vatteville, he could not collect his thoughts about a date and he notes in parenthesis, “will be checked from Hammer.”⁶³

Compared to Virginia Woolf, Tanpınar has less aesthetic concerns for his diary, in form at least. As seen on a few sample pages of manuscript given in the diary book and as the editors report, the manuscript is disorganized. Since it is a diary, the form is not surprising though: some notes were taken while Tanpınar was standing and scratching on his notebook, some phrases have no connection to each other and make up the majority of the text. Nevertheless, he was not as reckless in form as he seems, for he was periodically revising his diary. On 14 August 1953, after writing “bad administration makes this grudge something newsworthy,” he does not like the

⁵⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

⁵⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 244.

⁵⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 83.

⁵⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 121.

⁶⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

⁶¹ Enginün and Kerman, 205.

⁶² Enginün and Kerman, 103.

⁶³ Enginün and Kerman, 231.

expression and notes in parenthesis, “not well expressed.”⁶⁴ In another entry, he complains about his incorrect use of Turkish and says, “Now, a torment has appeared inside me [*sic*], is it correct? I was going to say I have felt a torment; it has torn my heart out. We do not know Turkish.”⁶⁵ In an entry about his novels, Tanpınar does not seem to be satisfied with what he has written, this time not due to form and diction but due to rhetoric; so, he stops writing and says in parenthesis: “I am almost asleep. Not a proper way to write.”⁶⁶ Seven years after he started keeping his diary, he was still complaining about his lack of writing habit: “It is bad not to still be used to writing in the notebook, not to revise; I am writing horribly. I need to write tidily or give it up.”⁶⁷

On another page, Tanpınar makes a clear revision and inserts a footnote about a waiter he met in France. After he writes ill of this waiter, he writes in a footnote that he “later knew this waiter inside out and liked him very much.”⁶⁸ Tanpınar seems to have felt bad about his words about the waiter, so he wanted to insert a postscript and let the reader know. Tanpınar sometimes edits the manuscript of his diary as on 14 September 1953 he erases out a word that was probably a name he does not want his reader to see. He notes “××× unfortunately bothers me. His senescence is so obvious. Palled.”⁶⁹

About the literary value of the diary, one can easily assume that it is not Tanpınar’s exquisite work, compared to his other works, especially compared to his novels. It is full of judgments on himself and about some other people near him, which makes the diary not a work of art but a notebook in which Tanpınar records his experiences and opinions on several issues. However, some diary entries show Tanpınar’s concern for audience and literary qualities. For example, he begins one of the entries with a sentence written in French and later continues in Turkish but oratorically. He writes about drama. If compared to some other sections of the diary,

⁶⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 89.

⁶⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 135. I have deliberately translated this sentence incorrectly because the original was also written incorrectly by Tanpınar as he in the next sentence criticizes himself. The Turkish original text reads: “Şimdi içimde bu azap belirdi, doğru mu? Azap duyduğum, içim birdenbire yandı diyecektim. Biz Türkçe’yi bilmiyoruz.”

⁶⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 157.

⁶⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 214.

⁶⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 89.

⁶⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 103.

especially to those with short sentences and wrong punctuation, this part shows how he indeed wanted this notebook to be a literary work of art.⁷⁰ He sometimes shows his dedication to his notebook: “I like this notebook. I think it will be read after me,”⁷¹ and he feels bad if he cannot open his notebook for a while.⁷² He sometimes announces to his reader what he is planning to write later in his notebook, as in one entry he says, “one day I will write my most true thoughts about Yahya Kemal.”⁷³

In some entries Tanpınar writes how much he values his diary and how important are the ideas he wanted to write in it: “I was about to go to sleep but got up and opened the notebook. I was planning to write about some very important things, very fundamental things, about poetry and the novel. But look what I have written instead!”⁷⁴ On 28 December 1958, he defines the scope of his diary: “I have a strange impatience. I cannot write. However, I have tons of things from poverty to novels that I need to discuss in this notebook.”⁷⁵ He saw diary-keeping as a necessary task that he even criticized Yahya Kemal for not keeping one: “Of course, Yahya Kemal did not have to keep a journal. But, he could have told us about Europe. He should have told us [...] his reflections on Western thought, music, the contemporary men of letters, and the women he liked.”⁷⁶ In another entry, he speaks of his regret at not keeping a diary seriously during his travels abroad: “Loneliness and not having books ruined my life in France. If I ever have another chance to travel, I will go with a notebook [...]. Not having books and the treachery of sickness. So, I will always carry my notebook and bag with me.”⁷⁷ On the other hand he sometimes questions the practice of keeping his diary, like Woolf, and writes: “It is getting frustrating to keep this notebook.”⁷⁸

The obvious literary motivation for the texts proves that Tanpınar and Woolf saw their diaries as works which could be improved and which would satisfy their professional sensibilities. Both Tanpınar and Woolf were well aware of the diary

⁷⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 153.

⁷¹ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

⁷² Enginün and Kerman, 134.

⁷³ Enginün and Kerman, 132.

⁷⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 139.

⁷⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 141.

⁷⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 206.

⁷⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 286.

⁷⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 149.

tradition and wrote with the knowledge of the diaries published before them. They read many memoirs, journals, and autobiographies and thus knew how others reflected their lives and experiences in their personal writings. Their diaries also hold great significance in terms of various interpretations of their novels. The diaries might be taken as hyper texts for their novels since several remarks in their diaries give clues about the novel-writing process, the influences, the motives, and the preparations for the novels are significant and shed light on the interpretation of the novels.

Tanpınar's Novels Revisited

Diaries can be a guide to interpret or reinterpret the novels. The diary entries sometimes give clear clues about how the characters of a novel are produced, how the context is designed, and on top of that how the writer comes up with this kind of fictional universe. Both Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar mention in their diaries the process of writing their novels; Woolf's and Tanpınar's novels should be reconsidered in the lights of their diaries. Some comments of Woolf and Tanpınar in the diaries are informative about the novels and guide the interpretations of readers of their novels, even after their deaths.

In *Antalyalı Genç Kıza Mektup* [A Letter to the Young Girl from Antalya], Tanpınar defines the novel as a task of talking while he considers poetry as silence. He says, "You might ask me why I write novels. I shall say that poetry is silence rather than speaking up. I tell in my stories and novels all I don't say in my poems. Therefore, my novels and stories give clues about the main hidden ideas of my poems, since I want them to be private spaces."⁷⁹ Tanpınar discriminates between his poetry and prose, and he writes how he is after himself in his poetry while in his novels he is after himself, life, and people – "after everything except me."⁸⁰ Considering Tanpınar's remarks on his poetry and prose, we can say that he talks about himself in all of his texts, while in poetry his aesthetic concerns take the lead. On the other hand he does not necessarily think of poetry as totally different from his prose, as he writes, "For me novelist and poet are like brothers who live in the same

⁷⁹ In Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 352.

⁸⁰ Tanpınar, 352-53.

house, who sometimes disturb each other but sometimes help each other out and who somewhat have to get along well with each other.”⁸¹

His diary was about his own interpretation on several points including his own texts. He writes about his poems, novels, stories, and articles that he was working on. The fact that he reflects his own interpretation about the writing process of his novels might lead to new interpretations of his six novels. Tanpınar mentions *Huzur* only twice in his diary since it was already published when he started writing his diary in 1953. In the entry dated 6 January 1959, he writes how he became happy when “Ahter Onan’s relative Melek Hanım had mentioned that *Huzur* was the only novel in Turkish. How happy I got. The saddest thing for a writer is not to have readers, and what is sadder is not to be able to work. Will I have time in my life for writing my masterpiece?”⁸² As mentioned very often in the diary, Tanpınar complains that his works do not get the praise he expected; in 18 September 1959 he cried that out loud and wrote, “*Huzur* is not read.”⁸³

While *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* was serialized in *Yeni İstanbul Newspaper*, Tanpınar was writing his complaints about his novel in his diary. On 24 July 1954, Tanpınar complained about the ambivalence of his *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* in an ambivalent diary entry: “The reality is that *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* has become a great caricature. Each page saves itself. There is no harmony in it and no reference to any names. My mind cannot ever do the organization [...]. Everything in my life is so shattered. There are thousands of repetitions and interesting pieces in this novel.”⁸⁴ On the other hand, in another entry, he compares the writing process of *Aydaki Kadın*⁸⁵ [Woman on the Moon] with that of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*. This entry gives a very good idea about Tanpınar’s reflection on the process of writing novels: “To tell the truth, I cannot catch it up. Everything seems to be missing in *Aydaki Kadın*. I cannot feel the satisfaction and the strong rhetoric that I had at the beginning of *Saatleri Ayarlama*.”⁸⁶ In the same entry, there is an important clue on what influences and inspires Tanpınar in the process of writing his novels.

⁸¹ Tanpınar, 339.

⁸² Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 146.

⁸³ Enginün and Kerman, 167.

⁸⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 117.

⁸⁵ Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2009).

⁸⁶ Tanpınar, 161.

He says, “a very rare thought on death came to my mind yesterday. I sometimes think of death from another perspective. Indeed, yesterday I got scared of cancer like brother Ziya. Out of all these thoughts, I felt like I saw the novel. Selim hides the misery. Behind him there is an unlimited perspective.”⁸⁷ His thought of death becomes a kind of inspiration for him to outline the characterization of the protagonist Selim in *Aydaki Kadın*.

In another entry, Tanpınar shows his dedication to being an artist while his need of money motivates him to finish and publish his novels:

I have not touched upon the drafts of *Beş Şehir*⁸⁸ [Five Cities] yet. I stayed in Erzurum. I have to publish *Beş Şehir*, poems, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* at once. Also I need to finish this novel [*Aydaki Kadın*] to earn some money. I think it will be my major work. However, I was planning to spend this coming two months on the poems! I should do so, anyways, and I will. Let it be I am out of money.⁸⁹

One of the dilemmas that Tanpınar suffered throughout his life was his feelings on poetry and the need for money. Novels were expected to bring money while he was writing the poems for himself.

Tanpınar’s revision of his novels is also recorded in his diary entries. On 15 October 1960 he wrote about how he did the changes in the serialized edition of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* and made it ready for its publication as a book. He says, “I have been busy with *Saatleri Ayarlama* for three days. I have thoughts incubated in my mind about the changes that I will make. I will remove many unnecessary parts [from the novel].”⁹⁰ The next day he writes about his plan to revise and deplorably says, “I am busy with *Saatleri Ayarlama* for a week. I have not managed to sort it out yet. I have even added new parts. I can see the manuscript with clarity now; some repetitions will be omitted, and some parts will be shortened.”⁹¹ On the next day, he keeps writing about his revisions of the same novel. This time he very

⁸⁷ Tanpınar, 160-61.

⁸⁸ Tanpınar, *Beş Şehir* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010).

⁸⁹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 219.

⁹⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 224.

⁹¹ Enginün and Kerman, 225.

neatly writes an outline for the revision; in the first entry, he writes down five names, which most probably would turn out to be the inspiration for the characters in the novel.⁹² We see Tanpınar wrote the epigraph⁹³ of the novel here in his diary along with some information about how he planned to divide *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* into four chapters.⁹⁴ We understand that he finished the revision of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* on 19 March 1961: “Today, I have decided to send the *Saatleri Ayarlama* to the press without making any additions or changes. So, my six-year hesitation just ended. There are a few more pages to be revised on Tuesday [...]. I am very pleased with Turan.”⁹⁵

Tanpınar’s first novel, *Mahur Beste*, started to be serialized in *Ülkü Magazine* in 1944 but remained incomplete; it was published in book format in 1975 more than a decade after Tanpınar’s death. The serialized version of the novel finishes with an incomplete sentence, so some critics thought that some parts of the novel were lost in the publishing house. However, Tanpınar writes a letter to the protagonist of the novel, Behçet Bey, also serialized as the last part of the novel in *Ülkü Magazine*, in Volume 99, (1 November 1945), 25-27. In the letter, titled *A Letter to Behçet Bey on Mahur Beste*, Tanpınar explains to the reader why he left the novel incomplete: “It started as your story, but you have carried such a huge crowd to the stage that it turned out to be not your story anymore. It has become the story of all of you, better to say that it has become the story of the eras that you and I have experienced. I would not let so many people gather around a person.”⁹⁶ He even writes about the

⁹² Apart from its master plan, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* was based on Tanpınar’s observations and notes on people and events happening in the meantime. However, some parts in the novel were removed by Tanpınar himself when the draft was being prepared for the book edition. Turan Alptekin, in *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Bir Kültür, Bir İnsan* [Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: One Culture, One Person], points out that “there was a long witty part about Peyami Safa that Tanpınar made me dictate; but upon the death of Peyami Safa’s son, he said ‘I cannot make fun of a sorrowful friend’ and omitted that part” (Alptekin, *Bir Kültür, Bir İnsan* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2010), 29.) Tanpınar does not mention that in his diary but give many ambivalent remarks on Peyami Safa; while on the one page he says, “I hate Peyami” (*Günlüklerin Işığında*, 203), after Safa’s death, he says “I liked him anyways. We had a long friendship; he had a unique elegance, wit, and even sweetness” (307).

⁹³ It is a couplet from İzzet Molla: *Bihakk-ı Hazret-i Mecnun izâle eyeleye Hak / Serimde derd-i hıredde biraz eser kaldı*. (See Tanpınar, *Saatleri Ayarlama*, 3 and Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 226.)

⁹⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 225.

⁹⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 268. Turan Alptekin, Tanpınar’s student and assistant, helped on the dictation of the novel.

⁹⁶ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Mahur Beste* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010), 152.

worries of Behçet Bey, as if Behçet Bey said, “you no more work, so I am afraid you are going to leave me half furnished”; Tanpınar allays the anxieties of his protagonist and says, “No, you will not remain incomplete. However, there are thousands of people piled around me now, and all talk at the same time [...]”⁹⁷ His letter and the novel finish as if he gave himself a break for a while and stopped serializing his novel by warning his protagonist: “Do not complete my word by yourself. I need to orchestrate the voices of all of them. You will be patient until this job is done. You will stay away from your friends for a while. You have no right to be less patient than me in this. Farewell! Always your friend, trust this.”⁹⁸

The 1945 letter⁹⁹ was the the most obvious sign for readers that Tanpınar was going to work on *Mahur Beste*. However, if it was not for the diary entry that Tanpınar wrote many years after the novel was serialized, no one would know anything about whether Tanpınar worked more on his novel. In the entry dated 22 April 1959, Tanpınar made a choice between *Aydaki Kadın* and *Mahur Beste*. He writes, “After the dinner: Either this hospital, or continue with Selim, or *Mahur Beste*. I think I will sail out to *Mahur Beste* for writing comfortably.”¹⁰⁰ On 8 December 1959, he wrote the sources of *Mahur Beste*. While Tanpınar was listening to a story that Selim Turan, a friend of his, was telling him, he found himself in a mood because of the fact that, he claims, he “has got back to *Mahur Beste* spiritually [...]. And at the very same minute *Mahur Beste* came to life. While [Selim Turan] was saying that, [he] was experiencing a different form of novel among those people that [he] hardly recognizes.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Tanpınar, *Mahur Beste*, 152-53.

⁹⁸ Tanpınar, *Mahur Beste*, 153.

⁹⁹ We find out from Turan Alptekin that there was a letter for *Sattleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, too. The letter was about Hayri İrdal, the protagonist of the novel, written by another character, Halit Ayarç, addressing to Doctor Ramiz. Upon finding this letter among Tanpınar’s papers, Turan Alptekin publishes it with a thought in his mind: “Hamdi Bey dictated this letter either to say more or for advertising purposes; however, he changed his mind and did not publish it. He did not ask me to tear it, so he approved that I kept it. Therefore I decided to publish it because it is a good explanation of the novel.” (Alptekin, *Bir Kültür Bir İnsan*, 31.) Considering the diary entries in which Tanpınar writes about *Sattleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, a new interpretation might be possible from the letter. The letter and the diary entries might give valuable clues on the characterization of Hayri İrdal and Halit Ayarç.

¹⁰⁰ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 162.

¹⁰¹ Enginün and Kerman, 177-78.

Tanpınar's other incomplete novel, *Aydaki Kadın*, is the most frequently mentioned novel in the diary. First published in *Journal of Turkish Studies* in the 1979 and 1984 volumes, *Aydaki Kadın* was collected into a book in 1987. Güler Güven, a student of Tanpınar, spent a lot of time on the manuscript since the novel had multiple copies and several unnumbered pages. Güven worked on Tanpınar's plans and notes on the novels, put the draft in order, and produced a novel out of a pile of pages; Güven claims that two thirds of the novel is complete. The diary entries about *Aydaki Kadın* hold a key to the novel, not only for interpretation but because of the editing process. No doubt Güler Güven studied the diary entries while working on the draft of the novel; therefore, *Aydaki Kadın* can be best understood if read together with the diary.

The significance of *Aydaki Kadın* for this study is multiple: it shows how valuable a diary can be for a writer, especially in the process of producing some works other than the diary. And for a person like Tanpınar, who is ambivalent, restless, depressed, and somewhat messy, the diary was an autocue. Tanpınar used the diary pages for the excerpts that he planned to include in his novel. In the entry of 25 March 1959, he mentions the sixth of September as the "closure date." We see that the novel begins and finishes on the sixth of September. Tanpınar writes an important "closure dialogue" that he was making up in his mind for a while: "the worst thing a society ever experiences is when a régime or group of people assume they are indispensable and fundamental. Cancer is a kind of contention of independence or denial. The cancer is to have private politics."¹⁰² This dialogue is intended for the closing pages of the novel but is criticized right away by Tanpınar himself as it should have been "something similar to this but more documenté."¹⁰³ He probably put some more thought on this conversation, did some changes, and wrote long passages on politics. In the novel we see how Selim considers politics as the "calamity of modern times."¹⁰⁴ Along with several notes on *Aydaki Kadın*, this excerpt as well as the preceding one about the setting and the time of the novel are important for they give the main idea of the novel. It also shows that Tanpınar

¹⁰² Enginün and Kerman, 159.

¹⁰³ Enginün and Kerman, 159. "Documenté" is one of the several French words that Tanpınar uses in his diary. Some of these French words in the diary are not translated since the meaning is clear.

¹⁰⁴ Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın*, 182.

wanted to show his contemporary political concerns in the novel he worked on until the last days of his life.

There are a few diary entries that are important to understand *Aydaki Kadın* better. One was written 30-31 March 1961, when Tanpınar seems more determined about the unfolding of the story:

I have certainly decided to have an old lover in the novel. So, there will be three fantastic scenes. The old man can help me on the death of Emir. And İnci's dog. Perhaps, these scenes need to be the strongest because of Nevzat's child. Nevzat's son, Nevzat's maddening, and his death should all be divided into different conversations.¹⁰⁵

However, we do not see the novel finish exactly the way Tanpınar was writing it. Probably Tanpınar would have included the death of Emir and many other points if he had time to complete his novel. By looking at the diary entries, other written plans for the novel, and those found in Tanpınar's house, one might guess the end of the novel or even dare to continue and finish the novel, and perhaps manage to write close to what Tanpınar was going to write, if not with the same delicacy.

On 19 December 1961, Tanpınar wrote the whole outline of his novel though he did not follow it in the process of writing:

Selim's life: Born in 1910. Graduates from high school in 1928 and has his first sexual encounter. At the same time he meets a very beautiful woman. He has an affair despite the fact that she is the wife of a close friend. The woman treats him like a child. In 1931, Paris; comes back in 1935 [...]. Loves Bardi. Devotes himself to literature [...]. He meets with Leyla in 1948. Goes to Europe in 1948, and they break up. In 1949 he returns. Between 1950 and 1955 he lives while yearning for her. In 1956 everything ends, and he works on a novel. Florence, Paris, Venice, Vienna.¹⁰⁶

In the same entry he also describes the subject matter he wants to include in his novel:

¹⁰⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 273.

¹⁰⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 329.

Fascism and Nazi Regime. Kemalism [...]. The question of Cyprus. As soon as we came to the table with the Greeks, this matter was done. Can I say that in the novel? Can I say that this question of Cyprus will cause us trouble like Crete. Why is it 1956 then? There is another year before the election. And I want the cocktail party at the Bosphorus. “Leylâ: I was married to my childhood. I was born in this house. I was married to die here.” Does this make sense?¹⁰⁷

On 25 June 1961, he was satisfied with the current version of his novel and wrote, “The novel is not bad as of today. If I do not bargain and do not yield to poverty, I will have a fine work next year. Mehmet Narlı can be a perfect character if I work more on him. Adrien is finished as of today. Selim, Gündüz, Refik, Suat, Nevzat should be more focused”¹⁰⁸ Although he is content with the current form of his novel, he mentions his worries about it: “All of these should not break my bond with poetry. My poetry is fundamental. However, the novel will establish my reputation and character. One of them is my thought, my main aesthetic; the other is my point of contact with my era. This contact point should derive from my own aesthetic and become the means for finding an ideal life.”¹⁰⁹

Another importance of *Aydaki Kadın* is that it is like a supplementary document for his diary or the biography/autobiography that gives information about Tanpınar himself. Unlike the other novels of Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın* is based more on individual themes. The successful and well-liked protagonist of the novel, Selim, might be considered a person whom Tanpınar would like himself to be. Especially in the second part of the novel he is quite similar to Tanpınar’s own life; that is clear only if the diary entries about the novel are analyzed. Similar to Tanpınar himself, the main character Selim is an ambivalent person and is often faced with dilemma. In one of the diary entries Tanpınar mentions Selim’s dilemma: “In the last four days, I

¹⁰⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 329. In *Aydaki Kadın*, Leylâ, one of the main characters of the novel, is giving a cocktail party and Selim, the protagonist who is desperately in love with Leylâ, plans to join the party. The whole day and the only day in the novel, several flashbacks and incidents cover the whole story of the novel. It reminds us of Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* with the single-day time span and the party at the end. See Virginia Woolf, *Mrs. Dalloway* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1996). All subsequent references are from this edition.

¹⁰⁸ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 309.

¹⁰⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 309.

have managed to complete some hollow parts of the novel. However, I have not linked it up to Selim yet. Selim, who loves Leyla is different from Selim at home. A puzzle [...]. Should the young man become Leyla's illusion or serious?¹¹⁰ Sahib Bey is not bad as a temporary character. But the novel itself is not clear yet."¹¹¹ We see Tanpınar's tempered mood, always in search of something, in the process of writing the novel. On 14 December 1958 he wrote, "I have spent the whole night working on the novel. But it is not strong. I always begin with searching. I cannot find or hardly find something and get quickly exhausted. I need a case after all. (I have written only sixty pages so far. And some parts are quite shoddy.) Will Nuri be like Yunus? But he is in no way similar."¹¹² Tanpınar's psychology during the writing process of the novel can be traced in the diary because the whole writing process of the novel was during the years Tanpınar kept a diary. We see him experiencing hardship in the early days of writing *Aydaki Kadın*: "I cannot feel the satisfaction and control that I had at the beginning of *Saatleri Ayarlama*."¹¹³

Like many other novelists, Tanpınar establishes characters in his novels based on his life experiences and expectations. Out of his five novels, *Aydaki Kadın* was probably the most autobiographical since it includes several events that Tanpınar actually experienced. Therefore, even for writing Tanpınar's biography one might look at *Aydaki Kadın*; surely the diary entries shed light on the characters and events in the novel. The main character, Selim, always lives under the pressure of his past and struggles with loneliness and poverty. His dreams are affected by his mood so that they are always "complicated"¹¹⁴ and disturbing. Tanpınar was having recurrent nightmares due to poverty and sexual desire. He wrote on 4 March 1954: "Tuesday morning. Woke up from terrible dreams. I have some weird feelings; the problem of money makes it worse."¹¹⁵ He was even associating shortage of money with his freedom and says, "I am not free. Neither in myself nor in my surroundings. Neither in the matter of money nor time."¹¹⁶

¹¹⁰ Tanpınar uses a French word, *serieux* here.

¹¹¹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 128.

¹¹² Enginün and Kerman, 141.

¹¹³ Enginün and Kerman, 161.

¹¹⁴ Tanpınari, *Aydaki Kadın*, 12.

¹¹⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 113.

¹¹⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 137.

Selim's knowledge is quite similar to Tanpınar's. Selim reads Baudelaire, Hugo, Vigny, and Racine, and learns French. Selim knows about Haşım, Yahya Kemal, and Şeyh Galib¹¹⁷ and was under the influence of Joyce's *Ulysses*¹¹⁸ for a long while. The influence of such writers on Tanpınar is clear and is several times pointed out in the diary. About Joyce and *Ulysses*, for example, Tanpınar wrote on 23 October 1960 that "After reading Zola, now James Joyce; deconstruct the conventional interpretation of reality. After reading James Joyce, putting poetry into this solid reality and capturing time in a different and deeper way. Making it psychological time."¹¹⁹

Selim is a doctor; however, his professional occupation is mentioned only once in the novel. His membership in parliament establishes his reputation and is more acclaimed than his profession as a doctor. He completes his military service in Kırklareli and is elected a congressman from the same polling district. Tanpınar was conscripted into military in Kırklareli and became a congressman from Maraş. Selim is produced out of Tanpınar's own experiences in the military and parliament. Selim is deeply affected by poverty after leaving parliament Tanpınar himself accepted the offer of membership in parliament due to poverty and faced similar hardship after leaving congress. As Selim states satisfaction in his membership in his political party, Tanpınar praises the CHP even though he was a fan of İsmet İnönü, not the party, as he many times mentions in his diary: "The People's Party and me: I have never got along well with the party. I am dedicated to the party due to İsmet İnönü and a few other friends."¹²⁰ As Selim criticizes Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, his personality, and his politics,¹²¹ Tanpınar too writes in his diary that "no matter what Adnan Bey does, he cannot achieve the reputation of İsmet Paşa, Atatürk, and the overthrown dynasty. The last ones [Menderes and his government] take their power from a past full of wrong doings and illiteracy."¹²² After the execution of Menderes in 1961, Tanpınar defines him in the diary as "the miserable fool" and writes how

¹¹⁷ Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın*, 71.

¹¹⁸ Tanpınar, 67.

¹¹⁹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 228.

¹²⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 220.

¹²¹ Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın*, 171-73.

¹²² Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 184.

“İsmet Paşa gave him a chance.”¹²³ Selim and Tanpınar have the identical political ideas. Selim mentions that he no longer likes politics and defines politics as “the calamity of modern times.”¹²⁴ After mentioning his character’s recklessness in politics, Tanpınar too defines it as a “cancer”¹²⁵ and in another entry as “serving in the military.”¹²⁶

Selim has a keen interest in art and literature; he has a novel project titled *İflas*. However, he cannot devote himself to writing his novel because he always hopes to concentrate on his job.¹²⁷ Tanpınar has a novel project with the same title mentioned twice in his diary. He too feels disorganized and says, “Which one will I write? I can no longer concentrate. Is it ‘İflas’? A failure that looks like success from the outside.”¹²⁸ Tanpınar uses *İflas* as a proper name with a capital letter and in quotation marks, referring to the novel project and as a common name referring to failure in his studies. He later writes why *İflas* was a failure: “The weakness of “İflas” comes from the fact that it is still composed of only anecdotes. I should look over it. The main themes should be distinguished and emphasized. All the themes should be based on human experience. I am not satisfied with some expressions, especially with the ordinary political quarrels.”¹²⁹ *İflas* is mentioned again on 29 May 1961 when Tanpınar gives a comprehensive outline of his *Aydaki Kadın*. Obviously *İflas* was going to be the third part of his *Aydaki Kadın* as the first part was titled as “İç İç” [One within the Other] and the second “Karşı Karşıya”¹³⁰ [Against the Opposition]. Selim has plans very similar to Tanpınar’s. For example, he plans to publish a periodical, as Tanpınar writes in his diary early on 17 July 1953 about his intentions of starting a magazine: “Now that I have worked off this complex of Europe, my

¹²³ Enginün and Kerman, 323.

¹²⁴ Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın*, 182.

¹²⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 159.

¹²⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 220.

¹²⁷ Tanpınar, *Aydaki Kadın*, 31.

¹²⁸ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 234.

¹²⁹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 195.

¹³⁰ “Karşı Karşıya” (Vis-à-vis) clearly reminds us Aldous Huxley’s *Point Counter Point*. (Huxley, *Point Counter Point*, (London: Dalkey Archieve Press, 1996). Tanpınar read it in 1960 from its French translation (as *Contrepoint* in 1930). He writes on 2 November 1960: “It is good to read *Contrepoint*. I think the main point is [...]” (*Günlüklerin Işığında*, 237). It is obvious that Tanpınar was influenced by several European writers and scholars. For example, Huxley (291), Woolf (129, 140), Joyce (228), Faulkner (228), Valery (22 23, 142, 151, 152, 208, 285, 288, 289 291), Baudelaire (142, 238, 307), Bergson (24, 213), Flaubert (213), Beckett (148, 172), Gide (152, 155, 261), Nerval (142, 177), T.S. Eliot (156), Chaucer (181), Dostoevsky (139, 154), and Shakespeare (154).

only hope is to publish a magazine.”¹³¹ Many years after this diary entry, Tanpınar was still writing about his plans for a magazine, even in the last days of his life: “As the days pass I feel a need to publish a magazine. A monthly magazine. An article a day on one subject. Even if it is published as a book, it will be composed of daily articles; a planned book of articles or studies.”¹³²

Tanpınar never mentions his third novel, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler*¹³³ [Those Outside the Scene],¹³⁴ in his diary. Serialized in *Yeni İstanbul* from 9 March to 26 May 1950, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* was published as a book in 1973. Like his other novels, the serialized version of *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* was revised and edited by Tanpınar himself since he was obviously planning to publish it as a book. It is odd that Tanpınar never mentions the revision of the novel in his diary, perhaps because either he did the revision before he began to write his diary in 1953 or he did not want to say anything about it.

Apart from the novels that Tanpınar writes about in his diary, we need to mention *Beş Şehir* and his famous poem *Eşik*¹³⁵ [Threshold] as texts several times noted in the diary. Although published very early in 1945, it took another fifteen years for *Beş Şehir* to be released. Tanpınar complains about that when he finds out his friends Mehmet Ali and Sabahittin Eyüpoğlu were rewarded for their efforts. He wrote on 1 November 1959, “Would not *Beş Şehir* get a prize.”¹³⁶ He several times gets mad at himself for not finishing the revision for the second print of *Beş Şehir*. Right before it was reprinted he writes, “I have brought¹³⁷ [sic] *Beş Şehir*. But, I do not like it anymore. I want no more to do with it.”¹³⁸ Even though Tanpınar defines

¹³¹ Enginün and Kerman, 70.

¹³² Enginün and Kerman, 35.

¹³³ Tanpınar, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* (İstanbul: Büyük Kitaplık, 1973). See Tanpınar, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007). Subsequent references to this book are from this edition.

¹³⁴ *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* is often translated by critics as *Waiting in the Wings*.

¹³⁵ Tanpınar, “Eşik,” in *Bütün Şiirleri*, ed. İnci Engünün (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010), 63--67.

¹³⁶ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 168.

¹³⁷ Tanpınar writes “Beş Şehir’i getirdim,” which should be translated as “I have brought Beş Şehir.” However, considering what comes right after this sentence, that is, “But, I do not like it anymore. I want no more to do with it,” I think Tanpınar wanted to say “Beş Şehir’i bitirdim,” which means “I have finished Beş Şehir.” The Turkish words, “getirdim” and “bitirdim” might get confused by Tanpınar. I should also note that there is no explanation of this sentence by the editors.

¹³⁸ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 241.

Beş Şehir as dated, he later shows his satisfaction by saying “with my unpopular *Beş Şehir* [...] I am a big part of Turkish Literature.”¹³⁹

Tanpınar’s famous poem *Eşik* is mentioned several times in his diary. Every time Tanpınar makes a list of his prospective texts, *Eşik* is placed at the top. The diary entries, especially the ones dated 19 and 21 April 1960, give important clues on the interpretation of his poem: “What I like in music is the revival of the musical instrument with the orchestral accompaniment [...]. I can do that in *Eşik* as Valery did that superbly. To what extent can I benefit from this in ‘Musical’ poetry and ‘Dance’ [...]? By listening to the first piano concerto, I have searched for an inspiration for the latest version of ‘*Eşik*.’”¹⁴⁰ Tanpınar was certainly expecting good reception for his poem as he writes, “I have not done anything about *Eşik*. It is like an iron leg. Yet this poem can save me, save the whole book. The book needs this kind of strong poem.”¹⁴¹ Tanpınar was valuing his *Eşik* greatly because it was “the poem about a puzzle.”¹⁴²

Reinterpretation of Woolf’s Novels

In her five-volume diary, Virginia Woolf mentions her novels several times. She gives many clues about how she came up with the context and the characters in her novels. Many studies have been done, and many articles have been written on Woolf’s diary entries in relation to her novels. However, the importance of her diary in terms of its connection with the interpretation of her novels is not studied sufficiently. Some entries are significant for this study to understand whether Woolf wanted to affect the interpretation of her novels.

Out of her nine novels, *Mrs. Dalloway* is perhaps the most well-acclaimed; Woolf says so while doing a quick comparison of two of her novels: “I want to think out *Mrs. Dalloway*. I want to foresee this book better than the others and get the utmost out of it. I expect I could have screwed *Jacob*¹⁴³ up tighter, if I had foreseen;

¹³⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 300.

¹⁴⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 183.

¹⁴¹ Enginün and Kerman, 183.

¹⁴² Enginün and Kerman, 183. By puzzle, Tanpınar meant the poem’s context that questions the change of civilization and its impact on ambivalent identities.

¹⁴³ Woolf, *Jacob’s Room* (NY: Dover Publications, 1998).

but I had to make my path as I went.”¹⁴⁴ Another diary entry on *Mrs. Dalloway* shows how Woolf strived to write her novel. It also gives her theoretical ideas:

For my own part I am laboriously dredging my mind for Mrs Dalloway & bringing up light buckets. I don't like the feeling I'm writing too quickly. I must press it together. I wrote 4 thousand words of reading in record time, 10 days; but then it was merely a quick sketch of Pastons, supplied by books. Now I break off, according to my quick change theory, to write Mrs D. (who ushers in a host of others, I begin to perceive), then I do Chaucer, & finish the first chapter early in September.¹⁴⁵

As Tanpınar was questioning himself for his writing mood, so was Woolf. Almost a year after she wrote the diary entry above, this time she questions herself in terms of the essence she was trying to give to her novel: “But now what do I feel about *my* writing? – this book, that is, *The Hours*, if that's its name? One must write from deep feeling, said Dostoevsky. And do I? Or do I fabricate with words, loving them as I do? No, I think not.”¹⁴⁶

Woolf's inclinations and mood on the production of her characters are important. The protagonist, Mrs. Dalloway, and the other main character Septimus Warren Smith have been studied from many perspectives, but they have not been much considered from an aspect that associates them with Woolf's madness. In the only introduction Woolf wrote for any of her novels, she writes how she initially planned to have Clarisa Dalloway commit suicide, but she could not make that happen so she created a different character, that is, Smith, a thirty-year-old WWI veteran.¹⁴⁷ Woolf very well explains the emergence of this new character in one of her diary entries: “Mrs. Dalloway has branched into a book; & I adumbrate here a study of insanity & suicide: the world seen by the sane & the insane side by side – something like that: Septimus Smith? – is that a good name? to be more close to the fact than Jacob: but I think Jacob was a necessary step, for me, in working free.”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁴ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 209.

¹⁴⁵ Woolf, 189.

¹⁴⁶ Woolf, 248.

¹⁴⁷ I will analyze Woolf's comments on the victims of shell-shock culture in Chapter 4.

¹⁴⁸ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 2, 207-8.

In the following summer she clearly writes her intention of showing sanity and insanity and the purpose of her composition of the novel: “In this book I have almost too many ideas. I want to give life & death, sanity & insanity; I want to criticise the social system, & to show it at work, at its most intense – But here I may be posing.”¹⁴⁹ By having both Clarissa and Septimus, Woolf broadened the range of themes, including sanity and insanity through Septimus; love, death and the meaning of life through Clarissa.

Woolf celebrates the 100th page of *Mrs. Dalloway*; however, this time she questions her characters in the novel. The following diary entry is significant because Woolf mentions her tunneling theory, which later becomes one of the most significant theories of the modernist writers. She also challenges Percy Lubbock, who was a major critic at the time:

The doubtful point is I think the character of Mrs. Dalloway. It may be too stiff, too glittering & tinsely – But then I can bring innumerable other characters to her support. I wrote the 100th page today. Of course, I’ve only been feeling my way into it – up till last August anyhow. It took me a year’s groping to discover what I call my tunneling process, by which I tell the past by installments, as I have need of it. This is my prime discovery so far; & the fact that I’ve been so long finding it, proves, I think, how false Percy Lubbock’s doctrine is – that you can do this sort of thing consciously.¹⁵⁰

To the Lighthouse is another Woolf’s novel that can in some ways be considered as an autobiographical fiction. From her childhood to madness and to her worries about the First World War, the novel is well organized around Woolf’s own fears, desires, and memories. However, she makes some careful displacements in the time and setting of the action so that the novel does not label her as one of the participants or character of the novel. Despite these historical and geographical shifts, *To the Lighthouse* can still be considered very personal, as her sister Vanessa Bell wrote to Woolf:

¹⁴⁹ Woolf, 248.

¹⁵⁰ Woolf, 272.

Anyhow it seemed to me in the first part of the book you have given a portrait of mother which is more like her to me than anything I could ever have conceived of as possible. It is almost painful to have her so raised from the dead. You have made one feel the extraordinary beauty of her character, which must be the most difficult thing in the world to do. It was like meeting her again with oneself grown up & on equal terms [...].¹⁵¹

A diary entry explains the involvement of Woolf herself in the novel and leads to reinterpretation of the novel. On completing the novel, she wrote: “I used to think of [father] & mother daily; but writing *The Lighthouse* laid them in my mind.”¹⁵²

The examples of diary entries on Woolf’s novels can be maximized; for each of her nine novels and for her other non-fiction writings, many diary entries were written, and these notes brought new perspectives to her novels. In addition, diary entries allow readers to interpret and reinterpret the novels some years after she wrote, and they also show how Woolf wanted to make her diary another literary work of art. As Tanpınar had that in his mind, Woolf too was guiding her readers to continue her legacy even through the interpretation of the novels. Tanpınar and Woolf showed how their novels should be understood; they wanted to control interpretation of their novels even after their death.

A Fictional Self in a Fictional Text

Woolf’s and Tanpınar’s diaries might be considered as semi-fictitious texts. Tanpınar’s diary has been critiqued only in terms of showing Tanpınar’s personality rather than his literary inclinations since it was published in 2007. However, it possesses literary value not because of its rhetoric, organization, or literary techniques but in terms of Tanpınar’s distinguished portrayal of himself. Tanpınar’s image in the diary has already been mentioned by almost all critics, but for the sake of analyzing Tanpınar’s personality. However, the literary techniques used to assess Tanpınar’s novels, poems, and articles have never been applied to evaluate the diary,

¹⁵¹ Qtd. in Avrom Fleishman, “‘To Return to St. Ives’: Autobiographical Writings,” in *ELH* 48, no: 3 (Autumn 1981): 610.

¹⁵² Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 208.

which confines the diary to a few shallow discussions. However, as *Huzur* has Mümtaz, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* has Cemal, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* has Hayri İrdal, *Muhur Beste* has Behçet Bey, and *Aydaki Kadın* has Selim as protagonists, the diary has a hero too – that is, Tanpınar himself.

The representation of the self in diaries is another important issue that explains the diary as a fictional text. Considering the motives of diarists, the issue of gender and authenticity is at stake since diary writing is pretty much linked to the question of whether the self can be rendered accurately in words. It seems problematic and unresolved since the self is to a significant extent invented, so the diary containing this self might thus be considered fictive. The riddle of subjectivity is then central to diarists' process of writing as Woolf was struggling to find her subjectivity early in life, and this struggle is most clearly seen in her diary. While in her early entries, she used her diary to mark her place, her difference, partially motivated by sibling rivalry. Later, she used her mature diary to construct the self and to show her struggle to fit into the social mold in the patriarchal system, and to find an identity as a writer. In one of her diary entries, she explains how diary-keeping serves several purposes such as “to get rid of the fidgets, to have a record of her life, to provide fodder for the memoirs she intended to write, to explore writing, and to explore her many selves.”¹⁵³

Diary-writing as a process of constructing a self may not be applicable to Tanpınar in terms of gender but whether he is proposing a new self/identity is a significant question. Women were likely associated with the diary form due to the fact that it was a significant literary space for women authors who were willing to express themselves. While women's writing in the early twentieth century had access to the literary marketplace, it was restrictive in terms of accepting radical or taboo subject matter, especially sexual subjects. For Woolf, it was a means to convey to an audience her thoughts and feelings that were too personal and controversial to expose.

Though Tanpınar does not mention why he started writing his diary, his appraisal of diary-keeping is well known. He says in his letter to Yaşar Nabi how he

¹⁵³ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 5, 335.

was upset because he had not kept a diary until then: “What upsets me most is that I have not kept a diary; my only advice to my young friends is that they keep diaries. A person can produce everything out of himself, out of his life. Keeping a diary means keeping oneself in the view all the time. There is no greater economy than that.”¹⁵⁴ The editors of the diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, similarly explain Tanpınar’s motives for keeping a diary. They point out in the Preface that the diary is “only notebooks in which loneliness was reflected.”¹⁵⁵ The emergence of the concept of the modern self is directly relevant to the representation of the self by Woolf and Tanpınar, especially in their diaries. Showing the connection between the novel as a fictional text to the diary gives us clues on how Woolf and Tanpınar turned their diaries into fictional texts.

The diary is associated with the emergence of the concept of selfhood. Considered within the context of the ideology of individualism, diaries – or in a more general sense personal accounts – became increasingly popular since the lives of most people are now worth publishing. Elizabeth Podnieks makes a list of very important developments that influenced the individual as individual, including “the erosion of the feudal system; progress in science, such as the discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo; the empiricism of Bacon; the philosophical speculations of Descartes, Locke, and Rousseau; a burgeoning interest in chronicle and family history; and increasing secularization.”¹⁵⁶ These events cover almost three centuries, from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, and make personal writing possible.

The modern recognition of the self and identity given in autobiographies may have contributed to the idea of a fictional self in the texts since it was self-fashioning. Sidonie Smith, in *A Poetics of Women’s Autobiography*, identifies how

the new recognition of identity as an earned cultural achievement, an arena of self-fashioning rather than as ascriptive, natural donée, the corollary recognition for identity as simultaneously unique and yet dependent on social reality and cultural conventions; an increased willingness to challenge the authority of traditional modes of inquiry

¹⁵⁴ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 308.

¹⁵⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 8.

¹⁵⁶ Podnieks, *English Diaries*, 15.

to promote the hermeneutical responsibility and authority of the speaking subject [...]. [These] coalesced to foster an environment in which autobiography as the literary representation of that human possibility became not only possible but also desirable.”¹⁵⁷

This desire for representation of the self was already available before the diary in the modern sense came out: “journals of travels, public journals, journals of conscience, and journals of personal memoranda”¹⁵⁸ might be taken as pre-diary habits, as Robert Fothergill notes in his *Private Chronicles*.

Not only the diary emerged along with the changing representation of selfhood and identity; but some other literary prose genres such as the novel, the biography, the autobiography, and the modern essay developed concurrent with the development of the diary. While this concurrence supports the very potentiality that genre boundaries can blur, it indeed explains how non-fiction works often have fictional aspects, as we see in Woolf and Tanpinar’s diaries. The influence of genres on the other genres is often seen, as in the influence of Montaigne’s *Essays* on essay writers as well as on writers of diaries and autobiography. As discussed in Chapter 1, Virginia Woolf was one of those who were influenced by Montaigne’s description of his own character, feelings, desires, and by how he makes himself the subject of the *Essays*. Woolf’s use of form and content in her diary was inspired by Montaigne.

Interconnectedness of non-fictional genres is often seen in literature, as the diary developed alongside biography and autobiography. While the diary is often associated with the journal, autobiography is defined in relation to biography. On the other hand, the elements of non-fictional texts can be seen in fictional narrations. Daniel Defoe, for example, in 1719 used the concept of autobiography in his novel *Robinson Crusoe* as if he were acting as the only editor of Crusoe’s self-narrated life story. He mentions in “The Preface” that “the editor believes the thing to be a just history of fact; neither is there any appearance of fiction in it.”¹⁵⁹ Samuel Richardson similarly uses life-writing genres in his *Pamela*¹⁶⁰ and *Clarissa*,¹⁶¹ as he was using

¹⁵⁷ Sidoenie Smith, *A Poetics of Women’s Autobiography* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987), 9.

¹⁵⁸ Fothergill, *Private Chronicles*, 19.

¹⁵⁹ Daniel Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 3.

¹⁶⁰ An epistolary novel, *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* was first published in 1740. See Samuel Richardson, *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded* (New York: Penguin Classics, 1981).

the epistolary mode and journals in his novels. That shows the interconnectedness of genres and, for this study, how the constructed a boundary of the novel is often transgressed by other genres, including autobiography.

Considering the emergence of the novel in the eighteenth century, the diary had already reached its full form and practice by then. Novels reflect some content of diaries and offer new possibilities for diary models, which shows the close association between novel and diary. Marcia Landy shows in her essay “The Silent Woman: Towards a Feminist Critique” that “in literature, the novel, in its portrayal of bourgeois society, its emphasis on romance and sentiment, on psychology, paved the way for a closer examination of social relations, particularly of male-female relationships. The biography and autobiography, the journal and the diary are inevitable counterparts of the novel.”¹⁶² On the other hand, Cinthia Gannet draws attention to the journal for social messages, which were also found in the novels of the time. In *Gender and the Journal: Diaries and Academic Discourse*, Gannet observes that “The journal would carry with it the critical habits of mind associated with close observation of and reflection on the physical world, the social world, and the inner world of sense and sensibility.”¹⁶³ Moreover, gendering the journal and sentimental novels as a female form establishes another connection between journals and novels.

The connection of diaries with novels is multifaceted: autobiographical writing might be an important part of a novel; it can also provide a context in which to develop characters until they are ready for the novel. In one of her early novels, *Night and Day*, Virginia Woolf used the diary as a pivotal text to escape from the traditional context. The novel’s two protagonists, Katharine Hilbery and Ralph Fenham, come together to confess their love but exchange documents, notes, doodles, and mathematical computations instead of expressing their love. Their relationship does not continue before they read each other’s personal texts: “But he

¹⁶¹ An epistolary novel, *Clarissa, or the History of a Young Lady* was first published in 1748. See Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa, or the History of a Young Lady* (New York: Penguin Books, 1985).

¹⁶² Marcia Landy, “The Silent woman: Towards a Feminist Critique,” in *The Authority of Experience: Essays in Feminist Criticism*, ed. Arlyn Diamond and Lee R. Edwards (Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 20.

¹⁶³ Cinthia Gannet, *Gender and the Journal: Diaries and Academic Discourse*, (New York: SUNY, 1992), 113.

took them in his hands and, giving her by a sudden impulse his own unfinished dissertation, with its mystical conclusion, they read each other's compositions in silence. Katharine read his sheets to an end; Ralph followed her figures as far as his mathematics would let him”¹⁶⁴ Diary sharing, which was very common in Victorian England, as discussed in the first chapter, is now a part of Woolf (Virginia Stephen in 1919) novel. The diary-sharing tradition is mentioned also in Woolf's diary when she commented on Bloomsbury's loss of nerve in diary sharing: “the sad thing is that we daren't trust each other to read our books; they lie, like vast consciences, in our most secret drawers.”¹⁶⁵

Editorial Interference in Woolf's Diaries

The diary's status as a finished work raises another point to be considered in terms of authenticity and text manipulation. Some diarists edit their texts themselves; this editing may vary from selecting what to include and exclude to omitting words and revising passages. As broadly discussed in the first pages of this chapter, Woolf and Tanpinar edited and revised their diaries, which raises questions on the sincerity of the texts. Far more questionable than the revision by the diarists themselves, however, is interference in the text by someone other than the writer himself or herself. In some cases the editors might tend to make changes according to their stereotypes or prejudices and sometimes according to the image that they want to project. In that case the editor holds a great deal of responsibility, and a distorted version of a text is at stake. Analyzing the diaries of Woolf and Tanpinar in terms of whether the texts are authentic or fictitious requires a close look at the editorial interference in the texts.

The issue of authenticity is connected to a significant extent to any interference by both editors and authors. Editorial interference is an external interference that might even a completely distort the text. This level of editorial manipulation, which causes textual distortion is rarely seen; however, when it occurs, it undermines the authenticity of the text. During the lifetime of a diarist, the diary remains unfinished

¹⁶⁴ Virginia Woolf, *Night and Day* (PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Electronic Classics Series, 2001), 428.

¹⁶⁵ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1: 95.

and open; something can always be added. However, after becoming a completed work, the diary is at the mercy of its editors. The editors might use the opportunity to revise the work in the process of publication. For example, Anne Olivier Bell, the editor of the ‘unexpurgated’ diaries of Woolf, accused Leonard Woolf’s earlier abridged edition of the diary, *A Writer’s Diary*,¹⁶⁶ for selectively excluding entries

with some hesitation and misgiving, knowing that such a selection would inevitably present a distorted and unbalanced picture of his wife, since it concentrates on a limited aspect of her personality and, although it reveals a moving and absorbing self-portrait of a true artist at work, its publication probably did a good deal to create or reinforce that popular journalistic image of Virginia Woolf, the moody, arrogant, and malicious Queen of Bloomsbury.¹⁶⁷

While Anne Olivier Bell was accusing Leonard Woolf of creating a journalistic image, Barbara Lounsberry, at “The Fifth Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf” in 1995, blames Bell for obscuring the diaries by excluding 76 entries from the Asheham diary. These entries were in a volume that Woolf kept to record changes in the weather, wildlife, and plant life around her house. However, Anne Bell preferred to exclude these entries and include only the entries from the notebook kept in London. Therefore, the full scope of Woolf’s diary has not reached us in its original form.¹⁶⁸

In terms of the editorial involvement with the text, Anne Bell’s remark about Leonard’s operation on Virginia’s diary manuscript is important. Before Quentin Bell, husband of Anne Olivier and a nephew of Virginia Woolf, began to write the biography of Virginia Woolf, he asked for the manuscripts from Leonard, who had thirty manuscript volumes transcribed and typed out. Instead of sending to Bell the original copies, Leonard sent them the carbons, which “turned out to be in tatters.”¹⁶⁹ Anne Bell also complains that Leonard did the selection of the excerpts for A

¹⁶⁶ Leonard Woolf, ed., *A Writer’s Diary* (St. Albans: Triad/Panther Books, 1978). Leonard Woolf published those extracts from the diary of Virginia Woolf for the first time in 1953 by Hogarth Press.

¹⁶⁷ Anne Olivier Bell, “Editing Virginia Woolf’s Diary,” 11.

¹⁶⁸ See Barbara Lounsberry, “The Diaries vs. Letters: Continuities and Contradictions,” in *Virginia Woolf: Texts and Contexts, Selected Papers from the Fifth Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf*, ed. Beth Rigel et al. (NY: Pace University Press, 1996), 93–98.

¹⁶⁹ Bell, “Editing Virginia Woolf’s Diary,” 13.

Writer's Diary with scissors; he cut the bits he wanted out of the carbon copy and sent them to the printer. The remnants were put into envelopes and sent to Quentin; the remnants plus the published copy, *A Writers Diary*, were the complete text.¹⁷⁰ Matching the pieces together and dating the entries were difficult, so Bell reconstituted the copy she had, typed out the published excerpts, and pasted them together with the remnants. She referred to Leonard's master copy kept in a cabinet at home at Monks House when she got puzzled.

There were clues to date the undated entries; Anne Bell used public events or private arrangements to date them or at least to narrow down the possibilities. For finding out the true references in the entries, Anne Olivier consulted her husband, Quentin, several times because Quentin already published a very comprehensive biography of Virginia in 1972; besides, when Leonard died in 1969, he left the copyrights of Virginia Woolf's writings to Quentin Bell and to Quentin's surviving sister, Angelica Garnett.¹⁷¹ Moreover, Anne Olivier reports that they had an extensive library in their home including the *Dictionary of National Biography* edited by Virginia's father, some other standard works of English and French literature, and several works written by the Bloomsbury writers. Therefore, all the notes and footnotes were organized, and information given in the entries was recognized and completed by Anne Bell in the process of editing and publishing.

Anne Olivier was displeased with the earlier publications on Virginia. *A Writer's Diary* gave, she says, "a very oblique portrait; in the story of [Leonard's] own life, we see much more of her; and Quentin's work, one would have thought, portrayed her full-length and in the round."¹⁷² Both Leonard and Quentin, Anne complains, "had completely misrepresented her, and by concealing or cooking the evidence to which only they had access, had been able to present their preferred image – and one in which Leonard himself figured as hero."¹⁷³ Especially, Quentin's biography was based upon some interpretations of Virginia's fiction, which is a questionable approach to biography. In another biography written about Woolf, there was the same scenario. Despite being politely discouraged by Leonard, Aileen Pippett

¹⁷⁰ Bell, 13.

¹⁷¹ Bell, 16.

¹⁷² Bell, 23.

¹⁷³ Bell, 23.

studied Virginia's letters to Vita Sackville-West; and "depending heavily upon lavish quotation from those letters" Anne Oliver Bell says, Pippett produced "an extraordinarily ill-balanced and ill-informed biography called *The Moth and the Star*."¹⁷⁴ The representation of Virginia Woolf in biographies and in the edited autobiographies brings out questions about the authenticity of Woolf's diaries since editorial interference is obvious.

Editorial Evidence in Tanpınar's Diary

The editorial job on Tanpınar's diary is important and might give some clues as to how accurate and complete the diary is. In the preface to Tanpınar's diary, the editors, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, informed readers of the editorial process. In a letter written right after the death of Tanpınar, Necmettin Halil Onan, a friend of Tanpınar, wrote to Bedrettin Tuncel about how he felt terrible due to his death and mentions that he had the responsibility to straighten up all the things, the house, the books, the writings, and such. He also complains that he could not manage to collect all the written texts scattered around the house. Even though the editors mention his complaints only to claim Onan as the first person who saw the manuscript, it appears that the compilation of the diary entries was similar to Woolf's. This pile of Tanpınar's writings remained for a long time although some entries were dug out by Mehmet Kaplan in 1963 – one year after Tanpınar's death – for his *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası*. He published them by including some excerpts from Tanpınar's personal account with a thank-you note to Tanpınar's brother Kenan for the entries. Eight years after Kaplan's study on the entries, the papers were still dispersed and probably some were in tatters, as suggested in a letter of 21 June 1971 by Kaplan to İnci Enginün, where he mentions how he, with Kenan, looked over the pile.

Kenan Tanpınar left his brother's six notebooks to Mehmet Kaplan and also let him decide whether to publish them or not. Kaplan had some worries about the publication but some remarks of Tanpınar in his diary entries, especially the one that

¹⁷⁴ Bell, 11. Anne O. Bell claims that Aileen Pippett had a close friendship with Vita Sackville-West and therefore used the letters sent by Woolf to West and wrote an ill-balanced biography. Leonard Woolf did not give permission for their publication, but he later allowed its publication in America and thus "made a further contribution to the distorted image of Virginia Woolf" (Bell, 12).

reads, “thinking about the publication of what I am writing now after me [...],”¹⁷⁵ changed his mind. Besides, Kaplan’s students, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, had great influence to change Kaplan’s mind: “In Europe, the most intimate letters and diaries of scholars are published, which leads new texts to be produced and gives some impression of the relationship of text and author. Artists need these sorts of texts for making films, theatrical productions, and especially documentaries. Why don’t we let that happen?”¹⁷⁶ After Kaplan handed over the documents, it took another twenty years for the diary to be published since the editors did not have time to collate the texts due to their university responsibilities; secondly, they had some difficulty reading Tanpınar’s handwriting, and there were several notes all around the manuscript which complicated the transcription process.¹⁷⁷ Nevertheless, I think the editors took advantage of having the manuscripts in the meantime by presenting some written-out texts at conferences and by publishing some of them in journals. They decided to publish the diary when they thought “to have only a few left to transcribe.”¹⁷⁸ The un-transcribed parts have not yet been published or made available, which raises questions about editorial interference.¹⁷⁹

The title of the diary, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar’la Başbaşa*¹⁸⁰ [In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar], is significant in terms of the editorial influence. “Kendimle Başbaşa” [Face to Face with Myself] was already a title Tanpınar had planned to give to one of his texts. The editors were inspired by

¹⁷⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 130.

¹⁷⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 7.

¹⁷⁷ See footnote 214 for another possible reason for the editors’ waiting more than twenty years to publish the diary. I do not give it here since it might be considered as a conspiracy theory, though there are plausible explanations.

¹⁷⁸ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 9.

¹⁷⁹ In his column in *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, Enis Batur has some negative comments on the publication of the diary: “the published form of *Tanpınar’la Başbaşa* is almost shameful: if it were not edited by two professors but by two university students, they would not have been graduated. Beside their awkward interventions, the book is full of errors and missing parts. [It is] not difficult to prove what I say; give the manuscript to me and Ekrem Işın for the second edition, let us show them how a decent work is done” (Batur, “Tanpınar’la Başbaşa,” *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, 24 July 2008.) My comments about the editorial interference will show whether Batur is right on his accusations, or his remarks are just academic arrogance.

¹⁸⁰ We can raise an issue about the name given to Tanpınar’s diary; there is no doubt that İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, as the editors, spent enormous effort on the publication process; however, the title could have been “Diaries” or “Tanpınar’s Diary.” *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar’la Başbaşa* sounds like it was an academic study based on Tanpınar’s diaries. However, the writer was Tanpınar himself, not Kerman and Enginün as their names are on the cover as the writers of the text.

Tanpınar's intention for the title and gave a similar name to the diary. One of the remarks of the editors is striking: it says, "'In Private with Myself' was an appropriate statement for explaining the occasional zingers in the diary."¹⁸¹ This protectionist attitude¹⁸² toward Tanpınar reminds us of Leonard Woolf's choosy attitude toward his wife's diary entries and his representation of the "preferred image."¹⁸³

"We have not tampered with the language of the diary," the editors say. The underlined words are left as they are on the manuscript and published with an indication on the footnote. Hundreds of first names were completed with their last names given in brackets, but some were not recognized and left as they were in the manuscript. Tanpınar had some crossed out words and sentences in his diary, which were not analyzed and identified but only the crossed out words in poems were transcribed as much as possible. We can raise another question about some of the footnotes. Some people's opinions of Tanpınar are given in the footnotes, some harshly criticizing, even insulting Tanpınar. They are not originally included in Tanpınar's diary; therefore, they sound like insertions to justify and back for Tanpınar's negative remarks about several people in the diary.

The editors had some thoughts on authenticity and audience, given in the preface to the diary. They mention how Tanpınar has a "sore"¹⁸⁴ tone in his diary, even sharper than that in his letters. The editors assert, "he was not addressing anybody this time. Besides, we do not assume that Tanpınar was censoring himself. These were the notebooks in which loneliness was reflected."¹⁸⁵ By mentioning their opinions on the issues of censorship and audience, Enginün and Kerman were in fact leading readers of the diary. Even Tanpınar's own remarks on the prospective audience of his diary are interpreted by the editors and given in advance in the preface. Tanpınar says, "I think this diary will be read after me."¹⁸⁶ This statement of purpose on its publication and his expectation of an audience has been interpreted by

¹⁸¹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 9.

¹⁸² See footnote no. 214 for another protectionist attitude of the editors toward Tanpınar.

¹⁸³ Bell, "Editing Virginia Woolf's Diary," 23.

¹⁸⁴ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 8.

¹⁸⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 8.

¹⁸⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

the editors as if Tanpınar were expecting those close to him to read his notebooks, not a public audience.¹⁸⁷

The editors seem to be in full control; in the preface they draw the attention of readers to certain points: “Tanpınar is unaware of the world he lives in”¹⁸⁸ say the editors; however, in the diary, Tanpınar is quite aware of the life he experiences; he was aware of the world, his life, and his struggle: “I wish I can say all my thoughts before I die; Turkey! You have drained me.”¹⁸⁹ In another diary entry he writes, “the truth is that I am new in Turkish but not in the world.”¹⁹⁰ Another misleading aspect of the preface is the editors’ feelings about Tanpınar: “while we were reading these diary entries, we felt both pity and anger toward him.”¹⁹¹ There are some other similar remarks of the editors in the preface; these lead and mislead readers and affect their interpretation of Tanpınar and his diary. Perhaps the most obvious interference with the manuscript is the form of presentation. The original manuscript cannot be read thoroughly but can be seen amongst the comments or the summaries of the editors. It is to a certain extent acceptable to see the commentaries of the editors in the preface and footnotes, completing missing words and phrases in the diary entries, but that the diary entries were merged with the instructive comments of the editors is very controlling and turns the diary into false academic study.

We can comment precisely on the editors’ influence and interpretation of Tanpınar and his diary. Like all literatures around the world, Turkish literature, too, has its canonical writers and canonical texts. Especially in the second half of the twentieth century, several literary circles in Turkey have their ‘own’ writers and scholars, publicized and acclaimed and popular. Mehmet Kaplan and his students, including Zeynep Kerman and İnci Enginün, are authorities in Turkish literature on Tanpınar. Therefore, the way they represent Tanpınar determines the standard interpretation of Tanpınar and influences most of the studies about him. Furthermore, sometimes anomalous opinions have been considered marginal and labeled as

¹⁸⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

¹⁸⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 10.

¹⁸⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 321.

¹⁹⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 301.

¹⁹¹ Enginün and Kerman, 12.

invalid. I will analyze this in Chapter 3, along with changing interpretations of Tanpınar.

Tanpınar's Book of Revenge

As mentioned previously, a diary allows change and growth. The author decides on his or her attitude toward the reader and determines the events to be reported. The characteristics of diary-writing allow the diarist to have room for changing the life experiences into an account full of fictitious elements. It is not easy – probably not fair, either – to claim that Woolf's and Tanpınar's diaries are fictional texts; however, some authorial attitudes and interference throw suspicion on the objectivity of the account. On the other hand, we should keep in mind that neither Woolf nor Tanpınar claim that their diaries are objective accounts, but the nature of autobiographical writings lead us to think of them as personal and authentic.

I have already analyzed the authenticity of Tanpınar's diary in this part of the study. In addition, within the context of this study discussions on style and content are worthwhile. Tanpınar's rhetoric is strong, aggressive, and sometimes implausible. The content mostly focuses on his writing about his relationship with himself – his inwardness. His distinctive rhetoric cannot be seen in his other works, especially in his novels. Besides, the observant attitude seem in some of his other texts¹⁹² cannot be seen in his diary; instead it is more inward and full of judgments about himself and those around him. Tanpınar's tension in his diary differs from his other works, especially his novels, and he discomfited many readers when it was published in 2007.

As a student and close friend of Tanpınar, Mehmet Kaplan worried about the publication of Tanpınar's diary prior to its publication because of possible reactions it might provoke. Kaplan was hesitant to publish some diary entries; he did not feel comfortable with its publication because Tanpınar would be a victim of distorted interpretations; that is, he had a protectionist attitude toward Tanpınar. He was to a certain extent right about his worries since when Tanpınar's letters were published

¹⁹² Tanpınar's well-acclaimed novel *Huzur* has never been discussed in the context of its main character Mümtaz's being in the presence of the old culture but having no say. Tanpınar's criticism in his diary of scholarly passivity against the progressive changes in society can be explained in the context of social reaction toward modernization in Turkey.

by Zeynep Kerman in 1974,¹⁹³ they were not well-received by some readers. Oktay Akbal said, “After reading this book, I felt emptiness [...]. Tanpınar’s letters were full of simple, insubstantial thoughts, examinations, and observations [...]. A writer is no way different in his daily life from an average person.”¹⁹⁴ Tanpınar’s letters and diary entries were full of accounts about unimportant errands and humdrums as well as his previously unknown ideas and ambitions. The reactions toward Tanpınar’s letters and diary give several clues about the role of the artist in Turkish society, which I will discuss in detail below.

Tanpınar’s unstable rhetoric and portrayal of the content in his diary differ from his other works and raise important questions. One argument in this study is that Tanpınar had a broad knowledge about Western culture but lived up to Eastern principles, and that caused him to struggle to find a way out of the depression that stemmed from the collapse of the Ottoman Sultanate and caused him to be ambivalent.¹⁹⁵ I will discuss Tanpınar’s ambivalence about the radical change in Turkish society in Chapter 3; however, his contradictory language and content raises questions about the authenticity of the diary. It also perhaps explains his struggle to produce a fictitious self in his diary; so the projected identity is more suited to the content and style. In other words, the crucial question is: are the novels, the diary, or both fictitious? The answer to this question depends greatly on an analysis of the difference between his short-tempered remarks in his diary and his good-natured attitudes and presentations in his other texts; this will help us assess if his diary was a fictional text.

Tanpınar wrote about his life experiences in his texts, especially in his novels. Although truth and fiction cannot always be separated in novels, Tanpınar’s novels are based on fictitious events, unlike diary novels.¹⁹⁶ Some authentic and semi-authentic characters, settings, and events in Tanpınar’s novels enriches the

¹⁹³ Zeynep Kerman, *Tanpınar’ın Mektupları* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007).

¹⁹⁴ Qtd in Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 7.

¹⁹⁵ In his *Sahnenin Dışındakiler*, Tanpınar describes the ambivalent characters who keep their traditional way of life but are much exposed to Western influences. In *Huzur*, through effective description of Istanbul Tanpınar delineates the conflict of East and West; *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* draws a picture of the society that he lives in, highlighting the conflict of being both Easterner and Westerner.

¹⁹⁶ Şinasi and Münevver Ayaşlı use diary-novel characteristics in their novels.

description through the author's life experiences. The purpose of his authorial presence can be best understood in his words; he writes in his *XIX. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* [The History of the Nineteenth-Century Turkish Literature]: "There is no author who does not write the story of his own generation at least once."¹⁹⁷ On the other hand, for Tanpınar it is not appropriate to mention real names in fictional texts:

These are all the reservations about the story that come immediately to mind. If I think about it, I would surely find several reminiscences connected to it. The reality is that a text exists alongside life [...]. Why am I not writing Gülbay's story as it truly happened? If I had done so, it would have been folklore. And I would have lost what I want in all my texts; that is the represented essence. That's why I changed the protagonist and the setting of the story.¹⁹⁸

Tapınar, who says that he writes his own story in the novels and in many other texts, tends to write a fictional self with a language particular to his so-called autobiography. In his diary, Tanpınar has a negative tone in his criticism; for example, he calls Yahya Kemal Beyatlı – his teacher, a close friend, and an eminent source of his inspiration – "slipshod"; degrades Ottoman culture and traditions; names his closest pupil a "firebrand," and speaks ill of many people around him. This inconsistent attitude, not spoken by Tanpınar but written in his notebook may stem from his ambivalence; however, it might be related to Tanpınar's establishing in his diary a different self with a different discourse.

The most striking and unexpected comments of Tanpınar in his diary are about Yahya Kemal Beyatlı. Before the diary was published, people assumed that Tanpınar always considered Yahya Kemal as his teacher, master, and close friend. His respect and admiration for him even led him to write a book about him, titled *Yahya Kemal*.¹⁹⁹ In the introduction to the book, he writes about his first impression of Yahya Kemal:

¹⁹⁷ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *XIX. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010), 441.

¹⁹⁸ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 346.

¹⁹⁹ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Yahya Kemal*, (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007).

The door suddenly opened. A medium-height, rotund, round faced, sharp-eyed man entered [...]. He did not seem brilliant. Perhaps, the face, the body, and all were parts of an easily breakable monolith. But when he began to talk, things changed. He talked about Alfred de Vigny that day. It was not a customary subject [...]. He was quite comfortable, dynamic, and stimulating. He seemed to be finding something while he was speaking, as he was impressing, inspiring, and motivating himself too, not just us. The bell rang; the class did not become empty but got more crowded. The bilateral hypnotism increased. Indeed, he was enthralling us with his intelligence and the innovation in his thoughts.²⁰⁰

In his letter to Yaşar Nabi, Tanpınar expresses his opinions about Kemal: “Yahya Kemal was the first person who had a great impression on me. By listening to his lessons, the mixed worlds inside me got settled. I have passed from the world of feelings to the world of ideas.”²⁰¹ From 1923 to 1933, Tanpınar remained separate from Yahya Kemal due to his own and Yahya Kemal’s occupation. When Yahya Kemal came back to Turkey, Tanpınar wrote an article titled *An Appreciation of Yahya Kemal*, and expressed his contentedness: “Yahya Kemal has just arrived. Those who know what it means to be away from him feel joyful now about his return [...]. I am among this joyful crowd.”²⁰²

After the diary was published, people saw a different representation of Yahya Kemal in the diary. In the first pages, Tanpınar goes with the grain and writes, “Yahya Kemal is always right.”²⁰³ On 26 November 1958 he wrote about the death of Yahya Kemal with great sorrow.²⁰⁴ However, after his death, Tanpınar’s notes about him changed dramatically: “I feel puzzled how Yahya Kemal drew these people around him and for so many years. That’s why I have felt bored at his gatherings and have even disliked what he offers [...]. Why would our lives be

²⁰⁰ Tanpınar, 18-19.

²⁰¹ Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, 547.

²⁰² Tanpınar, 231-23.

²⁰³ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 103.

²⁰⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 123-25.

ruined by the death of Yahya Kemal? This is sentimental.”²⁰⁵ In the subsequent pages he begins to question Yahya Kemal: “Isn’t Yahya Kemal taking the easy way out? How many lines are there in the *Yol Düşüncesi* [Thoughts on Road]? Or in some of his odes?”²⁰⁶ In another entry he criticizes the style of Kemal’s poetry:

I have read the drafts of Yahya Kemal’s book. In fact I have read them the second time. Yahya Kemal has not lived up to the image in my mind. The beautiful world of his first poems has been spoiled by the later, even by the latest parts of Süleymaniye and Koca Mustafa Paşa. It is disappointing [...]. I can even say that Yahya Kemal has ruined himself and his poetry by becoming a national poet.²⁰⁷

Tanpınar’s comments on his teacher Yahya Kemal are not restricted to criticism of Kemal’s writing. He even considers him a barrier that he struggles to break:

Yahya Kemal did a lot for us. However, he was not open-minded. He could have done a lot for me. He could have eased tons of things for me. He did not, because he was narrow-minded, too. He was imprisoned in Turkey. I don’t think Yahya Kemal’s appreciation of Eastern music is as good as mine [...]. Yahya Kemal wanted to build a Chinese wall against us. My biggest luck was to break and get through it before it was too late.

In his essay, titled *Tanpınar: Yahya Kemal’in Ephebesi* [Tanpınar: Yahya Kemal’s Ephebe], Hilmi Yavuz claims that Tanpınar’s comments about Yahya Kemal was an excuse for his lack of poetic talent.²⁰⁸ Many other critics say Tanpınar had some sort of oedipal complex due to Yahya Kemal; the presence of Kemal was a barrier to his achievements even though he did not often mention it in public but rather wrote it in his diary.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 132.

²⁰⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 134.

²⁰⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 278.

²⁰⁸ Hilmi Yavuz, “Tanpınar: Yahya Kemal’in Ephebesi,” in *Okuma Biçimleri* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010), 44.

²⁰⁹ Cahit Tanyol tells an anecdote on Tanpınar’s attitude toward Yahya Kemal; Tanpınar tells him only half in jest that “As İsmet Paşa took our freedom, now Yahya Kemal has tyranny over us.” (qtd. in Abdullah Uçman, “Bir Bağlılığın Yıllarca Süren Hikayesi,” in *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*, ed. Abdullah Uçman and Handan İnci (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı), 70.)

Tanpınar compares himself with his teacher in the diary: “The circle of concealment goes outrageously. Is my book of poetry really miserable? I am sure that I have done with a few poems in this book the most important job in Turkish poetry after Yahya Kemal. I have saved the language from the current aridity. But how can you tell that to people.”²¹⁰ He later clearly shows his discontent: “Yahya Kemal tried *verse libre* after he got old and was languishing. And obviously he finished his poems for money, just for the sake of finishing them.”²¹¹ Almost a year before his death, Tanpınar was still upset due to people’s attitude about him; he complained about people’s negligence toward him: “No one is celebrating me on New Year’s Day. I am going to be home alone. Whereas, my poetry book has been published this year and such and such [...]. Even sloppy Yahya Kemal had a circle of friends. Let pass [...].”²¹² The most interesting point about these negative remarks on Yahya Kemal is that when Tanpınar was writing these entries about Kemal, he was in the meantime writing his book *Yahya Kemal*. That clearly shows the paradoxical life he was living and explains his ambivalent position and the disillusionment he was experiencing.

Tanpınar expresses his feelings about his loneliness several times in his diary. His relationship with his circle of friends was obviously not very strong even though he struggled to establish close contacts with some of them. He was polite to his friends; this can be read in his letters. However, when it comes to noting in his diary, he was openly experiencing harsh criticism of almost everybody around him. His comments on Yahya Kemal were the biggest shock for readers of Tanpınar’s diary. But he spoke ill not only about Kemal in the diary; there were many others.

His friends were indeed not very close to him; the reason was Tanpınar’s ambivalent position, which made him neither an Easterner nor a Westerner.²¹³ According to Tanpınar’s diary entries, his friends were not finding him deserving enough to be in their group. However, if the essays and the articles written about him

²¹⁰ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 260.

²¹¹ Enginün and Kerman, 267.

²¹² Enginün and Kerman, 308.

²¹³ This point will be discussed in Chapter 3. Most of the people with whom Tanpınar was trying to establish friendship were dedicated to the official ideology of the new Turkish Republic. However, Tanpınar never rejected the past and traditions, which the Republican ideology was radically uprooting.

since his first publications until his death are considered – that is from 1943 to 1962 – people were taking him quite seriously by writing around sixty essays in nineteen years. Therefore, as Handan İnci noted in her opening adress for the conference held on 1-2 November 2010 at Mimar Sinan University and entitled “The Time of Tanpınar in the World and Turkey,” it was not anybody Tanpınar was expecting attention from but a group of people whom he wanted to be close to but could never do so.²¹⁴

Tanpınar was trying to treat people kindly while he was writing very harsh criticism about them in his diary; that clearly shows his paradoxical nature. Besides, he was trying to take revenge on people not in his lifetime but after his death. As he wanted to control and even change the interpretations of his novels, he also wanted people to find out his true opinions about them. That was the revenge he wanted to take after his death from those people who ignored him in his lifetime. He clearly indicates that in the diary entry dated 8 October 1960: “Everything sucks. I want to peg out and pay them back for what they have done to me.”²¹⁵ Taking revenge by dying definitely means Tanpınar wanted and knew that his diary was going to be published after his death. Therefore, he endured in silence until his death and began to retaliate with the publication of his diary.²¹⁶

About Mehmet Kaplan, who was Tanpınar’s closest student and the bearer of the diary entries after his death, Tanpınar has negative remarks in his diary. After receiving a letter from Kaplan, Tanpınar writes, “a letter from Kaplan. The ant has its wings now, trying to fly. How pathetic?”²¹⁷ Almost two years after his comment on the letter, Tanpınar has another entry on Kaplan’s letters: “After my reply to his famous letter, Kaplan stopped writing. What part did he get upset about? I could not make it out. Perhaps due to that I did not mention *Fundamenta*. He is writing such

²¹⁴ Handan İnci, introduction to *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Tanpınar Zamanı*, (İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012), x.

²¹⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 224. Slang words are a close translation of Tanpınar’s words.

²¹⁶ Tanpınar probably thought that his diary entries would be published earlier, not forty-five years after his death. When the diary was published in 2007, most of the people whom Tanpınar harshly criticized and wanted to take his revenge on by his entries were already dead. I might even assert that one possible reason of the editors’ waiting more than twenty years to publish Tanpınar’s diary was to protect Tanpınar and his remarks in his diary from those whom he attacks and tries to humiliate.

²¹⁷ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 127.

silly letters [...]. He should be content with my answers.”²¹⁸ As he called Yahya Kemal “sloppy,” Tanpınar defined Kaplan as a “megalomaniac,”²¹⁹ “conspirator,”²²⁰ and “chatterer.”²²¹

Tanpınar has some paradoxical statements on Kaplan, too. Almost six months after calling him a “plotter,” this time he praises Kaplan and says how “Kaplan is a great teacher. What I teach bursts like a bubble, but his remains as knowledge.”²²² About Kaplan’s reaction to Tanpınar’s remarks on him in the diary, the editors point out that even though Kaplan was the first person who saw Tanpınar’s diary notebooks and his several negative remarks on him, he did not strike any of them out. That shows “Kaplan’s respect for Tanpınar and his fidelity to the document given into his case.”²²³

There are many other cruel remarks on several other people. About Sabattin Eyüpoğlu, Tanpınar has ambivalent remarks: while in one page Tanpınar mentions how he has an inborn taste; on another page, he condemns Sabahattin for eating together with the whores he was taking to his place.²²⁴ He calls Takıyyettin Mengüşoğlu “monkey,”²²⁵ Ahmet Kutsi Tecer “camel,”²²⁶ İlhami “a shadow of his wife,”²²⁷ Peyami Safa “squalid,”²²⁸ Osman Turan “lout,”²²⁹ Zeki Faik İzer’s wife “a tamed ape,”²³⁰ Necdet Sander “one of the big monkeys,”²³¹ Necdet Saner’s wife “a fool,”²³² Oktay Aslanapa “completely asinine,”²³³ Ali Tanoğlu “dupe,”²³⁴ and Macit Gökberk “dummy.”²³⁵

²¹⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 182.

²¹⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 202.

²²⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 214.

²²¹ Enginün and Kerman, 201.

²²² Enginün and Kerman, 272.

²²³ Enginün and Kerman, 343.

²²⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 179.

²²⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 160.

²²⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 153.

²²⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 181.

²²⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 207.

²²⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 211.

²³⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 247.

²³¹ Enginün and Kerman, 247.

²³² Enginün and Kerman, 247.

²³³ Enginün and Kerman, 246.

²³⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 234.

²³⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 296.

One of the most paradoxical thoughts and remarks of Tanpınar was on the Ottoman Empire. Until the diary was published in 2007, Tanpınar was known for his admiration for the Ottoman Empire and its several institutions, and he saw it as a symbol of the past. Tanpınar mentions especially in his non-fiction works how he “sees some examples of Ottoman magnificence”²³⁶ and how he sorrowfully likens the fall of the Empire to “a ship of tales sinking into water under the moonlight.”²³⁷ In his novels on the other hand, he always has characters, who speak of the past and reflect on the sadness of the fall of the Empire. In *Mahur Beste*, for example, Sabri Hoca gives a very long speech to the protagonist, Behçet Bey, starting with “My son Behçet! Do you know what happens if a civilization falls into ruin?” Sabri Hoca compares the palace with the Ottoman civilization and defines how the palace was smashed up, and people of the time looked like the ones among the ruins. Sabri Hoca concludes his talk: “no matter how you struggle to do something new with the remnants [...] the magic is already gone.”²³⁸

Tanpınar’s belief in continuity has always been considered as his strongest bond with the past and as the connection with the Ottomans and Seljuks. In *Huzur*, Tanpınar makes his one of the main characters, İhsan, speak about the importance of continuity:

And we give thanks that we are before this sea, at this spring hour, in this restaurant. Later, we’ll try to establish a New Life particular [sic] to us and befitting our own idiom. Life is ours; we’ll give it the form that we desire. And as it assumes its form, it’ll sing its own song. But we won’t meddle with art or ideas at all! We’ll set them free. For they demand freedom, absolute freedom. A myth, solely because we long for it, doesn’t just materialize out of thin air. No, it erupts from social life. But to cut our ties with the past and to close ourselves off from the West! Never, what do you think we are? We’re the essence of

²³⁶ Tanpınar, *Beş Şehir*, 186.

²³⁷ Tanpınar, 205.

²³⁸ Tanpınar, *Mahur Beste*, 87-91.

Easterners of taste and pleasure. Everything yearns for our persistence and continuity.²³⁹

There are other numerous examples of positive remarks about the past and its reference, the Ottoman Empire, as the source of the fundamental traditions of Turkish society. However, Tanpınar confirms his ambivalent position on this issue and makes contradictory statements. He writes his thoughts about the Ottoman in his diary, quite contrary to what we often encounter in his other works. While he was criticizing Adnan Menderes and Celal Bayar, he compares them with Ottoman statesmen:

Adnan, Celal Bayar, and the members of the cabinet cannot say that “Yes, we have misgoverned the state; that’s true. But the government cannot be overthrown with a single move.” They don’t say that. This shows these people are not individuals. The Ottomans knew their positions and accepted that. But, what is Ottoman? A regiment of sheer ignorance.²⁴⁰

He keeps writing his opinions about the Ottomans in the same entry:

What was the Ottoman? A man who couldn’t see the Byzantine despite sitting on its land. In other countries, a few foreigners, a few seigniories began the Renaissance. After Mehmed the Second, there were a least twenty thousand Italians in Istanbul. A few hundreds of Frenchmen. We made them work as builders and architects [...]. However, we couldn’t take advantage of them in art and thought [...]. If the Ottoman had exploited the merits of its foreign subjects, the real urbanites would have become the founder, and Turkey would be different.²⁴¹

Woolf: A “Restless Searcher”

Eleven years after Virginia Woolf’s death in 1942, Leonard Woolf published some extracts drawn from Virginia Woolf’s personal record, which he had kept over

²³⁹ Tanpınar, *A Mind at Peace*, 106-7.

²⁴⁰ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 274.

²⁴¹ Enginün and Kerman, 274-75.

a period of twenty-seven years. Leonard was careful in choosing passages to illuminate Woolf's literary practice, yet daily life and humor constantly broke in. His selection ends with Woolf grappling with depression and household duties after finishing *Between the Acts*.²⁴² Virginia Woolf had feelings similar to her husband about the publication of her diary entries as she writes, “what’s to become of all these diaries I asked myself yesterday. If I died what would Leo make out of them? He would be disinclined to burn them; he could not publish them. Well, he should make up a book of them and burn the body.”²⁴³ However, Anne Olivier Bell had a different idea on Woolf’s notebooks and therefore began to publish them in 1977. Until then, nothing was published about Virginia Woolf against her image as the writer of *Mrs. Dalloway*; the diary proved a remarkable counterbalance to her reputation as a precious and aloof intellectual. In addition to the root impulses of her art, to her development as a writer, to her life during the period in which *To the Lighthouse* and *The Waves*²⁴⁴ were written, to the mature period of *The Years*,²⁴⁵ we also find moments of personal sadness, her sensibility, her sensitiveness, her humor, her drama, and her mood four days before she drowned herself. Among these humane characteristics, her gossipy remarks on many people caught the attention of readers of Woolf since readers could not see the tenderness of Clarissa Dalloway and Mrs. Ramsay or the compassion of Mrs. Swithin in her diaries.

As discussed in previously, Woolf paid a lot of attention to make her diary a work of art. Judy Simons defines Woolf’s diary as “a cornerstone for her total artistic undertaking.”²⁴⁶ Woolf applies a literary simile to everyday life and thus keeps her diary parallel to her novels in terms of literary aspect. She gives several clues about her novels and her practice of writing. However, her voice sometimes falters and irrational remarks sneak in. In her entry dated 9 January 1915, for example, she writes that she and her husband “had to pass a long line of imbeciles [...] everyone in that line was a miserable ineffective shuffling idiotic creature [...] an imbecile grin, or a wild suspicious stare. It was perfectly horrible. They should certainly be

²⁴² Virginia Woolf, *Between the Acts* (London: Mariner Books, 1970).

²⁴³ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 67.

²⁴⁴ Virginia Woolf, *The Waves* (New York: Mariner Books, 2006).

²⁴⁵ Virginia Woolf, *The Years* (London: Mariner Books, 1969).

²⁴⁶ Simons, *Diaries and Journals*, 170.

killed.”²⁴⁷ The very following sentence was told in a different mood: “[we] found a market going on at Kingston, as if it were Marlborough.”²⁴⁸ In one of the entries, she explains her unsettled mood: “Yet I have some restless searcher in me [...]. My depression is harassed feeling.”²⁴⁹

Woolf was applying her venomous tone to many people around her, including her Jewish husband, Leonard. Virginia mentions her dislike of the Jews several times, as in one of her letters she calls Leonard “a penniless Jew.”²⁵⁰ Hermione Lee notes a similar anti-Semitic attitude by Woolf in his book *Virginia Woolf*: “Woolf tended to exaggerate the number of Leonard’s relatives at family gatherings, as a joke about how Jews do multiply (and pullulate and copulate and amass).”²⁵¹ Woolf’s criticism of Leonard’s family can be seen in the diary as well. She writes that “the odd thing about the Woolf family, to me, is the extreme laxness of it. In my family, the discussions & agitations that went on about the slightest change in one’s way of life were endless; but with the W.’s it doesn’t much seem to matter whether they turn farmer [...] or marry a Polish Jew Tailor daughter.”²⁵² Virginia increases the rate of her criticism in her diary on Leonard’s family and still writes about them fifteen years after the entry above:

On the whole L.’s family do the trick most thoroughly. Everything is such an effort; so unreal; what I say is so remote from what I feel; their standards are so different from mine [...]. Mrs. W. who is the vainest of women (poor old lady – yes, one’s feeling of poor old woman churns & muddles all one’s feelings of her egotism, her vanity [...]. I begin to see very plainly how ugly, how nosey, how irreparably middle class they all are [...]. Mrs. Woolf began to dab her eyes [...] so vampire-like & vast in her demand for my entire attention [...].

²⁴⁷ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 13.

²⁴⁸ Woolf, 13.

²⁴⁹ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 62.

²⁵⁰ Virginia Woolf, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*, Vol. 1, ed. Nigel Nicholson and Joanne Trautman (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975), 501.

²⁵¹ Qtd. in Michael H. Whitworth, *Virginia Woolf: Authors in Context* (NY: Oxford UP, 2005), 71.

²⁵² Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 1, 16.

Lord Lord! How many daughters have been murdered by women like this!²⁵³

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's and Virginia Woolf's diaries are full of paradoxical remarks due to their ambivalent positions in their societies. Both diaries have been analyzed from a few aspects: one of them is about whether the diarists had any concern for a reader since any intentions of publication would lead to questioning the authenticity of the diaries. Both diarists wrote their diaries audience-oriented, for many remarks in the diaries show that clearly. Publication means for writers to polish their diaries and to keep the aesthetic and literary standards high. Instead of giving true personal accounts in their diaries, Woolf and Tanpınar tended to create projected identities in their diaries, which should also be interpreted as having ambivalent positions in the period of social transition.

²⁵³ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 320-1.

CHAPTER THREE

“CHANGE OF CIVILIZATION AND THE INNER MAN”¹: TANPINAR AS A WRITER OF MENTAL TRANSFORMATION

Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar became disillusioned because their societies became transformed out of conventional paradigms. Both Western and Eastern societies, especially Islamic societies, were already in a phase of transformation; however, in the process of modernization, Western societies began to move from a state of stability to the idea of progress, and the Eastern/Islamic communities from the traditional – with a religious basis – to the modern. This change has often been considered to have occurred through the erasure of the past and its replacement with the new that was expected to show a clash between modernity and tradition. However, in the West, the transition was more communal and inclusive, and did not necessarily reject all traditional values. But the Western influence of modernization on Eastern societies was provincializing and held different characteristics: in Eastern societies, especially in Turkey, modernization was ambivalent in that it meant the rejection of past and tended to alienate the majority of people. Therefore, Turkish modernization cannot be defined as a Western form of modernization; it did not occur in a traditional/Eastern form either, but followed a third pattern, from which most of the non-Western societies suffered due to its ambivalent characteristics. One of the best ways of analyzing this social transition is through scrutinizing carefully the works and the writers of the era. Virginia Woolf, with her fiction and non-fiction works, was concerned with change in society and its effects on the human character, as she tried to show in her works. And Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar always critiqued the Turkish modernization project in his texts, even though he kept a low profile.

A presupposition of the clash between modernity and tradition was the most fundamental characteristic of modernization theory. It provoked the institutionalization of several social fields, from sociology to political science, and

¹ “Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan” [Change of Civilization and the Inner Man] is one of the most acclaimed articles of Tanpınar (in *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 34-39).

influenced several scholars in the second half of the twentieth century in Turkey. In *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Bernard Lewis has observed this:

The growth of the sentiment of Turkish identity connected with the movement away from Islamic practice and tradition, and towards Europe. This began purely practical short-term measures of reform, intended to accomplish a limited purpose; it developed into a large-scale, deliberate attempt to take a whole nation across the frontier from one civilization to another.²

The assumption that the decline of traditional belief and increasing secularization as the only path toward the modernization in Turkish society, might lead to an ambiguous interpretation that societies need to reject their traditions to be modern, or that they need to reject modern reforms in order to keep themselves traditional. Considering the official ideology of the early Republican period and the writings of early mainstream Kemalist authors, this characterization of Westernization in Turkey might be useful. However, for Turkish modernization, which started even before Tanzimat in 1839, almost a century before the foundation of the Turkish Republic, this definition of modernization sounds narrow, even puritanical. For the late Ottoman and early Republican intellectuals were concerned with a proper appropriation of modernity in a non-European society, rather than solely discussing the struggle of modernity and tradition or the struggle of West and East.

All these scholars were concerned with retaining the cultural core of Turkish society, which faced a rapid change and Westernization. Both “Westernizers”³ and their conservative⁴ counterparts were to a certain extent modern and pro-Western. However, the difference between them was that Westernizers were in favor of a

² Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford UP, 1968), 3.

³ I need to clarify the concepts used for defining two groups of scholars who were influential in the late Ottoman and early Republican periods. “Westernizers” are those in favor of a complete adoption of Western values without questioning them. The concept holds an ambivalent definition as it is neither Westerner nor the Western but the Westernizer. A great majority of Westernizers tended to use the principles of the West and Westernization for their own political purposes and for establishing a new state based on the rejection of traditional values. Westernization as the official ideology of Turkey was indeed not a Westernization but a different form of modernization often seen in non-European societies.

⁴ I use the concept of conservative not in the American or European sense but as it is used in Turkey. In the Turkish vocabulary of political science, conservative refers to those who conserve their traditions and religious identities. The term conservative is often used equivalent to religious.

complete adoption of Western modernity. They wanted the adoption of not only the military and economic structures but also the political and governmental systems of the West. The disagreement between the conservative scholars and the Westernizers increased when it came to European modes of interpersonal behavior, morality, and some European values regarding religion.

The disagreement between the conservatives and the Westernizers is not unique to Turkish society. Japan, for example, decided that it could modernize industrially without westernizing culturally. Although the basic assumption on Japanese modernization was to proceed on “Western technique, Japanese spirit,”⁵ Japanese reformists “preferred to depict a West more universal than most Western thinkers would have accepted.”⁶ Japanese Westernizers began to advocate a radical vision of cultural Westernization and framed their antitraditionalism. Similar to students who went to Europe to have Western education and who came back with radical ideas on Westernization, Japanese students who received Western style education advocated that Western civilization was the only universal civilization and that “Japan should even adopt Christian ethics to embark on the universal path of progress and development.”⁷ Japan has been considered as part of the West as well as being part of the East. Japan became an inspiring model for other nations, as it was “an Eastern and non-Christian, yet modern and powerful.”⁸ Ziya Gökalp, a Turkish nationalist and critical proponent of Westernisation, noted in 1923 – the year when the Republic of Turkey was founded – that “Japan is accepted as a European power, but we are still regarded as an Asiatic nation.”⁹

The process of Japanese modernization was an important example to see the development and deployment of the idea of the West within non-Western national identities, including the newborn Turkey. In the face of an obvious need for modernization, all the Turkish intellectuals wanted to modernize in their own terms. According to conservative intellectuals, European superiority was a material affair

⁵ Ali A. Mazrui, *Cultural Forces in World Politics* (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1990), 4.

⁶ Cemil Aydın, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought* (New York: Columbia Press, 2013), 30.

⁷ Aydın, 30.

⁸ Robbert Woltering, *Occidentalism in the Arab World: Ideology and Images of the West in the Egyptian Media* (NY: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 24.

⁹ Ziya Gökalp, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization* (London: Greenwood Press, 1981), 277.

and had nothing to do with moral superiority. Therefore, they continued to conserve their cultural heritage, especially in the realm of morality and religion. The Westernizers on the other hand were eager to accept European superiority by all means and saw the need for a radical change in morality as well. Among the most remarkable examples of the Westernizers, there were Munif Paşa (1830-1910), Beşir Fuad (1852-1887), Baha Tevfik (1884-1914), and Abdullah Cevdet (1869-1932). They saw the European influence not only from political, economic, and material perspectives, but also as a moral one. There were on the other hand conservatives, most of whom were religiously inclined, such as Şehbenderzade Ahmet Hilmi (1865-1914), Said Nursi (1878-1960), Mehmet Akif Ersoy (1873-1936), Said Halim Paşa (1863-1921), and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901-1962), who were known for their serious reservations regarding European influences in Turkey. It is important to note here that all these intellectuals had a common concern to strengthen the state. We can describe their objectives in James L. Gelvin's term, "defensive developmentalism," as they wanted to "strengthen their states in the face of internal and external threat and to make their governments more proficient in managing their populations and their resources."¹⁰

Although there was the "defensive developmentalism" that featured several competing visions, it was mostly the Westernizers' vision that had great influence on the social and religious policies of the early Turkish Republic. The ideas of some Westernizers such as Baha Tevfik, Abdullah Cevdet, and Beşir Fuad had great influence on the development of thought in the late Ottoman period and early Republican phase. The ideas and writings of the conservative scholars on the other hand were written off in the margins of nationalist history by some Kemalist authors, who accused them of mindless conservatism and reactionary views. One of the ignored intellectuals of the time was Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, whose ideas were misinterpreted and neglected due to his reaction toward the representation of tradition and the modern in Turkey. His position in his lifetime is important in terms of the emergence and development of several concepts such as "East" and "West," "tradition" and "modern," "rightists" and "leftists," "conservatism" and

¹⁰ James L. Gelvin, *The Modern Middle East: A History* (New York: Oxford UP, 2005), 73.

“secularism.” Reading Tanpınar with respect to his position in Turkish society from the early Republican period to the 1960s also sheds light on the characteristics of the process of modernization and Westernization in Turkey. Equally important is to follow the changing representation and interpretation of Tanpınar after his death when he became to be claimed by those on the left and those on the right in the political spectrum and later, at the beginning of new millennium how he was interpreted as a man for all seasons. Such awareness yields invaluable awareness of him and the constantly changing paradigms in Turkey. His diary is the best possible source for understanding him in this context.

“Turkish Literature Begins with a Crisis of Civilization”¹¹

Tanpınar was considered a conservative writer until the end of the 1990s. This assumption is significant for analyzing the mindset of Turkish modernization. Tanpınar’s interpretation of tradition and his affinity with the past led to an interpretation of his identity and his world view that was valid until recently. The late 1990s witnessed many changes at the social level as Tanpınar was reconsidered: Yapı Kredi Publishing House (YKY), known as a predominantly leftist publisher, began to publish Tanpınar’s books, which broadened the circles of Tanpınar readers and considerably smoothed over the conservative Tanpınar image. When Tanpınar’s diary was published in 2007, the traditional Tanpınar image was completely revised. Before the diary came out, he was considered as conservative, traditionalist, reconciled with the past, nostalgic, and thus a Republican writer unsympathetic with the West and the modernization. He was assumed to be – or was misrepresented as – rightist, conservative, and even a religious scholar. However, the diary shows that he was liberal and a Western-oriented, not conservative and not at all religious. Surely, the diary was not the only reason that changed Tanpınar’s image; his image was affected by the ‘new’ definitions of rightist and leftist that which emerged parallel to dramatic changes in Turkey, especially after the 1990s.

The process of modernization forced Turkey to make radical decisions on either being local and traditional or becoming the periphery of the other. As seen in many

¹¹ Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, 104.

other societies having attributes of Europe, this led to mental changes in Turkish society as well. Tanpınar then might be studied as an “end product” since he lived and produced in the last and perhaps the most systematic phase of this process – that is, the early Republican. The Republic of Turkey was founded as a nation-state, principally rejected the multi-national nature of the Ottoman Sultanate, and adopted Westernization as the official reform plan. In this era, the traditional and the modern were perceived as if they were opposite concepts; the official ideology of the Republic was designed to bury the past and to imitate the West without adequately questioning its relevance to the social context. This erasure and denial caused an identity crisis that lasted for decades. Tanpınar was born just before the Second *Meşrutiyet*, experienced the foundation of the Turkish Republic, and spent his whole life among intellectual groups, and we will critique him in this context.

The Tanpınar image is related to the modernization process in Turkey from several perspectives. Turkish modernization implied that tradition is the opposite of what was modern, which caused those who value the past to be labeled as conservative, and Tanpınar was pigeonholed as a conservative scholar.¹² However, he actually valued the past and tradition to enrich the present; he used tradition as a reference point. This valuation of tradition is seen in all his works and sets him apart from his contemporaries. Most of his contemporaries were in favor of Westernization in the form of a Turkish society that would turn its back on its cultural heritage and adopt Western values in toto in order to be fully Westernized. Tanpınar on the other hand never rejected the old but was in favor of tightening the link between the past and present. His conservative image was produced by his reaction toward the cultural insensitivity and bluntness of the Republican regime. He struggled to replace this hostile attitude of the Republican régime toward the historical and cultural ties of Turkish society with a better understanding of its past. In Besim Dellaloğlu’s definition, Tanpınar was “establishing a link between the modern and the past by perforating the solid wall that modernization constructed.”¹³ Therefore, he valued the

¹² We need to mention that Tanpınar was considered as conservative in part because of the lack of rightist authors and scholars whom the conservatives would appreciate. Someone who smiled on the Ottoman or had positive remarks on the traditional was much welcomed by conservatives.

¹³ Besim F. Dellaloğlu, *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası* (İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012), 24.

historical continuity of cultural forms that had prevailed for centuries. He thought that if this chain of continuity is broken, it would lead to an identity crisis.

Tanpınar saw and clearly emphasized the connection between the cultural heritage and the problem of identity as the most fundamental issue in the late Ottoman and contemporary Turkish society. Western influence mixed with the Islamic heritage can be described as a “civilizational shift” that resulted in the emergence of a problem of identity. Tanpınar’s criticism was not only in cultural and artistic issues but in all areas of life, “in our industries, in our economic endeavors, in every stirring of society.”¹⁴ In the last page of his *Beş Şehir* [Five Cities], he describes the identity problem as “our most significant problem” and considers members of society as “the children of a crisis of conscience and identity.”¹⁵ About the reasons for this identity crisis, he writes in his article *Medeniyet Değişimesi ve İç İnsan*:

The reason for this crisis, which makes us deal with insignificant matters instead of being concerned with crucial matters and which turns important issues into a joke, is the duality brought about by moving from one civilization to another [...]. This duality first began in public life; then it split our society into two in terms of mentality, and in the end, it became rooted within us [...].¹⁶

Tanpınar was not worried about change since Turkish people had already moved away from one civilization to another several times in the past. The shift from a nomadic shamanistic past to sedentary Islamic civilization – namely the Ottoman Empire – did not result in a new society that was unable to create and continue its cultural and artistic synthesis. Therefore, the essence of the problem, for Tanpınar, was not the shift from Islamic to Western civilization, but rather the imposition of Western reforms from the top with no respect to the idea of continuity or synthesis. In the *Medeniyet Değiştirmesi*, he explains that the problem was not the change itself but how it happened:

¹⁴ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 34.

¹⁵ Tanpınar, *Beş Şehir*, 208.

¹⁶ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 34.

This reality [the shift of civilization] was supposed to lead us to goodness, illumination, and a modern interpretation of our surroundings; however, the outcome was not as expected and was thus destabilizing. This occurred because Tanzimat was ill-timed and badly-programmed, lacked knowledge and concrete aims [...], the economic crisis which began earlier and became aggravated after the 1850s, along with political incidents [...]. If these reasons did not exist, this phenomenon that I am going to call here the disease – if I had the courage I would say the psychosis – of civilization change might have never become this severe; it would have remained simply a struggle of the New and the Old, which would change its characteristics according to the stages of progress and would continue – even in the form of a psychological richness – toward a balanced synthesis.

But it has turned out to be just the opposite. In our public life today we are virtually devoid of the conditions necessary to perform any radical operation whatsoever. We can neither show any resistance to the things that would change us, nor can we completely submit to them. It is as if we have lost our existential and historical essence. We are in a crisis of values. We accept everything without internalizing it [...].¹⁷

Tanpınar elaborates on this crisis, which he claims allows neither resistance nor submission: “We have always lived as if divided in two. More precisely, we have not believed in most of what we have done because we always had something else, something in a different form, which has always existed and still exists. And it is this psychological state that distinguishes us from the Westerner and from our ancient Muslim forefathers.”¹⁸ Tanpınar explains this peculiar psychological change by presenting its mental state; it prevents the ‘new’ from being fully accepted and thus causes constant conflict: “Even though the new has become a part of our life today, we are ready to argue about it. We have never accepted our actions and their

¹⁷ Tanpınar, 34-35.

¹⁸ Tanpınar, 37.

consequences.”¹⁹ Tanpınar’s use of “Oedipal complex” explains the feeling brought out due to a rejection of the past: “If I were brave enough, I would say that since the Tanzimat we have experienced an Oedipal complex; that is, we are like a person who has killed his father accidentally.”²⁰

Tanpınar thought that reconciliation with the past could resolve the identity problem. His ideas on the past are important because they set him apart from his contemporaries, which resulted in his perceived conservatism. In a period when the elements of Turkish culture were in the process of erasure so that the new could replace the old, Tanpınar kept the past as a valuable heritage and used several traditional elements in his works. In an interview, he expresses his valuation of the past: “History is the very characteristic of a person [...]. It is at least the source of a man’s personality. A person cannot exist without it. He would drift into such a great isolation that even talking with him becomes impossible. Therefore, generations and individuals are always concerned with their past. They always take their positions according their past.”²¹

His criticism of reform was not a rejection but was because the reforms completely denied the past, which was indeed still alive and needed to be valued. In his *Huzur*, the protagonist, Mümtaz, says, “I am no Aesthete of Decline. Maybe I’m searching for what’s still alive and viable in this decline. I am making use of that.”²² As an explanation of his bond to the past, Mümtaz says:

Whether we like it or not, we belong to it. We admire our traditional music and for better or worse it speaks to us.²³ For better or worse we hold this key that unlocks the past for us [...]. The past reveals its epoch to each one of us and dresses us in its clothing. Because we harbor a treasury within ourselves and perceive our surroundings

¹⁹ Tanpınar, 37.

²⁰ Tanpınar, 38.

²¹ Tanpınar, 321.

²² Tanpınar, *A Mind at Peace*, 199.

²³ Mümtaz’s comments on traditional music is best explained by Karl L. Signell as he, in *Makam: Modal Practice in Turkish Music*, notes, “Turkish art music is clearly the product of the Ottoman civilization and, as such, suffers from a conscious opposition by those who reject that culture for ideological reasons. The force of tradition has been so powerful, though, that this music continues to find superb interpreters and capacity audiences after half a century of official and unofficial suppression.” Karl L. Signell, *Makam: Modal Practice in Turkish Art Music* (New York: De Capo Press, 1986), 1.

through the makams [models in Turkish art music]²⁴ of Ferahfezâ or a Sultanîyegâh [...].”²⁵

In an interview, Tanpınar explains how he considers both tradition and the new, or the Eastern and the Western, as the main cultural assets of the society: “What I am suggesting is not to become a tomb guardian or to do ironmongery of the past, but to know the adventures in this country [...] to grow out of this experience, to improve in a decent way [...] and to produce by drawing inspirations from Western experts.”²⁶

However, Tanpınar also points out that neither the past nor the new becomes the savior in that both have their own pressures on individuals. Having both of them as the essential dynamics of life results in the emergence of an identity crisis:

It is as if the two styles of dining, European and Turkish [...] had expanded and enlarged and divided our life. What is more, in the course of time, this mental state ceases its dynamic form and takes on a static form. It is as if it had set up immutable boundaries.

Yet the operation is not quiescent. In the first place, its rhythm exists in our life [...]. We are partisans and militants of the new, yet we are tied to the old. If it remains at this level, it is fine. But it does not; it becomes more capricious. In some periods of our life, as the men of the new, we feel the oppression of the old; in other cases, as the men of the old, we live under the oppression of the new. This switching of poles has ruled over our lives for a century.²⁷

The solution that Tanpınar offers to solve this crisis was considered eccentric by many people around him. The mainstream tendency was facing “toward the West” but Tanpınar offered a “return to ourselves” by recognizing and describing the symptoms of this cultural dilemma. He describes himself as “one of those who take the crisis of civilization as a theme [...] and the mental duality which it has

²⁴ See Karl L. Signell’s *Makam* for a comprehensive study about Turkish art music. Karl L. Signell, *Makam: Practice in Turkish Art Music* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1986).

²⁵ Tanpınar, 197.

²⁶ Mustafa Baydar, *Edebiyatçılarımız Ne Diyorlar* (İstanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitabevi, 1960), 195.

²⁷ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 38.

produced.”²⁸ The themes in his literary works were all about this crisis of civilization and its negative effects on the members of Turkish society. We can approach his works from two perspectives: context and rhetoric. While Tanpınar produced literature to examine the identity crisis, his analysis shows his attitude toward the language, which was/is in a flux, too.

In his *Türk Edebiyatı'nda Cereyanlar* [Currents in Turkish Literature], Tanpınar asserts that “modern Turkish literature begins with a crisis of civilization.”²⁹ He draws attention to a few big realities, especially to the fact that “this literature was born as a result of this civilizational crisis.”³⁰ He establishes a connection between events – especially political events – and the emergence and development of modern Turkish Literature:

This civilizational crisis started with the abolition of the Janissaries corps in 1826, which led to the Westernization of state institutions and society at large after the Tanzimat; it developed progressively due to the First Meşrutiyet in 1876 and the Second Meşrutiyet in 1908; it took its final and current form with the foundation of the Republic in 1923, with Ankara's becoming the capital and with Atatürk's radical reforms. In addition to all of these historical events, we should mention other important facts such as the collapse of the Empire (1918), women's liberation, and the inclusion of secularism and populism in government programs. Modern Turkish literature played a significant role in the emergence of these ideas and it was sometimes under the strong influence of these events that it paved the way for.³¹

As Tanpınar mentions, these social events resulted in mental changes and later led to identity crisis, and this crisis had some influence on the emergence and the development of modern Turkish literature, which can best be understood by analyzing these social events. Tanpınar's interpretation of modernization and

²⁸ Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine*, 115.

²⁹ Tanpınar, “Türk Edebiyatı'nda Cereyanlar” in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, 104.

³⁰ Tanpınar, 104.

³¹ Tanpınar, 104.

Westernization and his ideas about modern Turkish literature were related to problem of an identity crisis.

As Tanpınar often mentions in his works, Westernization as a transformation of identity is a long and complex phenomenon, which dates from long before the Republican Era: it is almost a two-century process. The Ottoman Sultanate always had connections with the West; however, during the height of their hegemony, the Ottomans never considered the West superior and thus did not imitate them. From the eighteenth century onward, reforms were thought to be necessary because the West was politically and militarily accepted as superior. Modernization reforms after the Battle of Vienna in 1683 until *Tanzimat Fermanı* [Imperial Edict of Reorganization] in 1839 were mainly military. The process that was previously restricted to the military was expanded to include institutions, individuals, and later the administrative system with its political and social practices. While the first stage only recognized the West in certain fields, during the second phase the West was taken as superior and as the only reference for improvement.³² The modernization process, which was planned to correspond to the West so that the Ottoman State might again become superior, turned out to be a mindless imitation of the West. The administrators realized that the so-called degeneration was not only in the military but in the entire system itself. The reforms unexpectedly caused the state and its institutions to become more Westernized instead of making them autonomous and independent like in the ‘old’ days.

Cultural and mental changes began to occur after the Tanzimat; the period of arbitrary social transformation ended and the phase of obligatory or guided changes started.³³ The Tanzimat decree of 1839 was unanimously accepted as the turning point in the transformation of the Ottoman state and was regarded as the starting point – if not the first – of Westernization or the attempt to radically transform the

³² Kemal H. Karpat, *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2012), 49.

³³ The enormous influence of the II. Mahmud Era on the cultural changes cannot be denied. About 150 students were sent to Europe for education; French as the language of education in some schools was brought in; foreign teachers were invited; several texts in several languages written about Turks were translated into Turkish; and most considerably the court etiquette and fashion began to change, for the first time imitating the West.

civilization.³⁴ It also caused an increase in centralization and bureaucratization of the Ottoman Empire. Issued by one of the top men of the new order, Mustafa Reşid Paşa, the Grand Vizier and former ambassador to London, a few months after the accession of Sultan Abdülmecid (1839-61), the edict merely expanded upon ideas and policies developed and implemented in the past. By promising “certain administrative reforms, such as the abolition of tax farming, the standardization of military conscription, and the elimination of corruption, [...] the guarantee of the equality of all subjects,”³⁵ regardless of their religion, the *ferman* aimed at modernizing the Empire militarily and socially so that it could compete with Europe. Reşid Paşa thought the proclamation of the edict was “not only a social necessity but an inevitable political measure.”³⁶ The fact that the *ferman* was considered a political ordinance is significant because it later affected the method of modernization in Turkey and it also gave clues about how this process was going to be interpreted by the public.

Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of the nineteenth-century Tanzimat reforms was that it was an eclectic approach, especially compared with the twentieth-century Republican reforms. The Republican reforms altered the cultural practices of everyday life in addition to the introduction of secularization and reformed education system. Thus, nineteenth-century reforms were not all-encompassing. Furthermore, the social reaction toward the *ferman* was negative, as expected. None of the groups were satisfied: the Sultan and the administrators were deprived of privileges; the Muslim community – the major group – was still feeling

³⁴ In his *Militarist Modernleşme*, Murat Belge claims, “the history of Turkish modernization does not begin with Tanzimat, as commonly mentioned, but with Vaka-i Hayriye (The Auspicious Incident). In an Ottoman society without Vaka-i Hayriye having happened, Tanzimat Fermanı could not be issued” *Militarist Modernleşme*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2012), 541. Bernard Lewis, in *The Emergence of Turkey*, defines the Auspicious Incident as “the massacre of Janissaries”; he writes, “The massacre of the Janissaries, known to the reformers as the Vak’a-i Hayriye – the Auspicious Incident – completed the preparatory work which the Sultan [II. Mahmud] had already begun with his campaigns to end provincial autonomy. The valley-lords and notables in the provinces, the Janissaries and dervishes in the capital, all those who restricted the arbitrary power of the Sultan, had been crushed and destroyed. Now no group remained that could challenge the Sultan’s will from entrenched positions of ancient and accepted privilege; no armed force survived, other than the Sultan’s own new-style soldiery – equipped with guns and gunners who no longer needed to fear the anger of the city populace” (Lewis, 67-68).

³⁵ William L. Cleveland and M. Bunton, *A History of the Modern Middle East* (PA: Westview Press, 2009).

³⁶ Mümtaz Turhan, *Kültür Değişimleri* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2010), 167.

superior despite their changing position in society; and non-Muslim subjects were unhappy with the idea of equality. Therefore, Tanzimat reforms were not considered a solution. These and other symptoms indicated that the transformation of the Ottoman State had entered a new phase. Indeed, one could easily wonder about the necessity of some developments³⁷ introduced by the edict while other more pressing problems still awaited solutions. *Islahat Fermanı* in 1856 [The Rescript of Reform] represents another important stage in the transformation of the Ottoman State. It was issued to reaffirm the provisions of the *ferman* of 1839, much of whose implementation supposedly had been delayed. Kemal H. Karpat claims that the *Islahat Fermanı* played a significant role in the emergence of nationalistic feelings among non-Muslim subjects in the Empire and thus in the long term led to the collapse of the Empire.³⁸ The changes from 1789 to 1856 – even until the beginning of the reign of Abdülhamid II in 1876 – were due to a gradual and natural response of the Ottoman leaders to social and political pressure, and followed to some extent the Ottoman traditions of change.³⁹

Tanpınar calls this process, which started in 1839, a tragedy, and also defines this form of Westernization unique to Turkey: “Neither Peter the Great’s sweeping reforms in Russia, nor the German Renaissance, the French Revolution, Christian Reforms, nor the Islamization of Iran [...] had such an enormous impact [...]. In some societies this was experienced during the establishment of the states [...] and in some others it remained only as some developments.”⁴⁰ However, for Turkish society, Tanpınar claims, “the change was absolute since it even threatened the idea of continuity.”⁴¹ Tanpınar compares the relevance of the social reforms with the mental changes in his article *Asıl Kaynak* [The Main Source]:

From 1839 onwards, Westernization not only changed the state institutions and some aspects of life, but it also apprenticed us in

³⁷ The introduction of some more basic measures, such as the commercial code (1850), administered by special trade courts, met with opposition, and Reşid Paşa – previously brought to power for a second time – had to resign in 1852. Kemal Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History* (Leide: Brill, 2002), 46.

³⁸ Karpat, *Türkiye Tarihi*, 52.

³⁹ Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman*, 46.

⁴⁰ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 40.

⁴¹ Tanpınar, 40.

European schools [...]. If we had some preparations before the process began, [...] it would definitely be different [...]. Two things would have been done: the old would have been completely destroyed so that the new could be established, or the reign of the new would begin while the old was left alone dying out. Tanzimat reformers opted for the second, partially because they had no choice, and partially because of the fear of negative reactions; and all of a sudden this country turned into the weird appearance of a colonized territory. Our life was divided into two parts [...]. The encounter of these two worlds in our lives not only reinforced the victory of the new but it also made us accept that we were not supposed to like the old anymore.⁴²

Tanpınar's remarks on the country's appearing like a colonized city can also be considered as having references to the continuation of the hegemonic structures in former European colonies. The discourse created under this colonization or as a reaction to colonization might to a certain extent resemble the condition of Turkey under the influence of Westernization. While the traditional life forms were still alive, the new was strongly superimposed on all the institutions of the society and was making the old unfavorable by "othering" it. In *The Location of Culture*, Homi K. Bhabha defines it as "mimicry" and points out that it is "constructed around an ambivalence"; this condition is "the sign of double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which appropriates the Other as it visualizes power."⁴³

The second half of the nineteenth century, especially the reign of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909), contributed to the condition of ambivalence that Tanpınar portrays. This period represents a synthesis of previous structural developments. Kemal Karpat claims that it was a period of economic and social growth, differentiation, and ideological transformation. Several articles were written in European journals at the Sultan's behest and emphasized the Ottoman progress under the leadership of

⁴² Tanpınar, 41.

⁴³ Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (NY: Routledge, 1994), 85.

Abdülhamid II, who was expected to take the Tanzimat reforms to new horizons.⁴⁴ The Abdülhamid II era started in the midst of an international crisis that soon led to a war with Russia; in August 1876, the Ottoman liberals put Abdülhamid II on the throne, after having received an approval of a draft constitution from him. The Ottoman constitution of 1876 was prepared by a small group of dissidents called The Young Turks,⁴⁵ who were critical “of free trade liberalism, bureaucratic authoritarianism, and the perceived inattention to the Islamic tradition of the Tanzimat.”⁴⁶ The constitution was supposed to guarantee personal liberty and the rule of law. The Sultan proceeded with arrangements for a general election. The first Ottoman parliament met on 19 March 1877, but when the new legislature was called into session, Midhat Paşa, writer of the constitution, was sent into exile. Within a year the Sultan suspended the constitution and dismissed parliament, which did not meet again for the remaining thirty years of Abdülhamid II’s rule.

The most important areas of modernization during the reign of Abdülhamid were in education and communication. The expansion of the public school network was significant, for there was no unified system of education although several overlapping systems existed, including public schools, a system of military academies, private schools, the mosque schools and *medrese* seminaries, schools operated by foreign missionaries, and technical schools such as an agricultural school, a veterinary school, a school of industrial arts, and the like. It was again under Sultan Abdülhamid II that the first Ottoman university, the Darülfünûn in Istanbul, was founded in 1900. The administrative centralization, which was an agenda of Tanzimat reforms, was improved by the development of the means of communication in the Empire, especially the telegraph. Thereafter, the network

⁴⁴ One of these articles is by İbrahim Hakkı, “Is Turkey Progressing?,” *The Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review and Oriental and Colonial Record*, (April 1892): 271-72.

⁴⁵ In Kemal Karpat’s words, “The Ottoman intellectual trio, İbrahim Şinasi (1826-71), Ziya Paşa (1825-80), and Namik Kemal (1840-88), usually referred to as Young Turks and described as the forerunners of the modern intelligentsia, were the first Muslims to attempt to develop a broad theoretical justification and an ideology for the emerging centralized modern institutions in terms of Islamic political tradition and Ottoman principles of government [...]. The intellectuals’ aim was to correct the errors of the Tanzimat reforms, and put an end to the cultural dichotomy which supposedly had resulted from a misunderstanding of the philosophical, ethical, and social foundations of the empire, and from the use of state power to impose an alien cultural system upon society” (Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman*, 50-51).

⁴⁶ Douglas A. Howard, *The History of Turkey* (CT: Greenwood, 2001), 68.

spread rapidly and in this era it reached every provincial town, thus giving the central government the means to communicate effectively with the provinces for the first time.⁴⁷ Railroads showed the biggest communications advance of all and the railroad industry became the most important sector of foreign investment in the Ottoman economy during this period.

Though students were not allowed to go to Europe after 1892, there was an increase in direct cultural contact with Europe. Western ideas were welcomed, especially by those who studied in the newly established schools and learned a foreign language, as did the Sultan, who considered the West as a model. The Sultan regarded “Westernism” as a model for technology, administration, and especially military organization. He changed the curriculum of the institutions, including nineteenth-century exact sciences, which led to an understanding that Westernization was associated with competence and acuity, and the old religious and traditional values were important as long as they supported this ascendancy. In terms of cultural and mental changes, it is significant that this interpretation of the West was associated with power.⁴⁸ Ironically, while Abdülhamid II was laboring to fashion Islamist modernity in opposition to the West, a large number of Ottoman intellectuals were increasingly drawn to the European doctrine of scientific materialism under one of the most pious sultans of the late Ottoman Empire.⁴⁹ It is ironic to see in the

⁴⁷ We should note that in order to support central control of the periphery, Mahmud II attempted to institutionalize the link between central and provincial administration. The first step, Şükrü Hanioglu mentions, “was to amass accurate information about the population of the empire. In 1829, an initial census was carried out in the imperial capital. A special new office was given the task of maintaining population records submitted by provincial authorities. [...] a general census carried out in 1830-31 provided the government with precise data about its subjects for the first time in the modern history of the empire.” Şükrü Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (NJ: Princeton UP, 2008), 61-2.

⁴⁸ Abdullah Cevdet, an influential member of the Young Turks, said: “There is no civilization except European.” Şerif Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006), 16.

⁴⁹ Many members of the new intellectual elite expressed the Darwinian triumph of science over religion in their time. One Ottoman statesman, Sadullah Paşa, expressed these sentiments in a poem entitled, *The Nineteenth Century*, which he wrote in elation after the Paris Fair of 1878 (qtd. in Hanioglu, *A Brief History*, 139):

The light of comprehension has touched the summit of perfection;
Many impossibilities have become possibilities.
Elementary substances have become complex, complexity has become elementary;
Many unknowns have become familiar through experience.
The truth has become figurative, that which was once figurative has become true;
The foundations of old knowledge have collapsed.
Now the sciences are astronomy, geology, physics, and chemistry,

bigger picture that the reformers faced with the contradiction that they were adopting Western ideas and institutions at the same time they were struggling against Western cultural imperialism.

The Young Turk Revolution overthrew the Hamidian regime under the banner of “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and Justice.” The post-revolutionary period, which started with the Second *Meşrutiyet* in 1908, witnessed the most far-ranging intellectual debate in late Ottoman history. We should indeed divide this period into two phases: Between 1908 and 1913 when the İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti [The Committee of Union and Progress (CUP)] controlled the government but was not completely in power. In the second period, starting in 1913 until the end of the Great War, the CUP had complete political power. In his *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*, Feroz Ahmad describes this first stage, which began right after the day Abdülhamid II restored the constitution thus: “[it] generated great optimism and euphoria throughout the empire, as the new era held the promise of ‘liberty, equality and justice’ for all citizens. Muslims and non-Muslims, as well as the various communities [...] the press was free to publish without fear of censorship; people congregated in coffee houses [...]”⁵⁰

The period of celebration did not continue long. The CUP did not have a clear ideology, and its goal was “to save the empire and to reform it so that its multi-religious, multi-ethnic society could survive in the world of the twentieth century.

Not misconceptions of the mind, conjectures, and analogies.

[...]

Wise men have probed the depths of the earth, / Treasures of buried strata furnish the proofs of creation.

[...]

Neither the belief in metamorphosis nor the fire of the Magians has survived,
The Holy Trinity is not the Qibla of fulfillment for the intelligent.

[...]

Atlas does not hold up the earth, nor is Aphrodite divine,
Plato's wisdom cannot explain the principles of evolution.

[...]

Amr is no slave of Zayd, nor is Zayd Amr's master,
Law depends upon the principle of equality.

[...]

Alas! The West has become the locus of rising knowledge,
Neither the fame of Anatolia and Arabia nor the glory of Cairo and Heart remains.

This is the time for progress; the world is the world of sciences;

Is it possible to uphold society with ignorance?

⁵⁰ Feroz Ahmad, *Turkey: The Quest for Identity* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2003), 49.

Because Ottoman society was predominantly Muslim, Unionist liberals could not secularize the constitution [...]. But within a year, they began to introduce reforms that shook society.”⁵¹ It is important to note that the level of discontent changed gradually among the members of society, especially among the scholars. The articles in journals written right after the Second *Meşrutiyet* showed some satisfaction while the latter ones – those written during the second phase of the CUP – were even more desperate than those written in the late period of Sultan Abülhamid II. It clearly shows how the social events influenced and were influenced by the intellectuals, and modern Turkish literature had a similar fate.

During the early days of relative freedom under the CUP, pundits of all ideological hues – ranging from Islamic modernism to socialism – vied for attention in the public sphere. The Westernization agenda was vigorously advocated by some journals, providing a kind of outline for the radical reforms that were later implemented by Atatürk. Concerning the ideas of Westernization, one faction supported cultural Westernization with vigorous opposition to Western imperialism,⁵² while another advocated a complete acceptance of Western civilization “with its roses and its thorns.”⁵³ At the same time, Islamist movements, which according to many intellectuals suffered persecution at the hands of Abdülhamid II, enjoyed a period of relative growth and tranquility under the CUP. Muhammad Abduh’s ideas on the reconciliation of Islam with science and modernity also had an impact. Westernizers were denounced for seeking to dupe Muslims into accepting a “new religion.”⁵⁴

The dualism in the Tanzimat era could be clearly seen in the literary works of the time. European literary forms, such as the sonnet, became standard, while classical forms began to be shied away from. *Edebiyat-ı Cedîde* [The New Literature] movement, started in 1891 by the proponents of “art for art’s sake,” and succeeded by the *Fecr-i Âtî* [Impending Dawn] current, whose objective was “to

⁵¹ Ahmad, 50.

⁵² See Celal Nuri, “Şîme-i Husumet,” *İctihad*, 22 January 1914.

⁵³ See Abdullah Cevdet, “Şîme-i Muhabbet” *İctihad*, 29 January 1914.

⁵⁴ Mehmet Akif Ersoy, the poet of the Turkish National Anthem, was one of the influential Islamist scholars of the era. For a comprehensive analysis on Ersoy and his works, see M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Mehmet Akif Hakkında Araştırmalar*, 2 Vols. (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2006).

alienate literature from all kinds of social issues”⁵⁵ and “to emphasize individual feelings.”⁵⁶ By 1900, major Ottoman literary figures presented images of a new modernist vision informed by French literature. In some works, such as Tevfik Fikret’s poem “Sis”⁵⁷ [Fog], the decay of the Ottoman Empire is examined through a negative portrayal of Istanbul as if Istanbul were “a whore who should cover [herself] and sleep forever.”⁵⁸ The Ottoman novel developed rapidly during the 1890s; an appealing example was Halid Ziya’s *Aşk-ı Memnu* [The Forbidden Love],⁵⁹ which was a psychological study of adultery in a Bosphorus mansion. It constituted an allegory of the decline of the Empire and became a literary model during the twentieth century.

Though Tanzimat and the aftermath did not bring the expected results, its effects on language and literature cannot be denied. Many texts written in the post-Tanzimat period had descriptive analyses on the society; novels of the era – a new genre then – played a significant role; they even helped establish theories on the physical and psychological shift in the society. There were several translations from the West in this period. Even though Hilmi Ziya Ülken claims that these translations were “disorganized and incidental,”⁶⁰ Tanpınar points out that “these incidental translations had a big impact [on literature].”⁶¹ Admiration of Europe was progressively observed in literature, which later affected individuals’ life styles and mental transformation. Several scholars and writers of the *Tanzimat* and of later periods discussed and wrote about this mental transformation and its influence on literature. As Tanpınar notes in the above excerpt that “modern Turkish literature played a significant role in the emergence of these ideas as well as it was sometimes

⁵⁵ İnci Enginün, *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı, Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010), 605.

⁵⁶ Orhan Okay, *Batılılaşma Devri Türk Edebiyatı* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005), 67.

⁵⁷ Güler Güven, a student of Tanpınar at İstanbul University, quotes Tanpınar’s comments on Tevfik Fikret’s *Sis*. On 25 April 1957, Tanpınar talked about Fikret’s *Sis* in class and defined the poem as “the damnation of a régime that insults humanity.” Güler Güven, *Tanpınar’dan Yeni Ders Notları* (İstanbul: Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı Yayınları, 2008), 64.

⁵⁸ “Örtün ve müebbed uyu, ey fâcire-i dehr” [cover yourself and sleep forever, O whore of the world] writes Tevfik Fikret; Istanbul was for the first time portrayed as a devilish and damnable place. Tevfik Fikret, “Sis,” in Rubâb-I Şikeste, ed. Abdullah Uçman and H. Akay (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2007), 296.

⁵⁹ A recent edition: Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, *Aşk-ı Memnu* (İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2012).

⁶⁰ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009), 259.

⁶¹ Tanpınar, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 264.

under the strong influence of these events that it paved the way for,”⁶² literature was then one of the most important instruments for explaining social phenomena. It was also an important part of the social construction of society and to a certain extent of reality.

Tanpınar was one of the most prominent scholars who wrote about this mental transformation and its influence on literature. He considers the beginning of this transition occurring as early as *Tanzimat* and emphasizes its influence on the emergence and development of modern Turkish literature: “It is a fact that since *Tanzimat* Turkish literature has been under the influence of a duality; Turkish society and Turkish people have had a depressed identity from this duality.”⁶³ His expression that “Turkish literature began with a crisis of civilization”⁶⁴ suggests that Turkish literature was under the influence of this social transition; the writers of this period placed great significance on explaining and even spearheading this transformation. The most important job in this mission fell to artists, literary scholars, and writers.

Tanpınar was by no means the only author to recognize and describe this cultural dilemma caused by a forced leap from one civilization to another. There were many others who were writing on this civilization change, such as Ahmet Midhat Efendi (1884-1912), Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar (1864-1944), Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (1889-1974), Reşat Nuri Güntekin (1889-1956), Halide Edip Adıvar (1884-1964), Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924), Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935), and Peyami Safa (1899-1961). However, Tanpınar’s works stand apart from the mainstream trends of modern Turkish literature in terms of content and language. His position in the counter-current can be understood through an analysis of the changing mainstream currents in literature. His position in society was ambivalent in the early Republican period; there was a surge of interest in 1970s after his death; due to changing interpretations of many concepts and principles in the late 1990s and 2000s he became more popular; after the publication of his diary in 2007, his position as a literary critic and artist was mostly ignored, and his reputation was at stake. By analyzing the various interpretations of Tanpınar, we can indeed pursue the

⁶² Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine*, 104.

⁶³ Tanpınar, 107.

⁶⁴ Tanpınar, 104.

mainstream trends in literature as well as the changing history of thought in Turkey. The mainstream literary trends have a direct relationship with the history of thought, as the emergence and development of modern Turkish literature are directly related to social and political issues.

Tanpınar as a figure isolated from the mainstream literary and philosophical ideas is best understood by analyzing the fifty-year period prior to the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 – the late Ottoman period. The second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries greatly influenced the establishment of the cultural and political trends of the newly founded Turkish Republic; this period saw great confusion of literary, political, and intellectual movements. Because literature was influential during the emergence of the social events, the intellectuals of the time were held in high esteem, and therefore their views were generally respected by the public. Writers often emphasized “return to the origin,” and therefore literary texts written in this period turned into political texts in which a search for the essence can be clearly seen. The political and social movements of the era can be associated with a few literary figures: “Ottomanism” might be associated with Namık Kemal, who was an acclaimed writer⁶⁵ and a respected intellectual. He was the first person to use the concept of ‘*vatan*’ [patrie] referring to a sense of patriotism for the native land for the Turkish-speaking people.⁶⁶ Kemal wanted to “resuscitate the victories and the energy of the Early Ottoman Period. But after a while he no longer contended himself with this exploit and felt the need to turn towards Celalettin Harezemşah [...] to expand the Islamic framework.”⁶⁷

“Westernism” was another movement, highly political and cultural. It was represented by a well-known poet Tevfik Fikret, seeking the Western concepts of individual liberty and freedom from governmental and religious confinements. “Islamism” had several important figures, among whom Mehmet Akif Ersoy was

⁶⁵ Namık Kemal’s poetry, plays, and essays were widely read by the intelligentsia, even though they were banned by the régime.

⁶⁶ Feroz Ahmad gives a description of Ottomanism: “All Ottomans, regardless of their religion or language, owed loyalty not the Ottoman dynasty but to their Ottoman fatherland” (Ahmad, *Turkey*, 38).

⁶⁷ Murat Belge, “Essentialism,” in *Balkan Literatures in the Era of Nationalism*, ed. Murat Belge and J. Parla (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2009), 21.

essential. The poet of the national anthem, Ersoy was an Islamist who also praised technological and scientific advancements in the West. Among those who supported “Turkism” there was Ziya Gökalp who was inspired by the Turks of Central Asia; he considered Turkism as the essential cultural source while he never turned his back on Western ideas. All the movements more or less showed a common rejection of the current condition of the state in stagnation and decay, and sought means to overcome it.

Among these main political and cultural trends, Islamism and Westernism held great significance since all the concepts were derived from, and all the movements were somewhat influenced by these two streams. Although before the foundation of the Turkish Republic, pan-Islamism and Ottomanism were promoted by the state, Ottomanism was later considered as a trend close to Islamism. The ideology of Turkism remained marginal and restricted to a small minority of intellectuals. Especially Muslim intellectuals, who came from Russia and who confronted the ideology of Slavism in the Russian Empire, popularized the ideology of Turkism. İsmail Gasparinski (1851-1914), Yusuf Akçura⁶⁸ (1876-1935), and Ahmet Ağayev (1869-1939) were the most important activists who tried but could not make Turkism – also called Turanism – “the dominant ideology and replace Ottomanism/Islamism while Turks ruled over a multi-ethnic, multi-religious empire.”⁶⁹

The process of modernization in the late Ottoman and the early Republican periods can be analyzed from the perspectives of two important trends: Islamism/conservatives and Westernism/ Westernizers. However, it is not plausible to call it tradition versus modernity as it is not correct to show Islamists as enemies to Westernizers – or vice versa. But rather this phenomenon might be described as different groups who have strategies to find ways to appropriate modernity in a non-European context. For European modernity was a concrete example for the intellectuals of the late Ottoman Empire. However, it was not just a representation as there were several happenings that affected contemporary scholars’ interpretations of Europe and European modernity: there were economic interventions, especially the

⁶⁸ See a recent edition of Akçura’s most important work: Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, (Ankara: Lotus Yayınevi, 2005).

⁶⁹ Ahmad, *Turkey*, 44.

Despite having a different interpretation from Münif Paşa about religion, Fuad and Tevfik shared very similar visions with Münif Paşa about Western superiority. Tanpınar writes in his *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* [History of Nineteenth-Century Turkish Literature] that “the new intellectuals ignore and do not mention Münif Paşa much because the Paşa kept himself away from the political movements after 1864.”⁷¹ Tanpınar must have felt closeness to Münif Paşa from this aspect since he was quite ignored by his contemporaries and the scholars of the following generations. Münif Paşa and Tanpınar had a similar fate due to their ambivalent positions in their society.

While Münif Paşa was trying to justify his position by explicitly or implicitly referring to Islamic tradition, Beşir Fuad never used any religious arguments to justify his ideas on science and religion. Fuad instead referred to Ludwig Büchner (1824-1899), a German vulgar materialist, in order to elevate science to a metaphysical level, and he tried to show science as the ultimate truth in human life. As discussed in the previous chapter, Beşir Fuad turned his suicide into a scientific experiment and wanted to make a final modest contribution to science by writing his feelings during the operation. He represented a different form of Ottoman intellectualism by becoming a complete positivist and by establishing weak intellectual and emotional links to Islam and Islamic culture. Therefore, he should be considered as the founder of Ottoman/Turkish materialism. His attitude toward science and religion was significant for it became the model for the late Ottoman and the early Republican intellectuals.

Materialism was not confined to the era of the CUP, but its characteristics were confirmed among the late Ottoman intellectuals. In a chapter entitled “Blueprints for a Future Society: Late Ottoman Materialists on Science, Religion, and Art,” Şükrü Hanioglu observes that one of the major characteristics of late Ottoman materialism was

the belief in science as the exclusive foundation of a new Ottoman society [...]. In the Ottoman context, the conception of a new society strictly regulated by scientific truth logically led to the rejection of the

⁷¹ Tanpınar, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 171.

old basis of society – the revealed truth of Islam. To the many Ottoman intellectuals [...] religion was the most dangerous type of philosophy, and a major obstacle to social progress.⁷²

Hanioğlu claims that the vulgar materialism represented by Ludwig Büchner, Karl Vogt, and Jacob Moleschott in the nineteenth century “instantly lost its vulgarity and became the ‘high philosophy’ and *Weltanschauung* of an entire educated class.”⁷³ This idea can be seen in the works of Beşir Fuad, Abdullah Cevdet, and Baha Tevfik – if not seen in the same ways. The early materialists such as Abdullah Cevdet and Celal Nuri İleri did not reject the influence of religion in the society as Cevdet believed that “human society cannot live without religion.”⁷⁴ He did not hesitate to name his journal “İctihad,”⁷⁵ keeping in his mind that he “would try to reconcile the [...] principles of Baháism with Islam in imitation of Muhammed Abduh.”⁷⁶

It is important to mention that some of the late Ottoman elite – especially those who were not religious – kept telling people how religion was not compatible with rationality and science. This strategy, whose aim was to educate people about the superiority of science over religion, was initiated in various ways. It was not denying religion at all but rather holding the power to define and control it. The discourse of materialism did not eradicate the influence of religion in society; however, it became the new philosophy deemed Islamic. This assumption stemmed from a condition that people were accepting without any judgment the ideas constantly repeated to them. This materialistic discourse, which defines and controls religion, is closely related to *laicism*. The Anglo-Saxon secularism never worked in Turkey as the realm of politics was never separated from that of religion. Republican leaders imitated the French laicism for they always wanted to use religion to control the masses and therefore could never keep the politics separate.

The founder of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), was influenced by the vulgar materialists even though he never mentioned his ideas on religion in public. Grace Ellison, a British author who traveled to Turkey in the

⁷² Şükrü Hanioğlu, “Blueprints for a Future Society: Late Ottoman Materialists on Science,” in *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy*, ed. Elizabeth Özdalga (NY: Routledge, 2013), 27.

⁷³ Hanioğlu, 80.

⁷⁴ Hanioğlu, 42.

⁷⁵ “İctihat” means precedent.

⁷⁶ Hanioğlu, “Blueprints,” 60.

1920s, quotes Atatürk's statement to her: "I have no religion, and at times I wish all religions at the bottom of the sea. He is a weak ruler who needs religion to uphold his government; it is as if he would catch his people in a trap. My people are going to learn the principles of democracy, the dictates of truth and the teachings of science. Superstition must go."⁷⁷ After the foundation of the Republic, Atatürk turned into a rationalist and "promoted a materialist and determinist ideology. An attempt to reform Islam was quickly abandoned in 1928. The view prevailing in Atatürk's circle was that a reform of Islam would be as useless as graft on dead wood."⁷⁸ Mustafa Kemal was obviously influenced by the ideologies and the teachings of the late Ottoman materialists, especially from those of Abdullah Cevdet. Hanioglu reports a correspondence between Mustafa Kemal and Cevdet: "The founder of the republic said to [Abdullah Cevdet], 'Doctor, up to now you have written about many things. Now we may bring them to realization.'"⁷⁹ Some materialists who were close to Abdullah Cevdet, such as Celal Nuri and Kılıçzade Hakkı, became deputies; and Abdullah Cevdet himself was offered by Mustafa Kemal a position as a deputy in 1925.⁸⁰

The influence of materialism on the late Ottoman intellectuals and the early Republican statesmen is important for it determined the future interpretations of religion, politics, and science. The connection established between the past and religion – that is, those who valued tradition and the past were considered conservative and pious – stemmed from the fact that "past" meant the Islamic heritage, and the modern was associated with Europe and European thought. Some Turkish historians often depict the Empire as a dark régime and considered the Republic as the symbol of progress and enlightenment. There was on the one hand the dark régime associated with the past and the Islamic heritage, with no complete rejection of religion, and the modern nation associated with progress on the other. The early republican Kemalists did not attack Islam but rather preferred to control and to redefine the concept of religion, which was quite successful and resulted in the emergence of a popular religion – we can call it "cultural Islam." Religion continued

⁷⁷ Grace Ellison, *Turkey Today* (London: Hutchinson & Company, 1928), 24.

⁷⁸ Adrew Mango, *Atatürk* (New York: Overlook Press, 2000), 535.

⁷⁹ Hanioglu, "Blueprints," 83.

⁸⁰ Hanioglu, 83.

to provide emotional comfort and ease for people; however, its practical aspects were not assimilated on the same level by the masses.

We should understand the position of Tanpınar and his alienation during his lifetime and after his death in this context. During his lifetime he was either unnoticed or alienated by his contemporaries. The condition after his death in 1961 was not much different; this time he was labeled conservative and went unnoticed until the 1990s. Tanpınar's significance stems to some extent from these ambivalent interpretations. While he was marginalized in his lifetime due to his attitudes toward the past and tradition, after his death, especially from the 1960s to the 1990s, he was deliberately kept out of mainstream ideology and literature due to his antipathetic image to the republican régime and the intellectuals. Tanpınar was indeed not a religious person, if not an atheist; however, the fact that he valued the past and tradition made the republican intellectuals think so. This interpretation started in the early years of the Republic and lasted for decades. A closer critique of Tanpınar proves his changing positions throughout the twentieth century and sheds light on the cultural, political, and intellectual transition in Turkey.

Tanpınar was known during his lifetime as a poet, scholar and essayist. His novels and short stories went unnoticed until the 1970s, almost a decade after his death. Before the 1970s there were very few works on him; one of them was Mehmet Kaplan's *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası* [Tanpınar's Poetic World].⁸¹ Another one was a series of articles published in *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* [Journal of Turkish Language and Literature], serialized right after Tanpınar's death and dedicated by the faculty members at İstanbul University, to Tanpınar where he taught for the last thirteen years of his life. In the following decade, not a single work on Tanpınar was published. This total lack of interest in him seemed to be broken in 1969 with the publication of more than a hundred of his articles on literature for the first time. One year after the publication of his articles on literature, a collection of his essays on various subjects were published in 1970. In 1972 two of his short stories, *Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyalari*⁸² [The Dreams of Abdullah Efendi] and *Yaz Yağmuru*⁸³

⁸¹ Mehmet Kaplan, *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2013).

⁸² Ahmet H. Tanpınar, "Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyalari," in *Hikayeler*, ed. İnci Enginün (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2011), 11-149.

[Summer Rain] were published. In 1973, his *Huzur* and *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* [Those outside the Scene]⁸⁴ were published almost twenty-five years after their first editions.

There are assumptions on this surge of interest in Tanpınar's prose after the 1970s: in her 1983 introduction to *Semantic Structuring in the Modern Turkish Short Story*, Sarah Moment Atış claims that "Tanpınar, who cannot be considered representative of any of the major movements which characterized the development of Turkish literature during his own lifetime, is now being discovered as a major forerunner of a movement which has begun to emerge only recently."⁸⁵ Atış of course could not consider the reinterpretation of Tanpınar in 1990s and that the diary, published in 2007, revised his image completely. She reevaluates Tanpınar to assess his position in a more comprehensive history of modern Turkish literature. Therefore, her consideration of Tanpınar was limited to the field of literature so the rediscovery of Tanpınar was within the aspect of his contribution to modern Turkish literature. This reinterpretation of Tanpınar was correct but uncomplete. Considering the changing representations and positions of Tanpınar in time, his contribution to Turkish thought and culture should also be pointed out.

Even though he was marginalized due to his thoughts on tradition and the past by the Westernizers, I claim that his attitudes were quite Western insofar as the West established a link with the past, tradition, and cultural heritage. Tanpınar's poetry, for example, presents a synthesis of elements drawn from three different traditions: "the French Symbolists, the Ottoman court poets and the Turkish folk minstrels. By means of an eclectic approach uniting past and present, East and West, courtly and folk traditions, Tanpınar found in his poetry a private answer to the problem whose solution he sought [...] in the prose work, *Five Cities*."⁸⁶ Tanpınar reveals this in his article *Türk Edebiyatı'nda Cereyanlar*, in which he also gives an objective self-characterization and describes his view of aesthetics:

⁸³ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, "Yaz Yağmuru," in *Hikayeler*, ed. İnci Enginün (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2011), 153-228.

⁸⁴ Ahmet H. Tanpınar, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007).

⁸⁵ Sarah Moment Atış, *Semantic Structuring in the Modern Turkish Short Story* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983), 2-3.

⁸⁶ Atış, *Semantic Structuring*, 5.

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar sought his own poetic language within an aesthetic over which he wanted the order of dream to prevail. His story entitled, *Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyalari*, gives one aspect of this aesthetic. In other stories and novels, this poet takes as a theme the civilization crisis discussed above and the mental duality which it has produced. His collection of essays entitled *Beş Şehir* seeks the means of reconciliation with the past through the problems of today. He is one of those who seek the sound of *aruz* [prosody] in the *hece* [quantitative] meter.⁸⁷

In his prose Tanpınar uses both the spoken Turkish of Istanbul while at the same time he distinguishes between written and spoken Turkish. He uses a broad lexicon: his long sentences are full of Turkish loan-words derived from Arabic, Persian, and French. He avoids using etymologically derived Turkish words and criticizes attempts at language purification:

The process of language purification has stretched the logic of the language beyond bounds and eliminated words without due regard to their usage. As a result, the language has been deprived of its plastic possibilities, while, at the same time, the insistence on certain topics that are viewed from certain angles has created simply a new conventionality. Moreover, the insistent use of popular expressions, which, in their own context constitute a world of beauty and color, has left little possibility for the writer to be individual in his own work and even raises the danger of limiting language and thought to a certain level.⁸⁸

His criticism of language purge as odd certainly made him look like he was against the language reforms that started in 1932 and lasted until the 1970s. I do not think Tanpınar was against the ‘simplification’ [sadeleştirme] of the language but rather the language purging [özleştirme] which can be considered as “Turkification” of language – that is, the replacement of words with roots Arabic or Persian with words

⁸⁷ In Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine*, 115. The translation of this passage is taken from Sarah Moment Atış’s *Semantic Structuring in the Modern Turkish Story*, 4.

⁸⁸ In Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine*, 128. The translation of this passage is taken from Sarah Moment Atış’s *Semantic Structuring in the Modern Turkish Short Story*, 6.

based on Turkish roots. The problem was that words were changed without respect for their extensive use by the public or the intellectuals. The language reform was indeed a new form of Turkish nationalism. There were several foreign scholars who worked at universities in İstanbul during this period of the government's premeditated scheme to free itself from imperial hegemony. In her *East West Mimesis*, Kader Konuk claims that Turkish officials "weighed each individual application against the person's desirability and the applicant's potential contribution to the modernization of the country [...] as the facilitators and promoters of Europeanness in the host country."⁸⁹ Among these foreign émigrés there was Eric Auerbach, who spent eleven years in Istanbul as an exile. In one of his letters to Walter Benjamin, he calls this new form of nationalism "fanatically anti-traditional nationalism" and criticizes the construction of the new Turkish identity:

[...] rejection of all existing Mohammedan cultural heritage, the establishment of a fantastic relation to a primal Turkish identity, technological modernization in the European sense, in order to triumph against a hated yet admired Europe with its own weapons: hence the preference for European-educated emigrants as teachers, from whom one can learn without the threat of foreign propaganda. Result: nationalism in the extreme accompanied by the simultaneous destruction of the historical national character.⁹⁰

The Romanization of the Turkish script was another important development before the language 'purification.' Right after abolishing the Arabic alphabet used in Ottoman writing, the Latin script was introduced. The educated class was overnight rendered obsolete and irrelevant, and the following generation would be unable to access the archives or the legal documents written within the Arabic script. This language reform – or language revolution – had a huge impact on Turkish politics and culture. In another letter to Walter Benjamin, Eric Auerbach points out the introduction of Latin script to the Turkish language. Auerbach's remark also explains the identity crises that Tanpınar and many other scholars expressed in their works:

⁸⁹ Kader Konuk, *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010), 75.

⁹⁰ Quoted in Emily Apter, "Global Translatio: The 'Invention' of Comparative Literature, Istanbul, 1933," *Critical Inquiry* 29, no: 2 (Winter 2003): 263.

Here all traditions have been thrown overboard in an attempt to build a thoroughly rationalized state that will be both European and extremely Turco-nationalistic. The whole process is being carried out with a fantastic and unearthly speed [...]. It is already hard to find anyone who can read Arabic or Persian or even Turkish texts written in the last century, since the language has been modernized and reoriented along purely Turkish lines and is now written in roman letters.⁹¹

Before Auerbach's arrival in Istanbul, Leo Spitzer, a Jewish émigré scholar exiled during the Nazi period, was offered a job of devising a philological curriculum for Istanbul University in 1933. Auerbach and Spitzer along with many other émigrés published substantial essays on philology. They worked together with several Turkish scholars, some of whom worked on state-sponsored projects to build a modern library for the newly born Turkish Republic. One of these Turkish intellectuals was Azra Erhat; she worked on Spitzer's methodology and word art. Emily Apter mentions in her article that Erhat "dedicated her career to the translation of Greek and Latin classics for a state-sponsored project to create a modern library [...]. The library formed part of a concerted mission to 'Greekify' Turkey and thereby consolidate the state's efforts to establish non-Islamic, anti-Ottoman cultural foundations on which secular nationalism could be built."⁹²

Considering the changes in language and literature as well as several other revolutions, the process of Westernization which was embraced in the early years as the official ideology of the Turkish Republic was not really a Western phenomenon. It was rather a form of imposition of reforms in the name of modernization and Westernization. Tanpınar was ostracized by the intellectuals of the time who interpreted him as dedicated to the past and thus conservative or even religious. He was surely not a Westernizer but rather a Westerner as his ideas and solutions that he brought to social problems were Western.

⁹¹ Quoted in Apter, "Global Translatio," 268.

⁹² Apter, 270.

Tanpınar: “A Western Easterner”

Despite his comments on the Ottoman past and tradition, Tanpınar was always in favor of Westernization and brought about the most convenient ways for the Westernization experience of Turkey. His alienation by his contemporaries, especially by the Kemalist intellectuals who were also in favor of Westernization, was both ironic and quite illuminating and can help us understand the differences between the Westernizers and the Westerners. The European influence on Tanpınar was obvious; however, he valued only some of the Western principles and thus was not in favor of a complete adoption of European principles with no regard to their appropriateness to Turkish society. In the subsequent section will give a brief analysis of Tanpınar’s ideas on Europe, his considered adaptation of European values into social life, his thoughts on the possibility of keeping the old traditions while embracing the new, and his disappointment about Europe.

Tanpınar articulates his ideas about Europe and European influence and shows his admiration for the West in several works. His diary especially holds great significance since his notes include not only his well-considered opinions, but also his surprises, curiosity, and disappointments. A comprehensive analysis of Tanpınar’s remarks about Europe in his diary will prove that he truly a Westerner but who suffered from a common misapprehension of Europe and European values. On 15 October 1960, Tanpınar wrote his thoughts on Westernization clearly: “I talked quite well; I especially focused on the East-West puzzle. I said, ‘we have no choice but to become Western.’ Whoever came to the stage after me began with my words and finished with my words.”⁹³ A very similar remark can be found in his entry dated 18 March 1961: “We will Europeanize however as a Turkish community that inhabit Asia Minor. We will Europeanize only as a whole, en masse.”⁹⁴

Tanpınar’s admiration was not for the mere purpose of adopting Western principles with no respect for their convenience and practicability in the society. He considered the process as a struggle to seek solutions in the West for the problems prevailing in Turkey for more than a century. He was quite aware of the fact that the Westernization experience of Turkey was proceeding in the right direction.

⁹³ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 224.

⁹⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 265.

Therefore, at every opportunity, in his speeches and articles, he was drawing attention to the characteristics of true Europeanization. While he was criticizing the East and Eastern countries and praising Western values, he sometimes felt ambivalent as one of the diary entries shows clearly. He criticizes Mehmet Akif Ersoy, the national poet and an Islamic scholar, for his appraisal of Eastern civilization. Tanpınar did not accept Ersoy's proposal and writes:

Communism, Socialism, the ultimate Westernism. All seem easy with Akif's idealization of civilization under the thumb of the East. The hardest thing is to recover from this physical and moral wretchedness. Neither Yakup [Kadri Karaosmanoğlu], nor Ali [Yücel], Falih Rıfkı [Atay] had this feeling of *angoisse* [depression]. We cannot kill the East by shooting at the East.⁹⁵

His strategy was not "shooting at the East" or totally rejecting it but focusing on some of the principles of the West; those principles were supposed to be a part of the true Westernization that Tanpınar espoused. In one of his diary entries, Tanpınar writes this time not specifically about the Westernization of Turkey but rather he analyzes the process in general, applying it to all Eastern societies. He gives priority to independence: "Eastern societies need to acquire some principles to genuinely become Western: at the top of the list there is a necessity for us to believe in all types of independence, as we believe in taking a breath as our most essential right."⁹⁶ In the second part of the same entry, Tanpınar gives an example of what he means by independence. He compares the celebrations of Labor Day in Paris with those in İstanbul: "1 May 1960: overcast weather, a semi-clear sky. A dimmed light; and then a gleam in a flash. The streets are full of women and children who sell canvallaria. Paris is celebrating the first of May. In İstanbul, there is a strict curfew. People have not seen such a thing since Atatürk's era. Newspapers are banned. The radio has no news."⁹⁷ Tanpınar jots down note about independence during his stay in Paris in 1953. He could not help criticizing one of his female Turkish friends and says,

⁹⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 260.

⁹⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 186.

⁹⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 187.

“Leyla is ready to complain about her husband. Our women are attracted by independence in Paris.”⁹⁸

Tanpınar had positive remarks on the continuity of Europe and European values. As he uses the same arguments for defining the problem of identity, Tanpınar emphasizes the lack of continuity and consistency in Turkey. He reveals his feelings in his diary and writes: “What upsets me in this adventure is that there is no permanence in Turkey. Things work in a different way in the West; they keep things going. Why can’t we do that?”⁹⁹ His appreciation of the continuity in Western societies was not only about social improvement, for he often praised continuity in art and literature. On 2 December 1958 he took notes on his novels and the novel genre in general. He refers to Virginia Woolf and says, “English novel, Woolf or Morgan [...] they stare at life from a secure perspective and ask for its continuity, see its continuity, and find right there. They want it for their individual lives. I think I can do the same for Turkey [...]”¹⁰⁰ In the last days of his life, on 26 August 1961, Tanpınar came up with a new perspective on continuity. His judgment on continuity to a certain extent reminds us of a general criticism of the Enlightenment: “Love is gone, so is the rest. Not surprising that the ancients said, ‘love the immortal’. To love Allah. The moderns have replaced Him with society and the public. I don’t like the public, individuals. How can I like those roughnecks walking in front of me in the festival – our doorman, my neighbors, the tram driver?”¹⁰¹

Another principle that Tanpınar mentions and appreciates in his diary is about “living with a purpose.” He defines it as one of the European characteristics that distinguish Europe and Westerners from Easterners. Among his notes from his trip to France, we find those lines:

The young girl said to her companion “I wonder if these would find a purpose by themselves.” Since I came to France, I have heard this quite often. I think there is always a goal in the minds of many people here, which I can say fills up their lives. They need to find goals for themselves. (I could not listen hear what the goal was all about.) Is

⁹⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 51.

⁹⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 235.

¹⁰⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 129.

¹⁰¹ Enginün and Kerman, 321-22.

that a modern form of French *vivre savie*?¹⁰² Is that politics?

Questioning identity?¹⁰³

Tanpınar's positive remarks on having a goal in life that determines the characteristics of European identity can be seen in another diary entry; this time he draws attention to the establishment of cities. His interest in cities, from their architecture to their socioeconomic states, is already known as he wrote and discussed five major Turkish cities in his *Beş Şehir*. In the diary entry he claims that the establishment of today's European cities comes from struggle in the Middle Ages: "European Middle Ages: The townsman made the city, owned the city, loved it, and fought for it."¹⁰⁴ Tanpınar's comments on establishing European cities throughout history is better understood when it is connected to his interpretation of the past. In another diary entry, he writes how the protection of the past is important to maintain current developments: "Franks protect their past. [...] Only the people change; decoration and property are always in their proper place."¹⁰⁵

Tanpınar admires and appreciates the Western interpretation of the past and tradition and considers it one of the characteristics that the new nation should emulate. He criticizes the complete rejection of the cultural heritage of Turkey and tries to find answers to being a Westerner in an Eastern society. His 18 March 1961 diary entry clearly gives his ideas on identity. He also criticizes those who are isolated from society but who consider themselves scholars:

The most important question is whether we can have two different cultures [...]. Can we become both Western and Eastern? By no means! But we can become Western Easterners. The East is our core for now. And I think it will remain so for a long time. The opposite is never likely since we, the whole society, cannot abandon our identity. This is one of the most significant depressions that Turkey currently suffers from but that no one can name it or even notice it. It is a form of alienation of the so-called scholars and the real scholars from the public [...]. How can someone consider himself a scholar if he does

¹⁰² Tanpınar originally writes the word in French. The editors write "a life to live" in the footnote.

¹⁰³ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 56.

¹⁰⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 290.

¹⁰⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 137.

not know the East and does not recognize us and our fundamental characteristics?¹⁰⁶

Tanpınar was clearly against a complete rejection of tradition and the past. While he was never against Westernization, he worried that some cultural elements would be lost or forgotten. On 18 March 1961, he writes,

The reality is that there is a community that we call the nation. And this society comes from a civilization which is different from the civilization of its history. This difference is a reality; so, I need to have a sentimental principle that comes from this difference. I knew Dede [Efendi] by coincidence. I found out a different aspect of humankind. I have a poet like Yunus [Emre] and an eccentric poet like Nabi; so why should I not know them? [...] Would I feel at ease if I do not know them? And for instance, can we say, “Oh, I have forgotten Dede Efendi today, and will get rid of İtri tomorrow?” Is it right to say so? What would we replace with all we have forgotten and will forget? Let’s say we have found something to substitute; what about the masses [...] the new generations? Are a few college- or French-school-graduates going to become the scholars of this society?¹⁰⁷

What distinguished Tanpınar from his contemporaries and thus caused him to be considered traditionalist was his ideas on the form of modernization. He was questioning the West and Western values rather than adopting them wholeheartedly. Apart from his notes taken during his trips to European countries and published in various periodicals, Tanpınar’s diary entries show his thoughts on the crises in Europe. He did not always praise Europe, but sometimes criticized it. Although in one entry he writes, “Spanish people don’t have stability,”¹⁰⁸ he longs for the days he spent in Spain in another.¹⁰⁹ His criticism of France and French people – unquestionable back then – can be seen in numerous diary entries. On 25 April 1961 Tanpınar wrote about the 1961 riots in France and notes how they are like those in

¹⁰⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 263-64.

¹⁰⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 264.

¹⁰⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 105.

¹⁰⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 107.

Turkey. He continues with his criticism of Europe and complains about how Europe cannot see the world's becoming a global village. Tanpınar says they think that "the world is witnessing riots, coups, wars, and treaties; however, the world is unified now; they don't know that. I have had these opinions for a decade or so; and today I see them in Valéry's works though I don't feel any pity for Europe."¹¹⁰ Tanpınar's criticism of Europe here was about the imposition of the local and national life styles of Europe as if they were universal terms and conditions that all the non-Western societies were supposed to adopt in order to modernize and be a part of the globalized world. I will discuss this in detail in Chapter 4. While Tanpınar's contemporaries were highly influenced by the provincializing strategy of Europe, Tanpınar struggled to distance himself from a unilateral image of Western thought and culture.

Tanpınar's attitude toward European culture and history and their influences on people, including politicians and students, was also different from the Republican scholars, who changed the curricula and adopted Western education system. Even though Tanpınar had two different ideas on the school curriculum before and after 1932,¹¹¹ his inquiry of what comes from the West can be seen in his diary entry of 1 May 1960. He even criticizes his teacher and close friend, Yahya Kemal, and writes, "Yahya Kemal's youth program: Teaching the French Revolution to the public. How can the history of the French Revolution save a politician from making mistakes? Our poor children [...]."¹¹² Tanpınar's thoughts on Europe and his criticism of Western influence on Turkey caused him to be considered a person who was rejecting the changes that the Republican régime effected as a part of the Westernization process in Turkey. His complaints on his loneliness mostly stemmed from his alienation, which was in part related to his isolating thoughts on many fundamentals of the newly founded Turkish Republic. We can raise two questions on Tanpınar's alienation: First is about the image of the lonely Tanpınar that he created in his diary. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Tanpınar was sometimes inclined to create a pseudo-identity in his diary for the sake of perpetuating control of his

¹¹⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 285.

¹¹¹ For Tanpınar's changing ideas before and after 1932, see Necmettin Turinay, "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: 1932 Öncesi ve Sonrası," *Hece* 61 (January 2002), 77-83.

¹¹² Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 187.

literary and social images even after his death. The second question is whether he was truly a traditionalist, or was really a conservative writer in the sense that Republican writers labeled him.

“They will Return to me One Day”¹¹³: Tanpınar’s Solitude

Out of many interpretations on Tanpınar, the most common one concerns his loneliness: in his lifetime he was not acclaimed by many critics and intellectuals, and he was even called “kırtıpıl Hamdi [Petty Hamdi].” This common perception been well confirmed by his own remarks in his letters and diary entries, especially when he complained about his loneliness and about how people around him did not recognize his achievements and did not see him as a poet. However, there were more than sixty articles and book reviews written about him and his works before his death. His poetry was highly acclaimed and praised by some critics in the 1950s and the early 1960s until his death. Handan İnci comments on Tanpınar’s reputation in her introductory speech given at the symposium, “Time of Tanpınar in the World and Turkey”, on 1-2 November 2010, by Mimar Sinan University Faculty of Fine Arts.¹¹⁴ İnci says that many intellectuals were giving credit to Tanpınar for his talent in literature: Edip Cansever, İnci remarks, was sometimes showing his poems to Tanpınar just to hear his criticism; Oktay Akbal once said he could read many of Tanpınar’s poems by heart; Melih Cevdet followed him closely and even paid attention to the words that Tanpınar used in his works; and many other young writers respected and admired Tanpınar and his works. That shows, İnci asserts, how Tanpınar was in fact much respected by many people around him, including some intellectuals and especially faculty members.¹¹⁵

Considering the numerous publications on Tanpınar during his lifetime, Tanpınar’s remarks in his diary and letters, full of complaints and sad comments on his loneliness, sound a bit awry. From his first diary notes in 1953 until the last ones in 1961, Tanpınar constantly complains of his loneliness. His notes in the diary are not the only texts in which he mentions his feelings: in his short stories, especially in

¹¹³ Enginün and Kerman, 260.

¹¹⁴ The proceedings were published in April 2012. Handan İnci, ed, *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Tanpınar Zamanı, Son Bakışlar* (İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012).

¹¹⁵ İnci, *Tanpınar Zamanı*, ix-x.

Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyalari, the main themes are isolation and the fear of loss.¹¹⁶ In one of the first diary entries, in Paris on 23 May 1953, Tanpınar writes, “Kenan asks ‘if anything was said and written about you?’ His question has reminded me of the governor of Yalova¹¹⁷ [...]. I am a lonely man, and I totally understand that. Have I really done something? I have made a contribution to the poetry for twenty years but what about it?”¹¹⁸ His complaints on loneliness in his early entries are not different from those in the later entries; on 26 May 1961, a few months before his death, Tanpınar writes:

It is all over. Twenty-three years of my life have wasted away with groundless fears. Ten-years period of that, I mean the last ten years, has been completely bootless. I have lost connection with everything. I should have finished this [publication of novels] in 1952, at the latest. But poverty, having no women, and life’s *circonstance* [circumstances]. Isolation. I am not ready to accept this.¹¹⁹

Tanpınar was indeed aware of his alienation from the groups that he wanted to be a part of. He has a few presuppositions on the reasons: on New Year’s Day 1959 he complains about his loneliness because he was not invited to the celebrations: “The other night I was in Mehmet Ali’s [Cimcoz]. They did not invite me to New Year’s Day. Neither did Nüzhet [Saman]. I think I palled on some people. So what? Mehmet Ali and all my other friends put an embargo on my writings. (There was also that thing going on about losing books and not returning books.)”¹²⁰ A few days later he restates his discontentedness with the people around him and writes, “I asked money from Kemal. Fazıl scolded me. Everyone scolds me. A terrible thing.”¹²¹

As one of the explanations to people’s negative attitudes toward Tanpınar, the editors of the diary assert that Tanpınar considered people around him as materials to

¹¹⁶ The fear of loss in the dreams of Abdullah Efendi is certainly related to Tanpınar’s ambivalent position and feelings that stem from the loss of Empire and the new country born out of the Empire’s ashes.

¹¹⁷ Tanpınar refers to a Turkish expression, the exact translation of which is, “Who cares about the district governor of Yalova?” Yalova, now a city in Turkey, was a district at the time Tanpınar wrote this diary entry. The expression is used in the case of someone’s showing no respect for or interest in a given subject or person.

¹¹⁸ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 57.

¹¹⁹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 297.

¹²⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 143.

¹²¹ Enginün and Kerman,.

be used in his works. We learn from a footnote in the *Diary* given by the editors that Prof. Süheyla Bayrav mentioned once that Tanpınar was going to reward him by personifying him in a novel or to punish him by not giving him a role in his works.¹²² That might have caused disaffection toward Tanpınar among those people. Another reason was probably Tanpınar's asking for money from his friends. The editors comment on how his poverty affected his relations with his friends: "Tanpınar did not have the money that he needed to execute his plans. He was not good at money affairs; people lent him money to be returned within a certain time, but he probably did not pay them back, which damaged his respectability and reputation."¹²³ Tanpınar himself also mentions this several times in his diary entries; he notes: "why am I that in need of people? He [Mazhar Şevket İpşiroğlu] is a trickster in his relations with his friends, and I am in need of money (Oh God! When am I going to get out of my debts?)"¹²⁴ In another entry, he associates money with freedom: "That's the point: I am not independent. Neither to myself nor to people around me. Neither on money issues nor on time management."¹²⁵ He was so depressed about his poverty that he once mentioned that dishonesty is necessary to get rid of that:

You cannot find an honest person as long as money exists in the world. Someone like your father, mother, grandfather, grandfather's immediate associates, or you should be slyly dishonest at one time in your life. So that you become honest for the rest of your life. I now remember Yahya Kemal as he often said that "Hamdi, there is no way to remain clean at least in our times."¹²⁶

Although the editors' assertions about Tanpınar's alienation sound very plausible and can easily be confirmed by Tanpınar's own remarks in the entries, I think the main reason for people's ignorance of him was his ambivalent position. Unlike many Republican scholars who were in favor of complete adoption of European values as well as protesting tradition and the past, Tanpınar did not completely reject the past and tradition but rather thought that the present can be

¹²² Quoted in Enginün and Kerman, 341.

¹²³ Enginün and Kerman, 345.

¹²⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 126.

¹²⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 137.

¹²⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 138.

better understood through a strong understanding of the past. Tanpınar's ideas on Westernization might have been considered idiosyncratic, which resulted in his alienation from mainstream Kemalist writers of the time. He was well aware of how others perceived him, but he did not give up following his Western thoughts¹²⁷ and attitudes.

Tanpınar was aware that his thoughts were different from mainstream ideology. In one of his diary entries, he complains about his alienation:

The ignorance continues; it can even be considered an assassination. Are my poems and my poetry book really that hopeless? I am sure that with a few poems in this book I am the greatest Turkish poet after Yahya Kemal. I have rescued the language from its current dryness. But how can you tell that to anybody? Those who consider Yüksel's [Aslan] pictures as tableaux surely cannot understand my poems [...].

They will return to me one day. But when? I think my book is sufficient in terms of quantity. I am aware of the modern; I am a man of my age. However, I cannot see the connection between poetry and this age. Living in the atomic era does not necessarily require perishing in aberration.¹²⁸

I am an intellectual. I believe in everything: love, life, humanity, and thought. However, I do not feel myself obliged to see these things through the lens of a few clichés. I have responsibilities toward myself, too, as I have toward society. I feel this dual responsibility. I don't have to eat caviar. I have things to do [...].¹²⁹

In one of his other diary entries, written a few months after the one above, Tanpınar elaborates his thoughts on his debilitating alienation. This diary entry also gives fruitful information about him, his ideas on art, as well as how his alienation is closely related to his being culturally different from the people around him:

¹²⁷ As explained earlier in this chapter, I consider Tanpınar's thought and attitude toward modernization as Western; I also claim that those who adopt Western social and cultural values without questioning them and with no regard for their appropriation for Turkish society were not Western but Westernizers. I will elaborate on this in Chapter 4 by making a direct comparison with the attitudes of Western writers and the inclinations of the Westernizers.

¹²⁸ "Aberration" is used by Tanpınar himself, not translated.

¹²⁹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 260.

When I consider the sixty years of my life, I sometimes see achievements but also failure and misery. The main reason for my failure is that among the generation that I have grown up with, I have become a person who does not deviate from his path and faith, but who lives without trying to appease people – even when I was a member of a party whose leader was someone I relied on – who is reconciled to his poverty and who sees only his artistic ideals [...].¹³⁰ Have those [stories and novels] not brought anything to Turkey? To Turkey and to Turkish? What about my poems? No one has ever mentioned my “Deniz” [The Sea] poem yet. “Deniz” is among the best Turkish poems. I am sure about that. Count on my articles, too. No, I deserve more than my little fame and have gone way beyond that. But, why this unfairness? What are my shortcomings?

I am still struggling with myself. I still don’t see myself as mature enough. Perhaps I am destroying myself. Maybe it is me who invites the discrimination against me. I am not hanging around with men of letters. I used to be very close to those between twenty and thirty-five years old; now I am very distant. There is a cultural gap between us. A distance [...]. This distance and division is nearly like that between me and the Westerners whom I admire. I should not have taken literature that seriously in this circumstance of my country.

Everything in Turkey is a political conflict. But I see Turkish politics, the real Turkish politics, in my works. The rightists don’t see me like themselves; I am not monopolist enough, illiterate enough. The leftists are hostile to me. Those who are culturally on my level find among the French people better than me [...].

The truth is that I am new in Turkish, but not in the world. The world – which brought art to a deadlock – asks for different things.

¹³⁰ In his *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat’tan A.H. Tanpınar’a*, Berna Moran explains Tanpınar’s attitude toward his ideals on art: “Tanpınar was trying to create a place of art that was above all designed to satisfy himself. I do not claim that Tanpınar only pursued to aesthetic because he was also a novelist of ideas [...].” Berna Moran, *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2009), 269.

The rightists are limited within Turkey, blindfolded, they go after a grandiose Turkish history; they talk only about domestic policy and propaganda. The leftists say that there is no Turkey and no need for that [...]. They ask for and are content with a Turkey without people who have ideas and ideals. But I am after a Turkey which is connected with the world, progressive, and reconciled with its past.

This is my position in this society.”¹³¹

Tanpınar defines his loneliness as the murder of ignorance or tragic solitude, and he complains about this in many diary entries. As discussed in my previous chapter, his psychological condition was so fragile that in one of the diary entries he writes, “Everything is terrible. I want to die and take revenge on what they have done to me. I am unlucky. I have never had such a strong feeling of failure before.”¹³² In the last two years of his life, Tanpınar was a more unbalanced character who was well aware of his loneliness and isolation from the people he wanted to be friends with. Even though he wrote harshly about them in his diary, he never wanted to become distant from them.

An analysis of the attitude of people around him is important to understanding his psychology as well as his own ambivalent position. As the editors of the diary mention in their explanatory comments among Tanpınar’s diary notes, Güzin Dino, an acclaimed poet and scholar and a friend of Tanpınar, wrote that Tanpınar wrote a poem, titled “Gelecek” [The Future], before coming back to Istanbul from Paris. Dino also claims that due to the coup in 1960 Tanpınar was afraid and did not publish his poem. According to the editors of the diary, Tanpınar had not yet finished his poem, therefore he thought it was not ready for publication.¹³³ Although they had a close relationship, Dino was so unaware of Tanpınar’s precision in his works that he could not figure out the poem was not in its final form.

One of the people whom Tanpınar wanted to maintain his friendship with was Sabahattin Eyüpoğlu. A writer and a translator, Eyüpoğlu (1908-1973) is mentioned more than twenty times in the diary. Tanpınar’s correspondence with Eyüpoğlu from

¹³¹ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 299-301.

¹³² Enginün and Kerman, 224.

¹³³ Enginün and Kerman, 190.

Paris was quite frequent. In the compilation of Tanpınar's letters, published for the first time in 1979 by Zeynep Kerman, we see three very long letters addressed to Sabahattin Eyüpoğlu. In every letter, Tanpınar begins by calling him "Dear Brother."¹³⁴ Despite Tanpınar's intimate correspondence, Sabahattin Eyüpoğlu did not establish a mutual friendship. Tanpınar complains about this in his diary and quotes Eyüpoğlu from the previous day: "Yesterday Sabahattin told me that I do not like the modern and that I remained in the nineteenth century."¹³⁵ Tanpınar was right in his assumption that Eyüpoğlu saw him as old-fashioned. In an article published upon Tanpınar's death, Eyüpoğlu points out that "for Tanpınar, to live in the moment did not mean to catch up with the times."¹³⁶ In his letter to Bedrettin Tuncel, Sabahattin Eyüpoğlu underestimates Tanpınar and his works and writes, "Hamdi is in a bad mood these days. He has stopped drinking. He has not learned how to cough."¹³⁷ In another letter to Tuncel, Eyüpoğlu belittles Tanpınar and writes thus, "brother Hamdi is a little sick. I visited him in Cerrahpaşa Hospital and stayed there for nearly three hours. He has become quite emaciated, but nothing serious. He needs to stay in the hospital and rest. Let's see how long he stays there."¹³⁸

Some diary entries show how Tanpınar was offended by writings about him. On 6 April 1961 Tanpınar reacted against negative criticism. This time he did not become enraged but got into a different mood and began questioning himself and his works. He was disappointed by the harsh criticism of someone whom he had dedicated one of his poems:

Suut's article. I am not angry with him. He could even write harsher: "Who is this Ahmet Hamdi? Why do we stand him despite his unproductiveness? [...] What does he tell us with all these connected and mechanical verses? These are all things a good reader – even an ordinary reader – manage to put together, right? [...]."

No, he doesn't say that. He is just obsessed by the word 'and.' He says these are all the poems of my youth. And he reminds us his own

¹³⁴ Zeynep Kerman, *Tanpınar'ın Mektupları*, 258-68.

¹³⁵ Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 260.

¹³⁶ Sabahattin Eyüpoğlu, "Tanpınar'da Zaman," in "*Bir Gül Bu Karanlıklarda*": *Tanpınar Üzerine Yazılar*, ed. Abdullah Uçman and H. İnci (İstanbul: 3F Yayınları, 2008), 133.

¹³⁷ Quoted in Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 342.

¹³⁸ Quoted in Enginün and Kerman, 342.

youth. He repeats to me exactly what I said in my speech at Rockefeller.¹³⁹ He objects to some words and to some changes in my poetry [...].

Suut would not write this article if he remembered that I dedicated the “Gül” [The Rose] poem to him. There is no explanation for his rage.¹⁴⁰

On the one hand there were people who followed Tanpınar and his works and showed their appreciation, but on the other hand there were people whom he called friends but who were harshly criticizing and humiliating him. Although he was isolated from the circles that he wanted to be a part of, Tanpınar could never muster the courage to walk away from them. He could only note his anger and show his temper in his diary, which he thought would be published right after his death so that he could take revenge. As discussed in the chapter above, his plan did not work out since the publication of his diary took much longer than he expected, and almost everybody Tanpınar harshly criticized passed away before the publication of the diary. That he could not show his attitude to the people around him in his lifetime but saved it until after his death also shows his ambivalence for he never wanted his true identity to be known in his lifetime. In the light of this discussion, the title of this section should be changed from ““They will Return to me One Day””: Tanpınar’s *Solitude*” to ““They will Return to me One Day””: Tanpınar’s *Self-isolation*” since it was Tanpınar himself who insisted on the friendship with a group of people who indeed did not show any reciprocal intimacy. Therefore, Tanpınar alienated himself from thousands of people who loved and respected him and his works.

“I am an Exposed Witness and Observer”¹⁴¹: No Country for Tanpınar

Tanpınar’s changing image both in his lifetime and after his death gives several clues to the political and cultural nature of Turkish society. He was not popular in his lifetime – at least with the people he wanted to appreciate him. It was his

¹³⁹ Tanpınar refers to his speech organized by the Rockefeller Foundation in Paris. Tanpınar went to Europe in 26 June 1959 by getting a fellowship from Rockefeller Foundation and stayed in France, England, Switzerland, and Portugal until he returned to Turkey in 8 June 1960 (Enginün and Kerman, 14).

¹⁴⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 277.

¹⁴¹ Enginün and Kerman, 332.

traditionalist attitude that kept him in his lifetime away from the liberals and the mainstream Kemalist intellectuals in the early years of the Turkish Republic. In the 1970s he became the man of the right; his works became a part of the canon of resistance, mainly supported by the rightists, nationalists, and religious groups. Against the prevailing pressure of the leftists or Kemalists, Tanpınar and his works could easily lend themselves to radical propaganda. His use of conservative images and religious motifs in his works were well received by the conservative and religious groups in Turkey. The changing circumstances of Turkey in the 1990s brought new definitions to concepts of right and left along with the decline of the political and social impact of the Kemalist régime on the institutions and the members of society. The publication of Tanpınar's works, which was to a significant extent restricted to rightist publishing houses, increased and therefore led texts that reached more people. Dergah Yayınevi, whose staff were known as conservatives, still had a partial monopoly since they had the copyrights.

From the 2000s on, Tanpınar's works became more popular since the changing political and social conditions allowed the conservative and religious groups to move beyond the position of resistance; they now had a new position that for the first time in the history of the Turkish Republic, gave them the opportunity to become mainstream: the creation of a conservative, religious canon became possible. We cannot say that it has so far been successful, multiple reasons: the politics of the AKP [Justice and Development Party]¹⁴² government on culture and literature and the changing interest of the conservatives from culture of resistance to having a keen interest in economic prosperity. The subject of this study is neither the cultural and economic policies of the government nor the changing interest of conservative groups; however, the increasing popularity of Tanpınar at the beginning of the 2000s is related to this changing status of the conservatives in Turkey. While the late 1990s and the early 2000s saw a great interest in Tanpınar and his works, the dramatic decrease of interest among conservatives in the years following the publication of Tanpınar's diary shows the erasure of his misrepresented conservative image. By analyzing the changing interpretations of Tanpınar from the early years of the

¹⁴² The ruling party in Turkey since 2002.

Republic of Turkey until now, one can see the changing dynamics of modern Turkey as well.

As mentioned earlier, Tanpınar was a solitary figure in his lifetime because the people around him, especially those with whom he wanted to have correspondence and friendship did not accept him in their circles. Those who were considered as completely Westernized never accepted Tanpınar as a Westerner since he was reconciled with the past and tradition. The common attitude of the intellectuals of the time was to reject the past, tradition, and religion and to adopt the Western values; therefore, Tanpınar was considered religious, backward, and anti-Western. However, Tanpınar's stance can be considered quite Western: his thoughts on the past and tradition were not due to his piety or religious orientation but to his belief that the past should be taken seriously to better understand the present. Tanpınar had an unfortunate position: he was isolated in his lifetime by the Kemalist intellectuals because he seemed religious and conservative even though he was not; and now, many years after his death, he is isolated by the religious and conservative people due to the shocking image portrayed in his diary. This shows the ambivalent position of Tanpınar and perhaps of Turkish society, which suffered – and still suffering – from the trauma of Westernization.

Tanpınar reflects his ideas on religion and religious people very clearly in his diary. Like his position, the diary entries on religion are quite ambivalent. In one of his entries, he writes, “it is good to be pious. [Religion] will be one of the main themes of this novel.”¹⁴³ While he was writing his thoughts on social change, he points out: “We cannot become socialists; we then move to the other pole right away; if we analyze the Quran and the Shariah law from this perspective, God knows what comes out. We cannot play with fire.”¹⁴⁴ His religious orientation sometimes changes and Tanpınar writes, “men of God make me feel disappointed.”¹⁴⁵ In another entry, he has stronger comments on religious rules and says, “Yes, I am sick of this person's religious blackmail. He puts so many barriers in life that it's unbearable. But I think I provoke him a lot. [...] Fasting is perhaps something ethereal. You can

¹⁴³ Enginün and Kerman, 270.

¹⁴⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 305.

¹⁴⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 133.

feel its mysticism. But this sacrificing! The piles of mess and torture. And we know its history, too. To undermine something, it is enough to know its history.”¹⁴⁶ Tanpınar’s most inclusive entry on religion and Islam was written thirteen days before his death:

What distinguishes me from those in favor of revolutions are: I believe in Allah. But, I don’t know if I am a Muslim. But, I would like to die as a believer of my parents’ religion; I never forget that people in this society are Muslim, and I want them to remain Muslims. I am a Westerner. I am sure Christianity is studied better and analyzed more deeply with its rich heritage. I am here clearly contradicting myself. I don’t know if there is anything comparable with the West except the Süleymaniye [Mosque] and a few musical works.¹⁴⁷

Apart from his ambivalent remarks on religion, his entries about the rightists and leftists explain his loneliness and his inbetweenness in his lifetime. In many diary entries he criticizes both groups for being ignorant, illiterate, and foolish. In a period in which most people, especially artists and intellectuals, were labeled either leftist or rightist, Tanpınar, who did not feel close to any of these groups, was inevitably going to be alienated and lonely. In some entries he writes about rightists and leftists separately, but in others he comments on both at the same time; these entries clearly show the reasons for his loneliness. They are also significant in terms of showing the changing interpretations of Tanpınar after 2007. He shows no affinity for either group, although both rightists and leftists embraced him at various times. Apart from giving clues about Tanpınar’s alienation, these entries might even be considered as a record of the changes in the history of Turkish politics. With a careful survey of Tanpınar’s diary entries, one can understand better this complicated period in Turkish political history.

About the rightists, he notes on 27 August 1960: “I don’t feel close to the rightists for the right means the East, and the East is always ready to swallow us, to absorb our most fundamental traits. If there were people around me like Barres, Maurras, L. Daudet or the like, things would be different. However, consorting with

¹⁴⁶ Enginün and Kerman, 265.

¹⁴⁷ Enginün and Kerman, 332.

Mehmet Akif [Ersoy], making a consensus with Mümtaz [Turhan] [...]. Never.”¹⁴⁸ He did not feel drawn to the leftists either: “There are indeed two types of human beings. Those coming from the monkeys and those coming from Adam [...] our friend Bazin came from France. I went to see him. A few fags, a match, and some coffee. While taking the booty, I had Hamit Bey’s [Ongunsu] advice in mind. (Do not go after or in front of the left. Run away. Ditch! Change your path.)”¹⁴⁹

Diary entries in which Tanpınar compares rightists and leftists are important to see his lack of attachment to either. He notes on 30 July 1960, “Leftists are mysterious, diehard, and ignorant. Rightists and all those so-called nationalists are illiterate and arid. Those in the middle are in disarray. Almost all of them are unpleasant and unendurable. Those who have some taste and intellect are envious. Oh God, I am so lonely.”¹⁵⁰ Eight months after this remark, Tanpınar rewrites his feelings on rightists and leftists and mentions his ambivalent position: “The stupidity of the rightists, the foolishness of the leftists, and the ignorance of both. I now see my luck inbetween and understand Yahya Kemal better. What arrogance and barrenness [...].”¹⁵¹ We see similar remarks in his last entries: “No one has ever written a decent biography of [Atatürk]. What a pity! The foolishness of the rightists and the illiteracy and fanaticism of the leftists.”¹⁵²

After expressing his thoughts on rightists at the end of his long entry dated 27 August 1960, he feels the necessity to make a comparison between the two factions that the whole of Turkish politics was based:

I am again writing about the rightists. To become a rightist is very difficult, even impossible. First of all, the most ignorant and foolish people in my country are rightists. Or they are obviously treacherous and despicable. Peyami Safa [...] can you see anyone more squalid than Peyami Safa?

¹⁴⁸ Enginün and Kerman, 205.

¹⁴⁹ Enginün and Kerman, 160.

¹⁵⁰ Enginün and Kerman, 203.

¹⁵¹ Enginün and Kerman, 261.

¹⁵² Enginün and Kerman, 290.

Besides, we should consider the era. We don't see any rightists even in the West. The bourgeoisie defends itself with the police and the military forces.

And the leftists! [...] Oh God, in our society the leftist thinker, the leftist poet, young poet, a leftist, the advanced man mean ascetism, stupidity, ignorance. And the worst of all is the new language. Inverted sentences [...] having no idea about history, which is worse than rejecting it. Philistinism. Neither the rightist nor the leftist. So? A mere intellectuality and being alone.¹⁵³

In the last entry written thirteen days before his death, Tanpınar makes his final comments on his position in society. The fact that he was misunderstood by those around him is well expressed in this entry as well as a lack of decent interpretations of his works:

We are in a domestic war. There is on the one hand the leftists – or the exploiter of the leftist ideas – who dare to do anything in group psychology but who in fact know nothing yet think or show themselves as patriots – at least some of them are like that. There are on the other hand racists, religious fanatics, extreme nationalists, and finally those who work under the command of economic exploiters. And in the middle there we are; those who do their jobs, or who struggle to do their jobs, wretches. I am just in a referee position. Of course, the leftists are calling me bastard; the rightist see me only through our friendship, as Necip Fazıl claims.

It is strange that they read my works superficially, and both groups judge according to that. According to the rightists, I am slipping to the left; I am more on the left side, which is a claim contrary to my works *Huzur* and *Beş Şehir*. According to the leftists, I am with the rightists – if not with the racists – since I mention the azan, Turkish music, and our history.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ Enginün and Kerman, 207.

¹⁵⁴ Enginün and Kerman, 332.

If Tanpınar was neither a rightist nor a leftist, what was his motive and ideology? He defines himself in the subsequent lines of the diary entry given above: “Indeed I want to do my work, do what I can do by myself. I am an exposed witness and observer.”¹⁵⁵ His distinguished thoughts and ideals made him alienated and ambivalent.

In order to call Tanpınar’s position truly Western, we should indeed consult the forms of transformation in European societies. As mentioned before, the modernization process in the late Ottoman and the early Republican periods was something neither Western nor traditional but followed a third pattern; this caused some scholars, including Tanpınar, who were expecting to see a change in the Western form of modernization, to be alienated and to take an ambivalent position toward the society. Analyzing the process of modernization in Western societies will help us to distinguish the form of modernization or Westernization in Turkey. Tanpınar was a good example to those who saw the chaotic characteristics of the transition period in Turkey. For the analysis of Western transformation there are several writers and scholars; however, I consider Virginia Woolf as the quintessential figure for in her works she had enormous concerns for and references to the changing socio-political circumstances which also led to her suicide. Through an analysis of Woolf’s context and style in her works, I will analyze social, literary, and cultural modernization in Europe in the next chapter. In the second part of the next chapter, I will clarify the position of Tanpınar as an intellectual who was really after a true form of modernization, and I will also show how Europe has tended to provincialize non-Western societies by imposing its idiosyncratic local and national characteristics as a universal form for modernization.

¹⁵⁵ Enginün and Kerman, 332.

CHAPTER FOUR

“ON DECEMBER 1910 HUMAN CHARACTER CHANGED”¹: WOOLF AS A WRITER OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

Throughout her life and in her works, Virginia Woolf showed great concerns about change in the society she lived in. She put enormous emphasis on this change on her works since the Britain in which Virginia Woolf died was different from the one in which Virginia Stephen was born. In Woolf's lifetime, there occurred changes such as the 1867 Reform Act, the independence of India, and many changes related to these events. Internally, changes in the role of women, the idea of family, relations between social classes and in education, were among the most important social incidents. Beside these shifts, there emerged a change in the dominant idea of the state: while in the late nineteenth century the ideal of a maximum of individual liberty prevailed, in the early twentieth century the state's restriction of individual liberty for the benefit of the whole nation was accepted. Probably the worldwide economic depression of 1929-30 was a fair justification for more authoritarian forms of government. Externally, relations between Britain and other nations changed: the position of the British Empire as the world's greatest economic power was challenged by Germany and the United States; the Boer War and the First World War were also prominent crises that Britain encountered; and the emergence of dictatorships in Italy, Germany, and Spain in the post-World War I period and some other incidents that led to World War II were among the important events that all Europe faced in the first half of the twentieth century.²

These incidents from the turn of the century onwards inspired many intellectuals to respond and react to the changing circumstances. Most of these intellectuals wrote about the events of their times and did not remain as mere reporters. They turned the events into experiences because they were aware of the significance of what was happening. They tended to grasp the meaning behind phenomena. New wine does not go into old bottles; new experiences shattered old forms. The modern writers

¹ Virginia Woolf, *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, 4.

² Michael H. Whitworth, *Virginia Woolf*, 30.

were aware of what was new and important, and gave adequate technical response to that awareness. Inevitably, “originality of thought and spontaneity of emotion creat[ed] fresh designs, strange music, new rhythms [...] even a new vocabulary.”³ Virginia Woolf was one of these intellectuals who understood human change and experimented with technique.

For many critics, Virginia Woolf was not someone who dealt with the politics and transformation of Europe. She has been mostly diagnosed by critics as an alcoholic, anal anorexic, frigid, hysterical, mad, manic-depressive, or traumatized. Her nephew Quentin Bell, in his biography of Woolf, portrays her as having “a cancer of the mind, a corruption of the spirit.”⁴ Virginia’s husband, Leonard Woolf, constantly characterized his wife as insane, described how her illness affected their lives,⁵ and claimed that she suffered from manic-depression.⁶ There are comments by several critics on the causes of her illness: while some highlight the trauma of early childhood sexual abuse, the death of her mother, and restrictions imposed by the patriarchal system of thought,⁷ some others thought that Woolf’s madness was a rebellious retreat from the real,⁸ or her problems came “from her being too involved with the realities of her life and situation.”⁹ Many critics dealt with her emotional attraction to women, her intimate friendships with several women including her love affair with Vita Sackville-West, as the main source of her depression. However, in this section I posit Woolf’s concerns with social transformation as the main reality that she could not escape, and which thus became the central cause for her sickness.

Interpretations on Woolf’s “madness” reminds us of Foucault’s notion that the experience of madness turns out to be a knowledge of madness. In Woolf’s case she became a melancholic artist in order to define the self. Woolf regarded her nervous

³ Bernard Blackstone, *Virginia Woolf* (Essex: Longman’s, Green & Co. Ltd., 1969), 4.

⁴ Quentin Bell, *Virginia Woolf: A Biography: Virginia Stephen* (London: Hogarth Press, 1972), 3.

⁵ Quoted in Janice Stewart, “Locked in a Room of One’s Own?: Querying the Quest for Keys to Woolf’s ‘Madness,’” *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 2, no: 1 (January 2004): 149.

⁶ Stewart, “‘Locked in a Room,’” 161.

⁷ See Jane Marcus, “Virginia Woolf and Her Violin: Mothering, Madness, and Music,” in *Mothering the Mind: Twelve Studies of Writers and Their Silent Partners*, ed. Ruth Perry and Martine W. Brownley (NY: Holmes and Meier, 1984), 180-201.

⁸ See Madeline Moore, *The Short Season between Two Silences: The Mystical and the Political in the Novels of Virginia Woolf* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984).

⁹ Jean Love, *Virginia Woolf: Sources of Madness and Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 5.

system as a hereditary phenomenon in the Stephen family, where many men were writers and melancholic: it is “a second-hand one [madness], used by my father and his father to dictate dispatches and write books with – how I wish they had hunted and fished instead! – I have to treat it like a pampered pug dog.”¹⁰ Apparently, her temperamental nervous system was an inherited characteristic of the Stephen family, causing Virginia to have the capacity to write well. Woolf’s melancholia was the inspiration and indication of her creative genius, which was at her time, at the end of nineteenth century, a masculine privilege. Janice Stewart mentions in her article on Woolf’s madness that melancholy was “inaugurated by Aristotle, revived by the Renaissance, enhanced by the Enlightenment, vaunted by Romanticism, fetishized by the decadents, and theorized by Freud” and became “a male distinction and privileged earmark of creative genius.”¹¹ Though Woolf was not ‘qualified’ as a privileged melancholic capable of artistic creativity since she was a woman, she set up a very complex relationship with the tradition of melancholia as a source of creativity.¹² Through her patrilineal inheritance and the construction of her identity, Woolf took advantage of this ‘male’ characteristic.

Woolf herself was aware of the connection between her creativity and her insanity, as she claimed that she wrote most prolifically after what she called “madness”. In one of her letters she notes, “As an experience, madness is terrific [...] and not to be sniffed at, and in its lava I still find most of the things I write about. It shoots out of everything shaped, final, not in mere dribblets, as sanity does.”¹³ Some of her works were involved with her madness – *To the Lighthouse*, for example. She says in one of her diary entries, “these curious intervals in life – I’ve had many – are the most fruitful artistically – one becomes fertilized – think of my madness at Hogarth – & all the little illnesses – that before I wrote *To the Lighthouse* for instance. Six weeks in bed now would make a masterpiece of Moths.”¹⁴ *The Waves*, another important work, was written under the influence, too: Woolf refers to *The*

¹⁰ Woolf, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*, Vol. 4, ed. Nigel Bicolson and Joanne Trautman (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980), 144-45.

¹¹ Stewart, “‘Locked in a Room,’” 151.

¹² For further reference, see Robert Burton’s *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, available in Project Gutenberg. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10800>

¹³ Woolf, *The Letters*, Vol. 4, 180.

¹⁴ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 3, 254.

Waves in a diary entry: “I wrote the words O death fifteen minutes ago with some moments of such intensity & intoxication that I seemed only to stumble after my own voice, or almost, after some sort of speaker (as when I was mad) I was almost afraid, remembering the voices that used to fly ahead.”¹⁵ This account about the writing process of *The Waves* highlights the inspirational quality of her madness. After her madness, Woolf felt capable of creativity, as if, she claimed, her mind was transformed from “dry and parched like a withered grass [...] [to] green and succulent.”¹⁶ In one of her essays, she describes how she takes advantage of her illness:

In illness words seem to possess a mystic quality. We grasp what is beyond their surface meaning, gather instinctively this, that and the other – a sound, a color, here a stress, there a pause [...]. Incomprehensibility has enormous power over us in illness [...] in health, meaning has encroached upon sound. Our intellect dominates over our senses. But in illness [...] words give out their scent [...] meaning is all the richer for having come to us sensually first, by way of the palate and nostrils, like some queer odour.¹⁷

Woolf’s thought that in health that the intellect dominates over the senses shows her aesthetic sense. It can also be considered a criticism on the idea of Enlightenment, as I will prove in the following pages. Though she was more fertile in her post-madness periods, her creativity was accompanied by melancholia and she confides in her diary, “this is dictated by a slight melancholia, which comes upon me sometimes now, & makes me think I am old: I am ugly. I am repeating things. Yet as far as I know, as a writer, I am only now writing out my mind.”¹⁸

Woolf was a melancholic who took advantage of it through strong perception and creativity, but this fact offers little to the general outline of my study. Nevertheless, the motives and the nature of her sickness are significant since the very reason of her depression stemmed, I assert, from her strong concerns about transformation of her society rather than, as many critics assert, the physical and

¹⁵ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 4, 10.

¹⁶ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 4, 42.

¹⁷ Woolf, “On Being Ill,” in *Collected Essays*, Vol. 4 (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1967), 200.

¹⁸ Woolf, *The Diary*, Vol. 4, 161.

neurotic conditions she suffered since childhood. As briefly discussed above, Virginia inherited her creative ability from her state of mind. Physical and emotional inheritance led Virginia Woolf to have strong concerns with politics. Quentin Bell's comprehensive biography of Virginia Woolf posits that the Stephen family's publishing career and the proper use of the English language began with Virginia's great-great-grandfather, James Stephen, with his *Considerations on Imprisonment for Debt* as the first known publication in the Stephen family. Virginia's great-grandfather spent part of his life in the West Indies, fought for the abolition of slavery, and wrote his political book *War in Disguise*. According to Janice Stewart, who quotes from F.W. Maitland,¹⁹ Virginia's grandfather "was an overly sensitive and nervously irritable"²⁰ civil servant. In Bell's words he was "very obviously neurotic."²¹ He dedicated his life to the abolition of slavery in the British colonies; similarly, Virginia's father, Leslie Stephen, left his comfortable job at Cambridge at the age of thirty and went to London where, according to Bell, he "was soon making a small but reputable name for himself in the *Republic of Letters*."²² As Janice Stewart quotes from Jane Marcus, "Leslie Stephen could boast of two outstanding achievements. He was the first English critic to elevate the novel to the rank of serious writing [...] [and he] described how social conditions shape literature."²³

The Stephen family lineage was one of authorship to evoke change in social attitudes and political circumstances. Although Virginia Woolf was regarded by her husband as "the last political animal that had lived since Aristotle invented the definition,"²⁴ and by her nephew Quentin Bell as "a distressed gentlewoman caught in a tempest,"²⁵ she was as aggressive in furthering this agenda as the earlier Stephens, through the intellectual commitment to a political agenda via her novels. In her *Three Guineas*, Woolf encourages women to rebel – a proper indication of her political inclinations: "if you retaliate, what harm is there in that? Why should we

¹⁹ Frederic W. Maitland, *Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (NY: Putnam, 1906), 433.

²⁰ Stewart, "'Locked in a Room,'" 160.

²¹ Bell, *Virginia Woolf*, 17.

²² Bell, 9.

²³ Stewart, "'Locked in a Room,'" 160-161.

²⁴ Leonard Woolf, *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939* (St. Albans: Triad/Panther Books, 1978), 27.

²⁵ Bell, *Virginia Woolf*, 185.

hesitate to do what our fathers and grandfathers have done before us?”²⁶ One can easily conclude that she was quite comfortable in the role of voicing social exhortations more than she was in the role of feminist activist: The political aggression of her forefathers, however, was not replayed since she was not at ease – unlike her ‘devisors’ – on the position of women in society and on rejecting feminine passivity.

Woolf’s remarks on societal transformation should be considered from both literary and social perspectives. From the portrayal of characters in novels to structuring the contexts, she drew an analogy between style and the context with the dramatic social changes in the first half of the twentieth century. Her well-known criticism on the traditional writers – more specifically on Edwardians – who only wrote about the exterior details on the characters and the setting exemplifies her attitude well. In *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, she states, “They have laid an enormous stress upon the fabric of things. They have given us a house in the hope that we may be able to deduce the human beings who live there.”²⁷ This deduction of human beings is related to the change in human relations, which, she asserted in 1924, leads to change in society: “And now I will hazard a second assertion, which is more disputable perhaps, to the effect that on or about December 1910 human character changed.”²⁸ In 1924, she recalled the pre-World War I days and alluded to the effect of the major post-impressionist exhibition in London organized in that month by Roger Fry and Desmond MacCarthy, two members of the Bloomsbury group. According to Stephen Toulmin, “For England just before 1914, that exhibition, along with Diaghilev’s *Ballets Russes de Monte Carlo*, was taken to mean that the tyranny of Victorian ideas was over.”²⁹ Jane Goldman has remarks on the exhibition, quite similar to Toulmin’s. Goldman points out that it was “the first major show of modern art in Britain, and the occasion for which an influential set of aesthetic formalist theories were formulated and broadly established by Roger Fry

²⁶ Virginia Woolf, “Three Guineas,” in *Selected Works of Virginia Woolf* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Edition, 2007), 834.

²⁷ Woolf, *Mr. Bennett*, 18.

²⁸ Woolf, 4.

²⁹ Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), 150-51.

and later, Clive Bell.”³⁰ In *A Modernist Mode: Fashion, 1910, and the Limits of Modernism*, Emma West considers Woolf’s statement on 1910 within the context of fashion and claims that: “Modern fashion was itself a product of change: technological advances, Suffragism and the changing status of women, urbanization, mass production, department stores and avant-garde art all contributed to the design, price, availability, circulation and popularity of dress.”³¹ West’s interpretation of fashion and its influence on people, especially on women, confirms how Woolf’s comment on this change should be broadened. Woolf claims: “All human relations have shifted – those between masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children. And when human relations change there is at the same time a change in religion, conduct, politics, and literature.”³² As relationships change, so does society as a whole; and consequently, old methods of writing about society and human relationships no longer worked. Woolf’s literary orientation was now organized according to political changes, which defied Woolf’s earlier assertion that the novel’s purpose is not political. She now claimed that writing was not separate from politics.

Woolf was not the first person to identify this turning-point or new epoch, which transformed the old, traditional world into a new, modern one. This change, not restricted to Britain only but to all of Europe, was reflected upon by many other intellectuals as well. Charles Péguy expressed in 1913 that the “world has changed less since the time of Jesus Christ than it has in the last thirty years,”³³ and dated the split back to the 1880s. Péguy draws attention to unconventionality of this change by comparing the 1900-year-old change with the one that occurred right after the decadence. Henry Adams’ well-known statement about the change, “historical neck broken by the sudden irruption of forces totally new,” was more precisely dating the “neck broken” to 1900, perhaps inspired by the Paris Great Exposition, where many machines and inventions were introduced. D.H. Lawrence, in his *Kangaroo*, dated the “Great Divide” very close to Péguy and Woolf and claimed that “in 1915 the old

³⁰ Jane Goldman, *Modernism, 1910-1945: Image to Apocalypse* (NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), 33.

³¹ Emma West, “A Modernist Mode: Fashion, 1910, and the Limits of Modernism,” *A Journal of Literary Studies and Linguistics* 1, no: 2 (December 2011): 69.

³² West, “A Modernist Mode,” 5.

³³ Charles Péguy, *Basic Verities: Prose and Poetry* (NY: Pantheon Books, 1945), 77.

world ended.”³⁴ These commentators surely did not think that there was a clear break between the new and the old; it was not an overnight transformation. Woolf, in her *Character in Fiction*, stresses that the change was not sudden: “not saying that one went out, as one might into a garden, and there saw that a rose had flowered, or that a hen had laid an egg. The change was not sudden and definite like that [...] a change there was, nevertheless; and since one must be arbitrary, let us date it about the year 1910.”³⁵

If this change after the decadence was unconventional and had a great impact on many institutions in European societies, it should be considered as the biggest – and perhaps the final – phase of European modernization/modernity. Apart from its influence on European societies, it drastically impinged on non-Western societies. Therefore, analyzing the transition in Europe will show that Turkish modernization did not follow a pattern that the Western modernization adopted, but it was rather in an ambivalent form modified by the Westernizers. Virginia Woolf, who had political concerns based on modernity is an important figure in terms of seeing this change in Europe. Besides, as a modernist writer, Woolf’s use of language and literature as a cultural and aesthetic reaction to late modernity will ground her fiction and non-fiction works on the portrayal of change in European societies, specifically British society.

“Humanity in General Falls”³⁶: Modernity as the Disenchantment of the World

It is not easy to define change in Western societies as it was gradual and inclusive – unlike Turkish modernization which occurred over a shorter time. Considering the scope of this study, European thought influenced non-Western societies in a form that was not Western but a third form. Therefore, we should narrow our survey down to the last phase of the change in the West: modernity as a new way of life. This change, I believe, is best understood through a consideration of the impact of modernity and modern thought on Western societies.

³⁴ D.H. Lawrence, *Kangaroo* (New York: Viking, 1960), 220.

³⁵ Virginia Woolf, “Character in Fiction,” in *Selected Essays* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008), 38.

³⁶ Woolf, *The Letters*, Vol. 3, ed. Nigel Nicholson and Joanne Trautman (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), 65.

There are numerous definitions of modernity, though none is a traditional definition. While Baudelaire defines modernity as “the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent, the half of art whose other half is the eternal and the immutable,”³⁷ Peter Child takes it in relation to modern life and describes it as “a way of living and of experiencing life which has arisen with the changes wrought by industrialization, urbanization and secularization.”³⁸ In *The Consequences of Modernity*, Anthony Giddens focuses on what modernity brought to life and writes, “The modes of life brought into being by modernity have swept us away from all traditional types of social order, in quite unprecedented fashion. In both their extensionality and their intensionality, the transformations involved in modernity are more profound than most sorts of change characteristics of prior periods.”³⁹ The outcomes of this societal shift are numerous, for they led to “disintegration and reformation, fragmentation and rapid change, ephemerality and insecurity” as well as “new understandings of time and space; speed, mobility, communication, travel, dynamism, chaos and cultural revolution.”⁴⁰

Although almost all the definitions focus on how the changes over the past three or four centuries have been dramatic in their impact, some advantageous aspects of modernity and others disadvantageous. Anthony Giddens, for example, focuses on the discontinuities of modernity and points out how one interpretation of modernity might be deconstructive on the basis of history:

History can be told in terms of a story line, which imposes an orderly picture upon the jumble of human happenings. History begins with small, isolated cultures for hunters and gatherers, moves through the development of crop-growing and pastoral communities and from there to the formation of agrarian states, culminating in the emergence of modern societies in the West.⁴¹

Seeing history as a unity makes modernity and modern institutions chaotic and reveals the discontinuities of modernity and modern life. According to Giddens, three

³⁷ Charles Baudelaire, *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*, ed. Jonathan Mayne (London: Phaidon Press, 1995), 13.

³⁸ Peter Childs, *Modernism*, 14.

³⁹ Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1996), 4.

⁴⁰ Childs, *Modernism*, 15.

⁴¹ Giddens, *The Consequences*, 5.

features separate modern social institutions from traditional social orders: “One is the sheer pace of change which era of modernity sets into motion. Traditional civilizations may have been considerably more dynamic than other pre-modern systems, but the rapidity of change in conditions of modernity is extreme.”⁴² Giddens refers to technology as the fundamental motive for this rapid change, which also affects all other spheres. He considers the “scope of change” as the second discontinuity of modernity and writes, “as different areas of the globe are drawn into interconnection with one another, waves of social transformation crash across virtually the whole of the earth’s surface.”⁴³ The third feature is about the “nature of modern institutions.” Giddens points out, “some modern social forms are simply not found in prior historical periods – such as the political system of the nation-state, the wholesale dependence of production upon inanimate power sources, or the thoroughgoing commodification of products and wage labor.”⁴⁴

Giddens’s interpretation of modernity as a separation from old forms of life, as a breaking point, reminds us of Emerson’s remarks on “Society never advances,” and Weber’s concept of “disenchantment.” In his essay, *Self-Reliance*, Emerson promotes self-reliance as an ideal and criticized dependence and conformity. In the third part of his essay on self-reliance and society, he states,

Society never advances. It recedes as fast on one side as it gains on the other. It undergoes continual changes; it is barbarous, it is civilized, it is Christianized, it is rich, it is scientific; but this change is not amelioration. For everything is given something is taken. Society acquires new arts and loses old instincts. What a contrast between the well-clad, reading, writing, thinking American, with a watch, a pencil and a bill of exchange in his pocket, and the naked New Zealander, whose property is a club, a spear, a mat and undivided twentieth of a shed to sleep under! But compare the health of the two men and you shall see that the white man has lost his aboriginal strength [...]. The

⁴² Giddens, 6.

⁴³ Giddens, 6.

⁴⁴ Giddens, 6.

civilized man has built a coach, but has lost the use of his feet. He is supported on crutches, but lacks so much support of muscle.⁴⁵

Max Weber, on the other hand, discusses concepts of rationalization and individual freedom, and defines the change as the “disenchantment of the world.” In his *Science as a Vocation*, Weber points out: “The fate of our times is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by the disenchantment of the world. Precisely the ultimate and most sublime values have retreated from public life either into the transcendental realm of mystic life or into the brotherliness of direct and personal human relations.”⁴⁶ Weber in fact defines secularization as “disenchantment” due to his concern for subjective experience and the constructed forms of social thought and organization. There is no clear privatization of religion or a direct reference to the secularization of society in Weber’s words; however, he defines the human condition in modern societies as “disenchanted” both on the personal and social level. He writes, “the bearing of man has been disenchanted and denuded of its mystical but inwardly genuine plasticity.”⁴⁷ Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* explains the changing dynamics of European societies. He writes how the Protestant ethic, especially Calvinism, led many people to engage in work in the secular world and allowed them to establish their own enterprises, which later caused the accumulation of wealth for trade and investment. He comments on the Protestant sect and religious conduct:

The view that the gods bless with riches the man who pleases them, through sacrifice or through his kind of conduct, was indeed diffused all over the world. However, the Protestant sects consciously brought this idea into connection with this *kind* of religious conduct, according to the principle of early capitalism: “Honesty is the best policy.” This connection is found, although not quite exclusively, among these

⁴⁵ Ralph W. Emerson, “Self-Reliance,” in *Essays* (PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Electronic Classics Series, 2001), 47-48.

⁴⁶ H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford UP, 1946), 155.

⁴⁷ Gerth and Mills, 148.

Protestant sects, but with characteristic continuity and consistency it is found *only* among them.⁴⁸

Rationalization here has profound results for the political and economic institutions of modern societies; it also has some affect on the psychological and spiritual as well as religious orientations of the modern individual. Weber's two concerns are deliberately highlighted here since the "disenchantment" of people and the reinterpretation of God in modern times plays a fundamental role in the emergence and later the institutionalization of these concepts in European societies.

On the other hand, there were intellectuals who saw the modern era as problematic but also thought, "the beneficent possibilities opened up by the modern era outweighed its negative characteristics."⁴⁹ Emile Durkheim was one of them; he theorized the change from an economic perspective and described how the increased division of labor resulted in individual consciousness, which conflicts with the traditional collective consciousness. This rapid change caused by the increasing division of labor created a state of confusion of norms and impersonality in social life and consequently a relative normlessness. Durkheim describes this breakdown of social norms as a state of "anomie."⁵⁰ As Durkheim focused on the aspect of the division of labor in society and what it brought to manners among the members of the society, Ferdinand Tönnies's concentration was on the development from rural communities to urban communities, based on comparison of interrelations between the interdependent members of rural communities, *Gemeinschaft*, and the independent, anonymous individuals of the urban society, which he termed *Gesellschaft*. As he writes in his 1887 preface to *Community and Civil Society*, "there is no individualism in history and civilization, except of the kind that flows from *Gemeinschaft* and remains conditioned by it, or else of the kind that gives rise to and sustains *Gesellschaft*. These opposing relationships of individual man to mankind in general are the very heart of the matter."⁵¹

While change was considered an inclusive matter from a broad perspective, it was also the topic of some minor issues as well. Among the various understandings

⁴⁸ Gerth and Mills, 313 (italics his).

⁴⁹ Giddens, *The Consequences*, 7.

⁵⁰ Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labour* (London : MacMillan Press, 1984), 304.

⁵¹ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001), 13.

of modern life, fashion, as previously mentioned, can be read as an important change in European societies, perhaps as an inspiration by modern people. Emma West claims, “Prior to 1910, fashion was largely exaggerated, restrictive and cumbersome [...]. In the 1910/1911 season, however, fashion changed. Designers [...] placed an increasing influence on simplicity of cut and form, on brighter colours, bolder patterns and lighter fabrics.”⁵² The new fashion inspired people, especially women, by altering “how women moved, lived, interacted and related to each other and their environment.”⁵³ West’s emphasis on fashion and how it inspired many people is important to understand Woolf’s remark on the change of human character.

Conceiving the beginning of modernity around 1850 might lead to an interpretation restricted to Baudelaire and avant-garde art. However, people considered themselves modern back in the twelfth century, with one very important difference from earlier notions of “the modern,” that is the connection of the modern with the past. In his *Modernity: An Unfinished Project*, Jürgen Habermas writes about this recent “modernity” as something different from past modernities. He first defines the old concept of modern: “With a different content in each case, the expression ‘modernity’ repeatedly articulates the consciousness of an era that refers back to the past of classical antiquity precisely in order to comprehend itself as the result of a transition from the old to the new.”⁵⁴ He later asserts that

this is not merely true for the Renaissance, with which the “modern age” begins for us; people also considered themselves as “modern” in the age of Charlemagne, in the twelfth century, and in the Enlightenment – in short, whenever the consciousness of a new era developed in Europe through a renewed relationship to classical antiquity.⁵⁵

Habermas concludes his discussion on the disintegrating aspect of recent modernity: “In the course of the nineteenth century *this* Romanticism produced a radicalized consciousness of modernity that detached itself from all previous historical

⁵² West, *A Modernist Mode*, 69.

⁵³ West, 69.

⁵⁴ Jürgen Habermas, “Modernity: An Unfinished Project,” in *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity*, ed. Maurizio P. D’Entréves and S. Behabib (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996), 39.

⁵⁵ Habermas, 39.

connection and understood itself solely in abstract opposition to tradition and history as a whole.”⁵⁶

Seeing the emergence of postmodern ideas – in art, architecture, and all – as a continuation of this “radicalized consciousness of modernity detached [...] from all previous historical connection” is important and will be discussed below. However, it also leads us to see modernity as a project of the Enlightenment. Habermas notes in the same article that “The project of modernity as it was formulated by the philosophers of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century consists in the relentless development of the objectivating sciences, of the universalistic foundations of morality and law, and of autonomous art, all in accord with their own immanent logic.”⁵⁷ Enlightenment and what it brought to Western civilization holds great significance in terms of both how the principles of modernity were established and how modernity – or modern forms of life – were introduced to non-Western societies. Defined as a cultural movement that emphasizes reason and individualism rather than tradition, Enlightenment was indeed more than a cultural phenomenon since it aimed to reform society by using reason while it challenged ideas associated with tradition and faith. That it promoted scientific thought and degraded superstition – and thus the Catholic Church – was to a significant extent welcomed by many people since the scientific revolution had already kicked in. Its long-term effects on the other hand had a major impact on the culture, politics, and governments of Western societies.⁵⁸

Much has been said and written about scientific advancement, the Enlightenment, and its various impacts on the European societies. However, the critique of the Enlightenment describes the condition of European societies in the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries, especially if the provincializing strategy of European societies and their influence on non-Western societies, including Turkey, are considered. Moreover, it helps us to understand the literature produced with respect to this context, that is the emergence of modernist

⁵⁶ Habermas, 39 (*italics in original*).

⁵⁷ Habermas, 45.

⁵⁸ We should note here that there was no single idea of Enlightenment.

writing – including Woolf’s – as a reaction to modernity and what modern life has brought out.

“*Sapere aude!*,” writes Immanuel Kant and gives the definition of the Enlightenment in his article *What is Enlightenment?*:

Enlightenment is man’s emergence from his self-imposed nonage. Nonage is the ability to use one’s own understanding without another’s guidance. This nonage is self-imposed if its cause lies not in lack of understanding but in indecision and lack of courage to use one’s own mind without another’s guidance. Dare to know! (*Sapere aude*). “Have the courage to use your own understanding,” is therefore the motto of the enlightenment.⁵⁹

What Enlightenment meant for Europe, according to Kant, was enormous since Europe, for the first time in the eighteenth century, felt responsibility to deliver an important message for humanity: the Enlightenment.

Kant’s concept of self and his rejection of guidance from another have often been considered heresy although it was rather against the “corrupted” church. The French Enlightenment writer Voltaire was famous for his attack on the established Catholic Church. He explains the religious situation in eighteenth-century Western Europe as having a “double theme: the collapse of the old feudal regime, and the near-collapse of the Christian religion that given it spiritual and social support.”⁶⁰ He and other Enlightenment writers treated Europe as a whole, not as a collection of nations, and harshly criticized Enlightenment thought. In his chapter in *Balkan Literatures in the Era of Nationalism*, Murat Belge notes on criticism on Enlightenment: “After the Enlightenment Period’s one-sided emphases on the omnipotence of ‘Reason’ some Europeans began to discover that the ‘not-so-rational’ ancient and medieval heritage also carried much beauty. They were searching for this beautiful heritage in those fields that the shallow rationalism of the Enlightenment had not yet taken over.”⁶¹

⁵⁹ Immanuel Kant, *Answer the Question: What is Enlightenment?*, trans. Daniel Fidel, archive.org, 2.

⁶⁰ Quoted in Will and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization: The Age Voltaire*, 141.

⁶¹ Murat Belge, “Essentialism,” 17-8.

Among such criticism, Isaiah Berlin's was one of the harshest. In his article, *The Counter-Enlightenment*, Berlin points out the opposition to ideas of Enlightenment as something not new but as old as the movement itself. His criticism is fundamentally based on two important points, which constitute criticism of the Enlightenment by many scholars and writers. The first point is about the acceptance of the scientific methods as the only reliable method:

The proclamation of the autonomy of reason and the methods of the natural sciences, based on observation as the sole reliable method of knowledge, and the consequent rejection of the authority of revelation, sacred writings and their accepted interpreters, tradition, prescription, and every form of non-rational and transcendent source of knowledge, was naturally opposed by the churches and religious thinkers of many persuasions.⁶²

We find elaboration on Berlin's assertion in writings of some other scholars. Ulrich Beck, for example, in the chapter titled, "Science Beyond Truth and Enlightenment," writes that today's risks derive from internal decisions that depend on scientific and social construction: "Science is one of the causes, the medium of definition and the source of solutions to risks, and by virtue of that very fact it opens new markets of scientization for itself. In the reciprocal interplay between risks it has helped to cause and define, and the public critique of those same risks, techno-scientific development becomes contradictory."⁶³ As illustration, Beck writes,

Primary scientization gains its dynamism from the contrast of tradition and modernity, of lay people and experts [...]. When they go in to proactive, the sciences are now being confronted with their own objectivized past and present – with themselves as product and producer of reality and of problems which they are to analyze and overcome. In that way, they are targeted not only as a source of solutions to problems, but also as a cause of problems.⁶⁴

Beck furthers his discussion and mention how science creates a critique:

⁶² Isaiah Berlin, "The Counter Enlightenment," 1.

⁶³ In Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage Publications, 1992), 155.

⁶⁴ Beck, 156.

The expansion of science presupposes and conducts a critique of science and the existing practice of experts in a period when science concentrates on science and therefore scientific civilization is subjecting itself to a publicly transmitted criticism that shakes its foundations and its own self-conception. It reveals a degree of insecurity.⁶⁵

As a consequence of all the given conditions, Beck links science and truth: “Science becomes more and more necessary, but at the same time, less and less sufficient for the socially binding definition of truth [...]. It is a product of the reflexivity of techno-scientific development under the conditions of risk society.” According to Beck, even the traditional Enlightenment position of science as a taboo breaker does not work at some level and “even the foundations of scientific rationality are not spared from the generalized demands for change. What was made by people can also be changed by people.”⁶⁶ Berlin’s and many other people’s criticism of the Enlightenment is important in order to understand European thought developed after the Enlightenment and French Revolution. It is also important to understand the provincializing strategy of Europe against non-Western societies.

Berlin draws attention to plurality and mentions how Bodin and Montesquieu used “the evidence of both history and the new literature of travel and exploration in newly discovered lands, Asia and the Americas.” They “emphasized the variety of human customs and especially the influence of dissimilar natural factors, particularly geographical ones, upon the development of different human societies, leading to differences of institutions and outlook, which in their turn generated wide differences of belief and behavior.”⁶⁷ Berlin refers to Giambattista Vico as one of the most influential thinkers who had a decisive role in counter-Enlightenment thought. Vico’s thought on science, especially how he interprets mathematics, is important to understand the link between science and reality: “Mathematics was certain only because it was a human invention. It did not, as they supposed, correspond to an

⁶⁵ Beck, 156.

⁶⁶ Beck, 157.

⁶⁷ Berlin, 2.

objective structure of reality.”⁶⁸ According to Vico, Berlin writes, “A utilitarian interpretation of the most essential human activities is misleading [...]. Each culture expresses its own collective experience; each step on the ladder of human development has its own equally authentic means of expression.”⁶⁹ Vico’s insistence on the plurality of cultures is important in terms of the history of the Enlightenment since, as Berlin claims, “there is one and only one structure of reality which the enlightened philosopher can see as it truly is, and which he can (at least in principle) describe in logically perfect language.”⁷⁰

As Vico shook the pillars on which the Enlightenment of his times rested, Johann Georg Hamann (1730-1788), a German theologian and philosopher, wanted to destroy it. Brought up as a pietist, Hamann thought God was the only solution to the problems of philosophy. He began as a disciple of Enlightenment but later turned against it. In his works, he wanted to undermine the ground by which reason and faith are contrasted, even though he did not directly respond to Kant’s arguments. In his *Metacritique*, however, he “objects to the threefold purism [...] of Kant’s vain effort to make reason free from history, experience, and language.”⁷¹ That should also be considered as an objection to Kant’s discussion of knowledge that is given *a priori*, independent of experience.⁷² He differs from Kant in many ways, especially in that he “offers no systematic analysis of the function of reason.”⁷³ Hamann’s rejection of the rationalist claim that there is a single route to reality is best explained by Isaiah Berlin as he quotes Hamann and adds his own commentary: “‘God is a poet, not a mathematician,’ and it is men who, like Kant, suffer from agnostic hatred of matter that provide us with endless verbal constructions – words that are taken for concepts, and worse still, concepts that are taken for real things.”⁷⁴

Vico’s and others’ insistence on plurality of cultures was indeed an opposition toward the changing dynamics of Europe. After the French Revolution, Napoleon

⁶⁸ Berlin, 4.

⁶⁹ Berlin, 5.

⁷⁰ Berlin, 6.

⁷¹ Kenneth Haynes, ed. “Introduction,” *Writings on Philosophy and Language*, ed. Kenneth Haynes (Cambridge UP, 2007), x.

⁷² See Kant’s Preface and Introduction to the *Critique of Pure Reason* for the discussion. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2000), 99-152.

⁷³ James C. O’Flaherty, *Johann Georg Hamann* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979), 82.

⁷⁴ Berlin, “The Counter-Enlightenment,” 8.

appropriated a new system which turned the Christian mission into a civilizing mission. It certainly had great impact on binary oppositions such as the constructed idea of Islam and Christianity. After the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, there emerged a pattern of Western civilization versus Eastern societies. If there was the West and Western civilization, Eastern societies were now the other. Napoleon contributed to this much as he considered history as “an agreed-upon fiction and the only true philosophy.”⁷⁵ He considered himself a negotiator between old and new orders and sought to restore Europe to its decent position. The real revolution was not the French Revolution but the conquest of history.⁷⁶ The order was restored in Europe, but this time it was unilateral: There was the Europe on the one hand and the East on the other. The world-view of Europe, which started with the Renaissance, came to a shape in Napoleonic time; it was a European identity and its civilizing mission. In *The Construction of a European World-View in the Revolutionary-Napoleonic Years*, Stuart Woolf explains this new concept of Europe:

it is timely to look again, critically, at the relationship between the concept of Europe and the experiences of the Revolutionary-Napoleonic period. These years witnessed the construction of a cultural and political concept of Europe which was structured fundamentally around two perspectives. First, a European view of the extra-European world was consolidated which drew on earlier perceptions, but transformed them into a radically different unifying concept of European civilization and progress which allowed the classification, and justified the material exploitation, of the rest of the world. Secondly, a distinctive conviction was forged of what constituted the essence of Europe's superiority, based on the division of its land mass into nation states and the role of the rational state in furthering progress. Such was European self-confidence in these political values that they were exported as a ‘model’ to the rest of the world, even to the extent of imposing the particular European legal

⁷⁵ J. Christopher Herold, ed., *The Mind of Napoleon: A Selection from His Written and Spoken Words* (NY: Columbia UP, 1955), xxvi, 244, 255.

⁷⁶ See the third chapter in *The Mind of Napoleon*. Or see Stuart Woolf, *Napoleon's Integration of Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

concept of the sovereign state on political entities, like the Ottoman empire, where it did not previously exist.⁷⁷

The imposition of the European model on the other societies, especially on non-Western societies, explains the Westernization phenomenon in Turkey in the late Ottoman and the early Republican periods. This will be elaborated in the last section of this chapter.

“Individuum est ineffabile,” wrote Goethe to Lavatar to express the importance of individual experience. As discussed above, the sciences might be of use in practical matters, but they do not shed light on understanding human beings, art, and what is conveyed through gestures, symbols, and the like. The alienation that the idea of Renaissance and Enlightenment brought to a new-world view determined the European literature of the twentieth century. In his introduction to *Absurd Drama*, Martin Esslin explained why the emphasis in drama shifted away from traditional forms to a form that lacks the final clarity of definition and a neat resolution:

The social and spiritual reasons for such a sense of loss of meaning are manifold and complex: the waning of religious faith that had started with the Enlightenment and led Nietzsche to speak of the ‘death of God’ by the eighteen-eighties; the breakdown of the liberal faith in inevitable social progress in the wake of the First World War; the disillusionment with the hopes of radical social revolution as predicted by Marx after Stalin had turned the Soviet Union into a totalitarian tyranny; the relapse into barbarism, mass murder, and genocide in the course of Hitler’s brief rule over Europe during the Second World War; and, in the aftermath of that war, the spread of spiritual emptiness in the outwardly prosperous and affluent societies of Western Europe and the United States. There can be no doubt: for many intelligent and sensitive human beings the world of the mid twentieth century *has* lost its meaning and has simply ceased to make sense. Previously held certainties have dissolved, the firmest foundations for hope and optimism have collapsed. Suddenly man

⁷⁷ Stuart Woolf, “The Construction of a European World-View in the Revolutionary-Napoleonic Years,” *Past & Present* 137 (November 1992): 74.

sees himself faced with a universe that is both frightening and illogical – in a word, absurd.⁷⁸

Esslin explains this loss of meaning in language to portray the conditions that led to the emergence of the “Theatre of the Absurd.” The shift in the forms of theatre, from well-made plays to Absurd Drama, can certainly be pluralized. Henrik Ibsen’s form from verse to prose; Anton Chekhov’s move from classical realism to “slice-of-life realism;” Bertolt Brecht’s defamiliarization in Epic Theatre, Eugene Ionesco’s and Samuel Beckett’s Absurd Drama; Tennessee Williams’s intention of making films might to a certain extent be considered a reaction to conventional theatre production. The structural organization of plays can be related to social conditions. For example, well-made plays are expected to have five acts with a traditional plot-driven dramatic structure like introduction, rising action, climax, and resolution. However, its form projects more than just a simple organization, it also shows how it is “conditioned by clear and comforting beliefs, a stable scale of values, an ethical system in full working condition.”⁷⁹ The philosophy of the well-made play, Esslin asserts, is to have “the implicit assumption that the world does make sense, that reality is solid and secure, all outlines are clear, all ends are apparent.”⁸⁰ The Theatre of the Absurd, on the other hand, “expresses a sense of shock at the absence, the loss of any such clear and well-defined systems of beliefs or values.”⁸¹

This critique of language was certainly not restricted to drama but was an issue for all genres. As realism in literature attempted “to depict life in an entirely object matter, without idealization or glamour, and without didactic or moral ends,”⁸² modernism or modernist art became, in Harold Rosenberg’s term, “the tradition of the new,” and was considered as the “artist’s freedom from realism, materialism, traditional genre and form, with notions of cultural apocalypse and disaster.”⁸³ If realism is considered to have been the prevailing mode of the novel since its emergence in Britain in the eighteenth century, modernism should be cultural and

⁷⁸ Martin Esslin, “Introduction,” *Absurd Drama* (Baskerville: Penguin Books, 1974), 13 (italics in original).

⁷⁹ Esslin, 13.

⁸⁰ Esslin, 12.

⁸¹ Esslin, 12.

⁸² Childs, *Modernism*, 1.

⁸³ Childs, 2.

aesthetic reaction to conventional writing modes, especially to realist novels. Modernism was then an alternative way of representing reality. Similar to Esslin's portrayal of the conditions that the Theatre of the Absurd emerged out of modernist writers reacted against a very important historical and political contexts dominated by

The Great War, the Russian Bolshevik Revolution, the execution of the Russian Tsar (1918), the establishment of the Irish Free State (1922), Mussolini's March on Rome (1922), the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (1923), Hitler's Munich Putsch (1923), the General Strike in Britain (1926), the collapse of the American stock exchange (1929), Hitler's chancellorship of Germany and the burning of the Reichstag (1933), the British abdication crisis (1936), the Spanish Civil War (1936), and the Second World War, culminating in the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki (1945).⁸⁴

There were on the other hand cultural and intellectual contexts that preoccupied and influenced modern literature, such as

the development and accessibility of transport, and huge increases in its speed; the emergence of visible and invisible communications such photography, the cinema, the telephone, telegraphy and the wireless, which resulted in the rapid transmission of news, ideas, and images on a scale previously unknown; the discoveries of X-rays and radium; the artificial generation of electricity and its use in everyday life; and not least, discoveries and hypotheses about the structure of matter, space, and time, and about the process of perception, and the understanding of the self.⁸⁵

From the middle of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, most alternative modes of representation were termed modernist and offered various techniques and forms in different genres. In poetry, Modernism is associated with "moves to break from the iambic pentameter as the basic unit of verse, to introduce

⁸⁴ Goldman, *Modernism, 1910-1945*, xiii.

⁸⁵ Goldman, xiii- xiv.

vers libre, symbolism and other new forms of writing.”⁸⁶ In prose, it was a struggle to portray reality more than realist writing. Modernist writing attempted to render human subjectivity and to “represent consciousness, perception, emotion, meaning, and the individual’s relation to society through interior monologue, stream of consciousness, tunneling, defamiliarization, rhythm, and irresolution.”⁸⁷ Specifically in terms of the novel, modernism was a reaction to the domination of realist fiction. There were Honore de Balzac, Charles Dickens, Elizabeth Gaskell, and George Eliot, who wrote novels with omniscient narrators, recognized characters, a contemporary setting, ordinary speech, and linear plots. Most of these characteristics of classical realism were challenged by modernist writers not from one country but from various countries by a range of figures, including Emile Zola, Henry James, James Joyce, and Virginia Woolf.⁸⁸

“In the Midst of Chaos there was Shape”⁸⁹: Woolf’s Search for harmony

As mentioned earlier in this study, Woolf put great emphasis in her works on changes in her society. She wrote in 1924, “On or about December 1910 human character changed. All human relations shifted [...] when human relations shift there is at the same time a change in religion, conduct, politics, and literature.”⁹⁰ She reflected this change in her works in many ways. Her texts sometimes have enabled “generations of readers to invoke her ideas in discussions about feminism, multiculturalism, ‘highbrow’ versus ‘lowbrow’ culture and entertainment, political correctness, civil rights, and gay and lesbian rights.”⁹¹ Her writings brought her an image, which, since the 1930s, “has been used to inspire change and has become synonymous with feminism, creative experimentalism, disestablishment, and sexual tolerance.”⁹²

⁸⁶ Childs, *Modernism*, 3.

⁸⁷ Childs, 3.

⁸⁸ T.S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land* (New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 2001), James Joyce’s *Ulysses* (London: Urban Romantics, 2013), Virginia Woolf’s *To the Lighthouse*, W. B. Yeats’s *The Tower* (New York: Scribner, 2004), and Ezra Pound’s *Cantos* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975) might be regarded as the canonical texts of high modernism.

⁸⁹ Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*, 154.

⁹⁰ Woolf, *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, 4.

⁹¹ Cliff Mills, *Virginia Woolf* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004), 16.

⁹² Mills, *Virginia Woolf*, 17.

Her social concerns were influenced by the group she was in: Bloomsbury. After the deaths of her parents, Virginia Woolf (Stephen then) moved to Bloomsbury, a neighborhood consisting of lower-class people who were known for welcoming Bohemian lifestyles. They engaged in discussions with people from Cambridge there, and discussed academic, artistic, political, and sexual subjects. This group of people was called the Bloomsbury group later. There were important figures in the group such as Lytton Strachey, Clive Bell, Desmond MacCarthy, John Maynard Keynes, Roger Fry, E.M. Forster, Duncan Grant, and Leonard Woolf. Some critics saw them as the “forerunners of the counterculture of the 1960s and provoked the same strong passion that the hippie lifestyle did.”⁹³ Virginia Woolf married a member of the Bloomsbury group, Leonard Woolf, about whom she wrote in her diary, “I was of course inspired with the deepest interest in this violent, trembling, misanthropic Jew.”⁹⁴

The influence of the Bloomsbury group on Woolf was quite obvious. That can be seen in discussion on war. Woolf wrote very little about World War I in her diary or letters and ignored it as much as possible. She thought that wars were stains of a male-dominated society, as she also called it “a preposterous masculine fiction”⁹⁵ in a letter to her friend Margaret Llewelyn Davies in 1916. She even made jokes about the war, probably to keep people distracted during the raids, until Leonard’s brother was killed in the war. Together with the members of the Bloomsbury group, she was later preoccupied with the issue of war and peace throughout her life, made war the main subject of some of her books, and finally drowned herself due to fear of war that she could not escape from.⁹⁶ During the 1920s, Virginia and Leonard at the Hogarth Press issued a series of pamphlets. Gillian Beer points out in her book chapter, “Woolf in Wartime, and Townsend Warner Too,” that “when Leonard presented a Fabian pamphlet in 1916 on possible future international government

⁹³ Mills, 38.

⁹⁴ Quoted in Victoria Glendinning, *Leonard Woolf: A Biography* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 57.

⁹⁵ Woolf, *The Letters*, Vol. 2, 76.

⁹⁶ Woolf’s last diary entry that she noted only four days before her suicide was not directly related with the war, although she refers to war once: “And before 5 minutes had passed she told us that two of her sons had been killed in the war (Woolf, *The Diary*, vol.5, 358). In her last entry, Woolf does not use the word “depression” but the months and weeks before her death, the word “depression” pops up repeatedly.

the manuscript was written in Virginia's hand, so intimately was she involved not only as scrivener but as co-thinker."⁹⁷ She was a writer of social transformation; however, she was definitely not satisfied with the European idea of progress. We see her dissatisfaction in one of her letters, defining Hollywood as "a marble city gleaming at your feet; and people so new, so brave, so beautiful and utterly *uncontaminated by civilization*, popping in and out of booths and theatres with pistols in their hands and aeroplanes soaring over their heads."⁹⁸ Like many other people in Europe, Woolf, too, saw America as a new country with a huge potential, which is also young, compared to old Europe, which was tired of wars and conflicts.

It was this and all other circumstances of decadence that made Woolf say "on or about December 1910 human character changed."⁹⁹ Woolf's remark should be considered in terms of how the art in question interpenetrates with the period's history and politics. Woolf thought that this crisis emerged from displacement of humanity from its central position. In 1923, she wrote, "my own view of humanity in general falls and falls [...] now I can see little good in the race and I would like to convey this in writing."¹⁰⁰ The condition of chaos led Woolf to structure her narrative accordingly; her search for harmony is central in her works. As Lily in Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* thinks, "In the midst of chaos there was shape,"¹⁰¹ Woolf was searching for harmony in the midst of crises through her writing. The second section of *To the Lighthouse*, "Time Passes," a span of around ten years but less than ten pages, is characterized by darkness, and covers the war years – though war is never mentioned – and gives a description of the interior of the house, which is now empty. Things get muddled, order turns into disorder, and disharmony dominates, as the seventh section of the second chapter of *To the Lighthouse* clearly depicts it:

Night after night, summer and winter, the torment of storms, the arrow-like stillness of fine (had there been any one to listen) from the upper rooms of the empty house only gigantic chaos streaked with lightning could have been heard tumbling and tossing, as the winds

⁹⁷ Gillian Beer, "Woolf in Wartime, and Townsend Warner Too," in *Virginia Woolf's Bloomsbury*, Vol. 2, ed. Lisa Shahriari and Gina Potts (New York: Plgrave MacMillan, 2010), 2.

⁹⁸ Woolf, *The Letters*, Vol 2, 84 (italics mine).

⁹⁹ Woolf, *Mr. Bennett*, 4.

¹⁰⁰ Woolf, *The Letters*, Vol. 3, 65.

¹⁰¹ Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*, 154.

and waves disported themselves like the amorphous bulks of leviathans whose brows are pierced by no light of reason, and mounted one on top of another, and lunged and plunged in the darkness or the daylight (for night and day, month and year ran shapelessly together) in idiot games, until it seemed as if the universe were battling and tumbling, in brute confusion and wanton lust aimlessly by itself.¹⁰²

We see a similar harmony in *Mrs. Dalloway*; memories and consequences of war that led to Septimus's mental torture is given parallel to the calm atmosphere of the dinner organized by Clarissa Dalloway. It shows how the serene, calm surface of society is about to be shattered, which the formal pattern of the novel discloses very well. *Between the Acts* is, too, a novel of fragmentation. Disharmony takes its highest form in the novel as "sentences, even words, crack up, fall apart, are blown away by the wind Discord, cacophony interrupted speech [...] a work of art which contains and expresses both discord and harmony."¹⁰³

Woolf's expression of cacophony was in fact one of the reasons for the emergence of modernism, as modernism emerged in a condition of crises.¹⁰⁴ Michael Levenson points out in his introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*:

Crisis is inevitably the central term of art in discussion of this turbulent cultural moment [...]. War! Strike! The Irish' Or [...]. Nihilism! Relativism! Fakery! This century had scarcely grown used to its own name, before it learned the twentieth century would be the epoch of crisis, real and manufactured, physical and metaphysical, material and symbolic.¹⁰⁵

Levenson raises a question similar to Woolf's concerns on progress and civilization: "Was modern civilization all a 'Heart of darkness?' Was it an arid 'Waste Land?'"

¹⁰² Woolf, 128.

¹⁰³ Rosemary Sumner, *A Route to Modernism: Hardy, Lawrence, Woolf* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2000), 154.

¹⁰⁴ Very similar to Woolf's definition of literature that it came out of crises occurred in the first decades of the twentieth century, Tanpınar, too, claims in his article "Türk Edebiyatı'nda Cereyanlar" that "modern Turkish literature begins with a crisis of civilization." (In Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 104.)

¹⁰⁵ Michael Levenson, *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2005), 4.

[...] The loss of faith, the groundlessness of value, the violence of war, and a nameless, faceless anxiety – no one is likely to be surprised by such a list of disturbances, at once individual and social.”¹⁰⁶

The fact that there was “little good in the race” created its own literary orientation. The new aesthetic mode dominated the construction of literary texts throughout the period from 1910 to 1945 and beyond. The catastrophic incidents penetrated the interior of artistic invention. Writers and painters drew subjects out of industrial machinery and the bodies broken in wars. We should mention Roger Fry’s “Post-Impressionism”¹⁰⁷ (1910), Clive Bell’s “Significant Form”¹⁰⁸ (1913), avant-garde activities, and Marinetti’s “Futurist Manifesto”¹⁰⁹ (1909) as essays and manifestos that suggest new forms of art. However, it was not just a cataclysmic moment of modernity, the inception of the avant-garde, and the shock of the new; it was also time for literary form to undergo a radical transformation. Literary change, which emerged as a cultural reaction to political and social upheavals, was great. Current events led the writers of the era to create new forms. The work of James Joyce, T.S. Eliot, and Lytton Strachey demonstrated that modern literature had found new forms. Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1922) and Eliot’s *The Waste Land* (1922) were among

¹⁰⁶ Levenson, 4-5.

¹⁰⁷ For a valuable contribution on Fry’s Post-Impressionism, see Benedict Nicolson, “Post-Impressionism and Roger Fry,” *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 93, no. 574 (January 1951): 10-15.

¹⁰⁸ In his *Art* (1913), Clive Bell defines “Significant Form”: “There must be some one quality without which a work of art cannot exist; possessing which, in the least degree, no work is altogether worthless. What is this quality? What quality is shared by all objects that provoke our aesthetic emotions? [...] Only one answer seems possible – significant form. In each, lines and colours combined in a particular way, certain forms and relations of forms, stir our aesthetic emotions. These relations and combinations of lines and colours, these aesthetically moving forms, I call “Significant Form”; and “Significant Form” is the one quality common to all works of visual art. [...] At this point it may be objected that I am making aesthetics a purely subjective business, since my only data are personal experiences of a particular emotion. It will be said that the objects that provoke this emotion vary with each individual, and that therefore a system of aesthetics can have no objective validity. It must be replied that any system of aesthetics which pretends to be based on some objective truth is so palpably ridiculous as not to be worth discussing.” Clive Bell, *Art* (Charleston: Nabu Press, 2010), 17-18.

¹⁰⁹ Published in *Le Figaro* in Paris on 20 February 1909, F.T. Marinetti’s “Futurist Manifesto” or “Manifesto of Futurism” was a reaction against the conventional writing modes. F.T. Marinetti explains how people “must break down the gates of life to test the bolts and the padlocks!” (50). He claims that “literature has up to now magnified pensive immobility, ecstasy and slumber.” He manifests that they “want to exalt movements of aggression, feverish sleeplessness, the double march, the perilous leap, the slap and the blow with the fist.” F.T. Marinetti, “Futurist Manifesto,” in *Futurims: An Anthology*, ed. Lawrence Rainey and et al (New Haven: Yale UP, 2009), 51.

the most notable ones. Woolf defined this process: “the smashing and the crashing began [...]. Grammar is violated; syntax disintegrated.”¹¹⁰

Woolf’s two essays give us good explanations for the literary transitions and the development of Modernist forms of writing. They also show us the position of Woolf as a writer of literary transition: “Modern Fiction” in 1919, revised and republished as “Modern Novel” in 1925, and *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* in 1924. According to Jane Goldman, Woolf’s “Modern Fiction” is “the manifesto of the new from which our ladders of literary modernity start.”¹¹¹ It was first published in “The Times Literary Supplement” in April 1919 as “Modern Novels” and later revised by Woolf herself for her first collection of essays, *The First Common Reader*. As Woolf’s best known and most-frequently quoted essay, “Modern Fiction” show the differences between Edwardian novelists such as H.G. Wells, John Galsworthy, and Arnold Bennett; and Georgian writers like Joyce and Woolf. While she defines the Edwardians as outmoded materialists, she praises the Georgians because of their spiritual and experimental writings. Woolf criticizes the Edwardians based on their failure to capture life:

Look within and life, it seems, is very far from being “like this.” Examine for a moment an ordinary mind on an ordinary day. The mind receives myriad impressions – trivial, fantastic, evanescent, or engraved with the sharpness of steel. From all sides they come, an incessant shower of innumerable atoms; and as they fall, as they shape themselves into the life of Monday or Tuesday, the accent falls differently from of old; the moment of importance came not here but there; so that, if a writer were a free man and not a slave, if he could write what he chose, not what he must, if he could base his work not upon convention, there would be no plot, no comedy, no love interest or catastrophe in the accepted style, and perhaps not a single button sewn on as the Bond Street tailors would have it. Life is not a series of gig lamps symmetrically arranged; life is a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of

¹¹⁰ Woolf, *Mr. Bennett*, 20-21.

¹¹¹ Goldman, *Modernism, 1910-1945*, 35.

consciousness to the end. Is it not the task of the novelist to convey this varying, this unknown and uncircumcised spirit, whatever aberration or complexity it may display, with as little mixture of the alien and external as possible?¹¹²

This passage describes the basic priorities of modernism. Woolf assigns the task of novelists to capture a moment and show the truth of it. Woolf's thought on time/life is similar to Tanpınar's, expressed in his poem *Ne İçindeyim Zamanın* [I am neither a Part of Time]: "I am neither a part of time, nor completely out of time / I am in the unified flow of a vast, monolithic moment."¹¹³ Similar to Woolf, Tanpınar too tries to capture time in his novels and other writings.

Woolf mentions James Joyce¹¹⁴ in her "Modern Fiction" as an example of the new "spiritual" writing. A modernist technique, stream-of-consciousness, is described as a tool to capture the moment. Joyce, Woolf argues, is "concerned at all costs to reveal the flickering of that inmost flame which flashes its messages through the brain."¹¹⁵ Woolf gives a clear definition of her own and other modernist writers' use of stream-of-consciousness technique through her example in *To the Lighthouse*:

Standing now, apparently transfixed, by the pear tree, impressions poured in upon her of those two men, and to follow her thought was like following a voice which speaks too quickly to be taken down by one's pencil, and the voice was her own voice saying without prompting undeniable, everlasting, contradictory things, so that even

¹¹² Woolf, "Modern Fiction," in *The Essays of Virginia Woolf*, Vol. 4, ed. Andrew McNeillie, (London: Hogarth Press, 1984), 160-61.

¹¹³ Tanpınar, *Bütün Şiirleri*, 19.

¹¹⁴ We should note here that Woolf differs from Joyce in some ways. The innovation brought to the novel by Hardy, Lawrence, and Woolf is to some extent different from some other modernist writers such as Joyce and Stein. In her letter to Ethel Smythe, Woolf writes, "The fact about contemporaries is that they're doing the same thing on another railway line; one resents them distracting one, flashing past the wrong way." Rosemary Sumner explains these differences in *A Route Modernism: Hardy, Lawrence, Woolf*: "Woolf's recognition that 'they are doing the same thing' implies that her 'railway line' runs parallel to or crosses others from time to time. It might be claimed, for instance, that the use of the single day in *Mrs Dalloway* is directly derived from *Ulysses*; but the differences between these two novels are more striking than their similarities. Joyce creates a rigid structure [...] the hour of the day of each section is just one controlling feature among many. Time in *Mrs. Dalloway* is also important – the booming of Big Ben reverberates throughout the novel, but the time struck is often unspecified [...]. The carefully calculated structures of *Ulysses* are alien to Woolf's methods" (Sumner, *A Route*, 1-2).

¹¹⁵ Woolf, "Modern Fiction," 161.

the fissures and humps on the bark of the pear tree were irrevocably fixed there for eternity.¹¹⁶

As discussed in the Chapter of this study, Woolf's use of stream-of-consciousness technique was used in her diaries, and the reality she portrays there – the description of weather, London, and people – is quite modernist: it is inside the mind as well as outside it. While she deliberately does that in her novels, so too in her diary; she notes the thoughts that puzzle her during the day in a stream-of-consciousness.

Apart from her declaration that “December 1910, human character changed,”¹¹⁷ in *Mr. Bennett and Mr. Brown* Woolf defines the moment of change and the inception of the new. This essay is important in that it gives of the basics of modernism through a comparative analysis between old and new forms of writing. Woolf continues her battle with the Edwardians, especially with Arnold Bennett: “Bennett says that it is only if the characters are real that the novel has any chance of surviving. Otherwise, die it must. But, I ask myself, what is reality? And who are the judges of reality? A character may be real to Mr. Bennett and quite unreal to me.”¹¹⁸ After criticizing Bennett's character development in novels, Woolf claims that Edwardians were “never interested in character itself; or in the book in itself. They were interested in something outside. Their books, then incomplete as books, and required that the reader should finish them, actively and practically, for himself.”¹¹⁹ Woolf then creates a story in which Mr. Wells, Mr. Galsworthy, and Mr. Bennett are traveling to Waterloo with a fictional Mrs. Brown. Woolf points out that Mr. Bennett “would observe every detail with immense care. He would notice the advertisement; the pictures of Swanage and Portsmouth; the way in which the cushion bulged between the buttons [...] how Mrs. Brown wore a brooch.”¹²⁰ Woolf writes two pages full of ‘likely’ descriptions of Mr. Bennett about the exterior details about Mrs. Brown; she gives a break to her description and asserts: “One line of insight would

¹¹⁶ Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*, 22-23.

¹¹⁷ Woolf, *Mr. Bennett*, 4.

¹¹⁸ Woolf, 10.

¹¹⁹ Woolf, 12.

¹²⁰ Woolf, 13.

have done more than all those lines of description.”¹²¹ She comes to the point after pages of description and writes, “We can only hear Mr. Bennett’s voice telling us facts about rents and freeholds and fines [...]. He is trying to make us imagine for him; he is trying to hypnotize us into the belief that because he has made a house, there must be a person living there [...]. Mr. Bennett has never once looked at Mrs. Brown in her corner.”¹²² Woolf’s harsh criticism finishes with her concern of life in literature: “They have looked very powerfully, searchingly, and sympathetically out of the window; at factories, at Utopias, even at the decoration and upholstery of the carriage; but never at her, never at life, never at human nature [...]. For us those conventions are ruins, those tools are death.”¹²³

Virginia Woolf’s contribution to modernism and the modernist writing is well described by Eric Auerbach in his classic work, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Auerbach offers an impressive reading of a section of Woolf’s *To the Lighthouse* to analyze what Woolf brought to literature, what was called “the tradition of the new.” In his final chapter in *Mimesis*, “The Brown Stocking,” Auerbach does a close analysis of a piece of narrative prose of the fifth section of part one in *To the Lighthouse*. He explains his purpose on choosing this excerpt: “Interpretation of a few passages [...] can be made to yield more, and more decisive, information [...] than would a systematic and chronological treatment. Indeed, the present book may be cited as an illustration.”¹²⁴ After giving a long excerpt from the section, Auerbach begins to explain the “matter of the author’s attitude toward the reality of the world [s]he represents.”¹²⁵ His analysis on the differences between the Edwardians and Georgians is remarkable:

Goethe or Keller, Dickens or Meredith, Balzac or Zola told us out of their certain knowledge what their characteristics did, what they felt and thought while doing it, and how their actions and thoughts were to be interpreted. They knew everything about their characters. To be sure, in past periods too we were frequently told about the subjective

¹²¹ Woolf, 14.

¹²² Woolf, 16.

¹²³ Woolf, 16.

¹²⁴ Eric Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (NJ: Princeton, 2003), 525.

¹²⁵ Auerbach, 535.

reactions of the characters in a novel or story [...] the content of the individual's consciousness was rationally limited to things connected with the particular incident being related or the particular situation being described [...] the author, with his knowledge of an objective truth, never abdicated his position as the final and governing authority [...]. The essential characteristic of the technique represented by Virginia Woolf is that we are given not merely one person whose consciousness is rendered, but many persons, with frequent shifts from one to the other [...]. The multiplicity of persons suggests that we are here after all confronted with an endeavor to investigate an objective reality, that is, specifically, the 'real' Mrs. Ramsay [...]. There is an attempt to approach her from many sides as closely as human possibilities of perception and expression can succeed in doing. The design of a close approach to objective reality by means of numerous subjective impressions received by various individuals (and at various times) is important in the modern technique which we are here examining. It basically differentiates it from the unipersonal subjectivism which allows only a single and generally a very unusual person to make himself heard and admits only that one person's way of looking at reality.¹²⁶

Woolf's aesthetics of reality is significant and distinguishes her from the conventional writers of the time. We should also consider Woolf's interpretation of the past to understand what kind of aestheticism she wanted to establish. Like Tanpınar, who used several images of the past and tradition in his works to enrich the understanding of the present, Woolf's orientation toward cultural and literary aesthetics is directly related to her perception of the past. As activists and writers of change, Woolf and other modernist writers including T.S. Eliot, never reject the ties of today with the past. This was in fact an aspect of modernism as Clement Greenberg describes it in his *Modernist Painting*:

¹²⁶ Auerbach, 535-36.

Art gets carried on under Modernism much in the same way as before. And I cannot insist enough that Modernism has never meant, and does not mean now, anything like a break with the past. It may mean a devolution, an unraveling, of tradition, but it also means its further evolution. Modernist art continues the past without gap or break, and wherever it may end up it will never cease being intelligible in terms of the past [...]. Nothing could be further from the authentic art of our time than the idea of a rupture of continuity. Art is – among other things – continuity, and unthinkable without it. Lacking the past of art, and the need and compulsion to maintain its standards of excellence, Modernist art would lack both substance and justification.¹²⁷

Woolf gives her ideas about the past within the context of her justification for keeping a diary. Her remarks on the past and its connection with the present remind us of Tanpınar's statements. Woolf writes in her *A Sketch of the Past*,

The past only comes back when the present runs so smoothly that it is like the sliding surface of a deep river. Then one sees through the surface to the depths. In those moments I find one of my greatest satisfactions, not that I am thinking of the past; but that it is then that I am living most fully in the present. For the present when backed by the past is a thousand times deeper than the present when it presses so close that you can feel nothing else [...]. Let me then, like a child advancing with bare feet into a cold river, descend again into that stream.¹²⁸

T.S. Eliot's essay *Tradition and the Individual Talent* can also be analyzed in this context since it portrays the connection of modernism and modernist writers with the past. His essay should in fact be considered from several perspectives. First, Eliot mentions the uniqueness of each culture and literature: "Every nation, every race, has not only its own creative, but its own critical turn of mind; and is even more oblivious of the shortcomings and limitations of its critical habits than of those of its

¹²⁷ Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," 6-7.

¹²⁸ Woolf, "A Sketch of the Past," 98.

creative genius.”¹²⁹ His remark on the idiosyncrasy of cultures might be regarded as his rejection of European superiority over the other countries and cultures. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this study, the Eurocentric view of diary-keeping tradition undermines the contribution of Eastern culture and literature to diary-keeping practice. In the last section I will examine the provincializing attitude of Europe toward non-Western societies.

Second, Eliot gives the definition of tradition in literature and connects it to the artist’s interpretation of the past; he writes that tradition “is a matter of much wider significance. It cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labor. It involves, in the first place, the historical sense [...] and the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence.”¹³⁰ Eliot calls it a prejudiced approach to see a poet or a writer completely individual and different from his or her predecessors since “the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order.”¹³¹ Eliot’s insistence on an artist’s appreciation of his predecessors is due to the impossibility of one’s existing alone. He points out that “no poet, not artist of any art, has his complete meaning. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead.”¹³² Eliot was not living completely in the past; he was, like Tanpınar, in favor of establishing some sort of connection between past and present in order to understand the present better: “The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the superinvention of novelty, the *whole* existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted; and this is conformity between the old and the new.”¹³³ The difference between the present and the past is explained as if it were in Tanpınar’s

¹²⁹ T.S. Eliot, “Tradition and the Individual Talent,” 13.

¹³⁰ Eliot, 14.

¹³¹ Eliot, 16.

¹³² Eliot, 15.

¹³³ Eliot, 15.

words. Eliot says, “the difference [...] is that the conscious present is an awareness of the past in a way and to an extent which the past’s awareness of itself cannot show.”¹³⁴

Eliot’s statement that “no poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone” is similar to remarks of Woolf and of some other modernist writers as well. Virginia Woolf creates one of the main characters in *To the Lighthouse*, Mr. Ramsay, as the representation of intellectuality and as someone who relies on his work to secure his reputation. Mr. Ramsay’s philosophy, which denies any kind of connection between mind, reality, and personality – therefore quite un-Woolfian – stands opposite Mrs. Ramsay. He thinks that the progress of human thought is analogous to the alphabet; each letter symbolizes a successive concept and every individual should struggle in his life to go through as many letters as he can. Mr. Ramsay reached Q: a great effort, which started from A all the way up to Q. He thinks only one man in every generation can reach Z. His reputation that he struggles to create by himself with no reference to the past makes him feel always afraid and insecure. “A single stone,” Mr. Ramsay says, “will outlast Shakespeare.”¹³⁵ Woolf was apparently criticizing a solid individualism, which was detached from the unity of body and mind and from an uncalculated orientation of the past.

Considering the attitudes of modernist writers, especially of Woolf and Eliot, we might reach an interpretation that says that the writers of the changing European societies, especially of Britain, were not necessarily dedicated to rejection of past and tradition. Literature was, surely, influenced by the crises, and it developed in respect to great social changes at the turn of the century. However, it was somewhat parallel to the rhythm of social changes. Having started after the Renaissance, accelerated with the Enlightenment, and peaked at the turn of the century as modernity, the transition in European societies was more gradual and inclusive compared to non-Western societies. In his *The Venture of Islam*, Marshall G. S. Hodgson highlights how modern Western societies in fact grew from traditions: “Modernity has necessarily created a breach with all the cultural traditions of the pre-Modern past. But as we have seen, in the West that breach with tradition is relatively mild: the

¹³⁴ Eliot, 16.

¹³⁵ Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*, 33.

West is relatively traditional in that there, all the major aspects of Modern society grow from traditions relatively continuous with an indefinite past.”¹³⁶

Non-Western societies, on the other hand, tended to reject tradition and the past for the sake of being modern and therefore are mostly non-traditional. According to Hodgson, for non-Western lands, especially Muslim lands,

The new, the Modern, has no older roots: it is purely modern. For them the breach in tradition, which is real enough in the West also, is harsh and drastic. To make a turn upon a common usage, it may be said that the heart of Modern world problems is that a *traditional* West, benefiting from the moderating effects of continuity, contrasts painfully to the rest of the world, which is untraditional where it matters most and, instead, starkly, is unrelievedly *modern*.¹³⁷

As discussed in Chapter 3 of this study, Turkish modernization, which started after the *Tanzimat* edict in 1839, has held similar characteristics to Hodgson’s portrayal of non-Western modernizations. Turkish modernization was defined as Westernization since from the late Ottoman to early Turkish Republic, Turkey was under Western influence so that all the faculties and the institutions of Turkey were highly affected by the West. However, considering the gradual process of Western modernization and its relations with tradition and the past, it is difficult to say that Turkish modernization was something truly Western. It was certainly not Eastern or traditional either. Therefore, a third concept should be created, to genuinely define Turkish modernization. Perhaps it is Western-oriented but not Western.

Literary works produced in the late Ottoman and early Republican periods held the characteristics of the periods; most of the intellectuals tended to reject tradition and were in favor of a complete adaptation of Western values. However, their attitudes were in fact not Western since even during the decadence most European writers did not break away from the past, completely reject tradition, and despise religion. Among Turkish intellectuals, Tanpınar was perhaps one of the few writers who truly followed the West. His attitudes toward tradition and the past alienated

¹³⁶ Marshall G.S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, Vol. 3, 428.

¹³⁷ Hodgson, 428.

him from his “Westernizer” contemporaries. Tanpınar’s struggle to understand the present by considering tradition and past was interpreted as if he were against social change or revolution, as if he were religious. He was indeed quite modern and not at all religious.

A question might be raised here: Why did Tanpınar’s contemporaries believe in a Europe different from Tanpınar’s? It was all about the representation of Western ideas for non-Western societies. In Turkey, the interpretation of Westernization as a military, political, social, and cultural model is quite different from that in Europe and America. In his *Türk Düşününde Batı Sorunu* [The Problem of the West in Turkish Thought], Niyazi Berkes defines it as “improving Turkish evolution in the appropriate direction.”¹³⁸ Berkes shows the contradiction of Westernization in Turkey by comparing it to that in Europe and America: “However, Westernization and Westernism in Europe and America means submission to Western diplomacy. Therefore, for them, the Kemalist era was anti-European; and the Menderes era was Westernizer. Westernism independent from Western diplomacy is, in European terms, a poor nationalism with animosity toward the West.”¹³⁹ There were several interpretations of Westernization: some considered it as imitating the capitalist Western societies and looking down on traditions and local or national traits. However, for Western societies, modernization means to advance and to industrialize, and there was in fact nothing else. It is not something ideological, religious, or cultural but is supposed to mediate developments in military, technique, and science. From the late Ottoman Empire to early Republic of Turkey – and I dare to say ‘until now’ – Westernization has often been considered as *the* requirement of change in cultural and social identity. Therefore, all debates on Westernization have had religious references: Those who are in favor of Westernization have been labeled sometimes as Kemalist, often Leftist, and almost always liberalist. These groups were never considered religious since religion and Westernization are supposed to contradict. However, while there exist those who are pious but who also seriously support Westernization, there also exist those who are nonreligious but who are also strictly against unquestioned adaptation of Western ideas and values.

¹³⁸ Niyazi Berkes, *Türk Düşününde Batı Sorunu* (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1975), 29.

¹³⁹ Berkes, 29.

Tanpınar should be considered in this context: He never thought that tradition and the Ottoman heritage should be rejected wholesale. We see that in his works he often wrote that the present is never understood without the past. On the other hand, he was completely dedicated to İsmet Paşa, who defended and established state projects to erase the Islamic tradition and heritage. Tanpınar became a CHP (Republican People's Party) parliamentary representative; however, the CHP as the ruling party in a one-party régime was in favor of complete adoption of Western values. Starting with Abdullah Cevdet and his friends in the late Ottoman period, the path that Westernization followed in the early Republic was overseen by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, İsmet Paşa, and after the execution of Adnan Menderes by *Milli Birlik Komitesi* [National Unity Committee]. Tanpınar's writings were then full of ambivalent references since he was neither a rightist nor a leftist, neither religious nor atheist, neither traditional nor modern. He was in favor of Westernization even though he never advocated a complete adaptation of Western values. He rather saw it as advancement in science, technology, and industrialization. For him, "the main purpose is to create new forms of life. We can look at East and West as our two separate sources. Both exist in us quite widely; I mean [...] they are our realities."¹⁴⁰

Attila İlhan, a leftist thinker who died in 2005, criticizes the misinterpretation of Westernization and tries to find answers:

Well, if we haven't taken Westernization as a social and economic modernization, how do we take it then? As a paradise on earth created by cinema, novel, news report, and comments on radio? The process of transition was not guided by precursors of economic and social developments but by bureaucrat intellectuals. Therefore, the West has been designed as if it were the dream society. Everything is bad in the East, and good in the West! We are supposed to do exactly what they do so that we become humans.¹⁴¹

Kemal Tahir brings out a different aspect of Westernization and comments on the source of socio-economic problems: "Since the nineteenth century, Western imperialist powers have compelled us to Westernize in their own way and that we

¹⁴⁰ Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi*, 42.

¹⁴¹ Attila İlhan, *Hangi Batı?* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2003), 16.

should accept that [...]. For one society to modernize, it is not necessary to reject, despise and break away from its history.”¹⁴² Tahir also criticizes the concepts created together with the idea of Westernization. He claims that it has brainwashed us:

Westernization has not made us suffer from cannons, rifles, radios, and automobiles. We have only suffered from the idea of Westernization. This idea has created some sort of brainwashing. In the common-used terms, being in favor of Westernization is to become an agent of imperialism. The most terrible situation is that we spend a great deal of effort to accept everything transferred from the West as modern, even though they are down and dirty; no questions asked; no matter what they are, either in art, an idea or a new form adopted from the West.¹⁴³

According to some opinion leaders, the scope of Westernization should have been restricted to the adoption of economic and technological advances in Europe. In the introduction to his most-acclaimed book *The Politicization of Islam*, Kemal H. Karpat highlights how European capitalism undermined the essential foundations of Ottoman society:

The Ottoman state, like the rest of the Muslim world, was exposed to capitalism and the threat of violent European occupation in the nineteenth century. Capitalism undermined, among other things, the economic-social foundation of the *vakıf* [foundation], *imaret* [cultivation], and above all the state-controlled land system, which maintained and assured the society’s unique Islamic cultural features.¹⁴⁴

The economic threat of the European powers to the Ottoman society was misunderstood by several Ottoman intellectuals, and therefore a complete adaptation of Western cultural and social values was seen as the ultimate goal in the late Ottoman and early Republican period.

¹⁴² İlhan, 16.

¹⁴³ Kemal Tahir, *Notlar/ Batılılaşma* (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1992), 44.

¹⁴⁴ Kemal H. Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State* (New York: Oxford UP, 2001), 3.

“Modernism’s Last Post”¹⁴⁵ and European Provincializing

Tanpınar’s loneliness was directly related to his ideas on several issues related to modernization and Westernization. His contemporaries, mostly Kemalists and pro-Western people, had different views on Westernization from that of Tanpınar. We should indeed trace the source of this difference on various perspectives on modernity. One interpretation of modernity/modernization is that it is a totalizing/unilateral ideology grounded in and associated with the European cultural and moral experience; this interpretation or form of modernity makes non-Western cultures and aesthetics groundless and ‘inferior.’ Another form of modernity, however, is a mode of social and cultural experience and expression which is open to all kinds of cultural and social inclinations and possibilities. As discussed in the earlier sections of this chapter, the ideas supported, for example, by Montesquieu, Hegel, Weber, Durkheim, and perhaps by the discourse of “Orientalism” gave the priority to Western culture and morality and defined modernity as a Western cultural¹⁴⁶ experience. This interpretation of modernity projects Western culture as the most essential characteristic of modernization; it also assumes that non-Western cultures and traditions are incompatible with modernization. If modernity is based on Western experience, then non-Western societies must adopt Western dispositions as a model of modernization, regardless of its suitability to the characteristics of that society. This rigid modern-secular imagination of modernity was role-modeled by the founders of Turkish Republic and became the form of modernization in Turkey.

A good example of this Eurocentric model of modernization can be demonstrated through the common reactions to the Iranian Revolution in 1979. Michel Foucault explains these reactions in an interview. First, he asks: “What is it

¹⁴⁵ In his article “Modernism’s Last Post,” Stephen Slemon brings a different interpretation to Modernism and its form in the second half of the twentieth century. He asserts that “Western culture is coming to understand that [...] the ‘armed version’ of modernism is colonialism itself, and that modernism’s most theoretically self-privileging figurative strategies [...] would have been unthinkable had it not been for the assimilative power of Empire to appropriate the cultural work of a heterogeneous world ‘out there’ and to reproduce it for its own social and discursive end.” (Slemon, “Modernism’s Last Post,” *Ariel* 20 (1989): 1) Slemon’s identification of assimilative power of Empire is important to understand Europe’s provincializing strategy against non-Western societies. After the world became more heterogeneous due to decolonization in many countries, increase in immigration, the power of diasporas, and technological advancements, Europe reproduced modernism as post-modernism “for its own social and discursive end.” Non-Western societies were now faced with a different form of hegemony. This will be discussed in the conclusion part of this study.

¹⁴⁶ I say “cultural”; however, modernity impacts all kinds of social institutions.

about what has happened in Iran that a whole lot of people, on the left and on the right, find somewhat irritating? The Iran affair and the way in which it has taken place have not aroused the same kind of untroubled sympathy as Portugal, for example, or Nicaragua.”¹⁴⁷ Foucault then explains how dissatisfaction stemmed from the fact that it was not a Western form of revolution:

Many here and some in Iran are waiting for and hoping for the moment when secularization will at last come back to the fore and reveal the good, old type of revolution¹⁴⁸ we have always known. I wonder how far they will be taken along this strange, unique road, in which they seek, against the stubbornness of their destiny, against everything they have been for centuries, ‘something quite different.’¹⁴⁹

This vision of is similar to Napoleon’s model of Europe. As explained in the previous sections of this chapter, the cultural and political concept of Europe in the Revolutionary-Napoleonic period was based upon two perspectives: “a radically different unifying concept of European civilization [...] which allowed the classification, and justified the material exploitation, of the rest of the world”; and “Europe’s superiority, based on the division of its land mass into nation states and the role of the rational state in furthering progress [as...] a model to the rest of the world.”¹⁵⁰

We can now discuss a different interpretation of modernity, which has great impact on everyday life. This interpretation of modernity gives spaces to a plurality of cultures. In his *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*, Marshall Berman defines modernity in this aspect:

There is a mode of vital experience – experience of space and time, of the self and others, of life’s possibilities and perils – that is shared by

¹⁴⁷ Michel Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 211.

¹⁴⁸ This interview was recorded in Paris in 1979, a few months after the Iranian Revolution. I wonder what Foucault would say about the Iranian Revolution if he were still alive in 2014. He would perhaps change his remarks about its being a “new” type of revolution; he would rather say it was indeed an “old type of revolution,” a part of the Western modernity project: Iran as a controversial role-model for Islam and the Islamic societies for more than three decades.

¹⁴⁹ Foucault, *Politics*, 224.

¹⁵⁰ Stuart Woolf, “The Construction of a European World-View,” 74.

men and women all over the world today. I will call this ‘modernity.’ Modern environments and experience cut across all boundaries of geography and ethnicity, of class and nationality, of religion and ideology: in this sense, modernity can be said to unite all mankind. But it is a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity: it pours us all into a maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish.¹⁵¹

Berman’s interpretation of modernization might be said to be practical and empirical to some extent and thus aimed “to liberate societies from their oppressive material conditions [...] its emphasis on modernity as a material condition leaves room for the possibility of a more local imagined interpretation of modernization.”¹⁵² This view of modernity was also articulated by Marx, Habermas, and Giddens, albeit each might have offered slightly different perspectives on the applicability of this vision of modernity on the societies. Marx’s opposition to liberal Enlightenment probably ended up in his critique of capitalism and liberal modernity. Even though his ideas were quite class reductionist and therefore should be questioned in terms of plurality of cultures and ethnicity, Marx’s views on Western modernity were not at all unilateral. Habermas saw modernity as an incomplete project, but for him the failure was not rooted in rationalization or modernization but in its failure to “develop and institutionalize all the different dimensions of reason in a balanced way.”¹⁵³ John Tomilson, in *Cultural Imperialism*, reads Habermas’s vision of modernity as “the sort of modernity that the West has developed and passed on to the developing world [which] is not the only possible historical route out of the chains of tradition.”¹⁵⁴ Like Habermas, Antony Giddens sees modernity as a Western project as part of two important Western institutions of modernity: the nation-state and capitalism. However, the globalized form of modernity is not necessarily unilateral:

¹⁵¹ Marshall Berman, *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Penguin, 1988), 15.

¹⁵² Ali Mirsepassi, *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization: Negotiating Modernity in Iran* (NY: Cambridge UP, 2004), 2.

¹⁵³ Thomas McCarthy, translator’s introduction to *The Theory of Communicative Action* (Boston: Beacon, 1984), xxxix.

¹⁵⁴ John Tomilson, *Cultural Imperialism* (Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1991), 168.

Is modernity peculiarly Western from the standpoint of its globalizing tendencies? No, it cannot be, since we are speaking here of emergent forms of world interdependence and planetary consciousness. The ways in which these issues are approached and coped with, however, will inevitably involve conceptions and strategies derived from non-Western settings. For neither the radicalizing of modernity nor the globalizing of social life are processes which are in any sense complete. Many kinds of cultural responses to such institutions are possible given the world cultural diversity as a whole.¹⁵⁵

The interpretations of Berman, Habermas, and Giddens offer more inclusive theories on modernity and take into consideration the distinguished characteristics of the experience of modernization in the Third World.

Woolf's reaction toward the drastic changes in societies might be considered in the context of modernity experienced by the individuals. Her struggle to break the image of modernity, which is conventionally represented in white, male, heterosexual, Euro-American, middle-class terms, should be read as merely one perspective on modernity. The scientific discourse created after the Enlightenment grounds its assumptions about the nature of reality on a materialistic epistemology. The narrative style and context used by Woolf in her works were a means of challenging this materialistic philosophy. Her techniques questioned the conventional narrative forms as well as the common understanding of mind and body: her use of stream-of-consciousness transcends mind over the body; free association helps establish a direct parallelism between a solid object and flowing ideas; free indirect discourse let her weave characters' thoughts into the narrative in a way that breaks the dominance of the author over the characters in the novel; the tunneling technique makes the reader go deeply into the minds of the characters to find a common point of view about a subject. By her techniques and the context that criticizes the anthropological turn in society, Woolf challenged the European model of a single form of modernity and its application to Western discourse.

¹⁵⁵ Giddens, *The Consequences*, 174-5.

Woolf's analyses of changes in society were about the effects of modernity on Western societies, especially on Western Europe; therefore, we cannot read the influence of modernity on non-Western societies through Woolf's works. Some critics consider the process of modernization in non-Western societies as unique to its location; that is, each Eastern country should become modernized through its own dynamics and characteristics. Individual analyses on modernization in Eastern societies are necessary; however, we should also pay attention to the fact that there is one form of Western influence on non-Western societies, which is constructed on the essentialist model of modernization for all Eastern societies. This 'perfect' Western model is often not questioned by non-Western societies and is taken as the only form of modernization. However, as Berman and many other intellectuals mention, the unilateral form of modernization, which should then be called Westernization, was in most cases inappropriate to the cultural and social principles of societies and caused crises in several layers of the societies. Social, cultural, religious, educational, and even geographical conditions of societies were in most cases not convenient as a Western model, which was nevertheless taken for granted. Turkish Westernization is a good example of this incompatibility, as Kemal Tahir points out in his *Notlar/Batıllaşma*:

Shortly, the reason of failure in our struggle to 'reach Western civilization' stems from the fact that the Ottoman Empire was in the form of like office-holder, and its socio-economic structure was not convenient [...]. Kemalists could not get rid of the *Tanzimat* tradition and fell into the error of completely adopting the institutions, originally organized for the bourgeois societies of the West [...]. Since Westerners did not create a different technique and science particular to us, this predicament is the result of differences between the societies. They focus on individuals, so they are willy-nilly selfish; however, we have social personalities [...] despite our struggle for Westernization, which makes us selfish.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ Tahir, *Notlar/Batıllaşma*, 38, 78.

Tanpınar's works are best understood in this context. He often points out that modern Turkish literature "begins with a crisis of civilization."¹⁵⁷ This crisis of civilization was due to a form of modernization that was taken for granted and whose applicability to Turkish society was not questioned. Mehmet Aydın defines this difference in terms of geography: "The forms of modernity in the Western and Islamic societies are completely different from each other. While modernization in the West is a spontaneous result of an historical and social reality, in some other countries, it is a painful process of imitation and failure."¹⁵⁸ What made this process "painful" is the misunderstood characteristics of it. Started in the late Ottoman period and continued into the early Republican era, many intellectuals misunderstood the basics of modernization. It was not even a complete adoption of Western values since they tended to reject the past and tradition. However, as previously discussed, Western modernization did not necessarily erase its cultural heritage but even grounded some of its fundamental institutions on its religious, cultural, and political past.

Tanpınar valued the past and the use of tradition to enrich the present; he used tradition as a reference point. This valuation of tradition is seen in all his works and distinguishes him or sets him apart from his contemporaries. The loneliness that he often complains about in his diary is to a significant extent due to his insightful thoughts on tradition and cultural heritage, which contributed to his being labeled as a conservative by his contemporaries. He was not a religious person but was accused of being old-fashioned, like religious people of the time. He defended the idea that modernization did not mean the rejection of traditional heritage but rather reaching an advanced level of industrialization. Therefore, he should not have been labeled as an old-fashioned traditionalist but a vigorous advocate of true Westernization. From this perspective, Tanpınar had thoughts similar to T.S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf.

Some late Ottoman intellectuals and most of Tanpınar's contemporaries considered modernization in a form that was neither exactly Western nor traditionalist. There are significant reasons for this misinterpretation of modernization. First, most Republican intellectuals considered the West as a whole

¹⁵⁷ Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine*, 104.

¹⁵⁸ Mehmet S. Aydın, "Din ve Modernite Üzerine," *İzlenim* 27 (1995): 30.

as if there were only one society labeled as “the West,” with the same philosophy, culture, and identity. This assumption stemmed from the fact that Westernization was a state project in the early years of the Turkish Republic. If they had considered the unique characteristics of Western societies, they could have discovered that what was adopted as the principles of the West and the Westernization was not in fact Western. Each society in the West modernized gradually throughout its history and according to its own dynamics; therefore, they did not encounter most of the problems that non-Western societies now experience. Kemal Tahir criticizes the Republican form of Westernization:

There are a few fundamental forgeries in Westernization. First is to generalize the West [...] as if there were a single West that has unique thought on the matter and belief, all unilateral. Generalization of the West is the best way for the state to hide the high treason. [...]. We have never given the name of the country or government, but rather just said “the ‘West’”: blurry, nasty, and merciless.¹⁵⁹

The second reason for misconceiving the West as a whole was due to its representation in the non-Western world. Napoleon’s assertion on history as “an agreed-upon fiction and the only true philosophy”¹⁶⁰ shows how the idea of Europeanness was formed and was proclaimed to societies outside the West. The evangelizing mission of the Christian West turned into a civilizing – and colonizing – mission since there was the West, superior and civilized, and there was the East, inferior and thus to be civilized. In *Orientalism*, Edward Said claims that the image of a single civilizing Europe was created after Napoleon’s French Campaign in 1798:

The keynote of the relationship was set for the Near East and Europe by the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt in 1798, an invasion which was in many ways the very model of a truly scientific appropriation of one culture by another, apparently stronger one. For with Napoleon's occupation of Egypt processes were set in motion between East and

¹⁵⁹ Tahir, *Notlar/Batılılaşma*, 74-75.

¹⁶⁰ Herold, *The Mind of Napoleon*, xxvi, 244, 255.

West that still dominate our contemporary cultural and political perspectives.¹⁶¹

Mircea Eliade, in his foreword to *The Myth of the Eternal Return or Cosmos and History*, approaches Western unilateralism from a different perspective:

Western philosophy is dangerously close to ‘provincializing’ itself [...]: first by jealously isolating itself in its own tradition and ignoring, for example, the problems and solutions of Oriental thought; second by its obstinate refusal to recognize any ‘situations’ except those of the man of the historical civilization, in defiance of the experience of ‘primitive’ man, of man as a member of the traditional societies.¹⁶²

Edward Shils has similar remarks in his book, *The Intellectual between Tradition and Modernity*. After defining the unique and untransferable characteristics of Western culture, Shils claims that “Asia and Africa have in consequence been pushed, in the course of the past one and a half centuries, into a condition of provinciality vis-à-vis the great cultural capitals of the Western world – London, Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Leiden, Utrecht, Berlin, New York, etc.”¹⁶³

According to Bedri Gencer, there is a third reason for the West’s pushing non-Western societies to modernize in the Western form: hegemony. Gencer claims in the introduction to his comprehensive study, *İslam’da Modernleşme* [Modernization in Islam], that hegemony as the hard power increases its effects only if it is supported by cultural leadership. Whoever dominates economically, technologically, militarily, and politically holds the power to dictate the norms and institutions in the global level. Gencer analyses the West in this context and asserts that the Western terms and norms have become the universal terms and norms due to Western hegemonic discourse. This universalization of the Western form, Gencer remarks, means legitimization and continuation of Western power.¹⁶⁴ Gencer’s assertion that the West legitimized itself by making unique Western norms universal is supported by

¹⁶¹ Said, *Orientalism*, 42.

¹⁶² Mircea Eliade, foreword to *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959), xii.

¹⁶³ Edward Shils, *The Intellectual between Tradition and Modernity: The Indian Situation* (Berlin: Mouton & Company, 1969), 11.

¹⁶⁴ Bedri Gencer, *İslam’da Modernleşme* (Ankara: Lotus Yayınları, 2008), 51.

Stephen Toulmin in a slightly different way. Toulmin claims that this “project for a *characteristica universalis* was never meant only as an ‘instrument of Reason’ for use among philosophers with abstract philosophical purposes. Aside from its possible utility in diplomatic negotiations and other international exchanges, it would also help to heal the wounds in the body of Christian Europe.”¹⁶⁵ Toulmin sees the project of modernity, including modernization and to certain extent secularization, in this context and considers it a transformation of the cosmopolis or social order.

Turkish modernization should be considered within this context since it had great influence on Islamic countries, including the Ottoman Empire and, later, the Republic of Turkey. Starting with Napoleon’s French Campaign in Egypt in 1798, this process of “othering” and cultural influence caused Muslim scholars to reinterpret Islam in accordance with their understanding of the West, which resulted in intellectual modernization in the late Ottoman period. After the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, Republican intellectuals believed that there was one form of modernization – the Western form. Among these early Republican intellectuals, Tanpınar who different thoughts from his contemporaries. As a writer and thinker who closely followed, studied, and wrote about the West, Tanpınar was perhaps one of the few intellectuals who saw that the image of the West and Western modernization represented in non-Western societies was quite different from true Western modernization. Tanpınar’s awareness, however, did not save him from depression: on the contrary, it was the source of his depression and loneliness.

We should conclude this chapter by asking whether there was or is any alternative form of modernization for non-Western societies. Some Asian countries such as Japan have modernized without rejecting its traditions and past, but as Nilüfer Göle suggests in her *Melez Desenler*, perhaps these “Asian” values were preserved just to challenge and transgress the Anglo-American thought insidiously penetrating the society.¹⁶⁶ Is this a lesson for Turkey? Can Turkey modernize through its own dynamics? Can Egypt, Turkey, and other Islamic societies establish a new form of modernization that emphasizes their religious and cultural similarities and differences? These and other questions await further research.

¹⁶⁵ Toulmin, *Cosmopolis*, 102.

¹⁶⁶ Nilüfer Göle, *Melez Desenler: İslam ve Modernlik Üzerine* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2011), 159.

CONCLUSION

In his “Life and Literature,” Mario Vargas Llosa points out that “it is literature, not science, that has been the first to explore the depths of human behavior and discover its terrifying destructive and self-destructive potential. So a world without literature would be blind in part to these terrible depths where the reasons for unusual behavior can frequently be found.”¹ The tragedy that Woolf and Tanpınar experienced during their lives and that led them to depression can be well explained with Llosa’s description of human behavior and its self-destructive potential. The unusual behavior of Woolf and Tanpınar stemmed from their encounter with the unusual changes in their societies; it was their works, and especially their diaries, that reveal the depths of their reactions and their self-destructive positions in their societies.

This dissertation has investigated an important source of Woolf and Tanpınar’s tragedy by analyzing their diaries. Their awareness of cultural change and its effects led them to show their reactions in their works, in which their depression can be seen clearly. As opposed to several claims by other critics who focus mainly on their problems of sexual dissatisfaction, poverty, and physical ailments, this study claims that their concerns about social transformation were the main realities that they could not escape and thus became the central motive for their depression. The fact that the majority of critics have focused on some minor problems and missed the bigger picture is related to the fact that Woolf and Tanpınar are often considered as novelists so that critics concentrate only on their novels. However, their reactions toward drastic social change should be studied in association with their psychological depression, leading Woolf to suicide and Tanpınar to the edge of suicide.²

For this very reason, Woolf and Tanpınar’s diaries hold great significance by showing their psychological conditions as the diaries are the site of their conflict between aesthetics and politics, as well as their inner struggles to define their roles as artists in the literary community. For Woolf, the diary was her most comfortable

¹ Mario Vargas Llosa, “Life and Literature,” in *Touchstones: Essays on Literature, Art, and Politics* (London: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2011), 147.

² Enginün and Kerman, *Günlüklerin Işığında*, 150.

literary mode and “a cornerstone for her total artistic undertaking.”³ Therefore, in addition to her struggle in life and her reaction toward social conditions, her literary inclinations can be best understood through a careful analysis of her diary. Tanpınar’s diary on the other hand is full of impressions, plans, novel and poetry drafts, inner conflicts, feelings and opinions about his surroundings, depressive moments, and even his sexual desires; all are recorded in the diary. He made long lists of essays he planned to write and to compile in his books, some of which materialized but others remained merely as plans. The significance of their personal writings make their diaries the main texts in this study, in which Woolf and Tanpınar’s reactions as well as their depression can be analyzed. Therefore, making the diaries of Woolf and Tanpınar the central focus of this study helps us to interpret social changes in European and Turkish societies in addition to Woolf and Tanpınar’s impact on literature.

If there was a transition occurring from one civilization to another, this transformation was wrought by knowledge and culture as much as by material factors such as military force and the use of nature in early history. This epochal shift should therefore be seen as a multidimensional model, which in Giddens’ words has four dimensions: “capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power.”⁴ I consider Giddens’ institutional dimensions in the context of Western influence on non-Western societies since these are the transformative dynamics of modernity that have become universal in the last phase of modernity. Through the so-called globalized dynamics of transformation, every aspect of existence has been challenged and a trend of de-traditionalization has spread all over the world, though it especially affected non-Western societies. Giddens conceives of capitalism as an exploitative system of commodity production and circulation that has victimized non-Western societies due to its “strongly competitive and expansionist nature.”⁵ If we consider the period right after the foundation of the Turkish Republic, we see a struggle to establish a capitalist system that was a huge failure. Institutions, corporations, social and economic attitudes that were expected to be local and

³ Simons, *Diaries and Journals of Literary Women from Fanny Burney to Virginia Woolf*, 170.

⁴ Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 59.

⁵ Giddens, 56.

national, were a rootless and weird imitation of Western capitalism. As Kemal Tahir mentions, “The bourgeoisie can under no circumstances be capitalists in the Western form. The social conditions are not like those in the eighteenth century since the historical feudal conditions that created capitalism do not exist.”⁶

Giddens’s industrialism depends on “the use of inanimate sources of material power in the production of goods, coupled to the central role of machinery in the production process. [...] Industrialism presupposes the regularized social organization of production in order to coordinate human activity, machines, and the inputs and outputs of raw materials and goods.”⁷ Industrialism is somewhat related to Giddens’s other two concepts, surveillance and military power, as the coordination of human activity and seeking raw materials dominated all the dynamics in the twentieth century. Defined by Giddens as “the supervision of the activities of subject populations in the political sphere, [...] which] is indirect and based upon the control of information,”⁸ surveillance’s connection to industrialism and military power can best be understood in the context of colonialism and later in the industrialization of war. Colonialism through the use of military power was not just a matter of physical subjugation, but more importantly its cultural and social impact on non-Western societies was assimilative. In his article “Modernism’s Last Post,” Stephen Slemon asserts that

Western culture is coming to understand that [...] the ‘armed version’ of modernism is colonialism itself, and that modernism’s most heroically self-privileging figurative strategies [...] would have been unthinkable had it not been for the assimilative power of Empire to appropriate the cultural work of a heterogeneous world ‘out there’ and to reproduce it for its own social and discursive end.⁹

Slemon’s identification of assimilative power of Empire is important to understand Europe’s provincializing strategy toward non-Western societies. It is also important in terms of understanding the continuation of hegemonic structure as a new wave of domination. We should briefly mention the idea of postmodernism here

⁶ Tahir, *Notlar/Batılılaşma*, 49-50.

⁷ Giddens, *The Consequences*, 56.

⁸ Giddens, 58.

⁹ Slemon, “Modernism’s Last Post,” 1.

since the world became more heterogeneous because of decolonization in many countries, increase in immigration, the power of diasporas, and technological advancements. These social changes might have pushed Europe to produce a new world order, as modernism was turned into postmodernism “for [Europe’s] own social and discursive end.”¹⁰ Non-Western societies were now faced with a different form of hegemonic structure. Considering that postmodernism refers to philosophical ideas that were mainly derived from poststructuralist theory and cultural formations, global popular culture is now the instrument that replaces military superiority and physical imposition. Postmodernism appears as the continuation and the latest phase of Western modernity. Ziauddin Sardar powerfully expresses this view in his *Postmodernism and the Other: The New Imperialism of Western Culture*:

Postmodernism, particularly from the perspective of the Other, the non-Western cultures, is simply a new wave of domination riding on the crest of colonialism and modernity. [...] Postmodern relativism embraces the Other, making alterity far more than just the representation of all non-Western cultures and societies. Alterity is the condition of difference in any binary pair of differences; there is even alterity within the self. Thus postmodernism avoids, by glossing over, the politics of non-Western marginalization in history by suddenly discovering Otherness everywhere, and arguing that everything has its own kind of Otherness by which it defines itself. While this proves the triumph of the postmodern thesis that everything is relative, it is incapable of suggesting that anything is in some distinctive way itself, with its own history. The postmodern prominence of the Other becomes a classic irony. Instead of finally doing justice to the marginalized and demeaned, it vaunts the category to prove how unimportant, and ultimately meaningless, is any real identity it could contain. We are all Others now, can appropriate the Other, consume artifacts of the Other, so what does it matter if Others want something different in their future such as the chance to make it for themselves!

¹⁰ Slemon, 1.

Postmodernism is thus several quantum leaps above colonialism and modernity. Colonialism was about the physical occupation of non-Western cultures. Modernity was about displacing the present and occupying the minds of non-Western cultures. Postmodernism is about appropriating the history and identity of non-Western cultures as an integral facet of itself, colonizing their future and occupying their being.¹¹

Even though I never mention postmodern influences on the Republican writers, I consider the idea of the West in the minds of Kemalist writers of the early Republican period as having been under a strong influence of this new wave of domination. It also helps understand the common criticism of the Kemalist élite that Westernization as the dominating ideology of the late Ottoman – including Tanzimat – and the official ideology of the early years of the Turkish Republic was ironic since it was the imitation of the West against which the reforms were made and later the Independence War was waged. The physical control was overthrown by the Independence War but was replaced by cultural hegemony. The form of modernization in Turkey was a part of this cultural and social domination by Western societies: the initial objective of modernization was technological and industrial developments, not ideological, religious, or cultural transformation. However, from the late Ottoman Empire to the early Republic – and I dare to say ‘until now’ – Westernization has often been considered as the requirement for change in cultural and social identity. Attila İlhan expresses this wrong interpretation of modernization:

Well, if we haven’t taken Westernization as a social and economic modernization, how do we take it then? As a paradise on earth created by the cinema, novels, news reports, and comments on the radio? The process of transition was not guided by precursors of economic and social developments but by bureaucrat intellectuals. Therefore, the West has been designed as if it were a dream society. Everything is

¹¹ Ziauddin Sardar, *Postmodernism and the Other: The New Imperialism of Western Culture* (Chicago: Pluto Press, 1998), 13.

bad in the East, and good in the West! We are supposed to do exactly what they do to become human.¹²

The problem was that almost all the debates on Westernization had religious references: those who are in favor of Westernization have been labeled sometimes as Kemalists, often Leftists, and almost always liberals. These groups were never considered religious since religion and Westernization have been falsely considered to contradict each other. However, while there exists those who are pious but who also seriously support Westernization, there also exists those who are nonreligious but who are also strictly against unquestioned adaptation of Western ideas and values. This dilemma stemmed from the form of modernization that was represented by the West and that was misinterpreted by the early Republican intellectuals. As Kemal Tahir points out, “Since the nineteenth century, Western imperialist powers have compelled us to Westernize in their own way, which we should accept [...]. For one society to modernize, it is not necessary to reject, despise, and break away from its own history.”¹³

Tanpınar’s position should be considered – and has been considered in this study – within the context of his resistance toward the imposed form of modernization. He often pointed out that modern Turkish literature “begins with a crisis of civilization.”¹⁴ This crisis of civilization was due to a form of modernization that was taken for granted and whose applicability to Turkish society was unquestioned. The imposed form of modernization required a complete adoption of Western values and cultural forms and the rejection of tradition and the past. I define it as imposed since it was not a true Western form of modernization: Western modernization did not necessarily erase its cultural heritage but even grounded some of its fundamental institutions on its religious, cultural, and political past. Therefore, it was the non-Western version of Western modernization, which held provincializing and hegemonic characteristics. The previous discussion on global popular culture as the continuation of Western hegemony on non-Western societies can be exemplified by Turkish modernization – especially the Westernization process after the foundation

¹² İlhan, *Hangi Batı?*, 16.

¹³ İlhan, 16.

¹⁴ Tanpınar, *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*, 104.

of the Turkish Republic – which already started to have an impact in the first half of the twentieth century.

Tanpınar had a different understanding of Turkish modernization: he valued the past and the use of tradition to enrich the present; he used tradition as a reference point. This valuation of tradition is seen in all his works and distinguishes him or sets him apart from his contemporaries. The loneliness that he often complains about in his diary was to a significant extent due to his distinctive thoughts on tradition and cultural heritage. His thoughts contributed to his being labeled a conservative by his contemporaries. He was not a religious person but was accused of being old-fashioned – as religious people were then considered to be. He defended the idea that modernization did not mean to reject traditional heritage but to reach an advanced level of industrialization.

Woolf's analysis of changes in society was about the effects of modernity on Western societies, especially on Western Europe. She criticized the transition in her society and challenged the European model of a single form of modernity and its application to Western discourse. Therefore, her struggle to break the image of modernity, which is conventionally represented in white, male, heterosexual, Euro-American, middle-class terms, should be read within the context of having a single perspective on modernity. Her rejection of these was a part of the modernist project. The scientific discourse created after the Enlightenment grounds its assumptions about the nature of reality on a materialistic epistemology. The narrative style and the context used by Woolf in her works were a means of challenging this philosophy. Her techniques questioned the conventional narrative forms as well as common understanding of mind and body: her use of stream-of-consciousness technique transcends the mind-body dichotomy; free association establishes a direct parallelism between a solid object and flowing ideas; free indirect discourse let her weave characters' thoughts into the narrative in a way that breaks the dominance of the author on the characters in the novel; the tunneling technique makes the reader go deeply into minds of the characters and find common points of view of a subject.

To conclude, this study has shown that Woolf and Tanpınar's concerns on social transformation were the main realities that they could not escape and thus became the central motive for their depression. Their awareness of changes in civilization caused

them to react through writing, and also led them to experience a tragedy. Tanpınar's works are among the best sources that describe the impact of Turkish modernization on Turkish society. His diary brings a different interpretation to this social transition since it helps us to analyze the deepest concerns of Tanpınar and thus sheds a light on the ambivalence of him and the whole society. Woolf experienced a similar tragedy from a different cultural perspective. She emphasized that a change in human character is a sign of decadence, and she identified a twentieth-century crisis. She also commented on the European form of modernization. To prove that Turkish modernization was neither traditional nor truly Western but in a different form – perhaps Westernizer – this study compares and contrasts the Enlightenment and modernity. Woolf and some other intellectuals' comments on modernity and change in European societies are important to understand since without a careful analysis of Western modernization, the Turkish modernization cannot be understood. This dissertation makes an original contribution to understanding the position of Woolf, Tanpınar, and their works – especially their diaries – in the context of social and psychic transformation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, H. Porter. "Old Virginia and the Night Writer: The Origins of Woolf's Narrative Meander." In *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women's Diaries*. Ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and Cynthia A. Huff. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996. 23-51.
- Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness.'" *Massachusetts Review* 18 (1977): 782-94.
- Ahmad, Feroz. *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2003.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları, 2005.
- Alptekin, Turan. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Bir Kültür, Bir İnsan*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2010.
- Al-Tahtawi, Rifa'a R. *An Imam In Paris: Al-Tahtawi's Visit To France 1826-1831*. Trans. Daniel L. Newman. London: Saqi Books, 2011.
- Andrews, Walter G. "A Revisionist Thesis for the Esthetics of the Ottoman Gazel." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 24 (1986): 1-21.
- Anonymous. *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*. Ed. Alexandre Tuetey. Quai Malquais: A Paris Chez H. Champion, 1881. See Gutenberg Project. <https://archive.org/details/journaldunbourgeo00tuet> (Accessed April 2013)
- Apter, Emily. "Global Translatio: The 'Invention' of Comparative Literature, Istanbul, 1933." *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 29, No. 2 (Winter 2003): 253-281.
- Atış, Sarah M. *Semantic Structuring in the Modern Turkish Short Story*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983.
- Asimov, Isaac. *Far As Human Eye Could See: Essays on Science*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Auerbach, Eric. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2003.
- Aydın, Cemil. *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*. New York: Columbia Press, 2013.
- Aydın, Mehmet S. "Din ve Modernite Üzerine." *İzlenim* 27 (1995): 28-34.

- Babur, Zahiruddin Muhammad. *The Baburnama: Memoirs of Babur, Prince and Emperor*. Ed. Wheeler M. Thackston. NY: The Modern Library, 2002.
- Bakewell, Sarah. *How to Live: A Life of Montaigne in One Question and Twenty Attempts at an Answer*. London: Vintage, 2011.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity." In *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990. 4-256.
- Battuta, Ebu A.M. Ibn. *Ibn Battuta Seyahatnamesi*. 2 Vols. Trans. A. Sait Aykut. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010.
- Batur, Enis. "Tanpınar'la Başbaşa." *Cumhuriye Kitap*, No. 962. (24 July 2008), 3-4.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*. Ed. Jonathan Mayne. London: Phaidon Press, 1995.
- Baydar, Mustafa. *Edebiyatçılarımız Ne Diyorlar*. İstanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitabevi, 1960.
- Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications, 1992.
- Beer, Gillian. "Woolf in Wartime, and Townsend Warner Too." In *Virginia Woolf's Bloomsbury*, Vol. 2. Ed. Lisa Shahriari and Gina Potts. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 1-16.
- Belge, Murat. "Essentialism." In *Balkan Literatures in the Era of Nationalism*. Ed. Murat Belge and J. Parla. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2009. 15-52.
- . *Militarist Modernleşme*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012.
- Bell, Anne O. "Editing Virginia Woolf's Diary." In *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*. Ed. James M. Haule and J.H. Stape. NY: Palgrave Publishers, 2002. 11- 24.
- Bell, Clive. *Art*. Charleston: Nabu Press, 2010.
- Bell, Quentin. *Virginia Woolf: A Biography: Virginia Stephen*. London: Hogarth Press, 1972.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: C. Hurst & CO. Ltd., 1998.
- . *Türk Düşününde Batı Sorunu*. İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1975.

- Berlin, Isaiah. "Counter-Enlightenment." In *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*, edited by Henry Hardy. New York: Viking Press, 1979. 1-24.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Penguin, 1988.
- Bey, Direktör Ali. *Seyahat Jurnali*. İstanbul: A. Asaduryan Matbaası, 1896.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. NY: Routledge, 1994.
- Blackstone, Bernard. *Virginia Woolf*. Essex: Longman's, Green & Co. Ltd., 1969.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon*. London: Papermac, 1994.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "I Write for Myself and Strangers': Private Diaries as Public Documents." In *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women's Diaries*. Ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and C.A. Huff. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.
- Boswell, James. *Life of Johnson*. New York: Oxford World's Classics, 2008.
- Bowles, Paul. *In Touch: The Letters of Paul Bowles*. Edited by Jeffrey Miller. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995.
- Caramagno, Thomas C. "Manic-Depressive Psychosis and Critical Approaches to Virginia Woolf's Life and Work." *PMLA* 103 (1988), 10 -23.
- Childs, Peter. *Modernism*. NY: Routledge, 2002.
- Cressy, David. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Çelebi, Evliya. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*. 2 Vols. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2011.
- Çelebi, Yirmisekiz Mehmet. *Paris'te Bir Osmanlı Sefiri: Yirmisekiz Mehmet Çelebi'nin Fransa Seyahatnamesi*. Ed. Şevket Rado. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2006.
- Cleveland, William L. and M. Bunton. *A History of the Modern Middle East*. PA: Westview Press, 2009.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Delany, Paul. *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1969.
- Dellaloğlu, Besim F. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası*. İstanbul: Kapi Yayınları, 2012.

- Durant, Will and Ariel Durant. *The Story of Civilization: The Age of Voltaire*. World Library Electronically Enhanced Text, 1994.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labour in Society*. London: Macmillan Press, 1984.
- Düzdağ, M. Ertuğrul. *Mehmet Akif Hakkında Araştırmalar 1-2*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2006.
- Efendi, Sıratip Ahmed. *Rûznâme*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1993.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959.
- Eliot, T.S. *The Waste Land*. Ed. Michael North. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.
- . “Tradition and the Individual Talent.” In *T.S. Eliot: Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1999. 13-22.
- Ellison, Grace. *Turkey Today*. London: Hutchinson & Company, 1928.
- Emerson, Ralph W. “Self-Reliance.” In *Essays*. PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Electronic Classics Series, 2001.
- Enginün, İnci and Z. Kerman, eds. *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar’la Başbaşa*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.
- Enginün, İnci. *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı, Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010.
- Esslin, Martin. Introduction to *Absurd Drama*. Ed. Martin Esslin. Baskerville: Penguin Books, 1974. 7-23.
- Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Ed. William Bray. London: M. Walter Dunne Publisher, 1901.
- Eyüpoğlu, Sabahattin. “Tanpınar’da Zaman.” In “*Bir Gül Bu Karanlıklarda*”: *Tanpınar Üzerine Yazılar*. Edited by Abdullah Uçman and H. İnci. İstanbul: 3F Yayınları, 2008. 132-135.
- Fikret, Tevfik. “Sis.” In *Rubâb-ı Şikeste*. Ed. Abdullah Uçman and H. Akay. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2007. 295-300
- Fish, Stanley E. *Suprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1998.

- Fleishman, Avrom. “‘To Return to St. Ives’: Autobiographical Writings,” *ELH* Vol. 48, No. 3(Autumn 1981): 606-618.
- Forster, E. M. “Virginia Woolf.” In *The Bloomsbury Group: A Collection of Memoirs and Commentar*. Ed. Stanford P. Rosenbaum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995. 222-247.
- Fothergill, Robert A. *Private Chronicles*. Cambridge: Oxford UP, 1974.
- Foucault, Michel. *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984*. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Frank, Anne. *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl*. Translated by B.M. Mooyaart Doubleday. NY: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1963.
- Fuat, Mehmet. “Günlük Hakkında.” In *Türk Dili* Vol. 11, No. 127 (April 1962): 434-35.
- . “Haftanın Kitabı: Yahya Kemal.” In “*Bir Gül Bu Karanlıklarda*”: *Tanpınar Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Abdullah Uçman and H. İnci. İstanbul: 3F Yayınları, 2008. 136-137.
- Gannet, Cintia. *Gender and the Journal: Diaries and Academic Discourse*. New York: SUNY, 1992.
- Gay, Jane de. *Virginia Woolf’s Novels and the Literary Past*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Gelvin, James L. *The Modern Middle East: A History*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Gencer, Bedri. *İslam’da Modernleşme*. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları, 2008.
- Gerth, H.H. and C.W. Mills, eds. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford UP, 1946.
- Gibbs, E.J.W. *The History of Ottoman Poetry*. Vol. 5. London: Luzac & Co., 1907.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1996.
- Gide, André. *The Counterfeiters: A Novel*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.
- . *Journals*. Vols. 3 & 4. Trans. Justin O’Brien. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- . *The Fruits of the Earth*. New York: Peter Pauper Press, 1969.
- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.
- Glendinning, Victoria. *Leonard Woolf: A Biography*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006.

- Greenberg, Clement. "Modernist Painting." Last Access 05 February 2014.
<http://www.sharecom.ca/greenberg/modernism.html>
- Greville, Charles C.F. *The Greville Memoirs: A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852*, Vol. 2. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1885.
- Goldman, Jane. *Modernism, 1910-1945: Image to Apocalypse*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Gournay, Marie le Jars de. *Preface to the Essays of Michel de Montaigne*. Ed. François Rigolot. Trans. Richard Hillman. Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998.
- Gökalp, Ziya. *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*. London: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Göknar, Erdağ. "Ottoman Past and Turkish Future: Ambivalence in A.H. Tanpınar's *Those Outside the Scene*." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 102, No. 2 (2003), 647-661.
- Göle, Nilüfer. *Melez Desenler: İslam ve Modernlik Üzerine*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2011.
- Güven, Güler. *Tanpınar'dan Yeni Ders Notları*. İstanbul: Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı Yayınları, 2008.
- Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity: An Unfinished Project." In *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity*. Ed. Maurizio P. D'Entrèves and S. Behabib. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996. 38-58.
- . *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon, 1984.
- Hakkı, İbrahim. "Is Turkey Progressing?" *The Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review and Oriental and Colonial Record* (April 1892): 265-279.
- Halid, Halil. *The Diary of a Turk*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1903.
- Haller, William. *The Rise of Puritanism*. West Sussex: Columbia UP, 1957.
- Halman, Talat S. *A Millennium of Turkish Literature: A Concise History*. New York: Syracuse UP, 2011.
- . "Yaşadıkça Yazılan." In *Türk Dili*, Vol. 11, No: 127 (April 1962): 436-41.
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2008.

- . “Blueprints for a Future Society: Late Ottoman Materialists on Science.” In *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy*. Ed. Elizabeth Özdalga. NY: Routledge, 2013. 27-116.
- Haynes, Kenneth, ed. “Introduction.” *Writings on Philosophy and Language*, by Johann G. Hamann. Ed. Kenneth Haynes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. vii-xxv.
- Hazlitt, William. *Table-Talk or, Original Essays*. London: John Warren, Old Bond Street, 1821.
- Herold, J. Christopher, ed. *The Mind of Napoleon: A Selection from His Written and Spoken Words*. Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Hodgson, Marshall G.S. *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*. Vol. 3. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Hourani, Albert. *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, 1789-1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998: 70.
- Howard, Douglas A. *The History of Turkey*. CT: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Hussein, Taha. *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2010.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Point Counter Point*. London: Dalkey Archieve Press, 1996.
- Huyghe, Patrick. “Diary Writing Turns a New Leaf.” *New York Times*, 8 November 1981.
- İleri, Selim. “Bir Roman için Virginia Woolf.” *Zaman*, November 9, 2008.
http://www.zaman.com.tr/selim-ileri/bir-roman-icin-virginia-woolf_758331.html
- İlhan, Attila. *Hangi Batı?*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2003.
- İnci, Handan. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Tanpınar Zamanı, Son Bakışlar*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. London: Urban Romantics, 2013.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Answer the Question: What is Enlightenment?* Trans. Daniel Fidel Ferrer. See Archieve.org:
<https://ia801900.us.archive.org/10/items/AnswerTheQuestionWhatIsEnlightenment/KantEnlightmentFerrer.pdf> (Last Access February 2014)
- . *Critique of Pure Reason*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Karpat, Kemal. *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2012.

- . *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History*. Leide: Brill, 2002.
- . *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State*. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Kaplan, Mehmet. *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2013.
- Keene, Donald. *Anthology of Japanese Literature: From the Earliest Era to the Mid-nineteenth Century*. NY: Grove Press, 1955.
- Kefeli, Emel. *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat İncelemeleri*. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2000.
- Kerman, Zeynep. *Tanpınar'ın Mektupları*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.
- Knights, Mark. "Diaries of the Seventieth Century,"
http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/civil_war_revolution/diaries_01.shtml
(Last access April 2013)
- Konuk, Kader. *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Korkut, Hasan. *Osmanlı Elçileri Gözü ile Avrupa*. İstanbul: Gökkuşbu, 2007.
- Landy, Marcia. "The Silent Woman: Towards a Feminist Critique." In *The Authority of Experience: Essays in Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Arlyn Diamond and L.R. Edwards. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988. 16-27.
- Lawrence, D.H. Kangaroo. *Kangaroo*. New York: Viking, 1960.
- Levenson, Michael, ed. *Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Lewis, Bernard, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London: Oxford UP, 1968.
- Lejeune, Phillippe. *On Diary*. Ed. Jeremy Popkin and J. Rak. Trans. Katherine Durnin. HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.
- Llosa, Mario V. "Life and Literature." In *Touchstones: Essays on Literature, Art, and Politics*. London: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011. 135-149.
- Lounsberry, Barbara. "The Diaries vs. Letters: Continuities and Contradictions." In *Virginia Woolf: Texts and Contexts, Selected Papers from the Fifth Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Beth Rigel et al. NY: Pace University Press, 1996. 93-98.
- Love, Jean. *Virginia Woolf: Sources of Madness and Art*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1977.

- Madeline Moore. *The Short Season between Two Silences: The Mystical and the Political in the Novels of Virginia Woolf*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984.
- Maitland, Frederic W. *Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen*. NY: Putnam, 1906.
- Makdisi, George. "The Diary in Islamic Geography." In *History and Theory*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (May 1986): 173-185.
- Mango, Andrew. *Atatürk*. New York: Overlook Press, 2000.
- Marcus, Jane. "Virginia Woolf and Her Violin: Mothering, Madness, and Music." In *Mothering the Mind: Twelve Studies of Writers and Their Silent Partners*. Ed. Ruth Perry and Martine W. Brownley. NY: Holmes and Meier, 1984. 180-201.
- Mardin, Şerif. *Türk Modernleşmesi*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2006.
- Marinetti, F.T. "Futurist Manifesto." In *Futurism: An Anthology*. Ed. Lawrence Rainey et al. New Haven: Yale UP, 2009. 49-53.
- Mascuch, Michael. *Origins of the Individualist Self*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1996.
- Matthews, William. *British Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of British Diaries Written between 1442 and 1942*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Mazrui, Ali A. *Cultural Forces in World Politics*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1990.
- McCarthy, Thomas. "Introduction." Jürgen Habermas. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon, 1984.
- McKay, Elaine. "The Diary Network in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century." *Eras Journal*. See <http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/publications/eras/edition2/mckay.php#4> (Last access March 2013)
- Mehmed, Fındıklılı Silahdar. *Silahdar Tarihi*. 2 Vols. İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası, 1928.
- Mills, Cliff. *Virginia Woolf*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004.
- Miner, Earl. *Japanese Poetic Diaries*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1969.
- Mirsepassi, Ali. *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization: Negotiating Modernity in Iran*. NY: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *Montaigne: Essays*. Trans. John M. Cohen. New York: Penguin Books, 1993

- Montesquieu, Charles de. *My Thoughts*. Trans. Henry C. Clark. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2012.
- Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A.H.Tanpınar'a*. Vol. 1. İstanbul: İletişim, 2009.
- Nicolson, Benedict. "Post-Impressionism and Roger Fry." *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 93, No. 574 (January 1951), 10-15.
- Nin, Anais. *The Diary of Anais Nin*. Vol. 1: 1931-1934. Harcourt: Mariner Books: 1969.
- Nusbaum, Felicity A. "Toward Conceptualizing Diary." In *Studies in Autobiography*. Ed. James Olney. NY: Oxford UP, 1988. 128-140.
- O'Flaherty, James C. *Johann Georg Hamann*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979.
- Okay, Orhan. *Batılşma Devri Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.
- . *Beşir Fuad: İlk Türk Pozitivist ve Naturalisti*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2012.
- . "Kırk Yıllık Dostluk." In *Bir Hülya Adamının Romanı*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010. 229-250.
- Pamuk, Orhan. "A Private Reading of André Gide's *Public Journal*," *Social Research* 71, no: 3 (Fall 2004): 679--690.
- . *Istanbul: Memories and the City*. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.
- Péguy, Charles. *Basic Verities: Prose and Poetry*. NY: Pantheon Books, 1945.
- Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Vol. 1. Ed. William Matthews and Robert Latham. London: G. Bell and Hyman, 1971. Also see <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4125/4125-h/4125-h.htm> (Accessed March 2013)
- Pickthall, Marmaduke. *The Glorious Qur'an*. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2002.
- Plutarch. *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*. Gutenberg Project. <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/674> (Last access April 2013)
- Podnieks, Elizabeth. *Daily Modernism: The Literary Diaries of Virginia Woolf, Antonia White, Elizabeth Smart, and Anais Nin*. Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
- Ponsonby, Arthur. *English Diaries*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1922.

- Porter, Roy. Introduction to *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. Ed. Roy Porter. NY: Routledge, 2002. 1-16.
- Pound, Ezra. *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa, or the History of a Young Lady*. New York: Penguin Books, 1985
- . *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded*. New York: Penguin Classics, 1981.
- Riker, Martin. “A Ramshackle Modernity.” *The New York Times*, 3 January 2014.
- Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, London: 1983.
- Rogers, Pat. Introduction to *Life of Johnson*. Ed. John Boswell. NY: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Confessions*. Trans. J.M. Cohen. New York: Penguin Classics, 1953.
- Russo, John Paul. *The Future without a Past*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2005.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage Books, 1994.
- . *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 2003.
- . *The World, The Text, and The Critic*. London: Vintage 1991.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. *Postmodernism and the Other: The New Imperialism of Western Culture*. Chicago: Pluto Press, 1998.
- Saint Augustine. *Confessions*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. New York: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Sawday, Jonathan. “Self and Selfhood in the Seventeenth Century.” *Rewriting the Self*. Ed. Roy Porter. NY: Routledge, 2002. 29-48.
- Sherman, Stuart. *Telling Time: Clocks, Diaries, and English Diurnal Form, 1660-1785*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Shils, Edward. *The Intellectual between Tradition and Modernity: The Indian Situation*. Berlin: Mouton & Company, 1961.
- Shikibu, Murasaki. *Diary of Lady Murasaki*. Trans. Richard Bowring. London: Penguin Classics, 2005.
- . *The Tale of Genji*. London: Penguin Classics, 2002.

- Shiran, Haruo. *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of 'The Tale of Genji.'* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- Shuger, Debora. "Life-Writing in Seventeenth-Century England." In *Representations of the Self from the Renaissance to Romanticism*. Ed. Patric Coleman et al. London: Cambridge UP, 2000. 63-78.
- Sidney, Philip. *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*. Ed. Gavin Alaxender. New York: Penguin, 2004.
- Signell, Karl L. *Makam: Modal Practice in Turkish Art Music*. New York: De Capo Press, 1986.
- Simons, Judy. *Diaries and Journals of Literary Women from Fanny Burney to Virginia Woolf*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1990.
- Slemon, Stephen. "Modernism's Last Post." In *Ariel* 20 (1989): 3-17.
- Smith, Sidonie. *A Poetics of Women's Autobiography*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- Spalding, Philip A. *Self-Harvest: A Study of Diaries and the Diarist*. London: Independent Press, 1949.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003.
- Steiner, George. *What is Comparative Literature?* Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Steinitz, Rebecca. *Time, Space and Gender in the Nineteenth-Century British Diary*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- Stewart, Janice. "'Locked in a Room of One's Own?': Querying the Quest for Keys to Woolf's 'Madness.'" *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, Vol. 2. No. 1 (January 2004): 147-175.
- Suetonius, Alexander T. *The Twelve Caesars*. KS: Digiread.com Books, 2007.
- Sumner, Rosemary. *A Route to Modernism: Hardy, Lawrence, Woolf*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.
- Süreyya, Cemal. *Günler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2013.
- Tahir, Kemal. *Notlar/Batılılaşma*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1992.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet H. *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010.
- . "Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyalari." In *Hikayeler*. Ed. İnci Enginün. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2011. 11-149.

- . *A Mind at Peace*. Trans. Erdağ Gökner. NY: Archipelago Books, 2008.
- . *Aydaki Kadın*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2009.
- . *Beş Şehir*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010.
- . *Bütün Şiirleri*. Ed. İnci Engün. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010.
- . *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.
- . *Huzur*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2009.
- . *Mahur Beste*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010.
- . *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2009.
- . *Sahnenin Dışındakiler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007.
- . *The Time Regulation Institute*. Trans. Alexander Dawe and Maureen Freely. NY: Penguin Classics, 2014.
- . *The Time Regulation Institute*. Translated by Ender Gürol. Madison: Turko Tatar, 2001.
- . *Yahya Kemal*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2006.
- . *Yaşadığım Gibi*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2006.
- . “Yaz Yağmuru.” In *Hikayeler*. Ed. İnci Engün. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2011. 153-228.
- Tidwell, Joanne C. *Politics and Aesthetics in the Diary of Virginia Woolf*. NY: Routledge, 2008.
- Tomilson, John. *Cultural Imperialism*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins UP, 1991.
- Toulmin, Stephen. *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Toynbee, Arnold. *A Study of History*. Vol. 4. London: Oxford UP, 1951.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Tsurayuki, Ki No. *The Tosa Diary*. VT: Tuttle Publishing, 2005.
- Turhan, Mümtaz. *Kültür Değişimleri*. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2010.
- Turinay, Necmettin. “Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: 1932 Öncesi ve Sonrası.” *Hece* 61 (January 2002): 77-83.
- Uçman, Abdullah. “Bir Bağlılığın Yıllarca Süren Hikayesi.” In *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*. Ed. Abdullah Uçman and H. İnci, 51--76. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2010.
- Uşaklıgil, Halit Z. *Aşk-ı Memnu*. İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları. 2012.

- Uyguner, Muzaffer. *Salah Birsal: Yaşamı, Sanatı, Şiirleri, Günlükleri, Romanı, Denemeleri, Tarihleri ile Yapıtlarından Seçmeler*. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar, 1991.
- Ülken, Hilmi Z. *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009.
- Valery, Paul. *Cahiers/Notebooks*. 5 Vols. Trans. Paul Ryan. NY: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2001-2010.
- Wesley, John. *The Journal of John Wesley*. Christian Classic Ethereal Library. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/wesley/journal.html> (Accessed April 2013).
- West, Emma. "A Modernist Mode: Fashion, 1910, and the Limits of Modernism." *A Journal of Literary Studies and Linguistics*, Vol. 1, no. 2 (December 2011): 65-78.
- Whitworth, Michael H. *Virginia Woolf*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Willy, Margaret. *English Diarists: Evelyn & Pepys*. London: Longmans & Green, 1963.
- Woltering, Robbert. *Occidentalism in the Arab World: Ideology and Images of the West in the Egyptian Media*. NY: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Woolf, Leonard, ed. *A Writer's Diary*. St. Albans: Triad/Panther Books, 1978.
- . *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939*. NY: Harcourt, 1967.
- Woolf, Stuart. *Napoleon's Integration of Europe*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- . "The Construction of a European World-View in the Revolutionary-Napoleonic Years." *Past & Present* 137 (November 1992): 72-101.
- Woolf, Virginia. *Between the Acts*. London: Mariner Books, 1970.
- . "Character in Fiction." In *Selected Essays*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. 37-54.
- . *Jacob's Room*, NY: Dover Publications, 1998.
- . Modern Fiction. In *The Essays of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 4. Ed. Andrew McNeillie, London: The Hogarth Press, 1984. 157-165
- . *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1924.
- . *Mrs. Dalloway*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1996.
- . *Night and Day*. PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Electronic Classics Series, 2001.

- . “On Being Ill.” In *Collected Essays*. Vol. 4. Harcourt Brace, 1967. 193-203.
- . “Sketch of the Past.” In *Moments of Being*. Ed. Jeanne Schulkind. Florida: Harcourt Brace, 1985. 61-160.
- . *To the Lighthouse*. London: vintage Books, 2004.
- . *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Vols. 2-5. Ed. Anne O. Bell. New York: Penguin Books, 1981-1985.
- . *Three Guinas*. Hertforshire: Wordsworth Edition, 2007.
- . *The Common Reader*. FL: Harcourt, Inc, 1984.
- . *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 1. Ed. Anne O. Bell. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979.
- . *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. 4 Vols. Ed. Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautman. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975-1980.
- . *The Waves*. New York: Mariner Books, 2006.
- . *The Years*. London: Mariner Books, 1969.
- Yavuz, Hilmi. “Kırtıpıl mı değil mi? Evet, Hangi Tanpınar?” *Zaman*, 30 January 2008, İstanbul Edition.
- . “Tanpınar: Yahya Kemal’in Ephebesi.” In *Okuma Biçimleri*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010.
- Yeats, W.B. *The Tower: A Facsimile Edition*. New York: Scribner, 2004.
- Yetkin, Suut Kemal. *Günlerin Götürdüğü*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1965.
- . “Günlük Üzerine.” In *Türk Dili*, Vol. 11, No. 127 (April 1962): 432-33.
- Zepetnek, Steven T.D. “From Comparative Literature Today Toward Comparative Cultural Studies.” In *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven T.D. Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 235-264.
- Zweig, Stefan. *Üç Büyük Usta*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012.