

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL CONTINUITY

IN THE MAKING OF OTTOMAN/TURKISH LITERARY HISTORY:

A METAHISTORIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

Ezgi Vissing

St Antony's College, University of Oxford

submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of DPhil in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies
at the University of Oxford

Michaelmas Term 2019/20

to Mica Ertegun

for being an embodiment of grace on the face of the earth

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	8
ABSTRACT	10
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	12
CHAPTER 1 - Introduction: A Brief Enquiry into the Making of Ottoman/Turkish Literary History.....	13
1. a. Surveying the Scene: A Short History and the Fundamental Concepts	13
1. b. Literature Review and the Background to the Study	33
1. c. Corpus and Method of the Study	46
CHAPTER 2 - Reading the Early Works on Ottoman/Turkish Literary History: Emerging Forms of Theory & Practice	64
2. a. Close Encounters with the Idea of Literary History & Historiography .	66
2. b. The First of its Kind: Abdülhalim Memduh and His <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye</i>	68
2. c. Theoretical Developments and their Implications for the Practice of Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography in the Case of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and His <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye</i>	83
2. d. Ali Ekrem Bolayır's Case	91
2. e. Specialization & Textuality in the Practice of Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography: Fâik Reşad & His <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye</i>	92

2. f. An Alternative Account of Ottoman/Turkish Literary History: Mehmed Hayreddin & His <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri</i>	103
2. g. Laying the Foundations: Theory and Practice	110
CHAPTER 3 - On Köprülü's Enquiry into Methodology	119
CHAPTER 4 - Early Formalizations of Method: Emergence of the Fundamental Paradigms in Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography	163
4. a. On Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's <i>Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı (History of the New Ottoman Literature)</i>	164
4. b. On Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's <i>Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri (Lectures on Turkish Literary History)</i>	184
4. c. On İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri (Lectures on Literary History)</i>	187
4. d. On Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)</i>	199
4. e. The Regulatory Change of 1925 and Its Significance for the Succeeding Works on Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography	202
CHAPTER 5 - Crystallisation of the Fundamental Dynamics in Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography: Manifestations of Theoretical and Practical Continuity in the Primary Cluster of Works	207
5. a. On İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi I-IV (History of Turkish Literature I-IV)</i>	214

5. b. On Sadettin Nüzhet Ergun's <i>Tanzimata Kadar Muhtasar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi ve Numuneleri (A Brief History of Turkish Literature and Its Examples until the Tanzimat Era)</i>	217
5. c. On Tahir Olgun's <i>Başlangıcından Tanzimat Devrine Kadar Edebiyat Tarihimize Dair Manzûm Bir Muhtıra (A Poetic Manifesto on Our Literary History from Its Beginnings until the Tanzimat Era)</i>	219
5. d. On Agâh Sırrı's <i>Levend Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri (Lectures on Literary History)</i>	222
5. e. On İsmail Habib Sevük's <i>Edebî Yeniliğimiz (Our Literary Modernity)</i>	225
5. f. On Celal Tahsin Boran's <i>Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri (Lectures on Literary History)</i>	227
5. g. On Orhan Rıza's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)</i>	230
5. h. On Mustafa Nihat Özön's <i>Metinlerle Muasır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Contemporary Turkish Literature with Texts)</i>	237
5. i. On İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's <i>Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları (Notes on the History of Literature in the Tanzimat Era)</i>	238
5. j. On Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)</i>	241
5. k. On Hüseyin Nihal Atsız's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)</i>	243

5. l. On Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay's <i>Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature from the Tanzimat Era to the Present)</i>	246
5. m. On Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's <i>Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (Illustrated History of Turkish Literature)</i>	249
5. n. On A. Ferhan Oğuzkan's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Tanzimata Dek (History of Turkish Literature – Until the Tanzimat Era)</i>	252
5. o. On Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Başlangıçtan Bugüne Kadar Türk Edebiyatının Tarihi, Tahlili ve Tenkidi (History of Turkish Literature: History, Analysis and Criticism of Turkish Literature from Its Beginnings to the Present)</i>	254
5. p. On Ahmet Kabaklı's <i>Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature)</i> ..	257
5. q. On Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Ekrem Yirmibeşin's <i>Türk Edebiyatı - Batı Örnekleriyle Birlikte (Turkish Literature with Western Excerpts)</i>	263
5. r. On Rauf Mutluay's <i>100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in 100 Questions)</i>	267
5. s. On Seyit Kemal Karaalioğlu <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)</i>	270
5. t. On Rauf Mutluay's <i>50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature of the Past Fifty Years)</i>	275
5. u. On Faruk Kadri Timurtaş's <i>Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Course of History)</i>	278

5. v. On Ömer Özcan and Mahir Ünlü's <i>20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı</i> (Twentieth Century Turkish Literature) (1987)	281
5. w. On Ahmet Oktay's <i>Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: 1923-1950</i> (Republican Era Literature: 1923-1950)	284
5. x. On Hüseyin Tuncer's <i>Tanzimat Edebiyatı</i> (Tanzimat Literature) (1994), <i>Meşrutiyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı</i> (Turkish Literature in the Constitutional Era) (1994), <i>Servet-i Fünûn Edebiyatı</i> (Servet-i Fünûn Literature) (1995), <i>Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı</i> (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era)	287
CHAPTER 6 – Enhancement of the Fundamental Dynamics in Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography: Manifestations of Theoretical and Practical Continuity in the Secondary Cluster	290
6. a. On Hasan Ali Yücel's <i>Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış</i> (A Comprehensive Look at Turkish Literature)	294
6. b. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's <i>Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (History of Nineteenth Century Turkish Literature)	299
6. c. Agâh Sırrı Levend's <i>Ümmet Çağı Türk Edebiyatı</i> (Turkish Literature at the Age of Ummah)	307
6. d. Kenan Akyüz's <i>Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri: 1860-1923</i> (The Framework of Modern Turkish Literature: 1860-1923)	310
6. e. On Agâh Sırrı Levend's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (History of Turkish Literature)	314

6. f. On Şükran Kurdakul's <i>Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı - Meşrutiyet Dönemi</i> (Contemporary Turkish Literature – The Constitutional Era) and <i>Cumhuriyet Dönemi</i> (The Republican Era)	317
6. g. Emin Özdemir's <i>Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı: Dönemler-Yönelimler</i> (Periods and Tendencies in Turkish and World Literature)	319
6. h. Attila Özkırımlı's <i>Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı</i> (Turkish Literature in the Course of History)	323
6. i. On İnci Enginün's <i>Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı</i> (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era) and <i>Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete (1839-1923)</i> (Modern Turkish Literature: From Tanzimat to the Republican Era [1839-1923])	328
6. j. On Talat Sait Halman et al.'s edition of <i>Türk Edebiyatı</i> (History of Turkish Literature)	331
6. k. On M. Kayahan Özgül et al.'s edition of <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış</i> (A Look at the History of Turkish Literature)	334
6. l. Classification of the Sources in the Corpus According to the Metahistoriographical Approach: A Visual Outline of the Resulting Analyses	336
CHAPTER 7 - Concluding Remarks: Revisiting the Making of Ottoman/Turkish Literary History	354
7. a. Recursive Clusters & Rare Deviations: The Last Hundred Years of the Ottoman/Turkish Literary Past	354

7. b. The Argument from Continuity versus the Rupture Bias: Tracing the Evolution of Texts and Context	360
BIBLIOGRAPHY	369
APPENDIX	384

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1. The Breakdown of Yearly Publication Statistics in the Ottoman Empire..	384
Table 2. The breakdown of publishing houses by cities in the Ottoman Empire (the geographical area within the present borders) and Turkey	384
Table 3. Swiggers et al.'s framework for the purposes of classification and categorization of literary histories	387
Table 4. "Table of Contents" of Abdülhalim Memduh's <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye</i>	387
Table 5. "Table of Contents" of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye</i>	389
Table 6. The Organisational Structure of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's Preface to <i>Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı</i>	391
Table 7. "Table of Contents" of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's <i>Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı</i>	393

Table 8. “Table of Contents” of Köprülü’s *Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* 394

Table 9. The sections of the preface to Dilmen’s *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* . 395

Table 10. Dilmen’s periodization and the historical milestones he refers to .. 398

Table 11. Filizok’s visualisation of the comparison between Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s *Malûmât-i Edebiyye* and Yöntem’s *Edebiyat* 400

Table 12. Orhan Rıza’s questionnaire for literary historians to establish the correct method for their work 409

ABSTRACT

The practice of literary historiography in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey is considered to be a relatively recent phenomenon, the emergence of which is thought to take place in the early twentieth century. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (1890-1966) is widely acknowledged as a pioneer of the discipline. Neither the period preceding Köprülü's input, nor the aftermath of his impact have yet come under the spotlight of rigorous scholarly research. There have been no comprehensive analytical surveys of the corpus, with a comparative perspective that evaluates the works in and of themselves as well as their similarities and differences, which could reveal the evolution of the theoretical and practical aspects of the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

The purpose of this study is to tell the untold story of the intellectual journey taken by the literary historians of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey employing a novel, analytical and systematic approach to the original texts. In this project, the focus is on the historiography of literary production in Turkish, both in Perso-Arabic script and Latin, and of the Ottoman Empire and of the Turkish Republic, although there might be historiographical practices carried out in other languages, by other peoples of the Empire. The study features an extensive analysis of the corpus, commencing with early forms of literary

historiography seen in the second half of the nineteenth century and encompassing the forty-five works written in the following period until the present day. It continues with an argument that challenges the prevalent viewpoint posited by contemporary criticism, featuring the idea of an epistemological rupture attributed to the transformations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and particularly to the formation of the Republic. Here is demonstrated that the idea of continuity dominates the course of historiographical practice, both in the theoretical and practical sense.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to have been a recipient of the Ertegun Graduate Scholarship Programme in the Humanities. The Ertegun House was my refuge in Oxford, possibly in the whole wide world for the most part - I found endless joy, comfort, and support in this beautiful space during my time in Oxford. It would not have been possible for me to fully explore my own potential, and to set out on the journey that I am enjoying now without this generous gift by Mica and Ahmet Ertegun.

When it comes to extending my gratitude to individuals who unconditionally and continuously have been there for me throughout this excruciatingly long and complicated process, I shall do so in person as my faith in the genuinity of the physical overrides the conventional value and power attributed to the verbal.

Nonetheless, thank you very much.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction:

A Brief Enquiry into the Making of Ottoman/Turkish Literary History

1. a. Surveying the Scene: A Short History and the Fundamental Concepts

In order for the reader to develop an overview of the particular discipline in focus, it is beneficial to relay the social, political and cultural conditions under which the history of Ottoman/Turkish literature begins to surface as an independent narrative, written with a strict focus on the literary production in its own right. Before presenting this concise survey, clarifying what the term “Ottoman/Turkish” signifies in the context of this study is necessary due to the complexity of the Empire’s vast literary, linguistic and cultural outlook.

In this project, I use the term “Ottoman” for denoting the social and cultural¹ habitus in which literary production is shaped within the chronological

¹ It is not my primary interest to explore the political connotations of the term, unless it is necessary for offering a contextual explanation while interpreting a specific text or a historian’s particular use.

and geographical limits of the Ottoman Empire. With a history over six hundred years and presence in three continents at the peak of its territorial expansion, the Empire accommodated a wide variety of languages and literary production throughout its rule. Apart from Turkish with its vernacular status, consisting of Turkish, Persian and Arabic elements with a Perso-Arabic script, ethnic minorities within the Empire maintained the cultural aspect of their collective identities largely by keeping their own languages and oral and/or written literary production alive. The Armenian, Judeo-Spanish, Greek and Kurdish communities as some of the demographically predominant minorities were/have been/are present in the literary scene in the Empire and, today, in Turkey. However, "Turkish literary historiography is a field of scholarship in which the contributions of non-Muslim authors and intellectuals are seldom acknowledged" (Mignon, "A Pilgrim's Progress: Armenian and Kurdish Literatures in Turkish and the Rewriting of Literary History", 182), and it is possible to extend this observation to the status of literary historiography encompassing the literatures of other minorities that mostly identify as Muslims, such as the Kurdish community. Despite being vital for developing a comprehensive and holistic understanding of literary culture in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, unanswered questions regarding the nature, the past, and the present of minority literatures persist - both in terms of the practice of literary historiography and its metahistoriographical analysis.

Given the subject-matter variety of languages and literary production observed in the Ottoman Empire, it is important to highlight the limits and the nature of literary production that the corpus of historiographical material dealt with in this study encompasses. In order to designate the scope and the

limitations of the corpus, one of the frequently used terms in this study for defining and describing the analysed works is "Ottoman/Turkish". While the first part of the term, "Ottoman", maintains the above-mentioned frame of reference, i. e. denoting the social and cultural habitus in its totality, the second part of the term designates the dominant linguistic aspect of the literary production and of its written history in question by bringing "Turkish" as a signifier that is stripped off its further connotations, i. e. ethnic. Representing a cluster that encompasses all three of these relations of signification, this term seems to accommodate the widest possible scope of references that both of these nomenclatures call without invalidating the status of under-studied literary cultures. Although recognizing the ethnically, culturally and/or linguistically diverse elements as legitimate parts of the literary past of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, this study is conducted for presenting a metahistoriographical analysis of only the works of Ottoman/Turkish literary history with the above-defined relations of signification in mind.²

Writing the history of Turkish literature is a relatively new phenomenon. The discipline of literary historiography, in the contemporary sense of the term, began in the second half of the nineteenth century in Ottoman Turkey. Accessible materials prior to this period, which can be considered as either a form of or source for literary historiography, are "tezkiretüş-şu'arâ"s³ (collections of poets' biographies, mostly including samples of their poetry), "mecmuâ"s (collections of poetry) as well as *zeyls*⁴ to *tezkiyes*, which are

² A study in which the tasks necessary and sufficient to present a historiographical and/or metahistoriographical analysis of the past of minority literatures are undertaken requires an in-depth debate on pluralistic approach in the making of literary history in terms of theory, practice and methodology, and this is beyond the objective set out for this project.

³ This term is referred to as *tezkire* hereafter.

⁴ This term is referred to as *zeyl* hereafter.

essentially addenda to these texts.⁵ This tradition of literary historiography as a practice of keeping the record of literary production in itself extends into the nineteenth century as well, and can be traced back in volumes such as *Numûne-i Edebîyyât-ı Osmaniyye* (*Examples from Ottoman Literature*) (published in 1879, by Ebüzziyâ Mehmet Tefvik [1849-1913]⁶) and *Osmanlı Edebiyatı Numuneleri* (*Examples from Ottoman Literature*) (published in 1893, by Mehmet Celâl [1867-1912]⁷).

Abdülhalim Memduh's (1866-1905) *Târih-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*), written in 1887/8, is the first volume of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography that coins the term "history of literature" in its title (Demir in "Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Bibliyografya Çalışması", ["A Bibliographical Study of Turkish Literary History"]). In the following decades, various volumes of Ottoman/Turkish literary history are produced: Şehâbeddin Süleyman's (1885-1921) *Târih-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmaniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*, 1910) and *Yeni Osmanlı Târih-i Edebiyyâtı* (*History of the New Ottoman Literature*, 1914), co-authored by Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (1890-1966), İsmail Habib Sevük's (1892-1954) *Türk Teceddüd Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of New⁸ Turkish Literature*, 1921), Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*

⁵ The term "zeyl" means "addendum" in Arabic, and it can be used for referring to the addenda to texts written in any genre, not only for *tezkiyes*, in Ottoman/Turkish literature.

⁶ Ebüzziyâ Mehmet Tefvik's date of birth and death can be found in Âlim Gür's *Ebüzziyâ Tefvik: Hayatı, Dil, Edebiyat, Basın, Yayın ve Matbaacılığa Katkıları* (*Ebüzziyâ Tefvik: His Life and Contributions to Language, Literature and Publishing*) (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1998).

⁷ Biographical information of the authors mentioned in this study are cited from Behçet Necatigil's *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü* (*Lexicon of Authors in Turkish Literature*) (1975), unless noted otherwise. The reason why this edition is preferred is because it is the last version of the work edited by the author himself.

⁸ The term "teceddüd" refers to notions such as "regeneration", "innovation", etc. Here, we preferred to translate this term as "new", because the term "new" seems to offer a sense of transformation in the context of late nineteenth century Ottoman/Turkish literature, implying a dichotomy between an "old" literature versus a "new" one and therefore satisfying the literal meaning of the term "teceddüd" as "innovation".

(*Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, 1918) and articles such as “Türk Edebiyatı Tarihinde Usûl” (“Method in Turkish Literary History, 1913) and “Türk Edebiyatının Menşei” (“Origins⁹ of Turkish Literature”, 1916) are only a few outstanding examples of those dealing with Ottoman/Turkish literature from its beginnings to the era in which they are written. From this point on, with Köprülü’s inescapable impact as an influential professor of Ottoman/Turkish literature, teaching at the University of İstanbul and Ankara at the time (actively between 1913 and 1943, and 1936 to 1941, respectively), Turkish literary historiography is a burgeoning field, beginning to incorporate varying approaches in the practice of literary historiography.

After the long nineteenth century, during which numerous social and political transformations took place such as the “Tanzimat” (a period of reforms, officially starting in 1839), the First Constitutional Era (1876-1878), the period of “istibdat” (“oppression”) under the rule of Abdülhamid II and the Second Constitutional Era (from 1908 until dissolution in 1922), the breakout of the First World War in 1914 brought the turmoil to its climax for the dissolving Ottoman Empire and the emerging Turkey. In a bid to maintain the political unity of the Empire, the intelligentsia attempted to appeal to ideologies such as Ottomanism, Islamism and the emerging Turkish nationalism. The rise of Turkish nationalism, as a systematic movement, began to materialise in the Second Constitutional Era around organisations, associations and think tanks such as *Türk Derneği* (*Turkish Association*, 1908), *Türk Yurdu* (*The Turkish Homeland Society*, 1911) and *Türk Ocağı* (*Turkish Hearth*, 1912). Endeavours

⁹ The word “menşe” may be translated as “source”, “origin” or “root” and it is used in singular form in Köprülü’s title. However, we preferred to translate it in plural form, because it refers to a total of origins of Turkish literature, rather than to “the” origin of Turkish literature.

to conceptualise Turkish nationalism started to emerge in the political agenda of “İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti” (Committee of Union and Progress, founded in 1889).

A quest for the remedy to heal the “sick man”, an exhausted metaphor for the failing Empire, took place in all areas of life. Literature, as one of the most powerful mediums of communication in Ottoman/Turkish culture, was one of these areas. In this context, the intelligentsia of the time was concerned with the question of how the “new” literature and its story ought to be in comparison to what preceded it. Defining and describing Ottoman/Turkish literature became a legitimate follow-up to such an enquiry, hence writing its history became an unavoidable task. After the first few innovative, albeit unsystematic attempts of writing the history of Ottoman/Turkish literature, Köprülü's role regarding the epistemological shift in literary historiography is of crucial importance. He argued that various aspects of historiographical methods, developed by French theorists and historians¹⁰ should be appropriated in a way in which the specific needs of Ottoman/Turkish literature could be addressed. This stance is worthy of attention in the context of early twentieth century Ottoman/Turkish intellectual history, as it is an important landmark regarding the transformation of historiographical practice in Turkish literature, both in terms of Köprülü's work in its own merits and the trend he set for the literary historians who followed his footsteps.

Köprülü, as the pioneer of a ground-breaking project for building a corpus

¹⁰ i. e. Gabriel Monod (1844-1912), Charles Seignobos (1854-1942), Charles-Victor Langlois (1863-1929), Henri Bordeaux (1870-1963), Henri Berr (1863-1954), Paul Lacombe (1834-1919), Daniel Mornet (1878-1954), Pierre-Jules Renard (1864-1910), Hippolyte Adolphe Taine (1828-1893), Ferdinand Brunetiere (1849-1906), Emile Hennequin (1859-1888), Gustave Lanson (1857-1934) (Köprülü, “Türk Edebiyatı Tarihinde Usûl”, 5)

of academic literature on Ottoman/Turkish studies, was a central figure in the intelligentsia of the early twentieth century, as well as the distinguished professor of many literary historians to come.¹¹ Although the political stances of literary historians after Köprülü may be diverse at times, ranging from radical left to national and religious extremism, one common feature to most of them seems to be Köprülü's call for Ottoman/Turkish literature to be treated as one of the fundamental sources for the study of national culture and history. Both by the literary historians preceding Köprülü (i. e. Abdülhalim Memduh, Şehâbeddin Süleyman, Fâik Reşad) and by Köprülü himself, the fundamental role of the literary historian in this period is seen to be leading the development of a national identity with a particular emphasis on its historical, social and cultural dimensions. Literary histories that were written in the twentieth and early twenty-first century mostly refer back to this viewpoint. Although it is not the case that the glorification of the national values or dismissal of non-national elements is encountered in all of these accounts, the idea of history becomes a medium through which one can make sense of the nation as a whole in this context: with a past, present, and future.

Writing history, in a similar vein, enables the historiographer to shape that understanding by presenting a picture of how a nation is composed in terms of its historical character. Practices of historiography and literary historiography are not functionally different in this respect: The stories they narrate contribute to the building of a perspective that helps the nation to be “imagined”, in the sense that Anderson uses the term. According to Anderson, a

¹¹ Nihad Sâmi Banarlı (1907-1974), Mehmet Kaplan (1915-1986), Ahmet Kabaklı (1924-2001 and Pertev Nailî Boratav (1907-1998) who received their education at the department of Turkish Language and Literature at the University of Istanbul. Some of these literary historians also taught at various universities (i. e. Mehmet Kaplan [at the University of Istanbul, from 1939 to 1983], Pertev Nailî Boratav [at the University of Istanbul and Ankara]).

nation is “an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign”, and he adds, recalling Seaton-Watson’s idea, that “[i]t is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6). Anderson argues that the idea of this imagination arose when the following cultural conceptions lost their axiomatic power: (i) a particular script-language that offers privileged access to ontological truth, (ii) the belief that society was naturally organised around and under high centres – monarchs who were persons apart from other human beings and who ruled by some form of cosmological (divine) dispensation, (iii) a conception of temporality in which cosmology and history were indistinguishable (36). For Anderson, throughout the transition from the mediaeval to the modern era, this change on men’s minds paved the way for a radical change:

The slow, uneven decline of these interlinked certainties, first in Western Europe, later elsewhere, under the impact of economic change, ‘discoveries’ (social and scientific), and the development of increasingly rapid communications, drove a harsh edge between cosmology and history. No surprise then that the search was on, so to speak, for a new way of linking fraternity, power and time meaningfully together. Nothing perhaps more precipitated this search, nor made it more fruitful, than print-capitalism, which made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to think about themselves, and to relate themselves to others, in profoundly new ways. (36)

In the particular case of literary historiography, the effect of print-capitalism described above by Anderson is manifested differently. Volumes dedicated to narrating the story of literary production in the Ottoman Empire and

Turkey point at similar purposes of self-identification as well as dissemination of information regarding the nature of an emerging identity.

Seaton-Watson's demonstration of how the nineteenth century was a golden age of vernacularising lexicographers, grammarians, philologists, and litterateurs (11) relays an intriguing parallel when one considers the birth of literary historiography in the Ottoman Empire. Examples of the Russian Academy's six-volume dictionary (written between 1789-1794) and official grammar (1802) (Anderson, 73), Ivar Aasen's new Norwegian grammar (1848) and dictionary (1850) (75), and Noah Webster's *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828) (197) are only a few of the colossal works that mark the momentum of nation-building processes throughout the globe. Similarly, Turkish dictionaries and books on Turkish grammar begin to appear in the publishing world of the Empire. Ahmed Vefik Paşa's *Lehçe-i Osmânî* (1873/1876), Muallim Nâci's (completely posthumously by Müstecâbîzâde İsmet) *Lugat-i Nâcî* (1894), and Şemseddin Sâmî's *Kâmûs-i Türkî* (1899/1900) are some of the first examples of lexicographical works in this period. Works on Turkish grammar can also be mentioned in this context, such as Ahmed Cevdet Paşa and Fuad Paşa's *Kavâid-i Osmâniyye* (1851), Süleyman Hüsnü Paşa's *İlm-i Sarf-i Türkî* (1876), Halit Ziya's *Kavâid-i Lisân-i Türkî* (1885), and Şemseddin Sâmî's *Nev-usûl Sarf-i Türkî* (1890/1891).

In addition to the developments in publications on lexicography and linguistics, Kohn mentions that the seeds of Turkish nationalism can be found in the vernacular press in İstanbul in the 1870s, and there were seven Turkish-language dailies by 1876 (105-7). Unsurprisingly, the very first volume of Ottoman literary history was published in 1887/8 by Abdülhalim Memduh, just

about a decade after. In a way, what was happening in the realm of print-capitalism was mirrored in the case of literary historiography. The early works by Abdülhalim Memduh, Mehmed Hayreddin, Fâik Reşad and Şehâbeddin Süleyman contain the first attempts to define and describe the nature of literary production as well as its chronological and geographical limits. How to present “Ottoman/Turkish literature” and/or “Ottoman/Turkish language” appears to be the key questions in these volumes, and the answers are multi-faceted. With Köprülü, his stance being inspired by and informed of the preceding accounts, a form of “vernacularization” in the Andersonian sense is observed in the literature: Literary historiography becomes a tool by which a greater message about the subject-matter community is promulgated – not by novels and newspapers made accessible by print-capitalism as argued by Anderson in this case, but mostly by textbooks and foundational sources provided to an audience who withhold the power of setting the pace for developing an image of Ottoman/Turkish literature.

In Meral Alpay’s *Harf Devriminin Kütüphanelerde Yansıması*, there is striking numerical data regarding the growth of publishing in the Ottoman Empire. While there were a total of one hundred and thirty-four press and publishing houses between 1729 and 1875, the increase in the following decades are exponential: One hundred and seventy-two between 1876 and 1892, one hundred and ninety-nine between 1893 and 1907, three hundred and sixty-eight between 1908-1917 (Alpay, 31). This rate of increase seems to continue, despite a slight fall in the curve due to the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1922) and its immediate aftermath. Between 1918 and 1928, there were two hundred and eighty-four active press and publishing

houses, and the number skyrocketed to five hundred and fifty-six between 1928 and 1938 (36). This graph shows that the opportunities for publishing improve considerably at the turn of the century. The growth in the number of books published in the Empire between 1729 and 1928 also supports this claim.¹²

Another set of data analysed by Alpay is the number of press and publishing houses by city, which makes an interesting case regarding the outreach of printed material for both at the point of authorship and readership. In addition to the overall increase in the total number, there is a significant rise in the number of outlets in cities other than İstanbul as decades go by.¹³

At the time when the early works of literary historiography were being published (the period from the publication of Abdülhalim Memduh's volume [1887/8] until Köprülü's article on method [1913]), the numbers show that İstanbul is the major spot for publishing. It is also highly likely that the distribution of the printed material was also primarily through and within İstanbul, at least for the immediate readership. While the ratio between the volumes of literary historiography published in İstanbul to the ones published in other cities is 1/7 between 1876 and 1917, the ratio of publishing outlets in İstanbul to the ones in other cities is 1/4.2 in the same period. The fact that the former ratio is lower than the latter demonstrates that the works of literary historiography were mainly produced in İstanbul, despite the increase in the number of press and publishing houses in other cities. This numerical comparison enhances the idea that there is a particular intellectual habitus in

¹² For the specific number of sources published in this period, see "Table 1. The Breakdown of Yearly Publication Statistics in the Ottoman Empire" in the appendix.

¹³ For the detailed presentation of this increase, please see "Table 2. The breakdown of press and publishing houses by cities in the Ottoman Empire (the geographical area within the present borders) and Turkey" in the appendix.

which the authorship of literary historiography shapes up as far as the early period is concerned. Another point of data that can be interpreted in the context of the close relationship between the educational framework and the outreach of works on literary historiography. Among the cities other than İstanbul, the highest increase is seen in the number of press and publishing houses in Ankara between 1928 and 1938, going up from eighteen to fifty-six. In this decade, there are two factors possibly playing a role in this change: (i) the intense preparations for a new educational model for the country following the regime change in 1923 (i. e. the changes put forward by the Ministry of Education regarding the content of textbooks on Turkish literature in 1925¹⁴), (ii) the Alphabet Reform in 1928 requiring new material to be published for schools and universities (Alpay, 36-7). Interestingly, eight out of the forty-five sources in the corpus of this study were published between 1928 and 1938, the highest number of new additions to the literature per decade. When the numerical data and statistics regarding the history of publishing and the development of literary historiography are juxtaposed, it can be deduced that the educational framework and its outreach in terms of printed materials play an important role in determining the immediate and derived readership of the works on Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

In the scope of this study there are only three authors out of forty, who neither were awarded a degree in the field, nor held a position in an institution that is part of the educational system. Thirty-seven authors were/are currently engaged with teaching, either at the level of higher education or of secondary

¹⁴ The new regulations announced by the Ministry of Education were aimed at changing the content of literature textbooks for high schools and universities. These changes required literary texts to be highlighted instead of the theoretical aspects of literature as well as literary dynamics in and of themselves (Filizok, 3).

education, some of them also holding affiliations with central institutions such as Turkish Language Association (“Türk Dil Kurumu”) and/or Turkish Historical Society (“Türk Tarih Kurumu”). The publishing houses run by universities and other institutions, with which these historians are affiliated, are the major outlets that publish, distribute, and promote works of literary historiography. Ali Kemal¹⁵ (1867-1922) observes this phenomenon as early as 1908:

Just in the beginning of an emerging endeavour towards intellectual progress in our era of reform, is this because the Ministry of Education is left in the hands of a distinguished man of letters for the very first tasks of utmost difficulty? In our higher education, the space for teaching literature is clearly expanding. Literature, history of literature, Ottoman literature, folk literature is laid before students.¹⁶ (509)

Ali Kemal's remark refers the reader to the history of education in the Ottoman Empire, and it is for a good reason. Ministry of Education (“Maarif Nezareti”) was led by Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem (1847-1914) in September 1908 (Kuneralp), a civil servant and intellectual of the era, prior to Ali Kemal's

¹⁵ Ali Kemal himself is also involved in discussions regarding historiography in the Ottoman Empire. Apart from his articles in the journal called *Progress* (“*İkdam*”) in 1908 and 1909, Ali Kemal's thoughts on the ideal practice of historiography is found in his work *Râşid: Historian or Poet?* (“*Râşid: Müverrih mi, Şâir mi?*”) (1918). In this text, Ali Kemal responds to Ahmed Refik's article on Râşid in the *The New Journal* (“*Yeni Mecmua*”), published by Refik Hâlid. Ali Kemal argues that Râşid is an excellent poet engaging with historiography at a basic level; however, his practice of historiography lacks the scholarly perspective that promotes social and political analysis of historical events, which Ali Kemal thinks is the backbone of writing history. He demonstrates his understanding of literary historiography by focusing on the past of Ottoman poetry, and expands upon the political events under the rule of Ahmed III in order to provide the reader with the historical insight he believes is valuable. Here, the shift from narrating history as relaying recorded events as opposed to combining this task with a significant degree of social, political, and cultural analysis is observed, which the reader comes across in the development of literary historiography from the end of the nineteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century, as shown in the following chapters in this study. For a thorough summary of Ali Kemal's above-mentioned work on historiography, see Laurent Mignon's “Ali Kemal ile Tarihi Düşünmek” in *Varlık* (March 2016, [38-42]).

¹⁶ “Bu devr-i tecdüdümüzün terakkiyyât-ı fikriyyeye doğru daha ilk hatve-i azminde, evvelîn icraat-ı sa'dında maarif nezaretimiz bir üstad-ı mükerrem-i edebimizin uhde-i kemâlatına tevdi edildiğinden midir nedir? Mekâtib-i aliyyemizde tedrisat-ı edebiyye fesîh bir inşirâhdır ki aldı, yürüdü. Edebiyat, tarih-i edebiyat, edebiyat-ı Osmaniyye[,] edebiyat-ı umumiyye hep rahle-i pîş-i istifade-i tullâba arz edilmeye başlandı.”

article being published on the sixth of December. Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem, despite being well-known as a poet before anything else, is also a teacher of literature, lecturing at two of the most prestigious institutions in İstanbul, Galatasaray Imperial High School (Mekteb-i Sultânî) and School of Politics (Mekteb-i Mülkiyye), from 1878 to 1887. Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem's textbooks and other works, some of which consisting of his lecture notes, *Lectures on Literature* ("Tâlim-i Edebiyyât") (1897), *Appreciation of Elhân*¹⁷ ("Takdîr-i Elhân") (1886), *Criticisms* ("Tahrîzât") (1896), and *Poets of the Past* ("Kudemâdan Birkaç Şâir") (1888) demonstrate the extent of his interest in literary history and criticism. In the period, November and December of 1908, İbrahim Hakki Paşa (1863-1918) and Abdurrahman Şeref (1853-1925) are two other ministers holding the post, with the former having served in the same position prior to Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem as well (6). İbrahim Hakki Paşa, a high-ranking civil servant, is also a published historian with his *A Brief Account of Ottoman History* ("Küçük Osmanlı Tarihi") (1890) and a three-volume work titled *General History* ("Târîh-i Umumî") (1887/8). Abdurrahman Şeref, one of the last official historiographers of the Ottoman Empire, plays a leading role in the Ottoman Historical Society ("Târîh-i Osmanî Encümeni") at its foundational stage, and his works encompass a wide range of historical research. When the scholarly and intellectual leaning of these ministers are taken into account, it is seen that the rising interest in historiography is almost immediately reflected upon the realm of literature and literary historiography.

The intellectual habitus, which accommodates the scholarly research and debates regarding the fundamental concepts shaping Ottoman/Turkish literary

¹⁷ Menemenlizâde Tâhir's (1862-1902) book of poetry, published in 1886.

history, appears to be formed by the authorship within this institutional context. The nature of this habitus, in turn, determines the audience that the major sources are presented to. Almost all of the forty-five sources analysed in this project are used in the curricula of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes where Ottoman/Turkish language and/or literature is taught. Some of these programmes are designed to train teachers for various levels of primary and secondary education. Then, it is possible to speak of two types of audience when it comes to the issue of readership in the case of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. The first type signifies the immediate readership: The readers who are directly exposed to these sources, such as students, trained teachers, academics, and intellectuals with a particular interest in the disciplines of Ottoman/Turkish language and/or literature.

The second type of readership comprises the audience who are indirectly presented with the materials through the educational framework, encompassing primary and secondary levels. Given that compulsory education in Turkey is twelve years since 2012, and that lectures on Ottoman/Turkish language and literature are parts of the core courses throughout this educational structure, the above-mentioned second type of readership encompasses nearly the entire population. This may appear as a numerically exaggerated hypothesis; however, it does point at a nation-wide phenomenon, given that the enrolment rate is nearly 100%. How the contents of the works of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography treacle down the educational framework, in this way, demonstrates the extent of their possible impact in the making of collective consciousness regarding the cultural aspect of the national identity. Thus, how the story of Ottoman/Turkish literature is narrated, both in terms of its form,

content, and method, becomes one of the key questions to answer in order to understand the social, political, and cultural paradigms shaping the past and the present.

Throughout the intellectual transformations debated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the concept arguably scrutinised the most is “modernity” and its implications for intellectual life in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. “Modernity”, as a notion, conventionally points at social, cultural and political paradigm shifts in history. Apart from marking radical transformations at a particular time and particular place, “modernity” seems to acquire a different meaning in every context it is used. This makes a historian’s job extremely difficult when it comes to offering a specific definition that can provide valuable insights into the complexities of the historical period in question. In the Ottoman/Turkish case, it is a most excruciating task, which, in contemporary criticism, becomes more of an end-in-itself than a helping hand to better understand the course of literary history. In other words, the debate on the conceptual aspect of “modernity” supersedes its function and other practical implications for the task of historiography itself.

Contemporary literary historians tend to consider Ottoman/Turkish “modernity” as a multi-faceted historical phenomenon which offers an explanatory framework for a number of social, political and cultural paradigm shifts that occurred throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The

common frame of reference for the representation of “modernity” in this context often involves a binary: “the old” as opposed to “the new”, or “the East” versus “the West”. One of the standpoints formulated based on a dichotomous understanding of modernity is an alleged case of an epistemological rupture that occurs in the course of Ottoman/Turkish intellectual evolution. In her *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri (Fathers and Sons: Epistemological Foundations of the Tanzimat Novel*, 1990), Parla claims that “the first-generation Ottoman Turkish novelists, writing in the two decades from the 1870s to the 1890s, took on paternalistic roles as the guardians of the new society, largely reproducing the absolutist-idealist ideology of their classical precursors”, an idea described as “fundamentally transforming the study of the subject” (Ertürk, 20). This argument relies on a binary opposition, featuring “the West” and “the East” having fundamentally different epistemological frameworks that dominate the intellectual sphere. Esen, in her *Modern Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Okumalar (Readings on Modern Turkish Literature)*, reiterates Parla’s thought as “an epistemological rupture of Western-origin that [...] Ottoman intellectuals are not aware of” (60).

According to scholars such as Parla and Esen, Ottoman intelligentsia in this period fails at liberating their thinking from the epistemological foundations of Islamic thought, and allow the idea of “individualism” to be crushed under the ‘absolute truth’ [of Islamic epistemology]” (Parla in Esen, 60). The ground upon which this claim seems to be founded is an impression of a literary phenomenon observed in the above-mentioned period of time, in certain novels accessible to the readers, who are mostly dependent on the transcribed

versions of Ottoman/Turkish novels of this period.¹⁸ For this school of thought, the birth of the “modern” novel and the alleged shift in the epistemological outlook of the Ottoman/Turkish intellectual life occurs later, as a result of the Republican revolution, in the course of the early twentieth century, as part of the en masse transformation in the social, political and cultural life in Turkey. This way of thinking is reiterated in the 1990s literary history and criticism. The shortcomings attributed to the rapidly changing Ottoman/Turkish intellectual thought, often observed in descriptions such as “false Westernization” (Gürsoy, 47), “extreme Westernization” (Mardin, 23-81), “belated Westernization” (Gürbilek, 599), are commonly identified through interpretations of literary production in the period, as seen in the way Parla puts forward her claim.¹⁹ Particularly in Esen’s reading of Parla’s claim and commentaries by historians like Mardin, the reader observes that this mistaken and/or belated rupture, which is supposed to be of socio-economic and epistemological nature, is generalised from the particular case of literary production to the Ottoman/Turkish mind-set as a whole.

Parla’s argument reverberated greatly in the field of Turkish literary history and criticism. Ertürk, in her *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey* (2011), describes her own discursive history of phonocentrism as possibly taking “Parla’s counterposition of an essentially ‘empirical realistic’

¹⁸ Parla, in her book, also uses transcriptions of the original texts, and she remarks that her father read one of her primary sources out loud to her, for she is unable to read the original in the Perso-Arabic script (7-8).

¹⁹ Other examples of this reading strategy are the following: Mardin, in his article titled “Tanzimat’tan Sonra Aşırı Batılılaşma” (“Extreme Westernization after the ‘Tanzimat’ Era”), acknowledges the phenomenon of “Westernization” in the Ottoman Empire as a transformative act that is built upon erroneous foundations, surpassing presumably acceptable forms of social change. In addition to Mardin’s analysis, Gürbilek reads Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem’s *Araba Sevdası* in “Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness and the Turkish Novel” (*The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102.2 [2003]: 599-628), where she develops the idea of belatedness regarding “modernity” in the context of the Ottoman/Turkish novel.

European epistemology to its 'aprioristic and idealistic' Ottoman counterpart" in another direction, while following Parla's work (20). The difference Ertürk recognizes between hers and Parla's take is that while Parla defines the alleged epistemological shift with the help of the death of the absolutist literary fathers and the following breakdown of orphaned literary sons, Ertürk finds that "the uncanny ascendance of phonocentrism suggests precisely the *inversion* of genealogical sequencing" (21). Both cases taken into account, the same argument for rupture is maintained: Parla asserts and Ertürk acknowledges the claim made for an epistemological shift taking place at the turn of the century, which is run by the assumed binary of the Euro-centric empirical realism versus the Ottoman spiritual idealism.

In this study, the notion of "modernity" in the Ottoman/Turkish case is used as a signifier of a reflexive process rather than one that is concerned with binary oppositions of the kind exemplified above. In a way, this approach treats the concept of "modernity" at its face value, tracing its roots from the early sixteenth century, the adjective "modern" is simply that which is "now existing", or later on referring to that which is "of or pertaining to present or recent times", from Middle French *moderne* and directly from Late Latin *modernus* "modern", from Latin *modo* "just now, in a (certain) manner," from *modo* (adv.) "to the measure," ablative of *modus* "manner, measure".²⁰ Highlighting the instantaneous nature of the term, what is proposed here for Ottoman/Turkish modernity as a localised notion is to map it out from within: In light of the texts read in their own right, exploring the manifestations of Ottoman/Turkish

²⁰ Online Etymology Dictionary, <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=modern> (accessed on 21 September 2019).

intellectual consciousness in this moment of transformation through a case study of literary historiography.

In the case of literary historiography, the “modern” leap in the conventional sense is considered to take place in the early twentieth century with Mehmed Fuad Köprülü’s work. In this study, this leap will be shown to have occurred earlier than that, i. e. throughout the second half of the nineteenth century into the twentieth century, as the fundamental tools of historiography are seen to undergo major transformations in this period. At the same time, the idea of social history emerges in the field of literary historiography, as observed in the early examples. Both the changing form and the analytical content pave the way for a methodological change, coming into play towards the end of the century and evolving into a fundamental dynamic to dominate the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography for a long time.

The move from *tezkires* to periodically and categorically arranged volumes of literary history can be observed in the corpus of works published in the late nineteenth century. This early shift from striving to assemble anthologies of poets’ biographies and merely sampling their works at times, to systematically narrating the story of how Ottoman Turks produced literature brings the idea of “agency” into play in the context of modernity. The historian of Ottoman/Turkish literature is no longer an observer, s/he is a narrator with a world view, a purpose and a story. In the context of the late nineteenth century, this does not come as a surprise, if we remind ourselves of the identity-building process Istanbulite Ottoman Turks are going through. Authoring, in this sense, becomes yet another means to an end, which, in this case, is either rejection or adoption of the past. For some, writing literary history was meant to show that

court literature was doomed and it was time to leave it behind. For others, it was to cherish the literary treasures of a vast heritage, as they saw it, of the Ottoman/Turkish identity. In both cases, literary historiography became a point of reference for what is to follow in the course of intellectual history: This is why the analysis of and an argument for the idea of continuity in Ottoman/Turkish literary history starts with a focus on the above-mentioned transition and the corpus of works that follow this transition.

In order to clarify the concept of continuity employed in this study within the context of building a national identity as a new “mode” of being in a new era, taking a closer look at Anderson’s reference to the notion of “simultaneity” can be useful. Anderson argues, inspired by Walter Benjamin’s *Illuminations*, that “the idea of ‘homogeneous, empty time’ in which simultaneity is, as it were, transverse, cross-time, marked by not prefiguring and fulfilment, but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar” replaces “the mediaeval conception of simultaneity-along-time” (24). He believes that this shift in the understanding of time and simultaneity is a significant step for the birth of the imagined community, since “the idea of a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogeneous, empty time is a precise analogue of the idea of the nation, which is also conceived as a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history” (26). What the notion of continuity in the case of literary historiography achieves in the volumes examined in this study, theoretically and practically serves a similar purpose: Building, maintaining, and conveying an image of literary production in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey that pertains to a homogeneous understanding of time in order to enhance a uniform cultural outlook as part of the national identity.

1. b. Literature Review and the Background to the Study

In contemporary Turkish literary history and criticism, there has been limited scrutiny of the theory and practice of historiography from the distant past to the present day. While an analytical and comprehensive study that conveys the overall picture of the discipline has not been conducted so far²¹, several critically-oriented pieces on the issue have been produced, such as journal articles, interviews and prefaces to recent volumes of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. In this section, a survey of the secondary literature on the topic is presented to the reader in order to highlight the particular gap that this study aims to fill in the discipline.

There is an increasing level of interest in the early works of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in recent years. This may be the case due to two reasons, although the commentary on such an intangible matter can only be in the form of an educated guess: (1) the gap in the literature regarding this particular topic may have become more obvious in the face of the accumulated knowledge over the decades dedicated to the study of Ottoman/Turkish literature and literary history, (2) the socio-political conjecture of the post-2000s, highlighted with an outspoken sense of pride in the Ottoman past, may have revived a certain degree of scholarly nostalgia towards the pre-

²¹ There are bibliographical studies that list the works conducted on Ottoman/Turkish literary history, such as Semra Demir's M.A. thesis (2011) titled "Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Bibliyografya Çalışması", the content of which is inaccessible via the National Thesis Database (<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>), run by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, although the text can be found online (<http://www.yenimakale.com/turk-edebiyat-tarihi-bibliyografyasi.html>), accessed on 15 September 2019). However, studies of the sort lack an analytical perspective and/or an interpretive axis that provides insight into the historical development of the discipline.

Republican era, accompanied by the desire to explore the previously unattended areas of the field. However, it is difficult to pinpoint how this increase is guided in light of such reasons, for the matter can only be discussed in a speculative manner as it stands.²²

The reader encounters a key question, raised when it comes to the problematization of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, “Is It Possible to Write the History of Turkish Literature?”²³ as the title of an interview conducted with Ömer Faruk Akün (1926-2016) in 1990. In the course of this interview²⁴, Akün brings up some of the most well-known accounts of literary history in the discipline, such as the works by Abdülhalim Memduh, Fâik Reşad, Köprülü, Tanpınar, and Banarlı. He dismisses Abdülhalim Memduh and Fâik Reşad’s accounts for merely repeating the simplistic approaches found in *tezkires*, failing to surpass the subjective and insufficient views regarding literary texts and authors as well as inappropriate classifications and categorizations of literary phenomena (107). Akün’s dismissal of the above-mentioned works is presented without further elaboration, which leaves the reader intrigued as to whether there is any textual evidence to back this opinion. Considering the rest of the examples of literary historiography produced in the same era to be of similar scholarly quality, Akün recognizes Köprülü as the first scholar in the discipline with a respectable degree of historical consciousness (107). For Akün, there is

²² It is possible to delve into the details of this issue; however, this requires an extended study of the previous era in comparison to the current state of affairs. The history of the social, cultural, and/or academic institutions in Turkey as well as the regulatory changes that take place in these institutions over decades may prove to be useful in such a study, which would require another project in its entirety.

²³ “Bir Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Yazmak Mümkün müdür?”

²⁴ Although interviews may not be seen as fit for scholarly discussions in terms of their format, the fact that this particular interview was conducted for and published in a peer-reviewed journal indicates that it addresses the issue within an academic framework. Given the lack of debate that is external to the works of literary historiography, any source that alludes to addressing how literary historians evaluate the matter becomes valuable in its own right.

no other source capturing an extensive image of Ottoman/Turkish literary past than Köprülü's work, including his successors such as Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901-1962) and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı (1907-1974).

After describing Tanpınar's work with an emphasis on its subjective nature, Akün talks about Banarlı's *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*Illustrated History of Turkish Literature*) from 1947/8. He finds Banarlı's account as yet another inadequate source, which is merely intended as a medium to promulgate the idea of a time-honoured and deeply-rooted literary world as a part of the Ottoman/Turkish intellectual history as a whole. Akün believes that the rest of the corpus is not worthwhile from a scholarly perspective, since these are either textbooks of a facile nature or accounts that lack objectivity and scientific character altogether. According to him, the practice of literary historiography requires a complete revision (109), and the issue of methodology remains unsolved with virtually no progress made in terms of grasping the most fundamental approaches such as Lanson's (110). Akün's generalisations, conveyed unreservedly in absolute terms, regarding the form, content and method of the entire corpus tend to oversimplify the matter, since his claims are neither backed by textual evidence, nor supported by further argumentation. For example, the literature prior to Köprülü's contribution has a lot more to offer in terms of reflecting the theoretical developments and practical transformation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, which is the focus of the third chapter of this study, let alone the possibility of an argument for the potential of *tezkires* and *zeyls* as inaugural forms of literary historiography, which comes under the spotlight of the second chapter. The latter is also rejected by Akün, for "the idea of literary historiography had not yet emerged at the time" (113),

even though these sources provide vital information into the past of Ottoman/Turkish literary production (114).

Nazım Hikmet Polat's brief article titled "*Türk Edebiyatı Tarihçiliği Çalışmalarının Neresindeyiz?*" ("Where Are We in the Progress of Turkish Literary Historiography?") from 2002 touches upon the general outlook of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography as well as listing the major accounts followed by short descriptions for each one of them in order to inform the reader about their scope and basic characteristics. Beginning with a thought expressed in similar terms to Akün's, Polat's piece, at its outset, highlights the shortcomings of *tezkires* and the insufficiency of the accounts written until the foundation of the Republic. According to Polat, this period manifests three stages of development: (i) the preparatory phases ("hazırlık aşamaları"), (ii) the first steps ("ilk adımlar"), (iii) towards maturity ("olgunlaşmaya doğru").

Polat considers Ziyâ Paşa to be the first Ottoman intellectual to identify the need for the practice of literary historiography with his *Harâbât* (1874), an anthology of Ottoman poetry with a long preface that involves a critical stance. However, Polat expresses his discontent with the fact that this attempt comes almost two-hundred years after Giovanni-Battista Donado's *Della Letteratura di'Turchi* (1688). Then, Polat lists other works from the era, which are mainly anthologies, such as Ebüzziyâ Tevfik's *Numûne-i Edebîyyât-ı Osmaniyye* (1879), Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem's *Kudemâdan Birkaç Şâir* (1885), Muallim Naci's *Osmanlı Şairleri* (1887) and Mehmet Celâl's *Osmanlı Edebiyatı Numuneleri* (1893). In this sequence of works, Polat points out at an important milestone in the practice of literary historiography: Ebüzziyâ Tevfik's anthology is the first example of its kind where prose is used. Although marking this

change in terms of form as a fundamental leap in the discipline, Polat does not consider these texts as examples of literary historiography in the strict sense of the term, as he believes that they still maintain the habits embedded in the practice of *tezkiye*-writing. For Polat, these attempts form the preparatory phases of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

The stage Polat describes as “the first steps” encompasses works of literary historiography by Abdülhalim Memduh, Mehmed Fuad Bey (1859-1925)²⁵, Şehâbeddin Süleyman, Fâik Reşad and Mehmed Hayreddin. According to Polat, Abdülhalim Memduh’s preface does not provide the reader with any in-depth knowledge of the fundamental concepts, and fails to go beyond a superficial introduction to the topic. However, he emphasises that the framework of periodization seen in Abdülhalim Memduh’s work is repeated in the succeeding works, which is noteworthy. Even though Polat appreciates this aspect of Abdülhalim Memduh’s account, his evaluation of the preface does not seem to treat the material with an analytical lens, given the lack of textual evidence supporting his claim. While Mehmed Fuad Bey’s work is only featured to highlight his use of the terms “literary history” and “history of literature”, Polat focuses on two aspects of Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s account. Firstly, he underlines that Şehâbeddin Süleyman is the first literary historian inspired to use theoretical tools from the Western intellectual sphere, in particular from Eugene Veron and Emile Faguet. The second aspect Polat notes is Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s juxtaposition of social history and literary history, which he believes serves as a pivotal framework for accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history written subsequently. Although it is fair that Polat regards Şehâbeddin

²⁵ This author is not to be confused with Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, for Polat reports that he presented *Târihçe-i Lisânî Osmanî* at a conference in London, held in 1892.

Süleyman as the first literary historian to expand upon such a juxtaposition, Abdülhalim Memduh's volume includes intriguing remarks on this particular point, which are analysed in the third chapter of this study. Polat's portrayal of Fâik Reşad's understanding of Ottoman/Turkish literary history reveals further claims that can be challenged. Polat believes that Fâik Reşad's stance is a "state-oriented" rather than a "language-oriented" viewpoint, since he takes the Ottoman identity to be at the centre of his strategy for demarcating the corpus of his account. However, Polat seems to overlook Fâik Reşad's highlights on language and cultural identity in the preface of his volume. Hence, a close reading of this text is conducted in the third chapter of this study. After emphasising that Mehmed Hayreddin chooses language as his main interpretive axis without further elaboration, Polat identifies three major characteristics at this stage: (1) these sources primarily deal with the literary production in the Ottoman Empire, (2) the fact that all of these accounts deal with the question of periodization demonstrates that the idea of literary historiography is planted, although the issue of subjectivity persists, (3) the majority of the volumes deal with poetry. Except (1), these observations by Polat are not developed into arguments that rely on examples from the texts themselves, and the close readings in this study aim at revealing the further potential of the text.

The stage that Polat describes as "towards maturity", encompasses Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's collaboration as well as Köprülü's and İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's work. Polat puts forward that *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı* by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü is "a real leap of faith" for the course of literary historiography. With a long and rigorous preface, this volume

provides a detailed discussion on methodology, which is the first attempt of its kind according to Polat. He also claims that Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* is a pioneering text in many ways, including the criteria of periodization it promotes, highlighting Turkish identity as a whole both in the ethnic and linguistic sense²⁶ and acknowledging literary history to be an essential part of the history of civilization.

Certain aspects of these claims, yet again, are not fully supported and factually incorrect. For example, the criterion of periodization Polat attributes to Köprülü's genius is one that was previously relayed by Ali Cânib Yöntem, as will be seen in the course of this study. Similarly, considering literary history as a part of social and cultural history is not a new phenomenon, for historians such as Abdülhalim Memduh and Fâik Reşad also entertain similar ideas in their accounts. Polat does acknowledge the presence of this idea in the preceding period; however, he advocates the idea that Köprülü is the first scholar who proposes a well-structured method for undertaking such a task. Then, Polat mentions Dilmen's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (1922) as a significant contribution to the field, which follows Köprülü's lead in terms of methodology, even though Dilmen's account also reveals certain differences regarding its historiographical strategies, as demonstrated in the analysis conducted in this study. For example, Polat's interpretation of Dilmen's emphasis on national identity does not involve a focus on the importance he attributes to language and linguistic development itself. In Polat's piece, the degree of continuity between the two historians' accounts does not seem to be elaborated upon in depth. Polat also mentions Ali Ekrem Bolayır's volume (1923) and İsmail Habib Sevük's *Türk*

²⁶ Here, Polat refers to Köprülü's inclusive attitude towards the Chagatai and Azeri Turkish.

Teceddüd Edebiyatı Tarihi (1925); however, he dismisses the former for being superficial, and the latter for employing a subjective viewpoint in historical analysis to the extent that it renders it a work of literary criticism. Considering İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (1925/6) to be similarly subjective as Sevük's work, Polat does not focus on Ertaylan's account within the context of continuity.

From this point onwards, Polat's begins to speak of a "Köprülü school" in the practice of literary historiography, although he does not provide the reader with a particular definition or description of what this term entails, other than the use of the same criteria of periodization and the emphasis on national identity in the context of literary history, both of which are shaped as a result of long intellectual processes and collective effort as opposed to Köprülü building a disciple from nothing, single-handedly. Polat enumerates other historians as contributors to the "Köprülü school" such as Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı as well as sharing the fundamental features of their accounts with the reader, demonstrating the similarities between the methodological tendencies in their work and the method Köprülü establishes in the discipline. Polat's piece takes a sporadic direction at this point, where he begins to list the rest of the corpus in an unsystematic manner. Nihal Atsız, Faruk Kadri Timurtaş, Mustafa Nihat Özön, Agâh Sırrı Levend, Ahmet Kabaklı, Necla Pekolcay are some of the historians Polat mentions, in addition to listing encyclopaedic sources as well as anthologies such as *Türk Ansiklopedisi* (1942/84), *Türk Dünyası El Kitabı* (1992) and *Büyük Türk Klasikleri* (1985/92). After providing a longer bibliography to his piece, Polat speaks of twenty-four historians whom he believes play major roles in the making of Ottoman/Turkish

literary historiography. Despite his attempt to compare and contrast some of the accounts at the start of his piece, Polat's elaboration, in overall terms, does not include an overarching conceptual framework that is sufficiently explanatory.

In 2006, Demirci conducts an interview with Orhan Okay (1931-2017) on the making of Turkish literary history. As an influential and prolific professor of Ottoman/Turkish literature, Okay's take on the practice of literary historiography in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey exposes similar biases the reader encounters in both Akün's and Polat's pieces. When asked about his opinion on the accessible accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, Okay begins his answer by "leaving Abdülhalim Memduh's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* aside as a first attempt", and dismissing the works of Şehâbeddin Süleyman, Fâik Reşad and Ali Ekrem Bolayır for their lack of a fundamental concept forming the backbone of their accounts (355). Without further ado, Okay moves onto praising Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* as the guiding source in terms of form, content and method, particularly regarding its criteria of periodization. As pointed out earlier, the proposal of the subject-matter criteria of periodization takes place prior to Köprülü's input; however, Okay maintains the mistaken belief that Köprülü is the first historian to introduce this milestone to the literature. According to Okay, the accounts of literary history succeeding Köprülü's work do not outperform his success in methodology, even though he does not specify how, if at all. Okay continues his survey by mentioning historians such as Dilmen, Sevük, Ertaylan, Levend, Ergun, Kocatürk, Banarlı and Akyüz, revealing a corpus similar to that of Polat's. He believes that the evaluations of literary history by these scholars do not manifest diverse qualities (356). The only historian Okay portrays differently is Tanpınar, whose account

of literary history deals with “the relationship between literature and civilization” and is built with an aesthetic lens. Okay also claims that the literary lineage put forward by Tanpınar differs from the earlier works; however, this claim is highly debatable, for the textual evidence on this issue highlighted in the fifth chapter of this study demonstrates otherwise. Speaking of the impossibility of “the perfect Turkish literary history” (356), Okay finds that Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography lacks the philosophical background that its Western counterparts have (357). This is yet another claim that is questionable, since the philosophical foundations of Köprülü’s stance on the issue of methodology in the practice of literary historiography are remarkably complex and remain uncharted to this day. The third chapter of this study provides a possible explanatory framework on the complexity of Köprülü’s take on method within the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, aiming at bringing the philosophical perspective into play.

M. Kayahan Özgül provides a lengthy discussion in the preface of *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış* (*A Look at the History of Turkish Literature*) as to what the fundamental issues in Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography are, and how it ought to be practised. The reason why Özgül’s manifesto calls for an inclusive attitude and a detailed reading is because it is one of the few pieces of writing intended to lay out a particular set of principles at the outset of a volume that directly deals with the applied aspect of the practice. Given that there is virtually no piece of writing since Köprülü and Orhan Rıza that is written in the same or a similar fashion of suggesting particular principles to be followed for the practice of literary historiography in the discipline, it would be unfair to ignore Özgül’s introduction to the above-mentioned volume of Ottoman/Turkish

literary history. Being one of the works published recently, it is potentially interesting to see whether Özgül offers a novel approach on the issue or not.

Emphasising the difficulty of studying the history of Ottoman/Turkish literature and claiming that it has not been written yet, Özgül identifies three fundamental qualities that are necessary for the proper practice of literary historiography, arguing that these are not present in the Ottoman/Turkish context. First, Özgül claims that the practice of literary historiography is a matter of culture, and societies that lack a long-standing cultural tradition of such a practice fail at it (V). According to him, the first condition to be satisfied culturally is having the entire literary production, be it oral or written, recorded. He believes that the scholarly effort in the discipline of Ottoman/Turkish literary studies is not adequate for dealing with issues such as not having a sufficient corpus of oral literature available or not overseeing the literary production in alphabets other than Latin. He also argues that the information about authors found in autobiographies, memoirs, letters and diaries is extremely limited in the Ottoman/Turkish context, while “the discipline of recording one’s private life and the ordinary itself is present in the West” regardless of the socio-economic status of the individual (VI). Other issues Özgül notes in terms of the cultural shortcomings are the insufficiencies of the printing industry and the lack of diligence in maintaining records in archives and libraries; however, he merely talks about his personal struggle with the administrative structure in Turkey. Most of what is meant to support Özgül’s points are anecdotal and extremely difficult to utilise in establishing logical inferences that could provide the reader with a valid and sound argument.

Secondly, Özgül speaks of the importance of an advanced level of literary criticism and critical reading strategies. He finds that the field of literary criticism is dominated by personal relationships and lacks the objectivity required in order to shed light onto literary phenomena that are to become a part of literary history (VIII-IX). Yet again, Özgül avoids presenting specific references to historical data, and makes generalisations that do not follow a particular thread of reasoning. Thirdly, he puts forward that literary historiography should be treated as a discipline on its own, and lists fifteen major requirements for this to be realised (XI). With some of the points being rather intriguing for the reader, such as the very first one manifesting a tautology, Özgül provides brief descriptions for each one. These descriptions involve references to specific aspects of Ottoman/Turkish literary history at times. For example, while discussing the first point, Özgül says that the first obstacle to tackle is the mistaken thinking that regards the practice of literary historiography to fundamentally be *tezkire*-writing (X). When the remarks on this particular issue by the historians from Abdülhalim Memduh to Köprülü are considered, Özgül's claim becomes difficult to justify. From the very beginning of Ottoman/Turkish historiography, the notion of authorship develops alongside the practice itself, and the historian's claim to independent agency becomes apparent as the corpus enlarges, which is demonstrated via the textual analyses in the third chapter of this study. Özgül's explanations for the remaining fourteen points tend to maintain the previously-described anecdotal feel, with occasional references to contemporary literary theorists and critics. While Özgül's commentary tangentially touches upon some of the important problems in the discipline, the content of his piece does not have an analytical

dimension and lacks the rigour that is necessary in order to develop an elaborate historical account. In this regard, his attempt to picture the fundamental problems in the practice of Ottoman//Turkish literary historiography does not go beyond a personal account that is essentially an informal exchange with the reader, filled with opinions that are loosely related to potentially crucial issues that require scholarly attention.

The secondary literature on the practice of literary historiography in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey from a metahistoriographical perspective is scarce and extremely limited in scope, as seen in the review above. Despite the brief and concise nature of Akün's, Okay's, Polat's and Özgül's commentaries are, it is possible for the reader to encounter a number of factually incorrect assertions, habitual biases and ungrounded claims in them that are used to define and describe the fundamental characteristics as well as the problematic aspects of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. This study primarily aims at (i) providing a detailed survey of the widest possible range of the works between 1887/8 and 2013, (ii) examining the conceptual transformations in the formation period (the period from 1887/8 to 1913), (iii) pinpointing the major historiographical strategies at the outset of the post-formation period, (iv) identifying the theoretical and practical manifestations of these strategies in the corpus.

1. c. Corpus and Method of the Study

Conducting a study on the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography is a difficult albeit compelling task. Two fundamental problems seem to arise at the preparatory stage of such a project. First, the corpus appears vast and unconquerable. Encompassing a timeline from the late nineteenth century to the present day, the common assumption is that it is extremely challenging to present a survey of the entire corpus within a limited scope. The second issue is the lack of a theoretical debate that evaluates the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history from a metahistoriographical perspective, dealing with the conceptual evolution of the basic dynamics of the practice in a systematic manner. This study aims to tackle these issues by employing a specific classification strategy of the sources as well as a close reading method from a metahistoriographical viewpoint.

In order to compile a corpus that can reflect the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in the most extensive and efficient way possible, the classification of the sources used in this study has been executed according to the stages described below:

(i) At the first stage of the catalogue research conducted in multiple locations in İstanbul and Ankara, the titles that primarily use the terms “literary history” and “history of literature” including descriptions such as “Ottoman”, “Turkish” and “Ottoman/Turkish”, have been listed for the initial evaluation of a possible corpus. Then, the content of the works has been taken into consideration, and it has been established that some of these sources were only anthologies that contained neither a dimension of historical evaluation nor any focus on textual analysis. The sources of this kind, such as Atilla Özkırımlı’s

*Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)*²⁷, have been eliminated from this initial selection as well as literary annals by literary journals such as *Varlık*. Another criterion applied at this stage of the corpus-building process was to exclude encyclopaedias (i. e. İhsan Işık's *Türkiye Yazarlar Ansiklopedisi*, 2001), glossaries (i. e. Tahir Olgun's *Edebiyat Lûgatı*, 1937), listings (i. e. Arslan Tekin's *Edebiyatımızda İsimler ve Terimler*, 2010), biographical (i. e. Mahmud Kemal İnal, *Son Asır Türk Şairleri*, 1932) and bibliographical volumes (such as Semra Demir's previously-mentioned work), even though some of these were written by literary historians, since these sources are neither intended nor adequate for conveying an overall picture of Ottoman/Turkish literary production at any given spatio-temporal interval.

In this study, my intention is to study the trends of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, as relayed in historiographical works written in Turkish language and in a limited intellectual habitus in order to provide a detailed discussion of the material within a feasible workable scope. That is why the relevant corpus does not involve the transnational material, i. e. works authored in other countries on Ottoman/Turkish literary history, such as Karapet Hovannesi Basmadjian (1864-1942), Georg Jacob (1862-1937), Wilhelm Friedrich Carl Giese (1870-1944), and Elias John Wilkinson Gibb (1857-1901). This is for two reasons: (i) ascertaining the direct, if any, and indirect interactions between authors from different scholarly spheres and authors of the habitus described above is an altogether different task, which requires yet another project with a comparative focus, (ii) the literary habitus taken into consideration in this study comprises a particular geographical area, where the

²⁷ This version of the work was published in 2003 with the above-mentioned title. The original edition, however, was published in 1982 with the title *Türk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi* (*Encyclopedia of Turkish Literature*) by another publisher.

authors pertain to a common literary environment in terms of publishing and readership, as specified at the outset of the project. The primary interest in this study is to examine the texts of the designated corpus in their own terms and referencing by fully relying on the form and content of the texts and attempting to refine the underlying dynamics as embodied in the applied aspect of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

(ii) At the second stage, close readings of volumes with multiple editions have been conducted in order to finalise the corpus in the optimal way, since the objective of the study is to reflect upon the scholarly contributions of these individual accounts as constituents of the entire corpus, rather than comparing and contrasting available versions of a particular text. Therefore, the most representative editions of the works have been selected for further analysis. In total, there are forty-five sources that make up the corpus analysed in this study. The chosen works are the following:

1. Abdülhalim Memduh's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*²⁸ (*History of Ottoman Literature*) (1887/8)
2. Şehâbeddin Süleyman's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*) (1910)
3. Ali Ekrem Bolayır's *Türk Edebiyat Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*) (1910)
4. Fâik Reşad's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*) (1911)

²⁸ For the works that are originally published in Perso-Arabic script with an accessible transcription, I opted to refer to the transcribed versions in order to present the source to a wider audience. However, I have compared the quoted excerpts to the original texts to establish that the transcriptions are valid and sound in the relevant sources.

5. Mehmed Hayreddin's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (Lectures on the History of Literature) (1912)
6. Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı* (The New History of Ottoman Literature) (1914)
7. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (Lectures on Turkish Literary History) (1914)
8. İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History) (1919/20)
9. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature) (1920/1)
10. İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi I-IV* (History of Turkish Literature I-IV) (1925/6)
11. Sadettin Nüzhet Ergun's *Tanzimata Kadar Muhtasar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi ve Numuneleri* (A Brief History of Turkish Literature and Its Examples until the Tanzimat Era) (1931)
12. Tahir Olgun's *Başlangıcından Tanzimat Devrine Kadar Edebiyat Tarihimize Dair Manzûm Bir Muhtıra* (A Poetic Manifesto on Our Literary History from Its Beginnings until the Tanzimat Era) (1931)
13. Hasan Ali Yücel's *Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış* (A Comprehensive Look at Turkish Literature) (1932)
14. Agâh Sırrı's *Levend Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History) (1932-1934-1938)
15. İsmail Habib Sevük's *Edebî Yeniliğimiz* (Our Literary Modernity) (1932) (1935)

16. Celal Tahsin Boran's *Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri (Lectures on Literary History)* (1933)
17. Orhan Rıza's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)* (1934)
18. Mustafa Nihat Özön's *Metinlerle Muasır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Contemporary Turkish Literature with Texts)* (1934),
19. İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's *Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları (Notes on the History of Literature in the Tanzimat Era)* (1942)
20. Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)* (1942)
21. Hüseyin Nihal Atsız's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)* (1943)
22. Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay's *Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature from the Tanzimat Era to the Present)* (1944/9)
23. Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (Illustrated History of Turkish Literature)* (1947/8)
24. A. Ferhan Oğuzkan's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Tanzimata Dek (History of Turkish Literature – Until the Tanzimat Era)* (1949)
25. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Nineteenth Century Turkish Literature)* (1949)
26. Agâh Sırrı Levend's *Ümmet Çağı Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature at the Age of Ummah)* (1962)
27. Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Başlangıçtan Bugüne Kadar Türk Edebiyatının Tarihi, Tahlili ve Tenkidi (History*

- of Turkish Literature: History, Analysis and Criticism of Turkish Literature from Its Beginnings to the Present*) (1964)
28. Kenan Akyüz's *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri: 1860-1923* (*The Framework of Modern Turkish Literature: 1860-1923*) (1965)
29. Ahmet Kabaklı's *Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature*) (1965)
30. Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Ekrem Yirmibeşin's *Türk Edebiyatı - Batı Örnekleriyle Birlikte* (*Turkish Literature with Western Excerpts*) (1967/8)
31. Rauf Mutluay's *100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in 100 Questions*) (1969)
32. Seyit Kemal Karaalioğlu *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*) (1973)
33. Agâh Sırrı Levend's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*) (1973)
34. Rauf Mutluay's *50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature of the Past Fifty Years*) (1973)
35. Şükran Kurdakul's *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı - Meşrutiyet Dönemi* (*Contemporary Turkish Literature – The Constitutional Era*) (1976) and *Cumhuriyet Dönemi* (*The Republican Era*) (1987)
36. Faruk Kadri Timurtaş's *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in the Course of History*) (1981)
37. Ömer Özcan and Mahir Ünlü's *20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı* (*Twentieth Century Turkish Literature*) (1987)

38. Ahmet Oktay's *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: 1923-1950 (Republican Era Literature: 1923-1950)* (1993)
39. Emin Özdemir's *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı: Dönemler-Yönelimler (Periods and Tendencies in Turkish and World Literature)* (1994)
40. Attila Özkırımlı's *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Course of History)* (1995)
41. Hüseyin Tuncer's *Tanzimat Edebiyatı (Tanzimat Literature)* (1994), *Meşrutiyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Constitutional Era)* (1994), *Servet-i Fünûn Edebiyatı (Servet-i Fünûn Literature)* (1995), *Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era)* (1996)
42. İnci Enginün's *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era)* (2001)
43. Talat Sait Halman et al.'s edition of *Türk Edebiyatı (History of Turkish Literature)* (2006)
44. İnci Enginün's *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete (1839-1923) (Modern Turkish Literature: From Tanzimat to the Republican Era [1839-1923])* (2006)
45. M. Kayahan Özgül et al.'s edition of *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış (A Look at the History of Turkish Literature)* (2013)

In the discipline of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, the existing intellectual tendency appears to be oriented toward the study of authors and texts that are representative of particular periods and/or genres, analysed individually or in designated clusters. Although studies of this sort are beneficial in their own right, it proves difficult to develop an overview of the history of historiographical practice that spans over more than a century only by the aid of the readily available literature on the topic. Thus, on the one hand, there is a ubiquitous lack of an attempt to systematically present, analyse and interpret the history of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in an extensive and exhaustive manner. On the other hand, the vast nature of the corpus renders this task methodically challenging.

With the opportunities provided by the metahistoriographical analysis, as proposed by Swiggers et al. in “Metahistoriography Meets (Linguistic) Historiography” (in Schmitter and Wal, 29-59), it becomes possible to offer a way in which readers of Ottoman/Turkish literary history can access a comprehensive account of the history of the historiographical practice itself. There are three steps set forth by this reading strategy that are particularly instrumental in undertaking such a task:

- (i) It provides a structured and detailed process for identifying each and every possible characteristic of a chosen piece of historiographical work.
- (ii) By enabling (i), it allows for the classification of sources according to their characteristics in a systematic manner.

(iii) With the assistance of the classification described above, it facilitates a comprehensive overview of a chosen set of sources, across which it becomes possible to pinpoint historiographical trends.

While the metahistoriographical approach is set out to deal with history of linguistics, the approach in itself is not a linguistic one. Swiggers, Desmet and Jooen in “Metahistoriography Meets (Linguistic) Historiography”²⁹, where they lay out the structure of the metahistoriographical framework, put forward that “[their] paper is a metahistoriographical one in that it discusses the nature (i. e. the status, the format, and the underlying empirical basis) of historiographical work” (30). In a nutshell, this is how Swiggers et al. clarify the conceptual hierarchy between “the metahistoriographical” and “the historiographical”: the endeavour of studying the historiographical work in and of itself. Therefore, I opted for describing my work as a metahistoriographical one as well, for it is categorically intended for conducting research on historiographical works in their own right.

Swiggers et al. also emphasise that the metahistoriographical approach “covers the three aspects intrinsic to linguistic historiography, which it shares with every science: (1) its object, (2) its techniques and methods, and (3) its scientific and ideological status” (31). This renders the metahistoriographical approach analytically versatile for its application in fellow disciplines, such as literary history. A recent example of the use of the metahistoriographical approach for the study of literary historiography is Min Wang’s research on Chinese literary history.³⁰

²⁹ This article can be found in Peter Schmitter and Marijke van der Wal’s *Metahistoriography: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the Historiography of Linguistics* (1998).

³⁰ See Wang’s *The Alter Ego Perspectives and Literary Historiography: A Comparative Study of Literary Histories by Stephen Owen and Chinese Scholars* (2013).

Then, the question becomes how these steps ought to be executed in light of the metahistoriographical approach. The sources are analysed in this study with a multi-faceted methodical approach, combining close readings of the original texts with a thorough classification of each item by appealing to the metahistoriographical approach. The framework proposed by this approach is utilised to demonstrate the similarities and differences between the works dealing with Ottoman/Turkish literary history in a concise manner, while the close-readings focus on the highlights of the historiographical construction in the textual content. In order to efficiently present the data extracted from this survey, I employ the organisational structure of the above-mentioned framework, which is organised according to five levels/parameters, each covering a unique aspect of an account of literary history. Providing a structured way in which a work of literary history can be assessed, Swiggers et al.'s level/parameters are the following: (1) the scope, (2) the depth, (3) the format, (4) the intellectual (scheme/figure), (5) the demonstrative (purpose/intention) (Swiggers et. al. in Wang, 140). The first level or parameter addresses the scope of a work of literary history, i. e. the aspects relating to spatio-temporality. In the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, both geographical and chronological categorizations are carried out. The scope, as it is to be seen in the collection of data in the table presented at the end of this chapter, is one of the most frequently used characteristics in the periodizations of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. The historian's deliberation of the milestones in such periodizations provide the reader with further insight as to the particular orientation of the historian and/or if the work in terms of political opinion as well as other surrounding aspects of his/her intellectual standing.

The second level or parameter is denominated as “the depth”, which evaluates the outcome of the literary historiographical practice in nature. There are four subcategories that are descriptive of the depth in a work of literary history according to Swiggers et al.: (1) factual, (2) descriptive/analytical, (3) descriptive/synthetical, (4) explanatory. Factual historiography involves a focus in collecting and presenting historical data in chronological succession. Descriptive/analytical historiography not only provides information regarding a spatio-temporal cross-section of literary history, but also the inherent epistemic value of the constituents of this web of information. On the contrary, descriptive/synthetical historiography fulfils the same task by following a different epistemic strategy: Instead of evaluating the inherent epistemic status of the parts that construct the entirety of historical narrative, it seeks the confirmation of this narrative in the outside world. The works of Ottoman/Turkish literary history are quite peculiar in this sense, for their standing with respect to the analytical/synthetical binary is a complex one. When the hybrid nature of Köprülü’s method in the practice of literary historiography is revisited in the context of this binary, a third option that oscillates between the two ends of this binary arises. Accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history almost always proffer their definitions and descriptions of the building blocks of their narrative, and strive for establishing a string of convincing epistemic relevance between these and the external world.

The third level or parameter, referred to as “the format”, takes the configuration of a work of literary history as its pivotal point with three subcategories: (1) sequential, (2) topical, and (3) detached historiography. Each one of these subcategories also reflect certain aspects of the methodical nature

of an account of literary history. On the one hand, sequential historiography is narrational, while topical historiography is theme/concept-oriented. On the other hand, detached historiography is shaped around arguments with social, political and cultural implications, therefore embodying a wider range of practical possibilities regarding the chosen domain of literary production.

The fourth level or parameter is designated as the intellectual scheme or *figura*, and it reveals how an account of literary history moves along an axis of interpretation: The first subcategory of this level or parameter, atomistic historiography, structures an account of literary history by pinpointing facts and events that have the potential of changing the course of history. For example, if the acts of uncovering a manuscript from a historically crucial era or correcting a misreading of a fundamental source that result in such a change are used as building blocks of an account of literary history, these would be regarded as practices of atomistic historiography. The second subcategory, structural historiography, moves beyond identifying particular events in literary history, and focuses on the multi-faceted dynamics from a comprehensive perspective: the architecture of conceptions by a specific author or a group, the connections between ideas/theories and socio-cultural events/data, the interrelationships between various modes of reading across different periods. The third subcategory, axiomatic historiography, employs hypothetical structures to make sense of literary history by testing the underlying presuppositions of those structures out in order to attain the inference to the best explanation. All of these subcategories can be observed in the works of Ottoman/Turkish literary history either in isolation or as an eclectic reading strategy.

The fifth level or parameter, the demonstrative purpose/intention, designates the “illocutionary” aspect of historiography, and this often stems from ideological preconceptions about “scientificity (the demarcation between science and non-science), “historicity” (linear or nonlinear, progress or not uniquely progress or even decay) and “(ir)rationality” underlying the existing historical approaches to language(s) (Swiggers et al. in Wang, 141).³¹

Using these levels/parameters provided by the metahistoriographical analysis, information can be compared and contrasted in a systematic and straightforward manner, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Let me present an example where the second level/parameter is utilised in this project: Out of the forty works composing the corpus subjected to metahistoriographical analysis, twenty-seven sources (67.5%) present features that are in line with the practice of factual historiography. This means that the majority of sources reflect a specific trend in how the practice of literary historiography is carried out in terms of depth of analysis, which is relaying of facts as perceived and presented by authors without any further descriptive or explanatory dimension. This particular lack paves the way for a number of works to form a cluster with a specifically repetitious outlook. Such a cluster, by virtue of its unvaried nature, demonstrates the idea of theoretical and practical continuity in the making of literary history, for the corpus falls short of providing a variety of analytical dimensions through which alternative standpoints can flourish. The rest of the sources (scoring less than half of the primary cluster), exhibit qualities that are compatible with the practice of descriptive-analytical and/or descriptive-

³¹ In order to provide the reader with a clear and thorough understanding of this framework, Wang’s brief and visually-practical summary of these levels/parameters is presented as a table in the appendix. This table notes the features attributed to the five levels/parameters as well as the abbreviations of each, and can be found under the title “Table 3. Swiggers et al.’s framework for the purposes of classification and categorization of literary histories”.

synthetical historiography; however, these comprise a minor part of the corpus as well as representing isolated accounts that do not form further following. The components of this latter cluster reveal merely a few diversions from the main trend in terms of its theoretical and practical aspects, which subsequently renders it a supporting cluster to the primary one. Thus, as a result of quantitatively and qualitatively analyse the works in the corpus according to the level/parameter of “depth” (of analysis), it becomes possible to identify one of the major characteristics of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in the making. Thus, the suggested framework is of utmost importance and crucial in order for a comprehensive survey to be carried out, as it proposes the most exhaustive strategy suited to the purpose of the study.

Before presenting the data in this framework, I ought to present two alterations to the principles by which it is proposed. The first alteration is related to the first level or parameter in juxtaposition to the rest. This level/parameter, designated as “the scope”, is fundamentally different to the other four levels/parameters in its effects. While “the scope” of a literary history suggests certain spatio-temporal limits to what the account may encompass, it hardly can dictate its content. Whereas the other level/parameters, i. e. “the depth”, “the format”, “the intellectual scheme/figura” and “the demonstrative purpose/intention” directly determine the form, the content and the method of a literary history. This means that the variations occurring at the first level do not hold the same epistemic status as the other ones do. In other words, this requires a two-dimensional graph rather than keeping all of the five levels/parameters explained above in the same dimension.

The second alteration I propose is related to the fifth level or parameter of the framework. This aspect, designated as “the demonstrative”, reveals the methodological axis of the account, for it identifies the scientific status, the historical understanding and the degree of reason within that evaluation. Given that “the demonstrative” expresses the practical direction of the account, it overlaps with the same categorical nature implied in the analysis carried out for Köprülü’s piece on methodology. Therefore, it ought to be treated in line with the two observations that stem from this analysis. Where a particular account of literary history manifests a variance of degree or in nature in this respect, it is noted in the relevant column. In this sense, “the demonstrative” would work as an internal control mechanism to revisit the direction of the premise of the study in harmony with the data provided.

In light of these two alterations, I shall treat the repetitions and variations accordingly in the following presentation of the data in this study. The reader shall bear in mind that the works discussed at this stage are volumes of literary history that satisfy two conditions: (i) being communicated to the reader as a historical account of literary phenomena of a chosen period and a chosen territory, (ii) having an overarching axis of composition. For example, *Eski Türk Edebiyatı El Kitabı (Old Turkish Literature Reader)*³² does not qualify as a constituent of my corpus, for it aims at communicating the fundamental concepts in Ottoman/Turkish literature from the thirteenth to the nineteenth century. It contains only a brief summary of the historical course, forming only around twenty-one percent of the entire volume. Therefore, on the basis of the first criterion mentioned above, works not focused on communicating a

³² İsen, Mustafa et al. *Eski Türk Edebiyatı El Kitabı*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2003.

historical account are not considered here. In order to clarify the second criterion, other examples can be given: Compilation of individual articles addressing a sporadic corpus with very little or no engagement with a particular direction of evaluation overall, i. e. Kaplan's *Türk Edebiyatı Üzerinde Araştırmalar*³³, or failing to present the mereological relationship between the ideas it features despite being described as thematic or according to a predetermined point of reference (i.e. period of time, territory), i. e. Necla Pekolcay's and Mine Mengi's accounts on Ottoman poetry³⁴ can be considered as the volumes that the second criterion dismisses. While enlisting and providing information about the volumes that qualify for the corpus of this study, my aim is to present pointers that help the reader make sense of the placement of these works in my interpretation of the explanatory framework by Swiggers et al. which is to follow the qualitative analysis below. This way, I shall be able to highlight the aspects that reflect the overwhelming sense of continuity throughout the succession of these works.

Before moving on to the discussion itself, it might be useful to briefly present the overall structure of the study for the reader's convenience. In the second chapter, the early works that appear in the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth century are evaluated in order to point at the major concepts brought into play by the literary historians of the period, such as

³³ Kaplan, Mehmet.

³⁴ *İslâmî Türk Edebiyatı: Giriş* (1981) and *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (1998), respectively.

Abdülhalim Memduh, Şehâbeddin Süleyman, Fâik Reşad, Ali Ekrem Bolayır, Mehmed Hayreddin and Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. After a thorough evaluation of the early works in terms of form, content and method, Köprülü's study of method in the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary history is analysed in the third chapter. In the fourth chapter, the early formalizations of method in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography are discussed in the works published between 1913 and 1920/1, ranging from Köprülü's article on method to his *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*). With a detailed account of the fundamental dynamics of literary historiography that surface in this period, the ongoing influence of these throughout the twentieth and twenty-first century corpus is revealed in the close readings of the corpus in the fifth and the sixth chapters, highlighting the impressions of continuity in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. These two chapters provide the technical classification of the sources according to the framework by Swiggers et al. in order to reveal the theoretical and practical manifestations of continuity in the corpus. While the analyses presented in fifth chapter demonstrate the crystallisation of the defining elements pointing at the dynamic of continuity in the majority of the works (i. e. the primary cluster), the sixth chapter reveals the supporting elements identified in the works that constitute the rest of the corpus (i. e. the secondary cluster). In light of the analysis presented in the fourth to the sixth chapters, the reader is presented with an overview of the corpus in the concluding chapter of the study, followed by the argument for continuity as the backbone of an alternative explanatory axis for the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography from a metahistoriographical perspective.

CHAPTER 2

Reading the Early Works on Ottoman/Turkish Literary History:

Emerging Forms of Theory and Practice

*Ex nihilo nihil fit.*³⁵

The transition from writing biographies of poets and compiling the finest examples of their poetry for centuries to formally launching “history of Ottoman literature” as a topic in its own right is a long, adventurous, and sporadically carried out process. The examples of literary histories in this period seem to be fruits of hard work, as the historians of the period often complain about the difficulties of this task (Abdülhalim Memdûh, 126; Fâik Reşad, 54). However grand the narratives are claimed to be by the authors of these works, contemporary research on literary history in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey does not yet seem to be willing to reconcile with the ghosts of the past. Considerable effort has been expended in recent years to transliterate these sources, given the growing interest in the field. However, critical analysis of these works in a systematic manner is virtually non-existent. Abdülhalim Memduh and Fâik Reşad’s volumes of Ottoman literary history, carrying the same title, *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye (History of Ottoman Literature)*, have been transliterated in 2012 and 2017, respectively. Transliteration of Abdülhalim Memduh’s work is presented by the editor with complementary chapters. These

³⁵ A philosophical expression that is inspired by a Parmenidean fragment, relayed for the first time by Aristotle in his *Physics* (https://lexundria.com/parm_frag/1-19/grk, accessed on 29 October 2019). It can be put simply as “nothing comes from nothing”.

chapters cover a range of topics such as the author's biography and his other works as well as a compilation of quotations by influential figures in Turkish literary history, who are neither contemporaries of Abdülhalim Memduh nor his self-confessed or otherwise established protégés, which renders the edition slightly eclectic. Fâik Reşad's transliterated volume contains the editors' introduction that does not go beyond offering a brief summary of the content and relatively succinct information about the author of the manuscript. Another recent example of a collective effort to transliterate parts of the early Ottoman literary histories, *Yöntem Bilgisi Açısından Osmanlı Dönemi Edebiyat Tarihleri (Histories of Turkish Literature in the Ottoman Era from a Methodological Perspective)*, was published in 2013. Contrary to what the title suggests, this volume also does fall short of critical analysis of the texts, although containing sizable lengths of the materials in Latin alphabet, which is useful for the less experienced readers of the subject. Other examples of research conducted on the works by historians of the era include dissertations and journal articles, which predominantly exhibit a descriptive character.³⁶

The common approach towards these works tend to remain that of a novice librarian in a way: Acknowledging the existence of the texts and providing a brief survey of the tables of contents seem to be regarded as sufficient for the scholarly urge. In this part of my project, I would like to dwell upon the early works of Ottoman literary history from a different angle, and discuss what the authors make of the most fundamental notions relating to

³⁶ Toluay's M. A. dissertation on Abdülhalim Memduh's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* can be listed in this category of publications. Journal articles such as Açıkgöz's "Some Evaluations [of] Early Ottoman Literature History and Its Historians" as well as Okumuş and Şahin's "A Study on the Literary History and Literary Writing from Tanzimat Literature to Present", as titled by the authors themselves, are other examples that are extremely brief and opinionated surveys of the topic, failing to provide in-depth analysis.

literature, history and literary history within this context, such as the conceptual links between the defining aspects of Ottoman/Turkish literature, and the methodological assumptions according to which the practice of literary historiography is shaped. In order to maintain this objective as my primary concern, I will predominantly analyse the prefaces of these works, for those are the legitimate playgrounds for most literary historians of the time, where they seem to exercise a particular sort of freedom as to define and describe the most complex notions of the intellectual debates on this particular topic in this era. This phenomenon, mostly recognized as a frivolous act of throwing in platitudes about the literary spirit and the rest, may offer a lot more insight than what this perception presupposes, as I wish to demonstrate.

2. a. Close Encounters with the Idea of Literary History & Historiography

Before discussing Abdülhalim Memduh's work, it would be useful to touch upon the anthologies that divert from the *tezkire*-writing tradition in practice, for these are texts that cannot easily be classified in either direction. Ziyâ Paşa's *Harâbât* (1874-5), Ebüzziyâ Mehmed Tevfik's *Numûne-i Edebiyyât* (1878/9), *Poets of the Past* by Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem (1881) are the works that are published prior to the very first title fully dedicated to Ottoman literary history. These three works each hold a particular place with individual characteristics that represent various strands of conceptual and methodical development in Ottoman literary history and criticism. In *Harâbât*, Ziyâ Paşa

dedicates the long preface to explaining the motivation behind writing this volume. The sections titled "Meşrûat u Ahvâl-i Şâirî" ("The Conditions and Characters of Poets"), "Ahvâl-i Eş`âr-ı Türkî" ("The Case of Turkish Poetry") and "Ahvâl-i Şu`arâ-yı Rûm" ("The Case of Anatolian Poets") provide further insights into Ziyâ Paşa's evaluation of the poetic character and literary production in the Ottoman Empire (Kurnaz, 68). Claiming that divan poetry is superior to folk poetry³⁷, Ziyâ Paşa receives Nâmık Kemal's criticism in "Tahrîb-i Harâbât" (1876), which is one of the earliest examples of an intellectual duel in the scene of Ottoman literary criticism. Apart from the elements of literary criticism in the preface of *Harâbât*, it appears to be a straight-forward anthology, encompassing three volumes of poetry produced in the Ottoman Empire. This anthology is organised according to the most commonly practised sub-genres of Ottoman poetry, each volume covering a specific style. Although not following the same organisational logic, Ebüzziyâ Mehmed Tevfik's and Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem's volumes are of similar nature; however, the critical aspect is mostly embedded in the individual analysis of the poets featured, rather than in an elaborate and sizeable preface, as it is the case in *Harâbât*. In fact, this aspect of Ziyâ Paşa's work leads to "Mukaddime-i *Harâbât*" ("The Preface to *Harâbât*") later to be published as a piece of its own as well by Ebüzziyâ Mehmed Tevfik in the series called "Kitâbhâne-i Ebüzziyâ" in 1893 (Kurnaz, 68). The common aspect of these volumes is their proximity to a new type of historiographical practice in terms of form and content in varying degrees, although the implicit endeavour to scrutinise the major problematics in literary aesthetics or historical

³⁷ It must be noted that Ziya Paşa in his article "Şiir ve İnşa" ("Poetry and Prose", 1868) reveals the exact opposite of what he defends in *Harâbât*'s preface by arguing for folk poetry to be regarded as the foundation of Turkish poetry, as well as calling for the purification of Turkish from the Arabic and Persian elements.

consciousness within the framework of literary evolution does not yet reveal signs of a maturing conceptual discussion that is analytically methodical and systematic.

2. b. The First of its Kind: Abdülhalim Memduh and His *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*³⁸

The first volume entirely dedicated to Ottoman literary history is by Abdülhalim Memduh (1866-1905), written in 1887, and published one year later by Ohannes Ferid. Titled *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye (History of Ottoman Literature)*, this volume has been transliterated and published in 2012, one hundred and twenty-four years later. Although frequently mentioned in articles and in volumes of literary history (i. e. Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir, 1915; Dilmen, 1919; Özön, 1941; Polat, 1987; İnal, 1988; Akün, 1990; Açıkgöz, 2012; Apaydın 2013), scholars tend to dismiss the possibility of an in-depth analysis of Abdülhalim Memduh's work by pointing out its allegedly simplistic aspects in terms of method, form and content. The discussion by İnal is the most comprehensive one on Abdülhalim Memduh in terms of biographical information, whereas the other scholars aim at providing short surveys about this author merely in order to highlight his significance in Ottoman literary history. Here, my endeavour is to present this material from an alternative perspective by appealing to the original text as well as its transcription and paying further attention to its preface with a particular focus on its conceptual

³⁸ For this section, I primarily use Aygün's transliteration of the volume. However, I have cross-checked the specific quotations here with a copy of the original text, kept in the Rare Collection at the Boğaziçi University Library, in order to verify the accuracy of Aygün's transcription.

premises while building a new form of literary history, following the *tezkiye*-writing tradition. I also discuss the points made from a metahistoriographical perspective by the later commentators, and try to re-evaluate their analysis.

Abdülhalim Memduh is one of the interesting albeit sidelined characters of Ottoman intellectual history. Born and raised in İstanbul, he was involved with writing and publishing during his undergraduate degree in law, an unfinished journey due to his arrest in his second year. Accused of founding a secret political organisation, Abdülhalim Memduh served a prison sentence for eighteen months, then was sent into exile in Konya along with a group of intellectuals, including Ali Kemal (İnan, *Son Asır Türk Şairleri*, vol. II, 928). After Konya, he was sent from one city to another within the country, mostly because of not being able to cope with the conditions in the posts he was assigned to. One exception to this was his exile in Tripolitania: This time the reason was that he “found the climate too extreme”, and demanded that he would be sent into exile elsewhere (929). After years of moving from one end of the country to another, Abdülhalim Memduh escaped to Europe in 1900 (Aygün, 32). He lived in France, Tunisia, and the UK. Suffering financial difficulties, he found refuge under the protection of Princess Nazlı, daughter of Mustafa Fazıl Paşa, and he also made a living by tutoring (33). He died of a drug overdose in Folkestone, at the early age of thirty-nine, in 1905 (İnal, 930).

The first aspect of Abdülhalim Memduh’s volume that stands out is its name. *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*) is not a title the reader encounters in the corpus preceding this volume, which consists of texts involving historical information in the literary realm, such *tezkiyes* and *zeyls* to these *tezkiyes*. Despite the novelty of its name and its form, Dilmen

argues that the content of Abdülhalim Memduh's work does not push the boundaries of the very idea of *tezkiye*-writing regarding its spirit (7). Abdülhalim Memduh primarily narrates in prose, as opposed to the conventions regarding form in the practice of *tezkiye*-writing, where poetry is the dominant mode with occasional use of prose. Given the strict nature of Ottoman court poetry when it comes to aesthetic form as well as and how its history is conventionally recorded in the same fashion, Abdülhalim Memduh's move is significant in introducing prose as an admissible alternative to poetry. Nevertheless, Dilmen's observation is consistent with what is to be seen after a close look at the text, particularly when the organisation of information is taken into account.³⁹ Abdülhalim Memduh organises and categorises historical information in a way that is reminiscent of *tezkiyes* by providing lists of authors, occasionally highlighting some of their literary production.

Numerically, Abdülhalim Memduh's work has a significantly narrower scope, compared to the ranges seen in the nineteenth century *tezkiyes*. For example, while Fatîh Efendi lists six hundred and seventy-two poets in his *Hâtimetü'l-Eş'âr* (*The Last Poets*) which was completed in 1853, covering the period from 1721/2 to its year of completion, whereas in Abdülhalim Memduh's volume the reader only encounters around twenty poets that are discussed beyond the act of name-dropping. There are two conclusions that can be drawn from this: (i) the likeness in form can only be compared in terms of the underlying organisational principle, and not in terms of scope, (ii) there is an implied shift in the core logic of the literary historian's agency seen in this bold reduction in the number of poets mentioned in the volume. The question of

³⁹ The table of contents for this source is reconstructed in "Table 4. 'Table of Contents' of Abdülhalim Memduh's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*" for the reader's convenience and can be found in the appendix.

content is a rather interesting one, as the form may lead the reader to believe that the content closely follows the line of similarity between the nature of Abdülhalim Memduh's work and the idea of *tezkiye*. However, there are certain moments in the text that divert from the conventional outlook of *tezkiyes* and they are thought-provoking in the context of literary historiography and its practice, which I will discuss in detail below.

Özön in his *Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History Turkish Literature in the Last Century)* briefly mentions Abdülhalim Memduh's work and relays to the reader his criticism of it. According to Özön, Abdülhalim Memduh's critical tone in the volume is "quite superficial albeit combative" (348-9). This two-fold observation touches upon the lack of depth in terms of meticulous research and conceptual development in Abdülhalim Memduh's work, and it highlights an unusual feature within the context of historiographical practice at the same time. Özön does not elaborate upon his comment any further, although the second part of his statement is intriguing. When the reader engages with the text at the discursive level, it is possible to observe that Abdülhalim Memduh does not shy away from bringing literary criticism into play at times, although he does not conceptualise it as such. His agreements and disagreements with the other members of the Ottoman intelligentsia are scarce but present throughout the text. Whether these points of conflict and compliance are factual or speculative, substantial or trivial, their existence hints at Abdülhalim Memduh's critical attitude. For example, in the second chapter, there is an example of Abdülhalim Memduh's correction of Ziyâ Paşa's claim in *Harâbât* regarding the birthplace of Nefî, where he asserts that Nefî is from Erzurum, not Van (154). He quotes Nâmık Kemal on the issue in order to strengthen his position. His criticism of

Ziyâ Paşa does not start and end there, as he compares Râgıb Paşa's take on Islamic mysticism to that of Ziyâ Paşa's, and mocks one of his couplets as an inferior example of the genre (163).

Özön also puts forward that the primary focus of Abdülhalim Memduh's work is to understand and promote the literary production of its era rather than shedding light on the past. In order to support this claim, Özön claims that Abdülhalim Memduh directly benefits from parts of Ebüzziyâ Mehmed Tevfik's *Nümûne-i Edebîyyât (Excerpts of Literature)* and Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem's *Kudemâdan Birkaç Şâir (Poets of the Past)*, and say that this demonstrates Abdülhalim Memdûh's lack of intellectual enthusiasm regarding the literary past. He also emphasises that the third chapter, which is about the late period, is longer than the other ones and he argues that this also points at the same fact (349). Although it is factually correct that Abdülhalim Memduh's elaboration is relatively breezy in the first and the second chapters compared to the third one, his framework is consistent with what he sets out as his purpose at the start. The criticism Abdülhalim Memduh's work attracts does not seem take into account what the author's viewpoint implies in his own terms, as explained in the preface of his volume as well as the introductory part of the first chapter, and this is why these parts of *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* are crucial for this study.

In the "Mukaddime" ("Preface"), Abdülhalim Memduh defines and describes what literature is and what it is capable of. According to him, literature is the highest point of intellectual achievement for human beings, and intellectual exchange is only possible via literature (125). The power of

literature, he believes, is the fundamental driver behind every nation's⁴⁰ efforts in preserving their language.⁴¹ At this point in the text, Abdülhalim Memduh does not expand upon the notion of nation; however, it is possible for the reader to sense the direction he contemplates given what he notes as part of Ottoman literary history. For example, in the section titled "Some Considerations",

⁴⁰ Johann Strauss, in his article titled "A Constitution for a Multilingual Empire: Translations of the Kanun-i Esasi and Other Official Texts into Minority Languages", presents a survey of the use of the term "millet" and its equivalents in the first Ottoman constitution (1876) and its translations, as well as preceding examples of "millet" constitutions, as Strauss puts, designed by and adopted by the minorities within the Empire. While the term "millet" was used to designate ethnic and religious minorities such as Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, and the Judeo-Spanish in the Ottoman Turkish version of the constitution, words meaning "community" ("koinotiēton/koinotiētos" in Greek, "hasarakut'eanc'/hasarakutenên" in Armenian, "obštiny/obštinata" in Bulgarian, "komunitas/komunita" in Judeo-Spanish etc.) were used in the translations of the constitution into the languages spoken by these minorities (Strauss, 46-7). However, in the "millet" constitutions, these communities refer to themselves as "nations" ("azg" in Armenian, "ethnos" in Greek, "nasyon" in Judeo-Spanish, etc.), as Strauss reveals (37). Here, an interesting question arises: Why would the terms equivalent to "nation" be used in the case of "millet" constitutions, and not in the case of translations of the Ottoman constitution, both signifying the same? The terms equivalent to "nation" seem to be preferred in the texts that are produced within the context of self-expression of the community in question, and by that community alone. When the relation of signification is established by the political authority of the Empire, i. e. the use of the term "millet" in the Ottoman constitution, it does not appear to be the case any longer. This shows that the use of the terms equivalent to "nation" as a means of political self-expression of a community did exist in the political literature developed within the Ottoman Empire, although it is difficult to trace the exact milestones of when, how and by whom they were known and used by this example alone. At the same time, given the theoretical and practical implications of this linguistic phenomenon, it becomes extremely difficult to rule out the possibility of the term "millet" to be adopted as a signifier for the Ottoman/Turkish "nation", as hinted at in the early works of literary historiography. This is why the usage of the term "millet" is revisited with a wide range of possibilities in mind, according to the particular characteristics of each volume analysed in this study.

Another interesting find regarding the use of "millet", not mentioned in Strauss' article, is in a document titled "Charter of Alliance" ("Sened-i Ittifak"), produced in 1808. Also known as "Deed of Agreement", this is considered to be the first legal document that manifests characteristics of a constitution. Signed between the grand vizier of the Empire and a number of powerful local rulers, Charter of Alliance contains two expressions that include the term "millet": "millet-i beyza-i Muhammediyye" (215) and "millet-i beyza-i Ahmediyye" (216) (transliterated by Ali Akyıldız in *İslam Arastirmalari Dergisi*, 2, 1998: 209-222), both designating the totality of the Muslim population. Although it is difficult to make a definitive assumption regarding historical usage of the term with respect to this document alone, it shows that the term was not only used to designate the non-Muslim communities, as often portrayed. It is also important to remember that the term does not seem to be only a general signifier for all of the non-Muslim communities, since they are also individually recognized as communities of varying ethnic origins, seen in the case of the *Nizamnames*. This is yet another reason to rethink how "millet" as a notion may have transformed throughout the nineteenth century, possibly employed as a signifier for the Ottoman/Turkish identity emerging with a new form in this period of transformation.

The last point that can be useful to raise is the fact that "Türkçe" ("Turkish") is presented as the official language of the Empire in the eighteenth and fifty-seventh articles of "Kânûn-i Esâsî" (<https://www.anayasa.gov.tr/tr/mevzuat/onceki-anayasalar/1876-k%C3%A2n%C3%BBn-i-es%C3%A2s%C3%AE/> [accessed on 31 August 2020]), while "Osmanlıca" ("Ottoman Turkish") as a term to denote the language is at the heart of the discussions during the Tanzimat Era

Abdülhalim Memduh demonstrates an inclusive approach towards Turkish language pre-Ottoman era as a justifiable part of Ottoman literature. First, he says that “the essence of Turkish is constituted by the old ‘Oğuz Han’ Turkish and Tatar”⁴² and he adds that there are occurrences of its use in the literary corpus (129). Following this statement, he quotes a poem by Ertuğrul Gazi, which is dedicated to his son Osman Gazi, the founder of the Ottoman Empire as we know it. The linguistic crossover in terms of the Turkish language and the Ottoman identity presented here by Abdülhalim Memduh provides insight into his sympathy towards the possibility of an Ottoman/Turkish identity. Later, he also expresses his views on how the pure form of Turkish becomes spoiled by Persian and Arabic (131), which puts even more stress on the “Turkish” side of the equation.

After hinting at the social and political function of literature, Abdülhalim Memduh dwells upon the difference between poetry and prose. For him, poetry is an act of “beautification through harmony” (125), whereas prose represents the word of literature in the most sublime way possible. The line of demarcation between poetry and prose in Abdülhalim Memduh’s case is blurry, as he presents his definitions as poetic expressions, and he does not elaborate on these any further. Although he introduces such a distinction, acknowledging that prose is also of aesthetic value by saying that it can be “observed within the harmony of nature” as opposed to poetry being an instance of elegance (125), his examples of accomplished authors from “the East and the West” are

(Levend in Alpay, 5). This use alone may not point at a strict fact regarding the constitution of a national identity at that point. Nevertheless, there is a certain degree of crystallisation observed in terms of a cultural component (i. e. language) being represented with a specifically ethnic connotation, which may be interpreted as a noteworthy moment for the historical course of nation-building practices in the Ottoman Empire.

⁴¹ “Bu yüzdendir ki her milletin lisânı büyük bir ihtimâm ile takyîd ve teşyîd ediliyor.” (125)

⁴² “Türkçe’nin esâsı, kadîm ‘Oğuz Han’ Türkçesiyle Tatarca’dan mürekkeptir.” (129)

presented without any appeal to this difference.⁴³ Here, on the one hand, the reader observes a rather generalist approach by Abdülhalim Memduh towards historiography, as he does not seem to put considerable effort into expanding upon his statements. On the other hand, his remarks regarding the conceptual connections between literature and history provide deeper insights. For example, the tasks of literature for Abdülhalim Memduh are “investigating an idea, beautifying memories, purifying [artistic] pleasure, promoting fairness and morality, explaining and expanding upon the aspects of rationality” (126). There are two functions in Abdülhalim Memduh’s statement that are noteworthy in the context of the analytical dimension of literary historiography: philosophical investigation and exploring rationality. Aesthetics, lyricism and morality, inseparably intertwined within the literary tradition, are aspects that are generally attributed to the nature of Ottoman court literature. However, philosophical investigation and rationality are at the forefront of neither literary expression nor very early forms of literary historiography such as *tezkires*. These two themes, even though nominally, being represented as part of the fundamental tasks of literature adds a novel layer to the critical framework of literary historiographical practice. For Abdülhalim Memduh, these functions render literature a social practice in nature. Following these remarks, Abdülhalim Memduh makes the following statement: “Therefore, works of literature are accounts of human history of a nation, and I was captured by the idea of writing the history of this history, given the influences of these works”.⁴⁴ In the context of Abdülhalim Memduh’s volume being the very first example of

⁴³ Abdülhalim Memduh lists poets and authors such as Imru’ al-Qais and Sadi-i Shirazi, as well as Dante, Shakespeare, Victor Hugo, Virgil and Homer.

⁴⁴ “Bu hâlde âsâr-ı edebîyye bir kavmin birer târîh-i insânîyyetidir ki mü’essirleri îtibariyle ben o târîhin târîhini yazmak fikrine düştüm.”

an account of Ottoman literary history, encountering the expression of “human history” as a term and in relation to literature is alluring. Establishing a scholarly way in which the relationship between literary history and human history can be examined is made possible by the intersectionality of these two disciplines. This, however briefly, is spelt out for the first time in Ottoman intellectual history by Abdülhalim Memduh, long before its conceptualization in the twentieth century. This mention, on its own and without further elaboration by the author himself, may seem rhetorical, therefore less of a remark that can alter our understanding of the text. Nevertheless, what follows raises the bar:

In this [volume], it is desired that the accounts of the literary corpus itself is understood, not those of the poets or the literati. Therefore, the life stories of the aforementioned are not regarded as necessary to be narrated here, and hence are not, although known to the author himself.

In addition to this, the authors who tend to follow a progressive understanding instead of the ways of the past in terms of their literary expression are discussed in this work, while most of their followers are abandoned. The objective here is not to narrate a history of events, but to show the transformation in the course of these historical events.⁴⁵

Abdülhalim Memduh, in the excerpt above, briefly outlines what his guidelines for writing his volume are, which brings the debate of methodology in literary historiography into play. First, he implicitly rejects the idea that an account of literary history must be regarded as a source for poets’ biographies, as he deliberately uses the title *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye (History of*

⁴⁵ “Bunda şu`arâ ve üdebânın değil edebiyâtın tercüme-i hâli - mümkün mertebe - anlaşılmaq matlûb olduğundan müşarûnileyhimin sergüzeştleri ma`lûm olduğu derecede bile yazılmamış ve yazılmaya lüzûm da görülmemiştir.

Bir de meslek-i ifâdesinde mâzîye teveccüh etmeyerek oldukça silk-i teceddüde mâil olan üdebâ mevzu`-i bahs edilmiş ve birçok peyrevleri metrûk bırakılmıştır. Zira maksad silsile-i cereyânı beyân etmek değil, o cereyânın inkılâbâtını ityân eylemektir.”

Ottoman Literature) and sets an alternative objective for his work. His desire is to highlight the works of literature themselves, and to help the reader understand them better. Here, the focus of literary historiography, which used to be the poetic persona and the lyrical cluster that is built around it, appears to shift to the text itself. In the later chapters of his volume, it is seen that he is not fully able to break the habit. He does, however, dedicate a very limited percentage of his writing to the biographical information about the authors. In a few cases, basic information about authors such as date of birth, date of death, place of birth and occupation is mentioned in a sporadic manner. For example, the reader is presented with dates of death for nine out of eighteen authors⁴⁶ predominantly mentioned in the volume, whereas there are dates of birth for only two authors. The erratic occurrences of such information is coherent with what Abdülhalim Memduh dictates at the outset: His main interest in literary history does not lie within the boundaries of a biography-oriented approach, i.e. *tezkiye*-writing. With respect to this characteristic of Abdülhalim Memduh's work, it would be unfair to consider it as incapable of surpassing or simply complying with the limits of *tezkiye*-writing in practice, like Yılmaz does in her summary of the text. Yılmaz argues that the lack of categorization according to genres and literary stances of authors renders Abdülhalim Memduh's work merely chronological, and later asserts that his volume is rather similar to *tezkiyes* and anthologies (in Polat, 41). However, the "lack" of a historiographical method that is not yet explored in the realm of Ottoman literary history is neither valid nor a sound reason to establish a great deal of similarity between the very early forms of Ottoman literary history and Abdülhalim Memduh's work. His denial of

⁴⁶ It must be noted that three of these authors are also Abdülhalim Memduh's contemporaries, so the lack of dates of death is not relevant in their cases.

compliance with *tezkire*-writing, observed both in numerical data and qualitative aspects of the volume, is fundamentally different to *tezki*res in nature, and this is noteworthy in itself. Apaydın also finds that Abdülhalim Memduh's volume "has the voice of the *tezkire*-writing tradition", because he reads that Abdülhalim Memduh's purpose is to "render the works and the authors unforgettable" (in Polat, 165). Apaydın, to the reader's despair, does not quote Abdülhalim Memduh on this. In my reading, I find the exact opposite to be the case: Abdülhalim Memduh asserts in the original text that he deliberately avoids relaying biographies of authors, for he does not believe that this is necessary to understand the literature in and of itself, as the quote preceding this paragraph shows (127).

Another interesting aspect of Abdülhalim Memduh's literary history is the fact that it includes a variety of genres that have marginal intersections with literary production. Historiography per se, lexicography and literary translation are fields that are included in Abdülhalim Memduh's volume. Apart from the surveys of authors and their works, which are mostly listings, the reader also observes this diversity in the sections that are meant to present samples of the authors' works. Abdülhalim Memduh's mention of Koçi Bey, for example, is notable in this respect. Koçi Bey is an Ottoman intellectual who lived in the seventeenth century as historical records show that he was in the entourage of Murad IV., although there is no certainty as to his date of birth or death (Akün, 143). Having been employed in the Ottoman court for drafting official correspondence and being in the close circle of the nobility, Koçi Bey's historical accounts are fascinating for Abdülhalim Memduh. The value he attributes to Koçi Bey's manuscript, which he refers to as "Lâyiha", is so high that he likens it

to Naîmâ's infamous work on Ottoman history. In addition to this, he claims that the literary stylistics of *Naîmâ Tarihi* (*Naîmâ's History*) is modelled on Koçi Bey's literary style (151). Including a historian in a volume of literary history as an important figure in prose shows that Abdülhalim Memduh chooses to diversify his selection of authors in a way that welcomes other genres, even disciplines as legitimate parts of literary history. In a similar vein, the reader sees Abdülhalim Memduh's profile of Asım Efendi in the second chapter, who is a translator and historian with a particular interest in lexicography. Asım Efendi is well-known for his translations of an Arabic dictionary from the fifteenth century by Fîrûzâbâdî, which is originally titled *el-Kâmûsü'l-muhît* (Kılıç, 287) as well as of a Persian dictionary called *Burhân-ı Kâtî`* (Kaçalın, 200) that Abdülhalim Memduh does not mention. Asım Efendi, being a historiographer of the Ottoman court from 1807 to 1819 (Kaçalın, 200), has a number of historical accounts, of which Abdülhalim Memduh mentions only one. Abdülhalim Memduh speaks extremely highly of Asım Efendi's rigour and diligence in translating titled *el-Kâmûsü'l-muhît*, and complains about the lack of such efforts for French (176). Another highlight of Abdülhalim Memduh's mention of Asım Efendi is the point where he finds Asım Efendi's translation of titled *el-Kâmûsü'l-muhît* as "suitable for the existing literary language" (176). It is difficult to claim that Abdülhalim Memduh hints at the contextual nature of Asım Efendi's translation solely on the basis of this description; however, this aspect of Asım Efendi's work is also highlighted elsewhere in the literature. Kılıç emphasises the fact that Asım Efendi's work goes beyond a simple act of translation, and renders the edition an individual work of scholarly production, for it compiles further information regarding the topic as well as extensively appropriating the

terminology to the corresponding language (288). In this way, Abdülhalim Memduh's recognition of Âsım Efendi's plausible contribution to Ottoman literature from a linguistic perspective demonstrates the scope of his viewpoint regarding the nature of literature and literary historiography. Another highlight of Abdülhalim Memdûh's remarkably inclusive approach to literary history is his emphasis of literary translation as a legitimate part of Ottoman literature. One of the most outstanding examples of this aspect of his work is the section on Pertev Paşa. Abdülhalim Memduh regards Pertev Paşa as one of the innovators of literary translation and its linguistic aspect (185), and presents examples of Pertev Paşa's translations of Victor Hugo's poetry (185-9). In order to show Pertev Paşa's ability to translate prose, Abdülhalim Memdûh mentions his translations of Jean Jacques Rousseau's letters, although there is no excerpt from these in the volume⁴⁷ (189). He also hints at the field of literary criticism, when he refers to Şinâsi Efendi and Nâmık Kemal as the pioneers of the discipline (quoted in Yılmaz, 44). Abdülhalim Memduh's mention of Reşid Paşa is also significant in this sense, for he considers Reşid Paşa's literary production, which is constituted by political writings, as part of Ottoman literature. He makes it clear that Reşid Paşa's political stance is not of interest for his volume (191); however, he includes a sizeable excerpt of Reşid Paşa's prose ("Sûret-i Nutk" ["A Sample of His Speech"]). This excerpt is the written form of a speech given by Reşid Paşa at an official gathering (192-5), which adds yet another layer to the diversity of genres and disciplines Abdülhalim

⁴⁷ What is peculiar here is that Abdülhalim Memduh does note that he would like to present several excerpts of these letters; however, it looks like these excerpts are omitted from the volume. It is possible to establish that this is the case, because there is a note, either by the author or the editor/publisher that says "mezkûr mektûb tayy olundu" ("aforementioned letter has been omitted") as Abdülhalim Memduh expresses this desire (190). For the reader does not come across any other example of such omission throughout the volume, this shows that including translations in a literary history is a challenging task for the historian.

Memduh shows interest in. Given the overall scope of Abdülhalim Memduh's literary history, where only eighteen major authors are discussed, for three authors that predominantly engaged with other disciplines to be discussed under the heading "history of literature" is an outstanding characteristic. Presenting works of historiography and literary translation alongside literary production, Abdülhalim Memduh's attempt may almost be seen as an act of interdisciplinary effort to make sense of literary history with its sources, related practices and corpora of varying strands of scholarly work. As the very first volume of its kind and as a crucial shift from *tezkires*, where no other genre than poetry carries literary importance or legitimacy, Abdülhalim Memduh's comprehensive framework is unique, no matter how its execution may seem factually dubious and insufficient at times.

After Abdülhalim Memduh's volume, there are fragments of literary historiographical practice that are essentially biographies and anthologies both regarding their form and content. Some of these are the afore-mentioned *Osmanlı Şâirleri (Ottoman Poets)* by Muallim Nâci (1890) and *Eslâf (The Pioneers)* by Fâik Reşad (1895/6). These works are compilations of poets' biographies and selections of poems, reminiscent of *tezkires* in their form, content and method. Muallim Naci refers to one hundred and seven (Muallim Naci, V-VIII), whereas Fâik Reşat in *The Pioneers* lists seventy-one poets.⁴⁸ The increase in the number of authors mentioned in these sources is noteworthy, as Abdülhalim Memduh's volume covers less than half of the latter in number. This

⁴⁸ I have counted the number of poets mentioned in *Eslâf's* transcription by Şemsettin Kutlu, which is based on the initial version, published in *Hazîne-i Fünûn (Treasures of Knowledge)*, and this number may be different in the printed version of the work. However, Kutlu says that the early version is more extensive than the later one, and that is why I opted for the former as the basis of the aforementioned numerical data (Fâik Reşad, *Eslâf*, 12).

can be interpreted as a sign that the intellectual interest in literary historiography steadily translates into practice in this decade.

2. c. Theoretical Developments and Its Implications for the Practice of Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography in the Case of Şehâbeddin Süleyman & His *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*

The second attempt at writing a comprehensive history of Ottoman literature is carried out by Şehâbeddin Süleyman (1885-1919) in 1910. Coming from a family of high-ranking civil servants and intellectuals, Şehâbeddin Süleyman received his primary education in İzmir and went on to studying at the School of Politics ("Mekteb-i Mülkiyye"). Upon his graduation, he first took a job at the Ministry of Education. Shortly after that, he began to teach French at a prestigious high school in İstanbul; however, his term in this institution was terminated in 1910, after the play *Dead End* ("Çıkmaz Sokak") he wrote and staged was found morally inappropriate for depicting homosexual relationships between female characters (Polat, *Şahabeddin Süleyman*, 78). In the meanwhile, he became involved in politics with the start of the Second Constitutional Era, and joined the Osmanlı Demokrat Fırkası ("Ottoman Democrat Party"), which opposed the radical discourse of İttihât ve Terakki Fırkası ("Communion and Progress Party"), and followed a rather unifying stance towards the demographically diverse nature of the Empire. Şehâbeddin Süleyman wrote numerous articles in literary and political journals and

newspapers. He also published plays and textbooks on literature and literary history as well as translations from French into Turkish.

The title of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's volume is also *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*), and is claimed to be written for sixth and seventh grade high school students in İstanbul (Gültekin in Polat, 61). The organisation of content in Şehâbeddin Süleyman is interesting in a number of ways.⁴⁹ First of all, he opts for giving subtitles to his periodization, and these subtitles bring genre and literary criticism into play. Secondly, there are footnotes assigned to the titles of chapters and subchapters that refer to several French intellectuals of the period without particular referencing. For example, the subchapter titled "Formation of Art" has a footnote that reads "paraphrased from Veron"⁵⁰⁵¹, yet another subchapter "The Literary Periods" has one that remarks "paraphrased from Faguet"⁵².⁵³ This feature of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's work is important regarding the use of foreign sources in Ottoman literary historiography, for it stands as the first example of this phenomenon.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman, compared to Abdülhalim Memduh, sets the tone of his introduction in a rather impersonal manner. In this part of his work, where the reader expects to see his explanation as to why he authored a volume of Ottoman literary history, Şehâbeddin Süleyman does not communicate a personal account of his motivation. Polat points out that Şehâbeddin Süleyman

⁴⁹ The reconstruction of the table of contents for his work can be found in the appendix ("Table 5. 'Table of Contents' of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*").

⁵⁰ Eugène Véron (1825-1889) is a French philosopher ("Eugène Véron". [Wikidata](https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Q9256118). <https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Q9256118>, accessed on 25 July 2019).

⁵¹ "Veron'dan Meâlen" (Polat, 49).

⁵² Émile Faguet (1847—1916) is a French literary critic and lecturer ("Émile Faguet." [Oxford Reference](https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095808614). <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095808614>, accessed on 25 July 2019).

⁵³ "Faguet'den Meâlen" (Polat, 55)

does not mention a desire or a plan of the sort in his other writings either (*Şahabeddin Süleyman*, 131).

As his volume does not have a preface, the reader is made to dive into the scholarly discussion from the outset. The first part of the introduction, “Formation of Art”, is a brief albeit dense section, where Şehâbeddin Süleyman presents his definitions and descriptions of art, literature and literary history in the specific context of the intellectual scene in the Ottoman Empire.

Acknowledging the value of artistic expression, Şehâbeddin Süleyman puts forward that it is beneficial to examine the nature of art itself (3). Then, he establishes a resemblance between how a society is formed by individuals and how literature also consists of isolated and individual contributions. However, this similarity does not imply the same extent of inspiring the idea of social history as it is in Abdülhalim Memduh’s case. What is methodologically noteworthy is that the principle behind such formations seems to be an inductive one, considering the relevant contributions as singular phenomena that constitute a whole.

After this hint at the underlying ontological understanding of how literary history is shaped, Şehâbeddin Süleyman begins to elaborate upon the idea of a collective⁵⁴ spirit when it comes to describing the backbone of literary expression for a people. He believes that every nation’s collective spirit, which embodies the public opinion and the intellectual feel of the era, expresses itself time and time again in the individual works of literature. Then, he brings forth another aspect of how literature, therefore literary history, is constituted. In his

⁵⁴ Şehâbeddin Süleyman uses the word “`umumî” (“public”) while referring to what I termed as “collective”. The reason for the first preference is that he uses the word “`umumî” almost always in the same context as “kavm”, therefore the term “collective” stands as a better match for the reader to grasp the internal dynamics of the text.

opinion, every single event in history reveals an interrelation of succession, and these events are all connected. For Şehâbeddin Süleyman, this is not due to historical contingency, although he acknowledges that it may not be possible to reveal all of these connections by means of scholarly research (4-5).

Nevertheless, he does not refrain from making an ontological assumption by saying that historian's incapacity of resolving this conundrum does not prove the absence of such events, thus such connections. This is the first hint of a methodical implication of employing scientific realism in historiographical practice in the course of Ottoman literary history, in the sense that there is a recommended belief in both the observable and unobservable aspects of the world described by sciences (Chakravartty, 1).

Şehâbeddin Süleyman's text takes an interesting turn at this point. Having highlighted how literary expression reflects the collective spirit of a nation, he explains that the ideas and emotions as primary subjects of literature become exhausted as they are repeated, and this renders the literature of the sort "old" (5). As humanity progresses, a need for the "new" arises, and Şehâbeddin Süleyman does not seem to think very highly of literary production that aims to fulfil what the "new" requires:

For rejuvenation of emotions, literary expression and thousands of its tricks are used. The limits of the strength that literary expression bears are approached. While, fundamentally, art owes the reason for its existence to setting its purpose as expressing and relaying what collective mind and spirit manifests, it shifts its focus to literary expression itself from then on. Then, a division between a group of curious individuals taking pleasure from these tricks and the rest, which is ninety-nine per cent of the population, incapable and disinterested in understanding art, arises. From this minute onwards, this division implies

that there are two segments of society: one that understands art, and one that does not.⁵⁵ (5-6)

Şehâbeddin Süleyman adds that this phenomenon repeats throughout history and that no society could ever escape its effects. Although he finds it compatible with the natural course of history, it is not difficult to read between the lines that he implies a strong dissatisfaction with the end result of this drive by saying that it is deceitful in nature. Accordingly, for this approach appears not to be in favour of previously un contemplated transformations, the principle of continuity and habitual change in literary production stands out at the other end of the dichotomy.⁵⁶

Şehâbeddin Süleyman's piece reveals another milestone regarding its evaluation of what the "Ottoman" nation implies. He posits that "Ottomans are fundamentally Turks" (6), whereas previously, Abdülhalim Memduh only entertains the thought that Turkish, without any further claims regarding ethnicity, is the original language of the Ottomans, as discussed above. This is noteworthy, since it is the first instance of the Ottoman identity presented as an essentially Turkish one in a work of literary history. However, Şehâbeddin Süleyman's following emphasis on a geographical divide shows that he does not reduce the Ottoman identity to a Turkish one. He puts forward that the

⁵⁵ "Tecdid-i tahassüsât için ifâdeye ve bunun binlerce hîlelerine mürâca`at olunur. Ifâdenin kâbiliyyet mihenginin en son noktalarına kadar gidilir. Esâsen san`at, hiss-i `umumî, fikr-i `umumîyi, nakil ve ifâdeyi gâye ittihâz ederek doğmuşken bundan sonra ifâde husûsunu gâye ittihâz etmiş olur. İşte bu zaman bu hîlelerden zevk duyan bir kısım erbâb-ı merâkla cem`iyyetin yüzde doksan dokuzunu teşkil eden bunlardan bir şey anlamayan, anlamak için cehd-u gayret etmeyen bir kısım avam teşekkül eder ki bu dakîkadan îtibâren cem'iyet, san`at hakkında anlayan, anlamayan olmak üzere ikiye münkasım olmuş olur."

⁵⁶ The reader will encounter why this emphasis of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's is the omen for a more substantial account of why this is the case and it is fundamentally important for Ottoman literary historiography when the discussion continues with the in-depth analysis of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's article on method.

Ottomans interacted and became unified with other nations as they conquered land people, which rendered them different to the Turks in Turkistan. For Şehâbeddin Süleyman, the term Ottoman literature does not refer to the literature in Turkistan, for the intellectual and cultural composition of this ethnic group is fundamentally different to the Turks who form the Ottoman nation (6). His interest lies in the Ottoman literary identity, despite the fact that he presents a specific origin of ethnicity for the Ottomans.

Moving onto the issue of Ottoman language, Şehâbeddin Süleyman starts out by resuming the story of where the Ottomans come from. He believes that this journey commences in Central Asia, and narrates how Süleyman Şah escaped the abuse of Genghis Han to end up in Anatolia as the forefather of the Ottomans (7). After this, he moves onto delivering an account of how the Ottoman language is formed and which the internal dynamics and external influences shape this language. He touches upon the significance of the fact that the official correspondence between the Anatolian Turks and the Seljuks is in Persian, and he quotes a long letter from Sultan Osman Gazi to “Alaattin bin Ferâmûz-i Selçukî”.⁵⁷ The heavy use of Persian in this letter is a clear indication of the very early impact of Persian and Arabic on Turkish language for Şehâbeddin Süleyman. Given this example, he argues that the Turkish language has been in the process of transformation since the early days of the Turks finding their way in and through Anatolia. This is an issue where the reader observes a difference in opinion between Şehâbeddin Süleyman and

⁵⁷ As far as I can trace who is meant by this sultan, I believe that it is Kayqubād III, for his full name is Alā’ ad-Dīn Kayqubād bin Farāmūz. If the reader pays attention to the dates of political activity of Kayqubād III, it is possible to determine the range of years during which this letter might have been written, for Şehâbeddin Süleyman does not note a date for this letter. Kayqubād III is traced back to the late thirteenth century, and his politically active years begin circa 1283 and lasts until his death in 1302 (Cohen, 294). This historical fact does not seem to clash with what Şehâbeddin Süleyman argues for.

Abdülhalim Memduh. The latter puts forward in the first section of his volume of literary history that Turkish is littered with Persian and Arabic borrowings, resulting in the loss of its purity after the expansion of the Ottoman Empire in later centuries (Abdülhalim Memduh, 131). Whereas, for the former, the interaction between and the refinement of these three languages by which the Ottoman language is shaped has a history that precedes the Ottoman Empire, and that is why Persian and Arabic are natural constituents of the Ottoman language.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman provides the reader with the underlying logic of his periodization in the subchapter “The Literary Periods” of the introduction. He says that “it is rather appropriate to determine the eras in literature in accordance with the transformations in the structure of the society”⁵⁸ (14). This remark can be interpreted as a shout-out to social history, lending a hand to the literary historian with respect to method, for it aligns the events of history with the literary phenomena. Şehâbeddin Süleyman also acknowledges that there may be differences between the literary stances of authors of a particular period as well as variations in genre (16). In his classification, he correlates the general specifications of literary eras to their dominant genres, as the reader may observe in the denominations used for these periods. However, Şehâbeddin Süleyman does not expand upon this aspect of his periodization in this subchapter. Gültekin reports that Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s following chapters do not offer any further categorization or elaboration either (in Polat, 66).

A novel feature of Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s literary history is the practice of comparisons between Ottoman and French authors, which is not a

⁵⁸ “Edebîyyât devrelerinin taksîmi, cem’iyyetin teşekkülâtının tebeddülüne göre tefrîk edilirse daha doğru, daha musîb olur”.

phenomenon observed in Abdülhalim Memduh's work. Gültekin mentions that Şehâbeddin Süleyman calls Halit Ziya "a Turkified Alphonse Daudet" while comparing Mehmed Rauf to Baudelaire (in Polat, 67). Given that this is also the first volume of literary history where references to French literary theory are made, it is possible to establish that the intellectual curiosity towards the French in the field of literary historiography is visibly present.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman dedicates the last chapter of his work to a few last words, where he rushes two more authors into the picture, highlighting that there are many more that he fails to mention due to the limited space he has (377). In this subchapter, the reader also finds that there is a correction by Fâik Reşad, which Şehâbeddin Süleyman thankfully cites (378). This shows that Fâik Reşad, as a literary historian of the time, is aware of other works published in the field and he actively engages with the debates regarding these.

Besides the outstanding and intriguing aspects of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's work as a literary historian, one of the characteristics of his volume that requires further attention is the level of subjectivity involved in his analysis. The peak of this phenomenon is seen in the oddly titled chapter "Confusions in Literature", where he attacks Muallim Nâci with the following commentary: "In order to gain popularity amongst youngsters instead of focusing on his work, busy with tricks and deceits that oozes a sinister influence upon the present literature, Muallim Naci Efendi is the man who single-handedly held back the perfecting of the literary style endorsed by Abdülhak Hâmid"⁵⁹ (Gültekin in Polat, 65). Putting the borderline ad hominem nature of the above-mentioned

⁵⁹ "Eserinden ziyâde şahsının etrâfında zamanının gençlerini toplayabilmek için çevirmedığı hilelerle dolaplarla edebiyâtta meş`ûm bir te'sîr yaparak Abdülhak Hâmid tarz-ı edebîsinin tekâmülüne birkaç seneler mâni olan Muallim Nâci Efendi'dir."

commentary aside, it is seen that the ungrounded causal connection between why a particular literary style is not taken up by other authors towards its betterment and Muallim Nâci's possible contribution to this is bringing literary criticism into the sphere of literary historiography. Comparatively, in Abdülhalim Memduh's work, despite its shortcomings, the critical commentary is minimal and this, in principle, renders his volume a fact-oriented one, although not necessarily a diligent one at all times, rather than a hybrid composition between literary criticism and literary historiography. The latter phenomenon begins to be observed in the practice of Ottoman literary historiography with Şehâbeddin Süleyman, where the historian's impressions of authors and texts are embedded in the literary histories.

2. d. Ali Ekrem Bolayır's Case

In 1910, another volume of Ottoman literary historiography appeared, written by Ali Ekrem Bolayır, Nâmık Kemal' son and lecturer at the Dârülfünûn, today's University of İstanbul. Published as a lithograph, this volume is a compilation of his lecture notes that focus on contemporary Ottoman literature. Çetin in his article about the issue of methodology in Ali Ekrem Bolayır's work states that this volume is neither periodically organised nor methodically rigorous (39). Parlatır, identifying the same issue as Çetin in his survey of Bolayır's life and works, notes that Bolayır's theoretical approach towards literary history is mostly inspired by Taine and Faguet (59), and that its scope is extremely limited. Although lacking a system of periodization and organised

around one literary period only, Bolayır mentions two strands of literary influence present in the corpus of works: The Eastern and the Western influences (Çetin, 40). As the reader shall be informed later, the emergence of this idea can be seen in a book review by Ali Cânib Yöntem as an objection to Şehâbeddin Süleyman's criterion of periodization.⁶⁰ However, it is difficult to establish where the gist of this thought comes from, for the month in which Ali Ekrem Bolayır's volume was published is not mentioned in the cover page of this publication, dating the same year as Yöntem's review of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's work.

2. e. Specialization & Textuality in the Practice of Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography: Fâik Reşad & His *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*

One of the other volumes of Turkish literary history is Fâik Reşad's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye (History of Ottoman Literature)*, following the lead of the two preceding volumes in terms of authenticity when it comes to titles, written in 1911. Having recently been transliterated, Fâik Reşad's work is one of the key sources for the reader to develop a deeper understanding of what the Ottoman intelligentsia of the late nineteenth century regarded as historiographical practice in the realm of literature.

Fâik Reşad held teaching positions at Dârülfünûn Târîh-i Edebiyyât (History and Literature Department at what is today University of İstanbul) and

⁶⁰ This objection is quoted and analysed in the section on Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work.

at the School of Land Registry & Cadastre. The volume in focus is an edition of his lecture notes that he accumulated over the years.

Ali Emîrî, a close friend of Fâik Reşad's, claims that Fâik Reşad loses his post at the university as a result of Köprülü's criticism of his literary history (54). Emîrî adds that Köprülü's underlying motive was to be assigned to the post held by Fâik Reşad. Having been made redundant in official terms, Fâik Reşad got downgraded to a teaching position at a high school in İstanbul and passed away two years later.

The chapters titled "İfâde-i Mahsûsa" (literally translated as "Special Words", equivalent to "Preface" in practice) and "Medhal" (literally translated as "Introduction") are the most significant aspects of Fâik Reşad's volume from a metahistoriographical perspective, as they reveal the thinking behind this volume. In the preface, Fâik Reşad highlights that he was encouraged to write on this topic merely because of the shortcomings of the previous works in his field (40). Another interesting remark in this preface is where Fâik Reşad presents the reader with a specific request: He kindly asks his readers to reach out for possible corrections that they think he should consider for future editions, paving the way for academic dialogue. He emphasises that he would take these remarks into account as long as they were reasonable and logical as well as supported with evidence and documentation. Fâik Reşad's emphasis on reason and logic as well as documentation in order for an opinion to be justified as a valid and sound contribution is an original statement in its own right. As we have seen in the case of *tezkires*, the conventional frames of reference tend to prioritise tradition over reason, which potentially overpowers the individual's attempts to bring new aspects into play. Fâik Reşad's emphasis on proper

argumentation, in this sense, is novel in the field. Fâik Reşad's tendency to remain critically-minded and maintain proper argumentation can be seen in his discussion of Ziyâ Paşa's take on literary history in *Harâbât*'s introduction. Fâik Reşad's disagreements with Ziyâ Paşa's statements seem to involve an argumentative angle in most cases, and he endeavours to justify his objections by putting forward textual and/or historical evidence that he believes is correct, or he tries to identify the incoherencies and inconsistencies in Ziyâ Paşa's work. To exemplify the first one of the two ways in which Fâik Reşad's objections are formed, it may be beneficial to examine his argument against Ziyâ Paşa's claim that the early Ottoman poets' knowledge of Persian metre (*arûz*) comes from their familiarity with Ali Şîr Nevâî. Fâik Reşad claims that this cannot be the case. Because, if we assume that Ziyâ Paşa is right, we must be able to see an expanded range of *arûz* styles in the poetries of Ahmed Paşa and Nizâmî. However, Fâik Reşad claims, we do not observe a change in this respect. On the contrary, according to him, we see the same poetic features to be repeated since the era of Şeyhî and Ahmedî, who precede Ali Şîr Nevâî. The second way in which Fâik Reşad constructs his objections is prevalent in another example, where he observes a contradiction⁶¹ within Ziyâ Paşa's piece. Fâik Reşad finds that the line "evvel söze başlamış Nevâî" ("Nevâî's word came first") and the couplets below problematic:

Eslâfda Ahmed u Necâtî

The ones that were the first, Ahmed
and Necâtî

Âvâre vü dil-şikeste Zâtî

Idle and heart-broken Zâtî

⁶¹ "contradiction" is expressed as "tenâkuz" ("contradictory" or "opposing" in Arabic) in Fâik Reşad's words.

Türkî sühâna temel komuşlar	They had built the word of Turkish
Amma temeli güzel komuşlar	And they had built it beautifully

According to Fâik Reşad, Ziyâ Paşa contradicts himself regarding the origin of Ottoman poetry, as he refers to both Nevâî and Ahmed as well as Necâti and Zâtî being “evvel” (“first”) or “eslâf” (“predecessor”). Then, Fâik Reşad quotes Nâmık Kemal’s statements on which poets must be enumerated in such a list. Although his reference to Nâmık Kemal is not necessarily an example of good argumentation as it appeals to authority, which is in itself a logical fallacy, his desire to nonetheless compare and contrast various parts of a text with a critical eye is remarkable in terms of its argumentative tendency.

Fâik Reşad’s volume touches upon various other issues, such as the relationship between literature, literary expression and poetry, poetic measures, literary stylistics and differences between trends of poetry in terms of their preferences regarding poetic measures, prose, as well as the use of Turkish language and punctuation. This is followed by his attempt at a conceptual evaluation of Ottoman literary history as a whole. In order to accomplish this task, Fâik Reşad first talks about the possible number of authors that are involved in literary production. His estimate is around one thousand when, in his words, the “imposters and plagiarists” are eliminated from the list. In his literary history, Fâik Reşad says that he wishes to focus on a certain number of authors, as he thinks that those are the ones who are small in number, but had served and influenced [Ottoman] literature to varying extents. He describes this group of authors as “mümtaz” (“chosen”) and “müstesnâ” (“exceptional”) (55). This moment in the text manifests a clear indication of the idea of “canonical

formation” being spelt out in literary historiographical practice as a methodical concern, consciously reflected upon and presented as the foundation of a literary history to epistemologically rest upon. In addition to the idea of canonical formation emerging in itself, we see Fâik Reşad’s way of denoting the result of this formation: He chooses the word “kadro”, which is likely to be a borrowed term from French “cadre”.⁶² The fact that Fâik Reşad prefers a foreign equivalent for this term and attempts at conceptualising this phenomenon may point at the fact that he desires to assign a new meaning to this early form of canonical formation, different than what the *tezkiye*-writing tradition does until that point in Ottoman literary history.

Fâik Reşad plans his literary history in three volumes. The first volume, which is the only one he could publish, consists of a preface, an introduction and twelve chapters on various periods in Ottoman literary history. The second volume would take up the timeline from where it was left at the end of the first volume and cover the literature until the then-present day, and the third one would be designed as an anthology of excerpts of poetry and prose. After putting forward his main reason for writing this volume and sketching out his plan as to how to proceed, Fâik Reşad moves onto the introduction, where we start coming across what renders his volume the first example of modern literary historiography. At the start of this chapter, he effortlessly posits that literary history is a branch of history as an overarching discipline. For Fâik Reşad, this is merely stating the obvious, and he gives the example of medicine as a science, and chemistry, pharmacology and others being branches of this

⁶² “cadre” in French stands for a number of meanings, ranging from “frame” to its use in the nineteenth century for a group of army officials or administrators (<https://www.cnrtl.fr/etymologie/cadre>, accessed on 29 October 2019). In Faik Reşad’s case, the inspiration for the use of this term remains unknown throughout the volume.

science (5). Given the dominant intellectual trends in the categorization and organisation of scientific knowledge in the late nineteenth century, Fâik Reşad's viewpoint is not strikingly different. However, his intention to directly associate the practice of literary historiography with the discipline of history itself is valuable, for it offers a certain degree of detachment from the aesthetic concerns maintained in the practice of *tezkire*-writing.

According to Fâik Reşad, literary history “is a branch of history that informs us of the historical aspects of each nation's literature, consisting of poetry and prose, from its beginnings until the present day or until a particular point in time”.⁶³ He highlights that the term “nation” is a placeholder for the particular literary history in focus, and in his case, it must be regarded as the “Ottomans”. His choice of words is intriguing, as he does not expand upon who the Ottomans really are. In this era, the use of the term “millet” undergoes a gradual albeit drastic shift from designating a group of people of a certain religion to becoming a conceptual placeholder for a particular ethnicity (Şentürk, 66). In Fâik Reşad's case, there is not any indication as to where his signifier stands in this spectrum at this point in the text.

After Fâik Reşad's definition of literary history and its appropriation to the case of Ottoman literature, he starts expanding upon the subject of literary history. There are three subjects for the literary historian to examine, according to him. These are (i) literary periods within the framework of social and natural bearings that shaped the production in the relevant eras, (ii) authorship in these literary periods and their works as well as their impact for the succeeding

⁶³ “Her millete nazım ve nesrden ibâret edebiyâtın ibtidâ`-i şuyû`undan hâl-i hâzırâ, yâhûd mu`ayyen bir zamana kadar olan ahvâl-i târîhiyyesini bildiren bir fendir”.

authors and their works, and (iii) development of language involving a focus on its evolution towards its perfect state.

For Fâik Reşad, literary history must penetrate the most intricate details of the existing literary works. This way, the historian can make use of the origins and sources of these literary works in order to establish a comparative viewpoint between the literature of the past and present, which then enables him/her to elaborate upon the progress and future developments in literary history. However, he quotes Ali Ekrem, an Ottoman intellectual that he closely followed, that this must not be regarded as an act of historical re-enactment: It must be understood as an effort to reveal the historical connections and literary influences that can be observed throughout a particular timeline.

Fâik Reşad's discussion of the concept of literary history takes a turn toward the specifics, and he expresses his desire to understand the primary qualities of "literature" as a notion in itself. For him, on the one hand, the term "literature" rings in an immediate relation of signification that any reader can grasp. On the other hand, he says that the terms "edebiyât" ("literature") and "edîb" ("author") are fairly new, being around for roughly forty-five years. Previously, Fâik Reşad recalls, the terms "ilm-i edeb" ("science of literature") and "ilm-i belâgât" ("science of rhetoric") would be in use while referring to what "edebiyât" stands for. Fâik Reşad mentions titles from the literature of the time, such as Diyarbakırlı Sâ'it Paşa's *Mizânü'l-Edeb* and İsmâil Ankaravî's *Miftâhu'l Belâgâ* in order to support his claim. Apart from these rather obscure examples, he also refers to Cevdet Paşa's *Belâgât-ı Osmâniyye*, which is dedicated to Ottoman literature. In the same vein, Fâik Reşad discusses the term "edîb" in the last part of his introduction. He explains that "edîb" signifies both "poet" and

“writer”, which pointed at entirely different capacities, and therefore enabling us to think of “author” as an appropriate term. Fâik Reşad’s last remark on this term brings in the long-standing aspect of being an intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: an “edîb” withholds wisdom both in the scholarly (“`ilm-i edeb” in particular) and in the intuitive (“ma`rifet”⁶⁴) sense.

There are three points that I believe must be made regarding Fâik Reşad’s use of “edebiyyât” and “edîb” as signifiers for literary production and *literati* in the context of Ottoman intellectual history: The first point is that the term “edebiyyât” seems to isolate literary production of aesthetic value, hence offering a separate critical space for scholarly enquiry of this field on its own terms. In other words, its use implies the existence of a corpus of literary production apart from everything ever written, which seems to be the case in the preceding period. The second point is that it reveals a cross-genre (i. e. poetry and prose) status for aesthetic production, hence involving other genres within the literary realm as legitimate parts of it. Yet another interesting point, the third one, to be made is about “edîb” replacing, or at least occupying a sizable space, as a referent for authorship. This can be analysed from a practical aspect, as in, authors confidently claiming their literary production, but also the idea that it is not what is put out as literary production that defines the *literati*. It is rather the fact that they “author: It is the act of “authoring” that is recognized independently of the literary work, expanding the horizon of literary history as well as literary criticism regarding the status of the text in its own right.

⁶⁴ Conventionally, “ma`rifet” is the preferred term for “knowledge of God” in the literature of Islamic mysticism, which is achieved through intuition and contemplation, and it does not always signify the same meaning as “`ilm”, which we can translate as “scientific knowledge” (Uludağ, 54).

Beyond the preface and the introduction, Fâik Reşad's literary history provides further insight into the extent of the mode of change in the practice of literary historiography in the Ottoman intellectual scene. One of the prevalent aspects of Fâik Reşad's volume that shows the limits of this newly emerging progressive mind-set regarding method is periodization. As explained in the preface, Fâik Reşad divides the first volume into twelve chapters, which are the following:

1- The Âşık Paşa Era, 2- The Şehrî Era, 3- The Ahmed Paşa Era, 4- The Necâti Era, 5- The Zâtî Era, 6- The Bâkî Era, 7- The Nef'î Era, 8- The Nâbî Era, 9- The Nedîm Era, 10- The Râgıb Paşa Era, 11- The Şeyh Gâlib Era, 12- The Şinâsi Era

As the reader would be familiar with the fundamental idea of *tezkires* at this point in our enquiry, s/he can easily recognize what the principle behind the periodization above reveals in relation to the preceding forms of historiographical practice: The rule of thumb is unchanged, the convention favours persons over reasons when it comes to defining and describing the overarching aesthetic spirit of a literary era. Hence, at the outset, Fâik Reşad's emphasis on "the social and natural bearings that shaped the literary production"⁶⁵ does not seem to alter the urge to present the literary character of an era as fundamentally embodied in authorship and through exemplification. Fâik Reşad, nevertheless, adds another layer to his periodization, which brings

⁶⁵ "edebiyâtın –esbâb ve mü'essirât-ı tabiyye ve ictimâ'îyye tahtında olarak– (...) zuhûr eden ashâb-ı âsâr ve eserlerinden" (5)

the theme of “intellectual adolescence” into play. He considers the first six eras referred to in the periodization above as “the infancy era”. At this point in his discussion relating to periodization, Fâik Reşad dwells into the debate of language. This detail demonstrates that he does take an analytically-minded angle on the issue, however conventional the end result appears to be. The best example of this phenomenon in his volume is when he compares the early days of the literary production in the Ottoman Empire to the “post-infancy era”. Fâik Reşad examines the effects of the Persian world on the Ottoman Empire in terms of their religious, political, social, historical and geographical relations, and concludes that the Ottoman poets still suffer from the problem of imitation in the subject-matter era; however, they are no longer concerned regarding the linguistic opportunities that Turkish provides them with. Fâik Reşad develops this thought by naming two authors as examples of what he thinks represents this shift in the best possible way. In addition to Nefî and Nâbî, he uses further examples to support his observation, all of which are poets that exemplify this phenomenon in his view.

The second layer of Fâik Reşad’s periodization follows the same train of thought, and introduces the periods of “kemâl devri” (“maturity era”), “ikbâl devri”⁶⁶ (“era of progress”) and “zevâl devri” (“final era”). The continuing theme of adolescence and coming of age is noteworthy, yet again, as Fâik Reşad’s expression of the period following the “infancy era” calls an anthropomorphic image of literary history. Furthermore, all of these periods are expressed as intellectual embodiments of the literary spirit of the time via specific impressions of Bâkî, Nefî and Nâbî, and Şeyh Gâlib. The period following the Şeyh Gâlib

⁶⁶ “ikbâl” in Arabic has a number of meanings such as “desire”, “intention” and “good luck”. In this case, I find it appropriate to translate this term as “progress”, as it combines the notions of intentionality and betterment.

era is, not to the reader's surprise, "constituted"⁶⁷ by Şinâsi, Ziyâ Paşa, Nâmîk Kemal, Ârif Hikmet, Avnî, Râtîb, Ali Rûhî, Fâik Eşref, Memdûh Kâzım, Celâl Paşa, Osman Şems and Seniî Efendi.

After his discussion of specific periods in literary history, Fâik Reşad shares his concerns with his readers again; however, this time in greater detail. He claims that the corpus of literary production since Osman I is fragmental albeit prolific, and the compilation of these sources is owed to the efforts of individuals. According to Fâik Reşad, a manuscript that we can regard as "literary history" does not exist, and this is the greatest obstacle for the historians of Ottoman literature. Fâik Reşad, then, brings up why he thinks that this is the case: incompetence of the previous generations of intellectuals as well as their neglecting attitude towards this task and laziness. Partly *ad hominem*, Fâik Reşad's arguments regarding this issue almost seem to be driven by the sheer frustration of being the first intellectual to engage with historiographical practice in the Ottoman Empire, having to deal with a topic that is vast and almost indefinitely spread out both chronologically and geographically. At this point, the reader rightly may wonder what Fâik Reşad's viewpoint on *tezkires* is. According to him, *tezkires* are legitimate parts of literary history. In other words, for Fâik Reşad, *tezkires* are not to be dismissed as nonhistoriographical or worthless for scholarly research. Nevertheless, he thinks that we are not informed of the entire corpus. Fâik Reşad's ideal solution

⁶⁷ The choice of words here requires further elaboration, for it points at a linguistic feature that is semantically important. Faik Reşad uses the word "teşkil", which is a transitive verb that comes from the root "şekl" ("form"). "teşkil" assumes an object as well as a subject, and this shows a mereological link between the authors as parts of a whole that is Ottoman literary history, bringing the notion of "agency" for the historian into play. The fact that Faik Reşad chooses this verb rather than "teşekkül" (which is the reflexive verb that descends from the same root) or any other possible equivalent hints at a deliberate expression regarding his take on the ontological aspect of literary history.

that he proposes is to assemble private and public research councils for these hidden treasures of Ottoman literary history to be revealed, which is a novel suggestion that introduces an institutional outlook to the making of Ottoman literary history.

2. f. An Alternative Account of Ottoman/Turkish Literary History: Mehmed Hayreddin & His *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri*

Another volume on Ottoman literary history was published in 1912 by Mehmed Hayreddin, who was a high school teacher from the province of Konya. In his *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (*Lectures on the History of Literature*), Mehmed Hayreddin shares his approach on the language issue with the reader. While Mehmed Hayreddin's immediate readership is highly likely to consist of his students, it is difficult to rule out the possibility of his work having a wider outreach in later decades. Reminiscent of Abdülhalim Memduh's stance, Mehmed Hayreddin believes that Turkish language used to be a pure language prior to its transformation into "a hybrid Ottoman language"⁶⁸, which is one that is intelligible to one person in one hundred thousand people, even in one million (2). His opinion on the issue determines how the rest of his take on Ottoman literary history as a whole shapes up. For example, Mehmed Hayreddin thinks that poets such as Zâtî, Sinan Paşa and Bâkî, and then Nefî, Nâbî, Necâtî and Râgîb Paşa use the language in a way that it destroys any aesthetic pleasure possibly expressed in their literature (3). For Mehmed Hayreddin, authors like

⁶⁸ "bir melez Osmanlı lisânı"

these who opt for heavily foreign vocabulary⁶⁹ are incapable of communicating its message with the “nation”, implied to be Turkish given the nature of his take on language. Borsokeyeva mentions that Mehmed Hayreddin considers Nedîm to be a pioneer in the process of simplification of language, followed by Şinâsi’s contributions that can be regarded as an omen for the major transformation to come; however, the problem comes back in the era influenced by the “Fecr-i Âtî” (“Dawn of the Future”) school (in Polat, 119). At the end of the preface, Mehmed Hayreddin expresses a preference for the “New Language”⁷⁰, as he thinks it represents the people and appeals to their spirit (in Polat 120).

After the preface, Mehmed Hayreddin begins his analysis under the title “History of Ottoman Literature”. For him, a literary history does two things: (1) it presents an in-depth examination of great authors, who are so by virtue of their use of the language, (2) it provides literary criticism about the works by these authors as much as possible (5). Then, Mehmed Hayreddin expands upon the implied driving force behind his thinking of how periodization ought to be carried out. He thinks that periods in literary history must correspond to the stages of linguistic development throughout time. As it can be seen in the analyses of the previous examples of literary historiography, choosing language as the pivotal point of literary historiography is a novel approach to the practice. On this topic, Mehmed Hayreddin favours Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s periodization amongst the sources available until then; however, he desires to improve it by bringing in the linguistic element. In Mehmed Hayreddin’s case, this can be described as determining specific periods in Ottoman literary history by reference to the ones in linguistic history in the Ottoman Empire.

⁶⁹ i. e. Arabic and/or Persian, referred to as “ecnebî kelimât” (3) in the original text.

⁷⁰ “Yeni Lisân”

The framework sketched out above is applied in Mehmed Hayreddin's literary history in a way that is essentially different from the accounts around at the time. His periodization of Ottoman literary history starts out with Yûnus Emre, Süleyman Efendi and Âşık Paşa and continues until Fuzûlî. For Mehmed Hayreddin, this period is when Turkish language is used in the closest form to its original state, whatever that may be, and the New Language era is the period that takes up the same set of principles with respect to language. However, in between these two periods, there are three other periods where Turkish language takes different paths of development, swerving away from its natural state, according to Mehmed Hayreddin. These three periods are the following: (1) a period starting with poets after Fuzûlî and Bâkî and ending with Nedîm, (2) a period starting with Nedîm and ending with Muallim Nâci, (3) a period starting with Muallim Nâci and ending with Fecr-i Âtî.

In general terms, Mehmed Hayreddin finds that the authors classified in these periods do not produce literature that suits the true spirit of Turkish language. Nevertheless, he puts forward two cases of authorship that he considers as exceptions: Abdülhak Hâmid and Tevfik Fikret. In Mehmed Hayreddin's opinion, these two authors deliver literary production that incites invaluable "opinions, emotions and imaginations" for the enrichment of Turkish language (6). For the rest of the authors, he examines in his account of Ottoman literary history, Mehmed Hayreddin's way of organising the information becomes relatively erratic, as Borsokeyeva reports (in Polat, 121). In her analysis, the reader is informed that forty authors are discussed under headings dedicated to them, whereas there are forty-four other ones taking place in the volume without a separate heading. Borsokeyeva finds it odd that Mehmed

Hayreddin devotes more space to certain authors than others, because she thinks that some of the latter authors have greater contributions in terms of either amount or scope. Some of the examples she notes are Nevî with an entire collection of poems and Nefî with poetry collections in Turkish and Persian (in Polat, 121). She then adds that it may be because such authors prefer to use a language crowned with borrowings from Arabic and Persian. It is highly likely that this is the reason for this phenomenon, as Mehmed Hayreddin's criterion for examining literary history is not claimed to be necessarily inclusive of authors who are prolific: He points out, time and time again, that his line of demarcation is whether authors and literary works are linguistically appropriate in his own terms and therefore reflect the true spirit of the people or not. In this light, what is rather odd is to comment on how bizarre it is for Mehmed Hayreddin not to devote a special section to a poet like Nefî who is keen to author an entire collection of poems in Persian.

Borsokeyeva also notes that Mehmed Hayreddin does not necessarily follow a chronological order in his volume, and presents an example of him talking about Râgıb Paşa as appearing in the literary scene after Nedîm, but adopting the literary style of Nâbî, while he brings up neither Nedîm nor Nâbî before that point (in Polat, 122). This, yet again, may have to do with how Mehmed Hayreddin imagines the linguistic continuity between these authors, for that is what he believes to be the glue that binds the chain of literary events to all together make up a meaningful and complete literary history.

Mehmed Hayreddin's account does not involve any biographical information except dates of birth and death, which is the proof of a practical departure from the historiographical mind-set of the *tezkire*-writing tradition in

his case. When it comes to listing the works of a particular author, Borsokeyeva identifies that Mehmed Hayreddin does not carry out the task diligently. She singles out examples of this, such as some of Şinâsi, Nâmık Kemal and Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem's work not being mentioned in the volume (in Polat 122). Let us take the case of Şinâsi. Mehmed Hayreddin talks about Şinâsi's *Tercümân-i Ahvâl* (*The Interpreter of Conditions*), *Tasvîr-i Efkâr* (*Narrator of Opinions*), his articles in *Cerîde-i Askeriyye* (*The Military Periodicals*), his poetry and an unfinished dictionary, and he completely ignores his play titled *Şâir Evlenmesi* (*The Wedding of a Poet*). First point to be made is that his play is originally published in *Tercümân-i Ahvâl* for the first time (Rais'niya, 207), and this shows the plausibility of Mehmed Hayreddin deliberately leaving this text out of his selection. When a closer look is taken at the texts he opts for, it is possible to see that Mehmed Hayreddin is keen on understanding and highlighting linguistic complexity, this may be why he does not show a further interest in a play that is perceived to be primarily aimed at entertainment at the time. This explanation proves not to be far-fetched, when the case of Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem is taken into account: Mehmed Hayreddin talks about his poetry, but not about his *Araba Sevdası* (*The Carriage Affair*). Although *The Carriage Affair*, a novel also perceived as light entertainment at the time for its presumed mockery of Ottoman dandyism, could provide more material for a potential analysis in terms of language, Mehmed Hayreddin's choice is Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem's poetry, possibly considered to be of higher value given the historical importance of the genre in Ottoman literary history. Then, what Mehmed Hayreddin's preferences demonstrate is a phenomenon beyond whether his account of literary history is complete or not. The absence of certain

texts, in this context, points at the then-present judgement towards genre when it comes to looking for the literary complexity and eloquence. Creating a vast catalogue of an author's bibliography is sought after in these volumes as one of the fundamental tasks of the historian to accomplish by some scholars like Borsokeyeva. However, such curated absences can provide unexpectedly useful insight into the collective memory of the literary realm at the time. Here, the issue is mainly regarding the level of critical thinking that is prevalent at the metahistoriographical level of research in Ottoman/Turkish literary history: Scholars often approach sources with a grand narrative in mind, which may be a construct of their own view of the literary world in question, instead of attempting close readings on their own rights. This, in turn, determines how much of the text at issue is understood by the scholar, and therefore analysed with a particular focus that can shed light onto greater problems, a quality which Turkish literary history does not lack.

The mingling of literary history and literary criticism is also seen in Mehmed Hayreddin's volume, as the reader is informed in the "Preface". In the body of the work itself, Mehmed Hayreddin often engages with literary criticism as well as taking it to the point where he engages in ad hominem attacks. For example, while describing Rıza Tevfik as "a shining page in the era of 'Edebiyyât-ı Cedîde' ('The New Literature')" (in Polat, 123), he suddenly brings up personality traits of the author being "light-minded and irreverent"⁷¹ (in Polat, 123). While presenting authors, Mehmed Hayreddin can be very complimentary as well, like when he talks about Abdülhak Hâmid. He says that "we do not have Shakespeares, Lamartines, Goethes, but we have Hâmid" (in Polat, 123).

⁷¹ "Lâkayd ve lâubâlîdir."

Similar to what the reader finds in Şehâbeddin Süleyman's comparison of Ottoman authors to French ones, Mehmed Hayreddin engages with personification of the standards of literary aesthetics by appealing to the aforementioned authors of English, French and German literature, and then presenting an equivalent literary mind from the Ottoman intelligentsia on a par with them.

The most unusual feature of Mehmed Hayreddin's work, when compared to the accounts preceding his, is its emphasis on language, and this is pointed out by other scholars such as Borsokeyeva (in Polat, 123). However, the effort by Mehmed Hayreddin to linguistically link a contemporary movement such as the New Language to a period he assigns to a point in time that is approximately four centuries ago demands further contextualization. The New Language movement led by Ömer Seyfeddin (1884-1920), Ziyâ Gökâlp (1875-1924) and Ali Cânib Yöntem (1888-1967) essentially defends the view that Turkish language ought to be rectified by removing the influence of Arabic and Persian from it, for there is need for a pure Turkish to appeal to and express the spirit of the nation⁷² (Odabaşı, 57). The manifesto of this movement was published in 1911, one year prior to the publication of Mehmed Hayreddin's volume. For a historian with a particular interest in the debate of language, like Mehmed Hayreddin himself, the ideas promulgated in the agenda of the New Language movement are of great importance, as the reader can grasp the

⁷² It is important to note that the New Language movement is an eclectic one as well, with each one of its founders putting forward a slightly different understanding of what it ought to imply. Ömer Seyfeddin and Ziya Gökâlp advocate a view that is in favour of embracing the dynamic aspects of language regardless of linguistic origin. Ali Cânib's stance is a rather radical one, defending the complete elimination of any other linguistic component than the ones originating from Turkish. For a detailed analysis of the differences between their views, see Cevat Özyurt's article titled "Dilde ve Edebiyatta Uluslaşma: Genç Kalemler ve Yeni Lisan Hareketi" (*Muhafazakar Düşünce*, year 2, vol. 5, Summer 2005, [53-79]).

extent of this by him establishing a key connection between this movement and the original state of Ottoman literature at its beginnings. Apart from his intellectual tendency, there is another aspect to be considered, which is where he is based. Since his work was published by the Konya Province Publishing House and he taught in Konya High School, it is known that Mehmed Hayreddin is a literary historian of “the periphery” away from İstanbul, the closely-knitted and lively intellectual environment of the cultural capital of the time. Him not being a part of the Istanbulite intelligentsia, the following question arises: Had he been a part of the intellectual community of literary historians in İstanbul prior to contemplating upon the issues of Ottoman literary history, would he still write a volume with this form, content and method? The answer of this counterfactual may or may not be answered; however, this does not alter the fact that such a unique attempt in literary historiography does originate from outside of İstanbul, where the Ottoman intellectual flair of the era is much less prominent.

2. g. Laying the Foundations: Theory & Practice

Taking a closer look at the corpus of works in this period by examining individual accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, the reader comes across the fundamental problematics shaping up to form a more comprehensive and in-depth debate. While maintaining the selective nature of *tezkire*-writing, the historians of the nineteenth century explore novel strategies when engaging with new forms of literary historiography. Curating their own range of authors to feature as representatives of the literary character of specific periods, they

adopt and transform the underlying logic of canonicity that is embedded in the nature of *tezkires*. As their tendency to internalise the potential of their agency grows stronger, the extent to which they exercise varying degrees of authoritative independence in building their particular take on Ottoman/Turkish literary history becomes increasingly evident. Despite taking root in the very early forms of literary historiography, the practices observed in the nineteenth century corpus manifest a number of characteristics that are unprecedented. When the individual accounts published between 1878 and 1913 are analysed with a strong focus on the possibilities these offer as texts in and of themselves, notable aspects of the transformation in the way in which the practice of literary historiography is perceived and carried out come to light.

This intellectual process commences with Abdülhalim Memduh's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*, which reveals an outstanding degree of agency in curating a selection of poets to be featured, contrary to the practical logic of *tezkire*-writing that conventionally assumes an aesthetically-pleasing and simultaneously the widest scope possible to be the ultimate goal of recording literary history. Although the number of authors featured increase in number in later works, i. e. in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Fâik Reşad's accounts, the reader is still presented with specific therefore limited selections of authors and texts as being representative of various eras and aspects of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, as opposed to the comparatively lengthy listings of *tezkires*. In Fâik Reşad's case, a significant attempt to conceptualise and justify this strategy of selection is seen, marking the first example of its kind within the context of literary historiography. It is also observed that the selective criterion is adjusted by the historian with respect to the central concept according to which

the account of literary historiography is written. For example, while aesthetic value seems to be dominating Fâik Reşad's selection, Mehmed Hayreddin's interest lies in language as the major factor of demarcation. Although the practical nature of this historiographical act is borne out of the tradition of *tezkire*-writing, there appears to be a theoretical shift as to the selective principles employed by the historian.

The notions of rationality and objectivity are also put forward within the framework of literary history for the first time in this era. Abdülhalim Memduh engages with positivist tendencies such as treating the practice of literary historiography as a form of philosophical investigation and putting rationality at the forefront of his enquiry. In terms of utilising the philosophical attitude in literary historiography, Fâik Reşad takes Abdülhalim Memduh's emphasis one step further, in a more systematic and analytical manner, employing reason and logic in his argumentation for or against the opinions asserted by his peers, relying on his own critical judgement and capacity.

Similar to the manifestation of the historian's self-consciousness in the practical expressions of literary historiography, significant developments follow in the way in which literary history is perceived. *Tezkiyes* and *zeyls* are texts that were strictly considered as part of the literary production, i. e. works of literature with an aesthetic appeal, whereas the accounts of literary history written in this period challenge this status. Abdülhalim Memduh is the first historian to bring the notion of human history into play as an overarching discipline by identifying literary history as a legitimate part of it. Fâik Reşad follows a similar line of reasoning by explicitly considering literary history as a sub-discipline of history. Although Şehâbeddin Süleyman seems to refrain from offering a clear-cut

definition of literary history as a field classified under the discipline of history, he describes the evolution of literature in terms of historical progress. As a concept found in the corpus since Abdülhalim Memduh's work, historical progress as a fundamental dynamic in the practice of literary historiography is emphasised by Fâik Reşad as well, particularly in terms of linguistic development.

Abdülhalim Memduh's mention of human history in the context of literary history finds its first practical application later in Şehâbeddin Süleyman's volume, where he argues for the need of scholarly attention towards social history when it comes to literary periodization. In his own work, Abdülhalim Memduh introduces the idea that Turkish language historically is an essential part of the Ottoman identity, which points at a discursive intent towards evaluating such aspects of literary and social character in their own right as well as in juxtaposition to each other, although his elaboration does not develop into a comprehensive analysis of the subject. Şehâbeddin Süleyman's approach is more organised and comprehensive in this sense, for he likens the formation of literature to the formation of society. The former being a subject within literary history, and the latter a subject of social history, Şehâbeddin Süleyman's pointer openly encourages the historian to appeal to social history as a source for the practice of literary historiography. Following the footsteps of Abdülhalim Memduh, Şehâbeddin Süleyman does rely on the idea of historical progress, only to take it further by introducing the notion of historical unity. Surrounded by various manifestations of historical progress in the context of literary history, such as the idea of a collective spirit that is central to the unity of a nation, or the existence of repeating historical patterns that constitute the entirety of historical reality, Şehâbeddin Süleyman's understanding of historical unity is the

first hint at the practical implications of positivism, particularly scientific realism, in the framework of literary historiography. Fâik Reşad does not utilise tools of social history for particular purposes in his volume, and his analytical emphasis is mainly on the texts themselves. However, he acknowledges that one ought to be mindful of the notion of historical progress while writing literary history, especially when tracing down the evolution of language. This is yet another point of departure from the norms of *tezkiire*-writing for the historians of the nineteenth century: *Tezkires* enumerate, whereas accounts of literary history present phenomena not only in historical succession, but also by establishing meaningful connections between them in light of specific alternative paradigms such as socio-historical implications of the literary production, language, and/or textuality.

Denying the sufficiency of *tezkires* in reflecting upon literary history, Abdülhalim Memduh does not only favour portraying the nature of literary production by appealing to the idea of historical progress, but also explores further possibilities to achieve a comprehensive image of it. For example, *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* implicitly addresses the above-mentioned insufficiency by contesting the lack of cross-genre outreach of *tezkires*: Regarding lexicography, literary translation and historiography itself as parts of the Ottoman literary production, Abdülhalim Memduh provides a stepping stone for his successors to expand the corpus beyond its conventional limits. In Şehâbeddin Süleyman's case, the reader observes that the discussion regarding the conceptual framework of literature and literary history unfolds further, in a different direction. In his bibliography, the first references to non-Ottoman sources are found, and these are works by French theorists such as

Veron and Faguet on aesthetic formation and literary periodization, respectively. The same phenomenon is also observed in the references to Taine and Faguet in Ali Ekrem Bolayır's volume. Although these references are vague and practically indeterminate, both Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Ali Ekrem Bolayır's intention to ground his reasoning and explanatory framework in a scholarly manner is noteworthy at this early stage. Despite such attempts of maintaining objectivity and developing an analytical approach, involving literary criticism in the practice of literary historiography continues in this period. For example, Şehâbeddin Süleyman cannot escape the built-in hybridity of historiography and criticism, grown out of the *tezkire*-writing practice, if the reader recalls the historian's evaluation of Muallim Nâci's personality and literary stance. Nevertheless, literary history as a specialised discipline with its own theoretical framework is recognized and developed throughout the corpus in question.

Expansion of literary history as an independent discipline paves the way for the conceptual analysis of its foundational elements such as literature, authorship, aesthetic value, and language as well as the nature of the collective identity that the subject-matter literary production is associated with. Out of the five volumes taken into consideration in this part of the study, definitions and descriptions as to the nature of national identity are presented in three sources. While Abdülhalim Memduh's idea that Turkish language is an intrinsic part of the Ottoman identity, which signals an eclectic approach, Şehâbeddin Süleyman's view fundamentally differs from Abdülhalim Memduh's. Şehâbeddin Süleyman believes in the en masse transformation of the Turkish linguistic and cultural identity throughout their journey in Anatolia, which render them essentially different to the Turkish population outside of this geographical

sphere. This transformation, in his opinion, inspires the Ottoman identity, which is born out of certain characteristics of the Turkish language and culture; however, it ought to be considered and appreciated in its own right in virtue of its social, cultural and linguistic elements. Mehmed Hayreddin advocates an entirely different point of view that aims at linguistically and culturally differentiating the Turkish identity from the Ottoman one. Fâik Reşad's discussion does not involve a focus on the debate regarding the nature of national identity, as the reader is provided with a simple signifier as "the Ottomans" in the preface of his volume without further ado. His analyses heavily revolve around textuality, and this enables him to dwell upon concepts that are at the heart of literary theory and history, such as what the term "literature" conceptually and practically stands for, and what "authorship" implies in the context of literary production. In Mehmed Hayreddin's case, the discussion is centralised around the debate on language, which in turn reveals his stance regarding the nature of aesthetic value as well as national identity.

The timeline along which these volumes are written and published is also possible to evaluate from a two-fold perspective, involving geography and demographics. Within the quarter century between Abdülhalim Memduh's work and Mehmed Hayreddin's volume, the geographical borders of the Ottoman Empire undergo several changes. In 1908, following the Young Turk revolution, the Province of Bosnia was lost to Austria. In the same year, the Principality of Bulgaria declared its independence, and shortly after annexed the autonomous Ottoman Province of Eastern Rumelia. In 1912, the Turco-Italian War did not end well for the Empire either: Tripolitania and Cyrenaica (together forming what is now known as Libya) was lost. First Balkan War erupting at the end of

1912 also fuelled the instability in the region, ending in 1913 with 83% of the Empire's European territory and 69% European population lost. The shrinking borders and therefore changing demographics may have led the historians to alter their perspective regarding how to define and describe the Ottoman/Turkish identity. While Abdülhalim Memduh primarily focuses on İstanbul-centred literary production and authorship in the Empire in 1887/8, the reader encounters an increasing interest in the cultural setting of Anatolia in the later works⁷³ such as Şehâbeddin Süleyman's (1910) and Mehmed Hayreddin's (1912). Thus, seeking the roots of the Ottoman/Turkish literary and cultural heritage in Anatolia is yet another aspect of the practice of literary historiography, which begins to form in the early works.

After Mehmed Hayreddin's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri*, Köprülü's article on method and his collaboration with Şehâbeddin Süleyman were published in 1913 and 1914, respectively. Following these publications, the debate on the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography enters a new phase, nurtured by the intellectual dialogue that is initiated by Abdülhalim Memduh and enriched by the contributions of the literary historians of the nineteenth century, such as Şehâbeddin Süleyman, Fâik Reşad and Mehmed Hayreddin. It is shown above that the evaluation of the major problematics in Ottoman/Turkish literary history

⁷³ This phenomenon only becomes more prominent in the works analysed later in this study, particularly in the co-authored volume by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü in 1914. After Şehâbeddin Süleyman retired from publishing scholarly research due to his illness in 1915, Köprülü continued to maintain the same perspective in his later works, which are discussed in the relevant chapters of this project.

occurs prior to the early twentieth century: Attempts to conceptualise the notion of national identity, discussions regarding the status of language, and debates on the role of aesthetic value in the context of literary history are observed in the corpus examined in this chapter. Thus, there can be said to be a substantially developed conceptual background to the theoretical leap in the practice of literary historiography that is commonly attributed to Köprülü without the recognition of the effort and depth in the preceding accounts. Nonetheless, Köprülü's role in communicating the pre-existing developments in the practice of literary historiography, which are shown to have shaped throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, calls for further analysis.

CHAPTER 3

On Köprülü's Enquiry into Methodology

Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (1890-1966) is regarded as one of the most influential literary scholars of the early twentieth century Ottoman Empire and Turkey. A man of many hats, having written on a variety of humanistic topics, Köprülü was a prolific intellectual. According to Gary Leiser, a translator and commentator of Köprülü's works, Köprülü wrote more than one thousand and

three hundred manuscripts in different genres (books, articles, reviews, etc.) (“Çağdaş Türkoloji Araştırmalarında Köprülü’nün Yeri” [“Köprülü’s Role in Modern Studies of Turcology”], 29). Most of his works have also been edited and published posthumously numerous times, such as his *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*), *Edebiyat Araştırmaları* (*Research on Literature*), *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (*Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*), *Osmanlı Devleti’nin Kuruluşu* (*The Founding of the Ottoman State*) and various articles like “Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl” (“Method in Turkish Literary History”).⁷⁴ He dealt with a wide variety of subjects, such as Turkish literature (in the Ottoman Empire, Anatolia, Central Asia, and the Middle East), history of the Ottoman Empire, Islamic mysticism, history of Islam and law, and education amongst many others. For Köprülü, in a broad sense, history is the totality of all events of the past (Palabıyık, 187). Within the purview of such an all-encompassing corpus, Köprülü believes that historiography should not be practised as a collection of narrations that are merely concerned with political exchanges between states: “Today’s history (...) should be about both the people and the outstanding men of letters that represent the intelligentsia” (quoted in Palabıyık, 187). Palabıyık, a historian of Islam and Islamic art, emphasises the vast range that Köprülü’s historical research assumes (187). Objects of Köprülü’s work, in this regard, reveal great similarity to objects of social microhistory. He utilises the sociohistorical method as a means towards picturing historical reality in its entirety (Palabıyık, 190). His work on

⁷⁴ *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*) and *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (*Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*) are examples of this, as the dates of publication range from 1926 to 2014 for the former, and from 1918 to 2014 for the latter. The overall number of editions is hard to determine. *Osmanlı Devleti’nin Kuruluşu* (*The Founding of the Ottoman State*) was also published in 1984, 1988, and 1991 by Turkish Historical Association, and again in 2006 by Akçağ Publications. Various articles, such as, “Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl” (“Method in Turkish Literary History”) have also been reprinted in different anthologies, textbooks, and compilations of Köprülü’s work.

Ottoman/Turkish literary history has been pioneering on various fronts, ranging from methodology to social, political, cultural and literary history, such as *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kuruluşu and Anadolu'da İslamiyet (The Founding of the Ottoman Empire and Islam in Anatolia*, respectively) that provide extensive structural analyses of Ottoman/Turkish culture and politics. Köprülü's arguments are claimed to have influenced Turkish national historiography and the idea of Turcol-Islamic synthesis to a great extent.⁷⁵

Köprülü was born in İstanbul in 1890, in the midst of a time of radical transformation for the Ottoman Empire and then Turkey that arguably stretches from the late eighteenth century to this day. The Ottoman/Turkish intelligentsia of the time devoted themselves to develop an understanding of this transformation and its possible reverberations, be it an attempt for an en masse change, or a desire to maintain the political and cultural status quo, or another alternative that offers to reconcile the former and the latter. Köprülü himself, as a man of letters, historian and politician was inevitably attracted to the very same question as many other intellectuals of the time: At a time when the people of the Ottoman Empire faced a challenge to reiterate or redefine their collective identity in this new era, what was to serve as the fundamental point of reference in reconstructing this representation?

⁷⁵ As Kafadar, a scholar of Ottoman history, explains, "one of these arguments is that the politico-military expansion of Turkish peoples, who emigrate from Central Asia to Anatolia, paved the way for such a synthesis as a fundamental component of the Ottoman conception of state (quoted in Aydın 152). In a similar vein, Dressler gives a brief overview of the works that evaluated Köprülü's writings in the context of nationalist historiography (207218). Dressler warns that the political dimension of Köprülü's historiography should not be disregarded ("Fuad Köprülü'nün Çalışmalarında 'Heterodoks İslam'" in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*, Ed. by Yahya Kemal Taştan, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012, 345355). It is, indeed, self-evident that there is an intellectual link between Köprülü's drive to work towards attaining a comprehensive view of Turkish history, which accounts for the genuineness of the national heritage, and the then - emerging movement of Turkish nationalism with its commitment to nation building as a function of its socio-political outlook. However, in this chapter, we will analyse Köprülü's historiographical methodology from an epistemological standpoint, which demonstrates a different aspect of the abovementioned link between Köprülü's historiographical practice and nationalism.

According to Karpaz, Köprülü is a modern conservative thinker who identifies revolutions as effects of historical evolutions, rather than as departures from the past (13). Hence, Karpaz argues that Köprülü regards the foundation of Turkish Republic and its rise as a nation-state as an outcome of the evolution of the Ottoman Empire (13). Karpaz says that his representation of Köprülü both as a modernist and as an advocate of the idea that Seljuk, Ottoman, and Anatolian Islamic values should be incorporated with the intellectual and sentimental spirit of the Republic, which aspires to make a new beginning, might seem to be contradictory; however, it is not (21). Beyond its valid claim to coherence, this representation, in fact, is also sound in pinpointing a crucial aspect of Köprülü's intellectual vision: his relentless efforts to demonstrate logical connections between different phases of cultural transformations that the "Turkish" identity had undergone from the beginnings in Central Asia until the formation of the nation-state in early twentieth century Anatolia. According to Karpaz, Köprülü shed light on the already-existing components of national identity, such as Ottoman history, language, and culture, and believed the necessity of their embodiment in the then new political system, since reconciling the "old" and the "new" and reaching a synthesis of the two is the essence of a vigorous understanding of modernity (2122).

Having aimed at building an extensive understanding of Ottoman/Turkish culture, with particular emphasis on history and literature, Köprülü largely contributed to the broad project of exploring, discovering and inventing Turkishness as a claim to an amicably overarching national identity in a new era. His involvement with stateled intellectual initiatives⁷⁶, such as *Millî*

⁷⁶ Here, we must point out that Köprülü is one of many who were actively engaged with such initiatives, although he is one of the most influential intellectuals in this sense. The institutional outlook of the Ottoman/Turkish academia at the turn of the century is a phenomenon that

Tetebbûlar Mecmuası (*The Journal for National Studies*)⁷⁷ and *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü* (Institute for Studies in Turcology)⁷⁸, as well as his role in *Türk Tarih Kurumu* (Turkish Historical Society)⁷⁹ (Tunçay, 27⁸⁰), in the Committee for Religious Reform of 1928⁸¹, and the major publication of *Halkevleri* (literally “People’s Houses”, in practical terms standing for Community Centres)⁸², entitled *Ülkü Dergisi* (*The Ideal*) (Gümüšoğlu, 456) all show his involvement with defining a national and cultural identity. His prominent institutional affiliations and central position in the intellectual debates of the period have attracted both praise and condemnation by his

requires further elaboration; however, it is beyond the scope of this chapter.

⁷⁷ “Millî Tetebbûlar Mecmuası” is a journal that was published five times in 1915, with the efforts of the Âsârı İslâmiyye ve Milliyye Tedkik Encümeni, also known as Encümeni Tedkik (Research Committee of the Islamic and National Corpus), founded on 23 March 1915, and Ahmed Şükrü Bey, the minister of education of the period. The objective of this journal was to contribute to the research on religion, ethics, law, economy, linguistics, aesthetics, science and sociology in the context of Islamic civilization and Turkish culture (Küçük, 83).

⁷⁸ Upon Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s request, Köprülü prepared an intellectual road map for the “Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü”, which was founded in affiliation with the Department of Literature at the University (Dârülfünun) of Istanbul in 1924 (Güleç, 560).

⁷⁹ “Türk Tarih Kurumu” (“Turkish Historical Association”) was officially founded in 1931, and continues to function as a research society that carries on studies in Turkish history.

⁸⁰ Tunçay’s article also provides a brief history of Köprülü’s political activism and the chronological sequence of his involvement with various political movements.

⁸¹ See Osman Nuri Engin’s *Türk Maarif Tarihi* (Ankara: Eser Matbaa, 1977) and Yahya Kemal Taştan’s “Dârülfünun İlahiyat Fakültesinin Dinde Reform Projesi” (in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Ed. by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 399-418).

⁸² *Halkevleri* (Community Centres) was one of the major institutions founded by the Turkish state, aiming at providing a space where citizens could have access to reading rooms and libraries as well as courses on literature, arts and handicrafts. As a state-sponsored project, *Halkevleri* was an important outlet where the Republican reforms could be communicated with Turkish citizens, since these venues enabled direct promulgation of information regarding the political and cultural agenda of the Republic from 1932 to 1951. In the following period (1963-1980) at the beginning of which the administrative structure of *Halkevleri* was handed over to the civil community, the nature of the political tendency of the organisation changed drastically. Centres accommodate strands of major political opposition movements that can be regarded as left-wing organisations. As a result, *Halkevleri* were closed shortly after the coup d’état of 1980. Having reopened in 1987, *Halkevleri* now functions as a sociopolitical organisation that defines itself as “an organisation of the people” that “stands up against bigotry, imperialism, and fascism” (<http://www.halkevleri.org.tr/hakkimizda>, accessed on 26 August 2016).

commentators.⁸³ Some critics openly identify “the school of national history” as “the Köprülü mektebi” (“the Köprülü school”).⁸⁴

A closer look at the course of Köprülü’s life provides insight into the different stages of his intellectual journey. He was born to a well-established family, in Sultanahmet, İstanbul on the 4th of December 1890 (Asılsoy, 213).⁸⁵ Members of his family held posts in various offices of the Empire. His father, İsmail Faiz Bey, was retired from law clerkship at the Second Court of Beyoğlu in İstanbul. His grandfather held an ambassadorial role as the Empire’s representative in Bucharest. His mother is said to be the daughter of Ahmet Hikmet Efendi, who was part of the İslimiye Scholars.⁸⁶ It is also claimed that he is a descendant of Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmet Paşa’s family, although this claim is challenged by several historians, and the controversy seems to remain unresolved.⁸⁷ Surrounded and brought up by family members who were mostly of higher educational and occupational status compared to the rest of the population at the time, Köprülü seems to have found himself in an environment that naturally nudged him towards exploring the intellectual world at an early age. Apart from the opportunities he was presented by simply being a member

⁸³ For example, Ocak refers to Köprülü’s god-given talent for intuitive thinking, ability for analysis and synthesis twice (330, 333). On one hand, Köprülü’s image is indeed overpowering and hard to dismiss as a part of his intellectual persona. On the other hand, he is subjected to extremely harsh post-mortem academic and ethical criticism. The Turkish intelligentsia’s love-hate relationship with Köprülü is an interesting one in many ways. Another strand of criticism is regarding Köprülü’s ethical stance in terms of academic integrity. Ocak, for example, implies that Köprülü used a good deal of unseen academic labour: He says that Köprülü received a lot of help from his colleagues and students who compiled primary and secondary sources, biographies, latest articles for him and translated the ones in some of the foreign languages Köprülü did not have proficiency in, such as Arabic, English, Hungarian, German, Italian (333). Later in his article, Ocak refers to his interview with Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, and repeats that the way in which Köprülü had his students work for him on the basis of empty promises cannot possibly be justified (340).

⁸⁴ Palabıyık’s original expression is “Köprülü mektebi” (199).

⁸⁵ The following biographical information about Köprülü’s family in this paragraph is also from Asılsoy’s article.

⁸⁶ İslimiye is a town in today’s Bulgaria, and currently referred to as “Sliven” (in Bulgarian, “Сливен”).

⁸⁷ See the third footnote in Asılsoy’s above-mentioned article.

of a household of this kind, Köprülü also had the chance to grow up in a city where access to all levels of education was available unlike the rest of the country at the turn of the century.

Köprülü attended the Ayasofya Rüşdiyesi (a secondary school in the district of Sultanahmet in İstanbul) not having received any schooling at the primary level as he reported in an interview (quoted in Asılsoy, 214), implying that he already was of a higher intellectual capacity that easily enables him to join secondary school at an earlier age. Having mastered Persian language at the secondary level, Köprülü studied Arabic and French during his high school years (quoted in Asılsoy, 214). He started attending the Mektebi Hukuk (law school) in 1907; however, after three years he concluded that he would not benefit from completing his studies there. He was particularly disappointed by the fact that his lecturers of “new European sciences”, as he put it, were not competent in the relevant European languages (quoted in Asılsoy, 214). As a result, he dropped out of law school, and began studying Ottoman history and literature at his father’s private library (Asılsoy, 215). He was following the debates in French literary criticism of the time (writings of Gustave Lanson, Auguste Comte, Saint Simon, D’Alembert, Hobbes, Voltaire, Rousseau, J. Stuart Mill, Spencer, Hegel, Vico, Montesquieu, Herder, Kant, Condorcet, Bougelé, Marx, Engels, Hippolyte Taine, and Renan in particular), as well as translating French literary works into Turkish.

Köprülü’s first published poems appeared in 1905 in the magazine *Musavver Terakki (Illustrated Progress)* (1895/61907). Between 1908 and 1913, he published numerous poems in different magazines (Asılsoy, 216). He made his first critical statement as a signatory of the collective manifesto of the literary

society, Fecr-i Âtî (Dawn of the Future).⁸⁸ Following this manifesto, Köprülü published articles that defended the literary stance of the Fecr-i Âtî society. Köprülü also wrote on the works various foreign authors, poets, and intellectuals, such as Roberto Ardigo, Leo Tolstoy, Thorkild Jacobsen, Alexis de Tocqueville, Henry Becq, Emile Faguet, Arne Garborg, Henri de Regnier, Paul Verlaine (Asılsoy, 217). Asılsoy, whose research is almost exclusively on Köprülü, presents a broad and eclectic range of thinkers and authors in his discussion of Köprülü's intellectual interests as manifested in his early publications. These articles explored various themes and ideas, as independent pieces of research that he conducted over this period. The diversity in Köprülü's interests is remarkable in this regard, as his writings reflect a wide variety of different subjects at the early stages of his intellectual formation with an endeavour to present examples from other philosophical and literary traditions.

Going back to the period during which Köprülü's early thought is shaped, it is observed that his engagement with literary theory and criticism took an important turn when he got involved in the publication of *Genç Kalemler* (*Young Pens*), which was one of the earliest publications of the Turkish protonationalist

⁸⁸ The Fecr-i Âtî society is described as "the representative of the future of Turkish literature" in the abovementioned manifesto. The principles endorsed by the Fecr-i Âtî society constitute an eclectic framework as to the ideal that Turkish literature is to evolve towards. On the one hand, members of the Fecr-i Âtî society regarded the literary societies of the Western world as a structural model for their society, and believed in the use of maintaining close relationships with their Western counterparts. Akyüz argues that the members of this society, as opposed to the preceding literary movements, show a genuine interest in the poetry of French symbolists (156). On the other hand, members of this society were keen on developing a literary identity that exhibits a certain degree of linguistic continuity, as the use of Arabic and Persian is prevalent in the poetry written by the Fecr-i Âtî poets. Moreover, the Fecr-i Âtî society defended an individualistic stance in terms of literary production (Akyüz 156). In this sense, their poetic tendency towards subjectivity plays an important role in the emergence of symbolist poetry of the early twentieth century Turkish poetry. The literary trend endorsed by the society, however, did not transform into a long-lasting one. With the emergence of a new literary society, *Genç Kalemler* (*Young Pens*), in 1912, most of the Fecr-i Âtî intellectuals joined this literary movement, which paved the way for the dissolution of the Fecr-i Âtî society.

movement of the twentieth century.⁸⁹ The pioneers of this literary group were Ali Cânib Yöntem (1887-1967), Ömer Seyfeddin (1884-1920) and Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924). Having argued that creating a genuine national consciousness was only possible by dissemination of political and cultural information in a new form of language that was accessible to Turkish people as a whole, Genç Kalemler aimed at revolutionising Turkish language by removing Perso-Arabic words from the vocabulary and establishing a uniform literary language.⁹⁰ For Köprülü, language was essentially a social phenomenon (Asılsoy, 218), which meant that it ought to be left to develop in its natural course of evolution. Therefore, Köprülü did not agree with the fundamental premises of the argument for a “new language” that was endorsed by this group of intellectuals. However, he did eventually align with the national literature movement that stemmed from this movement (Asılsoy, 218). This change points at an important turn in Köprülü’s journey, as his aesthetic stance shifts from defending “art for art’s sake” to instrumentalizing art for social and political transformation. His contribution to Genç Kalemler despite this fundamental conflict as well as his participation to the intellectual activities carried on by various associations such as Türk Derneği (Turkish Association), Türk Yurdu (Homeland of Turks), Türk Ocağı (Turkish Hearths)⁹¹ and Türk Bilgi Derneği (Turkish Informative Association)⁹² (Aydın, 149) are noteworthy in this context: Although he did not seemingly

⁸⁹ Genç Kalemler, published in Thessaloniki between 1910 and 1912, voiced the concerns of Ottoman intellectuals who focused on the problem of national language and the protection of the existing borders in the context of political unity of the Ottoman Empire (Aydın, 143).

⁹⁰ Although this objective underpins the overall project of Genç Kalemler, it is important to note the complexity of varying opinions regarding the language debate of the time: There were many other journals which aimed at promulgating similar projects, as well as intellectuals who defended remarkably diverse viewpoints while considering themselves as part of a certain movement (see Geoffrey Lewis’s “Ottoman Turkish” in his *The Turkish Language Reform : A Catastrophic Success: A Catastrophic Success* [OUP: Oxford, 1999]).

⁹¹ Köprülü was a member of the Hars Hey’eti (“Culture Committee”) in this organisation.

⁹² These associations were/have been active from 1908 to 1912, 1911 to the present, and 1912 to the present, respectively.

engage with political activism in this period, Köprülü enthusiastically took part in the projects that aimed at engineering a new cultural agenda for the transforming Empire with an emerging national identity.⁹³ In this regard, it is important to point at the institutional roles taken up by Köprülü in this period. For example, in 1913, Köprülü was awarded a full professorship at the İstanbul Dârülfünûn (today's University of İstanbul) by Gökâlp's endorsement, albeit having not obtained any degree of higher education. Köprülü also acted as one of the founding members of the Âsârı İslamiyye ve Milliye Tedkîk Encümeni (the Research Committee for Islamic and National Heritage), which was founded in 1915 and later transformed into Türk Tarih Kurumu (Turkish Historical Society). In 1924, he founded the Türkiyat Enstitüsü (the Institute of Turcology). Having published continuously in the journals affiliated with these institutions, Köprülü rigorously worked on establishing academic norms⁹⁴ for a systematic study of Turkish history and literature from the very beginnings of his intellectual journey. While doing so, he developed an academic network through which he could convey his vision – not only as an ordinary citizen with a humble interest in the disciplines he manifested passion for at a personal level, but also as a bureaucratically and administratively well-placed member of this environment.

⁹³ The anecdote found in Oral's article "Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Tarihçilik ve Mehmet Fuad Köprülü" ("Historiography from the Constitutional Era to the Republic and Mehmet Fuad Köprülü") hints at the level of the abovementioned enthusiasm. Oral quotes Ali Emîrî Efendi saying that Köprülü made almost one hundred visits to Ali Emîrî's private home over the forty days during which Ali Emîrî was chairing the Âsârı İslamiye ve Milliye Tedkik Encümeni (the Research Committee for Islamic and National Heritage), and Köprülü was the committee clerk. After Köprülü's visits, some of which were made at inappropriate times, Ali Emîrî resigned from the post, and Köprülü took over (Oral, 162).

⁹⁴ Aydın suggests that the norms Köprülü sought to establish were modelled by reference to their European counterparts (149). In spite of the fact that Köprülü portrays himself as a devoted reader of the latest literature on literary theory and criticism, especially that of French literature (see Cemal Köprülü's "Fuad Köprülü'nün İlmi Şahsiyeti, Türk Kültüründeki Rolü ve Bazı Hatıralar" in *Türk Kültürü* [7:81, July 1969, 636637] and Feridun Kandemir's "Fuat Köprülü Yedigün'e Anlatıyor" in *Yedigün* [VII:160, 1 Nisan 1936, 1821]), it is hard to presuppose that his project was simply an act of approximation of the "European norms" in the context of Turkish literary history. Our analysis of Köprülü's article "Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl" ("Method in Turkish Literary History") addresses this issue later in this study.

The organisations and institutions Köprülü built ties with or helped founding are central entities that greatly contributed to the intellectual momentum at the time, where he could actively take initiative in the areas he felt were academically neglected or in need of improvement. This way, Köprülü was able to position himself at the heart of the institutional network of his time, with a significant degree of power and influence in terms of defining the agenda in academic policy-making.

Apart from his indispensable role in the organisational aspects of the intellectual and academic scene in the early twentieth century, it is also important to highlight some of the general aspects of Köprülü's approach towards the question of how historiography ought to be practised by surveying his works from a purely scholarly and comprehensive perspective. Asılsoy, in his article titled "Fuad Köprülü'nün Tarih Anlayışı ve Metodu" (in Başar, 32-106), outlines that Köprülü's understanding of historiography is directed at achieving three tasks. The first one of these is presenting the history of Turkish culture and civilization as a narrative commencing in Central Asia fourteen centuries ago, and continuing to the then-present day (Asılsoy in Başar, 105-16). Secondly, within these vast geographical borders and this chronological timeline, Köprülü also aims at establishing meaningful political and social connections between peoples, languages, and cultures in order to achieve uniformity and continuity in his discourse. Finally, Köprülü intends to make sense of Turkish history within the context of Islamic history as well as global history. Turan emphasises that Köprülü's scholarly stance becomes particularly discernable with his systematic approach towards historiography (IX).

“Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl” (“Method in Turkish Literary History”) (1913), the text at issue in this study, is Köprülü’s first published piece that voices his endeavour to scrutinise the use, or lack thereof, of method in Turkish literary historiography. This attempt of Köprülü’s has not been the subject of a thorough reading on its own merit thus far, although it has generally been referred to as a foundational text, or as “a benchmark in the establishment of the modern study of Turkish literature and in the development of 20th century Turkish intellectual history”, as Leiser puts it (“Translator’s Introduction” in Köprülü, 53). It does not only stand as a fundamental point of reference for the field in itself, but also is the backbone of the rest of his work, particularly his study of history, literature, and other subjects, with an emphasis on the inaugural use of the European-style⁹⁵ modern scientific methods in Turkey (Leiser, 30).

The year in which Köprülü’s article was published also marks an important point in his academic career: He begins to teach Turkish literary history at the Dârülfünûn, while previously teaching at various high schools in İstanbul. Turan puts forward that this is when Köprülü’s journey as a scholar starts (XIII). Prior to this publication, his writings on theoretical issues in the humanities appear in literary journals such as *Servet-i Fünûn*. When the breakdown of Köprülü’s articles published in this journal between 1908 and 1913 is taken into account, it is possible to observe that Köprülü’s interest in

⁹⁵ We find Leiser’s term “European-style” problematic, because the word “European” is a fairly general signifier that is prone to criticism of reductionism. Köprülü’s appropriation of the “European-style” scientific method is heavily focused on the positivist philosophy, as we aim to show in this chapter, and the intellectual milieu in Europe back then did accommodate various schools of thought that differed from positivism in theory and practice. Hence, we will refrain from basing our understanding of Köprülü’s approach to methodology on the dichotomy between Europe and Turkey, or the East and the West. In its stead, our analysis will focus on Köprülü’s framework as an endeavour in its own accord, with a focus on its epistemological and ontological commitments in juxtaposition to the positive method in particular.

scholarly research is already expressed in his writings. Out of the seventy-three articles he published in this period, thirty-five are about Turkish literature, sixteen about art and literature, eight about literature in the West, and fourteen about philosophy, sociology, and ethics (İzler in Fildiş, 17). Fildiş argues that the analytical background to Köprülü's article on method seems to be, at least partly, inspired by his earlier writings in *Servet-i Fünûn*, particularly his articles on philosophy and sociology. Köprülü's analysis of Robert Ardigo's take on positivist thought consisting of three separate articles (17-18), and a collection of six articles on Comte's understanding of sociology (18) are some of the examples of how the scope of his earlier writings pave the way for his stance on methodology to develop.

Köprülü's article was originally published in the journal *Bilgi Mecmuası* (*Knowledge*) (1, [1339/1913], pp. 352) in PersoArabicscriptTurkish.⁹⁶ It reappeared as the commencing piece for a volume of Köprülü's articles with the title *Edebiyat Araştırmaları* (*Research on [Turkish] Literature*) in 1966 (Ankara, rpt⁹⁷, 1986), this time in LatinscriptTurkish. The line of argument in this article appears to have a deductive structure: Köprülü starts by exploring the universal principle behind "method", then narrows his discussion of general methodology in historical research to the specifics of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. He also touches upon various other questions that enrich his enquiry in a

⁹⁶ The term "Perso-ArabicscriptTurkish" stands for "Turkish language that is written in Arabic script", and I prefer to use it as an alternative to terms such as "Old Turkish", "Ottoman Turkish", and so forth. This is because, I argue, the latter group of terms as opposed to the former, denote "another linguistic entity that is different in kind to which it precedes". This sort of naming yields the assumption of a clearcut divide between an "old" and a "new" Turkish, which is problematic for various components (phonetics, phonology, morphology, orthography, syntax, semantics, discourse, and pragmatics) of the languages assumed by this binary. Unless a fairly rigorous understanding of what a binary as such would imply regarding the above-mentioned components of these languages is presented, the terms at issue remain unintelligible for keen readers of Turkish language.

⁹⁷ "rpt" stands for "repeated publication".

remarkably comprehensive manner: Some of these questions deal with “the meaning and scope of history, history as science, history and the theory of evolution, historical research and the scientific method, laws of history, the nature of Turkish literature, the status of the study of Turkish literature, the meaning of literature, literary taste and personal bias, the approach to understanding literary works, major Turkish research tools and reference works, the type of sources for research on Turkish literature, how to recognize, study and evaluate a literary work, and finally the major pitfalls in doing research on the history of Turkish literature”, as Leiser identifies (in Köprülü, 54).

The main question of this chapter is what Köprülü’s article endeavours to achieve in terms of his own vision of practising Turkish literary history. One of the answers, which this close reading aims to provide, is that Köprülü’s discussion seems to imply a methodologically complex, hybrid stance that reconciles various approaches to carrying on historical research. One of the strongest elements in this hybrid structure is represented by Köprülü’s affinity with the positive philosophy, particularly with respect to two aspects promulgated by it: the scientific attitude and the emphasis on analytical norms in carrying out scholarly endeavour as well as the logic it assumes when it comes to identifying elements of historical causality in the practice of literary historiography. Another equally crucial element is his aversion to the positivist claim that there is a one-to-one likeness between science and history. This aversion paves the way for another significant tendency in Köprülü’s methodological approach: The one which develops along a Bergsonian understanding of time and historical causality, engaged with at the theoretical

level.⁹⁸ Apart from the positivist implications and Bergsonian tendencies in his text, Köprülü utilises a wide range of conceptual tools regarding the practice of historiography. In order to present the nature of Köprülü's work on methodology in a clear and rigorous manner, I draw attention to how he engages with a multitude of theoretical statements along the same interpretive axis. By doing so, I intend to demonstrate why Köprülü's methodological stance reveals a hybrid nature, consisting of varied, and, at times, clashing components. All of these different viewpoints that are concerned with the epistemological and metaphysical nature of historical study are woven into the framework of his article, resulting in a hybrid methodological structure that enables Köprülü to discuss, evaluate, adopt and then contextualise general principles of historical research for the study of Turkish literary history. These general principles collectively allude to the idea of theoretical and practical continuity as a fundamental dynamic in the practice of literary historiography in the Ottoman/Turkish context: While the positivist tendencies and supporting conceptual tools by other schools of thought chart the roadmap for identifying and explaining practical continuity, the Bergsonian spirit paves the way for establishing the idea of theoretical continuity. Following the elaboration on this line of argument, I will try to show how this aspect of Köprülü's approach contributes to the structural outlook of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in particular, which in turn determines both the content and the form of the historical material itself.

⁹⁸ Dilek Sarmış's work on the nature of the Bergsonian thought within the context of Ottoman intellectual life can be consulted for further pointers on the issue (i. e. "Cumhuriyet öncesi Fikir Hareketlerinde Bergsonculuğun yeri ve yayılması" ["The Presence and Promulgation of Bergsonianism in the Intellectual Movements during the pre-Republican Era"], *Toplumsal Tarih*, December 2009, volume 192, [66-74]).

One of the first observations we come across in “Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl” (“Method in Turkish Literary History”)⁹⁹ is the lack of theorists in the course of Turkish literary history. He says that “the multiplicity of common threads between history in general and the history of literature, and the lack of the most basic ideas about method in history on the part of virtually all the historians, young and old, in our country, make it necessary for me to devote part of the present article to this matter”¹⁰⁰ (56).¹⁰¹ Köprülü also points out that the cultural and political history of the Turks is still unwritten as well as a history of Turkish literature that would fully meet “our national needs”¹⁰² (67).¹⁰³ It ought to be noted that Köprülü’s criticism here seems to be a common concern at the time. Other intellectuals of the era, like Ali Kemal, raise similar concerns in his articles in *İkdam*, putting forward that the need for developing a diligent practice of historiography is urgent (“Edebiyat, Edebiyat-ı Osmaniyye”, “Tarih-i Osmani Nasıl Yazılır?” in *Ali Kemal: Toplu Yazılar 1908-1909*, edited by Safiye Kıranlar, İstanbul: İsis Yayıncılık, 2010, [508-512] and [414-418], respectively). Referring to Taine’s idea that “a nation’s literature is its most lively historical document”

⁹⁹ Hereafter, Köprülü’s article will be referred to as “MTLH” in this chapter of the study.

¹⁰⁰ “Umumî tarih ile edebiyat tarihi arasındaki ittisal hatlarının kesreti ve memleketimizdeki genç, ihtiyar hemen bütün müverrihlerimizin usûl tarihi hakkında en basit fikirlerden mahrumiyeti, makalemizin bir kısmını bu hususa hasr etmeye bizi mecbur etti” (Köprülü, 5).

¹⁰¹ Leiser’s translations of Köprülü’s quotes are incorporated in the main text for the reader’s convenience; however, transliterations of the quotes, for which the original article is consulted, can be found in the footnotes. Throughout the transliteration for “MTLH”, the Turkish Language Association’s guide for spelling is followed.

¹⁰² “millî ihtiyacımızı” (Köprülü, 24).

¹⁰³ Köprülü’s criticism of the few works of Turkish literary history is arguably harsh. When discussing Ziya Paşa’s and Ebüzziyâ’s works on Turkish literary history, he says: “if ignorance had not revealed everything to mankind so easily and very clearly, we would not have encountered such superficial specialists today in every branch of knowledge. Thus, a person who wants to study our literary history according to scientific methods should begin only after first divesting himself of such ideas and opinions” (81).

and Lanson's emphasis on the importance of the history of literature as part of the history of culture¹⁰⁴ in harmony with the intellectual spirit of the era, Köprülü undertakes the task of scrutinising the issue of methodology as a fundamental step towards the systematic practice of historiography (65). Köprülü's approach to building an understanding of historiographical method is partially based on an analysis of various aspects of the late nineteenth century French schools of literary studies and their appropriation in the Ottoman/Turkish context. Since this publication of Köprülü's, the issue of methodology has been revisited by other literary scholars, mostly in volumes of Turkish literary history. The scope of discussions, however, have rarely reached the extensive scope and depth set by Köprülü's effort to suggest a way in which we can make sense of Turkish literary history as a discipline on its own merits.

Köprülü's article consists of three different parts: In the first part, he aims to deliver an introduction to the topic by referring to a basic definition of what method is. Köprülü defines method as "the path that the intellect must follow in order to arrive at the truth"¹⁰⁵ (55). Referring to the importance of method in the context of scientific progress, as argued by Bacon (1561-1626) and Descartes (1596-1652), Köprülü points out that the problematization of method is not only for philosophers and logicians, but a necessary task for scholars of every branch of knowledge. Following this, Köprülü states that particular methods should be followed for achieving true knowledge in each subject, since the idea of "an absolute method for thought", namely, an overarching "universal

¹⁰⁴ Here, we must note that Köprülü's reading of Taine and Lanson is rather one-sided. His references to these thinkers merely concern the nationalistic tendencies in their writings, whereas both Taine and Lanson wrote on the issue of methodology. However, this may be related to Köprülü's desire to propose a novel methodology that meets the particular needs of Ottoman/Turkish society, as he says that Lanson's work was of no use for him to develop such a viewpoint.

¹⁰⁵ "Usûl, felsefi manasıyla, zihnî hakikate vusul için takibe mecbur olduğu yol demektir" (3).

framework” for establishing “an unbroken tradition”¹⁰⁶ of unified knowledge (55), which is also required for scientific progress, could not eliminate the diverse nature of varying subjects of study. This deduction forms the first premise of Köprülü’s argument for a contextualised method for the study of Turkish literary history. Köprülü perceives the classification of positive sciences as introduced in the nineteenth century as a progressive step, and refers to Comte (17981857) as the pioneer of productive efforts in laying the foundations of a positive social science. He does not think, however, that the Comtean project of establishing a methodological overlap between natural sciences and social science is a successful one. He asserts that “being carried away by insignificant and superficial similarities and presenting essential differences as elementary differences, even if all this seems to be outwardly scientific, are of course, completely contrary to the requirements of science”¹⁰⁷ (55). For Köprülü, every branch of knowledge is to be studied with a particular focus that takes into account the specific nature of its objects. In the context of literary history, Köprülü states that the history of literature differs from other kinds of history in certain ways, and therefore he argues for adopting a number of different methods for the study of literary history (56). Acknowledging the need for adopting a range of methods rather than engaging with a one-dimensional approach, Köprülü hints at building an eclectic framework as the goal of his study.

In order to accomplish this task, Köprülü first appeals to sources that he describes as “the most recent and reliable”¹⁰⁸: Gabriel Monod (18441912),

¹⁰⁶ “silsile”

¹⁰⁷ “her marifet şubesine, mahiyetiyle mütenasib müstakil usûller vermekledir ki müstakil ilimler teşekkül edebilir; manasız sahte müşabehetlere kapılarak mahiyet farklarını basit derece farkları gibi göstermek, zahiren ilmî görünse bile hakikatte ilmin icabatına tamamıyla muhaliftir” (4).

¹⁰⁸ “en yeni ve en mutemed” (5)

Charles Seignobos (18541942), Charles Langlois (18631929), Louis Bourdeau (18241900), Henri Berr (18631954), Paul Lacombe (18341919), and Daniel Mornet (18781954) are the intellectuals directly referred to in this regard (56). Köprülü's literature review on the subject, when we take into account the complete list of references in "MTLH", is remarkably extensive in terms of its corpus. These references, in fact, mark an important aspect of Köprülü's viewpoint regarding the lack of theory in Turkish literary history. In the first twenty-two and a half pages of the article, Köprülü refers to sixty non-Ottoman/Turkish authors throughout his theoretical discussion of method in historiographical practice as well as his overview of the relationship between science, history, and literature. However, in most cases, Köprülü does not elaborate upon the function of each reference within the methodical approach he intends to build. The final ten and a half pages, which start with the remark on "the primary sources for the history of Turkish literature [being], relatively speaking, unscientific" (75), contain fifty references to Ottoman/Turkish authors, most of which are grouped and mentioned in brackets as examples of the then-present corpus of either literary history or aesthetic production in almost all cases.¹⁰⁹

Köprülü, nevertheless, expresses dissatisfaction regarding his findings.

In his own words they have "not turned up much of value"¹¹⁰ (56), despite

¹⁰⁹ These references are to Zeki Velidi Togan, Mahmud Kashgari, Kâtib, Çelebi, Âlî, Naima, Cevdet, Hüseyin b. İsmail, Osmanzade Ahmed Ta'ib, Âtâ'î, Ferîdûn Bey, Mecdî, 'Âtâullah, Şeyhî, Taşköprülüzâde, Lâtîfî, Sâlim, Fatîn, Ahdî, Kınalızâde, Hasan Çelebi, 'Âşık Çelebi, Fâizî, Âsim, Riyazî, Rûfâ'î, Kefevî, İzzetî, Safâî, Rızâ, Vâsîf, Himmetzâde, Müceyyib, Ebû Bekir Pashazâde, Âkîf Şefkatî, Ârif Hikmet, Nazmî, İsmâ'îl Belîğ, Hüseyin Efendi, 'Ali Emîrî Efendi, Sâkib Dede, Esrar Dede, Semâ'hânei edeb, Habib Efendi, Müstakimzade, Fehmi (Süleyman), Es'ad Efendi, Evliya Çelebi, Kemalettin Taşköprülüzâde, Şârih Sumurî, Eğirdirli Hacı Kemal, Bursalı Tâhir Bey. It is extremely important to note that none of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century literary historians, such as Abdülhalim Memduh, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Fâik Reşad are mentioned in Köprülü's article.

¹¹⁰ "tarih usûllerine ve sosyolojiye dair icra ettiğim naçiz bazı tetkikleri bir tarafa bırakırsam (...)" (5)

engaging with a substantial number of sources as part of the literature review on the subject. Theoretical readings Köprülü comes across are Georges Renard's (18471930) *La méthode scientifique de l'histoire littéraire*, Émile Hennequin's (18581888) *La critique scientifique*, Taine's (18281893) and Ferdinand Brunetière's (18491906) works in this context. The only author Köprülü identifies with in terms of the goal he is aiming to reach is Gustave Lanson (18571934) and his article "La méthode de l'histoire littéraire" in his *Méthodologie des sciences*. However, this source fails to prove useful as well, since it mainly deals with the issue of method in the context of French literary history, and "Turkish literature and French literature present enormous differences and contrasts with regard to origins, historical development and general trends"¹¹¹ (Köprülü, 56). Rejection of a one-on-one similarity between two different nations' literary histories shows that Köprülü not only reiterates the need for a particular method for the study of Turkish literary history in its own terms, but also nullifies the idea that the theoretical possibility of this particular method being successfully modelled on a foreign (i. e. French) counterpart. In this sense, Köprülü's discussion of foreign authors can hardly be seen as an aspirational attempt to source a theoretical framework from their contribution to the debate on literary historiography. On the contrary, it can be said that he considers himself as an intellectual who is on a par with the ones that he quotes and discusses in "MTLH" and, in a way, he opens the ground for discussion in the Ottoman/Turkish intellectual scene.

After setting the direction his argument is to take, Köprülü shifts the focus of his discussion towards the notion of history. For him, the corpus of historical

¹¹¹ "Türk Edebiyatı ile Fransız Edebiyatı, gerek menşeleri, gerek tarihî tekamülleri, gerek umumî hatları itibarıyla müthiş bir ihtilaf, hatta bit tezat arz ederler" (6).

research should encompass “the manifestations of the intellectual and physical activity of humanity”¹¹² in lieu of “[political] organisations of states and their interrelations”¹¹³: The latter corpus, he thinks, is favoured by historians who regard historiography as an act of narration and storytelling, which is incompatible with the idea of history as “organised within a scientific framework”¹¹⁴ (57). One of the problems Köprülü anticipates is the mistake of commencing history with the formation of political communities. Adopting the Comtean idea of taking the formation of social communities as the starting point for historical research, Köprülü refers to Nordau’s study on the periods prior to the formation of political communities in *Der Sinn der Geschichte* (57). Seeking a balance between a history of influential political figures and a history of ordinary people, he suggests that paying attention to the social milieu of historical figures is crucial in attempting to reconstruct historical reality. This means that historians must aim at enlarging the corpus they work with while practising historiography: “not only public and official documents but also every kind of personal document, letters and correspondence, judicial registers, tax records and works of art”¹¹⁵ (57). Allowing for the expansion of objects of interest for historians, this aspect of Köprülü’s methodology aligns his understanding of historiography with the practice of social history, an idea preceding Köprülü’s contributions to the discipline, particularly observed to have developed in Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s writings. For an elaborate study of literary history, Köprülü believes, the elements that constitute a society’s intellectual life must be closely examined. In this regard, he understands sociology as a

¹¹² “fikir ve fiiliyatı beşeriyenin mecmuı tezahüratı” (6)

¹¹³ “devletlerin teşkilat ve münasabatı mütekabileleri” (6)

¹¹⁴ “bir ilim şekil ve heyetinde tanzim ve tensik etmek” (6)

¹¹⁵ “yalnız vesai ki umumi ve resmîyeyi değil, her türlü hususi vesikaları, mektubat ve muharreratı, sicilatı, defteri hakani kuyudatını, asârı zanaatı” (6)

complementary field of study to history. Similarly, he thinks that the humanities and social sciences such as law, ethics, politics, language, literature, fine arts, philosophy and religion are also sciences that assist historical research (59). This premise leads one to bear in mind that Köprülü is a historian of many disciplines: Social, political, intellectual and literary history as well as history of religion. However, this diversity is also a unifying characteristic for Köprülü's work from a holistic point of view, as he understands the ultimate goal of the historian to reconstruct the history of humanity as a whole (57). Throughout "MTLH", we see Köprülü both as a historian with a capital "H" and as a literary historian, and his take on the issue of historiographical methodology is shaped by both these roles.¹¹⁶

The abovementioned premise of Köprülü's methodological framework encouraged his commentators to explore various trends of historiography, such as the Annales school of historiography, that are allegedly akin to that of Köprülü's. One of the advocates of this claim is Oral, who argues that Köprülü subscribes to the Annales school of historiography (175) with respect to his work on history per se. A similar interpretation is by Sönmez, whose argument is that the Annales school of historiography is the major influence on the historiographical practice that is carried on by the leading scholars of Ottoman history such as Köprülü, Barkan, and İnalçık. In the latter analysis, Sönmez's commentary on Köprülü's article emphasises the scope and the objects of Köprülü's historiography, and interprets these as by-products of his familiarity

¹¹⁶ In this chapter, we mainly focus on Köprülü's understanding of literary historiography. However, our close reading demonstrates that his discussion of this specific issue is driven by an inductive approach. Köprülü starts out by scrutinising fundamental concepts of general history, then he moves on to particular aspects of literary history (from "II" onwards). In this regard, it is nearly impossible to analyse "MTLH" without regarding him both as a "Historian" and a literary historian. Hence, our discussion endeavours to bring both aspects of his intellectual persona into play.

with the content and the methodology of European historiography in the early twentieth century. Following this, Sönmez claims that Köprülü and scholars of the Annales school, likewise, challenge the traditional historiographical practice that is predominant in the nineteenth century and before. There is indeed a remarkable similarity between the historical discourses that are produced by Köprülü and scholars of the Annales school regarding the emphasis on social history and certain aspects of its methodology. Nevertheless, this similarity does not justify the presupposed causal relationship between method and content. It assumes the very same relation of causality between method and content for both Köprülü's approach and the Annales school. However, similar historical understandings, historiographical methods and/or practices may emerge due to very different social, political, and cultural paradigms, and are almost always overdetermined. In this regard, taking the above-mentioned similarity as an indication of a complete overlap of historiographical theory and practice between Köprülü's stance and the Annales school may prove to be a false analogy. Moreover, the only reference Sönmez uses to support his claim is Köprülü's mention of Bloch and Febvre in his introduction to *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu* (*The Foundation of the Ottoman State*), published in 1959. The content of this reference, however, does not seem to allude to more than an expression of gratitude for Febvre's review of his above-mentioned book and a courteous appreciation of Febvre and Bloch's work on historiography. This is Köprülü's only reference to these thinkers in this volume, including the chapter on methodology that he adopted for his analysis of the subject, which shows that his reference to Febvre and Bloch cannot be interpreted as part of his theoretical framework. Besides, this approach seems to undermine the

importance of Köprülü's early work on historiographical methodology, which predates the emergence of the Annales school. Consequently, Sönmez's viewpoint is logically unsound, hence failing to be adequately explanatory, although the parallel drawn between Köprülü's stance and the Annales school is an interesting observation on its own accord.

Yeğen, another scholar who thinks similarly regarding Köprülü's theoretical tendencies, points to Köprülü's methodology as what distinguishes him from other historians. According to Yeğen, Köprülü was, "in the real sense of the word, a follower of materialist and social understanding of history" (238). As a supporting view, Yeğen refers to Berktaş's comparison of Köprülü to Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch, who are part of the Annales school of historiography. Referring to the passage analysed above from Köprülü's introduction to his book *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu* (*The Founding of the Ottoman State*), Berktaş claims that Köprülü is indebted to the Annales school. Our above-mentioned objection to his claim persists, as the said passage does not prove any intellectual link between Köprülü's method and that of the Annales school. Berktaş also associates Köprülü's historiographical methodology with a materialist viewpoint (81). Having not clearly defined what he means by "materialism", Berktaş later on refers to Marxist terms of analysis, such as "substructure" and "class" in Köprülü's writings after 1930 (87), which appears to be an indefinite attempt to suggest that Köprülü's research reveals "materialist" tendencies, especially in his work on Turkish history. The only reference to Marx in "MTLH" is when Köprülü's says that Marx modified Darwin's theory of evolution and applied it to the social sciences and that Marx complements Comte in some ways; however, he contradicts him morally in the

sense that Marx sees all historical events as results of humanity's effort to meet its essential material needs, whereas the driving force behind history is the human intellect for Comte (62). Here, Köprülü favours the Comtean approach as opposed to the Marxist principle of historical cause and effect relations. Therefore, with respect to Köprülü's viewpoint regarding literary historiography within the confines of "MTLH", however, there is no textual evidence to posit a claim such as Berktaş's on Köprülü's perception of the notion of social evolution.

As one of the recent commentators on the issue, Palabıyık's reading of "MTLH" also touches upon the notion of social evolution as well as historical causation as part of the overall nature of Köprülü's approach regarding the practice of historiography. The fundamental characteristics of Köprülü's historiography Palabıyık specifies are epistemic holism, progressive approach, comparative analysis, and historical continuity (191194); however, he does not account for these characteristics in-depth by analysing Köprülü's "MTLH" except four major references that concern the following points: (1) Turkish literary history should be written with reference to the relevant interrelations between intellectual phenomena, (2) social change is gradual rather than abrupt, (3) every event in history occurs as a result of various causes, and it is itself also one of the many causes of certain future events, (4) in the process of writing history, the historian should refer not only to public and official records, but also to private documents, letters, notes, registries of sorts, and artefacts (Palabıyık, 192, 193, 193, 195, respectively). Although these observations are accurate regarding Köprülü's understanding of history and its methodology, Palabıyık does not develop these aspects into a close reading of Köprülü's methodology

in terms of its historical context, epistemological foundations and outreach, argumentative structure and further implications for Turkish literary history.

The epistemological foundations of Köprülü's understanding of social evolution are not as obvious as it seems. Rejecting the Comtean classification of sociology under the static division of social sciences and history under the dynamic division, he takes both sociology and history to exhibit a dynamic nature in terms of their course of evolution¹¹⁷ (58). However, he also notes that Comte eventually acknowledges dynamism as a feature of his sociology and utilises positivist tools of analysis in his own methodological framework that he proposes in the second half of "MTLH".¹¹⁸ Some commentators of his work tend to ignore the detailed structuring of Köprülü's framework. For example, Fatih Altuğ discusses Köprülü's theoretical tendency in "MTLH" by appealing to the Bergsonian notion of "élan vital" ("vital jump"). Claiming that Köprülü abandons the Darwinist approach to evolution, which favours a systematic idea of social progress, and later subscribes to the rather nonlinear understanding of Bergsonian socio-historical continuity, Altuğ's interpretation seems to overlook the complexity of "MTLH". Köprülü's discussion of the concept of "the vital jump"¹¹⁹ constitutes a specific part of his article, which is intended to refute the claim that objects of social sciences can be treated like organisms. Referring to scholars of social psychology such as Tarde, Durkheim, Jankelevitch and Worms in order to support his claim, Köprülü expresses his disagreement with the alleged one-on-one resemblance between natural sciences and social sciences. In the second part of his objection, Köprülü argues, even if we were to

¹¹⁷ Köprülü refers to Coste and Spencer, who both think that all sociology to be dynamic, in order to strengthen his argument.

¹¹⁸ Our study elaborates upon this part from the next paragraph onwards.

¹¹⁹ "yaratıcı tekâmül" (11)

assume that such a relation of resemblance is true, this still would not prove the necessity of gradual evolution in history. As the Bergsonian concept of “the vital impetus” in the context of his theory of creative evolution shows that such jumps are often observed in nature, Köprülü questions the viewpoint that assumes “the necessity of a gradual evolution in the field of social sciences, which are more influenced by human will”¹²⁰ (60). According to Köprülü, Nordau is right in stating that “by attempting to study humans like plants, and society like a group of animals, it is impossible to discover any genuine laws of history”¹²¹ (62).

This premise and the reference to “genuine laws of history” brings the notion of causation into play. The discussion on causality in history constitutes a fundamental part of “MTLH”, as it provides valuable insight into how Köprülü attempts to reconcile different viewpoints on this issue by endeavouring to identify the fundamental dynamics that marry the theoretical and practical aspects of literary historiography. First, Köprülü explains the paradigm shift in the understanding of historical causation in the nineteenth century. He emphasises the influence of the hypothesis that “history is governed by law[s]”¹²², which was initially put forward by philosophers of history (62), even though he also reports that sociology is gaining remarkable momentum while the philosophy of history is falling out of fashion for historical research as an independent discipline in the late nineteenth century. Köprülü finds the observations of Mornet and others, who argue against the unscientific practice

¹²⁰ “iradei beşeriyenin daha çok tahtı tesirinde bulunan içtimaiyat sahasında (...) bir tekamülü tedricinin zaruriyeti”

¹²¹ Here, Köprülü’s writing is confusing, as it is hard to determine the extent of the reference to Nordau. We assume that the above-quoted part is originally authored by Nordau, as it appears to be a further elaboration of his idea that historians cannot establish a sound framework for historical analysis by overlooking the sociological and psychological phenomena, as opposed to scholars of real history, who take into consideration all particular characteristics of humans and human groups (62).

¹²² “tarihin bir kanun ile idare olunduğu faraziyesi” (16)

of historiography, “clear are meaningful”¹²³ in this sense (62). Köprülü also refers to Bourdeau’s criticism¹²⁴ of the old historians who perceived history as narration, and quotes him on the need for establishing historical laws (63). Following this, Köprülü borrows Mill’s definition of laws as “consistent similarities that bind phenomena together, and consistent successions (of events) that unite them together”.¹²⁵ At this point the idea of continuity as an overarching dynamic in the practice of literary historiography begins to crystallise in the conceptual sense in Köprülü’s writing, and brings further methodical concerns into play, such as practical applications that can facilitate such a dynamic. The above-mentioned definition, in turn, necessitates the use of statistical methods in lieu of the descriptive method, as the study of numerical data is essential for establishing historical laws. However, Köprülü then explains that this definition and therefore the use of statistical methods hold only in the case that one accepts the principle of social determinism of events (63). Nevertheless, he does not refrain from referring to Quételet and Wagner¹²⁶, whom he represents as enthusiastic advocates of unchanging laws determining collective behaviour, yet another pointer for an explanatory basis for the idea of continuity to be established theoretically. At this point, we start observing an intriguing tension in Köprülü’s discussion, particularly when he introduces Sorel’s view of causation. According to Köprülü, Sorel does not accept the determinism of social events as the only causal explanation for historical progress, but he does agree that there are particular laws that govern history to a certain extent (63). As Köprülü manifests a strong tendency to embrace the

¹²³ “vâzih ve manidar” (16)

¹²⁴ *L’Histoire et les historiens* (1888)

¹²⁵ hadisatı birbirine rabt eden daimi müşâbahatlar ve heyeti mecmualarını tevhid eden sabit teakublar” (1617)

¹²⁶ This scholar remains unidentified.

idea that history is governed by particular laws despite nullifying a strict commitment to social determinism, the question of whether scientific methods such as experimentation and observation are viable for historical research or not arises.

Köprülü asserts that experimentation in the social sciences is nearly impossible, hence observation is regarded as “the most tangible and genuine intermediary in this matter”¹²⁷ by scholars such as Giddings and Tarde; however, Köprülü then says that “to attribute an absolute reality to statistics is [not to be informed of all methods]¹²⁸”, quoting another scholar named “Guyau”¹²⁹ (63). Nonetheless, Köprülü warns against the danger of reducing history to a sociological method and emphasises the importance of treating history as an independent field of study. This emphasis leads Köprülü to state that he sees “indirect observation”¹³⁰ as one of the methods that is central to historical research, since he also thinks that history as a discipline on its own merits requires a set of methods that are peculiar to it (56). In other words, he does not reject the use of scientific methods altogether. Instead, he expresses a preference as to which aspects of scientific methodology suit the purpose of literary historiography. As his discussion progresses, we come across other examples of Köprülü’s efforts to arrive at a synthesis of different types of historical causality in order to offer a comprehensive theoretical mode of

¹²⁷ “bu hususta en maddi ve hakiki vasıta olan” (17).

¹²⁸ Here, we believe that Leiser misreads Köprülü, hence his translation fails to be an accurate representation of Köprülü’s expression. In the original text, Köprülü uses the word “usûl” as a plural (as part of the phrase “bütün usûlü tanınamak” [17]), and hence highlights the importance of avoiding absolutism in subscribing to one particular methodology. Here, he seems to acknowledge the possibility of other methods. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Köprülü uses “usûl” only as a plural: On most occasions, the term signifies a specific methodical strategy, and its use is singular. The above-mentioned plural use is a linguistic hint at the eclectic nature of Köprülü’s approach.

¹²⁹ This scholar also remains unidentified.

¹³⁰ “bilvasıta müşahade” (17)

continuity within the context of literary historiography. For example, he finds Coulanges' suggestion that historians should give up trying to find laws (64) an exaggerated view. Even though this view posits that historical causation is mostly accidental, Köprülü reminds the reader that there are opposing views which do not discard with certainty the idea of "history possess[ing] a number of laws that are particular to it" (64). Such laws, therefore, can be considered justifiable in a compatibilist framework that seeks multiplicity of method. On the one hand, once history as a moral science is distinguished from natural sciences, as Monod does, it becomes clear that the method used for the latter cannot be applied to history (Köprülü, 64). On the other hand, this does not mean that historical research is not to be regarded as a scientific enterprise. Köprülü agrees that historical events can only be examined as successive events rather than repetitious facts (Xénopol quoted in Köprülü, 64), and that this means that historical causation is accidental, even though this does not rule out the notion of historical succession bringing a strong sense of continuity into play. As long as this particular relation of causation is taken into account, he seems to find that observation carried on according to scientific principles does not represent a theoretical inconsistency, saying that the method of observation does not nullify the value and scientific nature of history (64). Referring to Seignobos in order to support this standpoint, Köprülü points to how relations of historical causality can be identified in light of the scientific attitude and analytical tools provided by the positivist thought at the practical level in the making of literary history.

In this sense, Köprülü's writings seem to hint at a more eclectic structure in terms of his critical tendencies regarding the practice and the actual extent of

Turkish literary history, particularly concerning the systematised practice of historiography. With respect to the principle of causality in history as a social phenomenon, Köprülü's thought effectively takes a Bergsonian turn. On the one hand, this turn, to a certain extent, enables him to explain and enhance the idea of continuity that he desires to attribute to the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. This tendency is observed in the literature authored by conservative intellectuals of the early twentieth century Ottoman Empire and Turkey (Mignon, *Ana Metne Taşınan Dipnotlar*, 161). However, as Mignon points out, it is important to mention that there were versions of "Bergsonism", rather than a uniform understanding of Bergson's thought (160). In Köprülü's case, what allows for this conceptual leap is the Bergsonian notion of "élan vital" in order for his methodological framework to allow for a more accommodating understanding of causality. He also refers to Mornet in this context, saying that views like Mornet's and Darwin's are no longer able to explain the notion of social evolution, and that theories of creative evolution, like Bergson's, Vries' and Sorel's, are favoured by the historians of the period (60). Historical causation for Köprülü is necessarily not a linear relation, since "examining all the factors that could be related to [a literary product]"¹³¹ leads to accurate analysis, whereas "attempting to describe and explain a literary phenomenon as the result of one type of cause"¹³² does not (82). On the other hand, this premise does not seem to prevent him from utilising analytical principles that exhibit positivist characteristics, emphasising the connections between literary phenomena in the historical context. His methodological framework reveals

¹³¹ "bir vakayı anlamak için onda medhaldar olabilecek avamili ihmal etmeme[k]" (47)

¹³² "bir hadisei edebiyeyi yalnız bir nev'i sebeplerle teşrih ve izaha kalkış[ma]" (47)

positivist tendencies particularly in practical terms¹³³ as well as certain theoretical assumptions in order to “provide [the] building block[s] for the] national and scholarly monument” that is the history of Turkish literature (Köprülü, 84). Considering the Bergsonian influence alone as the driving force behind Köprülü’s methodology may fail us in providing a satisfactory account of what Köprülü tries to achieve.

As seen in the close-reading above, Köprülü engages with a number of tasks in the first part of his article in order to set the scene for presenting his understanding of how literary historiography ought to be practised. First, he defines some of the fundamental concepts for his discussion such as “method” and “history” by exploring the literature, almost exclusively appealing to the sources of French literary history and criticism. Contemporary critics tend to classify Köprülü’s approach according to specific schools in the practice of historiography, such as Annales school and/or Bergsonianism, by taking up particular mentions in Köprülü’s discussion regarding the nature of method and history in general terms. However, readings carried out without dwelling into the complex structure of “MTLH” fail to reveal the internal tensions in the making of the text, and miss out on the opportunity of what these tensions may point at. Köprülü himself emphasises the need for a particular method for the study of Ottoman/Turkish literary history from a novel point of view, and he brings a multi-faceted theoretical structure into play at the outset, rather than committing to a particular framework. The first component of this structure is his take on causality in history, which he believes to be governed by laws; however, there are two different conceptual aspects that shape Köprülü’s approach. One of

¹³³ Dressler is one of the few scholars that acknowledges Köprülü’s positivist approach regarding his commitment towards a particular scientific method (208); however, he does not take this observation any further.

these aspects is heavily influenced by the positivist school of thought that prioritises the scientific practice of historiography and the need of identifying historical laws. In line with this thought, Köprülü also favours appealing to a particular set of analytical tools, such as observation, in order to carry out the practice of history-writing. On the one hand, Köprülü essentially adopts an understanding of historical reality as successive events, possibly governed by a particular set of laws that are identifiable via scientifically-guided practice, in the practical sense; on the other hand, he hints at the opportunity of making sense of the overall evolution of history by bringing the Bergsonian thought into play. How these two conceptual aspects, one functioning at the practical level and the other utilised at the theoretical level, form the hybrid structure Köprülü promulgates becomes increasingly apparent in the second part of “MTLH”, the close-reading of which commences below.

While the theoretical discussions in the first part of “MTLH” formulate the premises by which a complex methodological framework is possible, the second part of the article deals with the applied aspect of this framework. In fact, the latter part constitutes two thirds of the entire article, whereas the former is less than one third considering that there are also a few pages of introduction and conclusion. Given this proportion, it becomes crucial to examine the second part of “MTLH” in order to identify the fundamental characteristics of Köprülü’s understanding of method.

There are three stages of Köprülü's discussion regarding the applied aspect of method in this part of the article. First, he explains why the methodological framework he suggests is more appropriate than other alternatives like Lanson's, as he argues later (6970). One of the reasons why Köprülü finds that a rigorous analysis is necessary is that it is difficult to access information regarding the earlier periods of Turkish literary history (65). Köprülü also thinks that the social composition of Turkish society as a whole is a multifaceted nature with different levels of aesthetic appreciation, hence an extensive analysis must account for this diversity. However, "the historian who will study Turkish literature, a subject in sad condition having up to now been neither the object of a serious comprehensive study nor of specialised studies focusing on individual periods and personalities, must also face the burden of studying and bringing to life the still unwritten cultural and political history of the Turks"¹³⁴ (67).

The second stage of Köprülü's discussion starts with the reiteration of his perception of time. He says that the "subject [of literary history] deals not only with the past but also with the present; in other words, a past that has not finished but is continuing and flourishing before our very eyes" (68). Recognizing history as a perceptual phenomenon that constantly evolves, his description of temporality may remind us of the Bergsonian concept of "durée", which appears to follow from his earlier reference to "élan vital" in the context of historical causation; however, his arguments regarding how the past and the present are linked point to a different practical tendency, which emphasises the

¹³⁴ "Şimdiye kadar ne heyeti mecmuasıyla, ne de mütefarık devirleri ve eşhası itibarıyla bir tetkiki ciddiye mazhar olmayan zavallı Türk edebiyatını tetkik edecek müverrih, henüz yazılamayan Türk tarihi medeni ve siyasisini de tetkik ve ihya zahmetine katlanmak mecburiyetindedir" (24).

notion of continuity as a pivotal force in the evolution of literary history. First and foremost, Köprülü thinks that literary historians must identify literary works that are manifestations of human thought and national civilization. According to him, these literary works “that a class of readers at a certain time found to express their own spirit and inclinations” are masterpieces, and they constitute his focus of analysis (69) as they provide insight to the historical period they belong to. In addition to his emphasis on the context of a literary work as an essential part of its making, Köprülü suggests that there is a distinction between “historical taste” and “personal taste”, and while the former is shaped under the particular influences of the social and therefore aesthetic milieu of the era in focus, the latter is formed according to the aesthetic understanding of the present. Köprülü states that this is a major point of his disagreement with Lanson’s assertion that “a very early literary work would have the same effect on a modern reader that it had on its original readers” (68). He presents the above-mentioned distinction as one of the analytical tools of his method, since historical research cannot accurately portray the past, if literary historians undermine the genuine aesthetics formation of an old literary work and try to examine it with contemporary conceptions of aesthetic value. A literary work can only be regarded as a source in historical research if its historical context is evaluated in its own terms. In this sense, literary historians are expected to “bring the old scenes back to life”; however, it must not be at the expense of overlooking the historical reality and the literary works that represent the era they belong to. Making sense of the past requires literary historians to posit a clear divide between different eras of history so that they are able to maintain impartiality in their research, and therefore, to reveal a fair representation of their subjects of

study. In this sense, the present can be regarded as a 'span which fills the interval between two immensities of duration [the past and the future], and binds them together [...], can only be properly conceived with the aid of the two extremes which it unites and separates' (Comte quoted in Bourdeau, 33). Köprülü's remark of how the literary past, constructed by the national genius, "reveals the shape of the future"¹³⁵ (70) is also noteworthy regarding how he sees the past and the present in relation to the future in the context of literary history with an emphasis on the theoretical continuity, inspired by the Bergsonian idea of temporality, imposed on the practical aspects of historiography itself, which are identifiable by the analytical tools provided by the positivist approach.

Before Köprülü moves on to the third stage of his discussion, he points out the difficulties regarding methodology in historical research. Apart from the above-mentioned problem of context and historical variations of aesthetic value, Köprülü identifies three difficulties. One of these difficulties stems from the problem of aesthetic diversity among different groups in society. Literary historians must determine the masterpieces of every group in every period of interest, and then "explicate and analyse"¹³⁶ these masterpieces of "the national genius"¹³⁷, so that their research encompasses "all intellectual manifestations of the nation"¹³⁸ (70). Another difficulty arises from the problem of studying individual characteristics of authors. Köprülü argues that it is not an easy task to determine an author's personality; however, it is necessary, as they are distinct products of society like other collective expressions of social and intellectual

¹³⁵ "istikbalin şeklini (...) irae eder" (29)

¹³⁶ "izah ve tahlil" (29)

¹³⁷ "dehai milli" (29)

¹³⁸ "milletin her türlü tezahüratı fikriyesi" (29)

phenomena. The last difficulty, Köprülü believes, is in determining the extent to which authors are affected by their social milieu and their interpersonal relationships, since it requires an interdisciplinary approach that accommodates psychological, social and literary studies for conducting collaborative research (71). These three points regarding the difficulty of engaging with various aspects of literary historiography highlight the idea of a collectively structured social intellect over time, expressions of which ought to be studied via literary works in an intellectually harmonious manner.

At the third stage of his discussion, Köprülü elaborates upon the applied aspect of the methodological framework he suggests in order to tackle the above-mentioned difficulties. While doing this, Köprülü benefits from the initial structure he implies in the first part of “MTLH”, particularly along the axis revealing positivist tendencies at the practical level. On the one hand, the theme of continuity is prevalent in making sense of literary history as a whole in terms of the theoretical assumptions underlying the temporal aspect of historical progress observed throughout, reminding the reader of the Bergsonian thought on the notion of time brought into play earlier. On the other hand, for Köprülü, the scientific method is “to measure the degree of change that is observed by means of criticism and experimentation”¹³⁹, necessary for the task (71). Köprülü also advises the historian against fallacious assumptions and vast generalisations as well as subjective biases that may prevent him from maintaining a scientific attitude. This advice, when assessed in juxtaposition to his remark on the use of criticism and experimentation, implies that Köprülü endeavours to propose a methodological framework by which knowledge

¹³⁹ “tenkit ve tecrübeye karşı müşahade olunan temayülün derecesiyle ölç[mek]” (31)

acquired in historical research is to be validated. This theoretical tendency, as advanced by the positivist thinkers of the nineteenth century such as Comte, entails that “a firm objective basis” is a prerequisite for the scientific enterprise (Lenzer, 329). Köprülü assigns ultimate priority to “objective and critical methods”¹⁴⁰, and says that he shall “refer to [his/her] impressions and insights only on deep and profound points that are not possible to deduce or extract by other methods”¹⁴¹ (72). This represents a fundamental clash with the Bergsonian theory of knowledge, which endorses the method of intuition for knowledge acquisition. Knowledge, in Bergsonian terms, is not disinterested (Lawlor and Leonard, 13), whereas Köprülü emphasises on the need for reducing the influence of subjective biases as much as possible, therefore, for maintaining objectivity (72). According to Köprülü, there is a clear difference between “knowing and sensing”¹⁴², and the latter must be cautious in treating the latter as a means for the former, since it may be misleading (73): “An analysis based on subjective and sensory impressions, no matter how reasonable and appropriate, is insufficient”¹⁴³ (74). Nevertheless, Köprülü does not rule out the use of intuition altogether: He formulates its use as a secondary strategy for acquiring knowledge by proposing a methodological hierarchy that accommodates both methods in a compatible structure to arrive at a synthesis. This point further demonstrates the hybridity of his methodology that consolidates “different analytical tools”¹⁴⁴ in one framework. Stating that he

¹⁴⁰ “afaki ve tenkitî usûller”

¹⁴¹ “tesirat ve keşfiyatımıza, ancak, başka bir usûl ile istidlal ve istihrac kabil olmayan derin ve vicdani noktalarda müracaat edelim” (33)

¹⁴² “bilmek’le ‘hissetmek’” (33)

¹⁴³ “(...) gayri ihtiyari, nefsî bir tesirle mütefekkirane ve mütetebbi’ane bir tahlil, makul ve münasib usûller olmakla beraber nâkâfidir” (34).

¹⁴⁴ Köprülü says that literary historians can make use of “several different approaches” (“muhtelif birtakım tarzlar” [34]) in order to advance successfully in their studies (74).

desires to find out the “appropriate methods and terminology for [the] subject [of literary history]”¹⁴⁵ (74), Köprülü lays out the action plan for historians of Turkish literature.

In order to tackle this goal, Köprülü first provides guidance on the major sources for the study of Turkish literature. Emphasising that the primary sources of information in this regard are bibliographies, he refers to literary works that he considers to be influential in Turkish literary history. After he outlines this illustrative corpus, Köprülü moves on to explaining how the historian can objectively judge whether a literary work must be regarded as a possible object of historical research or not. He identifies seven criteria to which the historian must appeal in order to validate the status of a work as an object of his/her study of the history of literature. These are: (1) originality of a text, (2) completeness of a text, (3) date of production of a text, (4) language of a text, (5) historical point of view from which a text is produced, (6) biographical information on the author(s) of a text, (7) aesthetic influence of a text in juxtaposition to its popularity (7980). According to Köprülü, “the most reliable and detailed information”¹⁴⁶ (80) on a literary work can be acquired if and only if the historian collects sufficient data specified by these criteria. While conducting research of this kind, the historian is expected to “distinguish [his/her] subjective knowledge from objective information, [he/she] should give greater attention to the latter”¹⁴⁷ (Köprülü, 80). Köprülü’s stance regarding objectivity is another aspect of his methodological framework that is in line with the positivist attitude in terms of acquiring and validating knowledge.

¹⁴⁵ “mevzumuzla mütenasip usûller ve ıstılahlar” (33)

¹⁴⁶ “nisbeten en sağlam ve en etraflı malumat” (44)

¹⁴⁷ “enfesî bilgilerimizin afaki malumattan tefriki esnasında, bu ikinci kısma daha fazla bir vusât ver[erek]” (42)

The last example in “MTLH” that adds to the complexity of Köprülü’s methodological framework is the discussion on how to evaluate the degree to which literary texts can be considered as representative of their relevant era and aesthetic appeal. As mentioned earlier, Köprülü expresses that he is in favour of selecting the masterpieces as the objects of historical research (69); however, he later on introduces another method according to which literary works must be evaluated and grouped. First, he reconsiders his claim regarding masterpieces being the representative works of a certain era, saying that they are representative with respect to revealing the ultimate limit of aesthetic appreciation as “sublime and extremely refined products [that are] exceptional”¹⁴⁸, then acknowledges that mediocre¹⁴⁹ literary products, are “more noticeably representative with respect to their commonality”¹⁵⁰ (82). Following this, Köprülü refers to Mornet’s method for grouping mediocre literary works. This method instructs that literary products must be chronologically arranged in parallel series according to their comparative aesthetic value, as Köprülü describes (82). He then explains that the series that progress at an increasing rate point to new trends, whereas the ones that decrease identify the trends that are bound to vanish from the literary scene. Suggesting that a graph representing numerical data on the success or demise of literary works can help determine trends in the history of literature, is evidently an attempt to reconcile an aspect of statistical methods with the rest of Köprülü’s methodological framework. Despite the fact that he hesitates to use statistical methods for the study of literary history (63), this particular aspect of his methodology utilises statistics as an essential part of determining which literary works are “truer

¹⁴⁸ “(...) yüksek ve intihai vakalar tabiatıyla istisnai hadiselerdir” (48).

¹⁴⁹ “vasatî kıymeti hâiz” (45)

¹⁵⁰ “daha mer’i bir mümessiliyete haiz olmaları” (48)

reflections of [their] age”¹⁵¹ (82). Striving for diligence and objectivity, Köprülü proposes this framework as a shorthand for the historian to refer to in order to reach a comprehensive synthesis by analysing as much of the accessible knowledge as possible. In Köprülü’s terms, analyses of this sort identify the data that is essential for a thorough synthesis that combines and organises the outcomes of such analyses. Consequently, “analysis and synthesis”¹⁵² reveal “two aspects of reality that complement each other”¹⁵³ (83). By building a library of historical data in order to reconstruct the reality of the literary past as accurately as possible, Köprülü aim to determine the course of “intellectual and moral currents”¹⁵⁴ (80) in order to make sense of Turkish literary history as a whole. For Köprülü, a systematised study of literary history in this sense must be regarded as a “scientific necessity” (O. Köprülü in his introduction to his father’s *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* [*History of Turkish Literature*] quoted in Tezcan, 93). It is only then that the historian can work towards the ultimate goal of history, which is “to be able to compose and bring to life again the complete history of humanity in chronological order” (57). Although Köprülü thinks that this goal is theoretically impossible to tackle (64), he believes that a synthesis of the kind he proposes is “closer to reality and is, above all, closer to real life”¹⁵⁵ (82). Revealing an interesting parallel to the positivist concept of “connaissance approachée”, which assumes that science approaches truth without reaching it (Bourdeau, 13), Köprülü’s overall project for the study of Turkish literary history is to get closer and closer to the best possible portrayal of its historical reality on its own merits.

¹⁵¹ “o devrin daha sadık mukesleri, yani daha enmüzeci hadiseleri” (48)

¹⁵² “tahlil ve terkip” (50)

¹⁵³ “hakikatin yekdiğerini ikmal ve itmam eden iki cephesi [addolunabilir]” (50)

¹⁵⁴ “fikrî ve manevi cereyanlar” (45)

¹⁵⁵ “hakikate daha yakın ve bilhassa daha hayatî” (50)

“MTLH”, as a rigorous and novel study devoted to a thorough discussion of method in literary historiography, reveals Köprülü’s efforts to achieve three important tasks: First, the author elaborates on the reasons why he rejects the way in which traditional historiography, namely “history as narration”, is practised. Second, he provides a detailed discussion of the debates regarding different understandings of history in juxtaposition to natural sciences, purpose of history and historical research, methods in historical research, and theories of evolution in the context of historical progress. Throughout this discussion, Köprülü refines various angles of his proposal of a methodological model for the study of Turkish literary history, and this model is the focus of the third task he takes up in “MTLH”. As systematic as it was devised to unfold, “MTLH” is a text that is woven with internal tensions, reconciled under the overarching notion of continuity in the theoretical and practical sense. This chapter of the study demonstrates how these theoretical tensions are at play in the making of Köprülü’s critical strategy in building a new understanding of historiographical method, which relies on the fundamental dynamic of continuity, in the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. As a result of the close-reading carried on in this study, methodological hybridity stands out as the defining characteristic of Köprülü’s article as opposed to the analytically monolithic outcomes of the readings previously conducted on his work. This particular stance enables Köprülü to oscillate between different schools of scientific and historical

methodologies, and to employ particular aspects of each in a way that complements his proposal as a whole in order to highlight the above-mentioned dynamic. How Köprülü brings together varying, even contrasting, conceptual components into his framework crystallises throughout his discussion of historical causation and time, two of the central notions emphasised repeatedly in his enquiry into how literary historiography ought to be practised. While he appeals to the Bergsonian notion of time in order to make sense of how the evolution of literary history temporally forms a unified structure at the theoretical level, he relies on the positivist approach when it comes to identifying and explaining how this structure comes together in practical terms. This way, Köprülü establishes an eclectic structure with the analytical capacity to meet particular requirements of practising literary historiography with the goal of composing an all-encompassing picture of Ottoman/Turkish literary history in mind. In other words, contextualization of general principles of historiographical method for the specific nature of Turkish literary history is facilitated by the internal tensions that are reconciled by this hybrid structure, under the truss of theoretical and practical continuity as the unifying dynamic at work.

In light of our analysis, defining Köprülü's methodological framework in terms of a one-dimensional tendency does not seem to be theoretically justifiable. Numerous interpretations of Köprülü's work on historical method and literary historiography tend to suffer from this misconception, as they do not seem to explore the epistemological foundations on which Köprülü's methodological framework is built. As a result of our close reading of "MTLH", we argue that methodological hybridity, with the fundamental dynamic of continuity unifying the diverse aspects of this eclectic strategy, is the dominant

characteristic of Köprülü's approach, and that acknowledging this characteristic as the focal point of our analysis is an accommodating approach for a possibly deeper understanding of varied facets of his work on the history of Turkish literature. With the aid of the close-reading in this chapter, it is not only that an alternative interpretation of Köprülü's method is presented to the reader, but also that the fundamental dynamic of continuity in his work is revealed as a notable cursor for the analytical direction set before the practice of Ottoman-Turkish literary historiography.

In numerous works on Turkish literary history, what Köprülü wishfully calls "building blocks [of a] great national and scholarly monument [that is the history of literature]"¹⁵⁶, it is possible to trace the epistemological outlook that Köprülü sets forth for the explanatory framework regarding the practice of Turkish literary historiography (89). Köprülü's long-lasting influence on the

¹⁵⁶ It is worthwhile to quote Köprülü's message to the literary historians of the future, for it conveys the collective nature of his imagined effort to establish a strong sense of intellectual continuity as well in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography:

Every Turkish youth who is eager to study the history of literature should try to provide at least one building block, within the scope of the methods that have been described, for this great national and scholarly monument for which no construction materials are yet available. By helping to create this magnificent monument, he can help reveal the intellectual and sensory stages through which the great and noble Turkish nation has passed over the centuries in various milieux; and by presenting the uniqueness of the Turkish national genius, which reveals itself in those different stages, he will encourage future generations to pursue the same goal. For the historian of Turkish literature, could one imagine a more noble and sacred enterprise? (84)

[Tarihi edebiyata heveskar her Türk genci, henüz malzemei inşaiyesinden hiçbirini hazır bulunmayan bu bütün abidei milliye ve ilmiye için, izah edilen usûller dairesinde hiç olmazsa birer taş getirmeye çalışmalıdır. Çünkü, vücuda gelecek bu muhteşem abide, büyük ve zîşeref Türk milletinin tevalii a'sar arasında muhtelif muhitlerde geçirmiş olduğu fikrî ve hissî safhaları ve o muhtelif safhalarda mütecellî Türk dehai millisinin vahdetini göstermek, müstakbel nesilleri aynı gayei vahdetine sevk edecektir. Türk edebiyatı müverrihi için bundan daha asil ve makdus bir hedef nasıl tasavvur olunabilir? (51)]

perception of Turkish literature is one that still intrigues readers of Turkish literary history, and therefore undoubtedly calls for further intellectual attention.

CHAPTER 4

Early Formalizations of Method: Emergence of the Fundamental Paradigms in Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography

The genesis of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography as a scholarly discipline starts to take shape in the 1910s. In this chapter, I present the reader with close-readings of the works published between 1913, when Köprülü's article on method is published, and 1920/1, when he publishes *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*). With literary historians such as Şehâbeddin Süleyman, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, and İbrahim Necmi Dilmen publishing their works in this period, contributions to Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography begin to flourish.

I perform detailed analyses of these works in form of close-readings that first identify early formalizations of method in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, and then discuss the fundamental paradigms that emerge at that time in the discipline in the context of each historiographical account. The chapter also covers the growing institutionalisation of the

discipline by highlighting the regulatory change of 1925 and analysing its significance for succeeding works of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

In essence, I reveal the previously undiscovered shift from an analytically open-ended enquiry into the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography to a self-reinforced anthological approach to its making.

4. a. On Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı (History of the New Ottoman Literature)*

In 1914, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Mehmed Fuâd Köprülü collaborate to write *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı (History of the New Ottoman Literature)*. Their study is extensive, organised and it covers methodological concerns that the reader does not encounter in the previous works dedicated to Ottoman literary history. Similarly to the other volumes, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü endeavour to outline their thinking behind the study in the introduction, hence their work commences with a long preface, in which they scrutinise the key notions in literature and literary history under the titles such as “Târîh-i Edebiyyât” (“Literary History”), “Âsâr-ı Edebiyyenin Zuhûru” (“Formation of Literary Works”), “Âsâr-ı Edebiyyenin Âsâr-ı San`atla Münâsebeti” (“The Relationship Between Literary Works and Works of Art”), “Bir Devr-i Edebiyyenin Hudûdu Nasıl Tâyin Edilir” (“How Is an Era of Literature Determined?”), “Bir Eser-i Edebiyyenin Tahlîl-i Dâhili ve Hârici, Eser ve Muharrir” (“Internal and External Analysis of a Literary Work, Literary Work and

Author”), “Bir Eser-i Edebiyyenin Vücûda Getirdiği Te’sîrâtın Tedkîki” (“Analysis of The Influence of a Literary Work”), “Muhît-i Coğrafi ve İçtimâî: şerâit-i iktisâdiyye, hayât-ı âile ve kibârâne, hayât-ı siyâsiyye, ittikâdât, ahlâk, sanâyî-i sâire-i nefîse” (Social and Geographical Territory: economic conditions, etiquette and family life, political life, belief systems, ethics, other fine arts).¹⁵⁷

As the titles above demonstrate, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü take on a diligent attitude towards identifying the elements that construct literature and literary history. They also manifest a higher degree of awareness regarding the surrounding concepts and disciplines, which elevate the theoretical background of the study. First, they highlight where literary history stands in relation to the history of civilization in order to make sense of the field in a larger context within the humanities. In this section, they start with conveying their take on *tezkires*. In the past, they relay, the idea of literary history used to correspond to poets’ biographies; however, these *tezkires* do not hold any “scientific or positivist value”¹⁵⁸ (3). Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü emphasise that *tezkires* merely “reflect the external qualities of texts without penetrating their spirit” (3). On the contrary, they believe that literary history, as a part of the history of civilization, ought to imply an in-depth understanding of the entire journey of literature as well as the changes in the collective mind and spirit of the public. In order to develop an opinion regarding literary history, one ought to first show interest in various literary texts of different eras, then to compare and contrast the conditions under which they are produced (4). According to Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, this is the only way to strip

¹⁵⁷ A leaner presentation of these titles can be found in the appendix (“Table 6. The Organisational Structure of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s Preface to *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı*”).

¹⁵⁸ “kıymet-i ilmiyye ve fenniyye yahud bir kıymet-i müsbete”

historical enquiry from subjectivity and baseless imagination, and confer a scientific and a posteriori quality to it. On this remark, they refer to Hippolyte Taine¹⁵⁹ (1828-1893), as a historian who is capable of this intellectual strategy in literary historiography. Right after this reference, however, they also emphasise that the conclusions Taine draws are not free of subjectivity, although his approach inspires others to adopt a rather scientific and objective nature for enquiries in literary history (4).

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü predominantly appear to focus on the analysis of the connections between literary texts of the past in terms of how literary history can be understood in the best way possible. They argue that *tezkires* fail to accomplish this task, and there is no published source regarding methodology (4). Then, they explain the task they take up, which is following the principles of scientific enquiry from an objective perspective in order to eliminate subjectivity from the course of their literary historiographical practice.

The relationship between society and literature is acknowledged as a fundamental part of literary history by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü. On the one hand, the reader may remember that the idea of the interaction between society and literature in mutual terms are mentioned by other historians such as Abdülhalim Memduh and Mehmed Hayreddin, therefore Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's take cannot be assigned originality in the strongest sense of the term. On the other hand, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's desires and efforts for elaborating upon how this interaction exactly

¹⁵⁹ Although Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü do not mention which one of Taine's writings is the source they benefit from, it is highly likely to be his introduction to *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise* (1863-7). Taine presents his theoretical stance on literary historiography in this introduction, and highlights how it can be practised through "a process of intensive analysis, hypothesis, and verification based on the observed data of race, milieu, and moment in the author, his work, or in the nation's literature itself" (Sullivan, 26)

happens and in which ways it relates to literary history are far more detailed and composed. The introductory chapter of their work encompasses over sixty pages, all of which is devoted to this purpose.

For Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, a literary text carries all of the characteristics of the time and place it belongs to: its style, ideas and emotions it cultivates, its wording (5). It is not only that a literary text reflects the image of the environment it has created, but also it feeds the information it embodies back to society. This way, the public opinion and belief systems in a society can crystallise with clarity and certainty (5). As an example for this phenomenon, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü claim that it is literature that unchains the East from its orientation towards Plato and Neo-Platonism as well as Christianity. Without further ado on this point, they list a number of Ottoman authors, starting with Mevlânâ Celâleddin-i Rûmî and ending with Abdülhak Hâmid saying that literary history ought to be studied step by step and by paying attention to the stages of intellectual development in a society (6). In their view, Paul Bourget's (1852-1935) view on language, where he likens the development of an individual to the development of language, provides the most useful tool for analysis. Bourget, as Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü report, believes that the level of prosperity directly affects the individual in a society, and transformations in language occur as a result of the same mechanism being at work (6). Basing their viewpoint on this idea, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü begin to expand upon how the Ottoman society is in a similar condition from the very beginning of its formation until the presence of Kanûnî Sultan Süleyman (1520-1566). They describe the collective spirit and the linguistic phenomena in such periods as uncertain and continuously ever-

changing. Then, they claim that the state of language acquires a rather stable outlook in the following period. The mirroring effect of this phenomenon can also be seen in genre. They present the reader with a brief narrative of why poetry precedes prose in communities by appealing to the same reasoning. The collective nature of societal life, in their opinion inspired by Bourget, paves the way for a way of literary expression that reflects that nature, and poetry is the genre that suits this need. However, as this collective nature slowly transforms into a multi-layered structure of society by virtue of prosperity, the individual grows out of the societal shell, and both the language and the literary production acquires a rather free spirit (7). This remark by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü is an important observation, for it hints at the potential of an in-depth analysis that marries social history and linguistics as well as literature, providing insight into the intellectual development in Ottoman literary history.

The first section of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's introduction also involves objections to another historian of the period, referred to in the text as "the honourable professor" without revealing his identity (7). As a result of an extensive search, I found that the first direct quote from the "honourable professor" belongs to Fâik Reşad. This quote describes what literary history is and puts it simply as "a science that informs of the historical events of a literature of a nation, which consists of poetry and prose, from its beginnings to the present day" (Fâik Reşad, 41). Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü do not find this definition sufficiently descriptive of what literary history is, and suggest that they ought to "expand" on this definition and complete it":

Literary history is both to acquire knowledge of the stages of intellectual transformations, the social progress and the spirit of a nation or of a period, and to permeate the depths of the literary and personal lives of authors by analysing both the form and the content of the entire literary production [of a nation or of a period]. (8)

With the definition above, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü desire to make up for what they believe is missing in Fâik Reşad's definition. Their contribution, as alleged, is the component of "social history", which they regard as the most fundamental aspect of literary history. By introducing this component to the definition of literary history, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü declare that they "liberate literary history from the form of biographies and 'tezkiiretü's-şu'arâ's" (9). In other words, they say that they are the first historians to bring forth this aspect in the context of Ottoman literary historiography. This claim is an extremely difficult one to justify, given the previous analyses in this study. When the reader recalls Abdülhalim Memduh's utterance of "human history" (126), or Şehâbeddin Süleyman's remarks in the volume he authors on his own (57), or Fâik Reşad's highlight on the social as well as natural causes and effects on literary history (5-6), Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's claim loses its legitimacy in terms of theirs being the first attempt to bring the idea of social history in juxtaposition to literary history into play. Nevertheless, execution of this idea in a rather comprehensive and meticulous manner is another matter, and this may indeed be the case for what Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü are set out to achieve in their volume.

Following the discussion on the definition of literary history and what the literary historiographical practice implies, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü

assign another function to language and literature. “Patriotism”¹⁶⁰, according to them, is nurtured by language and literature, and a nation is deeply attached to its homeland by language, literature and its authors¹⁶¹ (9). Until this point in the text, the idea of a nation is developed as a community, a society that exists as a collective being without particular connotations as to what the glue that holds the members of this group. With the statement above, this undergoes a sudden change, and the reader is exposed to the notions of “nation” and “patriotism”. Quoting Emile Faguet, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü engage with an interesting remark: They believe that authors do not necessarily need to be patriotic, the works these authors produce are sufficient for them to awaken the patriotic emotions (9). Here, the reader is faced with an original approach to the relationship between literature, authorship in particular, and patriotism. Although Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü assume a direct and fundamental connection between literature and patriotism, they do not yet assign a political function to authorship. This approach is, even though it is politically liberal and appealing, to become more radical with respect to the extent of proto-nationalism in the following decade, as the reader shall see in the course of this study.

Authorship, in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s work, is given utmost importance on the contrary to the previous volumes taken into account in the study so far. While an author such as Abdülhalim Memduh consciously stays away from engaging with any practice reminiscent of tezkire-writing tradition, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü follow a different strategy. For

¹⁶⁰ “hissiyyât-ı vatanperverâne”

¹⁶¹ “O [târîh-i edebîyyât], hissiyyât-ı vatanperverâneyi takviyye eden esbâb ve avâmil dâhilinde de bulunmaktadır. Bir kavmin edebîyyâtıyla ve onun vasıtası bulunan lisânıyla, hülâsa âsâr-ı edebîyyeyi icâd ve ibdâ’ eden, lisânını zinde ve pür-hayat kılan üdebâsıyla, bütün san’âtkârlarıyla vatanına merbût olur.”

their purpose is to present an account of literary history that evaluates the past with a focus on how authors spark and maintain the nation's spirit, they find it necessary to dwell upon the "spiritual sides and personalities of the authors" (10). Then, they name Fuzûlî, Bâkî, Nedîm and Abdülhak Hâmid as some of the strongest characters in Ottoman literary history, and therefore these authors as well as others ought to be examined in the context of a literary history.

After the first section of their introduction, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü discuss other aspects of literature in previously unexplored ways. For example, they elaborate upon the formation of literary works at length in the second section. However, they only expand upon the emergence of poetry and song-writing in their simplest forms without enriching the scope of their enquiry any further. In the third section, they focus on the relationship between literary works and works of arts, such as music, architecture, drawing, sculpture and dance (18). According to Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, literature and fine arts are shaped by the same dynamics, and this can be observed in Ancient Greek history and the fourteenth century France (21-25) as well as the Ottoman Empire (25-28). The attempt to understand the underlying principles by which disciplines such as literature and fine arts come into being is a novel one in Ottoman literary historiography. Here, the reader may also realise the expansion of scope while bringing unusual examples into the picture. While previous historians bring up individual authors from Arabic, Persian, French, German and English literature in arguably superficial ways throughout their volumes, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü prefer to present the reader with more elaborate explanations while exemplifying an intellectual phenomenon. This aspect of their work stands out in this respect, for their analysis tends to

appear as more detailed and diligent when compared to their contemporary historians’.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü take up another genre in the fourth section of their introduction. They consider epic poetry almost as an internal part of literary history, rather than merely as a genre of literature. Especially when compared to poetry in itself and drama, epic poetry requires a completely different sort of scholarly attention. This, they argue, is because epic poetry captures the true image of a nation, which can provide the literary historian with insight regarding the spirit of an era (30). However, they express their disappointment, for epic poetry in Ottoman literature does not shine as the brightest light and most of it is gone (31). Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s interest in epic poetry can also be interpreted as a building block for what they imagine literary history, therefore literature, is to be: A linguistic medium to express the spirit of a nation, which in turn, cultivates the same spirit to travel through time while maintaining its patriotic outlook by narratives of historical unity.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü present the logic behind their periodization of literary history in the fifth section of their introduction. They describe this task as the most difficult and labour-intensive historiographical process that is desperately needed (31). In their opinion, this process shall not be carried out arbitrarily and subjectively, if done so, literary history would lose both its legitimacy to be regarded as an important part of the history of civilization and the social and historical insights it could provide the historian with. The need for objectivity in the context of periodization paves the way for the notion of method to be introduced in the text for the first time. Şehâbeddin

Süleyman and Köprülü define method as “the way that the human mind finds the truth” (32). Apart from the previous highlights on the idea of historical unity and continuity, they bring the concept of “truth” into play. This emphasis, in the general scheme of epistemology, rings in the framework of positivism, for it assumes a view of the existing phenomena as fully intelligible from a scientific perspective. “Truth”, in this sense, stands for this assumed possibility of a complete picture of the world, seen and unseen, as the ultimate placeholder for the knowledge of all things. Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü do not elaborate further on this epistemological hint and move towards an analogy between how the social environment surrounding a human being influences his/her upbringing to the greatest extent and how a literary text is produced under similar conditions (32-33). For Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, literary works are products of particular eras and the nature of collective consciousness dominant in these eras, therefore the most trustworthy and certain periodization of literary history ought to be carried out in line with the transformations and changes in society (33). Having placed the relationship between the literary works that reflect the nature of the collective spirit and social history at the heart of their enquiry, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü explain that there may also be literary texts that are unique in terms of the emotions they incite, the ideas they inspire, their language and stylistics. Although the uniqueness of these individual works is an indication of their literary value for Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, they believe that these works also carry the characteristics of the era they are produced in (33). They claim that the conditions within a certain era are what make an author capable of producing his/her literature in the best way possible. Their examples for this phenomenon are unusual: They refer to Oliver

Cromwell (1599-1658), Louis XVI. of France (1754-1793), Honoré Gabriel Riqueti Comte de Mirabeau (1749-1791), and Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) as intellectual personalities that would not have been who they are, had the political, social and economic conditions of their time not been the way they were (34). Up until the publication of their work, referring to authors from literary traditions other than Persian and Arabic is not encountered in the works of literary historiography. Attempting at such a change in the direction from the East to the West while establishing an explanatory axis within the context of Ottoman literary history, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü turn to Nedîm and Şeyh Gâlib as examples of authors who are by-products of the era they lived in. To support their claim, they quote Taine from his *Philosophie de l'Art*, where he dwells upon the irregularity of causality and the methodical unclarities in the Middle Ages (35), and they add that this is merely because the social, political and economic turmoil at the formation periods of communities is mirrored in literary tradition. This is why Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593), although as brilliant as Shakespeare (1585-1613) in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's opinion, could not become as famous as Shakespeare (36): It was a matter of timing.

For Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, one can observe how literature is shaped by social progress in the Ottoman Empire in the same way that one can in the cases of France, England and Italy. The period in which the spirit of Ottoman literature begins to develop is when Turks arrive to Anatolia, and diverse strands of thought meet in the same territory: Mevlânâ Celâleddin-i Rûmî's promulgation of Neo-Platonism alongside with the Arabic and Persian influence is dispersed through Anatolia, only to put down roots in the deepest

corners of the land (36). The authors producing literary works in this era, such as Âşık Paşa, Yûnus Emre, Şeyhî and Yazıcıoğlu, manifest a novice literary attitude that radiates hesitation, indecisiveness and innocuousness (37), which Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü present as further evidence to support their view on the direct impact of social progress on the literary realm.

In Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's volume, the reader is presented with one of the most important dichotomies of Ottoman literature for the first time: The literary trend that tailgates the intellectual course of the Ottoman court versus the literature that folk consume, as a categorization dated to last until the era of Beyazıt I. In this section of the introduction, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü do not revisit this dichotomy, especially as to how it disappears, if ever. Following this, they outline their periodization and specify which authors are to be discussed in each era.¹⁶²

With their framework of periodization, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü briefly point at what they imagine these periods imply from a literary point of view, repeating often how the developments in literature closely follow the transformations in the society. They also note that their periodization conflicts with what one of the authors, Şehâbeddin Süleyman, put forth four years ago (39). It is, then, possible to assume that the changes of opinion in Şehâbeddin Süleyman's case was incited by Köprülü, and this is of great importance given the novel aspects of their periodization.

There are several features of their volume that stand out in terms of periodization: One particular characteristic is that they introduce to the

¹⁶² For the reader's convenience, I below organise the structure of their volume as a table (39-41) and it can be found in the appendix ("Table 7. 'Table of Contents' of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı*").

periodization method is relating literary periods to historical eras, mostly described by the presence of the ruling sultan of the time, such as Beyazıt I., Fatih Sultan Mehmed or Sultan Süleyman-ı Kanûnî. Another one, is to propose an overarching division between the two major periods of Ottoman literary history by juxtaposing the East and the West for the first time in the context of literary historiography. Although, it must be noted that this dichotomy is first mentioned in the review of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's 1910 volume of Ottoman literary historiography by Ali Cânib Yöntem. In this article, Yöntem criticises Şehâbeddin Süleyman's periodization, where he says: "To portray 'the New Literature' [Edebiyyât-ı Cedîde] as the third period commencing a new era [...] is a mistake. I believe that Turks envisage two moments in literature: One when they turn to the East, and another one when they turn to the West, France" (Yöntem, 91-2). This commentary is neither quoted in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work, nor is there any reference to this thought at any other point in the text. However, it is difficult to imagine that both Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü would miss this piece, and this remark in particular, published in *Servet-i Fünûn*, one of the most influential periodicals at the time. The way that this dichotomy is presented in their work is also incredibly similar to Yöntem's way of putting it:

(...) we shall consider two periods... One that is nurtured by the East, Persian and Arabic literature, starting with Âşık Paşa and lasting until Âkif Paşa - Şinâsi, and another one that is nursed by the West, beginning with Âkif Paşa and continuing to this day... (39)

Having surfaced in rather clear terms since Yöntem's commentary as well as Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's volume on literary history, this division gains further momentum from very early on, and this study shall trace the continuation of this phenomenon in the later decades in the following chapters.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü devotes the fifth section of their introduction to what their understanding is of analysis of a literary text and its author. They believe that there are two aspects of such analysis, one being external and the other being internal (42). They begin to describe what their understanding stands in opposition to, and this is the biographical approach that the reader is familiar with from the *tezkiye*-writing tradition, although their example is Muallim Naci's presentation of Nedîm (42-3). Relaying Muallim Naci's, in their opinion, simplistic view of how to describe a poet's place in literary history by merely mentioning the posts he is assigned to or which poetic features he uses in his work, they point at the lack of the connection between the literary work and its author in the corpus of works on the Ottoman literary history.

For Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, it is completely natural for individuals to approach and assess a work of literature with their own view of the world, within the particular time and place they belong to (44). However, they believe that accurate analyses of literary works require an in-depth understanding of the era they are produced within. Only this way, it is possible for the historian to become capable of relating to the spirit beneath the literary work, and then to make sense of it. After this, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü continue with a wide range of examples from Nedîm, Rûhî Bağdâdî,

Sabrî and Nefî. As they elaborate upon the strategies regarding how this internal analysis can be executed, they bring the idea of “intuition” into play. When reconsidered in juxtaposition to their emphasis on objectivity in method, intuition being necessary to fully understand the emotions behind a literary work does not appear to be a logical tool to belong to the same bucket as the rest of the historiographical strategies they promote at the beginning of their volume. The concept of “intuition” being the highlight, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü also think that language is the main conveyor of emotions in literary works (46), therefore the historian can use this medium to provide deeper insight into a work of literature. They believe that the most accurate literary analysis can be done by using intuition to identify the most prevalent emotions in a literary work to establish comparisons and contrasts between different authors. The biographical aspect ought to be utilised for understanding the spirit of an author, only to see through the appearance of a literary work and penetrate its true nature.

In the seventh section of the introduction, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü continue to expand upon the methods of literary analysis that ought to be employed in the practice of literary historiography. They argue that it is necessary, but not sufficient to focus on how the social environment shapes a work of literature. It is also important to look at the impact of literary works on the era they are produced and consumed in (51). At this point, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü invite Émile Hennequin (1859-1888) to their debate. They wholeheartedly disagree with Hennequin's claim that textual analysis alone, without any consideration regarding the social environment it is produced within, is sufficient to understand a work of art. They read that Hennequin

rejects the idea of a literary work providing insight further than its own horizon, and argue that the literary realm reveals more than what seemingly offers to the reader (53). The author, as a literary genius, has the intellectual capacity and power to imagine and communicate further envisions beyond the scope of the work itself. As a result of this assumption, it follows that literary works also wield the power to influence the era they are shaped within. Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü wish to support their argument with examples both from the world and the Ottoman Empire: Werther from *die Leiden des jungen Werthers*, Emma from *Madame Bovary*, as characters that influenced readers deeply, and Mevlânâ Celâleddin-i Rûmî, Ziyâ Paşa and Halit Ziyâ succeeded in doing so by their works in Anatolia and the Ottoman Empire (54). Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's view of how to read a literary text marries textual analysis with social history, both focusing on the value of the text itself and its contextual value from a historical perspective, not only for evaluating the work in its own right, but also to contribute to the "history of civilisation, which is paramount to literary history" (55). They argue that the problematics in literature cannot be examined from a one-dimensional perspective. The symbiosis of "the literary" and "the social" ought to be scrutinised in terms of how they influence one another, which imply essentially different practices, and both are needed for "getting closer to the truth" (55). Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's contribution to the historiographical practice with the elaboration of this view is noteworthy: This is the first instance of a multi-layered framework of literary analysis in the context of literary history, which is to be utilised as a historiographical tool to grasp the spirit of an era, which in turn helps the historian to make sense of the literary corpora.

In the eighth and the last section of their introductory chapter, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü focus on the geographical and social environment with respect to its relationship with literary history. They describe this relationship by explaining to the reader how climate and geographical conditions influence the way people and their collective spirit are in nature, by the same token, these also bring about works of art and literary production (56). In this context, they provide the reader with various examples of how this dynamic is at work in the Ottoman Empire: The people of the Black Sea Region are quick and abrupt (57), while the folk from Adana region is quiet and melancholic (58) and these characteristics can be observed in the works of literary production in these areas. Bringing regionality into play is also a new mode of analysis in literary historiography in the Ottoman Empire, for the remarks on other cities than İstanbul do not go beyond designating a place of birth or death in the preceding literature on the topic, be it a *tezkire* or an earlier volume of literary history.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü present the reader with yet another interesting dynamic: Economic conditions (59). They exemplify the extent to which economic conditions influence the collective spirit, therefore artistic production, by talking about the Gothic period in Europe (59-60). According to them, Romans becoming militarily weaker at the time, the attacks by the Huns and degrading conditions regarding the welfare paving the way for the rise of Christianity facilitates the birth of the aesthetics of the sublime in order to reinforce the power of religion on people in the most physical way possible. Their example for this phenomenon in the context of the Ottoman Empire is Nedîm's emergence as a poet at the time of İbrahim Pasha (60), although they

do not expand upon this comment as much as they do for the former example. This may simply be because they assume that their average reader is more familiar with the case of Nedîm than the Gothic period, although the lack of explanation in the latter case does not seem to conform to the general principles of their analytical stance.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü find that family life and etiquette are important aspects of an author's life, and therefore ought to be examined in order to establish the reasons and conditions that shape the social sphere they belong to (61). They believe that eloquence and culture of courtesy in a particular era can provide fruitful insights into the making of a work of literature both in terms of textual and linguistic analysis, for these impact the nature of artistic expression (61).

Political life is another territory to be conquered by the literary historian, according to Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü (61). They argue that literature alters its form and content alongside the changes in the political conditions of the era. For example, while revolutions propel confusion, periods of oppression silence the voice of literature. It is possible to trace the proud moments of victory as well as the agony of losses in the history of a society being reflected in literature. Then, they suggest an interesting line of resemblance between absolute governance and literature in terms of their centrality (62). Although a seemingly simple comment that does not incite further ado in the text, it hints at a fundamental characteristic of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's viewpoint regarding the ontological status of literature. Establishing such a similarity based on centrality brings about two aspects for the nature of literature: (i) a presupposed centre, and therefore a periphery, (ii) centrality of historical

narrative with a focal point that overlaps with that centre. This approach determines the nature of the historical enquiry as well as its method, its outreach and its character. Assuming a historical narrative of this type, the historiographical method is aligned with objectivism and positivist attitude towards scientific enquiry, for attaining the knowledge of the overall picture is supposed to be theoretically possible in light of this method. In terms of topical outreach, this stance is also binding, as it requires the literary historian to bear this in mind while judging the epistemological limits of his/her enquiry. The character of an account of literary history is also shaped by this approach, for such an account having a focal point introduces a logic of centre versus periphery that incites varying levels of epistemological constraints on the enquiry with respect to its form and content.

Religion and ethics ought to be regarded as important sources of information for literary history as well, according Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü (62). They put forward that knowledge of Islam, Islamic mysticism and ethics is essential for the historian to master, otherwise “the history of the Ottoman Empire cannot be properly grasped by intuition”¹⁶³ (62): Neither Rûhî Bağdâdî, nor Nedîm can be understood without the knowledge of Islamic mysticism or the set of ethical conventions in the relevant era, respectively. Highlighting the role of religion and ethics to such a crucial extent as part of the practice of literary historiography also sets the tone regarding this issue for the first time in the context of Ottoman literary history. After this, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü briefly touch upon the relationship between fine arts and

¹⁶³ “itikâdât-ı İslâmiyyeye, ahlâk-i târihiyye-i Türkiye'ye vâkıf olmayınca târih-i edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye bihakkın hissölunamaz”

literature (63) and they refer back to their previous discussion of this issue instead of elaborating any further.

For Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, the only way in which an account of literary history can be regarded as sufficiently diligent and rigorous is for the historian to examine the geographical and social environments, the economic conditions, the personal circumstances of authors such as their upbringing and family life as well as the etiquette of their era, the political life, religion and ethics as well as fine arts in relation to literature (63). They assert that the lack of such analysis in the literature render a comprehensive Ottoman literary history impossible; however, their observation is to guide the young historians in the right direction.

Both the original aspects of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's approach in 1910 and the changes observed in his stance after he teams up with Köprülü in 1914 demonstrate that Köprülü's view on method may be both inspired by and inspirational for Şehâbeddin Süleyman's take on literary history. While Şehâbeddin Süleyman elaborates upon the idea of social history in juxtaposition to literary history for the first time at length, he does not dwell on the issue of method in great detail as well as engaging with impressionistic commentary regarding certain authors, such as Muallim Naci, in his volume. In their collaboration, Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü clearly work towards a detailed and comprehensive framework in terms of method, which embodies certain aspects of Köprülü's article titled "Türk Edebiyyâtında Usûl" (1913) such as objectivism and scientific positivism, and drafts away of the subjectivity the reader experiences in Şehâbeddin Süleyman's work from 1910. Polat observes that Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü collaborate to a great extent while

writing the preface (*Mehmet Kaplan İçin*, 196). However, he does not sufficiently dwell upon the theoretical changes that can be observed in Şehâbeddin Süleyman's volume from 1910 and the subject-matter collaboration from 1914. The emphasis on the nature of method with particular weight on objectivism and positivist attitude is only seen in the 1914 volume, whereas Köprülü's work in 1913 already initiates the discussion on these methodological concerns. What is carried over from Şehâbeddin Süleyman's work in 1910 seems to be the idea of causality in the course of social history and the interconnectedness of historical events, as examined in this study earlier. This principle is repeated in the preface of his work with Köprülü as they propose the notion of social progress to be the backbone of how literary history is shaped. The periodization is also largely reintroduced in the co-authored volume, although it is more intricate than the preceding version. Overall, the fundamental line of change is observed in terms of method in literary historiography.

4. b. On Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (Lectures on Turkish Literary History)

In 1914, Köprülü's lecture notes of the Turkish literary history course he teaches at the Dârülfünûn were published, following his collaboration with Şehâbeddin Süleyman. Özbek's research on this volume shows that only the second volume of this publication is currently accessible, although it originally encompassed two volumes and also an introduction (in Polat, 179). What differentiates this publication of Köprülü from the previous ones on this topic, possibly as striking as its content for the reader, is how it is titled: *Türk Târîh-i*

Edebiyyât Dersleri (*Lectures on Turkish Literary History*) is the first volume of literary history that is described as “Turkish” in its title. Köprülü’s article on the issue of method in Turkish literary history, “Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl” (“Method in Turkish Literary History”) also carries a title with the expression “Turkish Literary History”, which was published in 1913; however, the former manifests a higher degree of credibility given not only its form and content structured as a book of literary history, but also its legitimacy being presented in an academic context. In his collaboration with Şehâbeddin Süleyman in 1914, Köprülü endeavours to take on a more inclusive attitude towards the pre-Ottoman period as well, although the roots of this approach can be observed in Şehâbeddin Süleyman’s statement where he identifies the Ottomans as fundamentally Turkish (6). The difference Köprülü makes is to scrutinise these identities in the historical course of social, political and literary transformations they undergo, and represent a rather uniform, reconciled identity that is a marriage of the two.

In the second volume, Köprülü’s idea of an ethnic group as the “Turkish” is revealed in the section titled “Literature of the Western Turks and its Development”. The proposed binary between the Western and implicitly the Eastern Turks is a new way of categorising ethnicity in the context of a literary history. Köprülü highlights that Anatolian Turks, namely the Western Turks, are only discussed with respect to their political and military adventures in the literature so far, and he manifests his intention to change that (3-4). Köprülü expresses his discontent as to how the Ottoman historiography is handled by the scholars without any effort to understand the period prior to the eighth century, and finds this deeply wrong since “from a scientific perspective, the

language and literature of the Ottomans is altogether the language and literature of the Western Turks” (4). Shifting the focus of his literary history to the pre-Ottoman period and maintaining an inclusive attitude towards the Ottoman rule, Köprülü deliberately reimagines the newly-emerging Turkish identity that sets itself apart from what the Ottoman Empire stands for. In Köprülü’s case, this is a case of hybridization, a case of Ottoman-Turkish identity, even though its denomination is not yet formed in this particular fashion. Köprülü’s strong commitment to establishing deeply rooted connections between literary history and history of civilization leads him to elaborate upon various aspects of social, political and cultural life. In order to develop this line of thought, he chooses to organise the chapters of his work under the main title of “Hayât ve Medeniyet” (“Life and Civilization”) that comprises sub-sections titled “Siyâsî Hayat” (Political Life), “İdâre Teşkilâtı” (“Systems of Governance”), “Ordu ve Askerlik” (“Army and Military Power”), “Saray Hayâtı ve Eğlenceleri” (The Life and Entertainment at the Court), “İçtimâî Sınıflar” (“Social Classes”), “Mânevî Hayat: Tekyeler ve Şeyhler” (“Spiritual Life: Cults and Leaders”), and “Osmanlılıktan Evvel Anadolu’da Hayat-ı Fikriyye” (“Intellectual Life Before the Ottoman Presence”)¹⁶⁴

The drive behind Köprülü presenting a comprehensive survey of how the Anatolian Turks are in the process of developing social and political systems in the pre-Ottoman period is to demonstrate that the idea of settlement, therefore leaving the nomadic culture behind is not one that emerges with the foundation of the Ottoman Empire. Köprülü says:

¹⁶⁴ An organised breakdown of the titles for these chapters can be found in the appendix (“Table 8. ‘Table of Contents’ of Köprülü’s *Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri*”).

The Anatolian Turks were far more ahead than our writers [historians] think in terms of civilization by the time the Ottoman Empire was founded. The nomadic and tribal ways of living were completely parted with, especially in the big cities and towns. (9)

This idea forms the backbone of Köprülü's practice of literary historiography regarding the identity he intends to construct for his narrative. Recognizing literature as a medium of expression evolving in settled cultures, as observed in the quote above, Köprülü desires to reconsider the environment in which the Anatolian Turks begin to engage with intellectual practices that can only develop under such conditions. His tendency to treat social history both as a lead for literary history, and as a field that is nurtured by it, also stems from this aspect of his thinking. In his work, Köprülü's methodical tendencies to construct a narrative of continuity in Ottoman/Turkish literary history begin to appear, which then materialises to a substantial extent in *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* to follow in 1920/1.

4. c. On İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History)

İbrahim Necmi Dilmen is one of the first professors of Turkish language and literature, teaching at the level of higher education and engaging with literary historiography in the theoretical sense. Having taught in Dârülfünûn (Dilmen, 4) and being amongst the inaugural members of faculty at the University of Ankara¹⁶⁵ (Dengi in Dilmen, *Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları*

¹⁶⁵ In the context of the Turkish educational system, it is important to contrast İstanbul and Ankara. İstanbul University has a long history as the major institution for higher education since the late nineteenth century, known as the Dârülfünûn at the time. The formation of its educational outlook was shaped by the Ottoman Scientific Society ("Cem'iyet-i İlmiyye-i

[1940-41], 3), Dilmen holds a central position in the academic network of scholars dealing with Turkish literary history.

Dilmen's *Tarih-i Edebiyat Dersleri* (*Lectures on Literary History*) (1919-20) is a compilation of his lectures in various schools, as he describes (3). In this volume, the first striking impressions are the nation being referred to as "Turkish" and the country being referred to as "Turkey". Although the former signifier is used in previous works, the reader encounters the latter for the first time in the context of a literary history. Dilmen defines the scope of his work as the "analysis of Turkish literature in Turkey" (3); however, he adds that other works of literature from earlier periods as well as Turkish literature outside of Turkey is also to be discussed at times. Dilmen organises his literary history in two volumes, the first covering the "Old Literature" ("Edebiyat-ı Kadîme") and the second focusing on "the New Literature" ("Teceddüd Edebiyatı"), which he prefers to discuss at length and in greater detail (4). Dilmen presents three reasons to the reader for doing so: (i) this period is the most recent one in the course of history of literature and it possibly has a stronger influence on the future works, (ii) the works produced in this period are invaluable in terms of their qualities and quantities, (iii) this period proves particularly useful for him, since a part of the curriculum he teaches back then requires his input on this topic (4).

Taking a closer look at the logic by which Dilmen's introduction is organised¹⁶⁶, the reader may observe that he introduces distinct ways of

Osmâniyye"), founded and managed under the administrative structure of the Empire. In contrast, Ankara University was founded as an educational project under the rule of the new, Republican regime, directly in accordance with Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's request. While the intellectual habitus of İstanbul University manifests a politically and culturally conservative nature in support of the traditionalist values, the educational agenda set for Ankara University follows the reformist programme of the Republic.

¹⁶⁶ See "Table 9. The sections of the preface to Dilmen's *Tarih-i Edebiyat Dersleri*"

signifying the totalities of literary production in certain eras as well as the national denominations. For example, while discussing language and literature in and of themselves, Dilmen prefers the term “Turkish”. Then, he designates the literary production of a specific era with respect to the rule under which it is shaped, such as “Osmanlı Edebiyatı” (“Ottoman Literature”), or “Türk Edebiyatı” (“Turkish Literature”). Interestingly, Dilmen also uses the term “Ottoman Turks” when referring to the Turkish nation within the context of the Ottoman political sphere, although he does not carry this denomination over to the realm of literary production, i. e. naming the literary production by this nation as “Ottoman Turkish Literature”. The complexity of the signification relations in Dilmen’s work demonstrates the conceptual confusions in this era. As the idea of Turkish nationalism acquires a better-defined character at the turn of the century, the political, social and cultural phenomena that is surrounding or opposing this movement also begin to crystallise.

In Dilmen’s writing, the theoretical discussion regarding the conceptual aspects of literature and literary history manifests a deductive structure, similarly to what the reader observes in the frameworks of the previous volumes commencing with Abdülhalim Memduh’s work and continuing with Köprülü’s solo writings as well as his collaboration with Şehâbeddin Süleyman. In the first section of his introduction, Dilmen initially elaborates upon what history is, like his predecessors. One difference stands out, however: His definition of history contains the term “method”, regarding it as a fundamental part of historiography. He says “History examines the past of a nation in a specific area by appealing

in the appendix for the complete list of titles in Dilmen’s introductory chapter.

to a method”¹⁶⁷, which is to examine the works from a historical perspective, analysing the conditions under which they are produced as well as their aesthetic standing within the corpus of literary production as a whole (5). This is the first definition that directly embeds a particular emphasis on method, other than the extent to which Köprülü’s account on methodology in his infamous article from 1913 renders method as a substantial part of historical enquiry. Judging from how Dilmen refers to Köprülü’s work at the end of this section, it is likely that he is familiar with Köprülü’s ideas on methodology in literary historiography. Therefore, Dilmen being the first literary historian to prioritise method in the very definition of history demonstrates how central the notion of method becomes in the literature on the topic following Köprülü’s lead.

The extent of Köprülü’s impact can also be seen in Dilmen’s understanding of “documentation” in literary history. In the above-mentioned first section of the introductory chapter, Dilmen expands upon the sources of literary history and how these sources ought to be analysed. For Dilmen, the fundamental documentation for the literary historian to benefit from are sources on history and literary texts, which are to be analysed with two goals in mind (a) seeking the influence of social life on literary production, (b) the reasons that bring about the events in literary history (6). Dilmen’s view does not assign a higher status to literary history unlike his contemporaries, as the reader comes across in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s work when they put that “Râşit’s six-volume account of history cannot reveal as much as one gazel [ghazal] of Nedîm’s does when it comes to the Tulip Era”¹⁶⁸ (8). In Dilmen’s case, the

¹⁶⁷ “Tarih, bir milletin mu`ayyen bir sahaya ait olan geçmiş hâdiselerini, bir usûle tebâ`en tedkîk eder.”

¹⁶⁸ “Nedîm’in en küçük bir gazeli kadar Lâle Devri’ni altı ciltten ibâret olan *Râşit Tarihi* gösteremiyor.”

environmental conditions within which the literary text is produced, matter only insofar as to being useful for the analysis of the text in question as well as to providing information about the author of that text (6). He believes that literary texts are more tangible than an event of history that is merely traceable through what is left after it (6). The emphasis on the status of the literary text is slightly stronger in Dilmen's account. This leads to Dilmen's reiteration of another aspect that the reader finds in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work. The analysis of connections in social history and their relevance to the events in literary history is presented as the way in which to assign a scientific status to such an enquiry. However, there is a difference in the way that Dilmen refers to this thought process: While historians such as Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü prefer the term "analysis" ("tedkîk"), Dilmen uses the term "criticism" ("tenkît"). The notion of criticism is presented as a tool of literary historiography in relation to social history (Dilmen, 6), while the previous instances point at either its use in its own terms, i. e. in Mehmet Hayreddin's case when he presents literary criticism as a function of literary history (5), or a degree of multi-layered analysis that involve literary criticism as an inherent part of literary history without further conceptualization. In this sense, Dilmen's statement as to literary criticism being the major tool to examine the connections between social history and literary history is of great significance, for this becomes one of the deeply rooted issues in the due course of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

Dilmen's commentary in this section is noteworthy in a number of ways. Acknowledging language as the fundamental medium through which literature is formed and expressed, Dilmen describes it as "the most important feature of a

Here, it can be useful to recall Ali Kemal's criticism of Râşid in his *Râşid: Müverrih mi, Şâir mi?*, discussed earlier.

nation" (6-7). Bringing the concept of nation into play, Dilmen begins to elaborate on what is to be understood by language and nation in the context of the Ottoman Empire. He first differentiates the idea of the empire and the idea of the nation, and highlights that the latter ought to be the focus of the historical enquiry (7). Then, he states that the assumption of there being a corpus of Ottoman literature that is separate from the corpus of Turkish literature as previously argued is fallacious. He also disagrees with the idea that the Ottoman language is constituted by three different languages, i. e. Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Then, he clarifies what the term "Ottoman" refers to: Firstly, it refers to a particular segment of the Turks that gathered around the political constitution of the Ottoman Empire. In this case, it is possible to assume the existence of an "Ottoman literature", which is a part of "Turkish literature" in general terms. Secondly, it refers to the empire itself, accommodating various nations, all of which have their own languages and literatures. In this case, it is not possible to speak of an "Ottoman literature" in general terms, for there is no uniformity in terms of nationality, therefore language. This is an important instance where a literary historian debates what the political nature of the Ottoman Empire implies in terms of its multi-national nature. The practice of literary historiography in nation-oriented terms exists in the literature preceding Dilmen's work; however, this is the first time where the existence of other national literatures is acknowledged, and denounced thereafter in the context of literary historiography.

Although Dilmen presents Ottoman literature on its own terms, he follows Köprülü's approach that the pre-Ottoman period ought to be analysed to make sense of the literary production in the Ottoman Empire (7). For Köprülü is the

first historian to relate the pre-Ottoman period to the rest of the literary affairs in the succeeding Empire, his work is the only pointer Dilmen would have access to. Following this remark, Dilmen not only complains about the limited scopes of *tezkires* and the lack of proper literary historiography in the field, in the same fashion as some of his predecessors such as Fâik Reşad and Köprülü do, but also expresses his dissatisfaction regarding the insufficiency of the volumes of literary history that divert from the *tezkire*-writing tradition (7-8). He criticises Abdülhalim Memduh's account for being too short, Fâik Reşad's for lacking in elaborations upon the historical connections between literary phenomena, and Şehâbeddin Süleyman's for having a lot of shortcomings as well as Şehâbeddin Süleyman's collaboration with Köprülü being not quite there, despite theirs being the best of the corpus on the topic. From Dilmen's brief evaluation of the sources at the time, the reader understands that he is familiar with the works written by his contemporaries. Despite the fact that Dilmen does not engage with direct referencing, specific concepts previously seen in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work are present in his work, such as "progress" ("tekâmül") in the context of social history. Dilmen's references to method and methodical synthesis are also reminiscent of what Köprülü puts forward in his article on the issue; however, he does not directly refer to Köprülü's work on these occurrences either. These influences become more apparent in the text, as Dilmen develops his understanding of literary history around similar intellectual pillars.

Dilmen's literary history, although it is not discussed at length until this study, has intriguing characteristics for a volume written at the start of the

twentieth century.¹⁶⁹ In the second section of the introduction to his volume, Dilmen dwells upon linguistics by expanding upon the primary qualities of Turkish as a language, another first in the practice of literary historiography. Dilmen provides the reader with the linguistic journey the Turks take from Central Asia to Anatolia as well as outlining the language families in the world for the reader's convenience (9). Dilmen talks about various alphabets the Turkish-speaking population uses (i. e. the Runic alphabet in which the Orkhun inscriptions are written, the Perso-Arabic script)¹⁷⁰, and lists the texts that he considers as literary production penned by the Turks. For Dilmen, Uyghur Turks engage with prolific literary production in Turkish, until Islam comes into the picture with the influence of Arabic and Persian (10). Then, Dilmen's analysis takes an unexpected turn, as he puts forward that the influence of Arabic and Persian is seen at the level of high society, i. e. governance and court culture. However, he also highlights that Turkish is not non-existent: Every now and then, its linguistic and intellectual expressions are visible in folk poetry, "tekke" literature¹⁷¹ and in the literary production of the elite (11). Dilmen asserts that Turks in Anatolia in this era had to make sense of the cultural duality between

¹⁶⁹ Although the subject-matter volume was published in 1940/1, Dilmen's earlier work *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* has the major pointers that shape his take in his latter publications. Published right after his time at the Dârülfünûn's Department of Ural-Altaic Languages, *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri* highlights Turkish as a vital linguistic component of literary production in the Ottoman Empire, alongside with Persian and Arabic. However, unlike the purist arguments like that of Mehmed Hayreddin's, Dilmen first approaches the issue of linguistic variety from a technical point of view, and then expands upon how Anatolian Turks socially and culturally engage with these languages at the same time. In a way, Dilmen proposes an argument from linguistics in order to explain the literary development in Anatolia, whereas Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü suggest that social and cultural dynamics are the fundamental factors shaping the literary production.

¹⁷⁰ Dilmen's approach here manifests a double-standard: While Turks use different alphabets, and this phenomenon is somehow not impacting the purity of the language at all, other nations within the political union of the Ottoman Empire and using the Ottoman/Turkish alphabet are considered as having languages and literatures entirely segregated from the social and cultural environment in the Ottoman Empire.

¹⁷¹ This term captures the literary production by mystics of Anatolia, i. e. "Sufi's, forming sects that engage socially in centres that are designed for them to reside, which are called "tekke".

the philosophy of Islam they encounter and their own intellectual tradition embodying both its Turkic roots and its Persian outlook in the post-Abbasid era (11). This is why, Dilmen argues, the movement of national literature stems from “tekke” literature, and, in essence, from Islamic mysticism (12).

The argument above involves an alternative logic to what is pursued in Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s volume. In the latter, the formation of literary culture in the pre-Ottoman period is not tied into an effort of social and cultural adaptation by the Anatolian Turks. It is rather seen as an already-existing national identity that is expressed via the medium of language and literature. In the former argument, the nature of the subject-matter formation seems to be described as a social construct, as the by-product of a geographical, political and social placement in a new territory. Dilmen’s approach rings in a comparatively a posteriori tone, while Köprülü’s reiteration of “the spirit of the nation” tends to engage with the opposite side of the empirical balance. Dilmen treats the issue of language in a similarly empirical fashion. He proposes two denominations for the kind of Turkish that develops in the Ottoman Empire: “Garp Türkçesi” (“Western Turkish”) and “Osmanlı Türkçesi” (“Ottoman Turkish”) (12). Dilmen’s thinks that the number of borrowings from Persian and Arabic and the imported grammatical rules from Persian changes the nature of Turkish only insofar as to render it a dialect of Turkish. His desire to offer a numerical argument is yet again an unusual attempt of classification in this area.

In his work, Dilmen scrutinises various approaches in periodization in depth, which is an elaboration of the sort that has not been done in previous volumes. Dilmen seems to remain a sceptic when it comes to organising his

literary history in terms of particular eras. He finds that all of the previous attempts of periodization are biased and arbitrary, and the only credible way to organise the literary periods is to consider two major eras that cover the “old” and the “new” literature with respect to its foundations and intellectual substance (13).

The “old” literature in Dilmen’s case describes the literary trends led by the Eastern influence, as his phrase “the Eastern School of Literature” dictates, while the “new” literature refers to “the Western School of Literature under the French influence (13). The old literature, in Dilmen’s view, is extremely difficult to imagine in terms of specific periods. For example, he criticises Fâik Reşad’s periodization of the era featuring “Âşık Paşa - Şeyhî - Ahmed Paşa - Necâti - Zâtî - Bâkî - Nefî - Nâbî - Nedîm - Râgıb Paşa - Şeyh Gâlib”, saying that their literary styles do not form appropriate clusters for periodization (14). Following this criticism, Dilmen also presents his disagreement regarding periodization according to political eras, such as characterising literary periods by reference to the specific ruler in power (14). Having ruled out another criterion, Dilmen takes on the task of objecting to Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s periodization, finding it to be confusing a number of different criteria, therefore defeating its purpose (14). In his criticism of the above-mentioned periodization, he suggests that there ought to be further categorizations involved. For example, Dilmen argues that Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü should vertically examine “mystic literature (“tasavvuf edebiyatı”) in the specific context of literary production in the court, in Anatolia by the folk and by the “aşık”s¹⁷²,

¹⁷² “Aşık”s are performance artists who combine poetry and music in the context of story-telling, and their work is strongly associated with Islamic mysticism, for it manifests a wide range of literary characteristics that are observed in this tradition (Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, 368)

therefore enrich their periodization to be more comprehensive. Suggesting that there ought to be sub-categories of major ones that deal with the literary eras and genres in a well-organised albeit cross-sectional framework is introduced to the literature on the topic for the first time by Dilmen. Even though it is not spelt out in his writings, Köprülü seems to take Dilmen up on this suggestion, as the reader observes in his new volume of literary history in the very same year.

Dilmen's periodization of literary history¹⁷³ is two-fold: (1) He primarily opts for a chronological arrangement of the literary periods, i. e. starting and ending at the turn of centuries and mid-centuries, (2) he also considers a slight transposition of political history over the literary one as well as engaging with a certain degree of flexibility in order to accommodate the lifespans of influential authors in specific periods (15).

Although Dilmen specifies the political events that correspond to the highlighted chronological sequence, he does not necessarily relate these to the course of literary history. In this sense, this enumeration seems to be almost entirely informative except for the beginning of Sultan Abdülmecid's rule and "Tanzimat-ı Hayriyye", for it points at a substantially different literary era. What Dilmen uniquely endeavours to achieve with his strategy of periodization is to represent literary periods in the most impartial way, avoiding incoherencies and inconsistencies as much as possible. This characteristic renders his work out of the ordinary, when compared to the preceding works and to his contemporaries. However, it must be noted that Dilmen does not refrain from evaluating literary history without appealing to major transformations Turks undergo. For example,

¹⁷³ For the reader's convenience, the structure of Dilmen's periodization is presented as a table that shows the overlap between the chronological timeline and the timeline of political history he describes (15-17) and it can be found in the appendix ("Table 10. Dilmen's periodization and the historical milestones he refers to").

Turks converting to Islam is one of these transformations for Dilmen. He also implicitly takes the founding of the Ottoman Empire as yet another one, since he describes three major literary realms to form thereafter: (i) Court Literature, (ii) Mysticism or Tekke Literature, (iii) Folk Literature (18-19).

Similar to Köprülü's idea of how the Turkish national spirit forms in the pre-Ottoman period, Dilmen highlights another socio-political event as an important step towards "a national movement": The Karamanid ruler declares Turkish as the official language of the state (24). Dilmen takes this event, dated 1277 (Sözen and Sakaoğlu, 25)¹⁷⁴, to be a strong sign of the movement he imagines to take place in this period. Dilmen's focus on language and linguistics seen at the start of the introductory chapter comes into play once again, and the reference to the Karamanids occurs for the first time in the context of an Ottoman/Turkish literary history. Besides this novel emphasis, it is useful to highlight that Dilmen's approach differs from Köprülü's regarding the analysis of the leading literary figures in the pre-Ottoman period. Köprülü, in 1918, evaluates the historical connections between religious and literary trends in Central Asia and their echo in Anatolia by unfolding his research and interpretation of Ahmad Yasawi and Yûnus Emre (DeWeese in Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, viii). Dilmen takes Mevlânâ Celâlleddin-i Rumi, Sultan Veled and Yûnus Emre into account, as the most influential figures that each play an important role in the making of the Ottoman/Turkish literature (24). The reason why their strategy of analysis is different may, yet again, be due to Dilmen's particular interest in the linguistic aspect of literary development rather

¹⁷⁴ In Ibn Bibi's *Selçuknâme*, Birinci Mehmed Bin Karaman's statement that classifies Turkish as the official language of the Karamanid state is quoted in Persian, which is then conveyed by Sözen and Sakaoğlu in their edition of Şikari's history as the following: "Bugünden sonra hiç kimse dîvânda, dergâhda, bârgâhda, meclîste ve meydânda Türkçe[']den başka dille konuşulmayacaktır".

than Köprülü's exploring an overarching historical narrative that is mostly transposed upon the literary one. As Dilmen puts it, the collective need for a medium of expression to cope with the perplexing journey that Turks in Anatolia face leads to the hybridization of the pre-existing literary heritage they meet and their own linguistic characteristics in the same intellectual spirit. This, in his opinion, paves the way for "the emergence of a new Turkish language and literature"¹⁷⁵ in Anatolia (26).

In terms of its scope, there are two observations that pinpoint the unique aspects of Dilmen's work. The first observation states that Dilmen's volume is the first literary history in this fashion to extensively cover "the New Literature" ("Yeni Türk Edebiyatı") (Okumuş, 404). The second observation by Okay reveals that the socio-political status of literature defended by Şinâsi-Ziyâ Paşa-Nâmık Kemal versus the *l'art-pour-l'art* of Abdülhak Hamid-Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem-Sâmpaşaazâde Sezâî is spelt out by Dilmen for the first time in this volume as well (211), and this categorization of the major late nineteenth century intellectuals is adopted by the succeeding historians to a great extent (212).

4. d. On Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature)

In the years 1920-1921, it is claimed that Köprülü begins to publish parts of a larger project he is in the process of tackling, titled *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature), which is to come out as a volume in its entirety

¹⁷⁵ "yeni bir Türk tezâhür-i lisânî ve edebiyyesi"

only in 1926 (O. Köprülü in M. F. Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 22). Although covering fewer periods of time than Dilmen's, Köprülü's volume is the longest within the corpus of works on Ottoman/Turkish literary history up to that point in time. It is also the first large-scale example of how Köprülü practises the method of literary historiography he develops in 1913. Starting his enquiry with the pre-Islamic period, which is one that is examined for the first time in the field, Köprülü covers various geographical areas and undertakes the task of presenting the historical course of Ottoman/Turkish literature until the end of the sixteenth century. The first four chapters comprise information on the pre-Islamic period alone, and the following three chapters evaluate Islamic literature in its own terms. This part alone takes up one third of the entire volume. Then, Köprülü dwells upon on how, as he phrases it, "Islamic Turkish literature" begins to form with a particular focus on the Turkic languages such as the dialects of Turkish in the tenth and eleventh centuries or the differences between the dialect spoken in the Karakhanid Khanate (840-1212) and by the Oghuz Turks. The chapters following this brief part are devoted to "Turkish literature" in the Kara Khanid Khanate, Seljuk Empire, Mongolian Empire, and Chagatai Khanate (in the particular cases of Khwarazmian Dynasty, the Golden Horde, Mamluk Sultanate, Timurid Empire) as well as Anatolia. The above-mentioned chapters take up over seventy five percent of the volume.

The approach seen in Köprülü's above-mentioned discussion demonstrates the direction he desires to set in "Method in Turkish Literary History". Going back to the possible sources of literary currents as far back as possible and establishing connections between historical events and literary texts are the tasks Köprülü aims to carry out. While doing this, Köprülü appeals

to exemplification of literary works from different eras and territories, usually after presenting the political conditions of the relevant conjecture. However, very often, Köprülü appears to use narrative sources such as “rivâyet” (“hearsay”) and “menkıbe” (“legend”) to provide supporting information for his account. For example, he mentions the Seyyid Battal Gazi legend as one of the exemplary pieces from the period when the Turkish-Byzantine tensions were pronounced in the thirteenth century (*Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 329-32). Another example is when he talks about the literary production of epics in the Timurid Empire (*Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 411-6). While laying out the social and political conditions of an era, which he does at the start of each chapter, satisfies the condition of continuity that he stresses in his approach towards method, the supporting documentation and additional sources do not always seem to be matching the standard of rigour he sets previously. Nevertheless, his presentation of these sources as a narrative that pictures a line of evolution that commences in Central Asia and ties into the political, social and cultural life in the Ottoman Empire proves convincing for the intelligentsia at the time.

Köprülü’s methodology and its application to this crucial period about which tangible evidence is scarce accomplishes two tasks: First, it provides information, in its own terms, about the dark ages of the literary past that is imagined belonging to the Turks of the twentieth century. This is the first piece in the corpus of literary historiography that encompasses a vast geographical area, particularly in relation to Ottoman/Turkish literary history. Secondly, it organises and represents the totality of this information as a grand narrative, constructing a meaningful sequence of historical events as well as literary

corpora by appealing to the principle of continuity in theoretical and practical terms, as the analysis of his take on method reveals in the third chapter.

4. e. The Regulatory Change of 1925 and Its Significance for the Succeeding Works on Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography

Following Köprülü's volume in which the application of his method is revealed, there is a half-decade long silence in the world of scholarly publications on Ottoman/Turkish literary history. One plausible explanation for this stagnation in terms of scholarly production and publication seems to be the formation of the new republic and the bureaucratic complexity that is introduced by its emergence. Regarding the field of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, one of the most practical and therefore executively relevant aspects is its educational dimension. Within the context of carrying over the image of a long-standing history of Turkish literature into the Republican era in a politically compatible, complementary and sustainable way, focusing on how this image can be relayed in the educational sphere becomes the most important question in this period.

One of the most outstanding examples of this phenomenon is seen in the early years of the Republic. In 1925, the Ministry of Education announced changes to be implemented for literature textbooks spanning high school and university curricula. The new requirements call for literary texts to be highlighted instead of the theoretical aspects of literature as well as literary dynamics in and of themselves (Filizok, 3). Following this, Ali Cânib Yöntem wrote *Edebiyat*

(*Literature*) in 1926 to become a part of the reading lists according to these new requirements. Analysing the framework by which *Literature* is organised, the reader observes that it is largely based on *Malûmât-ı Edebiyye* by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü. When the tables of contents of these two works are compared¹⁷⁶, it can be seen that the sections devoted to explaining a variety of linguistic and literary devices in Ottoman/Turkish literary production are either omitted or simplified. Several sections that aim at providing an overview of literary stylistics, such as “Üslûbun Mahiyeti” (“Characteristics of Literary Stylistics”) and “Üslûbun Hasâis-i Umûmiyyesi” (“General Features of Literary Stylistics”), are also removed in the latter version. In addition to these, the section titled “Mecazın Suret-i Teşkîli” (“The Formation of the Representations in Figurative Speech”) is also abandoned Ali Cânib Yöntem’s work. Setting a new standard for textbooks of the future, the new regulation and its first token tends to limit the space for discussions regarding the theoretical aspects of literary production by virtue of these omissions. This limitation, in turn, enhances the foundational nature of works prior to 1925, since it practically inhibits the succeeding works to dwell upon the same aspects. As a result, reading against the grain becomes a difficult task, implying a fundamental disagreement with the conventional form and content for the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

The additions that are identified in the latter version are also noteworthy regarding their role in demonstrating how the new regulation influences the evolution of historiographical practice in a similar way. Increasing the number of

¹⁷⁶ See “Table 11. Filizok’s visualisation of the comparison between Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s *Malûmât-ı Edebiyye* and Yöntem’s *Edebiyat*” in the appendix.

texts to be presented as examples of literary production exponentially reinforces the already-existing structures of periodization and characterization without providing leeway for alternative viewpoints, resulting in the repetition of the same definitions and descriptions that are hardened by the sheer amount of examples presented in support of their explanatory necessity and sufficiency.

The omissions and additions observed in the two volumes are interesting, for they demonstrate how specific aspects of the corpus are treated in this case. Although neither *Malûmât-i Edebiyye* nor *Edebiyat* are sources of literary history per se, these are crucial volumes to reveal the interconnectedness of texts and the major transformation in the scope as a result of the above-mentioned regulatory change. What is more important in this example is for the reader to see the institutional network through which the theoretical and practical continuity in the context of Turkish literary history is built. It must also be noted that Köprülü was a member of the “İlm-i Heyet” (“Committee for Science”) of the Ministry of Education from its start, which precedes the foundation of the Turkish Republic and continues its activities until after their third meeting in 1926 (in *Cumhuriyetin İlk Dönemi Eğitim Kurumları* [1921-1926] Telif ve Tercüme Heyeti, 6). Then, the subject-matter committee dissolves itself to be replaced by “Millî Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu” (“The National Committee for Education and Culture”), which is the main government institution that drafts executive decisions regarding the state of educational matters in Turkey since then. In this case, Yöntem’s textbook had sixteen editions and it was on the reading lists as the central source of information for Turkish literature courses until 1944 (Filizok, 10).

In 1945, the Ministry of Education proposes another regulatory change that removes the textbook titled *Türkçe Metinler* (*Texts in Turkish*) from the curricula used at the high school level (Gönensay, *Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 6), which can be interpreted as an additional step to reinforce the regulatory change of 1925. Assuming the inclusion of excerpts in the Turkish literature textbooks themselves instead of being presented as volumes in isolation, this change encourages historians to minimise the juxtapositions their evaluation of social, political and cultural history with literary phenomena, by prioritising examples of literary production, which already is the case for the practice of literary historiography due to the regulatory change in 1925. Therefore, making sense of literary production with specific frameworks of analysis, be it a socio-historical approach or an analytically driven one becomes even more difficult to conduct within the limited structure of then-present curricula. This results in the theoretical direction of literary historiography largely to be sought in sources that are conventionally considered foundational. However, relatively unorthodox attempts to introduce alternative explanatory frameworks are also carried out, certain examples of which stand out in the overall corpus. Whether the pre-existing paradigms are revived, or emerging ones are employed, this process leads to the crystallisation of the fundamental dynamics of literary historiography. Moreover, a practical limitation occurs with the subject-matter change, since the space devoted to excerpts becomes even more limited than what was previously available: The process of canonical formation accelerates due to the constraints on the curation of excerpts that exemplify varying literary strands. This limitation, and thus the refinement of the historiographical strategies, occurring simultaneously, nudges the historians to

maintain the previously pinpointed theoretical structures and practical components of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography for decades to come.

Considering the paradigm shift explained and exemplified above, the need for a comprehensive survey of the works on Ottoman/Turkish literary history published after Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*) emerges. In the following chapter, the theoretical and practical nature of the corpus in question is examined by bringing each element to the limelight, revealing the highlights of the evolutionary course of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography by the aid of the organisational framework of metahistoriographical analysis.

CHAPTER 5

Crystallisation of the Fundamental Dynamics in Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography: Manifestations of Theoretical and Practical Continuity in the Primary Cluster of Works

The designated corpus for the scope of this study is one that compiles an extensive and exhaustive list of works in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. It is not an easy process to present an analysis of a corpus of this nature in a rigorous and systematic manner. One of the ways in which this issue can be tackled is to employ an analytical framework that fits the purpose of first classifying and then organising the accessible information. Therefore, I employ a specific organisational structure, suggested by Swiggers and others in “Metahistoriography Meets (Linguistic) Historiography” in Peter Schmitter and Marijke van der Wal’s *Metahistoriography: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the Historiography of Linguistics*¹⁷⁷, that highlights the prevalent features of these works. The reasons for employing this two-stage strategy are the following:

(1) While going through the library catalogues in multiple locations in Turkey, I have encountered very few volumes of literary history that refrains from organising the information according to a political milestone, which

¹⁷⁷ Although the scholarly motivation underlying the subject-matter framework is primarily for its use in linguistic historiography, Min Wang in her work titled *The Alter Ego Perspectives of Literary Historiography: A Comparative Study of Literary Histories by Stephen Owen and Chinese Scholars* utilises this scheme to categorise and discuss works of Chinese literary history, and efficiently presents a considerably wide corpus of data by appealing to the organisational tools its parameters imply. This particular model has inspired the application in this study, although specific modifications were introduced in order to accommodate the characteristics that stem from the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. These modifications, mainly relating to the fifth parameter of the framework, are explained in the introductory chapter of this study.

demonstrates the impact of the nineteenth century in terms of the historiographical transposition of social history onto the course of literary history. This juxtaposition brings about a degree of complexity that manifests slight variations regarding both the historiographical strategies as well as the form and the content of the accounts. If these paradigms had formed the organisational backbone of the project, specific works would have had to be left out of the current corpus. This, in turn, would have had a drastic impact on the level of inclusivity achieved. Therefore, this study benefits from an egalitarian criterion of demarcation that does not intentionally pick and choose specific sources to analyse, for it offers a comprehensive approach in listing the sources that deal with Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography from its early formalizations to 2013.

(2) In terms of the practical implications and ease of relaying the fundamental characteristics of these works, I have subscribed to the above-mentioned theoretical framework, since it provides a functional scheme to categorise and organise the information presented. Although the works manifest considerable overlaps in their social, political and cultural orientations, as their analysis will reveal, the five level/parameters specified by the subject-matter framework (i. e. the scope, the depth, the format, the intellectual scheme/figure, the demonstrative purpose/intention) help the reader develop an overall picture of what these overlaps and the major characteristics are. Utilising such a framework to succinctly present an overview of a corpus extending over a full century, seems to be the most efficient strategy to distil the dominant features of the works in a clear and systematic way.

With Köprülü's elaborations on method in his article titled "Method in Turkish Literary History" in 1913, the existing practical expressions of literary historiography acquire a refined and concise theoretical outlook. The fundamental characteristics Köprülü describes as desirable for accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history become clearer through his in-depth considerations regarding methodology, as the previous chapter demonstrates. Following from what these imply in the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, I derive the two major forces that constitute the intellectual inertia that I argue is present since its beginnings to 2013¹⁷⁸, which are the theoretical and practical aspects of continuity as the fundamental dynamics of historiographical practice. While the manifestations of theoretical continuity are primarily enunciated by conceptualizations of the major social, political and cultural paradigms in the practice of literary historiography, the practical manifestations of continuity are mostly identified in the textual highlights informing the reader of tangible components, such as criteria of periodization and specific curation of authors and texts. The themes spelt out in the title of this chapter aim at reflecting the undiscovered reality of the twentieth century Turkish literary history considering these aspects: Firstly, I hope to show that there are multiple strands of repetitions in the accounts of literary history, where neither the factor of variance is existent, nor is there any possibility regarding a reality beyond the limits of the scope acknowledged by these accounts.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ I opt for ending this time interval for the reason that there has not been any published volume with the scope that is matching the ones discussed in this study since 2013, the very last one being a two-volume work by a group of historians, covering the time span from the thirteenth century to the 1960s and focusing exclusively on the Ottoman Empire and Turkey.

¹⁷⁹ One may argue that repetitions naturally occur when the analytical focus is on the same era; however, the purpose of this study is not only to state the fact that these occurrences mark a major characteristic in the practice of literary historiography in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. Another objective is to examine and explain the underlying dynamics that lead to these repetitions in a specific way, implicitly dismissing the accounts that nudge towards the margins of what is established by the overall corpus.

Secondly, I argue that the accounts that appear to reveal diverse viewpoints on literary events and/or production embody fundamentally similar frameworks in terms of the driving analytical forces they employ. In order to accomplish these two tasks, I present a critical survey of the volumes on Ottoman/Turkish literary history that highlights the conceptual equilibrium in the course of historiographical practice. This survey lists the individual volumes in chronological order of publication, rather than their interpretive axis, criteria of periodization or specific scope, for the ease of conveying the resulting analysis step by step.

The analyses in the following chapters demonstrate that there are two main clusters of works that exhibit specific characteristics when it comes to the practice of literary historiography. The first (i. e. the scope) and the fifth (i. e. the demonstrative) level/parameters are common to all sources across the overall corpus, while the second (i. e. the depth of analysis), the third (i. e. the format of analysis), and the fourth (i. e. the intellectual scheme/figura of analysis) vary from source to source. The depth of analysis in these sources is identified by thorough evaluation of how the information is conveyed by the historians: Reading strategies, explanatory devices, and modes of presentation are analysed as the fundamental pointers in this regard. The format of analysis in the works are identified by appealing to how the information is organised in the works: Whether the information is conveyed in a sequential structure or a theme-oriented configuration, or, if an outlook promoting the social, political, and cultural paradigms as organisational building blocks are the main questions directed at the sources in this respect. Lastly, the use of particular intellectual schemes/figurae in the texts is demonstrated by the provided examples of

interpretive axes employed by the historians. After presenting the pointers that highlight which level/parameters are at work in the accounts, the results reveal a two-fold theoretical and practical structure, in the form of two clusters that are intertwined, which unfold through recurring patterns in terms of historiographical modes of organising and presenting information regarding Ottoman/Turkish literary history. The first cluster is signified as the “primary cluster”, where the majority of the sources share the following level/parameters: factual, atomistic and sequential historiography. The second cluster is signified as the “supporting cluster”, where the observed modes of practice are descriptive/analytical and/or descriptive/synthetical historiography, topical or detached historiography, and structural historiography.

When the subject-matter corpus is subjected to the framework suggested by this metahistoriographical approach, a significant number of works show characteristics that fall under the same level/parameters, as suggested above, revealing the intellectual inertia of the Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in the making. The first level/parameter that is shared across these works, which is the scope (i. e. the geographical area and the chronological span), is a part of the designation criteria for the corpus. Therefore, this level/parameter is not to be considered as a determining factor in analysis. However, the rest of the five levels/parameters identified in the majority of the works represent a noteworthy cluster. Twenty-seven sources out of forty share the same four

levels/parameters, which reveal the methodological tendencies behind the making of literary historiography in these accounts. These four levels/parameters are directed at (i) the depth, (ii) the format, (iii) the intellectual scheme/figura, and (iv) the demonstrative purpose/intention of analysis. In this cluster, the second level/parameter, depth of analysis in a work of literary history, appears to be in line with the practice of factual historiography as opposed to being descriptive/analytical, descriptive/synthetical, and/or explanatory. The common nature of the analysis carried out tends to be conveyed as “facts”, stated in isolation from an in-depth survey of the intellectual background in which the evolution of literary history takes place. This results in the information being presented as a collection of “facts” about various literary phenomena without a multi-faceted perspective, which is fundamentally in contrast to the complex nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

Another level/parameter that is common to the elements of this cluster is one which deals with the format (i. e. the configuration) of a literary history. Out of the three sub-categories of this level/parameter ([i] sequential, [ii] topical, [detached]), the configuration of the accounts in this cluster seem to promote a sequential nature. The information in these works is relayed in a purely narrational tone rather than dwelling into specific aspects of each era, and/or focusing on how the social, political and cultural paradigms shape literary history. This feature of the cluster demonstrates the dominance of the existing corpus in terms of setting the conventional format for the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. This, in turn, introduces limitations for

both the development and promulgation of diverse scholarly perspectives on the evolution of literary history of a vast intellectual heritage.

The fourth level/parameter of the metahistoriographical approach identifying the intellectual scheme/figura of a literary work appears to crystallise as a tendency to engage with atomistic historiography in this cluster, rather than structural and/or axiomatic historiography. The evolution of literary historiography is treated as a sequence of facts, events and phenomena that are regarded as yielding a certain degree of influence on the rest of the intellectual realm in its totality. This approach is questionable, as these facts, events and phenomena are presented as individual milestones in isolation to the rest of what literary history can offer. In this cluster, the changes in the course of literary history are marked with respect to specific authors, literary works and/or events without being structurally and/or axiomatically related to each other or to the rest of the literary world. Such a tendency does not seem to represent an inclusive approach in the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, rendering the outlook of the dominant part of the corpus extremely limited in elaborating upon the interconnectedness of varying elements of literary culture in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey.

As the pointers above suggest, the common features across the primary cluster translate into specific dynamics as well as certain constraints in the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. In light of the metahistoriographical approach, the analyses below aim at highlighting how the elements of the primary cluster reveal these characteristics, which establish and maintain the fundamental dynamics of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography at the theoretical and the practical level.

5. a. On İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi I-IV (History of Turkish Literature I-IV)*

İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan's (1889-1967) work is one of the early volumes of twentieth century literary historiography, published in 1925-6. The planned scope of this volume is completely different to the version that is accessible today. In the preface, Ertaylan expresses his desire to cover "İslâm'dan Evvelki Türk Edebiyyâtı - İslâm Tesîri ile Vücûda Gelen Türk Edebiyyâtı - Uygur Türklerinde ve Çağataylarda Edebiyyât - Azeri Türklerinde Edebiyyât - Osmanlılarda Edebiyyât" ("Turkish Literature Before Islam - Turkish Literature Under the Islamic Influence - Literature of the Uyghur and Chagatai Turks - Literature of Azeri Turks - Literature of the Ottomans") (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2011). Ertaylan does not carry out this task in this volume, as it only covers the period from the late eighteenth century to the first two decades of the twentieth century. This unrealized periodization is extremely similar to that of Köprülü's in *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, which is published in the same year as Ertaylan's work. Ertaylan's chapter on Köprülü shows the reader that he is aware of Köprülü's account of literary history, which hints at his source of inspiration of the above-mentioned periodization (898). Revealing the characteristics of sequential historiography in this regard, the organisation of information is mostly narrational in Ertaylan's work. However, there are parts of Ertaylan's analysis that evade this layout. For example, he does not fully conform to a chronological succession, which is seen in his discussion of

“Encümen-i Şu`arâ” (“Poets Society”). Ertaylan’s mention of Şinâsi is followed by a discussion, breaking the temporal sequence for the sake of pointing at the intellectuals whom he believes represent the transition from “the old” to “the new” (124). This is a novel attempt for its time, as it prioritises the thought processes rather than chronological order or thematic categorizations in the arrangement of historical information. Nevertheless, this diversion does not seem to have an interpretive function, for it is not developed into a further argument that fulfils an explanatory role.

In his work, Ertaylan covers biographical information as well as the subscribed literary trends, linguistic preference and artistic outlook of a wide range of authors who engage with literary production in the above-mentioned era. This approach towards providing information regarding literary phenomena in the historical context is in the form of factual historiography, by which each component is presented as a singular fact or event. This aspect of Ertaylan’s work also alludes to atomistic historiography, since the singular facts and events are presented to the reader in isolation without an overarching structure. For example, Ertaylan features four authors (Keçecizade İzzet Molla, Şeyhülislam Arif Hikmet Bey, Âkif Paşa, and Abdurrahman Sami Paşa) in order to portray the characteristics of poetry in the eighteenth century by devoting a subchapter to each. Although briefly elaborating on the social and political conditions of the era, Ertaylan does not dwell upon the relationship between these conditions and the literary production at the time. Rendering the intellectual scheme/figura of his work as an example of atomistic historiography, this feature is observed throughout his volume.

In the preface, he sets out with an analogy that likens literature to a river, mirroring its surroundings, which posits an inclusive attitude. This analogy hints at a more interconnected view of literary historiography; however, as the preface progresses, Ertaylan reveals his disapproval of the external influence on the political, economic and intellectual development of the Turkish people, and describes its consequences as “utter destruction” (XXIV). Ertaylan does not reveal an interest in the multi-faceted influence of the external literary reality on the Ottoman/Turkish literary production. Instead, he presupposes an authentic literary identity that is shadowed by such influences. This leads Ertaylan to engage with the practice of literary historiography in the way that he does: Providing information on the past of Ottoman/Turkish literary history in the form of factual statements about texts and authors, conveyed in a narrational mode.

Ertaylan’s account manifests an intense degree of subjectivity; not only in terms of his curation of authors to feature in his work, but also his opinions about the aesthetic standing of literary production. For Ertaylan, his commentary constitutes a legitimate part of his analysis, and he does not touch upon the debate regarding objectivity versus subjectivity in the practice of literary historiography. In a way, Ertaylan encapsulates his literary criticism in the sphere of literary historiography, which is reminiscent of the early works as well as the often-observed inclination of the *tezkire* writers. This aspect of Ertaylan’s work, however, does not nullify the fact that it is structured and executed as a literary history, nurtured by the frameworks preceding it, such as the one relating to periodization by Ali Cânîb, which is often mistakenly attributed to Köprülü, or the one that in fact belongs to Köprülü, which is the three-fold categorization of literary production with respect to its habitus, i. e.

folk, court, “tekke”. In this sense, Ertaylan’s work reinforces the preceding dynamics in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography by maintaining the same organisational criteria.

5. b. On Sadettin Nüzhet Ergun’s *Tanzimata Kadar Muhtasar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi ve Numuneleri (A Brief History of Turkish Literature and Its Examples until the Tanzimat Era)*

A graduate of the Department of Literature at the Dârülfünûn, Sadettin Nüzhet has a background in teaching courses on Ottoman/Turkish literature in numerous high schools based in Konya, Ankara and İstanbul as well as at the University of İstanbul for a brief period. Given his experience in teaching, the way in which Sadettin Nüzhet formulates an account of Ottoman literary history provides useful insights regarding the perception of Ottoman literary history at the time in the educational context. The sources that influence this perception and how they are utilised in the practical sense within the framework of literary historiography exemplify how widespread the principle of continuity is observed in the corpus.

In 1931, Sadettin Nüzhet's work, titled *Tanzimat’a Kadar Muhtasar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi ve Numuneleri (A Brief History of Turkish Literature and Its Examples until the Tanzimat Era)*, is published. The epigraph of Sadettin Nüzhet’s work reveals the first pointer regarding his inclination towards adopting the principle of continuity:

Here, we are not meant to offer a lengthy explanation about the need for and value of literary history as the most significant aspect of the history of civilization. Fundamentally, our purpose is to summarise the pre-existing knowledge on the topic instead of writing a novel account of literary history.

For the part of this book that has to do with history, our most important sources are numerous works and articles by Professor Doctor Köprülüzâde Mehmet Fuat Bey.¹⁸⁰

Indeed, Sadettin Nüzhet comprehensively benefits from Köprülü's writings in his work. Organising the information first in chronological order, he then closely follows Köprülü's lead in separately evaluating varying strands of literary production, i. e. classical literature and folk literature, in each chapter covering a specific century. Especially while elaborating upon the early period, he employs the same geographical scope as Köprülü in identifying what constitutes Turkish literature: areas where Chagatai and Azeri Turkish are spoken as well as the literary production in Khwarazmian Dynasty, Seljuk Empire, Mamluk Sultanate and Golden Horde are included in his account of Turkish literary history, following Köprülü's footsteps. Speaking of the emergence of a "national literature" ("millî edebiyat") as early as in the thirteenth century, Sadettin Nüzhet's account establishes the same interpretive axis along which the entire volume unfolds: the story of how the national literature of the Turks is shaped. Maintaining a narrational tone by employing the devices of sequential historiography, Sadettin Nüzhet gives the reader a summary of the pre-existing grand narrative. Given that his volume is a concise version of Köprülü's understanding and evaluation of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, the

¹⁸⁰ Medeniyet tarihinin en mühim şubesi olan edebiyat tarihinin lüzum ve fay[a]dası hakkında burada uzun uzadıya izahat verecek değiliz. Esasen maksadımız yeni bir edebiyat tarihi yazmak değil, mevcut olan malumatı telhis etmektir.

Kitabın tarihî kısmı için en ehemmiyetli me hazımız Pr. Dr. Köprülüzâde Mehmet Fuat Bey üstadımızın muhtelif eser ve makaleleridir.

fundamental dynamics of continuity observed in Köprülü's work are at play to the same extent.

Sixty-five percent of Sadettin Nüzhet's volume consists of excerpts that sample literary production from the thirteenth century until the nineteenth century, which renders his work the first literary history to contain a significant proportion of examples, therefore presenting a hybrid form that combines the practice of literary historiography and the compilation of an anthology. Written in a format that prioritises the number of excerpts over the theoretical explanations and historical background, Sadettin Nüzhet's volume of literary history manifests a divergence from the established norms of historiography, putting the emphasis on the literary production itself. By presenting a compilation of examples of literary production as a representation of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, Nüzhet's work hints at the features of factual and atomistic historiography: Excerpts are provided as individual statements of Ottoman/Turkish literary character, without further analysis that is concerned by the interrelationships between texts, authors and other literary phenomena.

5. c. On Tahir Olgun's *Başlangıcından Tanzimat Devrine Kadar Edebiyat Tarihimize Dair Manzûm Bir Muhtıra (A Poetic Manifesto on Our Literary History from Its Beginnings until the Tanzimat Era)*

Tahir Olgun's *Başlangıcından Tanzimat Devrine Kadar Edebiyat Tarihimize Dair Manzûm Bir Muhtıra (A Poetic Manifesto on Our Literary History from Its Beginnings until the Tanzimat Era)* is published in 1931. This volume is

a unique contribution to the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography for two reasons. The first reason is that Olgun relies on poetic form to convey information, associating his work with two other examples from the past corpus: one being a lyric *tezkire* by Gülfî written in the seventeenth century, and another being Ziyâ Paşa's preface to *Harâbât* from the nineteenth century corpus. However, Olgun believes that his work supersedes both of these examples, for his version is written in "national verse and simply put" (4). Although Olgun expresses an implicit desire to relate his work to a relatively recent contribution to Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, i. e. to the preface to *Harâbât*, he seems to regard the practice of *tezkire*-writing as his frame of reference in the scholarly sense. The main indication of this is observed when he highlights the lack of exemplary excerpts in his volume, and adds that "nonetheless, a separate *zeyl* could be written" (4). The fact that Olgun refers to the *zeyl* form to be used for a possible addendum for his volume clearly demonstrates the compatibility of his work with the practical aspect of *tezkire*-writing. Despite the similarities between Olgun's work and *tezkiyes* regarding form, the way he describes the main objective of his practice of literary historiography goes beyond the boundaries of the latter: "Besides, I did not dwell upon the biographies of authors, for my purpose is to convey the literary analysis about [their work].¹⁸¹¹⁸² (3). Prioritising the act of literary analysis over and above relaying information about authors' biographies, Olgun aims at diverting from the framework of *tezkire*-writing in terms of content. At the start of his account of

¹⁸¹ Here, Olgun actually refers to "the authors", therefore "the literary analysis" about "them", which yet again shows that his approach is authorship-oriented. This is another aspect of Olgun's practice of literary historiography that overlaps with the fundamental logic of *tezkire*-writing practice.

¹⁸² "Bir de maksadım, o kimseler hakkındaki edebî hükümleri söylemek olduğu için, terceme[-]i hâllerini tafsîl etmedim."

literary history, he presents the criterion of periodization he subscribes to, and this is the same one that is observed in most of the preceding accounts: (i) the era before the acceptance of Islam (until the twelfth century), (ii) the era after the acceptance of Islam (from the twelfth century to 1856), (iii) the era of authors mimicking “the European” character (commencing with Şinâsi and encompassing the then-present day), and (iv) the imminent “national”¹⁸³ era, which he believes ought to follow this sequence (5-6). Both referring to the acceptance of Islam as a milestone for literary periodization and regarding Şinâsi as the pioneer of the then-contemporary era show that Olgun maintains the pre-existing framework in terms of characterising literary periods, which appeal to the principle of theoretical continuity as a historiographical dynamic as an example of sequential historiography in practice. Olgun only covers the first two eras in his work, saying that the third era requires another project (156). He dedicates an extremely brief section to the first era, a total of seven pages, and the rest of his work deals with the second era. The literary styles and regions Olgun includes overlap with some of those covered by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, such as folk literature in Anatolia, Chagatai and Azeri literature and literary production that is nurtured by Islamic mysticism. His corpus of exemplary works and authors that represent the beginning of this period follows Köprülü’s example, particularly his work from 1920-1, such as the highlights on *Kutadgu Bilig* from the eighth century, *Dîvânü Lugâtî’t Türk* from the eleventh century and *Atebetü’l-Hakâyık* from the twelfth century as well as authors like Ahmed Yesevî (1093-1166). The way in which the information about texts and

¹⁸³ Olgun does not designate this era as “national” in a straight-forward manner; however, he believes the “[literary] production” of this fourth era must exhibit a “national” character (6).

authors is presented are isolated sub-sections, appealing to the practice of factual and atomistic historiography at work.

The resemblance of the literary and geographical scope as well as the limited corpus point at the practical continuity between Olgun's work and the preceding examples on Ottoman/Turkish literary history. The content of each following period also maintains this continuity: Authors such as Âşık Paşa, Ahmed Paşa, Şeyhî, Zâtî, Fuzûlî, Rûhî (Rûhî-i Bağdâdî), Nefî, Sabrî, Nai'î (Nai'lî-i Kadîm), Sâbit, Nedîm, Naîmâ, Seyyid (Hüseyin) Vehbî, Esrâr Dede, (Zübeyde) Fitnat and Sümbülzâde Vehbî are some of the examples showing how much of Olgun's corpus intersects with Şehâbeddin Süleyman's volume from 1910, even prior to his collaboration with Köprülü. Covering a timespan from the thirteenth to the nineteenth century, Olgun seems to reiterate the historical understanding of this era, captured by previous historians.

5. d. On Agâh Sırrı's *Levend Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History)

Agâh Sırrı Levend's *Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History) is his most comprehensive contribution to Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. Having been planned as four volumes at the start of the project, only three volumes of this plan are completed. These volumes cover the period from the eighth century to the early twentieth century, comprising literature produced in a variety of dialects attributed to Turkish language other than Ottoman Turkish as well as French, Italian, Spanish, German, English and

Russian to a lesser extent. Involving both chronological sequencing and geographical categorization, Levend aims at delivering an all-encompassing picture of literary history, not only within the realm of Ottoman/Turkish course of intellectual development, but also one that has a geographically and linguistically wider outreach in the global context. Sub-chapters are designed in an old-fashioned manner, mostly based on authorship and on specific texts at times, representing an example of factual historiography.

In terms of method, Levend employs the hybrid mode: He introduces definitions as building blocks of the historical account's informative aspect, and then presents a set of conditions that describe external realities surrounding those definitions. Both historiographical strategies are used to enhance the theoretical and practical continuity in the narrative. In Levend's introduction, the first reference regarding methodology is to Comte, whose influence on Köprülü is discussed at length in Chapter 3, and then to positivism in sociology and subsequently objectivism. Putting forward that "history is not a science by itself, it is an aid to sociology" (*Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri*, vol. I, 8), Levend recognizes the analytical hierarchy that prioritises methods of positivist sociology over history, if and when acknowledged as a discipline on its own. For example, when examining the literary development in the fifteenth century Anatolia, Levend presents the reader with definitions of the developing genres in poetry, and then explains that his objective is to demonstrate the evolutionary course and progress of literary production in these genres by appealing to textual evidence (*Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri*, vol. I, 93).

Following similar patterns throughout the three volumes, Levend's work is one of the accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history that stands out in a

number of ways. One of the characteristics that render this volume different from its contemporaries is the inclusion of literary production from other parts of the world¹⁸⁴, particularly in the pre-nineteenth century period. However, the information provided in this respect is not presented in relation to the literary phenomena in the Ottoman/Turkish context, which does not alter the atomistic structure of Levend's work, consisting of sub-chapters that deal with one genre at a time. He devotes an entire chapter on the sixteenth century world literature, where he briefly dwells upon the historical conditions that brought about the renaissance and Italian, French, Spanish, German and English literature both before and after the renaissance. On the one hand, one may argue that the volume itself is titled *Lectures on Literary History*, and this shows that the historian does not set strict boundaries for his work, allowing him to stroll along diverse realms of literature. On the other hand, world literatures specified above only constitute around seventeen percent of the volume with an extremely limited amount of information provided in each sub-chapter. The majority of the account is formed in a sequential outlook in order to portray a complete picture of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

5. e. On İsmail Habib Sevük's *Edebî Yeniliğimiz (Our Literary Modernity)*

¹⁸⁴ Karakhanid, Chagatai and Azeri literatures are enlisted under the heading "Turkish literature", therefore I follow the author's categorization and do not include these here.

İsmail Habib Sevük's *Edebî Yeniliğimiz (Our Literary Modernity)*¹⁸⁵ is an account of literary history that commences with the Tanzimat era and explores the first few decades of the twentieth century. The initial version of this work was published in 1925 with the title "Türk Teceddüd Edebiyatı Tarihi"; however, Sevük was asked to revise and republish this volume in 1930 by the National Committee of Education and Culture, which operates within the institutional body of the Ministry of Education.¹⁸⁶ Then, due to the high demand for the volume, another edition followed in 1935 and it was distributed by the same institution (Sevük, 4). Sevük's evaluation of the Tanzimat era conforms to the one by Dilmen to a certain extent in terms of the authors that are believed to characterise varying phases of the period, such as Şinâsi, Ziyâ Paşa, Nâmık Kemal, and Abdülhak Hamid. The authors in focus for the other periods are also the ones that are commonly found in the works of literary history spanning a similar chronological sequence. Sevük's work follows a greatly similar scope to the preceding accounts in terms of curation of texts and authors that are featured, which maintain nearly the same narrational mode of sequential historiography as those.

Sevük's organisation of information develops in a consistent manner until the end of the Constitutional era, which he finalises with a section on Yahyâ Kemal, and then offers an evaluation of the nationalist movement of the time. Sevük suggests that there are four phases of the nationalist movement¹⁸⁷, and analyses both leading and marginal figures involved in the debates on the

¹⁸⁵ Here, I use the term "modernity" for the term "yenilik", which would ideally call for the noun form of the adjective "new". I draw on the sense of change embedded in the expression of modernity, highlighted in the introductory chapter of this study.

¹⁸⁶ In this study, I only analyse the latest version of Sevük's work for two reasons: (1) he appears to have actively revised the later editions, and there is a negligible amount of alteration to the content and (2) the comparison of varying accounts of his would go beyond the purposes of this study.

issue. Following this chapter, Sevük dwells upon the variety of literary genres and presents a range of authors whom he curates to demonstrate the development of poetry, prose, novels, travel writing, rhetoric, humour, journalism, historiography, literary historiography and criticism. Sub-chapters devoted to particular texts and authors are presented to the reader as individual enquiries rather than as analyses of interconnected parts of a whole system, rendering Sevük's work an example of atomistic historiography in practice.

Sevük's idea of introducing the idea of "the new" at the start of the Tanzimat era and tracing its evolution along the succeeding periods is executed nominally, for he often engages with literary criticism as he provides information about the authors, occasionally relating his commentary to a general characteristic that he identifies as an important factor within the context of literary modernity. For example, in the case of Recâizâde Ekrem, Sevük thinks that his poetry is not successful and one of the many issues that causes this failure is the limitations arising from not being able to switch from the Persian metre ("arûz") to the "national" (syllabic) metre. Then, Sevük mentions the linguistic aspect of the same issue, putting forward that the preference of national metre requires yet another switch from the Perso-Arabic poetic vocabulary to the "live" language of everyday life (128), and this causes further problems in terms of poetic rhythm. Drawing on this instance, Sevük's general strategy can be said to inductively show why and how the tendency towards "the new", if it can be put as an overarching notion that withhold multitudes of the same intellectual substance, begins to manifest itself in the literary

¹⁸⁷ These four phases are (i) Turkish nationalism in the *Tanzimat* era ("Tanzimat Türkçülüğü"), (ii) Turkish nationalism under Abdul Hamid II's rule ("İstibdat Türkçülüğü"), (iii) Turkish nationalism in the Constitutional era ("Meşrutiyet Türkçülüğü"), and (iv) national Turkey ("Milli Türkiye").

production at the time. However, this strategy does not imply that Sevük gives up on highlighting the gradual nature of this transformation, and therefore acknowledging a certain degree of continuity in this line of conceptual evolution. That is why the reader comes across emphases such as the one on the “in-betweenness” of Recâizâde Ekrem’s poetic stance in Sevük’s evaluation - pointers in his analysis tend to explore how different phases of “the new” are experienced in the literary sense, and how these phases are interconnected, or can be juxtaposed at the very least. Although the notion of “the new” is hinted at as a possibly game-changing phenomenon, it is not entirely regarded as a pivotal point for analysis that is revisited for each text or author featured in the account. Following the outlook of factual historiography, Sevük’s work exhibits yet another characteristic that overlaps with the rest of the works in the primary cluster.

5. f. On Celal Tahsin Boran’s *Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History)

A bizarre case in the course of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography to briefly touch upon is Celal Tahsin Boran’s *Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri* (Lectures on Literary History), published in 1933. This work, although virtually inaccessible, is mentioned in most bibliographies, presented in the works of historians such as Ağâh Sırrı Levend (in his *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 1973) and Nazım Hikmet Polat (in his article “Türk Edebiyat Tarihçiliği Çalışmalarının Neresindeyiz?”, 2002). Bağdemir, in his article titled “Türk Edebiyatı Tarihinde Bulunamayan Bir Kitap

Üzerine” (“About a Lost Book in Turkish Literary History”), reveals that he possesses a copy of Boran’s work in his private collection. He also provides a summary of Boran’s literary history, which consists of two volumes. According to the content Bağdemir relays, Boran’s account involves an unusual focus with a heavily comparative approach at work. As far as Bağdemir’s summary implies, Boran’s periodization in the first volume consists of an era prior to the Islamic influence on literary production, another one that covers the “Islamic” literary production as well as chapters on folk and court literature until 1839 (236), which is within the confines of the sequential outlook of the previous examples. An interesting aspect seen in this early work is the inclusion of Ancient Greek literature in the corpus of excerpts alongside the ones that are often referred to, i. e. Arab, Persian, Azeri and Chagatai literature. Boran is the first literary historian to expand the scope for sampling literary traditions other than the ones conventionally brought into play, although this feature does not translate into a greater effect on the depth or format of analysis. The selection of texts and authors that overlap with the curation in the preceding works are presented in the form of factual historiography, as Bağdemir’s mention implies.

Another striking feature is observed in Bağdemir’s description of Boran’s chapter on court literature, the evolution of which is presented in comparison with the course of intellectual history in Europe. For example, Boran highlights the *renaissance* as a milestone, and prefers to use it as a pivotal point for his organisational framework: The chapters on court literature seem to be arranged as covering two major periods, *pre-renaissance* and *post-renaissance*, a previously unseen categorization in the case of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. Boran’s juxtaposition of the course of European intellectual history with

Ottoman/Turkish literary history is the first attempt of its kind, with varied repetitions of which can be found in later decades.¹⁸⁸ Bağdemir reports that Boran engages with a similar practice in the second volume, providing a survey of the key literary movements emerging “in the West”, such as pre-romanticism, romanticism, realism and naturalism, and simultaneously dwelling upon the Ottoman/Turkish literary production in the post-1839 period (236). When compared to the case of Boran’s evaluation of the *renaissance* in the context of his historiographical practice, the above-mentioned survey does not stand out as a radical attempt. While there is an endeavour to introduce a new paradigm for historical evaluation of literary phenomena, the overall organisational structure of Boran’s work seems uncompromisingly atomistic in terms of its configuration of analyses. It is also the case that these literary movements are actively discussed in the Ottoman intellectual scene of the era, demonstrating that a parallel drawn in this respect is commonly thought to be beneficial to develop a better understanding of the period, as it is frequently done in the previous works as well. Such discussions are often utilised for engaging with a narrational tone while attempting to convey a complete portrait of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, rather than an interest purely devoted to exploring the opportunities that such parallels may bring into play. In other words, such attempts do not extend beyond the configurative structures of sequential historiography, as seen across the primary cluster as well as this particular account.

¹⁸⁸ Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Ekrem Yirmibeşin’s *Türk Edebiyatı - Batı Örnekleriyle Birlikte* (*Turkish Literature with Western Examples*) from 1967-8 as well as Emin Özdemir’s *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı* (*Turkish and World Literature*) from 1994 are other examples of this phenomenon, and analyses of these are carried out in the following part of this chapter.

Although it points at a rather conventional strategy, Boran's preferred axis of comparative analysis in the second volume does manifest a theoretical orientation, which encourages a more in-depth look at the conceptual transformations in nineteenth century literary production. Boran's emphasis on the comparative perspective as well as a strong tendency to involve a focus on literary theory and aesthetics to guide the historical analysis points at a novel approach for its time.¹⁸⁹ Despite the originality of the interpretive axis, Boran's account aims at establishing and conveying a continuous narrative of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. In a way, Boran's enthusiasm about introducing a comparative perspective with a specific focus, which overarches the timeline from the beginning to the then-present day, demonstrates a historiographical tendency that is structurally similar to other accounts running on the principle of continuity that employ the tools of factual, sequential and atomistic historiography.

5. g. On Orhan Rıza's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)*

One of the works on Turkish literary history that is rarely accessible to general readership is Orhan Rıza's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)* from 1934.¹⁹⁰ From a note on its cover and Orhan Rıza's particular

¹⁸⁹ Unfortunately, I have been unsuccessful in touching base with Bağdemir in order to consult him regarding the possibility of receiving a digital copy of the work, which would have been the only way to include a more in-depth reading of the source in my study. Due to this difficulty, my analysis of Boran's work is limited in scope, since the only available source I could attain was Bağdemir's extremely brief summary of the original work.

¹⁹⁰ Despite a thorough search, I was unable to locate this volume in the major library collections in Istanbul; however, I managed to find a copy of its very first edition via a specialist bookstore, and purchased it for my personal collection. Thankfully, the copy has only minimal water

emphasis in the preface, it is possible to establish that this volume was predominantly intended for the purpose of teaching Ottoman/Turkish literary history at high schools and higher education institutions that specialise in training teachers. Another feature of the volume that is observed immediately is that it is dedicated to Köprülü, which highlights that Orhan Rıza was Köprülü's student at the Dârülfünûn.¹⁹¹ Although Orhan Rıza does not directly point at Köprülü and his writings as the major source of his work on literary history, the overall organisation of the volume is reminiscent of both Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work as well as the volume produced as a result of their collaboration. The criterion of periodization also reveals a similarity of the kind, since Orhan Köprülü subscribes to the pre-Islam and post-Islam division when identifying the early literary eras. For the later periods, he appeals to the ascription of "the Western" influence on literary production in Turkish, which is yet again a part of the periodization criterion seen in previous works. Regarding the configuration of the account, the outlook of sequential historiography is prevalent at the outset. In terms of the corpus of works and authors, particularly in the chapters covering the early period, Orhan Köprülü's selection largely overlaps with Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work as well, contributing to the familiarity of the account to the narrational tone found in earlier works.

The preface of Orhan Rıza's volume contains one of the most unusual, however brief, discussions on method in literary historiography. Emphasising that the particular choice of method for composing his account of literary history is made in order to serve its educational purpose, Orhan Rıza explains that he

damage, and it is complete, so it has been possible to include its analysis in the corpus of this project.

¹⁹¹ The exact statement of dedication is "- Kıymetli Hocam, Köprülüzâde Fuat Beyefendiye -", the first part of which translates as "to my precious professor".

nevertheless needed to surpass specific limitations of this method (3). One limitation he mentions is that his method requires the historian to present the content in a concise manner, in other words, summarising the information in order to render it more accessible for its intended audience. Orhan Rıza finds this aspect of the subject-matter method “unnatural”, and aims to tackle this obstacle by making exceptions when it comes to the key literary works and their analyses (3). In addition to this change he introduces to the method he employs, Orhan Rıza also prefers to include brief sections of qualitative evaluations of each literary era in question. This way, he expands the scope of his account beyond what the summary form presupposes. Orhan Rıza describes the preceding works on Ottoman/Turkish literary history as “eclectic and sporadic”, “insufficient”, “bulked up with excerpts” and “not representing [literary history] as a whole” (3). Then, he reveals the sources of his inspiration in terms of method: Jean Antoine Calvet (1874-1965), Charles Marc des Granges (1861-1944), and Rene Doumic¹⁹² (1860-1937). However, one particular source among the works by these historians, Rene Doumic’s *Histoire de la Littérature Française* (1906) is the one he chooses to follow closely. Orhan Rıza’s mention of Doumic’s popularity is especially noteworthy as a telling sign as to why this specific account appears appealing to him. He reports that Doumic’s account of French literary history has thirty-six editions that reach four

¹⁹² Doumic is an influential figure in French literary studies with numerous publications on literary history and criticism. Having been the president of the Société des gens de lettres for a period of time as well as a member of the Académie Française, and a fellow of the University of Paris, Doumic’s position within the intellectual sphere manifests an institutional nature. In this sense, there seems to be a similarity between Doumic and Köprülü, both having been in well-established posts that have the potential to steer the direction of scholarly work in their fields, particularly with a strong interest in literary history, historiography and method. Orhan Rıza’s statement at the end of the preface can be said to implicitly draw such a parallel as well, since he claims that his volume is “the first one of its kind that is modelled on its Western counterpart” (4). With this remark, he appears to deliberately disassociate his work from the preceding corpus in terms of its method, and in a way, denounces the link the reader may assume between him and Köprülü, given the dedication of the volume to Köprülü and the fact that Köprülü mentored him.

hundred and fifty thousand published copies by the year of 1918 (3). Regarding this as a strong indication of success for Doumic's volume, Orhan Rıza believes that Doumic's way of relaying the information does not prioritise sampling literary production. For Orhan Rıza, historians that favour including a large number of samples in their accounts engage with a "dogmatic" attitude, and this leads the readers to lose enthusiasm for the topic, which is undesirable in an educational context (3). Finding the inclusion of exemplary works in a volume of literary history dogmatic is an interesting emphasis, for it promulgates the idea that factual highlights, theoretical elaborations and specifically curated clusters of literary works as well as their analyses are rather crucial for producing a well-grounded and appealing account. Orhan Rıza highlights that his volume is neither simply a work of factual historiography, which he refers to as a "nomenclature" that consists of titles, events, narratives, people and numbers, nor is it an account of generalisations that is intended as a "fun read", namely "a vulgarisation": He prefers the notion of "authenticity" to describe what is at the heart of his approach¹⁹³; however, he does not explicate what this notion implies any further (4). Despite Orhan Rıza's desire to drift apart from the norms of factual historiography as he expresses in his discussion of methodology, the contents of his account fall short of challenging these norms. Chapters dealing with literary production in the Ottoman Empire (59-99) and its development under the influence of Western civilization (102-130) are only some of the examples of literary phenomena that are portrayed as factual statements

¹⁹³ Although no explicit reference is made at this point in the text, Orhan Rıza's emphasis on "authenticity" may be inspired by Köprülü, who develops this notion to define and describe the particular character of a national literature, i. e. Turkish literature, particularly in his *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (*Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*) written in 1918, and published in 1919.

regarding the characteristics of text and author without further analytical elaboration.

The conceptual foundations identified in Köprülü's article on method reappears in Orhan Rıza's work. Mentions of Auguste Comte's understanding of historical progress (6), Taine's use of positivism in the context of historiography (156) and Lanson's idea of literary history being a phenomenon in progress (168) are particular moments in which this tendency can be observed. Orhan Rıza's desire to evaluate literary history in line with the transformations in the history of ideas becomes increasingly apparent in the tenth chapter of his volume, titled "Methodology: Literary Schools and Textual Analysis". The nature of this specific chapter is one that is novel for its time, both in terms of its form and content. In this chapter, Orhan Rıza offers a conceptual analysis of what the term "literature" signifies, and then moves onto juxtaposing various philosophical and aesthetic doctrines with the literary schools in Ottoman/Turkish literary history. According to Orhan Rıza, this juxtaposition does not yield any fruitful result, since the intellectual processes out of which these philosophical and aesthetic doctrines emerge do not occur in the Ottoman Empire/Turkey. For Orhan Rıza, the most fundamental process in this sense is the author's urge to produce a literary work that wilfully negates the tradition preceding it, and this is not the case at any point in the context of Ottoman/Turkish literary production (167). He thinks that literary schools such as "court literature, European Tanzimat literature, Servet-i Fünûn literature and Fecr-i Âtî literature" present a strong sense of continuity regarding their themes, poetic features and form, despite the thematic variations observed in the Servet-i Fünûn and Fecr-i Âtî periods (165). Any other diversion from this axis of

continuity is an act of imitation, according to Orhan Rıza. For example, he asserts that Nazım Hikmet's poetry is dominated by his mimicry of Marxist thought and futurism, which results in his work lacking "the friendly warmth of poetry" (166). By the historiographical outlook of this aspect of Orhan Rıza's work, sequential historiography as a configurative approach seems to play an important part of his practice. On the one hand, Orhan Rıza expresses his discontent with the fact that Ottoman/Turkish literature lacks a truly transformational literary movement; on the other hand, he seeks to eradicate literary phenomena that manifests a different character to the rest of the corpus. This tension can be interpreted as Orhan Rıza's inclination towards embracing the continuity in Ottoman/Turkish literature, which he assumes to be deeply rooted, and denying the utility of philosophical and aesthetic doctrines that are not by-products of the intellectual evolution in the Ottoman/Turkish context when it comes to literary analysis. This inclination, in return, leads him to develop a new way in which Ottoman/Turkish literary works can be analysed, and he introduces a set of ten questions and rules that a historian ought to ask and follow in order to acquire sufficient information about a work of literature¹⁹⁴ (169). The questions posited by Orhan Rıza to define and describe the ideal method for the practice of historiography lead to an intellectual scheme/figura of analysis that is concerned by each literary fact or event in its own terms. This, in turn, brings out a framework that overlaps with the outlook of atomistic historiography.

Reminding the reader of theoretical continuity as a fundamental dynamic in the practice of literary historiography, the questions posited by Orhan Rıza

¹⁹⁴ The complete list of these questions can be found in the appendix ("Table 12. Orhan Rıza's questionnaire for literary historians to establish the correct method for their work").

overlap with the ones that are proposed by Köprülü in his article on method from 1913, although he does not refer to this source in his work. Without clearly stating that he benefits from Köprülü's set of questions and rules, Orhan Rıza employs the framework above as a guideline for scholars of Ottoman/Turkish literary history in an extremely similar manner. Nearly the entire questionnaire is based on Köprülü's proposal, except several questions directed at the originality of literary texts that are subjected to analysis. The fact that Orhan Rıza reiterates the questions of this kind might allude to another cultural shift that occurs prior to 1934. The Alphabet Reform taking place in 1928 and Perso-Arabic script being replaced with a Latin-based script, questions regarding originality of texts and/or validity of transliterations might have been an underlying concern for Orhan Rıza, since it becomes harder to tackle the archival difficulties while conducting research on literary production in the Ottoman Empire.

Following this, he also provides the reader with directions for writing dissertations, monographs, as well as *compte rendus*, analysis and criticism (169-170). Orhan Rıza's motivation to propose systemized instructions for the practice of literary historiography is a rare occurrence in the corpus, observed for the first time since Köprülü's work. What is more is that Orhan Rıza implicitly attempts to offer an explanatory framework as to why a new approach is necessary for the particular nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, which is also an uncommon phenomenon in equivalent works of the same era.

5. h. On Mustafa Nihat Özön's *Metinlerle Muasır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Contemporary Turkish Literature with Texts)

Mustafa Nihat Özön's account of literary history, *Metinlerle Muasır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Contemporary Turkish Literature with Texts*), is published in 1934 for the first time (İstanbul: İstanbul Devlet Matbaası), and its second edition is dated 1941 (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası). His account consists of eight chapters that are genre-oriented: These cover poetry, drama, novels, historiography, geography and travel-writing, literary history and criticism, letters and memoirs, and philosophy, respectively. Despite opting for a genre-focused organisation of information, Özön's account does not utilise this feature as an analytical tool in order to offer a variety of explanatory axes for interpretation. Within each chapter of his work, Özön follows a linear chronological course. His chapters either commence with an introduction providing the reader with a survey of definitions and facts regarding the genre in focus, or directly begin to list authors that are considered representative of particular aspects of the genre. Thus, in terms of its depth of analysis, Özön's account remains within the confines of factual historiography. The use of genres for the purpose of classification does not evolve into a means of topical or detached historiography either in Özön's case: The intellectual scheme/figura of his account is merely sequential, since the presentation of literary phenomena reveals a narrational tone. The mention of social, political and cultural outlook in the relevant eras appear as calendrical, marking temporal points that are not translated into explanatory paradigms.

Stringing the individually formed informative statements regarding literary production in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, Özön presents his take on the literary past in the form of atomistic historiography rather than in a structural or

axiomatic configuration in his work. For example, when Özön focuses on a specific genre, he lists authors and their works in mostly chronological order. Refraining from cross-genre comparisons and contextualised discussions of texts, Özön prefers to present information in isolated sub-chapters for each genre.

Relying on the assumed continuity in the succession of authors, a strong tendency that is prevalent since the early examples of Ottoman literary history, Özön follows suit and rarely brings any commentary borderlining conceptual analysis into play. Including a variety of lengthy excerpts is another phenomenon observed in Özön's work, reminiscent of the regulatory change in 1925 with respect to the nature of the instructive materials in Turkish literature courses at the high school and higher education level. Although outstandingly inclusive of genres that are liminally considered literary in the conventional sense of aesthetics, such as geography or historiography as well as philosophy, Özön's work does not challenge the limits of the past decade.

5. i. On İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's *Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları* (Notes on the History of Literature in the Tanzimat Era)

İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's *Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları* (Notes on the History of Literature in the Tanzimat Era) (1942) addresses an expectedly narrower scope in comparison to his major volume of Ottoman literary history discussed earlier in this study.¹⁹⁵ Dilmen's account is yet another example of an

¹⁹⁵ It must be noted that the limited nature of the scope may also result from the fact that this volume is a compilation of lecture notes and there are footnotes by the editors that further material covered during the lectures are not included in the printed version. For some of these footnotes, the reader can appeal to pages eleven, fourteen and twenty-two.

exclusively factual, sequential and atomistic account of literary historiography, even though its beginning manifests qualities of topical historiography, particularly the introduction where the discussion revolves around the notion of “modernity”.¹⁹⁶ Dilmen’s preceding work on Ottoman literary history exhibits a thorough conceptual and linguistic evaluation, which manifests a certain degree of intellectual complexity, whereas the subject-matter piece contains a simplified take on the key notions that are conventionally used to elaborate upon the Tanzimat era, such as “the Western influence” on Ottoman literary production and “modernity”. With shorter elaborations on similarly central concepts in this latter account, Dilmen neither dwells into detailed analyses of literary phenomena, nor ties in singular literary facts and events with any of the social, political and cultural conditions of the time. Instead, he presents information on individual texts and authors by maintaining a sequential format and dismissing the limitations of factual and atomistic historiography. His commentary on the intellectual outlook of the era points at concerns other than presenting the background to Ottoman/Turkish literary production in that period.

An increasing amount of opinionated commentary is seen in this piece, i. e. appraisal of disavowing the old literature and building an entirely new literary tradition (*Tanzimat Edebiyat Tarihi Notları*, 64), descriptions of cultural conservatism as a backward thought (*Tanzimat Edebiyat Tarihi Notları*, 7), while the judgmental tone in Dilmen’s previous account is comparatively more balanced than in his previous work. This may be because of two reasons: This edition appears to be prepared for teaching at an introductory level, and therefore the historical narrative may be simplified for this reason, although it is

¹⁹⁶ The term “modernity” is not used by Dilmen, he prefers to use “yenileşme” (*Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları*, 7), to which “regeneration” comes close.

perplexing that the institution where the lectures notes are taken is the Language, History and Geography Faculty at Ankara University - one of the most distinguished spots for higher education in Turkey. The second reason may be that Dilmen's political orientation takes a specific direction a while after writing his previous volume. When the Language, History and Geography Faculty at Ankara University was founded in 1936, Dilmen was assigned to the division of Turkology, where the focus was exclusively linguistic, and the curriculum was dominated by the study of Turkish and its dialects. The works in the early years of this faculty reveal a strong alignment with one of the most controversial linguistic theories of the twentieth century: The Sun-Language Theory.¹⁹⁷ Dilmen's brief praise of the Sun-Language Theory¹⁹⁸ demonstrates that he is an advocate of this view in the scholarly sense, at its very least. Compared to his take on languages and ability to scrutinise the complexities encountered in the formation of "Ottoman Turkish", using his preferred signifier from 1922, Dilmen's advocacy of the Sun-Language theory is interesting, given the political motivation and connotations of it as well as its well-known inadequacies from a scholarly perspective. The reductionist attitude and the elevated level of subjectivity in his elaboration towards literary production preceding the emergence of "modernity" may result from the context in which these views are cultivated as well as a personal and political transformation.

¹⁹⁷ The Sun-Language theory simply presents the hypothesis that Turkish language is the source of all languages, and it is inspired and heavily supported by the regime at the time, particularly by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, although most of the specifics of the theory are unlikely to have been developed by him (Ertürk, 98).

¹⁹⁸ Dilmen, İbrahim Necmi. *Türk Tarih Tezinde Güneş-Dil Teorisinin Yeri ve Önemi*. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1937.

5. j. On Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature)

Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı co-author a volume titled *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature) in 1942, covering a timespan from the seventh century until 1839. Two years later, Gönensay solely authors a volume with exactly the same title, this time encompassing the period from 1839 to the first decade of the twentieth century, which he intends as a follow-up to his collaboration with Banarlı (5). Therefore, these two volumes ought to be analysed in conjunction for a more comprehensive overview of the historiographical practice at work. The first volume in question hails Köprülü at the outset, acknowledging his work as the first example of literary historiography alongside Ziya Gökalp's contribution to the analysis of Turkish intellectual history (5). The curated absence of the works preceding Köprülü is notable albeit driven by a clear objective. Gönensay and Banarlı describe the reason why Köprülü and Gökalp ought to be regarded as the pioneers in the study of Turkish history: They address "the need of self-identification that emerged when our nationalistic emotions were awakened" in their work (5). As shown in the second chapter, Köprülü greatly benefits from the debate on the matters and sources of literary historiography in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and his understanding is shaped by the common intellectual ground of the era to a remarkable extent. While the portrayal of Köprülü as the forefather of the national literary historiographical practice in this context follows from the methodological dynamics he establishes, these are by-products of the intellectual environment in which he prospers at the time. This aspect

fundamentally links Gönensay and Banarlı's practice to the ongoing course of literary historiography.

Finding Köprülü to provide the first account of Turkish literary history as a whole (9) while criticising a limited number of works preceding Köprülü such as Abdülhalim Memduh's volume (119-122), Gönensay and Banarlı's work almost exclusively follows the form, content and method of his example to a rather condensed degree. From the periodization criteria to the authors and texts enlisted, Gönensay and Banarlı adhere to Köprülü's precedent, while Dilmen's example appears to be a more prevalent influence in the follow-up by Gönensay. The parts that are meant to provide a social, political and cultural overview of the relevant periods are extremely brief, mostly not exceeding a few paragraphs at a time. This results in the simplification of historical phenomena surrounding the literary production, and the ideological aspect largely overtakes the narrative as the major explanatory vector in both volumes.

Both volumes reveal similar structures in terms of the depth, the format, and the intellectual scheme of analysis. Information is exclusively presented in segments of isolated listings consisting of texts produced by a chosen author, which alludes to the outlook of factual historiography. Both volumes cover the historical background to specific literary periods merely in four to five pages, whereas authors spend approximately ten to twenty times more on providing encyclopaedic information on literary production without further analysis. For example, Gönensay's volume contains two extremely short chapters on the social, political, and cultural conditions in the nineteenth century with a total of six pages (5-7, and 7-11), while biographical information on authors and lists of texts produced in the era takes up more than one hundred and twenty pages

over individual sub-chapters (18-140). Providing these segments without an overarching structure, the configuration of these volumes reminds the reader the form of atomistic historiography. In light of the intellectual motivation promoted by Köprülü, the authors are invested in providing a comprehensive account of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. Refraining from topical or detached configurations in terms of format, they follow the blueprint of sequential historiography. The underlying tone of both works is a strongly narrational one that does not divert from the purpose of communicating a complete image of allegedly harmonious literary phenomena. This feature of the works, reminiscent of sequential historiography, enhances the idea of the theoretical continuity shaping the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

5. k. On Hüseyin Nihal Atsız's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature)

Nihal Atsız (1905-1975), one of the most outspoken Turkish nationalists of the twentieth century, published his *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature) in 1940. Atsız is a graduate of the Department of Turkish Language and Literature at the University of İstanbul, where he was mentored by Köprülü himself. For a brief period of time, Atsız takes up a post as a research assistant for Köprülü; however, he reveals his disagreement with the “Turkish History Thesis”, which results in his dismissal (Mishkova et al., 342). Continuing to publish on a variety of subjects ranging from politics to history, literature to

bibliographical research, Atsız remained a prolific writer up until two years prior to his death.

His account of literary history is possibly the most unusual volume that is considered in this study, purely because of how it defines the scope of Turkish literary history. For Atsız, the general periodization is based on the same conventional divide, consisting of the three major periods: (i) Turkish history in the era of Far Eastern civilization (pre-Islamic period, until the tenth century), (ii) Turkish history in the era of Near Eastern civilization (Islamic period, from the tenth century to 1839), (iii) Turkish history in the era of Western civilization (the period after 1839). Nevertheless, Atsız heavily focuses on the pre-Islamic period in this work, and very briefly touches upon the beginnings of the Islamic period. While considering the literary production in the pre-Islamic period as a strong manifestation of the true character of the Turkish nation in aesthetic form, Atsız appears less enthusiastic about ascribing such a quality to the literary corpus forming thereafter. The reader can observe this in the organizational framework of the account, which is arranged in seven chapters: (1) “Edebiyat ve Edebiyat Tarihi” (“Literature and Literary History”), (2) “İslâmiyyeten Önce Türk Tarihi” (“Pre-Islamic Turkish History”), (3) “İslâmiyyeten Önce Türk Medeniyeti” (“Pre-Islamic Turkish Civilization”), (4) “İslâmiyyeten Önce Türk Destanı” (“Epochs in the Pre-Islamic Period”), (5) “İslâmiyyeten Önce Türk Edebiyatı” (“Pre-Islamic Turkish Literature”), (6) Turkish Literature in the Era of the Karakhanids, (7) “Selç[u]kl[u]l[a]r [Ç]ağında” (“Turkish Literature in the Era of the Seljuks”). As seen in this structure, the majority of the volume is devoted to evaluating the era preceding the conversion. Overlapping with Köprülü’s way of delivering information regarding

the same period, Atsız's approach in configuring his account seems to be a sequential one that is directed at forming a narrative along the historical course of events. The content of the chapters consists of factual statements about the chosen periods. Neither the social, political and cultural paradigms nor their interrelationships with literary phenomena play a role in Atsız's elaboration upon Turkish literary history, resulting in his engagement with factual and atomistic historiography. For example, in the fifth chapter of his work, Atsız focuses on pre-Islamic Turkish literature (32-53). In this chapter, he provides information on literary production in the geographical areas governed by Huns, the Göktürks, and the Uygurs, respectively. Conveying both the linguistic characteristics, albeit briefly, and the contents of texts, Atsız does not engage with further analysis regarding the historical background and maintains an encyclopaedic take on the evolution of literary history.

At the end of the seventh chapter, Atsız abruptly concludes his work at the point where the chronological timeline reaches the emergence of the Ottoman Empire. Since he does not offer an explanation as to why this is the case, the reader is left perplexed. The fact that he neither dwells upon the subject in his later writings, nor publishes successive volumes hints at the possibility of him isolating the idea of Turkish literary history within a particular period that is confined within the aesthetic character formed prior to the Islamic influence. This tendency towards an extremely specific characterization of Turkish literary history in a geographically and chronologically limited scope does not formally conform to the principle of continuity, for it does not string the social, political and intellectual transformations in the later periods in order to sketch out a holistic image of the literary past. Thus, Atsız's stance regarding

literary historiography represents a noteworthy divergence from the dominant course of the practice. In order to make sense of this divergence, it is important to outline the particular approach Atsız adopts in terms of what Turkish nationalism implies as an ideology. In contrast with the nationalist thought of the late era under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, which mostly revolves around the idea of building a cultural identity, the defining characteristic seems to transform into a race/ethnicity-oriented one in the post-Republican era (Bölükbaşı, 47). In his political writings, Atsız advocates the latter, and reflects upon history, literature, and culture in light of this viewpoint. Opting for a complete reconsideration of what the concept of Turkish literature involves, Atsız presents a specific chronological and geographical outlook in his account of Turkish literary history that grows out of his understanding of nationalism.

5. I. On Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay's *Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature from the Tanzimat Era to the Present)*

In 1949¹⁹⁹, Gönensay published *Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature from the Tanzimat Era to the Present)* as the continuation of his collaboration with Banarlı. In the preface of the work, Gönensay highlights a difference in terms of periodization between the preceding volume and the subject-matter one. While the historians prefer to organise the information according to a centurial sequence in the former,

¹⁹⁹ Although the first edition of this volume was published in 1944, the second edition from 1949 is selected for analysis, since it informs the reader of the significant regulatory change mentioned above.

Gönensay opts for another strategy of periodization in the latter. He argues that literary movements in the era do not fully materialise as literary production, these mainly point to ideas instead (5). This statement is a noteworthy crystallisation of why factual historiography is yet again the preferred approach from a theoretical point of view. According to Gönensay, what is beneficial is to focus on particularly influential figures and their works when writing about the literary past of this era, despite his belief in the use of genres and their evolution as major points of reference for the practice of literary historiography.

Gönensay informs the reader about the significant historical events that shape the social, political and cultural life in the period, although he does this on very few occasions in a condensed form. The key intellectual figures Gönensay focuses on reflect a very similar curation and categorization as in Dilmen's work: Şinâsi, Ziyâ Paşa, Nâmık Kemal versus Ahmed Midhat Efendi, Şemseddin Sâmî Bey, Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem, Abdülhak Hamid Tarhan and Sâmîpaşazâde Sezâî. The reader observes that Gönensay offers an expanded version of the juxtaposition Dilmen previously provides, which manifests Gönensay's internalisation of the commonly used structure of Dilmen's.

An interesting aspect of Gönensay's account is that he does not only take the literary production by the Istanbulite authors into account, but he also talks about folk literature in the nineteenth century by appealing to poets such as Emrah (135) and Dertli (138). This rarely encountered category of information within the context of the nineteenth century implicitly points at the historian's desire to provide the best possible scope of a given literary strand, and the historiographical motivation for this appears to be nurtured by a

fundamentally inclusive approach. However, the development of Gönensay's account in this direction does not mean that he adopts an exhaustive strategy towards other literary phenomena of the time. His inclusion of folk literature is due to the idea that it is a legitimate aspect of Ottoman/Turkish literature, not an internal divergence that is nevertheless significant. In other words, whether such additions are worthwhile is determined by their compliance with the narrational tone of the account, which is configured according to the prerequisites of sequential historiography.

Another point of the account, where the dynamic of continuity is observed, is Gönensay's comparison between the qualities of court literature and the literary production in the Tanzimat era. He discusses the differences between these two literary strands from five different viewpoints: (1) language, (2) poetic metre, (3) poetic form, (4) literary genres, and (5) ideology (14-7). Although Gönensay relays these as potentially pivotal points for analysis, each component is yet again presented in isolation from the rest of the literary realm. When expanding upon language, poetic metre and poetic form, Gönensay tries to capture an extensive image of how these aspects may have evolved over the course of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, attempting to trace the roots of this evolution as far back as in the eleventh century. Bringing such an interpretive axis into play, albeit its success being debatable, Gönensay's account reveals historiographical elements that insinuate varying aspects of continuity as a fundamental dynamic.

**5. m. On Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*
(*Illustrated History of Turkish Literature*)**

Nihad Sâmi Banarlı is one of the first historians that pursues the encyclopaedic form in the practice with his *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*Illustrated History of Turkish Literature*), published over the course of two years (1947/8). With a timeline that extends from the eighth century to the then-present era, Banarlı's work is designed for delivering an extensive account of the Ottoman/Turkish literary past. After its launch, it has been reprinted numerous times (i. e. 1971, 1987, and 1998)²⁰⁰ by "MEB Yayınları" ("Ministry of Education Publications"), the latest edition coming out in 2001.

Banarlı, as an author and as a historian, was present on the Turkish literary scene for more than forty years. Producing literary texts (plays and a novel) and authoring several volumes of Turkish literary history, Banarlı's bibliography is mostly devoted to Turkish literature, although he did publish one book on Mehmed the Conqueror, entitled *Fatih'in Zafer Sırları* (*Secrets of Fatih's Victory*, 1974). In his *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, the chapter on Turkish literary history emphasises Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's influence in the field as the most prominent figure, and potentially revealing his scholarly connection to him. Given that Banarlı graduated from the department of Turkish literature at the University of İstanbul in 1927, and that Köprülü was appointed as the dean of faculty in 1923, Banarlı must have been Köprülü's student. Even though it is hard to determine the extent to which the master-pupil relationship between Köprülü and Banarlı had an influence on the latter's thinking, we could

²⁰⁰ Dates of publication and the information on the editions of the relevant works are extracted from the following online book sellers "Kitap Yurdu" (<http://www.kitapyurdu.com/>, accessed on 11/03/2014), "Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı" (<http://www.turkedebiyati.com.tr/sayfala.asp?nereye=tumkitaplar>, accessed on 11/03/2014), "İdefix" (<http://www.idefix.com/vitrin/>, accessed on 11/03/2014).

easily say that Köprülü's intellectual impact, by which at least one trend in literary historiography has been shaped, did reach out to Banarlı as a school of thought.

Beyond the interaction between Köprülü and Banarlı, and their overlapping personal histories, it is possible to see Köprülü's influence on how Banarlı relates to the Turkic, Ottoman, and Anatolian-Turkish heritage. Banarlı refers to Köprülü as the first scholar to examine the history of Turkish literature "as the literary history of the Turkic nations" and "as a whole" (1119), which he mentions in the preface of his literary history. Banarlı's motivation in framing the principle of continuity for Turkish literary historiography is very similar to Köprülü's way of exploring the roots of Turkish literature, although Banarlı seems a lot more enthusiastic about the expansion of the geographical and chronological scope of Turkish literature, which he defines and describes it based on ethnicity. For example, Banarlı examines Turkish literature in terms of consecutive time periods (from the pre-Islamic period to the twentieth century) and, in most of the cases, he divides these periods into sections such as "Central Asian Turkish Literature", "Azeri Turkish Literature", "Anatolian Turkish Literature", "Balkan Turkish Literature" and "Ottoman Turkish Literature". Neither the linguistic diversity in Anatolia, nor literary production in Turkish by non-Turkish authors has any mention in Banarlı's work. Besides, his analysis of the literary production in diverse geographical areas, as seen in the headings of the sections above, highlight the elements related to a specific national outlook, mostly materialising through race and language. These themes are merely organisational tools in Banarlı's account, since the overall configuration is a sequential one that strings literary facts and events together in order to structure

the desired narrative. It must be noted that these two aspects clearly show that his understanding of Turkish literature is ethnically centred to a large extent, for he appeals to the notion of “Turkishness” as a criterion to describe and categorise literary phenomena.²⁰¹ What is presented to the reader as the highlights of Ottoman/Turkish literary history are informative statements about texts and authors that fit in this particular perspective. This aspect of Banarlı's work exhibits features of factual historiography, presented within an atomistic intellectual scheme/figura of analysis. In his account, Banarlı does not only maintain the same level/parameters of historiographical analysis as seen in the rest of the primary cluster, but also enhances the politically-oriented axis that is often come across in foundational text books on Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

5. n. On A. Ferhan Oğuzkan's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Tanzimata Dek* (History of Turkish Literature – Until the Tanzimat Era)

²⁰¹ One objection to this claim could be that there are authors who were not marginalised in this period, although they were not Turkish, like Mehmet Âkif Ersoy (who was Albanian) and Ahmed Haşim (who was half Arab). However, it is a fact that the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a period in which the line between being/defining oneself as Ottoman and being/defining oneself as Turkish was blurry. Nationalism, as a rising movement, was desired to be transformed to fit the particular needs of the Ottoman-Turkish society, as a unifying concept for the Ottoman/Turkish society was mainly religion (the society being defined as “ummah”, the Islamic community). The idea of “millet” (“nation”) in juxtaposition to “ummah” became a Rubic's cube for the intelligentsia of the time: There were a great number of different social, political and religious dynamics at work, and it was not an easy task to align them in perfect harmony. Arguably the most powerful element in the process of conceptualising “millet” was religion as an identity marker and it even overrode ethnicity in this regard (Three basic meanings of “millet” as denoting a religion, religious community, and a nation were used in the Ottoman Empire concurrently until the Tanzimat period and afterwards, according to M. O. H. Ursinus [in “Millet”. Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C. E. Bosworth, E. van Dozel, W. P. Heinrichs. Brill Online, 2014]). In a nutshell, being a part of the Ottoman/Turkish “nation” still predominantly required being a part of the ummah. Both Mehmet Âkif Ersoy and Ahmet Haşim did belong to the Ottoman/Turkish “nation” in this sense.

Ahmet Ferhan Oğuzkan's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi - Tanzimata Kadar* (*History of Turkish Literature – Until the Tanzimat Era*) is a heavily condensed account of literary history, published in 1949. It covers an extremely brief introduction to the period before the thirteenth century, then Oğuzkan proceeds along a chronological sequence. Sampling no more than six authors per century, this ninety-five page long volume is the shortest example in the list of works taken into account in this study. Nevertheless, it demonstrates how the two fundamental dynamics of continuity in literary historiography are at work, despite the scope of the account. In the preface, Oğuzkan makes a remark that confirms this aspect of his work: "While preparing this book, previous accounts of literary history and biographical works have been studied, well-grounded statements [in these accounts and works] are treated with respect, care is shown not to drift away from correct opinions that are commonly acknowledged"²⁰² (3). With this statement, Oğuzkan recognizes the methodical canonicity in Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, whether he does so intentionally or not. The content of the short bibliographies at the end of each chapter in his volume seem to be devised with the same thought in mind, listed as pointers for sources of factual statements regarding literary phenomena. Oğuzkan lists up to twelve sources at a time in order to guide the reader towards a rather in-depth analysis of the topic, author and/or text in question. However, his account complies with the outreach of factual historiography regarding the depth of analysis. For example, while portraying the literary production in the nineteenth century (90-96), Oğuzkan presents the reader with a brief introduction to the era and provides information on several poets of the

²⁰² "Kitabı hazırlarken daha önce yazılan edebiyat tarihleri ve biyografik eserler gözden geçirilmiş, verilen sağlam hükümlere daima saygı gösterilmiş, genelleşen doğru kanaatlardan sebepsiz yere ayrılmamaya çalışılmıştır."

period (İzzet Molla, Enderunlu Vasıf, Emrah, and Es'at Efendi). Such statements are presented one after the other, merely based on being categorised under the same title. Atomistic historiography seen to be at play, Oğuzkan's account does not engage in any methodical diversions when the overarching outlook of previous volumes is considered.

Including a volume published by institutions such as the Language, History and Geography Faculty of Ankara University and another one by the Ministry of Education, the very first source in Oğuzkan's overall bibliography, unsurprisingly, belongs to Köprülü. Banarlı and Levend's works are also listed in the same bibliography. Oğuzkan subscribes to the periodic structure that emerged in the course of the late nineteenth century and then is reinforced by Köprülü: The pre-Islamic period, the period under the Islamic influence, and the period under the influence of Western civilization (6). This demonstrates yet another feature of Oğuzkan's work that appeals to the same configurative approach as preceding works. Overall, the reader observes a factual and atomistic strategy of historiography in a sequential manner, which also conforms to the general trend identified in the primary cluster of works on the subject.

5. o. On Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Başlangıçtan Bugüne Kadar Türk Edebiyatının Tarihi, Tahlili ve Tenkidi* (History of Turkish Literature: History, Analysis and Criticism of Turkish Literature from Its Beginnings to the Present)

Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Başlangıçtan Bugüne Kadar Türk Edebiyatının Tarihi, Tahlili ve Tenkidi*²⁰³ (*History of Turkish Literature: History, Analysis and Criticism of Turkish Literature from Its Beginnings to the Present*), from 1964, is one of the accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history that maintains a similar flair to that of Banarlı's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature)* in terms of form. The arrangement of content in Kocatürk's volume resembles the preceding works, although he opts for a rather mixed approach, combining chronological criteria with geographical ones up until the fourteenth century. After that, Kocatürk maintains the chronological organisation of information until the chapter on "Modern Turkish Literature". In this volume, the reader is faced with a clear conceptual leap from the pre-Republican habitus to the "modern" stage, which is the first time that the description "modern Turkish literature" is used in the context of literary historiography. Particularly when employed as a tool of periodization, the overlap of a political paradigm, i. e. the foundation of the Republic, and the introduction of "modernity" in literary production becomes an important statement as to what the socio-political implications of conveying an image of Turkish literary history of the sort may be. This noteworthy transposition, however, does not seem to reflect on the depth of analysis. The reader is presented with compilations of information in genre-specific sub-chapters such as "Poets of the Present Day" (805-806) and "Novel and Short Story" (807-815), where the content consists of short introductions to texts and authors without explanations as to how the notion of modernity is at play in these specific literary moments. Remaining in the boundaries of factual and

²⁰³ This volume is also published under the title "*Büyük Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (The Grand History of Turkish Literature)*".

atomistic historiography, Kocatürk's account is only tangentially experimental in terms of altering the long-standing conventions for the analytical aspect of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

Kocatürk's evaluation of Ottoman/Turkish literary history reveals a wide range of similarities with Köprülü's identification of varying strands of literary expression in Anatolia. For the period before the thirteenth century, although Kocatürk does not primarily use the acceptance of Islam as a major heading unlike Köprülü, he still does so in a subsequent section to "Turkish Literature in Central Asia". Focusing on this geographical specification, Kocatürk continues with the area between Central Asia and Anatolia and covers the time-span until the thirteenth century. Imagining the literary production in Anatolia in three cultural spheres, i. e. folk, court and tekke literature, Kocatürk develops his narrative along these categories from the thirteenth to the twentieth century. Overall, Kocatürk tends to engage with a sequential configuration in his narrative development by emphasising each of these separate spheres as complementary parts to the same whole, aiming at forming a coherent series of informative chapters on the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

In Kocatürk's lists of authors whose work is attended to in the volume, there seems to be an effort on the part of the historian to distribute the weight equally in each category. The general trend for the period prior to the Tanzimat era is to accept the tradition of court poetry as the dominant aspect of literary production in the Ottoman Empire, despite the fact that Köprülü promulgates the idea of folk and tekke literatures as essential parts of the literary formation in Anatolia. In Kocatürk's case, the Köprülü effect in this respect is clearly visible.

In fact, Kocatürk explicitly regards Köprülü as the pioneer of scholarly research in the field of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography:

Fuad Köprülü is the first to explain that literary history is a branch of history of civilization, that literature is a social phenomenon, and that it must be analysed with the tools of social sciences, as well as to author the first valuable account of this. (...) Köprülü is the greatest and internationally recognized authority in the field of Turkish history and literature.²⁰⁴ (Kocatürk, 825)

Although parts of the statement above are factually incorrect, i. e. Köprülü being the very first scholar to speak of literary history as being a part of social history or history of civilization, it demonstrates the extent to which Kocatürk regards Köprülü as a role-model for his own practice of literary historiography. Kocatürk also claims that what is available in terms of Turkish literature in the pre-Islamic period is entirely owed to Köprülü. At this point in Kocatürk's evaluation of Köprülü, a curious comment appears regarding the debate of nationalism in the context of Turkish literature: Kocatürk thinks that Köprülü was relatively late in joining "the fight for a national literature" (825). He does not expand upon the reason why he believes so; however, this comment marks an aspect of Köprülü's profile that is under-discussed. Given the perception of his work and collaborations with other scholars in the practice of Turkish literary history, the prevalent conception is that the fundamental driving force behind the Turkification of the Islamic values, rendering them more "Turkish" if put colloquially, and blending these into the comprehensive Turkish

²⁰⁴ "Edebiyat tarihinin, medeniyet tarihinin bir kolunu teşkil ettiğini, edebiyatın içtimaî bir mahsul olduğunu ve içtimaiyat ilminin usulleriyle tetkik edilmesi lazım geldiğini ilk önce anlatan ve bu yolda ilk değerli eseri vermiş olan Fuad Köprülü'dür. (...) Köprülü, Türk tarih ve edebiyatı sahasında milletlerarası en büyük otoritedir."

identity. However, the exact opposite of this is also entirely possible from a technical point of view, without nullifying the already-existing interpretation mentioned above. What the reader encounters in his work is the characterization of the period when the Turkish-speaking people arrive in Anatolia, and engage with a religion-orientated process of adaptation and settlement in their new “home”. For this process requires adopting the pre-existing culture through the gateway of religion and spiritual belief, the emerging class of literati has no choice but to internalise this en masse encounter with the intellectual heritage of Arabic and Persian worlds. On the one hand, this process results in an end-product that is ultimately seen as possessed by the “Turkish spirit”, for the agent of this internalisation identifies as one that of the tribe. On the other hand, the underlying mechanisms formed during this process are nurtured by a strongly religious momentum. Thus, Köprülü’s role in building a national identity is a double-sided coin, one not more important than the other in effect and fundamentally geared towards building a perfectly uniform image of Ottoman/Turkish literature by relying on the premise of continuity.

5. p. On Ahmet Kabaklı’s *Türk Edebiyatı* (Turkish Literature)

***Devri Türk Edebiyatı* (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era)**

Ahmet Kabaklı (1924-2001) began to publish *Türk Edebiyatı I-II-III* (*Turkish Literature I-II-III*) from 1965, and completed the series in 1968. Kabaklı graduated from the department of Turkish Literature at the University of İstanbul in 1948 and published on various subjects. However, his magnum opus is his account of Turkish literary history, initially a total of three volumes that were

later expanded into five. Acknowledging Köprülü as one of the founding fathers in Turkish literary historiography, Kabaklı also refers to other historians like İsmail Habib Sevük, Agâh Sırrı Levend, Mustafa Nihat Özön, Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk, Nihad Sâmi Banarlı and several others. Nevertheless, Kabaklı does not seem willing to follow up on any particular author in this group, and rather treats Köprülü's work as his leading source. On the one hand, he maintains the habit of promoting the idea that Turkishness is one of the primary qualities literary production must echo, which could be traced back in Köprülü's constructs of literary historiography, and in Banarlı's work as well. On the other hand, Kabaklı's recurring theme in formulating his explananda and explanantia regarding literary history is the significance of religion. "Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı" ("Turkish Literature Foundation"), founded by Kabaklı in 1978, serves as an important platform through which Islamic culture is shown to be an indispensable part of the very nature of Turkish literature. The foundation publishes a monthly journal, *Türk Edebiyatı Dergisi* (*Journal of Turkish Literature*), and a biannual journal, *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Araştırmaları* (*Modern Turkish Literature Researches*, as translated by the foundation), as well as books on a variety of subjects concerning Turkish literature and intellectual history in general. Given the list of the foundation's publications²⁰⁵, Kabaklı's work seems to be the main source that the foundation appeals to regarding Turkish literary history. At least one quarter of the corpus of books published by the foundation (around 40 out of a total of 165) consists of works relating to Islam and Islamic culture, and Turkish nationalism.²⁰⁶ This

²⁰⁵ The list can be accessed online via <http://www.turkedebiyati.com.tr/Sayfala.asp?nereye=tumkitaplar&sayfa=1>.

²⁰⁶ i.e. Kabaklı's *İslamla Kaynaşmış Türk Edebiyatı* (Turkish Literature Intertwined with Islam, 2006) and *Müslüman Türkiye* (Muslim Turkey, 2002), Garaudy's *Geleceğimizde İslam Var* (Islam is in Our Future, 2014), Muhâsibi's *Allah'a Dönüş* (Return to Allah, 2013), İbnü'l-Cevzi's *Allah Aşkı* (Love of Allah, 2012), Osman Yüksel Serdengeçti's *Akdeniz Hilalindir*

corpus is quite interesting, given that any cultural agenda subscribed by a literary foundation, society etc. is likely to unfold through their publications. In this sense, the collection of *Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı*'s published material seems to promote a national-religious stance to a large extent. Kabaklı, known as “the sheikh of the authors”²⁰⁷ to the members of the foundation, which he initiated and directed, is arguably one of the most influential advocates of such an agenda in the Turkish intellectual scene.

In his account of literary history, Kabaklı pursues a similar line of interpretation when it comes to conveying an image of the Ottoman/Turkish literary past. Kabaklı's periodization and the organisational skeleton of his account appears to bear a significant resemblance to Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's work on literary history in general terms. However, Kabaklı's account does not manifest the same degree of diligence when it comes to the juxtaposition of social history and literary history. There is a strong appeal in Kabaklı's work to factual and atomistic historiography, manifested in long lists of texts and authors without structured attempts for further analysis. For example, Kabaklı's chapter titled “National Literature” of the third volume of his work comprises four hundred and twenty-five pages on the subject. Kabaklı spends only twenty-five pages on a very short introduction to the historical and the conceptual background to the literary production era. The rest of the chapter, namely the remaining four hundred pages, consists of two main sub-chapters,

(Mediterranean Belongs to the Crescent, 1995), Dominique Abdullah Penot's *Peygamberimizin Çevresindeki Hanımlar* (Ladies around Our Prophet Muhammad, 2012), Cemal Aydın's *Taşa Kazınan İhanet: Ermeni İhanetinin Paris'teki Belgesi* (Treasure Inscribed on Stone: A Document of the Armenian Treason in Paris, 2012).

²⁰⁷ In 1996, “Aydınlar Ocağı” (“Hearth of the Enlightened”), a right-wing national-religious think tank, brought together 55 foundations, associations and organisations that awarded Kabaklı the title of “şeyhülmuharriîn” (see Kabaklı's biography by Erol Ülgen at <http://www.turkedebiyati.com.tr/Sayfala.asp?nereye=ahmetkabakli>, accessed on 08/03/2014).

one titled “Poets” and the other titled “Authors”, which are segmented into compilations of biographical information and excerpts without an interpretive take on the nature of the literary production at the time.

Kabaklı’s commitment to factual historiography reveals another characteristic, which enhances the nationalistic undertone in the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. In his account, the reader comes across specific cases of Kabaklı highlighting social, political and cultural phenomena in ways that serve the glorification of the national identity. In particular, Kabaklı’s evaluation of political history becomes an end in itself in some cases, as he tries to develop an understanding of the national values and how crucial it is for Ottoman/Turkish intellectuals to embrace these come what may. An example of this stance is observed when Kabaklı speaks of Ziya Gökalp as a “national intellectual”. Kabaklı’s general remarks on Gökalp’s mission in conceptualising Turkish nationalism is ensued by several anecdotes Kabaklı relates about Gökalp in the sub-chapter relating to Gökalp’s life and personal traits. These anecdotes reveal simultaneously Gökalp’s humble ways *and* his radical stance regarding Turkish nationalism, an intriguing juxtaposition. Quoting from Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu on how “optimistic” Gökalp was, describing the foundations of Gökalp’s philosophy as “hope and love” (vol. III, 48), Kabaklı narrates the following anecdote about the Armenian genocide of 1915, as an example of Gökalp’s bravery, which is portrayed as a positive trait of his:

The same author (Hakkı Süha Gezgin) narrates the brave answers he (Gökalp) gave to the jury while he was being judged by the War Court with an appeal to execution:

“The Chief [Nazım Paşa] asks:

- It is claimed that you have given the fatwa that makes the Armenian

massacre permissible. What do you have to say about that?

This question made him explode into bits:

- Do not slander our nation. There is no Armenian massacre in Turkey, but a Turkish-Armenian fight.²⁰⁸ They stabbed us in the back, so did we... he said.

They were not expecting an answer of this kind. Nazım Paşa was taken by this as a surprise. His eyebrows were raised, and his eyes were wide open. (Kabaklı, vol. III, 47)

Making Gökâlp into a “hero” before the War Court of the time for these words attributed to him, whether there is any historical accuracy to them or not, is an interesting form of narrating literary history, given that the anecdote above bears a value judgement in the context of a particular political stance regarding the Armenian genocide. Instrumentalizing Gökâlp's image as a “national intellectual” in support of a denialist project, Kabaklı not only presents Gökâlp in a specific way without referring to actual historical evidence, but also promotes a certain political stance that unfolds through his practice of literary historiography.

In contrast to the idealisation of Gökâlp like in the example given above, Kabaklı's stance drastically changes when it comes to the ways in which Gökâlp's stance departs from Islamic thought. Targeting Gökâlp, Kabaklı does not favour his notion of “social duty” [“vazife”] and presents an objection to Gökâlp's account which legitimises the attribution of absolute power to certain intellectual figures who are to lead the “nation” in the “right” way, and the necessity of top-down hierarchy concerning social duties (vol. III, 55). Kabaklı's objection relies on the idea that absolute power could solely be attributed to

²⁰⁸ The term Gökâlp is reported to have used is “mukâtele”, which means “mutual killing”.

God, hence human beings should rather follow their will to power, albeit limited, and hence should not submit to any other will that is claimed to be greater than theirs, except God's will. This particular concern derives from Kabaklı's belief in Gökalp's lack of reconciliation with Islamic norms.²⁰⁹ This belief reverberates several times in Kabaklı's work: He thinks that Gökalp does not treat the Seljuk and Ottoman heritage right in his works relating to the origins of Turkish history (56). Gökalp's quest for the "golden age" of Turkish history in the pre-Islamic period is not justified according to Kabaklı, as the aftermath of 1071 (Turkish settlement in Anatolia following the Battle of Manzikert) is the most substantial element to Turkish national history (56). Kabaklı claims that Gökalp's reluctance in referring to anything that is "Ottoman" points to a political rather than scientific purpose, and it comes from the CUP's anti-Ottoman discourse (56).

Kabaklı is also critical of Gökalp's approach to classical Ottoman poetry and classical Turkish music. Gökalp, as one of the prominent figures of Turkish nationalism, takes religion to be complementary to the national culture. However, it is not over and above the consciousness of "Turkishness" and the elements that collectivise this consciousness. Kabaklı expresses discontent with such aspects of Gökalp's thinking and inevitably acts according to his urge to argue these away, since they do not fit in with his interpretive axis, which reflects upon Ottoman/Turkish literature as a by-product of a both religious and nationalistic cultural heritage. The way that Kabaklı interprets various aspects of Gökalp's thought demonstrates his strategy of maintaining the same narrational mode throughout his work: He fully relies on his own presuppositions stated as

²⁰⁹ In the very same passage, Kabaklı tries to make a case for his rejection of "social duty" as a legitimate concept for proper governance by claiming that it clashes with the "democratic society that we [Turkish nation] miss". However, his appeal to democracy does not rule out his emphasis on Islamic norms, as democracy and Islam are not mutually exclusive concepts.

facts of the Ottoman/Turkish literary realm and adjusting his narrative within the framework of the nationalistic outlook. Thus, Kabaklı's engagement with the principle of continuity in his terms of historiographical practice appears to be a politically loaded one, which surrounds his account both in the theoretical and the practical sense while attempting to make sense of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

5. q. On Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Ekrem Yirmibeşin's *Türk Edebiyatı - Batı Örnekleriyle Birlikte (Turkish Literature with Western Excerpts)*

Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Ekrem Yirmibeşin's publish *Türk Edebiyatı - Batı Örnekleriyle Birlikte (Turkish Literature with Western Excerpts)* in 1967, and this work is listed by the Ministry of Education as one of the major sources for Turkish literature classes at high schools, as the publication reference informs. Consisting of three volumes, Çağlar and Yirmibeşin's account of literary history presents an overview of Ottoman and Turkish literature accompanied by excerpts from French, English, German, Italian and various other literatures. A systematic sampling of other literary texts in juxtaposition to the instances of Ottoman/Turkish literary production is seen in this work for the first time, while other examples of this are to follow particularly in the 1990s. The three volumes are not designed as chronological follow-ups for one another. The first volume provides information about basic literary concepts as well as a periodically-organised overview of literary history, followed by a separate chapter on

“Western Literature”. The second and third volumes are organised differently, focusing on genre as the norm dictating the arrangement and presentation of information. The logic behind the planning of these three volumes in conjunction with each other seems to be tailored for educational purposes, it is devised so that it can be used as a guiding source for all three grades of high school. Genre-based arrangement appears to be a convenient way to create placeholders for the preferred content in different volumes without introducing further organisational criteria or changing the already familiar structure of the work. In the section titled “Literary History - Periodization of Turkish Literary History” of the first chapter, Çağlar and Yirmibeşin’s explain their take on how literary historiography ought to be practised. They say that historians of literature ought to invest their interest in literary production that is proven by time and by the aesthetic judgement of the society they are shaped within (11). Çağlar and Yirmibeşin call such works as “classics”, introducing the idea of canonicity at the outset of the first volume. These classics are considered as exemplary modes of literary thinking, and younger generations ought to become familiar with these. Highlighting the educational aspect of literary history, Çağlar and Yirmibeşin believe that it ought to move away from subjectivity, and instead reflect upon how literary production shapes up and how it affects the society. According to them, such tasks were not carried out until sixty or seventy years ago, let alone regarding *tezkires* as contributions to literary historiography with the then-present sense of the word.

For Çağlar and Yirmibeşin, the general periodization of Ottoman/Turkish literary history follows the sequential framework as many other volumes mentioned in this study, first described by Ali Cânib Yöntem in 1910, and then

developed further by Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü: (I) Turkish literature before Islam, (II) Turkish literature under the influence of the Eastern civilization, (III) Turkish literature under the influence of the Western literature. The subsections of these main categories are also along the lines of the mainstream criteria of periodization; however, “tekke” literature is not included in the second category, which is simplified down to “halk” (“folk”) and “divan” (“court”) literature. Another aspect of this framework to be noted is how the third chapter is organised. After the conventional headings of “Tanzimat” and “Servet-i Fünûn” literature, the third and the final heading is “Twentieth Century Literature”. In the main category itself, the reader observes no separation of this sort, the entire sequence is described and thereafter referred to as “New Turkish Literature”. In the introduction to the third chapter, the beginnings of the “National literature” as a movement is associated with the start of the twentieth century, and the preceding periods are blended into this final era by curating a selection of literary texts that fit in with the thematic end point of the era. For example, when it comes to poetry in this period, the excerpts from following pieces are presented: Nâmk Kemal’s “Vatan Mersiyesi” (“The Saga for The Homeland”), Mehmet Emin Yurdakul’s “Ankara Destanı” (“The Epic of Ankara”), and Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel’s “Han Duvarları” (“Walls of the Inn”). The common flair to all of these examples is the emphasis on the sentimental value of one’s country and deification of the idea of a sacred homeland. Although it is not the entire selection featured in the chapter, these form nearly forty percent of it, which is a considerable amount of literary sampling for the theme to be strongly prevalent in the overall scheme of the chapter. Similarly overarching themes dominate the other two volumes as well. In the second volume, Nâmk Kemal’s

“Vatan Türküsü” (“Song for the Homeland”), Tevfik Fikret’s “Asker Geçerken” (“As a Soldier Parades”) and Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca’s “Metris Tepe’nin Düşmanlarca Alınışı” (“Enemies Seizing the Metris Mountain”) are some of the examples chosen from the vast corpus of poetry available at the time. These excerpts, presented as the highlights of the Ottoman/Turkish literary reality, bring out an informatively uniform structure in which curated facts and events dominate the entire course of the chosen period. This shows that the authors opt for factual historiography instead of other analytical modes in order to shape the narrative in line with the aspects of Ottoman/Turkish literary history that they desire to highlight, rather than favouring a wider spectrum of historiographical tools to employ in analysis. Provided as informative selections of texts and authors, Çağlar and Yirmibeşin’s account does not involve interconnected interpretive axes between these selections, resulting in an atomistic intellectual scheme/figura of analysis.

Çağlar and Yirmibeşin also sample poetry from other literary traditions, trying to match the themes with a desire to render Ottoman/Turkish poetry a part of the world’s literary heritage. However, this effort appears unseemly at times, such as when Kemalettin Kamu’s “Bingöl Çobanları” (“Shepherds of Bingöl²¹⁰”) (vol. II, 59) is followed by Virgil’s pastoral poetry, titled as “Songs of Shepherds” (vol. II, 61), for the implied relevance is not contextualised in any way. These exemplifications from other literary traditions tend to be a matter of matching the genre without further consolidation of a possibly common context for the subject-matter literary production. On the contrary, the excerpts from the Ottoman/Turkish literary production seem to be curated with a predetermined

²¹⁰ A city in Eastern Anatolia.

logic, which follow the structure outlined in the first of the three volumes. The authors selected and mentioned in the first volume repeat to a great extent in the other two, reiterating the idea of canonicity put forward by the historians at the outset. The transitions between various periods are not put distinctly, helping the entire sequence seem more of an uninterrupted chain of literary events that approximately span over twelve centuries.

5. r. On Rauf Mutluay's *100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı* (Turkish Literature in 100 Questions)

Rauf Mutluay, a literary critic with a history in education, is one of the few in the field who engage with historiographical practice although he does not hold a postgraduate degree. Being a graduate of the Department of Turkish Language and Literature at the İstanbul University, Mutluay's interest in Ottoman/Turkish literary history is not surprising, given the reputation of this institution, particularly under Köprülü's lead, in facilitating the debate of how Ottoman/Turkish literary history ought to be written. Mutluay has a long teaching history in high schools all over the country, in Antalya, Kastamonu, Edirne, and İstanbul, during which he produced numerous articles, book reviews and several short stories. Working closely with Fethi Naci (1927-2008), an infamous literary critic and a crucial publisher of literary criticism in the twentieth century, Mutluay's pieces appear in a wide range of literary publications, while he also takes part in compiling anthologies, compendium-style readers and encyclopaedia almost exclusively on literary matters. Two of his books, which

dwell on the topic of literary history are *100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in 100 Questions*) and *Son 50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı* (*The Past Fifty Years of Turkish Literature*).

100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı is a diverse form of literary historiography in the corpus of this study. Although it is not presented as an account of literary history per se, it is one in disguise, for the internal arrangement of the questions and the nature of the answers provided exhibit a similar framework to those that are defined as accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. Starting with a series of questions on the definitions of language, literature and various components of literary production, Mutluay follows a chronological order to his chapters: “Pre-Islamic Turkish Literature”, “Turkish Literature under the Islamic Influence”, “Court and Folk Literature from the XIV. Century to the Tanzimat Era”, “Characteristics of Court Literature”, “Turkish Literature Towards the West: Tanzimat Literature”, “Servet-i Fünûn Society”, “National Literature Movement”, “The Republican Period”, “The New Literature”. Within each chapter, Mutluay lays out the definitions and descriptions of the particular literary style and/or period, then he moves onto the historical development of the phenomenon in focus. In terms of periodization and categorizations, Mutluay subscribes to the frameworks established in the course of the past decades, i. e. the duality between court and folk literature, the idea that the interest in the West comes into play with the start of the Tanzimat era, the Republican period perceived in isolation from the preceding era. In terms of its appeal to sequential historiography, both in terms of form and content, Mutluay’s work maintains the conventional structure promoted by the earlier works in the primary cluster, despite manifesting a unique style.

The majority of the questions Mutluay curates involve an element of transformation, or they remain entirely factual. At times, Mutluay focuses on specific figures that he thinks are extraordinarily influential in various eras, such as Nâbî and Nefî for their impact on the character of the court poetry in the seventeenth century or Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) in terms of his role in the making of Turkish nationalism; however, he generally drifts away from analysing individual cases and scrutinises the modes of literary transformations, which is reminiscent of factual historiography in practice. Each pair of a question and an answer is presented as an individual bundle of information, which renders the intellectual scheme/figura of his work an example of atomistic historiography.

Although Mutluay employs a fundamentally different style in order to convey a practical account of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, the form and the content of his work remains unchanged in terms of the basic frames of references and historiographical tools, which collectively allude to the common features of the primary cluster.

5. s. On Seyit Kemal Karaalioğlu *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature)

Seyit Kemal Karaalioğlu's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature) is one of the largest works in the corpus, with five volumes of eight hundred pages on average, published in 1973. Karaalioğlu's work is more comprehensive than most of its counterparts published in the same period, especially in terms of its three-volume wide coverage of the literary production

in the twentieth century. From the start to the end, the reader finds that Karaalioğlu's practice of literary historiography manifests many of the conventional features of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography; however, at the same time, it is possible to discover aspects that are unusual. Karaalioğlu's very first sentence of his literary history is possibly one of the most striking, where he likens the image of Turkish literature to the one of the Turkish state by adapting the third article of the constitution²¹¹ to his case: "Turkish literature is a unity, it cannot be divided"²¹² (vol. I, 7). Apart from pointing at the basic principle according to which the overall narrative progresses, the statement above reveals the historian's political tendency in the context of his historiographical practice. Then, Karaalioğlu expands upon this analogy:

We have to understand and analyse our literature from its beginnings to the present day as a whole. This is what we have done. We examined the literary sources of the meaningful connection between Bilgä Qağan and Atatürk. Because, we know that the spread out wings of our literature, just like an eagle, reaches both the sky over Orkhun and the citadel of Ankara.²¹³ (7)

Placing a glorifying image of Turkish literature as the guard of the "homeland of the nation" in the first paragraph of the preface, Karaalioğlu implies that literature is first and foremost of a national character. Referring to Central Asia and then to the capital of the most recent Turkish state, Karaalioğlu

²¹¹ "The State of Turkey, with its territory and nation, is an indivisible entity" (See page 10 of the online version of the English translation of the constitution https://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution_en.pdf).

²¹² "Türk Edebiyatı bir bütündür, parçalanamaz."

²¹³ "Başlangıçtan bugüne gelen edebiyatımızı bütün olarak görmek, incelemek zorundayız. Biz, işte bunu yaptık. Bilge Kağan'la Atatürk arasındaki anlam dolu köprünün edebiyat kaynaklarını araştırdık. Çünkü biliyoruz ki; edebiyat kartalımızın bir kanadı Orhun semalarında ise diğer kanadı Ankara burçlarındadır."

presupposes a literary unity that extends from one to the other, exposing a monolithic nature that is expressive of the “Turkish character”. The assumption of continuity between the Second Turkic Khanate and the Republic of Turkey adds another layer to this characterization, bringing politics into play. Karaalioğlu’s emphasis on continuity, although revealed through informative statements of factual nature, hints both at the organisational logic and methodical nature of his work.

Karaalioğlu uses a number of epigraphs in his work, and in a very simple albeit telling sense, the chosen sources for these epigraphs reveal more than what is said in the epigraphs themselves. The very first one of these is by Tanpınar, where he complains that the Turkish look down on their own authors and artists such as Dede, Yûnus, Bâkî for them not being Wagner, Verlaine, Goethe and Gide, and that the vast heritage of Asia is ignored altogether; while a new synthesis ought to be drawn in order for the nation to give up on pretending to re-enact other nations’ experiences (7). Focusing on the thought of bringing forth the true nature of Turkish literature, Karaalioğlu benefits from Tanpınar’s emphasis on the need of a novel approach in building this identity. Whether Karaalioğlu manages to contribute to this cause is questionable; however, his way of trying to achieve this goal demonstrates how the fundamental mechanisms of linear succession and the historian’s urge to establish relations of continuity between the past and the present is at work. The tendency observed in Karaalioğlu’s work in this respect relates to the format of sequential historiography, employing linear temporality as the backbone of a continuous narrative. For example, the second epigraph that helps Karaalioğlu shape the content of his introductory chapter is by Köprülü,

where he explains that literature is the best mirror image in order to understand a nation's world view, collective intellect and spirit, and it serves as a branch of history that reveals the material and spiritual progress of the nation as a whole (11).

Karaalioğlu resumes his motivation in writing an account of Turkish literary history in light of the epigraph above, then he touches upon Turkish language, mythology, history and finally the periodization of literary history, where Köprülü's influence is yet again visible. First, Karaalioğlu accepts the literary production in the Karakhanid Khanate, Chagatai Khanate, and by the Oghuz, Turkmens, Azeris, Seljuks to be a part of Turkish literature, which then evolves into Ottoman literature, followed by "new Turkish literature" (18). The involvement of these clusters of literary production under the overarching term "Turkish literature" is first attempted by Köprülü in his *Turkish Literary History*, and this approach seems to be taken up numerous times in the works written and published afterwards, although the space devoted to geographical spread of literary production in Turkish until the Ottoman Empire decreases. One possible reason for this is the demand by the Scientific Committee ("Heyet-i İlmiyye") from 1925 that the theoretical information shall be replaced with samples of literature, which is seen to influence the proportion of excerpts included in previous works as well. The more excerpts from the recent periods of literary history are included in the volumes, the harder it becomes for the historian to devote sufficient space in his/her work to expand upon the complementary characteristics of this presumably Turkish-speaking world. This is true of Karaalioğlu's work in a proportional sense, given that he uses one

hundred and nine pages on three of the regions specified above, out of four thousand that constitutes his account of literary history.

In terms of periodization, Karaalioğlu follows the pre-existing scheme of “Pre-Islamic Turkish Literature”, “Turkish Literature in Light of the Islamic Civilization”, and “Turkish Literature in Light of the Western Civilization”. He covers the first two of these three periods in the first volume, and deals with the final period over the course of the other four volumes. Again, when taken into account in terms of proportionality, Karaalioğlu’s work appears to develop an image of Turkish literature of the recent period, using the preceding period as a stepping stone to reach the contemporary era with a sense of a discernible past. The functionality of the first two periods is merely to establish a chronological link that crowns the present state of Turkish literature with the idea of a deeply rooted tradition. Given that each bundle of factual statements regarding a specific literary phenomenon is presented in isolation, Karaalioğlu’s account is almost exclusively of an atomistic intellectual scheme/figura. The categorization of information within the third period reveals a similar nature, for each section individually encapsulates the idea of transformation and continuity in order to facilitate a smooth transition between different literary eras. Even in cases about which Karaalioğlu presents his opinions in an outright manner, there almost always seems to be an underlying thought of linking the subject-matter literary phenomenon to an earlier form. For example, Karaalioğlu describes the changing poetic form in the Tanzimat era as “the collapse of Divan poetry”. This dramatic statement is shortly after accompanied by the opinion that the newly emerging form of poetry is in fact a marriage of “the intimacy of folk poetry, the poetic discipline of Divan poetry, and the everyday

worries of the individual from the Western world”, which is then referred to “as a change in the worldview of Divan poetry”, eventually leading up to the poetic formation in the Republican era (68). Karaalioğlu also employs Dilmen’s often-used categorization of the Tanzimat intellectuals in his evaluation of the era: On the one hand, he discusses Şinâsi, Nâmık Kemal and Ziyâ Paşa; on the other hand, he treats Abdülhak Hamid and Recâizâde Mahmud in the same vein, although he does not include Sâmipaşazâde Sezâî²¹⁴ in this brief introduction, leaving this task to be carried out in the course of the chapter itself. These repeating attempts maintain the sequential outlook of his account with respect to its criteria of periodization and curation of authors.

Both in terms of form and content, Karaalioğlu benefits from the already-existing parameters in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. Although he does not seem to prefer presenting the social, political and cultural background to a literary era in great detail, his account of literary history includes a vast number of excerpts, particularly from the corpus of literary production in the twentieth century. While doing this, Karaalioğlu mentions authors that do not associate with a specific school as well as ones that are not necessarily recognized by the canonical formation beyond the acknowledgement of their names in encyclopaedic sources. This phenomenon is particularly manifested in the fourth and fifth volumes, where Karaalioğlu evaluates the post-Republican period. In this way, Karaalioğlu’s historiography stands out for extending the boundaries of the canonical formations of the twentieth century; however, this expansion is not categorically speaking vertical but lateral. In other words, this inclusive attitude does not challenge the

²¹⁴ As it is presented in Dilmen’s original remark.

conventional frameworks of the practice, although it helps him provide valuable insight for the reader in the context of Turkish literary history.

5. t. On Rauf Mutluay's *50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature of the Past Fifty Years)*

In terms of experimental forms of literary historiography, Rauf Mutluay's work is noteworthy. A historian of literature whose interest mainly lies in the twentieth century, Mutluay authors two accounts of literary history as well as anthologies and memoirs. *50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature of the Past Fifty Years)*, published in 1973, takes the foundation of the Republic as its starting point; however, it also provides two chapters that briefly inform the reader about the literary world before the twentieth century and during its early days. Although these two chapters do not form the backbone of his account of literary history, it is possible to sense the interpretive axis along which Mutluay operates. Exhibiting a strong tendency towards involving subjectivity from the outset, Mutluay's work continuously weaves in and out of the historiographical framework. The aspects that nonetheless render his volume an account of literary history is its comprehensive nature in terms of cross-genre scope and sizeable length, for it covers poetry, short stories, novels, plays, essays, travel-writing, journalism, scholarly works on literature and auto/biographies over seven hundred pages with a thorough index featuring just above eight hundred and twenty authors. Information is conveyed in the form of factual statements in the chapters and related sub-chapters, such as "Turkish Novel of the Past Fifty

Years” (538-648) and “On Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar” (574-581), each involving literary phenomena that only relates to the specific theme and/or era in question and thus promoting an atomistic intellectual scheme/figura.

Mutluay’s description of the literary world as “a field that one of the most successful applications of the Republic[an] values” in the preface immediately draws the reader’s attention to the ideological stance of the historian, and therefore possibly his account of literary history (1). Remarks in a similar vein repeat throughout the first two chapters, particularly when it comes to evaluating Turkish in juxtaposition to Persian and/or Arabic, or comparing the status of the folk versus the elite of the Ottoman court: According to Mutluay, Turkish language fails against the new common ground in Anatolia sustained by both race and religion that is communicated and enhanced via its linguistic medium (5), there is an aesthetic duality between the literary culture of the court and of the folk (10). While opinions of this kind highlight the subjective aspect of Mutluay’s work, he does not engage with a restrictive approach based on political orientation in his coverage of literary production.

It can also be said that Mutluay’s tendency to make opinionated remarks is less prevalent in the examination and exemplification of the literary material, as opposed to the parts dealing with social, political and cultural life in the relevant era. For example, on the one hand, Mutluay exhibits and maintains a nearly objective attitude in the third chapter on poetry, pointing at the poetic themes and tendencies in the defined period (154-384). On the other hand, a subchapter titled “Notes on the Past Fifty Years of Turkish Poetry”²¹⁵ contains Mutluay’s observations and commentary, where he exposes opinions such as

²¹⁵ “50 Yıllık Türk Şiiri Üzerine Notlar”

his disdain for the exclusion of women in the context of Ottoman poetry (385) or “the real love” that begins with the Republican attitude of turning towards the people and their values (389). Although vigorously promoting a clear case of betterment in the course of intellectual history after the foundation of Turkish Republic, Mutluay’s line of demarcation does not repeal the underlying mechanism of theoretical and practical continuity employed in his practice of literary historiography.

Mutluay’s juxtaposition of the folk culture and the court culture, favouring the former rather than the latter, and emphasis on the return to the people with the Republican agenda coming into play in Turkish political history hints at his desire to create a link with the past and the present in terms of constructing a narrative tone for his account. Although this link is constructed in Mutluay’s own terms, the content is not necessarily relevant, for what matters for the purpose of this study is showing that the historiographical practice runs on the dynamics of theoretical and practical continuity, established in the form of sequential historiography with respect to its configuration. Even though Mutluay exhibits a more biased approach towards the literary production in the Ottoman Empire than Köprülü, who regards this corpus too as a fundamental part of “Turkish” literary history, the former describes the latter as the first literary historian who abandons the way of *tezkires* and follow a nationalistic understanding of history and science, quoting from Necatigil (693). For Mutluay, it appears that there are no other accounts of literary history that are worthy of mention prior to Köprülü’s work, although this does not eliminate the intellectual succession of certain paradigms from the early works to Köprülü’s approach, and thus to the succeeding works by other historians. Therefore, Mutluay’s ideological stance

does not isolate him from the overall succession. On the contrary, it enhances the pre-existing construct with yet another strand of literary reality, expressed via the framework of literary historiography.

5. u. On Faruk Kadri Timurtaş's *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Course of History)*

Faruk Kadri Timurtaş's *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Course of History)* from 1981 is another example of "ceci n'est pas une pipe" type accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. In the preface, Timurtaş puts that his volume is "not exactly a literary history" (XIII), and it is meant to be studied at the level of higher education that specialises on topics other than Turkish literature. With this statement, Timurtaş hints at the reasons why he opts for the type of literary historiography he engages with; however, at the same time, he reveals his hope as to how his volume shall be a gateway source that can hold readers by the hand, and eventually, introduce them to the great works of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, such as Köprülü's *History of Turkish Literature*, Banarlı's *Pictured History of Turkish Literature* and other volumes by Levend, Kocatürk, Pekolcay and Kabaklı (XV). Explicitly pointing at the sources that he regards as significant, it is possible to assume that he benefits from these accounts in the making of his own literary historiography. In terms of method, Timurtaş claims that he develops a new and different one, which does not take chronology as the most basic measure of periodization, instead, it treats genres and themes as the major features according to which

information on literary phenomena are to be presented (XIV). Apart from setting the criteria of periodization as a different one than the rest, Timurtaş asserts that his take on method is one that recognizes the inseparable nature of language and literature, therefore he devotes a chapter on the linguistic development and features of Western Turkish, as he classifies it. Timurtaş also notes that the opinions expressed in his work are entirely personal and original. When this statement is taken into account alongside the self-denying premise posited in the preface, i. e. the historian revoking the “literary history” status for his work at the outset, the reader experiences the deliberate expansion of the critical space that the historian creates for himself. This phenomenon is observed multiple times in the course of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, occurring heavily in the post-1980s period. The intellectual relief that is facilitated by this mechanism of denial, and then the utilisation of the historiographical space, legitimises the inclusion of literary criticism within the limits of literary historiography.

The content of Timurtaş’s literary history presents information about the past of Ottoman/Turkish literature in an arguably original manner, considering his claim in the preface. After providing a general introduction to the “pre-Islamic period” and to the literary styles and poetic measures in the “Islamic period”, Timurtaş dwells upon the issue of language. Although Timurtaş asserts that he prioritises a genre-oriented and thematic way of arranging his account of literary history, the chapter he dedicates to genres and themes covers approximately seventeen percent of the entire work. Following this chapter, he begins to elaborate upon the literary production in its own right, in a form that is familiar to the experienced reader of the corpus: There are long lists of authors, about

whom brief biographical information is given, reminiscent of the *tezkire*-writing tradition. Presenting these lists in chronological succession, Timurtaş's practice of literary historiography becomes factual in terms of its depth of analysis to a great extent. In his work, interconnectedness of texts and themes are not brought into play in order to build a structural or axiomatic intellectual scheme/figura for analysis. Compilations of informative statements regarding Ottoman/Turkish literary history are presented to the reader as independent spheres of information, appealing to the norms of atomistic historiography.

Timurtaş's literary history demonstrates the internal conflicts of a scholar, whose area of expertise is philology, with a mission to teach Ottoman/Turkish literary history to non-specialists. Having taught students of economy, public relations, and music school (XIII), Timurtaş's case is one of conversion: Endeavouring to present the theoretical and practical continuity of Ottoman/Turkish literary history from every aspect, but in the most compact way possible. That is why his periodization manifests a multi-layered structure, representing a sequential configuration, designed to cover every possible characteristic that may have shaped the course of literary history as an overall narrative. However, his goal is a difficult one to pursue, for the pre-established norms of continuity seep through the cracks of habitual and conventional nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. Even though Timurtaş starts out with an alternative viewpoint on methodology, his line of thinking rapidly springs back to the basic modes of historiographical practice that promulgate principles of continuity, observed since the early days of the literary historiographical practice in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey.

**5. v. On Ömer Özcan and Mahir Ünlü's *20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı*
(*Twentieth Century Turkish Literature*) (1987)**

Mahir Ünlü and Ömer Özcan's *20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı* (*Twentieth Century Turkish Literature*) comprises four volumes²¹⁶, each covering a certain period starting from the turn of the century.²¹⁷ Ünlü and Özcan's work was first published in 1987, and another edition followed some sixteen years later, in 2003 by the same publisher. The latter is chosen to be examined in this study, for it is an expanded edition with a sizable amount of revisions and added information. Similarly to the other accounts of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, Ünlü and Özcan highlight in the preface that they have not set out with the idea of writing a literary history (vol. I, 9). As observed in works with similar opening statements, the revocation of such a status for a historian's work immediately brings about the chance of exercising a certain degree of critical freedom in the making of the historical narrative. This expectation from the above-mentioned expression of denial proves to be the case, for the historians begin to elaborate upon the principles they follow for their "evaluation" of authors and their literary production, which is effectively literary criticism embedded in the practice of literary historiography.

The structures of the four volumes of this work resemble each other to a great extent: Historians present either the theoretical or the socio-political background to the era in focus, then enumerate the authors and excerpts

²¹⁶ The fourth volume is solely authored by Mahir Ünlü, but I will analyse this volume in connection with the rest of the volumes, for it is published as a part of the same series. However, it ought to be mentioned that the volume includes only twelve authors.

²¹⁷ The first volume takes up the period from 1900-1940, the second and the third cover from 1940 to 1960, and the fourth volume deals with the post 1960s.

associated with this era. The elaboration on the subject-matter background information is mostly very brief and purely introductory, ranging from a single page to twenty-five pages in its longest form. The categorization of sub-chapters is executed according to two parameters: One is the thematic and aesthetic orientation of the authors and their works, and the other is their political stance, which is also reflected in their works. For example, in the first volume, the reader observes that the overall descriptor for the third subchapter is “occidentalism” (67-86), whereas the fourth subchapter dwells upon authors who draw on “Ottoman-Turkish aesthetics and tradition” (87-113). Although the organisational criterion for each chapter is slightly different, how their content is structured remains the same to a great extent: Authors are listed, and their most well-known works are sampled for the reader to develop a general idea regarding their literary stance. For the variations in terms of its organisational style do not impose any degree of analytical diversity on their account, Ünlü and Özcan’s practice of literary historiography exhibit factual and atomistic characteristics in terms of its depth and intellectual scheme/figura of analysis.

Apart from works of literature, Ünlü and Özcan include a chapter in each volume on scholars who deal with literary history, criticism and analysis. Mentioning scholars such as İsmail Habib Sevük, Agâh Sırrı Levend, Mustafa Nihat Özön and İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan in the period from 1900 to 1940, Ünlü and Özcan completely ignore Köprülü in this context. Their entry on Köprülü appears in the chapter “Türkçülük-Ulusçuluk (Milliyetçilik)”²¹⁸ (“Turkism-Nationalism”), which spans over three pages and ends with a quote from a critical piece published in *Yazko* by Hüseyin Ferhad in 1981. The historians’

²¹⁸ The second and third denominations capture the term “nationalism” in Turkish and Arabic. The historians may have opted for mentioning both in order to inform the reader about the variety of terms that can refer to the same literary trend.

choice of this quote is intriguing, since Köprülü's role in Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography is said to be deified, not because of how important his viewpoint is for the discipline, but due to the absolutism attributed to the agenda he sets for the course of the practice (vol. I, 152). Despite the fact that Ünlü and Özcan acknowledge Köprülü's contribution to the field, they exhibit a reserved attitude towards regarding him as one of the literary historians that their work is inspired by. In terms of continuity, Ünlü and Özcan's work comply with the overall graph: Chronological succession is not disturbed as their work's sequential outlook dictates, the intellectual transformations are conveyed in a line of evolution as an uninterrupted narrative. One of the interesting examples of the latter is seen in the third volume, where Ünlü and Özcan elaborate upon social realism in the twentieth century literary production. In the introductory chapter, the historians relate the notion of social realism in the era with the literary trends of realism and naturalism of the nineteenth century, which they then claim is integrated with the Marxist thought (vol. II, 7). The historiographical reflex observed in this ungrounded attempt to build a timeline for the social realism of the post 1940s is but the urge to legitimise the intellectual validity of the literary phenomenon in question without surpassing the limits of allegedly factual, sequential and atomistic historiography. The endeavour to show the theoretical relevance between different periods and literary phenomena, and therefore justifying the practical unity of the overall corpus dominate the underlying motivation of Ünlü and Özcan's work too.

5. w. On Ahmet Oktay's *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: 1923-1950 (Republican Era Literature: 1923-1950)*

Ahmet Oktay (1933-2016), a prolific literary critic and a poet, authors a volume titled *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyatı 1923-1950 (Republican Era Literature 1923-1950)*, which he describes as “a comprehensive reader”, and not as a literary history or an encyclopaedia of authors and texts (V). Although possessing a number of characteristics that align with the dynamics of literary historiography, the critic’s self-assessment of the volume warns the reader that his work is not to be categorised as a literary history per se. Oktay’s interest in literary criticism is an additional factor in why he chooses to refrain from identifying as a historian: This way he can operate in a rather unrestrained interpretive space, prioritising different dynamics in his evaluation of literary production. However, Oktay’s volume does serve the purpose of conveying a narrative regarding the past of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, and thus requires scholarly attention as a legitimate part of the comprehensive corpus.

Oktay provides the reader with a survey of the historical background for a better understanding of the era in the chapter “The Hinterland of Literature”²¹⁹, where the first section is titled “The Great Rupture”.²²⁰ Quoting Atatürk’s statement from an interview published in *Le Petit Parisien*, Oktay highlights the idea that “the new Turkey bears no resemblance to the old one” (5). Dwelling upon this en masse transformation after the foundation of the Republic, Oktay presents the economic, social, cultural and institutional changes occurring in this era. Throughout this evaluation, Oktay’s historical references and examples exclusively are dated in the post-1923 era. This strategy also applies to the allegedly changing nature of scientific research, as Oktay attributes a “positivist

²¹⁹ “Edebiyatın Arka Alanı”

²²⁰ “Büyük Kopuş”

and a posteriori” approach to Kemalist thought as the guiding light for the reforms to follow (48). Putting the extensive intellectual debates of the nineteenth century completely aside, Oktay’s pivotal interpretive point is the so-called rupture that takes place across all aspects of the intellectual outlook of the “new” Turkey. However, his text reveals an interesting internal conflict at this point when it comes to the past and present of cultural history:

At least since the foundation of the Republic until the 1930s, the regime that endeavours to cut its ties with the Ottoman heritage and does so, emphasises the notions of ‘nation’ and ‘nationalism’ merely at the ideological level. During the years it produces ‘The Turkish History Thesis’ and ‘The Sun-Language Theory’, it aims at reaching Central Asia by skipping the Ottoman [era] and ignoring the traces of this civilization. However, it is understood shortly after that it is not possible to build the contemporary culture only by appealing to the legend of Ergenekon. Thus, the cultural resources of not only the Ottoman/Islamic [era], but also that of the folk.²²¹ (48)

This statement manifests Oktay’s awareness of the fundamental dynamics of continuity in the practice of literary historiography, which is shown in the course of this study. As proven by the succession of works in the discipline of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, the narrative construction is ultimately pursued, whether it follows one ideological strand or another. This can be shown by the fact that the alleged gap between 1923 and 1930 is not a well-grounded claim either, for the data compiled demonstrates that the publications of some of the most binding volumes in terms of theoretical and

²²¹ “En azından Cumhuriyet’in ilanından 1930'lara kadar Osmanlı Mirası ile bütün bağlarını koparan, koparmayı isteyen rejim, ideolojik düzeyde sadece ulus ve ulusallık kavramını vurgulamış, ‘Türk Tarih Tezi’ ile ‘Güneş-Dil Teorisi’nin oluşturduğu yıllarda Osmanlı’yı atlayarak, o uygarlığın izlerini görmezden gelerek Orta Asya’ya ulaşmayı amaçlamıştır. Gelgelelim salt Ergenekon Efsaneleri’nden çağdaş bir kültür üretilemeyeceği de kısa zamanda anlaşılmış, gözler bir yandan Osmanlı/İslam bir yandan da halk kültürü kaynaklarına dönmüştür.”

practical continuity takes place within this period, i. e. Köprülü's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* in 1925/6. The transposition of the political reality of a particular period onto the course of literary history does not always work. Even though it can, it points at a matter of contingency, not necessity. In the Ottoman/Turkish context, the underlying mechanisms of literary historiographical practice are by-products of the intellectual self-assessment in the long nineteenth century and are built prior to the attempts to establish a cultural hegemony by the Republican momentum. Therefore, Oktay's emphasis on "the great rupture" does not reflect the reality of Ottoman/Turkish literary history; a reality of which he is also manifestly aware of, as seen in the quote above. In his own account, the conceptual emphasis of the described rupture is not reflected upon the analyses of the literary production in question. Oktay's curation of authors, who are highlighted as the representative voices of this era, only demonstrate a limited aspect of the literary development in the first half of the twentieth century. A total of fifty-three authors and their works are discussed in the entire volume (155-1293), across any genre, which is an extremely limited selection when compared to other accounts that are more inclusive towards the elements of literary production of the time. Following the footsteps of the previous volumes of the cluster as another example of factual and atomistic historiography, Oktay presents biographical information on authors and excerpts from their literary production to the reader in individual sub-chapters, briefly highlighting the themes that are dealt with in their works. Provided in a narrative tone, Oktay's account exhibits a sequential configuration. Despite being selective as to the representative authors and texts of the post-Republican era, Oktay utilises the conventional modes of historiographical practice, which is intriguing. Instead of

comparing and contrasting varying strands of literary production in this period, Oktay opts for dismissing these altogether by promoting a limited curation of literary phenomena. This demonstrates that even the accounts with an underlying premise of the alleged rupture engage with the pre-existing structures in historiographical practice, which is a noteworthy point to consider in the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

5. x. On Hüseyin Tuncer's *Tanzimat Edebiyatı* (*Tanzimat Literature*) (1994), *Meşrutiyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in the Constitutional Era*) (1994), *Servet-i Fünûn Edebiyatı* (*Servet-i Fünûn Literature*) (1995), and *Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in the Republican Era*)

In 1992, Hüseyin Tuncer began to publish a series of volumes on Ottoman/Turkish literary history, which focuses on literary production in the Tanzimat era and its aftermath. With a few years between each volume, the first two of Tuncer's titles are the following: *Tanzimat Edebiyatı* (*Tanzimat Literature*), and *Servet-i Fünûn Edebiyatı* (*Servet-i Fünûn Literature*). Both titles are crowned with another statement, "Arayışlar Devri Türk Edebiyatı" ("Turkish Literature in the Era of a Quest"). For the third and the fourth parts of his project on literary history, titled *Meşrutiyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in the Constitutional Era*) and *Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı* (*Turkish Literature in the Republican Era*), Tuncer no longer uses the expression involving the idea of a "quest", implying that the directionless nature of the literary world comes to

change with the materialisation of the nationalist movement and the foundation of the Republic.²²² In the preface to his work, Tuncer refers to Tural's description of the period from the end of the eighteenth century to the early decades of the twentieth century, which proposes an alternative to the existing paradigms (I). Tural's proposal is to use the term "an era of a quest" instead of imagining qualities such as "new", "modern", "renewed", "Western", "European" and "contemporary" to describe the nature of literary production during the period in question. Despite the alternative standpoint Tuncer employs, the chronological divisions used in his volume follow the same sequential structure as in the preceding works on Ottoman/Turkish literary history. The resemblance between Tuncer's account and the other ones in the primary corpus is not only in terms of configuration: His way of conveying information is exclusively in line with the modes of factual and atomistic historiography. For example, in the third volume of his account, Tuncer provides a six-page long introduction to the social, political, and cultural outlook of the Second Constitutional Era and then begins to list authors and their works in brief sub-chapters without an attempt to contextualise the information he conveys. His chapter on "National Literature" comprises nine authors (Ziya Gökalp, Ömer Seyfettin, Ali Canip Yöntem, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, Refik Halit Karay, Halit Fahri Ozansoy, Enis Behiç Koryürek,

²²² Tuncer's statement can be read as a moment of crystallisation for the alleged rupture to penetrate the analytical space in literary criticism, yet to become the dominant perspective with which the notion of modernity is discussed in the context of Ottoman/Turkish intellectual life for decades to come. The allegations regarding the belatedness of the Ottoman/Turkish modernity, the claims regarding "wrong/extreme Westernization", the suppositions about a possible paradigm shift with respect to the epistemological foundations of the literary world collectively enhance the understanding that the nineteenth century thought was only "en route" to an imagined level of intellectual achievement. The idea of modernity was thought to be out there as an external reality, which the literary historians and critics mostly found to be theoretically and practically "foreign" and interpret that the Ottoman/Turkish intelligentsia either failed to grasp it as is or oversimplified and mistook it as a result of their own intellectual shortcomings. In the meanwhile, the literary potential of "modernity" as a reflexive, self-borne and self-sustaining phenomenon emerging in the nineteenth century Ottoman/Turkish thought was long ignored.

Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel) and excerpts from their literary production in a one-dimensional manner, presented in individual sections. Overlapping with the curation of authors and texts in the previous accounts of the primary cluster, Tuncer's work reproduces the same historiographical outlook in practice despite his emphasis on the "modern leap" at the turn of the century.

CHAPTER 6

Enhancement of the Fundamental Dynamics in Ottoman/Turkish Literary Historiography: Manifestations of Theoretical and Practical Continuity in the Secondary Cluster

When the elements of the corpus are organised according to the five levels/parameters of the framework posited by the metahistoriographical approach, there appears to be a second cluster formed by the remaining sources. Compared to the primary cluster compiled as a result of the analyses above, this one comprises a numerically limited set of works. Nevertheless, the

common features exhibited by the elements in this cluster, just like the features across the former one, point at significant aspects of the works that support the final argument of theoretical and practical continuity in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. The elements exhibit characteristics that are eclectic, which is essentially different to the schematically one-dimensional nature of the works in the primary cluster. At times, more than one sub-category is applicable to a single account. The scholarly drive behind these accounts seem to stem from an endeavour to bring new perspectives into play; however, the outcomes tend to comply with the theoretical and practical patterns of thought presumed by the dominant cluster.

Apart from the level/parameters that are common to the entire corpus, namely the scope and the demonstrative purpose/intention, the elements in the secondary cluster reveal alternative approaches to the practice of literary historiography in terms of depth, format, and intellectual scheme/figura of analyses carried out. Regarding depth of analysis, the works present either descriptive/analytical or descriptive/synthetical characteristics. In some examples, both approaches seem to be at work. Essentially, there appears to be a shift from the practice of factual historiography to descriptive historiography, enriched by attempts to add an analytical and/or synthetical dimension to the analyses of phenomena that literary history is composed of. Instead of positing factual statements about the course of literary history as seen in the former cluster, these accounts manifest an observable degree of deliberate effort put into making sense of its components (texts, events and other literary phenomena) each not only in its own right, but also in relation to the rest. Be it along the lines of descriptive/analytical approach, by which the

internal validity of informative statements regarding literary history are evaluated, or of descriptive/synthetical approach, whereby the relationship between informative statements and external reality are explored, the works provide more than a collection of mere and alleged factual highlights.

With respect to the third level/parameter (i. e. the format), the works deal with topical historiography or detached historiography, the latter being less frequently observed than the former. While the works in the primary cluster promote a sequential format to convey information in a narrational mode, the works in the secondary cluster follow diverse strategies for presenting the course of literary history. Some accounts promote a topical configuration that revolves around a chosen theme, or themes, to explain literary phenomena in the historical context. Some others favour conducting analysis by appealing to the social, political and cultural conditions that literary phenomena both shape and are shaped by. In either setting, the insights provided by the accounts bring novel paradigms into play.

The fourth level/parameter, which identifies the axis of interpretation (i. e. the intellectual scheme/figura) in the works, is exclusively manifested in the form of structural historiography, in contrast to atomistic historiography as seen in the primary cluster. In these works, different aspects of literary history are systematically revealed by reference to structures of conceptions by authors or groups, to connections between ideas/theories and socio-cultural events/data as well as to the interrelationships between various modes of reading across periods. Given that topical and detached historiography are taken up for setting out the format for the accounts of literary history in these works, the idea of structural historiography being employed is not surprising: It is the most

compatible option to conduct in-depth analyses, allowing a wider range of conceptual tools to present historical information.

Considered in relation to what the primary cluster has to offer, the elements of the secondary cluster appear to be of a supporting and complementary nature. While the sources do not reveal the same level/parameters as the works in the primary cluster, the historiographical strategies employed do not exhibit fundamentally different theoretical and practical aspects. While the primary cluster promotes factual historiography in terms of the second level/parameter, the secondary cluster favours descriptive historiography, be it analytical or synthetical. This shows that the practice of literary historiography does not engage with the third option of this level/parameter, “explanatory historiography”, which uses empirical and abstract laws unlike its factual and descriptive counterparts. In other words, the epistemic outlook of the corpus relies on factual and descriptive historiography rather than explanatory historiography, pointing at the lack of a purely scientific framework in the corpus. Similarly, the works in the secondary cluster engages with structural historiography with respect to the fourth level/parameter, which, in turn, rules out the use of “axiomatic historiography”, which explore and interpret presuppositions as well as axioms of theory in the practice of literary historiography, confirming the uniformity of the primary and secondary cluster in terms of their epistemic outlook. When it comes to the third level/parameter, the works in the secondary cluster engage with topical and detached historiography as opposed to the primary cluster conforming to the premise of sequential historiography. Despite seemingly introducing a radical variation in terms of format by using a more thematical approach, the topical or detached nature of

these works do not allude to a fundamental change in content: The underlying narrational tone remains prevalent while conveying historiographical information.

Therefore, the nature of the secondary cluster does not seem to be powerful enough to alter the qualities of the inertia imposed by the dominant cluster: It merely adds momentum to it by enhancing the fundamental dynamics of continuity that is present in the historiographical practice. The analyses below demonstrate the variations in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography that take place in the works of this secondary cluster, as well as how these tend to remain on the same trajectory with respect to the norms determined by the primary cluster.

6. a. On Hasan Ali Yücel's *Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış* (A Comprehensive Look at Turkish Literature)

In 1932, Hasan Ali (Yücel) published *Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış* (A Comprehensive Look at Turkish Literature). Consisting of two volumes, this work manifests a distinct structure in terms of how the information is organised and presented to the reader. While it is observed that the preceding volumes almost always prioritise the act of periodization as the backbone of the informative structure, Hasan Ali follows a different historiographical strategy. First, he refrains from using the acceptance of Islam as a pivotal point in itself in order to characterise major eras in Ottoman/Turkish literary history. Instead, he

explains that literary production is shaped according to the social environment in which it evolves:

Literature, like other products of ways of life, is shaped by the ways in which individuals in a society live. Members of a society endeavour to communicate their emotions and ideas by appealing to the common structures of expression that are in harmony with these norms, which are embedded within that society. Are not the words we use while speaking, writing, and even contemplating by ourselves merely clichés that have been there prior to our birth, persisting through time within that social life?

Therefore, our starting point for understanding the specific phases and the historical progress our literature reveals, and identifying the literary movements in line with the historical reality ought to be the environment it emerges within.²²³ (5)

The quote above is how Hasan Ali's volume commences, directly putting forward a statement regarding the historiographical strategy he subscribes to. In his brief introduction, Hasan Ali outlines the principle according to which his account of literary history is organised. He believes that the nature of the social environment to which Turks belong undergoes major changes after the eighth century, when Turks convert to Islam. However, this collective act of religious conversion by itself is not a milestone that provides a clear-cut division within the context of literary history. This aspect of Hasan Ali's work is fundamentally different to the works of Ottoman/Turkish literary history that comprise the primary cluster. For Hasan Ali, what methodically matters is its impact on the

²²³ Edebiyat, diğer içtimaî müesseseler gibi, hayat tarzlarının mahsulüdür. İnsanlar her türlü duygu ve düşüncelerini onlara uygun kalıplar içinde anlatmağa çalışırlar. Halbuki bu kalıplar cemiyettedir. Konuşurken, yazarken, hattâ kendi kendimize düşünürken kullandığımız kelimeler, biz doğmadan önce, içine girdiğimiz muhitte esâsen yaşamakta olan kişilerden ibaret değil midir?

Şu hâlde, edebiyatımızın en eski zamanlardan bugüne kadar ne gibi safhalar gösterdiğini, tarihte nasıl bir akış takip ettiğini görebilmek ve meydana gelen edebî hareketleri seniyetlere uyar bir şekilde ortaya çıkarmak için yürüme noktamız, içine doğdukları cemiyet hayatı olmalıdır.

varying strands of social formations. Thus, his volume appeals to the outlook of detached historiography in terms of its format rather than a sequential one. His stance prioritises structural analysis of literary phenomena according to social, political, and cultural paradigms instead of only using the conventional milestones assigned to various moments of intellectual history without further elaboration. For example, Hasan Ali introduces the reader to the literary production in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey by elaborating upon the different social environments in which it takes place (5).

While maintaining the dominant framework of reference with respect to the events that define the overall timeline of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, Hasan Ali introduces a more eloquent approach for offering an explanation as to why and how such events lead to specific transformations in the intellectual sphere. Weakening the direct and immediate association of such events with the major points of reference that primarily characterise literary production, Hasan Ali's methodical framework challenges the one-dimensional outlook of the prevalent perspective on periodization. In other words, his approach shifts the interpretive emphasis from an event-oriented viewpoint to one that promotes a comprehensive socio-historical stance, although this stance is inspired by the same milestones as the former one is, i. e. conversion to Islam, introduction of reforms in the Ottoman socio-political sphere with Tanzimat.

Hasan Ali identifies four social environments in this context: (i) "medrese" ("madrasah"), the habitus for religious teaching and learning, (ii) "saray" ("court"), the administrative structure of the Ottoman state, (iii) "tekke", the habitus that highlights the intuitive and the aesthetic aspects of Islamic religious practice, which accommodates the authentic nature of pre-Islamic Turkish belief

systems and traditions, (iv) “köy” (“village”), the habitus that dissociates itself from outside influence, and that is the focal point of social identity (6). The first two of these four environments embed a similar intellectual outlook in Hasan Ali’s opinion, for “medrese” as an institution is formed and maintained under the overarching administrative structure of the court. While elaborating upon the organisational framework of his account and why it is consistent with the historical reality of the Ottoman/Turkish literary past, Hasan Ali explains that there are three fundamental literary strands, which are born out of the above-mentioned environments: Court, *tekke*, and folk literature. This divide is, yet again, a long-standing one; however, Hasan Ali emphasises the socio-historical formations that pave the way for this divide rather than merely ascribing cursory characterizations to depict literary periods. The depth of analysis in Hasan Ali’s work reminds the reader of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü’s diligence in juxtaposing social and literary history; not only in terms of the similarity between their explanatory frameworks, but also regarding the way in which they establish the historical continuity. For Hasan Ali, similarly to Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü, the degree of authenticity observed in the intellectual evolution of these strands is crucial to examine the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literature, therefore its history, since this aspect primarily determines the line of continuity that forms the narrational backbone of the historiographical practice both theoretically and practically. However, Hasan Ali does not oversimplify the co-existence of these literary strands that constitute the Ottoman/Turkish literary corpus: He acknowledges the cross-sectional nature of this corpus by stating that these literary strands influence each other, and thus share certain characteristics (7). For example, *tekke* literature adopts the styles of literary

expression developed within folk literature, although it manifests a considerable degree of thematic overlap with court literature. At times, it is observed that poets representing folk literature employ poetic forms that are associated with court literature as well. These examples from Hasan Ali's analysis of Ottoman/Turkish literary production represent descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical characteristics, since he provides information in terms of definitions and/or descriptions as well as contextualising these statements in relation to the external reality in which they are formed.

When recapping his methodical stance in a nutshell, Hasan Ali emphasises that he narrates the story of every literary institution and movement as "a life story", capturing the entire duration of their existence, from birth to death as well as every stage in between: This anthropomorphic image of personification in the context of literary historiography is one that suggests yet another pointer for the idea of continuity, providing a narrational basis (8). In light of this metaphor, Hasan Ali describes his work as "the biography of literary history in itself", not a collection of authors' biographies and bibliographies. This aspect of Hasan Ali's viewpoint also exhibits a holistic approach, enhancing the dynamic of continuity that is central to his analytical stance. Employing this as his primary historiographical strategy, Hasan Ali aims at portraying the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary history by virtue of relevant social, political and intellectual transformations in the Ottoman Empire. While doing this, he focuses on the influence of these transformations on the subject-matter literary strands beyond simply utilising them for the sake of periodization or characterization of a particular era. This feature of his work strongly relates to the application of socio-historical analysis within the framework of literary history; however, the

practical expressions of his stance differ from the ones in similarly structured works. For example, he does not present social and political events almost in isolation from the literary past: The reader does not encounter a single title in the volume that describes a particular literary era in terms of its political or religious connotations, the chapters are oriented towards a rather objective outlook. Historical events do not directly define and describe literary history as far as Hasan Ali's practice is concerned, they merely pave the way for the changes the society undergoes. These changes, in turn, determine the nature of literary expression. In this sense, Hasan Ali's elaboration potentially indicates an analytically versatile scope, despite relying on the same dynamics dominating the Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in terms of continuity.

6. b. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Nineteenth Century Turkish Literature*)

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Nineteenth Century Turkish Literature*) is considered one of the most influential (Enginün in Tanpınar, 5) and outstanding (Uçman in Tanpınar, 9) works on this period. It was published in 1949 in its revised entirety²²⁴, ten years after Tanpınar's assignment to the post vacated by Köprülü due to the commencement of his political journey (Kerman in Tanpınar, 640). Focusing on the nineteenth century, Tanpınar pinpoints the intellectual course of the period

²²⁴ The first version of Tanpınar's project comes out in 1942; however, the additions, omissions and editions Tanpınar executes for the second edition have a drastic impact on the account. Therefore, the analysis here primarily takes second edition under scrutiny, for I do not have a particular interest in providing a comparative perspective between varying editions of a specific volume in this study, unless the alterations have a direct implication regarding the methodical stance of the historian.

by offering close readings of specific authors and texts. Prior to Tanpınar, other historians such as Dilmen and Gönensay author volumes that take up the task of examining the literary developments in the same era; however, Tanpınar's in-depth elaboration and critical approach sets it apart from the rest. In the preface, Tanpınar lays out the purpose of literary historiography in a conventional manner:

Described in the briefest way possible, what is expected of a literary history is the task of listing literary events as these occur within the course of history, identifying their internal relationships and the external influence on these, discerning the major aesthetic and intellectual currents, and in a nutshell, pinning down the literary outlook of an era by diligently examining every possible text.²²⁵ (17)

Despite the rather customary approach observed in the quote above, Tanpınar adds that the framework of his account takes the issue further than the limits of the tasks proposed. According to him, the interconnectedness of literary phenomena is of paramount importance for identifying the essential characteristics of literary history. This viewpoint allows his approach to depart from the conventional appeal to factual historiography and brings a new dimension of analytical depth to his stance on the practice of literary historiography. He emphasises that, particularly in the second edition, historical events and social transformations occupy a lot more space than seemingly necessary; however, he also believes that it is the only possible way to properly portray the emergence of a new intellectual era. Tanpınar considers his

²²⁵ "Edebiyat vakıalarını zaman çerçevesi içinde olduğu gibi sıralamak, birbirleriyle olan münasebetlerini ve dışarıdan gelen tesirleri tayin etmek, büyük zevk ve fikir cereyanlarını ayırmak, hülâsa her türlü vesikanın hakkını vererek bir devrin edebî çehresini tespiti çalışmak, edebiyat tarihinden beklenen şeylerin en kısa ifadesidir."

methodical stance to be sporadic, and he mentions five literary theorists whose work is influential for the subject-matter volume. While Ferdinand Brunetiere (1849-1906), Julius Petersen (1878-1941), Eduard Wechssler (1869-1949), Albert Thibaudet (1874-1936) and Hippolyte Taine (1828-1893) are presented as the major sources of inspiration for Tanpınar's strategy in literary historiography, no other historian is quoted from the corpus of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography at this point in the text. The only source he explicitly benefits from Mustafa Nihat Özön's *Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature in the Last Century*) and refers to this volume at times (Okay in Tanpınar, 650).

In the preface to the second edition, Tanpınar briefly elaborates upon his viewpoint on the issue of method. He puts that his intention in writing this volume "is not proving the validity of a particular method or theory" (18). This statement sketches out an interesting way of scrutinising the idea of method, for it seems to present the methodological process in reversal. In its logical course, methods and theories are used as frameworks for explaining a particular phenomenon rather than utilising that phenomenon to justify their internal validity. Tanpınar is sceptical when it comes to employing other frameworks imposed onto literary phenomena, and he is in favour of using historiographical tools exclusively for the initial assessment of social conditions, chronology and textual originality. In other words, Tanpınar favours a methodological approach that first and foremost aids the elucidative nature of his account. He thinks that methods and theoretical approaches in literary history can merely act as an entry point into the depths of historical research, and the historical spirit then manifests itself naturally. For Tanpınar, a strict methodical stance or a strong

dedication to a theoretical approach may induce overinterpretation (18), and this may in turn overshadow the true nature of literary history.

Tanpınar also believes that the act of criticism is closely connected to the idea of history (50), and this thought of his determines the way he engages with the practice of literary historiography. At the same time, the act of criticism is a timeless form of “artistry” for Tanpınar (Özcan, 38). When these two thoughts are considered in juxtaposition, historiography and aesthetic criticism become inseparably intertwined in Tanpınar’s view, which in turn determines his approach to method. According to Dizdaroğlu, Tanpınar seems to avoid making a definitive choice between an aesthetics-oriented and a systemically historical approach in the prefaces of both editions (in Tanpınar, 631). This internal tension allows Tanpınar to simultaneously employ both a rather subjective viewpoint and maintain an overall narrative of intellectual evolution in the context of the nineteenth century. Kerman asserts that Tanpınar means to reconcile Köprülü and Tarlan’s methods (in Tanpınar, 641), Köprülü’s one possibly designating the objective and Tarlan’s one²²⁶ alluding to the subjective modes of literary historiography and criticism, although she does not offer any further explanation regarding how this reconciliatory process exactly takes place. Kaplan’s evaluation of where Tanpınar stands in juxtaposition to the

²²⁶ In her article, Kerman assumes that the reader is familiar with Ali Nihad Tarlan’s (1898-1978) approach towards literary historiography; however, it is useful to note its general characteristics here for the reader’s convenience. Ali Nihad Tarlan (1898-1978) is a literary critic of the twentieth century, specialising on Ottoman literature. In his article “Edebiyat Tarihi Hakkında” (“On Literary History”), published in 1965 for the first time, he outlines the ways in which literary historiography ought to be executed. This article summarises the nature of his practice in the field of literary historiography and criticism since 1930. Although he believes that a certain degree of theoretical diligence is necessary when evaluating literary texts, i.e. when determining the historical and geographical environment or examining the linguistic aspect of a text, Tarlan’s main focus is on imagination and emotions that build the text (32-3). Kerman, in another article, summarises Tarlan’s approach as “treating the literary text as a world of its own” without the external reality attached to it (in “Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar’ın Edebiyat Tarihi Hakkındaki Bazı Görüşleri”, *Doğumunun 100. Yılında Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar* edited by Sema Uğurcan, İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2003). Textual analysis of this sort brings forth the debate of subjectivity in Tarlan’s work, thus his stance appears to be the opposite of Köprülü’s.

direction Köprülü sets reveals a similar viewpoint. For Kaplan, Köprülü's perspective on literary historiography is shaped by his interest in the positivist thought of the nineteenth century, and his distant attitude towards literary criticism in the context of literary historiography is a by-product of this interest (in Tanpınar, 635). Nevertheless, Kaplan states that Tanpınar's pedigree is one that is formed by the norms of the twentieth century, which are essentially different from the ones of the preceding era, and he is also an author with a specific interest in the aesthetic qualities of a literary text. Thus, Tanpınar's take on the practice in terms of its analytical depth exhibits characteristics of descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical historiography. While the former allows him to define and describe literary phenomena from an objective point of view, the latter provides an opportunity for him to bring a critical attitude into play.

Despite this complex nature, Tanpınar's account manifests certain characteristics that appeal to the principle of continuity when it comes to building a uniform image of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. For example, when the succession of authors and texts discussed in his work is considered, Tanpınar's effort in presenting both the literary corpus and the authors hand in hand with the intellectual transformations in a linear manner is easily observed. Commencing his volume with a historical introduction to the phenomenon of Westernization in the Ottoman Empire circa the beginning of the eighteenth century, Tanpınar then starts aligning literary figures with the game-changing intellectual events in the era. Particularly after pinpointing the three authors Tanpınar regards as the pioneers of the "new"; Ahmed Cevdet Paşa (1822-1895), Münif Paşa (1830-1910) and İbrahim Şinâsi Efendi (1826-

1871), he focuses on the social and political milieu in which the intellectual formations of the era take place. While doing this, Tanpınar continuously establishes a relation of chronological continuity, similarly to the other sources in the corpus of this study. For example, he designates Şinâsi and Nâmık Kemal as the pivotal point for most of his account, and situates the other literary figures and problematics in temporal proximity to him: “The Young Ottomans Society after Şinâsi”, “Development of Genres after Şinâsi”, “Ziyâ Paşa Alongside Şinâsi”, “Nâmık Kemal After Şinâsi”, “Ahmed Midhat Efendi Alongside Nâmık Kemal”, “Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem Bey after Nâmık Kemal”, “Abdülhak Hamid After Nâmık Kemal” are the titles of the chapters that form nearly sixty-four percent of his work. Tanpınar’s tendency to envision a line of evolution that eventually forms an overall picture, which is reminiscent of the “artist” in him by Dizdaroğlu (in Tanpınar, 633). He desires to convey an image of the nineteenth century Ottoman/Turkish literature that is both historically informative and aesthetically superior, in terms of expressing not only beauty, but also repulsion. While being extremely gracious regarding his judgements about Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, especially when it comes to his work in historiography (176), Tanpınar cannot hold himself back from using demeaning descriptions for Ahmed Midhat Efendi’s intellectual capacity in a deeply pejorative manner (447). Weaving between the two extremes of subjective judgement, Tanpınar maintains the direction of his account by linking various elements of literary production.

Apart from his focus on particular literary figures, Tanpınar also highlights the dominant themes in novellas, novels, drama, poetry, literary criticism and essays. Appearing in a line of succession familiar from the arrangement seen

above, the sub-sections relating to genres and specific literary texts demonstrate the importance Tanpınar assigns to genre development. Despite relying on more than one paradigm to organise the different aspects of his interpretation of literary production, Tanpınar maintains the same interpretive axis throughout his work. Structural historiography, reconciling this difference in terms of method, fits Tanpınar's purpose in this regard: While he conducts his descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical analysis on the subject with consistency, he can also present the diversity of literary phenomena supporting his interpretive axis in a structured manner.

In the preface of the first version of the volume, Tanpınar argues for prioritising the temporal aspect of literary texts, which he believes ought to be followed with individualised textual analysis (III). To a great extent, Tanpınar follows this principle in the second version of the volume; however, the real challenge comes into the picture when he desires to blend all of these elements together in order to picture "the uniform scene"²²⁷ (III) of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, which he thinks he fails to in the first edition. In the preface of the second edition, these remarks are omitted, which makes the reader believe that his disbelief in achieving this goal vanishes in the course of perfecting his practice of literary historiography. Tanpınar's literary history qualifies as the first example of topical historiography that relies on descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical analysis of literary phenomena in a structural framework. On the one hand, these characteristics set Tanpınar's account of literary history apart from its counterparts, which tend to develop as examples of factual historiography with a sequential and atomistic structure. On the other hand, the

²²⁷ "yekpâre manzara"

prevalent tension in Tanpınar's elaboration is between his imagination and the reality he desires to reach out to. In other words, he assumes the existence of a "uniform image" that appeals to a certain degree of completeness, and relentlessly seeks this image in every possible way. For example, while describing how Bâkî employs a particular metaphor²²⁸ in the most aesthetically pleasing terms, Tanpınar wishes to reflect this image in the historical realm, embodying it in the blood and flesh of time and space in the context of literary analysis:

In this couplet, there is an extremely intangible connection between the first line that reminds one of a war horse alongside with its rider and the second line that instantly transforms this epic image into a flower as the fundamental metaphor here, which likens the latter to a messenger and completely destroys the vivid imagery of the former. In reality, what is left to us with this flower, or hyacinth, horse or man, runs with a breathless and trotting speed into becoming a dead object and -to recall Massignon's well-put opinion regarding Eastern arts- a pattern on a rug.²²⁹ (Tanpınar, 35).

Offering a hint of textual analysis over poetic imagery, and then interpreting the nature of this imagery in connection with the changing artistic perceptions of the era, the synthesis Tanpınar endeavours to achieve in terms

²²⁸ "Soaked in skyfull of sweat again, appeared at the porch

Brought the news, spring is here, said the hyacinth"

"Yine gömgök tere batmış çıkageldi çemene

Nevbahâr erdi deyü verdi haberler sümbül" (Tanpınar, 35)

²²⁹ "Bu beyitte daha ziyâde bir muharebe atını, şüphesiz süvarisiyle beraber hatırlatan ilk mısra ile bu destanî vizyonu, anında bir çiçek yapan ikinci mısra yani asıl mazmunun kendi arasında ancak haberciye (sâî) benzetmeden gelen ve çok zihnî, bütün canlı görüşü yıkan bir ilgi var. Hakikatte bu benzetme ile elimizde kalan çiçek, yahut sümbül, at veya insan, birinci mısranın doludizgin, nefes nefese hızından birdenbire cansız bir maddeye -Massignon'un Müslüman Şark sanatları için o kadar doğru hükümleri olan konferansını burada zikrederim- bir nevi halı desenine düşer" (Tanpınar, 35).

of method pushes the boundaries of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. The ideas of transformation, uniformity and eventually synthesis dominate Tanpınar's account of literary history, both in terms of content and method. Tanpınar's in-depth evaluation of Şinâsi is noteworthy in this sense, within the context of his overall strategy for revealing the transformations of the intellectual scene in the Ottoman Empire during its interaction with the Western world. The remarks Tanpınar chooses to feature are of specific importance on this point. For example, Tanpınar reports that Şinâsi longs for the lost values²³⁰ of Islamic civilization, which -he claims- are akin to those of the Western civilization, i. e. rationality, in the sub-chapter titled "Devlet, Hükûmet, Millet ve Mesûliyet Fikri" ("The Idea of State, Government, Nation and Responsibility") (Tanpınar, 205). Şinâsi's will to discover intellectual counterparts of the "Western civilization" in the one that of the Ottoman Empire seems almost paramount to arriving, or rather, revealing the already-existing synthesis of these two intellectual realms according to his viewpoint. Tanpınar's fascination with Şinâsi as one of the key figures of the era, judging by the pivotal role assigned to the latter in the volume, places the concept of synthesis in the focal point of the former's account.

6. c. Agâh Sırrı Levend's *Ümmet Çağı Türk Edebiyatı* (Turkish Literature at the Age of Ummah)

²³⁰ In Şinâsi's case, when the superstitious aspect takes over like wildfire, the primary qualities of religion change, which is the case for Islam, as Tanpınar paraphrases in the same part of the text. There is no specific reference to when -Şinâsi believes- this occurs in the historical course of Islam. The focus for the exemplification here is Şinâsi's desire to liken one civilization to another in terms of their fundamental nature.

Agâh Sırrı Levend's *Ümmet Çağı Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature at the Age of Ummah)* (1962) is an example of topical historiography, a relatively rare form for its time when compared to similar works produced in the later periods. The internal organisation of this piece also manifests a unique structure: The six chapters of the volume cover an introductory part, aesthetics, science, intellectual life, social life and a part devoted on miscellaneous matters, i. e. language, stylistics, pioneers of literature, poetic metre, "Tekke" and folk literature, as Levend puts it. Although a quite brief source, encompassing one hundred and seven pages, this volume is one of the important examples in the corpus that promote a diverse methodological outlook.

In the preface, Levend asserts that this volume can be regarded as an introduction to Turkish literary history (VIII). This claim has two strong implications as to how Levend evaluates pre-Islamic period, and to what he thinks shapes literary production. If Levend believes that an introductory source for Turkish literary history can span the literary production in the Islamic period, this belief tends to nullify the idea that Turks have been capable of literary production since the eighth century. Seemingly a marginal comment, Levend's remark shows a divergence from the endeavour of identifying the origins of "Turkish" literature from a linguistics-oriented and/or geographically minded approach, hints of which are observed after the transition from the early forms of literary historiography and taking a determinate shape with Köprülü's volume in 1921. The ease at which this comment is made may stem from the political conditions of the era, with the rise of cultural conservatism under the rule of the Democrat Party for the past decade. In the first government programme of the

Democrat Party, the Prime Minister Adnan Menderes presents an issue with the educational policies of the past:

Being scientifically and technically advanced does not ensure the freedom of a country, unless the youth is not equipped with the spiritual and humanistic values that stem from the national character and traditions of a country.²³¹ (in Tangülü, 393).

In the excerpt above, the reader may sense the criticism of the early-Republican agenda of putting scientific and technical progress first as part of the en masse process of secularisation, while disfavoured the religious outlook of the pre-Republican educational system. The phrase “national character” is reclaimed by Menderes, by emphasising “the spiritual and humanistic values” and “tradition” as indispensable parts of such an identity. The highlight on rejuvenating religious education in a formal context that can enable future generations to rebuild their “national character” in light of this moral code becomes apparent in the sixth article of the programme:

A thorough plan addressing the problem of religious teaching and the lack of institutions for educating instructors in this field is to be drafted. The faculties of religious teaching, accommodated within the universities, shall be autonomous.²³² (in Tangülü, 393).

²³¹ “(...) gençliğini Millî karakterine ve ananelerine göre manevi ve insani kıymetlerle teçhiz edemeyen bir memlekette ilmin ve teknik bilginin yayılmış olması, hür ve müstakıl bir millet olarak yaşamanın teminatı sayılamaz.”

²³² “Gerek dinî öğretim sorunu, gerekse de din adamlarını yetiştirecek kurumların kurulması konusunda uzmanlar tarafından esaslı bir program hazırlanacaktır. Üniversiteler bünyesinde yer alacak İlahiyat Fakülteleri özerk olmalıdır.”

The programme of the Democrat Party not only promises to facilitate the liberalisation of religious education at the time, but also offer assurances that can help maintain the new balance of educational affairs by attributing an autonomous status to it. Such a policy change, signalling a rather liberal approach in principle, may bring about a certain degree of freedom regarding the scholarly opinion about the literary heritage with a religious outlook. Thus, the ease at which Levend presents his work on such a corpus as an introductory source for Turkish literature per se is not entirely unjustified.

When it comes to the components of the intellectual environment that shapes literary production, Levend structures his work by overlapping several explanatory dimensions. While evaluating the nature of religious literature is the ultimate purpose of the volume, its intellectual foundations such as aesthetic principles and socio-cultural norms are thematically organised. Then, these foundations are individually elaborated upon in order to help the reader grasp the particular philosophical and literary references that constitute the texts of this era. The segmented configuration of his account enables Levend to engage with structural historiography, since this kind of intellectual scheme/figura of analysis allows him to sustain the same degree of analytical depth throughout the volume without impairing his ability to highlight the specific social, political, and cultural paradigms that he finds fundamental to the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary history.

Even though the originality and analyticity of content is arguable, Levend's attempt to organise and present the literary history of the era in a topic-oriented manner with an endeavour to point at its mirror image in social history is a novel one for its time. However, enhanced by the chronological

succession of the authors cited for textual evidence and the intent to maintain the homogeneity of the literary spirit, the fundamental dynamic of continuity is not altered at the theoretical or at the practical level.

6. d. Kenan Akyüz's *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri: 1860-1923* (*The Framework of Modern Turkish Literature: 1860-1923*)

In 1965, Kenan Akyüz published *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri: 1860-1923* (*The Framework of Modern Turkish Literature: 1860-1923*).

Currently, there are eighteen editions of the volume, with the latest one from 2015, which shows the level of scholarly demand for the work. Akyüz's work commences with an elaborate introduction to the idea of "modernity" in the Ottoman Empire, both in theoretical and practical terms, from the early eighteenth century onwards. Revealing his engagement with the outlook of detached historiography, Akyüz prioritises the evaluation of the social, political and cultural paradigms that embody the characteristics of this era within the context of literary history. Introducing a chronological perspective that dates back to an era prior to the nineteenth century to explain the roots of the then-contemporary literature is a relatively new attempt in the practice of literary historiography, for it provides an enriched socio-historical viewpoint that does not merely highlight specific events to characterise the intellectual evolution over a certain period of time: It enlightens the reader regarding diverse aspects of the transformation the Ottoman Empire undergoes over two centuries, or arguably longer.

Offering a brief survey of militarily, economically, socially, politically and culturally oriented changes, Akyüz brings an extensive sense of continuity into play in the theoretical sense, although focusing on a limited chronological scope of literary production in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. The way Akyüz achieves this is by appealing to first descriptive/analytical historiography, by which he posits interconnected definitions and descriptions that portray the historical background of the era in question instead of putting forward a limited selection of factual statements. Then, he engages with descriptive/synthetical historiography by offering how the tangible conditions of the time relate to the literary production of the era in specific ways. For example, Akyüz's discussion of the political climate during the "Fecr-i Atî" period, which he identifies to take place from 1909 to 1913 (148-163), is an incredibly detailed and succinct segment on the era. In this chapter, he does not only lay out the historical background as a collection of factual statements, but he also elaborates upon the changes in the nature of literary production that stem from the political conditions at the time. His commentary on the relationship between the political and economic difficulties that the Empire was suffering from and the fact that these difficulties had a long-lasting impact on intellectual life (152) is an important example of his approach in this vein.

In Akyüz's volume, the reader finds five chapters except the above-mentioned introduction, covering the following: literary production in the Tanzimat era (1860-1886), in the "Servet-i Fünûn" era (1896-1901), in the "Fecr-i Âtî" era (1909-1913) and in the "National Literature" era (1911-1923). Akyüz also devotes a chapter to evaluating the literary production between 1896 and 1901 that does not develop as a part of the "Servet-i Fünûn" school.

This act of expanding the categorical spread horizontally, in other words, describing the literary production within a particular era in more than one cluster is not seen often in the examples of historiographical practice. The use of structural historiography is largely at play in Akyüz's work, since each segment is presented in relation to the entire scope of the account. In this respect, the reader observes a certain degree of methodological flexibility Akyüz engages with. Nonetheless, Akyüz maintains a linear chronological sequence throughout the volume, presenting the above-listed literary periods in succession. Although he does not particularly list the literary periods prior to the year of 1860, Akyüz hints at the conventional periodization of Ottoman/Turkish literary history in the introductory chapter by saying that "Turkish literature gains a European character after its dissociation from court literature that is shaped within the Islamic civilization" (5). This statement assumes a period prior to the formation of court literature and after, which is in line with the three-fold periodization of Ottoman/Turkish literature seen in previous works.

Apart from stringing the literary periods together in the same way as done in the majority of the corpus, Akyüz's evaluation of the literary production between 1860 and 1923 also reveals a sense of continuity. For example, while dwelling upon the historical background to the "Servet-i Fünûn" era, Akyüz begins his analysis with the narration of political events that date back to 1878, endeavouring to make sense of the underlying historical mechanisms within the context of literary evolution (87). In the same vein, he recaps the social and political changes that occurred before 1909 in order to make sense of the "Fecr-i Âtî" era (148). Most importantly, Akyüz maintains the same methodical angle on the development of national literature by exploring the ideological roots and

the key intellectual figures influencing the course of this movement (164). While this historiographical strategy points at the theoretical aspect of continuity, the idea of practical continuity can be observed in the way in which Akyüz scrutinises the interconnectedness of literary phenomena (i. e. influential journals, publications, debates, etc.) that shape in each era as a whole. With such aspects of his work, Akyüz's stance in terms of literary historiography alludes to the perpetuation of the underlying principle of continuity.

6. e. On Ağâh Sırrı Levend's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature)

Ağâh Sırrı Levend's *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (History of Turkish Literature) (1973) is the first volume of a project he intended to finalise as six volumes in total. Unfortunately, the reader has access only to this very first volume due to Levend's untimely death. He describes the purpose of this volume as "laying out the foundational knowledge that the reader needs prior to reading literary history" (XIII) and covers four chapters that deal with the fundamental problems in Turkish literary history, literary works from the perspective of literary historiography, Arabic and Persian literature, the major sources of Turkish literary history, respectively.

As Levend mentions in the preface of the first volume, the planned volumes were to cover topics such as the overview of Turkish social, political and cultural history in Central Asia and Anatolia, and literary production in Turkish and its dialects from the beginnings to the 1960s. Levend refers to the conventional three-fold periodization in the theoretical elaboration, saying that it

is captures the most important milestones that direct the course of Ottoman/Turkish literary history (25). However, his breakdown of these tentative chapters shows that he intends to suggest a linguistic marker for each period in question, a different paradigm when compared to other accounts of literary history in the corpus. Employing a different paradigm for periodization in practice, Levend's account diverts from the conventional criteria and appeals to topical historiography as a means of configuration, although the chronological and geographical scope by which the limits of the material to be analysed seems to be extremely similar to the ones in examples preceding his work. However, the reader can only predict the extent to which this similarity would have been at work if the rest of Levend's work had been completed.

In the case of the theoretical aspect, Levend provides a brief albeit worthwhile discussion about the basic notions regarding the terminology and methodology, putting forward his particular choice of method in developing his understanding of historiographical practice. In the section titled "Edebiyat Tarihinde Yöntem" ("Method in Literary History"), Levend specifies his historiographical method as a "historical" one, which is based on documentation and favouring objectivity (*Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 14). These aspects of historiographical enquiry are emphasised by Köprülü in his article on method; however, he relates these strategies to a fundamentally positivist viewpoint. In Levend's case, the reader finds the rejection of positivism as a critical strategy amongst others such as "dogmatic" or "impressionist" literary criticism (17). The characteristics of his method point at a comparative, objective and rigorous regarding of the preceding literature on the topic (14-15). He also adds that anachrony ought to be avoided when evaluating the aesthetic value of the

literary texts of the past, prioritising the historical conditions under which these produced. Given the qualities he assigns to his methodological tendencies, Levend's approach slightly varies from Köprülü's or Tanpınar's line of literary historiography, the former having a positivist tendency, and the latter an impressionist stance, for it favours an approach stripped from the theoretical approaches imposed by such viewpoints. Nevertheless, qualities such as objectivity and logical consistency as well as a certain degree of dedication to documentation, Levend's approach reminds the reader of descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical historiography in terms of its depth of analysis.

In his discussion about method, Levend also puts forward a particular difference between history per se and literary history:

A historian and a historian of literature deal with different topics in practice, despite using the same method in principle. Although they both work on "the past", the past, which the historian analyses, is left behind as a part of history itself. The kind of past that the literary historian works on persists through the present. For example, the Tulip Era is over today. However, Nedîm's collection of poetry is still accessible and preserves its value.²³³ (15)

Arguing for a sense of temporality that acknowledges the literary phenomena to persist through time, Levend maintains a similar stance in terms of the epistemological foundations of his account of literary history. He briefly touches upon authorship and textuality in the same section, explaining that the literary historian ought to primarily focus on the characteristics that are shaped

²³³ Edebiyat tarihçisi ile tarihçi, esasta aynı yöntemi kullanmakla birlikte, uygulamada konularına göre birbirlerinden ayrılırlar. Her ikisi de "geçmiş" üzerinde çalıştığı hâlde, tarihçinin konusu olan geçmiş, artık devrini bitirip tarihin malı olmuştur. Edebiyat tarihçisinin ele aldığı geçmiş ise, sanat eserleriyle hâlâ canlı olarak yaşamaktadır. Örneğin bugün Lâle Devri yoktur. Ama o devirde yaşayan Nedîm'in divanı elimizdedir ve hâlâ değerini korumaktadır.

and manifested by these two dimensions. By highlighting these two aspects, Levend promotes a multi-layered approach in demonstrating the interconnected nature of literary production. Structural historiography, then, becomes the most viable option for Levend to adopt as the intellectual scheme/figura of analysis for the scope of his work. In order to do this properly, Levend believes that compiling and organising documentation is the most important task (18). In the section titled “How Can the History of Turkish Literature Be Amassed?”, he explains how this can be done efficiently and systematically. Emphasising that it is crucial for the literary historian to string together the compiled information, Levend’s understanding of the theoretical mechanisms underlying the fundamental dynamics of a literary history manifests a sense of continuity as well.

6. f. On Şükran Kurdakul’s *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı - Meşrutiyet Dönemi* (Contemporary Turkish Literature – The Constitutional Era) and *Cumhuriyet Dönemi* (The Republican Era)

In 1976 and 1987, Şükran Kurdakul published two volumes that constitute his account of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı - Meşrutiyet Dönemi* (Contemporary Turkish Literature – The Constitutional Era) and *Cumhuriyet Dönemi* (The Republican Era), respectively. Covering “the contemporary Turkish literature”, as he chooses to describe the focus of his work, over the Constitutional and following the Republican era, Kurdakul introduces a novel perspective to the corpus of accounts on the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literature, inspired by Marxist thought.

Kurdakul's background is considerably different from most of the historians of Turkish literature. He was arrested for communist propaganda when he was a high school student in İzmir in 1946, and served time for about half a year, and then serving again from 1953 to 1955, he did not attend any institution of higher education. Kurdakul, as a self-taught intellectual, poet and short story writer, published in literary magazines and newspapers, worked as an editor in several of them (*Tan* and *Yeni* newspapers as well as Varlık Publishing), and wrote *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Meşrutiyet Dönemi* (*Contemporary Turkish Literature: Constitutional Era*) in 1976 and *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Cumhuriyet Dönemi* (*Contemporary Turkish Literature: Republican Era*) in 1987. His work evaluates Turkish literary history from a Marxist perspective, which is a rare paradigm to encounter in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. Taking up the task of employing a particular political framework to explain the evolution of literary history, Kurdakul engages with detached historiography regarding the configuration of his analysis. Kurdakul's approach to literary historiography in this sense seems to tackle similar goals as the mainstream historians do, as his reading strategies demonstrate. He puts forward two principles that form the backbone of his practice of literary historiography: (1) discussing literary movements without isolating them from the social conditions in which they are produced, (2) evaluating the “new” that becomes “old”, and “future” that becomes “past” in the context of their chronological standing and stages of their transformation. While aiming at fulfilling these tasks, Kurdakul weaves between descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical approaches in terms of deepening his analysis on the subject. He does not only explain the conceptual mechanisms underlying

the literary production in the era, but also relates the plausible effects of these mechanisms on the historical development itself. For example, when Kurdakul discusses the literary movements and genre development in the Republican period, he devotes a chapter on the literary journals of the time (38-46). Highlighting the political orientations of these journals, Kurdakul endeavours to demonstrate an under-discussed aspect of Ottoman/Turkish literary history. However, despite such an interconnected outlook of analysis at the outset, Kurdakul appeals to atomistic historiography as the dominant intellectual scheme/figura for his analysis, tying his narrative together as a complete portrayal of Ottoman/Turkish literature of the time. Following the introduction to his volumes, Kurdakul lists authors and presents excerpts from their works in complete isolation, which is a frequently observed feature of atomistic historiography. This structure can be identified in both volumes, although the curation of authors and texts are slightly different to the selections in the primary cluster, which renders Kurdakul's work diverse in terms of its corpus. Overall, emphasising the continuously evolving nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary production, Kurdakul's image of literary history benefits from the principle of continuity to a great extent despite the alternative interpretive axis he opts for.

6. g. Emin Özdemir's *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı: Dönemler-Yönelimler* (*Periods and Tendencies in Turkish and World Literature*)

Another example from the 1990s is Emin Özdemir's *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı* (*Turkish and World Literature*), the first edition of which was published in 1994 by the Ministry of Culture. Its later editions feature a slightly altered title,

Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatında Dönemler-Yönelimler (Periods and Tendencies in Turkish and World Literature), since Özdemir reckons that it is more representative of the content than the previous one. In the preface, Özdemir emphasises that his volume “is not a literary history in the technical sense”²³⁴ (5), although he does not expand upon this sense further. He prefers to describe what his objective is: “This work is conducted (...) with the purpose of introducing the major transformations in the intellectual thought and sensibility throughout the course of history without dwelling into utmost detail.”²³⁵ (5). The first chapter covers the fundamental concepts in literature, the following two focus on the progressive history of Turkish and World literature by appealing to the relationship between literature and social life. In the following reading of Özdemir’s work, only the first and the second chapters are in focus, since the reception of World literature in the sphere of Turkish literary history and criticism is outside the scope of this study.

Acknowledging the vast nature of the task he commits to, Özdemir highlights that he curates a selection of events that he believes direct the course of literary history. With the critic’s announcement of his volume not being a literary history per se, the reader recalls Oktay’s case where a similar statement is made. Yet again, the critic desires to design a space in which he can assert a certain degree of evaluative freedom by denying the presumed limits of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. Özdemir’s work, despite lacking a strong axis along which an originality in terms of interpretive power can seep through, can still be considered as an attempt of detached and

²³⁴ “Terimsel anlamıyla bir edebiyat tarihi değildir.”

²³⁵ “Bu yapıt, ‘Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı’nın nirengi noktalarını saptama, tarihin akışı içinde düşünce ve duyarlılıkta oluşan başlıca dönüşümleri ayrıntılara yönelmeden tanıtmaya ereğiyle hazırlanmıştır.”

structural historiography with a tendency towards a descriptive-analytical and descriptive-synthetical approach. Emphasising the importance of the social, political and cultural conditions renders his account an example of detached historiography, while his tendency to use statistics as well as subjective judgement at times paves the way both for descriptive-analytical and descriptive-synthetical historiography to be at play. Creating several interpretive axes such as the discussion on cultural duality and its reflections in literary production (50-62) and the shift from Westernization to the endeavour to build a national identity in the intellectual realm (72-154) that overarch his narrative, Özdemir relies on structural historiography to link together different literary eras. In this way, Özdemir's work is a tangential account of literary history, and it ought to be read from this angle in order for the reader to explore the corpus in a comprehensive manner.

Özdemir's account presents his evaluation of literary production in Turkish from circa seventh century (79) until the then-present day. Given his emphasis on the connection between literature and social history, the sequence of historical events used in Özdemir's organisation of his account become vital in determining where the critical momentum in his perspective lies. For Özdemir, the value of literary production appears to stem from its connection with the folk, as he tends to describe the literary schools and/or periods in his work by referring to their proximity to the social surroundings of the era in question. For example, while describing "Servet-i Fünûn" authors as "the ones who could touch upon social issues"²³⁶ (146) Özdemir's preferred description for the authors of the early Republic is "the ones who give back [to the people]

²³⁶ "Toplumsal Sorunlara El Atamayanlar: Servetifünuncular"

what they receive [from the people]²³⁷ (190). He reiterates the alleged duality in literary thinking in the Ottoman Empire, i. e. aesthetics of the court versus the folk's (113), and then imagines the Republic as the force that re-establishes the weakened link between the emerging true spirit of the Turkish nation and its forgotten cultural roots. Özdemir uses an interesting point of data to support this thought. He claims that the demographics of authorship changes dramatically over time, from the Tanzimat Era to the foundation of the Republic. Özdemir expands upon this claim by referring to specific percentages: He puts that the ratio of Istanbulite authors versus Anatolian authors undergo a sizable change. In the Tanzimat Era, this binary reads as 79.5% versus 7.1%, in the Servet-i Fünûn period as 73% versus 11.7%, and in the Republican Era 29% versus 67% (186-7). Although Özdemir neither backs this point of data in a scholarly credible way, nor does he quote any source for the percentages mentioned above, it is an interesting attempt to demonstrate how the notion of authorship may have been transformed in this period, and how this transformation is owed to the Republican regime. Nevertheless, this transformation is interpreted as an ongoing evolution that always refers to preceding forms, and there is virtually no divergence as to the dominant literary styles: The idea is that the focus is shifted from the centre to the periphery to some extent. However, the object(s) of this focus are already existing, and the changes are not thought to be generated by transformations inherent to literary production itself. This aspect of Özdemir's analysis does not seem to challenge the idea of conveying the history of Ottoman/Turkish literature as a purely uniform narrative after all.

²³⁷ "Halktan Aldığını Halka Verenler: Cumhuriyet Dönemi Yazar ve Ozanları"

The emphasis on how literature is both shaped by and simultaneously shapes social history is accompanied by Özdemir's positive and supportive value judgements towards the policy changes occurring with the foundation of the Republic (189), implying yet again that this historical event is the major point of reference for transformations in this era. Özdemir often underscores this opinion in his work, saying that the preceding "National Literature" era is merely a prologue to what is to come with the Republican regime (176). Nevertheless, Özdemir also repeats that the texts produced in the Republican era are overwhelmingly directed towards the cultural and literary values of the folk (187, 194). Although the transformations on the early twentieth century are nominally regarded as the turning point for the course of literary history, the underlying motive fundamentally tends to be establishing a connection between previous literary paradigms and the then-present ones in order to maintain a continuous narrative. This tension in Özdemir's work exemplifies both aspects of the main argument of this project: While structural and methodological changes are mainly attributed to the commencement of the Republican Era, the historical narrative is defined and described by the constant yearning for identifying a point of origin as well as the connections between the present state of literature and this origin (210). Considering the initial institutional backing behind Özdemir's volume by the Ministry of Culture and his posts at various institutions of higher education as well as the Turkish Language Association, it is beneficial for the reader to explore the driving forces behind his evaluation of literary history.

6. h. Atilla Özkırımlı's *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Course of History)*

Atilla Özkırımlı in his *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Course of History, 1995)*, unlike most of his peers from the same period, does not shy away from acknowledging his work as an account of literary history. In the preface, Özkırımlı touches upon the issues of periodization and method in literary historiography. On both occasions, his frames of reference are quite familiar: In terms of periodization, he regards Köprülü's approach as his guide, and when it comes to method, he quotes Tanpınar's description of how literary history ought to be practised in addition to his own viewpoint. Nevertheless, Özkırımlı's elaboration upon historiographical method reveals diverse tendencies, involving a variety of paradigms that are to be considered for the purposes of historical analysis of a literary timeline.

Özkırımlı first recognizes the importance of socioeconomics in historical analysis, and the extent to which the intellectual development in a society and the relations of production are interconnected (22-23). At the same time, Özkırımlı does not want to reduce his approach to purely socialist and dialectic theories, and his focus remains the literary works and the authors in the course of their artistic evolution over time, and potentially, space. For him, tools of history, sociology, philosophy, linguistics, ethnology are beneficial in literary historiography as well as methods in sociology and psychology (24). Özkırımlı also agrees to a multitude of reading strategies, such as "historical and sociological criticism", "impressionistic criticism" and "structuralist criticism", although he does not expand upon what these stand for in his understanding

(24). There are certain methodological implications of Özkırımlı's emphasis at this point, when the metahistoriographical framework is considered. First, detached historiography regarding the format of analysis appears to be necessary to reconcile these different tendencies that are directed at social, political, and cultural conditions as fundamental aspects of literary history. When it comes to conducting the historiographical analysis itself, tools of descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical historiography become inevitable, since disciplines such as philosophy and sociology greatly benefit from the explanatory devices of these approaches. Lastly, for these two levels/parameters to work simultaneously, the appropriate intellectual scheme/figura of analysis for Özkırımlı's account appears to be structural historiography. This level/parameter can be observed in the outlook of his volume in terms of how Özkırımlı consistently engages with the social, political, and cultural analysis while discussing the literary movements of each era. In the part of his account that deals with the literary production in the Ottoman Empire until the Tanzimat era, Özkırımlı devotes more than half of the chapter on the historical background itself, and then moves onto providing information on the literary phenomena of the period (75-132). Similarly, Özkırımlı puts considerable effort into elaborating upon the historical conditions when discussing the Tanzimat era (137-175) and the contemporary literary production (179-247).

Even though Özkırımlı agrees to the idea of an eclectic approach in literary historiography, his main emphasis at the end of the preface is the "holistic presentation" of literary history, for which he finds it appropriate to establish connections between different eras as well as engaging with

generalisations and limiting the depth of his readings of literary texts to a functional extent (25). This attitude does not prevent Özkırımlı from occasionally challenging some of the long-standing assumptions in Ottoman/Turkish literary history: For example, Özkırımlı's evaluation of the alleged first instances of literary production in a Turkic language and/or by a Turkic tribe reads against the grain, for it discusses the vitality of presenting textual evidence for claims that are made on this point. Quoting other scholars of alternative viewpoints such as Tezcan and Caferoğlu, Özkırımlı refuses the idea of dating the beginning of literary production in a Turkic language to a time prior to the sixth century, since he believes that assuming otherwise is unscientific (27-28). Özkırımlı's stance does not always challenge the mainstream opinions regarding the development of literary production. For example, he conforms to the idea that the birth of the novel is not a natural consequence of the intellectual evolution in the Ottoman Empire. Adopting the political agenda of the era, the novel fails to bear any other function than being educational, and eventually, it negates itself as a result of drifting away from reality according to Özkırımlı (168). He uses an analogy to explain why this is the case: "This is not a natural childbirth, an intervention to the pregnancy is carried out as a result of misdiagnosis, then the infant is desired to be kept alive in an oxygen tent."²³⁸ (Özkırımlı, 168). Historians and critics, who evaluate the historical progress of genres and the early practices of writing texts in varying forms that are entirely new to the existing literary culture in the nineteenth century, often employ similar analogies to the one above: Expansion of the literary form, particularly in the course of the nineteenth century, is described as a ritual of coming of age,

²³⁸ "Normal bir doğum değildir bu, yanlış teşhis sonucu doğuma müdahale edilmiş, sonra çocuk oksijen çadırına alınarak yaşatılmaya çalışılmıştır."

and it is never believed to have been executed properly. Özkırımlı's volume involves accounts of social background and blends these with those of literary phenomena, whether his commentary is in line with the pre-established norms of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography or not, and this brings the coexistence of literary historiography and criticism into play. In Özkırımlı's case, the reader does not observe the act of denial that is seen in other examples from the same period, i. e. Özdemir and Timurtaş's literary histories, where the historian actively presents a disclaimer as to his/her work not being a literary history. Özkırımlı's attitude towards method may explain his ease at combining historiography and criticism under the title of "literary history", since he does not disapprove of employing a range of reading strategies and methods of analysis in the practice of literary historiography. Another reason may be that some of the post-1980s scholars, who engage with various forms of literary historiography, begin to surpass the line of demarcation between history and criticism in the realm of literature, with an endeavour to build a new momentum in developing alternative understandings of the Ottoman/Turkish literary reality.

Despite these minor signs of diversion from the mainstream course of literary historiography, Özkırımlı's volume does not break habits put in place by many other scholars in terms of periodization, assumed succession of literary trends and chosen corpus of literary production. This can be observed especially in Özkırımlı's understanding of the Republican period: He finds that the roots of the Republican literature do not only go back to the trend of National literature of the early twentieth century, but also reach the literary developments in the constitutional era²³⁹ (192). Threading the components of

²³⁹ Özkırımlı does not specify which one of the two constitutional eras this would be; however, if he refers to the first one, this would take the reader back to 1876. In terms of the conceptual evolution of the fundamental notions in identity-building, i. e. being Turkish, being an Ottoman,

contemporary literature back to its origins, Özkırımlı does enhance the chronological succession of these periods by claiming their simultaneously developing conceptual link.

6. i. On İnci Enginün's *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era)* and *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete (1839-1923) (Modern Turkish Literature: From Tanzimat to the Republican Era [1839-1923])*²⁴⁰

İnci Enginün is one of the scholars whose main interest lies in Ottoman/Turkish literary history, with a focus on the nineteenth century and twentieth century literary production in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. In 2001, she published *Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı (Turkish Literature in the Republican Era)*, and in 2006, her *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete (1839-1923) (Modern Turkish Literature: From Tanzimat to the Republican Era [1839-1923])* came out. In the first chapter of the former, Enginün puts that “it is with the foundation of the Republic that Köprülü launches an organised effort for the practice of Turkish literary historiography” (12). Implying a new phase in the course of intellectual life, Enginün highlights that a socially and politically new era commences with the Republican revolution (20). Despite acknowledging that the regime change is the most being a part of the Ottoman Empire, the debate commences back then, as demonstrated in the second chapter of this study. If Özkırımlı refers to the Second Constitutional Era, then this would only date back to 1908, several years before the beginning of the National literature period, generally acknowledged as 1911, for the journal titled *Young Pens* is launched then with a manifesto on the simplification of Turkish, driven by the thought that a national literature is not achievable without a national language (Özkırımlı, 186).

²⁴⁰ Enginün's above-mentioned works are discussed under a single title, as they share the same metahistoriographical indicators as well as an extensively similar interpretative standpoint.

prevalent marker of the social, political and thus cultural transformations in the era, Enginün recognizes the connections between the preceding era and the Republican period, adding that “the roots and the dreams of ‘the new’ stems from the literature of the post-Tanzimat period” (20). She places the thought of “the modern” leap in literary history as a transformation rather than an entirely novel phenomenon, which introduces an overarching interpretive axis to her account that highlights the effect of structural historiography as a methodological concern. For example, at the outset of the chapter on poetry, Enginün says that the literary production in this particular genre is the product and the continuation of the poetic understanding prevalent in the preceding period, in which the rejection of court literature is dominant (25). In terms of novel and short story, Enginün opts for a different interpretive axis to employ the principle of continuity and focuses on the textual content of literary production depending on the particular genre. For example, she points out that literary themes in the Republican period are often concerned with Anatolia, i. e. the long-ignored periphery to İstanbul, developing along the same content for decades to come (266). She puts that the fundamental criteria of periodization are genre development and author-oriented (16), and this particular historiographical strategy also reveals a strong tendency towards the principle of continuity, since Enginün aims at building an explanatory narrative that is based on the idea of literary evolution in the particular case of genres. Whether it is a socio-cultural concept such as “modernity” or a dominant genre for a chosen era, Enginün engages with an intellectual scheme/figura that establishes a structure within which she can compare and contrast different aspects of literary production.

While maintaining the two main interpretive axes throughout her account, Enginün demonstrates how the literary production of the era can be presented in relation to the underlying conceptual dynamics by appealing to descriptive/synthetical analysis. For example, in her sub-chapter titled “Memleket Edebiyatı” ([“Literature of the Homeland”], 41-69), Enginün establishes conceptual parallels between varying strands of poetic expression and prevalent social, political and cultural phenomena of the time. While portraying the poetic stance of Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel, Enginün focuses on the observational nature of his expression and the reasons as to why his poetry has this particular characteristic (42-45). Similarly, her discussion of Nazım Hikmet Ran’s poetry points at Marxism as an underlying political paradigm (60-65). Another example of cultural pointers utilised in Enginün’s historiographical analysis is observed in her discussion of poets inspired by Greek mythology, such as Salih Zeki Aktay, Ali Mümtaz Arolat, and Mustafa Seyit Sutüven (69-71). Endeavouring to work with the social, political, and cultural paradigms of the era, although to a limited extent, Enginün’s account is an example of detached historiography in terms of its configurative outlook.

In Enginün’s *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete*, which again involves a wide scope of historical analysis, the reader encounters a similar line of thinking. When evaluating the era preceding the Republican period, Enginün focuses on the emergence of new genres and their development in order to present the characteristics of literary production. Following a chronological sequence, Enginün treats the issue of emerging genres as an act of importing literary forms such as the novel that are new (Enginün in Nemutlu, 2) to the pre-existing set of aesthetic expressions. According to her, the overarching literary

binary that is central to the debate regarding this era is poetry versus prose, the latter of which is on the rise. Journals, newspapers and literary magazines began to appear on the publishing scene after the emergence of prose as a new form of literary expression. Such publishing platforms facilitate a space where authors who engage with experimental forms of literary production find refuge. Daily, weekly and monthly releases of short stories, novellas and novels take place in periodical publications of varying sorts. Debates relating to the nature of these new genres as well as philosophical discussions regarding previously unconceptualised²⁴¹ aesthetic paradigms (i. e. realism, romanticism) are also revealed in these publications. Enginün evaluates the evolution of genres in the nineteenth century as a matter of exploring new territory, implying a sense of “quest”, similarly to some other accounts dealing with the same era.²⁴² When it comes to the Republican era, Enginün’s analysis changes trajectory, and her account begins to develop into a steady narrative of a better-defined literary realm, as explained above. Maintaining the same methodological outlook of descriptive/synthetical, detached and structural historiography, Enginün’s work is a significant contribution to the supporting cluster of the corpus.

²⁴¹ Here, I shall relay to the reader of this project the reason why I refer to these aesthetic paradigms as “previously unconceptualised”. In the particular case of Ottoman/Turkish literary production, just like the idea of modernity, I believe in analysing aesthetic formations in their own right and by appealing to their conceptual background instead of modelling our understanding of these on the examples that are external to the literary realm in question. As a text-oriented approach with a strong emphasis on the socio-historical conditions that shape the intellectual tendencies, this strategy prioritises the literary production in itself as the guiding corpus, not the conceptual discussions or debates where authors convey their viewpoint and literary pedigree. Authorship is also a literary phenomenon that is shaped by the intellectual habitus within which it is expressed, and it ought to be subject to the same analytical process as the texts themselves rather than setting the foundations of an explanatory framework. For example, in a possible world, if a nineteenth century author claimed to be the Baudelaire of the Ottoman Empire, it would not necessarily indicate a burning desire to mimic the French poet. It would, instead, require an analysis of why and how this comes to be the case, without passing on a value judgement regarding originality or authenticity.

²⁴² See the previously presented analysis of Tuncer’s work.

6. j. On Talat Sait Halman et al.'s edition of *Türk Edebiyatı* (*History of Turkish Literature*)

An extensive compilation of articles dealing with Ottoman/Turkish literary history was published under the title *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*), edited by Talât Sait Halman et al. in 2006. As opposed to the volumes of literary history published previously, which are authored by no more than two historians and/or critics at a time, this four-volume work is collectively authored by ninety-one scholars. This points at a major change in the academic understanding of how literary historiography ought to be practised: Each particular subject (i. e. literary periods, influential authors, milestones in literary production, etc.) is examined by a scholar with relevant areas of interest and expertise. It shows that there is a rising level of awareness regarding academic specialisation in the discipline, almost one hundred years after the publication of Köprülü's article on method.

Featuring works by a large number of literary historians and critics in a total of four volumes, Halman's edition encompasses a timeline from the eighth century to the present day, slightly expanding the geographical scope observed in previous accounts of literary history by including the Balkans and other neighbouring countries where literary production in Turkish is present (Isen in Halman, 641). In the introduction to the compilation in the first volume, the editors say that the methodological foundations of Ottoman/Turkish literary history are laid by E. J. Gibb, Köprülü and Tanpınar, and these foundations set

the general direction of the practice; however, the editors also put that the purpose of this compilation is to “read Turkish literary history in light of new information and novel approaches” (23). The first feature of the work that stands out is how the issue of periodization is treated. The conventional three-fold structure of periodization is replaced by a centurial composition, which is then divided into “the early period” (from the beginnings until the thirteenth century), “the pre-classical period” (from the thirteenth century to 1453), “the first classical period” (1453-1600), “the mid-classical period” (1600-1700), “the post-classical period” (1700-1800), “the era of renewal/Ottoman modernity” (1860-1923) and “the Republican period” (from 1923 to the twenty-first century). The idea of a classical Ottoman/Turkish literature is conveyed by analyses of various literary phenomena, such as individual texts and authors, genre-development as well as socio-cultural and political events that shape the historical background to each era.

While not subscribing to the mainstream criteria of periodization and categorization, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* portrays the history of Ottoman/Turkish literary production from an evolutionary albeit multi-faceted viewpoint, promoting detached historiography as the preferred methodological outlook. On the one hand, the theoretical foundations of the account appear to be built without the conventional frames of reference that are used for religious and national identity-construction, and such aspects of socio-political life in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey are evaluated primarily with a literary lens. On the other hand, the Ottoman/Turkish literary identity is kept as a continual image, within the limits of the mainstream geographical and linguistic simplicity, reiterating the same spatial scope and literary production as previous accounts. This is

achieved by structural historiography as the leading intellectual scheme/figura that is observed in the articles that comprise the volumes. The practical aspect of historiographical analysis, i. e. limited scope and linguistic uniformity of the literary production analysed, are managed by the prevalent interpretive axes taken up by the authors: Social transformations (i. e. the problematic of the West versus the East), political milestones (i. e. the foundation of Turkish Republic), and cultural origins (i. e. the literary interactions between the Turks and the Persians) are some of the examples that contribute to the intellectual scheme/figura of this collective attempt to narrate the past of Ottoman/Turkish literature. However, these are mainly utilised as explanatory tools instead of serving as analytically hollow placeholders for encyclopaedic sequencing. As put by Halman, the editor-in-chief for the volumes, in the preface: "What is needed at this point in time is an evaluation of Turkish literature by appealing to methods that are interpretive and critical" (17), and the volumes achieve this goal by employing descriptive/analytical and descriptive/synthetical historiography, using a wide range of interpretive devices in their analysis to present the most accurate image of Ottoman/Turkish literary history possible. This variety can be observed in a number of examples throughout the volumes. In Murat Belge's discussion of the West versus the East in the context of literary production, the reader comes across an analysis that is based on the forms of character development in Ahmet Mithat Efendi and Ömer Seyfettin's works (volume III, 413-418). In Osman Gündüz's evaluation of novels produced in the period spanning post-1960s, historiographical analysis detect and employ a variety of literary modes, ranging from "Islamic and traditionalist" undertones to "social-Marxist" discourse amongst others (volume IV, 275-348). The diversity in

the volumes regarding the explanatory structures render *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (*History of Turkish Literature*) as an outstanding compilation of the supporting cluster, exemplifying a unique attempt in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography.

6. k. On M. Kayahan Özgül et al.'s edition of *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış* (A Look at the History of Turkish Literature)

The last work on Ottoman/Turkish literary history to be analysed in this study is titled *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış* (*A Look at the History of Turkish Literature*) and it comprises two volumes, one with the secondary title of *Eski Türk Edebiyatı* (*Old Turkish Literature*) and one with *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı* (*New Turkish Literature*), published in 2013. Both volumes are presented to the reader with the same preface, written by the editor. This preface encapsulates a broader discussion, with fifteen points that resume what an account of literary history in general and in the specific case of Ottoman/Turkish literary past ought to be like according to the editor himself, whose final verdict about the subject-matter edition is that it is not a literary history, but a handbook that enlightens the reader about literary history.

The structure of the work is devised in terms of centuries, and each century is taken up by a different contributor, who designs the chapter according to his/her expertise. For example, the chapters in the volume encompassing *Old Turkish Literature* are arranged with respect to varying criteria such as chronological succession, genre-oriented cataloguing, and

diverse literary styles. These criteria used simultaneously in some chapters, i. e. the part covering the sixteenth century (105-194), and at times, the historian opts for a particular criterion that dominates the entire article like the chapter on the eighteenth century that revolves around a presumably prevalent genre (i. e. “mesnevî”) in this period (293-312). In the other volume, which deals with *New Turkish Literature*, the chapters are almost exclusively genre-based as well as referring to a particular period: “Turkish Drama in the Tanzimat Era” (75-100), “Turkish Poetry in the National Literature Era” (285-332), “Turkish Short Story and Novel Between 1940-1960” (585-616) are a few examples of how the contributors choose to relay the overarching notion for their chapters. With this feature dominating the intellectual scheme/figura of analyses, structural historiography is prevalent throughout the volumes.

In terms of its organisational structure, which is in line with detached historiography to a large extent, the volumes appear to provide the reader with an unconventional perspective, which prioritises the development of literary genres within the historical course for configurative purposes. In order to make sense of genre-development as a fundamental dynamic in the evolution of literary production, authors turn to social and political history for interpretive pointers. For example, Cemâl Kurnaz and Yaşar Aydemir elaborate upon the political outlook of the sixteenth century Ottoman Empire in order to show the imprints of the historical developments in the era on the nature of literary works (105-195). Authors employ a descriptive/synthetical approach when it comes to depth of analysis in this chapter, since the information provided aids the in-depth analysis of the literary phenomena in question. Featuring the same level/parameters as the rest of the supporting cluster throughout both volumes, *Türk*

Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış (A Look at the History of Turkish Literature)

contributes to the recurring dynamics of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography in the making.

6. I. Classification of the Sources in the Corpus According to the Metahistoriographical Approach: A Visual Outline of the Resulting Analyses

What is demonstrated in the analyses so far is that there are two main clusters that the corpus in this study consists of. While the first (i. e. the scope) and the fifth (i. e. the demonstrative) level/parameters are common to all sources across the overall corpus; the second (i. e. the depth of analysis), the third (i. e. the format of analysis), and the fourth (i. e. the intellectual scheme/figura of analysis) tend to vary from source to source. The depth of analysis in each source is identified via how the information is conveyed by the historians: Reading strategies, explanatory devices, and modes of presentation are regarded as the fundamental pointers in this respect. The format of analysis in the sources are demonstrated by appealing to how the information is organised in the works: Whether the information is presented in a sequential configuration or a theme-oriented structure as well as if an outlook promoting the social, political, and cultural paradigms as organisational building blocks are the main questions directed at the sources in this regard. Finally, the use of specific intellectual schemes/figurae in the sources is shown by the provided examples of interpretive axes in the works. After highlighting the pointers that

show which level/parameters are at play in the accounts, the results reveal a two-fold theoretical and practical structure, in the form of two clusters that are complementary to each other, in the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, which exhibit recurring patterns in terms of historiographical modes of organising and presenting information.

The first cluster is the primary one, where the majority of the sources are grouped as a result of their shared level/parameters, i. e. factual, atomistic and sequential historiography. The second cluster is the supporting one, where descriptive/analytical and/or descriptive/synthetical historiography, topical or detached historiography, and structural historiography are the observed modes of practice.

The classification of the works encompassed by the corpus of the study is recapped below for the reader to have a brief overview of the level/parameters identified in each source. This way, the quantitative analysis that is presented in the concluding remarks can be easily observed in addition to the qualitative analysis conducted so far.

#	source (author/title/year)	level 1: the scope (chronological/geographical)	level 2: the depth	level 3: the format	level 4: the intellectual	level 5: the demonstrative (scientificity [S], historicity [H], rationality [R])
1	Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's <i>Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı</i> (1914)	14 th century ---> the early 20 th century	FH + DAH/DSH	SEH	ATH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A				
2	Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's <i>Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri</i> (1914)	circa 6 th century ---> circa 15 th century	FH + DAH/DSH	SEH	ATH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Central Asia, Anatolia MINOR: N/A				

3	İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's <i>Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri</i> (1919/20)	1299 ---> the end of the 19 th century	FH	SEH	ATH	S: the hybrid mode
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire				H: linear, progress
		MINOR: Central Asia, Anatolia				R: rational
4	Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1920/1)	8th century ---> 16th century	FH + DAH/DSH	SEH	ATH	S: the hybrid mode
		MAJOR: Karakhanid Khanate, Seljuk Empire, Mongolian Empire, and Chagatai Khanate (in the particular cases of Khwarazmian Dynasty, the Golden Horde, Mamluk Sultanate, Timurid Empire), Anatolia, Ottoman Empire				H: linear, progress
		MINOR: N/A				R: rational
5	İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi I-IV</i> (1925/6)	late 18th century ---> early 20th century	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Republic				H: linear, progress

		MINOR: N/A				R: irrational
6	Sadettin Nüzhet Ergun's <i>Tanzimata Kadar Muhtasar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1931)	circa 8th century ---> 19th century MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: Central Asia, Karakhanid Khanate, Seljuk Empire	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
7	Tahir Olgun's <i>Türk Edebiyatı'na Dair Manzûm Bir Muhtıra</i> (1931)	7th century ---> 19th century MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: Central Asia (including the areas where Chagatai and Azeri Turkish are spoken)	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: irrational
8	Hasan Ali Yücel's <i>Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış</i>	8th century ---> 19th century MAJOR: Ottoman Empire	DAH/DSH	SEH + DH ²⁴³	STH	S: the hybrid mode

²⁴³ Hasan Ali's account is a unique example of a borderline case that employs both the sequential and detached modes, since it follows a chronological structure within the analysis of each of the three literary strands; however, it presents these largely in isolation from each other without ruling out the possibility of specific common aspects they share.

	(1932)	MINOR: Central Asia, Anatolia				H: linear ²⁴⁴ , progress R: rational
9	Agâh Sırrı's Levend <i>Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri</i> (1932-1934- 1938)	8th century ---> early 20th century (end of Servet-i Fünûn) MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: Central Asia (including the areas where Karakhanid, Azeri and Chagatai are spoken), France, Italy, Spain, Germany, United Kingdom, Russia	FH + DAH/DSH	SEH	ATH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
10	İsmail Habib Sevük's <i>Türk Teceddüd Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1921), <i>Edebî Yeniliğimiz</i> (1930-2- 5) ²⁴⁵ , <i>Yeni Edebî Yeniliğimiz</i> (1940)	1856 ---> "Milli Türkiye" ("National Turkey") circa 1919 MAJOR: the Ottoman Empire and Turkey	FH	SEH + TH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational

²⁴⁴ For the same reason as explained above, the historicity of Hasan Ali's volume can be classified as linear in principle, although the reader must be alerted to the fact that this linearity is at work within each of the three segments that constitute his literary history.

²⁴⁵ The edition used in this study is the one from 1932.

		MINOR: Azerbaijan, Crimea, Iran				
11	Celal Tahsin Boran's <i>Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri</i> (1933)	beginnings ²⁴⁶ ---> circa 1930s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: Central Asia, Europe ²⁴⁷	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
12	Orhan Rıza's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1934)	circa 6th century ---> circa 1920s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: Central Asia, Chagatai Khanate, Abbasid Caliphate, Umayyad Caliphate, Ghaznavid Dynasty, Karakhanid Khanate, Khwarazmian Dynasty, Seljuk	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational

²⁴⁶ The exact century is not mentioned in the secondary source from which information on Boran's volume is extracted.

²⁴⁷ The reason why the exact countries cannot be spelt out is because there is no accessible copy of this work to general readership. The information extracted from a brief survey of the work only specifies that it includes a chapter on the renaissance, and the note here is based on this.

		Empire, Russia				
13	Mustafa Nihat Özön's <i>Metinlerle Muasır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1934), <i>Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1941)	late 18th century ---> 1930s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Republic MINOR: N/A	FH	TH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
14	İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's <i>Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları</i> (1942)	1839 ---> circa 1915 MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
15	Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1942)	7th century ---> 1839 MAJOR: Central Asia, Anatolia, Ottoman Empire, Chagatai Khanate, Azerbaijan MINOR: Ghaznavid Dynasty, Karakhanid Khanate, Seljuk Empire, Mongol Empire	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational

16	Hüseyin Nihal Atsız's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1943)	circa 8th century ---> 13th century	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: irrational
		MAJOR: Central, Asia, Karakhanid Khanate, Seljuk Empire MINOR: Uyghur Khanate				
17	Hıfzı Tevfik Gönensay's <i>Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1944) ²⁴⁸	1839 ---> post-1908 (early Republican period)	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A				
18	Nihad Sâmi Banarlı's <i>Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1947/8) ²⁴⁹	circa 7th century ---> circa 1930s	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Central Asia, Anatolia, Ottoman Empire, Chagatai Khanate, Azerbaijan				

²⁴⁸ The historian states that this volume is written as the continuation of the volume he wrote in collaboration with Nihad Sâmi Banarlı in 1942.

²⁴⁹ An expanded second edition of this came out in 1971/9.

		MINOR: Ghaznavid Dynasty, Karakhanid Khanate, Seljuk Empire, Mongol Empire				
19	A. Ferhan Oğuzkan's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Tanzimata Dek</i> (1949) ²⁵⁰	4th century ---> 19th century MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: irrational
20	Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's <i>Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1949)	19th century MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A	DSH	TH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
21	Agâh Sırrı Levend's <i>Ümmet Çağı Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1962)	late 13th century ---> 1839 (Tanzimat Devri) MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A	FH + DAH/DSH	TH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational

²⁵⁰ This piece consists of ninety-six pages in total.

22	Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Başlangıçtan Bugüne Kadar Türk Edebiyatının Tarihi, Tahlili ve Tenkidi</i> (1964) ²⁵¹	8th century ---> 20th century	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Central Asia, Anatolia, Ottoman Empire, Republic MINOR: N/A				
23	Kenan Akyüz's <i>Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri</i> (1965)	1860 ---> 1923	DAH + DSH	SEH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: N/A				
24	Ahmet Kabaklı's <i>Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1965)	circa 7th century ---> circa 1950s	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: Central Asia				

²⁵¹ There are later editions of this volume; however, as they are all published posthumously, I have taken the very first one into account.

25	Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Ekrem Yirmibeşin's <i>Türk Edebiyatı - Batı Örnekleriyle Birlikte</i> (1967/8)	pre-Islamic period ---> early 20th century	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific
		MAJOR: Anatolia MINOR: foreign (Ancient Greek, French, English)				H: linear R: irrational
26	Rauf Mutluay's <i>100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1969)	8th century ---> 1960s	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: N/A				H: linear R: irrational
27	Seyit Kemal Karaalioğlu <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1973)	unknown origins of oral literature & the 8th century ---> 1970s	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific
		MAJOR: Central Asia, Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: Chagatai Empire, Azeri Literature, World Literature				H: linear, progress R: irrational

28	Agâh Sırrı Levend's <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi</i> (1973)	5-8th century ---> (planned, but not achieved) circa early 1970s	FH + DAH/DSH	SEH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: Central Asia				
29	Rauf Mutluay's <i>50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1973)	1923 ---> 1973	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear R: irrational
		MAJOR: Turkey MINOR: N/A				
30	Şükran Kurdakul's <i>Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı - Meşrutiyet Dönemi</i> (1976) and <i>Cumhuriyet Dönemi</i> (1987)	1900 ---> the early 21 st century	DAH + DSH	SEH	ATH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
		MAJOR: Ottoman Empire and Turkey MINOR: N/A				
31	Faruk Kadri Timurtaş <i>Tarih İçinde Türk</i>	circa 8th century ---> 19th century	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific

	<i>Edebiyatı</i> (1981)	MAJOR: Ottoman Empire MINOR: Central Asia				H: linear, progress R: rational
32	Mahir Ünlü and Ömer Özcan's <i>20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1987)	1900 ---> post 1960s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: N/A	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: irrational
33	Ahmet Oktay's <i>Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: 1923-1950</i> (1993)	MAJOR: Turkey MINOR: N/A	FH + DSH	SEH	STH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: irrational
34	Emin Özdemir's <i>Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatı: Dönemler-Yönelimler</i> (1994)	circa 7th century ---> 2000s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkish Republic	DSH	DH	STH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress

		MINOR: Iran, Ancient Greece, Europe, North America, Latin America, Russia				R: rational
35	Attila Özkırımlı's <i>Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1995)	6th century ---> 1980s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: N/A	DAH	DH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
36	Hüseyin Tuncer's <i>Tanzimat Edebiyatı</i> (1994), <i>Meşrutiyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1994), <i>Servet-i Fünûn Edebiyatı</i> (1995), <i>Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı</i> (1996)	1839 ---> circa 1930 MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: N/A	FH	SEH	ATH	S: non-scientific H: linear, progress R: rational
37	İnci Enginün's <i>Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı</i> (2001)	1923 ---> 20 th century MAJOR: Turkey	DAH + DSH	TH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress

		MINOR: N/A				R: rational
38	Talat Sait Halman et al.'s edition of <i>Türk Edebiyatı</i> (2006)	circa 7 th century---> 21 st century MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: various regions neighbouring the Ottoman Empire and Turkey (i. e. the Balkans)	DAH +DSH	TH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
39	İnci Enginün's <i>Yeni Türk Edebiyatı: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete</i> (1839-1923) (2006)	1839 ---> 1923 MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey MINOR: N/A	DAH+DSH	TH	STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress R: rational
40	M. Kayahan Özgül et al.'s edition of <i>Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış</i> (2013)	13th century ---> 1960s MAJOR: Ottoman Empire, Turkey	FH + DAH	SEH + TH	ATH +STH	S: the hybrid mode H: linear, progress

		MINOR: N/A				R: rational
--	--	------------	--	--	--	-------------

Table A. Classification of the sources included in the corpus according to Swiggers et al.'s framework

CHAPTER 7

Concluding Remarks:

Revisiting the Making of Ottoman/Turkish Literary History

In the course of this study, the main objective is to inform the reader as to how the journey of literary historiography commences in the Ottoman Empire and persists through time up until 2013. The sources analysed encompass the complete corpus of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, beginning with *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye* (*History of Ottoman Literature*, 1887/8) and ending with *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış* (*A Look at the History of Turkish Literature*, 2013), a collectively authored work consisting of two volumes. This final part of the study aims to explain the findings of the analyses carried out, which consist of a structured evaluation of the sources according to the metahistoriographical approach by Swiggers et al. as well as highlights from the close readings that focus on the texts in themselves and/or the context in which these texts are produced.

7. a. Recursive Clusters & Rare Deviations: The Last Hundred Years of the Ottoman/Turkish Literary Past

In this section of the final part of the study, two points of reference are presented to the reader to engage with the resulting argument posited in the

following section: (i) a brief commentary on the table of listings of the sources analysed in this study, specifying their structural qualities defined and described by Swiggers et al., (ii) the fundamental findings grouped according to the similarities and differences in the explanatory frameworks of the sources analysed. This way, the presentation of data becomes feasible to manage within the limits of this study as well as preparing the basis to provide novel insight into the intellectual scene of the twentieth and twenty-first century Turkey.

Textual analysis of the sources that deal with Ottoman/Turkish literary history, as seen in the course of this study, reveal that a large number of these cluster around specific aspects of the five parameters advised by Swiggers et al., and the quantitative intensity observed in this respect is noteworthy. First, it is useful to look at the manifestation of individual levels/parameters across the corpus. A strong majority of the sources (thirty-one out of forty, or 77.5%) develop accounts of factual historiography. Similarly, thirty-two sources are examples of sequential historiography, even though not all of these are also accounts of factual historiography. An aspect where the practice of sequential historiography is observed as the criteria of periodization unfolds in the sources. The three-fold framework for periodization is repeated in almost all of the works, taking the acceptance of Islam (implying literary periods of pre-Islamic and Islamic character) and the beginning of the reform era in the Ottoman Empire (a literary era exclusively considered to be under the “Western influence”) as the major transformative milestones in the course of intellectual history. Proposed by Ali Cànib Yöntem for the first time and then established as the norm by Köprülü, Ottoman/Turkish literary production until the mid-nineteenth century is

imagined having developed along these three stages. For the following period, İbrahim Necmi Dilmen's work is taken as the frame of reference. As the timeline progresses, this conventional practice begins to weaken, especially in the works published in the 2000s, such as Halman's edition in which the reader can explore alternative historical events as well as social, political, cultural paradigms in the in-depth introductions to each literary era, which are purposefully not defined and described in light of conventional and loaded references (i. e. "pre-Islamic", "Islamic", "European", "Republican"). The ratio of examples where atomistic historiography is practised appears to be high as well, at 71.3% of the sources. It could be said that if the reader were to imagine the entire corpus in the body of a single work, it would entail a narrative that is designed to be an example of factual, sequential and atomistic historiography. The diversions from this particular set of characteristics are rarely observed. When such diversions occur, these tend to manifest a complementary nature rather than reading against the grain. Employing diverse historiographical strategies, such accounts do not divert from the main interpretive trajectory, whether they are descriptive/analytical and/or descriptive/synthetical in terms of the second parameter, topical for the third, or structural for the fourth. For example, Rauf Mutluay's experiment with form, i. e. building an account of literary history in a question/answer format, does not surpass any limits encountered in previous works. To remind the reader of another example, Tanpınar's *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (History of Turkish Literature in the Nineteenth Century)* has a strong descriptive/synthetical tendency with a topical orientation that is structural in nature. Nevertheless, Tanpınar's work follows the major categorizations put forward by Dilmen, with a

difference: He utilises tools of literary criticism in the historiographical space, which allows him to expand the horizon of his account in an unconventional direction. In a similar way, Kenan Akyüz's *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri: 1860-1923 (The Framework of Modern Turkish Literature: 1860-1923)* is within the boundaries set by the majority of the corpus in terms of periodization and geographical scope as well as text and author curation; however, the historian engages with a different reading strategy, detailing the historical account with extensive information about the social, political and cultural transformations of the era, as opposed to the mainstream examples. The fifth level/parameter, which consists of scientificity, historicity and rationality, is a relatively complex one, since it simultaneously addresses a multitude of queries. While scientificity demarcates whether an account explicitly puts forward a chosen method or not, historicity and rationality are judged based on the interconnectedness of the parts that constitute the account as a whole. Favouring a linear and progressive nature in terms of historicity, most of the accounts reveal a rational stance regarding the connections built between historical and literary phenomena. The relatively less frequent occurrence of irrationality in this level or parameter is seen in the accounts where the purpose of forming a historical narrative is not necessarily sought after, and these accounts are liminal of literary historiography that are grown out of anthologies by appealing to pre-existing structures of historicity.

In juxtaposition to the individual manifestations of historiographical level/parameters in the works, the overview of how these are distributed across the corpus points at the crux of the main argument. The two clusters that are formed when the sources are classified according to the metahistoriographical

approach demonstrate the theoretical continuity through the dominant and the supporting elements of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography both in qualitative and quantitative terms. The primary cluster reveals features that the practice of literary historiography is seen as an exercise of sequencing alleged facts, events and phenomena without further ado. Limiting the vast potential of Ottoman/Turkish intellectual history by treating the practice of literary historiography as a merely factual, atomistic and sequential one, the works in the primary cluster assert a large set of assumptions that nudge the readership towards a one-dimensional understanding of the literary past in a systematic manner. Repeatedly presenting the same set of informative statements via the same structural schemes in the same narrational tone, the majority of the sources in the corpus builds inescapable rules of thumb for the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, deeply rooted in the theoretical nature of each account. The secondary cluster consists of works that complement this nature. The underlying paradigms are expressed in a similar vein in the works forming this cluster, although varying levels/parameters are at play. The attempts to suggest alternative viewpoints tend to be manifested within the restrictions imposed by the dominant theoretical trends observed in the primary cluster. In overall terms, more than two-thirds of the corpus refers to the same aspects of the five level/ or parameters, which allows the reader to envision the general direction the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography takes in the past century or so. Thus, similarities observed in the form, content and method/methodological tendencies of the corpus provide an important basis for a possible explanatory framework at the theoretical level that highlights continuity as the fundamental dynamic.

Apart from the early works, forty sources on Ottoman/Turkish literary history are analysed regarding their historiographical characteristics, whether these are manifested in the overarching structural properties of the accounts or found underlying the details where the interpretive axis at work surfaces. One of the structural properties where a great similarity throughout the corpus is observed is the chronological span that is covered by the sources. The beginnings of Ottoman/Turkish literary history, almost exclusively, point at the same period from the eighth century to the present day. The second structural property has to do with the geographical spread: The typical scope taken into account extends from Central Asia to Anatolia, mostly including Turkish-speaking regions in between, occasionally involving intellectual and/or literary activity in Crimea or parts of Russia. Throughout the corpus, this aspect does not reveal any sign of change, except that the scope tends to narrow down to a specific subset of the one above, encompassing merely the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, as the timeline evolves nearer to the present day. The fact that the chronological span and geographical scope is maintained throughout the corpus points at the notion of continuity with respect to the tangible constituents of literary history, i. e. time and space. As explained previously and specified as “the hybrid mode” of scientificity in the explanatory framework, Köprülü’s stance regarding method, which is borne out of the progress made in the course of the nineteenth century, paves the way for a two-fold dynamic for the works to follow, and practical continuity is one of the two aspects that this dynamic is composed of. In addition to the structural similarities that reflect upon the spatio-temporal aspects featured in the works of literary historiography, such as overlapping criteria of periodization, as well as presenting extremely similar sets

of literary phenomena (i. e. selection of authors and texts that are featured), thus establishing the sense of practical continuity, there are further overlaps that dominate the entire corpus in terms of how the form and the content is interconnected by the method or methodological tendencies subscribed to by the historians. This brings the second aspect of the dynamic of continuity into play, which concerns the theoretical strategies that are employed in an account of literary history. In the subject-matter corpus, the theoretical continuity is achieved by relaying similar social, political and cultural paradigms in juxtaposition to the conceptual evolution of literary history and describing the varying strands of literary production by appealing to the same type of logical connections (i. e. representing court and folk literature in opposition to one another, identifying diverse literary schools in the nineteenth century²⁵² in conjunction, etc.). In other words, similar modes of interpretation are repeatedly used by historians to define and describe literary phenomena such as authorship, textuality, poetic form, genre development and pivotal themes. The analyses carried out in this study in light of the metahistoriographical approach, particularly with the aid of the proposed level/parameters of classification, demonstrates how Ottoman/Turkish historiography in the making reveals the same structures over and over again both in terms of theory and practice.

7. b. The Argument for Continuity versus the Rupture Bias: Tracing the Evolution of Texts and Context

²⁵² i. e. *Servet-i Fünûn* and *Fecr-i Âtî*

The extensive corpus analysed in this study informs the reader of a lesser known, albeit prevalent, aspect of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography. Underlying the similar structural features in terms of the historiographical strategies used, the same fundamental dynamic appears to be at work for the majority of the cases: the idea of a persistent narrative, elements of which are meant to establish a thread of absolute continuity, forming a uniform image of the Ottoman/Turkish literary past.

Aiming to make sense of the Ottoman/Turkish literary production as a whole, the historians appeal to two prevalent aspects of the above-mentioned historiographical dynamic. The first one of these aspects is the principle of continuity in the theoretical sense: The methods and the methodological tendencies in the accounts are motivated by the idea of bridging isolated components of the literary past. In order to accomplish this task, the historians aim to provide meaningful connections between social, political, cultural and literary phenomena in a way that offers an internally valid and sound account. They try to establish these connections by appealing to specific methodological tendencies that unfold through their preferred criteria of periodization, organisation of information, presentation and analysis of literary phenomena, and juxtapositions of these with particular aspects of social, political and cultural history. A straightforward way to demonstrate how these features are manifested in the works is to employ the metahistoriographical approach, by which it becomes possible to categorise each work according to how it conveys information on literary history. While the criteria of periodization and organisation of information observed in the sources, it is seen that the sources predominantly share a common ground in their appeal to sequential

historiography with respect to the format of analysis (i. e. the third level/parameter). In terms of the juxtapositions of literary phenomena with social, political, and cultural paradigms, the sources employ conceptual tools of factual historiography (i. e. one of the subcategories of the second level/parameter that identifies the depth of analysis) as well as atomistic historiography (i. e. one of the subcategories of the fourth level/parameter that identifies the axis of interpretation). With more than two-third of the sources appealing to the same historiographical tools when approaching historical information, the dominant outlook of the Ottoman/Turkish literary history in the making crystallises through the explanatory framework proposed by the metahistoriographical approach.

The second one of the aspects forming the fundamental historiographical dynamics is the principle of continuity in the practical sense: The chronological and geographical scope, i. e. two important dimensions of the tangible environment in which literary production materialises, are treated with a particular motivation to create an evolutionary, progressive line of development that contributes to a singular identity, the Ottoman/Turkish one, in this case. Although the chosen paths to realise this motivation may vary slightly in terms of the above-specified scopes, the ultimate desire is to present diverse components of literary history as complementary to each other, constituting a tangible background for the historical narrative to be transposed onto. With the aid of the first level/parameter (i. e. the scope of analysis) of the metahistoriographical approach, it is seen that the chronological and geographical span analysed in the sources is the same across the entire corpus.

Given the prevalent characteristics of the works on Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, resulting in a both qualitatively and quantitatively uniform outlook, the following question arises: If the making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history reveals an observable degree of similarity in terms of the methodological tendencies in the historiographical works, is there *really* an overarching epistemological rupture in the course of intellectual history, which is pertinent to the practice of literary historiography, in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey?

The answer is no. What the argument for continuity shows in contrast to the rupture bias is that there is an *ungrounded binary, arisen out of an alleged intellectual clash the West and the East in absolute terms, attributed to the presumed epistemological outlook of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography without any in-depth argument that relies on internal sources*: In this study, the emergence of literary historiography as a discipline is demonstrated to have developed in its natural course. The impact of the external literature introduced to the works of literary history, seen in Şehâbeddin Süleyman's volume for the first time and found in Köprülü's article on methodology in an advanced form, is of inceptive nature. Both the historians whose works precede this impact and the ones who are subjected to it remodel what they encounter in their own terms. As seen in the close reading of Köprülü's piece on method, the result of this intellectual effort is a hybrid mode of scientificity that is proposed to satisfy the particular conditions Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography requires. Given the extent to which this act of remodelling is embraced by the majority of the historians of the twentieth and twenty-first century, the thought of a binary between "the Western" and "the Eastern" thinking in the particular case of literary historiography is not applicable.

There are two problems with the opinion that pre-mediates the scientific characters of the West and the East in rigid opposition to each other and presents a dichotomy. Firstly, this opinion is not grounded in the context of Ottoman scientific history or even Ottoman intellectual history from a rather general perspective. It also reflects an extremely limited corpus of the textual reality of the era, while it claims to contribute to an argument that is meant to revolutionise the way Ottoman/Turkish literary history is perceived. These two aspects show that the extent to which the final argument is thought to reach is neither theoretically workable, nor practically meaningful, and this points at the first logical fallacy of the argument, known as composition/division. If the critic were to refrain from making a generalised assessment of the course of epistemological transformations in the late nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, and were to merely argue for an explanatory framework for a particular current within the intellectually multi-faceted composition of the time, it would be rather fit for purpose given the strength and the scope of the argument as it stands. Secondly, the subject-matter opinion eventually springs back to the surface of the debate in the conclusion drawn. The portrayal of the epistemological outlook of nineteenth century Ottoman thought in juxtaposition to the Western one appears to call for a literary coping mechanism, i. e. the theme of fathers and sons. The very fact that it is defined and described as a coping mechanism reveals a criterion of superiority in one direction, and of inferiority in another. This means that the dichotomy upon which the relevant premise relies is reproduced in the conclusion. Therefore, the argument fails to bring in new evidence that is independent of this premise in order to qualify as valid and

sound. This logical fallacy, referred to as “begging the question” in common parlance, is the second one that the critic commits.

Given the ungrounded presuppositions regarding the epistemological stances of two allegedly separable intellectual spheres, i.e. “the West” and “the East”, the post-1990s historians and critics appear to fail at grasping the pace and the phase of transformations taking place in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century Ottoman Empire as well as Turkey, therefore potentially misjudging the foundations of a possible explanatory axis that can shed light onto today’s literary state of affairs.

Since the early 2000s, the practical implications of a rather localised notion of modernity have been discussed in the field of literary analysis, criticism, history and historiography; however, there has not been a systematised metahistoriographical survey with an analytical lens in order to put the rupture bias to a test. To summarise, this study is a humble attempt to offer such an account, possible outcomes of which may possibly help the reader of Ottoman/Turkish literary history in engaging with the following tasks:

1. reconsidering what the nineteenth century literary historiography contributed to the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, which form the groundwork for the succeeding works
2. revisiting Köprülü’s work on method to emphasise the hybrid nature of the conceptual basis for the theory and practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography

3. developing a valid and sound argument for continuity by analysing a comprehensive corpus of works with the help of metahistoriographical approach to show why and how this principle is the fundamental dynamic in the practice of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography
4. therefore, demonstrating that the rupture bias emphasised by the post-1990s literary criticism is not a credible foundation for a possible explanatory framework to shed light on the nature of Ottoman/Turkish literary past
- 4*. then, possibly perceiving the Ottoman/Turkish modernity in an unexplored direction, set towards a novel evaluation of the social, political and cultural transformations in their own right, both in the particular case of literary historiography and intellectual history as a whole

The making of Ottoman/Turkish literary history reveals a remarkable degree of crystallisation of paradigms very early on between. In 1887/8, the course of literary historiography begins to reveal practically binding alterations in the perceptions of what literary history entails with Abdülhalim Memduh's work. In 1913, these alterations reach an observable point of stability with Köprülü's direct engagement with the debate of methodology, which in turn determines the succeeding works in terms of their form, content and method. In

the early works of this period after 1913, lasting a long one hundred years, the main drivers behind the historiographical strategies remain the same, with the scope and the rest of the five level/ or parameters Swiggers et al. put forward. When these common features are refined from a metahistoriographical perspective, the argument for continuity comes into play, shaped by the theoretical and the practical aspects simultaneously. The political formations in the early Republic also confirm this phenomenon, such as the impact of “Heyet-i İlmiyye” and the regulatory changes in the following decades, aiming at directing the course of how Ottoman/Turkish literary history is conveyed. The nature and number of the repeating explanatory frameworks of the sources analysed in this study enhances the potential of the argument for continuity as opposed to the rupture bias. Revealing the roots of the Ottoman/Turkish historiographical practice both in the theoretical and practical senses emerging in the early works of the nineteenth century, this study aims at raising a question about the notion of “modernity” that is ascribed to the formations that led to the Republican mind-set in the specific case of literary historiography. Regarding Köprülü’s thought as the genesis of historiographical practice in the field of literature, historians of the twentieth and twenty-first century fail to take the corpus from the nineteenth century and the conceptual evolution of the fundamental concepts relating to the practice of literary historiography into account. Instead, their focus mainly lies in the Republican revolution itself, and/or the dominant nationalistic movements that led up to the revolution, and their impact on the Ottoman/Turkish intellectual life in the post-Republican period. The argument for continuity points at the basic dynamics of literary historiography, with the help of which historians curate the building blocks of

their narratives. The ideas behind these dynamics sprout in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, are developed by Köprülü and scholars other than Köprülü, as the close readings in the second chapter of this study explicate. Köprülü's precursors spell out the fundamental concepts that are later promulgated by Köprülü in a more systematic manner, which forms the backbone of his legacy in the Republican era and thereafter. In this sense, the so-called epistemological rupture occurring in the new Turkey becomes nullified by the argument for continuity, as the paradigm shifts that lead up to the changes in the intellectual course of the Ottoman/Turkish thought in the context of literary history are shown to take place earlier, which suggests an alternative approach not only towards a new understanding of Ottoman/Turkish literary historiography, but also of the debate on Ottoman/Turkish modernity. Most literary critics of recent years, for approximately the past three decades, present the emergence of the nationalistic tendencies in the social, political and cultural transformations, i. e. a leap towards "the modern", fundamentally as a by-product of the Republican revolution, which is simultaneously interpreted as an epistemological rupture that drastically alters the underlying mechanisms of intellectual thought. In a nutshell, this study demonstrates the need for revisiting this causal connection and turning the tables, providing the argument for continuity as a rebuttal to the rupture bias.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdülhalim Memduh. *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*. Transliterated and edited

by Özcan Aygün. Edirne: Paradigma Akademi Yayınları, 2013.

Açıkgöz, Fatih Burak. “İlk Osmanlı Edebiyat Tarihleri ve Tarihçileri Hakkında

Bazı Değerlendirmeler”. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*,

vol. 27, 2012: 1-8.

Akün, Ömer Faruk. “Bir Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Yazmak Mümkün müdür?”. 1990.

TÜBAR. vol. XIX, Spring 2006: 107-116.

_____. “Fâik Reşad”. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 12. İstanbul: TDV İslâm

Araştırmaları Merkezi: İstanbul, 1995. 256-60.

_____. “Fatîn Efendi”. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 12. İstanbul: TDV İslâm

Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1995. 103-9.

Akyüz, Kenan. *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri*. (1965). İstanbul: İnkılâp

Kitabevi, 1990.

Ali Emîrî. “‘Bir Hiciv Münasebetiyle’ Serlevhasıyla 44 Sayılı Yeni Mecmua’daki

Makaleye Cevab”, *Osmanlı Târih ve Edebiyat Mecmuası*, vol. 1, 31

Mayıs 1334: 52-54.

Ali Kemal. *Ali Kemal: Toplu Yazılar 1908-1909*. Edited by Safiye Kıranlar.

İstanbul: İsis Yayınları, 2010.

- Altuğ, Fatih. “İmparatorlukla Ulusdevlet Arasında Kozmopolit Fuad Köprülü’nün Millî Edebiyata İhtidası” in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 119130.
- Altunış-Gürsoy, Belkıs. “19. Yüzyıl Türk Romanında Yanlış Batılılaşma”. *Aydın Türklük Dergisi*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2015: 47-56. DergiPark, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/564602>.
- Alpay, Meral. *Harf Devriminin Kütüphanelerde Yansıması*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakütesi Basımevi, 1976.
- Asılsoy, Abdülkerim. “Mehmet Fuat Köprülü’nün İlmî Hayatı ve Eserlerinde İzlediği Metot Üzerine” in *Tarihimizden Portreler: Osmanlı Kimliği Prof. Cevdet Küçük Armağanı*. Edited by Zekeriya Kurşun and Haydar Çoruh. İstanbul: ORDAF Yayınları, 2013. 213244.
- Atsız, Hüseyin Nihal. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Işık Basımevi, 1943.
- Aydın, Suavi. “20. Yüzyılın Başlarında Türkçülük, Türkoloji Çalışmaları ve Fuad Köprülü” in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 131158.
- Bağdemir, Abdullah. “*Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*’nde Bulunamayan Bir Tarih Üzerine”. *Türk Dili*, vol. LXXXIII, no. 603, 2002: 231-237.
- Banarlı, Nihad Sâmi. *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Yedigün Basımevi, 1947/8.

Başar, Fahameddin. *Vefatının 50. Yılında Mehmed Fuad Köprülü*. Ankara:

Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 2017.

Berktaş, Halil. *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü*. İstanbul: Kaynak

Yayınları, 1983.

Bourdeau, Michel, "Auguste Comte", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

(Winter 2015 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL

=<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/comte/> (accessed on 30 September 2019)

Bölükbaşı, Yusuf Ziya. "Türkçü-Turancı Milliyetçiliğin Düşünsel Temelleri

Üzerine Bir İnceleme". *Akademik Hassasiyetler*, vol. 5, no. 10, 2018: 45-60.

Bulut, Funda. "İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan'ın Edebiyat Tarihçiliği". *International*

Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education, vol. 2, no. 1, 2013: 256-278.

Chakravartty, Anjan, "Scientific Realism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of*

Philosophy (Summer 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL =

<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/scientific-realism/>>. (accessed on 17 July 2019).

Cahen, Claude. *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: a general survey of the material and*

spiritual culture and history. Translated by J. Jones-Williams. New York:

Taplinger, 1968.

Comte, Auguste. *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings*. Edited

by Gertrud Lenzer. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

“Cumhuriyetin İlk Dönemi Eğitim Kurumları (1921-1926) Telif ve Tercüme

Heyeti”, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı,

http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_06/06022003_heyeti_ilmiye.pdf (23.01.2016). (accessed on 15 August 2019).

Çağlar, Behçet Kemal and Ekrem Yirmibeşin’s *Türk Edebiyatı - Batı*

Örnekleriyle Birlikte. İstanbul: Kanaat Yayınları, 1967/8.

Çetin, Nurullah. “Ali Ekrem (Bolayır)’ın ‘*Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*’ Adlı

Eserinin Yöntemi Bakımından Değerlendirilişi”. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve*

Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Türkoloji Dergisi, vol. 17, no. 1, 2010: 39-

44.

Demirci, Neslihan. “Orhan Okay’la *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Üzerine*”. *Türkiye*

Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi, vol. 4, no. 7, 2006: 351-359.

Dilmen, İbrahim Necmi. *Tanzimat Edebiyatı Tarihi Notları*. 1940/1. Edited by

Zeynep Dengi. Alaeddin Kıral Basimevi: Ankara, 1942.

_____. *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri*. Matbaa-ı Âmire: İstanbul, (1338) 1919/20.

Dressler, Markus. “Fuad Köprülü’nün Tarih Yazısına Milliyetçiliğin Etkisi” in

Mehmet Fuat Köprülü. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve

Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 207218.

Ergun, Sadettin Nüzhet. *Tanzimata Kadar Muhtasar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*.

İstanbul: Sühulet Kütüphanesi, 1931.

Ertaylan, İsmail Hikmet. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi I-IV*. (1925/6). Ankara: Türk Tarih

Kurumu Basımevi, 2011.

Ertürk, Nergis. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York:

Oxford University Press, 2011.

Esen, Nüket. *Modern Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Okumalar*. İstanbul: İletişim

Yayınları, 2012.

Fâik Reşad. *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-i Osmâniyye*. İstanbul: Zarâfet Matbaası, 1910.

_____. *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-i Osmâniyye*. Transliterated and edited by Erdoğan

Erbay and Yusuf Babur. Konya: Çizgi Yayınları, 2017.

Filizok, Rıza. "Ali Canip Yöntem'in Lise Edebiyat Kitapları Üzerine".

<http://www.ege-edebiyat.org/docs/551.pdf>. (accessed on 25 August 2019).

Fildiş, Berna. "M. Fuad Köprülü'nün Çok Yönlü Entelektüel Kimliği ve

Disiplinlerarası Metodolojisi". *Çeşm-i Cihan: Tarih, Kültür ve Sanat*

Araştırmaları E-Dergisi, vol. 4, no. 2, Winter 2017: 14-26.

Gönensay, Hıfzı Tevfik. *Tanzimattan Zamanımıza Kadar Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*.

İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1944.

Gönensay, Hıfzı Tevfik and Nihad Sâmi Banarlı. *Başlangıçtan Tanzimat'a*

Kadar: Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1942.

Güleç, İsmail. "Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü" in *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslâm*

Ansiklopedisi, vol. 41. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayın Matbaacılık, 2012. 560561.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness and the Turkish Novel". *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 102, no. 2, 2003: pp. 599-628.

Halman, Talat Sait, et al.. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2006.

Kabaklı, Ahmet. *Türk Edebiyatı I-II-III*. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1965.

Kaçalin, Mustafa S. "Mütercim Âsım Efendi". *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 32. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi: İstanbul, 2006. 200-2.

Karaalioğlu, Seyit Kemal. *Resimli-Motifli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka Kitapevleri, 1973.

Karpat, Kemal. "Mehmet Fuat Köprülü ve Osmanlı: Muhafazakâr Modern Bir Tarihçi" in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 1324.

Kılıç, Hulusi. "el-Kâmûsü'l-Muhîr". *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 24. İstanbul TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2001. 287-8.

Kocatürk, Vasfi Mahir. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Başlangıçtan Bugüne Kadar Türk*

- Edebiyatının Tarihi, Tahlili ve Tenkidi*. Ankara: Edebiyat Yayınevi, 1964.
- Köprülü, Mehmet Fuat. *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*. (1918). Translated and edited by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff. Routledge: London, 2006.
- _____. "Method in Turkish Literary History." Translated by Gary Leiser. *Middle Eastern Literatures*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2008: 5384.
- _____. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. 1920/1. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2014.
- _____. *Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı Dersleri*. İstanbul: Matbaâ-i Âmire, (1329) 1914.
- Köprülüâde, Mehmed Fuad. "Türk Edebiyat Tarihinde Usûl". *Bilgi Mecmuası*, vol, 1, (1339) 1913: 352.
- Kuneralp, Sinan. *Son Dönem Osmanlı Erkân ve Ricali (1839-1922): Prosopografik Rehber*. İstanbul: İsis Yayınları, 1999.
- Kurdakul, Şükran. *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı: Meşrutiyet Dönemi*. İstanbul: May Yayınları, 1976.
- _____. *Çağdaş Türk Edebiyatı: Cumhuriyet Dönemi*. İstanbul: Broy Yayınları, 1987.
- Kurnaz, Cemal. "Harâbât". *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 16. İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1997. 68-9.
- Kurşun, Zekeriya and Haydar Çoruh. *Tarihimizden Portreler: Osmanlı Kimliği Prof. Cevdet Küçük Armağanı*. İstanbul: ORDAF Yayınları, 2013.

Küçük, Cevdet. "Millî Tettebbûlar Mecmuası" in *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslâm*

Ansiklopedisi. Vol. 30. İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2005.

8384.

Leiser, Gary. "Çağdaş Türkoloji Araştırmalarında Köprülü'nün Yeri" in *Mehmet*

Fuat Köprülü. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm

Bakanlığı, 2012. 2938.

Levend, Agâh Sırrı. *Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri I-II-III*. İstanbul: Kanaat

Kütüphanesi, 1932/4/8.

_____. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1973.

_____. *Ümmet Çağı Türk Edebiyatı*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi,

1962.

Mardin, Şerif. "Tanzimat'tan Sonra Aşırı Batılılaşma" in *Türk Modernleşmesi*.

İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991. 23-81.

Mignon, Laurent. *Ana Metne Taşınan Dipnotlar: Türk Edebiyatı ve*

Kültürlerarasılık Üzerine Yazılar. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009.

_____. "A Pilgrim's Progress: Armenian and Kurdish Literatures in Turkish and

the Rewriting of Literary History". *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 48, no. 2,

2014. 182-200.

Mishkova, Diana et al.. *Antimodernism: Radical revisions of Collective Identity*.

Budapest: Central European University Press, 2014.

Mutluay, Rauf. *100 Soruda Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1969.

_____. *50 Yılın Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1973.

Muallim Naci. *Osmanlı Şairleri*. Transliterated and edited by Cemal Kurnaz. Akçağ Yayınları: Ankara, 2000.

Necatigil, Behçet. *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü*. 1960. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1975.

Odabaşı, İsmail Arda. *II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi Basın ve Fikir Dünyasında Genç Kalemler Dergisi*. 2006. Marmara University, Ph. D. Thesis.
http://docs.neu.edu.tr/library/nadir_eserler_el_yazmalari/TEZLER_YOK_GOV_TR/II.%20Me%C5%9Frutiyet%20d%C3%B6nemi%20bas%C4%B1n%20ve%20fikir%20d%C3%BC.pdf (accessed on 12 September 2019)

Oğuzkan. Ahmet Ferhan. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi: Tanzimata Dek*. İstanbul: Saka Matbaası, 1949.

Okay, Orhan. *Batılılaşma Devri Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005.

Oktay, Ahmet. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyatı: 1923-1950*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1993.

Okumuş, Salih and İdris Şahin. "Tanzimat'tan Günümüze Edebiyat Tarihi Yazarlığı ve Edebiyat Tarihleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme". *Uluslararası*

Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi, vol. 14, 2010: 398-410.

Olgun, Tahir. *Edebiyat Lûgatı*. İstanbul: Asar-ı İlmiye Kütüphanesi Neşriyatı, 1937.

_____. *Türk Edebiyatı'na Dair Manzûm Bir Muhtıra*. İstanbul: İttifak Matbaası, 1931.

Oral, Mustafa. "Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Tarihçilik ve M. Fuad Köprülü" in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 159180.

Orhan Rıza. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Sûhulet Matbaası, 1934.

Özcan, Nezahat. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın Eserinde Resim*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi. 2012.

Özdemir, Emin. *Türk ve Dünya Edebiyatında Dönemler-Yönelimler*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1994.

Özgül, M. Kayahan, et al.. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihine Bir Bakış*. Ankara: Kurgan Edebiyat, 2013.

Özkırımlı, Attila. *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı*. Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 1995.

Özön, Mustafa Nihat. *Metinlerle Muasır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Maarif Vekaleti, 1934.

_____. *Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1941.

- Palabıyık, Hanefi. "Ord. Prof. Dr. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü'nün Tarihçiliği" in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 2528.
- Parla, Jale. *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1990.
- Parlatır, İsmail. *Ali Ekrem Bolayır*. Ankara Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987.
- Polat, Nazım Hikmet. "Fuad Köprülü ile Şahabeddin Süleyman'ın Ortak Eserleri" in Zeynep Kerman, *Mehmet Kaplan İçin*. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1988. 189-206.
- _____. *Şahabettin Süleyman*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987.
- _____. "Türk Edebiyatı Tarihçiliği Çalışmalarının Neresindeyiz?". *Beşinci Türk Kültürü Uluslararası Bilgi Şöleni*, 17 December 2002, http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/ESKI%20TURK%20%20EDEBIYATI/14.php#_ftn1, accessed on 30 September 2019.
- _____, et al.. *Yöntem Bilgisi Açısından Osmanlı Dönemi Edebiyat Tarihleri*. Kurgan Kitapevi: 2013.
- Sevük, İsmail Habib. *Edebî Yeniliğimiz*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1932.
- Sönmez, Erdem. "Annales Okulu'nun Türkiye'deki Tarih Araştırmalarına Etkisi"

in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*, Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012. 253266.

Sözen M. and Necdet Sakaoğlu. Edited by. *Şikârî: Qaraman-name - Kitab-ı Tevârih-i Karamaniyye*. İstanbul: Karaman Valiliği - Karaman Belediyesi, 2005.

Strauss, Johann. “A Constitution for a Multilingual Empire: Translations of the *Kanun-ı Esasi* and Other Official Texts into Minority Languages” in *The First Ottoman Experiment in Democracy*. Edited by Christoph Herzog and Malek Sharif. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2016. 21-51.

Sullivan, Jeremiah J.. “Henry James and Hippolyte Taine: The Historical and Scientific Method in Literature”. *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1973, 25-50.

Swiggers, Pierre, et al.. “Metahistoriography Meets (Linguistic) Historiography” in *Metahistoriography: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of the Historiography of Linguistics*. Edited by Peter Schmitter and Marijke van der Wal's. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1998.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman. *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*. İstanbul: Sancakciyan Matbaası, 1328/1910.

Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Mehmed Fuâd Köprülü. *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı*. İstanbul: Şirket-i Mürettibiyye Matbaası, 1914.

Şentürk, Ahmet Atilla and Ahmet Kartal. *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul:

Dergâh Yayınları, 2007.

Şentürk, Recep. "Millet". *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 30. İstanbul: TDV

İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2005. 66-70.

Tangülü, Zafer. "Demokrat Parti Dönemi Eğitim Politikaları (1950-1960)". *Türk*

Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, vol. 10, no. 2, Spring 2012: 389-410.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. (1949).

Ankara: Dergâh Yayınları, 2012.

Tarlan, Ali Nihad. *Edebiyat Meseleleri: Edebiyat Üzerine, Edebî Sanatler,*

Metinler Şerhine Dair, Metin Tamiri. (1981). Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları,

2017.

Taştan, Yahya Kemal. *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm

Bakanlığı, 2012.

Tezcan, Nuran. "Fuat Köprülü'nün Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Üzerine" in *Mehmet*

Fuat Köprülü. Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm

Bakanlığı, 2012. 93118.

Tekin, Arslan. *Edebiyatımızda İsimler ve Terimler*. İstanbul: Bilgeoğuz Yayınları,

2010.

Timurtaş, Faruk K. *Tarih İçinde Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları,

1981.

Toluay, İsmail. *Tezkirecilikten Edebiyat Tarihçiliğine Geçiş ve Abdülhalim*

Memduh'un Târih-i Edebiyât-i Osmâniyye'si: İnceleme-Metin. 2006.

Sakarya University, M.A. Thesis.

http://docs.neu.edu.tr/library/nadir_eserler_el_yazmalari/TEZLER_YOK_GOV_TR/Tezkirecilikden%20Edebiyat%20Tarihine%20ge%C3%A7i%C5%9F.pdf. (accessed on 16 September 2019)

Tuncer, Hüseyin. *Arayışlar Devri Türk Edebiyatı I: Tanzimat Devri*. İzmir:

Akademi Kitabevi, 1996.

_____. *Arayışlar Devri Türk Edebiyatı II: Tanzimat Devri*. İzmir: Akademi

Kitabevi, 1992.

_____. *Meşrutiyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı*. İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1994.

_____. *Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Edebiyatı*. İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1996.

Turan, Osman. "Mukaddime" in *60. Doğum Yılı Sebebiyle Fuad Köprülü*

Armağanı. (1953). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2010. V-XXIII.

Uludağ, Süleyman. "Marifet". *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 28. İstanbul: TDV

İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2003. 54-56.

Ulusoy Aranyosi, Ezgi. "Türkçe Edebiyatta Kolektif Belleğin Yansımaları".

2012. Bilkent University, M.A. Thesis.

<http://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11693/16716/0006553.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>. (accessed on 16 July 2019)

Ünlü, Mahir and Ömer Özcan. *20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: İnkılâp

Kitabevi, 1987.

Yeğen, Mesut. “Türk Tarih Tezi, Köprülü ve Togan” in *Mehmet Fuat Köprülü*.

Edited by Yahya Kemal Taştan. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı,
2012. 237252.

Yetiş, Kazım. “Ta`lîm-i Edebiyyât”. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol 39. İstanbul:

TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010. 514-515.

Yöntem, Ali Cânib. “Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye”. *Servet-i Fünûn*, vol. 1018,

25 TS. 1326, 8 December 1910. 91-92.

Yücel, Hasan Ali. *Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi,

1932.

APPENDIX

Table 1. The Breakdown of Yearly Publication Statistics in the Ottoman Empire

Dates	Number of Years	Number of Books	Yearly Average
1729-1829	100	180	1,8
1830-1875	47	2894	62,9
1876-1892	17	3277	192,7
1893-1907	16	4250	283,5
1908-1917	10	6827	682,6
1918-1928	11	6376	579,6
1928-1938	11	16063	1460

Table 2. The breakdown of publishing houses by cities in the Ottoman Empire (the geographical area within the present borders) and Turkey

İstanbul	Other Cities	Total	Dates
149	22	171	1876-1907

153	55	208	1908-1917
189	63	252	1918-1927
283	267	550	1928-1938

Table 3. Swiggers et al.'s framework for the purposes of classification and categorization of literary histories

5 levels / parameters	subdivisions of the dimension	Specifications	Cross- dimensional correlations
Level 1: the scope	- parts of history treated	- partial or complete	
	- geographical area(s) selected	- local, national, world	
Level 2: the depth	- factual historiography (FH)	- chronicling, collection of data	SEH ATH
	- descriptive/analytical historiography (DAH)	- a critical assessment	

	- descriptive/synthetical historiography (DSH)	- a critical assessment	TH, SEH, AXH
	- explanatory historiography (EPH)	- explaining empirical or abstract laws	
Level 3: the format	- sequential historiography (SEH)	- plain narrative or organised narrative accounts	ATH
	- topical historiography (TH)	- structural analysis of a theme or conceptions of a school	STH, AXH
	- detached historiography (DH)	- account of social background or philosophical reflection	STH, AXH, NON-STH, NON-AXH
Level 4: the intellectual scheme/figur	- atomistic historiography (ATH)	- facts and events	
	- structural historiography (STH)	- architecture, links,	TH, DH

a		interrelationships	
	- axiomatic historiography (AXH)	- presuppositions and axioms of theories	DH
Level 5: the demonstrative purpose/intention	- scientificity	- science versus non-science	
	- historicity	- linear versus non-linear history	
	- rationality	- rational or irrational historical approaches	

Table 4. "Table of Contents" of Abdülhalim Memduh's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*

MUKADDİME (INTRODUCTION)
BİRİNCİ FASIL -

BAZI MÜTÂLAÂT (CHAPTER I - SOME CONSIDERATIONS)	
İKİNCİ FASIL (CHAPTER II)	Sinan Paşa - Zarâ`etnâme - Edebiyyât-i Hâzıra ile Olan Münâsebeti - San'at-ı Edebiyye Fuzûlî - Şîve-i Acemâne - Leylâ vü Mecnûn - Şikâyetnâme'si - Sinan Paşa ve Fuzûlî Nefî - Şehâmet-i Edebiyye'si - Kasâid - Hayâlâtı - Gazelleri - Fahriyeleri Koçi Bey Nedîm - Ekrem Bey'in Nedîm Hakkındaki İfadâtı - Nazmı - Nesri Nabî - Âsârı Râgıb Paşa - Şiir ve Hikmet - Bazı Gazelleri Gâlib Dede - Hüsn-ü Aşk - Eş`âr-ı Sâiresi Koca Sekbanbaşı - Lâyihası Âsım Efendi - Kamûs'u
ÜÇÜNCÜ FASIL	Âkif Paşa - Fikr-i Edebîsi - Tabsıra - Parçası - Şarkısı

-	Pertev Paşa - Gazelleri - Ninni
DEVİR-İ TECEDDÜD	Reşid Paşa
	Şinâsi
(CHAPTER III	Kemal
-	Ziyâ Paşa
THE NEW ERA)	Ekrem Bey
	Hâmid Bey
	Peyrevânî²⁵³
	Hâtime

Table 5. "Table of Contents" of Şehâbeddin Süleyman's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât-ı Osmâniyye*

GİRİŞ	San`atın Teşekkülü (Formation of Art)
-	Osmanlı Lisânı (The Ottoman Language)
	Edvâr-ı Edebiyye (The Literary Periods)
(INTRODUCTION)	Tasavvuf (Mysticism)
BİRİNCİ DEVİR	Âşık Paşa, Niyâzî, Süleyman Çelebi, Sultan II.

²⁵³ Unfortunately, I have not been able to identify who Peyrevânî is.

ŞİİR VE ŞÂİR AKSÂMI - THE FIRST PERIOD CHAPTERS ON POETRY & POETS	Murâd, Şeyhî, Ahmed Paşa, Fatih Sultan Mehmed, Sinan Paşa, Necâti, Mihrî, Zâtî, Sultan II. Beyazıt, Cem, Sâdî, Yavuz Sultan Selîm, Halîmî Çelebi, Gûvâhî, Bezmî, Kanunî Sultan Süleyman, Fuzûlî, Bâkî, Latîfî, Rûhî-i Bağdâdî, Hakanî, Nefî, Sabrî, Koçi Bey, Şeyhülislâm Yahyâ, Cevrî, Nâilî-i Kadîm, Nâbî, Sâbit, Naîmâ, Nedîm, Seyyid Vehbî, Ahmet Neylî, Râgıb Paşa, Haşmet, Fitnat, Şeyh Gâlib, Kânî, Esrâr Dede, Koca Sekbanbaşı, Sünbülzâde Vehbî, Surûrî, Enderûnlu Vâsıf, Mütercim Âsım Umumî Bir Nazar (An Overall Survey)
İKİNCİ DEVİR TECEDDÜDÂT-I NESİR - THE SECOND PERIOD	Âkif Paşa, Reşid Paşa, Fuâd Paşa, Pertev Paşa, Şinâsi, Ziyâ Paşa, Sâdullah Paşa, Nâmık Kemal, Abdülhak Hâmid, Recâizâde Ekrem

DEVELOPMENT OF PROSE	
FETRET-İ EDEBİYYE - LITERATURE IN THE INTERMISSION PERIOD	Muallim Nâci, Nâbizâde Nazım, İsmâil Safâ
EDEBİYYÂT-I CEDÎDE - THE NEW LITERATURE	Halit Ziya, Tevfik Fikret, Cenâb Şehâbeddin, Mehmed Rauf, Faik Âli, Hüseyin Cahit, Süleyman Nesîb, İbrahim Cehdî (Süleyman Nazîf), Hüseyin Suat, Hüseyin Siret, Celâl Sâhir
BİRKAÇ SÖZ (A FEW WORDS)	

Table 6. The Organisational Structure of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's Preface to *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı*

Târîh-i Edebiyyât:	Literary History:
Târîh-i Edebiyyât târîh-i medeniyetin	Literary history is an important part of

mühim bir cüzüdü.	the history of civilization.
Âsâr-ı Edebiyyenin Zuhûru: efsaneler, şarkılar, masallar, hâmasiyat	Formation of Literary Works: legends, songs, fairy tales, literary epics
Âsâr-ı Edebiyyenin Âsâr-ı San`atla Münâsebeti	The Relationship Between Literary Works and Works of Art
Târîh-i Edebiyyât ve Destân	Literary History and Epic Poetry
Bir Devr-i Edebiyyenin Hudûdu Nasıl Tâyin Edilir	How Is an Era of Literature Determined?
Bir Eser-i Edebiyyenin Tahlîl-i Dâhili ve Hârici, Eser ve Muharrir	Internal and External Analysis of a Literary Work, Literary Work and Author
Bir Eser-i Edebiyyenin Vücûda Getirdiği Te'sîrâtın Tedkîki	Analysis of The Influence of a Literary Work
Muhît-i Coğrafi ve İctimâî: şerâit-i iktisâdîyye, hayât-ı âile ve kibârâne, hayât-ı siyâsîyye, ittikâdât, ahlâk, sanâyî-i sâire-i nefîse	Social and Geographical Territory: economic conditions, etiquette and family life, political life, belief systems, ethics, other fine arts

Table 7. "Table of Contents" of Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's *Yeni Osmanlı Târîh-i Edebiyyâtı*

The first era that is majorly influenced by Persian and Arabic literary traditions, beginning with Âşık Paşa and lasting until Âkif Paşa / Şinâsi	Devr-i Tasavvuf (Period of Mysticism) Âşık Paşa, Süleyman Dede, Yazıcıoğlu, Şeyhî
	Saray Edebiyyâtı Devri (Period of Court Literature) Hamzavi, Ahmedî, Sinan Paşa, Ahmed Paşa, Necâti, Zâtî, Fatih
	Devre-i Kemal (Period of Maturity) Baki, Fuzûlî, Hayâlî, Rûhî, Yahyâ Bey, Sabrî, Nefî
	Devr-i Fikri (Period of Intellectual Achievement) Nâbî, Sâbit, Nazım
	Devr-i Şahsiyyet ve İnhitât (Period of Character and The End) Nedîm, Gâlib, Râgıb Paşa, Vehbî, Serverî, İzzet Molla
The second era commencing with Âkif Paşa	Devr-i Tereddüt (Period of Hesitation)

and continuing at the time	Âkif Paşa, Edhem Pertev Paşa, Reşid Paşa, Ziyâ Paşa, Şinâsi
	Devr-i Tekerrür (Period of Repetition) Abdülhak Hâmid, Recâizâde Mahmud Ekrem, Nâmık Kemal
	Devr-i Fetret (Period of Intermission) Muallim Nâci
	Edebiyat-ı Cedîde (The New Literature)

Table 8. “Table of Contents” of Köprülü’s *Türk Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri*

Hayât ve Medeniyyet (Life and Civilization)	Siyâsî Hayat (Political Life)
	İdâre Teşkilâtı (Systems of Governance)
	Ordu ve Askerlik (Army and Military Power)
	Saray Hayâtı ve Eğlenceleri (The Life and Entertainment at the Court)
	İçtimâî Sınıflar (Social Classes)

	Mânevî Hayat: Tekyeler ve Şeyhler (Spiritual Life: Cults and Leaders)
	Osmanlılıktan Evvel Anadolu'da Hayat-ı Fikriyye (Intellectual Life Before the Ottoman Presence)
	İlk Manzûmelerin Eşkâl ve Evsâfı (The Form and Characteristics of the First Poems)
	Mevlânâ Celâleddin-i Rûmî
	Sultan Veled
	Yûnus Emre

Table 9. The sections of the preface to Dilmen's *Târîh-i Edebiyyât Dersleri*

Edebiyyât Târîhinin Mâhiyeti	The Significance of Literary History
Tarih Nev'ileri ve Edebiyyât Tarihi - Edebiyyât Târîhinin Vesikaları - Edebiyyât Târîhinde Usûl - Edebiyyâtın Mâhiyeti - Edebiyyât Târîhinin Milliyeti - "Osmanlı Edebiyyâtı Ne Demektir?" - Edebiyyât	Types of History and Literary History - Documents of Literary History - Method in Literary History - Significance of Literary History - National Character of Literary History - What Does "Ottoman Literature"

Târîhine Âit Müellifâta Bir Nazar	Mean? - A Look at the Works on Literary History
Türk Lisân ve Edebiyyâtına Umûmî Bir Nazar	A General Survey of Turkish Language and Literature
Lisanların Aksamları ve Lisân Âileleri - Türkçe'nin Lisânî Mevkii ve Taksîmâtı - En Eski Türk Yadigârları: Orhun Âbideleri, Kutadgu Bilig, Hitâbet'ül-Hakâyık - Türk Edebiyyâtının Kadîm Tekâmülü - Türk Edebiyyâtında İslâmî ve Sûfî Tesîrler	Linguistic Structures and Language Families - Where and How Turkish Is Classified - The Oldest Turkish Literary Works: Orkhun Inscriptions, Kutadgu Bilig, Hitâbet'ül-Hakâyık - Evolution of Ancient Turkish Literature - Islamic and Mystic Influences on Turkish Literature
Osmanlı Türklerinde Edebiyyâtın Tezâhürâtı	Emergence of Literature in the Case of Ottoman Turks
Türk Edebiyyâtında İslâm Nüfûzunun Tesîrâtı - Abbasî İnkırazı Devrinde Millî İntibâh - Anadolu'da bu İntibâhın Akisleri - Osmanlı Türklerinde Edebî Varlığın Menşe'leri ve Netâyici	Islamic Influence on Turkish Literature - National Awakening During the Dissolution of the Abbasid Rule - Reflections of This Awakening in Anatolia - The Sources of Literary Production by the Ottoman Turks and Its Outcomes
Osmanlı Edebiyyâtının Târîhî Devreleri	Historical Periods of Ottoman Literature

Edebiyyât TârîhimizdeTasnîf Tecrübeleri - Edebiyyât-i Atîka ve Cedîde Devreleri - Muhtelif Tâlî Taksîmlerin Münâkaşası - Tasnîfe Mâni Olan Avâmil - Zamanî Silsilenin Rüchânı ve Sûret-i Teselsülü - Hicrî Karn ve Nısf-ı Karnların Edebî Kıymetleri Hakkında İptidâî Bir Mütâla`a	Attempts of Periodization in Our Literary History - Periods of Ancient Literature and New Literature - The Debate Regarding Various Secondary Periodizations - Circumstances Presenting Difficulties for Periodization - The Supremacy and Succession of Chronology - An Initial Evaluation of Aesthetic Values of the Periods
Osmanlı Hükümetinin Zuhurundan Evvel Anadolu'da Türk Edebiyyâtı	Turkish Literature in Anatolia Before the Emergence of the Ottoman Empire
İslamiyyet Âleminde Türk Edebiyyâtının İnkişâfı - Saray, Tekke ve Halk Şiirleri - Hazret-i Mevlânâ - Sultan Veled - Yûnus Emre - Yedinci Karn-ı Hicr-i Nihâyetinde Anadolu'daki Türk Edebiyyâtının Evsâfı	Development of Turkish Literature in the World of Islam - Court, Tekke and Folk Poetry - Hazret-i Mevlânâ - Sultan Veled - Yûnus Emre - The Characteristics of Turkish Literature by The End of The Thirteenth Century

Table 10. Dilmen's periodization and the historical milestones he refers to

Sekizinci Karn-ı Hicr-i Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the Eighth	Şark Mekteb-i Edebîsi
--	-----------------------

Century ²⁵⁴) 699-805 (1299-1402)	veya Edebiyyât-ı Kadîme (The Eastern School of Literature or the Old Literature)
<i>Ottoman Empire founded ---> End of Yıldırım Sultan Bayezid's Rule</i>	
Dokuzuncu Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Evveli Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the First Half of the Ninth Century) 805-855 (1402-1451)	
<i>The Event of Ankara ---> İstanbul is Conquered</i>	
Dokuzuncu Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Âhiri Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the Second Half of the Ninth Century) 855-918 (1451-1512)	
<i>İstanbul is Conquered ---> Beginning of Yavuz Sultan Selim's Rule</i>	
Onuncu Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Evveli Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the First Half of the Tenth Century) 918-954 (1451-1547)	
<i>Beginning of Yavuz Sultan Selim's Rule ---> Beginning of Kanuni's Rule</i>	
Onuncu Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Âhiri Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the Second Half of the Tenth Century) 954-1012 (1547-1603)	
<i>Beginning of Selim-i Sani's Rule ---> Beginning of Ahmed-i</i>	

²⁵⁴ According to the Islamic calendar. The conversions of the dates are presented in the brackets after the originals.

<i>Evvel's Rule</i>	
Onbirinci Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Evveli Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the First Half of the Eleventh Century) 1012-1058 (1603-1648)	
<i>Ahmed-i Evvel's Rule</i>	
Onbirinci Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Âhiri Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the Second Half of the Eleventh Century) 1058-1115 (1648-1703)	
<i>The Rule of Avcı Sultan Mehmed, His Brothers, and Mustafa II.</i>	
Onikinci Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Evveli Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the First Half of the Twelfth Century) 1115-1168 (1703-1754)	
<i>Beginning of Ahmed-i Sâlis' Rule ---> Beginning of Osman-ı Sâlis' Rule</i>	
Onikinci Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Âhiri Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the Second Half of the Twelfth Century) 1168-1203 (1754-1788)	
<i>Beginning of Selim-i Sâlis' Rule</i>	
Onüçüncü Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Evveli Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the First Half of the Thirteenth Century) 1203-1255 (1788-1839)	
NOT SPECIFIED	

Onüçüncü Karn-ı Hicr-i Nisf-ı Âhiri Edebiyyâtı (Literature in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century) 1255-1293 (1839-1876)	
NOT SPECIFIED	
Onüçüncü ve Ondördüncü Asırlar Arasında Edebiyyât (Literature Between the Thirteenth and the Fourteenth Centuries) 1293-1311 (1876-1893)	Garb Mekteb-i Edebisi veya Edebiyyât-ı Cedîde
<i>Beginning of Sultan Abdülmecid's Rule & Tanzimat-ı Hayrîyye</i>	
Asr-ı Hâzır Edebiyyâtı (Contemporary Literature) 1311-... (1893-...)	(The Western School of Literature or the New Literature)

Table 11. Filizok's visualisation of the comparison between Şehâbeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's *Malûmât-i Edebiyye* and Yöntem's *Edebiyat*

<i>Malûmât-i Edebiyye</i> (Knowledge of Literature)	<i>Edebiyat</i> (Literature)
Medhal (Preface)	---

Nazım ve Eşkâl-i Nazım (Poetry and Poetic Meter)	---
Nazım ve Nesir (Poetry and Prose)	Nazım - Nesir (Poetry - Prose)
Vezn-i Millî (National Meter)	Hece Vezni - Aruz Vezni (Syllabic Meter - Persian Meter)
---	Hece Vezinleri (Types of Syllabic Meter)
---	Aruz Vezinleri (Types of Persian Meter)
İkinci Mebhas: Aruz Vezni (Chapter 1.2: Persian Meter)	
Eşkâl-ı Kadîme ve Cedîde (Old and New Types)	
Üçüncü Mebhas: Eşkâl-i Kadîme-i Nazm (Chapter 1.3: Metre in Old Poetry)	Eski Divan Edebiyatında Nazım Şekilleri (Types of Poetic Meter in Old Court Literature)
Mısra (Hemistich)	
Beyit (Couplet)	
Rubâî (Quatrain)	Rubâî (Quatrain)

Kıta ²⁵⁵	Kita
Gazel (Ghazal)	Gazel (Ghazal)
Kasîde (Eulogy)	Kasîde (Eulogy)
Medhiye ²⁵⁶	
Mersiye ²⁵⁷	
Fahriye ²⁵⁸	
Terkîb-i Bend ²⁵⁹	Terkîb-i Bend
Tercî-i Bend ²⁶⁰	Terci-i Bend
	Müstezat ²⁶¹
Hicviye (Satire)	

²⁵⁵ “kıta” is a four-line stanza that is common in folk poetry.

²⁵⁶ “medhiye” is a type of eulogy written for the appraisal of an individual, such as a ruler.

²⁵⁷ “mersiye” is a type of eulogy similar to “medhiye”; however, it features individuals who are no longer alive.

²⁵⁸ “fahriye” is a type of eulogy that the poet writes to praise his own self as well as poetic character and poetry.

²⁵⁹ “terkîb-i bend” consists of three to ten parts, each composed of six to ten couplets.

²⁶⁰ “tercî-i bend” consists of at least three parts, each composed of four to ten couplets with a particular structure regarding rhyme.

²⁶¹ “müstezat” is a particular type of Persian metre, which is basically an expanded form of ghazal.

Mesnevî (Mathnavi)	Mesnevî (Mathnavi)
Musammat ²⁶²	Musammat
Murabba ²⁶³	
Muhammes ²⁶⁴	
Müseddes ²⁶⁵	
	Divan Edebiyatına Türk Şairlerinin Zamm Ettikleri Nazım Şekilleri (Types of Poetic Meter Introduced to Court Literature by Turkish Poets)
	Tuyuğ ²⁶⁶
Şarkı ²⁶⁷	Şarkı
Kavâid-i Tahrîr (Rules of Prose-Writing)	

²⁶² “musammat” consists of various stanzas with different lengths, manifesting a specific structure regarding rhyme.

²⁶³ “murabba” consists of various four-liner stanzas.

²⁶⁴ “muhammes” consists of various five-line stanzas.

²⁶⁵ “müseddes” consists of various six-liner stanzas.

²⁶⁶ “tuyuğ” is a four-liner stanzaic form of poetic metre, mostly encountered in Chagatai and Azeri poetry.

²⁶⁷ “şarkı” is a four-liner stanzaic form of poetic metre, mainly used for poems written as lyrics for musical compositions.

İkinci Mebhas[:] Üslûbun Mahiyeti (Chapter 2.2: Characteristics of Literary Stylistics)	
Üçüncü Mebhas[:] Üslûbun Hasâis-i Umûmiyyesi (Chapter 2.3: General Features of Literary Stylistics)	
Dördüncü Mebhas[:] Mecazın Suret-i Teşkîli (Chapter 2.4: The Formation of the Representations in Figurative Speech)	
Mecâz (Figurative Speech)	Mecâzlar (Types of Figurative Speech)
	Mecaz-ı Mürsel (Metonymy)
Teşbih (Simile)	Teşbih
İstiâre (Metaphor)	İstiâre
Teşbih ile İstiâre Arasındaki Fark-i Esasiyye (The Fundamental Difference Between Simile and Metaphor)	
Kinâye (Allusion)-Târîz (Satire)	Kinâye-Târîz
Beşinci Mebhas (Chapter 2.5)	Mânâyâ Aid San`atlar-Lafza Aid San`atlar (Semantic Literary Devices-Linguistic

	Literary Devices)
Hiss-i Süver-i Beyân (Styles of Emotional Expressions)	
İltifât (Compliment)	
İstifhâm (Rhetorical Question-Asking)	
Teşhîs ve İntâk (Personification)	Teşhîs ve İntâk
Tekrîr (Repetition)	Tekrir
Mübâlağa (Exaggeration)	Mübâlağa
Nidâ (Exclamation)	
Fikri Süver-i Beyân: Edeb-i Kelâm (Style of Intellectual Expressions: Artistic Language)	
Tedrîc (Graduation)	
Terdîd ²⁶⁸	Terdîd
Tecâhül-i Ârif (Rhetorical Statement/Question)	Tecâhül-i Ârif

²⁶⁸ A literary device that presents the reader with an unexpected conclusion.

Tezad (Contrast)	
Hüsn-i Tâil ²⁶⁹	Hüsn-i Tâil
Rücû' ²⁷⁰	Rücû'
Kat' (Interruption)	
Altıncı Mebhas[:] Sanâyî-i Lafziyye (Linguistic Literary Devices)	
Tenâsüb (Comparison)	Tenâsüb
İhâm-ı Tenâsüb (Ambiguous Comparison)	İhâm
İhâm-i Tezad (Ambiguous Contrast)	
Tevriye (Ambiguity)	
Leff ü Neşr ²⁷¹	Leff ü Neşr
Telmîh ²⁷²	

²⁶⁹ This literary device allows the poet to establish an imaginary cause and effect relation between two irrelevant phenomena in order to attribute further aesthetic value to either of these. An example for this literary device would be saying that the beloved's appearance in a garden makes the roses bloom.

²⁷⁰ "rücû'" is when the poet retrieves a statement s/he makes earlier and replaces it with a stronger one to enhance meaning.

²⁷¹ "leff u neşr" occurs when the author presents both a resemblance and a contrast between two different phenomena, one after the other.

²⁷² This is a literary device used by the author to remind the reader of a well-known historical event or an anecdote.

Aks ²⁷³	
Cinas (Polyptoton)	Cinas
İştikâk ²⁷⁴	
Şebih-i İştikâk	
İktibâs ²⁷⁵	İktibâs
Tazmîn (Reference)	Tazmîn
Seci` (Alliteration)	Seci`
Tersî	
Târîh ²⁷⁶	Târîh
	[L]ugaz (Riddle)
	Muamma ²⁷⁷

²⁷³ “aks” refers to the reversal of a statement.

²⁷⁴ “İştikâk” is the use of words that have the same root.

²⁷⁵ This literary device involves the use of Quranic references.

²⁷⁶ “târîh” is the use of dates in literary texts. The next three items in the table are specific versions of this literary device, and the fourth one is the reference for the traditional calculation method of dates by associating numbers with Arabic letters, and then using these in literary form.

²⁷⁷ While “muamma” also refers to the use of riddles in literary texts, it is used specifically for God’s names and individuals. “lûgaz”, however, is used for any other phenomena.

Târîh-i Mücevher	
Târîh-i Mühmel	
Ta'miyyeli Târîh	
Ebcet Hesabı	
Sanâyî-i Lafziyyenin Eski Edebiyyâtımızda Mevki'i ve Mahiyeti (The Importance of Linguistic Literary Devices in Old Literature)	
	Dîvân ve Dîvân Edebiyyâtının Hususiyetleri, Hamse (The Ottoman Court and Court Literature, Hamse ²⁷⁸)
	Eski Nesir (Old Prose)
	Millî Nazım Şekilleri (Types of National Poetry)
	Mânî ²⁷⁹
	Varsağı ²⁸⁰

²⁷⁸ A “hamse” is a collection of five mathnavis that belong to the same poet.

²⁷⁹ A “mânî” is usually a single stanza, featuring various poetic metres.

²⁸⁰ This is a poetic style used in Southern Turkey, specifically for folk songs composed in the region.

	Koşma ²⁸¹
	Destan (Epic)
	Türkü (Folk Song)
	Millî Nazım Şekilleriyle Âşık ve `Avâmî Tasavvuf Edebiyyâtı Hakkında Malûmât (On the Types of National Poetic Meter and Mystic Folk Poetry)
	Yeni Edebiyyâtta Nesir Nev'ileri: Romanesk Nev[`], Târîh Nev`i, Didaktik Nev`, Dramatik Nev[`]i, Hitâbet Nev`i, Mektup Nev`i (Prosaic Genres in the New Literature: "Romanesque" Genre, Historical Genre, Didactic Genre, Dramatic Genre, Speech, Letter) Yeni Edebiyyâtta Nazım Nev[`]ileri: Lirik Nev`, Dramatik Nev[`]i, Didaktik Nev`, Pastoral Nev` (Poetic Genres in the New Literature: Lyric Genre, Dramatic Genre,

²⁸¹ A "koşma" typically consists of a minimum of two and a maximum of four stanzas, and involves a particular metre.

	Didactic Genre, Pastoral Genre)
	Siyâsî Tanzîmât (Political Reform)

Table 12. Orhan Rıza's questionnaire for literary historians to establish the correct method for their work

I - Gördüğümüz metin aslına mutabık mıdır?	I - Is the text in question in harmony with the original?
II - Tam veya değiştirilmiş midir?	II - Is it complete or altered in any way?
III - Metin tarihi, müstensihî, istinsah yeri belli midir?	III - Is the date it is from, the person who produced the copy of it, and where it is copied identifiable?
IV - Eserin şekil ve mana itibarî[y]le kıymeti nedir?	IV - What is the value of the text in terms of its form and content?
V - Eserin, her şeyden evvel, lisan ve edebiyat tarihimizin geçirdiği üç büyük safhadan -tahminen- hangisine mensup olduğunu; bundan sonra lisanın geçirdiği	V - First and foremost, approximately, which literary period out of the three major

tekâmül itibari[y]le eserin hangi asra ait olabileceğini. VI - Üslup ve mevzuun tetkiki VII - Manzumsa vezin ve şekli VIII - Bu ameliyeleri bitirdikten sonra, eser ne gibi ruhî tesirler altında kaleme alınmıştır; bunun için de muharrir hakkında muhtelif membaların mütalealarına müracaat edilmeli. IX - Eser zamanında şöhret kazanmış mıdır? X - Kökleşmiş kanaat ve nazariyelere bilatetkik kapılmamak	ones [that our literary history is divided into] the text belongs to, and which century it might belong to given the linguistic transformations observed in it. VI - Analysis of stylistics and theme. VII - If it is poetry, poetic measure and form. VIII - After identifying these, what kind of psychological influences under which it is written - for understanding this, evaluations of various sources about authors ought to be appealed to. IX - Has the text gained popularity for its time? X - Not to unconditionally accept the longstanding opinions and approaches.
---	--