

**FROM THE IMMORTAL REGULATOR TO THE WANNA-BE DICTATOR:  
THE SPECTERS OF THE FATHER IN SAATLERİ AYARLAMA ENSTİTÜSÜ  
AND KAR**

by

Adile Aslan

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Cultural Studies

Sabancı University

Fall 2011

**FROM THE IMMORTAL REGULATOR TO THE WANNA-BE  
DICTATOR: THE SPECTERS OF THE FATHER IN SAATLERI  
AYARLAMA ENSTİTÜSÜ AND KAR**

Prof. Dr. Sibel Irzık .....

(Thesis Supervisor)

Yusuf Hakan Erdem .....

Hülya Adak .....

DATE OF APPROVAL: 03.02.2012

*For All My Mothers*

© Adile Aslan 2011

All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

### **From the Immortal Regulator to the Wanna-be Dictator: The Specters of the Father in *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* and *Kar***

Adile Aslan

Cultural Studies, MA Thesis, 2012

Supervisor: Prof. Sibel Irzik

Keywords: *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, *Kar*, Modernization/Westernization, the Father complex, East-West division

This study brings two texts of modern Turkish literature together, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* [*The Clock-Setting Institute*] and *Kar* (*Snow*) in order to show their dialogue with each other through the issues of modernization/westernization, the father complex, East-West division. Close textual analysis shows that the former is a model for the latter, which Orhan Pamuk develops in accordance with the changes in narrative techniques, developments in literary movements and unfolding of events in the historical arena (“stage” in Sunay Zaim’s words) in the approximately five decades separating the two novels. The study’s main aim is to uncover the close relationship between the two novels through the father figure, carefully hidden in the former and overtly obvious in the latter, and to bring to light what the basic concerns behind their works are, what the conclusions or suggestions they propose are, if there are any.

## ÖZET

### **Ölümsüz Ayarcıdan Özenti Diktatöre: *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* ve *Kar*'da Babanın Gölgeleri**

Adile Aslan

Kültürel Çalışmalar, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2012

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Sibel Irzık

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, *Kar*, Modernizasyon/Batılılaşma, Baba kompleksi, Doğu-Batı ayrımı

Bu çalışma, modern Türkiye edebiyatından *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* ve *Kar* metinlerini bir arada incelemek suretiyle, iki metnin birbirleriyle olan diyalogunu modernleşme/batılılaşma, baba kompleksi, Doğu-Batı ayrımı olguları açısından göstermeyi hedefler. Yakın metin analizi sonucunda *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*'nün, Orhan Pamuk'un değişen anlatı tekniklerini, edebi akımlarda deneyimlenen gelişmeleri ve iki romanı birbirinden ayıran yaklaşık elli sene içerisinde tarihin arenasında (Sunay Zaim'in ifadesiyle "sahne") vuku bulan olayları göz önüne alarak geliştirdiği *Kar* metni için bir model teşkil ettiği gözlemlenmektedir. Bu çalışmanın esas amacı, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*'nde dikkatlice gizlenen, *Kar*'da ise açıkça belli olan baba figürü üzerinden iki roman arasındaki yakın ilişkiyi açığa çıkarmak ve bu eserler ardındaki temel ilgi odaklarına, şayet mevcutsa sundukları çıkarımlara veya önerilere ışık tutmaktır.

## Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	V
ÖZET.....	VI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VII
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	
1.1. Mustafa Kemal and Literature.....	1
1.2. A Short Survey on Mustafa Kemal As a Public Character.....	2
1.3. <i>Nutuk</i> as the Embodiment of the Principal Representation of Mustafa Kemal in the History of Turkey and the Official State Ideology based on the Former.....	4
1.4. A Father-Focused Reading of <i>Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü</i> and <i>Kar</i> .....	11
CHAPTER 2: Sunay Zaim: The Man Under the Shadow of Mustafa Kemal	
2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Masculine Republic/West and Feminine Ottoman/East—Fathers and Sons, The Son and the Mother .....	24
2.3. The Father Complex .....	29
2.4. Hayri İrdal: A Reliable Narrator or An insane Meczip.....	35
CHAPTER 3: Sunay Zaim: The Man Under the Shadow of Mustafa Kemal	
3.1. Introduction.....	40
3.2. Mustafa Kemal, Sunay Zaim: Kemalism and Its Discontents .....	44
3.3. Arts and Politics.....	62
3.4. Dark Doubles, Dual Duplicates, Doppelgangers, Alter Egos.....	64
CHAPTER 4:	
Conclusion.....	67
Works Cited.....	72

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

#### 1.1. Mustafa Kemal and Literature

In this study, I bring two texts of modern Turkish literature together, namely *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* [*The Clock-Setting Institute*]<sup>1</sup> and *Kar (Snow)*, which, I claim, are in dialogue with each other. Or, to be more precise, I argue, a close textual analysis shows that the former is a model for the latter, which Orhan Pamuk develops in accordance with the changes in narrative techniques, developments in literary movements and unfolding of events in the historical arena (or “stage” in Sunay Zaim’s words) in the approximately five decades separating the two novels. My main aim is to uncover the close relationship between the two novels through the figure of Mustafa Kemal, carefully hidden in the first one and overtly obvious in the second.

Focusing on how Tanpınar and Pamuk choose to represent Mustafa Kemal through the figures they build on him, his ideas, personality, relationships, private and socio-political, historical life in the above-mentioned works of theirs, I try to disclose the inherent Mustafa Kemal picture within them. I aim to bring to light on what kind of a picture of his personality they construct their narrative, what the basic concerns behind their work are, and what the conclusions or suggestions they offer, if there are any. Because the cult of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk as a prophetic leader, a unique soldier and an extraordinarily gifted statesman has a great influence since the 1920s, I aim to look at the ways these two novels react to this prevalent Atatürk cult: do they consciously or unconsciously acknowledge and reproduce it or do they have a more critical approach to it?

Behind these curious questions stands the idea that the figure of Mustafa Kemal is always on Turkish agenda, political or artistic, social or individual, yet the fact remains that he is a figure for the Turkish nation with whom has not been able to come to terms. This

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the original text of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* in the main body of this study. In footnotes, I quote the corresponding passages from *The Time Setting Institution*, translated by Erdal Gürol. Likewise, I use the original of *Kar* in the main body, whereas I give the corresponding passages in footnotes from *Snow* translated by Maureen Freely.

settling of affairs is true for literature as well. There has been an undeniable bond between Turkish literature and Mustafa Kemal since the 1920s. The shadow of the founder of the Turkish republic has fallen on the pages of innumerable works of art. In some of them, the father figure is visible with all its clarity. In some others, on the other hand, the shadow is somehow discernible, but very elusive. In this regard, this project undertakes to bring to light the barely discernible Mustafa Kemal figure in *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, and compare and contrast it with the explicit one in *Kar*, as these modern works of literature deal with the Mustafa Kemal figure, his impact on the history and public life of Turkey, as well as on private and daily spheres of life. Therefore, A short survey of biographical details about Mustafa Kemal's life and his place in Turkish history is necessary before the close reading of the two novels in question.

## 1.2. A Short Survey on Mustafa Kemal As a Public Character

Mustafa Kemal is one of the most renowned political leaders and capable commanders of the twentieth century. Born as Mustafa<sup>2</sup> in 1881 in Salonika (present-day Thessaloniki, Greece), he was the only surviving male child of a pious mother and progressive father. Completing his primary education at Şemsi Efendi School, he enrolled in military high school partly of his own accord and partly by the help of some male figures<sup>3</sup> in his close circle, despite his mother's protests. He completed his studies at the

---

<sup>2</sup> The official history, based on Atatürk's own memoirs and claims, indicates that the name Kemal was given to him by his mathematics teacher, since both were named Mustafa; Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, however, reveals that according to a schoolmate of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk there was another student in the class named Mustafa and the teacher named Atatürk as Mustafa Kemal to differentiate between the two students, not between himself and Atatürk. Mango, on the other hand, holds that either young Mustafa himself chose his "high-sounding" second name, being inspired by Namık Kemal or an elderly person proposed the name to him. See Volkan and Itzkowitz 1984, 36-7 and Mango 2000, 37.

<sup>3</sup> This male figure changes from one account to another. While Atatürk claims that he secretly sat for the examination on his own accord, in Armstrong's account it is his uncle who first suggests the military vocation for Mustafa (p.20); in Kinross's biography, it is young Mustafa himself who decides on a military career and is helped by the major neighbor (13-14); in Volkan and Itzkowitz's psychobiography, it is again Mustafa himself who secretly takes the examination by the help of the major neighbor, as a result of his narcissistic desires to wear a uniform and to identify with the idealized father (35).

War College in Istanbul in 1902 and attended War Academy, graduating in 1905. His early military career coincided with the revolutionary political attempts to overthrow the despotic reign of the sultan Abdulhamit II, who, after closing the first Ottoman Parliament and suspending the first constitutional era in 1877, initiated an absolutist reign for 31 years until the restoration of the Ottoman Parliament and the 1876 constitution in 1908. Despite being a member of the Committee of Union and Progress, which played an important part in overturning Abdulhamit II and became virtually sovereign power after 1909, Mustafa Kemal was an almost invisible figure in the politics of the falling empire, being exiled to remote parts of the empire due to his open criticism of the policies of Enver Pasha and the Committee. As a member of the triumvirate and, thus, one of the strongest men at the time, Enver Pasha always found a pretext to assign his regular critic to almost non-existent armies in remote parts of the empire and get him out of Istanbul. The opportunity to realize his dreams of grandeur came after the Ottoman Empire was defeated in World War 1, since she was allied with the Central Powers through Germany. The war came to an end in 1918 with the collapse of the Central Powers. The Ottoman Empire capitulated and signed the Armistice of Mudros. Based on the several articles of the armistice, the Allied Powers occupied different parts of the empire, forced the armies to disarmament and violated the local population. Mustafa Kemal was sent to Samsun by the sultan Mehmet VI and Damat Ferit Pasha as the General Inspector of the Eastern Forces<sup>4</sup> to restore order in the East and suppress the uprisings of Anatolian people, whereas Mustafa Kemal had already made plans with Ali Fuad (Cebesoy), Kazım Karabekir Pasha, Colonel Ismet (Inonu) and Colonel Refet (Bele) to unite the separate local movements against the Allied Powers into a nationalist movement. The dispersed local movements turned into the three-year-struggle of Turkey against the Allied Powers (Triple Entente) between 1919 and 1922. Mustafa Kemal acted as the leader of the nationalist movement and commander-in-chief of the Turkish forces, although the movement lacked coherence in the beginning. When the Independence Struggle was over with the victory of the Turkish armies, Mustafa Kemal embarked upon a rapid westernization and modernization movement through political, legal, cultural, social

---

<sup>4</sup>The authority of Mustafa Kemal was in fact extended to compromise all Anatolian forces through the help of his friends at the ministry of War and the parliament. See Volkan and Itzkowitz 1984, 121-3 and Kemal 1929, 15.

and economic reformations such as the abolition of the sultanate and the caliphate, the proclamation of the republic, the unification of education, the adoption of the Latin alphabet, of the Swiss civil code and of the Italian penal code, the establishment of Turkish History Association and Turkish Linguistic Society. Mustafa Kemal maintained his keen interest in westernization and modernization reforms until his death in 1938 and reinforced the implementation and acknowledgment of the reforms through Anatolian tours, public speeches, assembly meetings, and interviews. Hence, while he is officially the author of only one book, *Nutuk*, the book form of the speech at the national assembly between the 15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> November, 1927 for thirty six and half an hour, there is also a wide range of documents, pieces of writings and books made up from his speeches, memoirs, and interviews. He may even be claimed to be the (co-)author of most of his biographies, and many of writings on himself and on Turkish history, since they are based on the personal image, half-fictive personality, past and history he has created through various verbal and printed means. Hence, Atatürk as the author of his biographies and historical narratives is the unrivalled colleague of both biographers and historians. As I think *Nutuk* might be claimed to be the best example of the prevailing representation of Mustafa Kemal's personality and political life as well as the official ideology established on the former.

### **1.3. *Nutuk* as the Embodiment of the Principal Representation of Mustafa Kemal in the History of Turkey and the Official State Ideology based on the Former**

*Nutuk* is the speech delivered by Ghazi Mustafa Kemal in the Grand National Assembly. The prevalent status of the book in Turkey can be best exemplified in Hıfzı Veldet Velidedeoğlu's words: "Nutuk is like a sacred text, while it is also and simultaneously the autobiography of Atatürk, the journal of the Independence Struggle, a political history based on historical documents, and a guide to future generations."<sup>5</sup> Indeed, it has fulfilled all of these roles to a great extent to date. According to its narrator claim, *Nutuk* is the narration of political and historical events until 1927, though in reality the author/narrator/orator aims to convince his audience/reader to accept his interpretation of

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted and translated by Adak 2001, 152.

the events between 1919 and 1925 as the only true account of the years in question. Given that the author is the narrator is the protagonist (character), *Nutuk* may be identified as an autobiographical history of the certain period in question, but not *the history of that period in Turkey*. By drawing “an outline of the general events and indicate the tendency underlying them,” he plans “to make the task of the historian easier by pointing out the successive stages of the Revolution.” (376) In return, *Nutuk* remains *the history of the Turkish Republic* for the certain period in hand and whatever takes its place in *Nutuk* takes its place in history. This historical speech is also interesting in terms of the claims it contains. For example, Mustafa Kemal makes it clear that *Nutuk* is not merely the relation of what has happened since 19<sup>th</sup> May, 1919, but the account of what the narrator/protagonist has done to accomplish his predetermined resolution.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the narrator/protagonist calls his audience/reader to evaluate his actions in “their logical sequence:” if they fail to grasp the linear consistency in them, then there must be a lack of logical reasoning on the part of the audience. Likewise, he does not reveal the ultimate result to his companions, knowing that their internal/mental structure cannot supply the necessary means to bear this grand responsibility. He chooses the practical way of keeping them in the struggle and carries the burden on his own. Even so, he cannot prevent “certain differences of opinion of *more or less importance*, and even the discouragement and dissention” occurring from time to time, these differences of opinion being “sometimes in regard to principles, at others as to the method of the execution of *our programme* (19, italics mine.) So, the narrator/protagonist neither likes nor accepts any kind of differences between his opinions and those of his co-workers. As their immediate aim (to save the grieving nation/country) is the same, no kind of disaccord is acceptable. The narrator/protagonist puts the blame on some of his companions, because these differences of ideas stem from their limitation (20). Moreover, the narrator is omnipotent and omniscient, in complete control of the events from the beginning to the end. Even as in appearance he does not act in conformity with his predetermined project, in fact he does so to keep the nationalist movement alive, and that the narrator/protagonist is interchangeable with the victory of the nationalist movement: if he does not study even the minute details of

---

<sup>6</sup> Parla 2008, 27.

the movement meticulously, “it might become very dangerous” and great misfortunes may befall on the nation and the country, equating his absence in any phase of the movement with the absence of the movement itself. Besides, not only should he take part in every part of the movement but “[i]t was *essentially* necessary that [he] should ... be its leader.”(61) He considers it as his duty to “enlighten” people and apparently he is the only one who is able to do it: “I considered it imperative for me to inform, enlighten and guide the people in such a way that I would be to emphasi[z]e this view and induce them to accept it. <sup>7</sup> While doing all of these, he only trust his (inner) sources, he does not trust his companions, the accuracy of which is proven by time and events: “I admit that I had no confidence in the ability of any representative body to carry through the principles and decisions I have described that were adopted by the congress. Time and events have proved that I was right.”(60-1)

It is as if there is an empathic relationship between the nation/country and the narrator/protagonist. The narrator Mustafa Kemal, though he is not Atatürk yet, is the nation/country’s idealized parent, who is able to understand his “infant” emphatically. He senses, perceives, acts and speaks for the needs of his “baby,” a kind of relation, which, according to what the narrator tells us, does not exist between the other nationalist figures and the nation/country. No one can understand “the real inspirations and the innermost feeling of the nation” or have “a vital interest in these aspirations and feelings” better than he can do. (666) Such a strong relation with the nationalist movement and the identity of his self with the nation/country seems to reflect his much deeper association of the movement with his inner drives. His actions and decisions are not molded by the rules of the political arena/the external world. He listens to the voice of his conscience:

I communicated [my resignation] to the troops and the people. Henceforward I continued to do my duty according to the dictates of my conscience, free from any official rank and restriction, trusting solely to the devotion and magnanimity of the nation itself, from whom I drew strength, energy and inspiration as from an inexhaustible spring. (43)

The external events are less guiding for him than the dictates of his conscience: he makes changes in the external world so that it can respond to his inner ideals. The association of the nation/country with the sufficient mother, from whom he sucks “strength, energy and inspiration as from an inexhaustible spring,” is obvious.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the narrator/protagonist Mustafa Kemal and the nation/country take and exchange the roles of sufficient parent and hungry, needy infant according to Mustafa Kemal’s unconscious drives: first Mustafa Kemal becomes the idealized parent and nurses his “baby” so that in return the nation/country can satisfy his needs, a kind of narcissistic gratification on the side of Mustafa Kemal. Parla and Davison define the relationship between Mustafa Kemal and the nation/country as of charismatic nature: acknowledged to own some eternal truths (similar to the Semitic prophets), a charismatic leader (Mustafa Kemal in this case) reigns over the rest. (146) Parla also records the Mustafa Kemal’s distrust of “the capability of correct action and self-consciousness of masses,” obvious by all means: “Mass-people-nation has an essence which it is consciously not aware of and which only the leader can see that mass-people-nation has it and only he can operate and direct. Atatürk’s idea is that nation is a child to be brought up by himself.”<sup>9</sup>

The narrator of *Nutuk* is like a commander-in-chief in his narrative. He has all the rights to reserve on what to narrate when: “Reserving the right of reverting to this question, I shall now proceed to my main subject– the Green Army.” (404) He feels completely free to direct the mental activities of his audience/reader: “Now let us keep in mind what has been said in these three documents and subject them to a short analysis.” (304) He knows the proper sequence of events as well as the needs of his audience/reader so as to fully understand what he relates: “In what now seems to be its proper sequence, I will tell you something about our eastern front, but I must first give you an introduction to it by

---

<sup>8</sup> Volkan and Itzkowitz notify the reader that Zübeyde lacked a self-sufficient supply of milk and a wet nurse helped her to nurse Mustafa Kemal. See Volkan and Itzkowitz 1984, 24.

<sup>9</sup>The original is as follows:

Zaten Atatürk her vesileyle görülebileceği üzere, kitlelerin öz bilincine ve doğru eylem yeteneğine kesinlikle güvenmez. Kitle-halk-millet, ancak önderin işleyip yönlendirebileceği; kendinin bile bilinçli olarak farkında olmadığı, yalnızca önderin onda bulunduğunu görebildiği bir cevhere sahiptir. Atatürk’ün düşüncesi odur ki, halk büyütülecek bir çocuktur [.]

recording one incident that had taken place previously.” (405) He makes it sure that his audience/reader has the necessary background to grasp his narrative and includes a vertical image of the situation, focusing on Anatolia as well as Thrace so that the audience/reader can get the picture wholly: “Gentlemen, let us now cast a glance at the situation in Thrace at the time of which we are speaking.” (419) He knows exactly what is important to recount, and what is not worth dwelling on: “Instead of trying to throw light on this doubtful subject, I prefer to recall certain stages, certain incidents and discussions bearing on the situation and thereby facilitate your study of it.” (574) Besides, he has complete mastery over the memory of his audience/reader: he knows what he has told up to now and what he has not and explains the logical reasons behind his decisions regarding his narration technique. What’s more, he does not confine his audience to the deputies present in the assembly; he is confident that coming generations will read his narrative and learn the history of their nation from him. So he is careful to relate all the important historical events for them. In every respect, *Nutuk* underscores the narrator’s “infallibility, his indubitability, his unquestionability, his singularity, his unmatched patriotism and devotion”<sup>10</sup> for the present audience in the assembly and also for the future generations. At the end of his detailed account of the period in question, he suddenly declares that all these detailed descriptions belong to the past; the younger generations should look to the future from now on: his six-day-long descriptions “are, after all, merely a report of time” which belongs to a bygone period and he only wants to ensure that his nation and future generations will be interested in the truths he has related. Instead of concerning themselves with the details of a period in the past, the youth of Turkey should protect and preserve what the narrator achieved at the expense of great sacrifices. In a dramatic gesture, *Nutuk* ends with the message to the youth in which the narrator warns the youth against the visible and invisible dangers in the future, and tells them that their greatest mission is to preserve and protect the holy treasure. Parla summarizes Mustafa Kemal’s omnipotent control as follows:

It is such an ego-centric, even solipsist sense of self-righteousness and claim that history-maker/writer persona/charismatic leader is prosecutor, litigant

---

<sup>10</sup> Parla and Davison 2004, 200.

and judge all at the same time; he prepares the suit, creates the evidence, arrives at the decision, but simultaneously he does not fail to emphasize that the truth will come to light on “its own accord” and in any case the world agrees with him. Moreover, he does not let history take its course itself, he endeavors to prove his claims through documents and ‘recollections[.]’<sup>11</sup>

Indeed, even a superficial analysis of *Nutuk* reveals how all the other nationalist figures fall on the way one by one, whereas Mustafa Kemal never errs or falls throughout the whole ordeal. Mustafa Kemal is the sole person who could see the sole reasonable solution, “to create a New Turkish state, the sovereignty and independence of which would be unreservedly recognized by the whole world.” and arrives in Samsun to realize his predetermined resolution. He remains the same all the time, because otherwise it would mean that he was not good enough/the best in the beginning. He improves the nation to its ideal state.<sup>12</sup> In this grand mission, the narrator assumes his authority neither through institutions nor other leading figures, but from his uniqueness as the only one who can penetrate into the heart of the nation. (35) Not trusting anyone except for himself, Mustafa Kemal regards it as his duty to direct the nation through his political party so that he can ensure that the nation and political figures have not deviated from the true path, which only he claims to know. Even constitutions can fall short of the nation’s need, but Mustafa Kemal knows and satisfies every need of the nation. When the constitutions contradict with the intentions of Mustafa Kemal, he chooses to follow his decisions, by surpassing the constitutions: although his term of office as Commander-in-chief has expired and the new law has not been enacted, he decides to continue holding his office as before and he informs the Council of Ministers of his decision. He is above the law and the constitutions.

---

<sup>11</sup> The original is as follows:

Öyle bir ben-merkezci, hatta solipsist haklılık duygusu ve iddiası ki, tarih yapan/yazan kişi/karizmatik lider, hem savcı, hem davacı, hem yargıçtır; iddiayı kendi hazırlıyor, kanıtları kendi yaratıyor, hükmü kendi veriyor, ama bir yandan da gerçeğin “kendiliğinden” ortaya çıkacağını ve zaten tüm dünyanın da kendisi gibi düşündüğünü vurgulamayı ihmal etmiyor. İşi tamamen tarihe de bırakmıyor, söylediklerini belgeler ve “anılar”la doğrulamaya çalışıyor: “Bununla birlikte, ben, bu söylediklerimi geçmiş günlere ait bazı anılar ve belgeler ile de burada doğrulamayı, gelecek kuşağın toplumsal ve siyasal ahlaki açısından bir görev sayarım. (Parla 2008, 56.)

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, 30.

More importantly, the nation Mustafa Kemal praises, elevates, draws his energy is not the present one as such, but an abstract idealized nation in his mind, waiting to be improved by him.<sup>13</sup> In a related manner, when he goes on Anatolian tours to listen to people and understand their “psychology,” he can talk for hours instead of listening to them as if the people for whom he is there do not exist:

The monarchy having been abolished and the Caliphate denuded of its powers, it had become very important to get into close touch with the people and once more to study their psychology and spiritual tendencies. [...] I requested that the population should freely ask questions on subjects that were near to their hearts. In order to answer them I delivered long speeches which often lasted for six or seven hours. (587)

Even when he wants to study the psychology of the nation, the nation does not speak: he speaks for them, as presumably the distance between the two does not exist. He wants to repair the wounds of the war-weary nation, but he does it in his own way.

Interestingly, despite all his aggression and feelings of omnipotence it is possible to find Mustafa Kemal’s sense of border, which, according to Volkan and Itzkowitz, comes from his idealized father. Instead of abolishing all boundaries and being destructive for illogical desires, he proposes the protection of “national borders” and wants to bring happiness to the Turkish nation. Volkan and Itzkowitz define Mustafa Kemal’s leadership as reparative rather than destructive: by idealizing the nation and containing it as his idealized extension, Mustafa Kemal “strengthens the cohesiveness and stability of [both] his grandiose self” and the nation. (238-9) Similarly, Parla regards Mustafa Kemal’s nationalism as “non-aggressive, non-expansionist, non-irredentist, ...which elevates the nation to gain self-confidence, but not pushes forward it to the political subordination policy.”<sup>14</sup>

When one evaluates Mustafa Kemal in this light, it appears that:

---

<sup>13</sup> Parla 2008, 47.

<sup>14</sup> The original is as follows: “Bu sözler, Atatürk’ün saldırgan, yayılmacı ve irredantist olmayan milliyetçiliğinin özlü ifadelerinden biridir: Milleti, özgüvenini kazanması için yücelten, ama bunu siyasal üstünlük kurma politikasına vardırmayan milliyetçiliğinin.” Parla 2008, 72.

his characterizations of his actions were themselves constituted by self-conscious charismatic intentions, specifically by his sense of his own extraordinariness and his claim that he alone possessed the nation's truths. [...] Charismatic assumptions were evident in Kemal's self-conception as the sole person capable of leading Turkey out of "darkness," along the "logical" "stages" of development en route to the "original target" that only he knew.<sup>15</sup>

So, *Nutuk* is "precisely what [Mustafa Kemal] had tagged it: a lesson in 'social and political morality;' ... a lesson, in short, of Kemal's infallibility as the unparalleled father of the Turks."<sup>16</sup> Without a doubt, *Nutuk* tells much more than the years of Independence Struggle. It makes claims to history, illuminates the audience/reader on moral, social and political issues, depicts a gallery of political elites, though in not very elevating terms.<sup>17</sup> In psychoanalytic terms, *Nutuk* is the package: the narrator needs to tell the nation/country that he has fulfilled all his duties so that he can continue with his other predetermined projects.

#### **1.4. A Father-Focused Reading of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* and *Kar***

*Nutuk* has remained the authoritative text for the nation-state ideology. Different scholars, only some of whom I refer to here, have carried out critical readings of the text yet it is not very easy to break free of the ideological cobwebs. Therefore, while *Nutuk* has been scrutinized at various times by various people, it continues to be a landmark of Kemalism in Turkey.

What I intend to do in this study is to bring two literary texts together and do a close textual analysis thereof as critiques of Kemalism while at one and the same time focusing on the Mustafa Kemal figure, I claim, they entail. *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* might be claimed to be an early example in criticism of Kemalism in literature. It would not be wrong to say that *Enstitü* is one of the earliest literary texts that call for a critical approach at the socio-political events of the time. I juxtapose it with a contemporary work, *Kar* by

---

<sup>15</sup> Parla and Davison, 192-193.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 193.

<sup>17</sup> Parla 2008, 22.

Orhan Pamuk. All this while, *Nutuk* remains as a reference point and, from time to time, surfaces with its certain passages so as to be compared and contrasted with those from the novels. It should be noted that the chronological distance between the two novels are taken into consideration about the choice of the texts. As opposed to *Enstitü*, which can be said to deal with the early republican era, *Kar* treats current issues. As a result of the time difference, Pamuk finds the possibility of developing Tanpınar's early criticism by adding new layers to the narrative. In the way Tanpınar has opened Pamuk can elaborate his criticism of Kemalism, which becomes outdated in the 1990s. Accordingly, the Mustafa Kemal figure in *Kar* becomes quite grotesque, in comparison with Halit Ayarç. Also, the close intertextual kinship between them becomes almost tangible at the end of the study. The reader sees the dialogue between *Enstitü* and *Kar*. Besides, both of the novels centralize on the relation between art and society, revealing similar results despite the five decades that separate them. That is to say, both show that the father figure in the Kemalist paradigm infantilizes the society/nation to a considerable extent. Simultaneously, Mustafa Kemal turns out to be the artist and the society his work of art, but this artistic aspect is not without some violence. Both novels present scenes from this poetics of violence. Especially in *Kar*, this violence assumes a highly physical dimension, which shows that to treat life as a work of art, to try to mold people and to attempt to give a shape to society entails violence, in some cases physical violence.

## CHAPTER 2

### *The Clock-Setting Institute: Modern/Western-ization with The Immortal Regulator*

#### 2.1 Introduction

*Tanpınar'ı modern Türk edebiyatında benzersiz kılan; yalnızca şiirleriyle değil, öyküleri, romanları ve denemeleriyle de bu edebiyatı bir baba-oğul probleminde, edebiyatın tüm Hamlet'lerine musallat olan baba hayaletinden, daha ilksel bir kayıplar alanına, öksüz Ophelia'nın sularına taşımış olmasıydı. (Nurdan Gürbilek, Kör Ayna Kayıp Şark, 138)*

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar can be claimed to be the first modernist Turkish writer in that he was the first novelist to make modernist concerns the center of his attention and writing, such as focusing on the narrative, making aesthetics the central point, problematizing the concepts like subjectivity, interiority, identity, whilst the first (post-)modernist novel is generally accepted to be *Tutunamayanlar* because of its ground-breaking narrative techniques. Even as Tanpınar's themes mainly address the issues of loss, mourning, "alienation, problematic identity, tortured father-son relationships,"<sup>18</sup> his innovative narrative centralizes on dream aesthetics.<sup>19</sup> A sense of loss and the relentless search for integrity might be claimed to be the basic idea in his works. His literary world can be said to be essentially based on art, work of art, individual, narrative, and time.<sup>20</sup>

As much as today he is accepted to be one of the greatest figures in Turkish literary history; his works continue being the subjects of many distinguished literary, academic and artistic writings while he is recognized as the precursor of modernist Turkish literature for the following generation of writers, his literary reputation has not always been positive. To the contrary, his evaluation as a writer and a critic ameliorates gradually in accordance with the changes in the political history of Turkey. His non-conformism to the Kemalist language reform and adherence to Ottoman language led to his disfavor with the established literary critics of the early decades of the republican Turkey. In her discussion of novelistic canon in

---

<sup>18</sup> Parla 2008, "Wounded Tongue," 31.

<sup>19</sup> Gürbilek, *Kötü Çocuk Türk*, 66-88.

<sup>20</sup> Parla 2011, *Türk Romanında Başkalaşım*, 154.

Turkish literary history, Parla claims that Tanpınar's *History of Nineteenth Century of Turkish Literature (Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı)* was the single critical work which could have initiated "a canonistic discussion had it not been dismissed as the work of an odd scholar who did not embrace the republican reforms as wholeheartedly as he should have." As a result of this "ideological" negligence, Parla goes on to argue, the canonistic discussion in Turkey had to wait until the 1980s. ("Wounded," 31) Even if Parla's claim about the formation of canon in Turkish literature might be argued against, the inarguable fact remains that Tanpınar's *History of Nineteenth Century of Turkish Literature* is the earliest critical work on Turkish literature and Tanpınar has been disregarded for decades owing to the predominant ideological attitude of the principal literary institutions and actors.

While *Peace of Mind (Huzur)* is considered to be his seminal literary work and one of the most remarkable Turkish novels, *The Clock-Setting Institute* has also a distinguished place in Turkish literature. As Oğuzertem rightly observes, "[fifty five] years after its publication, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's enigmatic *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* continues to beguile its readers and mislead its critics. Despite the laudatory remarks it regularly receives, we are still far from completely comprehending what the novel is all about, how it holds together if it ever does, and the nature of the questions it internally deals with."<sup>21</sup> First serialized in 1954 and later published as a book in 1962, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* is the story of Hayri Irdal, a non/anti-hero who claims to pen the present book to record the historical importance of Halit Ayarç, his savior and master, and write about the latter's innovative Clock-Setting Institute, while in fact the narrative is more of his auto/biography until the time of Ayarç's death.<sup>22</sup>

The title refers to the Institute whose mission is to synchronize all watches and clocks in the country. The narrator Irdal enunciates that his sole aim in writing this "book" is to preserve the historical details related to the Institute and its genius founder Halit Ayarç, Irdal's "reverend" benefactor. He also notes that to relate his experiences is his

---

<sup>21</sup> Oğuzertem 1995, 3.

<sup>22</sup> Feldman asserts that several features of the novel make it the autobiography of Irdal rather than a biography of Ayarç or the history of the Institute. He points out that the protagonist of the story (albeit helpless and feeble) is unarguably Irdal: the whole plot revolves around him and characters come to the scene as much as they take part in his life. 38-39.

greatest duty to the next generations!”<sup>23</sup> Yet, in contrast with the claim of historicity, there is hardly any mention of actual dates of the events taking place in the book. Moreover, references to historical, socio-political events of the narrated time are almost nonexistent, which makes the events narrated in the novel, at least on a surface level or at a first glance, look like as if they take place independently of the actual historical developments in Istanbul and in Turkey at the time. What one can learn in terms of historical background is that İrdal is born at the very end of the nineteenth century (“16 Receb-i Şerif, sene 1310” – the use of Hegira calendar should be noted,) Nuri Efendi dies in the very beginning of 1912, Aristidi Efendi dies in February in 1912 (this time the Gregorian calendar, maybe because the modernization project already begins for Tanpınar or the death of Nuri Efendi in 1912, the year when Balkan Wars begin, symbolizes the end of the multiethnic empire,) İrdal serves during the WWI, returns to Istanbul at the end of the war, marries Emine and moves to Abdüsselam Bey’s mansion, unfortunate misunderstandings lead him first to a legal prosecution and later to mandatory psychoanalytic sessions with Dr. Ramiz (at the time of which Zehra, the first surviving child of İrdal is three years old,) Dr. Ramiz introduces him to H. Ayarcı several years later, and that İrdal works for the Institute for a decade. References to the actual historical events, persons, and institutions do not stretch beyond a scattered and elusive mentions of Committee of Union and Progress, the Second Constitutionalist Period, the murder of Mahmut Şevket Paşa, II. Abdulhamid era in his childhood. Based on a rough calculation of these dates, their references being very evasive, it is possible to say that the adulthood years of İrdal must historically overlap with the 1920s, and 1930s, which corresponds to the early decades of the republican Turkey. If one thinks of the fact that these years are the times when reforms in all layers of the society were carried out in an unprecedented speed, this seemingly unimportant lack of historicity in the plot becomes all the more captivating. It seems to me that Tanpınar chooses to place socio-historical references subtly within a rough framework of the early twentieth century while it is possible to find implicit references to the experience of modernity and westernization in the novel on a closer textual analysis.

---

<sup>23</sup> “gördüklerimi ve işittiklerimi yazmak, gelecek nesillere karşı en büyük vazifemdir.” (11)

Against this backdrop of the young republican Turkey, Halit Ayarçı inexorably becomes the representation of new state ideology, top-down modernization/westernization and the rootless idea of the new of the Kemalist era in the novel. The surname Ayarçı is clearly a symbolic name: one could easily assume that during the implementation of the surname law reform in 1934, he must have chosen it himself, as Mustafa Kemal does for his surname. Yet, not surprisingly, not only is there no mention of the surname law but also nowhere in the novel, as far as I can trace, is there any explicit reference to the Kemalist reforms. Yet, close reading of the text reveals opposite results. For example, in the first pages of the novel, İrdal confesses that he has no command over Ottoman and skips over the Arabic and Persian words in the scarce texts he has read all his life, which can be regarded as a reference to the Kemalist language reform. Or, İrdal complains that once Istanbul was full with black people, but now they are like “rare import products” which may point at the decreased ethnic variety in society, though not through a politically correct expression. (10) Yet, there are other much heartfelt references to the fall of the empire. The Ottoman type of big household is one of the most favorite symbols for the old times. Abdülsselim’s mansion, with its greatness, variety of several generations and diversity of ethnic origins of the inhabitants, is clearly associated with the Ottoman Empire:

Hürriyetin ilânından sonra, ayrı ayrı planlarda bir benzeri olduğu imparatorluk gibi, konak da yavaş yavaş dağıldı. İlk önce Bosna-Hersek, Bulgaristan, Şarkî Rumeli ve Şimalî Afrika arazisi ile beraber birader beylerle hemşire hanımlar ayrıldılar, sonra Balkan Harbi sıralarında küçük beylerin ve gelin hanımların bir kısmı evden çıktı. Sonuna doğru hemen hemen yalnız Ferhat Beyle -kardeşinin damadı-kendi çocuklarının bir kısmı kaldı. (38-9)<sup>24</sup>

The disintegration of the mansion takes place almost simultaneously with that of the Ottoman Empire, from 1908 to 1918. At the end of the World War I, the empire and mansion becomes equally desolate. The long for an Ottoman household is discernible in İrdal’s mansion, Villa Saat as well: he looks for an Arabic overseer to give his house an aura

---

<sup>24</sup> “Following the Declaration of Independence, along with the dismemberment of the empire, the mansion also started to dissociate, though on a different level. First, simultaneously with the severance of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Eastern Thrace, and Northern Africa, the aunts took their leave, and during the Balkan War, a good many of the gentlemen and daughters-in-law left the premises. Eventually, only his brother’s son-in-law, Ferhat Bey, and some of his own children remained.” (54)

of dynasty. The desire for the multiethnic times, traditional and communal lifestyles is marked from the beginning.

Criticism of socio-political environment with examples from ordinary daily life continues with one of the most commonly used terms. A quiet ironic and most explicit reference to the historical events occurs when Irdal complains about the recent restriction of the word freedom (hürriyet) to its political sense.

Benim çocukluğumun bellibaşlı imtiyazı hürriyetti. Bu kelimeyi bugün sadece siyasi manâsında kullanıyoruz. Ne yazık! Onu politikaya mahsus bir şey addedenler korkarım ki, hiçbir zaman manâsını anlamayacaklardır. Politikadaki hürriyet, bir yığın hürriyetsizliğin anahtarı veya ardına kadar açık duran kapısıdır. Meğer ki dünyanın en kıt nimeti olsun; ve tek insan onunla şöyle iyice karnını doyumak istedi mi etrafındakiler mutlak surette aç kalsınlar. Ben bu kadar kendi zıddı ile beraber gelen ve zıtlarının altında kaybolan nesne görmedim. Kısa ömrümde yedi sekiz defa memleketimize geldiğini işittim. Evet, bir kere bile kimse bana gittiğini söylemediği halde, yedi sekiz defa geldi; ve o geldi diye biz sevincimizden, davul, zurna, sokaklara fırladık.

Nereden gelir? Nasıl birdenbire gider? Veren mi tekrar elimizden alır? Yoksa biz mi birdenbire bıkar, "Buyurunuz efendim, bendeniz, artık hevesimi aldım. Sizin olsun, belki bir işinize yarar!" diye hediye mi ederiz? Yoksa masallarda, duvar diplerinde birdenbire parlayan, fakat yanına yaklaşıp avuçlayınca gene birdenbire kömür veya toprak yığını haline giren o büyülü hazinelere mi benzer? Bir türlü anlayamadım.

Nihayet şu kanaate vardım ki, ona hiç kimsenin ihtiyacı yoktur. Hürriyet aşkı, – haydi Halit Ayaracı'nın sevdiği kelime ile söyleyeyim, nasıl olsa beni artık ayıplayamaz, kendine ait bir lügati kullandığım için benimle alay edemez!– bir nevi snobizmden başka bir şey değildir. Hakikaten muhtaç olsaydık, hakikaten sevseydik, o sık sık gelişlerinden birinde adamakıllı yakalar, bir daha

gözümüzün önünden, dizimizin dibinden ayırmazdık. Ne gezer? Daha geldiğinin ertesi günü ortada yoktur. Ve işin garibi biz de yokluğuna pek çabuk alışıyoruz. Kıraat kitaplarında birkaç manzume, resmî nutuklarda adının anılması kâfi geliyor.

Hayır, benim çocukluğumun hürriyeti, hiç de bu cinsten bir hürriyet değildir. Evvelâ, burası zannımca en mühimdir, onu bana hiç kimse vermedi. Bu sızdırılmış altın külçesini birdenbire kendi içimde buldum. Tıpkı ağaçta kuş sesi, suda aydınlık gibi. Ve bir defa için buldum. Bulduğum günden beri de küçücük hayatım, fakir evimiz, etrafımızdaki insanlar, her şey değişti. Vakıa sonraları ben de onu kaybettim. Fakat ne olursa olsun bana temin ettiği şeyler hayatımın en büyük hazinesi oldular. Ne dünkü sefaletim, ne bugünkü refahım, hiçbir şey onun mucizesiyle doldurduğu seneleri benden bir daha alamadılar. O bana hiçbir şeye sahip olmadan, hiçbir şeye aldırmadan yaşamayı öğretti. (21-22)<sup>25</sup>

---

25. My childhood's greatest privilege was freedom. This word has today merely political connotations. Very deplorable indeed! Those who are of the opinion that freedom is restricted to politics, will, I am afraid, never understand its meaning. Political freedom is the key to mass enslavement or its wide-open-door. It is the rarest boon on earth; let an individual choose to feed himself on it to his hearth's content, the onlookers are sure to remain starved. I have never seen such a thing which is always accompanied by its very opposite to hear that our country had been visited by this freedom on seven or eight instances. Yes, through no one told me that it has never left the country, it did come on seven or eight occasions; and upon the said glad things, we rushed into the streets beating drums and blowing horns.

Where does political freedom come from? How can it disappear all of a sudden? Does the bestower retrieve it? Or is it we who grow tired and make a gift of it to others, saying, "Here you are, sir, it's yours now. We have had our share of it. Now it's your turn. Help yourself. Who knows, it might do you good"? Or is it like that magic treasure described in fairy tales, which flares up at the foot of a wall but which, no sooner do you reach for it, than it turns into a heap of coal or earth? I just don't know. It became evident that nobody was in need of it. Love of freedom--- if I may use here a favorite term of Halit the Regulator, as I feel sure that he would not reproach me for it, nor would in any way make fun on me for using a word from his own vocabulary---is but not snobbery. If we stood truly in need of it, if we sincerely loved it, we would never let it go once we had it in our trip. Bu alas! The very next day after its advent, it vanishes into thin air. The funny part is that we soon get accustomed to its absence. We seem to be satisfied when we see it quoted in a poem, a book, or a public speech.

The freedom I have been referring to in connection with my childhood experiences was nothing of the sort. To begin with --- and this is, I think, a point of paramount importance--- it was not given to me. I found this ingot in me like the chirping of birds perched on a tree or the mysterious light on a body of water. It came my way only once in my life. My humble life, our modest home, and the people around us all took on a different aspect.

Being one of the most critical pieces in the novel, the above-quoted passage is heavily charged with social critique, containing evident allusions to the turbulent political events of the first decades of the twentieth century and manipulation of certain concepts by the political actors. First of all, the narrator is distraught at the restriction of the meaning of the word to its political connotations. He suggests that not only is this limitation to the political denotation nonsensical but also, and most importantly, the concept is abused for power issues by political figures. To the narrator, who is very insightful at this particular passage, what political freedom means is in fact “mass enslavement.” If one person decides to have political freedom, or in Irdal’s words “feed on it,” then the rest starves, implying to a dictatorship or a single-man regime. Irdal goes on to say that political freedom is closely accompanied and always engulfed in the end by its very opposite, that is to say restriction, servitude, limitation, captivity, dependence, thralldom...etc. In his distant style, Irdal mocks the fact that freedom has visited the country for at least seven or eight times, even though it has never left before in the first place. He also derides the fact that “we” seem satisfied enough with freedom “quoted in a poem, a book or a public speech.” The talk of political freedom in public sphere closely reverberates with the political atmosphere in Turkey in the first decades of the twentieth century, while the mention of liberty in poems and books can be seen as a hint to the literary scene overwhelmed by the political issues.

Excessive modernization, especially rootless and incongruent westernization, is one of the main concerns of the novel and, accordingly, treated with the most prominent motif of the narrative. The basic symbol of excessive modernization/westernization and the critique thereof in the novel comes in the shape of a watch or a clock. First of all, Irdal tells the reader that as a child his “settled state” was upset by a gift of watch from his maternal uncle: ‘Vakiâ on yaşlarıma doğru bu mesut hayatı bir ihtiras bulandırdı. Dayımın sünnet hediyesi

---

Though I eventually lost it, the gifts it lavished on me in the meantime became the treasures of my lifetime. Neither my misery of yesterday, nor my easy circumstances of today could take from me those years that it filled with wonder. It taught me to live without owning any property, or letting the grass grow under my feet.” (39-40)

olarak verdiđi saatle hayatımın ahengi biraz bozular gibi oldu.” (23)<sup>26</sup> It is interesting that a watch given by a father figure interrupts his stable temper. Most importantly, this unsettling gift is given during the circumcision ritual, a ritual whereby a young man is initiated into “manhood.” The castration of the child by the father becomes identical with the watch given as a gift by a father figure. A couple of passages later, the reader learns that an earlier present of the (same) uncle is a minaret: when the watch comes, all the previous toys, including the once favorite minaret, are discarded. It is as if the modern/secular replaces the traditional/religious in all levels, in society, in family and in personal lives, and Tanpınar chooses secret symbols to convey his concern.

The identity between watch/clock and (critique of) westernization deepens further with the advent of the events/novel. Hayri İrdal points out that Nuri Efendi has a unique philosophy of his own, in which he focuses on similarities between human being and clock, clock and society in the early chapters of the novel (33). This is an early sign that clock references in the novel might be at times read either as a sign of human being or society. The most obvious reference to the similarities between clock and society, however, comes earlier than this passage. Hayri İrdal states that “Tam saat ayarı haddizatında imkânsız olduđu için -bu, saatlere mahsus bir ferdî hürriyet meselesidir[.]...Herkes bilir ki, bir saat ya geri kalır, yahut ileri gider. Bu işin üçüncü şekli yoktur.” (14) The clock in this sentence must be society in the age of modernity. A society is either belated or developed. There is no in-between option for a society in the modern age. In the following quotation, the watch, the castration fear, critique of westernization and socio-political situation intertwines into each other:

Sahiplerinin mizaçlarındaki ağırlığa, canı tezliğe, evlilik hayatlarına ve siyasi akidelerine göre yürüyüşlerini ister istemez değiştirirler. Bilhassa bizim gibi üst üste inkılaplar yapmış, türlü zümreleri ve nesilleri geride bırakarak, dolu dizgin ilerlemiş bir cemiyette bu sonuncusuna, yani az çok siyasi şekline rastlamak gayet tabiidir. Bu siyasi akideler ise çok defa şu veya bu sebeple gizlenen şeylerdir. Hiç kimse ortada o kadar kanun müeyyidesi varken

---

<sup>26</sup> “The watch of which my paternal uncle had me a gift on the occasion of my circumcision ritual interrupted my settled state.”

elbette durduđu yerde, “benim düşünceş şudur” diye bağırır. Yahut gizli bir yerde bağırır. İşte bu gizlenmelerin, mizaç ve inanç ayrılıklarının kendilerini bilhassa gösterdikleri yer saatlerimizdir. (15)<sup>27</sup>

This paragraph is very significant for several reasons. To begin with, it contains one of the earliest clues that there is a difference of opinion between İrdal and Ayarcı. Whereas İrdal believes that watches differ even from one owner to the next, Ayarcı wants to regulate every single watch and clock in the country. If the watch in the above passage is associated with private space, personal tendencies and individual preferences, then Ayarcı wants to penetrate into the most private spheres of people’s lives and make each life, each person identical with the rest according to his grand scheme. Not only is the power of the authority is felt even in the most intimate level but also this authority is quite domineering and oppressive. On another but closely related level, if the watch signifies society, then politicians become “the owners” of society. Every society “walks” at a certain speed, depending on the tendencies, ideas and aims of owners who help shape that society. Therefore, while the narrator supposedly comments on his observations and impressions without giving much thought to the accompanying socio-historical events or showing any concern for the conditions he talks about, there is a subtly hidden socio-political criticism. At the end of the book the reader learns that İrdal is not that naïve and that he can be quite ironic, even sarcastic in these first pages, it is highly possible that İrdal makes fun of modernization processes in Turkey, presumably resonating Tanpınar. İrdal underscores the fact that “especially in a society like ours, having carried out countless reforms one after the other and overtaken many communities and generations, clock/watch as symbols of political creeds is very common and ordinary.” In a way, the political dimension of the period Hayri İrdal talks about is referred to from the first pages of the novel. Yet, the detached, careless, somewhat ego-centric tone of the narrator makes the political allusions in this passage seem arbitrary or insignificant at most. When one thinks of this seemingly unimportant

---

<sup>27</sup> “So are watches. They change their rhythms according to the prudence or rashness of their character, and their matrimonial lives and political creeds. Especially in a society like ours, which has undergone successive reforms and taken gigantic steps forward, leaving behind whole casts of people and generations, it is only too natural to see the influence of these political creeds. These political creeds on the other hand, are often kept secret for one reason or another. No one of sound mind would challenge the prevailing multitude of sanctions, by boldly stepping forward to declare aloud, “Now, gentlemen, here is my opinion,” or one does so sotto voce. Now, there is no better place for these concealments and differences of idiosyncrasies and beliefs to become manifest than in our watches.” (34)

articulation of socio-political atmosphere together with other components and layers of the novel, it becomes evident that all the criticisms Irdal addresses in his narrative have a reference in terms of the republican Turkey. For instance, the above-quoted passage touches upon the freedom of (political/individual) expression, albeit in an in-passing fashion: individual ideas are prohibited from being made public through legal bindings. The passage makes it clear that public announcements of personal opinions are forbidden through law. Being aware of punitive consequences, people are carefully discreet about their personal notions. If these ideas are made known or shouted out notwithstanding, then this coming-out might be carried out in a secretive place. Nevertheless, watches, Irdal claims, can still be revealing in terms of characteristics, especially political tendencies of their owners. The criticism seems at one level to be related to the lack of freedom of expression and to political autocracy despite the innumerable successive reforms in a society riding at full speed on the road of civilization. On another level, the real signifier of society is claimed to be people, how they live, what they think or feel, not the modernization processes undertaken by the owner, as Hayri's (our) country is an appropriate example. The uninvolved tone of the narrator makes these criticisms look like they are not of significant consequences, but then the entire narrative is based on clocks and the clock-setting institute. The intriguing question remains what exactly these clocks/watches reveal about political creeds of their owners in this speedily developed country? Or which kinds of dissident political creeds are represented through them in spite of the restrictive items of law? In the text, it is not explicitly given what sorts of clocks represent which types of political tendencies or what is the exact political situation in Hayri Irdal's country at the time. However, when one thinks of the entire novel, it becomes inarguably clear that there is a misfit between the owner and the clock. Despite this misfit, the clock willy-nilly gets used to abiding by the law of the owner. (15)<sup>28</sup>

As it is clear from the preceding novels, time is treated as the basic motif in the novel, while watch/clock becomes the basic tool to bring out the relation to time. Political leaders are the owner of the clock/society and time is their fundamental tie. The owner wants to

---

<sup>28</sup> The original is "saat, ister istemez sahibine temessül eder, onun gibi yaşamağa ve düşünmeğe alışır."

regulate the clock, keep it in order and have the correct time. The clock, however, may lag behind the usual time. The whole idea here is how the owner regulates the clock and how the clock reacts to it. It might be noted here that at least two different understandings of time are represented through the characters of Nuri Efendi and Halit Ayarçı. The time signified by Nuri Efendi is the that of a more traditional existence before the advent of modernity: simple, spiritual, one to one, one person-one complete work, deeper and more permanent ties to the world, people and profession. The kind of time embodied in the person of HA is a modern concept of time based on contemporary life and its processes (such as bureaucratization, secularization, division of labor, standardization, marketing, automatization): fast, efficient, reproductive, practical...etc. Thinking of this charge of time together with Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's general concerns, one can say that time and watches/clocks Hayri Irdal talks about must be related to the issues of East versus West and of westernization: through their relationship with time symbolized through watch in the novel, Hayri Irdal (and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar) seems to be suggesting that people inescapably announce their general attitude towards life. Since the events in the novel takes place in the first half of the twentieth century, when the multiethnic Ottoman Empire is replaced by the nation state Turkish Republic, this attitude toward life inevitably contains the dilemma of East vs. West, tradition vs. modernity, authenticity vs. commodification.

After his reflections on the relation between a watch/clock and its owner, emphasizing that every watch/clock adopts and mirrors the personality of its owner as a result of the time spent together and of being the most intimate friend, Irdal opens a parenthesis about his general belief on the close affinity between personal items and their owners. He declares that if not to the extent of a watch/clock, still all of our items appropriate and take over our characteristics. Following his claim that our accessories and garments become parts of ourselves (and that is why we give our personal goods and clothing to our maids and servants, that is to say to make them resemble us), he gives two examples from his own life. In the first one, he claims that with the old suits of Cemal Bey given to him as a kind of gift by the owner, a love for his wife Selma passes on to him. In the second example, the gift-giver in question is Halit Ayarçı: Ayarçı gives him a pair of new suit in the first days of the foundation of the Institute and the day he wears it, he changes forever. He begins to talk, think and act like Ayarçı (15-7.) In my opinion, the

image of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and an ironic dramatization of dressing code reform are hidden in these passages. It cannot be a coincidence that the first item he mentions when he begins to talk about the relation of goods to their owners is the hat, reminding one of Atatürk's first phenomenal appearance with his panama hat. Toward the end of the novel, the hat becomes the ultimate emblem of Halit Ayarçı. When he is deeply upset by the opposition of the Institute staff against his modern housing project, "he leaves the Institute even without taking his hat."<sup>29</sup> I think Tanpınar may be making a reference to the hat reform in particular, garment and clothing reform in general and mocking it by implying that to try to change a certain society by garment reforms is as ridiculous as İrdal's above idea. It is by this first clue that one realizes the novel, in fact, contains a great number of references to the figure of M.K. Atatürk hidden in the characterization of Halit Ayarçı. Hayri İrdal's ironic and idiosyncratic narrative helps this hidden Mustafa Kemal symbolism become discernible. Otherwise, this deeply buried allegory would remain concealed. It may be more fitting to expound on them in a separate section.

## **2.2. Masculine Republic/West and Feminine Ottoman/East—Fathers and Sons, The Son and the Mother**

Parla thinks that references to the personification of M.K. Atatürk are traceable in the characterization of Halit Ayarçı (*Başkalaşım* 162) and she quotes the following passage from the novel as an example of this referentiality:

Ve içtik. Devletin eli omuzuma ve bakışı gözlerime değdiği andan itibaren bende bir değişiklik mevcut olmuştu. Birdenbire iştahım artmış, bütün vücudumu bir rahatlık hissi, bir nevi saadet ve ferahlık kaplamıştı. ... Bu hafiflik, bu boşalma ve doluş,-- çünkü giden sıkıntılarımın yerine garip bir sevinç, bir iç rahatı, bir güvenme geliyordu—şüphesiz ondan, onun omuzumu çökerten ağır ve heybetli elinden, gözlerime akan mıknatıslı bakışlarındandı. (210)<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> "Ve şapkasını dahi almadan çıkıp gitti." 363

<sup>30</sup> "So we cheered. I had felt a certain change come over me as soon as the hand of the illustrious gentleman had touched my shoulder, and his look had encountered mine. My appetite had increased, a feeling of well-being had come over me, I felt serene and blissful. ... This lightness, this evacuation and refilling – for the place of the departing sorrows was being filled by a joy, by a serenity and reliance – were doubtless due to

The person in question this passage is in fact another charismatic authority figure Hayri sees in a restaurant while he eats with Halit Ayarçı for the first time. Nevertheless, the novel encompasses countless references to Halit Ayarçı, in which he is described as a magnetic, enigmatic, charismatic person. Besides, the above passage is so intertwined with the first impressions of Halit Ayarçı on Irdal that it is difficult to determine for certain whether he talks about the stranger or Ayarçı. As Parla records, this passage strongly resonates memoirs related to Atatürk penned by figures in his inner circle and could easily be replaced with a quotation from one of them. Irdal, in a way, becomes one of the sycophants surrounding Atatürk-Ayarçı. One nuance, however, must be pointed out. Irdal is the only critical sycophant among all the uncritical others and openly discloses (at least in the narrative) his disapproval of Ayarçı's opinions, plans or suppositions, although he continues to carry them out most of the time. Thus, it becomes appropriate that the narrator is Hayri Irdal, which helps a critical account of Ayarçı and his reforms to be articulated. Otherwise, it would be similar to *Çankaya* in tone.<sup>31</sup>

Certain idiosyncrasies the character Halit Ayarçı is pictured to have in the novel bear intriguing resemblances or at least lead to striking associations with Atatürk. For instance, as previously specified, his surname is as symbolic as Atatürk's: the way Atatürk wants to be regarded as the father of Türks, Ayarçı aspires to be the regulator, longing to order the entire nation, which is openly reflected by his surname. Ayarçı believes in the idea of the absolute synchronization of the whole country, a passionate desire represented by the Institute. The Institute is founded by Halit Ayarçı to orchestrate the country from the center by means of local branches, as if the entirety of the population and country is homogenous or the development thereof is simultaneous at all layers. As noted above, Hayri Irdal, on the other hand, confesses that personal dimensions make this synchronization impossible. Ayarçı is represented in the first pages of the novel as the genius discoverer, albeit in an ironic tone as we learn later. He believes in the notions of creation and discovery, in the act

---

him, to his enormous grip under which my shoulder had sunk, and to his magnetic looks that had penetrated my eyes." (195)

<sup>31</sup> The following is the caption for *Çankaya* by Falih Rıfki Atay: "Haber vereyim ki Atatürk ne yaptığını, nasıl yapacağını, kimlere ne yaptıracağını, kimleri nerede nasıl kullanacağını bilen pek hesaplı bir adamdı. Yapmış oldukları üzerinde istediğiniz tenkidlerde bulunabilirsiniz. Fakat kendi varmak istediğine ulaşmaktan başka bir şey düşünmeyen, dostluklarının, yakınlıklarının, sözde sırdaşlıklarının üstünde bilhassa 'kendi kendine vefalı' bir lider olduğu su götürmez bir gerçektir."

of actually carrying out. His realism deviates from the common sense of the word and merges into pragmatism: realism in the generally accepted usage means “defeatism” for Ayarcı, which, he claims, belongs to “the old man.” (219) The new man’s realism is to ask what he can do with what he has at hand in the best possible way. (219) He talks, acts and decides with precision, without taking others’ ideas into consideration. For him matters are all or nothing. (235) He is only convinced that the Institute does not need a “Muamelat” manager, when the mayor points out that “Muamelet” is not an appropriate name for an institute in the age of Öz Türkçe/pure Turkish. (238) Ayarcı’s response to a critique of one newspaper about the Institute as being “a milestone in the history of bureaucratization in terms of its name and its mission as well as its organization:

Bu asra birçok ad verilebilir. Fakat o her şeyden evvel bürokrasi asrıdır. Spingler’den Kayserling’e kadar bütün filozoflar bürokrasiden bahsederler. Ben hatta derim ki, bürokrasinin asıl kemal çağı istiklal devri bu devirdir. Bunu anlayan adam mühim adamdır. Ben mutlak bir müessese kuruyorum. Fonksiyonunu kendi tayin edecek bir cihaz... Bundan mükemmel ne olabilir? (269)<sup>32</sup>

Instead of having a critical attitude toward bureaucratization in the age of modernity, Ayarcı submits to the facts, data, logic and structures of modern life, makes use of and carries them to an insane level. It is also possible to find the patriarchal features of the Kemalist reforms in the details about the Institute. For instance, about the future personnel to be hired, Ayarcı firmly asserts that:

Bana kalırsa bu ayar istasyonları personelini sadece genç kızlara ve kadınlara inhisar ettirelim. Hiç erkek almayalım. Sizin dediğiniz şekilde terbiyeyi ancak genç kızlara verebiliriz. Erkekler için başka işler ararız... Bir yığın delikanlıyı otomat haline ne diye sokalım! Zaten yapamayız.

---

<sup>32</sup> “Many a name can be attributed to it. But first and foremost it is an age of bureaucracy. All philosophers from Spengler to Keiserling speak of bureaucracy. I would even go as far as to say that the age in which bureaucracy has fully flourished and acquired its freedom is the present age. A person who can see this is surely an important man. I am here to establish an absolute institution. A device that will assign its own function. What can be more splendid than such a thing?” (244)

Şimdi kadınlar da erkekler kadar genç ve güzel kadınlarla anlaşabiliyorlar... Sinema artislerine hayranlıklarından belli. (250)<sup>33</sup>

The immediate passage following the above-quotation begins with an inner thought of Hayri İrdal. He is convinced that there are as many witless men as witless women, but he prefers not to contest Hayri Ayarcı. This passage is very revealing, though in an understated manner, about the patriarchal side of the republican spirit. And this is not the single example of pejorative attitude toward women in the text. If one considers the roles of all women in the realization of the Institute, it becomes quite clear that Ayarcı turns women into both physical and symbolic resources of his grand undertaking. For instance, he manipulates first Pakize and via her Hayri İrdal's aunt, and they become staunch supporters of the Institute. The aunt puts all her energy and money in the service of the Institute. The two sisters of Pakize become other important symbols of Ayarcı's modernization process. It can easily be claimed that Halit Ayarcı manipulates women and make use of them in the symbolization of his "work of art." A similar treatment of the instrumentalization of women for man's modernizing projects can also be detected in Kar which will be dealt with in the second chapter of this study. Therefore, as already specified, Ayarcı is the quintessential father figure and portrays the familiar characteristics associated with M.K. Atatürk in a ridiculously exaggerated fashion. An aggressive, virile, power-oriented, charismatic leader obsessed with the idea of new; champion of modernization, westernization, bureaucratization, standardization/automatization; admirer of the West; advocate of pure Turkish; an exemplary frontrunner for under-developed and developing countries, already ready to do away with all the ties to the past; author and strong supporter of fake theories as well as of biographies of non-existential historical figures (probably equivalent of Turkish History Hypothesis, Sun Language Theory, nation-state ideology), appropriator of Nuri Efendi's spiritual philosophy of time to pragmatic slogans under new names, according to his present needs (presumably adaptations from previous lines of thought, İttihat Terakki's policies and Ziya Gökalp's corporatism). The ball at the mansion of Hayri's aunt, where

---

<sup>33</sup> "If you ask my opinion, for the proposed regulation station personnel we should limit our choice exclusively to young girls and women. Let us engage no males. A training such as you are contemplating can be given only to young girls. For males we can find other jobs. Why should we turn a mass of young man into automatons? Moreover, we could not do it even if we wanted to. Now women, like men, can get along quite well with young and beautiful women. You can tell this from their admiration of film stars." (228)

Van Humbert learns how to do a “zeybek” dance calls up the republican balls where Mustafa Kemal does his famous zeybek dances. All of these similarities instill an association of the regulatory leader with the father of the Turks. Still, there is something about the characterization of Ayarçı, which somehow softens this critical portrayal. All throughout the novel Ayarçı is represented as truly believing in what he does: he seems to heartily have faith in his reforms, which will, again in his opinion, transform the society in a revolutionary way. It is the sycophants surrounding him who do it for profit without really believing. Ayarçı is deeply disappointed when his enthusiastic followers withdraw their support because they do not want Ayarçı to include their own lives in his modernization projects. It is with this great disappointment that Ayarçı becomes dispassionate and quits his projects. One interesting detail is that Ayarçı has an affair with İrdal’s wife whose child, İrdal notes in a seemingly unsuspecting manner, resembles Ayarçı day by day. Could this be an implicit, subtle reference to Atatürk’s virility/overt-sexuality? It seems to me that these small yet significant details sound strikingly familiar in terms of the Atatürk era and helps in creating an overall yet subtle critique of the early republican period.

In this process of identification of Ayarçı and Atatürk, Hayri İrdal becomes the means of bringing out the oddities of Ayarçı. For example, Ayarçı is overwhelmingly taken by İrdal’s suggestions of a uniform and a certain standardized addressing style carried out with the same words and expressions every time and with a poignant assertion of expertise in the fashion of a set-clock. Of the uniform, Ayarçı thinks as a very characteristic machine and of the standardization of the staff’s dictum as a kind of automatization, which is “the greatest weakness and strength of our age.”(249)<sup>34</sup> He simply loves the idea of “plak insan/record human being.” İrdal’s role as the unveiling factor of Ayarçı’s peculiarities, is touched upon openly towards the end of the novel. Ayarçı claims that İrdal is his mirror (339).<sup>35</sup> Ayarçı regards İrdal as a reflection of his own self. When one thinks of Ayarçı’s basic characteristics, it is possible to claim that Ayarçı reflects his mirroring processes to his followers and İrdal satisfies these mirroring needs of the charismatic leader.<sup>36</sup> In a way,

---

<sup>34</sup> Very interestingly, Gürbilek points out that the weakness and strength of Tanpınar’s writing comes from the same source: his obsession with the same image in all his writings (137).

<sup>35</sup> “Siz benim en güzel aynasınız!” (339)

<sup>36</sup> In an interestingly similar analogy, Volkan and Itzkowitz, in their *Immortal Atatürk*, assert that being a narcissistic leader, Atatürk satisfies his mirroring needs through his close circle by choosing persons similar to him in ideas and manner.

Irdal and Ayarcı are doubles. Ayarcı reflects some of the characteristics of Irdal that even he is not fully aware and the opposite is equally true. Further in the novel, the double-ness of Irdal and Ayarcı is revealed even more explicitly:

Düşüncelerimizi birbirimize söylemeğe ihtiyaç olmadığını, konuşmadan anlaşığımızı artık anlamanız lâzım! diye cevap verdi. İkimizin de hatası cep saatlerimizden harekette ısrar oldu. Fakat vakta ki siz de, ben de cep saatlerimizin yerine Mübarek'i düşünmeğe başladık; mesele değişti. Yalnız siz beni geçtiniz. (357-8)<sup>37</sup>

Irdal is quite surprised that Halit Ayarcı knows all the details about the new Institute building's plan that he has not disclosed yet. In response, Ayarcı makes the above explanation to Irdal. It seems to me that Ayarcı is the dark double of Irdal. Ayarcı is his pragmatic and practical side. That Hayri Irdal carries out all the ideas and plans of Ayarcı, despite his open disagreement also seems to support this claim.

I have already noted that the hat becomes the mark of Ayarcı and his personality. His charisma is reinforced by the addition of hat. As his double, Irdal assumes his share of charisma gradually: the more he spends time with Ayarcı, the more the hat becomes a part of his image. In the first pages of the narrative (when all the events have already taken place and Ayarcı is already deceased), the hat is an indispensable part of Irdal's portrayal. There is an interesting detail here, though. In the case of Ayarcı, the hat and the man becomes inseparable, as if they are natural together, complementing each other. When we come to Hayri, things change a bit. He has a problem with the hat: "Gözlüğüm, şemsiyem, hiçbir zaman yerine tam oturmayan şapkam, biraz bol kesilmiş elbiselerim, babayani hâllerim, hulâsa elimdeki teşbihe varıncaya kadar her şeyim bu muvaffakiyeti besleyecek şekilde tanzim edilmişti "(302.) The hat never fits his head completely. It may be because that he cannot get used to a borrowed item and society's dilemma in the face of East versus West issue or that the hat symbolizes Irdal's incompatible position in the Institute. Neither does Irdal agree with Ayarcı nor he can reject him. He cannot identify with him, but he stays within his command until the end. Irdal fights against him, argues with him, openly

---

<sup>37</sup> "You must by now know that we don't have to exchange thoughts and that we communicate with each other without having recourse to words. Our common mistake was to start from the concept of the pocket watch. But as soon as we began to substitute the Blessed One in place of our pocket watches everything changed. However, you have gone much farther than I have." (317)

criticizes him, but still carries out his every idea devotedly. Ayarcı is a powerful authority figure, whom Irdal neither repudiates nor idealizes completely. However, Ayarcı is not the only figure that Irdal has a problematic relationship with.

### 2.3. The Father Complex

The issue of “the father complex” in the novel is not limited to Ayarcı, even as he is the essential authority/father figure in the novel. Whereas the most patriarchal figure in the novel is inarguably Halit Ayarcı who is cast in an Atatürk-wise manner, all the authoritative male figures in the novel are represented in a negative way to a great extent. His father interferes with what he can read or not: “Babam ilk zamanlarda Emsile ve Avamil gibi Arapça sarf ve nahiv kitaplarından gayrı, sonraları mektep kitapları dışında kitap okumanın aleyhinde idi. Belki bu sansürün veya tahdidin yüzünden ben düpedüz her türlü okumayı reddetmiştim.” (8)<sup>38</sup> When the father becomes the symbol of prohibition with his restrictions and threats, the son rejects him by completely refusing his restrictive act. Besides, Irdal does not have high opinions of and feelings for his biological father:

Vâkıa babama pek hayran değildim. Acayip tabiatları vardı. Huysuzdu, fazla konuşurdu, kendisini idare edemezdi. Hulâsa pek öyle sevilecek, hürmet, riayet edilecek bir adam değildi. Yahut talihsiz adamdı. Ama yine babamdı. Sevmesem bile acırdım. (111)<sup>39</sup>

He complains that his father cannot even manage himself. He is not a respectful man in Irdal’s regard. For these reasons he cannot idealize with his father. The most he can feel for him is pity. Throughout the novel, the biological father is presented with some disagreeable aspects to his character. Most probably, the story of Mübarek is not true and the father is in reality a thief.

---

<sup>38</sup> My father was against my reading any books other than grammar books in my early years, and schoolbooks later on. As a result of his ban, or restriction, I might have given up reading altogether. (27)

<sup>39</sup> “I have never been an admirer of my father, there is no denying it! He was of a queer nature. He was whimsical, garrulous, and with no self-control. Not an amiable, respectable, authoritative character. Or call him an unfortunate fellow! But then it was my father. I sympathized with him even though I did not love him.” (114)

Dr. Ramiz can be said to be one of the most unsympathetic authority figures in the novel. Even if his unique idiosyncrasies and obsessions can be claimed to add a humorous aspect to the narrative, his representation as a hypocritical minion and an uncomprehending self-opinionated character, makes him disagreeable. What Irdal calls “long conversations” with Dr. Ramiz is in fact, Irdal confesses, long monologues of Dr. Ramiz where Irdal is always the listener (8). Irdal protests about sudden or sharp changes of his opinions in the presence of Ayarçı. Dr. Ramiz’s attention to Irdal contains too much dramatization to be taken seriously. The character of Cemal Bey, on the other hand, rests on wickedness and humiliation. The figures in his childhood are definitely not exemplary people either. Aristidi Efendi, Seyit Lutfullah, Naşit Bey all display some or other negative characteristics.

Where does this deep father complex leave us? As Berna Moran points out, there are only two positive male figures in the novel: Nuri Efendi and Ahmet, Irdal’s son. The right key necessary to solve the mystery of this scarcity of positive male figures in the novel is given by Gürbilek. According to Gürbilek, the main imagery, which Tanpınar aims to reach in his novels/poems/stories is “Nur/Light” The way Nuran characterizes the ideal (the form of good) in *Peace of Mind*, one can deduct that Nuri Efendi symbolizes the ideal in *the Institute*. He represents the true values one should follow or strive to have. Nuri Efendi renounces all the materialistic, pragmatic, interest-driven values. What’s more he refuses patriarchal, superficial and demanding modern values Halit Ayarçı embodies. Nuri Efendi is also a father figure like Ayarçı, yet he is not as aggressive and masculine as Ayarçı. Nuri Efendi is more of a father who has integrated his masculine and feminine characteristics harmoniously. That is to say he is a respectful authority figure, as well as a lovingly nurturing container. Therefore, Nuri Efendi represents the ideal father while Ahmet the ideal son. Ahmet whose name means “worthy of praise” “praised” is the type of son the father of Turks (Atatürk/Ayarçı) should ideally have, not Hayri Irdal. So, I think Dr. Ramiz’s diagnosis for Irdal that he suffers from “the father complex” is true, despite the fact that Dr. Ramiz is a comical, a not-to-be-taken-seriously character.

Mamafih sonuncu babanızın ölümü ile size bir nevi istiklâl ve olgunluk gelmiş olabilir. Mesele şimdi bu kompleksin neticelerinden kurtulmanızda. Zaten şuur altında bir hâdise olduğu için kendi kendisi kaldıkça ehemmiyetsiz bir şeydir. Ehemmiyetsiz ve hattâ tabiî bir şey. Bilhassa bugünkü cemiyetimizde. Çünkü

içtimaî şekilde bu hastalık hemen hepimizde var. Bakın etrafa, hep maziden şikâyet ediyoruz, hepimiz, onunla meşgulüz. Onu içinden değiştirmek istiyoruz. Bunun mânâsı nedir. Bir baba kompleksi değil mi?.. Büyük, küçük hepimiz onunla uğraşmıyor muyuz?.. Şu Etilere, Frikyalıları bilmem ne kavimlerine muhabbetimiz nedir'? Baba kompleksinden başka bir şey mi? (112)<sup>40</sup>

In an unexpected clarity and consciousness, Dr. Ramiz analyzes and summarizes the real problem Irdal and society has in common. Dr. Ramiz himself is not free from this (self)diagnosis. Dr. Ramiz suffers from the father complex. His father figures include Ayarcı, Freud, Jung, Marx, Engels and many others. In a very similar mindset to that of Ayarcı's, Dr. Ramiz tries to prescribe definite formulas for society. He attempts to apply what he experiences in Europe to his local conditions, yet is very disappointed when the match comes short of his great expectations. He is deeply dissatisfied with his senior doctors, who do not understand his innovative and informed techniques. Irdal, who fails to have the dreams he prescribes for him, disappoints him. In a way, Dr. Ramiz, like Ayarcı, believes society needs regulation and, hence, tries to order through his psychoanalytic treatment. I believe the casting of the character Dr. Ramiz in a picaresque fashion is related to the sense of anxiety and need of guard Moran talks about regarding the possible future criticism against the book.<sup>41</sup>

Tanpinar's choice of names for his characters seems to connote an allegorical designation, while also offering another crust to the fathers and sons in the novel. If one looks up into their meaning, the character's names constitute not only a symbolic layer but also at times an ironic, almost mocking dimension to characters as well as to the novel. For example, Halit means 'infinite, immortal, eternal' and his surname Ayarcı, as already stated, the regulator. In the historical literature of Turkey, Atatürk is conferred upon with the title 'Ebedi Şef,' which can be translated as "eternal chef/leader." Vamik D. Volkan and Norman

---

<sup>40</sup> "However, with the death of your late father, you may have acquired some sort of independence, a kind of maturity. The problem that is facing us now is how to do away with the consequences of this complex. As a matter of fact, since this is in your subconscious, as long as it doesn't change its identity, it's not so important. Not so important. It's even quite natural. Especially in our community today. For socially, we all suffer from this [disease]. Just look around you; we always complain of our past, we are all [obsessed] with it. We want to [transform it from within.] What does this mean? Isn't it the father complex itself? [Child or adult,] we are all concerned with it? [What is all this affection] for the Hittites and Phrygians, and for, I know not what societies, come from if not from our father complex?" (115).

<sup>41</sup> Moran, *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bakış*, 297-322.

Itzkowitz entitle their book on Atatürk as *The Immortal Atatürk: A Psychobiography*, an invaluable book resulting from a seven-year-collaboration of a psychoanalyst and an Ottoman historian with psychoanalytic treatment between 1974 and 1981, to underscore their subject's insatiable desire for immortality as well as his immortality in Turkish history. The name Ramiz is an intriguing choice. In Turkish the name means "akıllı, zeki, işaretlerle, simgelerle gösteren," which can be translated as "smart, intelligent, symbol, signifier." As I have already noted, Dr. Ramiz's diagnosis for the Turkish society (the father complex) is remarkable and quite appropriate when one thinks of the recent Turkish history, thus a symbol, a signifier; although Tanpınar prefers to give it under cover of the half-mad, half obsessive-compulsive personality of Dr. Ramiz. Whereas the name Emine, the first wife of Hayri İrdal, means "trustworthy, reliable, fearless," the name Pakize of the second wife means "pure, chaste, unblemished." While the first name perfectly suits the character portrayed in the novel, the second name must be an ironic naming, as the reader knows that she has an extramarital child with Halit Ayarç, while still being married to Hayri İrdal.

I am convinced that the above discussion on the novel is very closely related with Gürbilek's commentary on Tanpınar, although *The Clock-Setting Institute* is the work she least focuses on among Tanpınar's writings. Gürbilek claims that for Tanpınar the lost empire, the missed mental/spiritual sultanate and the dead East is a feminine phenomenon, more like a lost/dead mother, the loss of mirror and his art is in the service of this "primary loss." (Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark 93-96):

Tanzimat'tan beri bir nevi Oedipus kompleksi, yani bilmeyerek babasını öldürmüş adamın kompleksi içinde yaşıyoruz' demesine rağmen bir baba arayışına girmek, ya da babanın kudretini taklit etmek yerine, esas problemi başından bu yana bir anne kaybı, bir ayna yitimi olarak anlatır. (95)

Gürbilek's formulation of Tanpınar's main theme in his works summarizes what is happening beyond the curtain of irony in this complex novel in a nuclear form. Although there are many father figures in the novel, the story is not about a search for a father or about fatherlessness (Parla *Fathers and Sons*), but being able to come to terms with the patriarchal father figure and mourning for the loss of the empire which must have been

more like a nurturing and saturating container for Tanpınar. What distinguishes Tanpınar's art is that he does not try to revive, but mourns for the past as bygone period:

Her ne kadar yapay ve taklit bir medeniyet tehlikesinden yakını, "bize her an kendimizden koparmaya çalışan kudretli cereyanlar'a karşı 'milli, yani halis'olana dönmek gerektiğini savunursa da, Şark'a gerçekten geri dönebilirmiş gibi yazmamış, Doğu'yu sanatının yitik nesnesi kılabilmiştir Tanpınar. (95)

Thus, Tanpınar's feminine East in the symbolization of a lost/dead mother comes to the front thanks to Gürbilek's penetrating study on the writer. Tanpınar himself states that "modern Turkish literature begins with a crisis of civilization" and observes that modern Turkish literature informs and is informed by socio-historical events in Turkish history in his "Türk Edebiyatında Cereyanlar" (in Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler, 103-4) Therefore, even in a seemingly absurd story of a weird institute and its insane founders, Tanpınar treats the issue of crisis of civilization and encounter. Of this encounter, Gürbilek notes the following:

Üstün olduğu varsayılan bir yabancıyla karşılaşmanın, benliğini o yabancıya göre tanımlamak zorunda kalmanın, kendini onun karşısında yetersiz hissetmenin, yani tem ve tek olmadığını fark etmenin yol açtığı bir narsisistik yara da vardır çünkü burada. ...Madem Batı diye bir yer var, madem yalnızca Doğu'yum ben artık, madem tam değilim artık, o halde şimdi ben neyim? Bu ilişkide kimin erkek kimin kadın; kimin etkin, kimin edilgen; kimin eril kimin hadım; kimin nüfuz eden, kimin nüfuz edilen olduğu sorusu, temeldeki bu yarayı, derinde yatan bu yetersizlik duygusunu giderme gayretinin bir ifadesi olarak öne çıkmış gibidir. (82)

A narcissistic blow to the ego, with the encounter of the West and the loss of mirror with the dead of the Ottoman mother, charismatic leader tries to mend it, in a patriarchal manner (the way Atatürk marries with Anatolia). In the case of M. K. Atatürk, there is a spatio-temporal difference that Atatürk disregards in his modernization/westernization project, which Tanpınar reflects by the sense of differences in time, the split of character/schizophrenic personality, and the failure of The Clock-Setting Institute. The failure of the Institute stands

for the failure of the grand social and national project of modernization/westernization based on a different social structure than Turkey.

What Tanpınar reveals through his work is that he cannot identify with Ayaracı, but with Nuri Efendi who represents the light and ideal. Instead of embarking on an insanely ridiculous social development and westernization project, he prefers to mourn for the rich past, the dead mother/the container Nuri Efendi. The hastily imported westernization project leads to a schizophrenic existence, a divide in the sense of time and being, a superficial automatization, loss of communal ties, a fruitless obsession with the new, which has to be always already old due its nature, as exemplified with the frenzy for always something new of Ayaracı. The solution, if we accept Dr. Ramiz's diagnosis of the father complex as true, is, then, the son should either eat the lion/devour the father or kill it/him.

In the last section of this chapter, my main question is what role the narrator plays in this narrative of traumatic encounter with the West and crisis of civilization?

#### **2.4. Hayri Irdal: A Reliable Narrator or An insane Meczip**

It is Hayri Irdal who defines himself as a "meczip," by pointing out that Dr. Ramiz's opinion of him is more or less the opinion of everyone else who knows him: "Hakkımdaki kanaatı herkesin kanaatı idi. Yani bana ilk devirlerde hep bazı hususi meziyetleri de bulunan biçare bir meczip, kabiliyetsiz bir adam, bir hayat dışı gözü ile baktı." (33) Moran states that "this childish innocence of Irdal, half-meczip, strange personality, his introversion and his being a man living half within the society and half outside it enables him to look at the society from without, from a different angle."<sup>42</sup> (299) Berna Moran claims that by the claim of looking at life and its matters, human relations, society and its rules from a distance, of casting himself in the role of a audience/viewer Irdal becomes an example of the stranger in the literature of satire." Yet again, it is Irdal who complicates matters when he expresses his

---

<sup>42</sup> The original:

"Irdal'ın bu çocuksu saflığı, yarı meczip garip kişiliği, içine kapalılığı ile toplumun yarı içinde yarı dışında yaşayan bir adam olması, ona, topluma dışarıdan, farklı bir açıdan bakmak olanağını sağlar."

opinions of the figures surrounding him: “Nuri Efendi ustamdı, dñnyanın en iyi adamıydı. Lutfullah biçare bir meczuptu, söyledikleri yaptıkları beni eğlendirirdi. Masal gibi hoşuma giderdi. Abdusselam Beye gelince çok iyiliğini gördüm.” (110)<sup>43</sup> Moran thinks that given that Irdal is the narrator, it is important to determine the personality of Irdal and the norms according to which he criticizes the society. He continues “if Irdal is a meczup in the proper meaning of the word or a madman, then his observations and critiques lose their meaning. If he is not literally a meczup or gaby, but a fraud who pretends to be a gaby, “a sham who is strongly convinced by his own lies” in the words of Konur Ertop, then his moral criteria will be different than from ours. Or, Moran asks, is Irdal an observer who presents the weaknesses and faults of people to us with his childish innocence, strong commonsense and clean heart? (300)<sup>44</sup> He argues that Irdal is all three of them at different parts of the novel, which complicates the narrative for readers as well as critics. According to Moran, Tanpınar sacrifices the credibility of the character Irdal, who is simultaneously the narrator and the anti/non-hero of the novel so as to create the most comical effect in such a long narrative. I think Irdal is an inconsistent, if not completely unreliable, narrator. The Hayri Irdal in the beginning of the novel as the grateful old man writing his memoirs about his late respectful master completely differs from the cynical one at the end of the novel and there is only a couple of weeks in between the two stages: Irdal begins to write his memoirs three weeks after Halit Ayarcı’s funeral (although we do not know how much time has elapsed since the confiscation of the Institute.) Still, the tone in the first pages must be an ironic one. The narrator Irdal can be argued to intend to mean the opposite of all he writes in these pages. But, what makes him inconsistent is the insurmountable differences among different Hayri Irdals the reader encounters at different stages of the novel, sometimes only one paragraph apart from each other. At one point Hayri Irdal appears as such a sharp observer with such strong sense of witticism and irony that it is not easy at all to compromise this Irdal with the

---

<sup>43</sup> “Nuri Efendi was my master. The best man I’ve ever known. Poor Lütfullah was a simpleton. He amused me with his words and actions. He seemed to be telling tales. As for Abdüsselam Bey, he has been very kind to me.” (114)

<sup>44</sup> The original: “*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* Irdal’ın ağzından anlatıldığına göre Irdal’ın kişiliği, toplumu ne adına hicvettiği, normların ne olduğu önemli. Eğer Irdal gerçekten tam bir meczup veya delinin teki ise yaptıkları gözlemlerin ve eleştirilerin bir anlamı kalmaz. Yok gerçekten meczup ya da safdil değil de işi saflığa vuran bir sahtekar, Konur Ertop’un deyişiyile “kendi yalanına kendini kuvvetle kaptırılmış bir dolandırıcı” ise, ahlak ölçütleri bizimkinden çok farklı olacaktır. Yoksa Irdal, çocuksu saflığı içinde kuvvetli sağduyusu ve temiz yüreğiyle, insanların zaafalarını, kusurlarını önümüze sergileyen bir gözlemci mi?”

downtrodden, innocent, half-meczip, simple-minded İrdal the narrator tries to portray. I will try to show it with examples from the novel. To begin with, İrdal does the following observation on his personality:

Halil Ayarcı'nın hayatıma girdiği andan itibaren ben büsbütün başka bir insan oldum. Realitenin içinde yaşamağa, onunla mücadeleyle alıştım. Evet o bana yeni bir hayat buldu. Bu eski şeylerden şimdi çok uzaktayım. İçimde, kendi mazim olsa bile o günlere karşı katılmış bir taraf var. Ne vazık ki, bu mazi dönüşünü yapmadan kendimi anlatamam. Ben yıllarca bu adamların arasında, onların rüyaları için yaşadım. Zaman zaman onların kılıklarına girdim, mizaçlarını benimsedim. Hiç farkında olmadan bazen Nuri Efendi, bazen Lûtfullah veya Abdüsselam Bey oldum. Onlar benim örneklerim, farkında olmadan yüzümde bulduğum maskelerimdi. Zaman zaman insanların arasına onlardan birisini benimseyerek çıktım. Hâlâ bile bazen aynaya baktığım zaman, kendi çehremde onlardan birini tanır gibi oluyorum. ..Belki de şahsiyet dediğimiz şey bu, yani hâfızanın ambarındaki maskelerin zenginliği ve tesadüf, onların birbiriyle yaptığı terkiplerin bizi benimsemesidir. (51)<sup>45</sup>

This passage is a very sophisticated, perceptive and powerful description of inner dynamics of personality in general and his personality in particular. It is simultaneously a self-explanatory, self-defensive passage for the inconsistencies of the character İrdal. The narrator İrdal defends himself by making it clear that he has changed irretrievably after he has met Ayarcı and, hence, the reader should not be surprised to find conflicting, even opposite aspects in the character of H. İrdal in the rest of the novel. In fact, he announces his split of character earlier in the novel:

---

<sup>45</sup> "Thanks to [Halit Ayarcı,] I started to live in reality and learned to struggle with it. He created a new life for me. I am far removed now from those old occurrences. I feel myself out of touch with those days, even though they are my past. But alas, without such a flashback I could not depict myself. I lived with those men for years, and contributed to the realization of their dreams. There were times when I put on their clothes and adopted their idiosyncrasies. Quite unwittingly I became, respectively, Nuri Efendi, Lûtfullah, and Abdüsselam Bey. They became my patterns, masks that sometimes unexpectedly I discovered adhering to my face. On more than one occasion I wore them when I was surrounded by people. Even now I seem to catch sight of one of them when I see myself in a mirror. ...Maybe this is what we call personality, the rich variety and random selection of masks stored in our memory and their taking a fancy to us through their correlations." (65-6.)

[Halit Ayarcı'nın hediye ettiği elbiseyi sırtıma geçirdiğim günde bütün varlığımın değiştiğini gördüm. Birdenbire ufkum, görüş zaviyem genişledi. Hayatı onun gibi bir bütün olarak mütalaaya alıştım. .... Bittabi bütün bunlar Halit Ayarcı'da olduğu gibi pürüssüz geçmiyordu. Yumuşak ve uysal, merhametli, sefaleti tatmış tabiatım ikide bir işe karışıyor, lafımı kesiyor, kararlarımı değiştiriyordu. Hulasa birbiri arasından düşünen, karar veren, konuşan bir adam olmuştum. (16-7)<sup>46</sup>

So, the reader must be aware of the fact that s/he is face to face with a narrator who suffers from a split of character, a schizophrenic narrator, if you will: if he is this compassionate, honest, obedient, simple-at-heart person at the present moment, he can be a pragmatic, down-to-earth, worldly, wise man in the next one. The narrator himself fights with his two opposite sides, let alone guaranteeing or promising an integral narrative or personality to the reader. Therefore, if there are any incompatible passages in the book, it is because there are two Hayri Irdals, the narrator warns us in the beginning. Still, certain uncanny passages make the narrative and narrator issue much more complicated than the story of a schizophrenic narrator could solve. In the first pages, Irdal relates his cold relationship with any kind of reading and writing, his poor capacities as a reader and writer, while at the same time he underlines his absolute attitude towards narration: he claims his absolute belief in complete sincerity and that people should only write if they do with utter sincerity. If the tone in these first pages, as we have just said, is ironic, then what should one say about the attitude of the narrator towards narration? Is he undercutting his own narrative, its reliability, its relation to the actual experiences? He has noted that he is the author of fake biography about a non-existent historical persona just two pages earlier. Is he trying to say that a person called Halit Ayarcı has never existed nor there was ever an Institute, that the Institute would have been unrealistic if it had existed, but since it did not exist, there is nothing wrong about his book about this non-existent Institute and fake biography of Halit Ayarcı? Is he proposing that the reader should regard the book as a realistic fiction, the way Halit Ayarcı proposes about Ahmet Zamani Efendi? It should also be noted here that

---

<sup>46</sup> "No sooner had I put the suit then I experienced a total metamorphosis. My horizon and outlook grew wider. I appropriated his way of looking at life as a unity. .... However, unlike Halit the Regulator, I was assailed with questions. My docile, congenial, kind nature, which had known misery, interposed, cut in, and prompted me to change my decisions. In short, my thinking, my decision-making, and speaking faculties overlapped." (35.)

although Irdal claims that the book he is writing is about the Institute and Halit Ayarçı, all the events, characters, and narration go around Irdal, and, hence, the narrative is not what it claims to be.

Maybe one of the best solutions for the evaluation of the narrator Irdal is Feldman's suggestion:

One of the Hasidic characters in Buber's novel *For the Sake of Heaven*(1969), one of whose eyes expressed naïveté while the other expressed shrewdness. The naïve eye was unaware of what the shrewd eye saw while the shrewd eye saw all that the naïve eye was able to see. (51)

This double-sided narrator partly relieves the complicated narrator issue. However, what is of significance is not whether Irdal is literally mad, insane, or schizophrenic, but the relation between madness/sanity, repression and literature. In the light of the above question, I can claim that madness becomes the means of representing, coming to terms with, articulating, liberating what is repressed in the recent Turkish history and in this way rebukes ideology. Only madmen tell the truth, but because they are mad, they are not regarded as dangerous.

## Chapter III

### Sunay Zaim: The Man Under the Shadow of Mustafa Kemal

#### 3.1. Introduction

If Halit Ayarçı is the eternal regulator who fervently advocates that society can/should be regulated to the ‘minute’ synchronization like a clock, Sunay Zaim is the head teacher of this same society, both take these roles over from the persona of Mustafa Kemal in Turkish history. The bizarre clock-setting institute in TCSI becomes the absurd theatre scene in *Snow*. Sunay Zaim is the authority figure who wants to educate the Turkish nation according to Mustafa Kemal’s Western ideals: if Mustafa Kemal teaches in front of a blackboard, Sunay Zaim teaches on the stage through his didactic plays. The absurdity of the Institute reaches a deadly level in the theater of *Snow*. In both cases, the nation is infantilized: it is in need of being instructed, schooled and regulated, but cannot become aware of this need on its own. The charismatic leader as passionate entrepreneur therefore engages in the authoritarian enterprise of educating and disciplining the nation.

If in Halit Ayarçı’s vision Turkish society becomes a mechanical clock devoid of any human qualities, it transforms in Sunay Zaim’s dream into a fabric to which he tries to give shape in his ‘terzihane’ (tailor’s atelier), and into the vulnerable, docile student-audience in the Millet (Nation) Theater.

According to TDK, Sunay is of Arabic and Turkish origin, meaning bright as moon, luminous. It is used both for males and females.<sup>47</sup> Zaim is, on the other hand, of Arabic origin, being used in the sense of landowner or land proprietor of fiefs in the Ottoman Empire as a financial term; guarantor or bailman as a proper name for males.<sup>48</sup> Not surprisingly, both the name and surname can be claimed to have connotations with the

---

<sup>47</sup> “Sunay: Köken: Ar.+T. *Cinsiyet*: Erkek Ay gibi parlak olan, parıltı veren. *Cinsiyet*: Kız Ay gibi parlak olan, parıltı veren.

<sup>48</sup> “Zaim: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda zeamet adı verilen toprakları tasarruf etme hakkına sahip olan kişiler. Zaim topraktan elde ettiği gelirin ilk beş bin akçesi hariç sonraki her beş bin akçe için bir cebelu beslemek zorundadır. BSTS/ İktisat Terimleri Sözlüğü  
Zaim: Köken: Ar. *Cinsiyet*: Erkek Kefil. Kişi Adları Sözlüğü

recognizable characteristics associated closely with Mustafa Kemal. For example, Mustafa Kemal is almost always described with a bright light radiating from his being, which causes some people not to be able to look at him directly. In this sense, Sunay is also associated with light/a source of light, but this time the source of light is not as powerful as the sun. The moon, on second thought, is very appropriate, because Sunay Zaim is the shadow man, not the real source of the energy and light. And what he does to Turkey compared to Mustafa Kemal is the moon to the sun in scale. The detail that Sunay is a unisex name may also not be accidental. The unisex name might be chosen to imply or remind the feminine characteristics of Mustafa Kemal, alongside his overtly emphasized masculine features.<sup>49</sup> Zaim, on the other hand may be said to be pointing at Mustafa Kemal's spiritual marriage with Anatolia. As his surname suggests, Sunay, the small-scale source of light, is the proprietor of the Anatolian land.<sup>50</sup>

A former communist leftist, Sunay Zaim transfigures into a Kemalist theatre player & public intellectual from the middle of 1980s onward. In his last attempt to resemble or identify with Mustafa Kemal, he decides to save Kars from religious reactionaries through his theatre coup. His 'enlightening' play 'My Fatherland or My Headscarf' becomes a real military coup d'état when "the brave young soldiers of the republic [who] burst on the scene to save [the unveiled woman]" shoot at the audience with real bullets. (150) Sunay Zaim seizes power and rules Kars as a dictator for the next couple of days, which comes to an end with his half suicide/half murder within another play of his on the stage. Once a popular artist of leftist plays in the 1970s, Sunay Zaim is now a staunch Kemalist 'artist'

---

<sup>49</sup>The passage where Halide Edib, her *Turkish Ordeal*, talks about Mustafa Kemal's hands seems to comprise feminine and masculine qualities of Mustafa Kemal in the image of "faultlessly shaped hands:"

The door of our compartment opened suddenly and Mustafa Kemal Pasha's hand reached up to help me down the step. In that light his hand was the only part of him I could see distinctly, and it is that part of him which is physically most characteristic of the whole man. It is a narrow and faultlessly shaped hand, with very slender fingers and a skin which nothing darkens or wrinkles. Although it is not effeminate, one would not expect it to be a man's hand. Its swift and sudden movements reminded me of Mehmed Chavoush and of that new revolutionary type of whose existence I had become aware in Samandra. It seemed to me that the merciless hunting of the human tiger in Turkey had its answer in this hand. It differed from the large broad hand of the fighting Turk in its highly strung nervous tension, its readiness to spring and grip its oppressor by the throat. (127)

<sup>50</sup>Zeynep Ergun maintains that Sunay calls up the name of Cevdet Sunay, the president of military background 1966-73. Ergun 2009, 62.

and a walking ghost of Mustafa Kemal whose main goal, in more or less his own words, is to save the nation, enlighten the mass, modernize the country and make it a part of the West, *for* the people, *despite* the people, no matter what hardships he has to face. However, even these ‘phrases’ are not his own: in their basic sense, they belong to Mustafa Kemal & early Republican period and have been in use since then. He impersonates Mustafa Kemal, or tries to do so, in every aspect. The shadow of Mustafa Kemal falls on him during the 1980s. With the 1980 coup d’etat, all the left-wing theatrical activities are prohibited. The Turkish state decides to film a major movie on Mustafa Kemal which is to be aired on television to celebrate Mustafa Kemal’s hundredth birthday. Whereas until then only famous Western actors are deemed fit for the part of the blond, blue-eyed Mustafa Kemal, for once, Turkish actors are allowed nomination through the mediation of *Hurriyet* on the public opinion. Sunay Zaim is the most popular candidate among the public, which encourages him to appear in all kinds of newspapers and television programs. However, upon a question from a reporter, Sunay’s impromptu expression of his willingness to play the role of Prophet Mohammed, if the public consents, leads to chaotic reactions from both the secular press and the Islamist press. Sunay Zaim’s attempts at reconciliation and compensation with both sides are to no avail: he is summoned at General Staff by a high officer and is ordered to withdraw his nomination for the role and the prime ministry postpones the film ‘for the time being,’ which comes to mean ‘never’ as it is never filmed. Sunay Zaim can never recover from the failure of his once-in-a-life-time chance, even while he claims the opposite:

Hayatımın ancak deha sahibi talihlilere gelen en büyük fırsatını yakaladığım, evet, tam sanatımla tarihin akışına müdahale edeceğim gün birden her şey ayağımın altından çekilince bir anda en sefil çamurun içine düştüm. Orada da yılmadım ama, kasvetle çarpıştım. Bu çamurun içine daha da dalarsam, pisliğin, rezilliğin, yoksullukla cehaletin içinde, asıl malzemeye, o büyük cevhere ulaşacağıma inancımı hiç kaybetmedim. Sen niye korkuyorsun?" (189)<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> “I had seized the great opportunity that comes only to those graced with genius—yes, I had— and on the very day that I was going to use my art to intervene in the flow of history, suddenly the rug was pulled out

It seems that the chance to play the role of Mustafa Kemal and to be the first Turkish actor to do so, feels for him like a historical moment wrapped in a magical rug, which is pulled away from under his feet, causing him to fall on his face and to disgrace once and for all. He cannot come to the terms with the idea that he has missed the chance to “be” Mustafa Kemal, even if that being is within a television film. After more than a decade, he is still upset and melancholic, being unable to mourn this loss properly. Most importantly, it is not clear whether he has lost the chance to act the Mustafa Kemal part or the integrity of his self, as he begins to act as if he were Mustafa Kemal or the resurrected Mustafa Kemal, following the fiasco. His Anatolian tour forms the first phase of his Mustafa Kemal era. After one year in Black Sea region and some time spent working as activity directors and preparing theatrical entertainments throughout the Antalya area, together with his wife, Sunay Zaim founds a touring theatre troupe and goes on a tour all over Anatolia for a decade.

Anadolu'da on yılımı bu mutsuz kardeşlerimi bu kasvetin ve hüznün içinden çıkınsınlar diye verdim," dedi Sunay kendini hiç acındırmadan. "Komünist, Batı ajanı, sapık, Yehova şahidi, pezevenkle orospusu diye defalarca içeri tıktılar, işkence ettiler, dövdüler. Irzımıza geçmeye kalktılar, taşladılar bizi. Ama oyunlarımın ve kumpanyamın verdiği mutluluk ve özgürlüğü sevmeyi de öğrendiler. (195)<sup>52</sup>

Sunay Zaim's decade-long Anatolian tour resembles Mustafa Kemal's Anatolian tours in the early period of the Republic in many ways, which is treated under the next section. In November 1995 when he is in Kars with his theatre troupe for the third time during his Anatolian tour, he still tries to “change history through his art” as if in an attempt to heal

---

from under me and I found myself dragged through the worst imaginable mud. Although it failed to destroy me, my old friend depression now returned to haunt my soul. But no matter how long I languished in the mire, no matter how much filth, wretchedness, poverty, and ignorance I saw around me, I never lost my belief in my guiding principles, never doubted that I had reached the summit. . . . Why are you so frightened?” (192)

<sup>52</sup> “I gave ten years to Anatolia because I wanted to help my unhappy friends out of their misery and despair,” said Sunay. There was no self-pity in his voice. “They accused us of being Communists, perverts, spies working for the West, and Jehovah's Witnesses; they said I was a pimp and my wife a prostitute; time and time again they threw us into jail, beating and torturing us. They tried to rape us; they stoned us. But they learned to love my plays and the freedom and happiness my theatrical company brought them.” (195)

his ever-open wound and, most importantly, he admits to Ka that for him theatre is a substitute for history, which does not offer him any role: "Tarih ile tiyatronun aynı malzemededen yapıldığını ilk Hegel fark etmiştir," dedi Sunay. "Tıpkı tiyatro gibi tarihin de birilerine 'rol' verdiğini hatırlatır. Tıpkı tiyatro sahnesi gibi, tarihin sahnesine de cesurların çıkacağını da..." (199).<sup>53</sup> According to Sunay, both theatre and history distribute roles to actors and the scene of theatre as well as that of history is occupied by the performances of courageous leading actors. In the case of his personal *play*, the stage of theatre replaces that of history, which Sunay Zaim longs to bring back or rather merge with the former. Since he has missed the chance to become the first Turkish actor to animate Mustafa Kemal and no new roles are offered by history, he does not want to miss what he regards as his last chance for stepping on the stage of history/theatre & changing history through his theatrical performance in snow-bound Kars, out of legal reach. At the end of his first play, he gets hold of power in Kars and rules as a dictator for a couple of days, causing fatal casualties under martial rule. All the while, he is quite cognizant of the fact that his historical performance is strictly restricted to several days at most, as the law will return to the city when intensive snow subsides. He ends his two-day-long historical performance with a deadly act and dies within his play on the stage of history/theatre.

### **3.2. Mustafa Kemal, Sunay Zaim: Kemalism and Its Discontents**

As in the case of Halit Ayarç, it is possible to discern certain recognizable traits associated with Mustafa Kemal in the figure of Sunay Zaim. Whereas in the Institute the textual allusions and adumbrations to Mustafa Kemal through Halit Ayarç are deeply buried beneath a thick veil of symbolism and distortion, the references to Mustafa Kemal through the character of Sunay Zaim can be said to be much more explicit in *Snow*. All the details about Sunay Zaim and his life indicate a parallelism with those of Mustafa Kemal's, while simultaneously parodying, heightening, distorting, dramatizing them in a purposeful manner. In fact, there is one sentence uttered by Sunay Zaim to Kadife on the stage during

---

<sup>53</sup> It was Hegel who first noticed that history and theater are made of the same materials," said Sunay. "Remember: Just as in the theater, history chooses those who play the leading roles. And just as actors put their courage to the test onstage, so too do the chosen few on the stage of history." (202)

the acting of *Tragedy in Kars*, which summarizes the dramatization of the persona of Mustafa Kemal in his character in a nuclear form: “Askerî darbe yapıp, Batılılara benzemiyorlar diye halka ateş eden biri olduğum için benden iğreniyorsunuz herhalde, ama bunu millet için yaptığımı da bilmenizi isterim.” (404)<sup>54</sup> Nonetheless, the correspondences drawn between Sunay Zaim and Mustafa Kemal require close textual analysis.

Sunay Zaim is not the protagonist of the novel, the narrative being basically based on Ka’s feelings and ideas. Nevertheless, the main plot depends on Sunay Zaim and his theatrical coups: the series of events in Kars begin with his first play, *My Fatherland or My Head Scarf* & ends with his second and last play, *Tragedy in Kars*. There is also an exclusive chapter entitled “Sunay Zaim’s Military and Theatrical Careers” in which a short survey of his life, with a special focus on the unexpected and unfortunate events during the Mustafa Kemal film project is related, but the references to his personality, ideas and idiosyncrasies are generally distributed throughout the whole novel. In the first chapter of this study, I start the discussion of the striking parallels between Halit Ayarç and Mustafa Kemal with a passage about the charismatic grip of Halit Ayarç on İrdal and the light radiating from his eyes. It may be a good strategy to begin with analogous passages from *Snow*. Not surprisingly, Sunay Zaim is described as gifted with a natural light beaming all over his existence so powerfully that others cannot look at him in the eye for long:

İki gün içinde, onu yakından görebilmek için her türlü tehlikeyi göze alacak kadar ona hayran olan Kars'ın orta yaşlı devlet memurları, dul kadınlar, televizyondaki görüntülerini şimdiden yüzlerce kere seyretmiş genç Atatürkçüler, maceraya ve iktidara meraklı erkekler ön sıralara ondan bir ışık, bir ışın yayıldığını, uzun bir süre onun gözlerinin içine bakmanın imkânsız olduğunu söylemişlerdi. (393)<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> You probably detest me for having staged this coup and opening fire on the audience, just because they weren’t living like Westerners. But I want you to know I did it all for the fatherland.”(411-2).

<sup>55</sup> “It was a disparate group: Many were middle-aged officials who’d risked their lives to get as close to this great man as decorum allowed. Some were widows, others perhaps best described as young admirers of Atatürk—and they had already seen these images hundreds of times. There were also a few hungry for adventure, so to speak, or at least interested in power. But they all spoke of the light shining in Sunay’s eyes, radiating in all directions; it was dangerous, they said, to stare into those eyes for more than a few seconds.” (400)

This is such a familiar depiction used to portray Mustafa Kemal that anyone familiar with republican Turkish history can immediately recognize it. In Kemalist historiography, discourses and literature (in both sense of the word), Mustafa Kemal is always defined to be emitting dazzling light and accordingly, his blond hair is always associated with the sun.<sup>56</sup>

Aynı anda Funda Eser'i çember sakallı "gerici" saldırganların elinden alacak beklenen kurtarıcı sahnede belirdi: Sunay Zaim'di bu; başında Atatürk'ün ve Kurtuluş Savaşı kahramanlarının giydiği cinsten bir kalpak, üzerinde 1930'lardan kalma askerî bir üniforma vardı. Sahneye emin adımlarla (hafif aksadığını hiç belli etmeden) çıkar çıkmaz, çember sakallı iki dinci gerici korkup kendilerini yere attılar ... Üzerine kuvvetli bir ışık düşünce Sunay Zaim bütün Karşılara bambaşka âlemlerden gelmiş bir harika gibi gözüktü.(154-5)<sup>57</sup>

The very familiar things linked immediately with Mustafa Kemal are also placed throughout the text. Anyone versed in the republican Turkish history knows that “kalpak”

---

<sup>56</sup> One of the most widely-known examples of this imagery is Atilla İlhan's “Mustafa Kemal” poem. The following excerpt is the third and last ‘heroic’ stanza:

“nasıl böyle varıp geldin hoşgeldin  
çingri kaymış yalazlanmış gözlerin  
sol yüzünde güneş südü sıcaklık  
ellerinden öperim mustafa kemal  
senin dalın yaprağın biz senin fidanların  
biz bunları yapmadık  
sen elbette bilirsin bilirsin mustafa kemal  
elsiz ayaksız bir yeşil yılan  
yaptıklarını yıkıyorlar mustafa kemal  
hani bir vakitler kubilay'i kestiler  
çün buyurdun kesenleri astılar  
sen uyudun asılanlar dirildi  
mustafa'm mustafa kemal'im”

<sup>57</sup> “At the same moment, a man came onstage to rescue Funda Eser from the two round-bearded reactionaries: this man was Sunay Zaim. He was wearing an army uniform from the thirties with a fur hat in the style of Atatürk and the heroes of the War for Independence. As he strode purposefully across the stage (no one could have known he had a slight limp), the two “fundamentalists” took fright and threw themselves at his feet. The brave old teacher stood up once more and applauded Sunay's heroism with all his might. One or two others shouted, “Bless you! Bravo!” Standing in the center of the spotlight, he seemed to all of Kars to be a wondrous creature from another planet.”

has been almost synonymous with Mustafa Kemal during the Independence War years:

Simdi eskisi kadar yakışıklı değildi, yorgun, yıpranmış ve solgundu. Masanın üzerinden 1940'lardan kalma askerî bir dürbün aldı. Anadolu gezilerinde on yıldır giydiđi kalın ve yıpranmış keçe paltosunu ve kalpađını kafasına geçirdi. (197)<sup>58</sup>

In one paragraph, nearly the emblems of Mustafa Kemal are listed: kalpak, field glass, felt coat and his well-known good appearance. Also, the first part of *Tragedy in Kars* summarized by the narrator as follows contains a very obvious Mustafa Kemal image:

"Geri, yoksul ve akılsız" bir kasabada bir kan davası söz konusuydu ama insanların neden birbirlerini öldürmeye başladığı, paylaşılmayan şeyin ne olduğu hiç anlatılmıyor, ne katiller ne de sinek gibi ölenler bu konuda bir soru soruyordu. Bir tek Sunay halkının kan davası gibi geri bir şeye kapılmasına öfkeleniyor, bu konuda karısıyla tartışıyor ve anlayışı ikinci ve genç bir kadında (Kadife) arıyordu. Sunay zengin ve aydın bir iktidar sahibi görünümündeydi ama yoksul halkla da dans ediyor, şakalaşüyor, hayatın anlamını bilgece tartışıyor ve bir çeşit oyun içinde oyun havasıyla onlara Shakespeare, Victor Hugo ve Brecht'ten sahneler oynuyordu. Ayrıca şehir trafiđi, sofrada adabı, Türklerin ve Müslümanların vazgeçemedikleri özellikleri, Fransız ihtilalinin coşkusu, aşının, prezervatifin ve rakının faydalan, zengin orospunun göbek dansı, şampuan ve kozmetiklerin boyalı sudan başka bir şey olmayışı gibi konularda öğretici ve kısa sahneler de oyunun şurasına burasına doğal bir düzensizlik içerisinde serpiştirilmişti. (392-3)<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> "He wasn't as handsome as he'd been in those days; he looked tired, pale, and worn. Sunay picked up a pair of 1940s army-issue field glasses that were sitting on his table. Then he picked up the thick but ragged felt coat he'd worn throughout his ten-year tour of Anatolia and, putting on his fur hat, took Ka by the hand and led him outside." (201)

<sup>59</sup> "I could make out a blood feud in some "backward, impoverished, and benighted" town, but when its inhabitants started killing one another, I had no notion of what it was that they'd been unable to share, nor could the murderers or their victims offer a clue as to the reason for so much bloodshed. Only Sunay raged against the backwardness of blood feuds and of people who allowed themselves to be drawn into them; he

There is something wrong going on in a backward society, but people are not conscious of what is happening in their society. Only Sunay can see the backwardness of all these. Not only does he endeavor to save the society in spite of not being understood, but also he mingles with the public, despite his power and wealth. He loves dancing with the poor villagers (it must be “zeybek” with the villagers, who is the master of the nation), teaches modernity and westernization, gives lectures on various topic to the public, discusses highest works of art with these poor villagers. Even in these altruistic actions devoted to the good of the public, the underlying top-down aspect of socio-political events is evident. The tone of the narration is definitely ironic: in a seemingly detached, objective narrative, this great leader seems to be praised for his humility, even while he is being parodied for his sense of superiority and power-centered personality. Not only does the societal picture the play presents resemble the socio-political history of the twentieth century Turkey but also general comments on the audience preceding the plot related by Orhan supply the reader with a very familiar picture of republican ceremonies. These details about the people at the Nation theatre that night tells about the ideological apparatuses of the state. Pamuk, however, does not stop there and goes on to excavate the implicit feminine beauty abundant in descriptions of Mustafa Kemal through Sunay Zaim:

Herkes onun güzelliğini, aydınlığını fark etti. 1970'li yıllarda Che Guevera, Robespierre, ihtilalci Enver Paşa rolleriyle onu solcu öğrenciler arasında çekici yapan o sert, kararlı ve trajik havayla, kırılğan, hatta hafif kadınsı güzelliği ayağını sakat bırakan kahredici Anadolu turnelerinde büsbütün yıpranıp tükenmemişti. Beyaz eldivenli sığ elinin işaret parmağını dudaklarına değil, ama çenesinin altına zarif bir hareketle yaklaştırıp, "Susun," dedi. Buna gerek yoktu, çünkü hem metinde yoktu bu söz, hem

---

debated the matter with his wife and a younger woman who seemed to understand him better (this was Kadife). Though he was a rich and enlightened member of the ruling elite, Sunay's character enjoyed dancing and joking with the poorest villagers and, indeed, engaged them in erudite discussions of the meaning of life, as well as regaling them with scenes from Shakespeare, Victor Hugo, and Brecht, if only to furnish the promised “play within the play.” He also offered an assortment of short soliloquies on such matters as city traffic, table manners, the special traits Turks and Muslims will never give up, the glories of the French Revolution, the virtues of cooking, condoms, and raki, and the way fancy prostitutes belly dance. These discussions, no more than his subsequent exposés of adulterated brands of shampoo and cosmetics, shed little light on the bloody scenes they interrupted, and as one out-burst followed another, it grew harder to imagine that they conformed to any logic at all. (399-400)

bütün salon zaten susmuştu. Ayaktakiler de hemen oturdular[.]<sup>60</sup>

As specified in preceding quotations, “aydınlık” (brightness) is commonly associated with Mustafa Kemal. The dazzling brightness is also enforced by the charismatic effect of the leading actor, Sunay Zaim/Mustafa Kemal, which makes the crowded theatre hall fall into complete silence as if spellbound. It seems to me that by juxtaposing “güzellik” (beauty), instead of yakışıklılık (handsomeness), with brightness to describe Sunay Zaim’s physical appearance and appeal to masses, Pamuk not only affiliates Sunay Zaim with Mustafa Kemal but also points at the generally passed off affiliation of Mustafa Kemal with feminine beauty despite all-too-well-known Godly savior and unique soldier attributes. The Anatolian tour adds one more layer to this symbolic imagery. As noted above, Sunay Zaim’s decade-long Anatolian tour alludes to Mustafa Kemal’s Anatolian tours in the early period of the Republic in many ways. First of all, both of them are undertaken when things do not go well at work: the Anatolian tour resumes a straightening-out quality in both cases. Secondly, the tour is centrifugal: the tour “giver” moves from the center to the periphery, from Istanbul or Ankara to Anatolia. Thirdly, both Zaim and Mustafa Kemal carry out their Anatolian tours for their own interest with the aim of making things right, even though both reflect the tour as self-sacrifice, a bestowing of kindness upon the masses and an enlightening mission out of solely altruistic motives and love. In a more limited sense, the imagery in Sunay Zaim’s above quoted tirade evokes the impression of Mustafa Kemal’s Anatolia years after his first arrival in 1919. In a more refined language, lofty tone and divine content, the above sentences could be attributed to Mustafa Kemal and the hardships he faces during the Independence War years. In fact, the following is a quotation from *Nutuk*, which will surmise the whole point in one neat sentence:

It was incumbent upon me to develop our entire social organization, step by step, until it corresponded to the great capability of progress which I

---

<sup>60</sup> Everyone noticed how handsome and enlightened he looked. The long and punishing years spent touring Anatolia may have left him lame, but they had not diminished his attraction; he still had the hard, decisive, tragic air and faintly feminine good looks that had made him such a sensation among leftist students when he played Che Guevara, Robespierre, and the revolutionary Enver Pasha. Instead of bringing the index finger of his white-gloved hand to his lips, he rested it elegantly on his chin and said, “Quiet!” (158)

perceived in the soul and in the future of the nation and which I kept to myself in my own consciousness as a national secret. (20)

Since his companions fail at one point or another during the course of the nationalist movement because of their mental limitations, Mustafa Kemal has to save the nation on his own and furnish it with its due “social organization.” What directs him in his conducts is the potential in the heart of the nation that only he can perceive. Knowing the limitations of his co-workers, he keeps the national secret to himself. In Parla’s words, the nation does not know its potential consciously; it only senses it through its conscience. Mustafa Kemal is the nonpareil leader who not only senses the conscience of the nation but also represents it. The nation is the conscience and heart, the leader consciousness and head.<sup>61</sup> To keep the national truth secret more than implies the existence of enemies within the Turkish state and underlines the constant presence of danger. Similarly, for Sunay the nation has a great capacity, which only he can see and has yet to develop. Even if not the ideal citizens for the time being, the masses will become so in the future thanks to his national enlightening arrangements. Sunay can perceive that the nation needs to be saved from the current “darkness” through his light & deserves to be enlightened, but has yet to understand enlightenment and development properly. In Kemalist discourses, Mustafa Kemal is defined as the populist hero. In his highlighted proverbs, he expresses his trust in the nation (“Türk, Öğün, Çalış, Güven” or “Beni Türk doktorlarına emanet ediniz”), he praises the underprivileged classes (“Köylü milletin efendisidir.”) Under-handed, however, there is an infantilization of the nation: the father knows the best of all for the nation and he will disclose the particulars one by one in due time, when the nation is ready for it. Likewise, Sunay Zaim is characterized as “populist, Atatürkist, and enlightened” playwright, a proper copy of the original father. He has embraced all the values the father of the Türks has pointed at, thanks to his great capabilities. His main mission in life is to transfer these to the nation, which can be led astray by reactionaries, old guards, internal and external enemies or incompetent politicians. Sunay’s “enlightened/ing” tirades throughout the novel either resonate with Mustafa Kemal’s own speeches<sup>62</sup> or those of the following Kemalist

---

<sup>61</sup> Parla 2008, 35.

<sup>62</sup> The following quotation is from *Nutuk*, but we would not be surprised at all, if it was in *Kar*: “History shows irrefutably that in all great enterprises the *conditio sine qua non* of success lies in the fact that there

statesmen, mostly of military background: "Şerefli ve aziz Türk milleti," dedi Sunay Zaim. "Aydınlanma yolunda çıktığın o büyük ve soylu yolculuktan kimse seni döndüremez. Merak etme. Tarihin tekerine gericiler, pislikler, örümcek kafalılar asla çomak sokamaz. Cumhuriyet'e, özgürlüğe, aydınlığa uzanan eller kırılır."<sup>63</sup> Even when he undertakes a revolutionary, (post-)modern theatrical coup, everything he does is exactly the same the former revolutionaries have done before him. During the first play, the audience hears the words "Acılar içinde!" The narrator tells the reader that there is some confusion about the reference point of this exclamation. The audience cannot understand who or what is in pain: Is it the play in pain, Funda Eser, or the republic? Or else is the audience who is in pain? In previous times, it is collectively/publicly known that the nation/the public is in pain.<sup>64</sup> The irony is that the nation has been told/taught that it has been in pain. In a very expected and familiar fashion after the theatrical coup, Sunay Zaim declares a curfew, has the enemies of the republic brutally punished (breaks their hands), and makes his public announcement in the same wording as those of the previous revolutionaries: Ka is bored even before Sunay finishes his first sentence. (206) In the meantime, he, like his fathers, sacrifices all he has – intelligence, capabilities, efforts, strengths; in fact his body (first limping leg) and his life (then stage-suicide)-- for the Atatürkist enlightenment of the needy Turkish nation. Even so, he is obviously condescending and holds the nation in contempt. He complains that except for Ka and himself, there is not a single person in Kars who knows about T.S. Eliot, to his great dismay and pity. People cannot understand his works of art at the original level he longs to carry out. Therefore, he has to simplify his modern plays and, only in this way,

---

must be a leader available who possesses special qualifications and untiring energy. At a time when all the statesmen have been seized with despair and are paralysed by their impotence, when the nation is plunged into the darkness of night without any one to show them the way, when people of every possible description calling themselves patriots think and act in precisely as many different ways as it is possible for anybody to proceed with confidence, clear sightedness and energy, and succeed in the end to achieve one of the most difficult of all aims when he feels himself forced to accept this or that advice, to succumb under a host of varying influences and avoid hurting the feelings of a multitude of other persons?"

<sup>63</sup> O honorable and beloved citizens of Turkey," said Sunay Zaim. "You've embarked on the road to enlightenment, and no one can keep you from this great and noble journey. Do not fear. The reactionaries who want to turn back time, those vile beasts with their cobwebbed minds, will never be allowed to crawl out of their hole. Those who seek to meddle with the Republic, with freedom, with enlightenment, will see their hands crushed

<sup>64</sup> "Acılar içinde!' Galiba yarım söylenmişti bu söz, çünkü kimin acılar içinde olduğunu kimse anlayamadı. Eskiden bu sözle halk, millet akla gelirdi; şimdiyse Karşılılar bütün gece seyrettikleri şeylerin mi, kendilerinin mi, Funda Eser'in mi, yoksa Cumhuriyet'in mi acılar içinde olduğunu anlamadılar. Gene de sözün ima ettiği duygu doğrudur. Bütün salon korkuyla karışık içli bir sessizliğe gömülmüştü."

teaches the masses what they need and improves them through education. (307)

All the while, however, there is something incongruent about these plays. Sunay Zaim himself acknowledges that he has to add, to his sublime Atatürkist, enlightened plays & motherland poems, various parts of low taste to keep the interest of the audience, which includes critiques and parody of advertisements, adventures of the goalkeeper Vural. Nevertheless, what Sunay Zaim apparently regards as progressive, informative, edifying belongs to the 1930s. It is as it were, in the sixty-five years in-between the republic, the nation, the core nationwide issues have not undergone any change at all. Just like in the case of his Atatürk-wise speeches, which focus on the exhausted paranoia, his plays do not fit properly into the current issues any more. For example, he changes the name of the play to “Vatan yahut Türban,” from Vatan yahut Çarşaf,” as, unlike the early republican era, the Islamic symbol is not Çarşaf any more, but türban (Veil or Head Scarf). However, he seems to forget to change the content of the play. Despite the titular “türban,” the play is still about çarşaf. Sunay Zaim’s play, one understands, is the exact copy of the original one in terms of the text. The reader also learns, through Orhan, that other works by the playwright, now in his nineties, are also on A. such as Atatürk Geliyor, Liseler için Atatürk Piyesleri, O’ndan Hatıralar etc. Thus, what Sunay Zaim claims to be modern, progressive and enlightening is in fact a work by a playwright who produced all his texts on A. for national education. Accordingly, Sunay Zaim becomes the prototype of whom he despises and stereotype of what he accuses of the motherland enemies do. The only novelty Sunay Zaim brings to his divine plays is the deadly militarism. He actually kills the nation, including himself in the name of progression. This deadly dose of progression that Kemalists attribute only to themselves can be taken both literal and figurative levels: whilst claiming to make Turkey join the modern Western states, this dusty ideology paralyzes the nation/country and the individual/the sons and the daughters of the father, at the same time the political policies and acts conducted under its name causes extremely noxious coup d’états.

It seems to me that the above incident of incongruity between the title and the content is meant to denote a wider framework and treated at different dimensions of the novel. For example, Sunay Zaim is not the only one gripped on the play *My Motherland or My Veil*. Apparently, all figures from different periods and background, and consequently

the novel are fixated with this monumental play. From bits and pieces, the reader learns that the play has been in use, albeit discontinuously, since its first appearance in the 1930s. In its first term of service, which is roughly from the thirties to the end of WW II, high school students and civil servants welcome the play ardently. In 1948, Funda Eser's mother acts out the role that she herself later takes on, i.e. the unveiled woman in a school play. Muzaaffer Bey, a former municipality president, talks about a revolutionary play he and his friends act at the People's Houses in his youth, the play in which 'a young girl of ours' awakens to enlightenment and burns her black *çarşaf* on the stage, although he also records that due to scarcity of black *çarşaf* at the time, they cannot find even a single one in the whole of Kars, having to bring it from Erzurum, ignoring to question when they cannot find a single one, why he, with his friends, needs to act a play with anti- black *çarşaf* emphasis, as Ka thinks to himself. The first play of Sunay's, *Vatan yahut Türban* is the same as the original text of the 1930s. The second one, *Tragedy in Kars*, differs in name but the content, the story and the message remains the same, exactly like any version of the play. As noted earlier, the greatest difference of Sunay's plays from the previous ones the reader reads about is the virtual death on the stage, first the nation (symbolized in the figure of audience) and then the father (through Sunay Zaim). Thus, if there is anything revolutionary about the play, it is this blurring of the borders between art and life which post-modern works are generally recognized to bear. The theatrical coup takes place within a play. However, the coup also takes place in real life. In this sense, Sunay Zaim's theatre is a post-modern and his coup postmodern coup, reminding one the February 28 coup, defined in political literature as the post-modern coup.

This eternal repetition is not limited to speeches about the nation or to a pervasive play about the enlightenment in spite of the reactionaries. The seemingly endless recurrence of same/similar narratives, discourses, plots, nightmare scenarios is also discernible in the matter of characters. There is a big long chain of identity/similarity between male characters: Orhan Pamuk- the narrator Orhan- Ka-Sunay-Necip-Fazil- Necip Fazil Kisakurek. It is as if they are several mirrors looking at each other and reflecting the other in an infinite number of images (an image Orhan Pamuk talks about in his Istanbul: *The City and The Memoirs*). Mustafa Kemal is the original father; Sunay Zaim is the copy and simultaneously son of the original father. While Necip and Ka are the originals (yet they are

lost with their texts) Fazil and Orhan are the copies that remain with their texts  
Sunay Zaim is himself the emblem of infinite repetition:

"Zalim olmayın," dedi Sunay telsize, "ama ihtilalin ve devletin güçlü olduğunu, kimseye pabuç bırakılmayacağını hissettirin." Çenesinin ucunu sol elinin başparmağıyla işaret parmağı arasında düşünceli bir şekilde ve öyle özel bir hareketle tutmuştu ki, Ka, Sunay'ın aynı cümleyi 1970'lerin ortalarında tarihi bir oyunda söylediğini hatırladı. (197)<sup>65</sup>

Even for different political segments at different conditions in different times, whether in actual life or in a historical play, Sunay uses the same kind of phrases, talks about analogous concerns. So, enlightening plays, progressive discourses informing them, political problems, the nation, conditions in the country do not change at all for decades. There is a nightmarish eternal repetition of the same plot, same discourse, same threats and same figures, whether in the 30s (when the original play appeared) or 1940s (when young children of the republic act it) or in the mid-1990s (when Sunay Zaim stages it in Kars), whether it is of Spanish origin (Turkified version of *Spanish Tragedy* by Kyd, obviously Turkish Tragedy) or a republican play. It is as if everything is mummified, like Mustafa Kemal's body, in the 1930s. It is not possible to discern the actual time any more: it feels like we are eternally in the same time period and face-to-face with the same dangers.

This tired and careworn but still handsome and eye-catching man" (13) sees everything in terms of West the ideal versus East the backward and turns art, and most of all his very life, into a grand civilizing mission, although it is not clear whether the reason for his exhaustion is actually the nation or his own fixation on the national courses (like quite many other people). Even his marriage with Funda Eser (whose name can be translated as Heather Work) is a kind of a symbolic marriage, a national act. If there is any representational allusion in her surname, and I think there is, she is the work of Sunay

---

<sup>65</sup> "Don't be cruel," Sunay said into the walkie-talkie, "but let them feel the power of the revolution and the state and let them see how determined we are." He'd raised his left hand and, propping his chin between thumb and forefinger, assumed a pose of deep thought, a gesture so distinctive that Ka now had a memory from the mid-seventies of Sunay posed this way while uttering the exact same words in a history play." (201)

Zaim, who helps him in his massive services to the Motherland. The theatricality of their marriage is constantly played out for the audience. Similarly, for Mustafa Kemal, his own marriage stands for one aspect of his grand westernizing mission. Theirs is to be example to the public, Latife Hanim being the cast in the westernized Turkish woman of the new nation state. Hence is the emphasis of theatricality of the couple in the novel, implying the theatricality of the original, at least in Mustafa Kemal's part to some extent: they are always on the stage of history. There is one question about Funda Eser, though. What could belly dancing and displaced sexuality of Funda Eser mean? Could it be a symbolic attitude& approach toward Turkish women in the Kemalist discourse? The "significant other" of Sunay Zaim is quite militant and militarist, even though she is implied not to fully understand what she really denotes through her roles. She is the militant comrade of Sunay Zaim, who does not seem to be troubled with being involved in his lethal plays. Theatricality of Sunay Zaim, on the other hand, is highlighted quite many times. It does not make any difference whether he is on the stage or not. His gestures, mimics and intonations are always dramatized to high registers. On the stage, it is his captivating dramatic performance, which wipes out everything else on the stage:

But the wild series of improvisations was somehow still worth watching, if only for the passion of Sunay's performance. Whenever the action began to drag, whenever he sensed the people of Kars losing interest, Sunay could always find something to bring them back under his spell; he would fly into a fury and, borrowing a fine theatrical pose from one of the most illustrious roles of his career, he would rail against those who had brought the people low; with tragic abandon he would then pace the stage recounting youthful memories and quoting Montaigne on friendship as he mused on the quintessential loneliness of Atatürk. His face was wet with perspiration.<sup>66</sup>

Thus, he closely orchestrates the attention of the audience, as if that is the fuel he needs to

---

<sup>66</sup> "Sık sık tuluat ve doğaçlamanın araya girmesiyle iyice karışan bu oyunu toplayan, Karanlı seyirciyi sahneye bağlayan tek şey Sunay'ın tutkulu oyunculuğuydu. Oyunun ağırlaştığı yerlerde sahne hayatının en iyi anlarından hatırladığı jestlerle birden öfkeleniyor, ülkeyi, halkı bu hale düşürenlere verip veriştiyor, trajik bir edayla topallayarak sahnenin bir kenarından diğerine yürürken gençlik hatıralarını, Montaigne'in arkadaşlık üzerine yazdıklarını ya da Atatürk'ün aslında ne kadar yalnız olduğunu anlatıyordu. Yüzü ter içindeydi." (393)

work or act. Very interestingly, the above quoted passage is almost a carbon copy of a passage about Mustafa Kemal in Halide Edib's *Turkish Ordeal*:

There must be something doing – he must be on the stage, a unique actor perpetually astonishing the world – a dangerous kind of actor, but dangerous for others and safe for himself. He must be exacting all that the spectators can give – fear, wonder, adoration. And he would have only shadows on the stage, shadows called or sent back at his will, simply to make the show showy – no more. [...] Compared to the future and the destiny of the Turkish people which they themselves would shape out of their undying vitality, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was one single wave in a mighty sea.<sup>67</sup>

It seems that Sunay Zaim signifies the audience effect on Mustafa Kemal and his need to stand out from the rest while he is the leader on the stage of Turkish history, albeit in a distorted version.

Certain “biographical” details about Sunay Zaim conjure up Mustafa Kemal's own life. Sunay Zaim comes from a military education background, though he is not a soldier in profession. Sunay Zaim studies in military high school in Istanbul, from which he is expelled due to his involvement in *Buzlar Çözülmeden*, a play with political undertones tiled by criticism of state corruption. Mustafa Kemal is known to have engaged in politics during his military education, but he was never dispelled. More importantly, maybe, is the foreshadowing that Sunay Zaim will engage in politics and will act in ways that “only the crazily foolhardy” can do.<sup>68</sup>

As already recorded, the Anatolia tour of Sunay Zaim is in a way/to some extent an allegory of Mustafa Kemal's Anatolia tours during and after the Independence War, both aiming at enlightenment of the mass, service for the nation and the Motherland. If Sunay Zaim is in a way Mustafa Kemal or a would-be Mustafa Kemal, then Nuri Çolak is Kazim Karabekir. The reader learns, while Sunay Zaim tells Ka about the coup behind the scenes, that whereas Nuri Çolak is not a high officer in the army, he is the highest officer in Kars at

---

<sup>67</sup>Edib, 355-6.

<sup>68</sup>Erol, 415.

the time of the coup, all his seniors being out of the city for one reason or another. As the incessant snow closes roads to Kars obviously for a few days, Sunay Zaim grabs his only chance this time, unlike the Mustafa Kemal film part. Nuri Çolak is the one who provides armament and troops for the coup to get under way, since Sunay Zaim does not have any. During the Independence War, Mustafa Kemal was dismissed from the army by the Istanbul government and left without any military rank, authority, armament or brigade. Kazım Karabekir was one of the highest military officials and had the largest military power available at the Eastern front. Thanks to his military power, which he put in the service of Mustafa Kemal, Mustafa Kemal could sustain the resistance. Kazım Karabekir and Nuri Çolak merges in the same figure when one also takes into account the fact that both Mustafa Kemal and Sunay Zaim see their plan (Independence War and the theatre coup, respectively) as the fortune to change their life and history and can fulfill thanks to the former friends.<sup>69</sup>

Raki is one of the most obvious emblems of Sunay Zaim-Mustafa Kemal parallelism. The reader always sees Sunay as drinking nothing but raki. The decision of the coup is taken at a raki table and thanks to raki (196). Sunay Zaim smells of “raki fumes when he is on the stage.” (397) At a meeting with the news reporter Serhat and Ka at the tailor-atelier-turned-military-quarters, when the coup is under way, there is a “rakı sofrası” waiting for them:

Ama çok daha önceden özenle hazırlandığı belli olan rakılı beyaz peynirli bir sofraya buyur edildiler ve başkalarının kaderine hükmetmeyi doğal bir şey olarak görmeyi başarmış iktidar sahiplerine bulaşan bir güven, iç rahatlığı ve acımasızlıkla içki içip yemek yiyerek dünya işlerinden söz ettiler. (335)<sup>70</sup>

Here the “rakı sofrası” is connected with power and cruelty in ways calling up the rakı

---

<sup>69</sup> “Hayatimin firsati,” 52.

<sup>70</sup> “But now as they welcomed this man to a carefully laid meal, with white cheese soon, he was sure, to be accompanied by raki, it was clear to Ka that such urges had no place at the table of revolutionary leaders, who sat down with an easy confidence known only to those for whom it has become second nature to decide other people’s fates.”

sofrasi of Mustafa Kemal at Çankaya. The criticism for Jacobinian idea of “for the public, despite the public” is served cold with raki.

In connection with the above passage Jacobinism seems to be another mutual trait between Mustafa Kemal and Sunay Zaim. Mustafa Kemal’s political acts are generally regarded to have close affinities with Jacobinism.<sup>71</sup> The familiarity of his policies and attitude to those of Napoleon is still disputed in historical and political discourses. Whilst Enver Pasa is known to have been an admirer of Napoleon, the similarities and differences between Envar Pasa and Mustafa Kemal are also widely discussed. In the novel, the reader is told that Sunay Zaim has been much appreciated for his parts as Napoleon, Lenin, Robespierre or Enver Paşa, all of whom are regarded with Jacobin revolution at some level. By way of the term Jacobin and its carrier Sunay, the political background of Mustafa Kemal’s policies and, accordingly, of Kemalism are implied in the novel. That he is the authorial/father figure who does the best for his children is emphasized by the small detail that he has been offered “makul baba’ (reasonable father) roles in advertisements. (193)

Unlike Halit the regulator, Sunay Zaim is not representative of Mustafa Kemal. Or rather he is not only that, even though he evidently personifies him to some extent. Sunay Zaim is more like a symbol of infantilization under the crushing effect of the name of the father or, if one might so put it, of Kemalism, “symbolized and revered in the person of Mustafa Kemal. (Irzık 192) Kemalizm is a quite prevalent line of thought, which can be basically defined as militant laicism in the state issues, the constancy of which is believed to depend on the Turkish army, while the actual separation of religion from politics can be probed and refuted on an analysis of Kemalist discourses. In fact, Taha Parla shows that religion has never been separated from politics, but only taken under control under the name of laicism. As a guardian of the Turkish Republic founded by Mustafa Kemal, Sunay Zaim puts his Kemalism as such: “Üstelik bu ülke ancak yüreklere din korkusu salınarak

---

<sup>71</sup> For a critique of the theoretical and political parallels drawn between Kemalism and Jacobinism in Turkish political theory, see Nazim Irem, 2005 “Jakobenizm – Cumhuriyetçilik Açmazında Kemalist Radikalizm.”

hakkıyla yönetilebilir. Her zaman bu korkunun haklı olduğu çıkar sonra ortaya. Halk dincilerden korkup devlete, ordusuna sığınmazsa Ortadoğu'daki, Asya'daki kimi kabile devletlerinde olduğu gibi geriliğin ve anarşinin kucağına düşer." (202) He revealingly confesses that to be able to rule the country, religious fears have to be manipulated in Turkey and it has always been so, rightfully, disclosing that religion, just like the army, has been manipulated for power relations. When the public/nation is fearful at heart of reactionaries, who are discursively underscored to be the enemies of the republic and freedom, then the little nation seeks security and stability in the Godly state and in His strong army. In another conversation, when Sunay Zaim confesses to be a coward but still wants to do something heroic, Ka replies that heroism in Turkey is either to kill oneself or somebody else. (308)

As a matter of fact, not solely heroism, but father, law, authority are always closely associated with life-death matters and martial/army issues. The greatest figures the Turkish public collectively know or acknowledge are always soldiers. The five main streets in Kars are named after the generals, as they represent the highest degree in the eyes of the Turkish people and in the common Kemalist discourse.<sup>72</sup> Navy-Blue relates the story of Rüstem and Suhrab to Ka, a story basically based on the dilemma of son's killing the father or being killed by the father. On the first day, neither of the sides can halt the other. On the second day of fighting, Suhrab gets the chance of killing Rüstem, but does not do so owing to his being told that it is against the Persian conventions to kill the enemy on the first chance. On the third day, R. kills Suhrab in an instant and realizes that he was his son only after his fatal wounding. Navy-Blue explains that the end of the story makes him cry, because he claims to understand the meaning of Suhrab's death. Suhrab, who is motivated by the love of the father is killed by him. At that point, Navy-Blue's admiration for Suhrab's love of father is replaced by a deeper and more mature feeling for the dignified pain of R. who is tied to the social conventions and rules. He goes on to say that, throughout the story, his love and awe transfigures from the side of the rebellious & individualistic Suhrab into that of powerful and responsible R.<sup>73</sup> Navy-Blue implies that there is a constant struggle

---

<sup>72</sup>"Rusların açtığı beş caddeye, askerden başka büyük bilmedikleri için..." (26)

<sup>73</sup> "Hikâyenin bu noktasında her defasında ben de ağlarım: Rüstem'in acısını paylaşmaktan çok zavallı

between fathers and sons, but he sides with the responsible father, tradition, hierarchy, social conventions. In another instance, there is an on-going uncertainty about the death of a former president: it is not known for certain whether he has been killed as a result of his decision to rescind “faytons” as they are not “modern” or whether he is involved in bribing and malpractice.<sup>74</sup> Either of the options leads to a problematic. In the first case, the father is an authoritarian modernizing figure, who is killed by the discontent son. In the second one, the father upsets the balance of the society, acts unlawfully, even while he is the figure of law. The plot of the novel parallels these small stories narrated within the main story. The events taking place in the actual novel character’s life in the main plot are resolved by the suicide of the father-son figure on the (historical & artistic) stage. Sunay Zaim stands for the overwhelming desire of the son to identify with the father and be one with him, be him on the one hand, and on the other hand, how he/the son cannot contain/carry this idea, being crushed under this powerful godly figure. He can neither identify with him nor refuse him completely. Only in death, he can resolve his father complex (and return to the womb & reunify with the dead mother through the resolution of all anxieties and the attainment of the blissful static state). On another level, it is not only Sunay Zaim who cannot identify with the father: Ka and through him the narrator Orhan all have problems with identifying with the father and a certain passage in the novel includes all parts of the above mother-father-child issue:

Yıllar sonra Nişantaşı'ndaki evlerine gidip, her zaman huzursuz ve kuşkulu babasıyla yaşlı gözlerle uzun uzun ondan bahsettiğimiz bir gün, evdeki eski kütüphaneyi görmek için izin istemiştim. Ka'nın odasındaki çocukluk ve gençlik kütüphanesi değil, oturma odasının karanlık köşesindeki babasının kütüphanesiydi aklımdaki. Burada şık ciltli hukuk kitapları, 1940'lardan

---

Suhrab'ın ölümünün anlamını anladığım için ağlarım ben. Baba sevgisiyle harekete geçen Suhrab'ı babası öldürür. O noktada iyi kalpli çocuksu Suhrab'ın baba sevgisine hayranlığımın yerini daha derin ve olgun bir duygu, kurallara ve geleneğe bağlı Rüstem'in vakur acısı alır. Hikâye boyunca sevgim ve hayranlığım isyankâr ve kişisel Suhrab'dan, güçlü kuvvetli ve sorumluluk sahibi Rüstem'e geçmiştir." 81

<sup>74</sup> Öldürülen eski başkanın "modern değil" diye faytonları kaldırmaya kalktığı için değil, (öldürüldüğü için bu girişimi yarıda kalmıştı sadece), asıl rüşvet ve yolsuzluk yüzünden herkesin nefretini çektiğini söyledi. (31)

kalan yerli ve çeviri romanlar, telefon ve telefon rehberlerinin arasında bu özel ciltli Hayat Ansiklopedisini görmüş, dördüncü cildin arka iç kapağındaki gebe kadın anatomisine bir göz atmıştım. (213-214)<sup>75</sup>

In her detailed analysis of the above passage, Zeynep Ergun asserts that what Ka and Orhan (and Sunay Zaim) feels in relation to the father is anxiety and the need to look into “the father’s library” expresses the desire for coming to the terms with the father. (40) The pregnant woman with a fetus in her womb in the library of the father stands for Sunay Zaim, Ka and Orhan’s main problematic.

There are indeed intriguing parallels between Ka and Sunay Zaim. In fact, they might be claimed to constitute a whole together and be two different faces of a medal. Sunay Zaim is one side of the medal/coin that mirrors the father complex, while Ka is the other side that reflects the mother issues. As a whole person together, Sz is the part of Ka that deals with the father issue, while Ka is apparently paralyzed by the lost /dead /unavailable mother. “Önemli olan o umutsuz birlikteliktir, bütün dünyanın dışarıda kalacağı iki kişilik bir merkez kurmaktır. Bunu da Ipek ile aylarca hiç durmadan sevişerek kurabileceğini hissediyordu.”(303) Instead of overcoming his primary attachment to his mother (or being unable to do so,) Ka wants to re-create it through Ipek, the substitute of the lost mother. In his fantasy world, there are only two people: Ka and Ipek/the replacement mother. The only possible world for this is the womb. Accordingly, the word hopeless is all the more revealing.

Representing the repressed side of each other, Ka and Sunay Zaim has a similar attitude towards art. Writing and acting seems to help them to place and pronounce their ambivalent attitude toward the father and coming to terms with their own feelings and thoughts to some extent. Art is seen as a therapeutic healing and the way to constitute

---

<sup>75</sup> Although the city’s schools were closed, he saw five or six students in the library reading room; there was also a handful of retired government officials; like the students, they had probably come here to escape the cold in their houses. In a corner, among the dog-eared dictionaries and tattered children’s encyclopedias, he found several old volumes of *The Encyclopedia of Life*, which had given him so many hours of pleasure as a child. Inside the back cover of every volume was a series of colored transparencies, which, as you leafed through them, revealed the organs and inner workings of a car or ship or the anatomy of a man. Ka went straight for the fourth volume, hoping to find the series featuring the baby nestled like a chick inside an egg within its mother’s distended tummy, only to find that the pictures had been torn out; all that remained were frayed edges attached to the back cover.

autonomy they desperately need. The meeting with the west organized by Ka ve Enlightened Plays of Sunay Zaim: both of them are artful. In both cases, the main aim is manipulation: Ka for İpek (mother) Sunay Zaim for power (father), Complementing each other into one person.

In this restless world covered by the misleadingly peaceful snow, the dead haunts the stage of both individual and social stage: the dead mother is at the center of all main issues in Ka's life. Later, Ka becomes the main figure in Orhan's life, his death initiating the process. Sunay Zaim has been haunted by Mustafa Kemal and his law, until he commits suicide on the place where it has all begun, the stage. The voice of the death is also heard in different spheres of life. For instance, the stage of literature has also been haunted (school books, poems, novels, biographies, memoirs...etc. all somehow related to Mustafa Kemal). The translations of some modernist works of art into Öz Türkçe by Fahir are simply distasteful to Ka and Orhan (56.) The so-called progressive discourses control, regulate and, if need be, restricts the flow of information, create and disseminate their own truths. Fiction becomes the truth in this world, which takes us to the next section.

### 3.3. Arts and Politics

The modern theatre seems to stand for westernization/modernization processes taking place in Turkey. The way TANPİNAR uses the Institute as a symbol of modernization, Pamuk uses modern theatre to designate socio-political atmosphere. Sunay Zaim claims that he is trying to reach myth on stage, "to become one with Myth," as myth, he claims, is "the outer limit" of real art." The way he tries to achieve this highest level of art is revealed in the next sentence. "Anyway, once the snow melts tomorrow and the roads open again, my death will cease to be of the slightest importance for the people of Kars." (337, 344)<sup>76</sup> Zeynep Ergun states that Sunay Zaim's theatre group and plays mark the conventions of epic and myth in the novel. She likens them to the Athenian warriors of The Illiad: the way they hid in a

---

<sup>76</sup> "Gerçek sanatın en sonunda ulaşması gereken yere, efsaneye varmaya çalışıyorum," dedi Sunay. "Ayrıca yarın sabah karlar eriyip yollar açılınca benim ölümümün Karşılılar için hiçbir önemi kalmayacak." Bir an karısıyla gözgöze geldi. Karı koca öyle derin bir anlayışla birbirlerinin gözlerinin içine baktılar ki Ka kıskandı onları. Kendisi de İpek ile aynı derin anlayışı paylaşarak mutlu bir hayat sürecekti miydi?" (337)

Trojan horse to conquer the city from within, Sunay Zaim's theatre group seizes the city by disguise. She argues that the basic difference is that they are not the soldiers of a foreign army (35). I agree with Ergun's arresting assertion that a similarity between Sunay Zaim's theatre and the Athenian warriors is discernible and maybe even intended consciously by the author. However, I do not think they are not "foreign." Of course they are not foreign in the sense Ergun is talking about. Both sides are officially "Turkish" in the novel, coming from the same imagined community. However, Sunay Zaim, his players and his plays are foreign to Kars and people of Kars, as they are to Sunay Zaim. But more important, Ergun's observation is indispensable for me in the discussion of art in *Snow*. I believe that when one takes Ergun's assertion into consideration with the guide of James Joyce's aesthetic theory in *A Portrait*, the true quality of Sunay Zaim's art comes to the front. To explain what I mean, I first need to quote from James Joyce:

The simplest epical form is seen emerging out of lyrical literature when the artist prolongs and broods upon himself as the centre of an epical event and this form progresses till the centre of emotional gravity is equidistant from the artist himself and from others. The narrative is no longer purely personal. The personality of the artist passes into the narration itself, flowing round and round the persons and the action like a vital sea. This progress you will see easily in that old English ballad Turpin Hero which begins in the first person and ends in the third person. The dramatic form is reached when the vitality which has flowed and eddied round each person fills every person with such vital force that he or she assumes a proper and intangible esthetic life. The personality of the artist, at first a cry or a cadence or a mood and then a fluid and lambent narrative, finally refines itself out of existence, impersonalizes itself, so to speak. The esthetic image in the dramatic form is life purified in and reprojected from the human imagination. The mystery of esthetic, like that of material creation, is accomplished. The artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails. (244-5)

According to this theory, in the lyrical form, “the simplest verbal vesture of an instant of emotion,” one is not even conscious of himself/herself, while the epical form begins to form only the moment the artist dwells on and regards himself/herself as the heart of an heroic event. Even in the most developed examples of the latter form, where the axis of “emotional gravity” is midway between the artist and others, the narrative bears “the stamp of the artist’s character. When one looks at what Sunay Zaim claims to be modern “life theatre” with this theory in mind, it is possible to argue that as Sunay Zaim has heroic aspirations, his theatre is still in the phase of epical form, while having undertones of lyrical form with its gravity resting in thinly veiled volatile emotional flow. The passages about Sunay’s acting concentrates on his central place on the stage, his enigmatic grip on the audience, as if other players do not exist. The personality of the artist is in everything about Sunay’s play. Since his plays are not examples of developed epic forms, the distance between the artist and other players, the artist and the audience is unbridgeable. Sz is the unredeemable center. What is more to the point, however, this central personality in his plays is a borrowed one from the father. The main actor tries to impersonate the father, ending being entirely engulfed in him. The way Kemalist discourse is claimed to be the most progressive ideology in the country, while being strictly struck in the 1930s version and causing necrosis in the society, which the discourse attribute to its “other” discourses (i.e. Islamism, Sharia...) Sunay claims his theatre to be the most enlightened art, but one sees that it merely reproduces the decades-long ideas without any artistic or content-wise revolution, causing decay, instead of advancement. In the framework of Joyce’s aesthetic theory of modern art, Sunay’s art proceeds in the opposite direction: declaring to be forwarding-moving Sunay’s art is regressive and constitutes a reverse movement, in the exactly opposite direction. The progressive Sunay Zaim wants to catch the mythical tone on the stage. This, however, seems quite contradictory, given the fact that he aspires to high modernism.

### **3.4. Dark Doubles, Dual Duplicates, Doppelgangers, Alter Egos**

In the treatment of all the above-mentioned issues, Pamuk makes use of deconstruction of binary oppositions in an ironic way and discloses his technique in his narrative, in line with

postmodern texts. The passage quoted below is the declaration of his technique:

Ka İpek'in babasıyla konuşurken kendisine, de birşeyler söylediğini, aslında odadaki herkes gibi hep çift anlamlı konuştuğunu, bakışlarını kimi zaman kaçırıp kimi zaman yoğunlaştırmasının da bu iki anlamı vurgulamaya yönelik olduğunu hissetti. Kars'ta Necip dışında karşılaştığı herkesin içgüdüsel bir ahenkle cilt anlamlı konuştuğunu çok daha sonra fark edecek, bunun yoksullukla mı, korkularla mı, yalnızlıkla mı, hayatın yalınlığıyla mı ilgili olduğunu soracaktı kendine. "Babacığım, gitmeyin," derken İpek'in kendisini kışkırttığını, Kadife'nin ise bildiriden ve babasına bağlılıktan söz ederken aslında Lacivert'e bağlılığını dile getirdiğini görüyordu Ka. 243)<sup>77</sup>

Not only is everyone in the room speaking with a double meaning, but also everyone in the novel is speaking with a double meaning. Many characters are fervent advocates of the political- ideological terms, which, they believe, they symbolize with their body, dressing style, in fact with their entire existence, yet it becomes clear that they confuse terms for things which they are not, so they undercut their own sayings, symbols, all terms while in vain trying to enforce them. As the characters speak in a double, ambivalent manner, meaning something other than the one they actually intend, if not the complete opposite, the terms they use also stand for other things than they are actually intended for. The text makes it clear that history and truth should not be confused with ideology and politics. Or, Kemalism may not mean progression or Islamicism conservation all the time, but that they can melt into the same thing, as they do in the novel. Or else modernization should not be reduced strictly to westernization. The west as the ideal can be merely the west imagined. The borders between art and reality can be blurred, but it should be remembered that it might then inherently contain certain violence. The best examples for the consequences of

---

<sup>77</sup> "While Ipek spoke to her father, Ka took stock: It seemed that—as with everyone else in the room—everything she said had a double meaning; as for this game she was playing with her eyes—averting her gaze one moment, staring at him intensely the next—he could only assume that this was just another way of transmitting the same mixed message. Only much later would he realize that—apart from Necip—everyone he met in Kars spoke in the same code, and so harmoniously that they seemed almost a single chorus; he would go on to ask himself whether it was poverty that somehow brought it out in them or fear, solitude, or the very simplicity of their lives. Even as Ipek said, "Daddy, please don't go," she was teasing Ka; even as Kadife spoke of the statement and her bonds to her father, Ka could see she was revealing her bonds to Blue." (249)

blurring of the lines between arts and politics in the novel are Ka and his dark double Sunay Zaim. The following quotation exemplifies Sunay's familiar ambiguous talks:

"İyi bir aktör," dedi Sunay hafif tiyatromsu bir havayla, "tarihin içinde yıllarca, yüzyıllarca birikmiş, bir köşeye sıkışmış, patlayıp ortaya çıkmamış, dile gelmemiş güçleri temsil eder. Bütün hayatı boyunca en ücra yerlerde, en denenmemiş yollarda, en sapa sahnelerde kendisine gerçek bir özgürlük bağışlayacak olan sesi arar. Onu bulduğunda ise korkmadan sonuna kadar gitmesi gerekir." (201)<sup>78</sup>

It is not clear whether he really intends to talk about art or politics, but at least the double meaning in the talk is on purpose. He defines both artist and political leader in the above passage. He describes both the actor on the stage of theatre and the actor on the stage of history. Similarly, he is sick at heart and at head. He is going to die soon, but he commits suicide on the stage and Ka is killed in Germany in the end. About the confusion of terms, one can also notice that being a leader should not mean being a dictator or a despot. Politics and military issues converge into each other and again in the novel, it is explained that the political traditions (gelenek) in Turkey encourage the turn of events in this familiar way.

---

<sup>78</sup> "A good actor," said Sunay in a light theatrical tone, "is a man who represents the sediment, the unexplored and unexplained powers that have drifted down through the centuries; he takes the lessons he has gleaned and hides them deep inside him; his self-mastery is awesome; never does he bare his heart; no one may know how powerful he is until he strides onto the stage. All his life, he travels down unfamiliar roads to perform at the most out-of-the-way theaters in the most godforsaken towns, and everywhere he goes he searches for a voice that will grant him genuine freedom. If he is so fortunate as to find that voice, he must embrace it fearlessly and follow the path to the end." (206)

## Chapter IV

### Conclusion

The Turkish novel has always been regarded as an instrument of social critique since its first appearance in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Didactic tone, educatory purposes, social themes, moral warnings, historical lessons have always pervaded the pages of the Turkish novel for decades. Among the predominant themes and motifs of the Turkish novel, warnings against moral decay, admonition against excessive Westernization, dilemma of East versus West, the elevation of Anatolian people and life, “the class oppression and state corruption” could be counted.<sup>79</sup> Against this background, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is generally regarded as the first modernist Turkish writer in that he is the first novelist to centralize on modernist concerns in his writings, such as focusing on the narrative, making aesthetics the central point, problematizing the concepts like subjectivity, interiority, identity. While his literary world is based on art and individual, a sense of loss and the relentless search for integrity is the dominant idea in his works. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is a very valuable literary father for Orhan Pamuk, who, time and again, acknowledges his debt to the former. He states that they both address the issues of cultural conflicts and civilization crisis.<sup>80</sup> This literary dialogue between the two famous writers of Turkish literature is brought into the open in this study through a close textual analysis of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* and *Kar*. As attempted in the preceding chapters, Pamuk seems to take the issues where Tanpınar has left and move them ahead by adding new layers to his main concerns through new developments in literature and history. What’s more, in *Saf ve Düşünceli Romançı*, Pamuk makes it clear that he reads *Enstitü* as an allegory. The countless intertextual parallels between the two point at the same direction.

Behind this study stands the idea that the shadow of the founder of the Turkish republic has fallen on the pages of innumerable works of art. Therefore, I first focus on the barely discernible Mustafa Kemal figure in *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, and compare it with the explicit one in *Kar*, as these two novel deal with Mustafa Kemal’s impact on the

---

<sup>79</sup> Irzik 2003, 555.

<sup>80</sup> Pamuk 1995, “Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar,” 45

history and public life of Turkey, as well as on private and daily spheres of life. In line with their chronological background, the main figure is the father in *Enstitü*, whereas in *Kar* the troubled son who longs and tries in vain to become the father takes the stage. However, instead of simply reproducing what Fredric Jameson has named “national allegory,” they both undercut, subvert, twist, deconstruct and disintegrate it by showing the problematic sides of the relationship between the public and the private where a division between the national and the personal does not exist. Both novels, albeit in different ways, demonstrate that the father figure in the Kemalist paradigm infantilizes the society/nation to a considerable extent. Simultaneously, the paternal father, in his ardent attempt to mold the society according to his ideals ends up being an artist manqué who fails to force his work of art into his desired shapes, as scenes on poetics of violence abound in both of the novels. Especially in *Kar*, this violence assumes a highly physical dimension, which shows that to treat life as a work of art, to try to mold people and to attempt to give a shape to society entails violence, in some cases physical violence. If Mustafa Kemal stage-manages public and politic life from the assembly, then Halit Ayarçı orchestrates through the Institute and Sunay Zaim from the stage. All three of them simultaneously make use of all the other available means (newspapers, radio, and also television in the case of Sunay Zaim). However, their work of art resists to this high level of pressure and vomits the attempt. The precious work of art becomes all the more fragile, due to their excessive attention and control.

The relation of the novels with art in general and modernism in particular can be recapitulated in a single sentence: society/human beings/art cannot be regulated, synchronized, automatized the way Atatürk/Ayarçı/Sunay Zaim embody in their respective ways. In the reading Jale Parla offers for *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, the clocks entail a multifaceted denotation “as metonyms of incompleteness and lack, on the personal-psychological level as well as the cultural-aesthetic.” She suggests that “supply[ing] the missing n (which, by the way, in Turkish also means “what”) to the insistent questions of Ayarçı (“where does one see the clock in these?”), we will have *art (sanat)* in the word *clock (saat)*” and this gives the key to the enigmatic events taking place in the novel:

*Saat* (clock) is *sanat* (art) minus the *n*. A person whose aesthetic development is curtailed becomes a *saat* just as a society that lets its culture be led by charlatans (like Halit Ayarç) will turn into a clock-setting institute instead of an oasis of cultural regeneration. All that kind of society will get, then, is a hegemon, a totalitarian leader who will manipulate it as Halit Ayarç manipulates the whole system. By the same token, one who allows oneself to become the clock will suffer the authority of the father from which one cannot free oneself but will sink into further automation by giving up creativity. The missing *n* that turns the word sanat (art) into *saat* (clock) stands for lack of maturity, lack of art, lack of self-actualization, and the Lacanian desire for completion.<sup>81</sup>

Among the commonalities between these two kindred novels, the encounter with the idea of the West and the narcissistic blow it causes is very important. In the *Enstitü*, the reader witnesses the story of a charismatic leader trying hard to repair the narcissistic wounds of the idea that there is a superior West which we/the East lag(s) behind. Because the narrative comes in a comical package, the effect is a subtle acerbity. In *Kar*, the whole series of incidents are arranged so as to heighten the drama of this unsettling encounter. Still, Lacivert sharply summarizes it in a couple of sentences:

Aramızdaki yabancı sensing [Ka], imanı tam şu kızcağızda farkında olmadan yarattığın şüpheler, tuhafliklar da bunun kanıtı. Kendini beğenmiş Batılı bakışlarıyla bizi yargıladın, içten içe gülümsedin belki de bizlere... Ben aldırmadım, Kadife de aldırılmazdı, ama aramıza kendi saflığın ile birlikte Avrupalının mutluluk vaadini, doğruluk hayalini soktun, aklımızı karıştırdın. Sana kızmıyorum, çünkü, bütün iyi insanlar gibi, kötülüğünü farkına varmadan yapıyorsun. Ama şimdi sana bunu söylediğime göre, bundan sonra masum sayılamazsın." (235-236)<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Parla, 2003, "Car Narratives," 542-3.

<sup>82</sup> You're the stranger in our midst. You've sown doubt in this lovely and devout girl, and the strange things going on around her are the proof. And now you've aired all your smug Western views, probably even having a few laughs deep down inside at our expense. I don't mind, and neither does Kadife, but by inflicting your own naïve ideas on us, by rhapsodizing about the Western pursuit of happiness and justice, you've clouded our thinking. I'm not angry at you, because, like all good people, you are not aware of the evil inside you. But

The West, which is the cause of narcissistic blow, is not the West encountered per se, but the West imagined: the west as a detached, cold, indifferent, lawful, condescending Other internalized by the East. *Kar* shows that “what is thought to belong to the past of Turkish modernity, and is assumed to be surpassed (i.e., the Western hegemony; the perspective of ‘lack’; the non-contemporaneous perception of time; the binary opposition of traditional/modern) is very much present in the hegemonic deployment of what modernity means.”<sup>83</sup> The Occidentalist fantasy elicits in Lacivert, and likewise in Sunay Zaim, a feeling of lack, which is followed by an ardent desire to fulfill, while their imagining may be identified as projection in the psychoanalytic sense: they displace “what is intolerable inside into the outside world/to the other (the West-the East) and, hence, thus refuse to know. (365-6) In the mythical time of the Occidentalist fantasy, which is represented by the journey to Kars, “the past reappears as the desirable future.”

If the Bihruz syndrome is characterized by the unconditional admiration for the West and infantilization of the East, unquestioning labeling the West with superiority and the East with inferiority and uncritical conceptualization of the West with progress/center and the East with backwardness/periphery, *Enstitü* and *Kar* can be categorized as the subversion of the Bihruz syndrome or of the symbol of snob in Turkish literature (a word Irdal uses quoting Ayarçlı.) Along similar lines, the two novels “break the illusion of the autonomous self” and thus are novels where “the writer is no longer the guardian of the true self[.]”<sup>84</sup> By the same token, the self-assured narrator is subverted.

In the context of the republican period, on the one hand the official historical narrative separates itself from the Ottoman history through the orientalizing of the Ottoman Empire and tries to create a national history from the zero point and, on the other hand, the trajectory of republican history is based on the frame of Westernization. *Enstitü*

---

having heard it from me, you can't claim to be an innocent from now on.” (242)

<sup>83</sup> Ahiska 2003, 362.

<sup>84</sup> Gürbilek, 2003, 6129.

and *Kar* respond to this historical narrative by criticizing the traumatic modernization reforms, some of which leads to an irreversible divide in the cultural heritage of the nation. According to Göknaar, while Turkey has never been a colonized country in the sense of what the other third world countries have undergone, (a proposition Pamuk agrees with) all the traces of imperial domination are visible in the history of the republican Turkey. For Göknaar, the embracement of Western garments, the language reform, the adaptation of Western legal rules, the suppression of Islam and the education reform are all the tangible shadows of imperialism in modern Turkey, whereby the Ottoman Empire is transformed into the obsolete other/oriental. Since Atatürk reforms related to civilization and modernization are based on the model of imperial Europe, an identification with the aggressor, the transition from the Ottoman Empire into the modern Turkey, where the main aim of the nation has been reflected as progress, development, improvement, advancement, implicitly comprises a notion of evolutionary history that advances from a primitive stage to a developed one. Göknaar claims that the psychological consequence of modernization is the identification with the father through a process of internalization and, hence, asks “What is the modernization/ westernization/ identification which has been forced upon a nation, if not an imperial dominance?” *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* and *Kar* elaborate not on the identification with the father, but, more crucially, on the problematic identification with the father or the impossibility thereof.

Last but certainly not least, the two novels are noteworthy for their portrayal of the relation between the republic and women. In both of them, the reader sees how women are manipulated into being the tools of historical leaders/actors in their quest to make their grand republican project. Mustafa Kemal/Halit Ayaracı/Sunay Zaim stage-manages women as the public face of their work of art and turns them into the symbols of westernization/modernization. The displaced sexuality, overt theatricality and excessive performativity of women characters in both *Enstitüsü* and *Kar* put forward the problematic sides of this instrumentalization.

## WORKS CITED

- Adak, Hülya 2001. *Intersubjectivity: Halide Edib (1882-1964) Or The "Ottoman/Turkish (Woman)" As The Subject of Knowledge*. PhD. dissertation. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago.
- Ahıska, Meltem 2003. Occidentalism. The Historical Fantasy of the Modern. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 102(2-3): 351-379.
- Armstrong, H.C. 1932. *Grey Wolf: An Intimate Study of A Dictator*. London : A. Baker.
- Atay, Falih Atay. 2008 (1958). *Çankaya*. Istanbul: Pozitif Yayınları.
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. 1999 (1969). *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal*. İstanbul : Remzi Kitabevi.
- Edib-Adivar, Halide. 1928. *The Turkish Ordeal: Being the Further Memoirs of Halide Edib*. New York: Century.
- Ergun. Zeynep. 2009. *Erkeğin Yittiği Yerde*. Istanbul: Everest Yayınları.
- Erturk, Nergis. 2008. "Modernity and Its Fallen Languages: Tanpınar's Hasret, Benjamin's Melancholy." *PMLA* 123, 41-53.
- . 2011. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Feldman, Walter. 1998. "Time, Memory and Autobiography in *The Clock-Setting Institute* of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar." *Edebiyat Bol.* 8, pp 37-61.
- Erol, Sibel. 2007. "Reading Orhan Pamuk's Snow as Parody: Difference as Sameness." In *Comparative Critical Studies*, 4: 403-432.
- Felman, Shashana. 2003. *Writing and Madness: Literature/Philosophy/Psychoanalysis*. Translated by Martha Noel Evans and Others. Stanford University Press.
- Gökner, Erdağ. 2006. "Beyaz Kale'de Özdeşleşme Politikası." In Orhan Pamuk'u Anlamak. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Gürbilek Nurdan. 1992. *Vitrinde Yaşamak*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- . 2001. *Kötü Çocuk Türk*. Istanbul: Metis
- . 2002. "Romanın Karanlık Yüzü." *Virgül no. 49*, 8-13.
- . 2003. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness and the Turkish Novel." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, volume 102, Number 2-3, Spring/Summer.

- . 2008 *Mağdurun Dili*. Istanbul, Metis.
- . 2010. *Kör Ayna, Kayıp Şark: Edebiyat ve Endişe*. Istanbul: Metis
- Joyce, James. 1996. *A Portrait of the Artist As A Young Man*. Berkshire: Penguin Popular Classics.
- Irzık, Sibel. 2003. "Allegorical Lives: The Public and the Private in the Modern Turkish Novel" in *Relocating the Fault Lines*, 551-67.
- . 2009. "Orhan Pamuk's Snow: Re-Imagining the Boundaries between East and West, Art and Politics." In *Europe and Its Boundaries: Words and Worlds, Within and Beyond*. Edited by Davison, Andrew and Muppidi, Himadeep. Lenham: Lexington Books, 189-202.
- Irem, Nazim. 2005 "Jakobenism – Cumhuriyetçilik Açmazında Kemalist Radikalizm." *Journal of Faculty of Business*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 2004 – No.1.
- Karpat, Kemal H. 2001. "The Rise of Modern Turkey." *The Journal of Military History*. Jul 2001; 65, 3; 771-5.
- Kemal, Gazi Mustafa. 1929. *A Speech delivered by Ghazi Mustafa Kemal*. Leipzig: K. F. Koehler.
- Kinross, (Lord) Patrick Balfour Baron. 1964. *Atatürk: A Biography of Mustafa Kemal, Father of Modern Turkey*. New York: Marrow.
- Köroğlu, Erol. 1996. *The Concept of Time in Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*. Boğaziçi University. MA Thesis.
- Mango, Andrew. 2000. *Atatürk*. London : John Murray.
- Moran, Berna. 2008 (1982). "Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü." *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları. 297-331.
- Oğuzertem, Süha. 1995. "Unset Saats and Upset Sihhats: A Fatherless Approach to *The Clock-Setting Institute*". *The Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 19.2 (Güz 1995): 3-18.
- Pamuk, Orhan. 1995, "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar." *Defter Spring*.
- . 2011(2002). *Kar*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- . 2004. *Snow*. Translated by Maureen Freely. New York: Faber and Faber.
- . 2011. *Saf ve Düşünceli Romancı*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Parla, Jale. 2000. *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- . 2003. "Car Narratives." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Volume 102, Number 2-3, Spring/Summer.
- . 2007. "From Allegory to Parable: Inscriptions of Anatolia in the Turkish Novel" *New Perspectives on Turkey*. No: 36/ Special Issue on Literature and the Nation. Spring 2007.
- . 2008. "The Wounded Tongue: Turkey's Language Reform and the Canonicity of the Novel." *PMLA*, Vol. 123, No. 1, January 2008, p. 27-40.
- . 2011. *Türk Romanında Yazar ve Başkalaşım*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Parla, Taha and Andrew Davison. 2004. *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey*. Syracuse, NY : Syracuse University Press.
- Parla, Taha 2008. *Türkiye'de Siyasi Kültür'ün Resmi Kaynakları: Atatürk'ün Nutku [The Official Sources of Turkish Political Culture: Atatürk's Great Speech]*. İstanbul: Deniz Yayınları.
- Shayegan, Daryush. 2007 (1989). *Cultural Schizophrenia: Islamic Societies Confronting the West*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. 2010(1961). *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- . 2001. *The Time Regulation Institute*. Translated by Ender Gürol. Madison, Wis.: Turko-Tatar Press.
- . 2007 (1969) "Türk Edebiyatı'nda Cereyanlar." *Edebiyat Üstüne Makaleler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 104-129.
- . 2007 (1969) "Şark ile Garp Arasında Görülen Esaslı Farklar." *Edebiyat Üstüne Makaleler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 130-141.
- Volkan, Vamik D. and Norman Itskowitz 1984. *The Immortal Atatürk: A Psychobiography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.