

THE PORTRAITS OF THE ARTISTS
AS CRITICS IN RE-CREATION OF
THE MODERN WITH TRADITION:
TANPINAR AND ELIOT

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

by

İdris ÇAKMAK

Fatih University

November 2008

© İdris ÇAKMAK

All Rights Reserved, 2008

For Halil Turgut

APPROVAL PAGE

Student : İdris ÇAKMAK
Institute : Institute of Social Sciences
Department : English Language and Literature
Thesis Subject : The Portraits of the Artists as Critics in Re-creation of the Modern with Tradition: Tanpınar and Eliot
Thesis Date : November 2008

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Wisam Mansour
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Ali Murat Yel
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Murat Yel

Prof. Dr. Wisam Mansour

Prof. Dr. Ömer Çaha

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

Assist. Prof. Gökhan Bacık
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.
2. The program of advanced study of which this thesis is part has consisted of:
 - i) Research Methods course during the undergraduate study
 - ii) Examination of English, American and Turkish Literatures including criticism, a comparative approach to the literatures and assessment of several literary theories which have contributed to this thesis in an effective way.
3. This thesis is composed of the main sources including several books by the major authors discussed in comparison; and the secondary sources including scholarly articles from academic journals as well as newspaper articles, and theoretical books on the criticism of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Thomas Stearns Eliot.

İdris ÇAKMAK

November 2008

University : Fatih University
Institute : Institute of Social Sciences
Department : English Language and Literature
Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Ali Murat Yel
Degree Awarded and Date : November 2008

ABSTRACT

THE PORTRAITS OF THE ARTISTS AS CRITICS IN RE- CREATION OF THE MODERN WITH TRADITION: TANPINAR AND ELIOT

İdris ÇAKMAK

The present thesis explicates the literary and social criticisms of Thomas Stearns Eliot and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar who are both prominent figures in constructing the modernist inclinations in English and Turkish literatures. Their attitudes towards tradition in shaping criticism with modern norms are quite worthwhile for they attribute a significant value to tradition as critics. Their criticism and theoretical affiliations are elaborately based on the reinterpretation of tradition since tradition does not only change the present but also creates it by means of its sturdy ramifications into the past and the present. Their criticism bears comparison with each other in terms of the stress they make upon the significance of tradition and the links between past and present.

In that study, first, the emergence and the structure of Modernism as a thought and a literary theory and its relation with modernity will be elucidated. Second; the literary extensions of Modernism by focusing on the criticism of Eliot and Tanpınar and the importance of tradition in the theories of these two influential critics will be illustrated. Therefore, their insistence on the idea of continuity and their special attribution to the presence of past will be studied. The relation of their

criticism to tradition and modernist approaches will be scrupulously illustrated. Then, Western shadows behind them, such as Bergson, who give a coherent picture in unraveling their sources and intersecting parts in their critical agenda will be sifted thoroughly. As a result, that they both structure their criticism on modern thoughts but by establishing it on the grounds of traditional legacy they have inherited will be analyzed. Therefore the gist of this thesis will be upon the criticism of both Eliot and Tanpınar and how they re-created the modern by focusing on tradition.

Key words:

Tanpınar, Eliot, Modernism, tradition, criticism, Bergson, the idea of continuity, poetry

Üniversite : Fatih Üniversitesi
Enstitü : Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Bölüm : İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Tez Danışmanı : Yard. Doç. Ali Murat Yel
Tez Tarihi : Kasım 2008

KISA ÖZET

MODERNİN GELENEKLE YENİDEN YARATILMASINDA SANATÇILARIN ELEŞTİRMEN OLARAK PORTRELERİ: TANPINAR VE ELIOT

İdris ÇAKMAK

Bu tez İngiliz ve Türk edebiyatlarındaki modernist eğilimlerin oluşturulmasında çok mühim isimler olan Thomas Stearns Eliot ve Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın edebi ve sosyal eleştirilerini ele alır. Eleştirmen olarak geleneğe önemli bir değer attikleri için, eleştiriye modern normlarla şekillendirmede geleneğe karşı takındıkları tutum dikkate değerdir. Onların tenkidi ve kuramsal yaklaşımları, geleneğin anı sadece değiştirmede aynı zamanda geçmişe ve şimdiye doğru güçlü dallanmaları vasıtasıyla tekrar kurduğu için, genel itibarıyla geleneğin tekrar yorumlanması üzerine kuruludur. Onların eleştirileri birbirleriyle geleneğin önemine ve geçmişle geleceğin birbiriyle bağlantısına yaptıkları vurgu noktasından benzerlik arz etmektedir.

Bu çalışmada ilk olarak Modernizm'in bir düşünce ve edebiyat teorisi olarak doğuşu ve yapısı, ve moderniteyle olan ilişkisi incelenecektir. İkinci olarak, Modernizm'in edebi uzantıları, Eliot ve Tanpınar'ın eleştirileri ve iki etkili eleştirmenin teorilerinde geleneğin önemi üzerinde odaklanarak gösterilecektir. Bundan dolayı onların devam fikri üzerindeki ısrarları ve geçmişin şimdiliğine yaptıkları özel atıf ele alınacaktır. Eleştirilerinin gelenekle ve modernist

yaklaşımlarla olan ilişkisi detaylı bir şekilde gösterilecektir. Daha sonra Bergson gibi eleştirel programlarında kesişen noktaların ve kaynaklarının ortaya çıkarılmasında net bir resim veren arkalarındaki Batılı gölgeler etraflıca incelenecektir. Sonuç olarak onların ikisinin de eleştirilerini modern düşünceler üzerine bina etmeleri fakat bunu tevarüs ettikleri geleneksel miras üzerine kurarak gerçekleştirdikleri düşüncesi çözümlenecektir. Bu yüzden bu tezin ana mevzusu Eliot ve Tanpınar'ın eleştirisi ve onların modern gelenek üzerinde odaklanarak nasıl kurdukları hakkında olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Tanpınar, Eliot, Modernizm, gelenek, eleştiri, Bergson, devam fikri, şiir

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to divulge my unbounded gratitude to all who succoured in the composition of this study as an idea, theory and thesis. Firstly I want to thank the thesis committee who despite their loaded schedule accepted to read my thesis and furnished me with their inestimable insights.

Secondly, I would like to verbalize my appreciation for İsmail who shared the same chaotic hours with me whenever the contractions for a new birth of an idea started, deliberated over the questions I aroused and witnessed the genesis of this thesis in discussion and conceptualization part. I am also beholden to Metin Boşnak with whose illumination I was emboldened to adopt a comparative study as this.

My wife whose perspicacious endeavours permeate nearly most of the time spent in the writing of this thesis and space allotted to the existence of that thesis deserves the essential portion of recognition. She alleviated my temper when my zest tended to dwindle and consoled me when my study began to get frantic.

Ultimately, I would like to proclaim my deep acknowledgements to my supervisor Ali Murat Yel who, in the first place, made me feel conceited by accepting me as his pupil just before the end of the deadline of the thesis. He buttressed me with his selfless nature and always lent an ear to my precarious statements with his conscientious profundity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I	
1. The Advancement of Modern Idea and Modern vs. Modernist	8
CHAPTER II	
2.1: Two Poets and Criticism on Poetry	22
2.2: Criticism of Eliot and Tanpınar's Theories on Criticism	36
2.3: Cathartic Functioning of Drama	46
CHAPTER III:	
3. Enduring Legacy as a Resistance to the Modern: Tradition and Usable Past	50
CHAPTER IV:	
4. The Idea of Continuity and the Perseverance of Tradition	72
CHAPTER V:	
5. Tanpınar and Eliot under the sway of Henri Bergson	88
CONCLUSION	107

INTRODUCTION

Thomas Stearns Eliot (1888-1965) and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901-1962) are two illustrious men of letters for Anglo-Saxon and Turkish civilizations. They have witnessed the tremors of the first half of the twentieth century and experienced the consequences of modern dilemma. Their voyage in the field of literature is not stable: they have progressed from being highly elitist and individual to being a defendant of social habits or from being a passionate adherent of traditional nexus to being extremely selective. Their “physical” voyage from their own cultures, America and Turkey, to the most civilized place Europe bears resemblance to their cultural journey. They have considered Europe as the center of civilization and culture therefore they have always yearned for going there. Eliot after his first visit to Europe in the beginning of the twentieth century completed the last phase of his life in Europe. He has been baptized in the Anglican Church and became a full European; however, Tanpınar’s visit to Europe, again in the last stage of his life like Eliot’s, is shorter. He has paid a short visit to Paris and other notable capitals of Europe, which are reified to be the archetypal centers for civilization in his writings. Their quest for the civilization and their voyages to Europe mostly stem from the aspiration for the maintenance of tradition which will be discussed in the ensuing chapters.

Tanpınar and Eliot are both proficient in fiction: Tanpınar have written short stories and novels, and Eliot dramas. In their fiction and poetry they have created some antagonists who represent the dilemmas and baffling of the age they have lived in, such as Gerontion, Prufrock, Abdullah Efendi and Hayri İrdal. To liken J. A. Prufrock, for instance, to Abdullah Efendi would reveal the veiled correlation between Tanpınar’s attitude towards the hurdles of modern mind and Eliot’s

response to the plight created by the novelty of the age. What is more, to juxtapose them in the same place as poets and analyze the weight of European poetry on their poetic creations would be an influential study, because their poetic gift is renowned by the critics who are familiar with English and Turkish literatures. They have proved to be triumphant in poetry and been acclaimed as the accomplished and authoritative poets in their culture. Poetry is the station they feel secure most and the place they are more proficient as keeping with their own judgment. To appreciate greatness, poetry is the best department for Eliot in which he is the most qualified. Tanpınar considers poetry as his primary road to expand to the other parts and genres of literature. The span of that thesis, as the title indicates, subsumes only “the criticism” of Tanpınar and Eliot; however, those convictions betoken that their poetry is a cardinal figure in evaluating their criticism. As they are both poets and critics at the same time, their criticism reveals their poetic authorities and their poetry buttresses the very foundations of their critical program. As maintained by Eliot in To Criticize the Critic (TCC), when he remarks about Valéry, a self-conscious poet, the one who propounds a theory of poetry, is under the guidance of his theory; that is something to be appreciated in a poet because he knows what he writes (TCC 39). Their analysis of literary works and social matters as “self-conscious poets” are guided by their poetic temperament. The present study converges only on the critical agendas of Eliot and Tanpınar, although their poetry precedes their criticism. Dwelling on their theory of poetry with their other critical propensities, their poetry and fiction will be invalid in that study. Their literary and social criticism will be predicated on some of their books. These include: Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler [Essays on Literature] (EÜM), Yaşadığım Gibi [As I Lived] (YG), Yahya Kemal

(YK), On Poetry and Poets (OPP), The Sacred Wood (SW), To Criticize the Critic (TCC), The Idea of Christian Society (ICS) and The Use of Poetry and the use of Criticism (UPUC). These are the primary works that would be counted among their criticism; however, Tanpınar's case is a bit different: most of his books, including the first two books above, some novels and memoirs, were published after his death and edited by his pupils. Some of his lecture notes and his letters, which are among those as well, will be discussed in the present study. These are: Bir Kültür Bir İnsan [One Culture One Man] by Turan Alptekin, Tanpınar'dan Yeni Ders Notları [New Lecture Notes from Tanpınar] by Güler Güven, Tanpınar'ın Mektupları [The Letters of Tanpınar] by Zeynep Kerman. When those books are quoted, they will be referred not to Tanpınar's surname in the text but editors'.

In that comparative disquisition their theory of poetry, their critical sentiments on criticism and drama, the place of modern thought and modernist tendencies in their critical programs, tradition and its relevance to the present, and Bergson's weight in their philosophies will be thoroughly conferred. Their conflicting characteristics and the resemblances they bear, in line with their perplexed identities, will be put forward.

First chapter investigates the emergence, the roots and the extent of modern thought. Modernity as an ideal which seeks for the reason and mind's supremacy over the compartments of life posits the dissolution of traditional elements. The new situation in the aftermath of a far-reaching and long-time entity which includes the Enlightenment, geographical discoveries, Industrial Revolution, mass production and technical advancements prevails in the political, economic and cultural experiences of Europe first and all over the world then. The intrinsic outcome of modernity in

literature is the reflection of the chaotic plight and pandemonium of modern subject. The current in arts sequel to modern condition and a response to the disruptive performance of modern expansion is entitled Modernism. The differences between modernity and Modernism will be evaluated in the first place. In order to contemplate the criticism of Tanpınar and Eliot an overview of modern idea, what makes Modernism divergent and how it formulates the modern subject in arts will be introduced.

After the presentation of modern situation and Modernist attitudes, their commentary of poetry, criticism and drama will be sifted in Chapter II. The meaning of poetry, their stance to the emotion and place of poet in poetry, modernist tendency in the portrayal of poetry and social status of poetry for both critics will be examined. For they assign particular qualities to social functionality of poetry to make out what poetry and social extension of poetic sensibility denote for them is essential to expound. They emphasize that changes in society is a substantial factor in the improvement of poetry and criticism. They do not see poetry as a means of indoctrination of beliefs and thoughts; however, poetry carries a distinctive feature in its very air which propels society into a kind of mobility and change in their critical program so what makes social facet of poetic creation will be studied. As the criticism of Tanpınar and Eliot constitutes the core of that dissertation, their criticism of criticism, that is, what they have in mind when they assert their views on criticism and how they devise the ideal criticism in the modern age will be submitted. An able critic should have the enjoyment of poetry to be able to evaluate poetry in both critics' agendas. Their criticism on the weaknesses of critical thinking in their society is another element which will be discussed. Their expositions on drama will be

inquired since they attribute a special significance to drama as the most sociable form of arts. It instigates a kind of communication between the units of society and artistic works. The ceremonial bearing of theater in modern world and its cathartic mission are stressed by both Tanpınar and Eliot.

In Chapter III, the place of tradition in modern period, the account of Modernist approaches in their criticism, and the comparison between the usage of tradition and modern inclinations will be investigated thoroughly. In re-creation of modern with the subscription of tradition is among the cardinal presuppositions of both Eliot and Tanpınar. The presence of past which operates on the creation of new works is what they dwell on. Time within the historical context is instrumental in the regulation of present situations so the past accumulates and interferes in the creation of literary works. Their emphasis on the position of tradition in their own societies will be scanned. The origins of the concept tradition in their criticism will be explored as they both employ the term with a zealous yearn. How tradition applies to modern/ist approaches in the twentieth century is another element that will be clarified. While Modernist tendency towards language and cultural practices are not connected to tradition and are desultory, Tanpınar and Eliot's attitudes impose the everlasting company of tradition over new situation. The conception that the re-creation of new artistic activities for modern mind with the implementation of past gives the essence of their criticism. Eliot's modernist aspiration and Tanpınar's stance on the emergence of a modern state are among the consequences of their obsession with tradition. The definition of "Modernist" and their critical orientation towards it will be scrutinized in the light of the concept tradition. While Eliot's posture is indubitably Modernist, whether Tanpınar's viewpoint is Modernist or not

is contentious. Considering the debates on that issue, Tanpınar's style will be estimated in terms of the Modernist leanings. As Modernism is a response to modernity in arts and tends to destroy the traditional artistic forms, their opinions on the form of poetry will be gauged.

Chapter IV delves into "the idea of continuity" in the critical works of Tanpınar and Eliot because that term embraces most of their criticism as a central figuration. Their supposition is that life as an entirety is operated by an enduring authority which encompasses whole units of it. As past in the form of tradition accumulates in the present, the actual modes of entities are re-created by the past habits. The past and the artistic productions which belong to past integrates into the continual process in the organic structure of life, that is, the present. They bring up the social, political and cultural fractures in the natural stream of that continuity. Modern age is among the most virulent epochs of history in that the consciousness of modern subject breaks apart as a result of splits in the perennial construction of social organism. Eliot employs the conception "the mind of Europe" and Tanpınar "Turkish spirit" in order to signify the idea of continuity in their criticism. Their insistence that the "order" in the nature of society as a therapeutic factor should be maintained will be ruminated by focusing on the concept of continuity.

The last chapter includes the sway of Henri Bergson on both artists' criticism. Bergson as a philosopher who foregrounds the presence of past and its authority on the present, and criticizes modern age with his account of "time" exerts authority on the critical programs of Eliot and Tanpınar. The roots of the common dispositions, of Eliot and Tanpınar, which have been studied in the previous chapters such as tradition, the presence of past, continuity and organic unity of time are all borrowed

from Bergson's philosophy. That inter-textual manifestation of their criticism will be deliberated by indicating the correspondences between the works of Eliot and Tanpınar and of Bergson. The concepts that inspire both critics such as evolution, intuition and interrelation between time and space will be worked over. Their employment of Bergsonian philosophy and disparities in adopting it will be spotlighted.

CHAPTER I

The Advancement of Modern Idea and Modern vs. Modernist

Modernity is one of the most important turning points in the transformation of not only European history but also of the other cultures all around the world. It has influenced the social and cultural structures of the world in such a way that the world would not be the same after the emergence of modernity. No other period in the world history has had as huge and widespread an impact as modernity. If modernity deserves such a definition, how is it potent in changing the mindset of European thought? The answer to that question will be pointed out throughout this chapter. For Thomas Stearns Eliot, as one of the most prominent Modernist thinkers, will be compared to Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar who is one of the most outstanding characters in the emergence of modern Turkish Literature, the aim here is not to delineate the scope of Modernism and modern thought or provide superfluous information about Modernist and modernization theories but it is to look over the definitions of Modernism in order to determine the role of both figures in a Modernist context. Modernity, as the word “modo” means the present time, is considered to be the change of social and cultural codes from a traditional scope to a more flexible and contemporary one in a secular standpoint. This change includes not only one field but also the realms of science, technology, literature, art, politics, trade and religion. The roots of modernity go back to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. “Modernity and Enlightenment are so frequently linked that either term almost automatically evokes the other” (Barnett 1). Barnett discusses when he defines modernity and its birth that the Enlightenment is a kind of sparkle in changing the

traditional attitudes in European thinking. The reliance on “reason” is one of the most important ideas of the age. Reason replaces not only religious teachings but also anything related to tradition. The transformation and the evolution of European civilization start with those revolutionary ideas of the fifteenth and the sixteenth century in religion and art; later the geographical discoveries which enrich the European countries by the means of colonialism lead to an economic prosperity and the emergence of the Industrial Revolution. In most of the studies on modernity the term points out to two basic phenomena, European Enlightenment Project and Industrial society. The aftermath of those vital changes has been the birth of a new era in Europe and the territory she interacted with. That territory includes the colonized countries, from Americas to the Far East and from Africa to the Middle East, and other non-colonized countries such as Turkey, Japan, China and Russia. Modern thought in every discipline has been the outlet of a new world system which had never existed before. It has changed most of the traditional institutions, the state structures, the imperial formations and the religious perceptions first in Europe and then, by the means of European colonization process and American-based modernization theories, in the other parts of the world.¹ Turkey, whose case will be discussed here when comparing the characteristics of Eliot and Tanpınar, is among the countries that have been affected by the modern inclinations and reformations. All these abovementioned geographies, into some extent, have experienced modernity which altered the traditional flow of their societies in terms of many issues

¹ Modernity and Modernization theory are totally different from each other. The latter is a bunch of theoretical aspects that propound the unique sovereignty of the United States in cultural and technological areas. However, it does not consist of a school of thought; it bears only various assumptions itself (Altun 13).

such as the governance of state, the shift of authority, the disintegration of religious foundations and the position of petit bourgeois.

The debate here commences in the general characteristics of modernity. What is the historical development of modern thought? How did modernity transform both Western and Eastern societies? What did modernity reject when it establishes its bedrock? Where did it lead societies to? How did art and literature respond to modernity and its consequences? These questions are the key elements in exploring the attributes of modernity. In the present chapter, in order to better grasp the purview of modernity in the structuring Eliot's mindset as a major Modernist artist and thinker and Tanpınar as a notable figure in the emergence of modern Turkish literature, modernity first, Modernism then, will be evaluated in depth.

Definitions of modernity are so different from each other in details, but still in the essence the definitions signal to some basic elements that constitute the ontological premises of modernity. As posited above, the natural boundaries of modernity is not limited to the nineteenth and the twentieth century but it goes back to the Enlightenment and even to the Renaissance. Europe's long quest to obtain today's value system starts in the thirteenth century, passes through the Enlightenment and results with the transformations in the twentieth century; this long period constitutes the time-bound aspect and definition of modernity:

More generally, modernity is an imprecise and contested term. It has been said to encompass Western history from the Renaissance, or the epoch that began with the seventeenth century scientific revolutions of Galilea, Hobbes, Newton, Leibniz and Descartes; it has also been argued to have been inaugurated by the eighteenth century Age of

Enlightenment and its drive toward a mastery of nature and society through reason, since which rationality has been considered the key to justice, morality, control, organisation, understanding and happiness.

(Childs 16)

Secular and reason-oriented manner of the Enlightenment inspires the modern thought and is the origin of modernity. Secularization and falling apart from tradition are among the other characteristics of modernity. Structural and intellectual transformation of Europe has been typified by the Enlightenment; and the social transformation has been finalized by the development of Communist industrial society. Europe's travel from a precise religious society to a secular one in politics, economy and art is one of the other characteristics of modernity. The shift from a religious perspective to a secular system has been a difficult process for societies which were exposed to the impacts of modernity. The transition of society from a metaphysical dimension to an autonomous and secular entity by disregarding any kind of supernatural existences has made up the bedrock of the basic interpretations of modernity.

One of the rudiments of modernity or modernization is envisaged as 'the disintegration of traditional elements' by its theorists. If that is to be more thorough, the society would be modernized easily and enhancement in social institutions would be more rapidly. That preconception has become one of the most important world-wide acclaimed aspects of modernity:

The more thorough the disintegration of traditional elements in the process, the more able a society would be to develop continuously, to deal with perennially new problems and social forces, and to develop

a continuously expanding institutional structure, to increase its capacity to absorb change, and, implicitly, to develop other qualitative characteristics of modern societies such as rationality, efficiency, and predilection to liberty. (Eisenstadt 15)

Decomposing of conventional elements in society has changed the world in a striking and swift manner. The tradition and its ramifications have been dismembered; which has led to a great turmoil in the organic edifice of society and its dynamic construction. That disarray, later, has caused the political disorders and the independence of the colonies from Western powers.

While Modernity erases the traces of religion and tradition, it assumes new premises as religion does. Those premises promise what the progressive narration of religion once promised in sacred books. However, it does not designate that progressive narration as religion; some critics stipulate that modernity bears resemblance to religion and its premises on humanity and emancipation:

Lyotard...says that the metanarratives of modernity promise the 'progressive emancipation of reason and liberty, progressive or catastrophic emancipation of labour, enrichment of the whole humanity through the progress of capitalist techno-science.' They are not necessarily opposed to the Christian narrative of the redemption of souls through sacrificial love . . . Before modernity, such narratives appealed to a notion of a transcendent being or entity, imagined in the form of a deity or a divine or supra-human force, independent of human will, yet active in the world in fashioning individual and communal destinies. The discourse of modernity breaks with the

metaphysics and onto-theology, that is to say, it breaks with the discourses which refer to the problem concerning the meaning of being to a basically religious and mythical imagination. (Venn 18)

The world of secular identity is professed by those kinds of suppositions; modernity as a secular phenomena alienates the individuals first and society then to an extent that there is not an exact identical pattern. That condition leads the fragmented minds of modern world into a kind of quest in which one tries to make life worthwhile. The journey of the modern individual is a process that is made futile by the secularization of both society and cultural atmosphere that surrounds him. The hindrances and the predicaments put by modernity impel an atypical identity, which is meant to be “basically religious and mythical imagination”, on the modern subject. Those dilemmas which are embodied in various levels of imaginations become a substitute for the “supra-human” imaginations once expounded by religious attitudes, faiths and belief systems. The aspiration of modernity for a new order has resulted with the new designs and frames that proposed the essentiality of some basic rules and a common ambiance for all the societies it operates in. However, that aspiration would mean the advent of a quasi-religious entity. While the societies which preferred modernity as an ultimate goal tried to disintegrate conventional elements, they had to face with a less strong religion-like organism with all its methods and practices that are the same as or similar to religion. The problem for modernity is to envisage “a universal element like reason”; this idea supposed the reconciliation of not only minor groups but also nations (Venn 22). This fantasy resulted with the reactions and oppositions from both tradition and the social elements and groups that were nourished by the ramifications of tradition. Modernity is also a battlefield of tension. This tension is

built on the control and discipline on the one hand, autonomy and liberty on the other hand. There is not a clash between civilizations as Huntington discusses; it is rather a clash between modernities Yıldırım adduces (41). Today there is not one “modernity” in the sense it emerged in the Western European countries; the term “multiple modernities” is today popular in social sciences.² The concept modernity proliferates as it drives away from the domination of Western societies.

Modernization theories and the spread of liberation movements among the colonies of Western Countries are among the other reasons of the emergence of non-Western and multiple modernities.

While Habermas defines modernity as “an incomplete project” as it continues its self-definition through many utterances of projection, some argue that modernity has failed at the end. The recent wars and results of new developments once did not exist are kept in view as malignant tumors of modernity: “they argue (and here they have a point) that the modern project was a costly failure, bringing not the sweet dreams of reason, but war, famine, disease and ecological disaster” (Barnett 3). In his acclaimed book Tradition, Change, and Modernity, Eisenstadt, when delineating the frontiers of modernity, talks about the breakdowns of what modernity brings. He points out that Modernizations in Chile and pre-Peron Argentina are negative examples of modernization, and Nazism and Fascism are among the most important disruptions of modernization at much more advanced levels of development: “Thus

² For non-Western modernities and the reflections of those formulation on culture and social life, see Göle’s “First Course on Non-Western Modernity.” *Doğu Batı* 2 (1998): 65-73.; Yasuo Yuasa, Overcoming Modernity: Synchronicity and Image-thinking. Tr. John W. M. Krummel. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008).; Kwame Gyekye, Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).; Culture and Modernity: East-West Philosophic Perspectives. Ed. Eliot Deutsch. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991).; Farzin Vahdat, God and Juggernaut: Iran's Intellectual Encounter With Modernity. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2002).; Stephen W. Martin, Decomposing Modernity. (Lanham: University Press of America, 1996).

all these developments took place within the frameworks of processes of modernization as parts of these processes. They can be seen as pathologies of breakdowns of modernization, or, as in the case of Nazism, as attempts at what might be called demodernization” (50-1). For Venn “ethnocides in Eastern Europe, in Rwanda, in East Timor, fundamentalist brutalities everywhere” are all associated with modern and its aftermath technology (Venn 16).

Promising the reason’s sovereignty over the celestial patterns of traditional elements, modernity has identified itself as a new auspicious system that advances some opportunities instead of the established belief systems. The manner in which modernity portrays itself and is portrayed has been a kind of well that swallows individuals and distances them from traditional elements and religious tendencies. That alienation has substantiated the inevitability of a new design, or a new age of presuppositions in arts and literature. The reactions and the stance of artists against the imminent incidents conveyed by modern endeavors have comprised Modernism.

While modernity is considered to have emerged in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century, Modernism is weighed to be the paradigm shift in arts at the end of the nineteenth century. This perception of Modernism, the one which will be signified throughout this study, belongs to the Anglo-American tradition, not to the definitions of Modernism in the French sense.³ The terms Modernism and Modernist are something to do with arts and artists in the last decade of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century; as hinted above, the gist of Modernist thought is shaped by the reactions and the responses of the artists towards the new situation

³ While Modernism is “the literary production of novelists and poets” in the Anglo-American tradition, in French tradition the word intimates to “attempt to modernize the doctrine of the Catholic Church by incorporating into it the findings of modern historical criticism.” In Italian and German it has a theological sense, as well (Macey 258).

which is designated as modern such as the life in city, crises in the perception of human kind and the intrusion of technology. The new condition has entailed a new style and method of narration in order to be able to cope with the disturbance modernity created. The traditional narration and style have been inadequate in dealing with what modernity had brought and taken. That is to say, Modernism is the inevitable process in the quest for a new modus operandi for deploring the predicament of human kind:

It involves a deliberate and radical break with some of the traditional bases not only of Western art, but of Western culture in general. Important intellectual precursors of modernism, in this sense, are thinkers who had questioned the certainties that had supported traditional modes of social organization, religion, and morality, and also traditional ways of conceiving the human self . . . (Abrams 167)

Modernism is associated with attempts to render human subjectivity in ways more real than realism: to represent consciousness, perception, emotion, meaning and the individual's relation to society through interior monologue, stream of consciousness, tunnelling, defamiliarisation, rhythm, irresolution and other terms. . . . Modernist writers therefore struggled, in Ezra Pound's brief phrase, to 'make it new', to modify if not overturn existing modes of representation, partly by pushing them towards the abstract or the introspective, and to express the new sensibilities of their time . . . (Childs 3-4)

The advent of Modernism is considered to be the year Eliot published The Waste Land, Joyce Ulysses and Woolf Jacob's Room, 1922 (Macey 258). The styles of

those works are totally different from the conventional perception in literature which presupposes the linear flow of time, the perfect articulation of sentences and god-like position of narrator. Like its antecedent, modernity, Modernism postulates the total disintegration of traditional elements in language, narration of modernist fiction, response of modern man to life and ways of asserting new man's perspective. The style of modernist narration is different from traditional story telling in pressing the meaning into the service of physical perception (Deane 54). Major works in the field undermine the primary codes of earlier prose by scattering narrative continuity and deviating from standard ways of narrating characters. The language of modernist work violates the old syntax and coherence by fragmented sentences, stream of consciousness and diverging from usual standards of linguistic perception (Abrams 167).

Here, Peter Childs' book Modernism will be worked out in order to be able to take a clear picture of the frontiers of Modernism and to contemplate the reflections of and criticism on Modernist thought. How Modernism is different from its precursors Romanticism and Realism will be instrumental in defining it.

. . . the principal features of realism, opposed to earlier Romance, are: narrative authority and reliability, a contemporary setting, representative locations, ordinary speech, linear plots and extensive use of free indirect discourse. Modernism challenged many of these conventions, particularly in terms of narrative technique, character portrayal, self-referentiality and linearity. (Childs 74)

Even though Modernism is not the recurrence of Romanticism in literary style, it is a reversal in realist inclinations and challenge to traditional elements. In addition, it

refers to a withdrawal from the ingrained rudiments of representation across the arts. The established rules of narration techniques and accepted conventions of artistic elaborations have been challenged by disparate movements in different fields of arts, such as Symbolism and Imagism in poetry, abstraction as the essential feature of the Avant-Garde in visual arts, cubism in drawing and the International Style in architecture (Macey 259).⁴

The modern artist is utterly different from the previous age's artist such as Classic, Romantic and Realist. He occupies some different styles and narrative devices from the artists of the eighteenth and the nineteenth century. He substitutes “the eternal beauty and the amazing harmony of life in capital cities”, “landscapes of the great city—landscapes of stone, caressed by the mist and buffeted by the sun” (Frisby 18) for beauties of nature, what emotion it arouses in the artist, and representation of nature in precise narrations.

From Baudelaire onwards, avant-garde writers focused on the city in a new way and Modernism is often considered to be the first literature to deal directly with urban existence . . . the Modernists had to confront a new urban environment, with offices and traffic, advertising and shopping: the entire metropolitan utopia/dystopia of a fast and compact social and cultural existence that is not contrasted with provincial life but is divorced from and supersedes it. (Childs 182)

⁴ Those movements and others such as Expressionism, Impressionism, the geometricism, the biomorphism, Surrealism, Futurism and Dadaism are considered to be the reflections of Modernist thoughts in different aspects of arts and literature.

As aforementioned this confrontation of the Modernist artists has led to a new perception and then representation of social environment and human mind. The characteristics of the “the newness of present” are “disintegration and reformation, fragmentation and rapid change, and ephemerality and insecurity”. These are, for sure, the consequences of industrialization, urbanization, and secularization.

Distinctive features of Modernist composition are: “. . . radical aesthetics, technical experimentation, spatial or rhythmic rather than chronological form, self-conscious reflexiveness, skepticism towards the idea of centered human subject, and a sustained inquiry into the uncertainty of reality” (Childs 14-8). Those lineaments of Modernist attitude have been employed in the works of the age. When Childs sifting through the story “The Virgin and the Gipsy” (1930) by D. H. Lawrence, he elucidates the Modernist aspects of the narration as “epistemological crisis: death of the old and birth of the new, since Mater and her ‘will to power’ are ceremoniously drowned in the flood; and overt sexual symbolism” (Childs 87). Modernist literature, as a definitive statement, has not been a literature of not just transformation but a predicament and crisis, even though “while history, reason and logic had failed the modern world as organizing principles, aesthetics had not” (Childs 183).

Modernism, however, has never been really just one thing and never really unified as discussed above. Like in the case of modernity and its ramifications, and multiple modernities, Modernism exhibits itself by miscellaneous aspects in different fields such as literature, plastic arts, music and painting. What is more, it has not remained only as a reaction to modernity but also it has constituted a new discourse with various forms and patterns for the perception of the modern mind.

Modernism has been criticized for a bunch of reasons. Modernism, especially literary modernism, has been considered a drift away from reality and social concerns by later critics. As Deane points out and quotes from Frederic Jameson:

One of the more commonly held stereotypes about the modern has of course in general been that of its apolitical character, its turn inward and away from the social materials associated with realism, its increased subjectification and introspective psychologization, and, not least, its aestheticism and its ideological commitment to the supreme value of an autonomous Art as such. (45)

However, Modernism's insistence on glorification of art and creation of a high art often overlaps with what is today called popular art. Moreover, the claims that Modernism is totally elitist and reiterates the popular culture have been challenged as Modernism does not only put emphasis on pure and elitist art. The poems of modernist tradition were not only constituted by a gloomy and melancholic poetic elaboration but also they have been created with an affluent variety in style and content. As Modernism is not one thing and is a pugnacious issue, it has fascinated critics in diverse ways. While some glorifying the Modernist inclinations, some have criticized it for its highly elitist nature. As Chinitz professes in his article "T. S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide": "A reappraisal of Modernism as a whole therefore seems necessary if our understanding of the transformation of culture during the twentieth century is to continue to grow" (246). The paradoxes of Modernism should be displayed by the assessments of Modernism/s in a plausible context. The role of popular culture and the post of miscellaneous cultural fragments should be studied together in the same contextual stage. Today, Modernism, especially after the

emergence of post-modernism, is to be defined not as elitist and high art but it is to be reconsidered since it has different aspects and expositions like modernity, and to be elucidated by means of the new enhancements in literature, pluralistic society and linguistic opportunities. Modernity, as remarked above, is not one thing and not unique to only one region of the world; neither Modernism is. Therefore they are not evaluated just from one angle today, but they are appraised in different formats and fragments. They are among the subject matter of different fields of social sciences including sociology, anthropology, literature, arts and history. Even though modernity and Modernism have emanated from the same source, the social and cultural tumults in Europe, the outcomes of both modernity and Modernism are to be associated with the entities exposed to modern/ist inclinations and discourses all around the world such as different cultures, states, artistic currents and social connections.

CHAPTER II

Two Poets and the Critique on Poetry

T. S. Eliot and A. H. Tanpınar are both devoted poets in the first place; even though the analysis of their poetry is not within the scope of the present study, their critical programs, that is, their essays and lectures on poetry, poets and literature in general, mainly focuses on poetry. When scrutinized initially, they seem to share very few features in common for, on the one hand; Eliot never wrote novels,⁵ did not relate his critical program to the existential toil of his nation both psychically and culturally and employed a criticism, so to speak, against Romantic involvements. On the other hand, Tanpınar never wrote drama even though he attempted to write some verses and fiction with an intention of writing drama, which are neither complete nor exert the characteristics of the genre drama,⁶ did not make himself and his own critical program independent from the struggle of his social pattern and embraced nearly all the literary movements and currents emanating from European thought including Romanticism. However, both figures are poets in the first place when one ranks their literary authorities, (as a subjective ranking, Eliot: poet, dramatist and critic; Tanpınar: poet, novelist and critic) so they bear almost similar characteristics in that sense. In the present study their poetry and other literary products, such as dramas, novels and short stories, will be ignored as the accent will be put on their critical programs as the title of the study goes “the portraits of the artists as critics”.

⁵ For Eliot’s only fiction, except for his poetry in which characters epitomize the features of a kind of fiction into some extent, see the short story Eeldrop and Appleplex. 20 Nov. 2007
<<http://www.readbookonline.net/readOnLine/3178/>>

⁶ For Tanpınar’s attempts to write a dramatic poetry, unlike what Eliot calls poetic drama: see Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, “İnsanlar Arasında.” [Among People] Şiirler. (İstanbul: Dergah, 1998). and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, “Son Meclis.” [The Last Assembly] Hikayeler [Short Stories]. (İstanbul: Dergah, 1998).

What makes them special is their common feature; they are both poets and critics. That is a quite momentous aspect of their critical program because as critics, their writing has been affected by their poetic sensibilities. As the title says “the portraits of the artists as critics” and is an implication to the modernist dispositions, to James Joyce’s majestic work A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, their standpoint in modern/ist attitudes will be surveyed all through their critical writing in this study.

Definition of poetry in general is very similar for both Tanpınar and Eliot. It is something that prose could not articulate (YG 315) and speech could not communicate (OPP 31). Speech and prose aim to convey a kind of meaning, whereas their capacity to convey the significance is sometimes restricted. In the place where prose and speech cease to convey the message, the authority of poetry begins. As it is a product of a kind of system whose tenets are immanent within itself, the field of poetry is uninhibited. Therefore the significances that could not be expressed within the boundaries of ordinary language are uttered in poetry within the norms peculiar to itself. The technique of poetry makes for its order and conjures up the power to create the “inner man” in Tanpınar’s terms. In spite of the fact that the meaning that could not be articulated is expressed by poetry’s authority, Eliot loads poetry a kind of mission that could also be discerned by means of intellect and mind.

Notwithstanding the ambiguity in making out the poetry’s meaning, “wisdom” is an intrinsic element in the articulation of poetry according to Eliot. That wisdom is one of the distinctive features of poets whose readers are foreign; poetry is here in the second place after wisdom (OPP 222). When reader attempts to digest wisdom, he is also affected by poetry itself. That is the impossibility of poetry, which would not be communicated at all without its perception as poetry. If the reader does not absorb it

as poetry in the second place, the grasp of it as wisdom in the first place would not be adequate as poetry and wisdom are inseparable and the notion that could not be communicated without poetry is wisdom. Tanpınar ponders that a situation that is called denotation occurs by definition in the art of poetry. Poetry is the impossible and instantaneous part of intellect (EÜM 27). As poetry is the art of substitution according to Tanpınar, it appears as a miraculous moment of human wisdom in the form of sensations and replacements. Those moments of poetic experience witness the impossible juncture of poetry's significance. Although the products of personal invention are not creation, they reflect the wisdom and poetic sensibility together.

Eliot's theory of personal expression is quite renowned. In his criticism, poet detaches himself from the work in order to actualize the inner order of poetry and tailor poems to the "objective correlative", that is, the vanishing of poet from poem. His extinction as the creator of the work results with the disappearance of emotion of artist. The utterance of poetry is the indirect expression of poet. An objective construction is identified with the sensations of poet; so that the poet asserts himself by means of poetic devices (Austin vii). Even though his theory seems to separate poetry and emotions of the poet, the former could not be made out without the backing of the latter. "Objective correlative" is the leading pattern in configuring the relation between poet and poet's personal existence in poetry. While demarcating the span of poetry, Tanpınar stand up for the same theoretical bases with Eliot's theory of personal expression. He upholds that poetry is after "self"; however the self in poetry is not the actual self but a circumstance of "self". The new self, as a mode of definite self, reflects something but by means of actual self. In fact, in a sheer piece of poetry, there is no "self" but poetry. A complete and perfect poetry is like a "facet

diamond” or an “object” (YG 338). That is exactly what Eliot means by “objective correlative”. The self as a distinct entity and poetry as an object constitute the two dimensions of poetic process. The object as the correlative device between poet and poetry substitutes the emotions of poet and actualizes the evanescence of poet from poetry. Poetry as professed by Tanpınar is timeless; that is to say, poetry advances out of the boundaries of time by evading of poet and his emotions from poetry’s construction. That is purveyed by the object that correlates with poet’s personal heritage. Both Tanpınar and Eliot’s elaborations on the disappearance of poet from their own artistic productions envisage that poet and his personal experience should be sent away from his artistic creation by formulating a kind of object that facilitates the interconnectedness between the work done and the doer, that is the poet and poetry itself. Poet’s authority on his work is only rendered by ensuring the relevance of his own “self” to the artistic production.

In modern times the place of poetry is a bit different from the traditional modes of poetic representations. While poetry is a means of ceremonial practices, in the primitive eras of humanity, after the development of civilization, it becomes a genteel and cultivated activity. However, the modern age has collapsed that function of poetry; the crude form of poetic endeavor has returned as stated by Eliot. In modern epoch “poetry is meant to be spoken”. While the ritualistic performances of ancient times give pleasure and promise the fertility of the earth and nature such as “the murmur of innumerable bees or the moan of doves in immemorial elms”, the sounds of modern notes are products of “dissonance” and “cacophony” (OPP 32). A modern poem in its entirety has transitions between its parts in order to acquire its peculiar rhythm and intensity. The prosaic significance of poem is reflected through

its passages by fluctuating in an unrhythmical manner in the poetry of modern times. That's what Modernist narration anticipates in poetry: the prosaic operation of poetic text and a vehement expression of rhythmic elements and clamor of unorganized sounds. For Tanpınar the crisis (buhran) of modern age is not as frivolous as it is imagined. However, he is concerned about the modern dilemma and its aftermath in poetry. He realizes that language, images and "the air" keep changing (YG 297). Although Tanpınar is not a Modernist, he follows the advancements in the modern currents, the changes in literary field of the new era and the novelties in the cultural flow of European society. His awareness of Modernist structures is one of the primary features that approximates him to Modernist literature although he is a traditionalist and is one of the initiators of cultural and literal preferences of a modern national state. Even, in establishing the cultural background of the new republic, he manifests that not only building but also deconstructing is indispensable for a society to acquire a new culture, by which he denotes the Western culture (Alptekin 139). Destructing and reshaping of the conventional structures in literature which are among the focal figurations of the Modernist attitude are among what Tanpınar as a conformist suggests. Demolishing the old forms of literary assertions is among the most prominent devices of Modernist poetry; that is done by employing the strident voices and raucous melodies of modern times as maintained by Eliot. In both critics' agendas, that the cacophonous and fruitless penchant of modern tunes replaces the sweet euphony of traditional stream is foregrounded as a hallmark of modern poetry.

Their special attribution to tradition in their criticism, as mentioned above, impinges upon their notion of poetry. That emphasis results with the social function

of poetry and poetry's indivisible part in society. When Eliot puts together poetry and criticism, he pays attention to the social function of poetry and relates the growth of poetry to the turn of events in society:

You may say that development of criticism is a symptom of the development, or change, of poetry; and the development of poetry is itself a symptom of social changes. The important moment for the appearance of criticism seems to be the time when poetry ceases to be the expression of mind of a whole people. (UPUC 21-22)

Changes in society are hallmarks of improvement in poetry and criticism, which lead to be the expression of whole people in society. He underlines the account of poetry in the development of society and its evolution towards a bright future. Tanpınar's frame of mind in poetry's function is not opposite to what Eliot posits about poetry and society: "However, poetry is social and attached to tradition. Poet feels more secure within the hundred-year-old forms and rules"⁷ (YG 316).⁸ For Tanpınar, as for Eliot, poetry is not divorced from the social bonds; on the contrary it is aroused by tradition and society in whose recreation tradition plays an enormous role. Eliot plays up "the moral significance of poetry" (Buckley 87) as he assumes that poetry is inseparable from society and the features that constitute it, such as mores, epoch, philosophy and belief systems. In that regard poetry is embedded within the morality and belief systems of society as its watershed in conveying the moral tenets. While Eliot overemphasizes the business of poetry in social advance, Tanpınar's standpoint

⁷ Halbuki şiir sosyaldır. Geleneğe bağlıdır. Şair asırlık şekillerin ve kaidelerin içinde kendini daha emniyette hisseder.

⁸ All translations of Turkish passages in that thesis are mine.

is not disparate; He assigns particular qualities to poetry and considers poetry as the representation of collective emotions of society:

What we understand from poetry is that it is an art form that expresses our inner mentality which is not possible to express by means of ordinary language, rhythm and harmony emanating from the combination of words; our excitement and ecstasy; our bliss and sorrow and in that way constitutes the magic that we call aesthetic concern. (EÜM 16)⁹

In Tanpınar's terminology poetry has the ability to express the joy and grief not only of poet and individuals but of society and collective memory. It sets up a kind of magic that amalgamates the elements and individuals of society together in order to make a whole. Similarly poetry is counted to be a communication vehicle for new experiences and fresh understandings of something which do not have words, as in Tanpınar's reasoning, and cannot be expressed but it broadens the consciousness of collective memory and distils the sensibility of people (OPP 18).

Tanpınar highlights that poetry has an order and demeanor and that air merges all the unconnected pieces of thought and the disjointed elements of emotion within a unity (EÜM 19). The illustration of an order and unity which acts in poetic process composes the hub of both critics' philosophies; the narrative of order and continuum which mainly derives from Bergsonian philosophy will be studied in the subsequent chapters thoroughly. Eliot comprehends artistic process as one of ordering, too: poetic fragments come together over years and mature into an ordering

⁹ "Bizim şiirden anladığımız mana, kelimelerin terkibinden doğan ritim, ahenk vs. vasıtalarla alelade lisanla ifadesi kabil olmayan deruni haletlerimizi, heyecanlarımızı istiğraklarımızı, neş'e ve kederimizi ifade eden ve bu suretle bizde bedii alâka dediğimiz büyüğü tesis eden bir sanat olmasıdır."

to assemble poetry. Creation of a poem becomes an order in which poet writes with the language of not only his age but of preceding generations. Eliot christens the artist who constructs his poetic order with the backing of earlier generations and traditions not only poet but “European poet” because he does not hold his position in history alone, on the contrary he perseveres in giving delight and benefit to consecutive generations. His account of permanence and universality is not a historical record; he remains to be the value of every age. People of all ages in Europe will acquire benefit and pleasure from good poetry; in Eliot’s coinage it is called “edification”. Contemporary age’s endeavor to pursue social philosophy in poetry and replace religion with poetry is a result of that edification (OPP 183). The order in the structure of poetry gathers not only the organism of poetic and linguistic features but also the people of separate ages and societies in a whole and indivisible unity. This conception of continuity and order could be mentioned in the same breath as what Tanpınar proposes by the concept “order and demeanor of poetry.” In parallel with Eliot’s thoughts, Tanpınar believes that if one runs into a great poet in a society, there is always a foregoing minor poet or generation who prepares the circumstances for him (Alptekin 137). That is quite harmonious with Eliot’s idea of continuity in the flow of ages; a poet is not only the outcome of his poetic gift and personal insight but of the durability of his society and collective memory. While Eliot talks about the intensity of poetic experience (UPUC 34), Tanpınar points out that poetry is the perfection which springs from coiling up of soul over its soul and observation of it for a moment (EÜM 14). In both expositions poetry is designated as a spiritual upshot; that issues probably from their being both critics and practitioners. Their poetic identities in delving into the meaning of poetry make their critical

program poetic; therefore the process of poetic creation, for both Tanpınar and Eliot, is not something independent from social and spiritual affiliations. Eliot conceives history as destiny in which poetry becomes “existential mystery” rather than being an issue of culture (Liebman 208); likewise, Tanpınar gives a god-like significance to poetry and starts his poetics from a “spark of spirit” (Demiralp 31). Even though they impute a spiritual meaning to poetry, they do not hesitate to separate poetry from other disciplines and religious inclinations:

And certainly poetry is not the inculcation of morals, or direction of politics; no more is it religion or an equivalent of religion, except by some monstrous abuse of words. And certainly poetry is something over and above, and something quite different from, a collection of psychological data about the minds of poets, or about the history of an epoch; for we could not take it even as that unless we had already assigned to it a value merely as a poet . . . (SW xi)

Poetry is not the indoctrination of ideas, politics and religion. It is quite dissimilar to everything that surrounds it; it is not a history book and not the chronicle of poet’s experiences. Pure poetry is not the collection of biographical information; even it is totally different from the feeling that the reader acquires after reading the poem. Tanpınar’s posture in splitting up poetry from religion and other social disciplines bear resemblance to the Eliot’s rejection of poetry’s function as an apparatus of propaganda. Like Eliot, he is influenced by French poet Paul Valéry. Tanpınar, by borrowing from Valéry, hypothesizes that pure poetry is different from all the elements that are unfamiliar to it:

In that case what Valéry understands from pure poetry is, first of all, isolation of it from all the components that are unfamiliar to it. History of philosophy, morals, and in short, thought in itself are essentially alien to poetry. Artist is supposed to make poetry a pure language of spirit by redeeming it from all this contaminated mass. (EÜM 472)¹⁰

Tanpınar defends the process in which cleansing poetry from other elements is essential. Isolation of poetry from thought and ideas and attaining pure poetry are among the chief tasks of artist. Here Tanpınar equates spirit with intellect by borrowing from Valéry; intellect insulates the sketch of poem from non-poetic elements that distracts poet and reader.

Both critics' posture towards the poetry's disposition as a spiritual matter and then placing poetry into its divergent character from any other elements seem contradictory. In the first place they charge an unidentified connotation to poetic process, define poetry in a delirious circle and burden artist with a religious attribute; in the other, they split up poetry and other disciplines. As hinted above, that is because of their poetic sensibilities, in other words, since they are poets, their artistic productions and poetic standpoints perform on their criticism, their assessments on poetry and other literary issues. That contradiction is among the central traits of both Eliot and Tanpınar in evaluating and comparing their positions as critics. To deepen that investigation of critics' incongruity in depositing poetry into neither a mystical point nor an independent place is to be indicated with other instances. Eliot

¹⁰ Şu halde Valéry'nin saf şiirden anladığı şey, her şeyden evvel şiirin kendisine yabancı olan bütün unsurlardan tecerrüt etmesidir. Felsefe tarihi, ahlak, velhasıl her türlü şekliyle fikir, haddizatında şiire yabancı şeylerdir. Sanatkarın onu bütün bu gayrı saf yığından kurtararak ruhun saf bir lisani haline getirmesi lazımdır.

presupposes that to juxtapose poetry with mystic features is a pitfall for reader, poet and critic: “. . . there is another danger in the association of poetry with mysticism . . . that of leading the reader to look in poetry for religious satisfactions. There were dangers for the critic and the reader; there is also a danger for the poet”. While he pays attention to the danger of confusing mysticism and poetry, he accentuates the undeniable post of mystic leanings in poetry and poetic process: “. . . there is a relation . . . between mysticism and some kinds of poetry, or some kinds of state in which poetry is produced” (UPUC 139-140). Although a mystic tendency is assigned to the poetic creation, the basic refraction between poetry and other disciplines is emphasized. Quoted from Matthew Arnold, Eliot signifies that poetry usurps the functions of religion and philosophy (UPUC 113); however, poetry, and religious and philosophical attitudes are utterly poles apart for him. Poetry, for Tanpınar, is imagination, a kind of universe comprised of dream, zeal and, with his genuine word, “angoisse”. The “hemistich” that exerts all of those emotions is the mysterious product (YG 297). That arcane significance to poetry is again restrained by stating that poetry starts and finishes in its own self and that is the only existential goal of poetry (EÜM 14). That discrepancy between their narratives of poetry is, seemingly, an essential drawback in their critical program. While they claim to be comprehensible in their criticism and accuses the traditional tendencies in critical account such as Romantics and Divan poets, their elucidations on poetry’s station, because of their characters as poets/practitioners, remains inconsistent as well.

Social ramifications of poetry which are discerned by both Eliot and Tanpınar do not confine to mystic and religious ascriptions as studied above. Their critical programs include a special credit for the social function of poetry, which is a

prevalent trait of literature in general, and because of the epoch they lived in specific, even though the Modernist narrative theories privilege a pattern which tends to be more individual in representing human subjectivity than being social. Unlike Modernist accounts, Eliot and Tanpınar's discourses of accentuating the social function of literature are among the chief assumptions of their critical programs. Tanpınar puts forward that no country's intellectual would be social like Turkish intellectuals and espies it to the individual's surrender to society (YG 303). Eliot supposes that an inception of deterioration in the poetry of somewhere in Europe, for instance in Norway, would mean that people are deprived of asserting themselves, and would cease to communicate their feelings as civilized entities (OPP 25). The social facet of poetry is played up by both of them; poetry always has affinities with the social framework of society. If poetry operates in the lives of people and social parties, the supervision of society and social groups is in the right direction. While poetry, for Tanpınar is something that can be devised according with some social orders such as personal and impersonal rules; for Eliot poetry which is involved in moral and social values is involved in life and poetry which is concerned with life is concerned with moral ideas. Eliot designates that aspect of poetry as "social function of poetry"; which is to say that nations have a constant mutual interaction and influence of each part on the others. The layers of social life are connected to each other with a sensibility that should be widespread through whole nation. That vigor, excellence and speech of nation is composed and exerted by means of poetry. That is prevailing characteristic of a living and healthy nation; in its largest sense that is called "social function of poetry" (OPP 22). The most useful poetry for Eliot is the one which dissolves the partitions of public taste and which escalate the social

degenerations. Poetry and theater are among the most useful instruments in averting the disintegrations in society (UPUC 152-3). Social purpose of poetry, according to Tanpınar, is its rigorous bearing on life and society, the latent desires and the critical aims of society's members (EÜM 29). Poetry's potency to vitalize the lifeless words and to galvanize the social fragments of life is its social province for both Tanpınar and Eliot. They give priority to poetry's business as an entertaining mechanism. On the one hand poetry is a mirror of culture, social habits and beliefs; in the other it is a matter of pleasure and esthetic. To know the age and its social nexus is not adequate in understanding poetry; rather it is allied with beauty and enjoyment of it.

Eliot stresses the attributes of images and circumstances as the embodiments of internal factors such as personal traits and emotions. According to Austin, that is the personal expression of poet as opposed to the representation of social world (304). Even though Eliot accentuates the extinction of personal factors from artistic productions and accuses Romantics of expressing the poetic self instead of the disappearance of personal characteristics from poem, he executes the same mistake by emphasizing the internal factors instead of external ones. Here he is criticized of discounting the exercises in the social domain. He does not situate his literary criticism into the religious or redeeming prospect of literature which is employed by modern discourse:

Why didn't Eliot tie his literary criticism up to his social criticism of modernity? Because he rejected the position—as he saw it, the specifically modern position—that literature can have a socially redemptive function. Eliot agreed with Arnold that the progress of modernity entailed the collapse of traditional intuitions of moral

authority—the church and the hereditary aristocracy—but he did not believe that literature could be called upon to fill the gap that “poetry will save us.” “It is like saying that the wall-paper will save us when the walls have crumbled” was his response. (Menand 567)

Poetry cannot save the distorted minds of modern ages, that is to say, after the collapse of traditional elements the attempts to substitute religion are not swallowed by Eliot’s critical program. Although he regards poetry as a result of social impulses, he never attaches, in his criticism, the modern trauma and the task of poetic diction, only his own artistic concoction presupposes a gloomy illustration of modern world. Tanpınar’s attitude towards the social function of poetry is not different from Eliot’s. Poetry is contingent upon some personal and impersonal social orders. It is pertaining to human kind in that it gives the beauty (YG 286) but his rendering does not charge any redemptive function to poetry in social arena. In the advent of modern representations and the disturbance of human perception against the modern considerations the social and moral task of poetry subsides. In a modern frame of reference for both critics it is impossible to relate their criticism to the redemptory mission of poetry, and to regard it the savior of the twentieth century people could be quite fruitless and futile. Eventually, while they stress the social facet of poetry, they do not believe in the spiritual function of it in the modern era.

Criticism of Eliot and Tanpınar’s Theories of Criticism

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and T. S. Eliot, as the constitutive poets of their literature, culture and civilization, are evaluated as influential critics as well. Though

their poetic gifts preceded their critical fames, their competence as critics could not be discounted. The portraits of the artists as critics, as the title of the thesis goes, are decisive in grasping the realms of their authority. Their competence in the criticism of their period indicates the traces of their authorities. This chapter intends to investigate the assessments of both critics on criticism. As criticism, in the first half of the twentieth century, is in an evolvment phase with the advent of formalist approaches which bring the text rather than the author to the foreground, the critical dispositions of Tanpınar and Eliot institute crucial bases for their literatures. Eliot, today, is deemed to be among the founding fathers of text-based literary theories such as Formalism, Structuralism and New Criticism. In any introduction to literary theory book, one could find the elaborations of T. S. Eliot on tradition. Tanpınar's substantial groundwork 19 uncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı [The Nineteenth Century Turkish Literature] is still conclusive in the evaluation of Turkish literature under the influence of West. Additionally, his appeal to the civilizational roots and to the unfolding of tradition has been the instigation in the occurrence and the progression of criticism in Turkish literature. However, they are both exalted and denounced as critics and poets. The assessments on both critics vary; while T. S. Eliot is sometimes judged not to be a "theorist" (Eagleton 75) or saluted as a proponent in the advancement of the philosophy in the twentieth century (Melaver 65), A. H. Tanpınar is acclaimed as "the greatest critic of Turkish literature" and accused of being "failed poet" (Koçak 582). Those contradictory perceptions of their criticism are abundant as they constitute the roots of criticism in their literature in the beginning of the twentieth century. Whatever maintained on these two personalities, their criticism engages a considerable proportion in making out their place and

influence in their own literatures. In their criticism the definition and the function of criticism and the critic will be spelt out throughout this chapter.

The rudiments of criticism lie in the skill of distinguishing a good poem from a bad one according to Eliot. The function of critic is to designate the substance of a good poem in order to adjust and reply to the new situation (UPUC 18). It is apposite to note that the function of tradition over the present and an enduring legacy in literature, which will be evaluated thoroughly in the following chapters, are apparent here in that idea of Eliot. To tailor a past activity of the culture, which is the poem, to the present situation of literature and culture the critic ascertains the consequence of a good poem. Tanpinar yearns for the quest of continuity in the criticism. A good critic investigates the works of literature assiduously and searches for the chain of endurance. He signifies the severance in that continual process of social and cultural context (EÜM 74-5). Critic should alter the present by examining and working out the continuity according to both critics' philosophy. The works of the past operate on the present works of art. The basics of criticism are to seek for the exercise of the past over the present time and cultural products.

The literary critic, for Eliot, should have experienced the gratification and the admiration of a poem. Without the experience of the poet himself the criticism would be arid and unavailing. The critic must convince the readers of his poetic penchant; so that he will supply readers with his own experience of poetry. Eliot's sentiments upon criticism evolve throughout the years. When he rates his own critical attitude, he holds that criticism was "the elucidation of art and the correction of taste" but now (in 1956) it is "to promote the understanding and enjoyment of literature" (OPP 115). The course of his ideas on criticism changes from an objective tastelessness to the

appreciation of beauty. The article “To Criticize the Critic”, in which he criticizes his own criticism, classifies critics into different segments. He places himself in the last category in which critic’s criticism is the by-product of his creative activity (TCC 13). Furthermore, he supposes that “Every creator is also a critic” (SW 93). For Eliot, a critic, if he is not a poet, may fail. To become a poet, a creator, is one of the most momentous criteria in achieving the utter critical endeavor. The critic as a poet will succeed in the interpretation of the works as he reflects the experiences of his appreciation of artistic creation. The portraits of the artists as critics, as the title denotes, are thus crucial. That category of critics applies to both Eliot and Tanpınar; they are both poets and critics. This is among the most significant features that make them worthwhile to juxtapose and compare. Their critical attitudes and artistic expositions are intertwined. Again for Eliot criticism is the innate characteristic of poetic activity or vice versa. Critic is someone who institutes the enjoyment of literature in readers as he experiences the creative activity as poet. As maintained by Sağlık, Tanpınar’s aesthetics lies on the relation between beauty and human being (206). In Tanpınar’s critical agenda, the beauty and the taste which come from the criticism and poetic exercise constitute the major component of his critical frame of reference. What he looks for in a good criticism is the “stance”, that is partiality of critic. Beauty is one of the factors that effect this partiality of critic. If a work of art or criticism lacks that fondness, it does not have the ability to make a excellent work. Aesthetics and the “enjoyment”, sevki or neş’e in Tanpınar’s coinage, are the leading elements in the evaluation of the works of art. Additionally, for Tanpınar, the asset of criticism is to find the correlation between human and society, not only beauty (Güven 16). While Tanpınar stresses the elegance in the assessment of a literary

product, he does not forget the social aspect of critical stance. Tanpınar is a man of aesthete so his criticism is in the direction of beauty and appreciation however, he does not overlook the historical and social facet of criticism and literature. It is certain that there is not a direct influence of each critic on the other but Tanpınar asserts the same sentence as Eliot does. He maintains that “Critic is the actual creator” (YG 313). As they are both poet-critic, they do not differentiate between the function and posture of critic, and of poet. Being a practitioner is one of the pivotal initiatives in being a good critic. Eliot makes a distinction between a scholar and practitioner in which he indicates the qualifications of a good critic:

The scholar is more concerned with the understanding of the masterpiece in the environment of its author: with the world in which that author lived, the temper of his age, his intellectual formation, the books which he read, and the influences which had moulded him. The practitioner is concerned less with the author than with the poem; and with the poem in relation to his own age. He asks: Of what use is the poetry of this poet to poets writing to-day? Is it, or can it become, a living force in English poetry still unwritten? (OPP 146-47)

While scholar is someone who is concerned with the factors that are outside the text, a practitioner is within the text. That is one of the most significant procurements of the twentieth century literary criticism. Scholars deal with cultural and social aspect of a work and analyze the author of the text; however, practitioners sift through the text and its operation within itself and examine its relation to the other texts. His assumption on the significance of the text is the forerunner of literary theories in the second half of the twentieth century such as Structuralism, Post-structuralism and

Deconstruction. Tanpınar anticipates the primacy of the poem/work rather than the author as he is a good follower of Western literature. In his lecture notes he emphasizes that the precedence of the text is substantial (Alptekin 103). The distinction between scholar and practitioner could be followed in Tanpınar's critical program as well. He divides criticism into two: to analyze tradition and head towards to one distinct work. The first one is sociology of literature and the other is literary criticism in modern sense. Tanpınar's suppositions emerge when there is not a precise distinction between literary criticism and other disciplines such as sociology and history. While he glances at literature as an entirety, he is prone to the independence of text. Eliot and Tanpınar's classifications parallel as they both dwell on the creator's competence. Even though they do not despise the scholar's function as a critic, they underscore the text-driven criticism which highlights the work itself rather than the social and cultural context and all the conditions that are outside the text. Tanpınar insists that "text and man" are not to be ignored notwithstanding the epoch and the generation. Although he does not turn a blind eye to biography, it should not come first. He remarks "Our life" and "text" are two disparate things in criticizing a literary production. Biography is not as weighty as the emergence of a text as a unique literary entity. When Tanpınar criticizes the Divan literature of Ottoman Empire he pronounces that if biography is a volatile criteria when talking about any poet it becomes totally nonsense in the criticism of the old poets because classic Turkish poetry negates "life" and is a sheer abstraction (EÜM 183). Text-based criticism is what Tanpınar favors even though he does not totally disregard the social and historical criticism and biographical context of author. As he produces his criticism in a period that contemporary literary theories are about to emerge, his

criticism does not give priority to textual interpretation; however, one could observe the presumptions of textual analysis in his critical writing. He anticipates the criticism that repudiates the outer constituents of a work and dwells on the sifting of text as a separate entity. Eliot warns about the dangers of biographical criticism like Tanpinar does. While Tanpinar reckons it to be something in vain, Eliot appraises that however biography bears meaning in interpretation for further understanding, it carries the danger of diverting deliberation from poetry to poet, which constitutes bad criticism (OPP 117). If the “factual information” about the time of the poet and conditions of the society he lives in is confused with his poetry, that leads “us”, in Eliot’s wording, to the pitfalls of a depraved criticism. Biographical data could be a key for the significance of an art form; however “personal expression” is not a customary norm.

The creative construction of the artist buttresses the critical posture of him in both critics’ opinions. The poetic gift of the critic who is a “practitioner” in Eliot’s terms cooperate with the criticism he is about to produce. However, as the emotions of the poet should not interfere in the poem, critic should absent himself from his criticism. Despite the fact that the critic cannot disengage himself from the scope of his production, the presentation of criticism should materialize in an objective and impersonal manner. The expression of self in an “objective correlative”, an Eliot concept which connotes the only way for a critic/poet to express the emotion in an artistic practice and refers “a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion” (SW 85), will enable critic to detach himself from the work and to become a successful one. The emotions of the artist in a work correlate with the indicated parameters above. The poetic instruments for an

artist are the elements that abort the sensations for making the poem effective. Objective correlative is a suitable label for that theory of personal expression or extinction. The extinction of the poet is purveyed by means of the objective elements that are outside the emotions. Criticism is a development of sensibility for Eliot; that is to say perceptions shape a structure in good criticism; however bad criticism presents only the emotions. Criticism is critic's understanding of the consciousness of writing and his own self. In grasping the intuition and reason Tanpınar's criticism is disparate from Bergson and Thibaudet the philosophers he follows. While Tanpınar pursues reason in his criticism unlike his fiction, these philosophers espouse intuition as the main critical motive (Demiralp 69-70). Therefore, Tanpınar's attitude here resembles Eliot's theory of personal expression. While Eliot promotes the extinction of poet's personal assertion from his work, Tanpınar excludes personal intuition from his critical agenda. As dream and sub-consciousness serve as a paramount actor, he rules out the instinctive features in his criticism which is entirely composed of rationality by employing an objective procedure.

When Tanpınar evaluates the critical process in Turkish literature he unravels some convoluted predicaments in Turkish critical tradition. As he probes into the reasons why criticism does not flourish in Turkey, he identifies some estimation on the problem. First of all, he complains that one of the most substantial reasons of frailty in Turkish literature is the lack of criticism. He adds that criticism as a Western form of literary genre embarks upon Turkish arena without critic. The idea of criticizing is aligned in the second or third place in Turkish literature. Tanpınar also accuses Namık Kemal, a nineteenth century novelist, poet, playwright and critic in whose era Western sense of literary genres transpires and traditional poetic forms

are left out, of not being an effective critic as he lacks the inkling of life. That deficiency is apparent in not only in his criticism but also in his fiction (EÜM 77). He professes that the absence of “idea” (fikir) in Turkish prose is a portrayal of Eastern literatures’ characteristics which tend to find some fragments of ideas and then possess them. Tanpınar’s that grievance is the typical attitude of the intellectuals in the period. Gürbilek illuminates that issue:

Criticism in Turkey—not only social and cultural criticism but also literary criticism—is mostly the criticism of a lack, a critique devoted to demonstrating what Turkish society, culture, or literature lacks. Thus statements of lack (“We don’t have a novel of our own” or similarly “We don’t have a tragedy, a criticism, a philosophy, or an individual of our own”) are typical of a critical stance that positions itself from the very start as a comparative one . . . (599)

That reflection mostly emanates from the adaptation of literary genres from Western literatures, especially French literature, after the nineteenth century. As everything is new and every field of writing is relatively untouched at the time, the criticism focuses on the lack of a tradition of newly adopted literary genres and their inadequacy. That accusation and complaint is not pertinent to the field of poetry. Nobody denounces Turkish literature for it lacks poetry notwithstanding the criticism of poetry because poetry has a tradition of more than one thousand year in Turkish literature. However, there is not a tradition of novel, drama and criticism so the criticism in the second part of the nineteenth century and the first half the twentieth century spotlights the “lack” as Gürbilek presumes.

Eliot's criticism of English criticism concentrates on its being argumentative. He maintains that it tries to persuade rather than to state. However he admires the ancient critics as they left their irrevocable taste of their own (SW 104). The criticism of the modern period is to be displaying rather than presenting and attempting to persuade readers. Criticism could sometimes be dangerous according to Eliot. It is dangerous to surmise that poetry has just one meaning and one interpretation. Second danger is to assume that the interpretation correlates the intention of the author. Eliot warns about the traditional approaches in analyzing the works of art. He highlights the autonomy of the text as a solitary entity (OPP 113-4). In regard to this, Tanpınar asserts that critic tries to come before their work and adds that the criticism of the new age is not a criticism at all. It is a kind of ambiguous philosophy. If one attempts to work out with philosophy and dialectic, there is no end to it (YG 336). That is where Tanpınar and Eliot's philosophies collide. While Eliot is tenacious to hold his views of the precedence of the text, Tanpınar is not steadfast in defending the text's priority. This is because of, as it is explicated above, the emergence of the Western sense of literature in Turkey at the time. Tanpınar's reaction to the scope of criticism in the first half of the century is not discerning but collective, which is to say that he does not pick up the literary theories as theories but employs some of their premises separately. Therefore, when looked at from the twenty first century, his attitude might seem rambling; however, in its social and cultural context he is accomplished at grasping the theoretical novelties of his own period.

The portraits of the artists as critics are irresolute in concluding the span of what criticism is and how it functions in the modern age. While Eliot is one of the founding fathers of contemporary literary theory with his accent on tradition, his

critical sentiments swing in time. Tanpınar imbibes various judgments from Western-oriented school of thoughts. Even though he fashions a criticism that is peculiar to his own culture and civilization, it is baffling for one to determine whether his critical elaborations emanate from Romanticism, Formalism or Structuralism or not when looked at from the perspective of modern literary theories. However both critics concur that an eminent critic should have the quality of appreciation of works of art. That is possible in being a practitioner, which is to say that a critic should be a poet as well. What is more, in both artists' criticism the weight of tradition is apparent. It is the fundamental hallmark of issuing their critical viewpoints. Both Eliot and Tanpınar emphasize that an interpretation of works without the guidance of tradition, the presence of past, would not make a substantial criticism.

Cathartic Functioning of Drama

Tanpınar is not a playwright but Eliot is a competent dramatist with his plays in the modern age. After he writes the play Murder in the Cathedral, he is considered to complete the circle in English Literature by returning drama back to the church (Burgess 51). However he is a poet in the first place:¹¹ that characteristic of him is dominant in all of his writings such as drama and criticism. So in drama and criticism of drama Eliot's reflections are more voluminous and satisfactory than Tanpınar's'. However, they both write on the meaning, function and boundaries of drama. This part of the second chapter intends to illuminate their critical estimations on drama

¹¹ Remember Eliot's distinction between a practitioner and a scholar. He remarks that an able critic should be a practitioner, that is, poet who joins in the critical undertaking while he makes criticism.

and its definition, and especially Tanpınar's, on theatre's appearance in Turkish literature lately and its consequences in modern Turkish drama.

Eliot beholds that "drama is perhaps the most permanent, is capable of greater variation and of expressing more varied types of society, than any other" (SW 51). In that regard, he signalizes the social function of drama as he does of poetry but drama is the most perpetual literary genre in exhibiting the various aspects of social life. While poetry's sociality is limited and meager, drama is more open to society with its interactive discourse. Of course to look upon drama as one of the most open genres to communal activity of people stems from the very nature of drama; it is staged unlike the other literary genres, which means that to produce a play requires the laborious works of several individuals. That makes drama one of the most important genres in connecting the cultural clusters of a society. Tanpınar's perceptions pertaining to the social function of drama are analogous to Eliot's. He states that: "Theater is more pertinent with life than novel. Actor is the most complicated apparatus for he has the world that we call personality" (EÜM 83).¹² Among the other literary genres drama is more concerned with social life as it is open to interaction among the performers and between the performers and the audience. What is more, in the preparation period it involves the mutual interplay of so many people. For Eliot, the most useful poetry is the one which prevents society from disintegrations of collective predilection. That kind of poetry could be actualized best in the form of theatre (UPUC 152-3). To load a social function, a kind of morality, to literature is not an attitude of Modernist literature. While modernity attempts to

¹² Tiyatro, belki romandan ziyade hayatla münasebetlidir. Aktör arkasında şahsiyet dediğimiz alem bulunduğu için en karışık icra aletidir

amplify social disintegrations, Eliot's supposition is backing the traditional values. Drawing attention to the social repercussions of drama, Tanpınar impresses upon the affinities between history and drama. Drama is like history as characters live together like in the historical course of society. According to Tanpınar, there is no preparation in history while drama is subject to "repetition". With its convention, drama contrasts to history (Alptekin 192). While history does not repeat an occurrence twice, drama reproduces the same event several times. The stage is a kind of world in Tanpınar's criticism; the characters and the imaginary atmosphere make drama closer to history, society and actual life. The basic distinction between reality and dramatic life is the latter's repetitive mode on a stage. That repetition gives rise to the drama's decline from actuality to a fictional and representational reality. In life people's experiences are turbulent and unnerving, yet drama's habitual world does not let turbulences.¹³ It moves in one direction cyclically so drama is an art of continuity and repetition. That mechanic reiteration prevents drama from being the life itself though it is one of the most pertinent genres for the social functionality of literature as maintained by Tanpınar.

Correspondence between poetry and drama is another facet of their critical opinions on drama. Poetic drama is one of the most important devices Eliot employs. He does not only give his opinion about poetic drama, but also he practices it in his own plays. He attests that the twentieth century has to find a medium for the verse in drama. In that agency reader should be able to listen to the voice of modern man, characters could assert poetry without any genteel manner and they should be able

¹³ That exposition of Tanpınar on drama exhibits that he does not talk about the Modernist and post-modernist attitudes in drama as the drama of the modern ages is far away from the conventional modes of drama

conduct the most conventional message without any ridiculousness (OPP 38). He advances that a great poetic dramatist, as creator does in Eliot's elucidation of poet, creates a world in which he is everywhere present and hidden so Shakespeare could only be found in the characters he created. In his suppositions of poetic drama Eliot accentuates the need of contemporary world for a new artistic medium. Poetry's and drama's role in modern world is a quasi-religious ambition which exerts the qualities of traditional and ritual protocols. As modern world lacks those soothing fulfillments, poetic drama would bind the stratifications in society and express the most commonplace idea without a grandiose manner. Even if Tanpınar does not attribute any sacred resemblance to poetry and drama, he fastens them from a different angle. The order in poetry is one of his most significant propositions; therefore, he underscores that feature in drama. In accordance with what he signifies, drama is one of the most appealing arts for the one who espouses the order of poetry (EÜM 82). Here that insinuation accords with Eliot's presumption of poetic drama. For Tanpınar, as well, drama needs a poetic breath in which social apparatuses awaken and poetic sensibility operates a binding coalition between cultural segments of society. In parallel with his notion of "dream" in poetry Tanpınar adduces that drama plays a role which is outside but like the "life". The action in drama embodies the form which a dream wears. Between dream and life drama is both outside and inside of this world.

In the first part of that chapter on their opinions of poetry, it is surmised that their inconsistency in placing poetry into a superior position in the modern world is quite apparent. That incompatibility is resolved in the clarification of drama in both critics' agendas. While they put an emphasis on that poetry is closer to the center of

mystical essentials of modern subjectivity, they remark that it could not be delineated by the religious and moral aspects of society. However, in explicating drama they precisely affirm that drama is within the boundaries of social exertion of modern man. Instead of religious ceremonies and rituals of ancient times and tradition, drama behaves as a form catharsis to fulfill the social needs of modern individual. Both critics underline drama's social routine; that is to say drama has a ritualistic function with its verse production and performance. The language and the presentation of drama involve the social interaction between the cultural codes of society in which it is produced. Highlighting that connection Tanpınar and Eliot place drama between social functionality and poetry. When poetry could not satisfy the customary needs of populace, especially in the twentieth century, drama acts as the central entertaining and spiritual mechanism. Drama is the closest artistic form to the life in both critics' philosophies.

CHAPTER III:

Enduring Legacy as a Resistance to the Modern: Tradition and Usable Past

Tanpınar and Eliot emphasize the relevance of tradition as a source for their critical agendas. They make use of past as a ruling entity over the present. While they articulate a modern/ist critical program they underline the accumulation of past in the present and its operation on the habits and attitudes of contemporary epoch. The piling up of past constitutes tradition, which is to say, tradition is the amassing of past experiences of not only poet but also of collective consciousness. The activities that make collective consciousness follow an order to amount to tradition which is totally opposed to the individuality of artist. Modern inclinations repudiated the course of tradition and, what is more, modernity defines itself in the disintegration of traditional elements.¹⁴ As deliberated in the first chapter, the concept modern mostly emerges from the reactions to the traditional elements. The falling apart of social structures that are traditionally institutionalized are substituted by the modern discourse.¹⁵ The modernist movement is considered to be the reaction to and reflection of human perception against that modern situation. The frivolity and feebleness of human consciousness is denoted in the Modernist works of art not only in literature but also in the other fields of cultural exercises such as painting, architecture and music.

¹⁴ As maintained below, modern is habitually comprehended as an opposition to tradition: The development of the qualitative characteristics of modern societies was often conceived as tantamount to the decline of tradition: “. . . characteristics of modern life led to the development of many of the major typologies of classical sociology that were based on a dichotomous conception of traditional versus modern societies or of tradition versus modernity” (Eisenstadt 9-10).

¹⁵ Remember the poem “Second Coming” by W. B. Yeats who is considered to be a Modernist poet.

To make out the implicit relation between the criticisms of Tanpınar and Eliot, tradition and modern thought will be studied in regard to their criticism. In the advent of the twentieth century, modern thought evolved into a new direction. One of the main premises of “modern” is the dissipation of traditional elements in a society and its gradual unfolding towards a new character. The literary movement of Modernist assumptions is not quite discrete; the focal presumption of Modernist literature that is conventional orientation in literature is not adequate in portraying the fragmentary minds of modern age. Narrative techniques of traditional literature cannot articulate the requirements of human subjectivity against modern situation. The frailty of human perception is among chief reasons of dismembering traditional elements in literary inclinations. However, the attitudes of both critics in a modern context is in contrast to the basic postulate of Modernism; that is to say, in both critics’ agendas a particular merit is attributed to tradition and its functioning in a modern plight. Quite contrary to what modernism presupposes, Tanpınar and Eliot set up their criticism upon the re-creation of tradition. Moreover, they persist that modern is to be built up on the ashes of tradition. How could that paradox be possible? In what circumstances could tradition create the modern? What is the burden loaded on the shoulders of men of letters in that context? Their emphasis on tradition and its significant portrayal in the articulation of the “new” will be examined throughout this chapter. How they expound tradition and erect their criticism on it will be studied as well.

Eliot’s understanding of tradition is quite historical. The idea of continuity and accounts of time by Eliot which will be discussed in the ensuing chapters are akin to his sentiments on tradition and its performance within time. What he understands from tradition is a perception:

. . . not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional. And it is at the same time what makes a writer most acutely conscious of his place in time, of his contemporaneity. (SW 40- 41)

In his one of the most quoted articles, “Tradition and Individual Talent”, he postulates that when a piece of art is produced something happens to all pieces of works throughout history. The personal genius of the poet is regenerated and recreated by the means of interminable aspect of the previous ages within the accumulation of time. The work of an artistic exertion shapes and changes the array of the past productions. After the presence of new work of art, whole order changes “for order to persist”. Tradition shows itself in that format in the enduring flow of literature and time. Those readjustments in the nature of the whole body of literature constitute the new order; which is to say, the charge of tradition operates on literature. “Past should be altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past” according to Eliot. He presupposes that the presence of past and the operation of the present on past both fashion tradition within a culture and literature. Eliot’s own production of drama, for instance, complies, for instance, with morality plays which are the productions of devoted Christians in the church before the Renaissance.

Eliot's work and morality plays, in turn, concludes each other; and they are regulated and crowned by the emergence of novelty, which means new pieces of art. The chief distinction, in Eliot's rendering of tradition, between the past and the present is "an awareness of the past" which is epitomized by "the conscious present". Tanpınar's assumption of tradition and its exercise on the present and past are not dissimilar to Eliot's account of time and its whirling within past and present. He confesses that:

. . . a piece of art, in this way, is a product of coincidences and adventures which belong to the culture it is attached to and whole history. . . . in the general evolution of an art they are reinvigorated just so, rise to the surface, those that are forgotten and hibernating regenerate, amalgamate with life and become pure and abstract nutrient, hue and flavor. (EÜM 93)¹⁶

Tradition in the sense that Tanpınar punctuates runs parallel with the norms that Eliot clarifies. A piece of art is brought forth concisely by means of several factors that are related to the history, culture, literature and civilization in Tanpınar's philosophy.

When art progresses, which squares with the birth of a new piece of art and its involvement in the literary tradition in Eliot's criticism, whole subconscious parts of a literature, that is tradition, regenerate. The new piece of art is the product of all civilization and cultural undertaking of a nation for Tanpınar. Even though it seems to be the outcome of unfettered coincidences the production of one generation is effected by the successive generation's creations. Consequently whole body of texts that accounts for the literary heritage of a civilization moulds the tradition. He

¹⁶ . . . bir sanat eseri de öylece bütün tarihin, mensup olduğu kültüre ait birçok macera ve tesadüfün mahsulüdür. . . . bir sanatın umumi tekamülünde de bunlar öylece dirilirler, satha çıkarlar, unutulmuş ve uyuyan canlanır, hayata karışır saf ve mücerret gıda, renk ve lezzet olur.

discerns that the present situation of Turkish intellectuals is linked to the unawareness of past and ignorance of enduring legacy of whole tradition. Presence of past steps, at this point, in Tanpınar's critical program: past can be apprehended within the present. He pursues past, in the light of what Kahraman adduces only to articulate present. Without the present, it is impossible to define past and to survive. The only notion that will prolong the idea of continuity by Tanpınar is the concept of the presence of past. Again, that idea, for Kahraman, is the plain authority of Bergson on Tanpınar, which will be conferred in the last chapter (32).

Eliot denounces twentieth century Anglo-American culture which suffered from its lack of tradition and a lack of historical sense. The intellectuals of early twentieth century Anglo-American culture, as Tanpınar deprecates Turkish intellectual sphere, are deprived of a prolific, vivid and wholesome foundation (Zilcosky 22). Without the insights of tradition and its fertility artists float over the surface and cannot contemplate the depth of the literary legacy they are in. His famous poem The Waste Land signifies the inconsistent nature of European mind which undergoes a tremendous fracture in its edifice. The cost of the lack of tradition in European sense is innumerable. The spirit of European mind disappears as a result of religious insensibility and negation of traditional elements in the advent of the twentieth century. Tradition, which is a synonym for order and custom in Eliot's outlook, is not a hindrance for the artist but an advantage for the steadfastness of literary endowment. The steadiness of European literary chain subsides by the inclinations that target the tradition and using it as the source for literary production. Tanpınar upholds the idea that artists should go back to their own cultural affluence in order to re-create a modern literature (Gürbilek 602). He cites that "we had to be

our own selves” by moving back to the past fabricated by Seljukid and Ottoman Turks over nearly a millennium. Here his insistence on artists’ lack of sensibility for tradition overlaps with Eliot’s. Uhlig stresses that past created by the dispositions of Eliot strengthens his poetic intentions and presents him a secure place. He creates a past for himself in which poet is nourished. This, for Uhlig, is the endeavor to stamp tradition as a “usable past” (198). Artist, for Eliot, should use the past and tradition instead of denying them. The atmosphere of the present that is nurtured by the accretion of past habits and literary propensities is one of the unique sources for artists in initiating their own artistic enterprise. That dream of Eliot, usable past, is not an unavailing attempt; on the contrary, it is a sense of advance and progress. Additionally it is “the secular process of eternal mind” in the criticism of Eliot because it does not denote a dreamy and impractical purview. Eliot uses the terminology of the contemporary sciences which connotes organic growth and development when he recounts the affinity between the present and the past and between the individual artist and tradition (Ellis 291-2). The equilibrium in the state of individual talent, that are artist and his poetic gift, and the sturdy stature of tradition as a whole is among the substantial elements in delineating the edge of what tradition is, what modern is and additionally how the employment of tradition is done in a modern context. Tanpınar belittles the make-up that repudiates the attribute of past generations, which had been the official politics of the new republic. He assumes that tradition as a “usable past” is what the intelligentsia of the newly established republic lacks in constructing new identities and demarcating the cultural boundaries of the new nation. Therefore Tanpınar, in his novels, depicts some in-between characters whose indecision between East and West, modernity and

tradition comprises the main theme of Tanpınar's works and, moreover, the other novelists and intellectuals of the epoch (Irzik and Güzeldere 292). The ambivalence of the fictional personalities in the narratives of the era is illustrated in the critical accounts of Tanpınar as well. The characters' strenuous attempts to reify themselves between two opposite poles are associated with the lack of tradition and consciousness that employs the past as a source in the creation of the present. When tradition prevails in the society and the resources of literary reproduction, the continuity and maturity will be accomplished according to both critics' philosophies. While Eliot upholds that "novelty is better than repetition" and encourages artist to create new pieces of art, he supports that "the mind of mature" (SW 40-4) braces poet in utilizing the past as the feeder of his creative art. Tradition does not blockade the innovation and modern insights; conversely, it sustains the potentiality of sheer art and novelty in literature. If a tradition, according to Tanpınar establishes itself briskly, it tends to settle down and to ripen into excellence and intactness (YG 24). The perfection in literary productions and endurance in the artistic endeavors are obtained through an ardent labor to espouse the value of past in the form of tradition and embrace the presence of the past as professed by both critics. As the artist lives not only in the present but also "the present moment of the past", he can create a thorough piece of art by only ascribing himself to the collage of past which emerges as tradition.

Eliot's conception of tradition encompasses the history of all Europe from Homer and Shakespeare to the present literature of modern era as he purports in "Tradition and Individual Talent". He claims that today's people of Europe are still the citizens of Roman Empire. The supposition of Virgil that being a Roman citizen

is the highest ideal is embraced by Eliot (OPP 130). Roman citizenship appears in the format that Europe has a continual mind, which assembles the literary and cultural legacy of Europe produced throughout the centuries in one collective memory. As “the mind of Europe” endures, the artistic creations of every single poet/writer of European origin renew and regulate it and recreate the tradition in “collective subjectivity”. Even though the “individual talent” seems to be independent from the body of texts created by the foregoing generations, the subjective characteristic of the mind of poet contributes to the endurance of European mind and involves in the instinctive stream of tradition. Eliot reiterates that personal expression of poet in his work should be diminished. Extinction of poet from the scene is one of the important factors in the success of the artistic work. In relation to the tradition the personal expression of the poet is somewhat a trivial issue. He steadily emphasizes the significance of order and authority of an outer power (Austin 2-3). The impact of order is to be greater on the poet than his personal skills in the creation process. To partake in the continual reinvigoration of collective memory, the subjectivity of individual should replace with the “objective correlative” the concept Eliot employs to express the course of tradition and extinction of personal expression from the work. Tanpınar’s standpoint in that respect is not dissimilar to Eliot’s perspective. As Eliot insists that “we” are the citizens of Roman Empire, Tanpınar stresses that “In fact Ottoman Empire is still alive” (Kerman, 170). He believes in the circular reasoning of time in an intuitive route. He stresses that Yahya Kemal, his mentor and the one who affected him in his historical philosophy and elaborations on civilization, has made a curve to return to the healthy side of tradition in a miraculous way (EÜM 75). Tanpınar gets Molla İsmail, a central figure in his novel Mahur Beste (Song in the

Mahur Mode), talk. Molla who is a wise man and who generates solutions for the crisis of modern era stipulates that the Turkish nation, expressed as “we” in the novel, is neither Eastern nor hinges on the past but she is affiliated to the life of that country. The concept “life”, a Bergsonian term, represents the present in Tanpınar’s philosophy; which signifies “now”, or modern, by centralizing it. (Ertop 330-1)

Turning a blind eye to the past, here, does not mean disregarding it; on the contrary, it is the presence of the past. Tanpınar is in favor of recreating the “now” without detaching himself from the past and the civilizational codes he is in. They both could be considered classicists in the tenets that glorify the purport of the past over the modern and the operation of tradition on the poet and the poet’s potency to regulate the influx of tradition. Both critics, as a result of the pattern continuity they devised, defend that the continuity of life and time enable those civilizations to live as tradition in the cultural and literary spheres of modern context.

T. S. Eliot’s philosophy of tradition which stresses the presence of the past is inherited from the nineteenth century philosophers such as Marx, Nietzsche and Pater. He remodels that conception to manifest his own sifting of the early part of the twentieth century which experienced a cultural crisis. The hypothesis of tradition and its enduring authority on the presence, for Brooker, could be an imperative abstraction for the reevaluation of the works of artists such as Yeats, Valéry, Joyce and other contemporaries (Brooker, 55). “Dissolution of the apparent opposition between past and present” is the main supposition of Eliot’s conception of tradition. According to Zilcosky, Eliot creates “discordant alignment” of “dead”-“present” and “living”-“past” in order to conjecture a solution to the cultural and linguistic crisis of the modern age. “The temporal disorientation” created by Eliot intentionally is

resolved by the phrase “the present moment of the past”. Eliot envisages a poet who is acquainted with his own place in the present and his own pastness (25-6).

Tradition as something operating on the present is proposed as the resolution of the crisis and the degeneration of European Mind. The divisions in the continual process of the leaning in European Mind, which is purveyed by the perception of a historical consciousness and continuum, are among the foremost reasons of the cultural and spiritual crisis of the early twentieth century Europe according to Eliot. Those divisions will be reintegrated through the balmy effect of remembering the presence of the past and accepting the performance of tradition over the present creations of the artists. Tanpınar detects some similar answers to the crisis of the early twentieth century. What he calls that crisis is quite crucial for it will be constructive in analyzing how he perceives the modern situation and tradition. Tanpınar views Tanzimat reformations as refraction from the natural progression of Turkish spirit and literature. While determining the cause of the split in Turkish spirit, he designates the new era as the modern period in Turkish literature and reckons that modern Turkish literature begins with a civilization crisis (EÜM 104). The crisis originates in the deterioration of cultural aggregation and the severance from the connective elements in a society. The factors that bind the whole particles of society split up as a result of tradition’s evanescence from the cultural sphere in the arousal of the republic after the dismembering of the Ottoman Empire. The intellectual crisis of the newly founded republic mounts on the account of the confrontation of the pro-Western intellectuals with their past and their disability to grab hold of the tradition produced through centuries. Tanpınar’s own fundamental predicament, on the report of Atış, lies in that encounter as well (Atış 5). The dilemma of the intellectuals in

rebuilding a nation stems from the lack of their desire to utilize their own past and the obsession to make use of Western civilization with all its faculties instead. The plight of the artists in ascertaining their roots and acquiring a sense of belonging constitute the focal contradiction of the intellectual crisis for Tanpınar. Even though the disability of the intelligentsia to accord themselves to the natural stream of tradition, in Tanpınar's criticism, is deemed to be the pre-eminent cause of the crisis, he expects, as an exception, that the lack of an ancient and sturdy tradition could be the genesis of creating an abrupt literature and hopes that the quandary of Turkish intellectuals could turn out a regeneration process (EÜM 92). The recreating new is only possible through a process in which there should be no interference of tradition. The linguistic degeneration is the most fundamental aspect of crisis diagnosed by both Eliot and Tanpınar. Their criticisms intersect in that regard: the crisis of the modern era is a linguistic one. The Waste Land is rated as a language in crisis. Prufrock, the antagonist of Eliot's acclaimed poem The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock, is assumed as an instance of modern subject who is lost in language. Eliot is one of the first poets who got to grips with the repercussions of modernity. The Waste Land's dissonances, sudden transitions, shifts in rhythm and characteristically Modernist obsession with language have often been seen as an indicative of alienation from life and from history (Childs 99-102). Eliot who pursues discipline and structure in his poetry and criticism strives to create an artistic order for the mayhem of modern life by assembling the mundane objects, prosaic phrases and tedious expressions in his poetry.

Probing the function and operation of tradition over the present in both critics' agendas, their appraisal on what modern/ist is and how it relates to tradition

will be sifted from now on. While Eliot is judged to be one of the founding fathers of Modernist literature, Tanpınar's role in defining and identifying modernity and Modernism in Turkish literature is fairly controversial. That is because Modernism has affected Turkish literature not in the sense of Western literatures but in a different angle. The emergence of modernist reactions in Turkish literature goes back to 1960s unlike European Modernism which dates back to 1920s. The grounds for the belatedness of Modernism in Turkish literature are manifold; however, this study will not focus on Modernism, modernist currents and modernist predispositions in Turkish literature.¹⁷ Tanpınar is an esthete of the first half of the twentieth century; his biographical account falls together with Eliot's. While Eliot and his works are held to be modernist, whether Tanpınar shows modernist qualities in his works or not is still a question. How they are modernist and how that is exhibited in their criticism will be studied from now on by examining the critical points in their writings. How they relate tradition to a modern context is another discussion point in analyzing Modernism and the concept "modern" in their criticism. Since the boundaries of tradition and its employment in the present, that is the presence of past, are delineated in that chapter, it will be easy to discern how they envisage modern as they establish their proposal of modern on accumulation and operation of tradition in the present. Tanpınar and Eliot's conceptions of tradition and a usable past concur as they both persevere in devising the present as the continuity of past and composing literature with the heritage of tradition.

¹⁷ For the emergence of Modernism in Turkish literature see the conclusive book of Kahraman: Hasan Bülent Kahraman, *Türk Şiiri Modernizm Şiir* [Turkish Poetry Modernism Poetry]. (İstanbul: Agora, 2004).

O'Hara supposes that Eliot's critical adventure can be divided into two in terms of his preferences and inclinations in the depiction of critical matters. The first one is the classic defender of modernist criticism, and the second one is closet Romantic theorist. However, in both Eliots one thing remains the same. This is the "modernist desire" to obliterate the established manners of thought, consciousness and action, which Eliot espoused and implemented throughout his own critical agenda. Although this is the response of modernist aspiration to the conception of tradition, Eliot's stance which is consisted of the re-creation of tradition in a modernist prospect:

. . . recommends a leap beyond the immense panorama of futility and anarchy of the present Western culture back into the original sources, the ground of our unique creativity. This is the Eliot who valorizes the monumental simultaneity of tradition, not because it is the last grandiose vision left to the histrionic imperial subjectivity but because it could become an inspiring supplement to this project of selective return. (O'Hara 99)

Eliot intends an awareness of return to the sources which embody the mind of Europe. It lies underneath the wreckage of the modern world. He devises a modern panorama that can only substantiate itself through going back to the original sources. That revitalization process, which includes the re-creation of European rudiments and turning back to the immense literary heritage of Western world, cleanses the present chaos of European culture and inanity of modern mind, and heals the ruptures between subject and object that are the main leitmotifs in modern rhetoric. Modernist attitude, as pretended by Eliot, attends to the habitual depravities of

modern context. The reaction of Modernist attitude towards the futility and chaos of the modern situation could only restore the frailty of modern mind. That reaction is to purvey a salubrious bond between the groundbreaking originators of European literary legacy and the figures of the present age. The perpetual task of artist, for Eliot, is to couple the tradition and the present in one point, which are intertwined in so many respects.

Even though modernity and the meaning of modern idea are discussed in Turkey elaborately, the role of Modernism and the meaning of the modernist are not identified clearly. Moreover, modernity and Modernism is often confused, as if they are the same concepts. That is relevant in different disciplines of social sciences. Despite that, some literary critics discerned the very foundations of Modernism and interpreted it in their critical writings. The intellectuals of the early twentieth century Turkey were aware of the shifting in the field of literary studies. The birth of new genres and the alterations in the form of poetry were all contemplated by that new generation who was influential in the remaking of Turkish literature from the ashes of late Ottoman legacy. In that, they followed the example of Western world, that is to say, they employed the Western standards in the creation of literary productions such as novel, drama and short story. However, as the literature is precisely effected by the social conditions of the epoch, Turkish literature at the time was mainly under the influence of Turkish independence war, cultural ambiguity of the present generation and the confrontation of the West. These are all characteristics that seem to contradict with the attitude of the Modernist literature which speaks up for the psychological quest of individual mind, the representation of the modern man's agony and the fragility of subjective perception against the modern situation.

Tanpınar's work is contingent on that supposition as well but he is a bit different from his contemporaries in recognizing the currents, inclinations and alterations in Western literature. First of all his work is not a sheer preaching which recites the independence songs of the nation unlike some of his contemporaries. He cares about the aesthetic values and the uniqueness of a literary production which is different from the other forms of writing such as chronicles, history and sociology. Even though he is not blind to the social dilemma around himself and reflects the predicament of modern Turkish intellectual in the characters he create, his work is rather aesthetic than being social. That feature distinguishes him from the other men of letters however he is to be portrayed with his period and environment in analyzing his attitude towards what modern is and what modern Turkish literature is like. As pointed above, he does not articulate the modernist and Modernism directly in his criticism. The word "modern" means novelty in his coinage, which he stresses so many times. He portends the emergence of a "new" form of poetry and literature with broken sentence structures and equivocal word formations and the other modernist elements related to the form of poetry. However, he does not talk about it as a modernist proclivity and does not focus on the essence of modernist thought: for him it is just the advent of new forms and fashions. What is more, he does not favor the new trends in poetry but prefers being the champion of tradition to the course of new fashions in the structure of poetry. While he is discussed as a modern figure in the genesis of modern Turkish literature, he is not treated as modernist.

One of the few articles on whether Tanpınar is modernist or not belongs to Orhan Pamuk who could be considered a post-modernist in his style and stance. Here, this article will be evaluated exhaustively as it will be advantageous in comparing

Eliot and Tanpınar in terms of Modernism and the boundaries of modernist writing. Modern, as asserted by Pamuk, is the glittering of the break from the past and the flame of enthusiasm it promised therefore it could be associated with everything around us that is new including the door of the room, the lighter, the glasses and the microphone. Even though we are moderns, that does not mean we are modernists because Modernism is a literary current of the early twentieth century. In Turkish intellectual sphere modern is generally identified with “not inherited from ancestors” and “non-traditional”. However, Modernism is the departure of society from the communal tunes and of literature from its highest purpose representation. Literature does not reflect life, not explain the rules and secrets of it and not attempt to catch the life itself; but it is something produced for its own self (Pamuk 446-7). According to Pamuk, Modernism is not a relevant key to open up Tanpınar because his works kindle the sublime and characters endeavor to enlighten the life. They, and Tanpınar himself, are representatives of their community. Tanpınar interferes in the narration of the characters and bestows himself upon the characters in his novels. As he is inside his own work as an omnipotent narrator, he speaks on the behalf of his community (Pamuk 450). That makes him the mouthpiece of his nation according to Pamuk; which is against the suppositions of modernist tendency in literature. Tanpınar is deemed to be a nineteenth century novelist by him so he could not be a Modernist. He teaches and shows reader how to perceive the relations between characters and situations taking place in his novels. He is a man of people who burdens the plights of his nation stemming from the dilemma of shifting civilization. He is a man of community, who is aware of both the predicament of his nation on the threshold of cultural ambiguity and the modernist alignments (Pamuk 456-7). He is

not restless with the society he lives in and does not feel the discomfort that Modernist writers are supposed to feel. That is what Pamuk posits about Tanpınar's attitude towards the modern situation. However, what Pamuk misses or overlooks is the social context and the historical evolution of Turkish literature from an Eastern-oriented version to a pro-Western one, such as adaptation of Western genres and leaving out Divan Literature. At the time Turkish literature were still in the process of adopting genres from European literatures especially French literature. The literature had been in the maturation phase and had faced the embarrassment of the existential and cultural crisis; therefore Tanpınar's attitude and the characters he created are not disparate. The fact that he speaks up for his community and intervenes in the narration stems from the existential toil of a nation that were about to be born. Furthermore, Tanpınar admits that he has missed Modernism: "However, I could not find Modernism, I missed it" (Alptekin 41).¹⁸ He is aware of the emergence of Modernism as a literary current but he is conservative in the construction of poetry. When he is asked in an interview why he breaks down his rule that poetry should follow a metric and rhyme system and writes poetry in free verse, his response is that he is a modern man (YG 316). He decrees a rule and disobeys it himself. Even though he considers himself modern he discloses that he is not modernist. Here, what Kantarcıoğlu, who is among the few who juxtaposes Tanpınar and Eliot as literary figures, challenges is exactly related to that case when she upholds that while Eliot inherits a tradition, Tanpınar lacks it (35). Tanpınar does not lack a tradition but lacks a tradition in the Western sense of literature. He inherits a one-thousand year-old poetry tradition which he both admires and criticizes in his works and which he

¹⁸ Fakat Modernizm'i bulamamıştım, onu kaçırmıştım

benefits from primarily. What is all put forward here related to his ideas on tradition is an extension of that tradition. However, he does not inherit the literary currents and genres of Western literatures. Romanticism and Modernism are equally remote to him while drama and novel are outlandish to him alike. Undertaking the point that Kantarcıoğlu is right, one could surmise that Pamuk's criticism seems to be relentless; however, he adds that he credits Tanpınar a bit. As Tanpınar does not have pioneer novelists who could be considered the substantial instances of Turkish literature in the Western sense, to accuse him of not being Modernist, as Pamuk does, is not plausible. Tanpınar himself could be viewed as the originator of modern Turkish literature within the Western norms even though he is not a Modernist in the sense that Pamuk wishes him to be. Nevertheless, there are some indications he specifies, which are among the symptoms of modernist literature. Notwithstanding that he does not incline towards those modernist extensions in the poetry of new generation Turkish poets; he makes out the advent of modernist structures and attitudes in Turkish literature. Henceforth, those intimations he addresses will be likened to the modernist dispositions of Eliot.

The concept of the mind of Europe, which will be thoroughly discussed in the following chapter, is not a deviation from the modernist bent in Eliot's philosophy; but his conception of tradition and the idea of continual flow of European mind render modernist reasoning. Brooker exposes that the impression of tradition serves as "a textbook example of modernist dialectic" because it entails "the interplay of past and the present, old and new, the community and the individual, the mind of Europe and the individual mind, and other roughly parallel pairs commonly thought to be opposites" (Brooker 60-2). The concept "mind of Europe" as a dynamic

figuration repeats the modernist logic in its course. While European mind was directed by “reason” in the Enlightenment period, it was dominated by “feeling” in the Romantic age. When it comes to the twentieth century, cultural ambiguity and decadence in the main structure of European entity led it to subsidence and corruption. The cultural wholeness of European identity has crumbled into separate pieces in the first half of the twentieth century which has witnessed the rise of modern ideal and its amplification and then the rise of modernist writing and its reaction against the modern situation. Tanpınar’s invention of Europe is close to Eliot’s. He envisages it as a totality which is tied up to a tradition of civilization and culture, a life and a past. While Europe as an instance of perfection and good taste exhibits its beauty in the form of petal and stalk of a flower, it strikes roots into the treasures that are hidden under the soil. That metaphor sums up the conception of tradition of Tanpınar. Europe has been Europe by attaching itself to the roots of its history and the legacy of its tradition, which is a premise underlined by Eliot as well. Whenever Turkish intellectuals in the period of apprenticeship, Tanpınar adds, emulate the blossoming of that beautiful flower, they discover that they have imitated something devoid of roots which has ramifications to history and past. Accordingly, Tanpınar (in the original text “we”) divines that the ideals like beauty and integrity are only to be found in the life (the present) and the past of a nation (EÜM 93). A concept borrowed from French philosopher Henri Bergson, “life” is a key figure in Tanpınar’s criticism. He attributes special significance to the term since he counts life as the redemptive power of Turkish society which was under a repression culturally and politically. Life will remedy the cultural crisis of the nation by

ramifying to the presence of the past and utilizing the cultural heritage of the civilization.

Modern situation for Eliot is a kind of inertia which symbolizes the pagan aspect of the century. The new system, which has been founded over the dismembering of Christian culture and society, represents the primitive desires of human culture and retreats from the conventional forms of narration and dispositions. It substantiates the presence of itself by:

. . . destroying traditional social habits of the people, by dissolving their natural collective consciousness into individual constituents, by licensing the opinions of the most foolish, by substituting instruction for education, by encouraging cleverness rather than wisdom, the upstart rather than the qualified, by fostering a notion of getting on to which the alternative is a hopeless apathy. (ICS 13)

As Modernism is a reaction to the modern situation, that is modernity, the works of modernist writers mirror the dissipation of modern context which Eliot depicts as the heathen facet of the twentieth century. Collective subjectivity is amputated by modern mind; that is to say that the tradition which constitutes the major portion of Eliot's criticism is to be ignored. Eliot ridicules the modern situation by juxtaposing the antithetical elements together. While tradition is represented by collective consciousness, opinion, education, wisdom and the qualified; the modern is portrayed as an individual constituent, opinions but of most foolish people, instruction, cleverness and the upstart. Such an analogy is adequate in contemplating Eliot's stance as a Modernist artist against modernity. When it comes to the literary aptitude of modernist culture he thinks that "now" is deprived of nutritive facilities of

customary norms. The present situation is, without the fruitful insights of tradition, “in doldrums”. That is what English language suffers today according to Eliot. The deranged performance of English language since Milton has culminated in the first half of the twentieth century. The crisis which is a linguistic one in its origin could be ameliorated by being “broken and remade” unless free verse is opted for liberation from form (OPP 37). That is the natural tendency of modernist writing. The escape from the conventional elements in the course of society ends up with the receding from the traditional forms of narration. Structures are to be “broken and remade” as manifested by Eliot. Tanpınar’s neither literary production nor critical accounts are modernist in the narration; conversely, as Pamuk professed above, his narration is traditional and he is devoted to the traditional norms of literature. However, he heralds the arrival of Modernism in his criticism but he does not commend the nature of it as that kind of narration is upheld by the new generation of Turkish poetry:

. . . to discharge the form completely, to doubt the word, to consider the image too poetic and get rid of it, or to take up the word with its all its weight and pursue all the things to be asserted. . . . Eventually, the desire to change that oldest form of art utterly made poetry something that is confined to the ones who understand it, to the small circle of the poet and even to the poets and men of letters from the same generation. (YG 335)¹⁹

¹⁹ . . . şeklin tamamen atılışı, kelimededen şüphe etmek, imajı fazla şairane bulmak ve ondan kurtulmaya çalışmak, yahut kelimeyi çıplak ve bütün ağırlığı ile alarak söylenecek her şeyi onda aramak. . . . Hülâsa bu en eski sanatı baştan aşağı değiştirmek arzusu, şiiri sadece anlayanlara, şairin küçük muhitine, hatta aynı nesilden şairlere ve edebiyatçılara ait bir şey yaptı.

Those features echo the ambit of modernist account even if he does not register a modernist predilection in his narration. The broken sentences and images, the overestimation of the word and order in the disorder of modern situation are what Tanpınar presages in his criticism. He is a bridge between the traditional nature of Turkish literature and the forthcoming modernist wave in Turkish literature. Even though he sways towards the modernist dispositions in his latest works,²⁰ his language is under the domination of traditional traits.

²⁰ See his unfinished novel, which was published three decades after his death, *Aydaki Kadın* (The Woman in the Moon) and his short stories which are closer to the modernist narration than his novels.

CHAPTER IV:

The Idea of Continuity and the Perseverance of Tradition

The idea of continuity is among the common characteristics of Tanpınar and Eliot's critical programs. They both underscore the significance of continuity in life, different from the lives of individuals; that philosophy arises from Henri Bergson's accounts of time, life and change, which will be studied in the following chapter. That continuity is extensive in the abstract resolutions of life, such as literature, beliefs and social behaviors. The perpetual progression of traditional elements in a modern context is proposed by both critics. In the flow of time, present and past accumulate in the same spot, which is ensured by the presence of past, time's supremacy on the creation of new pieces of art and past's sovereignty over the present exercises. That explication of time and continuity is so conventional in the criticism of both personas that it makes up the quintessence of their critical writing. That they dwell on the idea of continuity and that idea infuses their whole philosophy are entirely marked in not only their critical essays but also poetry and literary productions. However, their critical program, as that thesis sifts their criticism only, will be taken up to disclose the layout of the idea of continuity.

Continuity for both critics is the vital process in life, which is unbreakable and perennial. Their viewpoints can be condensed into the notion of continuity at all. Their deportment as critics of society and aesthetics is provided by their conceptualization of continuity. Continuity is the miracle and constructive mystery of the concept "society" for Tanpınar. Society, culture and art are a chain of continuity which traces back and forth to infinity. It is the sum of his response to the issues of

social circumstances, cultural conducts and aesthetic concerns (YG 15). Eliot highlights that “the mind of Europe” is an entity that cannot be segregated and more important than the mind of individuals. Eliot presupposes continuity, as Tanpınar does, which reflects the collective subjectivity of a nation/country. That continuity which develops by changing does not leave behind anything. It composes the tradition by means of never-ending regulations and transformations within time. Individual mind’s subjugation by past and the habitual proliferation of what is conducted by human beings are the appearances of that continuity. Continuity traverses the long path of time from the rock drawings to Homer and Shakespeare (SW 42-3). The presence of past and tradition’s role in re-creation of the modern are, here, interconnected with each other. For the perpetual change and growth, time operates its course on the present, which is embodied in tradition.

Eliot stresses that upon Aeneas destiny of Europe lies; his choice is not a matter of “self-glorification” but a kind of responsibility put by fate. To regard Aeneas, Virgil, Homer or Milton as the originators of modern European literature is a result of his conceptualizations about time and tradition. He, again, looks upon tradition as the conveyor of past to modern (OPP 128). Tanpınar glorifies the return to the refinement of Turkish sources such as Fuzuli, Baki, Nedim and Galib. He considers the appreciation of those poets as the accumulation of some fragmented traditional elements and salvaging them from the total loss. He admires the generation who evaluates those figures according to the elegance of the life they created (YG 42). The resurgence of tradition within the sentiments of the present age is among the most significant features of Tanpınar’s conceptualization for the steadiness of “Turkish spirit”. When Tanpınar talks about “Turkish spirit” and Eliot

“the mind of Europe”, they both set out the same notion of time and the guidance of tradition over present. The abiding conception of tradition’s role on the present and its presence in the every moment of life within the format of change, transformation, improvement or expansion is what both critics mean by the concept “the idea of continuity”.

Tanpınar, in parallel with what Eliot puts forward, accents that Turkish literature from the initiation to the modern era has a chain that is exclusive and durable when he discusses the role of Yahya Kemal, his mentor, in imparting the continuity to the modern Turkish literature. Aydın claims that Tanpınar considers Tanzimat (Reformations) a fracture in the chain and the reason of the crisis of people in the Republic (248). The attempt to estrange people from language, territory and direction is the initiator of the crisis and the chaos. Turkish spirit is wounded by the superficial transmutations during Tanzimat period. What Turkish society lost after that period is the idea of continuity according to Tanpınar. The problem of the early part of the twentieth century is the mentality and “inner human” crisis according to Tanpınar. That crisis is the root of the discontinuity in the lives of people who has been experiencing the broken time of the century (YG 36). Those people and the artist undergo the problems that are inherited from the previous generations and will be inherited to the subsequent ones. They make those problems thresholds that could not be stepped over. There is not a presence but past and future; however, those people and the artist are in the presence. That manifestation of mentality crisis, in the light of what Tanpınar upholds, is reckoned to be the genesis of modern person’s inner conflicts and his encounter with the outer reality; which is caused by the irrelevant auto-critic of society. The greatness of the foregoing scholars and artists

arises from the confidence they have because they do not look askance at themselves and the ones who lived before them. They affix past to the present in their mind. Therefore the chain of continuity is complete in the minds and lives of the previous people. The chief concern of the present time is the disintegration of that united and collective sensibility. The modernization process beginning with Tanzimat cracks the shell of social life and then threatens the historical existence of human being in the center (Işın 36). Even though those changes aim a civilization shift, it fails at the end. The irrelevant transformations in the social life detonate the endurance of civilization and continual progress of time.

The convulsion in the natural flow of society and literature in Eliot's program come into view with a different appearance. Since the time of Shakespeare English mind which is the representation of stability in the continental circulation has been demented. The period of Milton and his linguistic impairing, particularly, are among the chief deviations in English language (UPUC 85). The refractions in the regular roll of time fracture the imperishable durations and sensibility of societies. As maintained by Brooker, the poem The Waste Land denotes the breakdown of the mind of Europe; which signifies, for Eliot, the discord between the persistent progression of continuity and the condition of Europe at the time (66). Eliot borrows the idea of the "mind of Europe" from the nineteenth century; however, his selection has a different purpose. He employs the idea to analyze the cultural crisis of the early phase of the twentieth century. As he considers that chaos period as a split from the continual flow of European paradigm, he tries to weld the fragmented mindsets of European individuals in the same vessel. For the coherent appreciation of the works of contemporaries such as Yeats, Valéry and Joyce, one, for Brooker, should dwell

on the idea of the mind of Europe and Eliot's concept of tradition (55). That conceptualization of the "mind of Europe", exerted by the modernist dialect as an essential metaphor, is a result of the mental collapse of Europe in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Eliot prefers the mind of Europe, a term for the collective consciousness of the whole continent and literatures, to the mind of individuals. Eliot is aware of his contemporaries; Yeats' desire for Great Memory matches the idea of European Mind in Eliot's terminology. It is the literary tradition that makes European mind persistent: "The literary tradition is the medium by which European mind preserves its identity through the millenniums" (Uhlig 202). However, the tales of those contractions in the accumulation of tradition and the mind of Europe, for O'Hara, could be utilized as useful allegories. In spite of the linguistic detriments of Milton and Dryden and their dissociated sensibilities, those monuments could be profited (98). They construct history together by not rejecting or wearing away those unfruitful cracks and splits. Eliot's monuments are not discharging the old way of thinking but putting together all healthy and divergent fragments (Zilcosky, 29). His critical standpoint considers those deviations as the accumulation of tradition within one spot. For Zilcosky and O'Hara the departures from the traditional succession could be regarded as the proliferation of continuity in a different format.

In that regard Eliot and Tanpınar's undertakings to expound the fatal consequences of split between the substantial segments of society are to be placed in the same context. They both consider those breakings as malignant tumors on the continuity of time and social transmission. The breaks and concussions in the intuitive current of social life, literature and historical consciousness generate frantic discrepancies which are hard to restore. The cracks and the dissolutions in the

structure of “collective personality” and the spirit of order are among the primary reasons which endanger the air of continuity in the frame of social praxis.

Nonetheless, Tanpınar’s assumptions of divergence from the roots of society and civilization’s course in one route are exact deviations from the unbreakable envisage of time and continuity. While Tanpınar’s explication is quite detrimental for the furtherance of endurance and sustainability of social life, Eliot’s considerations on the dissociations are deemed to be a part of the continuity into some extent.

Tanpınar and Eliot are linked up to each other in that they both champions the European notions and benefiting from Europe as a source. They envisage Europe as an assistant in passing on the legacy of past experiences and concept of continuity. In the article Asıl Kaynak [The Essential Source] Tanpınar unfolds that Europe is one of the two supplementary sources for Turkish intellectuals. When he compares the characteristics of East and West, he mentions that West is inside the reality by experiencing life personally, which is an account of stability and continuity (YG 27). What makes European nations distinctive is incessant craving for continuity and their quality of approach to embark upon their sources again and again. The desire for seeking continuity for Tanpınar is one of the vital mediums for the commencement of a civilization. In European philosophy and literature as an interminable entirety that continuity and aspiration are immanent (EÜM 493). That idea is congruous with the idea of following the continuity in the literature of Europe postulated by Eliot. However, Europe, for Eliot, is not a secondary source; he considers Europe as the primary path of his criticism. Although he was American origin and grew up there, he preferred to be a European so in his idea of continuity or the continuum of European heritage Europe is in the center. When he depicts the complexion of

Europe he specifies his own self and his primary sources in setting up his philosophy. When he stipulates the permanence and universality of European literature his conviction is that:

The European poet must not only be one who holds a certain position in history: his work must continue to give delight and benefit to successive generations. His influence is not a matter of historical record only; he will continue to be of value to every Age, and every Age will understand him differently and be compelled to assess his work afresh. And he must be as those of his own race and language as to others. (OPP 211)

The poet of the continent in which values, societies and traditions are not separated is a man of the carrier of the enduring legacy of tradition. He is not only a record which is shut; his existence as a persistent organism will contribute to the other ages, alter the perception's of other ages and will be changed by the consciousness of another era. Perpetuity and ubiquitous facet of European poet is universally renewed by the taste of very period, that is to say, it is created as a modern entity by every culture and epoch. That is the incarnation of tradition in the persona of European poet; his personality, his flavor and his experience ripen into the endurance of artistic production. However the delineation of European poet is not confined to that quality. He is a man of his own country, race and local culture in a more positive sense. Here the idea is analogous to the notion of poet's function as a representative of his own nation by Tanpınar. Gürbilek assumes that Tanpınar " . . . favored the idea of an unbroken continuum in cultural history and was occupied with problems of producing an authentic national literature, of creating an original synthesis of native

characteristics and European ideals” (607). Tanpınar’s attempt to synthesize European notions with local culture is equivalent to Eliot’s conceptualization of “poet of Europe”. The literatures of Europe, for Eliot, are interlinked with each other into an extent that to designate a European literature is only conceivable with the survival of each local culture. To imagine a totality in European concept is possible with the duration of nations and their regional cultures. As Atıf brings to light Tanpınar strives to create his individual aesthetics comprised of Ottoman ideals and French symbolists; that is to mean his personal cultivation is attuned to European teachings (19-20). In both artist’s critical agendas European ideals and local inheritances are the identical poles for the composition of tradition and endurance within society. There is not a disparity between the locality of cultures and their universal correspondence in the formation of tradition and its permanence throughout ages.

Poetry and its equivalent, extension process of artistic creation for Eliot and Tanpınar, are in a kind of “order” which operates on poet and time. That deduction indicates the significance of order or “nizam” in Tanpınar’s coinage for the continuity in social life and its subconscious flow. That flow is created by dream-like moments of life which are denser than the routine and requires the bounce from the threshold; that situation could be squared with the creation of an ultimate piece of art (Demiralp 22). The world of poetic creation is rapid and full of coincidence; however that domain of coincidence is within and as a result of an order. The continuity that dominates time and space does not allow that process and poetic fragments to stray from the mainstream cohesion. The vein of continuity in the poetry of Yahya Kemal is deemed to be the reconciliation of gods Apollo and Dionysus by Tanpınar as he

pursues continuity in not only the broader sense of social experience but also of individual life's run. His protagonists in his novels are in the struggle of balancing the "inner order" against their mirror images. When Tanpınar throws light upon the literary history, composes fictional characters and creates poetic metaphors he borrows his figures, examples, phrases and expressions from the idea of a constant order. Balcı sets forth that "water archetype" in Tanpınar's poetry is an allusion of entirety and unity which is an indissoluble torrent (124). The idea of continuity that appears in the format of water and flow is manifest in that metaphor of Tanpınar.

Order in both critics' philosophy entails the evanescence of individual life and personality of poet. This order functions in the life of societies not in the individual experiences; even though the life of poet is a different realm and has a stream of continuity. The idea of community reduces the calamity of individual infirmities thanks to the endurance prevailing in the society:

When the idea of society comes into view the tragedy of fate diminishes because there is no death in community as there is in individual. There is continuity there. The chain stretches into the eternity. Even if it is divided into fragments the subsequent completes the proceeding. Social life overcomes the idea of death for individual as it does for community because in the chain of values it establishes there is a room for death too. (YG 22)²¹

²¹ Cemiyet fikri işe karışınca kader trajedisi azalır. Çünkü cemiyet içinde fertte olduğu gibi ölüm yoktur. Orada süreklilik vardır. Zincir ebedilik boyunca uzanıp gider. Parça parça olsa bile bir sonra ki, kendinden önce geleni tamamlar. Cemiyet hayatı, topluluk için olduğu gibi fert için de ölüm düşüncesini yener. Çünkü kurduğu değerler zincirinde ölmenin de bir yeri vardır.

The lives of individuals within the social pattern do not represent the idea of continuity; on the contrary individual is someone who gains his existence via social life. In order to participate in the chain of continuity human being as an individual is to participate in the life of society. Even the death of people is not a break in the chain but it is one of the actual components of continuity. Because death is an element in the endurance of society, the individual crowns its existence by his/her death, in other words the permanence of society. The continuity of order in Tanpınar's vocabulary has an established standing as it does in Eliot's. Eliot maintains that the whole human order is more momentous than the perspicacity of individuals (Buckley 94). As Eliot always voices, for the reification of "collective subjectivity", the order is to persist, that is to say, individual's own sensibility fades away into the aggregate insight of human order. According to Buckley the whole of Eliot's work is the investigation of the issue of order and continuity. The whole body of texts which comes down throughout the Western Literary Tradition constructs a transparent and definable order. This order influences the present works of Western literatures by operating on their continual process. "Traditional literary order" prevails in the literatures of Western societies which tend to make up a totality. This totality which arises from Homer and comes to Eliot is the embodiment of human order within the European mind. The mind of Europe is a conceptualization that covers the whole history and tradition of Europe, which is impervious in its surge and domination. İşın diverges from Tanpınar's idea in that Tanpınar employs an abstract and passive existential symbolism when he claims that individual is the spoiled form of harmony and that symbol is deprived of totality and continuity. To stand on a healthy ground individual should head towards the historical existence of

society which has totality and continuity (23). Işın deplors the idea of individual's vanishing from the scene of existence by leaving its place to society's continual collectivity. Tanpınar criticizes the twentieth century for it is individualistic in its cogitation of ideas and sensations of human subjectivity unlike in the previous centuries. Seeing that art is social and represents order, that century is not capable of circulating the chain of continuity. Society, order and continuity are envisaged in the same path in Tanpınar's criticism. Order is implemented via social prospect of literary exertions and partaking in the continuity of social concerns (YG 318). Eliot, when he talks about Virgil and his place in the classical antiquity, underlines the significance of order. Virgil is a man of order and dignity, which makes him endure throughout the ages. Eliot alludes that order is one of the momentous aspects of domination. Order with its repeated trajectory entails continuity in the stream of social life and time (OPP 131). In both Eliot and Tanpınar's literary and social criticisms the trifling stature of individual against society, the rehabilitation of individual soul by releasing it from the impediments of being individual and endurance of a detachable order and continuity are underscored.

The idea of continuity in both critics' insights upon poetry's meaning parallels the ideas in Chapter II in which their poetics is discussed to a great extent. As discussed in that chapter, they talk about the air of poem which mingles with the unconnected pieces of language to create a new piece of art. The hibernating words slumbering as meaningless symbols rouse in the form of sheer artistic productions, that is, poetry. That idea which is also acquired from the philosophy of Bergson is a reflection of the idea of order and continuity in both critics' agendas. The air of poem is conveyed from the spiritual condition to the language by the "order of art" for

Tanpınar (EÜM 20). The air which tends to exist in the incessant gush of time is the depiction of continual process in the process of artistic production. Poet's attempt to create a sheer piece of art is a contribution to the continual progression of time and society within the scope of the present and presence of past. Eliot articulates that Hardy and Chaucer are contemporaneous to each other in that European Literature follows a pattern from Homer to the other centuries to constitute biological cells in a whole unbreakable body. The "simultaneous order" of Eliot which regulates the biological metaphor of Europe as a total entity and literature makes Hardy and Chaucer contemporary. Ellis dwells on that an orderly tradition, for Eliot, is possible through the critical spirit and art. (301). However, his "simultaneous order" hinges on the esthetic values of a literary production not only on the historicity of critical appreciations (Reeves 114). The order is rendered through the gradual receding of poet and his involvement in the continual cascade of life. The united sensibility of individual poet transmutes into both change and endurance of tradition, in other words, continuity of individual esthetics in collective subjectivity. For Tanpınar again the ultimate function of literary works and criticism is to make out the chain of continuity and the fractures in that chain (EÜM 74). Both Eliot and Tanpınar accentuate that the focus in the evaluation of an artistic production is not on the poet but poetry. Poet, in Eliot's critical program, participates in the continual flow of time by driving his work forward; that corresponds to the evanescence of poet from his own work, in Eliot's coinage, the extinction of personality and continual self-sacrifice (SW 44). Individual could evade finite aspect of life by appending himself to the social life and becomes a part of continuity as stated by Tanpınar. Poet's individual entity transforms into the unremitting course of continuity in a chain.

Individual lives of people are paltry when compared to the colossal actuality of society and life. Poet needs the idea of continuity even though it is an illusion. Including the illusionary aspect of it past is a sort of inevitability that should not be come off. If past is overlooked by the artist it will hurt as a strange object as it never gives up its course so it is something that artist should participate in. Aydın advances that Tanpınar acquires past as a certainty that poet could not withstand; therefore, poet's purpose is not to diverge from the stream of time but to involve in the recurrent plane of continuity. He posits that Tanpınar's disposition of continuity is a compulsion for the artist (249).

The definition of genius is hidden in the accumulation and gathering according to Tanpınar. The aftermath of what generations amass together create genius and sage. That master is the victory of all ages that prepare him gradually to crown the accumulation of all conditions (YG 326). Tradition is what makes that genius available for the good of other generations. Without the accumulation of endeavors of antecedent preparations tradition and its intrinsic output genius would not exist. As discussed above Zilcosky assumes that Eliot's view of tradition is an endless accumulation rather than being deterioration unlike Nietzschean philosophy (Zilcosky 29). Eliot's perspective of tradition is in compliance with Tanpınar's; tradition creates the change and transformation by the means of build-up in social manners and literary perceptions. Nothing is discharged in Eliot's concept of tradition, albeit detrimental. New masters stand upon the shoulders of the preceding pile of social habits, artistic practices and literary tendencies. The accumulation of cultural elements in the collective consciousness of societies makes up civilization in Tanpınar's philosophy. The cultural accumulation of civilization set up in the scale

of an empire echoes the world of objects that build up the human subjectivity (Işın 7). The parallel between collective consciousness and personal heresy is purveyed by the continuity that controls the civilization utterly. Tradition is a compilation of personal experiences, which will result with the establishment of civilization in all. Continuity is the binding factor that operates on tradition, past, the present, society, individual, order, civilization, culture and time.

Tanpınar professes that “History, artistic works and traditions are all society’s consciousness of continuity” (YG 22). The idea of continuity is the brain of organism that runs in the body of social network. The sub-consciousness of societies is framed by the augmentation of social and cultural elements in the form of tradition. The only thing that builds up tradition and records the collective memory of social bodies is the concept of continuity. It enables society to weld different segments of communal connexion together. People from different occupational, ethnic, religious and cultural background are cemented together with the assistance of continuity in the natural cascade of social life. The divergence in the actual steam of tradition culminates in the break-up of continual chain. That collapse finishes with the loss of collective memory and disenchantment of the nation. Eliot’s account in that regard accords with what Tanpınar alleges. For him tradition is an issue of continuity which is a combination of social and cultural exertions in life (Buckley 97). Continuity is directly aligned with cultural and social exercises of people. As the notion of tradition in Eliot’s vocabulary is historical, the cultural activities of social entities establish the continual current which gathers all the identical traits in the accumulation of tradition. History is perceived through the idea of continuity by Eliot. The continual self-sacrifice of artist, a concept Eliot employs to explicate the

perpetual object of poet, emanates from the undertaking to join the natural course of tradition. The purpose of intellectual is to reunite the split parts in the national mind: otherwise the regulations and disintegrations will deaden the existence of national memory.

“The most significant secret of social life is the continuity in the national consciousness” (EÜM 94) affirms Tanpınar. Both critics champion the invigorating aspect of continuity in social life. To ensure the endurance of a national mind tradition operates on past and the present, what is more, it accumulates with the help of time to set up a collective memory of the nation. Continuity is the quintessence of society in which culture, religion, literature and any other social habits are intermingled. If the fundamental nature of society is altered the continuity will stop its organic betterment and deviate from its intuitive characteristics. That will spoil the totality of national self and collective consciousness. Both Tanpınar and Eliot suppose that there have been such inconsistencies in the historical surge of their own nations. However the uniformity of society which is constituted by the accumulation of social exercises lingers on in the endurance of time over the deviations. Continuity is among the key concepts of both Eliot and Tanpınar’s critical agendas. They employ the metaphor in a similar context; their presuppositions on the instinctive course of artistic production coincide with each other’s outlook into some extent. “The mind of Europe” and “Turkish spirit” are two noteworthy hypotheses that reveal the significance of continuity in the criticism of both Eliot and Tanpınar. They assume that continual process of life and society is what constitutes tradition and sustainability of nations. The overall perception of life is not the lives of separate

people and individual progressions but the permanence of tradition and continuity of time.

CHAPTER V:

Bergson's Influence on Tanpınar and Eliot

In order to pinpoint the affinity between Eliot and Tanpınar, the philosophies and philosophers they have been influenced could be spotlighted. In that respect, this chapter aims to look for the close relations between the philosophies of Eliot and Tanpınar by focusing on the nineteenth century French philosopher Henri Bergson whose philosophy on time and *durée* has deeply affected the early twentieth century thought. Bergson has an apparent influence on both of them which has been studied in different articles and books. The present study aims to contend with those studies, so that the exact relation between Eliot and Tanpınar would be elucidated. Even though both Eliot and Tanpınar bear little comparison to each other and would not be settled into the same category, the influence of Bergson on both of them is unconcealed. First of all, the philosophy of Bergson will be studied in order to comprehend his domination on both Eliot and Tanpınar.

Bergson, as a twentieth century philosopher, changed the perceptions of his epoch in philosophy which was then under the influence of science and the other philosophies like evolutionist theories and scientific rationalizations.²² For some “he gave a new turn to modern thought” (Douglass 10). With his philosophy, modern thought has changed into a new direction which was dissimilar from its previous path. He repudiated the materialistic interpretations of time and space. His elaborations on the discrepancies between daily time and inner time, which he entitles *durée*,

²² For further reading on Henry Bergson and his philosophy, see: Gilles Deleuze, Bergsonism. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, (Brooklyn: Zone Books, 1990).; Suzanne Guerlac, Thinking in Time: An Introduction to Henri Bergson. (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2006).; and The Crisis in Modernism: Bergson and the Vitalist Controversy. Ed. Frederick Burwick and Paul Douglass, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

changed the interpretations of the related concepts. His philosophy mainly depends upon the criticism of “time” (Tunç 19). His conception of time has constructed the gist of his philosophy. As Douglass adduces “Bergson began his career in reaction against ‘scientific time,’ and embarked on a path involving, the ‘phenomenological mode of adhesion to immediate experience’” (Douglass 8). Scientific time that is regulated according to measurements and regulated as scientific slices does not stand for *durée*, real time; and it does not endure. He alleged that the real structure of time can be ascertained by *durée* and enduring the life of substances in that *durée*. He designates time as a “living and moving eternity” (Le Brun 153). Time and life are important figurations in his philosophy as they complete each other and cannot be separated. After indicating the philosophy of life and time, two important concepts of his coinage “*élan vital*”²³ and “*durée réelle*”, Tanpınar’s insistence on life and its continuum from one generation to the other without interruption and time’s vital role in implementing that cohesion among the whole units of society and generations and Eliot’s emphasis on tradition’s imperative function in merging the miscellaneous aspects and epochs of Europe as a single entity will be quite obvious.

Bergson’s reasoning for the most part depends upon a philosophy of time, or rather duration. Authentic *durée*, for Bergson, constitutes the essence of consciousness and life (Topçu 47). *Durée* is the real time when it is compared to the laboratory assumptions of time such as hour, minute and second. In this occurrence of duration things and time formulate one indissoluble organism that encloses society

²³ *Élan vital* was translated into English as vital impetus or vital force. Bergson uses the term for the evolution and progression of organic structures.

and time in which society endures. Bergson uses the illustration of melody or musical notes when he likens scientific time to duration. Musical notes:

. . . differ from something like a person, which again is something which endures and changes through time. A person whose life was exactly the same from the moment to moment, who never developed or changed in any way, would hardly be a person at all. But a person is what he is at a given moment all the same. If I meet Smith at noon I meet the whole of Smith, or Smith as a whole . . . A melody is essentially a unity, which owes its whole nature to change. It has to last its whole length to be the melody it is, while a person can be cut off in his prime without ceasing to be, or to have been, that person, even if he did not reach his full potential. (Lacey 27-9)

While a melody becomes a sheer piece of art it ensures this by completing itself as a whole; however, if one listens to it in a fragment of time, that sound will not make up a complete work of art. The duration and its perception by human being are quite disparate. A person crowns his/her own self with his whole being in past, the present. “At any given moment” Smith is Smith with all his own self unlike musical notes which cannot fashion a whole body from unrelated sounds. This projection of time in a sense resolves the manners, behaviors and experiences into a uniform entity, that is, human kind. Unlike musical notes that are contingent on the unity of different components to form a totality, human kind his/her essence will be experienced as a whole even in an interrupted time. That wholeness is ensured by *durée* which comprises of time, space and human individual. Bergson states that *durée* is the rudiment of individual existence. “Duration is” he portrays “the continuous progress

of the past which gnaws into the future and which swells as it advances. And as the past grows without ceasing, so also there is no limit to its preservation” (Bergson, Creative Evolution 7). The role of the past over the present is incontrovertible as it flourishes without refraining. Eliot’s and Tanpınar’s emphasis on the robust relation between past and present and the conspicuous effect of the former on the latter is palpable.

In that flow of time and continuum of human experience, evolution plays an important role. For Bergson sees life as an evolution, there is a continuous creation which becomes manifest in an evolutionary form in it (Bergson, Creative Evolution 328). To liberate itself from physical restrictions “consciousness” operates on “inert matter”; which is designated by Bergson as evolution. He “equates consciousness with freedom and matter with necessity” (Habib 266). Therefore, evolution is considered to be the emancipation of “inner human” from the limitations of necessity which encases the life around the human being in the dormant matter; that is procured by extensive authority of duration. In that respect consciousness correlates with duration; that is to say, duration’s dominion on human life enables consciousness to operate on the physical body, inert matter. The freedom is spawned by not “impulsiveness” but amalgamation of emotions, thoughts and evolution. In here, the concepts evolution, duration and freedom seem to overlap; even though the distinction between them does not appear precise, Bergson propounds a plausible interpretation of evolution and duration by explaining the affinity between consciousness, matter and freedom. As Douglass puts forward and quotes from Bergson:

Intuition enables growth, and growth evolution. Intuition cannot do without analysis, nor *vice versa*. Troubled by its own evolutionary heritage, Bergson's intuition still attempts to affirm it. . . . "The home of matter is space. The home of life is time" (CE 16). But we live in both. The reality Bergson presents us in Creative Evolution is thus a coherence in confusion, a disorder in evolution, a reality making itself in reality unmaking itself (CE 251). (22)

Time and space are two components that are indispensable for life, since human beings live in both of them reciprocally. In an evolutionary process, which corresponds to life, people experience order and disorder, confusion and coherence, and making and unmaking while duration operates within that contradictory system. In clarifying those notions Bergson proposes a new concept, intuition. It is regarded essential for evolutionary growth; and it needs to be analyzed for a dynamic progress.

Pure intuition, external and internal, is that of an undivided continuity. We break up this continuity into elements laid side by side, which corresponds in the one case to distinct *words*, in the other to independent *objects*. But, just because we have thus broken the unity of our original intuition, we feel ourselves obliged to establish between the severed terms a bond which can only then be external and superadded. (Bergson, Matter and Memory 183)

Intuition, in that regard, parallels duration as it presumes a thorough continuity. The scatter of that continuity culminates in words and objects, which can only be recovered by outward features. The elements that command the natural course of life's continuity, as Bergson puts forward, are severed by the external factors, such as

words and objects. Intuition innervates the steadfast bond between material and spiritual world. It revokes the discrepancy between bodily things and spiritual entity. It is the sympathetic mingling with things that bring about intuition, the knowledge of concrete reality. What is more, Bergson considers intuition as the knowledge of utter reality. The philosophy of intuition which constitutes the kernel of life's consistency is construed as the "negation of science" which only signifies the material facet of human progress (Bergson, Creative Evolution 293).

Life has an intrinsic flow of growth and evolution which is "graspable only intuitively." Poetry grasps, imitates and epitomizes "this living process." Poetry, which is a representative of language and literature, is one of the tools that ameliorate the experience of human being, although intellect originates impediments to it. Since intuition provides a wholesome kinship between material and spiritual world and facilitates the perception and persistence of continuity, poetry is one of the most important champions of that progression. It builds up the sympathetic relevance between soul and life which will perform itself in *durée*. In other words, it begets poetry and modifies "signals" into the "instruments of art words". Bergson aims to manifest that feelings and emotions are kinds of products of linguistic categories; which means the effect of language on our sensations is greater than it is assumed. Language is one of the most substantial determinants in life's continuity and its actual process for Bergson. Another aspect he attributes to literature is that art embraces the spiritual life and avails it in "liberating from the nightmare of materialism". Additionally, language carries on the progress of order though unconsciously (Douglass 67). Language's position against art is quite striking in Bergson's philosophy:

. . . the most basic premise of Bergson's aesthetics is that art creates novelty. Whereas language is spatial, art is temporal, expressing duration, expressing the authentic flow of experience which is encrusted over by language. The poet's business, then, is to rebel against the generality and conventionality of language. (Habib 271)

Word is lethargic in its essence; which "reduces novelty to commonplace forms".

While language consists of inert signals, art releases life force to those inanimate objects; as discussed above, duration implements the same task in the world of "inert matter." Here again, art which is a living organism coincides with duration, life and evolution. At that point, it is time to arise the issue of modernist inclinations of the early twentieth century. What is the correlation between Bergson's evolutionary theory and modernist writing? How does *durée* correspond to the rendering of human subjectivity or nihilist conducts in Modernism? Douglass stipulates that in Bergson's philosophy: "artist performs the task of taking the coin of everyday speech handed down by evolution and 'making it new.' Once he has intuited duration and felt the necessities of action drop away, the artist becomes infused with the desire to create" (Douglass 35). It can be surmised from this elucidation that the manner 'making it new' in which modernist tendency substantiate itself is tantamount to Bergson's keynote subject, life's continuity and duration. Artist is supposed to have the desire to create, in other words, making the lethargic word and inert object new and dynamic. He recreates a vigorous piece of art from the dull material with the help of intuition and duration.

With respect to what has been argued above, how Bergson's philosophy holds sway over Eliot's and Tanpınar's critical agendas will be elaborated from now on.

They both have acquaintance with the philosophy of Bergson, which is quite patent from their critical works, textual references and, additionally, direct and indirect allusions in their writings. In spite of the fact that both critics' literary products do not bear comparison with each other a lot, their work could be juxtaposed in terms of the domination of Bergson's conception of *durée*, intuition and evolution. Life and its dynamic equivalent art, or poetry, are in an organic articulation in the continuity and accumulation of time in Bergson's philosophy as it is in both critic's reasoning.

Bergsonian influence on Eliot is not recondite and abstruse. It has been discussed by several authors some of whom are quoted in the present study, such as Douglass, Habib and Le Brun. Eliot is quite familiar with what Bergson attempts to assert in his composition of time and space. One can smoothly ascertain the vestiges of *durée* and other philosophical narratives of Bergson on his criticism, though Eliot sometimes deplores his assumptions. His poetic mentality has been primarily molded by Bergson's ideas. Le Brun maintains that T. S. Eliot:

. . . was greatly influenced by Bergson, in particular by Bergson's accounts of time, change, and the individual consciousness; influenced to such a degree in fact that, had he not known Bergson's philosophical writings, Eliot's major formulations about poetry—about tradition, the associated sensibility of the artist, and the work of art as objective correlative—would have been quite different from what they are. (149)

He wrote a manuscript, dated 1911, on Bergson while he was at Harvard, in which he appraised the scope of Bergson's philosophy.²⁴ He does not agree to all the suppositions of Bergson while he evaluates his philosophy. His forceful reaction cannot be corresponded with the pronounced influence of the philosopher on his poetry. The answer for Eliot's vehement retort is that when he wrote the manuscript, "his aversion was philosophical and political" (Habib 258). Eliot finds the notion of *durée* Romantic as duration puts emphasis on human personality as the only source for the reality. He denounces Bergson of confusing genres of philosophy and literature and of engendering emotional impetus rather than "clear thinking."

Quite contrary to his cogent defiance of some of Bergson's assumptions, Eliot has inherited too much from the theory of evolution and accounts of time of Bergson. That legacy is quite unmistakable in Eliot's poetics and critical elaborations. The idea of change is one of the defining hallmarks of life and its rudimentary experience. When the change is evinced in the life-form, it is not random in the nature; even though it may appear so. The change is a kind of evolvment to something truly new for both Eliot and Bergson, which is one of the cardinal assertions of modernist literature. The impression of change in Eliot's criticism complies with the notion of evolution and duration in Bergsonian terminology. Continuity and growth are among the basic elements of life and duration. In an evolutionary surge of life, duration acts its course in the natural flow of time.

The fact is that Eliot's concept of permanence is essentially *organic*; that is, it is in terms of continuity within time and change and not in

²⁴ "Draft of a Paper on Bergson," Ms. 1910-11, Eliot Collection, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

terms of something outside time. That such a theory of continuity is a part of Bergson's account of the nature of time Eliot was well aware. . . . Bergson argues that in the evolution of life each form that arises 'flows out of previous forms, while adding to them something new, and is explained by them as much as it explains them'. That the past, containing the seeds of the present, helps to make the present comprehensible is a fairly commonplace idea. (Le Brun 154)

Eliot's perseverance on the continuity of Europe in an undeviating glide is the corroboration of Bergson's ascendancy. That leverage of Bergson's philosophy in terms of continuity, change and even intuition is overt in the writing of Eliot. As Bergson postulates "the piling up of the past upon the past goes on without relaxation Our past remains present to us." (Bergson, Creative Evolution 7), Eliot's outlook on tradition and the concept of past which operates on present, "the presence of the past," are the reflections of Bergson's theory of evolution and continuity of life in duration. Even though Douglass deems Eliot's concept of tradition as the renunciation of Bergson's doctrine of time (Douglass 49), it is quite contrary to what Douglass supposes; tradition, in Eliot's terminology equates with the presence of the past as he spells out in one of the most quoted essays of Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent." That idea of past's dominance over the present in Eliot is a pertinent utterance to what Bergson intimates by "our past remains present to us." However, the fact that Eliot opposes to Bergson's accounts of time is equitable; he disproves the precedence of time over space and opts for the Bradleyan vein as a disciple of him (Habib 258).

Eliot employs time as an aggregating inventiveness as its actuality is not negated in the natural flow of life. The equilibrium in the harmonious drift of past is never disordered by the individual's freedom (Hamilton 402): on the contrary, past nourishes the creation of new works of art. The newly created art with its convenience modulates the existing structure towards the continuity of the order:

. . . what happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. The existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the *whole* existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted; and this is conformity between the old and the new. (SW 41)

Tradition is a kind of lake which is constituted by the accumulation of the past experiences. The works of the former poets and the flow of the new ones will amalgamate in a new order. That is the authority of *durée* on life and the generator of life's continuity in an order. Tradition is the marrow of the subject in Eliot's coinage. In regard to Bergson's philosophy, Eliot's one of the most portentous conceptions is tradition. In creating artistic works, the accumulation of the works of the previous ages promotes the new ones and gives rise to another amassing for the next generations. For Eliot "the difference between the present and the past is that the conscious present is an awareness of the past" (SW 41). The awareness that the artist

has is what elapses by means of the past. In Bergsonian terms it is the “survival of past” (Bergson, Creative Evolution 7). Eliot supposes that there is an authentic creative activity in poetry, which cannot be explained. As Bergson conjectures, the dormant words are enlivened by making them new in the process of poetic creation. In that artistic process past and the present mold an organic continuity. The organism that comprises of the accumulation of the past experiences and life’s continuity throughout duration is procured by the livelihood of poetry against the inability of lifeless words. Meaning is framed by the communication between the voices of the present and past (Habib 272-4). A living language for both Eliot and Bergson is in an invariable process of change, which functions through time and *durée* in Bergsonian terminology. That analogy between Eliot’s idea of change and living language and Bergson’s notion of continuity and change is considered to be the precise translation of Bergson from French to English in Eliot’s critical program by Le Brun (153). For Eliot language is insufficient in delivering the “uniqueness of experience”; therefore, poetry undertakes the streamlining of language (Habib 275). Language’s deficiency in conveying the life’s change and vividness is both from Bergson’s terminology; what is more, that hallmark is the typical modernist reaction against the inaction of words as lifeless symbols of language. Both Bergson’s philosophy and Eliot’s critical agenda are concordant with modernist attitudes in literature in that respect. As modernist writing violates the conventional syntax and consistency of narrative language (Abrams 167), Eliot accentuates the language’s affliction in reflecting the human being’s subjective perception against the modern situation. Dettmar puts forward that the quintessence of Modernism, for Eliot, lies the idea “make it new”; therefore the perennial task of poetry could be pursued in making every abeyant

word new (“Introduction”). The conception of “perpetual task of poetry” parallels Bergson’s narrative of endurance and continuity in life. Modernist disposition, Eliot’s critical sentiment and Bergson’s evolutionary hypothesis are quite in harmony.

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, in the emergence of Turkish Republic from the ashes of Ottoman Empire when the crisis of “to be or not to be” was in the culmination, produced some of his writing and witnessed the genesis of a new nation that had lost most of its pre-war territory and been detained in relatively diminutive land. Thus, his criticism would not be independent from what he had experienced, as Eliot’s poetry is abound with images of the First World War and the distorted human subjectivity forged by the war.²⁵ With regard to this, in elucidating Bergson’s impression on Tanpınar’s critical program, it is easy to behold the social weight. Bergson’s philosophy of “élan vital” had inspired the desperate intellectuals of the late Ottoman and early Republic. What is ascribed to the Turkish Independence War is an utter gauge of how Bergson is apprehended by the Turkish intelligentsia. They had tried to reconcile Bergsonism and Islamic mysticism; Mustafa Şekip Tunç, for instance, rates religious belief as the nucleus of civilization and progress, and Rıza Tevfik equates Bergsonism with Turkish Sufism (Demiralp 93). The motive that embarks on the war is deliberated as the actualization of Bergson’s philosophy “élan vital” and creative tension and evolution (Kahraman 17). Translated as “vital principle” or “vital force” to English, “élan vital” acts for “a general order of nature” which is “repairing faults, correcting effects of neglect or absentmindedness, putting things back in place . . . ” (Bergson, Creative Evolution 246-7). The dominating

²⁵ Notwithstanding Eliot’s criticism is not social, for the accent of the traumatic and fragmented mind of modern man, consider the broken images of human perception in The Waste Land; and the characters that cannot hold in Eliot’s poetry like “Hollow Man”, “Gerontion”, “Apeneck Sweeney” and “The Love Song of J. A. Prufrock”.

instinct of living things in struggle for the survival stems from the vital force which is commanding impetus against brute matter. Uğurcan quotes from Hilmi Ziya Ülken that the young generation who gathered around that theme estimated that Turkish Independence War was the triumph of quality and creative force (Uğurcan 127). Since evolution entails an artistic creation, for Bergson, the travail of Turkish people and intelligentsia at that time was perceived as the embodiment of a necessity for evolution in Bergsonian terminology.

Tanpınar unswervingly points out that Bergson's philosophy of time is quite instrumental on his poetry and aesthetics in the letter to a high school girl, in which he summarizes the main divisions of his critical and artistic insights: "In my poetry and aesthetics the Bergson's account of time plays a crucial role" (Kerman 277).²⁶ That influence is again the extension of the struggle discussed above. He assumes Anatolia, the only land left to Turks after the war, was fighting a battle of vitality against statistics (YK 27).

Bergson's conclusive effect on Tanpınar's criticism is not made up of the idealistic desires of a preacher grappling with the survival of his people and does not embody the vital fluctuations of a nation. Conversely, Tanpınar holds significant opinions about the philosophy of Bergson; his concern is mostly aesthetic and critical rather than idealistic and moralistic. Bergsonian concept of time has an indispensable station in his poetry and artistic insights. As conferred above, Eliot's and Bergson's perception of time overlap; additionally, Tanpınar's explication of time concept accords with Bergson's portrayal of *durée*. "The universe endures. The more we study the nature of time, the more we shall comprehend that duration means

²⁶ Şiir ve san'at anlayışında Bergson'un zaman telakkisinin mühim bir yeri vardır.

invention, the creation of forms, the continual elaboration of the absolutely new” Bergson propounds in Creative Evolution (14). In parallel with what Bergson supposes Tanpınar perceives time in continuity which is the keystone of his critical agenda. He presumes that to change by continuing and to continue by changing is the fundamental imperative of creating something new. The actual breakdown would only create half creatures not a whole (YK 24). Time for Tanpınar, as for Eliot and Bergson, is a totality, which illuminates all transformations as a continuum in that totality. It cannot be disintegrated, Kütükçü and Kızılarda postulate, that even though there seems to be some scatterings and fluctuations which are unattached to the tangible stream in the intuitive cascade of life, those could only be the outcomes of artificial courses and cannot be related to the entirety of time (74).

Tanpınar is in the “disposition of becoming” in all stages of life according to Kahraman. He contends that Tanpınar is in need of perceiving and defining everything in continuity or becoming. That is the consequence of Tanpınar’s quest for continuity in the intersection of his cultural/traditional and social/individual conceptualizations (33). In Tanpınar’s terminology time operates on both past and present. Its course is not dependent from the social condition and individual experience. Time changes both man and stream of life by functioning on it. That concept of time in Tanpınar’s coinage associates with Bergson’s *durée* in which past and present blend in the same pot to structure a new form; it is in Bergsonian and Eliot’s vocabulary, in Tanpınar’s as well, “continuity.” Representation of past in the present and their amalgamation in the same stand are expounded in Tanpınar’s critical program. In one of the most quoted verses by Tanpınar, which is considered

to be the summary of his viewpoint, the merge of past and present in a continuous flow as a whole is quite pronounced:

I am neither inside nor totally outside of time;

In the unbreakable stream of whole, a huge present (Tanpınar, Şiirler 19)

Similarly, Bergson's account of time conforms to the expression "unbreakable stream of present". Bergson, too, gathers that "this is to replace ourselves in pure duration, of which the flow is continuous and in which we pass insensibly from one state to another: a continuity which is really lived . . ." (Bergson, Matter and Memory 186) and "Our past remains present to us" (Bergson, Creative Evolution 7). His clarification of past and the present is not dissimilar to what Tanpınar and Eliot concludes from the same concepts. For Bergson "we trail behind us unawares the whole of our past" (Bergson, Creative Evolution 184); human kind completes his own self by picking up recollections from the memories of past and pouring them to the present situation. Without the present it is not probable to identify the past and survive so past is not an enclosed paradigm for Bergson. Likewise, Tanpınar believes that past can only be discerned within the present; that is to say, he hunts for the present in order to recreate past. Continuity is the only inkling that would be constructive in ministering to that model. Only in that, the presence of past could be certified. The "life of individuals" does not denote the continuity within past and the present; but it is the "continuity of time" through life for Tanpınar (Demiralp 15). The durable stream of time cannot be purveyed by only one life, whereas the endurance is an outcome of time as a whole. He envisages neither past nor the West

as the paramount legacy of the newly found republic's intellectuals but the "ball of wool-like life" (YG 43).

One of the few critics who liken Eliot to Tanpınar, Yavuz maintains that Tanpınar endeavors to conciliate *durée* and the outer time, in Bergsonian jargon scientific time, in the poem "Bursa'da Zaman" [Time in Bursa] as Eliot does in "Portrait of a Lady" and "Preludes" ("Tanpınar ve Bergson (2)"). The addresser in the poem strolls to the yard of the mosque and sees the fountain and remembers the previous night, which epitomizes the outer time; however, he, subconsciously, looks back on past and starts facing *durée*. The mind of the persona strays into the forest of past. The exodus from the boundaries of physical time is viable by advancement towards past. As Birlik adduces:

Tanpınar reflects two different experiences of reality: the one which is based on clock time and the other which is based on the intuitive time of extra-spatial realm. He is not concerned with progression in time but with going back and forth into another dimension of intensifying freeing himself from the ordinary reality and its time. (175)

Tanpınar's premises of time and its continuity concur with the delineation of Bergson's tenets related to the endurance of time within a certain flow. That depiction of time is disclosed in Bergsonian philosophy as the "nature of time"; "duration signifies invention, the creation of forms, the continual elaboration of the absolutely new," what is more, "it is immanent to the whole of universe" (Bergson, Creative Evolution 14). Time is not something in which days follow each other ordinarily in Tanpınar's criticism; the "insect of time" follows a distinctive pattern in every phase of life. Time in Tanpınar's sense is manifold, perplexing and "a whole

and huge present”. He always views past and Westernization process in Turkey from the perspective of “time” concept which he inherits from Bergson at all (Aydın 259). While intuition in Bergsonian perspective is the liberator of language from dormant words by delivering artistic gist and leading them towards a poetic sensibility, criticism for Tanpınar is much more a product of rationality. Tanpınar is all for the idea of Bergson in which life is graspable only intuitively, but in the same breath he diverges from Bergsonian account of time in devising his critical attitude. Aesthetic composition is created by the intellect not by intuition as he includes that even dreams can be written by a wide awake artist.

Tanpınar’s aesthetics is an evolutionary and vigorous one; therefore, the meaning attributed to the function of words and the act of poetry/literature by him are in the same direction. As discussed above, Bergson, Eliot as well, concedes words as static and automatic signals that do not have the capacity to accomplish a meaning. Tanpınar, in parallel with that view, complains about his inadequacy to command words and failure in expressing the intuitive grasp of reality (Birlık 182). He always grumbles about that there are still too many words that he has not used. The automatic outlook of words is transformed by the competence of poetry into thorough piece of art. Words alone conceal the reality between human perception and inert matter for Bergson. They are utilitarian rather than being noble so they are façades of reality. The words of practical world do not substitute for the words in poetry, which are conducted to the absolute and unbreakable significance from their conventional messages for Tanpınar. Poetry and novel could not be same after the time concept of Bergson and the insights of Freud’s interpretation of dreams and could not use the same language as before. In the age of atom, the arrow of love

means nothing (YG 296). That the traditional mediums of narrative would not be adequate is the central presumption of modernist writing. The interpretations of Tanpınar's work center on modernity and modern Turkish literature; that emphasis is also the access to his criticism that is comprehensibly under the potency of Bergson.

In regard to what is discussed above, one can conclude that Bergson's hold on both critics is quite discernable. Kahraman as a critic who juxtaposes both Tanpınar and Eliot, goes a step further and intimates that the modern inclinations of Tanpınar's criticism and analysis of his criticism could be comprehended by focusing on the influence of Bergson on both Tanpınar and Eliot (40). Bergson whose authority manages its course on modern thought has been an influential figure in Tanpınar's and Eliot's criticism and aesthetics. The present chapter highlights some of the characteristics of their criticism in terms of Bergsonian philosophy. The sway of Bergson's notion of time on the poetry of both critics who are outstanding poets in the first place is another subject matter to be studied, which is out of the scope of such a study as this.

CONCLUSION

Tanpınar and Eliot are like two distinct rivers which diverge from different springs and then converge into the same headwater and vice versa. Their philosophy and criticism subconsciously overlap with each other in various projections. That latent intersection between the two critics who are both practitioners has been edified in this comparative study. The sources they issue forth and then flow into are European critics, philosophers and poets of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century, and their own sources. The European intellectuals they were influenced are diverse in number. However, Bergson is among the philosophers who hold sway over both critics. That influence is noteworthy as Bergson's account of time impresses the criticism of both figures in a substantial way. Even though the Bergson's authority is not very conspicuous in the textual basis, the codes of their critical attitude indicates that he is a dominant philosopher on both of them; and that origin which both critics utilize is a momentous step in exploring the bearing between them so the weight of Bergson has been probed exhaustively.

Both critics as they have experienced the same period of time, the first half of the twentieth century, are products of modern ages. Their criticism is contingent on the condition emerged after the amplification of modern thought as well. Therefore the critical bent between East and West, American and European, modern and traditional, and new and classic exhibits the hues and indecisions of early twentieth century literature and philosophy. Their vacillation between tradition and modern thought is an intimation of their critical makeup. Both Tanpınar and Eliot are portrayed as having conflicting characteristics as they do not display a consistent political, religious, ideological and even literary personality. Brooker adduces that:

Eliot is often seen by literary historians as personifying a series of conventional oppositions. He is described for example. as a romantic and a classicist, an elitist and a radical democrat, a reactionary and one of the avant-garde, an American, a European, a Catholic and a Protestant, a sceptic and a believer, an intellectual and an anti-intellectual and so forth. (70)

That is exactly what Eliot is by surmising from his critical writings. His character cannot be confined to any kind of identity; he is all of them and none of them. The same kind of dissension is pertinent to Tanpınar's demeanor and how he renovates his critical disposition. On the report of what Ayvazoğlu supposes, he experiences both kinds of confusions and collisions in his characters when he strings the components of his own nation, culture and civilization together; on the one hand he glorifies Turkish culture and discusses its own renaissance, but on the other hand he accuses Turks as not knowing the civilization (221). When looked at from only one angle their frame of mind could not be fixed to a certain belief system, ideological category and even literary theoretical group. That is mostly related to their standpoint as both poets and critics who experience the appreciation of poetic process as critics and postulate a theory of poetry as poets.

Tanpınar contends that whatever page of a modern work you open it is inevitable that the modern writer talks on history (YG 321). Even though he is not a Modernist in essence he sometimes personates a Modernist figure in Turkish literature. Even though his poetry and novels do not convey the Modernist patterns in their construction, his estimable portrayal of modern subject's predicaments and conflicts incited by the uneasiness of individual who endeavors to adjust his

fragmented mind to the traumatic aspect of modern situation make his narration Modernist. Although he speaks as a representative of his society, his representation of fidgety personalities and the accounts of modern man's plights against the repressive hurdles of man's vulnerability could be considered a Modernist aptitude. Eliot whose works are deemed to be the typical example of Modernism in literature reflects the futile nature of modern age and the perverted character of modern mind. While his modernist style is more explicit in his poetry, his criticism tends to conserve the habitual attributes of society. That is contrary to the idiosyncrasy of modernist writing; he discourses as a traditional man of letter. Here his criticism intersects with Tanpınar's; they both hold forth that tradition plays an immense role on the present exercises of society and culture. That's the heart of both critics' philosophy and common characteristics, which also constitute the gist of that dissertation. Both inherit the ambition for "tradition" from their mentors Bradley and Yahya Kemal. The insistence upon tradition and a usable past exhibits the incongruous desire for the despondency of modern subject. Whenever the concept tradition is brought up, the names of Eliot and Tanpınar in their cultures come first. Emphasizing the signification of modern, their criticism which mostly deals with tradition and its operation on the present is pondered in that thesis. Tradition is a kind of conscious endeavor which looks over the continuity in their criticisms. They tie the past of their civilizations and the present practices in one point. The enduring course of tradition helps that tie to be embedded in time and space. Society's salubrious functioning is only possible with the incessant operation of tradition's authority, which can be yielded by continuity.

“Continuity” is another key concept that both critics dwell on most. There is a concordance between the wholesome performance of tradition and the concept “continuity”. As professed by them, even though there are some displacements in their civilizations and languages in the stream of continual chain, the past always acts upon the present exertions of societal functioning in the structure of cultural habits. The concept endurance of cultural legacy is grounded in the deep roots of their civilizations, which is to say that when they evaluate the conditions of modern atmosphere, they refer to the writers, names and terms of previous epochs. Tanpınar cites the names belong to the ancient times of Turkish culture as a reference such as Fuzuli, Yunus Emre, Neşati, Nedim and Ahmet Mithat. These are the figures that could be situated within the sequence of tradition and considered as the envoys of continual progression within the civilization. That’s among the common characteristics of both critics: they both study the works of ancient culture by nominating some personalities which reinforce their theoretical pattern. They refer to tradition and continuity in tradition by pointing to the names that epitomize the very nature of their eras. Even though they do not seem to share any common traits, they are the products of the same collective consciousness according to the philosophy of continuity. Eliot affixes the modern Europe’s cultural production to the writings of Homer and Virgil, which means he sticks the artistic creation of contemporary Europe to the past pillars of European literary heritage such as Shakespeare, Goethe, Chaucer, Milton and Hardy. The rings of the continual chain follow a pattern which is affected by any new production; that is what they mean by the presence of past. “Simultaneous existence” in the intuitive drift of time and continual order of cultural operations are the fundamental columns of society in its survival and endurance; that

could only be achieved by preserving tradition and its course on the present. While Eliot emphasizes “the mind of Europe” and goes back to the Greeks and Romans in order to rationalize that conception, Tanpınar points out Ottoman and Seljukid roots of modern Turkish literature as an everlasting chain in the formidable flux of tradition. Actually they have been among the last rings of that continual chain; both of them as critics and practitioners have contributed to the stupendous succession of tradition in their civilizations.

Tanpınar and Eliot have established reconciliation for the conundrums of modern man in the age where there are interruptions between the existential and cultural entities of modern subject. That curative engagement is the functioning of continuity in the course of time and society. They act in accordance with each other that the salutary performance of them is purveyed by the fulfillment of tradition in a modern age. The mutual compliance of both time and society as the most important fragments of modernity is conceivable by the re-creation of past with tradition.

WORKS CITED

- Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 7th ed. Boston: Heinle&Heinle, 1999.
- Alptekin, Turan. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Bir Kültür Bir İnsan [One Culture One Man]. İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.
- Altun, Fahrettin. Modernleşme Kuramı Eleştirel Bir Giriş [Modernization Theory a Critical Introduction]. İstanbul: Küre, 2005.
- Atıf, Sarah Moment. Semantic Structuring in the Modern Turkish Short Story: An Analysis of the Dreams of Abdullah Efendi and Other Short Stories by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.
- Austin, Allen. T. S. Eliot: The Literary And Social Criticism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Aydın, Ertuğrul. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'da Tarih ve Zaman" [History and Time in Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar]. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Spec. Issue of Hece 61 (2002): 248-69
- Ayvazoğlu, Beşir. Geleneğin Direnişi [The Resistance of Tradition]. İstanbul: Ötüken, 2000.
- Balcı, Yunus. Tanpınar Trajik Bir Şair ve Şiiri. [Tanpınar a Tragic Poet and His Poetry]. İstanbul: 3F Yayınevi, 2008.
- Barnett, S. J. Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Bergson, Henri. Creative Evolution. New York: Random House, 1944.
- . Matter and Memory. Brooklyn: Zone Books, 1988.

- Birlik, Nurten. "Tanpınar's Attempts to Go Beyond the Temporal Reality: 'The Dance', a Bergsonian Analysis." Middle Eastern Literatures Aug. 2007: 175-183.
- Brooker, Jewel Spears. "Transcendence and Return: T. S. Eliot and the Dialectic of Modernism." South Atlantic Review May 1994: 53-74.
- Buckley, Vincent. Poetry And Morality: Studies On The Criticism Of Matthew Arnold, T.S. Eliot, And F.R. Leavis. London: Chatto&Windus, 1959.
- Burgess, Anthony. English Literature. Essex: Longman, 2003.
- Childs, Peter. Modernism. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Chinitz, David. "T. S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide." PMLA Mar.1995: 236-247.
- Deane, Seamus. Nationalism Colonialism and Literature. Ed. Seamus Deane. London: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Demiralp Oğuz. Kutup Noktası, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Üzerine Eleştirel Deneme [Pole Point: Critical Essay on Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar]. İstanbul: YKY, 2001.
- Dettmar, Kevin J. H. "Introduction." A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture. Ed. David Bradshaw, and Kevin J. H. Dettmar. Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Blackwell Reference Online. 14 March 2007
<http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9780631204350_chunk_g97806312043502>
- Douglass, Paul. Bergson, Eliot, and American Literature. Lexington : University of Kentucky Press, 1986.
- Eagleton, Terry. After Theory. London: Penguin, 2004.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. Tradition, Change and Modernity. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Eliot, Thomas Stearns. The Idea of Christian Society. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1976.

---. On Poetry and Poets. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

---. The Sacred Wood Essays on Poetry and Criticism. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

---. The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism, Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England. London: Faber and Faber, 1964.

---. To Criticize the Critic. New York: Farrar, Straus&Giroux, 1965.

Ellis, P. G. "The Development of T. S. Eliot's Historical Sense." The Review of English Studies Aug. 1972: 291-301.

Ertop, Konur. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Romancı Kişiliği ve Geçmişle Hesaplaşması" (Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: His Personality as Novelist and Confrontation with Past) Bir Gül Bu Karanlıklarda [A Rose in This Darkness]. Ed. Abdullah Uçman and Handan İnci. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2002. 18-24.

Frisby, David. Fragments of Modernity. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1988.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel." The South Atlantic Quarterly 102.2-3 (2003): 599-628

Güven, Güler. Tanpınar'dan Yeni Ders Notları [New Lecture Notes from Tanpınar]. İstanbul: Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı, 2004.

Habib, M. A. R. "'Bergson Resartus" and T. S. Eliot's Manuscript." Journal of the History of Ideas Apr. 1993: 255-276.

Hamilton, Paul. "Reconstructing Historicism: Historicism and Bergsonism" An Oxford Guide Literary Theory and Criticism. Ed. Patricia Waugh. Oxford: OUP. 2007. 386-404.

- Irzık, Sibel, and Güven Güzeldere. "Introduction." The South Atlantic Quarterly 102.2-3 (2003): 283-292.
- Işın, Ekrem. A'dan Z'ye Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar [Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar from A to Z]. İstanbul: YKY, 2003.
- Kahraman, Hasan Bülent, "Yitirilmemiş Zamanın Ardında: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Muhafazakar Modernliğin Estetik Düzlemi" [After the Unlost Time: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and the Aesthetic Prejection of Conservative Modernity]. Doğu Batı 11 (2000): 11-43.
- Kantarcıoğlu, Sevim. Yapıbozumcu ve Semiotik Yaklaşımlar Işığında Tanpınar'ın Hikayeleri [Tanpınar's Short Stories in the Light of Deconstructional and Semiotic Approaches]. İstanbul: Akçağ, 2004.
- Kerman, Zeynep. Tanpınar'ın Mektupları [The Letters of Tanpınar]. İstanbul: Dergah, 2001.
- Koçak, Orhan. "'Our Master, the Novice': On the Catastrophic Births of Modern Turkish Poetry." The South Atlantic Quarterly 102.2-3 (2003): 567-598.
- Kütükçü, Tamer, and Sanem Kızıllarda. "Tanpınar'da Müziğin Bergsoncu Algılanımı" [The Bergsonian Perception of Music in Tanpınar]. Varlık 12.1191 (2006): 74-80.
- Lacey, A. R. Bergson. Florence: Routledge, 1996.
- Le Brun, Philip. "T. S. Eliot and Henri Bergson." The Review of English Studies 18.70 (1967): 149-161.
- Liebman, Sheldon W. "The Turning Point: Eliot's: The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism." boundary 2 9.2 (1981): 197-218.

- Macey, David. The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory. London: Penguin Reference, 2001.
- Melaver, Martin. Rev. of T. S. Eliot and the Philosophy of Criticism, by Richard Shusterman. Poetics Today 10.3 (1989): 651-652.
- Menand Louis. "T. S. Eliot and Modernity." The New England Quarterly Dec. 1996: 554-579.
- O'Hara, Daniel "'The Unsummoned Image": T. S. Eliot's Unclassic Criticism." boundary 2 9.1 (1980): 91-124.
- Pamuk, Orhan. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernizmi" [Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Turkish Modernism]. Bir Gül Bu Karanlıklarda [A Rose in This Darkness]. Ed. Abdullah Uçman and Handan İnci. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2002. 330-336.
- Reeves, Gareth. "T. S. Eliot and the idea of Tradition" An Oxford Guide Literary Theory and Criticism. Ed. Patricia Waugh. Oxford: OUP. 2007. 107-118.
- Sağlık, Şaban. "Bir Şahsi Nizamın peşinde Estetiği ve Felsefeyi Arayan Adam" [A Man Seeking for Aesthetics and Philosophy After a Personal Order]. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Spec. Issue of Hece 61 (2002): 204-31.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler [Essays on Literature]. İstanbul: Dergah, 2005.
- . Bütün Şiirleri [Poems]. İstanbul: Dergah, 1998.
- . Yahya Kemal. İstanbul: Dergah, 2001.
- . Yaşadığım Gibi [As I Lived]. İstanbul: Dergah, 2005.
- Topçu, Nurettin. Bergson. İstanbul: Dergah, 2002.

- Tunç, Mustafa Şekip. Bergson ve “Manevi Kudrete” Dair Birkaç Konferans
[Bergson and Some Conferences on Élan Vital]. İstanbul: Muallim Ahmet
Halit, 1934.
- Uğurcan, Sema. “Tanpınar’ın Eserlerinde ‘Hayat’ Kelimesi Etrafında Bir Gezinti”
[A Short Excursion among the Word ‘Life’ in Tanpınar’s Works].
Doğumunun 100. Yılında Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Ed. Sema Uğurcan,
İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003.
- Uhlig, Claus. “Tradition in Curtius and Eliot.” Comparative Literature 42.3 (1990):
193-207.
- Venn, Couze. Occidentalism: Modernity and Subjectivity. London: GBR, Sage
Publications, 2001.
- Yavuz, Hilmi. “Tanpınar ve Bergson (2).” Zaman Gazetesi, 02 Jan. 2002.
- Yıldırım, Ergün. Hayali Modernlik Türk Modernliğinin İcadı [Imaginary Modernity
the Invention of Turkish Modernity]. İstanbul: İz, 2005.
- Zilcosky, John. “Modern Monuments: T. S. Eliot, Nietzsche, and the Problem of
History.” Journal of Modern Literature 29.1 (2005): 21-33.