OSMANLI ARAŞTIRMALARI
VI

THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES
VI

THE CONTRIBUTION OF
RECĀ'Ī'ZĀDE MAḤMŪD EKREM'S
TA'LĪM-İ EDEBĪYĀT TO THE
DEVELOPMENT OF OTTOMAN RHETORIC
PART II[1]

Christopher Ferrard

The role of emotion in literature

Proceeding to the second section of the first chapter (İkinci Mebḥas, Birinci Faṣl), Ekrem deals with emotion as a factor in literature. He conceives of emotions as inherent elements, functioning at a level between ideas, whence they emanate, and style, upon which they bear influence. He first postulates that what can be perceived must also be capable of being emotive, but later seems to contradict himself when he suggests that a work dealing with the sciences may be devoid of emotion, a statement which he qualifies by dismissing such works as of a non-literary nature. In lieu of a definition of emotion, he describes some of the more common types of emotive reaction : joy, sadness, inclination, aversion, love and hatred, all of which can be categorised on the basis of their type and strength : they may engender sympathy or antipathy, they may be moderate or impassioned. He resorts to metaphor in describing the moderate emotion as a bright quality which bathes the heart in light, while the passions are lofty and set the heart aflame. As illustrations of literature exploiting these emotions, he cites the *Leylī-Nāme* of Fużūlī and Kemāl's *Zavallı Çocuk*, examples of the moderately emotive, and Kemāl's *Vaṭan yāḥōd Silestre* and Şeyḥ Ġālib's *Ḥüsn-ü-'İsk*, the impassioned.

He justifies the intrusion of emotion into literature on the grounds that just as the propagation of truth by reasoning is

laudatory and valuable, so too will the use of emotions for this end be good. In this process, it is the role of the intellect to prepare the reader, and to the emotions falls the task of actually winning him over to the writer's point of view. The emotions are not only a means of persuading the reader, but also serve a higher moral purpose; for Ekrem holds that it is not sufficient that the writer distinguish the good from the evil, he must also be prepared to influence the reader to desire the one and detest the other.

Ekrem implies that emotion is inherent in all literary works, a view which does not stand up to close scrutiny. An emotion is, at least according to his description of its salient features, that part of the reader's reaction to the work which may be characterised as non-intellectual. Many literary works, it could well be argued, do not evoke an emotional reaction. The crux of the argument lies in the problem of deciding the nature of emotional response. Is the smile on the face of the reader who has just read a particularly satisying *beyt,* an emotional or intellectual response; or to use Ekrem's terminology, is it «ḳalben» or «ʿaḳlen»? The problem is, of course, insoluble, and this probably accounts for his avoidance of this question (pp. 31-33).

Emotions, like ideas, are discussed by Ekrem in terms of their attributes. They are marked both by intrinsic and incidental qualities, the former consisting of the true, and the natural emotion, corresponding to the «fikr-i ḥaḳīḳī» and «fikr-i selīm» of the previous section. Given that these two qualities exist in all emotions, they may be further characterised by certain attributes of which the four most prominent are (1) the sincere (sāde-dilāne), (2) the tender (raḳīḳ), (3) the stirring (müheyyic) and (4) the sublime (ʿālī) emotion.

The true emotion comes from the heart and must be entirely free from artificiality or contrivance. The illustration is a *mersiye* composed by Ebü 's-Suʿūd Efendi on the death of his child. It is appropriately chosen, for here is an elegy that avoids the contrived expressions of bereavement and expresses sorrow forcefully without resort to hyperbole; the second *beyt* in particular rings true (p. 34) :

Seni beḳāda ḳoyub ben fenā bulam dirdim
Vücūd bulmadı endīşe-i muḥālim, gel!

Ekrem further observes that no writer can excite in his readers
emotions which he has not experienced himself. Although this point
is made subsequent to the illustration, it would seem to be a
continuation of the discussion, inserted as an after-thought, rather
than a reflection on the illustrative poem.

The second intrinsic quality of emotion is naturalness. A na-
tural emotion must not exceed sensible bounds, the emotive response
being in proportion to the stimulus. The illustrative passage is a
portion of a *merṣiye* by Fużūlī to the memory of Ḥüseyn, the
grandson of the Prophet. In this poem the author bitterly reproaches
the Sphere, which represents Fortune, for having schemed the
murder of Ḥüseyn.

As the brief description of these qualities has given the reader
only a perfunctory idea of their nature, Ekrem interposes a pa-
renthetical discussion (istiṭrād) in which he reiterates the salient
features of these two qualities, and compares them to one another.
He maintains that a true emotion must also be natural, otherwise
it will have no efficacy; as an example of failure in this respect
he cites the words of a mother, who upon losing her child, cries out :
«My poor lamb; would that the world had been destroyed rather
than you should have died! Fate has left untouched, mothers with
three or four children, and yet has taken from me my only child».
No matter how true this sentiment may be, it is nevertheless irra-
tional and therefore unacceptable. The aim of literature being to
influence the reader, the writer is obliged to express true emotions
rationally, and this may be achieved by observation of the conditions
which ensure that the emotion is natural. An example of false and
inappropriate emotion is given in an elegy by Fażlī (d. 1562), in
which the poet calls upon each of the elements in the heavens to
adopt a posture of mourning : the sun extinguished, the stars
scattered, the clouds weeping rain, thunder moaning, and the night
enwrapped in a cloak of bereavement (pp. 35-38).

True emotion could have been more simply defined as that
which is genuinely felt by the writer. Fażlī's elegy is dismissed,

presumably because the appeal to the elements to imitate human behaviour does not express his true feelings. Fużūlī's anger at fate for scheming the death of Ḥüseyn, on the other hand, is felt to reflect true and natural emotion. For natural emotion, however, no simple definition is offered; it would seem that its most salient feature is its ability to move the reader, which is the true purpose of emotive language. This is achieved by evincing the emotional reaction which will appear most appropriate to the reader in a given situation. Ekrem probably objects to the bereaved mother's wish that the world would come to an end on the grounds that her emotional reaction is exaggerated. It would have been more appropriate for her to have wished the child never to have been born, or even that her own life should be taken away, rather than to yearn for the end of all existence.

Of the numerous incidental emotions Ekrem chooses to dwell on, there are four which he considers most worthy of note. The first is innocence, which is briefly defined as that emotion in which can be found sincerity, informality, and those qualities peculiar to children. The examples are taken from a dialogue in *Zavallı Çocuk,* a play by Kemāl, in which a young lady, Şefīka, declares her love for her sweetheart. The theme of the play is based on the conflic between the generations around the question of whether the parents or the children should arrange a marriage, whether, in other words, true love or tradition should be the dominant consideration in matrimony. Şefīka reveals her love in a frank and direct manner which must have struck all the audience as extremely sincere; the more traditionally minded readers would no doubt have been shocked. The second example, taken from 'Abdülḥakk Ḥāmid's *Nesteren* consists of exactly the same type of theatrical encounter, this time between Ḥüsrev and the eponymous heroine (p. 38) :

> Ḥüsrev : Melekseñ, burası seniñ ocağıñ
> Nesteren : Meleksem, cennetim seniñ ḳucağıñ

Tenderness is characterised as that quality which fills the heart with fondness and affection. It is likened to the effect of a

light breeze upon the leaves of a tree causing them to tremble with delight. The examples consist of three poems, by Kemāl, 'Abdülḥaḳḳ Ḥāmid and Refīḳ Bey respectively. The first of these evocatively describes a rose which gently penetrates the author's consciousness, only at the end of the poem is he aware that he is perceiving his motherland. The second is somewhat similar, in that the author is haunted by visions of his beloved which gently intrude into his awareness. The third emotion is one of sympathy, which the author feels for the nightingale which will not sing; the writer ponders on the reason for its silence and attributes various causes to it (pp. 38-40).

The stirring (müheyyic) emotions, on the other hand, move the reader either to excitement or to sorrow, and are likened to sudden petulant spring storms. Three examples are given, the first an epitaph for a girl, the second 'Ākif Paşa's (d. 1848) famous elegy for his granddaughter and thirdly, a passage from 'Abdülḥaḳḳ Ḥāmid's play, *Ṭārıḳ,* each illustrating the literary expression of the human response to the death of a loved one[2]. However, in each case the quality of pathos is most in evidence, whereas it is the stirring and forceful nature of the emotions rather than their pathetic qualities to which attention should be drawn. The first of the examples, to illustrate the use of verse to excite a tenderness of feeling, could be regarded as the very antithesis of all that Ekrem has said previously about the quality of sincerity and simplicity as desiderata. In the verse all those clichés of the old poetry are introduced with no particular modification that would fit them for the intention of the poetry, the simplicity and directness that must be regarded as essential in stimulating grief are invalidated by the use of a four syllable *redīf* which gives a

2   The first of these illustrations, Ekrem found on a tombstone :
Āh Memdūḥa seniñ-çün dīdeler ḳan aġlasın
Dīdeler diller degil cān aġlasın cān aġlasın
Gül yüzüñ, nergis gözün, gonca femiñ yād eyleyib
Gīsū-yı dil-cüleriñ-çün sünbülistān aġlasın
Bulmadım bir çāre rūḥānī-vü-cismānī saña
Derdiñ añdıḳça ben 'ālemde dermān aġlasın
Sen ciger-pārem cinān bāġında gez güller gibi
Derd-i ḥasretle babañ bī-çāre her ān aġlasın

mechanical structure to the poem. Far from exciting compassion, such verses can only give the impression of an amateurish attempt to achieve expression within the conventions of a poetry that, by its very nature, was never intended as a vehicle for sincere feelings. Reading such verses a century after Ekrem, one is left to wonder at the quality of his own literary criticism and how much in fact he believed the doctrines he so confidently expounds (pp. 40-44).

The sublime ('ālī) emotion induces us to aspire to some higher plane and fills our hearts with wonder and yearning. The first example is taken from Āyetüllāh's translation of C. F. Volney's *Les Ruines*, a philosophy of history much influenced by the author's travels in the Levant. The passage cited is from the opening of the *Invocation*, a salutation addressed to the ruins, to which are attributed wisdom and truth by virtue of their age. They have proclaimed, the author declares, those sacred dogmas of liberty and equality much despised by tyrants. These are sublime thoughts, no one can deny, but are they necessarily emotive? Again one has cause to suspect that Ekrem was prompted to consider this passage as such, only because Volney professes to be thus moved while gazing upon those stones: «Benim ḳalbim siziñ temāşāñızdan iḥsāsāt-ı 'amīḳa ve efkār-ı 'alīye iktisābı-yle[3] inşirāh bulur.» However, no matter how much its author may declare himself emotionally overwhelmed, it does not necessarily follow that the passage itself will evoke in others those same emotions. The second example, taken from 'Abdülḥaḳḳ Ḥāmid's play, *Eşber*, is far more convincing : Aristotle is reflecting on the murder of Rukzan by Alexander the Great, whose tyranny he condemns. The third and the seventh quatrains of the passage cited are :

> Hem-cinsini maḳbere delālet
> Īrās̱-i mażarret-ü-sefālet
> Yā Rabb bu ne vaḥşiyāne ḥaṣlet!
> Eyā bu mu bizdeki 'adālet?
>
> Bu mażlimeyi getir de yāda
> Gez şevḳ ile 'ālem-i ziyāda

3 The text has *iktisāb ile*.

Aç çeşmiñi nezd-i Kibriyāda
Nūruñ ola dem-be-dem ziyāde

Of course, one must take it for granted that any statement uttered
by Aristotle —no matter how banal— will, by virtue of his repu-
tation, be considered of exceptional value. However, this conside-
ration apart, the monologue may with some justice be deemed
sublime (pp. 43-46).

In none of the illustrations which purport to arouse the emo-
tions, has Ekrem identified those elements which render the
language emotive. He has failed to analyse the passages and
subsequently demonstrate those features which distinguish, let us
say, sublime emotion from sublime thoughts. He is often at a loss
for words to describe the function and effect of the various emo-
tions. One symptom of this problem is his occasional recourse to
metaphor in order to define the concepts under discussion : the
stirring emotion is, for example, likened to a storm, the tender
emotion to a breeze.

The role of taste in literature

Having concluded his discussion of the emotions Ekrem
proceeds to investigate some of the ancillary properties of a literary
work : good taste, imagery, wit, memory, genius and skill. The
first of these, good taste (ḥüsn-i ṭabī'at), in importance the equal
of the intellect and emotions, is considered the consciousness of art.
It discriminates between beauty and ugliness, clarity and obscurity,
truth and falsehood, and makes plain those subtle differences
which cause the sublime to be debased. Ekrem offers one defini-
tion : «good taste is the immediate emotional response to virtue
in the midst of banality or to the banal in the midst of virtue». He
is clearly not satisfied with this definition, for he proceeds to
enlarge upon his own description of the attributes of good taste.
It monitors thoughts by condemning the vulgar, the pretentious,
the contrived and exaggerated and regulates the emotions by de-
lineating those boundaries within which they are sensible; it con-
fines imagery within the limits of truth, or what appears as true,

and requires art to be natural. Good taste is a prerequisite for all who aspire to writing well, and although it is a natural quality it may nevertheless be acquired by a critical and analytic study of accepted literary works.

The role of imagery in literature

Contrasting good taste with the faculty of imagination (ḳuvve-i ḥayālīye), Ekrem suggests that while the former senses, discriminates and corrects, the latter invents, illuminates and adorns. He offers an analogy between writing and painting, in which the function of the imagination is likened to the paints with which the artist fills his canvas. The imagination gives nobility and sublimity to writing, and when it cannot express a truth, it invents a world of its own and so gives body and soul to it. He provides two illustrative passages for both the proper and the improper use of imagery, the former is taken from Şeyḫ Ġālib's *Ḥüsn-ü-'Işḳ,* the latter from 'İzzet Mollā's *Gülşen-i 'Işḳ.* Şeyḫ Ġālib describes a desert thus :

> Bir deşt-i siyehde oldu güm-rāh
> Yeldā-yı şitā belā-yı nā-gāh
> Bir deşt bu kim, ne 'ūẕü bi-'llāh
> Cinler cirid oynar anda her-gāh
>
> Birbirine ye's-ü-ḥavf lāḥiḳ
> Geh kar yaġar idi geh ḳaranlıḳ

'İzzet Mollā, also depicts a frightening and hostile landscape and describes it thus :

> İki yol arasında māristān
> Eñ küçük hayye bir ḳalın urġan
> Nehri gūyā cehenmemiñ deresi
> Bu imiş vādi-yi ġamıñ deresi
> Ḳaldı hayretde iki yār-ı şefīḳ

Both illustrations employ vivid imagery, but while Şeyḫ Ġālib gradually develops a scene of increasing desolation, 'İzzet Mollā

destroys the effect he is aiming at by overstatement. Ekrem advises the reader that the imagery need not necessarily conform to truth, but warns him that should he depart from it, he must avoid incongruity or levity, and this may be achieved only by the use of one's own judgement. On these grounds he rejects 'İzzet Mollā's use of imagery.

The role of wit in literature

Ekrem proceeds to the discussion of wit (*ẓarāfet*), an innate quality which may not be acquired by study. It is adequately described through its attributes, so that the reader is left in no doubt as to the function of this faculty. By the employment of wit a writer is able to lend to his works and charm, and a reader may immediately recognise allusions and perceive what is intended in other literary figures. It is that element of genius which discovers those relationships between objects on which metaphors and similes are based, and should not be confused with the intelligence or reason. It is not an essential quality for every literary genre, and a writer bereft of wit may nevertheless acquire an appreciative readership and achieve a high position in the estimation of his peers.

The role of memory in literature

Ekrem discusses the function of the faculty of memory in a section entitled «Ḳuvve-i Ḥāfıẓa» and in the following istiṭrād. He distinguishes between the conscious effort of committing material to memory and the unconscious assimilation of information, the first being subject to recall at a later date, while the latter intrudes into the consciousness involuntarily. He terms these «taḥaṭṭur» and «tevārüd» respectively. Having borrowed the latter expression from the stock of technical terms peculiar to Arabic criticism, he is obliged to define it in its classical meaning. Arabic literary theory admits of several terms for literary theft or borrowing, each

---

4 Compare Lefranc (pp. 51-53) with Ekrem (pp. 61-64). The quotation by Kemāl is from his essay «Edebīyāt ḥaḳḳında ba'żı Mülāḥaẓāt» (p. 103).

indicating a particular degree of plagiarism. *Tevārüd* occurs when two writers, unbeknown to each other, conincidentally produce the same line of verse, or a similar passage of prose. This is extremely rare and only generally met with in chronograms where the idea to be expressed is already established and the freedom of choice and ordering of its expression will be severely curtailed not only by the exigencies of meter and rhyme, but by the additional demand of the artihmetic composition of the verse. Ekrem acknowledges the rarity of true *tevārüd* in contemporary writing, and suggests that much coincidence is the result of downright plagiarism (sirkat-ü-intihāl), rather than being cases of minds arriving fortuitously at the same choice of words. Ekrem's «tevārüd», however, allows for literary borrowing as long as it is done unconsciously.

The function of the memory is to assimilate the ideas of others, subject them to critical analysis and judgement, and then to store them in the mind whence they may be recalled as an aid to the creation of new ideas, fresh imagery and brilliant description. Ekrem observes that although the memory is capable of storing ideas which have not been properly understood, the process will impose an inordinate burden on it and will ultimately destroy this precious faculty. The suggestion that understanding is an aid to memorisation, besides being a statement of the obvious, should be understood as a damning indictment of the contemporary educational system which demanded of students the assimilation of vast quantities of undigested material, rather than the development of an analytic and questioning mind.

The role of genius and skill in literature

Ekrem then discusses genius and skill (dehā-vu-hünerverī), qualities which are possessed by very few individuals. Genius, by far the rarer of the two gifts, allows a writer to discover the unknown, and to invent that which did not previously exist, while skill permits one to adapt the ideas of others and to present them as one's own. No further explanation or development of this idea is offered, and we can only be left with the impression that these two terms have been defined somewhat arbitrarily.

The aesthetic component in literature

The last topic of discussion in this, the first part of the *Ta'līm-i Edebīyāt,* is the question of aesthetics. In this section, which he entitles «Ṣanā'i'de Güzellik neden 'Ibāretdir», he creates an analogy between literature and the other arts, the former appreciated by the mind, the latter by means of the external senses. While beauty in art is achieved by blending colours in painting, shapes in the plastic arts or sounds in music, in literature it results from the conformity of expression to the idea it represents. These two elements must conform also to truth and nature, and to the noble aspirations of the human spirit. While everyone recognises beauty, no one had yet defined it.

Ekrem's discussion of style

The second section of the work is devoted to style (esālīb), the treatment being a mixture of Eastern and Western rhetorical modes. Accepting the best from each of the two distinct traditions, Ekrem achieves a rather felicitous alliance between systems which may, at first, appear incompatible. The Arabic tradition, seeking to achieve a tightly structured theory of language through the analysis of its mechanism, does not accord well with the European practice of identifying adherent charactaristics. This marriage of Eastern and Western rhetoric was achieved by the relatively simple process of adopting the broad framework from Europe and incorporating Arabic theory only when it provided a more appropriate exposition than could be found in the foreign model. Ekrem's exploitation of the *'ilmü 'l-belāġa* is, however, little more than the casual borrowing of some technical terms from the traditional science, and a relatively small amount of its substance; in principle he rejects the spirit of this Islamic discipline with its passion for comprehensive ordering and classification. However, the urge to systematise and tabulate must have been an instinct controlled only by the most constant vigilance and self-restraint, a literary taxanomy had become second nature to all Ottomans. Ekrem does occasionally relax this vigilance and adds more classifications when he finds the existing categories deficient.

This, however, is not a serious criticism of his method; indeed, it could be justifiably asserted that these lapses into the old methods contribute the most lucid passages in the work for many readers not imbued with Western literary ideals. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the casual introduction of terms and concepts from the traditional rhetoric may have been intended to provide some props on which the old scholars might lean, in order to survey around them the mass of unfamiliar ideas expressed in an alien jargon.

The following tables of contents from Lefranc's *Traité* and the *Ta'līm-i Edebīyāt* serve best to explain how this section has been composed :

The Introduction consists of two sections, the introduction proper (entitled «Üslūb») being merely a translation of Lefranc's general remarks on sytle, and the *istıṭrād,* no more than a restatement of this, in terms more familiar to the Ottoman reader. The translation is for the most part faithful, the only concession to Ottoman literary norms being the interpolation of two *beyt*s. He completes his general discussion on style with two paragraphs from Kemāl's literary manifesto. Conscious of the pioneering nature of his work, a footnote is provided in which he justifies his choice of «üslūb» to render the concept of «manner of presentation», without acknowledging that here it translates the French word, «style». The *istıṭrād* repeats the substance of the introduction, but in a language more elevated than that of the first section, which was bound too tightly by the restraints of accurate translation[4].

The main body of the section on style can be divided into three notional divisions, the first being based on the *muḳaddime* to the *Telḫīs,* which deals with the negative attributes of style, that is, the faults incidental to *feṣāḥat.* Ekrem expands this section to include lapses which are peculiar to Ottoman usage and, by extrapolation, to Persian. To the traditional faults of style, *Zaʿf-ı teʾlīf, taʿḳīd, ġarābet, tenāfür,* he adds «Ġalaṭ-ı teḥakkümī», «tetābuʿ-ı iżāfet» «keṣret-i tekrār», «şiveye muġāyeret», «imlāsızlıḳ», «muṭabaḳat-i elfāẓ» and «müşkil-pesendlik», and here his inspiration comes more from the Eastern mode of rhetorical analysis than the Western. Setting himself up as arbiter of usage, and drawing on criterion of the mechanism of language rather than the effect it produces, he attempts to account for all faults and adds to those already identified in the *Telḫīs* many which might otherwise be termed Ottomanisms or instances of poetic licence.

The concept of *feṣāḥat,* purity of language, is common both to the Islamic tradition and to Lefranc's exposition, in the former the concept being expressed through a highly developed analysis of linguistic faults, while the latter merely draws attention to the existence of barbarisms and neologisms and their adverse effect on style. In the *Belāġat-i ʿOṣmānīye,* Cevdet Paşa treated only of *tenāfür, ġarābet, muḥālefetü 'l-ḳıyās, żaʿf-ı teʾlif, taʿḳīd* and *tetābuʿ-ı iżāfet,* indicating that their incidence may be controlled by reference to the traditional linguistic sciences. *Ġarābet* is governed by the science of lexicography, *muḥālefetü 'l-ḳıyās* by the *ʿilmü 'ṣ-ṣarf, zaʿf-ı teʾlif* and *taʿḳīd-i lafżī* by *naḥv* and *taʿḳīd-i maʿnevī* by *beyān,* while *tenāfür* is recognised by one's own aesthetic awareness (ẕevḳ-ü-ḥiss). In this last case Cavdet Paşa has made a radical departure from Islamic practice which attempts to explain aesthetically displeasing combinations in physical terms. Unwilling to apply the Arabic laws of euphony to Turkish, Cevdet Paşa leaves the onus of deciding what constitutes disharmony in language to the reader (p. 16). Ekrem, however, realising that many stylistic faults are peculiar to Turkish, makes little attempt to define them in terms of other linguistic sciences, being content merely to identify their existence and to suggest some rules whereby they may be avoided.

The «ġalaṭ-i teḥakkümī» consist of violations of the principles governing normative written Ottoman. He divides them, in the best scholastic tradition, into words in which the letters are increased, decreased, or exchanged. This can be caused either by the careless use of words, as in the case of «egerçi» instead of «eger» where the increase is represented by the suffix «-çi», or by ellision, «temīz» in place of «temyīz». Many of these instances are used for particular effect, often to comply with exigencies of meter or rhyme. While modern stylists with exigencies of meter or rhyme. While modern stylists would consider such aberrations as licence permissable in the language of poetry, Ekrem regards these as «ġalaṭ». In some cases, carried away by his zeal in identifying instances of these faults, he wrongly accuses authors of violating *feṣāḥat.* Taking a *beyt* by Ṣābit (d. 1712) :

Mey-i ʿisküñle bir piyāle pür
Ṣunub üftādeñi ayaḳlandur

he objects to the rhyme, which he feels has been achieved by imposing a change in the vowelling of the verb «ayaḳlanmaḳ». He would vowel the causative suffix with a *kesre,* complying with the current rules of vowel harmony, a convention not applicable in Ṣābit's time.

Ġalaṭ-i Teḥakkûmī represents the conscious violations of orthography and usage and contrasts with imlāsızlıḳ, which is the unintentional mis-spelling of words, usually arising from confusion between Arabic consonants which are undistinguished in conventional Turkish pronunciation; this most frequently occurs between ṣ, s and ṣ; t and ṭ; ḥ, ḫ and h; and ẕ, z and ẓ. His treatment of *zaʿf-ı teʾlīf, ġarābet, tetābuʿ-ı iẓāfet* and *tenāfür* are based on the traditional analysis of style. However, unlike Cevdet Paşa and the preceding generations of rhetoricians, Ekrem provides copious examples and evinces a concern not only for the mechanism of these faults but also for their cause and effect. He also introduces some new faults, «keẕret-i tekrār», the excessive repetition of a word within a text, and «ṣīveye muġāyeret», violation of conventional usage. This section concludes with two observations : firstly, when considering the choice of words in a passage, he believes that for any given concept a single word, and no other, is most appropriate. This quality, which he terms «muṭābaḳat-i elfāẓ», corresponds to the «proprieté» of Lefranc, who held that exact synonyms do not exist. Secondly, he notes with dismay the tendency of critics to be excessively demanding in regard to purity of language. The faults he identifies as «müşkil-pesendlik» would, he feels, confine the language in a straight-jacket of borrowed rules and conventions.

One may presume that this last fault has been included to counterbalance the necessarily negative tone of this section. Ekrem seems incapable of totally freeing himself from the restraints imposed by the traditional method of analysis, and therefore feels obliged to treat peculiarly Ottoman faults in the manner of the *Telḫīṣ.* One would certainly have expected a less rigid approach here, an argument that would identify incidences of violation of normative practice, and an attempt to explain both their reason and effect. Ekrem himself seems to recognise this deficiency and presents «müşkil-pesendlik» as if to make amends for an excessively negative approach to style.

Having dealt with purity, Ekrem proceeds to the treatment of five adherent qualities: clarity, naturalness, precision, harmony and appropriateness, the last of these being further subdivided into various stylistic modes. Here the treatment is little more than the direct adaptation of Lefranc's theory, applied to Ottoman literature. Unlike Süleymān Paşa, Ekrem has adopted only those qualities which have a more or less universal applicability, and illustrates them with a variety of authors. The *Mebāni 'l-İnşā* had attempted to provide society with literary models —such as oratory— which were incapable of being assimilated in the contemporary political and social environment, and the examples were drawn, often quite uncritically, from writers already influenced by the West. Such an approach can be criticised in that it adopts a theory of literature from a foreign tradition in order to apply it to that part of one's own literary corpus which was already most directly influenced by it. The implication inherent in such an approach is that, because the alien theory may be applied to a part of one's own literature, it may be applied to the whole. Ekrem, however, resisted this temptation and may be credited with attempting to produce a balanced and representative range of illustrations. The majority of the examples cited do, indeed, come from the modern period, but he has nevertheless incorporated enough of the old writers to constitute a representative survey of Ottoman literature, if not in terms of the complete literary out put of the past five centuries, at least in respect of what his contemporaries were currently reading. The citations, like those in the first *faşl* of the book, may be deemed unconvincing in that they do not exclusively illustrate the literary characteristics under discussion, often being more appropriate to some other quality. This fault —if it may be so considered— is unavoidable with this approach, for any given passage of prose will contain several adherent qualities, it being consequently inevitable that, on occasion, the most striking of these will not be the one intended in the illustration

Ekrem may also be criticised for not being more critical of his source. However, it is characteristic of a product of the Tanzimat, such as Ekrem was, that he can accept a foreign model for the innovation he is urging without reflecting on, or even criticising,

the principles on which this imported system rested. One need not probe deeply to find an explanation for such a servile attitude towards the new authority —indeed the reliance on established authority was wholly characteristic of the scholarship of Islam throughout the Ottoman period— for the whole premise of the reforms which had been introduced into society by the men of the Tanzimat implied a feeling of inadequacy in existing systems to fulfil the demands of the new direction in which they observed their society was moving. The reverence that was, in other branches of learning, shown towards the medical text-book, the military manual or the treatise on chemistry, finds its exact psychological counterpart among those who longed for a literature which would, as in Europe, mirror faithfully the reactions of the artist to the stimuli of the circumstances in which he lived. These imitations, unfortunately, went beyond the mere technical borrowings no- ticeable in Ekrem and his followers, extending even into what might be regarded as the spiritual ambiance of creative writing, so that they were prepared to accept for themselves the attitudes of romanticism, of realism, and of sentimentality which European models had shown them to be the appropriate posture of the artist.

Ekrem's treatment of tropes and figures of speech

The third and fourth section are devoted to tropes and figures of speech, the third *faṣl* encompassing all the figures of *beyān* and some from *bedīʿ*, the fourth the *ṣānāʾiʿ-i lafẓiye*. What is most striking about this organisation is that it violates the traditional classification of figures. The *Telḫīṣ* divides the figures of speech into two chapters, *beyān* which analyses the psychological mec- hanism of metaphor and related tropes, and *bedīʿ* which merely lists and explains the nature of the other figures. Ekrem, obviously influenced by Lefranc, breaks down this traditional distinction. Although he incorporates some of the highly sophisticated analytic approach of the traditional treatment of metaphor, he has —by virtue of placing it within the same chapter as other figures— departed from the original purpose of *beyān*. It is no longer the precocious Islamic science which predated modern European lin-

guistic analysis by several centuries, it is now relegated to the level of *bedī'*, the product of scholastic classification.

Both the Western and Eastern approach to the study of figures of speech share —by concidence rather than borrowing, it must be emphasised— many features in common, most noticeably a predilection for identification and classification of new figures. As all languages inevitably share certain features, many figures of speech will be common to most of them and it should, therefore, not be surprising that Lefranc's exposition mirrors the classical Islamic approach in many respects. It is virtually impossible to determine whether Ekrem's «rücū'» (p. 316), for example, is based on the traditional Islamic figure or on Lefranc's *correction* (p. 195), so alike are they in many respects; and similarly, *iltifāt* (p. 306) could be *apostrophe* (p. 202) and *mübālaġa* (p. 299) *hyperbole* (p. 164). Some figures purely French in inspriation: «İstifhām» (p. 308), «nidā» (p. 310), «ḳat'» (p. 312), «terdīd» (p. 313), «tekrīr» (p. 320), «tedrīc» (p. 321)⁵; others purely Islamic: *sec'* (p. 351) and *terṣī'* (p. 355) (if, in fact, these two techniques of prose composition should really be regarded as tropes in the context of Ottoman). What does not belong to the Islamic tradition is the explanation of the figure in terms of its purpose, or the effect produced by it. Some of these Ekrem describes in terms which contrast sharply with the traditional mode. *Rücū'*, for example, is described in the *Telḫīṣ*⁶ thus :

و منه الرجوع وهو العود الى الكلام السابق بالنقض لنكتة

Ekrem on the other hand, considers it
«... a figure which corrects and amends a
statement with an expression which is yet
more effective, more forceful or more
colourful and brilliant. It is used as
if to interpolate into a statement a point

5   These are based on Lefranc's *interrogation* (p. 190), *exclamation* (p. 205), *disjonction* (p. 154), *dubitation* (p. 191), *repetition* (p. 152) and *gradation* (p. 189) respectively.

6   Celāleddīn Muḥammed b. Abdürraḥmān el-Ḳazvīnī, *Et-Telḫīṣ fī 'Ulūmi 'l-Belāġa* (2nd ed., Cairo, 1932), p. 359.

forgotten, or deny a statement which had
unintentionally slipped off the tongue,
the intention being to give the statement
more force or elegance...» (p. 316).

What is most suprising in his treatment are the omissions. Where, for instance, are *ḥüsn-i taʿlīl, irsāl-i meẟel, tecâhül-i ʿārif* and *sehl-i mümteniʿ*, figures which are especially prominent in Ottoman literature and given such particular attention in works such as Nācī's *İṣṭlāḥāt-ı Edebīye*?

It is probably a significant indication of the divided mind of the Ottoman intellectual at this time that these tropes of bedīʿ are given anything more than a passing notice in a work of his character. All that has preceded would indicate that Ekrem was removed from the mechanical analysis of the literary model which sought to reduce its effects to a classifiable system. Unfortunately, he had this legacy of rhetorical terms conveniently at hand, and presumably could not resist the facility they offered to complete the exposition of his theory of literature in a manner in which, after all, appeared to have the sanction of his European preceptors.

In any original work of literature produced by someone of creative talent, there is no conscious striving after a specific effect through the employment of a text-book trope, the impact of the statement having always sprung from the inspiration of the moment. The fact that certain familiar metaphorical usages, certain inversions of language recur from period to period and from author to author should really be regarded as part of the vocabulary of literature, and it is only through the analytical attitudes of people who are themselves not creative that it was felt necessary and possible to collect and classify them.

Towards the end of the book, Ekrem prescribes, for the first time, certain practices to enable the student to write better Ottoman. These are, however, presented as a continuation of the *Ṣanāʾiʿ-i Lafẕīye*. In a section dealing with the «şerāʾiṭ-i tescīʿ,» he lays down laws which cover the use of *secʿ*. The overriding principle gover-

ning its use is that it should conform to sound aesthetic appreciation (ẕevḳ-i selīm), which is based, in turn, on five laws: (1) it should be natural; (2) it should not be overused; (3) it must, in terms of the first two conditions, be appropriate to the particular style being written; (4) the component rhyming phrases of a sentence must be balanced in terms of their length; and (5) secondary *secʿ* may be placed within the primary scheme, but not a tertiary within the secondary. Nowhere does he allude to the syntactical function of *secʿ*, in which the rhyme acts as an index of conjunctive relationships, treating it purely as one of the «tezyīnāt», a function which it often did not serve.

Ekrem's assessment of contemporary Ottoman literature

The *Taʿlīm-i Edebīyāt* concludes with some observations on the state of the Ottoman language and its need for reform (pp. 381-387). Echoing Kemāl's appeal for the establishment of a society which would promote higher literary standards, he poses several questions which it might wist to ponder: (1) Does Ottoman possess an adequate vocabulary for science and literature? (2) Should a dictionary of Ottoman be compiled, and if so, on what bases? (3) Should it be necessary to commit to memory thirty-two different Arabic and Persian words for «lion», for example, while the language was in need of vocabulary to express subtle ideas? (4) Could spelling be standardised? (5) When two languages share a common set of principles, manner of expression and basis of rhetoric, can they then be considered as two distinct languages? Indeed, can a language which is governed by the rhetorical principles of another look forward to any progreess? (6) Which of the Arabic and Persian principles must inevitably be used in Turkish? Must they be incorporated along with the rules which apply only to Turkish? And finally (7), must Arabic and Persian be dismissed as of no relevance to Ottoman? He provides some answers, offered as no more than his own opinions: (1) Ottoman is deficient in scientific terms, and yet overloaded with an inert vocabulary. (2) A complete dictionary of Turkish should be compiled in which newly borrowed words would be included, and the Arabic and Persian vocabulary restricted. (4) Spelling should be standardised by means of a good gram-

mar and dictionary. Turkish is completely independent in its rhetoric and literary principles, and these should, therefore, be compiled in a form appropriate to it. (5) A language which has a rhetorical system belonging to another cannot progress. He concludes by admitting that the study of Arabic and Persian are necessary, but insists that Turkish too must be studied.

It is beyond the scope of this article to analyse the implications of these questions, and the answers tentatively offered. In these speculations it is clear that Ekrem is not advocating an «arı Türkçe» such as is presently being promoted by the Dil Kurumu; the very concept would have been beyond the limits of even the most revolutionary imagination in the 1870 s. His aim, one must presume, is a Turkish which avoids the unnecessary use of Arabic and Persian where alternative Turkish correspondences exist. For Ekrem, the dominating influence of Arabic over the Turkish element in Ottoman, manifests itself most noticeably in the use of its grammar and rhetoric. Like Kemāl, he considers rhetoric one of the most important dimensions of the language and associates the traditional system with many of the evils which beset Ottoman; in particular bedīʿ contained all the ornamentations and figures associated with the «bombast» of oriental literatures, a feature which was markedly absent in much produced in the West. However, accepting that rhetoric is as necessary as morphology and syntax, he feels unable to abolish the old without somehow replacing it.

Conclusion

Many of the faults in the Taʿlīm-i Edebīyāt stem not from Ekrem's lack of familiarity with Ottoman literature, but from a basic misunderstanding of the function of language in Western European countries, in particular the role of literary language. Kemāl's literary manifesto had appealed for a national literature which would reflect the language of the people, there being, of course, no Ottoman nation within the traditional political structure, Kemāl's idea was the establishment of a nation state with a national literature, very much on the model of France and England, and as a step in this direction, he he appeals for a «national rhetoric», the Arabic

bedīʿ being identified as one of the most inhibiting influences on the Ottoman language. Its figures endowed writing with much of its aesthetic quality, but only at the expense of obfuscating the intention of the speaker and frustrating the goal of communication. But Kemāl was not so naive as to believe that language could be effective without rhetorical embellishments; rather his appeal was for a system that would distinguish between those that elucidate and those that obfuscate. Ekrem responded to Kemāl's appeal by accepting as axiomatic that French literature was worth emulating in all respects, and it was natural, therefore, that he should take a standard college textbook as his model. This was, however, a work of literary theory, in every way as dependent on Latin and Greek formulations as Ottoman was on Arabic. The one feature of the *Traité* that was born of the French literary experience is the brief introduction on ideas. This, Ekrem expands, the main text of the *Traité* being absorbed into the *Taʿlīm-i Edebīyāt* without the enthusiasm that is so noticeable in his treatment of ideas. It is as if he had realised that French literary theory, as presented in the *Traité* was, after all, no more relevant to French society than the *Telḫīṣ* was to Ottoman.

The *Taʿlīm-i Edebīyāt* succeeds in its immediate objective, to provide Ottoman with a rhetorical systeh that was not based completely on Arabic. In the long term, the goal was to develop a Turkish rhetoric, and here it failed, for Ekrem could not discover a set of principles which was exclusive to Ottoman, the *Traité* and the *Telḫīṣ* both dealing, in the main, of concepts which have universal applicability. One cannot therefore suggest that the *Taʿlīm-i Edebīyāt* replaced the Arabic with the French model, for the latter was in fact a work of ancient rhetoric, applied to but not evolved from French. To aspire to a Turkish rhetoric is as futile as to wish for one peculiar to French or English. The value of the *Talīm-i Edebīyāt* lies in the emphasis on ideas, a theme well developed by Ekrem.

The *Taʿlīm-i Edebīyāt* starts from the premise that a theory of rhetoric was necessary for the development of a language, and furthermore that it should evolve from the practice of that language. Both these notions are false: many languages, in fact, exist without a formulation of rhetorical practices, indeed many litera-

tures exist in the complete absence of rhetorical theory; those languages that do have a rhetoric, have often quite successfully borrowed and exploited that of another civilisation. What is certain, however, is that there exists some sort of relationship between rhetoric and literature which may at first not be immediately apparent. An awareness of rhetorical theory can but influence the literary production of a civilisation.That is not to say that the writer will consciously employ rhetorical devices merely because they exist (although in many literatures this is precisely the case), but rather, a study of rhetoric will arouse in him a curiosity about the mechanism of language and, by displaying before him a variety of exemplary forms, will encourage him to emulate them. Just as rhetoric is a good servant, so too is it a bad master. The Ottomans ruled many aspects of their society through the Arabic sciences, their attitude to them being deferential and subservient: they had allowed their literature to be dominated by Arabic rhetorical theory. Ekrem was hoping to liberate Ottoman litterature from the tyranny of the *Telḫīṣ,* and to place it under the liberal rule of the *Traité* until such a time as Ottoman rhetoric had developed to a point when it could overthrow alien domination.

The value of the *Ta'līm-i Edebīyāt* is that emphasised the importance of ideas in contrast to the outward forms, the main concern of the traditional approach. How much more satisfying would the work have been had he merely presented the chapter on ideas by itself. However his brief was the compilation of a work on rhetoric and he was forced to fall back on the traditional approach, be it Arabic or French, in order to give his course structure. To put forward the thesis that good style consists of good thought is tantamount to admitting that there is tittle to be learnt from the subject itself, the student being more usefully employed in acquiring knowledge and learning how o think.