

**OSMANLI ARAŒTIRMALARI**  
**IV**

NeŒir Heyeti — Editorial Board  
HALİL İNALCIK — NEJAT GÖYÜNÇ  
HEATH W. LOWRY

**THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES**  
**IV**

İstanbul - 1984

---

Sahibi : ENDERUN KİTABEVİ adına İsmail Özdoğan

Yazı İşleri Sorumlusu : Nejat Göyünç

Basıldığı Yer : Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası

Adres : ENDERUN KİTABEVİ, Beyaz Saray No. 46

Beyazıt - İstanbul

---

# THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN OTTOMAN RHETORIC UP TO 1882

## PART II

### CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OUTSIDE THE *MEDRESE*<sup>1</sup>

*Christopher Ferrard*

The first part of this article consisted of a summary outline of the major works which paved the way for the *Belāgat-i 'Osmānīye* of Cevdet Paşa (1881). These were all either translations or adaptations of El-Ḳazvini's *Telhīs fi 'Ulūmi 'l-Belāga*. This was not surprising as the *Telhīs* was an integral part of the *medrese* curriculum, and it was in the *medrese* that most students had their sole exposure to the principles of Islamic rhetoric. There did, however, develop an alternative tradition of rhetoric. Represented by a limited number of books, approach to rhetoric was to find its most forceful expression in Recā'izāde Maḥmūd Ekrem's *Ta'lim-i Edebiyat* (1882).

#### *The Menāzırü 'l-İnşā*

From the sixteenth century onwards, the student of *belāga* had recourse to the *Menāzırü 'l-İnşā*, a Persian work written in India which was to have immense influence on the development of the study of rhetoric, which previously could only be studied within the *medrese* system.

The author of the *Menāzırü 'l-İnşā*, Maḥmūd b. Şeyḫ Muḥammed Gīlānī, known as Ḥ'āce-i Cihān, was born in Gīlan, and after travelling as a merchant took employment at the court of 'Alā'eddīn Hūmāyūn Zālīm Behmanī (d. 865/1461) in northern Deccan, and rose to the vizierate under his successors, Nizām Şāh (d. 867/1463)

<sup>1</sup> Part I, in *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, III, 165-188, dealt with the *Medrese* tradition.

and Muḥammed III Leşkerî (d. 887/1482), who had him executed in 886/1481. Apart from the *Menâzirü 'l-İnşâ*, he compiled his elegant letters in the collection entitled the *Riyâzu 'l-İnşâ*, and is credited with a *divân*. During his vizierate the Behmenid state became the first in India to exchange ambassadors with the Ottoman empire, one of the letters in the *Riyâzu 'l-İnşâ* being addressed to Meḥmed II Fâtih. It is very probable that this diplomatic interaction between these two distant states accounts for the arrival of a copy of the *Menâzir* in Istanbul, very likely within the lifetime of the author. In the Ottoman Empire it achieved some popularity, to the extent of being translated in the early 17th Century, both its text and translation being later published<sup>2</sup>.

The *Menâzirü 'l-İnşâ* is, as suggested by its title, a work on epistolography. Its importance to the study of rhetoric lies in its introduction, which offers an abridged presentation of the basis of rhetorical theory<sup>3</sup>. Omitting the section on *me'ânî* and *bedî'*, the *Menâzir* proceeds from the definition of *belâgat* and *feşâhat* (pp. 18-22) to the study of *beyân* (pp. 22-49). To this is added a chapter on the various types of poetic form and a treatise on *inşâ* with several examples of the art of the *münşî*. Although the section on *belâgat* is intended as a mere introduction to the proper subject of the work, *inşâ*, its treatment is extremely satisfying. The most casual perusal through the work will immediately impress on the reader the advantages it possesses over the *Telhîs* and its derivatives. When dealing with the faults incidental to *feşâhat*, he quotes the examples in the *Telhîs*, explains them, and then proceeds to illustrate the point with several Persian couplets of his own choice. By presenting the rhetorical theory by way of a preamble to the main section of his work, H'âce-i Cihân has reduced it to the status of an ancillary science, while at the same time restoring to it utility and purpose, which had been denied it by the Arabic theoreticians.

2 The printed edition of the *Menâzirü 'l-İnşâ* was published in Istanbul, no date being given, but very probably in the 1860's. The page references are to this edition.

3 Taşköprizâde acknowledges the importance of this work of *inşâ* in the *Miftâhü 's-Sa'âde* (I, 182), indicating that it was popular among the Ottoman 'Ulemâ and the Persian *Fuzalâ*.

Here its applicability to the needs of the secretary is no longer implicit, it has become the very *raison d'etre* of this science.

Unlike the *Telhîs*, the popularity of the *Menâzırü'l-İnşâ* is not due to historical accident; lying outside the *medrese* curriculum, it earned its place in the literature of Islamic rhetoric entirely on the strength of its own intrinsic merits. It is in its method of presentation that lies its greatest appeal: the definition is the same as in the *Telhîs*, the explanation is identical, the example is, in the first instance, borrowed therefrom, but then, having completed the theoretical exposition, H'âce-i Cihân, almost with an air of relief at having discharged an onerous duty, provides several examples which entertain and delight the reader. In his hands, rhetoric is no longer an alien science mastered for its own sake, it has become a tool of poetic expression, the handmaiden to a shared aesthetic.

### *The Miftâhü'l-Belâga*

The *Menâzır* was translated by İsmâ'il Ankaravî, Rûsûhî (d. 1041/1631), a Mevlevî *şeyh*, best known for his commentary on the *Meşnevî*. He wrote the *Miftâhü'l-Belâga ve Muşbahü'l-Fesâha*, in response to a request by two of his grandchildren, both students of students of rhetoric who were experiencing difficulty in understanding the *Telhîs*. He intended his translation to be a guide to this epitome and explains his motives for writing it thus :

«Zübde-i evlâd-ı ma'nevî ve zümre-i ahfâdumuñ  
aşlahı ve ehl-i talebi, ya'nî, Dervîş 'Âmil ve  
Mehmed Şâdık Celebi — *yessera 'Ulâh le-hümmü*  
*'l-'ilme 'l-edebî* — vaktâ ki şan'at-i şî'r ve  
ma'rifet-i inşâya talib, ve 'ilm-i belâgat ve  
fenn-i feşâhate râğıb olup; bu fakîr-i mevlevî,  
a'nî Şeyh İsmâ'il Ankaravîden Hañb-i Dimişkinüñ  
agmaz-ı muşannefatından olan metn-i *Telhîsi*  
ta'allüme şürü' idüb; hâlbuki anlaruñ ol fennde  
yedleri kaşır olduğundan, o kitâb-ı belâgat  
-nışâbda münderic bulınan ma'nâ-yı dağıkkanuñ  
fehmi zihnlereine 'asîr geldiği cihetle 'ilm-i  
mezkûra iştigâlden sîr-ü-melûl olmuşlar idi.

Bu fakir-i keşirü 't-takşirüñ derünında sefaķat-i fıtrıye ve merħamet-i cibillıye cüsa gelüb, anlara ve anlardan ğayrı talib-i belāġat-ü -feşāħat olanlara teshil itmek için, ol kitāb-ı bedi'ü 'l-esāsuñ bedi'ü-beyānına müte'allık olan, ve fennlerinden tullāba ehemm-ü-elzem olan ebyāt-u-kelimāt telhıs-ü-ıktibas kılınub, Türkī 'ibārāt üzre terceme-vü-tefsir olındı.» (pp. 2-3)

Here we have an explicit condemnation of the method of presentation employed by the *Telhıs*. He praises the students for whom he is writing this work, and finds their inability to comprehend «the most obscure of Hařıb-i Dimiřki's writings» a matter for sympathy rather than reproach. He later explains the choice of title :

«Ümiddür ki bu cevher-i şeb-tāb ve tuħfe-i kem-yāb *Miftāħa* miftāħ, ve fünün-i belāġate mute'allık olan kütübe nisbetle mişbāħ ola» (p. 4)

The implication here is that the existing works on rhetoric are obscure, and he sees it as his purpose to shed light on the system of poetics and rhetoric, so that the reader may be better able to understand the secrets of the *Meşnevi* and the Traditions of the Prophet, and to appreciate the miraculous nature of the Koran. Although the *Miftāħ* is virtually a direct translation of the *Menāzırı 'l-İnşā*, Rüsühî, in common with most Ottoman rhetoricians, fails to acknowledge his debt thereto. In a preface to the printed edition (1284/1867), the publisher identifies the *Menāzır* as the source of the *Miftāħ*, and describes it as the first work on rhetoric to be written in Turkish, a claim which cannot be justified, except in so far as it was indeed the first to be published :

«İşbu *Miftāħü 'l-Belāġa* nām kitāb-ı ma'ārif -nısāb ki fi 'l-ħaķıķa fenn-i bedi'ü-beyānda lisān-ı Türkī üzre yazılmıř olan kitāblarıñ birincisi, ve tarıķ-ı edebiyātda açılmıř olan ebvāb-ı belāġatıñ eñ evvelkisi dinmege sezā . . . dur.» (p. 1)

This is truly a remarkable statement in that the publishers have used the word «*edebîyât*» to denote «literature» rather than the more common «*inşâ*», signifying prose composition, at a period when its use was extremely rare. One wonders if this work was published as a response to Nâmiğ Kemâl's plea for a Turkish rhetoric in an article published in the *Taşvîr-i Efkâr* in the previous year, 1283. (This article is discussed in some detail on the following pages). The fact that the *Miftâh* was published by this newspaper would tend to suggest some connection, and one should perhaps ask whether it was Kemâl himself who recommended its publication. As the editor at the time of the *Miftâh*'s publication, he would surely have had a direct participation in all decisions as to what works were published on the printing presses of his newspaper<sup>4</sup>.

There is no doubt that those who were instrumental in the publication of the *Miftâh*, be it Kemâl, editor at the time of its publication, or his friend Ekrem, who was to succeed him only ten days after the appearance of this work, were aware of the many virtues it shared in common with the *Menâzırü'l-İnşâ*. It is, when compared to those tedious and arid works derived exclusively from the *Telhîs*, a felicitous exposition, for the same reasons which set the *Menâzır* apart from all other works on rhetoric.

#### *Nâmiğ Kemâl's Contribution*

The publication of the *Miftâh* in 1284/1867 can be seen as the first positive efforts of a school of literatî who were rebelling against the cautious approach adopted by scholars such as Aḥmed Cevdet Paşa whose ultimate justification for writing the *Belâgat-i 'Osmanîye* was to be the fact that the Koran was revealed in Arabic. They began to adopt a radically different approach, which was to produce

4 Kemâl was editor of the *Taşvîr-i Efkâr* until he fled to France on August 31st 1867, ten days after the date of publication of the *Miftâh*. There was no doubt that Kemâl was familiar with the *Menâzır*, for in response to a criticism, he defined *inşâ* using the definition given in this work (text given in *Kulliyât-ı Kemâl : Makâlât-ı Siyâsiye ve Edebiye* [Istanbul, n.d.], p. 122). Page references for the article in the *Taşvîr-i Efkâr* are to the text as given in the *Kulliyât-ı Kemâl*.

works of rhetoric intended to serve literature, just as it in turn would serve as an active force in moulding a new society. If the credit for founding this new school were to be given to any individual, it would be to Nāmık Kemāl. Likewise, if one were to seek any one moment in history to mark its birth, it would, without doubt, be the 16th and 19th of *Rebī'ü'l-Âhur*, 1283 (29th July, 2nd August 1866), when there appeared an article in the newspaper, *Taşvîr-i Efkâr*, entitled «Edebîyât hakkında ba'zı Mülâhazât». This short essay was in fact a literary manifesto, in which he envisaged a new literature, playing a new role in a new society, and as part of his scheme for its creation, he demanded a new rhetoric.

Nāmık Kemāl, having been imbued with the ideals of representative and consultative government, realised that such a political system would presume the existence of a language suitable as a medium for the exchange of ideas. The written word had the power to endow the individual with immortality, and at the same time serve society as a means of communication. Inspired by Buffon, to whom he tacitly alludes by quoting his dictum «*Le style c'est l'homme même*», he accepts that good style proceeds from sound thinking, presenting this dichotomy as «feşâhat-i edâ» and «belâgat-ı mü'eddâ». He has consciously associated the Western concept of eloquence, that is the mode of effective communication, with the technical terms drawn from classical rhetoric (p. 103). Implicit in this casual association is the notion that rhetoric can teach the student better to communicate his ideas. Justifying his adoption of Western standards, Kemāl characteristically looks to an Islamic precedent and quotes Zemahşeri's observation to the effect that the word is more powerful than the sword, rendering the concept of persuasive speech as «hük-m-i belâgat» (p. 104), and remarking that Ottoman society lacked any tradition of eloquent speech, let alone oratory. In order to establish a literary tradition analogous to the literatures which had served to strengthen the unity of European nation-states, he presents a programme of action which he believed would further this cause.

His literary manifesto advocated five ways in which a national literature could be developed. Firstly, the principles of the language needed to be compiled and arranged systematically. Secondly, the



practice of seeking unusual vocabulary to express simple concepts was to be condemned. Thirdly, the orthography must be reformed and standardised. As a fourth condition, he recommended a greater use of Turkish modes of constructing phrases, and finally, he deplored the current practice of employing figures of speech which tend to obfuscate the intention of the speaker (pp. 111-112). Among the steps he recommends for implementing these ideas is the compilation of a work of rhetoric (*belāgat kitābı*) suitable for Turkish. In particular, he is concerned with the '*ilm-i bedī'*, to which he refers as the «*tezyināt-ı lafziye*» (p. 116). Of these, some will have to be discarded as unsuitable for Turkish, while at the same time it is conceded that many should be retained, as language is to some degree in need of ornamentation. More important than outward grace is sound content, which is for him the factor which will assure a work its place within the national literature.

In order to implement language reform, Kemāl suggested a five-point course of action: firstly, a better grammar of Turkish was to be composed; secondly, a well organised dictionary of the language was to be compiled; thirdly, the *galat-i meşhūr*, that is, Ottomanisms which violated the Arabic paradigm, were to be legitimised and accepted as an integral part of standard Ottoman Turkish; fourthly, an anthology of good Turkish writing was to be produced and taught in the schools; and fifthly, a work of rhetoric, appropriate to the Turkish language was to be written. Kemāl did, however, envisage difficulties with this last proposal; in particular, he foresaw a reaction from the conservative elements of society who might wish to preserve the old elegancies. He also recognised that a certain body of opinion, inspired by Western literary standards, was advocating the abandonment of all traditional ornamentation. Kemāl himself recommends a middle course which would rid the language of inappropriate figures and retain those that were effective (pp. 112-115).

The ornamentation to which he refers is that stock of rhetorical figures found in *bedī'*. He does not however suggest what criteria he would apply to the selection of tropes suited to Turkish, and indeed any critical analysis of *bedī'* would have been well without the scope of a short essay. He does, however, offer one example of

how such a process of selection may proceed (p. 118). He takes the three types of hyperbole, *maḳbûl*, *ma'kûl* and *medhûl*, the first being possible both rationally and experientially, the second being rational but improbable in the light of human experience, while the third admits of no possibility either by reason or from experience. This third kind, Kemāl argues, should be avoided, for its use stems from dissatisfaction with the beauties of nature (ṭabī'atīñ muḥasse-nātı) and seeking that which is superior to the works of God. Whoever strives for superiority over the works of God, far from being educated (edīb), is considered a philistine (bī-edīb).

The reasoning behind his decision to avoid the third type is far from clearly expressed. Whatever interpretation one puts on this passage the argument is not convincing, for it cannot be denied that irrational hyperbole is often extremely effective as an aid to communication.

As we shall see, Kemāl was to maintain a close watch on the development of an Ottoman rhetorical theory. He corresponded both with Recā'izāde Maḥmūd Ekrem and Süleymān Paşa, as indeed he did with many of the important writers of his day<sup>5</sup>. It is clear from the tone of his letters that he saw himself in the role of a teacher, feeling in himself the authority to advise and criticise, untroubled by the fear that his attitude might have been considered excessively patronising. His criticism is always blunt, his praise always moderated by correction or reproof. When writing to Ekrem Bey he did not hesitate to provide detailed critiques, as when, for example, he received a copy of *Mes Prisons*, a translation which had recently been published by Ekrem (1291/1874) :

«*Mes Prisons* bir kaç def'a okudum; sâir eserlerinden aşağı buldum; lâkin ta'rîzâtımın yüzde doksanı sana değil müellifi içindir . . . Terceme husûsunda birçok i'tirazlarım var; ez cümle kâfiye-perverlik ziyâde. Bâzi nâ-ma'rûf istilâhlar var. Tetâbû'-ı izâfât dahî bâzi

5 His letters have been edited by F. A. Tansel, *Namık Kemal'in Mektupları*, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1967-69) and in *Hususi Mektuplarına Göre Namık Kemal ve Abdülhak Hâmid* (Ankara, 1949).

yerlerde hadd-i cevâzı geçmiş. Bâ-husûs ki, kitâbın ibtidâsında olan mebhasler ile, sonunda mebhasler, bir lisân-ı edebte değil. Evvelkileri biraz fasih edivermek, senin için güç birşey değil idi.»<sup>6</sup>

Kemâl not only criticises but offers advice, as when he suggests in a letter to Ekrem that he should read the works of the following authors: Walter Scott, Hugo, Alexandre Dumas, George Sand, Balzac, Eugène Sue, Ponson du Terrail and Bulwer-Lytton. Besides the obvious interest which Kemâl maintained in literature, he was also passionately engrossed in questions of language and constantly raises issues concerning certain usages in his letters. While in exile his correspondence is filled with pleas for certain books, among them works of rhetoric. Writing to a certain 'Osman Bey in 1875 he asks: «Hani Mutavvel? Üzerine mi oturdun? Ne yaptın? Edebiyata âit bir kitab yazacağım, âna muhtâcım»<sup>7</sup>, clearly a reference to the translation by 'Abdünnâfi'. Similarly he was to show an extraordinary impatience in awaiting the arrival of copies of the *Mebâni 'l-İnşâ* and the *Ta'tim-i Edebîyât*.

#### *Süleymân Paşa's Mebâni 'l-İnşâ*

Five years after Kemâl's article on literature, there appeared the first volume of a work on literary theory: the *Mebâni 'l-İnşâ*. Its author, Süleymân Paşa (1838-1892), was a committed modernist, participating wholeheartedly in the quest for new standards in both the political and literary domains. In 1876, while director of the Mekteb-i 'Ulûm-ı Harbîye, he was to play a leading role in the deposition of 'Abdül'azîz, in co-operation with Hüseyin 'Avnî Paşa, the commander-in-chief of the Army, to whom the *Mebâni 'l-İnşâ* is dedicated. He later commanded the troops at the Şıpka Pass (1877-78), sharing with Gâzî 'Osman Paşa the credit for holding back the invading Russian army. His heroic stand against the enemy, however, did not save him from being exiled to Baghdad (1878-92), where his reformist zeal could be safely contained.

<sup>6</sup> *Namık Kemal'in Mektupları*, I, 344-45. Transcription is the editor's.

<sup>7</sup> *Namık Kemal'in Mektupları*, I, 372. Editor's transcription.

Published by the press of the *Harbîye* in two volumes (1288-89/1871-72), the *Mebāni 'l-İnşā* is a literary handbook, a compendium of rhetoric, poetics and stylistics. It was the first Ottoman work of literary theory to take cognisance of western ideas, probably as a direct response to Kemāl's manifesto in the *Taşvîr-i Efkâr* in 1283/1866, the text of which he published *in extenso* in an appendix (II, 246-261)<sup>8</sup>.

Süleymân Paşa was uncompromisingly progressive, not in deed only, but also in his writings. It is to be regretted that the *Mebāni 'l-İnşā* appeared in the formative years of Tanzimat literature, for had he undertaken this pioneering work several years later, it would most certainly have evinced a firmer grasp of French literary ideas. Handicapped by his limited knowledge of foreign literatures, he was, also, restricted by the conservative nature of the society for which he was writing, a readership which he was careful not to alienate by the premature use of the neologism, «*edebîyât*» in the title of his book. The *Mebāni 'l-İnşā* is not, as its title would suggest, a work confined exclusively to epistolography, or even prose composition in its broadest sense, the second volume being devoted to poetics; this apparent contradiction may be reconciled if we assume that by *inşā* is intended *edebîyât*, a term used in the text with no obvious reluctance. As the work describes, to some extent, European literary theory, we should take the expression *inşā* as signifying «*literature*», rendered into Turkish as *edebîyât*. This latter term had already been used by Kemāl to encompass both of the classical divisions of *şî'r* and *inşā* into which all of the *âsâr-ı edebîye* could, in theory, be divided.

In a later work, the *Ta'rîh-i 'Âlem*, Süleymân Paşa was to advocate Turcism and the language reforms necessitated by this ideology<sup>9</sup>. A man of action and vision, Süleymân Paşa yet lacked a clear

8 Süleymân Paşa and Kemāl were childhood friends. For an account of their relationship see F.A. Tansel, «Süleyman Paşa ile Namık Kemal'in Münâsebât ve Muhâberâtı», *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, XI(1954), p. 131-152.

9 Ziyâ Gökalp gives the credit for the foundation of Turkism to Ahmed Vefîk Paşa and Süleymân Paşa (*The Principles of Turkism*, p. 4), whom he believed to be prime movers in the rise of Turkish nationalism (*Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*, p. 66).

understanding both of the problems to be overcome, and the means available for their solution. Having been born in the reign of Maḥmūd II, there was virtually no possibility of his acquiring the necessary education which would allow such ideas to mature; he could do no more than scatter the seeds, some of which might germinate in the fresh soil of the new generation.

He modeled the *Mebāni* on an unpretentious work by Émile Lefranc, entitled *Traité Théorique et Pratique de Littérature*, published in three volumes, the first dealing with ideas, style, and composition, the second with categories of poetry, and the third with prose and public rhetoric<sup>10</sup>. This tripartite literary theory was intended by Lefranc to be the prologomena to an ambitious project of universal literary history, consisting of one volume each on the literatures of the Greeks, the Latins and Christianity, three on the French, and two on foreign literatures. This eleven-volumed literary survey, designated the *Cours élémentaire de littérature*, was designed to meet the educational needs of the Second Republic and the Empire of Napoleon III, a meritocracy regulated by state examinations. This handbook offered ready answers to questions which had already been posed in the text, so that the student, ever mindful of his immediate goal, a pass in the examinations, could judge his progress by measuring his ability to assimilate the material against the question asked. The text begins thus (I, 13) :

1<sup>er</sup> — *De la logique*

1. Qu'est-ce que la logique? — 2. Sur quoi s'exerce l'art de penser? — 3. Quelles sont les principales facultés de l'esprit? —
4. Qu'est-ce que comprend la logique?

1. La *Logique* est l'art de penser.

2. L'art de penser s'exerce sur les idées au moyen des diverses facultés de l'esprit.

<sup>10</sup> Originally published in three volumes in Paris, 1837, each volume subsequently saw a number of reprints: Vol. I, 6 rep. between 1843 and 1880; II, four between 1842 and 1874.

3. Les principales facultés de l'esprit sont la *sensibilité* et l'*entendement*.

4. La Logique comprend: 1° les *idées*; 2° les *facultés de l'esprit*; 3° l'*emploi des facultés de l'esprit* ou la *méthode*.

This work would have had an immediate appeal to a man such as Süleymān Paşa, an Ottoman of progressive temperament but deprived of immediate access to the works of European literature. He was to do for Ottoman literature what a previous generation had done for the military sciences: translating a basic text-book which had already found general acceptance in the country of origin. The weakness of this pragmatic approach was that while the military sciences were in themselves of European origin, the literary theory was intended for a literature as yet little influenced by the West. Süleymān Paşa had, in short, committed the cardinal error of applying a literary theory evolved from one tradition to a literature based upon another. One should be sympathetic, for in many aspects the *Traité* must have seemed, if only superficially, rather familiar. Because the method of presentation is a response to the same pedagogical requirements for which the *Telhîs* was composed, the work shares, in common with the Arabic tradition of literary theory, many points of similarity, the most striking of which is the tendency to divide and classify, to order and categorise, features most commonly associated with the scholastic tradition. Moreover, as the work reflects the literary tastes of a period dominated by the romanticists it shares some of the same aesthetic principles, and inevitably it will share some concepts common to all literatures. Occasionally a scheme of classification peculiar to one literature will seem ideally suited to adaptation, tempting the borrower to apply it to an alien system, even though, in fact, the similarity goes no deeper than mere lexical equivalence.

We can easily understand how Süleymān Paşa may well have been beguiled by the apparent facility with which the *Traité* lent itself to translation from the definition of literature offered in the

introduction to the work<sup>11</sup>. At the lexical level, that is, in terms of rendering each word with an immediate correspondence, one could well imagine the definition to have been written by an Ottoman describing his own literature. Lefranc's tripartite division of style, *le style sublime, tempéré* and *simple*, can be rendered familiarly into Turkish as «kelâm-i 'âlî», «kelâm-i mu'tedil», and «kelâm-i basîf» without misrepresenting the purport of the original. One wonders, however, what an Ottoman reader would make of such ideas as «şervet» (*richesse*), «nezâket» (*finesse*), «zarâfet» (*delicatesse*) and «talâvet» (*grace*) as distinct concepts. However, as traditional Islamic literary theory does not recognise such qualities, the reader cannot be misled too far; but when *rhétorique* and *éloquence* are rendered as *belâgat* and *feşâhat* confusion must surely ensue. Having adopted these lexical equivalents, Süleymân Paşa then proceeds to provide corresponding examples of political and military speeches under the headings «Feşâhat-i Politikîye» and «Feşâhat-i 'Askerîye».

However misleading the work may be, it does nevertheless represent the first attempt to impose Western literary theory on an Islamic language. One might suggest that had he merely translated the *Traité*, he would surely have better served his students, for this in itself is an excellent work from which to gain an insight into Western literary practice. However it does presume some degree of awareness of the product of the Western European literary effort. A translation of the theory would therefore have been useless as a guide to European methods of criticism, without the context of some of the literature from which it was evolved. (The converse was also true: contemporary Europeans approaching Islamic literary theory discovered *belâga* to be totally inadequate as a guide, without its context, and it has consequently never been translated into a European language in its entirety.) Süleymân Paşa's effort to provide Ottoman with a rhetorical theory of its own is based on a compromise, being neither a complete translation of Western theory, nor

11 The definition offered by Lefranc is as follows: «*La Littérature est la connaissance des Belles-Lettres, ou des modèles qui se trouvent dans les auteurs, soit anciens, soit modernes. Elle comprend ainsi les vers et la prose, la poésie et l'éloquence, c'est-à-dire, tous les genres de composition littéraire, la théorie qui en fixe les règles, et la pratique qui offre l'exécution.*» (I, 11).

its wholesale imposition on the classical language. It takes those features of French theory which most closely resemble an Islamic counterpart, albeit at a superficial level, and those examples of Ottoman writing most susceptible to analysis by alien criteria. If the Western model cannot be applied (as in the case of prosody), he rejects it, falling back on the traditional approach, while the examples are, as one would expect in such a work, chosen to fit the theory. Although selected from the corpus of Ottoman literature — here the term is to be understood in its widest sense, as some examples are taken from the existing translations out of French — they cannot be considered representative.

The first volume of the *Mebāni 'l-İnşā* is divided into seven *faşls* and these are followed by the first of two *makāles*, the second of which comprises most of the second volume. Towards the end of the latter the author reproduces some texts intended to inspire the student with new ideals and standards in prose composition. The whole work possesses, superficially, a logical unity, progressing from the definition of *kelime* and *kelām* (*faşl-i evvel*, vol. I, p. 7) to the qualities of speech, both general and particular (*faşl-i şānī*, p. 16), and the pre-requisites of speech (*faşl-i sālis*, p. 42). The classical science of *beyān* is the subject of the fourth *faşl* (p. 53), while composition is dealt with in the next three; the fifth *faşl* (p. 72) is devoted to the art of persuasion, both by oration and essay; the sixth (p. 139) to various styles of writing, and the seventh (p. 160) to epistolography. There now follows the two *makāles*, the first devoted to those figures of *bedī'* classified as *lafzīye* (p. 170) and the second in volume two (II, p. 2), to the *ma'nevīye*. Süleymān Paşa completes his presentation with the classical description of rhyme, meter and poetic form (II, pp. 96-133). As an appendix to the second volume (II, p. 134) we have prose passages by Okçızāde, 'Ākif Paşa and Nāmık Kemāl and several excerpts from the translation of *Télémaque*, followed by a few pages of definitions of Arabic proverbs (II, p. 276).

Süleymān Paşa attempts to present European criteria of literary criticism within the broader framework of the classical description. Relying on the *Menāzırü 'l-İnşā* of H'âce-i Cihān and the *Meseli 's-Sā'ir* of Ziyā'eddīn b. el-Eşīr as his guides to the traditional



theory, he provides a fairly lucid exposition of the sciences of *belāga*, *'arūz* and *kāfiye*. Into this he interpolated a European approach inspired by Lefranc, the result being that the two systems are ill-suited, the Western theory failing to blend with the traditional presentation. Nevertheless, it is immediately apparent to the reader that an alien view of literature has been introduced.

The qualities of speech, the subject of the second *faşl*, may, to a certain extent, be intelligible to an Ottoman student, as yet unexposed to European literary analysis, but the material contained in the fifth certainly will not. There the Western tradition of forensic rhetoric, developed in the courtrooms of the Ancient World is, together with other modes of speech-making, presented as a subject for study by members of a society to which no opportunity for public speaking had yet been afforded. It must, however, be mentioned again, in this context, that Süleymān Paşa was instrumental in introducing the constitution of 1876, so that this section may indeed represent a political ideal. The fact that he translates the French «éloquence» as «feşāhat», can only lead to even greater confusion.

Both Cevdet Paşa and Kemāl were to severely criticise the *Mebāni 'l-İnşā*. Cevdet, ever wary of foreign influence, disliked the introduction of elements which did not belong to the *'ilm-i belāgat*. He also found fault with the choice of examples, in particular, a memorandum by 'Alī Paşa which far from being a fine example of prose, was on the contrary one of his worst pieces of composition. So dissatisfied was Cevdet that he wrote a critique which he entitled the *Ta'dil-i Mebāni 'l-İnşā*, a review which was, however, to remain unpublished<sup>12</sup>.

Kemāl's reaction was predictable: «Paşam Efendim», he wrote, «Mebāni 'l-İnşālar geldi, büyük teşekkürlər ederim, oğutmağa başladım. Bir hayli muâhazâtım var . . . Husûsiyle misal sûretinde inthâb olunan beyitleri beğenmiyorum . . .»<sup>13</sup>

Despite its numerous faults, the work was popular enough to run into a second edition, but whether this was due to its own

12 *Tezâkir*, IV, 118. See also *Tezâkir*, IV, 150-151 for Cevdet's criticism of Süleymān Paşa's *Ta'rih-i 'Alemler*.

13 *Namık Kemal'in Mektupları*, I, 357. Editor's transcription.

intrinsic merit, or to the demands of the students, for whom it was prescribed reading, cannot be determined. Although Süleymân Paşa failed in his attempt to introduce new standards of criticism, this failure lies not in his conception of what Ottoman literature should be, but rather in his adherence to the belief that Western and Eastern theories could combine harmoniously. Though he did not attain his ideal, he did, however, pass the torch of his zeal to a young scholar who was able to produce, from exactly the same materials, a work which was to leave a lasting impression on Ottoman literature. The *Ta'lim-i Edebiyât* of Recâ'izâde Maḥmûd Ekrem achieved that goal which Süleymân Paşa had set himself, however short he was to fall in its realisation.