



International

Journal of Human Studies

Uluslararası İnsan Çalışmaları Dergisi

ISSN: 2636-8641

Cilt/VOLUME 8 Sayı/ISSUE 15 Yıl/YEAR: 2025

Alındı/RECEIVED: 13-07-2024 – Kabul/ACCEPTED: 26-09-2024

Orientalist Representations of Anatolia Imagined by an Appropriative Narrator

Temellükçü Bir Anlatıcının Tahayyülündeki Şarkiyatçı Anadolu Temsilleri

Gökhan ALBAYRAK¹

Abstract

This paper aims to explore how Anatolia was represented by the orientalist perspective of the British intelligence officer William John Childs, who traversed across Asia Minor on foot in 1911 in the last decade of the Ottoman Empire during the turmoil that preceded the First World War, prior to the impending collapse of the empire in 1918 and the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. It also attempts to investigate how Asia Minor not only repelled, but also enchanted the Western traveller. Furthermore, this study intends to shed light on how the British colonialist traveller portrayed the peoples of

Öz

Bu çalışma, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun son on yılında, Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nın hemen öncesindeki kargaşa döneminde – imparatorluğun 1918'deki beklenen yıkılışının ve 1923'te Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluşunun öncesinde – 1911'de Küçük Asya'yı yürüyerek gezen İngiliz istihbarat subayı William John Childs'ın oryantalist bakış açısından Anadolu'nun nasıl temsil edildiğini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Aynı zamanda, Küçük Asya'nın Batılı gezgini nasıl hem iğrendirdiğini hem de büyülediğini irdelemeye çalışmaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra, bu çalışma, sömürgeci İngiliz seyyahın emperyalist bir

¹ Gökhan ALBAYRAK, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Ankara Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı, galbayrak@ankara.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2703-4326>

Asia Minor from an imperialist vantage point. Regarding the British as the genuine inheritors of the ancient Greek spirit that he believed he had come across in Anatolia, Childs appropriated the legacy of the ancient Hellenic civilisation in the name of Britain, considering that the peoples of Asia Minor could not live up to its fame. Disregarding the fact that the peoples of Asia Minor had a lot in common and shared certain similar characteristics as the subjects of the Ottoman Empire who had been living together for hundreds of years, the imperialist officer sought to underline the differences between the ethnic communities of Anatolia, bent on spoiling a sense of having a common destiny and fostering an unfortunate sense of hostility among its peoples. In accordance with the colonialist and imperialist agenda of the British Empire, Childs misrepresented the peoples of Anatolia as savage, primitive, uncivilised and parochial bigots so that it would be just to allow the British Empire, as opposed to the Germans and the Russians, to take over. Childs's descriptions of the Anatolian landscape demonstrate how he embodies the colonial desire to penetrate the mysteries of the land that he rendered impregnable.

Keywords: Travel writing, Anatolia, Orientalism, British travellers, The Orient

bakış açısından Küçük Asya halklarını nasıl betimlediğine dair de ışık tutmayı hedeflemektedir. Britanyalıları, Anadolu'da karşılaştığını düşündüğü kadim Yunan ruhunun gerçek mirasçıları olarak gören Childs, antik Helen medeniyetinin mirasını yine Britanya adına temellük etmiştir çünkü Küçük Asya halklarının bu medeniyetin ihtişamlı şöhretine ulaşamayacağını düşünmüştür. Küçük Asya halklarının, Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun yüzyıllardır birlikte yaşayan tebaası olarak benzer özellikleri ve birçok ortak yanı olduğunu göz ardı eden emperyalist subay, Anadolu'nun etnik toplulukları arasındaki farklılıkların altını çizmeye çalışmıştır çünkü bu halklar arasındaki talihsiz bir düşmanlık hissiyatını beslemek ve böylece ortak bir kader anlayışını dağıtmak istemiştir. Britanya İmparatorluğu'nun kolonyalist ve emperyalist ajandasıyla uyumlu bir şekilde, Childs Anadolu halklarını vahşi, ilkel, medenileşmemiş ve dar görüşlü bağnazlar olarak yanıltıcı bir şekilde sunmuş ve böylece, Ruslardan ya da Almanlardan ziyade, İngilizlerin buradaki kontrolü ele geçirmesini haklı kılmaya çalışmıştır. Childs'ın Anadolu'nun doğasına dair betimlemeleri bile, zapt edilemez olarak sunduğu bir ülkenin gizemine nüfuz etme arzusu olan kolonyal arzuyu nasıl kendi bünyesinde barındırdığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Seyahat yazını, Anadolu, Şarkiyatçılık, İngiliz seyyahlar, Şark

Introduction

Walter Benjamin (1968) states that people imagine the storyteller as the trading seaman who comes from afar or the resident tiller of the soil who stays at home and narrates local stories (pp. 84-85). This demonstrates that stories, whether orally transmitted or written down, have been closely connected with travelling. The wanderer has told us tales since times immemorial. A culture-founding canonical text, Homer's *Odyssey* has given us the archetypal figure who roams the world and stores tales in ancient times. Medieval pilgrims and romantic errant knights follow epic heroes of ancient tales in the Middle Ages. In the modern era, writing and travel were inextricably linked. Travellers in the Renaissance began recording their observations. The sixteenth-century explorers found "a 'new continent' of truth, based on experience and observation rather than the authority of the ancients" (Hulme & Youngs, 2002, p. 4). Hence, early modern travellers generated a vast body of knowledge about the world predicated on their individual experiences and subjective observations.

A great number of western travellers have travelled to the East throughout the ages. Politicians, scholars, artists, merchants and tourists in the modern era followed medieval pilgrims and crusaders (Lewis, 1968, p. 296). Europe was deeply interested in the Ottomans in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, fearing the impregnable Ottoman army threatening "to overwhelm Europe" (Maclean, 2007, p. 1). Yet, fear was mingled with fascination in the colonial narratives based on this curious blend of repulsion and enchantment. The western traveller was not only mesmerised by the natural beauty he was exposed to, but also revolted by the colonial culture that he could not disengage himself from (Edmond, 2002, p. 152). As a result, in the seventeenth century, their fears merged with their "fascination with elements of Ottoman culture" even though their dread carried on (Maclean, 2007, p. 2).

Travel writing in the eighteenth century embodied the spirit manifested in Dunton's lines: "*Terra Incognita* shall fly before us, / And all the savages behind adore us" (as cited in Sherman, 2002, p. 33). Hence, the commercial motivations of the sixteenth century were followed by the "imperial rambles" in the eighteenth century (p. 33). Britain sought to know and make knowable the *terra incognita* where they set up colonies. As Said (1979) asserted, the East "needed first to be known, then invaded and possessed" (p. 101). Anatolia was a particular place that lured many European travellers in the eighteenth century, which stimulated a vast production of writing. To illustrate, Drummond published his travelogue in 1754 and portrayed the Turks as "a savage race" (p. 97). In addition, chiefly remembered for her *Turkish Embassy Letters*, posthumously published in 1763, Lady Montagu (1763) said that the Turks were not as "unpolish'd" as the western travellers represented them, and acknowledged that they were magnificent, yet their "magnificence" was of a different kind (p. 68). Lewis (1968) pointed out that Montagu oscillated between the myths of "the Muslim as barbarous infidel" and the oriental as the incarnation of "mystery and romance," and the later myth that portrayed them as "the paragon of virtue, wisdom and wronged innocence" (p. 301). Bowen (1945) called her "the most delightful" of all British authors who visited Turkey (p. 24). These narratives evince that vulgarity dovetailed with refinement in these embodiments of the Turks.

Similar impressions permeated the narratives of the nineteenth century, too. Lord Byron, who also fought against the Ottomans during the Greek War of Independence, visited Turkey during his “Oriental pilgrimage” in 1810-11 (Oueijan, 2011, p. 31). Yearning to display his Olympic spirit, the Romantic poet swam across Hellespont in Turkey in imitation of the Greek hero who swam across the strait to spend time with his beloved. Byron’s passion for reviving the Hellenic spirit was a significant motivation for western travellers. Many travellers were intrigued by the relics of Greek antiquity. For instance, Hamilton (1838) travelled to Anatolia in 1836, explored the ruins of Hellenic civilisation and published an account of his journey “extracted from private letters” (p. 137). Similarly, Fellows (1839) visited the remains of Greek civilisation, which he believed were the primary attraction for travellers (p. iv). Smith (1887) visited Anatolia in 1884 and recorded the Greek inscriptions on ruined walls and rocks (p. 216). Most nineteenth century travellers also had a political agenda. They portrayed the Turks as despotic and bigoted (Aydin, 1999, p. 18). Their descriptions were fraught with “clichéd stereotypes” which implied that The Turks were inferior (İşçi, 2021, p. 255). Their representation of the Turks was not dissimilar to that of the preceding centuries.

This perspective continued into the twentieth century. For instance, Eliot (1908) portrayed the Turks as uncultivated nomadic looters (p. 12). William John Childs, the primary object of this paper, traversed across Asia Minor in 1911 during the turmoil that preceded the First World War and published his travel narrative in 1917. Childs meticulously recorded his impressions in his diaries (Kuş & Alan, 2022, p. 2958). He was a British intelligence officer who compiled information that was important to the British Foreign Office. Hence, a stream of intelligence flowed from the Ottoman Empire to London. Hamm (2012) pointed out that the Ottoman Empire had an exceptional significance for the British foreign policy (p. 1). The period between 1900 and 1914 was “a deeply unsettled period” since imperial powers were competing for dominance in the East (Carr, 2002, p. 78). In this restless period, Childs published his travel account which displayed Britain’s imperial ambitions. Hence, this study examines Childs’s orientalist narrative about Asia Minor and explores how Anatolia both repulsed and fascinated the British officer, how he was intrigued by the spirit of the ancient Greek civilisation that he would reclaim for Britain as the only true inheritor of the Hellenic culture to be capable of appreciating its timeless value. Besides, this paper scrutinises how the colonialist British officer reproduced the orientalist narrative to portray the peoples of Asia Minor as monstrous and uncivilised, and to render their land as uncharted and undomesticated. This analysis also discloses how the colonialist travel writer de-historicised Asia Minor and foregrounded the differences among its peoples rather than paying attention to the fact they inhabited a contemporary reality which had nothing to do with the Asia Minor imagined by the British coloniser.

The Tumultuous Black Sea

Leaving Constantinople by ship, Childs arrived in Samsun, located on the coast of the Black Sea, began his journey towards inland Anatolia and ended his journey on the Mediterranean coast. I have decided to concentrate on Samsun to keep the scope of this paper brief and to underline the fact that this city was designated as the birthplace of the Anatolian resistance towards the imperial powers after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.

Childs (1917) noted that he differed from the other travellers, who had traversed Anatolia in carriages, for he had walked across Anatolia. The objective of his journey was to traverse Anatolia “in this more intimate fashion” (p. v). Journeying off the beaten track evoked for the colonial observer the lure of the marvellous discovery. His narrative recorded “legends, traditions, and historical events” of Asia Minor, “a land crowded with ancient memories” (p. vi). He stated that the Anatolians were very hospitable although “perhaps, much less might have been expected” from them (p. vi). He regarded himself as “a mysterious foreigner wandering about the country” and “photographing, taking notes” (pp. vi-vii). Childs thought that he was viewed by “the patriotic official eye” as an “inquisitive alien figure” (vi-vii). He saw himself from the perspective of the local Anatolian and positioned himself as an unreliable outsider. Stevenson (1899) succinctly observes that “[t]here is no foreign land” but “it is the traveller only that is foreign” (p. 78). Likewise, Childs regarded himself as the stranger. He portrayed Anatolia as an unmapped land to justify Britain’s imperial presence in the East. His account reflects the metaphors of colonial travel writing. Like the nineteenth-century British travel writing engaged “to map, classify, and comprehend” India (Teltscher, 2002, p. 193), Childs wanted to map Anatolia. He wanted to perpetuate the image of the undomesticated oriental other of Europe. The orientalist traveller regarded this land as a romantic and beguiling place of “exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes” (Said, 1979, p. 1). Besides, he underlined the ethnic divisions among the peoples of Anatolia. He paid special attention to the Anatolian Greeks, was obsessed with the ancient Greek relics and saw the British as worthy of this Hellenic legacy.

Childs was neither an ancient epic hero roaming the world nor a medieval pilgrim embarking on a spiritual quest. He was an intelligence officer who traversed Asia Minor to gather intelligence for the British Empire. Therefore, while he followed his predecessors’ footsteps, he embodied the political agenda of the British Empire and maintained the orientalist perspective that marked modern travel writing. Childs’s narrative fit in the orientalist paradigms, following certain representational themes about the Ottomans developed in the early modern England. Maclean (2007) stated that these themes consisted of such ideas as “licentious eroticism, ‘different sexualities,’ barbaric cruelty, despotic absolutism” and these misrepresentations fed “directly into the Orientalist mind set” (p. 19). Accordingly, Childs’s account reflected the Orient that was “almost a European invention” (Said, 1979, p. 1).

Childs’s narrative opens with his description of the raucous Black Sea and its “stormiest mood” (1917, p. 1). The boisterous Black Sea is utilised as a symbol to express the menacing land. The sea has been frequently used as one of the best metaphors that shows “the uncertainties of travel” (Hulme, 2002, p. 96). Uncertainties of colonial travel translated into uncertainties of colonial writing. The ship was going against a fierce, “wild north-easterly gale” from Russian steppes which brought “squalls of hail and rain, and whirling feathers of snow” (1917, p. 1). The untimely snow seems to have made Childs feel a sense of unease (p. 1). He mistrusted the land’s climate. His account gives away a sense of unease. He realised, at the same time, that the Austrian captain found the British greedy. According to the captain, the British had made the harbours, then took possession of them “like the gold-fields of South Africa” (p. 2). Childs believed that the captain “felt himself in the company of one” that could be hazardous (p. 3). The traveller knew that the British were seen as threatening in the region. The captain thought that Anatolia was

frightening, full of mountains, wolves, bandits and “savage, little-known people” (pp. 3-4). Like the western production of the myth of cannibalism about the colonised lands to use it “as an excuse for imperialist plunder” (Carr, 2002, p. 77), Childs emphasised the savagery of the land and of the people throughout his narrative. This puts him into the line of the western travellers such as Raleigh (1997), who documented cannibals and men with heads in their chests (1997, pp. 145, 149, 178). In addition to these grotesque images of cannibalism, Childs accentuated the fascinating uncanniness of the landscape that he viewed as unknown and unnamed; therefore, he reckoned that someone who delighted “in the sun and wind and open sky” on unfamiliar paths of adventure would find pleasure in “this ancient Eastern land” (1917, p. 4). In fact, these remarks are demonstrative of the colonial narrative that orientalist the east by aligning the land with the unnamed. This is the concrete manifestation of the orientalist perspective that romanticised the east by viewing it as the *incognito* land. From this vantage point, Anatolia harboured unheard-of roads that tempt the colonialist to identify, name and thus own them. Otherwise, the land as it exists by itself would not exist in the western imagination if it were not identified and named by the British coloniser.

The coast of the Black Sea was characterised by “a curious quality of mystery” according to Childs, who was gazing at the lofty mountains of Asia Minor (1917, p. 6). He believed that those mountains looked like “the jealous exterior guardians of mystery and romance,” and therefore their interior was “always walled in” (p. 6). He felt that those mountains never offered “a satisfying glimpse” into themselves and therefore no one could get “in contact with” those mountains (p. 7). The White Mountain was not too majestic for him to admire, as it was “defrauded of its full” splendour (p. 30). The Black Mountain had an evil and “sinister name” and was notorious on account of the storms and armed bandits (p. 30). These bandits had hitherto killed or robbed whomever they liked (p. 30). These images of savagery and eccentricity contributed to the constructed image of the East as a land of brutality and unlawfulness. Colonial travel writing featured “the promise of marvellous monstrosity” (Whitehead, 2002, p. 122). The imperialist powers made use of this discourse that forged the East as a “quasi-monstrous” other (Said, 1979, p. 154).

Childs (1917) felt that this menacing, unyielding territory offered romantic adventure (p. 7). He wished to take the less trodden path and to follow “those beckoning tracks” that could be “seen in the distance slanting across” hillsides (p. 15). He desired to go into “deep gorges” and to reach inaccessible villages (p. 15). He longed to feel as unbridled as a dervish that roams freely (p. 15). He yearned to follow “the fashion of the land” and to satisfy his “liking for a picturesque superstition” so he wanted his horse “to have blue beads plaited into his mane and tail as protection against the Evil Eye and wear [...] bells beneath his neck” which would offer them music (p. 15). He dreamed of getting in touch with the land and identifying with a local figure, a dervish, that is a mendicant ascetic who has deserted the illusions of the ego and has taken vows of poverty. These images Childs employed to describe his impressions regarding the East demonstrate that the western man of reason regarded Anatolia as a land of superstitions and blindly accepted groundless beliefs. He was fascinated by the oriental other that he fabricated in his imagination and designated as “backward, degenerate, uncivilised, and retarded” (Said, 1979, p. 216).

The Strangest Medley of Eastern Traffic

Childs wished to get in touch and discern the secret of the impenetrable mountains. This desire to penetrate the mystery of the land corresponds to the coloniser's impulse to colonise the so-called exotic Orient. The western traveller needed this culturally made image of the oriental other to describe himself as the rational one, and thus, to establish his sovereignty over the world. He employed the orientalist discourse to designate the East as "irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike" as opposed to the "rational, virtuous, mature" West (Said, 1979, p. 49). Childs (1917) saw the roads, which came to the shore from the uncanny interior, as the evidence of "mysteries beyond" and they made enticing "promises on behalf of" the unseen heartland (p. 7). He believed that his impressions sprang from magic that dwelled on the Anatolian "white main roads" which came winding down the mountains and terminated on the shore (p. 7). Those twisting roads of Anatolia constituted, for Childs, a sharp contrast to the modern roads in the western industrial cities of straight lines and uncluttered boulevards, rationally designed and constructed such as Paris and London. He was allured by the overpowering beauty of the road that came winding down the mountains (p. 8). He described this bewitching road which "came curving in and out around the spurs," and vanished and reappeared "between fields of maize and tobacco" (p. 8). This meandering road descended "steeply into the hot, cobbled, tree-lined main street of Samsun, and bringing in the strangest medley of Eastern traffic" (p. 8). He felt those impenetrable mountains that dwarfed him seemed to menace him, yet the curious hodgepodge fascinated him, too. He both feared and admired Anatolia. This highway in Anatolia had the most bewitching name according to Childs; it was called the Baghdad Road as it led to Baghdad from Samsun (p. 8). The winding road symbolised disarray that the western colonialist discourse associated with the tumultuous East. For Childs, this strange road was marked by "the smoke of charcoal-burners' fires rising above blue wooded spurs" in the daytime and "the glow of those same fires" at nights (p. 8). This fairyland also had "the highway life of a wide eastern country devoid of railways" and on this road one could see "caravans, peasants, beggars, gypsies, smugglers, soldiers, dervishes" (p. 9). This ancient land appeared as an undeveloped and inchoate country to Childs's western eyes. It was, however, the western sense of normalcy and supremacy that reduced this country to an abnormal land.

Childs's orientalist narrative evinces how the West objectified the East and reduced it to a fabulous land, where one experiences the titillating romance of the exotic roads, which brings back "the atmosphere of childhood" when a path embodied the road into the fairyland at first sight, but later "the highway to the sea and cities and wonders of the world" (1917, p. 7). Adding that these roads hide "something more than the imaginary behind them" (p. 7), Childs unwittingly acknowledged that this image of Anatolia only existed in their imagination, unearthing the colonial desire to grasp the secret of the impregnable land that tantalised the coloniser. This orientalist account romanticised Anatolia and disconnected it from its concrete reality. In the face of the sublime mountains that towered over him, the narrator infantilised the land and by extension its people. Anatolia was defined as an unheard-of realm of romance and fairies. Childs was enchanted by this magic land that evoked the ambiance of childhood. This shows how the East tapered off in the western imagination that associated it with the assumed naiveté and

innocence of children. Childs regarded the imaginary ancient East as an immemorial land to be explored and colonised.

This fabulous land with its sublime mountains, however, housed a strange medley of odours which the western traveller found repulsive. Childs (1917) noted that the prosperity of Samsun resulted from the Baghdad Road, upon which all the trade between the port and the heartland came and went; he depicted the traffic of this Eastern highway as “slow, cumbersome, and wonderfully picturesque” and described turbulent scenes where hundreds of vehicles and thousands of animals dammed the streets (p. 11). According to him, the city was characterised by the turmoil of various shrieks and roars: the “thud of heavy sticks upon donkeys' hindquarters,” the incessant “tinkling of donkey-bells,” the sluggish “clanging of camel-bells” and the howling ox-cart wheels (p. 11). Certain adjectives that Childs used to describe the sounds of the city are suggestive of brutality, sluggishness, tedium and humdrum monotony. This medley of people and animals moved and reposed under a scorching sun, and the obnoxious smells of men sweating profusely and animals, the odours “of cook-shops and tobacco and garlic and the sea” fused into a scent that would soar into the heavens (pp. 11-12). Childs's remarks about the city in summer were marked by the olfactory sense. The lingering smells of the city were implied to be repulsive.

The Plague of Asia Minor

During his journey Childs (1917) stayed in a *khan* that resembled “an old English coaching inn” (p. 21). He described his room as unpainted, filthy, dusty and saw there were “smears of blood” on the walls where terrifying insects such as “gorged and lethargic *tahkta bitis*” had died “under the hand or slipper of enraged owners of the blood” (pp. 22-23). The description of the room was marked by repugnant images such as dirt and smears of blood. In addition to these images of disgust, the fear of diseases, contagion and contamination is also reflected in his account. He dreaded being infected not only with cholera, but also with typhoid, “the plague of Asia Minor” (p. 23). This dread of being infected by cholera and typhoid portrayed Asia Minor as a land of plagues where the western traveller struggled hard to keep his body from contamination and to keep himself clean and proper altogether.

Staying in that unkempt *khan*, Childs (1917) was intrigued by the attendant who roasted and pounded coffee in a leisurely manner (p. 34). He expressed his admiration for the Turkish ritual of coffee-making that he “coveted exceedingly” by using images coloured by his gustatory sense (p. 34). His minute description of the ritual of coffee-making contributed to another orientalist image of the eastern peoples. This narrative of making coffee unhurriedly spread the idea that the eastern peoples were laid-back and slothful, and they cared very much for their palatal delight. This was in accordance with the orientalist discourse that portrayed the eastern peoples as savages whose lives were marked by the pleasures of the body, including “the excess of libidinous passions” (Said, 1979, p. 171). Besides, an embodied sense of life and an immersion in bodily pleasures seemed to mark their way of life, as opposed to the enlightened European, whose cognitive and rational capacities were claimed to have created the modern world. This image of indolence may be also seen as pitted against the colonial traveller's “Protestant thrift, resourcefulness, and willingness to work hard” (Hooper, 2002, p. 184). He also romanticised the country as he came across traditional flour mills. He was delighted by “the flashing of water, the

purring of stones, the kindly white dust of flour on everything” and he was charmed by the hearty and prosperous miller besides the romantic images of water, earth, dust and stones which were described poetically (1917, p. 35). Anatolia was an agrarian land, not industrialised. It was portrayed as a pastoral arcadian land of romance as opposed to the industrialised western Europe, especially Britain, which was the first country to be industrialised in Europe.

As Childs (1917) observed the inmates of the inn in the common room, he saw “a mass of swarthy figures dimly seen through clouds of tobacco-smoke by the light of a single lamp” (p. 25). They were sitting “cross-legged exchanging news” (p. 25). This inn gave away a sense of medieval mystery; after the dark, the inn turned into an uncanny place: fires glowed around him; the scent of the smoke was in the air; the “murmur of unseen men and animals” was heard only to be broken “by the clink of chain hobbles” or a howling jackal (p. 25). This scene was both enchanting and disquieting for the western traveller. Far away from the industrial west, where the printed word counted more than the spoken word, he was fascinated by the art of storytelling in a place that did not have a printing press and delighted by these gathering places where rumour passed for news (p. 25). These rumours were “picturesquely embroidered” tales that reflected the existing conditions of life; he was charmed by those stories that embodied those people’s desires, ambitions, goals, aspirations as well as their despairs, unease and aversion (p. 25). Childs referred to the old travellers who treated those wonderful tales of common people as “ill-coded messages” and extracted truthful elements from these stories (p. 25). The Orient was, for Childs, a fairyland deprived of the modern printing press. For Childs, the difference between rumour and news corresponded to the difference between the West and the East. People in this inn recounted shocking and gruesome stories besides charming stories; these amazing stories expressed their fantasies, desires, and fears, which subsequently contained some crumbs of truth although they were poorly encoded. Therefore, Childs was captivated by the fabulous stories of simple peoples of Anatolia even though he was also repulsed by smears of blood and dreaded being infected with diseases.

Some Dwarf Unfamiliar Species: Goatherds, Beggars, and Satyrs

Having left the inn the next day, Childs (1917) came across a track on the mountainside and went up this track “in lightness of heart” (p. 27). He had been seeking such a mountain-path in the wild (p. 27). As he was walking on this track, he imagined himself reverting to the “earlier and more romantic days” of the world (p. 27). He felt that this “illusion” stemmed from “the sounds that floated through” the silence of the countryside (p. 27). He heard his Turkish companion “crooning a plaintive Turkish melody to himself, and the jingling of his ponies” which was accompanied by the “hollow beating of camel bells” (p. 27). As he was listening, “a far-away tremulous piping struck in” and he heard “the reed-pipes of goatherd boys” (p. 27). Childs associated this fairyland with the primitive days of the uncivilised, unpolished world before it was cultivated by humankind. He was enchanted by this romantic picture of the pastoral world, where people indulged in georgic calm, enjoyed simple rustic pleasures such as humming in a soft voice, singing mournful songs, listening to camel bells and to the piping goatherds. For him, this arcadian land was like a pre-modern, prelapsarian paradise that had not been lost, where an unrefined, immature, naive folk was immersed in bucolic scenes without realising the difference between good and evil. Even the trees in this idyllic land harboured “some dwarf unfamiliar species” (p.

27). He was puzzled until he saw the reason why they were dwarfed: goats (p. 28). Andrews claims that the western travellers who viewed themselves as the big-game hunters boast about their encounters with the wilderness, “‘capturing’ wild scenes, and ‘fixing’ them as pictorial trophies” (as cited in Hooper, 2002, p. 176). That is why Childs was disappointed when he realised that he had not actually discovered an unfamiliar species in this uncharted land. The forest in this region had been “recklessly felled” and then “the profitable goat” came “in myriads” when nature began to restore itself and arrested its regeneration process (1917, p. 28). Because of deforestation, this land received less rainfall, and the bare land could not retain much of it. Hence, the western sightseer witnessed “washed-out roads, fans of shingle and detritus spread at the foot of gullies, and many dry watercourses” (p. 28). Anatolia, hence, emerges as an impoverished land of debris and trash in the western eyes of the colonialist traveller.

Moreover, Childs, who had arrived from the land of prosperity, came across a weird beggar on the road in the land of poverty. Intrigued, he inspected the curious figure, then realised that he had been fooled by a mendicant who pleaded with him for alms. He was also hoodwinked by another mendicant that earned his living by exhibiting his ill health and deficiencies (1917, p. 29). The beggar “went on all-fours,” displayed several “antics” and imitated animals (p. 29). Childs realised that he had no thighs and that the leg was rigid, and it was “only half the usual length” (p. 29). He would think that he had encountered “a satyr in life” had the beggar had a tail besides “his grim bearded face thrust upwards” and the bizarre “movements of his little legs” (p. 29). Childs eventually photographed the beggar and examined him closely as if he was a curiosity. He employed the language of the colonialist discourse that utilised “the tropes of degeneration, savagery, and monstrosity” (Youngs, 2002, p. 158). Like western travellers who employed animal imagery to depict “savage others” (Carr, 2002, p. 83), Childs utilised images of beasts to identify the oriental other. He saw him as a weird man with his truncated body; everything about the handicapped beggar was grotesque. Then, Childs also realised that the mendicant was handicapped. He described him as an inhuman, bestial, feral, and strikingly unusual man as he photographed this exotic creature while inspecting him minutely. He saw him through utterly “dehumanized lenses” (Said, 1979, p. 280). The act of the photographer was a colonial attempt to appropriate others and bring them under control, as Susan Sontag suggested (1973, p. 2). These descriptions put Childs on the same footing with the western travellers such as Leo Africanus, who made disdainful “judgements” about African peoples, which were generally “couched in bestial imagery” (Youngs, 2002, p. 158).

Anatolian Greeks: Homeros or Christos?

As Childs (1917) went on to talk about the people he came across in Anatolia, he thought that “the hopeless racial differences” troubled the Ottoman Empire; he recounted his encounter with a Greek boy with his “Greek adroitness” who asked him to help the Greek navy (p. 13). Childs described him as resourceful and dexterous, emphasising that these characteristics belonged to the Greeks. He recounted this encounter for propaganda. He stated that the Greek boy represented the desire for the reconstruction of the Hellenic Empire that would have Constantinople as its capital city (p. 13). Childs noted that the people of Samsun were “largely Ottoman Greeks” and added that the town’s trade and wealth was mostly “in their hands” although Samsun could not “claim direct descent from old Greek Amisus” (p. 13).

Ancient Greek city intrigued the European traveller, and his narrative was deeply inscribed by a nostalgia for the Greek past. Childs believed that ancient Greek relics would be underappreciated or would not be paid their due respect in a tedious, uncivilised land, where the simple folk was driven by primitive passions and primordial instincts. Therefore, ancient Greek sites were viewed as in desperate need of the British wisdom and vigour that alone could liberate the immense resources of Asia Minor. He stated that he could imagine the Greek myths of Argonauts and the Golden Fleece, and the witchcraft of Medea in Anatolia (1917, p. 4). He noted that Anatolia held Homeric scenes from ancient Greece, biblical and medieval scenes before the rise of the Ottoman Empire (p. 4). For his European gaze, this ancient land was associated with imagination. Anatolia was imagined as a land of legends, witches, enchanting islands and narrow waters. He paid homage to all the celebrated ancient civilisations that flourished in Anatolia. However, he predominantly referred to the Hellenic culture of ancient Greece and the biblical narratives such as those of Paul; as a result, this orientalist narrative that reduced the multilayered and multicultural fabric of Asia Minor merely to ancient Greek civilisation is a concrete embodiment of the western construction of Asia Minor, a land romanticised and ripped from its historical and contemporary reality.

The author added that the British Empire had also appeared on the Anatolian coast. While referring to “the legendary combats of Troy” in western Anatolia, he also mentioned Britain’s “authentic Landing on the Beaches of Gallipoli” to show his own country as part of the historical events that had taken place in Asia Minor and were chronicled in immortal stories (p. 4). It is interesting that the British landing at Cape Helles was rendered authentic, whereas Trojan war was perceived as legendary. He also mentioned that the Ottoman Empire was about to collapse, implying that the British Empire could follow the Ottoman Empire in Asia Minor (p. 4). Childs reflected the British sense of entitlement that would allow him to claim the Hellenic legacy in Asia Minor after the impending fall of the Ottoman Empire.

In addition, Childs was enthralled by an “unexpected survival” that reminded him of ancient Greece when he saw on the coast of “Sinope” a boat which he imagined was like the boats represented on ancient Greek coins (p. 5). He imagined that 2000 years ago the coast of the Black Sea was filled with thriving Greek cities (p. 6). The British traveller admired the image of the boatman since it revitalised the ancient Greek civilisation in his mind. He was upset that those cities had disappeared, yet “the blood remained” and several Greek traditions and customs about the sea, fishing and boat building continued (p. 6). The image of the boatman was invaluable for the author because it accorded well with the discursively fabricated image of ancient Greece in his imagination. He wished to reclaim the Hellenic past through this image and to bridge the Hellenic past and the Greek present in Anatolia. This attempt to resuscitate the ancient image of the Greek fisherman stemmed from the western desire to reconstruct ancient Greek civilisation that was forged in their minds according to their imperial needs. This western reinvention of a near eastern culture is also another imperialistic attempt; they capitalised on ancient Greece, reshaping it as the foundation of their modern civilisation. Besides, the author did not take into consideration that those Greek cities on the coast of the Black Sea had been colonies founded by the Greeks themselves on foreign lands. He tended to see the Anatolian Greeks as the true owners

of the land and to disregard the multiple civilisations that merged into one another over the course of time.

Childs glorified the ancient Greek spirit as he felt he had an instantaneous glimpse into the ancient Greek past of Asia Minor. He believed that he saw whatever the ancient Hellenic sculptors beheld, imagined, and reflected in an arrested form in their statues. He described the “exceedingly well-formed and muscular” Greek man fishing in the pool whose “natural and unconscious pose” demonstrated “the very spirit of Greek sculpture” (p. 36). Childs asked him his name, hoping to find that his name was Pericles or Homeros, yet he was crestfallen when he found out that his name was “merely Christos” (p. 36). He thought that this Greek name was not glamorous enough and was associated with “modern Greece” and modern Greeks whose “Western admirers” assumed would be unable to dignify and be faithful to the glory of ancient Greece (pp. 36-37). Childs’s disillusionment about the Greek man’s name demonstrates that his vision of ancient Greece had nothing to do with the contemporary reality of the Ottoman Greeks; this vision was imagined and forged by the western Europeans who were gazing from afar. He identified himself with the Hellenic civilisation much more ardently than the Ottoman Greek living in Asia Minor, and he believed that he was the one to deserve to inherit the ancient Greek civilisation as he could appreciate that culture. Accordingly, the British officer appropriated the ancient Greek legacy and disinherited the modern Greeks.

Childs (1917) also recounted the differences that he observed between the Christians and the Muslims during the time of the cholera. He saw people who dropped “in the streets in agony” and did not know then “what had overtaken them” (p. 13). Under those extreme circumstances, Childs observed, “the business community of Samsun” that consisted of “foreigners, Greeks, and Armenians” had to fight the disease (p. 14). He emphasised how differently the Christians and the Muslims responded to the disease; the former would do everything they could do while the latter would not do anything but depend on God’s will (p. 14). He pointed out that the Christians strived against the disease whilst the Muslims submitted themselves to god’s will. To highlight the Muslims’ response to the epidemic, Childs mentioned other places that suffered from the disease because of filthy streets and water and referred to the town of “Chorum” where fanatical Muslims lived (p. 14). He stated that the people in this town received cholera by resigning themselves to “the Will of Allah” (p. 14). He noted that they washed the victims, grieved their loss in family gatherings around the corpse, and recorded that the epidemic came to an end “only when it had exhausted itself (p. 14). This account of the fanatical Muslims was marked by the orientalist discourse that the western traveller utilised. This discourse represented the eastern peoples as “ignorant of self-government” and lacking agency (Said, 1979, p. 237). Thus, this narrative contributed to the reproduction of an image of Muslims as weak in willpower and yielding to divine authority as opposed to the strong-willed Christians, who resolutely fought against the disease, took their fate in their hands, and took the disease under control. The orientalist narrative stereotyped the peoples of Anatolia and forged an immutable, timeless, de-historicised Middle East that would not change.

Britan's Imperial Rivals: Russia and Germany

Deeply concerned about the commercial interests of the British Empire in the East, Childs also inspected the Russian influence in the region. He (1917) portrayed Samsun as an ambitious city proud of its prosperity yet neglected by the Ottoman government (p. 10). Speaking of the future potential of the city, he mentioned the threat of the Russians who could take over the construction of Samsun's harbour and railways (p. 11). The shadow of Russia over this land was another concern that Childs paid attention to in his memoir. He stated that without Russia's approval, the Ottoman Empire could grant no concession for the construction of railways or harbour (p. 19). Childs sought to propagate the view that Russia was the sole national enemy of the Ottoman Empire. He pointed out that the people in Asia Minor told one another rumours and spread far-fetched stories about the anticipation of a Russian invasion (p. 20). This narrative showed that these people were disconnected from reality, that their minds were muddled, and that they were unable to assess their predicament politically, and therefore they were so terrified of a possible Russian occupation that they could only take comfort in forging stories about it to soothe themselves and to render the harsh reality bearable and controllable. All the same, Childs noted that their fear may not be so unreasonable, considering his conviction that Russia would control the Straits and the Ottoman capital, or it could be kept out by another imperial power that had a mightier army (p. 20). His remarks turned the above-mentioned anticipation of the local people and their preposterous stories into hard facts. Childs noted that Germany could be that imperial power, but Russia could take over if German ambitions failed (p. 20). He pointed out that Germany could not be a mighty power to stop the Russian advance and therefore Russian occupation was imminent. He presented Russia as a real threat towards the Turkish Empire. He implied that a much mightier power could prevent the Russian Empire from possessing the Turkish territory and that mighty empire would ideally be the British Empire.

Besides the rising power of Germany and its imperial influence in Turkey that bothered the British Empire, the construction of the Baghdad Railway, entrusted to Germany, was evincing that the Eastern lands were losing their exotic otherness (Carr, 2002, p. 82). Aggravated by the German presence in the Middle East and troubled by the Ottoman modernisation attempts, Childs particularly attempted to turn the image of Turkey in the twentieth century into an unknown and exotic land, like the almost mythical accounts of travellers who had romanticised the unknown to be able to colonise the land. His account deliberately changed Anatolia into an *incognita* land so that it could be explored by the coloniser. The coloniser needed his exotic other to be able to maintain his political interests and to preserve his assumed superiority in the Middle East. His travel account reduced the Ottoman Empire to a bunch of undeveloped towns in Anatolia, but it did not consider the modern cities of the empire such as Istanbul, Izmir or Salonica. Mary Louise Pratt (1992) argued that travel writing in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries generated "the rest of the world" and made it recognisable for the West (p. 5). However, Carr (2002) contended that towards the end of the nineteenth century, the dread that the distinctive otherness of the rest of the world was in decline crept into travel writing, adding that the boundary that differentiated Europe from the rest of the world was becoming dangerously blurred (p. 81). Carr also maintained that travel writers came to realise that they were depicting "hybridised cultures" (p. 82). They had indeed sought to underline the difference, strangeness and exotic sensuousness

of the Orient so that they could deploy the orientalist discourse to be able to delineate the boundaries of their cultures and to demarcate themselves from the uncivilised world (Said, 1979, p. 81). They wanted to preserve and maintain the boundaries between the West and the East so that they could designate themselves as the civilised in opposition to the uncivilized East that needed to be civilized. The eradication of the boundary between the civilised West and the uncivilised East would render their presence in the Middle East problematic. The annihilation of the boundary between the rational West and the irrational East would not allow them to justify their colonisation of the eastern lands. The modernisation of the East would spoil the Europeans' image of superiority as the bearers of the modern civilisation. Therefore, colonial travel writing accentuated the difference between the European civilisation and its uncivilised other, the Orient.

Conclusion

Mark Twain (2006) spoke of a "three-legged woman" and a "man with his eye in his cheek" that he saw in the Ottoman capital; he described the beggars he came across as "human monsters" who exhibited "their deformities in the gutters" of Constantinople (chapter 33, paragraph 12). Twain's narrative about the Ottomans reflected the dominant orientalist discourse about the East. Likewise, Childs employed the same discourse that represented the peoples living in Anatolia as savage and monstrous. As Said (1979) contended, the European travellers sought "to domesticate the Orient" and to colonise it (p. 87). Hence, this article analyses Childs's travel account and dwells on the orientalist representations of the East, specifically focusing on Samsun, the first Anatolian city where he started his journey. In conclusion, Childs reproduced the colonialist discourse as he recounted his experiences and expressed his opinions about Asia Minor and its peoples. Under the western eyes of the British intelligence officer, Anatolia was unknown and unmapped, which granted him, he believed, the right to make it recognisable for the world. This sense of entitlement also becomes manifest as Childs laid claim to the ancient Greek culture of Anatolia and wanted to revive the ancient Hellenic spirit in the name of the British Empire. Furthermore, this article shows that Anatolia both repelled and fascinated the western traveller, who incarnated the colonial desire to penetrate the mysteries of the land he deemed *terra incognita* and thus bring it under control. This analysis discloses how the colonialist travel writer de-historicised Asia Minor and foregrounded the differences among its peoples rather than paying attention to the fact that they inhabited a unique contemporary reality which had nothing to do with the Asia Minor imagined and fabricated by the British coloniser.

References

- Aydin, K. (1999). Images of Turkey in western literature. Eothen Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1968). Illuminations: Essays and reflections. Schocken Books.
- Bowen, H. (1945). British contribution to Turkish studies. Longman Green & Co.
- Carr, H. (2002). Modernism and travel (1880-1940). In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 70-86). Cambridge University Press.
- Childs, W. J. (1917). Across Asia Minor on foot. W. Blackwood.
- Edmond, R. (2002). The Pacific / Tahiti: Queen of the South Sea isles. In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 139-155). Cambridge University Press.
- Eliot, C. (1908). Turkey in Europe. Edward Arnold.
- Fellows, C. (1839). A journal written during an excursion in Asia Minor. John Murray.
- Hamm, G. (2012). British intelligence and Turkish Arabia: Strategy, diplomacy, and empire, 1898-1918 [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto]. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/32729/3/Hamm_Geoffrey_201206_PhD_The_sis.pdf
- Hamilton, W. J. (1838). Notes of a journey in Asia Minor in 1837. The Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London, 8, 137-157. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1797790>.
- Hooper, G. (2002). The Isles / Ireland: The wilder shore. In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 174-190). Cambridge University Press.
- Hulme, P. (2002). Travelling to write (1940-2000). In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 87-101). Cambridge University Press.
- Hulme, P. & Youngs, T. (2002). Introduction. In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 1-13). Cambridge University Press.
- Islam, S. M. (1996). The ethics of travel from Marco Polo to Kafka. Manchester University Press.
- İşçi, V. (2021). Representations of the Turks in twentieth century British travel writing on Asia Minor. Tarih Dergisi, (73), 249-276. Doi: 10.26650/iutd.751171
- Kuş, A. & Alan, G. (2022). William John Childs'ın gezi notları ve Amerikan Board kayıtlarında Anadolu Koleji yerleşkesi. Idealkent, 13 (38), 2953-2974. Doi: 10.31198/idealkent.1101802
- Lewis, B. (1968). Some English travellers in the East. Middle Eastern Studies, 4 (3), 296-315. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4282253>
- Maclean, G. (2007). Looking east: English writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Montagu, L. M. W. (1994). The Turkish embassy letters. Virago. (Original work published 1763).

- Oueijan, N. (2011). Lord Byron's oriental world. Gorgias Press.
- Pratt, M. L. (1992). Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation. Routledge.
- Raleigh, W. (1997). The discoverie of the large, rich and bewtiful Empire of Guiana. Manchester University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1979). Orientalism. Vintage.
- Sherman, W. H. (2002). Stirrings and searchings (1500-1720). In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 17-36). Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. H. (1887). Notes on a tour in Asia Minor. The Journal of Hellenic Studies, 8, 216-267. doi: 10.2307/623459.
- Sontag, S. (1973). On photography. Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Stevenson, R. L. (1899). The Silverado squatters. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Teltscher, K. (2002). India / Calcutta: City of palaces and dreadful night. In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 191-206). Cambridge University Press.
- Twain, M. (2006). The innocents abroad. Project Gutenberg, August 16, 2006, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3176/3176-h/3176-h.htm> (Original work published 1869)
- Whitehead, N. L. (2002). South America / Amazonia: The forest of marvels. In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 122-138). Cambridge University Press.
- Youngs, T. (2002). Africa / The Congo: The politics of darkness. In P. Hulme & T. Youngs (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to travel writing (pp. 156-173). Cambridge University Press.