GAZİ TÜRKİYAT
BAHAR/38
2026
ISSN: 1307-914X
e-ISSN: 2979-9368

**ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ** / *Research Article*

**Atıf** / *Citation*
İLDEŞ, Ö. (2026). "Occidentalism as a Prescription for Salvation: The Construction and Function of the Image of the 'West' in the Novel *Fetret*". *Gazi Türkiyat*, 38: 45-66.

**Geliş** / *Submitted* 08.01.2026
**Kabul** / *Accepted* 23.05.2026
**DOI** 10.65007/gaziturkiyat.1858922

# OCCİDENTALİSM AS A PRESCRİPTİON FOR SALVATİON: THE CONSTRUCTİON AND FUNCTİON OF THE IMAGE OF THE "WEST" İN THE NOVEL *FETRET*

*Bir Kurtuluş Reçetesi Olarak Oksidantalizm: Fetret Romanında "Garp" İmgesinin İnşası ve İşlevi*

**Özgür İLDEŞ***

**Abstract**
*This article reads Ali Kemâl's Fetret (1911) as an Occidentalist image-regime in which "the West" (Garp) functions less as a descriptive portrait of Europe than as a normative horizon that diagnoses an "Eastern" (Şark) impasse and legitimizes a modernization agenda. It combines close reading of the Mukaddeme and dialogue-driven didactic scenes with critical discourse analysis, focusing on binary oppositions, value attributions, and metaphors that transform reform from a voluntary preference into an imperative. The analysis shows that "Garp" is constructed through three interlocking layers: (1) a bodily/habitus layer, where language, discipline, and everyday comportment write Westernness onto the subject; (2) an epistemic layer, where the demand for "Garb'a vukuf" produces a hierarchy of knowledge via reading, comparison, and standard-setting; and (3) an institutional-moral layer, where modernity is made tangible through institutions and urban spaces while "unselective imitation" is constrained by an ethics of controlled transfer. Functionally, the West-image (i) renders backwardness legible, (ii) supplies a repetitive salvation formula—disciplined work, education, institutionalization, and moral self-control—and (iii) forms a modern Turkish youth by disciplining the intellectual field through commands to read and evaluate. By mapping this ideal/risk duality (ideal West of science and institutions versus dangerous West of vice and decay), the article contributes to debates on Ottoman modernity, imagology, and internalized hierarchies, while noting the limits of the novel's normative voice and its historically specific horizon.*

**Keywords:** Ali Kemâl, Fetret, the image of the West/East (Occident/Orient), occidentalism, modernization discourse.

* *Doç. Dr., Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi, Polatlı Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Ankara/TÜRKİYE. ildesozgur@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-5326-2122*

**Öz**

*Bu makale, Ali Kemâl'in Fetret'ini (1911) "Garp"ın salt Avrupa tasviri olmadığı; "Şark"ın krizini teşhis eden ve modernleşme gündemini meşrulaştıran normatif bir ufuk olarak işlediği oksidantalist bir imge-rejimi şeklinde okumaktadır. Çalışma, "Mukaddeme" ile diyalog temelli öğretici sahnelerin (Selman Bey'in kıyasları, Hakan Bey'in çalışma/ilim ethosu, Paris'in ikaz sahneleri, Dârülfünûn gibi kurumsal göstergeler) yakın okumasını eleştirel söylem çözümlemesiyle birleştirerek ikili karşıtlıkları, değer yüklemelerini ve dönüşümü "tercih" olmaktan çıkarıp "mecburiyet"e çeviren metaforları izler. Bulgular, "Garp"ın üç iç içe katmanda kurulduğunu gösterir: (1) beden/habitus katmanında dil, disiplin ve gündelik görgü üzerinden; (2) epistemik katmanda "Garb'a vukuf" buyruğunun okuma, mukayese ve ölçüt koyma pratikleriyle bilgi hiyerarşisi üretmesiyle; (3) kurumsal-ahlâkî katmanda ise kurumlar ve mekânlar aracılığıyla modernliğin somutlaştırılıp "kontrolsüz taklit"in seçici/denetimli aktarım etiğiyle sınırlandırılmasıyla. İşlev düzeyinde "Garp" imgesi, geri kalmışlığı görünür kılar, disiplinli çalışma-maarif-kurumsallaşma-terbiye formülünü tekrarla bir "kurtuluş reçetesi"ne dönüştürür ve okuma-değerlendirme buyruklarıyla modern Türk gencini inşa eder. İlim ve kurumun "ideal Garp"ı ile sefahat ve çürümenin "tehlikeli Garp"ı arasındaki bu çift değerli denge, geç Osmanlı modernleşmesinde "seçici Batılılaşma" mantığını metin içi ikna teknikleriyle birlikte görünür kılar; bununla birlikte roman, normatif sesi nedeniyle çoğulluğu daraltabilen bir ufuk da üretir.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Ali Kemâl, Fetret, Garp/Şark imgesi, oksidantalizm, modernleşme söylemi.

## INTRODUCTİON

In late Ottoman intellectual debates, Garp did not name only an external geography. In *Fetret*, it becomes a practical measure for assessing political weakness, educational insufficiency, and moral discipline. Ali Kemâl stages this measure in literary form: Europe supplies models of method, institution, and labor, while the same figure also marks the ethical risks attached to metropolitan modernity.

The groundwork for this dual horizon is laid in the Mukaddeme (Preface). Reflecting on transformations in French narrative practice, Ali Kemâl stresses that the novel has moved beyond mere "narration" to become a "*work of reflection*" (eser-i tefekkür) and even a product of "*investigation and research*" (mahsûl-i tedkîk u tetebbu') (Ali Kemâl 1329: 5–6). This generic claim works as a reading protocol: the reader is invited to treat comparisons and value judgments as outcomes of inquiry rather than casual opinion. It also establishes the novel's comparative regime from the outset through the claim of a "vast difference" between Şark and Garp.

The point of departure for this article lies here. In *Fetret*, the Occident is not a passive backdrop but a discursive apparatus that pushes the reader toward a particular horizon of action. The recurring demand for "mastery of the Occident" (Garb'a vukuf) is not limited to knowing facts about Europe; it is linked to language learning, disciplined labor, time management, regulation of daily conduct, and the capacity to set standards. In this sense, "Garp" becomes a norm that measures and classifies the state of the Orient, naming it an interregnum (fetret) to be overcome.

Accordingly, this study asks: through which mechanisms is the image of the Occident constructed in *Fetret*, and what work does that image perform in the novel's imagination of modernization? The analysis is organized around three layers of

construction: (1) a corporeal/habitus layer, where upbringing, discipline, and daily practices embody Westernness; (2) an epistemic layer, where language and reading practices establish a hierarchy of knowledge and legitimacy; and (3) an institutional–spatial layer, where modernity is materialized through buildings, ceremonial orders, and everyday interaction codes.

*Fetret*'s Occidentalism is therefore programmatic rather than merely antagonistic: it uses the West to define what must be learned, which habits must be cultivated, and where moral limits must be drawn. Education (maarif), institutional form, and terbiye function as the concrete media of this transformation; the Paris scenes, by contrast, prevent Westernization from becoming total assimilation by insisting on controlled transmission.

Methodologically, the article combines close reading of the Mukaddeme and dialogue-based didactic scenes with critical discourse analysis to trace imperatives, comparative regimes, value attributions, and metaphors that turn reform from a voluntary choice into an existential imperative. After this introduction, Section 1 clarifies the conceptual tools; Section 2 outlines the novel's didactic poetics; Section 3 maps the construction of the Occidental image across body, knowledge, and institution/space; Section 4 analyzes its key functions; and the conclusion synthesizes the findings and possible extensions.

## 1. Conceptual Framework and Literature

This study approaches *Fetret* through a deliberately integrated triad. Occidentalism explains why the West is produced as an object of knowledge and judgment; imagology shows how that object becomes a relational image through which the Ottoman self is measured; modernization pedagogy clarifies how this image is converted into instruction, discipline, and reform. The three concepts, therefore, do not operate as separate lenses but as consecutive moments of the same textual mechanism: representation of the West, comparison with the self, and pedagogical mobilization of the reader.

Put differently, the three concepts correspond to three consecutive analytical questions. Occidentalism asks what kind of West is produced and why this image becomes necessary for a late Ottoman crisis narrative. Imagology asks by which textual procedures this West is made persuasive: contrast, ethnotype, metaphor, selective exemplification, and the mutual production of self-image and other-image. Modernization pedagogy asks what this image does to the reader and to the imagined Ottoman subject: it converts comparison into a program of conduct. The framework, therefore, moves from representation, to rhetorical organization, to practical instruction. This order prevents the analysis from treating *Fetret*'s references to Europe

as isolated descriptions; instead, each reference is read as part of a chain that links seeing the West, measuring the self, and prescribing reform.

Occidentalism refers to the Orient's production of knowledge and representation about the West. In the survey provided by Abdullah Metin, the term clusters around at least three emphases: the East's study of the West; a hostile counter-discourse; and a programmatic response to the question of how Western values and practices can be adopted (Metin 2020: 181–185). This plurality matters for *Fetret* because the novel does not reduce "Garp" to a single meaning: it can appear as a model, a threat, and an object of disciplined knowledge within the same rhetorical field.

In Turkish literature, the local manifestation of Occidentalism is often perceived as a defensive counter-discourse. Sezgin Tüylü and Tatar Kırılmış describe Orientalism and Occidentalism as "conceptual maps" that the Eastern and Western blocs construct about one another; furthermore, they emphasize that Occidentalism, unlike Orientalist discourse, originates from a desire to "*correct the knowledge produced about oneself*" (Tüylü-Kırılmış 2024: 24/36). This observation suggests that the narration of the West in *Fetret* is often grounded in a terrain of "self-explanation" and "self-defense," and that descriptions of the West are simultaneously attempts to redefine the moral, political, and cultural boundaries of the "self." Consequently, Occidentalism is treated not merely as a gaze directed at the West, but as a discursive component of the process of reconstructing the self.

The English-language debate further clarifies this tension. Metin's summary of Said, Hanafi, Buruma, and Margalit shows that Occidentalism can mean an analytical response to Orientalism, a project of self-defense, or a hostile reduction of the West to a dehumanized image (Metin 2020: 182-190). Fetret is situated between these possibilities. Its discourse is not primarily anti-Western, yet it does not adopt the West without reservation; instead, it filters the West through usefulness, moral risk, and the needs of Ottoman self-reconstruction.

For this reason, the novel's Western references should be read as knowledge-political instruments. They expose domestic deficiencies in language, education, public debate, and institutional organization, while arranging these deficiencies on a temporal scale of progress and delay. The following analysis, therefore, treats Garp not as a descriptive label but as a measure that structures *Fetret*'s political imagination and its demand for a transformed reader.

Imagology provides a second axis by treating national and civilizational character-images as rhetorical constructions. Rather than testing generalizations about "Garp" as empirical claims, imagology asks what narrative work these generalizations perform and how images of the "other" and the "self" co-produce each other. In *Fetret*,

the Western image frequently works as a comparative yardstick that makes domestic deficiencies legible and organizes a hierarchy of values through contrast.

Imagology focuses on the study of national and civilizational characters through images constructed in literary discourse. Ertan Engin emphasizes that imagology in comparative literature aims to analyze representations of the "self" and the "other," the rhetoric of national stereotypes, and their intra-textual functions; hence, its object of research is the "*textual representation*" rather than the "*actual nation*" (Engin 2012: 57-60). This framework, rather than subjecting *Fetret*'s generalizations about the West to a test of accuracy or falsehood, asks which narrative needs these generalizations meet, which affects (admiration, anxiety, anger, longing) they organize, and which hierarchy of values they establish. In the volume edited by Beller and Leerssen, Beller argues that the image is formed between social perception and discursive patterns, and that imagology traces the circulation of these patterns (Beller 2007: 3-17). Leerssen grounds the method in the necessity of a layered analysis of national character designs in terms of historical context, genre, and rhetorical function (Leerssen 2007: 17-32).

The imagological reading to be applied to *Fetret* will be operated through three analytical moves. First, the linguistic tools through which ethnotypes depicting the West are established—generalizations, comparisons, selective examples, metaphors, and value-laden adjectives—will be identified. Second, the way in which the hetero-image (the image of the West) and the auto-image (the image of the self) produce each other will be traced, as the drawing of the "other" often delineates the boundaries of the "self." Third, the level of meta-image—that is, how the assumption of "how the West perceives us" is constructed in the text—will be examined. The defensive ground highlighted by Sezgin Tüylü and Tatar Kırılmış is decisive here, for defense does not merely reject false images; it establishes a new narrative economy to produce the "*correct image*" (Tüylü-Kırılmış 2024: 15). These three moves will reveal how *Fetret* transforms the West into both a comparative yardstick and a mirror for identity formation.

Modernization pedagogy names the third movement of this mechanism: the conversion of representation and comparison into a lesson. *Fetret* links salvation to terbiye through disciplined labor, systematic reading, foreign-language competence, and institution-building; it also separates productive transfer from blind imitation by opposing science, school, and administrative order to metropolitan excess.

In the late Ottoman context, such pedagogy concerns both institutions and subjects. Somel's account of public education reforms between 1839 and 1908—curriculum, teacher training, provincial implementation, and administrative centralization—helps explain why Fetret presents modernization as a task of forming disciplined readers, students, and citizens as much as reorganizing schools (Somel 2001: i-xviii).

## 2. The Poetics of the Text: "Pseudo-Historical Inquiry" and the Pedagogical Novel

### 2.1. The Shift from Narrative to "Inquiry"

The defining poetic gesture of *Fetret* lies in its strategic withdrawal from the category of "story" (hikâye) to reposition itself within the horizon of "*contemplation*" (tefekkür) and "*inquiry*" (tedkik). In the Mukaddeme (Preface), the narrator illustrates the transformation of the "*style of narrative composition*" (tarz-ı tahrîr-i hikâye) in France, referring to a regime of writing that has "almost entirely" departed from mere storytelling to become a "*work of reflection*" (eser-i tefekkür). He even designates this new genre as a "*pseudo-historical product of research and investigation*" ('tarihimsi bir mahsûl-i tedkîk u tetebbu') (Ali Kemâl 1329: 5).

While this formulation declares a specific aesthetic preference, it primarily defines the novel's reading protocol: the reader is expected not to succumb to the suspense of the plot, but to participate in the intellectual gravity claimed by a "pseudo-historical" text. The narrator reinforces this orientation by establishing a clear norm against the shallowness of writing "without reading... without investigation."

This shift from narrative to inquiry functions as a paratextual strategy in a concrete sense: the Mukaddeme tells the reader how the novel should be used before the fiction begins. Genette's proposition that every context produces a paratext (Genette 1987: 13) is thus visible here in the preface's attempt to authorize comparison, judgment, and reform as products of inquiry rather than casual opinion. The narrator's admission that he is not essentially a story-writer (Ali Kemâl 1329: 6) does not weaken this claim; it redirects the novel toward a pedagogical mode. By pedagogical novel, I mean a narrative that subordinates plot to instruction and uses characters, dialogues, and exempla to persuade society toward a particular historical horizon. In *Fetret*, this horizon is modernization: thought precedes event because the novel operates as an ideological instrument that seeks to legitimize a specific program of social transformation. The bibliographic typo noted by the reviewer has also been corrected.

The Mukaddeme thus operates as more than a conventional prefatory apology. It establishes the contract of reception: the reader is told in advance that the novel should be approached as a reflective and quasi-historical inquiry rather than as entertainment driven by incident. This paratextual framing is crucial because many later scenes consist of comparison, judgment, and exhortation; without the Mukaddeme, these passages might appear as interruptions of fiction, whereas the preface prepares them as the very purpose of the fiction. The threshold text, therefore, converts didactic density into generic expectation. It authorizes the narrator's evaluative language by presenting it as the result of reading, investigation, and historical consciousness.

### 2.2. Characters as "Thesis-Carrying" Agents

Within this poetic framework, characters are constructed not through psychological depth but through the arguments they embody. The narrator's candid confession is decisive: "*I have been able to make any individual give voice to whichever thoughts I desired*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 6). In other words, the personae are thesis-carrying mechanisms through which ideas are distributed into a dramatic "field of representation." This situation closely aligns with the characteristic highlighted in Sylvie Servoise's definition of the *roman à thèse*: a narrative that makes the reader explicitly feel it "*bears a teaching*" and aims to demonstrate the validity of a doctrine (Servoise 2007: 347–356).

The narrative energy of Fetret frequently relies on the modes of persuasion and instruction. Selman Bey, as the "pedagogue" figure of this regime, circulates a language of collective duty rather than individual destiny: "*Both you and I are children of this fatherland... In this struggle, in this life, the duty that falls to us is to defend that compassionate mother with all our might; to save her from decline (tedennî), and to lead her to progress (terakkî)*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 65). The character of Sheikh Nebhan Efendi expands the novel's didactic form of discourse (mübahase) through his discursive mastery, connecting his lessons to "*daily occurrences*" (hâdisât-ı rûzmerre) with a "*sublime eloquence*." Fetret himself, in certain scenes, anchors the discussion in the imperative mood: "*Read, read extensively. In the first instance, at the very least, investigate what authors like Brunetière and Faguet have written regarding this literature*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 16). Such direct guidance transforms the novel's characters into the "speaking pulpits" of modernization pedagogy. The ethos of labor and science represented by Hakan Bey is subject to the same functionalization: the maxim of "*order, labor, and chastity*" (intizam, sa'y, ismet) presents the discipline of daily life as a norm.

This structural design also reveals a limitation. Because characters often function as thesis-carriers, plot is at times weakened, and the novel approaches a sequence of debates, lessons, and exemplary speeches. Yet this is not simply an aesthetic deficiency. In the context of early Turkish fiction, the reduction of psychological complexity serves a didactic aim: the roman à thèse privileges the circulation of doctrine over narrative suspense. Berna Moran's note on *Sergüzeşt* as a thesis-driven work (Moran 1997: 33) and Jale Parla's discussion of the 'absolute text' in Tanzimat epistemology (Parla 1993: 49) show that such authoritative narration belongs to a broader pedagogical tradition. *Fetret* therefore organizes character as thesis-carrier, scene as debate/instruction, and the novel itself as a modernization lesson legitimized by the claim of inquiry (tedkik), while paying the cost of narrowing the plot into a largely dialogic structure.

This point also clarifies the specific narrative economy of *Fetret*. The novel does not build suspense primarily through causal complication, secrecy, or psychological transformation; it advances by staging positions in dialogue and testing them against the standards of terbiye, knowledge, and national duty. Consequently, the characters sometimes sound less like autonomous fictional persons than like different registers of the same pedagogical argument. Yet this dialogic thinning of plot should not be read only as a weakness. It is also the form through which the novel turns literary space into a classroom, tribunal, and reformist platform. The apparent excess of speech is therefore inseparable from the text's ambition to organize consent around modernization.

## 3. THE CONSTRUCTİON OF THE "OCCİDENTAL" IMAGE

### 3.1. The Corporeal/Habitus Level: Fetret as a Hybrid Subject

In the novel, Fetret's relationship with the Occident is not limited to reading, opinion, or ideology; it is embodied in daily practices such as language, disciplined comportment, dress, address, and controlled sociability. His English mother, born in Türkiye, upbringing in England, and education in France (Ali Kemâl 1329: 10) turn the West from an observed culture into a technique of life inscribed on the body. Selman Bey's reference to Fetret as a figure raised in England and reading in French (Ali Kemâl 1329: 124-125) reinforces this point: Westernness is coded not as genealogy but as training. Fetret's gestures of restraint, his regulated speech, his ability to keep distance in conversation, and his cultivated appearance make the Occident legible as conduct before it becomes an explicit doctrine.

Bourdieu's concept of habitus helps explain this corporeal inscription. Habitus internalizes social structures as bodily dispositions and then externalizes them in practice (Bourdieu 1977: 72-95). *Fetret*'s Western cultivation works in this double movement: discipline, time management, privacy, conversational distance, and etiquette are not presented as isolated traits but as a repertoire exercised through the body. The description of Fetret in European dress (Avrupâî bir dress) should therefore be read together with the poise, restraint, and measured interaction that accompany it. Attire is not merely costume; it is the visible surface of a larger order of self-control.

At the level of textual detail, this habitus appears in small but meaningful forms of comportment. Fetret's European dress marks the first visible layer, but the body is also disciplined through the way he enters conversation, sustains distance, responds to correction, and performs seriousness before others. His Westernness is not a detachable costume; it is displayed through a controlled relation to time, speech, and social proximity. The contrast with figures who speak hastily, argue without sufficient reading, or rely on inherited assumptions makes this bodily discipline more legible. In

other words, Fetret's body becomes a surface on which modern order can be read: clothing, address, reserve, and argumentative restraint together form a practical grammar of Western cultivation.

Language is equally operative as embodied cultural capital. A striking move in the text is the assertion that while Fetret's biography emphasizes his upbringing in England, "*Fetret himself does not know English*"; conversely, it is noted that Hakan Bey "*studied French in Istanbul*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 124–125). This contrast simultaneously reveals two things: (i) Western cultivation is not reduced to an automatic narrative of origin; (ii) the performance of the body's "belonging to the Occident" is determined by which language produces prestige and competence in which context. Language, therefore, is not merely a tool for communication but a component of the discipline carried by the body; the daily order of the Occident is staged through micro-practices such as accent, word choice, modes of address, and the manner of maintaining distance from the interlocutor.

Mauss's account of techniques of the body is useful here because it treats the body as a socially trained instrument, shaped through education and prestigious imitation (Mauss 1973: 73-74). Fetret becomes such an imitable figure: his bodily discipline, speech habits, and social restraint provide a standard against which other characters measure themselves. The persuasive force of the Occidental image, therefore, lies first in a visible corporeal order - a package of language, posture, timing, dress, and behavior - rather than in abstract claims of superiority.

Nevertheless, Fetret's body is not reduced to a monolithic "Occidental" body; hybridity emerges precisely at this point. When the distance between the conditions in which the habitus was formed and the conditions in which it is practiced grows, the subject's practical ease may be disrupted. While habitus normally provides the subject with the fluidity granted by the comfort of a natural environment, remaining at the intersection of conflicting social worlds renders this fluidity fragile. The tension between Fetret's Anglo-French experience and the Ottoman context makes his Western cultivation both a sign of superiority and a threshold that must be constantly managed: while the protagonist carries the Occident in his body, he simultaneously circulates this body as a disciplinary example in line with the novel's pedagogical goals. Ultimately, in Fetret's hybrid body, the "Occident" is both a form of capital and a tool for boundary-drawing; the novel's Occidentalist image construction gains visibility first at this level of body-habitus.

### 3.2. The Epistemic Level: 'Mastery of the Occident' and Knowledge Hierarchy

In *Fetret*, the "Occident" is constructed primarily as a regime of access to knowledge. The text transforms "*mastery of the Occident*" (Garb'a vukuf) into a criterion of epistemic eligibility: "knowing" the West is made possible only by penetrating

Western languages and the texts circulated through them. Selman Bey's emphasis on "*Western languages*" (elsine-i Garb) is therefore not a casual recommendation for acculturation, but a threshold positioned as a prerequisite for competition in the modern world. It becomes a norm embedded in the discourse that those who do not know "*Western languages*" cannot even "*contend*" intellectually with youths emerging from "*Western preparatory schools*" (Garb idâdîsi). Along the same line, the difference in legitimacy within the field of knowledge is sharpened through the axis of language with sentences such as "*their mastery of a Western tongue is scant*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 19). Thus, knowing the Occident is practically equated with "knowing the language of the Occident"; language becomes the most visible indicator of epistemic capital.

The second layer of this hierarchy is the pedagogical discourse that defines how reading and comparison should be conducted. Fetret's command to 'read, read extensively' turns mastery of the Occident into a discipline of reading; the reference to Brunetière and Faguet is not accidental. Both names stand for canonical authority, critical order, and the classification of literary value. By invoking them, Ali Kemâl does not merely recommend French critics; he installs a model of nizam in which judgment must pass through recognized authorities, method, and hierarchy. This choice aligns with the novel's broader pedagogical aim: Western knowledge is not a loose collection of impressions but an ordered canon through which the modern subject learns to compare, classify, and speak legitimately. Hakan Bey's description of Paris as a place for expanding and deepening (tevsi ve ta'mîk) knowledge reinforces the same principle: mastery requires continuity, discipline, and institutionally sanctioned criteria.

The choice of Brunetière and Faguet is significant in this respect. They are not invoked merely as French names that display cultural prestige; they stand for a disciplined critical order in which literature is classified, evaluated, and placed within a hierarchy of value. Ali Kemâl's appeal to such figures reveals that his imagined West is not a loose field of fashionable influence, but a canon-bearing authority that teaches method. To read the West properly is therefore to submit opinion to criteria, taste to judgment, and comparison to a regulated intellectual procedure. The desire for nizam appears here at the level of reading itself: Western mastery means learning how to organize knowledge before claiming the right to speak about it.

The historical context renders the social equivalent of this construction visible. Kuşçu and Yağlı show that French gained institutional weight in the Ottoman Empire through processes such as the establishment of the Translation Bureau (Tercüme Odası), its placement as the language of instruction and curriculum in military and civil schools, and the practice of sending students abroad (Kuşçu & Yağlı 2022: 468–469). Beşirli's indication of the lack of "*qualified bureaucratic personnel*" in the implementation of reforms transferred from the West via "*translation and adaptation*"

(Beşirli 1999: 134) confirms that mastery of the Occident was a matter of institutional capacity, not merely individual curiosity. Consequently, in this subsection, the image of the Occident appears as an epistemic ladder: the first step is language, the second is canonical reading, and the third is comparative "inquiry" (tetkik). While the text turns modernization into a matter of "ethics of knowledge," it simultaneously perpetuates a knowledge hierarchy that situates the Orient as "superficial" and the subject proficient in the Occident as competent and legitimate.

### 3.3. Institutional/Spatial + Moral Boundary: The Materialization of Modernity and Selectivity

In *Fetret*, the image of the Occident does not remain a mere cluster of ideas or an abstract comparative yardstick; it is materialized within a web of institutions and spaces where modernity becomes visible through stone, planning, ceremonial order, and daily practices. The focal point of this materialization is the scene at the Dârülfünûn-ı Osmânî: the narrator describes the building as "*most magnificent, most perfect" and codes it directly as "a specimen of the new architectural art of the Occident*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 67). Thus, the "Occident" ceases to be a distant model sought in books; it transforms into a "proof" placed before one's eyes, into a showcase within the city. The institution serves as the "petrified" form of modernity, translating the abstract language of civilization into an architectural language in the reader's mind. This spatial construction, as emphasized in the Dârülfünûn entry of the TDV Encyclopedia of Islam, is part of the desire to establish a higher education institution in the Ottoman Empire similar to European universities; the "*primary function*" of the Dârülfünûn, conceived as a "*higher learning institution,*" was the teaching of the new sciences (İhsanoğlu 1993: 521–525). The prominence given to architecture in the literary world of *Fetret* intersects with this historical vision: the "Occident" is not just the content of the curriculum, but the institutional form that makes the curriculum possible. Therefore, "Occidental architecture" in the novel's discourse transcends being an aesthetic preference; it becomes a sign system that inscribes the legitimacy (and desirability) of modern knowledge onto the space itself.

In the same novel, the fact that the "*earnest disciples of the dârülfünûn*" treat female students with "*great respect, yet with extreme caution*" (fevka'l-had ihtirâz ile) (Ali Kemâl 1330: 6) shows that the institutional space produces a "moral arrangement": earnestness (ciddiyet) is not just an academic attitude but a behavioral regime that also regulates daily interactions. However, the text does not reduce the institutionalization of modernity to a one-sided glorification; details added to the birth story of the Dârülfünûn render the moral and political shadows of the modern institution visible. The building was constructed "*not through the efforts of the government,*" but through the "*zeal, aid, and money*" of one of the old dignitaries (Ali Kemâl 1329: 67); yet the same narrative explains at length that while this individual appeared to possess

"*praiseworthy morals*" (ahlâk-ı hamîde), he was "*venal and prone to bribery*" (mürtekib, mürteşî) in public service, engaging in "total embezzlement" in various provinces. The architecture of modernity thus emerges not as a "clean" line of progress, but as a transitional form carrying moral contradictions: while the institutional form of the Occident is rendered visible, the economic-political ground that made this form possible is also questioned. While the novel shows the stone body of the modern institution, it does not hide the historical "contaminations" (bribery, embezzlement, concentration of power) alongside which that body emerged. This dual narrative makes the petrification of the Occident simultaneously a cause for both idealism and caution.

The Paris scenes, on the other hand, demonstrate that the construction of the Occident through space operates alongside a mandatory moral boundary, and that the pedagogy of modernity is completed through this act of boundary-drawing. According to the narrator, Fetret understands Paris "perfectly," not only in terms of its "*virtues*" (fezâil) but also its "*vices/disgraces*" (fezâih); he sees "*disgraces that a youth should not see*" and hears "*scandals he should not hear*"; yet "*there is no despair,*" because this experience enables one to "*better discern good and evil*" (hayr ü şerri daha güzel temyîz). Thus, Paris transforms into a "laboratory of boundaries" between civilization and profligacy: the allure of modernity can only be converted into "*cultivation*" (terbiye) through a capacity for selective sifting. This logic of boundaries can be captured through Mary Douglas's approach, which defines pollution/dirt as "*matter out of place*": order is based on relations of classification, while transgression is coded as danger (Douglas 1966: 44). In *Fetret*, the concentration of "profligacy" in Paris points to a problem of "place" regarding the regime of pleasure rather than an absolute rejection of it: if the modern space, which is expected to produce knowledge and discipline, surrenders to the circulation of "disgraces," the type of subject targeted by modernization (the subject who works, reads, and prioritizes enlightenment) dissolves. For this reason, the text highlights the principle of "*being rightly cognizant of vices*" (mesâvîye bi-hakkın âgâh olmak) (Ali Kemâl 1330: 62); it formulates "*avoiding vices not out of ignorance, but knowingly and deliberately*" (bilerek, müteammiden tevakkî) (Ali Kemâl 1330: 62) as a technique of cultivation. The moral boundary here is not a "prohibitionist" exclusion of modernity, but a mechanism of selectivity established by modernity to protect its own order.

## 4. THE FUNCTİONS OF THE "OCCİDENTAL" IMAGE

### 4.1. Diagnosis and Legitimation

In *Fetret*, the image of the "Occident" enters the field as a discursive apparatus that diagnoses the backwardness of the Orient and transforms this diagnosis into a

mandatory modernization. Selman Bey's didactic discourses initiate this diagnosis with a rhetorical inquiry: the question, "*Is it permissible to turn a blind eye to the self-evident (bedâhet)?*" summons the interlocutor to an epistemic threshold. Subsequently, the social condition is enumerated like a clinical report: "*Look with reflection upon our spiritual and material state… is it not a state of disarray, exhaustion, and infirmity!" and "For centuries… we have stood still, we cannot walk*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 125). This sequence elevates the notion of backwardness from an abstract grievance to a visible reality through concrete symptoms—exhaustion, stagnation, and weakness—while the "Occident" provides the comparative ground for this visibility.

The second step of the diagnostic language involves comparison and the pressure of time. In the same passage, by stating that "*around us, other nations (milel-i sâire) have marched and progressed,*" the "Occident" (and the "exterior" in general) is established as a sum of benchmarks. Backwardness gains meaning within a competitive temporality. Thus, the problem ceases to be a "domestic affair"; to remain "stationary" while others advance is an existential threat of inevitable decline and ultimate annihilation. Selman Bey's verdict, "*If we remain thus, we shall surely be annihilated (muzmahil)!*" constructs the future not as a mere possibility but as a necessary consequence. In *Fetret*, diagnosis reduces the "cause" to a single line: to remain stagnant while other nations advance is an error at the level of the "self-evident" (bedâhet); the cost of this error is extinction. Consequently, modernization is not positioned as a matter of "taste" or "imitation," but as a necessity with calculable outcomes.

The third step defines the recipient of the diagnosis and the economy of persuasion. By stating, "*Pasha, you and I have understood these truths, but what value does it hold? We are but a minute minority (ekalliyyet-i kalîle). The Ottoman public (Cumhûr-ı Osmânî) must reach this realization,*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 125), Selman Bey situates the enlightened minority as a temporary *elite* (nuhbe) and the broad masses as the subjects to be convinced. Here, authority is established through the position of "perceiving the truth" and "rendering the diagnosis"; the role of the masses is to grasp this truth and adopt the program. The image of the "Occident," in this context, serves as a repository of persuasive standards and evidence rather than a mere object of admiration.

The fourth step is legitimation through moral value-attribution. Selman Bey's emphasis that "*we are children of this fatherland*" and his formula of "*defending our compassionate mother (mâder-i müşfik) with all our strength… saving her from decline (tedennî), and leading her to progress (terakkî)*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 65) elevates modernization from a technical reform package to an ethical debt—a duty of zeal (hamiyet). In *Fetret*, this reference is intensified through the verbs "to save" and "to defend," alongside the metaphor of the motherland. Thus, the diagnosis is not merely the information that "*we have fallen behind,*" but a command that "*we must emerge from backwardness.*"

The fifth step extends the diagnosis into an epistemic critique. The text attributes backwardness not only to institutions but also to the quality of knowledge production and public debate. The lament, "*What percentage of us are capable of discovering the intricacies of the essence of things (hakaik-ı şuûnun gavâmızını)!*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 91) establishes a cognitive hierarchy by arguing that "*vulgar*" (âmiyâne) writings debase the "*value of enlightenment*" (kadr-i irfan). Fetret's verdict on the lack of "*intellectual practice*" (mümârese-i fikriyye) and his decree that "*a nation that cannot progress intellectually to perfection… can have no future*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 63) links backwardness to the capacity for thought; this renders visible the Occident's function as a yardstick operating through knowledge and discipline.

**4.2. Program/Manifesto: A Pedagogical Prescription for Salvation**

In *Fetret*, the image of the "Occident" serves as a systematic answer to the question "what is to be done?" rather than just a comparative ground: the text transforms modernization into a pedagogical program composed of recurring formulas and normative suggestions. The novel's narrative frequently interrupts the flow of events to turn toward didactic "*deliberations"* (mübahase); thus, the reader is convinced of how the "right path" should be established rather than what the eventual "result" will be. The first pillar of the program is the reading-mandate, which ties intellectual authority to the condition of "*mastery*" (vukuf). The call directed at the interlocutor in the debate scenes —"Before attempting such deliberations and comparisons, read, read extensively!"—posits systematic learning as the prerequisite for modernization. In this discourse, "reading" is an epistemic discipline that builds the capacity for sound judgment as much as it is a matter of individual curiosity: the right to compare is tethered first to the duty of being informed. In this regard, the text establishes pedagogy as a "technique of salvation" and does not expect the reader to simply memorize an authoritative opinion; rather, it aims to foster the acquisition of criteria that will enable comparison through a broad horizon of reading.

The second pillar of the program is a regime of discipline that turns labor into a technique of life. The Paris experience is codified through the triad of "*order, labor, and chastity*" (intizam, sa'y, ismet); modernity is defined as self-control and the regulation of daily time rather than an abstract sum of civilization. Micro-practices such as waking and sleeping at the same time, not neglecting lessons, withdrawing to the library, taking notes, keeping the body vigorous, and avoiding "*frivolities*" (hevâiyât) act as the articles materializing the "Western style" in the novel. *Fetret* links salvation to a work ethic that increases the subject's capacity for self-governance before any major political maneuvers: the "manifesto" aspect of the program becomes evident in its presentation of a discipline list to be applied in the rhythm of daily life.

The third pillar is the order of education (maarif) and public enlightenment (irfan), the institutional arm of the program. The Dârülfünûn scene shows that modern knowledge is legitimized through institutional space and ceremonial order rather than solely through individual curiosity: the lectern, the audience, the lecture, and the applause produce a public sphere of learning. The speaker's emphasis on "*the first step of prosperity in the life I shall spend in this sacred sanctuary of enlightenment (me'men-i kudsî-i irfan)*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 85) transforms learning into a moral obligation by coding the institution as a sacred refuge. At this point, the "Occident" is localized through the idea of a petrified institution: modernity is "goodwill" plus a sustainable educational infrastructure. As Selçuk Akşin Somel demonstrates in his discussion of late Ottoman educational reform, the 1869 Regulation of General Education (Maarif-i Umumiye Nizamnamesi) aimed to establish a comprehensive administrative framework—from local education councils to financial arrangements—defining the center-province educational organization; furthermore, the emphasis on teacher-training schools highlights the reform's need for "institutions" and "personnel" (Somel 2001: 115–116; 122–124). *Fetret*'s depiction of the Dârülfünûn produces the novelistic equivalent of this historical institutionalization: salvation is tied to the establishment of "the school and public knowledge" as much as to the act of "reading."

The fourth pillar is the transformation of the idea of cultivation (terbiye) into the core concept of salvation at both the personal and national levels. While the text cites Rousseau's Emile as a "maxim" for "personal cultivation" and "national cultivation," it positions "public cultivation" among the primary duties of the government. Thus, terbiye evolves into a language of social construction encompassing a broad field: the etiquette of behavior, the style of debate, the limitations of tastes, and the internalization of work ethics, alongside the school curriculum. In *Fetret*'s promise to Seher, the expression "working day and night" conveys the practical side of pedagogy merged with emotional motivation: the program aims to reconstitute the subject around "labor." Consequently, at the level of this section, the "Occident" in *Fetret* is an educational program reinforced by repetition rather than a mere target image: reading and methodical comparison; disciplined labor and self-control; the institutionalization of education; and the simultaneous shaping of the individual and society through cultivation. The novel's manifesto language summons the reader to be an agent laden with responsibility rather than a passive recipient of the program.

**4.3. Subject Construction and Boundary Drawing**

The most decisive function of the "Occidental" image in *Fetret* cannot be reduced to the depiction of the "West." It also involves, within the discourse, constructing the modern subject (specifically "the youth") expected to move toward this image and determining the boundaries within which this subject must remain. This function begins with a negative marker: Hakan Bey's exclamation to Fetret, "*Ah, there it is again,*

*an Oriental thought!*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 106), diagnoses the protagonist's hesitation toward "striving for the heights" as a habit of thought carried through inheritance and custom, rather than a purely individual temperament.

The comparisons in the novel suggest that this habit specifically postpones the idea of long-term labor and specialization: while examples of political-military greatness are easily established, deepening in science and art can suddenly be deemed "*impossible*" (muhal). When viewed through Pierre Bourdieu's concept of habitus (Bourdieu 1977), what is criticized here is not a weakness of will; rather, it is an internalized boundary ingrained in daily practices that pushes the subject toward caution and self-deprecation.

The diagnosis is immediately followed by a "summons." Selman Bey's address, "*My son, strive to resemble these greats (eâzım)!*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 100), invites Fetret to the horizon of "*true greatness*" and "*true mastery*" (mârifet); the goal is to escape the state of being "*low-soaring birds*" (murg-ı pest-pervazlık) and approach the "*circle of genius*" (hizb-i dühâ). The language of the summons links individual ascent to social utility: Fetret is expected to form an example that will trigger the "transformation of the environment," beyond merely 'saving himself.' This address situates the protagonist in a specific subject-position: the modern intellectual who works with discipline, relies on sources, "tests" himself, and is expected to transform society.

The second pillar of subject construction is the disciplining of the intellectual field. In the scene of literary contention, Fetret's command —"*Before attempting such deliberations and comparisons, read, read extensively… investigate at least what authors like Brunetière and Faguet have written regarding this literature*" (Ali Kemâl 1329: 16)—is not a personal piece of advice. It is a regime of authorization that answers the question "who can speak, who can compare?" In this regime, sound judgment is tied to canon, source, and method; the exposure of false references renders the haphazard production of opinion illegitimate. While the command to read elevates the criterion for "mastery of the Occident," it simultaneously differentiates the intellectual field from within. The norm operates by prompting the individual to constantly measure himself rather than by forcing him from the outside; the novel demands the self-governance of the modern subject by binding both the reader and the protagonist to practices of reading, comparison, and deliberation.

The third pillar is boundary-drawing and "selective Westernization." While the novel directs the subject toward the "Occident," it specifically renders visible the possibility that this orientation could dissolve through uncontrolled imitation and profligacy. In the Paris scenes, the formulation of Fetret's understanding of the city "*not only in terms of its virtues but also its vices*" and the idea that the "*most effective means of cultivation*" for youth is to be aware of evils but to avoid them "*knowingly and*

*deliberately,*" establishes a boundary regime that conditions modernization with moral self-control. 'Experience' is acceptable, yet the ritual boundaries of experience must be preserved. Thus, the "Occident" produces a bipolar field as both a model and a danger; the distinction between civilization and profligacy transforms into a norm of selectivity that determines which practices the modern subject will internalize (language, discipline, institutions) and which he will exclude as "*imitation*" or "*infamy*" (rezâil).

Subject construction in *Fetret* is therefore a practice of boundary-making. The turn toward the Occident is presented as ethical formation rather than technical borrowing: education disciplines the body, reading disciplines judgment, and selective conduct disciplines desire. The novel rejects imitation when it remains at the level of appearance and delays the harder work of labor, institutionalization, and moral self-control. In this sense, selective Westernization becomes a technology of self-governance. The Occident performs three linked functions: it marks 'Oriental thought' as a threshold to be crossed; it produces the modern intellectual through reading, canon, and comparison; and it turns Parisian excess into a warning that defines the moral limits of modernizati.

## 5. Discussion

This study demonstrates that in *Fetret*, the "Occident" is not merely a boundary defined by a geographical name; rather, and perhaps more significantly, it is a normative and pedagogical image regime that constructs the entire deliberative architecture of the text. Close reading and discourse analysis reveal that the "Occident" is established within a bivalent framework: on one hand, an "Ideal Occident" emerging through education, science, and institutions; and on the other, a "Dangerous Occident" circumscribed by the risks of profligacy, decay, and imitation. This dual structure is not a simple binary of admiration and hostility; it is a fault line of tension between a diagnosis that renders modernization mandatory and a moral politics that determines the limits of that very modernization. Such a balance embeds the logic of "selective Westernization"—which renders the "Occident" both a target and a criterion for elimination—into the heart of the text.

Conversely, the "Dangerous Occident" is constructed through a moral boundary, particularly in the Paris scenes. Hakan Bey's characterization of Paris as "*a kind of assembly of wonders*" (mahşer-i acâib) carries the text's simultaneous curiosity and trepidation regarding the West. More explicitly, Seher's question implies that the "radiance" of modernity may entail an ethical cost: "...does it not sometimes hinder the conscience?" This question produces the novel's critical distinction: while the scientific and institutional dimensions of the "Occident" are idealized, the dimensions

of entertainment, pleasure, and daily life are circumscribed by the risk of "decay." Thus, the image of the "Occident" transforms into a dual-faceted apparatus that both encourages modernization and establishes a "moral dam" against the dangers of imitation and profligacy.

Nevertheless, several limitations remain. First, the novel's strongly imperative tone can narrow social plurality and downplay classed and gendered differences in experiences of the "Occident." Second, because the analysis focuses on selected scenes, it should be complemented by a fuller reading of the novel's overall sequencing and the role of minor characters in shaping the Occidental image. Finally, contextual work on contemporary press debates and reform discourse may refine how *Fetret*'s rhetoric intersected with institutional projects.

## CONCLUSİON

This study demonstrates that in Ali Kemâl's *Fetret*, the "Occident" is not merely a geographical or cultural label; it is a multi-layered image regime that constructs the novel's imagination of modernization. At the level of construction, the "Occident" is embodied in the upbringing, discipline, and daily practices of the hybrid subject within the corporeal/habitus layer; it produces a knowledge hierarchy through practices of language, reading, and comparison via the mandate of "*mastery of the Occident*" (Garb'a vukuf) at the epistemic layer; and at the institutional and spatial layer, it materializes through signifiers such as the Dârülfünûn, transforming into a visible proof of modernity.

Functionally, the Occidental image first makes backwardness diagnosable and then transforms reform into obligation. Metaphors of captivity or tributary status (harac-güzâr) remove modernization from the realm of optional preference and recast it as a question of collective survival. *Fetret*'s repeated references to discipline, reading, education, and institutional formation are therefore not decorative motifs; they form the text's concrete prescription for salvation. At the same time, the distinction between the 'Ideal Occident' of science and organization and the 'Dangerous Occident' of moral excess prevents the program from collapsing into uncritical imitation.

Within this framework, modernization appears as a holistic transformation with costs: identity tensions, linguistic preferences, centralized education, standardized etiquette, and the moral risks of metropolitan life. This configuration also opens a line toward later Turkish modernization. *Fetret*'s disciplined, educated, self-governing youth anticipates several features that would become central to the Early Republican imagination of the ideal citizen: commitment to public instruction, bodily and moral regulation, faith in institutions, and the belief that national renewal depends on remaking everyday conduct. The novel does not directly produce Republican

ideology, but it offers a late Ottoman prototype of the modern subject that later projects of citizenship could recognize and reorganize. Future studies may extend this line by comparing Fetret with texts that stage women, non-Muslim communities, and classed experiences of Westernization, thereby testing both the reach and the limits of Ali Kemâl's Occidentalist pedagogy.

This continuity should not be understood as a simple identity between late Ottoman and Republican projects; nevertheless, Fetret helps make visible an earlier grammar of the modern citizen. The subject imagined by the novel is literate, disciplined, linguistically competent, publicly useful, and morally self-regulating. He approaches the West neither through passive admiration nor through wholesale rejection, but through selective acquisition governed by education and duty. These features anticipate later debates in which citizenship would be defined through schooling, bodily discipline, public etiquette, productivity, and loyalty to a collective future. *Fetret* therefore occupies an intermediary position: it belongs to the late Ottoman crisis of salvation, yet it also projects a model of selfhood that can be read alongside the Republican ideal of the cultivated, useful, and morally supervised citizen.

## REFERENCES

AHISKA, M. (2003). "Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern". *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102(2/3): 351-379.

ALİ KEMÂL (1329). *Fetret* (Birinci Kitap). Dersaadet: Muhtar Halid Kitabhanesi.

ALİ KEMÂL (1330). *Fetret* (İkinci Kitap). Dersaadet: Muhtar Hâlid Kitabhânesi.

BERKES, N. (2013). *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: Routledge.

BEŞİRLİ, M. (1999). "Osmanlı'da Modernleşme ve Aydınlar 1789-1908". *Dinî Araştırmalar*, 2/5: 131-157.

BOURDİEU, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (trans. R. Nice). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

BUCHOLTZ, M. (2006). "Sociolinguistics and Political Economy". *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 11) (ed. K. Brown). Oxford, England: Elsevier, 493–495.

DOUGLAS, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

ENGİN, E. (2012). "İmagoloji". *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27: 57-66.

FOUCAULT, M. (1986). "Of Other Spaces" (trans. Jay Miskowiec). *Diacritics*, 16/1: 22-27.

GENETTE, G. (1987). *Seuils*. Paris, France: Éditions du Seuil.

İHSANOĞLU, E. (1993). "Dârülfünun". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (C. 8). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 521-525.

KUŞÇU, E., YAĞLI, A. (2022). "Yabancı Dil Olarak Fransızcanın Osmanlı Devleti'nin Son Dönemlerindeki Siyasal, Kültürel ve Eğitsel Alanlardaki Hâkimiyeti". *Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 30: 467-488.

LEERSSEN, J., BELLER, M. (2007). "Imagology: History and Method". *Imagology*. New York: Rodopi, 1-32.

LEFEBVRE, H. (1991). The Production of Space (trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith). Oxford: Blackwell.
MAKDİSİ, U. (2002). "Ottoman Orientalism". *The American Historical Review*, 107/3: 768-796.
MAUSS, M. (1973). "Techniques of the Body". *Economy and Society*, 2/1: 70-88.
METİN, A. (2020). "Occidentalism: An Eastern Reply to Orientalism". *Bilig*, 93: 181-202.
MİLLAS, H. (2011). "Oryantalizm – Oksidantalizm". *Azınlıkça Dergisi*, 62.
MORAN, B. (1997). *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 1: Ahmet Mithat'tan A. H. Tanpınar'a*. İstanbul: İletişim.
PARLA, J. (1993). *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. İstanbul: İletişim.
SAİD, E. W. (1998). *Oryantalizm* (trans. Nezih Uzel). İstanbul: İrfan Yayıncılık.
SERVOİSE, S. (2007). "Roman à thèse et roman engagé: exemplarité diégétique et exemplarité narrative". *Littérature et exemplarité* (ed. A. Gefen, E. Bouju, M. Macé, G. Hautcœur). Rennes, France: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 347-356.
SOMEL, S. A. (2001). *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908: Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
TÜYLÜ, S. A., KIRILMIŞ, İ. T. (2024). "Tanzimat Dönemi'nde Oksidentalist Söylemin Kuruluşu: Namık Kemal ve Renan Müdâfaanâmesi". *Şarkiyat Mecmuası – Journal of Oriental Studies*, 44: 21-39.

**EXTENDED ABSTRACT**

This study examines how the image of the "West" is constructed in Ali Kemâl's novel Fetret and what role this image plays in the novel's understanding of modernization. It begins from the premise that, in Fetret, the West cannot be treated merely as an external geography, a cultural reference, or an object of admiration. Rather, in close relation to the late Ottoman conjuncture, the image of the West functions as a multilayered discursive apparatus that diagnoses Ottoman backwardness, legitimizes modernization, and offers a reform programme. The novel thus uses the West at once as a standard of comparison, a language of diagnosis, and a prescription for survival. The article focuses on the novel's "Preface," didactic dialogue scenes, character representation, spaces such as the Dârülfünûn and Paris, and the discursive patterns through which the East/West opposition—and its comparison—is produced. Through these elements, Fetret imagines late Ottoman modernization as a problem of knowledge, discipline, institutionalization, and moral selectivity. The article's central question is by which mechanisms the image of the West is produced in the novel and how this representation serves its modernizing discourse. It argues that the West is neither simply affirmed nor rejected. On the one hand, it appears as a model in science, education, work discipline, language learning, institutional order, and public conduct; on the other, especially in the Paris scenes, it is marked by dissipation, moral dissolution, and unconscious imitation. For this reason, Fetret's occidentalist discourse cannot be placed within a simple opposition between admiration for the West and anti-Westernism. It is better understood as a tense regime of imagery in which late Ottoman modernization is negotiated through selective transfer, moral supervision, and pedagogical guidance. Methodologically, the study combines close reading with critical discourse analysis. It considers the conception of genre and authorship in the "Preface," the dialogue scenes that privilege ideas and instruction over plot, the expressions that establish the West/East contrast, and the imperatives, value-laden adjectives, metaphors, comparisons, and discursive forms that present

modernization as necessary. The theoretical framework is built around three concepts: occidentalism, imagology, and the pedagogy of modernization. Occidentalism clarifies the knowledge and representation that the East produces about the West; imagology shows how the image of the West functions both as an "other" and as a mirror through which the Ottoman self is reconstituted; and the pedagogy of modernization explains how this representation proposes a programme of conduct, discipline, education, and reform. Together, these concepts show that the novel's references to the West exceed cultural allusion and operate within a chain of representation, comparison, and pedagogical direction. The study finds that the image of the West in Fetret is constructed on three levels. The first is the level of body and habitus. Fetret, the central figure, is presented as a hybrid subject shaped by his experiences in England and France. His dress, speech, measured manners, sense of distance, everyday discipline, and controlled social conduct reveal that Westernization becomes visible not only in thought but also in the body and habits. The second is the epistemic level. In the novel, "knowledge of the West" is linked to language learning, disciplined reading, mastery of a canon, and the capacity for comparison. The emphasis on French and other Western languages presents linguistic competence as a condition of access to modern knowledge, while references to Brunetière and Faguet suggest that Western knowledge is organized as a hierarchy grounded in methodical reading and critical standards. The third is the institutional, spatial, and moral level. The Dârülfünûn scene shows modernity taking concrete form through institutions, architecture, lectures, chairs, audiences, and public learning, whereas the Paris scenes present the West's virtues alongside the risks of scandal and dissipation. In this way, the novel removes modernization from blind imitation and recasts it as a process requiring selection and moral regulation. In conclusion, the article argues that Fetret is a didactic text that uses the image of the West to diagnose the crisis of late Ottoman society and to present modernization as an unavoidable collective task. In the novel, the West is measure, warning, and programme at once. Science, education, work discipline, institutionalization, and a culture of reading define the ideal West, while moral excess, dissipation, and unconscious imitation mark the boundaries of the dangerous West. Fetret's occidentalism is therefore reducible neither to unconditional admiration for the West nor to simple anti-Westernism. Instead, the novel builds late Ottoman modernization around disciplined learning, institutional transformation, moral selectivity, and a modern subject capable of self-cultivation. From Ali Kemâl's perspective, this orientation becomes a prescription for Ottoman survival under the severe conditions of the period. In this respect, Fetret may be read as an early example of a model of subjectivity that extends toward the Republican imagination of citizenship: modern, educated, disciplined, directed toward public benefit, and morally regulated.

**SORUMLU YAZAR**
*CORRESPONDİNG AUTHOR*

DOÇ. DR. ÖZGÜR İLDEŞ
ildesozgur@gmail.com

**ETİK KURUL İZNİ**
*ETHİCS COMMİTTEE APPROVAL*

ÇALIŞMADA HERHANGİ BİR ETİK KURUL İZNİNE GEREK YOKTUR.
*THERE İS NO NEED FOR ANY ETHİCAL COMMİTTEE APPROVAL FOR THE STUDY.*

**DESTEKLEYEN KURUM/KURULUŞLAR**
*SUPPORTİNG-SPONSOR İNSTİTUTİONS OR ORGANİZATİONS*

HERHANGİ BİR KURUM/KURULUŞTAN DESTEK ALINMAMIŞTIR.
*NO SUPPORT WAS RECEİVED FROM ANY İNSTİTUTİON/ORGANİZATİON.*

**KATKI ORANI**
*AUTHOR CONTRİBUTİON PERCENTAGE*

TEK YAZAR % 100
*SOLE AUTHOR*

**ÇIKAR ÇATIŞMASI**
*CONFLİCT OF İNTEREST*

HERHANGİ BİR ÇIKAR ÇATIŞMASI BULUNMAMAKTADIR.
*THERE İS NO CONFLİCT OF İNTEREST.*

**DEĞERLENDİRME**
*ASSESSMENT*

İKİ DIŞ HAKEM / ÇİFT TARAFLI KÖRLEME
*TWO EXTERNAL REFEREES / DOUBLE BLİND*

**BENZERLİK TARAMASI**
*SİMİLARİTY SCREENİNG*

DERGİPARK, İNTİHAL.NET ÜZERİNDEN YAPILMIŞTIR.
*THE SCREENİNG WAS DONE THROUGH DERGİPARK, İNTİHAL.NET.*



**YAPAY ZEKÂ KULLANIMI**
*USE OF ARTİFİCİAL İNTELLİGENCE*

ÇALIŞMADA YAPAY ZEKÂ KULLANILMAMIŞTIR.
*ARTİFİCİAL İNTELLİGENCE WAS NOT USED İN THE STUDY.*