System Crisis and Theater in the Ottoman Empire: Representation of the Late Ottoman System Crisis in Theatrical Plays

Fırat Güllü

A thesis presented to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
at Boğaziçi University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

May 2016

Abstract

"System Crisis and Theater in the Ottoman Empire:
Representation of the Late Ottoman System Crisis in Theatrical Plays"

Fırat Güllü, Master's Candidate at the Atatürk Institute
for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, 2016

Prof. Dr. Şevket Pamuk, Thesis Advisor

In this paper, the term "artistic truth" is a starting point for studying the past through two works of literature; two theater plays written in late nineteenth century in order to get a multifaceted picture of the time. In this analytical reading, the Habermasian perspective of "system crisis" provides us a useful basis from which to give meaning to world presented in these plays.

First, I will start with a summary of general theories on the phenomena of "system crisis," from liberal thinkers of late eighteenth century to German sociologist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas, who produces his own approach from a synthesis of the theories of Karl Marx and Talcott Parson. Consequently, I will create a new approach to the nineteenth century Ottoman history from his perspective.

Second, I will conceptualize the interrelation between history and literature and draw the borderlines of my approach for the study of historical, literary texts. After that, I will present a general view of nineteenth century theater and play-writing activities.

Lastly, I will focus on two interesting theatrical plays. In the fourth chapter, I will analyze Şemsettin Sami's *Gave* (1877) and to put forth his political vision and advice to save the empire from a systemic crisis. In the fifth chapter, I will take Hagop Baronian's *The Honorable Baggers* (1881) into consideration to disclose the playwright's view about the destructive effects of the Ottoman system crisis on the Armenian community living in Istanbul.

40,000 words

Özet

"Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kriz ve Tiyatro:
19. Yüzyıl Sonu Osmanlı Sistem Krizinin Tiyatro Oyunlarında Temsil Edilişi"

Fırat Güllü, Yüksek Lisans Adayı, 2016
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü

Prof. Dr. Şevket Pamuk, Tez Danışmanı

Bu çalışmada "sanatsal gerçeklik" kavramından hareketle, 19. yüzyılın sonunda kaleme alınmış iki tiyatro oyununun analitik bir okumaya tabi tutulması amaçlanmaktadır. Çalışma esnasından Habermasın "sistem krizi" teorisinden yararlanarak bu oyunlarda temsil edilen dünyayı "kriz" bağlamında ele almak hedeflenmektedir.

Çalışmaya ilk olarak 18. yüzyılın liberal düşünürlerinden başlayıp, Karl Marks ve Talcott Parson'un fikirlerini özgün bir bağlamda sentezleyen Alman sosyolog ve düşünür Jürgen Habermas'a kadar ulaşan süreçte "sistem krizi" olarak adlandırılan olgunun nasıl anlamlandırıldığının bir özetini sunarak başlayacağız. Ardından 19. yüzyıl Osmanlı tarihini bu perspektiften yeniden okumaya dair bir öneri yapacağız.

İkinci olarak tarih ve edebiyat arasındaki ilişkiyi kavramsallaştırmayı ve tarihsel değer taşıyan edebi metinler üzerinde çalışırken çalışmanın sınırlarını nasıl çizmemiz gerektiğini tartışacağız. Daha sonra 19. yüzyılda Osmanlı'da tiyatro ortamı ve oyun yazımı faaliyetlerine genel bir bakış atmayı deneyeceğiz.

Son olarak, iki ilginç tiyatro oyunu metnine yakın okuma yapmayı deneyeceğiz. Dördüncü bölümde Şemsettin Sami'nin *Gave* (1877) piyesini inceleyecek ve yazarın politik fikirleri ve Osmanlının geleceğini kurtarmaya dönük önerilerinin oyun içerisinde nasıl temsil edildiğini anlamayı; beşinci bölümde ise Hagop Baronyan'ın *Haşmetlü Dilenciler* (1881) adlı oyununu değerlendirerek Osmanlının yaşadığı sistem krizinin Osmanlı Ermeni toplumu üzerinde yarattığı yıkıcı etkinin oyuna nasıl yansıdığını tespit etmeyi deneyeceğiz.

<div align="right">40.000 kelime</div>

To my loving wife and wonderful daughter
who encouraged me to write this thesis
during hours and days
stolen from our shared time.

x

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Preface/Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed directly or indirectly to this study. Primarily, I would like to thank my adviser, Prof. Dr. Şevket Pamuk for his encouragement and detailed comments on my thesis; without his support and spurring, this thesis would never have been finished. I am especially grateful to Prof. Dr. Duygu Köksal who provided valuable, extensive comments or determining main targets and frame of the work. I am also greateful to Prof. Dr. Kevork Bardakjian and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bülent Bilmez –both in face to face talks and with the help of their published and unpublished works- for awakening my interest in Şemsettin Sami's and Hagop Baronian's political ideas and their importance in Ottoman intellectual life. Further thanks to Asst. Prof. Erol Köroğlu and Asst. Prof. Mehmet Fatih Uslu for their helpful comments on the interrelation between history and literature. Particular thanks to Tracy M. Lord and Jonathan Phillips who kindly read an early version of this thesis and provided valuable and extensive comments. Lastly, thanks to my friends Alişan Akpınar, Ayşan Sönmez, Sevan Değirmenjian and Çiğdem Şimşek for their tireless enthusiasm and for encouraging me to finish this work. Of course, all errors and oversights are my own.

NOTE: The in-house editor of the Atatürk Institute has made recommendations with regard to the format, grammar, spelling, usage, and syntax of this thesis in compliance with professional, ethical standards for the editing of student, academic work.

Do you know Ignaty Prokofyitch? A capitalist, in a way of business, and he speaks fluently. … "When," he said, "all the land is in the hands of foreign companies they can fix any rent they like. And so peasant will work three times as much for his daily bread and he can be turned out at pleasure. So that he will feel it, will be submissive and industrious, and will work three times as much for the same wages. But as it is, with the commune, what does he care? He knows he will not die of hunger, so he is lazy and drunken. And meanwhile money will be attracted into Russia, capital will be created and the bourgeoisie will spring up." … Ignaty Prokofyitch speaks well.

–Timofey Semyonitch, Fyodor Dostoyevski's *The Crocodile: The Extraordinary Incident* (1865)

Ah, Apisoghom Agha you cannot imagine what our teachers in Constantinople have to endure. They have achieved the zenith of poverty. … It is not only teachers who are in this position. Editors, authors, publishers, book-dealers, all who are dedicated to books, are destined for misery. We scream for progress, but stumble toward darkness.

– Teacher, Hagop Baronian's *The Honorable Beggars* (1881)

1

Introduction

To the historian these voices [from works of literature] are sources, because even though the names are fictitious, the events are not.

–Werner T. Angress, The Interplay of History and Literature: An Essay

"The Crocodile," a satiric story by Fyodor Dostoyevsky begins with a note:

> A true story of how a gentleman of a certain age and of respectable appearance was swallowed alive by the crocodile in the Arcade, and of the consequences that followed.

With ironic style, this sentence disproves itself: we, as the readers, know that it cannot be true although presented as a true story; in other words the "truth" in this short story is "artistic truth" not scientific truth: ...not a propositional truth or "truth about", but "truth to." It's a form of similarity (Ankersmit 2010, 30).

Frank Ankersmit in his article *Truth in History and Literature* in which he takes difference between historical text and historical novel (literature) into consideration and argues that there is an asymmetry between them defined by the help of the difference between "saying" and "showing": Histori-

ans do not show the past in their work, only describe it by saying what it has been like; but historical novelists as the men and women of literature are expected to show their readers what the world was like in the past (45). That is the essential dissimilarity of the presentation of the truth in a study of history and a work of literature: truth is in narrative form in history and in representational form in literature. Both, the historian and the novelist have to research the subject about which they will write, but they use historical knowledge in different ways.

However, for a fruitful partnership of history and literature, historians can use historical works of literature as historical sources. According to Werner T. Angress, a novel or a play used as a historical source can be a powerful supplement for reconstructing the spirit and atmosphere of the past, but the historian must remember that the fictitious works have a subjective approach and distortions are possible in their representation of the past (Angress 1979, 412).

§ 1.1 Targets and Theoretical Premises

In this paper, the term "artistic truth" is a starting point for studying the past through two works of literature; two theater plays written in late nineteenth century in order to get a multifaceted picture of the time. In this analytical reading, the Habermasian perspective of "system crisis" provides us a useful basis from which to give meaning to world presented in these plays. In the following action, I will summarize the theoretical and historical premises.

This work contains four main sections:

1 In the second chapter following the introduction, I will start with a summary of general theories on the phenomena of "system crisis," from liberal thinkers of late eighteenth century to German sociologist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas, who produces his own approach from a synthesis of the theories of Karl Marx and Talcott Parson. Consequently, I will create a new approach to the nineteenth century Ottoman history from his perspective.

2 In the third chapter, I will conceptualize the interrelation between history and literature and draw the borderlines of my approach for the study of his-

torical, literary texts. After that, I will present a general view of nineteenth century theater and play-writing activities.

3   In the next two chapters, I will focus on two interesting theatrical plays. In the fourth chapter, I will analyze Şemsettin Sami's *Gave* (1877) and to put forth his political vision and advice to save the empire from a systemic crisis. In the fifth chapter, I will take Hagop Baronian's *The Honorable Baggers* (1881) into consideration to disclose the playwright's view about the destructive effects of the Ottoman system crisis on the Armenian community living in Istanbul.

1.1.1   *Pursuing a General System Crisis Theory*

1.1.1.1   A General Theory of Crisis

The first thinkers who attempted to produce a general theory of system crisis were liberals such as Jean Baptist Say and Adam Smith. They defined the crises as the result of the transgression of liberal economic rules. They argued that there are no structural defects in the capitalist economic system if the market works freely. Nevertheless, we know that the life proved this dogmatic belief is untrue many times.

The first important critical theory on structural defects in the capitalist economy came from Karl Marx. He argued that economic crises are created by the capitalist system itself because of inherent structural contradictions; in other words, endemic economic crises are inevitable in capitalist economies. His revolutionary ideas on political and economic theory affected others. Most famously, Kontradiev formulated a repeating cycle theory of the capitalist economy. According to his evaluation, in capitalist economies cyclic periods of depression emerge leading to a structural reformation of the system which brings about new, cyclical eras of economic growth. These theories were popular, especially between the world wars. However, there are two significant questions regarding these Marxist notions of the crises of capitalism:

1   First of all, they focused only on economic issues and made limited reference to the phenomena of the system crisis.

2 Second, they were deterministic in their expectation of a catastrophic fall of capitalism because of the crises created by structural contradictions in the system.

After World War II, the lack of a Marxist analisis of the resilience of capitalist institutions to the crises brought about new approaches in Western academia. The most famous one was "Systems Theory" of Talcott Parsons. He defined a social system as an integrated unity of four sub-systems, which he initially called GAIL: goal-attainment (politics), adaptation (economy), integration (legitimation) and latency sub-system (motivation). According to Parsons, a social system is in crisis when the sub-system imperatives lose their integration, therefore, all system crises are "integration crises".

Parsons' formalistic theory of social systems and integration crises enlarged the vision of social scientists by formulating a sub-systems theory governing relations between individuals and social institutions. However, its historical dimension was not so powerful; it could not be applied to historicizing crises within modern social systems of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Jürgen Habermas created a synthesis of Marxist and Parsonsian theories and produced a more detailed social system crisis theory. First, he made a distinction between two problems of integration: problems with the integration of the goal-attainment and the adaptation sub-systems produce a "system integration crisis," while difficulties between the integration and the latency sub-systems produce a "social integration crisis". Second, he argued that integration problems among the sub-systems in different historical periods create different types of crises, and he adopted the Marxist notion of social formation to formulate specific definitions for the different types. For example, in primitive and traditional societies, the most important problems are "identity crises," but in modern social formations, crisis threaten the social system itself.

1.1.1.2 Late Ottoman History and the Theory of Crisis

Modern historians of the early and mid-20th century have never considered late Ottoman history from the perspective of a "system crisis". Older generation of Ottoman historians conceptualize the era as a the struggle between "progressive" modernists and "reactionary" Islamist forces. Two important

exceptions are Niyazi Berkes and Halil İnalcık: they found the binary contradiction of progressive versus reactionary attitudes spurious, and they explain the principal political and socio-economic contradictions by challenging the modernization programs of different arms of the state. Engin Akarlı made an important contribution to the discussion arguing that it was neither a matter of progress conformity, nor a question of modernization. The internal and foreign policies of the late Ottoman state can only be understood by understanding imperialistic pressures on the empire and the defensive strategies of the Ottoman state. Çağlar Keyder supported these arguments and maintained that it was the third stage of the Ottoman Empire's peripheralisation. In this period, Western powers took control of the economy through imperialistic financial mechanisms.

First, Eric Jan Zürcher used the term "crisis" for the late Ottoman period. He argued that from 1873 to 1877 economic, diplomatic and political factors contributed to a condition of total crisis. François Georgeon developed this approach in his work on Sultan Abdülhamid, defining the sub-periods of a long period of crisis from 1873 to 1908. In the last part of the second chapter, I will synthesize both historians' arguments from the perspective of Habermasian system crisis theory.

1.1.2 *History and Theater*

1.1.2.1   History and Literature

In the first part of the third chapter, I will focus on two theoreticians' approaches to the study of historical literary works. To begin, I will summarize Franco Moretti's critical study of literature in rhetorical and historical dimensions. In the introductory chapter of *Signs Taken for Wonders: On the Sociology of Literary Forms*, Franco Moretti emphasizes that there is a strong connection between studies of literature and history (Moretti 2005, 1-41). As a sociologist of literature, he argued that a critical study of literature must consider rhetorical and historical bases together. For him, rhetoric is not restricted to literary works, but "literary discourse is entirely contained within the rhetorical domain." Literary works, generate feelings in the readers through aesthetic means and manipulate them to support or challenge a set of values; therefore, rhetoric is a way of wining adherents to political ideas

with the help of emotions. On the other hand, literary works are also "historical products organized according to rhetorical criteria." Historicizing literary work can help us to move beyond rhetorical boundaries. Indeed, for Moretti the concept of "literary genre" makes it possible to define the historical range of a text.

Moretti suggests that a more complete study of a literary work will be possible when diachronic and synchronic approaches –concerning the historical and rhetorical dimensions, respectively- are at work simultaneously. Researchers must put a literary work into the boundaries of a specific genre to understand its historical range, but in the same time, they must analyze the inner structure and internal order of the form woven into the text.

Erol Köroğlu's model of "four-temporalities," which makes the creation and reception of meaning in a literary text possible, supports Moretti's approach. (Köroğlu 2006, 84-87) He argues that there are four categories of temporality, two inner and two outer forms:

1. The inner temporality of the story, which is the chronological flow of the story of the literary work.
2. The inner temporality of the plot/discourse, which is the narration of the story in a past determined by the author through a past or a future.
3. The outer temporality of the writer, which is the time and the space in which the text was written and the historical conditions of the society to which the author belonged.
4. The outer temporality of the reader, which is the time and the space in which someone reads the text.

According to Köroğlu, the interpretation or the subjective meaning of the literary work emerged from an authentic combination of these four temporalities; therefore, a cultural historian must study on them simultaneously to reveal the inner and the outer features of the text.

1.1.2.2   Theatre as Literature

In the opening part of the third chapter, I will present a general view of the modern theater activities in the Ottoman capital. I will first take the problems into consideration: the political pressure by the government that affected artistic activities and the press, censorship mechanisms and increasing

political control over the Armenian population including well-known actors and actresses of the time. Second, I will mention the conditions and activities of well-known theater troupes of the time, especially of Mınakyan's *Ottoman Dramatic Company*, which is the locomotive force of the modernist theater activities and of the *tuluat* companies, which staged improvised shows led by famous Muslim comedians.

Finally, I will refer to play-writing activities and a few important productive playwrights of the time. The successes of the *tuluat* companies, which were based on improvised acting rather than written texts, may be a reason why play-writing was deficient and did not fully grow. It was of directors (such as Mınakyan, Fasulyacıyan or Mağakyan) and brilliant actors and actresses and great comedians, not playwrights. Directors preferred the plays of Namık Kemal, Ahmet Mithat, Şemsettin Sami or adaptations of Ahmet Vefik Paşa and Director Ali Bey from the earlier period; or translations of famous European plays. The only exceptions are two successful comedy writers, Feraizcizade Mehmet Şakir, and Hagop Baronian and a famous poet, Abdülhak Hamit, who wrote eminently literary, romantic plays that were never staged in his lifetime. Under these conditions, written theater texts that are accessible and distinguished works of theater that richly represent late Ottoman life and society on the stage, are rare. In this thesis, I will study two of these unusual literary works.

1.1.3 *Representation of the Late Ottoman System Crisis in Theatre Plays*

1.1.3.1   Şemsettin Sami's *Gave* (1877)

Şemsettin Sami published *Gave* in 1877 and Armenian company leader Tovmas Fasulyacıyan first staged the play in 1884 in Thessaloniki. Sami used the Persian masterpiece *Shahname of Firdevsi* as the literary source of his play. He took his inspiration from Shakespeare who had used ancient Greek and Roman myths to throw the problems of his own age into sharp relief. Sami likewise used eastern classics and legends to create an opportunity for discussing contemporary political problems. This work was an exceptional and unusual dramatic success in its time, which displays the emergence of a system crisis in a traditional empire and offers some resolutions to integration problems in the final act. In the fourth chapter I will analize how Şem-

settin Sami presents the Ottoman system crisis on the stage and what are his main political messages to the audience for saving the Ottoman Empire in an age of imperialism and nationalism.

1.1.3.2 Hagop Baronian's *The Honorable Beggars* (1881)

Hagop Baronian published his famous satirical novel *The Honorable Beggars* in installments in the years 1880 and 1881. He remarked that, "he would have much preferred to present his work in the shape of a comedy rather than a novel." (Bardakjian 1984, 139)

Therefore, especially western Armenians converted the work into a comedy several times, not only in Armenian, but in other languages, as well. However, the work couldn't be staged until the end of Hamidian absolutist monarchy and had to wait. The play starts with the lines: "A man is standing on the dock at Galatia, having just gotten off the steamer from Trebizond. It is 1870 something…" From these first lines, we start to read, with adoration the smart observations of a great author witnessing his time. In the fifth chapter, I will analyze this well-structured comedy to find signs of the Ottoman system crisis in a period in time in which the modernization and integration mechanisms of the empire had failed.

In the fifth chapter, I will show that Baronian had a more complex and greater picture of the system crisis that the Ottoman Empire was suffering, but in this grotesque comedy, he preferred to focus on the Armenians of Istanbul and display the misery of actors and leading figures in the community. I will show how the author represents the destructive aftermath of the Ottoman system crisis, which ended a glorious enlightenment movement among Ottoman Armenians.

2

Theories of System Crisis

> *Crisis arise when the structure of a social system allows fewer possibilities for problem solving than are necessary to continued existence of the system. In this sense, crises are seen as persistent disturbance of system integration.*
>
> –Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*

As R. J. Holton stated, since the 1980s crisis-talk has dominated all fields of the social sciences: Experts continuously use such terms as "global or international crisis," "crisis of nation-states," "crisis of accumulation," "crisis of legitimation," "crisis of management," "fiscal crisis," "crisis of bank credits," "crisis of motivation," and "ethical and moral crisis." The term "crisis" is generally used to indicate people's intolarance of the present and contains the connotation of social criticism and the necessity of reform (Holton 1987, 502).

In the other hand, attempting to create social-scientific theories out of crises in both traditional and modern societies is not a new tendency. In this part of this thesis, I will summarize the evolution and main arguments of theories of crisis by taking the works of Karl Marx, Talcott Parsons and Jürgen Habermas as examples.

§ 2.1 Theories of Endemic Economic Crisis of Capitalism Before and After Marx

There are several theoretical explanations for economic crises in capitalism, but it is possible to sort the theories into three main groups:

1 Liberal theories of crises by economists like Adam Smith and Jean Baptist Say.
2 Theories with repeating cycles like those of Jugler, Kitchen, Kuznets and most famously Nicolai Kondratiev.
3 Marxist theories of structural crises in capitalism (Kaymak 2008, 9-36).

According to liberal economists, there are no structural causes for crises in capitalism if the mechanisms of supply and demand work freely. The most famous liberal theory about crises is Say's Law:

> It is worthwhile to remark that a product is no sooner created than it, from that instant, affords a market for other products to the full extent of its own value. When the producer has put the finishing hand to his product, he is most anxious to sell it immediately, lest its value should diminish in his hands. Nor is he less anxious to dispose of the money he may get for it; for the value of money is also perishable. But the only way of getting rid of money is in the purchase of some product or other. Thus, the mere circumstance of creation of one product immediately opens a vent for other products. (Say 1834)

However, real life has often proved the inadmissibility of Say's Law. Indeed, after 1815 a global economic crisis brought about socio-economic trouble around the world. Therefore, many economists started calling classic liberal theories into question.

First, Thomas Robert Malthus indicated that one of the main problems of the capitalist system is over-production and another economist, Sismondi advanced the theory arguing that the only means of resolving over-production is international trade. Both of them continued to reason within the liberal economic paradigm (Kaymak 2008, 12-13).

It was clear that the "invisible hand" of classical liberal economic theory does not provide a sufficient and effective understanding of the causes and

nature of crises in capitalism, especially their cyclic character. Nikolai Kondratiev opened a new phase in the social sciences with his statistical analysis method:

> His research was one of the first major quantified inquiries into economic history. It established a consensus on approximate dating of the initial long term economic movements and for a certain time it became a paradigm of explanation of changes in capitalist development. (Freeman and Lauça 2002, 90)

According to him, periods of depression in a capitalist economy function as turning points for structural reform between eras of economic growth. The paradigm of Kondratiev and his successors suggesting that capitalist growth occurs in long waves including series of booms, stagnations and depressions is useful for understanding how the system reacts to technological, organizational and infrastructural problems and recovers from a period of crisis. On the other hand, however, this theoretical paradigm does not analyze structural contradictions within capitalism that are essentially a system creating its own crises.

First, Marx and some successors attempted to underline the problematic, fundamental relations in capitalism that inevitably create crises. According to Immanuel Wallerstein, the capitalist system creates crises not because of its failure, on the contrary, because of its success (Wallerstein 1984, 16). The principal, historical motivation of capitalism is steady accumulation of capital and at each stage of the system, capitalists found a way to transcend the limitations on making a profit. Those who did not find a way to profit lost the game and disappeared; others survived and became stronger. However, because of the essential motive to make a profit, whenever the system exceeded, crises repeatedly emerged. Marxist theorists blame this phenomenon of inevitable systemic crises first on the contradiction between the motivation of profit and social productivity (the actual means to realize profit) and second, on the fact that decisions regarding production and investment mechanisms are made individually by autonomous entrepreneurs, not based on a global action plan. Marx called this situation as "production anarchy" (Kaymak 2008, 17).

Marxist theorists comprise two general groups based on their approach to the phenomena of crisis. The first group consist of "possibility theorists" and the second "necessity theorists" (Shaikh 2001, 180-184). First group argues that there are two causes of crisis: under consumption and squeezing of the wages for labor. In both cases, the state can regulate the system and intervene to resolve the problem. "Necessity theorists" do not agree with the former on the role of the state in an economic system; for them the significant issue is the "tendency for the rate of profit to fall." It is not a "possibility;" it's an imminent necessity of the system. According to Marx, every capital owner increases the profit ratio by increasing exploitation through longer working hours and lower wages, obtaining cheaper technology and raw materials, making more international trade, and building join-stock companies. On the other hand, under the conditions of the free market, each organization seeks to provide the best prices to consumers. All of these behaviors force prices to fall in the long run, which is a structural characteristic of historical capitalism. Low prices slow down the accumulation of capital leading to a crisis in the end. Every crisis brings about a process of natural selection and some companies disappear while some others become larger. Monopolistic companies attack high wages labor to gain strength and the system recovers. In other words, crises are opportunities to deconstruct the old system and speed the emergence of a new one with new technologies, new organizational models, and new production mechanisms.

§ 2.2   Talcott Parsons' Systems Theory and the "Integration Crisis"

Marxist theories of economic crisis were popular during the great depressions of 1930s but after World War II began to be criticized. Its structural analysis of the defects of the capitalist economy was strong but its weakness was a prognostic approach to economic crises. Marx argued that endemic economic crises would lead to social disorders and breakdowns; therefore, a revolution which would make it possible to liberate the world from crises was inescapable. Marxist theory did not take into account that capitalist institutions have a capacity to manage endemic crises (Holton 1987, 550-551).

By the 1950s, another school of crisis theory gained traction. The leading figure of this new approach was Talcott Parsons who published his magnum opus, *The Social Systems* in 1951. According to Parsons, modern societies cannot be harmonious and trouble free because they are socially differentiated systems; that is, in the modern world, social systems include functionally differentiated sub-systems. Habermas defined these as "inherent system-imperatives that are incompatible and cannot be hierarchically integrated" (Habermas 1992, 2).

In *The Social Systems* Parsons developed…

…a four sub-system model of social system around four tasks facing a social system in relation to its environment. These four sub-systems (GAIL) were goal-attainment (the polity), adaptation (the economy), integration (cultural system of general values that is concerned with law and social control) and latency (normative problem of motivation to fulfill positions in the social system). (Turner 1991, XVIII)

The theory of crisis was part of this general social system theory. When a social system cannot properly re-integrate its differentiated sub-systems, problems occur. Parsons rarely used the term "crisis," initially preffering "strain" or "instability". However, in the 1970s he used the term "storm center of crisis" to describe social mobilizations in social systems around the world, arguing that, "social conflicts may occur wherever rights of inclusion are denied or to the extent that sub-system imperatives cannot be integrated with each other" (Holton, 512).

According to Habermas, when systems theoreticians talk about the integration crises, it implies two kinds of problems: the failure of system integration and the lack of social integration. Disturbances of system integration are important, but only when there is also a social integration crisis do they actually threaten the continuity of the social system. Only under this condition are "consensual foundations of normative structures are so impaired that society becomes anomic" (Habermas 1992, 3).

According to Habermas, a social-scientific appropriate crisis concept must grasp the connection between system integration and social integration.

Table 2.1 System Integration and Social Integration

	System Integration	*Social Integration*
Talcott Parsons' vocabulary	Adaptation (economy) and goal-attainment (polity)	Integration (general values) and pattern maintenance (motivation)
Habermas' vocabulary	System	Life-world

Source: Habermas 1992, 4-5.

The most important criticism of Parsons' systems theory by Jürgen Habermas is that…

> …the conceptual strategy of systems theory encompassed normative structures within its language; but it conceptualizes every social system from the point of view of its control center. Thus in differentiated societies, the political system (as a separated control center) assumes a superordinate position vis-a-vis the socio-cultural and economic systems. (Habermas 1992, 5)

§ 2.3   Jürgen Habermas and the Theory of "System Crisis"

The Habermasian theory of system crisis is an original conceptualization of the phenomena based on a synthesis of Marx and Parsons. According to him, an environment divided into three sub-categories surrounds every social system: its outer nature, other social systems and its inner nature. A social system realizes the adaptation of its outer nature to society with the help of instrumental actions such as organizing the labor force, making technological innovations and creating production strategies. This process is known as "production." In addition, a social system adapts its inner nature to the society using communicative actions that give members norms of justification. This is "legitimization." A social system achieves system integration through production processes and social integration through legitimization processes. The basic ingredient of the production processes is "scientific truth" and that of the legitimation processes is "discursive correctness" conveyed through myth, religion, philosophy or ideology (9-10).

In contrast to this formalistic and universalist starting point, Habermas' theory weighs in on historical evolution of societies with a clear reference to Marxist "social formation" terminology, thereby constructing a strong basis for defining the social phenomena of system crisis.

Scheme 2.1   Social Formations

Primitive (without social classes)
Civilized (social class based)
    Traditional
    Modern
        Capitalist
            Liberal capitalist
            Advanced capitalist
        Post-capitalist
    Post-modern

Source: Habermas, 17.

In primitive social formations, the institutional core is a kinship system and the organizational principle is based on age and sex. This is not a differentiated system, and both social and system integration are realized through the same mechanism: the family. Norms are conveyed by collective rituals and taboos. There is no extreme exploitation of labor and no need for surplus. Potential causes for a system crisis are all external: uncontrolled demographic growth, ecological changes or interethnic dependency (Habermas, 18).

In traditional civilizations, institutional cores are the state and the system of social labor and its organizational principle are class domination in political form. These social systems are differentiated into secular and sacred powers: on authority apparatus and legal order, on the one hand, and counter factual justification mechanisms and a moral system, on the other hand. Secular power is responsible for system integration and sacred power for social integration. The rate of exploitation is high and the labor force is pushed to produce a surplus within technological limits. The fundamental contradiction, from which potential crises arise, is internal. The contradic-

tion is between 1) the validity claims of systems of norms and justification mechanisms that do not explicitly permit exploitation, and 2) a class structure in which privileged appropriation of socially produced wealth is the rule. Class struggles threaten social integration. The system needs to find new ways of legitimatization and to found a new group identity (18-20).

In modern liberal capitalist formations, institutional cores are the state and civil society and their organizational principle is the relationship of wage labor to capital. Social and system integrations are again united and realized through the market. The authority apparatus and legal order lose their independence and captured by justification mechanisms and the moral and ideological system of the bourgeoisie. Technological innovations support labor productivity and a free market economy maximizes profits. In this social formation the fundamental contradiction from which potential crises arise is opposition between the interests of wage labor and those of capital owners. There is another breaking point that threatens the system and social integration in a capitalist economy: the interruption of processes of accumulation. In modern, liberal, capitalist social formations, social and system integrations are realized in market conditions, so system crises occur in the form of economic crises. However, actually, crises span in all sub-systems: economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system, rationality crisis in the goal-attainment sub-system, legitimation crisis in the integration sub-system, and motivation crisis in the latent pattern sub-system. In other words, system crises in modern liberal capitalist social system are absolute crises (20-23).

In modern, advanced capitalist formations, the competitive stage of capitalism has ended and a new form of organized, state-regulated capitalism emerges. It is a mixed economy with three sectors: the private sector based on the competition among small companies, a public sector that allows for engagement by the state in the economy, and oligopolies, which are an intermediary between the private and public sectors. State supported oligopolies control the market and determines the rules with help from international fiscal and financial institutions. Administration is realized through global planning: the state replaces the market mechanisms of the previous, liberal stage and creates the conditions that guarantee the realization of capital for large entrepreneurs. Similar to traditional societies, the administrative system is separated from legitimization mechanisms. Through the emergence of

formal democratic institutions, which circumvent real, direct or effective participation by the masses, administrative decisions are made by governing elites. The new mechanisms for securing mass loyalty are based on career building opportunities, leisure time activities and consumption possibilities (33-41).

Table 2.2   Social Formations and Types of Crisis[1]

Social Formation	Principle of Organization	Social and System Integration	Type of crisis
Primitive	Kinship	No differentiation	Externally induced identity crisis
Traditional	Political class rule (state and classes)	Functional differentiation	Internally determined identity crisis
Modern liberal capitalist	Unpolitical class rule (wage labor and capital owner)	System integrative economic system which has socially in-tegrative tasks (no differentiation)	System crisis
Modern advanced capitalist	Political class rule (interventionist state and social classes)	Formal democratic institutions which permits administrative decisions independent from public participation	System crisis and identity crisis

Source: Habermas, 24.

---

1   The last line is added to Habermas' original table as a summary of the secion of his book on pages 36-37.

§ 2.4   Looking at the Late Ottoman History from a Habermasian Perspective of System Crisis

A Habermasian theory of crisis provides us a a basis from which to analyze radical changes in Ottoman political and social institutions in nineteenth century and its effects on society, but historians and social scientists have never attempted to understand late Ottoman history from this perspective.

In this part, first, I will give a short summary of the different perspectives on late Ottoman history:

1   The classical paradigm of historians like Enver Ziya Karal or Bernard Lewis understands late Ottoman history as a struggle between reactionary tyrannical forces (evil) and progressive forces urging liberty (good).

2   Other historians like Niyazi Berkes and Halil İnalcık approach Ottoman-reformation in the nineteenth century as a competition among different modernization projects within the empire, particularly along Western vis-à-vis Islamic lines.

3   Engin Deniz Akarlı's view of the late Ottoman Empire is that was self-defensive in light of the imperialistic conflict, and Çağlar Keyder approaches its history from the perspective of a world-system as the peripheralization and integration into the world economy.

Second, I will adopt the framework and terminology of Habermasian crisis theory to late Ottoman history. I will argue that in the nineteenth century, the Ottoman social system passed through two sequential crises within a short period:

1   In the first half of the century, state elites attempted to a transition from traditional to modern society, which brought about an *identity crisis*.

2   Because of the global crisis in the last quarter of the century, which closed the liberal era of modern liberal capitalism, Ottoman social system faced with a *system crisis*.

Finally, I will first analyze the features of the identity crisis in the Ottoman social system; and second, summarize the thesis of two relatively new historians of the crisis of the late Ottoman history (Zürcher and Georgeon), and

reformulate their arguments through the lens of the Habermasian theoretical framework.

2.4.1 *Modern Historiography of the Late Ottomans and the Concept of System Crisis*

It is a relatively new perspective to explain late Ottoman history especially in the late nineteenth century as an absolute system crisis with economic, political, and socio-cultural aspects. An older generation of Ottoman historians approached it as a period of political chaos that could not be controlled by the state, or as an internal conflict between the absolutist, conservative state mechanisms of the Sultan and libertarian Young Turks (Karal 1962, Lewis 1970). It is clear that the paradigm of a struggle between "reactionary", tyrannical forces and progressive ones motivated by liberty theme from early Kemalist historiography (Fortna 2011, 71-72).

Two important figures questioned this paradigm:

1   Niyazi Berkes argued that the terms of "modernization" and "Westernization" are not synonyms, and that while Tanzimat Paşas preferred a more mimetic Westernization, for example Abdülhamid II was a typical Ottoman reformist who tried to realize an Islamist modernization project, but not Westerner (Berkes 1998, 256-260).

2   İnalcık supported Berkes, by advancing the argument that even the Tanzimat edict, which was the first official document that started the Westernization of Ottoman jurisprudence has a traditional character (Somel 2001(b), 2).

However, for both historians, the focus was still on the relations between religion and the state.

One of the first opponents to this perspective came from a young doctoral student in 1976. In his dissertation, Engin Deniz Akarlı used primary sources from the Yıldız Palace archives to show that the reactionary policies of Sultan Abdülhamid and the country's internal conflicts cannot be understood without analyzing the era's global structure. He focused on the character of a new phase of imperialism to explain the meaning of the Sultan's defensive policies as a strategy to balance global power relations. According to him, anyone cannot frame the secret motivations of the Sultan, who hid be-

hind the walls of his palace on top of Yıldız Hill, without taking imperialistic advances of great European powers under considiration. He put the global economic crisis of 1873 in the center of his analysis and argued that predominant protectionism among industrialized, Western countries was a reaction to increasing rivalries which forced Britain, as the first industrial super power, to defend itself by tightening control over world commercial routes. The British occupation of Egypt in 1882 was one of the main results of this new strategy, triggering a race to partition Africa. Imperialistic rivalries turned into a struggle to allocate the whole world.

Akarlı explained that the choices of the Sultan in foreign and internal politics were part of a defensive strategy that aimed to…

1 balance British and French aggressions,
2 ally with the dual monarchy of Germany and Austria-Hungary,
3 keep peace with Russia to preserve peace in Balkans, and
4 improve relations with new Balkan states, especially Greece.

From this perspective, the pan-Islamist and reactionary policies of the palace and its rejection of the multinational empire and liberal citizenship notions of Tanzimat must understood in consideration self-defensive strategy to prevent foreign (British and French) intervention by taking advantage of the empire's multi-ethnic social structure. According to him, Abdülhamit's failed foreign policy was experiment in neutrality; relations among the great powers changed for worse and polarization created inimical camps.

Akarlı's perspective gave new meaning to the Hamidian era in the light of the big picture of imperialistic struggles taking place in a transitional period of industrial capitalism. Some historical sociologists looking from a world-system perspective supported it. Çağlar Keyder is one scholar who approached the Hamidian in terms of peripheralization and integration of Ottoman Empire into the world economy. According to him, the Hamidian era was the third phase of the peripheralization of the Ottomans:

1 The first phase was "the period of free trade" which started symbolically with the signing of the Treaty of Baltalimanı with Britain in 1838.
2 The second phase was "the period of foreign borrowing" which started after the Crimean War in 1856.

3   In the third phase was Western capital owners took control over the Otto-
man economy with the help of the Public Debt Administration founded in
1881 as well as over direct investments, especially railroads and port con-
struction (Keyder 1987, 39-41,44-45).

The reaction of the government against this new stage of imperialism be-
came defensive, and "it was pushed to embrace the resentment of traditional
orders against the European impact." That is to say, the supposed reaction-
ism and pan-Islamism of the "Red Sultan" was nothing more than a reaction
to imperialistic attacks by the great powers.

The effort to explain late Ottoman history from the perspective of a sys-
tem crisis was led by two foreign historians: Eric. J. Zürcher and François
Georgeon. I will summarize their arguments later.

2.4.2   *Identity and System Crisis in Late Ottoman Society*

2.4.2.1   Westernization Processes; Integration into the Liberal Capitalist
World-Economy, and Identity Crisis in Early Nineteenth Century
Ottoman Society

The Habermasian formulation of "identity crisis" of traditional societies pro-
vides valid arguments for explaining the conflicts in Ottoman society during
and after mid-nineteenth century reforms to the state and legal structure the
empire.

Daryush Shayegan defined the situation of Islamic societies confronting
the West as "cultural schizophrenia" (Shayegan, 1992). He argues that the
reason for this schizophrenia is the tendency of Islamic societies to take
technical support for modernization from the West while forbidding the
materialistic mentality, on which such modernization is founded. Shayegan
regards this attitude as a kind of "duplicity" and criticizes futility of modern-
izing Islamic societies' simultaneous juxtaposition of modern and traditional
conceptualizations. Shayegan thinks this attitude resulted from a phobia
about losing the authentic culture (30).

This mode of existence was typical in mid-nineteenth century Ottoman
society. Habermas, in his formulation of "identity crisis in traditional socie-

ty," maintains that the reason for this "duplicity" are the highly differentiated social characteristics of traditional civilizations.

In "the Classical Age" of the Ottoman Empire, for example, sultan, his bureaucrats, and a secular code called *kanun* were independent of justification mechanisms and the moral system, which were under the control of the *ulema* and the religious codes of the *şeriat* (İnalcık 2003, 76-81; Berkes 2002, 175-178). The Westernization reforms of Mahmut II and the Tanzimat *Paşas* were realized (in Parsonian vocabulary) in the sub-systems of adaptation (economy) and goal-attainment (polity), which made it possible to achieve system integration. On the other hand, justification mechanisms and moral values were left untouched and retained power as the most essential element of society. The result became an inescapable "identity crisis". Because of his reformist vision and Western life-style, Mahmut II was named the *Gavur Padişah*. Ali *Paşa* and Fuat *Paşa* as figures of modern bureaucracy of the Tanzimat remained abhorrent to Muslim majority in the empire (Zürcher 2004, 130). Opposition was strong even among the lower ranks of the bureaucracy, the and Young Ottomans, as the leading figures of popular antagonism against Tanzimat reforms, maintained their criticisms until the declaration of the Ottoman constitution. It is clear that modern methods received from the West to realize system integration failed to curtail a social integration, and this situation presented itself in the form of an "identity crisis."

In this new stage of the empire's history that continued for decades, the effects of the capitalist global market and values related free market ideology steadily increased. As Habermas formulated, since the market is not only a system integration mechanism, but also an alternative to social integration in a modern, liberal, capitalist social formation, the emergence of a free market in Ottoman society reinforced the "identity crisis." A new liberal market started competing with traditional justification mechanisms and moral systems.

The legacies of Ali *Paşa* and Fuat *Paşa*, which were published in foreign newspapers, are the typical examples of the market-based, liberal discourse of high-ranking Ottoman bureaucrats in the mid-nineteenth century. In Fuat Paşa's legacy, he defines the aim of the state "to reach at the level of the contemporary Western civilization" and predicates the need for radical reform to become a Western, modern state. The main elements of this reform

movement were scientific rationality, adherence to the values of the British Empire, secularism and secular education, and a concept of Ottoman citizenship independent of the ethnic and religious identities of the subjects of the Empire (Çavdar 1992, 19-22). Ali Paşa, similarly emphasized that the only path to socio-economic development was to become a part of European civilization. Therefore, the Ottoman government had to protect the fundamental rights of its subjects and embody a concept of citizenship independent of ethnic and religious identity (24-27). Neither of these high-ranking Ottoman governors questioned the necessity of a liberal market as the only means for socio-economic development in the empire.

In contrast to the liberal ideas of these two Tanzimat Paşas, another high-ranking Ottoman bureaucrat, Cevdet Paşa, argued that the Westernization of the Ottoman state and society was impossible. The ancient social and moral values of the empire differed from the moral systems of Western societies; they were structurally incompatible. According to him, the essential element of the Ottoman Empire was Islam, and the economic and political salvation of the society was possible by the reunion of the Muslim societies. On the other hand, he agreed with Ali *Paşa* and Fuat *Paşa* that the contemporary economic system had to be based on liberal tenants, never questioning liberal market ideology (32-37).

This discussion among Ottoman elites significant responsibilities in the government in the mid-nineteenth century exemplifies the identity crisis in Ottoman society during processes of Westernization and integration into liberal capitalism. However, in the 1870s another crisis emerged. This time, the crisis was global and would have long-term effects. According to the the Marxist terminology also employed by Habermas, this was the symptomatic crisis of transition from a liberal capitalist social formation to an advanced capitalist social formation. I will examine its effects on the Ottoman Empire, but first, I will summarize the arguments of two important historians.

2.4.2.2 Zürcher and Goergeon's Arguments about the Crisis of the Late Ottoman Empire

Eric Jan Zürcher penned one of the first attempts to explain the late Ottoman period as a crisis of the Ottoman state and society. In "The Crisis of 1873-1877 and its Aftermath," the sixth chapter of the first part of *Turkey: A Modern*

History, he explains the causes of the crisis as a combination of economic, diplomatic, and political factors:

1   Economically the Ottoman crisis was a result of a catastrophic famine of 1873, which reduced the revenues of the state (an internal factor) and the Great Depression of 1873, which negatively affected foreign debt mechanisms (an external factor). It forced the government to enact new taxes.

2   The economic crisis was a trigger for political and diplomatic crises, because new taxes led to rebellions in the Balkan provinces, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and later in Bulgaria. Russia and Austria-Hungary intervened in the political crisis they termed the "Eastern Question" and this diplomatic crisis led to a war between the Ottoman Empire and Russia, which deemed itself the protector of the Balkan Slavs. The frustrating result for the Ottomans was that they had to accept independence of the empire's Christian subjects on the Balkan peninsula. This foreign political crisis brought about an internal crisis for the Ottomans.

3   Sultan Abdülaziz, who could not manage the economic, diplomatic, and political crises, was forced to declare a constitution and share power with the Western-oriented bureaucrats. Since he rigorously rejected this project, he was deposed and the implementation of the empire's first constitution was shifted first to Murat V and then Abdülhamid II, who successively took the throne after him (Zürcher 2004, 141-148).

According to Zürcher's approach, in order to understand the reign of Abdülhamid II, one must not forget the historical background of its aftermath. Such policies as pan-Islamism, increasing pressure on non-Muslim subjects, strengthening the Ssultan's position through absolutist practice, and the shift to ally with Germany instead of Britain and France on foreign political matters are all meaningful from this perspective. Reactionist policies of the sultan were a reaction to the crisis between the years of 1873 and 1878 (155-174).

Support for this argument came from François Georgeon in the book *Sultan Abdülhamid,* where he constructs a theory of crisis for late nineteenth century Ottoman history. According to him, the crisis had started just before Abdülhamid took the throne:

1   There was a catastrophe in Balkan provinces because of high taxes, and the state could not pay foreign debts on time and declared bankruptcy.

2   After a drought in Anatolia in the years 1873-1874, a famine occurred among peasants, and the Great Depression started in 1873. (Georgeon 2006, 49-53)

In the first months of his reign, Abdülhamid had to manage two problems: the declaration of a constitution and the threat of war with Russia. He declared the constitution and a national assembly opened, but the war started as a consequence. He then closed the assembly using power derrived from the constitution. The war included with the victory of the Russians and the two states started a peace conference.

After the Berlin Treaty, the losses of the empire were so heavy that a second era of the crisis (1878-1881) started. According to Georgeon, in the second phase of the crisis, the sultan had to solve two problems: a "legitimation crisis" of a constitutional regime with an absolutist monarch, and an "economic crisis" related to the Great Depression and decreasing prices in the world agricultural market. Georgeon argues that because the sultan survived one of the most serious crises of the Ottoman Empire, he became more powerful (142). The most important threats against him came from defenders of constitutionalism, separatists, modern bureaucrats, who has wrested control control from his predecessors, military officials controlling the army and *ulema*.

The sultan dispensed with these threats with specific solutions, about which Georgeon presents a detailed analysis:

1   He moved to a secure palace in Yıldız turning an old summer palace into the new center of government.

2   He worked with a young, well-educated, loyal group of bureaucrats, whom he kept in Yıldız Palace.

3   He was himself commander-in-chief himself and all *Paşas* and the head of the army were selected among loyalists.

4   He found ways to manufacture public opinion with the help of a supporter press and controlled it by a secret police organization and strict mechanisms of censorship.

5   He created and financed a special treasury directly under his control called *Hazine-i Hassa,* which gave him personal control of 6 % or 10 % of the revenues.

6   He appointed young, loyal provincial governors and granted local power to keep these relationships strong.

7   He adopted the title of caliph and the idea of the unity of all Muslim people to strengthen his personal image. (147-248)

Georgeon argues that using these power mechanisms, the sultan took state control upon himself, but this was not enough to end the crisis. The next chapter of his book was aptly titled "From One Crisis to Another" (249-360).

Imperialist attacks continued inside the country through military, economic, political, religious and cultural means:

1   Britain and France conquered the North African provinces of the empire.

2   Outside powers started controlling the Ottoman economy through organizations such as the Public Debt Administration and the Tobacco Régie, as well as through direct foreign investment.

3   Consulates and foreign schools in the country had a religious and cultural impact on the subjects of the empire.

The sultan tried to resist such attacks by…

1   establishing close military and economic relations with Germany by buying new weapons and inviting military and financial experts,

2   buying agricultural lands with the money in the *Hazine-i Hassa* to prevent the establishment of capitalist farms by foreigners,

3   opening new public schools and making reforms in the educational system,

4   sponsoring cultural and artistic pursuits of Ottoman subjects such as Osman Hamdi founder of the Imperial Museum of Archeology.

However, other problems like budget deficits, insufficiently educated personal, and nationalist movements among Muslim subjects (especially Arabs, Kurds, and Albanians) threatened the idea of the unity of Islam and strengthened opposition of Young Turks. In spite of these problems, Sultan

Abdülhamid survived in power for 33 years. He was not able to end the crisis of the Empire, but maintained control over it for a long time.

2.4.2.3 Reformulating Zürcher and Georgeon's Arguments from the Perspective of Habermasian System Crises Theory

If it is preferred to identify the problem in Habermasian terminology, the crisis of the Ottoman system in the late nineteenth century have to be taken into consideration under four sub-categories:

1 There was an economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system: The famine of 1873, the great depression of 1873-1896, deflation in the agricultural sector, the state's need for revenues to balance the budget and its bankruptcy in 1876, and the foundation of the Public Debt Administration in 1881 signified this crisis.

2 There was a political crisis in the goal-attainment sub-system: Rebellions in the Balkan provinces from 1873 to 1876, the "Eastern Question" and the war between the Ottomans and Russians, the separation of the new Balkan states from the empire in 1878, the legitimization crisis of the Ottoman throne after the dethronement of Abdülaziz, and the abolishment of the first national assembly were the manifestations of the crisis in the political sub-system.

3 There was a legitimization crisis in the integration sub-system: The disappearance of an ideal of Ottoman citizenship independent from ethnic and religious identities of subjects and the emergence of the new nation states in the former provinces of the empire demonstrated the crisis of legitimization.

4 Finally, there was a motivation crisis in the latent pattern sub-system: The most important manifestation of this crisis was that bribery had spread like wildfire.

The first two crises are related to "system integration." Sultan Abdülhamit II tried to solve the "system integration" problems by producing such resolutions like…

1 recreating a strong portrait of an Ottoman sultan similar to ones who governed in the classical age by building a new palace and evoking the former titles of Ottoman sultans as commander-in-chief and caliph,

2 generating a new bureaucratic class among younger, more loyal candidates,

3 establishing close relations with Germany to balance English and French imperialism, and

4 founding a private treasury named *Hazine-i Hassa* and taking possessions of large swathes of land in Anatolia to prevent the establishment of capitalist farms owned by Europeans.

The last two crises are associated with "social integration" and the sultan attempted to restrain them with the help of some policies like…

1 replacing the Tanzimat concept of Ottoman citizenship with the earlier idea of a union of Muslims (i.e. pan-Islamism),

2 manufacturing public opinion and controling it through censorship and a strong secret police organization,

3 reproducing and reseting of a system of values through educational institutions, especially with new public schools and sponsoring original cultural and artistic projects to strengthen a modernized image of Islam, and

4 establishing a new rewards system and offering all subjects the titles of privileges, medals of honor, superior positions, and gratifications.

Sultan Abdülhamit's "system integration" and "social integration" policies help him to remain a strong monarch on the Ottoman throne, but in the long run, he was unsuccessful in putting this great system crisis behind the empire. New actors in Ottoman history with new resolution projects would depose him from power.

3

Representing Crisis on the Stage

> *Literary texts are historical products organized according to* rhetorical *criteria. The main problem of a literary criticism that aims to be all respects as a* historical discipline *is to do justice to both aspects of its subjects: to work out a system of concepts which are both historiographic and rhetorical.*
>
> –Moretti, *Signs Taken for Wonders: On the Sociology of Literary Forms*

As A.D. Harvey maintains, readers can take information from types of literary productions at any time and in any way; it is more important what kind of information they are taking (Harvey 1988, 29). The information they absorb relates mostly to the author and to the reader, not to the subject itself.

Though all works of art contain discrete facts illluminating society, it is not easy to pick them up. There is also a question of how significant or even how true these facts are. Literature is not to be taken literally: if it is a reflection of reality, readers need to know something about the mirror.

In this part, I will develop a methodology for analyzing the features of *the mirror*, that is to say, of two theater plays written in the late Ottoman era. Therefore, I will start with a discussion about theoretical premises of the lit-

erary criticism and the relation between history and literature. After that, I will continue with and the analysis of the Ottoman case in the late nineteenth century. First, I will focus on literary theater genres that were popular in Istanbul and then take a short look at the performing and play-writing activities of the time. Lastly, I will consider how two chosen plays reflect the time and society in which they were written.

§ 3.1 History through Literature

3.1.1 *Rhetoric and History*

In the introductory chapter of *Signs Taken for Wonders: On the Sociology of Literary Forms*, Franco Moretti emphasizes that there is a strong connection between studies of literature and history. As a sociologist of literature, he argued that a critical study of literature has to be constructed on the twin bases of rhetoric and history (Moretti 2005, 2-9).

Moretti starts his analysis with a detailed definition of the term rhetoric, applying Aristotelian terminology: "Rhetoric is like a branch … of the science dealing with the behaviour, which it is right to call political."

In addition, he lists some generalizations about the term:

1 Rhetoric always has social and political missions.
2 Rhetoric is produced for a specific audience and focuses on the internal relations of that specific group (such as a nation, community or class). Therefore, rhetoric accepts that society is not homogeneous and united, but as a heterogeneous and divided community.
3 Rhetorical discourse targets the emotions. In contrast to the universality of rational conviction, its aim is to turn subjects into supporters of a particular value system. Rhetoric doesn't convince subjects; it persuades them.

For Moretti, rhetoric must not be restricted to literary works but "literary discourse is entirely contained within the rhetorical domain." Literary works, using esthetic means, generates feelings in the readers and can manipulate them to support or challenge a set of values; therefore, rhetoric is a way of winning adherents for political ideas by the help of the emotions.

On the other hand, literary works are also "historical products organized according to rhetorical criteria." As a field of study that analyzes rhetoric forms, literary criticism is also interested in social contradictions and conflicts in a heterogeneous and divided society. Therefore, establishing a productive coalition between rhetorical analysis and the social sciences is possible, and can be eye opening. Historicizing literary work can help us to extend beyond the rhetorical boundaries.

For Moretti, the concept of the "literary genre" makes it possible to define the historical range of a text. The essential question is if it is possible to perform "the dual operation" of analyzing a text diachronically and synchronically. Moretti maintains that we need 1) a rhetorical analysis that focuses on the formal qualities of the artistic product and 2) a historical analysis that concerns in its historical background and social functions. He argued that the concept of "genre" provides the theoretical framework needed to successfully complete this dual operation. However, the existing definition of the term "genre" is insufficient and will be necessary to define it from a wider perspective.

3.1.2 *Different Representations of the Past: Fiction and History*

Erol Köroğlu further develops Moretti's two-dimensional method for the study of literature and he, suggesting a model of four-temporalities. This makes it possible to understand the mechanisms from which the interpretations or subjective meaning of a text for each reader (Köroğlu 2006, 84-87).

According to Köroğlu, studies of history and historical literary works, both represent the past as selected and incomplete slices of time. On the other hand, while the study of history is objective, analytic and scientific, the work of literature is interested in the aesthetic means to create emotions within the audience. For a researcher studying history through the literature, works of literature will be the primary sources from the time period on which he focuses.

The author of a work of literature that produces a literary representation of the past, is like a restorer completing the defects of historical material with his own imagination. On the other hand, the historian, who creates a reconstruction of the past in his study, resembles a museum director, who must

show his references formally and preserve the defects as signifiers of the authenticity of the historical material. However, in spite of this essential dissimilarity, the work of literature and the study of history are both only representations of the past, one of many possible interpretations.

In this context, Köroğlu refers to Doritt Cohn to explain the distinction between fiction and history. Cohn defines the term "fiction" as "a literary nonreferential narrative text" (Cohn 1999, 1). A study of history must be referential and present all the sources used by the author; on the other hand, fiction may refer, but does not need to refer to the real world. (15).

Table 3.1:   Boundaries between Fiction and History according to Cohn

	Fiction	*History*
Levels of Reference	story plot/discourse	story discourse references (sources)
Characters	People who lived or who could have lived in the past	People who lived in the past according to the sources

Source: Köroğlu 2007, 160-161.

According to Cohn, *story* is the chronological flow of the events in a work of literature; p*lot/discourse* is the rearrangement of this flow by the author to achieve literary aims. However, in a study of history, these terms do not accurately explain the process of writing. Cohn suggests a three-tiered model for a work of history. In a historical work, the author has to refer to an independent database of historical resources and establish a chronological *story* using them. The sources are meaningless until a historian finds them and turns them into integral parts of a meaningful story. The *story* is the common element for both works of literature and studies of history. There is *plot* in a work of history because the author cannot rearrange the chronological flow of events written in the *sources*; instead there is *discourse* (Köroğlu 2007, 160-161).

Köroğlu reduces cultural historians into four groups according to their approach to the historical study of literature:

1 Those who suggest that works of literature must be taken as independent of history and that the text must be analyzed without reference to the author's biography or the conditions and context of the time it was written.

2 Those who argue that to understand a text, it must be studied its author's biography and mentality: his opinions, ideology, preferences, and tendencies.

3 Those who think that the work of literature is an alternative historical source, which can reveal hidden and secret realities of the time.

4 Finally, those who maintain that to understand a work of literature, it must be analyzed the inner structure of the text as well as the historical context in which it was produced and consumed.

Köroğlu maintains the last approach, which has similarities with Moretti's two-dimensional method and argued that there are four categories of temporality: two inner and two outer.

1 The inner temporality of the story, which is the chronological flow of the story of the literary work.

2 The inner temporality of the plot/discourse, which is the narration of the story in a past determined by the author through a past or a future.

3 The outer temporality of the writer, which is the time and the space in which the text was written and the historical conditions of the society to which the author belonged.

4 The outer temporality of the reader, which is the time and the space in which someone reads the text.

According to Köroğlu, the interpretation, and subjective meaning of the a literary work emerged from an authentic combination of these four temporalities; therefore, a cultural historian must study them simultaneously to reveal the inner and the outer features of the text.

3.1.3 *Proposal for an Analytical Methodology*

In the next two chapters, I will analyze how the late Ottoman system crisis is represented in two theater plays: Şemsettin Sami's *Gave* and Hagop Baronian's *The Honorable Beggars*. In my analysis, I will stick to a methodology derived from the theoretical framework drawn by Moretti and Köroğlu.

As a first step, I will focus on the inner qualities of the text under the title of "rhetorical analysis". I will consider *the inner temporality of the story* and *the inner temporality of plot/discourse*. As I mentioned above, the story is the chronological flow of the events narrated in the literary text. As nonreferential fiction, a work of literature has no need to refer to real life or to historical sources to create a story; but if an author prefers, she can use historical events and characters as a basis for creation. In the first example, Sami's *Gave,* the story is not original; it is taken from a masterpiece of the eastern civilization. Sami, transforming the story into a contemporary theater play, manipulated it to conform with his own political ideas and created a plot transgressing the border of the chronological narrative: He added new characters, new events, and too many imaginary dialogues. The play starts at the mid-point of the original story, in between a mysterious past and unknown future. While the author replotted the original story in the form of a modern theater play, gradually a *discourse* emerges. That discourse is the plot itself.

The situation is different in *The Honorable Beggars*. Baronian wrote it with a chronologically linear structure, and adaptations also stick to it. In other words, story and plot are identical in this play. The process of plotting of the story does not help to analyze how discourse emerges. We have to look under the surface to demystify the discourse using another level of analysis called dramaturgy.

The second step of the methodology, we will focus on "historical analysis". In this part, I will first explore the historical background that led the author to write the text; that is, *the outer temporality of the author*. I will argue that better understanding an author's mind, opinions, and projections of the past and future, and social missions will bring about an excellent analysis of his work. Finally, I will try to put on my subjective interpretation of the play as a contemporary reader: *the outer temporality of the reader.*

§ 3.2 Representation of the Past on the Theater Stage

3.2.1 *Historical Dramas and Comedies on the Late Ottoman Stages*

In the preface of his play *Gave*, Şemsettin Sami refers to Shakespeare and Hugo arguing that these famous figures of Western literature maintained that

dramatic works must be faithful to historical sources. How do audiences understand the author's sensitivity to "historical truth" in his work as a writer of fiction? After all, his work is not a study of history; it is a drama written for performing on the stage. As the novelist Alfred Döblin said, "the historical novel is, in the first place, a novel; in the second place, it is not history" (Cohn 1999, 153).

This confusion related to the establishment of "historical drama" as a modern literary genre. In the sixteenth century of Shakespeare, there was no reference to this kind of genre; "histories" were confused with tragedies mostly (Grant and Ravelhofer 2008, 1). The first theoretical writings on the genre were produced by late sixteenth century, but they did not manifest the specific characteristic of the genre. Even in the beginning of the twentieth century, the boundaries were not strict. In the book named *Werden und Wesen des historischen Dramas* (1901), Otto von der Pfordten listed the main characteristic of the genre (Kueffner 1905, 22-24):

1 Historical drama is a modern genre. In antiquity, there is no such genre.
2 The genre emerged in England in Renaissance. Italy, Spain, France and finally Germany followed suit.
3 Plays in this genre present true representations of real historical events with definite people, in definite places and at definite times.
4 Authors of this genre, may arrange but not falsify historic facts. They must give a true picture of a past reality.
5 They can use imaginary characters but these have to be historically plausible.

The intellectuals of the time could not escape the limitations of positivist thought. Even the phrase of "true representation of real historical events" echoes the famous comment by German historian Leopold von Ranke: history wants to show *wie es eigentlich gewesen* [what actually happened]. Şemsettin Sami was affected by these opinions.

However, positivist thought has been dethroned in the social sciences. By the turn of the millennium, relativist theories gained traction and postmodern historiography dominated the cultural field. According to Dolezel, for example, history is a means to create a plot about the past, just as is literature about the past. The only difference is that history deals with real charac-

ters that lived in the past and real events that are told in chronicals. On the other hand, literature does not to do so (Köroğlu 2007, 158-159).

Moreover, the confusion about literary genres continues. As Mehmet Fatih Uslu maintains, researchers such as Metin And and Niyazi Akı do not agree on a classification of the theatrical genres popular in nineteenth century Ottoman cities (Uslu 2014, 19-24). And prefers to establish a more detailed classification: comedies, poetic dramas, romantic dramas, emotional dramas, melodramas, and musicals, while Akı suggests: comedies, tragedies, historical dramas, romantic dramas, melodramas, and folkloric dramas. Mehmet Fatih Uslu finds both categorizations too broad to make an effective analysis of the literature of the time. He considers the social and political functions of plays and prefers a model with fewer subcategories: melodramas focused on ethical issues, historical dramas related to the establishment of national identity in a cosmopolitean empire, and comedies in which the economy and relations of exchange are central.

Table 3.2   Theatrical genres and their rhetorical characteristics

	Genres		
	Melodrama	*Historical Drama*	*Comedy*
Rhetorical characteristics	Absolutist moralism that is close to the negotiation	Establishment of the national identity	Open to exchange and negotiation
	Discursive power that is able to arouse the emotions directly		The power of a critical attitude
	Under the subservience of nationalisms		Circulating projections about the future of the Empire

Source: Uslu 2014, 19-24.

According to Uslu, the first two of these genres create conflict; in contrast, comedies are texts of negotiation. Although melodramas and historical dramas are deemed as different genres, their rhetorical strategies were actually similar.

Uslu analyzes five different historical dramas including Şemsettin Sami's *Gave* and finds some common features (Uslu 2014, 139-177):

1. Plays directly target the emotions of the audiences and are intended to arouse patriotism.
2. They sublimate values that are accepted as essential to the public.
3. Failures belong to leaders, not to the public. The plays warn leaders about their responsibilities.
4. In four of these plays, with the exception of *Gave*, characters are from the nobility. Pratogonists and antagonists are all nobles.
5. In conformity with melodramatic rhetoric, benevolence and evil, were defined exactly. From this contradistinction, a moralistic message emerges about national identity.

According to Uslu, "melodramatic historical dramas" were the product of a time in which all elements in the empire were looking for a solution to prevent the collapse of the state. Moreover, most of them are men of letters living in the same time, and literature is their means of struggle. However, under the subservience of nationalist thought, this relatively young generation of Ottoman intellectuals, could not produce a discourse of unification; rather they made the boundaries between different elements of the empire sharper.

On the other hand, in Ottoman society, comedies were second to melodramatic rhetoric, but were a genre more open to negotiation. Uslu maintained that, although their number was few, comedies symbolized a break from the dominant melodramatic rhetoric and an escape from the exclusive, confrontational framework of the nation building processes (179-213). According to him, comedies had some important distinctions from melodrams:

1. First, comedies did not close the doors on discussion. By delimiting the borders separating different producers of rhetoric, they encouraged the exchange of ideas. In other words, they produce the belief that the Ottoman Empire could be more democratic.
2. In contrast to melodramas, moralistic aims are replaced by the animadversion.
3. Characters were not drawn from the nobility. They were common people and the main themes related to day-to-day issues.

Hence, in this thesis, I will analyze two theatrical texts from two genres to understand the contrast between two possibilities for late Ottoman political history. These were written for the stage and completed on the stage after performance, and it is well know that it is very hard to find materials about performances. Thus, I will take them as literary texts and disregard their performance. On the other hand, in order to understand the theatrical conditions at the time the plays were written, I will focus on contemporaneous theater activities and play-writing below.

3.2.2 *Theater Performances and Play-Writing Activities in Late Ottoman Istanbul*

As several researchers in Turkey agree, there was a crisis in the development of the modern theater in Ottoman society during the Hamidian Era (Sevengil 1934; And 1972; Aytaş 2002; Şarasan 2008). Because of the systemic crises summarized in previous sections, the number of companies had decreased, staging plays in Armenian was forbidden and many plays were banned in light of strict censorship. The order by Abdülhamit for the deconstruction of the theater hall in Gedikpaşa after the staging of a play named *Çerkez Özdenleri* by Ahmet Mithat (And 1972, 217)is symbolic turning point. However, theater performances continued. In this section, I will draw a general picture of the theatrical circumstances of the time; I will address the problems such as political pressures, censorship, bribery to obtain permissions from national authorities, and increasing political control over Armenian actors, actresses, and company leaders. I will discuss activities by modernist theater companies such as "Osmanlı Dram Kumpanyası" directed by Mardiros Mınakyan and *tuluat* (commedia ala Turca) companies led by a group of famous Muslim comedians. Finally I will discuss the activities of play writing.

First, I start with the problems. The most important problem of the time was political pressure. Turkish historians use the term "istibdat" (pressure) to define the Hamidian Era because the sultan chose an absolutist way to govern the country. He abolished the national assembly for 30 years, used his constitutional rights to strengthen his personal power and impeded the progress of democratization in the imperial monarchy. As a result, he estab-

lished a system of social repression with a secret police, complicated espionage system and strict mechanism of censorship. The most important problem for theater company leaders was censorship. The government formed a committee under the name of *Teftiş ve Muayene Encümeni Tetkik-i Müellefat Kurulu* (249). This committee published special regulations for theater books and performances. According to this document, it was forbidden to question the power of the monarch or suggest that the audience do that, to show nationalistic symbols or symbols paying tribute to foreign countries on the stage or to perform on stage actions that are not in line with the moral and religious rules of the Ottoman society. Words like "justice," "freedom," "*murat*," (a word which in Ottoman Turkish meant "wish" but at the same time was the name of the sultan's deposed), "brother", "nose" (because sultan had a characteristic nose) also could not be pronounced on the stages (Özön and Dürder 1967, 362).

Famous actor and company leader Mardiros Mınakyan writes about bribery to obtain permission for a play. According to him, companies had to pay high amounts to authorities under the name of *hediye-i nakdiye*. There were also strict rules about costumes: actors and actresses could not wear official uniforms, religious costumes or traditional Islamic dress on the stage. The language spoken in the auditorium was another important issue. After Berlin Treaty of 1878, as a result of strained relations with the Ottoman Armenian community, performing plays in Armenian became incrementally more difficult even in the capital. According to And, the Üsküdar and then the Kadıköy municipality forbade performances in any language except Turkish (And 1972, 182). Şarasan argues that the last play in Armenian language in Istanbul was staged in 1893 (Şarasan 2008, 137).

None of these problems, however, could stop theater activities in Istanbul. In contrast with the first days of the Tanzimat, the center of artistic entertainments was not Pera, but Şehzadebaşı (And 1972, 182). There were two kinds of theater troupes: modern companies, which were followers of Hagop Vartovyan's (Güllü Agop) Ottoman Theater, and *tuluat* companies, which acted out plays with no written text in a mixture of traditional and modern artistic styles. The most famous, durable example of former ones was *Osmanlı Dram Kumpanyası* (The Ottoman Dramatic Company) under the direction of Mınakyan. He first appeared on the stage in Vartovyan's legendry

company and was a member of a brilliant generation of Ottoman Armenian theater artists in late nineteenth century.

His master, Hagop Vartovyan was active from 1870s to 1880s, and succeeded in obtaining an official monopoly for plays written for performance. His company, *Osmanlı Tiyatrosu* (The Ottoman Theater) was the first semi-official theater in the Ottoman Empire. Most skillful, well-educated figures of the time became a part of his company, and Mardiros Mınakyan was but one (Şarasan 2008, 21-22). When Hagop Vartovyan was taken in by the court to contribute to theater in Yıldız Palace, the company lost its leader, continuing under the leadership of Mınakyan and later Fasulyacıyan. In 1884, Mınakyan established his own company and engaging most of the old members of Vartovyan's troupe. This company would survive more than a quarter of a century and was the only high quality modern theater company of its time (Özön-Dürder 1967, 315).

During this period, it had only a few rivals such as *Mesire-i Efkar Tiyatrosu* under Mağakyan (another important descendent of Vartovyan's troupe) in Istanbul or Fasulyacıyan's troupe formed under the supervision of Ahmed Vefik Paşa in Bursa and later in Istanbul. However, none of these companies resisted economic and political conditions and did not persist. Mınakyan was a hard-worker: he staged hundreds of play in Turkish and Armenian and translated more than 50 plays into Turkish. He added the term "dramatic" in his company's name. According to Fatih Uslu, the most popular genre of those days was "melodrama," and most of the plays in Mınakyan's repertoire were romantic dramas and melodramas that had been translated or adapted into Turkish only for performance, but were never published (Uslu 2014, 115-116; And 1972, 443).

Uslu argues that romantic dramas and melodramas are the genres, that affected Ottoman intellectuals from different ethnic and religious groups and were used for political and moral aims. Although Mınakyan translated or adapted the popular European plays and novels to the stage, his company's economic and financial conditions were not good, and members of his company had terribly poor standards of living (Şarasan 2008, 28).

Commercial success belonged to neighboring companies: In the newly emerging art sector, the *tuluat* companies were more profitable. *Tuluat* was a kind of performance based on improvised acting with no written text, like

the sixteenth and seventeenth century Italian tradition of *Commedia dell'Arte*. In traditional Ottoman theater, *Ortaoyunu* and *Karagöz* exemplify this kind performance. The main difference between *tuluat* plays and these traditional spectacles was their plot, which was generally taken from a modern European play. According to one argument, this "hybrid" of traditional and modern genres had emerged because of the monopolistic limitations on Hagop Vartovyan's company, and the first *tuluat* plays were staged by Fasulyacıyan, who had left Vartovyan's company to establish his own (Özön-Dürder 1967, 408). Fasulyacıyan, staging an "*Ortaoyunu* with curtain with no text", had escaped the limitations of the monopoly.

In the Hamidian Era, the monopoly of the Ottoman Theater was finished and not renewed, and the number of *tuluat* companies increased, because they had gained popularity in the years of the monopoly. The places, where *tuluat* shows took place were called *handehane,* small halls transformed from coffeehouses. Many small and large *tuluat* companies were the contemporaries of Mınakyan's company, including *Temaşahane-i Osmani, Handehane-i Osmani, Hayalhane-i Osmani, Lubiyat-ı Osmani, Gülünçhane-i Osmani*, and *Eğlencehane-i Osmani* (And 1972, 182-198).

Most of the companies were led by a comedian such as Kavuklu Hamdi, Küçük İsmail, Abdürrezak, and Kel Hasan. They would take famous European plays, change whatever they wished of their plots and characters (and of course, their name), and stage them freely. For example, while Mınakyan's troup was performing Victor Hugo's famous play *Angelo, tyran de Padau* for a few spectators, the next building over a *tuluat* company would stage same play under the name of *Orfano Köprüsü* (The Bridge of Orfano) adapting it to their own dramaturgy and acting style (And 1972, 446). Famous Turkish author Reşat Nuri Güntekin argued that *tuluat* was a story of commercial success challenging literary theate, which was in financial crisis (Özön and Dürder 1967, 408).

These successes of theater based on improvisation rather than written texts was a reason for the deficiency and lack of development of play-writing at the time. Gıyasettin Aytaş suggests that the original plays written and published in this period numbered less than 50 (Aytaş 2002, 361-366). Only two plays of Ahmet Mithat were staged under the direction of Fasulyacıyan in the Ottoman Theater in 1884: *Çengi* and *Çerkez Özdenleri*. There is no evi-

dence weather others were performed or not. In a list published by Metin And prepared using advertisements in periodicals and newspapers, it can be seen that directors preferred the plays of Namık Kemal, Ahmet Mithat, Şemsettin Sami and adaptations from the earlier period by Ahmet Vefik Paşa or Director Ali Bey (And 1972, 454-462).

Two important, unusual Muslim figures of the time were Abdülhak Hamit and Feraizcizade Mehmet Şakir. The former is an aspiring writer of tragedy, but Metin And does not think that products were literally sufficient, so he prefer to use the term "lyric drama" for Hamit's works. On the other hand, And argues that Feraizcizade Mehmet Şakir wrote very original Ottoman comedies and he was ahead of his time in creative use of language and to conceptualization of Molièresque comedies (327-332). Cevdet Kudret maintains that this avant-garde comedy writer was unknown until 1970s and if Metin And had not researched him, his name may have been forgotten (Kudret 1974, 3-4).

In contrast, Abdülhak Hamit was a popular poet even in his own time. Both men were followers of Ahmed Vefik Paşa, the creator of the most original adaptations of Molière into Ottoman Turkish and accepted as the first great patron of Imperial Ottoman Theater. As the governor of Bursa, he established an official municipal theater inviting Tovmas Fasulyacıyan from Istanbul to act as director (Özön-Dürder 1967, 176).

Cevdet Kudret emphasizes that Feraizcizade Mehmet Şakir was a member of this troupe and gave pronunciation and Ottoman literature lessons to its actors and actresses (Kudret 1974, 4). After Ahmed Vefik Paşa was removed from the office, the theater was abolished and Mehmet Şakir wrote and published important pieces from his own printing house. These original comedies were never staged during his lifetime and their value was only recognized nearly a century later. Hagop Baronian was another important journalist, playwright, and satire writer. He wrote famous works in Ottoman Turkish and Armenian. Just as Feraizcizade, he did not see his plays realized on the stage and their value was understood only after his death. In contrast with Mehmet Şakir, he started to write comedies as early as the 1860s publishing most of them in installments in his periodicals (Bardakjian 1984, 140-141). His masterpieces, *Medzabadiv Muratsganner* (The Honorable Beggars, a satiric theatrical novel) and *Baghdasar Ahbar* (Uncle Baghdasar) were writ-

ten in Hamidian Era, but during this same period, his periodicals were systematically banned. It is unsurprising that both authors were compared with Molière and called as Molière of their community and time (Molière of the Turks or of the Armenians), because the genre of comedy came from the West to both the Muslim and Armenian communities of the Ottoman Empire through adaptations of Molière (Uslu 2014, 86). They may have been the "Molière" of their time, but they did not find a "Louis XIV" in the court to support artistic activities and playwrights.

In conclusion, the Hamidian era of the empire can be defined as a time of political and economic crises. As a result, the theater companies struggled with the financial problems and political pressures such as bans and censorship. On the other hand, many theater men and women stayed on stage despite their poor living conditions. Some were idealists who put artistic aims above commercial ones (such as the members of the Ottoman Dramatic Company), while others sought financial success (such as *tuluat* troupes). Besides this, it was a time for directors (such as Mınakyan, Fasulyacıyan or Mağakyan) and brilliant actors and actresses, but not for playwrights. Theater struggled to survive until the end of the century because of the efforts of a few people.

3.2.3 *Two Plays on Ottoman System Crisis in the Late nineteenth Century*

In the following chapters, I will analyze two historical, literary works of theater from the late Ottoman period with the methodological approaches of Moretti and Köroğlu. The first one of these plays, *Gave* is written by Şemsettin Sami in 1877 and was first staged by Armenian company leader Tovmas Fasulyacıyan in Thessalonica in 1884. Sami used the Persian masterpiece Shahname of Firdevsi and the Kurdish legend of Kawa the Blacksmith as the literary sources of his play. He took his inspiration from Shakespeare who had used ancient Greek and Roman myths to throw the problems of his own age into sharp relief. Sami likewise used eastern classics and legends to create an opportunity for discussing contemporary political problems. This work was an exceptional and unusual dramatic success in its time, which displays

the emergence of a system crisis in a traditional empire and offers some resolutions to integration problems in the final act.

Hagop Baronian published his famous satirical novel *The Honorable Beggars* in installments in the years 1880 and 1881. He remarked that, "he would have much preferred to present his work in the shape of a comedy rather than a novel." (Bardakjian 1984, 139)

Therefore, especially western Armenians converted the work into a comedy several times, not only in Armenian, but in other languages, as well. However, the work couldn't be staged until the end of Hamidian absolutist monarchy and had to wait. In the fifth chapter, I will analyze this well-structured comedy to find signs of the Ottoman system crisis in a period in time in which the modernization and integration mechanisms of the empire had failed.

At this point, a question may be raised: Why choose these two texts for close reading? First, my main aim is to find theatrical texts that represent late Ottoman system crisis on the stage. The number of the plays written at the time is few, and well-qualified ones that are effective samples of the genre even fewer. These two texts are, on one hand, prominent examples of the theatrical literature of the time, and on the other hand, they give dramaturgically strong representations of the crisis. Second, I chose texts from two different categories: one confrontational (a melodrama or historical drama) and one negotiatory (a comedy). Also important, they are written by authors from different communities within the Empire: by a Muslim Albanian and a Christian Armenian. Hence, they present a polyphonic discourse about the phenomenon of the crisis. Finally, these texts are distinct from their contemporaries because they not only show the world of notable people, but reflect the daily life experiences of different social groups on the stage. Therefore, they present a wide range of historical Ottoman society.

4

Şemsettin Sami's *Gave:* Representations and Resolutions

> *Long live justice! Long live rights and the law! No more of the evil of tyranny!*
>
> –Sami, *Gave*

Ş emsettin Sami wrote his third theatrical play, *Gave,* in 1877. In the preface, he mentions that he chose the method of universal geniuses such as Shakespeare or Hugo, taking the story of his work from history. He also argues that these famous figures of the Western dramatic literature maintained that dramatic works must be faithful to their original historical source. Sami states that Ferdowsi's *Shahnameh* inspired his work, but he made reasonable changes to the original story while creating his authentic plot (Sami 2006, 17-18).

Mehmet Fatih Uslu argues that *Gave* answers the question of whether it was possible to write alternative "historical drama" pieces about the late Ottoman era or not (Uslu 2014, 168-177). For him, *Gave* is a non standard example of its genre because…

1 besides the royal cohort including opposition in the palace, Sami's play places common people such as shepherds in the mountains and poor, urban workers on the stage;

2 the tyranny that was repressing the whole of society was center of the play but the *savior* comes from outside, from the side of the public;

3 it presents a complex representation of society established by social class. This heterogenous class-based society antagonizes the tyrannical government.

In contrast to standards of the genre, the discussion of the establishment of national identity as a point of confrontation among the different communities in the empire does not find place in *Gave*. Hence Uslu asked whether it was one of the last parts of the project to keep society together even as all elements of the empire had taken up battle cries.

In this section I will start with a rhetorical analysis and focus on the inner structure of the play. First, I will summarize the original story from the work of Ferdowsi (Ferdowsi 2012, 19-49; Firdevsi 2009, 72-102); later I will turn to Sami's version (Sami 2006) to uncover the plot/discourse of the play. Accordingly, I will conduct a historical analysis and deal with the biography and intellectual life of the author, his political opinions and his own analysis and suggestions regarding the late Ottoman system crisis. Lastly, I will explain my subjective opinions about the play as a reader.

§ 4.1 Rhetorical Analysis

4.1.1 *The Inner Temporality of the Story*

Zohak, the evil Serpent King, had dethroned Jamshid, the wise, mythical king of Persia, conquered his land, took his sisters Shahrnaz and Arnawaz into his harem as concubines, and started governing the country through absolutist oppression. He is the sole ruler of Persia, but he suffers from a big problem: because of a deal with the Satan to take the throne from his father, two wild serpents had emerged from his neck. To feed of them, Zohak must sacrifice two young people daily and present their fresh brains to the monstrous snakes.

Two wise, simple-hearted men, who work in the palace as cooks, make a plan to end this cruelty. They start setting one young person free and mixing flesh of the other with mutton. Those who escape the palace of the tyrant go

to the mountains to live. According to legend (and some ancient sources such as the sixteenth-century *Şerefname* by Şeref Han of Bitlis), these young escapees explain the origin of the Kurdish nation.

One day Zohak dreams that three brothers attack him; the youngest has a mace formed in the shape of a cow's head. The young boy kills Zohak with his mace. They tie him up and drag him along in the presence of crowds of people. Shocked by this dreadful nightmare, Zohak calls all authoritative interpreters in the country to analyze this dream. They meet for three days and declare that in the future, a boy named Feridun will be born. Zohak will murder his father, and this boy, in order to take his revenge, will kill Zohak and take the throne from him. There is a sign to recognize the boy: his wet nurse will be a cow.

To prevent this ominous prediction from coming true, Zohak orders his army to murder all newborn babies belonging to the old royal family. However the prediction comes true: a boy named Feridun is born and his father is slayed by Zohak's men. The mother makes for the mountains with his son and leaves the newborn baby with a man in an upland meadow who owns a milk cow named Purmaieh. The man nurtures the baby with cow's milk and hides him for three years. Since soldiers learn about the boy and the cow, the mother conveys her son to a safer place leaving him with a monk on the mountain Alberz. Soldiers find the cow that had supplied milk to feed the young boy. They kill the cow and all members of her owner's tribe but they do not seize Feridun. The old monk takes care of the boy until his sixteenth birthday. After young Feridun descends from the mountains, he meets his mother and learns the details of his story. He takes an oath of revenge and decides to kill Zohak.

Kavah the Blacksmith enters in the story at this point. He visited King Zohak to ask for justice for his family. Seventeen of his eighteen sons were taken by the soldiers to sacrifice to the serpents. He rose up with indignation in the presence of the king to spare the life of his last son. The words struck the king with dismay, and he agrees to release the blacksmith's son with one condition: the blacksmith's name will be inscribed in the register as a sign that he accepts Zohak's legal and fair authority. Kavah rejects this condition; he tears the register and casts it under foot. He takes his son with him and

they leave the palace. Amazement seized the malicious king's heart, and he did not punished the angry father.

Meanwhile, Kavah goes to his shop affixes his black leath apron to his javelin, turning it into a flag against the injustice of tyranny and calls upon the people to unite under the rule of Feridun to end Zohak's oppression. Feridun, who accepts the public support, asks Kavah to produce the mythical cow-head mace and then raids the palace of the king. He destroys all the talismans and evildoing monsters with his mace and captures the building. Afterwards he sets all captives free including the two sisters of Jamshid, Shahrnaz and Arnawaz. The women inform him about Zohak's military expedition to India with an immense army. Feridun takes the empty throne and the king's treasure for himself.

When Zohak learns of Feridun's successful attack on his palace despite the black magic the king had prepared, he orders his commanders to attack Feridun and regain the throne. However, there is a rebellion even in the army against the tyrant; some soldiers support the new king. Thereupon Zohak makes a plan to kill Feridun in his camp at the night, but the plan fails. Feridun recognizes him and strikes a furious blow with the cow-headed mace. At that point, a supernatural voice whispers that it is not yet time for killing the oppressor; his punishment will be given later. Feridun binds Zohak with heavy chains, puts him a dark cave in the mountains to await his lingering death.

4.1.2 *The Inner Temporality of the Plot/Discourse*

4.1.2.1 The Plot

The piece starts with a moment of crisis. As Habermas said, "in classical aesthetics, from Aristotle to Hegel, crisis signifies the turning point in a faithful process":

The contradiction, expressed in the catastrophic culmination of conflict, is inherent in the structure of action system and personality systems of principal characters. Fate is fulfilled in the revelation of conflicting norms against which the identities of the participants shatter, unless they are able to summon up the strength to win back their freedom by shattering the mythical power of fate through the formation of new identities (Habermas 1992, 2).

The play includes the dethroning of Zohak the malicious Serpent King by Feridun after the riot led by Kavah the Blacksmith. In contrast to the original text which suggests that the reign of Zohak has lasted one thousand years, in Sami's play, which presents only the events just before and at the time of Kavah's riot, the tyrant had dethroned Jamshid only 16 years before, but he had neither been able to establish his authority in all parts of Persian society, nor even within the state. The opening soliloquy of Ferhad, an original character created by Sami, conforms to the statements of Habermas and gives information about the conflicting norms between the new regime of Zohak and old one of Jamshid. Jamshid symbolizes life but Zohak death; the sun and nature are the symbols of Jamshid, but snakes are those of Zohak. Ferhad, who was a loyal servant of the former king has hidden his intentions and behaved like a loyal slave of new king, in order to actualize a secret plot the audiences does not know about. He explains the rules and regulations enforced by new monarch: he forbade traditional Persian rituals and imposed his own tribal religion on the whole society in the lands he conquered.

Ferhad's opening monologue is interrupted with the entrance of other important character, Perviz, who is actually Feridun, but neither he nor the audience knows his real identity yet. He also explains his dichotomous situation he seems content, in contrast to Ferhad. In his early life as a shepherd in the mountains, he lived in a small wooden barrack, wore old, battered clothes, and carried a wooden stick. However, now he has been living in a palace, wears clothes embroidered with gilded silver thread and carries a javelin dressed with gemstones.

In Sami's version, there is an important change: the person who brought Feridun to the mountains to save his life was Ferhad not his mother. He addresses the old man as "father" though he knows that Ferhad is not his actual father. Ferhad asks him to keep their acquaintance a secret. In the next scene after his monologue, the audience gets more information about Perviz's life in the palace. In Sami's version, he is turned into a standard young lover trope and falls in love with Zohak's daughter, Hubcher. From this point on, the plot moves forward along two axes: one is the story of Zohak's increasingly oppressive attempts to spend his power over all of the society; the second is the naïve love story of two young people. However, the author does

not allow these stories to flow independently. The hand of oppressor reaches the young lovers and shatters their innocent microcosm.

In the fourth scene of Act 1, Princess Mehru, the daughter of Jamshid, now the concubine of Zohak, enters. She is also a mysterious character: she lost her son Feridun 16 years ago and expresses sympathy for Perviz as he is in the same age as her lost son. Perviz also feels close to the melancholic woman and does not understand why she is so sad in such a rich palace. Only Ferhad knows her reasons for crying, but he cannot risk his secret plan to help her. The relations between these two old characters are not good because of secrets that cannot be revealed: Mehru knows that Ferhad has information about her son's destiny and believes that Ferhad betrayed the old royal family.

In the eighth scene, Zohak's daughter Hubcher appears on the stage - actually she is the granddaughter of Jamshid, but like Perviz/Feridun neither she nor the audience knows this. She complains about Zohak's oppression. As the only princess of the kig, she had never found love in the palace. In the dialogue with Mehru, she also uses dichotomies to describe her situations. She prefers to be a poor beggar's daughter than only heir of the world's strongest monarch, because she thinks that the beggar's daughter would be happier because she has her father's actual love. Mehru, like Ferhad, has a secret that she cannot tell Hubcher. In the next scene, the two young people meet accidentally; the audience sees that each falls in love with other but they cannot declare their love because of social differences between them.

From this point on, the plot of the play shifts to the monarch and his cohort in the palace. Sami prefers to portray the persecution of Zohak in the form of religious intolarance. In the sixteenth scene of Act 1, Kahtan the chief commander of Zohak's army gives a briefing to his lord. He had ravaged the temples of the old religion of Jamshid and constructed new temples in line with Zohak's religion, but in the mountains, some continued to pray in the traditional way. Zohak's order is clear: he does not want even a single man in his land praying to the old gods. All believers in the old religion must be destroyed. Kahtan's excuse that he has insufficient men and supplies is strongly rejected and the tyrant orders his chief commander to plunder those who continue to keep to Jamshid's faith. If Kahtan is successful in this mission, he may marry with Princess Hubcher.

In the nineteenth scene of first act, the interpretation of the tyrant's dream plays a critical role in the plot. Sami completely changed the nightmare's content and function: in Sami's version the king sees a dog watching over a flock of sheep. In the time, the number of sheep increases from five to five thousand. The dog starts to talk and asks for meat instead of bread; otherwise, he will not guard the flock. The king calls interpreters and asks for the meaning of the dream. The interpretation is clear and simple: Zohak, who was previously, the leader of a small tribe on Arabian peninsula, had conquered a large country such as Persia. His tribal gods demanded not animal but human sacrifices. Because of the explanation provided by the interpreters, Zohak gives an order to seize the possessions of all who resisted submitting to the new religion and to capture their children to present as sacrifices for the gods. In contrast with Ferdowsi's original story, the sacrifice of young humans emerges at a later stage of the oppression.

Young Perviz who observes the decision-making processes of the king, changes his mind: despite the sumptuousness of the palace, it is actually is a place of all kind of duress. He decides to go back to the mountains instead of staying and participating in wedding ceremony of the girl with which he had fallen in love. In the last scene of the first act, lovers meet again and Hubcher faints when she hears that her father had decided to marry her to Kahtan.

Act 2 starts in the Temple of the Snakes with a dialog between Perviz and Hubcher. The young lovers promises to keep their love for one another until death, though this love will cause punishment by the king. Perviz changes his mind again and gives up the plan to go back to the mountains. He does not want to leave Hubcher alone during these hard times. Ferhad does not know Perviz's actual reasons for staying in the palace; he also feels the pricks of his conscience because he had become part of Zohak's public cruelty in order to hide his secret plan. When they leave the stage, the other two characters, Mehru and Hubcher enter. Mehru, old and world-wise, advises Hubcher to submit her father's decrees, otherwise she will be punished by death. But the young woman is bent on meeting up with her lover at any cost. In the next scene, the two old characters had compromised with the new regime for different reasons, Ferhad and Mehru consult about the situation of the young lovers. They cannot find a solution that does not place the youths' lives at risk defer the matter.

The wedding ceremony starts without delay with a foreseeable end. When the priest asks Hubcher, she refuses to marry Kahtan at the expense of contravening her father's orders. Her negative answer to the priest's question of consent displeases not only Zohak but also Ferhad and Mehru; in contrast Perviz pleases from her encourage. Hubcher forces to explain her justification for his refusal; she defends his right to marry with a candidate who she choose and now there is such a candidate who is only owner of his heart and life. Despite she refused to give his name, Perviz introduces himself and does not leave alone his lover. The end of two lovers is predictable: they will be first sacrifices of Zohak to snakes in order to be an example to all rule breakers. The executor of this capital punishment will be Ferhad who realizes it is his last chance to execute his secret plan. Act 2 finishes with a farewell to the elderly and the youths.

The first part of the play shows that weak opposition in the palace cannot control the development of the political events and resolve the crisis stated at the beginning of the play. The second part starts in the mountains. In Sami's play, the locations in which the drama takes place have symbolic meanings. In the first two acts, actions occur in places where the oppression of the evil serpent king is most intense: in the palace and in the Temple of the Snakes in which everything seems very pessimistic. Similar the original text of Ferdowsi, the mountains are the place where the hope for freedom is still alive.

Act 3 starts in the mountains with Kurdish shepherds. The mountains have not be taken under the sovereignty of new regime and the highlanders freely practice their traditional rituals from time of the Jamshid. They are talking about the policies of the Zohak and his prohibition of the traditional religioun. Kubad an old man who is a projection of Ferhad in the mountains, advises them to bear. According to him, if a regime guarantees the safety, property and freedom of conscience of the people who live under its sovereignty, they can bear with it. Kubad argues that under the regime highlanders still have rights; therefore it is unnecessary to launch an act that will cause killing of thousands. He repeats similar dichotomies to Ferhad: the sun is life but the snake is death. The first sun is shining behind the mountains; it is the holy day of Nowruz and symbolizes the time of Jamshid which will come again in the near future.

In the second scene, the protagonist of the play appears on the stage: Kavah the Blacksmith and his two sons come to the place in which shepherds have been carrying out Nowruz rituals. They come from the cities that are under control of the new regime, and this scene of freedom to pray in the traditional way surprises them. He and his sons participate in the highlanders' ritual, but they are trespassing against the rules of Zohak. However, because their time is limited, they have to go because of the time restriction early; they have to mine some coal to bring home if they do not want to be hungry that night. This signifies the economic conditions in the cities.

In the fourth scene an unexpected guest enters. Perviz comes onto the stage and warmly embrace the shepherds. Perviz – actually Feridun- grew up with these people and is one of them. He informs about the decree of death and the order of the tyrant, which forbids traditional rituals and prescribes that the children and all property be taken from believers in the Jamshid's religion. It is clear that Zohak's rule now extends to the highlanders; now they learn that their safety, property and freedom of conscience are not guaranteed by the king, so they do not need to submit the oppression of the tyrant anymore. However, even at this point, Kubad's suggestion is interesting: He offers to continue the Nowruz ritual while they still have time to complete it. This choice reminds Ferhad and Mehru's deferment in the palace.

As predictable, the ritual is interrupted by soldiers. The commander orders his soldiers to take the children away as the new rules require. However, the shepherds outnumber the small unit and they decide to take only the animals. The shepherds thank God because their children remain with them even though they lost all their property. Kubad repeats his usual advice: They have no choice except to forebear it and meditate even under these conditions.

In the eighth scene, Kavah and his sons return with the coal and the pessimistic atmosphere surprises them. When they left the shepherds, a few hours before, there was the festivity of Nowruz, but now everybody is crying. The shepherds tell the story to them. According to Kavah, the loss of the property is not cause for a riot, but if their lives and honor are threatened, they must fight. He promises to fight together with them if the shepherds' children are taken. Just after he leaves, a larger unit of soldiers comes back to

take the children. The shepherds, after a desperate resistance, concede their children to the soldiers and ask the help of the blacksmith.

Act 4 opens in Kavah's workshop and the audience learn the economic and political conditions in cities through a soliloquy by Mihriban, the wife of the blacksmith. For the poor, it is hard to find basic commodities since economic activities is weak. Mihriban has difficult understanding the reasons for this fundamental transition in the economic conditions and remembers the "good old days" when they easily supplied all their necessities. Simultaneously, Kavah and his sons arrive at home with the sacks of coal; they are tired and hungry but find nothing to eat at home. The only thing they found is a a peasant's broken axe to be repaired, work which provides them some food for dinner. They do not complain, but the worst thing is to work from morning to night and will go to bed on an empty stomach. When his wife asks him, Kavah comments that the reasons for the weakening economic conditions are oppressive state policies. With money from the peasant Behram and Rüstem, the sons of the blacksmith go to the bakery. In his sons' absence, Kavah and his wife talks about the new rules regarding children of parents who do not believe in the state religion. Mihriban argues that common people should not partake in political acts because this kind of behavior can be harmful to them and their families; by contrast, Kavah feels people have the right to rebel if the governors are not reasonable and fair. The news from his husband depresses Mihriban but, they stop talking when the sons arrive and start eating.

Suddenly a unit of soldiers comes onto the stage and the commander declares that they have a question for Kavah. He asks Kavah where he and his sons were that morning. Kavah does not give exact answers, but the commander accuses him of participating in the forbidden, traditional rituals of Jamshid's religion. The rules are clear. One of his sons would be taken for sacrifice in the Temple of the Snakes; if he resisted, he would lose the other child, too. Kavah and Mihriban conceded their one son to save other; but just after soldier leave the shop, another group of soldiers comes and they take the other boy. Simultaneously, the shepherds arrive at the shop and they banned together to save their children from the oppressor's hand. The rebellion starts.

The last act opens in the Temple of the Snakes with a soliloquy by Ferhad. He admits that his strategy to return power to give Jamshid's family has failed; in fact, it has complicated crisis. Since they hide their secrets in their heart, Ferhad and Mehru cannot cooporate against the oppressor. At the same time, in the temple preparations for the sacrifice rituals are continuing. The actual dissolution of Jamshid's sovereignty will take place ones his people have no memory no remembrance of his religion and everybody starts praying to Zohak's gods. Until that day, those who resist and keep the traditional religious rituals should be heavyly punished. The first two sacrifices of the day are chosen by lot and Hubcher and Rüstem, the son of Kavah are selected.

Just before the ritual starts, Kavah and his band raid the palace and kill the king and chief commander. They rescue captives and finish the reign of tyranny. Kavah, despite having been the leader of the riot, does not want to take the throne and declares that the new monarch must descend from Jamshid. At this point, Ferhad announces the real identity of Perviz: He is Feridun, grandson of Jamshid, and only legitimate claiment to the throne. Hereupon, Mehru reveals her secret and tells that Hubcher is not the daughter of Zohak, but the daughter of his brother, granddaughter of Jamshid. The decision of two cousins to marry symbolizes the beginning of a new order: an order of love, wealth, happiness, justice and positive law.

4.1.2.2 The Discourse

Sami's play gives a complete picture of a state turned into an instrument of oppression with all predicaments that entails. The author puts Zohak at the center of this instrument but he does not govern the state alone. He has to share power with military and religious bureaucrats, but he is characterized as the dominant figure in the decision-making processes. This is a radical representation of the absolutist monarchy on theater stage in the late Ottoman period. As the first modern political playwrights of the time, the Young Ottomans never directly criticized the sultan, preferring to call out high-level bureaucrats in the palace. In some plays like Namık Kemal's *Gülnihal* or Ebüzziya Tevfik's *Ecel-i Kaza*, the targets of playwrights' criticism was not the even the central government; the power of the government was questioned indirectly through the provinces. However, Sami uses a technique he

learns from famous Western playwrights such as Shakespeare. His play takes place in a different region and relates a story which written centuries ago. In this way, he could put the monarch itself at the center of his criticism. The bureaucracy is depicted as nothing more than a group of flatterers who cannot maintain their political power without the king.

Zohak is a powerful king but not a legitimate one: despite his cruelty, he was unsuccessful in realizing an absolute submission in the lands he had conquered sixteen years before. The author implies that even in the absence of powerful mechanism of legitimation, political power can sustain itself for a long time. In the play, religion is presented as the most powerful instrument of legitimation. The tyrant knows that as long as Jamshid's religion survives, his own sovereignty will never be realized. As Louis Althusser formulated, besides an "oppressive state apparatus", every state needs an "ideological state apparatus"; no political system can survive for a long time with only the help of the instruments of oppression (Althusser 2003).

This formulation helps to understand the efforts of Ottoman Intellectuals to create an official ideology in the last century of the empire, one which promoted the unity of the subjects from different ethnic and religious groups. They created the ideologies of "Ottomanism, Islamism, and Turkism," respectively, but could not realize the ideal of an empire based on a modern citizenship. In contrast with Zohak, Feridun never has a legitimation problem. He comes from Jamshid's family who ruled the land for centuries, and he is a representative of the people from the mountains and the cities with whom he lived together for a long time.

The bureaucracies must be considered not as a united block, but as contending parties. While corrupt religious leaders force the king to be even crueler to his people, military leaders satisfy the needs of army by plundering property of common people. Even a character like Ferhad, who hides his real intentions to help the Jamshid family regain the throne does not escape the criticism of the author. Sami allows the audience to feel sympathy for Ferhad, but he shows that his pragmatism is bound to fail. He is never portrayed as a hope for the resolution of the crisis.

The playwright presents a wide-ranging panorama of the opposing groups which he defines in terms of dichotomies such as rural-urban, elite-public, nomadic-settled, male-female. From this perspective, the most dan-

gerous forces are rural-nomadic and males. The leadership is represented by Kavah, as a settled-urban male and the power of rural nomads is only made useful through his pioneering leadership. Sami's Kavah is represented not as a middle class artisan, but as a poor worker. This representation of the black-smith stimulates the audience's curiosity about the author's political approach to socialism as a contemporary ideology of his time. He is aware of social injustice and the results of economic inequality are expressed numerous times in the play but in the finale, the throne is resumed by a grandson of an aristocrat, not by the actual leader of the riot.

The playwright is supporting the idea of an armed uprising but only as a final solution, when conditions are unbearable. This approach coincides with the ideas of Young Ottomans such as Namık Kemal. The shepherds and blacksmith prefer to endure and prey, but when they lose their children, they are left with no other solution except public rebellion. In order to end an extremely irrational and illegitimate political system, the only solution is a public uprising under the leadership of urban workers, but even this should not lead a radical change in the political regime. A restoration that provides social justice for all is satisfactory for the author.

In the play, people frequently talk about inalienable rights such as the right of personal security, the right to private property, the pursuit of virtue, and the freedom of conscience. All of these rights and freedoms are infringed upon by one during the play. As mentioned before, the most concrete form of Zohak's oppression is the forcing subjects to prey to new gods and prohibiting the traditional rituals of Jamshid's religion. Sami clearly defends the idea that freedom of conscience and religion must be guaranteed in written laws, just like other liberal Ottoman intellectuals of the Tanzimat. Second, the fact that Jamshid's daughter and daughter-in-law were taken into Zohak's palace as captive concubines is another tangible infringement on the right to live with virtue and honor. The decisions made after the Zohak's nightmare are clear signs that show that the state is not concerned about the right to life or private property. Again in the play, characters such as Kavah argue that one result of the extreme political oppression will be an inconsistent economy; in a country that trespasses inalienable rights, people cannot be expected to pursue their welfare in accordance with liberal economic rules. According to Sami, under these conditions people have the right to

rise up against tyranny. This is one of the essential political principles of the Enlightenment.

The role of the love affair must also be considered a political phenomenon. In accordance with the tendencies in the literature of the time, the romantic love story of Hubcher and Perviz brings about another moment of opposition in which the restrictions and will of tyranny is disobeyed. The playwright thinks that the uncontrollable power of desire will challenge any political system that aims to strictly rule over all its living subjects, but this challenge never turns into a real revolutionary force; rather it engenders a self-destructive life policy. He intends to create sympathy in audience for Hubcher and Perviz but they are never presented as components of a revolutionary block, only as passive resisters. Their pursuit of happiness comes to a happy end only with the help of the radical restoration of order realized by public forces in the final scene. Nevertheless, by equating the new rulers with the resister lovers, Sami implies that the legitimate sovereignty of Perviz and Hubcher creates a new world in love affairs can be lived freely. In fact, the play is just starting for them.

In conclusion, Şemsettin Sami's play *Gave* (Kavah) was an authentic, dramatic work for its time because of its political dramaturgy and the aesthetic forms used by its author. First, he radically criticized absolutist governors who ignore inalienable rights of their subjects by directly presenting a monarch as the oppressor on the stage. In this representation, other elements of power were portrayed as weak flatterers who would never be dominant figures in decision-making processes. The criticism takes explicit aim at the monarch himself. He also argued that extremist absolutism will eventually cause public rebellion and this rebellion, which will unite people from different social groups, probably be led by urban workers. While creating this work, he used Shakespearean techniques: he took a classical, oriental myth and transformed it into a stage work that drew a picture belonging to his own time. However, because of political pressure, he could not continue writing political pieces and this would be his last successful work staged in theaters.

§ 4.2 Historical Analysis

4.2.1 *The Outer Temporality of the Author*

4.2.1.1 A Short Biography

Turkish historians of the Republican era accept Şemsettin Sami as an avantgarde founder and figure of Turkish nationalism, and they argue that he was the "first Turkish novel writer," "first Turkish dictionary and encyclopedia publisher," "first designer of Turkish punctuation marks," and "first major defender of the simplification of the Turkish language" (Hikmet Turhan 1934; Şecaattin Tural 1999; Akün 2009; Levend 2010). According to these sources, he was born in 1850 in a town called Frasher in Janina. In Albania he is actually known as Sami Frasheri (Bilmez 2005; Gawrych 2006). His was a prominent Muslim family with strong *Bektashi* roots that had served for the Ottoman state for centuries. After his father's death in 1859, the family moved to Janina and received a good education in the notable institutions of the region. He attended to the Zossimmaia Greek School, the best-known educational institute of Janina from which he received modern Western education; on the other hand, he benefited from the local madrasa to learn eastern languages. The first steps becoming a linguist were taken at these early ages, and he had knowledge of several languages like modern and ancient Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Arabic, Persian and Ottoman Turkish.

He moved to Istanbul in 1871 or 1872 and started a career in the state service as a young bureaucrat. From 1872 to 1874 he made translations from French, wrote a novel *(Taaşşuk-u Talat ve Fitnat)*, and wrote for Ebüzziya Tevfik's newspaper *Sirac*. Consequently, he became editor of another newspaper called *Hadika*. In 1874, he assigned as the editor of *Vilayet* newspaper in Trablus, where he stayed for nine months. He returned to the capital in 1875 and wrote a play named *Besa yahud Ahde Vefa*, it is staged in Hagop Vartovyan's company *Tiyatro-i Osmani* with Armenian and Muslim actors and actresses. The piece was highly praised, and his first success as a playwright encouraged him to write two other plays: *Seydi Yahya* (1875) and *Gave* (1877). At the same time, he continued to write for *Sabah* newspaper. In 1877, he was sent to Rhodes and after a short assignment, returned to Istanbul. He started writing in another newspaper belonging to an Armenian publisher

(Mihran) called *Tercüman-ı Şark*. From this point on, he stayed in Istanbul for the duration of his life, and his intellectual career rapidly blossomed.

He continued translating from French and became the first translator of several books, including *Le Miserables* in Ottoman Turkish. Published some periodicals such as *Aile* and *Hafta* as well as small educational booklets like *Kadınlar*, *Medeniyet-i İslamiye*, *İnsan*, *Lisan* and *Usul-i Tenkit* ve *Tertip*. But his most important works during this period were his famous dictionaries, grammar books and encyclopedias: *Kamus-i Fransevi* (1882), *Kamusu'l A'lam* (1889-1899), *Kamus-i Arabi* (1898), and *Kamus-i Türki* (1899-1901). Because of these contributions to Turkish studies, he became accepted one of the most preminent figures in founding of Turkish national identity. He made a similar contribution to the building of an Albanian national identity. He was one of the leading figures of Albanian society in the capital city of the Ottoman Empire. He was member and later head of the *Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Arnavudiyye*, a cultural society of Albanians in Istanbul. He prepared an Albanian grammar book (1886) and alphabet (1900) and kept maintained his membership until his death.

4.2.1.2 Sami's Approach to the Ottoman System Crisis and His Advice for Its Resolution

During his career as an Ottoman bureaucrat and a man of letters, Şemsettin Sami was a living observer of the Ottoman crisis from 1870s to the beginning of the 1900s. In Habermasian terminology, this was a total "system crisis", which affected all sub-systems of the Ottoman Empire, as I mentioned in pages 27-28:

1   There was an economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system
2   There was a political crisis in the goal-attainment sub-system
3   There was a legitimization crisis in the integration sub-system
4   Finally, there was a motivation crisis in the latent pattern sub-system

Şemsettin Sami approached the Ottoman system crisis from two important perspectives:

1   First, he defended an Islamic version of socialism, which was normally a class-centered political ideology that emerged in opposition to the destruc-

tive social-economic policies of industrial capitalism. He argued that social-ism is a humanist ideology that will be a hope for the future of human being.

2   Second, to protect against the political and cultural strategies of aggressive, the nineteenth century nationalist empires, he became the effective champion of a new united Islamic empire comprised of different nations freely living their national identities. He turned into a founding figure of Turkish and Albanian national identities.

Nevertheless, neither an Islamic socialist ideal, which aimed to keep all elements of the empire united, nor a new synthesis of nationalism and Islamism which intended to create a modern Islamic empire was admissible for the present Ottoman government. Sultan Hamid also supported Islamist policies, but his version of Pan-Islamism did not allow for parallel movements based on the nationalist or class-centered ideas. Therefore, Sami's constructive suggestions, which could be seen as alternative solutions for the system crisis, were never seriously taken under consideration. On the contrary, they were taken as dangerous ideas to be repressed.

SOCIALISM AS THE HOPE OF HUMAN BEING

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Ottoman intellectuals took a strong interest in comtemporary socialist and communist movements and using the printing press, they started discussing upraisings against industrial capitalism in the West. Especially the Commune of 1871 was a main issue of the time vehemently debated in newspapers. For example Namık Kemal argued in the newspaper *İbret* that in Paris Commune, Communards did not defend *iştirak-ı emval* (communism) and he felt free to express his sympathy for them. For most intellectuals including Kemal, on the other hand, the idea of *iştirak-ı emval* was the mother of all evils (Kocabaşoğlu and Berge 2006, 19-22).

   After he settled in Istanbul, Şemsettin Sami established close relations with the Young Ottomans and especially with Ebüzziya Tevfik who was a disciple and close friend of Namık Kemal. They were sharing ideas related to efforts to create a model combining Islamic state tradition and modern constitutional monarchy (Mardin 2006, 441-454). After he wrote *Gave,* in which he showed his sympathy for socialist ideas firstly, Şemsettin Sami plainly

stated his opinions in a newspaper article. He was the one of the first columnists to emphasize a difference between the terms *socialism* and *communism*. In 1878, he wrote a front-page editorial in the 74th issue of the newspaper *Tercüman-ı Şark* titled "Sosyalizm ve İştirak-ı Emval" (Socialism and Communism) in which he argued that these two terms are unrelated to each other (Cerrahoğlu 1975, 49-57).

In those days, because of the assassinations of European leaders, these terms were frequently used in the newspapers. Sami defended socialism and complained about writers who used these words synonymously; for him socialism and communism had different meanings. He saw socialism as an ideal that would bring humanity prosperity and collective happiness, and he paid tribute to it. However, Ottoman intellectuals misused the term of socialism in the meaning of *iştirak-ı emval*; to prevent the misinterpretation, Sami suggested using the original, untranslated term because it was nearly impossible to capture all its meanings in translation. On the other hand, he maintained that the idea of *iştirak-ı emval* cannot stand together with principle of divine justice and fails to comply with human nature; thus, it was illegitimate. Conversely, socialism stands for freedom and equality, justice, prosperity, and the happiness of all.

Sami's concept of socialism was based on the program of the Gotha Project produced by First Socialist International of 1875. He summarized the main principles of this program from the perspective of liberal rights and responsibilities: Each citizen has the general right to vote, to participate in government, to justice, and the freedom of speech, belief, and conscience. Military service must be obligatory for all male citizens. National education must be compulsory for all children.

According to Şemsettin Sami, for centuries socialism had struggled against those who were interested only in their own profits rather than the common welfare of society. However, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century lower classes who were becoming aware of the power of socialist solidarity and intellectuals who were chosing to stand with them became more organized and effective. In large metropolises such as London and New York, the socialists could establish centers and societies and were able to meet with lower class people directly and freely by these institutions. Thus, in Western civilizations the masses of poor people and most intellectuals had

been heading towards socialism. For Sami, this was a democratic and healthy way to decrease social tensions caused by injustice and inequality; he added that pressures on these normal social reactions would lead larger and more destructive movements at the roots of society.

Lastly, Şemsettin Sami argued that socialism as a political ideology is harmonious with the essence of Islam. This is another fact that proved that socialism is not communism for communism was contradictory to divine, religious rules. This perspective is closely related to the Young Ottomans' political concept of a special, different path of modernity and modernization for Muslim societies.

According to Cerrahoğlu, Sami's conceptualization of socialism based on the Gotha Program was subjective and incomplete. He could not take part in the collectivist arguments taking place in the first part of the program and he preferred to write about only the second part related to the organization of the state. Even then, he excluded debates on tax reform. In other words, Sami tried to moderate the Gotha Program's arguments to increase the acceptability of political ideology of socialism in Ottoman society. Nevertheless, he did not escape social, political, and intellectual opposition.

A quickly published, anonymous brochure responding to Sami's arguments spread in the capital city. According to author(s) of this brochure, divided Sami's arguments in four:

1 While Sami argued that Socialism and *iştirak-ı emval* are not the same, the author of the brochure answered that even if they are not separate political doctrines, both are closely tied; Sami's attempts to differentiate them are useless.

2 Sami defended socialism as a hope for the human beings. The author of the brochure rejected his argument and maintained that socialism would lead the decline of civilization and collapse of order.

3 Sami wrote that socialism were very popular in Western countries. The author contradicted him writing that they are a small, marginal group and the representatives of evil on earth.

4 Sami claimed that the principle of the Gotha Program was harmonious with divine religious rules. The author did not accept this and argued that the

Gotha Program should be forbidden because it is sickening in the light of Islam (58-61).

According to the author of the brochure, only the government of a powerful monarch could provide for the happiness of human beings. People demanded social order from the state, and in the Ottoman Empire, the only person to realize that order was Abdülhamid as sultan and caliph. Thus, Muslim society in the empire should obey his authority.

According to Cerrahoğlu, a person or group charged by the sultan himself wrote this brochure. Moreover, the state's response to the article was not limited to this brochure. The police arrested Sami and took him into custody for a few days (Kocabaşoğlu and Berge 2006, 26).

Another important figure also objected to Sami's conceptualization of socialism as a hope for human beings and as a modern political idea harmonious with the essential rules of Islam. In a letter written to Menemenli Rıfat, Namık Kemal, as master of young Sami, stated that Sami's conceptualization of socialism was mistaken. For him, there was not a single interpretation of socialism, there were socialisms. Sami's approach was closer to the First International. Second, refuting Sami's argument that "socialism" could not be translated into the Ottoman language, he suggested *ıslah-ı hâl-i cemiyet* (improvement of the situation of the society). Lastly, he argued that a socialist movement would not bring about better welfare for humanity. Rather it would bring into effect the deconstruction of order and chaos because of the absence of leadership and government (27).

After these harsh direct and indirect replies to his arguments coming from the state and prestigious intellectuals, Sami stopped the discussion and never again wrote of his personal opinions on socialism.

IN THE SUBSERVIENCE OF TWO NATIONS

One much-disputed issues on Şemsettin Sami concerns the multi-national characteristic of his personal identity. In other words, paradoxically, Sami was simultaneously one of the canonical figures of two different nationalisms, Turkish and Albanian. On one hand, some of his texts in his voluminous works such as *Kamus-i Türki* and *Kamusu'l A'lam* accepted by Turkish nationalists as the first manifestations of Turkish cultural nationalism; on the

other hand, he was widely acknowledged in Albania as the author of an Albanian book published in 1899 in Bucharest titled *What was Albania, What is it and What will be?* The book is accepted as an important historical document of emergent Albanian nationalism in nineteenth century. Because of his controversial characteristics, Şemsettin Sami is perceived using a selective approach in the historiographies of both nationalisms (Bilmez 2004-2005, 4-6). To understand Sami's paradoxical situation, the perceptions of terms such as nation, nation building, nationalism, and nation state must be questioned.

In his article "Nation States as Empires, Empires as Nation States," Krishan Kumar seeks the answer to the essential question: Are nation states the antithesis of empires? According to him, in classical, political historiography from the time of the European Enlightenment, "nation-states" and "empires" are seen as opposing institutions. However, Kumar is not sure that this is the only way to tell the story. He suggests another version:

> Many nation-states are empires in miniature; they have formed as empires have usually been formed. There is in that sense an inescapably imperial dimension to nation-state. (Kumar 2010, 128)

Another point implied by Kumar is that nationalism as a modern historical phenomena changes from the late eighteenth to the twentieth century. He defined two different stages of nationalism in world history: liberal nationalism of early nineteenth century and organic nationalism of late nineteenth and early twentieth century. According to Wolfgang Mommsen, this change in nationalist ideas caused by the high imperialism of great powers such as Britain, France, Germany, and the United States a "deformation of national politics" (132). Coakley gives different names for these stages of nationalism calling them French and German conceptions (Coakley 2012, 207-208).

In Turkey, nationalist historians use a different terminology for the transition to a Ottoman perception of nationalism as a political ideology imported from Europe. In his canonical article, "Three Policies" (Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset), Yusuf Akçura argues that:

> It seems to me that since the rise of the desires for progress and rehabilitation spread from the West, three principal political doctrines

have been conceived and followed in the Ottoman dominions. The first is the one which seeks to create an Ottoman Nation through assimilating and unifying the various nations subject to Ottoman rule. The second seeks to unify politically all Muslims living under the governance of the Ottoman State because of the fact that the prerogative of the Caliphate has been a part of the power of the Ottoman State (this is what the Europeans call Pan-Islamism). The third seeks to organize a policy of Turkish nationalism (*Türk Milliyet-i siyasiyesi*) based on ethnicity. (Akçura 2010)

On the path from the civic nationalism of Ottomanism to the ethnic nationalism of Turkism, a long period of Hamidian pan-Islamism took place. This was a transitional period. The Ottoman state was looking for ways to preserve the empire's unity and prevent further loss of territories at its borders. Because of large territorial loss from 1875 to 1880, the empire's demographic structure changed radically: the percentage of Muslims increased nearly %10 percent from %66 percent to %75 because of the secession of non-Muslim provinces as well as supernumerary Muslim immigrations from these same provinces during this short period. Sultan Abdülhamid decided to adopt the title of "caliph" to bring together the Muslim subjects of the empire, that is to say the Turks, Kurds, Arabs, and Albanians. He used traditional networks of religious sects to reach his subjects directly and changed the school system and educational programs to emphasize the role of caliphs in the history of Islam. He gave more importance to Islamic holy lands than his predecessors, and he preferred to focus development efforts on Arab provinces rather than Balkan territories like Macedonia and Albania. He also used the ideology of holy war (jihad) as a threat against colonialist European powers while establishing powerful networks with the greater Islamic world from China to India and Africa (Georgeon 2012, 270-289).

Şemsettin Sami and other Ottoman intellectuals did not agree that this official interpretation of nationalism based not on ethnicity but religion could bring together the nations living in the empire. They believed that Islamic culture and tradition must be an important part of a modern Ottoman identity, but that did not mean that the state must suppress national identities. The Ottoman government needed to recognize the national identities of

its subjects and to find a way to unite them under the roof of Islam. However, after the separation of the Balkan states from the empire, the sultan tended to construe all nationalist movements as dangerous. Under these conditions, how to explain the works of Sami shared among Turkish and Albanian nationalists?

John Coakley, in his book named *Nationalism, Ethnicity and State* in which he studied the literature on nationalism comparatively and offered an overview of nationalism as a historical phenomenon, mentioned that without considering two perspectives and three major actors of nationalism we cannot understand the basic mechanisms of its ideology and political projects (Coakley 2012, 23-24):

1   First, nationalism must be understood from the perspectives of those who are politically dominant and control the state power; vis-à-vis their opposition, who wish to reshape the state in line with their own ideology in a revolutionist, separatist, or reformist manner.

2   Second, all the actors taking on important roles in the development of a nationalist movement should be considered:

◆   a centralizing "metropolitan area" which controls economic, political, and military powers;

◆   a "regional periphery" which complains about economic exploitation and political and military suppression by the center; and

◆   a "regional center" whose role cannot be predicted before and whose choices determine the characteristic of the nationalist movement.

From this perspective, it's interesting to see that some text of Şemsettin Sami written in both Turkish and Albanian, reflected the two perspectives of nationalism simultaneously. This results from his special position at the center of the empire (in the "metropolitan area") and as a representative of Muslim community in Albania (of the "regional center"). It is well-known that Sami's ancestors were prominent Muslim families in Albania. His father had a long ancestry of "tımar" holders from the early Ottoman times. His mother's roots extended as far back as İmrohor İlyas Efendi, a famous military leader from the time of Murat II and Mehmed II, who were the Ottoman rulers that conquered Albania (Gawrych 2006, 13). This information as a

historical fact shows that Sami's family is representative of the "metropolitan center" in the "region," that is to say they are members of the "regional center." In this case, relations between "regional" and "metropolitan" centers were problematic for two reasons:

1 Albanians lived in a region accepted as the fabric of nationalist mobilizations. They could not remain indifferent to nationalisms among their neighbors.

2 Sami and his family are from the Bektashi order -problematic in a period in which a Sunni caliph has been gaining power in the center of the empire.

According to Coakley, the type of a nationalist mobilization should be determined from the actors leading it. In his point of view, there are three types of nationalist mobilization (Coakley 2012, 171-172):

1 *Integrationist nationalism*: The leading figure of this type nationalism is the "metropolitan center." It seeks to integrate outlying territories into its zone of sovereignty. The key terms are "territorial unity," "cultural integration," and "irredentist nationalism". Hamidian pan-Islamist policies are good examples of integrational nationalism.

2 *Colonial nationalism*: In this type, a coalition of the "regional center" and "regional periphery" struggle against the "metropolitan center" for independence.

3 *Separatist nationalism*: This involves the revolt of "regional periphery" against the coalition of "regional center" and "metropolitan center". Balkan nationalisms are good examples of this kind of nationalism.

In the light of the theoretical background above, there were two options for Sami and the "regional center" of Albania represented by his family:

1 In the age of national struggles and independence movements, they could make a coalition with the Ottoman central power loosing their prestige among the complaining masses of the "regional periphery".

2 They would take the leadership of the masses against the empire.

In the beginning, all the members of Sami's family had contact with the capital, especially his eldest brother Fraşerli Abdül Bey, who as one of the leading figures of Albanian nationalism, became one of the applicants of the Con-

gress of Berlin in 1878 by formal request of the sultan. After the Treaty of Berlin, border problems emerged between Albania and other Balkan states. Albanians founded "unionist societies" defending interdependency on the Ottoman Empire. Many armed volunteers including Abdül Bey and his fellow soldiers organized to fight against potential occupiers and save Janina as a territory of the Ottoman Empire. Consequently, Abdül Bey anticipated the foundation of a nationalist league in Prizren against Serbian and Montenegrin threats, but eventually the league turned into an Albanian nationalist organization and Abdul turned into a revolutionary leader. Albanians stated that they want to be part of the empire but they also requested reforms from Istanbul. Abdülhamit was displeased with this situation and had Abdül Bey arrested (Gawrych 2006, 46-50; Levend 2010, 39). The sultan interpreted these requests as a demand for autonomy. He gave Albanian Muslims the promise of a just administration and providing reform; but nationalist organizations were forbidden (Gawrych 2006, 65).

At the very beginning of this story, Abdül Fraşeri had sent his brothers Sami and Naim to Istanbul as part of a plan prepared by the "regional center" to reach a consensus with the "metropolitan center". What message of the "regional center" was carried by these two brothers?

Adopting Coakley's theory of national mobilization types to the case of nineteenth century Albania, note that the country was under Ottoman dynastic rule from the fifteenth century to 1912. During nineteenth century, Albanian nationalism developed along with the other nationalisms on the Balkan peninsula, but it tended to align with the central power of the empire in contrast with Serbian, Bulgarian and Greek nationalisms. In 1876, an embryonic political party system emerged in Istanbul. There was no special Albanian party, but some individual representatives applied to the sessions of the national assembly. Abdul Fraşeri was one, and just before the catastrophe in Balkan Peninsula he made a spectacular and provocative speech in the assambly on the need for reformation in Albania. According to him, the reasons for the lack of progress of the "state" and "nation" were lack of education, unjust administration, and incompetent officials (41).

From 1872 through 1880's Sami represented Albanian Muslim elites and suggested that in order to keep the empire alive, the Ottoman state had to establish a fully-fledged party system. Even his arguments on socialism can

be understood from this perspective. According to him a liberal democratic system would provide the military and political alignment of the Albanian "regional center" with the "metropolitan center" and prevent separatism. However, it is obvious that the "metropolitan center" had a different idea for governing the country, namely "mass authoritarian dictatorship." Thus, the message of the "regional center" was not received by the "metropolitan center".

Accepting this proposition, how can the cultural works of Sami in the capital be explained? First, it should be remembered that from 1877 until his death, Sami could not leave the capital city. In the last years of his life he was even under house arrest (Bilmez 2005, 100). According to Georgeon, to keep his officers inside or close to the palace and to forbid them from leave the capital was one of the Sultan's well-known strategies for maintaining state power (Georgeon 2006, 181-185). In this way, he could cut all interconnections between "metropolitan and regional centers." From the 1880s on, Sami was kept in Istanbul and his political activities were under the observation and control of the palace. In situations in which he crossed "the red lines" - such as his discussion on socialism- anonymous someone(s) warned him, as did opposing intellectuals. As a result, Sami focused on cultural issues, which seemed as non-political activities to the government.

Were these activities non-political? Remember the message of the "regional center": This outdated state can be turned into a modern nationalist empire. In such an empire, independent nations can live together and unite under the flag of Islam, but they never hide their national identity. For Albanian nationalists in a new nationalist empire, people had "to live like a tree alone and free, like a forest in brotherhood", as the famous poet Nazım Hikmet Ran wrote. Besides this, for a modernist intellectual who believed that "nation" and "nation-state" are the highest political categories developed by humanity, defending to an "other's" national identity as one's own cannot be seen as paradoxical. It is actually a consistent attitude (Bilmez 2005, 140).

Sami's voluminous works on Turkish and Albanian language and history directly served the building of these nations. Coakley includes studies on language and history among the "elements of national mobilization," together with race, religion, and material culture (Coakley 2012, 27-133). According to him, language was one of the most important factors for the separation of

small nation-states from empires such as the Habsburg, Ottoman or Romanov Empires. The argument in these cases was that each community speaking the same language is a nation.

However, in Sami's work, as a counter strategy, language was imagined as a symbol of unification for Muslim subjects in the Ottoman Empire. For a century, European scholars had already been studying the Albanian language as a language of a nation (Bilmez 2004-2005, 15). Thus, to deny the reality that Albanians are a different nationality despite their common religion with the Turks, Kurds and Arabs in the empire, would create a discursive inconsistency for the empire in domestic and foreign relations straining its credibility.

Similarly, his studies on history focus on the "myths of origin" which put forth a theory of the genealogy of the two nations. According to Coakley, these myths served as a first step of a process he calls "politics of remembrance": the definition of the nation connected to an ancient ancestor living in the homeland for a long time (Coakley 2012, 112). In both cases, with the help of this "ancient-ness" narrative, Albanians and Turks accept themselves as the "real "and the "only" owners of their homelands (Bilmez 2004-2005, 10).

But Sami argued two more things:

1   He, as a subject of the empire, had two homelands. The first one is *vatan-ı umumi* (the general homeland), the second one is *vatan-ı hususi* (the special homeland). Ottoman territory without distinction is his general homeland, but Albania is his special homeland. One should love both equally (Gawrych, 526).

2   He argued that historical national boundaries are more important than homeland for conceptualizing a sacred national territory known as "Turan." In contrast to official, Ottoman pan-Islamism, he defended pan-Turkism and unification of the Turkic people living in central Asia. He used ancient texts such as *Kutadgu Bilig* ant the Orhon Inscriptions as evidences of connection with these people and the antiquity of Turkishness (Bilmez 2004-2005, 22).

For Sami, it was natural to engage all his life in defining the rules and codifying the essential elements of both Turkish and Albanian languages and researching on the history of both nations. He felt he belonged to both national

identities simultaneously. As Bülent Bilmez wrote: Sami was first of all a modernist who regarded his projects as instrumental for the construction of a modern collective identity within a modern society. This identity could be ethnocentric, nationalist, religious (Islamic), or imperial (Ottomanist). According to many modernist intellectuals like Sami, the modern nation was the most developed (civilized) for of human society. National identity was the ideal, collective identity and the nation-state was the ideal political, economic, and cultural (Bilmez 2004-2005, 26).

4.2.2 *The Outer Temporality of the Reader*

In his "Social Systems theory," Parsons developed…

> … a four sub-system model of social system around four tasks facing a social system in relation to its environment. These four sub-systems (GAIL) were goal-attainment (the polity), adaptation (the economy), integration (cultural system of general values which is concerned with law and social control) and latency (normative problem of motivation to fulfill positions in the social system). (Turner 1991, xviii)

The theory of crisis was part of this general social system theory: when a social system cannot properly integrate its differentiated sub-systems, some problems occur. According to Habermas, when Parsons was talking about integration crisis, he was imlpying two kinds of problems: the failure of *system integration* and the lack of *social integration*. Disturbances in system integration are important, but only if there is also a social integration crisis, they threaten the continuity of the social systems. Under this condition "consensual foundations of normative structures are so impaired that society becomes anomic" (Habermas 1992, 3).

Habermas argues that the period from the 1870s to the beginning of the 1900s was characterized by an absolute system crisis, in which the modern liberal stage of capitalism was ending and the advanced one was beginning. In modern liberal capitalist social formation, since social and system integrations are realized in market conditions, system crises occur in the form of economic crises, but actually, there are crises in all sub-systems: economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system, rationality crisis in the goal-attainment

sub-system, legitimation crisis in the integration sub-system, motivation crisis in latent pattern sub-system. In other words, system crises in modern liberal capitalist social system are absolute crises.

If it is preferred to identify the problem in Habermasian terminology, as we mentioned in pages 27-28, the crisis of the Ottoman system in the late nineteenth century have to be taken into consideration under four sub-categories:

1   There was an economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system
2   There was a political crisis in the goal-attainment sub-system
3   There was a legitimization crisis in the integration sub-system
4   Finally, there was a motivation crisis in the latent pattern sub-system: The most important manifestation of this crisis was that bribery had spread like wildfire.

The first two crises are related to "system integration," and the last two are associated with "social integration."

Sultan Abdülhamit's "system integration" and "social integration" policies help him to remain a strong monarch on the Ottoman throne, but in the long run, he was unseccessful in putting this great system crisis behind the empire. New actors in Ottoman history with new resolution projects would depose him from power.

How can we read Sami's play, Gave from this perspective? Sami draw a picture of a mythical Persian country fallen into an absolute system crisis in his play the dramatically case of crisis has many similarities with the Otto-man case:

1   Zohak's situation as an illegitimate monarch recalls the discussions of the Ottoman Empire in 1870s. Problems regarding the Ottoman throne during the last days of the Sultan Aziz's era created a legitimation crisis. The crisis continued during the short reign of Sultan Murat, darling of the Ottoman reformists and supporters of a constitutional parliamentary system, and through the early rule of Sultan Hamid, who was not a crown prince and was enthroned by some arts and wiles of politics.

Zohak is not a legal king because for two reasons: First, he is not a successor of the legal king, Jamshid, and usurped authority through an unlawful

act. Second, he is illegitimate in the eyes of the public because of his oppressive policies. Therefore, the rebellion of Kavah against the unjust king of Zohak reestablishes justice and order. By contrast, Feridun is a legitimate monarch because, on one hand, he is the direct descendent of Jamshid. On the other hand, his shadow personality –Perviz- is the mere son of a shepherd; thus, he is representative of the public itself. At the end of the play, the legitimate monarch will again establish justice and order in the country.

2   In the play, there are many scenes and dialogues about the economic plight of the country under the irrational tyranny of Zohak the evil serpent king. The picture drawn by the author was pessimistic. Ordinary people in towns and rural areas cannot even provide themselves with the essential goods. Fundamental economic activities especially the trade in towns are interrupted and incomes have fallen dramatically. The state policy giving soldiers permission to plunder the property of common people who refused to submit to the goods of the new regime further aggravates economic conditions.

   The dialogues about the relations between political acts and mechanisms directing economy are interesting. For example, in the fourth scene of Act 4, Mihriban asks her husband the reasons the economy was going from bad to worse. Kavah gives political explanations for the economic problem: the most important reason are the oppressive policies and tyrannical governance of the king.

   The Ottoman government raised taxes to cover the budget deficit and the scarcity that followed this policy led to massive upraisings in the Balkan provinces in 1873. Similarly, Zohak's orders to his chief commander that allowed soldiers to plunder the artisans', peasants' and shepherds' goods as wages lays the foundation for the rebellion led by Kavah.

3   In the play, religious oppression –i.e., forcing them to submit to the new gods- symbolizes the new regime's urgent need to legitimize itself. Zohak knows that so long as the sovereignty of Jamshid's religion remains, he will not be able to seize actual, state power. Therefore establishing a new, official religion is vitally important, as it can bring about the loyalty of the subjects to the new regime.

   In the play, however, Zohak's plans do not work: the most concrete example of the legitimization problem is exemplified by Perviz, who initially

thinks that living in the palace of Zohak is a golden opportunity for a poor shepherd, but later revolts against him after he sees the tyrant's evil. Finally, he enters a process of transformation and evolves into Feridun, the true king of Persia. Zohak's regime even cannot integrate a loyal subject who submits voluntarily; conversely, it turns him into an adversary.

In the Hamidian era, the Ottoman state experienced similar problems with its subjects. From the Tanzimat era to the closing of the first national assembly in 1878, the official principle of citizenship was Ottomanism and all subjects of the empire were theoretically equal ethnic, religious, and cultural plurality notwithstanding. However, this artificial ideology was unable to unite unruly components and nationalisms in the Balkan provinces started threatening the unity and existence of the empire. Under conditions of crisis, the government imposed a new, official ideology in the Hamidian era: Islamism. It hoped secure the devotion of Muslim subjects to the state, but this official ideology also was defeated by a rival ideology of nationalism in later years.

4   The unpaid wages of Ottoman officers were the most conspicuous sign of the Ottoman economic crisis, but also the cause of a motivaiton problem in the bureaucratic mechanisms of the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman sultans tried to solve this problem in different ways For example Sultan Abdülhamid gave titles of privilege or medals of honor to his officers. The sultans could not (or did not want to) prevent bribery as a mechanism for bureaucrats of different ranks to supplement their income, and they took no notice of it.

In Sami's play, several scenes recall this common practice. Zohak, in order to convince the soldiers to bring the shepherds in the mountains under control, gives permission to plunder, since the soldiers do not believe that they accomplishing this for a holy reason. He promises his chief commander that if he can strengthen the king's sovereignty throughout the country, he will become the son-in-law of the king. But it is clear that such rewards given by the king to motivate his servants creates new oppressions, directly damaging his legitimization and reputation.

The author makes a suggestion for the resolution of the crisis in the final scene of the play. Zohak's tyranny ends with a public rebellion led by an urban worker who unites all oppositional forces under a single black flag. This

solution recalls Sami's empathy for the socialist ideas: intolerable oppressions by governors who never mind even the basic rights of their subjects cannot escape the people's rage, such regimes cannot survive long. On the other hand, Sami does not let Kavah the Blacksmith take the power though he was the leader of the successful rebellion. He gives the throne to the legitimate monarch, Feridun, and submits to him. Feridun's empire will maintain strong political power, which can unite different nations through their shared religion. This is a smart representation of Sami's conception of an Islamic empire: He believed that the Ottoman Empire could solve its integration crises only if it could bring together different Muslim nations to live side by side under the principle human rights and common banner of Islam. However, his ideals were utopian for the time and were never taken officially into consideration.

5

Hagop Baronian's *Honorable Beggars*: Destructive Effects of the Crisis on the Armenian Community

> *Praised be the Lord. Our provident Turkish government, having astutely foreseen the present famine, took effective measures long ago by getting the people used to hunger beforehand.*
>
> –Baronian, *Collected Works*

Hagop Baronian published his famous satirical novel The Honorable Beggars in installments between the years 1880 and 1881. He remarked, "[h]e would have much preferred to present his work in the shape of a comedy rather than a novel" (Bardakjian 1984, 139 Therefore, especially western Armenians converted the work into a comedy several times, not only in Armenian, but in other languages, as well. One of the famous adaptations in English belongs to Jack Antressian (Baronian 1980), and in this chapter we will use Antressian's adaptation to analyze Baronian's intentions.

I will start summarizing of the story and plot. Since Antressian's adaptation is faithful to the original, I will not separate the inner temporalities of story and plot, and I will accept both of them. My aim will be to give a general idea about the play and its main characters -"honorable beggars"- and show Baronian's representation of the declining conditions of the Armenian

community in Istanbul. Second, I will bring the principle causes that forced the author to write this theatrical novel into relief by elaborating on his short biography and his other works written on the Ottoman political, economic and social life. I will argue that Baronian was aware of a greater picture of global and domestic crisis and understood its actors among the Ottoman government and great powers of the West, but in *The Honorable Beggars,* he focused on just Armenian leaders and intellectuals who were responsible people for the decline of the society. Third, I will explain the play from a perspective that considers the failure of the Armenian Enlightenment's to be a natural and inevitable product of the Ottoman system crisis.

§ 5.1 Rhetorical Analysis

5.1.1 *The Inner Temporalities of the Story and the Plot/Discourse*

5.1.1.1 The Story and Plot

The play starts with the lines: "A man is standing on the dock at Galatia, having just gotten off the steamer from Trebizond. It is 1870 something…" (Baronyan, 3) From these first lines, we start to read, with adoration the smart observations of a great author witnessing his time. The name of the man standing on the dock in the opening scene is Apisoghom, he is the protagonist of *The Honorable Beggars*: the owner of a large farm and a merchant who came to Constantinople via Turkish steamship to find an appropriate candidate for marriage. As it is seen in scene twelve, which takes place in a photographer's studio, although he is from one of the most important port cities of the empire he wishes to be seen as a man of countryside:

> I want the picture to be very impressive. I will be seated in an armchair, with two servants ready to do my bidding, one of them a maid. Make it appear as though I am on a farm, with crops showing off to one side, and cows being milked on the other; sheep grazing here, and there some planting being done, and farther off some reaping. Ploughing, making madzoun, gathering watermelons, making butter, ducks swimming in the pond, trees being cut in the woods, wheat be-

ing transported in carts – everything that takes place on a farm should be a part of the picture. (Baronian 1980, 109)

When Apisoghom Agha leaves the steamship, the first people he meets are five porters. Each one picks up one piece of agha's luggage and begins carrying them to the place where he will stay. This is the newcomer's welcome ceremony in the capital; he has to learn the manners of staying alive in the largest and most cosmopolitan city of the empire.

After the porters disappeared, another man emerges on the dock and extends his hand to the agha in greeting: He is an editor of a local Armenian newspaper and has learned the arrival of this rich man to the capital. He requests payment to yearly subscription of his newspaper; in return, he will inform the public about the visit of this "important person."

After this long opening scene, Apisoghom Agha fortunately arrives at the owner-occupied flat that he will stay untill he finds his bride-to-be. First, the audience sees the Landlady complaining about his husband:

He is always after his politics and it does not ever enter his mind that we might need bread to eat, or butter, or rice; that we need wood for fire to cook them, or coal… we have nothing but politics in this house, politics every night… (18)

There are two important aspects to this monologue that Baronian wished to bring up: the poor (and worsening) living conditions of middle-class families in Constantinople (the theme of the whole play in fact) and the incompetent of politicians of the Armenian community who could not solve even their families' simple daily problems.

After Apisoghom Agha reached to apartment and finished his dinner, visitors who wanted to see him started coming in turn. Excluding the priest and matchmaker, most are the men with prestigious employments: intellectuals, men of the arts, outstanding figures of the community in Constantinople. They include a poet, a photographer, a doctor, a teacher, a writer, a lawyer, an actor, a printer.

The first visitor is the priest. He is visiting the agha to say welcome and inquire after his health. He complains about the economic conditions of the time:

> The times are very bad. The people are burdened with much suffering and their piety seems to be declining steadily day by day. (27)

He demands 2 lira from the agha in order to dedicate the next weekend's church service to him. The agha cannot refuse the priest and gives the money, but his first impressions of the people of the city are not positive.

The second visitor of the first day is the poet. He enters to the room and is so profuse in praising agha that Apisoghom himself cannot understand the reasons behind the exaggerated gestures. The poet removes his hat, leaps on the table, and starts reciting a poem, which criticises the dark ages and pays tribute to the modern, enlightened age. The agha, who does not understand a word of this speech, gets nervous and tells him off. The poet starts crying and complains about the Armenian community's ignorance of national poetry:

> Your servant wants to serve his people with his writings. But our people treat their writers with ingratitude and contempt. (36)

Finally, he formulates his actual request: he wants sponsorship from the agha for his latest book. He convinces the agha to pay money for a pastoral poem, which will be a narration of him on his farm is animals and servants. It will published in a local newspaper in Constantinople and bring prestige to the agha.

The agha starts his dinner with the owner of the house, Manuk Agha. While the agha engages only with his meal, Manuk Agha forces him to listen to the gossip of the community in the capital city. He can go to bed only at midnight and stays alone after a long, hard day. However, he cannot sleep well because of the normal, city noises of peddlers in the early morning.

New visitors start coming early and first one is the photographer. The agha does not like his project of depicting him as a modern man visiting a modern city. However, Manuk Agha convinces him to pose, because:

> These days everybody from the young to very old has his pictures taken a few times a year. The only ones who don't are still in their mothers' womb. And one day they will find a way to have their pictures taken too. (62)

Hereupon the agha accepts the photographer's proposal to take his pictures the next day in his studio and pays him a deposit. Manuk Agha starts talking about the elections of the representatives for the Armenian national assembly. Interestingly, Apisoghom Agha -a rich man from the province- knows nothing about political life in the capital city.

The next visitor is the matchmaker. She heard that the agha is looking for a young girl to marry. The agha does not understand the marriage rituals in this city; even finding a bride is a financial matter:

> I know girls of every class, high, middle and low and I have merchandise available in all three classes. Your honor must consult with his purse and say to me: 'I want a girl from this class.' Obviously, upper class would be very expensive; the middle less so and low is not expensive at all. (77)

The matchmaker leaves to find a suitable candidate.

The landlady brings the daily newspaper and the agha reads the article related to him and for which he had paid for a yearly amount of subscription. Other books and newspaper follow it. The landlady brings letters from different authors and editors; everybody wants the financial support from the agha to continue their publication activities. Meanwhile, Manuk Agha continues to give information about the elections, but these are uninteresting for the guest from the province.

Subsequently, the doctor enters. He spent years in foreign countries for his medical education, and his only aim is to be a servant of his community. But his people preferred to take medical treatment from foreigners:

> We have more than two thousand Armenian doctors here and only two or three, and at most five or six, lead comfortable lives. The rest wait and wait, day after day, for someone to treat, for some way to make a living. (85)

The agha, who has no symptoms of sickness, decides to have an examination from him and pays for it in cash.

Apisoghom Agha leaves the house to escape the crowded group of visitors and goes to a restaurant to take his lunch. An Armenian teacher recognizes him, comes up and sits at the agha's table. For years, he has worked for

the community but he cannot manage on his insufficient income. He shows his book to the agha and asks for financial support for it:

> Teachers are considered servants of the nation and such are scorned by the nation, when in reality they are the masters of the nation. A nation progresses through them. But what's the use? No one realizes this or cares about it. A teacher is given a position one day, and dismissed the next. Why? Because he didn't humble himself before a member of the school committee. If he serves for few months and asks for his salary, he is dismissed for being so presumptuous as to make such request. And people never stop saying to him: 'You are supported by public funds… you are a burden to our people… go make a proper living... leave us free of your demands. (92-94)

While they are talking, a writer and a lawyer move closer to introduce themselves. The writer presents his latest book to the agha. The lawyer tries to explain why he needs representation in this city. In order to break away from them, the agha pays all of their checks and leaves the restaurant to return to guest house where he was staying. An actor was waiting there to meet him. He could not sell even a single ticket for that night's show and invites the agha to the theater:

> I beg you do not refuse these tickets. If you refuse, you will be responsible for my being disgraced in the streets. (104)

However, the agha who is distressed by the constant disturbance during the day kicks him out. With that, the printer enters and tells off the agha for his response to the actor's invitation. The actor could not pay the expenses of the show to the printer, and since he did not buy the tickets, the agha is responsible for the misery of the actor. The agha gives some money just to send them away, and he is finally alone for a short afternoon rest.

The agha goes to the photographer's studio before nightfall and the barber starts preparing him. His son is receiving education in Paris and the barber needs money for supporting him. The barber asks to barrow money from the agha for his son's tuition. Subsequently, the clergyman enters and offers to find to the agha a girl to marry. This offer delights Apisoghom Agha, but first he has to wait for the barber to finish. Meanwhile, he complains about

the city and people who live in it. The clergyman's explanation simple and remarkable:

> Times are bad too, effendi. Economic crisis, crisis in economy, choking everything. The nation has many poor (Baronian, 114).

While the barber and the clergyman are trying to persuade him, the matchmaker comes in. A quarrel starts among them. Manuk Agha pulls him off to the side and warns him about these kinds of thoughtless people; but than, he also wants money from the agha for the expenses. The agha leaves the studio to go to the guesthouse and pack. There, the landlady makes the last gaffe and asks to the the agha for money. Moreover, news arrives about a crowd waiting outside to meet with the agha. This is the straw that broke the camel's back, and the agha leaves the city in a hurry.

5.1.1.2 The Discourse

Hamdi Özdiş states that during the 1870s, begging and beggars were very popular tropes in Ottoman satiricial periodicals. The beggars on the Galata Bridge were criticized because of their bad views and and authors of satirical texts charged them with deception. According to them, the beggars were in reality very wealthy people, but they were continuing to beg by appealing to people's emotions. On the other hand, begging was considered a social problem that had to be solved by the state, and was therefore an image problem for the Ottoman government (Özdiş 2010, 155-157).

English writer John Gay, with his satiric work *The Beggars' Opera (1728),* is one of the most famous figures who used the metaphore of beggars for social critique. The famous German director Bertolt Brecht made a modern adaptation of it - *The Threepenny Opera*- to criticize the wildness of the capitalist system. Interestingly, Hagop Baronain, who lived half a century before from Brecht in Istanbul, created his best work in a similar vein.

The Honorable Beggars is a play dealing with the subversive effects of the socio-economic crisis in the late nineteenth century Ottoman capital. The protagonist is a representative of rich people from the provinces, who had invested in a materialist way of life, but were not interested in culture or the arts. The other main characters are intelectuals and prominent figures of the Armenian community living in Istanbul, who had turned into beggars be-

cause of the lack of capital in the empire. Baronian was aware that the enlightenment movement of the Ottoman Armenians in the nineteenth century was a product of several factors. The economy was the most important: The growing world economy and the capital that accumulated in large Ottoman cities had long sponsored the cultural activities related to the Armenian Enlightenment. However, in conditions of crisis, this sponsorship suddenly disappeared. Morover, the effects of political pressures of Hamidian tyranny were even more distructive. Under these circumstances, the optimism of the enlightenment movement died down.

Baronian's representation of the intellectuals and leading figures of the Armenian community has two dimensions: On one hand, he approach them with emphathy or their desperation. On the other hand, he criticized them because they were so engaged in the market economy, and money had become the real value of their activities. Baronian did not accept begging as a way of getting his daily bread. In his personal life, in spite of deep economic problems, he never surrendered. According to him, the real value of the intellectuals was tasted not in the old days of economic development, but in the time of the crisis.

In the play, most of the beggars are seen on the stage only once. They come, and bring up their matters, take the money, and leave the stage. Baronian is not sympathetic to all of them, but some beggars are depicted as more dramatic: the poet, the teacher and the actor. However, the priest, the photographer, the matchmaker, the doctor, the lawyer, and the barber are characters who do not think of anything except money and are presented as rank swindlers trying to clear Apisoghom Agha out. As these charlatans accomplish their plan, the real casualties who actually serve the agha such as the porters and the landlady cannot take their own due.

Beyond this, there is no act or dialogue directly critical of the government. Censorship rules and growing political pressure prevented it. Hence, the audience observes and feels the heavy atmosphere caused the crisis and see its victims, but cannot understand how the matter relates to the responsible government. *The Honorable Beggars* is a play not about the causes and the offenders of the crisis, but about its results and the victims.

§ 5.2 Historical Analysis

5.2.1 *The Outer Temporality of Author*

5.2.1.1 A Short Biography

One of the most comprehensive biographies in English of Hagop Baronian was written by Kevork Bardakjian, but was never published (Bardakjian 1978). He collected numerous Armenian and Turkish sources and prepared a dependable biography.

Hagop Baronian was born in Edirne in 1843. In those days, the city was not an important Armenian settlement, but its Armenian community was well-organized with its schools, churches, and other institutions. His father was a banker and his mother was the daughter of a rich Armenian family. He finished his elementary education in the local Armenian school and his teachers advised his parents to send him to the Greek High School. However, was unable to finish and left after only one year because of "the difficulties of the Greek language." According to Bardakjian, this was not the actual reason as he would master both modern and ancient Greek in the future; the real cause of this "failure" was the overly classical and bothersome educational system of the school.

By the end of his school life, he started trying his chances with works; first in a pharmacy and later in the local *Regie de Tabac* as an accountant. During the years spent in Edirne, he laid the foundations for his self-education in languages (Turkish, Greek and French), classical and modern literature, and history. However, provincial life bored him and he decided to move to the capital. The Armenian community in Istanbul on those days had a rich social and cultural life. It was charming that a young intellectual could live independently in a largest and most cosmopolitan metropolis of Europe.

He arrived to Istanbul in 1863 and he stayed with his cousin Hovhannes Katipyan, who provided Baronian with a rich library and the opportunity to meet the important intellectual figures of the time. Later he found a job and started living on his own in a flat in Pera. He subsequently started his literary career by writing comedies for the stage: *Yergu derov dzarav mı* (A Servant of Two Masters) which was adapted from Goldoni's *The Servant of Two Mas-*

ters, and *Adamnapuyj aravelyan* (Oriental Dentist). He would not see these plays performed on the stage in his lifetime.

By the year 1870, he started a career in periodical press and became chief editor of several periodicals: *Poğ aravodyan* (Morning Clarion), *Yeprad* (Euphrat), *Meğu* (Bee), *Şoğokortı* (The Flatterer), *Tadron* (Theater), *Luys* (Light), *Tadron barekam mankanç* (Theater, Friend of Children), and *Higar* (Ahikar). Besides these Armenian periodicals, he also published a Turkish periodical called *Tiyatro,* which was not Turkish version of *Tadron*: most of the articles specially written for publication in this periodical.

Hagop Baronian is generally known as the father of satirical literature in Armenian. In the first years of his career as an editor, he put his ideas and critiques on social and political situation of the empire into words without restriction. After 1877, however, because of the war between the Ottomans and Russia, censorship and oppressions was imposed on the press.

In 1881, he was elected to the Armenian national assembly as the representative of the city of Edirne. He continued publishing some of his important works until he died in 1891: *Kağakavaruteyan vnasnere* (Disadvantages of Courtesy), *Artnin tasaranner* (Domestic Scenes), *Ahtabanutin baroyakan* (Moral Pathology), *Hosakçutik mereloç* (Dialogues of Death), *Bağdasar Ağpar* (*Uncle Baltazar*), *Medzabadiv muratsganner* (The Honorable Beggars), *Azkayin Çoçer* (*Armenian Big-Wigs*), and *Bduyd mı Bolso tağeun meç* (A walk in the Quarters of Constantinople).

As Kevork B. Bardakjian wrote, Baronian was a smart journalist who observed his time carefully and regularly shared his impressions and opinions with public in local or foreign periodicals (25-26). I will summarize his opinions on the crisis of Ottoman Empire in the next two sections:

First, I will try to show the greater picture drawn by Baronian: his opinions on the Armenian National Constitution (*Nizamname-i Millet-i Ermeniyan*), the unjust internal policy of Ottomans in the eastern provinces of the empire, foreign policy of the great powers as they relate to Ottoman Armenians, and incompetent leadership within the Armenian community of the Ottoman Empire.

Subsequently, I will illustrate his approach to the emerging crisis in the empire drawing on examples selected from his only Turkish periodical, *Tiyatro.*

5.2.1.2 Macro Cosmos: The Greater Picture of the Eastern Crisis (1872-1880)

Hagop Baronian is known as the most famous satirical writer in the Armenian language, but few researchers have written about him as a journalist and observer of his time. Kevork B. Bardakjian is one of them. In his 1977 unpublished doctoral dissertation at Oxford titled "Hagop Baronian's Political and Social Satire," the first part concerns the political satire of Hagop Baronian. Bardakjian used not only articles published in Ottoman Empire but also others among periodicals of the Russian Armenians.

Bardakjian argues that Hagop Baronian wrote political satire between the years 1868-1884; later because of censorship, he abandoned this kind of article. According to him, Baronyan's career as a political satirist had four, distinct periods (17):

1   From 1868 to 1872, he focused on attempts to reform the Armenian Constitution.

2   From 1872 to 1875, he criticized Ottoman domestic policy, especially in eastern provinces with large Armenian populations which he called Armenia as a geographical territory.

3   From 1875 to 1878, he wrote about the Eastern Crisis, which started with revolts in the Balkan provinces and finished with the Congress of Berlin.

4   From 1878 to 1884, he was interested in the relations between the Ottomans and the great powers in a period in which reformist hope ended.

First, why did Baronian believe that reform was needed in eastern provinces? He was maintaining that in contrast to developments in the capital of the empire, the living conditions of Armenians in the eastern provinces were terrible. Besides this, the political and intellectual power of the community was concentrated at the center and its connection with the provinces was weak; in other words, the powerful figures among the Ottoman Armenian community had no ideas about the situation of Armenians in provinces. The only sources for Baronian to take information about provinces were regular reports of the patriarchy and interviews with immigrants coming from the eastern provinces. He reached the conclusion that Armenians living in the provinces did not even have such basic human rights as the right to live and own private property, the right to a just system of taxation, the right of reli-

gion and belief, and the right of democracy. Baronian, as a typical liberal individual of his time, argued that the government needed to guarantee these basic rights by law (27-28).

The Armenian Constitution could provide this guarantee of rights. First, it must be emphasized there is a debate about this historical document in Ottoman society. Armenians understood it as the first constitution of the empire, but for Ottoman authorities, it was only a regulation (*Nizamname-i Millet-i Ermeniyan*). That is to say, for the Ottoman government the regulation would arrange internal issues of Armenian community, but would never change the legal status of the community with respect to the empire. On the other hand, Armenians believed that it would change the destiny of the Armenian nation that had lived for centuries under the pressure of a religious majority to whom belonged state power.

Baronian believes the constitutional movement was important because he had idealized a political regime that can be called "public democracy." For him, the source of all power comes from public, and thus the public had to own its power. This liberal idea was derived from J. J. Rousseau's conception of the "social contract." Political leaders were representatives of people, and they had to give account to their electors (31-33).

Second, in contrast with many Muslim intellectuals of his time, he thought that there is no place for religion in the democratic decision-making process of a modern political system. The Armenian Constitution led to important modifications in the political structure of the community, and non-religious members among the leadership gained stature. However, the status of the Armenian community within the Ottoman legal system remained a religious group *(millet)*, and this was the actual dilemma of the constitution.

For Baronian, the meaning of nationalism was to serve the community to solve the problems blocking political, economic, and cultural development, but he was against the flag-wavering nationalists of his time. He never defended separatist ideas, instead supporting reforms that would improve the conditions of all living in the Ottoman Empire, Armenians included. The constitution would be a good step in this struggle.

However, Baronian's dream of constitutional reform did not last long. First, he understood that the leadership of the community did not have enough executive power to solve problems and make progress on wide-

ranging reform. The legal status and the financial sources of the community were insufficient to undertake a considerable program of reform. Moreover, because of defects in the electoral system, representatives of the community were incompetent as decision makers and executors. They did not feel to give account to their constituencies and behave in a bureaucratic and authoritarian manner toward the common people of the community.

When his expectation of constitutional reform waned, Baronian focused on Ottoman policies, especially in the eastern provinces (59-107). Political and economic conditions of the empire had been getting worse day by day as Ottoman society started feeling the effects of the global economic crisis. Unemployment rates were rising. People could not pay their taxes. The state had been trying to find ways to increase venues and could not balance the budget because of its failures to get enough foreign debt. Military effected conditions negatively, and a financial crunch was approaching step by step. Requests for reform in the eastern provinces were never taken into consideration as both the Ottoman state and foreign powers were more interested in the problems of the Western provinces. Under these conditions, Baronian thought the only hope for considerable, general reform in the empire was pressure by foreign powers.

After the political crisis that emerged in the Balkan provinces in 1875, Baronian focused on international relations between the Ottomans and the great powers like Britain, Germany, Austria, and Russia (108-139). In the beginning of the crisis, he thought the intervention of foreign powers would bring about a wide-ranging reform movement in the empire. However, he soon became aware that the conditions of people living in the Ottoman Empire were not interesting to these powers; their only concern was their own political and economical benefit. Because of their own political and economic rivalries, there was no unified front pressuring the palace to reform and the Ottomans used these rivalries to create strategies of resistance to foreign intervention. Thus, he started criticizing the great powers' foreign policies related to the Empire. Germany supported the war in Balkan provinces, while the separatist movements were encouraged by Russia. In he beginning, Austria opposed Russian expansionism in the Balkan territories and defended Ottoman unity, but later changed its foreign policy and supported territorial separations from the empire. The only power that defended Ottoman

unity was Britain but in those days the foreign policies of the British Empire were in flux as liberal and conservative representative of the ruling classes argued amongst themselves. As a result, Britain also could not make an effective stance against the other powers to preserve Ottoman unity. Baronian was frustrated by these developments and lost hope for serious reform in the empire.

5.2.1.3 Micro Cosmos: Perspectives from *Tiyatro* on the Footsteps of the Crisis (1874-1875)

Tiyatro was a Turkish satirical magazine published by Hagop Baronian in 1874 and 1875. According to Dyer, "satire" as a literary branch, was rooted in the ancient world but was reborn as a distinct, modern genre in the liberal atmosphere of nineteenth century Europe after the 1830s (Dyer 1997, 35-36). He makes a distinction between the terms "satiric" and "satire," and argues that satiric expression is "one of the four narrative categories of literature prior to the ordinary literary genres" (the others being romantic, tragic, and comic). There are two essential elements of all satiric creation: object of attack and wit or humor founded on fantasy, the grotesque or the absurd (Dyer, 31). Dyer defines the term "satire" as "a sophisticated discursive assault as literary mode of expression" and historicizes its development. According to him, from ancient to modern times, there is a tradition of satire in the history of literature. Ancient forerunners such as Juvenal and Horace continued to be models for modern satire writers but the unique product of the modern times was "radical modern satire."

Dyer maintains that radical satire in Britain, which condemned the nobility and defended parliamentary reformism, is the most political type of modern satiric literature (73-74). He describes the features of radical satire by applying Mikhail Bakhtin's analysis of "carnivalesque" (109). Bakhtin's "carnivalesque" and modern British satire have elements in common, such as:

1 parodic representations,
2 inversions of hierarchy,
3 rhetorical celebrations of disorder,
4 juxtaposition of narrative voices and subgenres,
5 pluralism and internationalism (globalism).

Dyer argues that these shared elements of "carnivalesque" and nineteenth century radical, British satire are actually the manifestation of a more essential commonality: their key product is "polyphonic discourse." That is to say, they use more than one narrator juxtapose statements with opposing meanings. Therefore, the radicalism of nineteenth century British satire is the result of the "politics of the style": "Political meanings borne by specific discursive procedures" (31).

In the Ottoman Empire, the tradition of modern satire started in Armenian periodicals such as *Zvarcağos* or *Meğu* in the mid-1850s. *Diyojen,* published by Teodor Kasap in 1869, is accepted as the first Turkish satiric periodical. Because of censorship and systematic bans, Kasap shut it down and published several other periodicals such as *Çıngıraklı Tatar* and *Hayal*. According to Kevork Bardakjian, Baronian's *Tiyatro* was the fifth Turkish satirical periodical following Zakarya Efendi's *Latife* published in 1873. Its first issue was published on 1 April 1874 and the last one was dated 12 October 1875 (Bardakjian 1986, 57-58).

According to Akşin Somel, the decade from 1868 to 1878 was the second period of Ottomanism as a political ideology; it followed the first period starting in the 1830s, which Somel called as "authoritarian stage of state Ottomanism" (Somel 2001(a), 88). The most important characteristic of the second stage of Ottomanism was the increasing interest of Ottoman intellectuals in public opinion. The first reason for the boom in satirical periodicals in the Ottoman Empire was the strategy of Young Ottomans to shape public opinion using mass media. However, there are other factors including relatively lax censorship and technological advancements from European metropolises that made possible lithographic tabloid press (Wiese Forbes 2010).

Baronian's *Tiyatro* was a periodical that contained short comedies; pieces from theater works and anonymous dialogues; short descriptions of social life in Istanbul; fictional letters, advertisements, telegrams, and on the last page of every issue, a caricature by Berberyan. The variety of content brought about a multi-vocal or polyphonic discourse reminiscent of the style of contemporary British satiric periodicals. According to Bardakjian, this periodical played an important role during its publication time for specific reasons (Bardakjian 1986, 58-59):

1   *Tiyatro* was one of the first attempts in the Ottoman Empire to transcend the wall dividing Ottoman society into traditional, independent communities. Baronian referred to his readers as modern Ottoman citizens.

2   It was a prosaic, satiric periodical, and Baronian used day-to-day language for literary ends just as other satiric periodicals of the time. But he avoided the didactic tone adopted by other periodicals.

3   For *Tiyatro*, the concept of stagecraft was not only a metaphor, but determined the structure of the periodical. The source of its polyphonic discourse was the choice of the author to use dramatic writing techniques.

Because of its multi-vocal character, *Tiyatro* presents of the emerging socio-economic crisis in the Ottoman Empire. The material in *Tiyatro* on the Ottoman crisis can be placed in five categories:

1   General critiques on the capitalist market system.
2   Formal reception of Western culture and lifestyles in Ottoman society.
3   Signs of an emerging economic crisis.
4   New methods of surviving and resisting the conditions created by the crisis.
5   Moral failures of Ottoman individuals trying to survive the crisis.

For Baronian, the capitalist market economy was the source of the anti-humanitarian values that dominated contemporary civilization. For example, he criticized new sectors such as the stock exchange, selling insurance, and advertising. In a piece written as anonymous dialogue, one speaker advises his friend to buy insurance for his sick son in order to profit from his death (*Tiyatro,* no. 2). In the other dialogue, a man talks about the new methods of stores in Beyoğlu that employ beautiful girls and women to compel men walking along the streets to enter shop (*Tiyatro,* no. 2). If there were rules in this new system, rookie Ottoman entrepreneurs did not know them. In another dialogue, a man asked his friend about the rules governing the rises dips of the stock exchange market. His friend said that if there is money in the market, it will rise; if not it will fall. The man does not understand and asks again: "I didn't have money this week, and it fell, but I had money last week it still fell again, so did someone steal my money?" (*Tiyatro,* no. 22) In a long dialogue, a man argues that building a joint stock company is one of the most important signs of civilization. However, when the potential stock-

holders ask the reasons, he makes long, meaningless speeches that say nothing. In the end of this long piece, which continued across four issues, the potential stockholders refuse to buy since the man could not satisfy them. Especially in this long dialogue, Baronian maintains that the capitalist market economy is nothing than discursive deception (*Tiyatro,* no. 79-82).

Baronian and his contemporaries were not against "modernization," but in most satirical periodicals, the writers criticized implicitly imitating or copying Western societies. According to them, over-imitation of the West had brought about an erosion of Ottoman values, loss of identity, and corruption, and they had a strong dislike of Western cultural imperialism (Özdiş 2010, 146). In a dialogue in *Tiyatro* called "The Trouble of Paul and Virginie," Baronian caricaturizes young Ottoman girls and boys who read French novels and imitate the life style of Europeans by their fathers' dime (*Tiyatro,* no. 3). In a short comedy called "The Dance" (Ayak Oyunu), Baronian jokes about dandies of Istanbul who are obsessive imitators of the West (*Tiyatro,* no. 4). In a dialogue among a merchant, his wife, and his daughter, the audience sees how the extreme consumption habits of the families lead to economic collapse of families (*Tiyatro,* no. 11).

In some issues of *Tiyatro*, Baronian wrote some pieces about the economic crisis of the Ottoman Empire. In a short article called "The Scarcity," for example, Baronian gives information on the famine of 1873-74 in Anatolian provinces, which was caused by a bad harvest and high grain prices. He recommends that victims of the famine can survive for two or three months more if people collect relief aid for them in Istanbul (*Tiyatro,* no. 7). In a short comedy, "The Talented Servant" (Müstaid Uşak), Baronian parodies Muhsin Efendi, who is a bankrupt merchant trying to run away from his creditors by the help with his smart servant Hasan Agha (*Tiyatro,* no. 12). In a dialogue between the two merchants, they maintain that cash safes can be used as hiding places because they are empty (*Tiyatro,* no. 18). In a short funny piece, Baronian manifests the direction of progress in the country: Ladies are moving towards fashion houses, merchants towards jail, bankruptcy towards shops, money towards Europe, houses towards auction (*Tiyatro,* no. 20).

A dialogue titled "Bank without Interest" makes fun of the mentality of common Ottoman people with regard to the global economic crisis. A man

who bought shares of the Austrian-Turkish Bank in 1871 complains to his friend:

> - This bank was to develop agriculture and the transportation; we bought its shares, but we met with losses. There is a crisis in Vienna.
> - Who is this crisis?
> - I don't know, but if you look at my losses, he is not a good man.
> - Is he still in Vienna now?
> - Most probably, because if he leaves the city my shares will increase in value.
> - So, let's go there with some friends and drive him away.
> (*Tiyatro,* no. 46).

Another important subject in *Tiyatro* is the methods of survival under conditions of economic crisis. According to Baronian, if someone wants to survive, he should not sit and give the first order, otherwise he will have to pay the bill; he should not use the term "bankruptcy", but "liquidation"; he should not look at his back to avoid his creditors' eyes; he should look at his watch and drop off if he has guests for dinner; and if his fez wears out, he should go out without a hat like a European (*Tiyatro,* no. 7). In a short piece called "The Ways of Making Money" (Para Kazanmanın Yolları), Baronian advises readers to go to bed after dinner so they will dream of hidden treasure and finally take it out. In a short absurd comedy, a dandy father and son waltz with their creditors in order to put off paying their loans, the creditors set their hearts on the collective dance and forget the debts (*Tiyatro,* no. 45).

All of these examples show us that Baronian as a smart observer of his time presented the crisis of Ottoman Empire started in the early 1870s as economic, social, and moral corruption. On one hand, he wrote political articles about the big picture and tried to show the role of the Ottoman government, local Armenian leaders and European powers in the crisis. On the other hand, he could analyze the destructive effects of the crisis on individuals in an ironic way. According to him, the baseless pseudo-modernization of the empire had finished and the cicadas of summer had to face the harsh conditions of the global winter. Nevertheless, the people who were living under the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire would be negatively affected by the changing situations.

5.2.2 *The Outer Temporality of Reader*

Baronian's comedy, *The Honorable Beggars,* represents the Armenian's situation in the time of system crisis in the Ottoman Empire. Analyzing this well-structured comedy, the audience finds the signs of the collapse of the Ottoman Armenian's modernization and enlightenment, which had lived a golden age in the period of integration with the growing world economy in the early nineteenth century.

5.2.2.1 Good Times

There are some determining causes of the Armenian Enlightenment in the nineteenth century:

1   Integration to the world economy and signing of free trade treaties caused significant growth in the Ottoman economy.
2   Increasing job opportunities changed social and demographic conditions in big port cities.
3   Emergence of a news-printing sector brought about progress in freedom of speech and a new political strategy for intellectuals to manufacture public opinion.
4   Liberalization and democratization processes were realized in Ottoman political life.
5   A new generation of intellectuals *-Jeune Arménien-* emerged and were strong with respect to the cultural and political issues of the Ottoman Armenian community.

Let's consider these one by one.

1   I will start with the first lines of the play to understand the invisible codes lying behind simple and short expressions:

> A man is standing on the dock at Galatia, having just gotten off the steamer from Trebizond. It is 1870 something…

First, I have to mention the steamers' role with respect to the issue. As Zürcher mentioned:

> (…) after the free-trade treaties with major European states in 1838-1841, the incorporation of Ottoman economy into the capitalist system progressed faster than before. (Zürcher 2004, 66)

On the other hand, for İlber Ortaylı, incorporation started much earlier and the goal of free-trade treaties such as the Baltalimanı Treaty (1838) was to provide a legal basis for foreign trade, which was taking place illegally. (Ortaylı 1995, 92)

Again, for Zürcher:

> Ottoman foreign trade expanded at a rate of over 5 per cent a year, doubling the volume of trade every 11 to 13 years. (Zürcher 2004, 66)

New transportation opportunities played a key role in this rapid expansion of the Ottoman foreign trade:

> From the late 1870s onwards, steamships began to dominate the long-distance traffic in the eastern Mediterranean. Like the railway companies, steamship companies were almost exclusively foreign owned, except for the lines in and around the capital. In combination with the railway lines connecting the ports to the productive hinterland, the steamships speeded up the integration of some areas and some sectors of Ottoman economy into capitalist system (82).

Trebizond was one area that became a center of transit passage for international trade between Iran and Europe:

> Trabzon shipping, in the period 1800-1914, climbed from 15 to 500 tons, as the value increased seven times from 1840-1912. (Keyder, Özveren and Quataert 1993, 531)

The first company that ran a steamship line from Trebizond to Constantinople was founded by English capital in 1836. One year later, an Ottoman steamship company followed it.

During the Crimean War, Trebizond became an important center of supply for the Ottoman and European armies. Increasing commercial opportunities and trade activities brought about demographic changes in the city. Local people from rural areas immigrated to Trebizond, and the number of

inhabitants reached 55 thousand, 6 percent of which were Armenians. Armenians were usually employed in foreign trade and great number of them accumulated great amount of wealth as a result. By the 1870s, after the golden age of commerce, the importance of the city as a local center of international trade declined as did the population. Even during this period of depopulation, non-Muslims from rural areas who became rich by through opportunities of trade generally stayed in the city (Turgay 1994, 66-67).

2   Porters are also symbolic figures of the city of Constantinople in the nineteenth century. The main sources of manpower for this job were eastern cities like Erzurum, Bitlis, Van, Muş, and Elazığ (Harput), in general, Armenians and Kurds were employed in different parts of the cities (Çiçek 2009). According to Şevket Pamuk, during the nineteenth century the Ottoman population in urban areas increased from 18 to 23 percent, but we do not know the exact numbers of the people employed in different sectors (Pamuk 2014, 72). Most immigrants from eastern cities were coming to te commercially-active port cities for job opportunities and better living conditions. After the abolishment of the Janissary corps in 1826, Sultan Mahmoud sent Kurdish porters out of Istanbul because of their previous affiliation with the Janissaries. As a result, Armenian porters dominated the sector for a long time.

3   As Erik Jan Zürcher mentioned, regular printing of news in the Turkish language was part of the centralization project of Mahmud II with the publication of the official newspaper, *Takvim-i Vekayi,* in 1831. The first non-governmental Turkish newspaper was *Tercüman-ı Ahval,* and it started being published in the 1860s by an important Ottoman intellectual of time, İbrahim Şinasi. İlber Ortaylı accepts the emergence of this newspaper as the starting point of political criticism in the Ottoman Empire and as a step toward modernization. On the other hand, the Armenian community living in Ottoman Empire had long before begun to publish newspapers and periodicals. The first Armenian newspaper of the community in Constantinople was *Tidak Püzantayan* (The Observer of Byzantium) published as early as 1812 (Tuğlacı 2004, 467). However, Ortaylı mentions that this newspaper was published in Venice by Father İnciciyan, who was a Mıkhitarist priest, and most of the readers were from among a small circle of Catholic Armenians in

97

Constantinople (Ortaylı 1995, 37). According to him, the first Armenian newspaper in the Ottoman Empire was an Armenian version of *Takvim-i Vekayi,* and Arsen Yarman corroborates (Yarman 2012, 185). On the other hand, by the year 1850, more than 30 newspapers had been publishing by foreigners and non-Muslims in the empire.

4   Liberalization of political life also hit a high in the Empire in the nineteenth century, and because of the political activities of people from different communities, a constitution was declared in 1876 and the sultan granted permission to open a national assembly with representatives throughout the empire. Armenians were the forerunners in political activism. Long before the Ottoman constitution was declared, the Armenians of the empire prepared a special regulation for their community, which the government officially in 1863. Greeks and Jews followed them, also receiving special constitutions:

> (…)the *millets* achieved a degree of formal institutionalization they had never had in the classical Ottoman time (Zürcher 2004, 65).

The declaration of the Ottoman constitution and official opening of the national assembly were the peak of such democratization movements in the empire. With its colorful, cosmopolitan, ethnic, and religious make up, the assembly of the empire was maybe unique in its time (Ortaylı 1995, 245).

5   In his eye-opening book *Armenians and Modernity,* Boghos Levon Zekiyan summarizes the phases of the Armenian Enlightenment (*Zartonk*) and he shows that in nineteenth century Constantinople was the indisputable cultural capital of Armenian renaissance (Zekiyan 2001). In those days, the children of wealthy Armenian families in Constantinople often received education in European metropolises such as Paris, Vienna, and Venice, returning to the capital with liberal ideas for transforming their community and Ottoman society, as well (Yumul and Bali 2001, 363). The equivalent of this group in Muslim society were the Young Ottomans (or *Jeune Turc* in French). Although from different social backgrounds, *Jeune Arméniens* and Young Ottomans had some features and objectives in common because they were the same age:

◆   First, they aspired to produce knowledge, and all believed that knowledge could change the society.

- ❖ Second, they thought the most significant obstruction for social progress was ignorance and they prioritized making ordinary people conscious of their situation using the press, literature, theater.
- ❖ Finally, they had a critical mindset, which Şerif Mardin called as "culture of critical discourse" (Mardin 2006, 441-454).

On the other hand, there was a definite distinction between them:

For the Jeune Arméniens, the salvation of their millet was not identical to the survival of the state. By contrast, the main objective for Young Ottomans was:

…instilling a true feeling of citizenship and loyalty to the state among all Ottoman subjects, Muslim and non-Muslim (Zürcher 2004, 71).

Baronian observed the *Jeune Arméniens* and disliked these men who were a crude imitation of Western culture. Ortaylı makes a distinction between two types of Tanzimat intellectuals using characters from Ahmet Mithat's novel, *Felatun Bey ve Rakım Efendi,* as examples. According to him, there were also well-educated and skilled intellectuals among modern bureaucrats (Ortaylı 1995, 217).

5.2.2.2 Bad Times

By 1870's, the conditions, which made it possible to realize an enlightenment movement for Armenians, changed quickly:

1 The economy of the Empire declined simultaneously with the "Great Depression" of 1873 in Europe as Zürcher mentioned:

A combination of drought and floods led to a catastrophic famine in Anatolia in 1873 and 1874. This caused the killing-off of livestock and a depopulation of rural areas through death and migration to the towns. Apart from human misery, the result was a fall in tax income, which the government tried to compensate for by raising taxes on surviving population, thus contributing to its misery. (…) it also looked to the European markets to provide it with loans, they were not forthcoming. (Zürcher 2004, 76)

The situation of the city that Apisogham Agha visited was not the same compared with the 30 years ago. In the first period of the integration to the global economy, because of rising global food prices Ottoman economy had grown rapidly. Pamuk shows that GNP rates in Ottoman Empire during nineteenth century increased 50 or 60 percent in general, but these rates were under the global averages. On the other hand, each part of the Empire did not grow in the same proportion and port cities, as I mentioned above, took much bigger shares from the incomes of international trade (Pamuk 2014, 154-155). Therefore, the city of Constantinople between years 1840-1870 was one of the richest and economically developed parts of the Empire. We can observe the change of the social status of new riches of the capital by looking to new regions in the city in which people from high income groups were living together (Ortaylı 1995, 226-227). Even the port cities in Anatolia such as Trebizond turned to places of luxury consumption (Turgay 1994, 66). However, by the economic crises of 1873, the flow turned and each part of the society began to remember those good old days in a nostalgic manner.

2   In the reign of Sultan Hamid number of Kurdish porters started ascending again, they became main rivals for Armenian porters in Constantinople by the support of the Sultan personally (Çiçek, 2009). When *The Honorable Beggars* was written in the first years of 1880s, the conditions in Constantinople were in downgrade for Armenian porters.

3   All of the first newspapers and periodicals suffered from strict censorship and financial problems. Especially in 1880s, there is an insufferable state oppression on the national press. Under Hamidian regime, state was usually declaring some lists such as "dangerous words forbidden to use" and "the books to be fired" (Ortaylı 1995, 176; Demirel 2007, 173-185)Hagop Baronian's periodicals also banished several times during these period and it was not so easy to cope with the financial difficulties (Bardakjian 1986, 58). Because of this strict state control over the press and deep financial problems of newspapers, editors started putting an emphasis on "non-dangerous issues" and news for advertising purposes.

4   When Baronian wrote his satiric novel, this democratic institution has just vanished and people had to wait for reopening of it for 30 years. However, Baronian preferred to turn his arrows not to the government, to his own

people. In the play, Manoug Agha tells his activities to his wife with these words:

> We finally finished work on council today. The election will be this Sunday, and I must say that all the candidates are fine upright men. Toros Agha offered me a few drinks, and was after me to support his candidates. But I voted for my own people since they entertain me with raki every night, and are good and honorable men, and don't steal from treasury like others… (Baronian 1980, 18-19)

Manoug Agha talks too much and does nothing; this is the main critique of Baronian to the leading figures of his community. Normally Armenian people created the first modern and well-organized community of the Empire (Artinian 2004, 122-123). However, the efforts of the forerunners to reach in a democratic society wasted by future generations and they will understand what they lost later but in a very tragic way.

5 When Apisoghom visited the capital, Armenian intellectuals had lost their power in social and political life in the Empire. After the Ottoman-Russian war of 1877-1878, when Abdul Hamid started controlling all country by using his power as the sultan and the caliph, he expatriated important members of Young Ottoman movement. Furthermore, usual pressure on press, censorship and a wide network of Sultan's secret police organization and espionage system were typical policies of Hamidian era.

Another factor of big catastrophe in the capital was economic depression that we discussed previously. In the play, the Poet summarizes the conditions of the Armenian intellectuals during the reign of Sultan Hamid in his dialog with Apisghom Agha very well:

> I have written some patriotic poems… exquisite pieces… beautiful lines… in which imagination, emotion, spirit, excitement, take wng and soar. (…) Our people do not recognize their value and significance. They dismiss them as adolescent exercises and abandon their author to starvation and neglect. (Baronian 1980, 36).

In the dark atmosphere of the city, all of the visitors ask for the money to Agha as the honorable beggars; all of them had lost their idealistic beliefs.

According to Ohannes Kılıçdağı, this is a situation that could be named as "the end of the Armenian Enlightenment" (Kılıçdağı 2015, 59-61). He argues that the members of the greater Armenian community of nineteenth century who were living in a dispersed settlement from Venice to Madras, from Istanbul to Tiflis, from Isfahan to Vienna, although they lived in different countries in which different languages were spoken and people had different cultures, could imagine that a common and universal modern Armenian identity is possible to be established. The most important ideal which unite them is will power of freedom but they were not agreeing on the way to gain freedom as a nation. While Western Armenian intellectuals who were living in the big cities defended a liberal project of citizenship and democracy, nationalist Eastern Armenians argued that without an independent powerful political body, that is to say a modern nation-state it would be impossible to defend nation's rights. Western liberals thought that by the help of the modernized Ottoman bureaucracy and the European Powers support, their project would meet with success. Unfortunately, they erred and because of the changing global and domestic conditions neither Ottoman state nor the Great Powers did not give hand to their project. In contrast, nationalist ideas of the Eastern Armenian intellectuals succeed to reach out common Armenian people living in the Eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Especially because of the violent state policies in 1890's, nationalist and separatist ideas became more popular than liberal ones; hence, 20th century Ottoman Empire is a history of struggling nation-state projects.

Baronian's comedy throws the conditions of liberal Armenian intellectuals, who lost the struggle of turning their country into a more democratic and free place, into sharp relief. He prefers to focus on these leading figures' frailty and incompetency as the cause of their failure. We know that he was aware of the changing conditions of the time, the big system crisis of Ottoman Empire, crucial socio-economic problems, which will lead a big world war in the future, and hypocritical imperialistic policies of the Great Powers. On the other hand, for him, this tragic defeat of Armenian enlightenment preeminently was caused by the non-proactive acts of the leaders and intellectuals of Ottoman Armenian community who did not give importance anything accept their personal interests.

Kılıçdağı summarizes the situation with these words:

Ottoman Armenians, as a community which had newspapers, modern schools, societies and the capability to produce the discursive power needed to corroborate its demands of freedom and equality with the actual political and philosophical discourses, received attention and antagonism of the state and the neighboring communities of the Empire; but they didn't have a preponderant political power, neither armed or not, to support their demands, as a result they became the victims of the antagonism which they received. (Kılıçdağı 2015, 61)

5.2.2.3 The Time of the Crisis

As I mentioned in pages 27-28, in Hamidian Era there was a absolute system crisis: Economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system and political crisis in goal-attainment sub-system are related to *system integration*. Legitimization crisis in the integration sub-system and motivation crisis in latent pattern sub-system are associated with *social integration*.

Abdülhamid's policies to provide system and social integrations led to the fadeaway of Armenian Enlightenment. His censorship mechanism, secret police organization, pressure on the opposition in the country wiped out the base of all freedoms including freedom of speech and finished the process of liberalization and democratization of the political life. The global economic crisis and its ruinous effects in the Ottoman land hardened the trouble. As Baronian's metaphor shows, under these conditions, the leading figures of the Armenian Enlightenment turned to the beggars who were trying to survive

In the opening scene of *The Honorable Beggars*, when Apisoghom Agha left the steamship at Galatia, he could not know what kind of city he came. Cultural enlightenment was on the wane because of the Ottoman system crisis, experience of democracy had created a disappointment and disappeared, efforts of non-Muslim subjects for freedom had turned to a struggle of survival. It is possible to summarize the essential idea underlying the situation with the idiom "the calm before the storm". Therefore, Ortaylı describes the nineteenth century for Ottomans "neither dramatic, nor grotesk but a tragic" age: It was such an age that a society had been running to its inevitable fate steadly (Ortaylı 1995, 25).

6

Conclusion

For me, history is the total of all possible histories. The only error, in my view, would be to choose one of these histories to the exclusion of all others. That was, and always will be, the cardinal error of historisizing.

–Braudel, *On History*

From the viewpoint of possible-worlds semantics, this [standard] formulation [that history is reconstruction of the past] is unobjectionable as long as we understand that historical reconstruction does not re-create the past in actuality, but in represented possibility.

–Dolezel, *Possible Worlds of Fiction and History*

C an a work of literature provide researchers of the past with historical facts about the time and society it was written in or on? Some theoreticians such as Doritt Cohn argue that works of fiction about the past or written in the past, and works of history both present narratives of the past. The difference between them is that fiction does not have to be based on true

events or real characters from the past; but the latter has to refer to historical sources from past to show that the events and characters are true. However, neither can escape being discursive narratives.

We can learn from a work of literature on the past or written in the past, but we have to remember that information taken from a work of art is subjective, seen from its creator's eyes, and spoken from her mouth. However, works of literature written in the past are primary sources for researchers who study the mentalities and approaches of people who lived in past, as well as the expression of the general ideas and popular or avant-garde usage of language of the time. In this context, as Werner T. Angress said, though the names are fictitious, the events are not.

In this thesis, I aim to show the approach of two leading intellectual figures from the late nineteenth century to the crisis in the Ottoman system in their plays. These two playwrights, Şemsettin Sami and Hagop Baronian, are characteristic of their contemporaries in certain respects. Firstly, they were, as the followers of the first generation of modern, "enlightened" Ottoman intellectuals, interested in politics and using public opinion as a modern way of intervening in political life. They wrote articles in newspapers and periodicals, and created works in literary media such as novels, short stories, poems, and plays.

Secondly, they were supporters of the ideals of a liberal and democratized modern state that would respect the fundamental rights of citizens such as the right of free speech. Therefore, they were in favor of a constitutional parliamentary system as exemplified by the British Empire.

Both came from the provinces to the capital, and because of their early experiences and education out of the center, they did not have access to engage the Ottoman core, which dominated and determined political life in the empire. Sami, though a well-educated Muslim officer, was never promoted to higher positions; he remained a middle-rank bureaucrat who spent his time on cultural works. Baronian neither joined the jeunes Arméniens nor became a popular supporter of restricted Amiras, the Armenian nobles. He criticized their admiration of the West as imitation and disinterest in the true problems of their community.

On the other hand, these men, who came into the capital at an early age, had very different backgrounds. They were members of different millets, that

is to say, they came from different ethnic and religious groups in the empire. Sami was Muslim, but from the Bektashi order. Members of his family were leading figures of Albanian nationalism. These characteristics were disadvantageous at a time when the Ottoman government was planning to create an Islamist-Union to assume all authority under a powerful Sunni caliph, and therefore opposed all nationalisms and sectarianisms.

Baronian was a Christian Armenian, but never supported leading figures of that community, who had strong relations with the palace, and he argued that these strong people never used their power and prestige for the benefit of their community. His situation became more difficult after the 1878 Berlin Congress, which is accepted as the starting point of the "Armenian Question" as an international issue of the Ottoman Empire. By the 1880s, pressure emerged on the Ottoman Armenian community, especially on intellectuals living in the capital.

Both men were aware of the system crisis of the Ottoman Empire during the 1870s and the 1880s, but their approaches were dissimilar. According to Sami, the crisis was caused by political issues. The unity of the empire had weakened over the last century, and to keep it alive, governing classes had to find ways of regenerating the loyalty of the people living under the reign of the Ottoman sultans. Sami, as a Muslim subject of the empire coming from the Balkan Peninsula, was aware of the power of nationalist movements in the new age. He thought that any political attempt to keep the empire united could not ignore this power. His advice for a resolution was complex: an empire that provides Islamic unity among different Muslim nations in other words, an empire that would not ignore national identities but unify the different nationalities under the flag of Islam.

Baronian focused on socio-economic issues as well as political ones. He was conscious that the reasons behind the crisis of the Ottoman Empire were not one dimensional. The primary actors were the imperialist Western powers and Russia; oppressive Ottoman powers; and importantly, incompetent leading figures in the Armenian community. The Ottoman Armenians could take advantage of the opportunity to construct a modern, social organization during the first half of the century. Complacent leaders in the community did not take the chance to guarantee the community's rights and freedoms. They thought that foreign powers' and Ottoman state's interests would al-

ways be more important than those of Armenians in a remorseless world in time of crisis. However, in his satirical writings, he targeted the faults of Armenian leading figures, who directly or indirectly, served the powers that were laying the groundwork for the tragic fall of Ottoman Armenians.

Because of the difference in their approaches to the Ottoman system crisis, the two men preferred to write plays in different genres. Sami wrote a historical drama using Shakespearean methods. He borrowed from the mythology of the Orient to create a contemporary play named Gave. He rewrote part of the well-known story of Ferdowsi's Shehname, turning it into a modern theatrical play. When he wrote the play, the Ottoman Constitution was in force and the parliament was open. Sami tried to warn the public about the dangers of tyrannical governments and the destructive policies of the oppressive monarchs. According to him, it is useless to increase pressure on society to keep the empire united under crisis conditions. Instead, the best policy would be to unite different nations believing in the same religion under a legitimate, fair monarchy that would defend the rights and freedoms of all its subjects.

Baronian, in The Honorable Beggars, preferred to write a comedy focused on socio-economic misery of Armenians living in the capital. The play narrates the destructive results of the emergent crisis, not the reasons for it. We can see that leading figures of a community, turned into wretched beggars, are presented as aimless, desperate outcasts. However, between the lines, it is the author's early warning about the danger concerning a situation in which leading actors in a community have lost hope for the future. Baronian was neither a separatist nor an extreme nationalist. He was a man who only sought his community's welfare. However, he could see that policies of the government that never gave even a flicker of hope to the people would destroy any possibility for the nations of the empire to live together. Baronian was aware, as Mehmet Fatih Uslu mentions, that the time of negotiation had ended, and the age of conflicts was beginning.

There are some thematic similarities and differences in the two plays. First, both depict poverty as the most important signifier of an economic crisis. In Gave, the economic conditions of rural nomads and urban workers; and in The Honorable Beggars, those of urban middle classes are represented. For Sami, the repressive, tyrannical methods of the government are the

main reason for the bad economic conditions, and he argues that liberalization and democratization of the government will lead to better economic conditions. But Baronian is not interested in the reasons for the bad economic conditions. He focuses on the responses of a society that was shaped under free-market conditions as it transitions to the new conditions of a global economic crisis. According to him, no character in his play has the power to solve the system crisis. Moreover, none of them stands as candidate. From this perspective, Sami's play has a sign of hope for changing the situation; Kavah and public forces intervene in the crisis and finish it. On the other hand, in Baronian's play, there is not a grain of hope.

Second, in both plays, written in the last phase of the historical golden age of the liberalism, the audience sees a society in which the mechanisms of political participation have disappeared entirely. In Sami's play, Zohak rules the country with absolutist policies; his regime is oppressive and unjust. Sami focuses on the behaviors of the governing class. In contrast, Baronian is interested in the guests of common people. He criticizes the complacency and irresponsibility of the community members about the workings of the Armenian National Assembly. In Sami's play, the right to participate in the decision making processes is monopolized by a monarch; but in Baronian's, people refuse to use it effectively.

Third, both prefer to speak to their own communities, not to the general public in the empire, but they still talk about common problems. Sami does so through a well-known Oriental myth of the Muslim community in the empire. Baronian's play, on the other hand, is written in Armenian and all characters in the play are Armenians. However, the audience can easily relate the particular situations presented in the plays to the general conditions that all communities deal with.

Sami and Baronian aimed to warn Ottoman governors and the public about the threats of tyrannical mismanagement by writing plays. As might be expected, the state never considered these weak warnings of the two authors, and Sultan Hamid preferred to fight the conditions of the crisis in his own way. Here, the term "crisis" is used in a Habermasian manner as the problems that occur in a social system's sub-systems: economic crisis in the adaptation sub-system, rationality crisis in the goal-attainment sub-system, legitimation crisis in the integration sub-system, and motivation crisis in the

latent pattern sub-system. At the turn of the century, a global system crisis emerged in the transition phase from liberal capitalism to advanced capitalism. According to Habermas, this was different from the earlier system crises, because system crises in modern, liberal capitalist social systems were "absolute system crises." In other words, all sub-systems were in crisis simultaneously.

In the Ottoman case also, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, there was a deep and absolute system crisis. In other words, several problems occurred simultaneously in all sub-systems: economic problems in the adaptation sub-system, political crisis in the goal-attainment sub-system, legitimization crisis in the integration sub-system, and motivation crisis in the latent pattern sub-system. As I mentioned before in pages 27-28, the first two crises are related to "system integration;" the last two crises are associated with "social integration." The trials of solution, like backing away from the Tanzimat concept of Ottoman citizenship and supporting an earlier idea of Muslim union, controlling public opinion and ignoring fundamental rights through strict censorship and a strong secret police organization, and repressing all movements of opposition by force, did not solve the problems. They helped the sultan only by delaying the absolute collapse of the state.

Unfortunately, the advice of alternative intellectuals such as Sami and Baronian were never seriously considered by the government. Instead of liberal and pro-democracy projects, authoritarianism and power relations would determine the events of the last phase of the Ottoman Empire. Şemsettin Sami, in spite of his marvelous cultural support of Turkish nationalism, lived his last days in house arrest as a disgraced Muslim officer of the empire. Baronian's situation was direr; his periodicals were systematically banned during the 1880s and he died destitute at a young age. Their plays were not freely staged in Istanbul theaters until after the "revolution" of 1908.

Bibliography

Akarlı, Engin Deniz. "The Problems of External Pressures, Power Struggles and Budgetary Deficits in Ottoman Politics under Abdulhamid II (1876-1909): Origin and Solutions." PhD. Diss., Princeton University, 1976.

Akçura, Yusuf. *Three Policies*. Translated by David S. Thomas. Accessed July 24, 2015. http://vlib.iue.it/carrie/texts/carrie_books/paksoy-2/cam9.html

Akün, Ömer Faruk. Preface to *Kamus-i Türki,* by Şemseddin Sami. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2009.

Althusser, Louis. *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları.* Translated by Alp Tümertekin. İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları, 2003.

And, Metin. *Tanzimat ve İstibdat Döneminde Türk Tiyatrosu.* Ankara: Türki-ye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1972.

Angress, Werner T. "The Interplay of History and Literature: An Essay." *Monatshefte* 71/4 (1979): 410-416.

Ankersmit, Frank. "The Truth in History and Literature." *Narrative* 18/1 (2010): 29-50.

Artinian, Vartan. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Ermeni Anayasası'nın Doğuşu, 1839-1863.* İstanbul: Aras Yayıncılık, 2004.

Aytaş, Gıyasettin. *Tanzimatta Tiyatro Edebiyatı.* Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2002.

Bardakjian, Kevork B. "Hagop Baronian's Political and Social Satire." PhD diss., St. Anthony College, Oxford, 1978.

Bardakjian, Kovork B. "Baronian's Debt to Molière." *Armenian Studies* 1 (1984): 139-162.

Bardakjian, Kevork B. "Baronyan's Tiyatro." *Klatzor Armenian Review* 2/1 (1986): 57-64.

Baronian, Hagop. *The Honorable Beggars.* Translated and adapted by Jack Antressian. New York: Ashod Press, 1980.

Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Oxford: Routledge 1998.

Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.

Bilmez, Bülent. "Myths of Origin and Autochtony in Şemseddin Sami Frasheri's Texts Contributing to the Construction of Both Albanian and Turkish We's." The text of the research carried out at CAS (2004-2005)

Bilmez, Bülent. "Şemsettin Sami mi Yazdı Bu Sakıncalı Kitabı?" *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* 1 (2005): 97-145.

Cerrahoğlu, A. *Türkiye'de Sosyalizmin Tarihine Katkı*. İstanbul: May Yayınları, 1975.

Coakley, John. *Nationalism, Ethnicity and State*. London: Sage Publications, 2012.

Cohn, Doritt. *The Distinction of Fiction*. Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Çavdar, Tevfik. *Türkiye'de Liberalizm (1860-1990)*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1992.

Çiçek, Nevzat. *Hamallık Mesleğinde Kürt ve Ermeni Rekabeti*. Agos Gazetesi, October 30 and November 6, 2009.

Dağlıoğlu, Hikmet Turhan. *Şemsettin Sami Bey: Hayatı ve Eserleri*. İstanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası, 1934.

Demirel, Fatmagül. *II. Abdülhamit Döneminde Sansür*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 2007.

Dostoyevski, Fyodor. *The Crocodile: The Extraordinary Incident.* Transleted by Constance Garnett. Accessed December 27, 2015. www.online-literature.com/dostoyevsky/3367/

Dyer, Gary. *British Satire and the Politics of Style 1879-1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Ferdowsi. *Shahnames: The Book of the Kings*. Translated by James Atkinson. Auckland: The Floating Press, 2012.

Firdevsi. *Şahname*. Translated by Prof. Dr. Necati Lugal. İstanbul: Kabalcı Kitabevi, 2009.

Forbes, Amy Wiese. *The Satiric Decade: Satire and the Rise of the Republicanism in France*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010.

Fortna, Benjamin C. "II. Abdülhamid'in Saltanatı." *Türkiye Tarihi (1839-2010)*, edited by Metin Kunt, 37-71. Kitap Yayınevi, 2011.

Freeman, Chris and Lauça, Francisco. *As Time Goes by*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Gawrych, George. *The Crescent and the Eagle*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Georgeon, François. *Sultan Abdülhamid*. Translated by İstanbul: Homes Kitabevi, 2006.

Georgeon, François. *Sultan Abdülhamid*. Translated by Ali Berktay. İletişim Yayınları, 2012.

Grant, Teresa and Ravelhofer, Barbara. Introduction to *English Historical Drama (1500-1660)*. Edited by Teresa Grant and Barbara Ravelhofer. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Güllü, Fırat. *Vartovyan Kumpanyası ve Yeni Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: BGST Yayınları, 2008.

Güllü, Fırat. "Gave: Şemsettin Sami'den Osmanlı Tiyatrosunu Politikleştirme Yolunda Özgün Bir Girişim." *Tanzimat ve Edebiyat*. Edited by Mehmet Fatih Uslu and Fatih Altuğ, 359-384. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2014.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Legitimation Crisis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Harvey, A.D. *Literature into History*. Honk Kong: The MacMillan Press, 1988.

Holton R.J. "The Idea of Crisis in Modern Society." *The British Journal of Sociology* 38/4 (1987): 502-520.

İnalcık, Halil. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003.

Karal, Enver Ziya. *Osmanlı Tarihi VIII*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1962 .

Kaymak, Muharrem. "1873-1896 Krizi: Kapitalizmin Uluslararasılaşması ve Osmanlı İktisadiyatı." PhD diss., Hacettepe University Institute of Social Scinces Department of Economics, 2008.

Keyder, Çağlar. *State and Class in Turkey*. London-New York: Verso, 1987.

Keyder, Ç., Özveren, E. and Quataert, D. "Port Cities in the Ottoman Empire." *Port Cities in Eastern Mediterrenean, Rewiev*. Fernand Braudel Centre, 1993.

Kılıçdağı, Ohannes. "Ermeni Aydınlanması: Yeniden Doğuştan Yok Oluşa." *1915: Siyaset, Tehcir, Soykırım*, edited by Fikret Adanır and Oktay Özel. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2015.

Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur and Berge, Metin. *Bolşevik İhtilali ve Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006.

Köroğlu, Erol. "Edebiyatla Tarihin Flörtü". *Milliyet Sanat* 567 (2006).

Köroğlu, Erol. "Milli Hakikat Üzlerine Tezler: Atilla İlhan'ın Gazi Paşa'sında Tarih Yazımı ile Tarihsel Roman Arasında Sınır İhlalleri." *Toplum ve Bilim* 109 (2007).

Kuderet, Cevdet. Preface to *Evhami, or, Bir Türk Molière'i: Feraizcizade Mehmet Şakir,* by Ferizcizade Mehmet Şakir. Varlık Yayınevi, 1974.

Kueffner, Louise M. "Historical Drama." *Modern Language Notes* 20/1 (1905): 22-24.

Kumar, Krishan. "Nation States as Empires, Empires as Nation States." *Theory and Society* 39/2 (2010): 119-143.

Levend, Agah Sırrı. *Şemsettin Sami*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları, 2010.

Lewis, Bernard. *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1970.

Mardin, Şerif. *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2006.

Moretti, Franco. *Signs Taken for Wonders: On the Sociology of Literary Forms*. London-New York: Verso, 2005.

Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: Hil Yayınları, 1995.

Özdiş, Hamdi. *Osmanlı Mizah Basınında Batılılaşma ve Siyaset (1870-1877)*. İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2010.

Özön, Nihat and Dürder, Baha. *Türk Tiyatrosu Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1967.

Pamuk, Şevket. *Türkiye'nin 200 yıllık İktisadi Tarihi*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2014.

Ran, Nazım Hikmet. *To live*. Unknown translator. Accessed July 28, 2015. https://www.marxists.org/subject/art/literature/nazim/

Sami, Şemseddin. *Gave*. Edited by Kemal Bek. İstanbul: Bordo Siyah Yayınları, 2006.

Say, Jean Baptist. *A Treatise on Political Economy*. Translated by C. R. Prinsep. Philedelphia: 1834. E-book edition.

Sevengil, Refik Ahmed. *Yakın Çağlarda Türk Tiyatrosu*. İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1934.

Shaikh, Anwar. "Ekonomik Bunalımlar." *Marksist Düşünce Sözlüğü*. Edited by Tom Bottomor. Translated by Ali Doğan, 180-184. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001.

Daryush, Shayegan. *Yaralı Bilinç: Geleneksel Toplumlarda Kültürel Şizofreni*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1992.

Somel, Akşin. "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlıcılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)." *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi.* Edited by Tanıl Bora and Murat Gültekingil, 88-97. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001(a).

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire (1839-1908).* Leiden: Brill, 2001(b).

Şarasan (Sarkis Tütüncüyan). *Türkiye Ermenileri Sahnesi ve Çalışanları.* İstanbul: BGST Yayınları, 2008.

Tiyatro. 1-86 (1874-1875).

Tuğlacı, Pars. *Tarih Boyunca Batı Ermenileri-1.* İstanbul: Pars Yayın, 2004.

Tural, Şecaattin. *Şemsettin Sami.* İstanbul: Şule Yayınları, 1999.

Turgay, A. Üner. "Tabzon". *Doğu Akdeniz'de Liman Kentleri.* Translated by Gül Çağalı Güven. Edited by Çağlar Keyder et al, 45-74. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1994.

Turner, Bryan S. Preface to New Edition of *The Social System,* by Talcott Parsons. London: Routledge 1991

Uslu, Mehmet Fatih. *Çatışma ve Uzlaşma.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "Geçiş Olarak Bunalım." *Genel Bunalımın Dinamikleri.* Translated by F. Akar, 15-64. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1984.

Yarman, Arsen. *Ermeni Yazılı Kültürü.* İstanbul: Türkiye Ermenileri Patrikliği, 2012.

Yumul, Arus and Bali, Rifat. "Ermeni ve Yahudi Cemaatlerinde Siyasal Düşünceler." *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi.* Edited by Tanıl Bora and Murat Gültekingil, 362-367. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001.

Zekiyan, Boğos Levon. *Ermeniler ve Modernite: Gelenek ve Yenileşme / Özgüllük ve Evrensellik Arasında Ermeni Kimliği.* İstanbul: Aras Yayıncılık, 2001.

Zürcher, Eric Jan. *Turkey: A Modern History*. Leiden: I.B.Tauris 2004. E-
    book version.