

DR. ABDULLAH CEVDET’S TRANSLATIONS (1908-1910): THE MAKING OF A
WESTERNIST AND MATERIALIST “CULTURE REPERTOIRE” IN A
“RESISTANT” OTTOMAN CONTEXT

SEVDA AYLUÇTARHAN

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2007

Dr. Abdullah Cevdet's Translations (1908-1910): The Making of a Westernist and
Materialist "Culture Repertoire" in a "Resistant" Ottoman Context

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Translation Studies

by
Sevda Aylutarhan

Boğaziçi University
2007

Dr. Abdullah Cevdet's Translations (1908-1910): The Making of a Westernist and
Materialist "Culture Repertoire" in a "Resistant" Ottoman Context

The thesis of Sevda Aylutarhan

has been approved by:

Prof.Dr. Saliha Paker
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof.Dr. Işın Bengi-Öner

Prof.Dr. Ethem Eldem

Assoc. Prof. Şehnaz Tahir-Gürağlar

Asst. Prof. Cemal Demircioğlu

September 2007

Thesis Abstract

Sevda ayluçtarhan, Dr. Abdullah Cevdet's Translations (1908-1910): The Making of a Westernist and Materialist "Culture Repertoire" in a "Resistant" Ottoman Context

This study aims to analyze Abdullah Cevdet's translations published within the first three years (1908-1910) of the Second Constitutional period by taking "culture-planning" aspects of them as its focal point. The present thesis is the first academic attempt to reflect specifically on the Turkish translation history of the Second Constitutional period within a modern paradigm of translation studies. In this research, Abdullah Cevdet's translations are examined from a systemic point of view, and are associated with the dynamics in the Ottoman cultural polysystem.

This study shows that Abdullah Cevdet aimed to introduce new literary and cultural "options" into the Ottoman "culture repertoire" with his translation of Shakespeare's plays. From a systemic point of view, this research connects Abdullah Cevdet's translation of the plays with his ideological program. On another level, it points to a new orientation at the turn of the twentieth century observed in Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations regarding the concept and practice of translation.

Abdullah Cevdet's non-literary translations published in the relevant time span are also contextualized in this research in terms of the significant role they played in Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program. Another significant discussion in this study is related to why and how the materialist and anti-Islamic "options" Abdullah Cevdet inculcated with his controversial *Tarih-i İslamiyet* encountered large-scale active "resistance" by conservative Ottomans.

Tez Özeti

Sevda aylluçtarhan, Dr. Abdullah Cevdet'in Çevirileri (1908-1910): "Muhafif" Bir Osmanlı bağlamında Batıcı ve Maddeci bir "Kültür Repertuvarının" Teşekkülü

Bu çalışma Abdullah Cevdet'in İkinci Meşrutiyet döneminin ilk üç yılında (1908-1910) yayınlanmış edebi ve edebiyat-dışı çevirilerini "kültür planlaması" yönüyle odak noktasına koyarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu tez, Türk çeviri tarihinin özellikle İkinci Meşrutiyet dönemine, modern Çeviribilim paradigmasıyla ışık tutan ilk akademik girişimdir. Bu araştırmada Abdullah Cevdet'in çevirileri dizgesel bir bakış açısıyla incelenmiş ve Osmanlı kültürü çoğul-dizgesinin dinamikleriyle ilişkilendirilmiştir.

Bu çalışma Abdullah Cevdet'in Shakespeare oyunlarından yaptığı çevirilerle Osmanlı kültür "repertuvarına" yeni edebi ve kültürel "seçenekler" getirmeyi amaçladığını ortaya koymaktadır. Dizgeci bir bakış açısıyla Abdullah Cevdet'in bu oyunlardan yaptığı çeviriler, onun ideolojik programıyla ilişkilendirilmiştir. Öte yandan, bu araştırma çeviri kavramı ve uygulamasında yirminci yüzyılın başında Abdullah Cevdet'in Shakespeare çevirilerinde gözlemlenen yeni bir yönelime işaret etmektedir.

Bu araştırmada Abdullah Cevdet'in söz konusu dönemde yayınlanan edebiyat-dışı çevirileri de Abdullah Cevdet'in ideolojik programında oynadıkları büyük rol bağlamında ele alınmaktadır. Bu çalışmadaki bir diğer önemli mesele de Abdullah Cevdet'in tartışmalı çevirisi *Tarih-i İslamiyet* yoluyla telkin ettiği maddeci ve İslamiyet karşıtı "seçeneklerin" neden ve nasıl muhafazakâr Osmanlılar tarafından geniş çapta "aktif bir muhalefetle" karşılandığıdır.

Acknowledgements

I owe an immense debt of gratitude to my advisor Professor Saliha Paker for her invaluable guidance and support during the entire course of this study and for the long hours she spent revising and editing my research. Her academic enthusiasm and the confidence she gave to me have always stimulated me to work harder. I also wish to thank Professor Edhem Eldem, Professor Işın Bengi-Öner, Assoc. Prof. Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar and Assistant Professor Cemal Demircioğlu for kindly accepting to be members of the Examining Committee and for their insightful criticisms and suggestions. I also wish to express my gratitude to Professor Zehra Toska for her revising some of the quotations I transcribed into Modern Turkish.

I am also grateful to Abdullah Cevdet's daughter Gül Karlıdağ and the son of his grand-son Professor Taner Derbentli for joining in my thesis defence and for kindly and generously devoting their time to my questions about Abdullah Cevdet. I am also deeply grateful to Professor Şükrü Hanioglu for seriously answering the questions in my e-mails.

I would like to thank my friends Seyhan Bozkurt and Ekaterini Kayadelen for their support and friendship.

Special thanks to my parents Emine Ayluçtarhan and Nurettin Ayluçtarhan on whose constant encouragement and love I have relied throughout my life.

Lastly and most importantly, I dedicate this thesis to my husband Arif Ayluçtarhan who offered me emotional and motivational support all the way since the beginning of this research.

CONTENTS

Chapter	
1.	INTRODUCTION.....1
2.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY.....22
	Systemic Approaches and Their Implications for the Present Research.....22
	Summary.....34
3.	ABDULLAH CEVDET’S SHAKESPEARE TRANSLATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR HIS CULTURE PLANNING.....36
	A. Cevdet’s Translation Policies.....39
	Directness of Translation.....48
	Matricial and Textual-Linguistic Features of A. Cevdet’s Shakespeare Translations.....53
	Critics’ Ideological Denial of the First Full Translations of Shakespeare’s Tragedies82
	Summary.....87
4.	ABDULLAH CEVDET’S NON-LITERARY TRANSLATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR HIS CULTURE-PLANNING96
	Some Preliminary Notes on A. Cevdet’s Non-literary Translations (1908-1910).....99
	A. Cevdet’s Non-literary Translations as Cultural Tools for Mobilizing and Modernizing Muslims.....104
	Active Resistance against Dozy, <i>Tarih-i İslamiyet</i> and its Translator A. Cevdet.....133
	A. Cevdet’s Culture Planning: “Success” or “Failure”?157
	Summary.....162
5.	CONCLUSION.....171
	APPENDICES.....188
1.	Detailed Information on A. Cevdet’s Translations Between 1908 and 1910.....188
2.	Translator’s Preface (<i>İfade-i Mütercim</i>) in <i>Jül Sezar</i> Transcribed in Modern Turkish.....189
3.	Translator’s Preface (<i>İfade-i Mütercim</i>) in <i>Tarih-i İslamiyet</i> Transcribed in Modern Turkish.....191
4.	Translator’s Preface (<i>İfade-i Mütercim</i>) in <i>İstibdad</i> Transcribed in Modern Turkish.....194
5.	Translator’s Preface (<i>İfade-i Mütercim</i>) in <i>İngiliz Kavmi</i> Transcribed in Modern Turkish.....199
6.	A General Bibliography of Translated Literary and Nonliterary Works Published within the First Three Years of the Second Constitution (1908-1910).....201

7. Abdullah Cevdet

REFERENCES.....222

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The poet, a honey bee

I carried Suns from the West to the East,
and equals to paradise, and its river.

I am wealth given to this land of poverty,
and a bee drowned in its own honey.¹

(Abdullah Cevdet: *Karlıdağ'dan Ses* [Voice from a Snowy Mountain] 1931).

The present thesis dwells on Abdullah Cevdet's (1869-1932) eight translations systematically published within the early years of the Second Constitutional period (1908-1910). It takes the ideological and "culture-planning" (Even-Zohar 2002a) aspect of these translations as its focal point. This study is unique as it is the first attempt to reflect specifically on the Turkish translation history of the Second Constitutional period within a modern paradigm of translation studies. My research could be seen as a continuation of the works of some researchers who contextualized both the Ottoman translation history of the pre-Constitutional period (see Paker 1986, 1991, 2002, 2006; Demircioğlu 2005, Bengi-Öner 1990, 1991), and the period beginning from the foundation of the Turkish Republic (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2001).

Abdullah Cevdet was a medical doctor who is described by Süssheim as a "Turkish poet, translator of Shakespeare and Omer Khaiyam, politician, free-thinker and prominent publicist" (1987: 55). A very important point about his personality is that he was one of the founding-members of the secret group of the Committee of Union and Progress, which was established to struggle against Abdülhamid II's absolutist regime. He is generally assumed to be one of the precursors who prepared

¹ Şa'ir, Bal Arısı
Garbden Şarka güneşler taşıdım,
Cennete, kevsere eşler taşıdım;
Ben bu yokluk elinin bir varyım,
Yaptığı balda boğulmuş arıyım.

the intellectual basis of the Turkish republican reforms which brought secularization to every sphere of life; e.g. educational and legal institutions, official script, lifestyle and clothing (Hanioglu 1997: 143). In this regard, “significant elements of Kemalist ideology have clear roots in the writings of Cevdet,” though Cevdet’s role in the Turkish reforms following the foundation of the new Turkish Republic is generally underplayed (Creel 1980: 9). The fact that Cevdet used his translations as an effective tool for his “culture-planning” (Even-Zohar 2002a) project explains — to some extent — the reason for my choosing his translation activities as a focus for the present research. Another important reason beside many others is related to the fact that Cevdet was the first to produce complete translations of six of Shakespeare’s tragedies into Turkish. I should also admit that the controversy and fierce discussions² around his personality works and deeds, today as well as in the past, have been a stimulating incentive for me to choose his translations as the topic of my M.A. thesis.

Translation and the Ottoman Context between 1908 and 1910

The evident abundance of translation activities and publications within the first three years of the Second Constitutional period could be accounted for by the politically liberal atmosphere the Constitution introduced. The re-establishment of the Constitution on July 23 1908 brought great ease and freedom to the Ottoman press, namely to the publication of journals, newspapers and books. Accordingly, the early years of the Second Constitutional period witnessed a tremendous rise in the

²See Ebuzziya Tevfik’s defence of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and its translator Abdullah Cevdet against harsh critiques and anger of opposing Ottoman literati in the bibliography. See also a serious critique of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* by Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı (1912) and İsmail Fenni Ertugrul’s criticism (1928) of the mentioned translation and of the translator Abdullah Cevdet. A late criticism of the work was done by Mehmet Ali Derman, a medical doctor like Abdullah Cevdet, who wrote a short “reply” (*cevabımız*) to “Dr. Duzi, Şprenger [and] Dr. Moir” (1972).

publication of translated texts (Ülken 1935: 366) from European languages, mostly from the French (See Appendix 6 for my bibliography of the translations published between 1908 and 1910). This inclination towards literary and non-literary European sources certainly did not appear all at once. The Ottoman bureaucracy and intelligentsia had long recognized that the Empire was no longer capable of keeping up with the level of advancement of European countries with respect to the military, economical and technological spheres of life (Zürcher 1998: 37). This admission of “lag and lack” (Paker 2006: 336) in the face of superior Western nations had stimulated or “impelled” the learned Ottomans (Ülken 1935: 358) to turn towards European sources for inspiration as early as the declaration of the *Tanzimat* edict (1839), which is generally regarded as the beginning of “formal and conscious Westernization” (Paker 1991: 18).

Before the Second Constitutional period however, Hamidian censorship which escalated in the second half of the 1880’s interrupted the publication of both original and translated works and led to a stagnation period compared to the more productive previous decades in terms of the translation of Western “high” literature³ (cf. Paker 1991: 30; Raif Necdet 1910: Preface). The political censorship of translated texts led to the production of abundant “low-brow” and apolitical texts during this period (Paker 1991: 28). Mostly melodrama, sentimental novels, romances and thrillers were published and detective stories became even more popular with the growing skepticism prevalent in the Empire due to the espionage activities initiated by the Sultan (Sevük 1940, v.2: 602). The popularity and relative abundance of such translations could be explained by the fact that the Sultan, too,

³ İsmail Habib Sevük mentions these decades as the productive period of *Tanzimat* in terms of both indigenous and translated literature. Especially during the period between 1873 and 1883 both original writing and translated literature (especially fiction and drama) enjoyed the most fruitful and fertile term until the foundation of the Turkish Republic (Sevük in Paker 1991: 28).

was fond of reading such books (ibid.). One can argue that Hamidian censorship had an indirect effect on the rise of the production of popular translations both during the oppressive years of his rule and within the early years of the Second Constitutional period.

There was also a practical reason for the increase in the number of translated popular works. Ottoman writers preferred translating (*terceme*) as a means to disseminate their ideas rather than writing indigenous works (*telif*⁴), thereby hoping to avoid state oppression and to escape responsibility for the content of the publications during the absolutist regime of Abdülhamid II. This expectation takes its root from an assumed principle that it should be the author, not the translator, who takes on the responsibility of the content of a published translated work (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 9). Abdullah Cevdet's apologetic sentences from his preface to *İstibdad* (which was in a way directed against the nature of Abdülhamid's rule, was first published in 1899 and was republished in 1908) formulate this principle and indicate how he points to it as an excuse for translating this politically provocative work:

The perfections and defects of works that were translated with complete care belong to their author, not to their translator. The existence of some points in a work conflicting with the thoughts and firm beliefs of a translator must not prevent it from being translated. What is more, a translator can translate a work which is totally incongruous with his own ideas and submit it to everyone's eyes for their judgment and investigation.⁵ (Abdullah Cevdet (1899: 9) [my translation].

⁴ Some diachronic studies on Ottoman translation concepts and practices suggest that the boundaries were blurred between the terms *terceme* (translation) and *telif* (indigenous work) in the Ottoman literary tradition (Paker 2002). See Paker (2002: 120-143) and Cemal Demircioğlu (2005: 137-147) for a contextualization of the term *terceme* as a culture-bound Ottoman concept of translation. See also an Ottoman Turcologist, Necip Asım, for his own conception of *terceme* at the turn of the nineteenth century. He comes up with quite a modern translation discourse compared to his contemporaries: "full and direct translations that convey the integrity of the original" (in Paker 2006: 341).

⁵ "İtina-yı tam ile tercüme edilen eserlerdeki kemalat ve nekayıs mütercimlerine değil müelliflerine aiddir. Bir kitabda mütercimnin efkar ve yakiniyatına mügayır bazı nukatın bulunması, tercüme edilmesine mani olamaz. Hatta mütercim serâpâ efkarına gayrı muvafık bir eseri de tercüme ederek herkesin nazar-ı hüküm ve tedkikine arz edebilir."

One can also claim that the discontent with the Sultan’s oppression stimulated the authors, translators to write and translate more. It is most probable that there had been many translations written but unpublished which waited for a safer time to enter the publishing market before July 1908. This date, which paved the way for the dethronement of the Sultan the following year, became a turning point for the freedom of the press. Accordingly, the publishers’ and translators’ reaction against the censorship which was dominant during the absolutist regime of Abdülhamid II (1876-1909) manifested itself with a rise in the scale of the production and publication of translated texts during the first years of the Second Constitution.

Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare Translations in View of the “Classics Debate” of 1897

Abdullah Cevdet was one of the few figures of the Second Constitutional period who strongly felt the necessity of systematizing⁶ the translation of Western classics into Turkish (cf. Ülken 1935: 374; Mardin 1983: 167). Unlike many literary translations of the post-*Tanzimat* period which functioned “as a ‘secondary activity’, sustaining the non-canonized or popular stratum both in fiction and in drama” (Paker 1991: 28; cf. Appendix 6), Abdullah Cevdet translated from Shakespeare, a canonical figure of English romantic literature. I will argue in the second chapter that the nature of Abdullah Cevdet’s strategies while translating Shakespeare made him quite “innovatory” (Toury 2000b: 193) in terms of his selection of texts, and of source

⁶ “Paris Beynelminel Sosyal Eğitim Kongresi’ne verdiği bir muhtıradan, Abdullah Cevdet Türklerin kültür düzeyinin yükseltilmesini memleketinin ilerlemesinin en önemli etkeni saydığını belirtmişti. Bunu da sağlamanın en kolay yolu *bir seri Batı klasiği* ve Batı akımlarına açık bir dergi yayımlamak ve yayını yeniden kurulacak bir matbaadan yönetmekti” (my emphasis, Mardin 1983: 167). “In the paper he presented for the ‘Paris International Social Education Congress’ (*Paris Beynelmilel Sosyal Eğitim Kongresi*), Abdullah Cevdet declared that he considered elevating the cultural level of the Turks as the most important factor for the advancement of the country. The easiest way to reach this goal was, through the assistance of a new printing house, to publish *a series of Western classics* and a journal which was open to Western trends” (my translation and emphasis).

culture as well as textual-linguistic features, especially when compared to the other products of translated dramatic literature between 1908 and 1910. In other words, both Abdullah Cevdet's selection of literary text types as well as his translation strategies entailed "innovative" literary and cultural "options" introduced into the domestic "repertoire" (Even-Zohar 1997: 2).

Between 1908 and 1910, Abdullah Cevdet produced a large oeuvre of translations, including four translations of Shakespeare's tragedies: The translations of *Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar* (translated by Cevdet as *Jül Sezar*) were published in 1908, the same year as the declaration of the Second Constitution. *Macbeth*, translated by Cevdet as *Makbes*, was published the following year. His translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (*Romeo ve Jülyet*) was serialized within the pages of the prominent Ottoman magazine *Şehbal* between 14 July 1909 and 14 August 1910⁷. In addition to the translations Abdullah Cevdet published between 1908 and 1910, he also published a translation of *King Lear* in 1917, though he had finished translating this work as early as 1904 [or 1901] (Süssheim 1987: 58). Besides, he finished translating *Antony and Cleopatra* in 1913, but published it in 1921 under the title of *Antuan ve Kleopatra*. Here, I should note that Süssheim describes Abdullah Cevdet's *Antuan ve Kleopatra* as a "masterpiece" and adds that it was Shakespeare's only tragedy to have been translated by Abdullah Cevdet from the English original (1987: 59). Although it would be quite interesting to analyze Abdullah Cevdet's translation strategies in *Kral Lir* and *Antuan ve Kleopatra* within a modern paradigm of translation studies, I have not analyzed them yet in comparison with their English source texts and with Abdullah Cevdet's other Shakespeare translations since they fall outside the scope of the present research.

⁷According to the Turkish Financial Year these dates correspond to 1 July 1325 and 1 August 1326 respectively.

I think it is imperative to contextualize Abdullah Cevdet's systematic efforts of translating Shakespeare's drama into Turkish in terms of the discussions held on translating classics in the literary circles of the period. The "classics debate" of 1897 was initiated by Ahmed Midhat's appeal to the intellectuals of the period for the translation of "European" classics (Paker 2006). Some men of letters such as Necip Asım, Ahmed Cevdet, Cenap Şahabeddin and Kemalpaşazade Said became involved in this debate to offer their own solution to the "problem" of translating Western classics. In her article "The 1897 'Classics' Debate as a Focus for Examining Change", Paker reflects on the "debate" of 1897 as "a moment (perhaps the first) of collective confrontation with the problems of translating a 'foreign' literature and culture on the one hand and, on the other, with the problems of generating a comparable literature 'of their own'" (2006: 325). It is inferred from Paker's article that the participants in the debate considered the translation of Western classics as a problem and tried to propose their solutions (2005: 325; cf. Demircioğlu 2005: 154). This debate also indicates that the intellectuals drew a distinction between "what was 'totally foreign'" i.e. European languages, and "what was 'not so foreign'" i.e. Arabic and Persian (Paker 2006: 325). It was mainly the introduction of "Western foreignness" (325) which brought two major questions: Whom to translate and how to translate. To be more precise, the "classics debate" exhibited a concern for differentiating between Western literary works of different literary trends, e.g. romanticism versus realism. This discussion of whether to follow the romanticists or the realists was in fact a continuation of the debate of the "decadents" which had started earlier and led to a polarization between the Ottoman romanticists and realists (Paker 2006: 329). In addition, the classics debate also centred on the question of

whether imitation (*taklid / tanzir*) or translation (*terceme*) was better for translating the “great” works of the West (Paker 2006: 325).

In terms of the issues discussed, this debate could be regarded as a milestone in Turkish translation, literary and cultural history. The “classics debate” took place just three years before Abdullah Cevdet proclaimed in an education congress in Paris that the translation of Western classics would play a crucial role in the advancement of his country. In my opinion, an analysis of the “classics debate”, which serves a rich material in terms of the Ottoman practices of translation and discourse, will help us to explore Abdullah Cevdet’s translation strategies while working on Shakespeare’s drama. Most probably Abdullah Cevdet, as a poet, translator and publisher, was aware of the literary discussions in the intellectual and literary circles about the problem of translating a “foreign” literature and culture. In addition, I should note that Abdullah Cevdet started to produce his Shakespeare translations in 1902 (Süssheim 1987: 57); that is to say only five years after the “classics debate”. That is why, in this introduction, I want to make some general comments on Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations in terms of some of the issues discussed in the “classics debate”. I want to relate Abdullah Cevdet’s translation practice and discourse to the “classics debate” in terms of his selection of texts, translation strategies, and target readership.

Before my discussion of the “classics debate”, I want to touch upon an ideological bias which made it less possible to recognize the significance of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations in Turkish translation history. Although Abdullah Cevdet reproduced the first full Turkish translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies, almost no attention has been paid to them by now due to this ideological bias. Few exceptions of critical notice about his literary translations generally

involved a negativistic perspective which isolated the works from their socio-cultural milieu and projected the nationalistic discourse of the modern Turkish Republic on them. It will be shown in the second chapter that such critics generally condemned Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations for his use of "high" Ottoman, instead of "plain" Turkish, or what Paker calls "a Persianized poetic diction" (1986: 94). In addition, he also translated some Eastern classics into Turkish, such as Hayyam's and Mevlana's poetry. A comparison of Abdullah Cevdet's translation strategies and discourses while translating Western and Eastern classics remains to be investigated. I consider that an evaluation of Abdullah Cevdet's translation practice and discourse while translating Shakespeare, an exponent of British romanticism, in terms of the discussions held in the "classics debate", may reflect a new vision of the Ottoman conceptions of translation and practice at the turn of the twentieth century. It will be shown in the second chapter that Abdullah Cevdet's strategies in his Shakespeare translations, in fact, reflect a new understanding and discourse on translation. This research exhibits Abdullah Cevdet's conception of translation and answers in a way his approach to the problem of translating a "foreign" literature.

Abdullah Cevdet seems to be in agreement with Ahmed Midhat, the initiator of the "classics debate", in terms of the benefits of translating the European romantics. While Abdullah Cevdet seems to agree with Ahmed Midhat in his answer to the question of "who to translate", he differs from him greatly in his answer to "how to translate". Paker argues that the participants of the "classics debate" generally exhibited a "defensive" (Paker 2006: 331) manner in the face of "Western foreignness" (Paker 2006: 325), though with varying degrees of "permissiveness" (Paker 2006: 331). Compared to many of the participants of the "classics debate" such as Ahmed Midhat, Ahmed Cevdet and Cenap Şahabettin, Abdullah Cevdet

seemed to be far more “permissive” in his discourse and practice of translating “Western foreignness”. One can associate Abdullah Cevdet’s “permissiveness” with his “extreme Westernist” inclinations (Hanioglu 1981?: 92) which ultimately made his journal “the center of Westernist thinking” at the turn of the twentieth century (Hanioglu 1992: 150). It is shown in the second chapter of my study that Abdullah Cevdet came up with quite literal renderings, and strictly adhered to the constraints of the source language and culture while translating Shakespeare. This fact could be seen as an indication that Abdullah Cevdet was more “permissive” than Ahmed Midhat, who often resorted to “imperialist” (Paker 2006: 331) translation strategies e.g. “imitation”, “summary” and “annotation” (Demircioğlu 2005: 292-293, 302). Besides, contrary to Ahmed Midhat who thought of translation in relation to “intelligibility” and “informative purposes” (Demircioğlu 2005: 292) and Necip Asim who was “involved in the movement for plain Turkish” (Paker 2006: 339), Abdullah Cevdet’s translation strategies did not reflect such a concern since he set the educated elites as his target group. This can be accounted for by the textual-linguistic features of his translations and his use of “high” Ottoman with many Persian and Arabic compounds, as I will discuss in the second chapter. Accordingly, Abdullah Cevdet’s translation strategies while translating Shakespeare and his fidelity to the source text did not bear the same conclusions with the participants of the “classics debate”, whose “principle of fidelity in translation” “played a role” in “clarifying the literary language and style of the Ottomans” (Paker 2006: 345).

Abdullah Cevdet is quite similar to the participants of the “classics debate” as all of these Ottoman intellectuals considered translations from European works in terms of the “lack and belatedness” (Paker 2006: 345; cf. Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 3-8; A. Key 1908: 685-722) of the Ottomans and voiced the necessity of conveying the

“great” works of Western literature into Turkish to fill this deficiency. Like the participants in the “debate”, Abdullah Cevdet related translating Western classics to the notion of “progress” (*terakki*) (Paker 2006: 329). In the paper he presented for “Paris International Social Education Congress” (*Paris Beynelmilel Sosyal Eđitim Kongresi*), Abdullah Cevdet declared that he considered elevating the cultural level of the Turks as the most important factor for the advancement of the country. The easiest way to reach this goal was publishing a series of Western classics with the assistance of a new printing house, and a journal which was open to Western trends (Mardin 1983: 167). As is already known, Abdullah Cevdet established the said printing house and the journal himself, naming them both “*İctihad*”⁸. Besides, he tried to realize his dream by “[making] versions from the French of works” (Süssheim 1987: 56) of some romantic poets such as Byron, Shakespeare, Schiller, Alfred de Musset, Victor Hugo and André Chénier (cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 47, 49; Süssheim 1987).

Shakespeare Translations in Turkish before 1908

Abdullah Cevdet’s importance in producing the first full translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies will be better conceived when compared to the number and nature of the first Shakespeare translations in Turkish before the re-establishment of the Ottoman Constitution (1908). A study on Shakespeare’s works in Turkish in the post-*Tanzimat* period clearly shows that few translations had been produced before Abdullah Cevdet’s translations. These texts were produced by Hasan Bedreddin & Mehmed Rifat, Hasan Sırrı, Mihran Boyacıyan, Muallim Naci and Mehmed Nadir.

⁸ *İctihad*, as an Islamic term, could be defined as introducing novelties to Islam through “creative legal reasoning” (Hallaq 1995: 180).

Both Enginün and Sevük refer to Hasan Bedreddin and Mehmed Rıfat's version of *Othello* (1876) as the first Turkish translation from Shakespeare (Sevük 1940, v. 1: 527; Enginün 1979: 21). Enginün states (1979: 22) that it was translated into Turkish from Jean François Ducis's French adaptation of the work, whereas Sevük mentions a notice on the cover of the book informing readers that it was translated from "Dozi's" French translation (*Doz'inin Fransızca tercümesinden nakledildiği*, in Sevük 1940, v. 1: 527).

Sevük does not include Hasan Sırrı's translations of the *Merchant of Venice* (*Venedik Taciri* 1884) and *The Comedy of Errors* (*Sehv-i Müdhik* 1887) in his list of the first Shakespeare translations of the *Tanzimat* period while Enginün underscores them as "the first full translations" (Enginün 1979: 30) of Shakespeare's plays in Turkish. Enginün states that Hasan Sırrı's *Venedik Taciri* and *Sehv-i Müdhik* are also the first two translations to have been rendered from their English original (ibid.).

According to the information provided by Enginün (1979: 57), Mihran Boyacıyan is another translator who produced the first Turkish translation of Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors* under the title of *Sehiv Komedyası* (1886) (1979: 64). He also translated *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (*Verona'nın İki Asilzadeleri* 1886) and *Romeo and Juliet* (*Romeo ve Jülyet* 1886). Both Sevük and Enginün agree that Boyacıyan translated all these in the form of "short stories". (Enginün 1979: 3; Sevük 1940, v.1: 527). According to Enginün, Boyacıyan used Charles and Mary Lamb's abridged English versions of the plays as his source texts (1979: 3). In addition, Muallim Naci and Mehmed Nadir translated some of Shakespeare's sonnets, and the latter also translated *The Lover's Complaint* and some pages from *Hamlet, Troilus and Cressida, Antony and Cleopatra, Romeo and Juliet, The Rape of Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis* (Enginün 1979: vi, 21). These partial translations

were published scatteredly in the periodicals of the period. Quite interestingly, Mehmed Nadir also published a work under the title of *Kıış Masalı* (1882) and ascribed it to Shakespeare, though this work was in fact the translation of *Pandosto* by Robert Greene (Enginün 1979: 73). Enginün states that she needed to touch upon *Kıış Masalı* too in her study, since it influenced Ottoman readers' perception of Shakespeare (ibid). Apart from the translations mentioned above, Enginün claims, it is possible to come across other scattered and partial translations of Shakespeare in the *Tanzimat* period (1979: 3).

In her work on the Shakespeare translations and their influence during the *Tanzimat* period (*Tanzimat Döneminde Shakespeare Tercümeleri ve Tesiri*), Enginün refers to Abdullah Cevdet as the second translator who produced "full" (Enginün 1979: 30) translations of Shakespeare's plays after Hasan Sırrı's *Venedik Taciri* (1884) and *Sehv-i Müdhik* (1887). Sevük does not comment on the fullness of Abdullah Cevdet's translation of the tragedies, but he proposes that Abdullah Cevdet was the first "who thoroughly carried out translating Shakespeare's works and gave momentum to their publications" (*Şekspir tercümelerine seri bir şekil vererek ilk esash mütercimliği yapan*, 1940, v. 1: 527).

Abdullah Cevdet's non-Literary Translations

Apart from Shakespeare translations, Abdullah Cevdet also translated from some other Western academics who produced serious works on political, historical, social and psychological issues. The two volumes of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (1908 and 1909,

original title: *De Voornaamste Godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*⁹), translated from the French version of the source text by the Dutch Orientalist Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy¹⁰ (1300/1883) is the most controversial among Cevdet's entire oeuvre, including his original works. This work led to a large-scale wave of indignation among conservative Muslims and therefore created in a way a similar effect (cf. Bardakçı 2005) with the controversial *The Satanic Verses* (1988) of Salman Rushdie.

*İngiliz Kavmi (Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais*¹¹, 1909), translated from the French academic Emile Boutmy (1835-1906) deals with sociological matters and it is also among the translator's nonliterary works. Another noteworthy non-literary translation in terms of the translator's ideological program, *İstibdad (Della Tirannide*, 1908 [1st edition 1899]), dwells on political themes and was translated from the French version¹² of the Italian dramatist Vittorio Amedeo Alfieri's work (1749-1803). Finally, *Musiki ile Tedavi (Musicothérapie*, 1908) is related to the use of music for medical purposes, and was translated by Abdullah Cevdet from M. Doubresse.

⁹ Although Dozy wrote his work (Haarlem 1863) in Dutch with the title I give above, Abdullah Cevdet introduces the work in the cover of his translation as *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, which is in fact the title of the French translation written by Victor Cauvin (Paris, 1879).

¹⁰ There are two variances of his name indicated in the library catalogues: "Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy" is mostly used, but I have also encountered him being referred to as "Reinhart Piener Anne Dozy". Vedat Atila, who recently published a modern Turkish version of Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's work, presented the author's name as "Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy" on the book cover. In the paratext of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, Abdullah Cevdet presents his name with an abbreviation: "Doktor R. Dozy."

¹¹ Süssheim gives a longer title for this work: *Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais au XIXème siècle* (Süssheim 1987: 58).

¹² Süssheim mentions this translation as "a good translation from the French" (Süssheim 1987: 56).

Aims

As was mentioned above, Abdullah Cevdet prolifically started and carried out the translations of Western sources in a systematic way, covering both literary and non-literary texts. These translations were systematically published (Sevük 1940 v.1: 527) by his own publishing house (Matbaa-i İctihad), and were closely linked to his initiatives as a “culture-entrepreneur” and “idea-maker” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 1).

The systematic continuation of Cevdet’s translation activities was a reflection of his ideological stand-point and culture-planning aims. His text selection and translation strategies were certainly not free from his ideological view-point. The name he gave both to his publishing house and journal, “*İctihad*¹³”, indicates his worldview and suggests that he considered himself as a “mujtahid” who synthesizes or reconciles materialist modern science with Islam through “creative legal reasoning” (Hallaq 1995: 180; cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 39) and brings liberating novelties to the Islamic perspective. Cevdet’s statements in his preface to *Jül Sezar* clearly indicate what kind of a role he envisaged for himself for “awakening” his readers:

Achilles, Homer’s creature, trained strong warriors. The work in our hand presents a Brutus figure, drawn by Shakespeare, who trains heroes who wring out their hearts with their own hands and throw away. A nation that feels among its members the existence of fathers resembling Brutus and mothers resembling Portia can only claim independence; since they will undoubtedly be independent tomorrow despite today’s captivity. [...] “Brutus! You are sleeping, wake up and see who you are. Is Rome going to survive? Say, strike, set it right. Brutus! You’re sleeping, wake up!” someone shouted and

¹³ “*İctihad*” as an Islamic term could be defined as “creative legal reasoning” in Islamic law (Hallaq 1995: 180). “Wherever the textual sources offer explicit statements on matters of faith, worship, and personal status, there is no room for *ijtihad*. However, all other matters of a practical nature, affecting the affairs of the Muslim community and public life and policy, are subject to reinterpretation by means of *ijtihad*. Those who are capable of undertaking *ijtihad* are the legitimate holders of authority, [...] who decide on behalf of Muslims and act in their best interests” (Hallaq 1995: 181).

made him save Rome and the Romans. Ignoring my insignificance before Brutus's infinite grandeur, I shout at you o Muslims, o Turks, o Turkey's citizens: You are sleeping. Wake up, speak up, strike and set it right.¹⁴ (Abdullah Cevdet 1908g: 304) [my translation]

I should note at the beginning of my thesis that what I find specifically important about Abdullah Cevdet's entire translated oeuvre (which amounted to about thirty [Hanioglu 1988: 93]) are his translations of Shakespeare's drama and his famous and controversial *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. *Tarih-i İslamiyet* became and actually has been a very important translation in Ottoman cultural history in terms of the radical cultural "options" (Even-Zohar 1994: 3) it introduced to the Ottoman cultural "repertoire" (Even-Zohar 1997: 2) as well as in terms of manifesting to what extent "agency" in any translation activity gains importance, and therefore may lead a translator to be held responsible for the content of a translation.

In general, what I aim to do in this study is to question how Cevdet's "scientific [or materialist], anti-religious and elitist ideology" (Hanioglu 1995: 23) accompanied by a passionate desire for Westernism, shaped his selection of texts, themes, *genres* and cultures to be translated as well as his translation strategies. What were Cevdet's translational strategies which were inescapably linked to the political, cultural and literary system in which he wrote? In other words, I aim to explore Abdullah Cevdet's translations within a model which Theo Hermans calls the "temporalization of semantics" (2002: 183), that is the contextualization of the translated texts in terms of their whats, hows and whys and in terms of their

¹⁴ "Homer'in aferidesi olan Aşil büyük muharipler yetiştirdi. Bu elimizdeki kitapta Şekspir'in arz ettiği Brütüs, selamet-i vatan, hürriyet-i umumiyye yollarında, öz kalbini öz eliyle koparıp atan kahramanlar yetiştirecektir: Efradı arasında Brütüs'e benzer pederler, Burciya'ya benzer valideler bulunduğunu sezen bir millet kendisini hür ilan edebilir; çünkü bugün esir olsa da o milletin yarın hür olması muhakkaktır. [...] Brütüse "Brütüs! Sen uyuyorsun; uyan, kim olduğunu gör, Roma kalacak mı? Söyle, vur, hakkı yerine getir. Brütüs! Sen uyuyorsun, uyan!" diye bağıarak Roma ve Romalılar kurtarılmıştı. Ben de Brütüs'ün bi-intiha büyüklüğü karşısında küçüklüğüme bakmayarak, ey Müslümanlar, ey Türkler, ey Türkiyeli vatandaşlar, sizlere böyle bağıryorum: Uyuyorsunuz, uyanınız, söyleyiniz, vurunuz, hakkı yerine getiriniz."

interrelations with the other elements in the Ottoman cultural system. In addition, the Ottoman readers' perception of Cevdet's translations and whether or not he succeeded in "proliferating options" ((Even-Zohar 2005a: 2) in the Ottoman cultural repertoire including the literary sphere are other issues which will be explored within this research.

I mainly argue in my thesis that Abdullah Cevdet proliferated options both in the field of literature and in the more encompassing cultural polysystem. The second chapter will be devoted to the new options Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the Ottoman literary repertoire. The third chapter will specifically dwell on the radical cultural options Abdullah Cevdet inculcated into the Ottoman cultural repertoire. To be more specific about the organization of my research, I will devote the second chapter of this study to the contextualization of Cevdet's translation activities within a theoretical framework of modern translation studies. In this part of the thesis, I will explain the theoretical tools I will be using through my thesis. I will also reveal my reasons for choosing these tools. Cevdet's literary translations from Shakespeare will be analyzed in the third chapter where I will specifically focus on Abdullah Cevdet's translation strategies, the originalities of these strategies and how they were shaped by his ideological program. More specifically, I will dwell on the issues of Abdullah Cevdet's "translation policy" (Toury 2000: 202), "the directness" (ibid.) of his translations, and the "matrix" (ibid.) and "textual-linguistic" (Toury 2000: 203) features. The analysis of such issues will give us clues about the new options Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the Ottoman literary repertoire. I will also relate his translations of Shakespeare's drama and his translation strategies to his role as a "culture-planner" and "idea-maker" (2005a: 9).

In the post-*Tanzimat* period, I believe, Abdullah Cevdet's role in re-shaping the Ottoman culture repertoire is not less than that of Ahmed Midhat whose significant contributions in re-shaping the Ottoman literary polysystem has often been acknowledged in modern literary circles (Demircioğlu Türkçe makale: 21). I consider that Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Shakespeare's drama, especially his *Romeo ve Jülyet*, is quite significant in Turkish literary history. The reason is that it reflects best Abdullah Cevdet's own understanding of translating the "foreignnes" of a Western classical work, as I will discuss in the second chapter. Besides, *Romeo ve Jülyet* also reflects Abdullah Cevdet's conception and practice of translation, which was in fact quite innovatory for his time.

In the fourth chapter, I will dwell on Abdullah Cevdet's non-literary translations and how they related to his role as an "idea-maker" and "culture entrepreneur" (Even-Zohar: 2005a: 9). Abdullah Cevdet's great role in Ottoman / Turkish cultural and intellectual history and how he devised his political, sociological and historical translations for his ideological program will be the main focus of this chapter. Here, the emphasis will be on his selection of texts, on his prefaces and footnotes rather than on the matricial and textual-linguistic features of the translations. In this part, I will also devote a special part to Abdullah Cevdet's famous translation *Tarih-i İslamiyet* which led to quite "active resistance" (Even-Zohar: 2002a: 48) within the Ottoman cultural "polysystem" (Even-Zohar 2000b: 192). An analysis of the natures of "resistance", to Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program and particularly to his *Tarih-i İslamiyet* will constitute a significant part of the fourth chapter.

I expect that my study will constitute a step forward towards filling a gap, which Saliha Paker refers to, in Turkish translation history: "Academic research into

the history of translation into Turkish is still largely confined to this [republican] period. Implicit is the need for further serious research on the long tradition behind modern notions and practices.” (Paker 2002: 121).

An Overview of My Bibliography of the Literary and non-Literary Turkish Translations (1908–1910) and Their Implications

Here, I would also like to mention within a few paragraphs my findings resulting from a painstaking preliminary research to produce a bibliography of the first three years of the Second Constitutional period, which will be presented in the appendix of this thesis (Appendix 6). This research has helped me to sketch out the general state of the translated literature in this period. According to my bibliographic study in which I largely benefited from Seyfeddin Özege’s catalogue (1991), from the databases of the Turkish libraries, and from the database of the Turkish Ministry of Culture (The bibliography of Turkish works printed in Non-Latin [Arabic, Armenian and Greek Characters] 1584-1986, 2001) there are 227 literary and non-literary translated works published by various publishing houses within the first three years of the Second Constitutional era. Interestingly, in 39 cases, the author’s name was inaccessible. There were a few cases (9) where there was no any reference to the translator at all. In addition, there were hardly any references in the catalogues, databases and other sources to the source language from which these works were translated. I tried to complete the missing information by investigating the same entry in other sources as well. Still, some of my bibliographic entries fail to give a clue as to the source language. An important reason for this information gap is that there were many cases where the author’s name was not cited.

As for the source languages being translated, 64 works out of the total are French, excluding doubtful ones. This proves the dominance of French (the *lingua franca* of the period) in the domestic literature (cf. Koç 2006). The rate of the translations from Arabic is interestingly as high as 28 out of 227. This rate is higher than expected since academicians generally pronounce the period beginning from the *Tanzimat* Edict (1839) as the age of translations from Western sources (Kefeli 2006: 44). 16 entries are various translations from English. Very few translations are from Persian, Dutch, Italian and German, though it is not certain whether or not they were translated through a mediating language.

The corpus of the published translated works between 1908 and 1910 suggests that the literary translations were largely selected from detective fiction and short stories by French authors. These translations were generally published within series such as *İkbal Kütüphanesi Cep Romanları* (“Pocket Books of İkbal Library”) or *Tercüman-ı Hakikat’in Garaib Cüzdanı Kütüphanesi* (“Amazing pocket books of Tercüman-ı Hakikat”). Jules Verne, Arthur Conan Doyle, Michel Zévacco, Alexandre Dumas, Thomas Mayne Reid, Paul de Kock, François Coppée, Guy de Maupassant, Maurice Leblanc are the main figures whose literary works were translated into Turkish in this period. Apart from these names, there are also a few translations from the works of some “high-brow” authors such as Voltaire, Victor Hugo, Shakespeare, and L. Tolstoy.

As for non-literary translations, some of them are related to Islam and Islamic civilization and history. About one tenth (21) of the total is directly related to military matters as the most common subject of the non-literary translated works of the period. There are also some translations on the history of the Ottoman Empire and Europe. 10 entries are on the laws of the European countries, and were mostly

translated by Mehmed Münir Ertegün. The works dealing with Islamic mysticism (from Muhyiddin-i Arabi, Mevlana Celaleddin-i Rumi, Ahmed er-Rifai and Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed Efendi) also occupy an important place in the corpus. There are also a few entries on cosmology, agriculture, health and biology.

My analysis of Cevdet's translated oeuvre within this period has also required a meticulous process of investigation. The relative inaccessibility of "rare" books and the librarians' great care for their preservation made the research less easy. In addition, I had to transcribe Cevdet's translations and some other secondary sources in Arabic script into Latin script, which also needed more time and effort (Appendix 2, 3, 4, 5).

Popular books published by private publishing houses in the Republican period carry the traces of the Second Constitutional period as Tahir-Gürçağlar argues in her doctorate thesis (2001: 57). As in the translations of the republican period, in the translations published within the early years of the Second Constitutional period the boundaries between translation (*terceme*) and indigenous (or *terceme* and *teelif*) are blurred (Paker 2002). That is why there are often gaps in the references to the title of the source text or original author in the "paratexts"— "presentational material accompanying translated text" (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2001: 44) — of these translations and in the bibliographies of this period (See Özege 1991 and Appendix 6). Therefore, it would not be wrong to suggest that the "translational norms" (Toury 2000: 198) in the republican period were influenced by the discourses and practices of the Second Constitutional period to some extent. Likewise, it is more likely that translations of the Second Constitutional Period carried some traces of the discourses and practices of the previous decades.

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Systemic Approaches and Their Implications for the Present Research

The theoretical formulations of systemic approaches, especially those of Even-Zohar, and the methodology provided by Toury will largely constitute the theoretical framework of the present thesis. It should be noted that Even-Zohar's analytical description of "systems" (1979, 2005b) and "culture-planning" (1994, 2002a) gives researchers a useful and objective framework to study translations and their diachronic interrelations with the literary and cultural context.

The Polysystem Theory

In his polysystem theory, Even-Zohar describes a socio-semiotic system as "a heterogeneous, open structure. It is, therefore, very rarely a uni-system but is, necessarily, a polysystem—a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent" (2005b: 2). What is especially important for my topic in this definition is the interactions between systems which, Even-Zohar argues, possess an "open", "heterogeneous", and, therefore, dynamic nature (2005b: 2-3). An understanding of systems as open and heterogeneous entities constitutes a reasonable and meaningful framework for the socio-cultural characteristics of the Ottoman society of the Second Constitutional Period. The present research dwells on a period when "Western foreignness" (Paker 2006: 325) had far-reaching repercussions in the Ottoman cultural polysystem; thus

an understanding of the Ottoman cultural system as an “open” set of relations becomes even more indispensable. By the same token, a conception of a system as “heterogeneous” helps any researcher to investigate the Ottoman multicultural system in its real-life complexity. The polysystem theory has been and will be of great use for me in explaining “diachrony” (Even-Zohar 2005b: 1) in the systemic relations of the Second Constitutional Period. Only through the incorporation of “diachrony” and dynamics may an analysis account for “change and variation” in the Ottoman cultural system (ibid.). However, I should note, one has to be aware of the deficiencies in Even-Zohar’s early formulations of the polysystem theory (1979) which failed to put an adequate emphasis on human intervention and dynamics in the transformation of cultures and societies. This is why he has tried hard in recent years (2005a; 2005b) to compensate for such gaps.

Beside the merits of the polysystem theory, one should be aware of some problematic issues while using it in translation research. Even though recent studies of the polysystem theory devote more analysis to the heterogeneity of systems and their dynamic nature (Even-Zohar 2005b; 2000a), the theory has often been criticized for its structuralist foundations which give an impression that systems reproduce themselves without any actors and dynamics involved (cf. Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003: 259-60). One must also keep in mind that systemic approaches unavoidably have the shortcoming of reducing the complexes of reality into more manageable and abstract terms (cf. Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003: 261). Some academics criticized Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory also on the grounds that it fails to give adequate place to human agency and foreground translators sufficiently as actors in his formulations (Pym 1998: 116). Another significant criticism is related to Even-Zohar’s description of “center” vs. “periphery”, “primary position” vs. “secondary position” and

“canonized” vs. “non-canonized” as dichotomized conceptions when he deals with literary polysystems. As Tahir-Gürçağlar argues, such “binary classifications offered by the polysystems theory (centre / periphery; canonized / non-canonized; primary / secondary) obscure the relations between the agents and the systems” (2001: 64). Still, I have a contention that the polysystem theory is beneficial for a historical analysis of translation, like mine, for students of translation, provided that a researcher is aware of such problematic issues, and compensates the deficiencies.

“Translational Norms”, “Patronage” and “Poetics”

The stress on the factor of dynamism in the systemic approach seems to constitute the theoretical basis for the Descriptive Translation Studies introduced by Gideon Toury (1995). Owing to a dynamic and diachronic understanding of systems, the conceptions of equivalence and adequacy have changed and become historic and contextual (cf. Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003: 248). This fact could be regarded as the departure point for Descriptive Translation Studies and Toury’s definition of “translational norms” (2000) as a culture-specific and time-bound concept. Toury’s definition of norms enables translation researchers to study translations without any prescriptive judgment since there will never be a single definition of “equivalence” because of the dynamic nature of translational norms.

Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar’s evaluative statement below about the relationship between the Descriptive Translation Studies and the systemic approach point at how Descriptive Translation Studies benefited from the systemic approach to evolve its descriptive and analytical methodology:

The descriptive approach, which adopts the emphasis of the systemic approach on the target system and its interpretation of the notion of dynamism, studies translation decisions / behaviors, determined on the level of individual texts, through an inductive method and introduces some regular patterns and common behavioral models¹⁵ (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003: 255) [my translation]

What I will do in this study is to investigate Abdullah Cevdet's translations benefiting Toury's inductive methodology. Accordingly, Abdullah Cevdet's "translation decisions" and "behaviors" will be analyzed first. My findings at the end of this analysis will give clues about Abdullah Cevdet's translation strategies or his "translational norms" (Toury 2000: 199).

Toury's methodology has proved to be quite practical for my study since it provides an empirical procedure to follow while studying translations (Toury 1995 and 2000: 148-63). Toury's notion of "translational norms" enables researchers to find interconnections between a translation and the socio-cultural milieu in which it is hosted. In principle, the descriptive approach to translation requires a study of translations without any prescriptive and normative judgments. It finds every kind of lingual transfer, including pseudo-translations, adaptations, abridgements, etc, relevant to the investigations of translation phenomena (Toury 1995: 32). For that reason, it offers a wide and inclusive framework to study the works which are assumed to be translations with an objective manner.

I want to use Lefevere's terms "patronage" and "poetics" in order to describe the position of Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations in the Turkish literary system, especially in the early decades of the new Turkish Republic. "Patronage" is described as "the powers (persons, institutions) which can further or hinder the

¹⁵ "Dizgeci bakış açısının erek dizge üzerindeki vurgusunu ve devingenlik kavramına getirdiği yorumu benimseyen betimleyici yaklaşım bireysel metin düzleminde saptanan çeviri kararlarını / davranışlarını inceleyerek tümevarımcı bir yöntemle bir takım düzenli örüntüler ve ortak davranış biçimleri ortaya koyar." (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003: 255).

reading, writing and rewriting of literature” (Lefevere 1992: 15). “Patronage” functions as a control mechanism operating from the outside of a literary system (2000: 236). There is also a mechanism which governs the literature from within: “poetics”, i.e., “the dominant concept of what literature should be, or can be allowed to be in a society” (1992: 14). I am aware that Lefevere devises these terms specifically for evolutions of literary systems and he regards translated literature as “texts produced on the borderline between two systems” (2000: 234). No doubt that one can speak of the relevance of “patronage” and “poetics” for the translated literature as well (cf. Hermans 1999: 128; Tahir-Gürçağlar¹⁶ 2001:181, 190). Tahir-Gürçağlar adapts the notion of “poetics” for the system of translated literature as follows: “The concept of what translated literature should be in the social system as a whole, and the inventory of literary devices, genres and symbols, which also included criteria for selecting works for translation and translation strategies” (2001: 190). I consider that Lefevere’s notions of “patronage” and “poetics” will be very helpful in understanding the “omission” of Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies in the “rewritings” (Lefevere 1992) produced after the foundation of the new Turkish Republic.

“Culture-Planning” and the Making of a “Repertoire”

The activity of “culture-planning” (2002a: 45) is a very important phenomenon that is vital in the transformation of a culture, thus explaining to some extent the factors of “diachrony” and human intervention in any cultural system. Culture-planning is the making of a new “repertoire”, that is “the aggregate of options utilized by a group

¹⁶ See Tahir-Gürçağlar’s Ph.D thesis *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960* (2001) for a systemic analysis of translated literature in Turkey 1923-1960 with some of Lefevere’s notions such as “patronage (p. 181) and “poetics” (p. 190).

of people and by the individual members of the group, for the organization of life” (Even-Zohar 1997a: 2). This important business is performed in real life either “inadvertently” or “deliberately” (Even-Zohar 1997a: 3). Some initiators, who risk their time, energy, money or even their life for “making, re-making or maintaining” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45) a cultural repertoire, are the deliberate performers of “culture-planning” who, according to Even-Zohar, may at times transform into “idea-makers” and / or “cultural entrepreneurs” in a social entity (2005a: 1).

I argue that the nature of Abdullah Cevdet’s large translated oeuvre — which amounted to about thirty until his death — point at a “deliberate act of intervention” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45) in the course of affairs in the Ottoman culture at the turn of the twentieth century. Abdullah Cevdet’s “deliberate” use of translations as a means of re-shaping Ottoman culture meets Even-Zohar’s theoretical precondition that there should be “deliberateness” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45) in any set of activities to be called “culture planning”. It will be explained in the following pages of this study that Abdullah Cevdet’s translations served well his aim of creating materialist and Westernist models for the Ottomans.

Another factor which makes “culture-planning” a reasonable framework within which to study Abdullah Cevdet’s translational activities lies in Even-Zohar’s suggestion that “preoccupation with planning began at a very low state in the welfare of a population” (Even-Zohar2002a: 47). I think the general Ottoman discourse in the post-*Tanzimat* period on the “lag and lack” (2006: 336) of the Ottomans and of the Eastern world in the face of the West justifies the idea that the Ottomans were in fact “at a very low state” in that period since they had “less access to [needed] resources” (Even-Zohar2002a: 47) than their Western counterparts. This, in fact, represents an important component in any “culture-planning” activity,

namely “justification” for the initiative (Even-Zohar2002a: 46). In addition, Abdullah Cevdet’s translations could be viewed as resources mobilized by Abdullah Cevdet as an “idea-maker”. “Idea-makers”, according to Even-Zohar, are “some brainworkers who have mental capabilities of producing new ideas that may be converted to new or alternative options for the repertoire of culture by which the life of societies is shaped and organized” (2005a: 1). There is some evidence which proves that Abdullah Cevdet also became active in attempts towards the “implementation” of the “ideas” he preached, as will be discussed in the fourth chapter. Therefore, in Even-Zohar’s term, we can also describe Abdullah Cevdet as a “culture-entrepreneur” (2005a: 1). Even-Zohar’s theoretical formulations connote three main components in any culture-planning activity: a “social unit”, makers of “repertoire”, and a “culture repertoire” which provide “effective models” as well as “justification” for the activity. In my thesis, I want to analyze and interpret Abdullah Cevdet’s translations benefiting from these three main components of culture-planning. Certainly, one should also take the “reactions” against the inculcated repertoire as well as its “prospects of success” (Even-zohar 2005a: 1-4) into account.

Abdullah Cevdet was a person who could be counted among a “small dedicated group of thoughtful” (Margaret Mead in Even-Zohar 2005a: 6) in Ottoman society, who attempted to reconstruct the Ottoman “cultural repertoire” through his translations. I will argue in my thesis that Abdullah Cevdet’s translations entailed some new literary and cultural “options” — a term which “connotes the choice between two or more possibilities at a given situation” (Even-Zohar 1994: 3) — to be introduced to the Ottoman cultural polysystem. I will examine these “options” more closely in the following chapters where I will study the nature of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations and those of his non-literary translations. Among Abdullah

Cevdet's non-literary translations, the famous *Tarih-i İslamiyet* seems to possess the most radical cultural "options" the translator introduced to the home "repertoire", thereby violating the long established cultural conventions of Ottoman society.

Even-Zohar points out that a new repertoire is made through two procedures: "Invention" and "import" (1997a: 3). Due to the fact that an "invention" necessarily and inescapably bears in itself some degree of "import", the latter is far more decisive in the making of a repertoire (ibid). Abdullah Cevdet's translations could be seen rather as "imports" from Western literary and non-literary sources, though his translational strategies may reflect originalities. A challenging question for the topic of the present thesis is whether Abdullah Cevdet's imports became "transfers", i.e. "the state of integrated importation in a home repertoire", in the Ottoman cultural entity (Even-Zohar 1997a: 4). In other words, the following questions are significant issues to be scrutinized within the following chapters of the present thesis: What were the repercussions of Abdullah Cevdet's enterprise as an "idea-maker" and "cultural entrepreneur"? (2005a: 1). Did Abdullah Cevdet's "imports" become an integral part of the home repertoire?

It is an established fact that the First and the Second Constitutional periods were times of "culture-planning" activities through translations from Western sources (Demircioğlu 2005: 97; Uluğtekin 2004: 5). Some "free-agents" (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45) among the Ottoman literati had long diagnosed "the lag and lack" (Paker 2006: 336) in their society with respect to the European nations and reached the conclusion that they had no alternative but to follow the example of the Western nations. This fact finds its theoretical basis within Even-Zohar's formulations of "the position of translated literature within the literary Polysystem" (2000b). Here, he argues that translations assume a "central position" when a literature is "young",

“peripheral” and “weak” and “when there are turning points, crises or vacuums” in a literature (2000b: 194). I assume that this statement embraces not only a literary system but also the more encompassing cultural polysystem. Thus, the peripheral and weak situation of the Ottoman cultural system of the Constitutional periods is manifested in the famous “lag and lack” discourse of the Ottoman intellectuals (Paker 2006: 336). Of course it “requires a criterion to ascertain such things as the youth or strength of a culture or the presence of a ‘vacuum’ in it” (Hermans 1999: 109). I am aware that characterizing the Ottoman cultural polysystem as “young”, “weak” or in a “vacuum” will inescapably entail my own value judgements and “deliberate intervention” (Hermans 1999: 109) as a researcher. One can assume that the Ottoman cultural polysystem carried certain aspects of each of these types (cf. Paker 2003: 38). Suffice it to say that the relations within the network of the Ottoman cultural polysystem in the post-*Tanzimat* period, and the general discourse on that polysystem inescapably makes us ascribe a “primary”, i.e., “innovatory” (cf. Hermans 1999: 108), role to translations (Even-Zohar 2000b: 193), both in the literary and non-literary field. It is always admitted (Ortaylı 1983: 10) that the post-*Tanzimat* period, including the Second Constitutional period, constituted a turning point in Ottoman and Turkish cultural history (cf. Ortaylı 1983: 10). In a socio-cultural atmosphere in which individuals had to make a choice between Western models and the domestic “culture repertoire”, translation assumed an “innovatory” (Even-Zohar 2000b: 193) role within the Ottoman context. These translations provided both new “explanation models of reality” and new “models of action” (Even-Zohar 2002b: 79), for the Ottoman readers to modify their perception of the world and way of life.

The period beginning with the *Tanzimat* witnessed this kind of a turning point in Ottoman literature which certainly cannot be isolated from the cultural polysystem. In her article where she contextualizes (Paker 1991: 22, 25) translated literature in the *Tanzimat* period, Saliha Paker draws attention to the changes which occurred in the literary polysystem as part of cultural transformations beginning with the *Tanzimat* reforms. She refers to the “struggle” in this period between the dominant literary models and innovatory “options” (Even-Zohar 1997: 3) introduced to the Ottoman literary polysystem through translations from Western literature. She contextualizes the indigenous and translated literature of the period in connection with the political and cultural developments within a systemic point of view. Her study demonstrates that translated European literature paved the way for many “linguistic and literary innovations” (Paker 1991: 30) such as the simplification of prose and the “transfer” (Even-Zohar 1997: 4) of some Western literary genres such as the short story, drama and the novel. In the third chapter of my thesis, I will dwell specifically on Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations in connection with the larger literary and cultural context they hosted. I think that my analysis of Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of Shakespeare’s drama will shed some light on the new literary and cultural “options” (Even-Zohar 1994: 3) introduced to the Ottoman context at the turn of the twentieth century.

Beside the “options” he introduced to the literary sphere, Abdullah Cevdet also had some non-literary translations which directly aimed at transforming the Ottoman cultural sphere. It will be argued in the fourth chapter of this thesis that Abdullah Cevdet endeavored to “make” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45) a materialist, evolutionist anti-religious and Westernist culture “repertoire” through his non-literary translations. Of course, an analytical perspective on the cultural “polysystem”

(Even-Zohar 2005b) has to entail awareness as to the need for exploring these new models with respect to their struggles against “established models” (Even-Zohar 200b: 194). These innovations should be explored by no means without “resistance” (Even-Zohar 2002a). In fact, this study largely deals with Abdullah Cevdet’s making of a materialist, evolutionist and anti-religious repertoire through his translations, especially through his *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, and how his new “models” “clashed” with the “established models” in Ottoman culture. The “clash” I will be dealing with in this thesis is related more to the cultural sphere and less to the literary sphere due to the fact that Abdullah Cevdet intended to shape the more encompassing culture repertoire rather than to merely transform the literary sub-system.

“Resistance” to Abdullah Cevdet’s Ideological Program

Even-Zohar’s notion of “resistance”, a term described as “any kind of unwillingness towards the advocated, or inculcated, repertoire” (2002a: 48) will enable me to present the struggles between the new models and the established models in the Ottoman culture repertoire. This relationship is also important in its capacity to explain “success” (Even-Zohar 2000a) in any “culture-planning” activity. Abdullah Cevdet’s motives behind his selection of translations rather than original works as a communication tool was probably connected to his aim of reducing “active resistance” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 48), which implies an “overt” and “straightforward” opposition to the planned repertoire (ibid.). It seems that Abdullah Cevdet made use of translation as a kind of “disguise technique” (Toury 2002: 152) through which he aimed at avoiding the anger and criticism of the Ottoman readership and the

oppression of the “power-holders”¹⁷ (Even-Zohar 2000c: 401) due to the political and sometimes blasphemous nature of his “planning”.

In many cultures, tolerance of anomalies has been greater in acts and products assumed to be translational than in non- translational behavior, which lends initial legitimization to the introduction of novelties by means of translation. (Toury 2000: 155).

This statement is quite valid for many of Abdullah Cevdet’s translations published within the first three years of the Second Constitution. The content of *İstibdad* constituted a threat for the supreme power-holder of the time: Abdülhamid the Second. Still, Abdullah Cevdet could publish *İstibdad* in 1899, during the reign of Abdülhamid the Second who would most probably have censored or banned this work if it had not been published in the politically freer atmosphere of Egypt (cf. Göçmen 1995: 669). The translator’s preface to this work reveals that he justified himself by claiming that he only acted as a mediator whose sole responsibility was to convey the “perfections” (*kemâlât*) and the “defects” (*nekayıs*) of the source text with “complete care” (1899: 9; Appendix D). Nonetheless, Abdülhamid II seemed to be even less tolerant of the dissemination of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar*, since they were about unjust rulers who were executed at the end. It is not surprising that the performances of these plays were subject to strict censorship in the Ottoman lands and they were banned (Paker 1986: 91). This could be shown as a reason for why Abdullah Cevdet was able to publish the translations of these plays only after 1908, though he had finished translating *Hamlet* in 1902, *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth* in 1904 and *Romeo and Juliet* in 1905 (Süssheim 1987).

¹⁷ See Ebuzziya Mehmed Tevfik for the details of the political restrictions on the work and how its publication and circulation were forbidden by the government (1910: 3, 7).

Among Abdullah Cevdet's translations, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was the work which unquestionably evoked the harshest and most bitter "resistance" among the Ottomans (cf. Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı 1913; İsmail Fenni 1928; Derman 1972; Ersoy: 1990: 4-13; Abdullah Cevdet: 1912: 1103). It was a very controversial and provocative work with its blasphemous content through which Abdullah Cevdet attempted to violate the "sacredness of Islam" (Hanioglu2005a: 50). The ideas in Dozy's work as well as the translator's own comments in the preface have been quite provocative and controversial since the publication date up until the present. These ideas and comments have always been subject to extensive criticism, even today¹⁸. The fact that this work was a translation became a frequently-used justification for Abdullah Cevdet and his supporters against the "resistance" of the power-holders and of the readership. In his preface to *Tarih-i İslamiyet* Abdullah Cevdet justified himself by claiming that he fulfilled an important duty to the advantage of the Muslims (*ehl-i İslam*) by translating this work (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 8). An ardent supporter of Abdullah Cevdet, Ebuzziya M. Tevfik, published a book to defend *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and its translator against the criticism of the conservative *literati* and criticized governmental restrictions (1910). In this work, Ebuzziya proposed that Abdullah Cevdet had translated this work in order to make the Muslims aware of the "insults" of a non-Muslim against the prophet Mohammed. This way, Abdullah Cevdet enabled the Muslims to fight against the "assaults" in Dozy's work (1910: 9).

¹⁸ Quite interestingly Mehmet Ali Derman wrote a book criticizing Dozy's ideas in 1972, 64 years after the publication of Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's work in 1908. See also Hilmi Yavuz's comments on this translation as a more recent discussion at: <http://www.zaman.com.tr/webapp-tr/yazar.do?yazino=446331#> and <http://www.zaman.com.tr/webapp-tr/yazar.do?yazino=450367#>

Summary

All in all, I find systemic approaches to cultural and translational phenomena a useful framework within which to study the strategies of Abdullah Cevdet's nine translations published in the first three years of the Second Constitutional period. Even-Zohar's definitions of different elements within a culture offer us an overall picture of what a system is and what the dynamics behind the transformations within this cultural system are. To be more precise, the notions such as "conservatory" and "innovatory forces" (2000b: 194) within a social entity, "polysystem" (2005b), "culture-planning", (2002a: 45) "cultural entrepreneurs" (2005a: 1), "import", (1997: 3), "transfer" (4), "justification" (2002a: 46) and "resistance" (48) are really instrumental tools of the systemic approach which will guide me through a deep and multi-dimensional analysis of the translations. These theoretical tools seem to be very illuminating since they shed light on almost all aspects and elements of culture-planning, which is the main topic of the present thesis.

CHAPTER 3: ABDULLAH CEVDET’S SHAKESPEARE TRANSLATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR HIS CULTURE-PLANNING

I will propose in the present chapter that Abdullah Cevdet’s translations from Shakespeare “proliferated” “options” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 2) both in the field of literature and, most seriously, in the more encompassing Ottoman cultural polysystem. In the post-*Tanzimat* period, therefore, the role of Abdullah Cevdet in re-shaping the Ottoman literary and cultural “repertoire” should be emphasized adequately, like that of Ahmed Midhat, whose significant contributions in re-shaping Ottoman literature and culture has often been acknowledged in modern literary circles (cf. Demircioğlu 2003: 15; Bengi-Öner 199975).

Due to the fact that Abdullah Cevdet was a culture-planner, his literary translations cannot only be judged on their “aesthetic” level. It will be discussed in this chapter that Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth* could be read as critical texts directed against Abdülhamid II’s absolutist regime. In that sense, one can attribute a pragmatic aspect to these translations as well. Both the “aesthetic” and “pragmatic” functions of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations justify the Prague Structuralists and Even-Zohar in that a literary system is closely bound to external conditions (Hermans 1999: 105). As Hermans puts it, “literary change then stems from a combination of intrinsic evolution and extrinsic intervention.” (1999:105). Accordingly, I will focus on Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations both at the aesthetic and pragmatic levels.

I consider that Abdullah Cevdet’s translation of *Romeo and Juliet* is especially significant due to the fact that it reflects best Abdullah Cevdet’s own

understanding of translating the “foreignness” of a Western classical work. Besides, *Romeo ve Jülyet* clearly reflects Abdullah Cevdet’s conception and practice of literary translation, which was in fact quite innovatory for his time.

In addition, Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies gain even more significance with the fact that the new “options” they carried were by no means confined solely to the literary system. It is not a coincidence that the contents of *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* suited perfectly Abdullah Cevdet’s political aims as a member of the Committee of Union and Progress, a secret organization which fiercely struggled against Abdülhamid’s absolutist regime. In the present chapter, I will point at the new “options” Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the Ottoman literary and cultural repertoire through his Shakespeare translations.

Toury’s methodology for descriptive and interpretative analyses of translated texts (as discussed in Toury 1995) and his notion and categorization of “translational norms” (Toury 2000: 198-211) will provide a systematic and empirical framework for my analysis of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations from a multidimensional perspective. My discussion of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations will take into account Toury’s classification of translational norms and his descriptive and analytical methodology.

Even though full translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies did not appear before 1908, the Ottomans had already held an interest in Shakespeare’s plays since the first decades of the nineteenth century (Enginün 1979: 14). The activities of the Armenian and Greek theatres seem to have contributed a great deal to Shakespeare’s reputation among the Ottoman theatre-goers (ibid). Another pioneering event which added to his fame was Mehmed Nâdir’s translation of Victor Hugo’s article, entitled “Shakespeare Bir Heykele Muhtaç mıdır?” (“Does Shakespeare Need a Statue?”

(cited in Enginün 1979: 72). Such important events and several other scattered articles published in the periodicals of the *Tanzimat* seem to have stimulated educated Ottomans in their appreciation of Shakespeare's works (Enginün 1979: 111, 240). Apart from the texts prepared for theatre performances, various published translations, adaptations and abridgements from Shakespeare's plays had amounted to seven before 1908 (Enginün 1979: 20).

Despite Shakespeare's considerable influence on the Ottoman elite before the Second Constitutional period (Enginün 1979: 254), Abdülhamid II's political censors could only permit the translations of less political plays. Such early translations from Shakespeare are *The Comedy of Errors* (by Hasan Sırrı 1887 and Mihran Boyacıyan 1886), *The Merchant of Venice* (by Hasan Sırrı 1884), *Romeo and Juliet* (by Mihran Boyacıyan 1886), *Othello* (by Hasan Bedreddin & Mehmed Rıfat 1876, and Mihran Boyacıyan who finished translating in 1896 but was not allowed to publish it until 1912) and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (by Mihran Boyacıyan 1886) [cf. Enginün 1979]. While Hasan Sırrı produced "full" (Enginün 1979: 30) translations of *The Comedy of Errors* and *The Merchant of Venice*, Mihran Boyacıyan reproduced *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Othello* "in the form of short stories" (Enginün 1979: 3; Sevük 1940, v.1: 527). Among these early translations, Hasan Bedreddin and Mehmed Rıfat's adapted version of *Othello* is generally considered to be the first translation of Shakespeare in Turkish literary history (Sevük 1940, v. 1: 527; Enginün 1979: 21). Interesting as it seems, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Othello* were translated repeatedly whereas the plays which were considered more political and threatening by the Hamidian administration such as *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* had not been translated fully until 1908.

Considering the socio-cultural and intellectual milieu of the time, it is understandable that aesthetic concerns were not Abdullah Cevdet's only reason for working on Shakespeare's drama. They also reflected some cultural concerns or "pragmatic functions" (Hermans 1999: 105), which were intimately linked with his cultural project. First of all, Abdullah Cevdet shared the same concern with many of the contemporary Ottoman intellectuals who appreciated the necessity of translating Western classics into Turkish in order to reach "the target of hoped-for perfection" (*kemâlât-ı matlûbe menzili*, Ahmed Midhat in Enginün 1979: 249; cf. Mardin 1983: 167,174, 175). However, it is worth questioning why Abdullah Cevdet preferred English as a source culture and Shakespeare's tragedies as source texts instead of other Western works of classical nature. What made these plays so strategic and significant in terms of Abdullah Cevdet's culture-planning? What were Abdullah Cevdet's translation strategies which served his culture-planning aims? In this chapter I will try to find answers to these crucial questions.

Abdullah Cevdet's Translation Policies

As was pointed out in the introduction, Abdullah Cevdet published four of Shakespeare's tragedies between 1908 and 1910. These are *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *Romeo and Juliet*, in the chronological order of their publications. Of these, Abdullah Cevdet translated *Hamlet* first, then *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar* and *Romeo and Juliet* successively¹⁹ (See Appendix 1). I will discuss below his "translation policies" which refer to "those factors that govern the choice of text types; or culture / language at a particular point in time" (Toury 2000: 202).

19 This chronological order is based on the detailed information given by Süssheim whose research is regarded as the most detailed secondary source on Abdullah Cevdet (cf. Mardin 1983: 164).

The Relevance and Role of the Source Culture for Abdullah Cevdet's Planning

First of all, Abdullah Cevdet's decision-making process starts with his choice of English culture as a source for translation. Due to the fact that the selection of source language and culture is an important factor in accounting for any kind of "translation policy", Abdullah Cevdet's selection of source language and culture needs to be questioned (Toury 2000: 202). Obviously, this preference also affected Abdullah Cevdet's political opinions. During the years of the WWI, he was in conflict with other members of the Union and Progress Party in power since he supported cooperation with England during the war whereas the others wanted an alliance with Germany (Hanioğlu 1981: 230-31). This is why he contributed to the foundation of the Society of Anglophiles (*İngiliz Muhipleri Cemiyeti*, Hanioğlu 1981: 303). His position as a supporter of England could be associated with his belief in the evolutionary supremacy of English society over other Western peoples (Doğan 2006: 182). His translation *İngiliz Kavmi* from Emile Boutmy clearly reflects his ideas about the "high" qualities of the English (Abdullah Cevdet 1909b). Mazhar Osman Bey, a close friend of Abdullah Cevdet's, also affirmed that Abdullah Cevdet "was convinced of the greatness of the Anglo-Saxon culture" (Mazhar Osman Bey 1932: 5875). He proposed that one of the three reasons for the backwardness of the Turks was "their adoption of the language and culture of the French rather than those of the English or Germans"²⁰ (Abdullah Cevdet in Arıkan 2005: 101).

His high opinion of the English people could also be observed within the pages of his journal *İctihad* where he states that "the English are truly the greatest of

²⁰ "İngiliz veya Alman lisanı ve harsı yerine Fransız lisanı ve harsını almamız"

the nations” (Abdullah Cevdet 1914b: 1982). This claim could be accounted for by Abdullah Cevdet’s social Darwinist ideas which were largely shaped by the teachings of Gustave Le Bon and Ludwig Böhner²¹ (Doğan 2006: 74, 171). Abdullah Cevdet divided all the races of the world into four and ranked Europeans and Indians the first (Doğan 2006: 182). For him, what determined the degree of a race’s evolution was not “intelligence” (*zekâ*) but their “dispositions” (*seciye*), owing to which the English were superior to the others (ibid). He was also affected by some French thinkers such as Emile Boutmy and Emile Demolins who complained about the inadequacy of the French educational system and turned toward Anglo-Saxon educational methods (Mardin 1983: 175). Abdullah Cevdet and many other intellectuals of the period were well aware of the importance of educational systems for the re-awakening of a people (ibid.). It seems that all of the reasons mentioned above led Abdullah Cevdet to turn to the sources of English culture for inspiration, both for himself and for his countrymen.

Abdullah Cevdet’s Selection of Shakespeare’s Plays

A translator’s “choice of source text” is another factor which is governed by the translator’s “translation policy” (Toury 2000: 203). Abdullah Cevdet’s choice of drama to translate stands meaningful for his ideological program, considering that this *genre* has the advantage of being the most direct form of communication with the Ottoman audience. Then, why did he prefer Shakespeare’s plays rather than

²¹ Abdullah Cevdet’s worldview was so deeply influenced by the formulations of such sociologists that Atila Doğan places him in the avant-garde of those who introduced Darwinist, evolutionist theories to Ottoman lands (2006: 172).

French ones which were more popular among his contemporaries?²² (Enginün 1979: 20) The answer to this question lies in Abdullah Cevdet's admiration for Shakespeare which is evident in his writings. His article "Şekspir ve *Hamlet*" indicates that Victor Hugo's role in inspiring such admiration was considerable²³ (1927: 4319-23). In this article Abdullah Cevdet praises Victor Hugo's work on Shakespeare and mentions that it has been "a companion to [his] soul" (*ruhumun arkadaşı*) beginning from his years in prison in 1895 (1927: 4319). In the same article, he agrees with Hugo that Shakespeare is a true "homme-océan" (1927: 4320) and justifies his admiration for Shakespeare by defining him as "the greatest source after the Highest Creator" (*Halik-ı a'zamdan sonra en büyük mebde*, ibid.). Abdullah Cevdet's admiration for the English poet is so conspicuous that Vahid Turhan described him as a "Shakespeare idolater" (1965: 56). It must have been this kind of "idolatry" which made Abdullah Cevdet write a poem of nine quatrains to express his "youthful excitement and admiration²⁴" for Shakespeare in the dungeon of the medical school in 1884 (Abdullah Cevdet 1927: 4320).

Apart from Victor Hugo's impact, the interest aroused for Shakespeare in the *Tanzimat* period, cultivated especially by various men of letters, seems to be equally important in approximating Abdullah Cevdet to Shakespeare. In her work on Shakespeare translations and their influences in the *Tanzimat* period, Enginün examines the traces of Shakespearean influence in some plays of the *Tanzimat* period

²² Enginün states that there were 79 translations from French drama whereas only 8 plays were rendered from English between 1277 and 1311 [between 1860 and 1896 according to the Christian Calendar] (1979: 29).

²³ Vahid Turhan points out that Victor Hugo is an important figure who introduced Shakespeare to the Ottoman intellectuals and his work on Shakespeare "seems to have been the most influential one in spreading the love of Shakespeare in Turkey" (1965: 54).

²⁴ Abdullah Cevdet reports in one of his articles in *İctihad* that his poem on Shakespeare had been translated into English by E.J.W Gibb (Abdullah Cevdet 1927: 4321). However, I could not find it in Gibb's extensive work on Ottoman poetry (1958).

and concludes that a number of playwrights such as Ebuzziya Tevfik, Sami Paşazade Sezai, Namık Kemal and Abdülhak Hamid, “the greatest poet” (*şair-i azam*) of his time, were significantly influenced by Shakespeare’s works (1979: 115, 203, 254). Enginün argues that it was this influence which prepared the ground for Abdullah Cevdet to become “a great translator of Shakespeare” in the Second Constitutional period (1979: 254). Shakespeare’s influence on Abdülhak Hamid has often been pronounced by many other literary critics as well, and his poetic style was often compared with that of Shakespeare (cf. Enginün 1979: 157; Turhan 1965: 54; Abdullah Cevdet 1913: 424). It appears that Abdülhak Hamid, with whom Abdullah Cevdet was acquainted in 1885 at the age of sixteen and was influenced by to a great extent, contributed much to Abdullah Cevdet’s admiration for Shakespeare (cf. Abdullah Cevdet 1913: 426).

Political constraints on the production and distribution of Shakespeare translations under Abdülhamid II’s absolutist regime could best be studied within the framework of Lefevere’s notion of “patronage” (1992: 15). “Patronage” is defined by Lefevere as “the powers (persons, institutions) which can further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literature” (ibid.). Studying the ideological constraints on the production and consumption of Shakespeare translations with the notion of “patronage” will provide us with a more concrete way of explaining “ideological overdetermination of translation” (Hermans 1999: 120).

In the light of Lefevere’s definition of “patronage” (1992: 15), Abdülhamid II’s restrictions on some of Shakespeare’s plays which he thought might threaten his absolutist regime could be viewed as a “control mechanism” (Hermans 1999: 126) on literature in Ottoman society. That is why Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies could only be published after Abdülhamid II’s absolute

monarchy was weakened by the re-establishment of the Ottoman Constitution. Of these, *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth* reflected Abdullah Cevdet's reaction against Hamidian despotism and his love and advocacy of liberty. One must also remember him as one of the founding members of the Party of Union and Progress — a secret organization which conspired to overthrow Abdülhamid's absolutist regime. The argument that Abdullah Cevdet's translation of *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth* reflected his opposition to Abdülhamid II's absolute monarchy could be justified with the fact that the themes of the translated plays were perceived by the political authorities as threatening, since they were about the murder of kings and heads of state, as was already mentioned in the introduction of the present thesis. This fact accounts for why none of the tragedies except *Romeo and Juliet* (an abridgement by Mihran Boyacıyan 1886) appeared in Turkish before 1908. Hamidian censorship on such themes was so dominant that Nüzhet could not state that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was the portrayal of Caesar's murder (Nüzhet in Enginün 1979: 243). Instead, he explained that the play depicts the ““passing away” [vefatı] of the famous Roman General and legislator” (ibid.). Another manifestation of censorship on some of Shakespeare's tragedies is that the actor Ernesto Rossi's attempts to play *Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth* were prevented on instructions given by Abdülhamid II, who perceived these plays to be dangerous for his rule (And 1972: 438). Obviously, Abdullah Cevdet's translations of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* could be “read” as a critique of the Hamidian regime since they convey to the audience who the oppressed are and what kind of ruler the oppressor is (cf. And 1961: 84-85).

Among Shakespeare's tragedies, *Hamlet* (1908) unquestionably had priority for Abdullah Cevdet. In his reviews of Shakespeare's plays, he places it at the top of

what he calls “the four inauspicious tragedies” (*dört meş’um dram* 1914a: 307): *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear* and *Othello*. He also adds that critics sometimes replace *King Lear* with *Romeo and Juliet* (ibid.). Abdullah Cevdet translated all of these tragedies except *Othello*²⁵. This could be related to the fact that *Othello* had already been adapted by Mehmed Rifat and Hasan Bedreddin Paşa and published in 1876. The play was retranslated by Mihran Boyacıyan but could be published only in 1912, after the re-establishment of the Second Constitution, because of censorship (Enginün 1979: 57).

In Abdullah Cevdet’s view, *Macbeth* is famous as the drama of “ambition for status” (*hirs-ı cah*), *King Lear* as that of “ingratitude” (*küfran-ı nimet*), *Romeo and Juliet* as that of “love and affection” (*aşk ve muhabbet*), and *Othello* as that of “envy” (*haset*) (1914: 307). However, Abdullah Cevdet finds it incongruous to describe *Hamlet* only as “the drama of “hesitation” (*tereddüt*) and “doubt” (*şek*) (307), because, he asserts, *Hamlet* includes many other aspects of human psychology as well (1927: 4321).

The importance of *Hamlet* for Abdullah Cevdet could be justified with the number of reviews he wrote on it. Among the six reviews he wrote on Shakespeare’s plays in *İctihad*, three are on *Hamlet* (1930a; 1927; 1914), one on *Julius Caesar* (1930b), one on *Macbeth* (1931a) and one on *Richard III* (1931c). In addition to *Hamlet*’s literary quality, there is also an ideological aspect of it which affected Abdullah Cevdet’s perception of the play and stimulated him to translate it as early as in 1902, before he translated any other play by Shakespeare. *Hamlet* appealed to Abdullah Cevdet since he found many parallels between himself and the young

25 Although Abdullah Cevdet finished the translation of *King Lear* on April 1904 (or 1901) and its printing began in 1912, it could only be published in 1917 (Süssheim 1987: 58). He also finished the translation of *Antony and Cleopatra*, another tragedy by Shakespeare, on 18 November 1913, and it was eventually published in 1921 (Süssheim 1987: 59).

Hamlet (cf. Dr. Hüseyinzade Ali 1932: 5897). Hamlet struggled against his step-father who unjustly became king. Abdullah Cevdet saw parallels between Hamlet's step-father and Abdulhamid II, the sultan, who had been brought to the throne (1876) on the condition that he would promulgate the Constitution (*Kanun-i Esasi*) but did not really keep his promise. This is why the abolition of the Constitution (1878) had the symbolic meaning of "to be or not to be" (*var mı olayım, yok mu*) for the young and sensitive Abdullah Cevdet and for many other young Ottoman intellectuals (ibid.).

Zeki Arıkan states that Abdullah Cevdet "saw a supremacy in the educational and civilisational components of Anglo-Saxons in *Hamlet*" (2005: 102). This was obviously another important reason which paved the way for Abdullah Cevdet's translation of the play.

Even though Abdullah Cevdet does not include *Julius Caesar* (translated by Abdullah Cevdet with the title *Jül Sezar*) among what he calls "the four inauspicious tragedies", it was the only play for which Abdullah Cevdet wrote an impressive preface, and it was the second play he translated and published after *Hamlet*. In a sense, special importance was attributed to *Julius Caesar* by Abdullah Cevdet for ideological reasons and it was also highly esteemed by other revolutionaries in the Union and Progress Party (Enginün 1979: 119)²⁶. Indeed, his long preface to this play could be seen as a manifesto of his mission as a "cultural entrepreneur" (Even-Zohar 2005a: 10) who chose to "awaken" his countrymen by showing them the "truths" (*hakikatleri*) with "gentleness" (*hilm*), "poetry" (*şiiir*), "lyrical expression" (*terennümler*) or "cries and clamor" (*sayhalar*) (Cevdet 1908g: 306-307). This preface clearly indicates that this late Ottoman intellectual identified himself with

²⁶ Enginün reports that *Julius Caesar* was translated in Japan with similar motivations. (1979: 119).

Brutus, the protagonist of *Julius Caesar*, who fought for the “salvation of the country (*selamet-i vatan*) and to keep the “general freedom” (*hürriyet-i umumiyye*) of the nation (Cevdet 1908g: 306). The words quoted below from the preface demonstrate how the translator identified himself with Brutus who tried to reawaken his people with all his might and to raise their consciousness for liberty and the acquisition of republican values.

“Brutus! You’re sleeping, wake up and see who you are. Is Rome going to survive? Speak, strike, set it right. Brutus! You are sleeping, wake up!” someone shouted and made him save Rome and Romans. Ignoring my smallness before Brutus’s infinite grandeur, I call on you o Muslims, o Turks, o Turkey’s citizens: You are sleeping. Wake up, speak, hit and strike it right.²⁷ (1908g: 305; Appendix B) [my translation].

Because of a growing suspicion that Caesar intends to convert republican Rome into a monarchy under his own rule, Marcus Brutus and his fellow conspirators motivated by the demands of honor and patriotism want to eliminate Caesar before he proclaims himself dictator. For this purpose, they assassinate Caesar. Apparently Abdullah Cevdet drew a parallel between these conspirators and the Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress to which he belonged. Just like Brutus and his comrades, these Ottoman intellectuals aimed at deposing Abdülhamid II who had abolished the parliament and the Constitution and hence had betrayed the constitutional values. However, as Cevdet’s words suggest, he was unlike Brutus who used brutal force to reach his aims, whereas Abdullah Cevdet wanted to persuade his countrymen with words and ideas, be they original or translated.

²⁷“ Brütüse ‘Brütüs! Sen uyuyorsun; uyan, kim olduğunu gör, Roma kalacak mı?... Söyle, vur, hakkı yerine getir. Brütüs! Sen uyuyorsun, uyan!’ diye bağırarak Roma ve Romalılar kurtarılmıştı. Ben de Brütüs’ün bi-intiha büyüklüğü karşısında küçüklüğüme bakmayarak, ey Müslümanlar, ey Türkler, ey Türkiyeli vatandaşlar, sizlere böyle bağıryorum: Uyuyorsunuz, uyanınız, söyleyiniz, vurunuz, hakkı yerine getiriniz.”

Romeo ve Jülyet (1909-1910), which was published in the prominent magazine *Şehbal*, seems to be a significant work through which Abdullah Cevdet clearly exhibited his own reply to the question “how should European classics be translated?” In *Romeo ve Jülyet*, one can see both Abdullah Cevdet’s discourse (in the paratexts) and his practice of translating a European work of classical nature, as I will explain further in the following pages of this chapter. Compared to *Jül Sezar*, *Hamlet* and *Makbes*, which attracted attention with some critical political messages besides their aesthetic aspects due to the socio-political environment of the period, Abdullah Cevdet’s *Romeo ve Jülyet* became more conspicuous with its aesthetic aspect. Thus, it might be viewed as more closely related to the Ottoman literary system.

Directness of Translation

One needs to examine the languages Abdullah Cevdet knew in order to clarify the “directness” (Toury 2000: 202) of his translations, since his Shakespeare translations were published without reference to his source text or author(s).

Mazhar Osman Bey, a friend of Abdullah Cevdet’s, reports that Abdullah Cevdet had competence (*vukuf*) in Arabic and Persian and knowledge of French (1932; 5875). He was also acquainted (*aşina*) with German and English and studied English until the last days of his life (ibid.). The existence of French and Persian poems in one of his personal collections of poetry, *Kahriyat* (Deep Sorrow, Abdullah Cevdet 1908f), shows that he was proficient in both of these languages in which he could write poems. One should also keep in mind that Abdullah Cevdet graduated from the military medical school of Gülhane (*Mekteb-i Tıbbiye*) where he got a very good French education (cf. Sağlam 1981: 48 and 89).

The evidence above supports the argument that Abdullah Cevdet benefited much from the French translations of Shakespeare while translating four of Shakespeare's tragedies since he was not competent enough to translate a literary work by Shakespeare from the English (cf. Mazhar Osman Bey 1932; 5875). This claim is justified by the fact that Abdullah Cevdet often praises François Victor Hugo's translations of Shakespeare in his reviews and describes them as "most charming" (*en rengin*, 1927: 4322). Vahid Turhan points out that Victor Hugo is the person who first introduced Shakespeare to the Ottoman intellectuals. He adds that Victor Hugo's work on Shakespeare was one of the most important events in making Shakespeare known and admired among the Ottomans (1965: 54). This testimony may also serve as a clue to support the argument that Abdullah Cevdet benefited considerably from the French versions of the English poet's plays while translating them. It was not until 1913 that Abdullah Cevdet felt competent in the English language and translated Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* from the English original, a translation described by Süssheim as a "masterpiece" (1987: 59).

Unfortunately, no reference is given in the paratexts of Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations to the authors or editors of the source texts he used (cf. Süssheim 1987: 59). Even though there is a general recognition that Abdullah Cevdet rendered Shakespeare's plays from their French versions (Süssheim 1987: 59; Adivar 1943: 219), paratextual and extratextual evidence suggests that he made use of the German and English versions as well. Footnotes which were abundantly used by Abdullah Cevdet and his reviews of the plays in the journal *İctihad* include the names of some French and German translators. In the footnotes of Abdullah Cevdet's translation of *Hamlet*, there is a reference to the French translator Montégut (Jean-Baptiste-Joseph-Emile Montégut, 1867) and a reference to "Shakespeare's

annotator” (Shakespeare *müfessiri*, Abdullah Cevdet 1908a: 130 and 240), Farmer, on whom I could find no information during my research.

In *Makbes*, there is again a reference to Montégut who is said to translate the word “stale” not as water (*su*), unlike “all the German and French translators” (1909a: 140). In addition, Abdullah Cevdet quotes the Latin saying “*catus amat pisces, sed non vult tingre plantas*” in the footnote to explain a relevant translation unit, and explains that this saying was borrowed from François-Victor Hugo’s translation (1909a: 37). In another footnote in *Makbes*, Abdullah Cevdet compares Johann Heinrich Voss’s (1818) German translation of a sentence with the English original and reports that the French translators rendered the sentence the way he (Abdullah Cevdet) did (1909a: 144). Such evidence in Abdullah Cevdet’s footnotes manifests that he consulted both the French and German versions of the plays as well as the English originals when he found it necessary, though no information was given about the editors of the English versions.

To sum up, peritextual evidence leads us to the conclusion that Abdullah Cevdet benefited from Montégut, Hugo, Voss and some other French and German translations that are not cited in the footnotes while translating *Macbeth*. In addition, he resorted to the English source text where he felt necessary. This finding of my research conflicts with a common belief that Abdullah Cevdet was only guided by French texts.

In *Julius Caesar* however, there are no such references. Again, the translator does not mention a specific translator’s name in the footnotes of *Romeo ve Jülyet*, though he ambiguously refers to some “Shakespeare annotators” (*Şekspir müfessirleri*) and complains that they explained a relevant translation unit insufficiently (1909-1910: 220; 234; 440). However, he sometimes gives the English

source text correspondence of some translation units in the footnotes (1909-1910: 353, 419; 440) without mentioning the editor. These footnotes suggest the possibility that the role of the English source text is relatively more important in *Romeo ve Jülyet* than in the other plays. Besides, there are some untranslated French words e.g. *marotte* (1909-1910: 298) *confesseur* (1909-1910: 320), *coquin* (1909-1910: 220) in *Romeo ve Jülyet* which give a clear idea about the mediating language of the translation. The fact that these non-translations do not exist in the English source text is a clear indication that Abdullah Cevdet translated these parts from a French translator. Moreover, some of these words, such as *doer* (1909-1910: 481) and *marotte* (1909-1910: 298) are explained in the footnote with a reference to Şemseddin Sami's *Kamus-u Fransevi*. This fact reveals that Abdullah Cevdet saw no harm in making explicit that he was translating the text from a mediating language. This manner is very important since it can give some clues about the Ottoman translation practices. Abdullah Cevdet's manner points at a possibility that translating from a mediating language was not something to be concealed in the Ottoman literary "polysystem" (Even-Zohar 2005b) of the period. Certainly, one must take other translations and translators into account to speak of such a translation "norm" (Toury 2000: 198-211).

Abdullah Cevdet mentions in his review of *Hamlet* that the total number of various French and German translators amounted to 150 (1927: 4322). He points out that François-Victor Hugo's French version of *Hamlet* is "most charming" (*en rengin* *ibid.*). He also finds Théodore Reinach's 1880 edition of *Hamlet* written in verse very successful (*ibid.*) and counts François-Pierre-Guillaume Guizot's (1787-1874) ("Gı zÿ") text among the best translations of *Hamlet* (*ibid.*). In addition to these, as his reviews of the play suggest, Abdullah Cevdet examined some German

translations of *Hamlet* by August Wilhelm Schlegel (1797-1833) and Christoph Martin Wieland (1762-1766), who also represented Shakespeare's works in prose. Unfortunately, this evidence fails to prove that Abdullah Cevdet benefited from these for his Shakespeare translations, since he mentions these German translators in one of the 1927 issues of *İctihad*, long after he had finished his translation of *Hamlet* in 1902.

Even though some intellectuals of this period such as Necip Asım showed sensitivity about the necessity of rendering Western classics directly from their originals (in Paker 2006: 340), Abdullah Cevdet did not seem to share the same sensitivity (cf. Süssheim 1987: 59). Besides, there are no acknowledgements in the paratexts as to the mediating languages or texts except some scattered references in the footnotes, which I mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. This seems to be quite interesting, considering that Abdullah Cevdet's original works as well as his translations generally include meticulously detailed bibliographical information. The book covers of his translations mostly give the name of the source text and that of the author, the year and place where the translation was published, sometimes a dated preface, the date and place where the translation was completed (*Hitam-ı Tercüme*), and a given number among the *İctihad* Library (*Kütübhane-i İctihad*) series. In the case of his Shakespeare translations however, paratextual evidence fails to give any clear idea as to the directness of the translations of the four tragedies.

According to Enginün, François Victor Hugo's Shakespeare translations were the most popular among the Ottoman intellectuals of the period compared to various French translations of Shakespeare (Enginün 1979: 11). This premise and the references Abdullah Cevdet often gives to Hugo's work constitute a justifiable basis

to argue that Abdullah Cevdet was considerably influenced by Hugo's French translations of Shakespeare while translating the plays (cf. Paker 1986: 102).

Enginün argues that Hugo constructed Shakespeare in French in such a way that the "integrity" of his works were "given back" and these works were "stripped off the fantastic flamboyance and excessive burdens" overloaded by previous French translators (1979: 11; cf. Willems 2007) [my translation]. I will claim in the following pages of the present thesis that Abdullah Cevdet, too, rendered the plays adhering closely to the source text and preserved the integrity of the works (cf. Paker 1986: 94). Considering the nature of the texts they produced, both of them aimed at the reading-public instead of the theatre-goers (cf. Willems: 2007; Paker 1986: 94). Interestingly enough, François Victor Hugo's translations were republished in 1959, 100 years after the first editions (Willems 2007) whereas Abdullah Cevdet's translations from Shakespeare were almost cast into oblivion within three decades. An important reason was that he verbalized Shakespeare's words in heavily "Persianized poetic diction" with much Arabic and Persian vocabulary and compounds (Paker 1986: 94) unlike Hugo, who preferred to "depart from conventional language and poetic diction" (Willems 2007).

The Matricial and Textual-Linguistic Features of Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare Translations

At this stage of the thesis, Abdullah Cevdet's "matricial" and "textual-linguistic" features will be the focal point (Toury 2000: 203). These are the features which affected "the matrix" of his translated texts, and "his selection of material to formulate the target text in" (ibid.). Abdullah Cevdet's choice of lexical items, his

style, whether he represented Shakespeare in prose or in verse and the motives behind it, are the main issues to be scrutinized in this part of this chapter.

In general, Abdullah Cevdet comes on the scene as a fidelity-seeking translator in his renderings from Shakespeare, and this is manifested with his conspicuous concern for “keeping the textual integrity of the original” (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 6). He preserved the number of acts and scenes in each play. Besides, there are only a few cases of small omissions, some of which are discussed in the following pages of the present thesis. Likewise, there are hardly any manipulations of the original segmentation in the plays. Abdullah Cevdet transformed Shakespeare’s “blank verse”²⁸ into prose which, as I have discovered in my reading and examination of the texts, manifests remarkable similarities with the traditional Ottoman prose style of *inşa*, as will be elaborated in a later part of the present chapter. The natural characteristics of the Arabic alphabet, in which Cevdet’s translations appeared, only allowed the translators of this period to represent foreign proper names phonetically in Turkish. Generally, however, Abdullah Cevdet resorted to the Latin lettering of these names in paratexts in order to indicate their true spelling. As his Shakespeare translations were mediated by French texts to some extent, some proper names were kept in French spelling. For instance, in *Hamlet* Cornelius is presented as “Cornélius”, and Ophelia as “Ophélia”. In addition, Abdullah Cevdet uses some French words in Latin script in his Shakespeare translations, which also seems to have resulted from the fact that, while translating, he benefited considerably from the French translations of Shakespeare. Sometimes, apart from translating a word, he also gives its correspondent in French: e.g. in *Hamlet* he presents the French word *sauveur* in the footnote (1908a: 15) as the

²⁸ See Halman for his evaluation of “blank verse” in Shakespeare’s drama and how to recreate it in Turkish (1953: 63).

correspondent of his Turkish word *münci* (rescuer) though in the English source text the word is “saviour”. Note that the French translator Guizot (death: 1864) also represented the English word “saviour” with the French word *sauveur*.

Shakespeare’s Drama “Fully” Reproduced in Ottoman Turkish Prose

On the inside cover of the book, Abdullah Cevdet describes his translation of *Hamlet* as a “complete rendering in verse and prose” (*manzum ve mensur tercüme-i kamilesi* 1908a). Despite this claim, one can hardly call his translation verse. As Süssheim would also agree, he conveyed Shakespeare’s verses in “rhymeless prose” except for Hamlet’s soliloquy (Act II Scene II), where he practiced a traditional Ottoman meter²⁹ (*aruz*), but did not apply it to the entire speech (1987: 59).

Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of Shakespeare’s drama resemble those of some contemporaneous French and German translators, e.g. Guizot, Shlegel, Wieland, in that they represent Shakespeare’s blank verse in prose (Willem 2007). Extra-textual evidence proves that Abdullah Cevdet was familiar with these names and wrote highly of them (Abdullah Cevdet 1927: 4322). Similarly, Montégut and Hugo, who are frequently referred to in Abdullah Cevdet’s footnotes and reviews (as I discussed under the heading of “Directness of Translation” in this chapter), wrote French translations of Shakespeare’s drama in prose. This similarity may suggest that Abdullah Cevdet’s choice of prose for Shakespeare’s drama was due to the fact that he was guided by these translators to a great extent during the translation process, especially by the French translators Hugo and Montégut. However, these translators’ influence stands insufficient to account for Abdullah Cevdet’s choice of prose to

²⁹ mef’ûl-ü / mefâ’îlü / mefâ’îlü / fe’ ûlün

translate Shakespeare's verses. It is most likely that the natural differences between the source and target languages and the difficulty of rebuilding the semantics and aesthetic elegance of Shakespeare's expressions in Turkish also affected Abdullah Cevdet's decision of representing Shakespearean drama simply in prose (cf. Demircioğlu 2003: 29). However, the real determining factor on Abdullah Cevdet's preference of prose over verse is probably related to the "translation norms" (Toury 2000: 202) of the period and of the translator. Even though "traditional constraints established in Ottoman poetics [required] that poetry should be rendered in verse, hence by a poet" in the form of "parallel poetry" or "Perso-Arabic verse", this norm was already challenged by a new understanding of translating dramatic literature in the post-*Tanzimat* period (Paker 2006: 342). Ahmed Midhat was one who expressed such a challenge when he stated his dilemma between preserving the form or the content while translating Corneille's *Le Cid* under the title *Sid'in Hülasası*:

Ahmed Midhat could not have translated *Le Cid* "identically" (aynen terceme) because the play was originally in verse; and even if he had done a free translation (serbest terceme), that would not have been able to convey the 'rhetorical eloquence' (belagat) of the original, because such translation (aynen ve nazmen terceme) is not possible" (Ahmed Midhat in Paker 2006: 330).

Apart from Ahmed Midhat's *Sid Hülasası*, some Turkish translators of Shakespeare such as Mehmed Nadir, Mihran Boyacıyan, Hasan Sırrı, and Hasan Bedreddin Mehmed Rıfat, whose translations had appeared in the market earlier than Abdullah Cevdet's, also rendered the plays in prose (Enginün 1979). This fact also confirms that prose translations of Western drama were possibly becoming a translational norm in the post-*Tanzimat* literary system.

Such a norm was by no means inconsistent with Abdullah Cevdet's understanding of translation, which entailed preferring "inner virtues over apparent beauty" (*melâhat-ı zahirîyi hüsn-i batınîye tercih etmedik*) (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 9). In his preface to *İstibdad*, Abdullah Cevdet made some remarks which allude to the well-known proverb that "translation is like a woman: if she is faithful, she is not beautiful; if she is beautiful, she is not faithful" (The Language Realm: 2007).

Our translation could have been more beautiful, but then that beauty would have resembled the beauty of a faithless and disloyal nymph. We haven't preferred apparent beauties over inward virtues. We sacrificed the stylistic elegance for the sake of not wasting the slightest opinion and emotion of Alfieri. This translational strategy had been applied in the transfer of *Wilhelm Tell* into Turkish as well.³⁰ (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 9) [my translation]

Apparently Abdullah Cevdet was not in favor of a "free" translation that would charm readers only with its form at the expense of important reflections and emotions inherent in the source text. I argue that Abdullah Cevdet's discourse of preferring "inner virtues over apparent beauty" while translating is closely related to his mission as an "idea-maker" (Even-Zohar: 2005a: 1; see my discussion of the term in the introduction), who was reluctant to "waste" any small semantic detail of the source text which was seen as a specimen of "the only civilization" of the world.

Apparently, Abdullah Cevdet was against those who gave priority to popular taste and popularized translated texts through some liberal choices and "domesticating strategies" (1995: 20) such as abridging the text or effacing its "foreignness" in order to make it appeal to the general readership. Certainly, one needs to test the compatibility of Abdullah Cevdet's translation discourse with his

³⁰ "Tercümemiz daha güzel olabilirdi, fakat o güzellik sadakatsiz, vefasız bir güzelin dilberliğini andırırdı. Biz melâhat-ı zahiriye hüsn-i batıniye tercih etmedik. (Alfieri) nin en ufak bir fikir ve hissini zayi etmemek yoluna üslub-u beyan letafetini kurban eyledik. Bu tarik-i tercüme (Giyom Tel) in Türkçe'ye naklinde de takib edilmişdi."

actual translational choices. Textual evidence that is presented in the following pages of the thesis demonstrates that Abdullah Cevdet frequently adhered to his principle of preserving the integrity of the source text (albeit of the French and/or German translation of Shakespeare) with some exceptions.

Despite the fact that Abdullah Cevdet avoided large scale omissions while translating, he rarely resorted to omissions in the face of what he considered a drawback in the content. For instance, he erased a few dialogues of Sampson and Gregory in *Romeo and Juliet*, as presented below in comparison with Yusuf Mardin's translation published in 1945. The content of the omitted sentences seems to explain the reason for the omission. It is most likely that the content of the passage seemed obscene to Abdullah Cevdet and led him — or probably the French translator Abdullah Cevdet translated from! — to erase this conversation. In other words, the conservative readership of the period must have impelled Abdullah Cevdet to resort to such self-censorship.

Abdullah Cevdet's Translation (Act I, Scene I)

GREGUAR – Senin bir korkak olduğuna işte burhan; çünkü en ziyade kuvvetsiz olan daima duvara istinad etmeye çalışır.

SAMSON –Evet doğru, binaen aleyh kadınlar en narin kâseler olduklarından daima duvara doğru itilirler; bunun için “Montegu” ailesinin uşaklarını duvardan uzağa atacağım; beslemelerini duvara sıkıştıracağım.

GREGUAR –Fakat cidal ancak efendilerimizle, hizmetlerinde bulunan bizler arasında değil.

SAMSON – Bence müsavi; ben müstebidane hareket etmek isterim; erkeklerle döğüşdükten sonra kadınlara karşı bi-eman olacağım; bekâretlerini sarsacağım.

GREGUAR – Haydi, kahramanım, çek kılıcını. İşte Montegu familyasına mensub iki adam. (1909-1910: 135).

Yusuf Mardin's Translation (Act I, Scene I)

GREGORY

Korkarsın da ondan. Malûm a! Korkak duvar dibinden gider.

SAMPSON

Hakkın var. Kadınlar da mahlûkların zayıfı oldukları için tabii onlar daima duvara itilirler. İşte ben de Montague'lerin erkeklerini duvardan itip kızlarını oraya dayarım.

GREGORY

Nasıl olur, kavga yalnız efendilerle biz uşaklar arasında.

SAMPSON

Hepsi bir yola çıkar. İş onlara ezeceğimizi anlatmaktır. Adamlarla dövüştükten sonra kızların da canlarını okur, başlarını uçururum.

GREGORY

Ne diyorsun, kızların da başlarını mı?

SAMPSON

Evet, kızların yahut kızlıklarının. Artık ne mânaya alırsan al.

GREGORY

Onlara nasıl gelirse öyle alsınlar.

SAMPSON

Şüphesiz beni iktidarım olduğu müddetçe hissedecekler. Zaten ne yaman et parçası olduğumu herkes bilir.

GREGORY

Şükret ki balık değilsin. Yoksa muhakkak bir çiroz olurdun. Haydi bakalım! Kılıcını çek. İşte Montague'lerden iki kişi geliyor. (1945: 4-5).

English Source Text (Act I, Scene I)

GREGORY

That shows thee a weak slave, for the weakest goes to the wall.

SAMPSON

'Tis true; and therefore women being the weaker vessels are ever thrust to the wall: therefore I will push Montague's men from the wall, and thrust his maids to the wall.

GREGORY

The quarrel is between our masters and us their men.

SAMPSON

'Tis all one, I will show myself a tyrant: when I have fought with the men, I will be cruel with the maids, and cut off their heads.

GREGORY

The heads of the maids.

SAMPSON

Ay, the heads of the maids, or their maiden heads: take it in what sense thou wilt.

GREGORY

They must take it in sense that feel it.

SAMPSON

Me they shall feel while I am able to stand: and
'tis known I am a pretty piece of flesh.

GREGORY

'Tis well thou art not fish; if thou hadst, thou
hadst been poor John: draw thy tool! here comes
of the house of Montagues. (Shakespeare 1994c: 32-33) [emphasis
mine]

Abdullah Cevdet summarized the four dialogues underlined above in a single sentence in the target text: “bekaretlerini sarsacađım”. Another translator of *Romeo and Juliet* (undated), İlhan Siyami Tanar, also skipped the mentioned part, probably for the same reason (undated: 15), without even summarizing the content like Abdullah Cevdet. Evidently Abdullah Cevdet summarized the gist of the dialogues, but avoided further elaboration of the obscenity. This must have been in order not to disappoint his readers, who should regard Shakespeare’s works as important representations of the so-called “superior” Western culture.

When compared to Mardin’s translation of *Romeo and Juliet* published in 1945, Abdullah Cevdet’s text seems to be less intelligible partly because of his expressed preference for the literal meaning of the words rather than their metaphorical or idiomatic implications. Compare it with Mardin’s translation and the source text:

Abdullah Cevdet’s Translation (Act I, Scene I)

SAMSON – Greguar, söylüyorum, onlar bizim sırtımıza çıkmayacaklar.

GREGUAR – Hayır, o halde biz kömür hamalı oluruz.

SAMSON – Demek istiyorum ki eđer bizi kızdırırlarsa onlara gösteririz.

GREGUAR – Evet yaşadığın müddetçe dikkat et ki başın omuzlarının üstünde muhkem görülsün (1910: 135).

Yusuf Mardin’s Translation (Act I, Scene I)

SAMPSON

Gregory, şunu bil ki bu hakaretlere artık boyun eğmeyeceğiz.

GREGORY

Bunlara katlanmak için doğrusu insanın hamal olması lazım.

SAMPSON

Demek istiyorum ki kızınca artık kılıçlarımızı çekmeliyiz.

GREGORY

Öyle ya! Sen yaşadıkça boynunu idam ilmiğinden çekmeye çalış.

(1945: 4)

English Source Text (Act I, Scene I)

SAMPSON

Gregory, on my word, we'll not carry coals.

GREGORY

No, for then we should be colliers.

SAMPSON

I mean, and we be in choler, we'll draw.

GREGORY

Ay, while you live, draw your neck out of the collar. (Shakespeare

1994c: 32)

In the footnote he put for the sentence “Hayır, o halde biz kömür hamalı oluruz”, Abdullah Cevdet explains the metaphorical meaning of the source sentence and adds that he found it improper to “flatten” (*tayy etmemeyi*) such idioms or metaphors “for the sake of preserving the integrity of the text” (*metn-i eserin muhafaza-i temamiyeti için*, 1909-1910: 135). He says that he followed the same principle in the translation of the “obscene dialogues” (*perde-birunâne muhaveratı*, *ibid*) of the play as well. Although his statements indicate that he kept the semantic integrity of the play without effacing the obscenity, his literal rendering seems to erase such nuances. To put aside the illusion of the possibility of keeping the integrity of a work without taking metaphorical aspects into consideration, Abdullah Cevdet seemed to believe that a text unit should be rendered verbatim at the expense of losing the figurative meanings beyond it.

Observe the same sentence in the other Turkish translations of *Romeo and Juliet*:

Target Text I

GREGORY
Elbette, biz hamal değiliz ki. (Oflazoğlu 2001: 11).

Target Text II

GREGORİ – Haklısın... Bu kadar hakareti insan hamal olsa kaldıramaz. (Tanar, undated: 15).

Target Text III

GREGORY
Bunlara katlanmak için doğrusu insanın hamal olması lazım (Mardin 1945: 4).

All three translators took the metaphorical meaning of the mentioned part whereas Abdullah Cevdet rendered the same unit in a radically literal way: “Hayır, o halde biz kömür hamalı oluruz”. It could be argued that Cevdet’s translation of the mentioned unit is isolated from the context and is less intelligible than the other three translations. He came up with a similarly “foreignized” (Venuti 1995: 148) correspondence in his rendering of Shakespeare’s “being the weaker vessels”. Mardin represented the words with their contextual meaning: “Kadınlar da mahlûkların zayıfı oldukları için [...]”. Unlike Abdullah Cevdet, Oflazoğlu also conveyed the contextual meaning: “kadınlar, daha güçsüz oldukları için [...]”. The few comparisons I made above between several Turkish translations of *Romeo and Juliet* suggest that Abdullah Cevdet’s text is the most literal of all.

Abdullah Cevdet’s *Romeo ve Jülyet* involves a number of non-translations, the majority of which are from English and French: “constable”, “alderman”, “ver-

Coquin”, “Imperial” (1909-1910: 220), “marotte” (1909-1910: 298) “confesseur” (1909-1910: 320), “rebec”, “chanterelle” (1909-1910: 440) and “doer” (1909-1910: 481). Except “livre” and the three Italian words “passado”, “roverso” and “hai” (1909-1910: 277) which Abdullah Cevdet explains to have been taken from the duelling terminology (*meç istilahatından*), many of these words accompany their Latinized forms. It is inferred from the footnotes of these non-translations that Abdullah Cevdet preferred not to render them since he found no exact correspondence in the Ottoman culture. He left them non-translated but explained in the footnotes. Especially historical, geographical and mythological details are the ones which are kept mostly non-translated.

Either French or English, Abdullah Cevdet explains the position of all of these formerly given foreign words in the “source” culture and familiarizes his readers. For instance, he defines “ver-coquin” as a type of caterpillar and “alderman” as a municipality officer in England. He also gives the Latinized form of the words related to Greek mythology such as “Phoebus”, “Phaéton” (1909-1910: 340, English original “paethon”), Cynthie (1909-1910: 378) the English original: “Cynthia”) and echo (1909-1910: 235, original the same) in the footnotes and explains what they represent in Greek mythology. Besides, some historical personages such as “Laure”, “Petrarque”, “Didon”, “Cléopâtre”, “Hélene” and “Thisbé” (1909-1910: 277) are introduced to the Ottoman readers together with their Latinized forms in the footnotes.

Abdullah Cevdet’s Elitism Reflected in His Language

Paker points out that Abdullah Cevdet's translation of *Hamlet* appealed to "an educated readership, in its adherence to the norms of heavily Persianized poetic diction, current in his time" (Paker 1986: 94). This educated minority, who were relatively few in Ottoman society, had been acquainted with the Ottoman literary style, which was based on a "common universe of discourse expressed in common lexical material" of three lingual and cultural systems: Turkish, Arabic and Persian (Strauss 2002: 128-29). Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations appealed to these elites whereas the non-educated majority, who were unfamiliar with the sophistication of this "common discourse" and belonged to a relatively less sophisticated and much purer Turkish domain, did not feel at ease while reading Cevdet's "ponderous" texts (Paker 1986: 94). Abdullah Cevdet's elitist manner of translating is consistent with Atila Doğan's assertion that Abdullah Cevdet's Darwinist and materialist ideas stimulated him to devote much of his efforts to the education of a distinguished group who would realize the necessary transformations in Ottoman society (2006: 175; cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 42).

The already bad prospects of the first full translations of Shakespeare's tragedies got even worse with the growing concern for simplifying Turkish, an effort which had already started in the pre-republican period and was consolidated further by the policies of the new Turkish Republic (Gürçağlar 2001: 77). Ultimately, even Abdullah Cevdet himself seemed quite convinced that his Shakespeare translations were not suitable for the newly emerging Turkish nation only about twenty years after their first edition (Abdullah Cevdet 1927: 4323). Instead of advocating his own texts, Abdullah Cevdet voiced his contention that it was time to establish a committee who would bring in "excellent" (*mükemmel*), "exquisite" (*nefis*) and "full

translations” (*tercüme-i kâffesini*) of Shakespeare’s entire oeuvre into the “language of the Turks” (*Türk diline*) (1927: 4323).

In one of his reviews of *Hamlet* published in his journal *İctihad* in 1930, he mentioned that he “had retranslated” *Hamlet* (1930a: 5511) and it was going to be published by the Ministry of National Education, though his initiative later came to an end due to his sudden death (1930a: 5511). Unfortunately, this “re-translation” was inaccessible during this research. That is why it is not clear whether this new translation had a potential to meet the expectations of the target readers of the time or the nationalist Turkish bureaucrats of the 1930’s, who strived for the “purification” of the Turkish language. Another point that needs to be brought to light is why this translation was not published after the translator’s death, though he claimed in the same article that the Ministry of National Education had agreed to publish it³¹ (*ibid.*).

The “unsuitability” of Cevdet’s translations for the expectations of the new generations can also be observed when they are compared to Kamuran Şerif Saru’s translation of *Hamlet* published in 1927 by the Turkish Ministry of Education. Saru came up with a much “plainer” Turkish compared to Abdullah Cevdet, whose version of *Hamlet* had appeared in the book market only nineteen years earlier.

Kamuran Şerif Saru’s Translation of Hamlet’s Soliloquy

Vücut mu, yoksa adem mi, işte bütün mesele bunda... Tali’in acı sitemlerine tahammül mü göstermeli yoksa bu musibet deryasına karşı isyan edip bütün felakete bir nihayet mi vermeli? Necabet acaba hangisini icab ettirir?... Ölüm uykudan başka bir şey değil... O kalbi ıztırlara, tabiatın cisme bıraktığı binlerce sadmelere bir uyku

³¹ Taner Derbentli, who is the son of Abdullah Cevdet’s grandson, informed (2007, my personal contact) me that Abdullah Cevdet submitted what he called the “new translation” of *Hamlet* to the State printing house (*devlet matbaası*) before his death. It was to be published in this printing house, which was, as Abdullah Cevdet’s daughter Gül Karlıdağ reports, just behind the city walls of Topkapı (*Topkapı Surları*). Due to Abdullah Cevdet’s sudden death, however, Abdullah Cevdet’s initiation of publishing his “re-translation” of *Hamlet* came to an end.

ile hatme çekmek can-u gönülden istenilen bir akibet değil midir? Ölüm uykudur. Evet uyku, fakat belki de bir rüya! İşte en büyük engel de bu değil mi? Çünkü ruhumuz bu fani cesetten sıyrıldıktan sonra, ölüm denilen bu uykuda nasıl bir rüya göreceğimizi bilmemektir ki bizi durduruyor... İşte bu felaketli hayatı bu kadar uzun sürdüren düşünce bu... (1927: 19).

Abdullah Cevdet's Translation of Hamlet's Soliloquy (37 lines)

Varlık mı ya yokluk mu?.. Budur mes'ele işte;
Dîv-i kaderin gadrine etmek mi tahammül,
Ya karşı gelüp cûşuna seylâb-ı fenânın
Vermek mi bu tûfân-ı belâyâ nihâyet!
Bunlardan acep hangisi îcâb-ı necâbet?
Bir hâlet-i diğerk değil, ölmek uyumaktır;
Pâyân bulur ol uyku ile zücret-i kalbin
Bin zahm ki mîrâs-ı tabîisi bu cismin,
Olsaydı eğer mes'ele bu tarzda münhal
Kim cân u gönülden ona olmazdı şitâbân?
Ölmek uyumaktır; uyumak.... Belki de rü'yâ,
Zira şeb-i makberde biz oldukda kefen-pûş
Sonsuz bu ölüm uykusunun var mı ki bir ferd
Bilsin nasıl evhâmı, ne rüyâları vardır;
Bunca senelerden beri bu fikirdir ancak
Temdid eden âlâm-ı siyeh-reng-i hayâtı.

An apparent distinction which is readily perceived between the two target texts is that Saru's text is far more easily understood than Abdullah Cevdet's translation. Saru employs plain Turkish, except for a few Ottoman words: "vücut", "Adem", "necabet", and "sadme". Except these words, none of the words in the text seem to be foreign to today's Turkish readers who have grown up with a "purer" language than their late Ottoman predecessors. It is not surprising that Saru's abridged *Hamlet* was preferred by the Turkish Ministry of Education over Abdullah Cevdet's translation of the same play due to the plain Turkish trend prevalent especially in the early decades of the new Turkish republic. Abdullah Cevdet's first edition of the translation is evidently full to the brim with Arabic and Persian words and has a "heavy style" which was the very reason why it was disregarded by the nationalist bureaucrats of the new Turkish Republic. "Âlâm", "temdîd", "zahm", "mîrâs",

“münhl”, “zücret”, “hâlet”, and “necâbet” are the Arabic words in the text which will most likely be not apprehended by an ordinary Turkish reader today. Similarly, Abdullah Cevdet used some Persian vocabulary such as “şitâbân”, “şeb”, “seylâb”, “cûş” “makber” and “kefen-pûş” which again will hardly be understood by many of today’s target readers. Some of his compounds seem to be a synthesis of Arabic and Persian. “Cân u gönül”, “mîrâs-ı tabîisi”, “âlâm-ı seyr”, “zücret-i kalb”, “hâlet-i diğêr”, “tufân-ı belâ” and “icâb-ı necâbet” are the cases in point where the translator combined two words — Arabic or Persian — through Persian grammar rules. It is most likely that his translated texts which were never suitable for a dramatic rendering appealed only to the reading tastes of the educated elite (cf. Paker 1986: 94; Vahid Turhan 1965: 56). Though Abdullah Cevdet’s *Hamlet*, with a preface of 208 pages (Abdullah Cevdet 1930: 5511) was going to be republished by the state printing house like Saru’s translation, this never happened after Abdullah Cevdet’s sudden death. In fact, Abdullah Cevdet’s daughter Gül Karlıdağ reports that Abdullah Cevdet submitted a copy of his new translation of *Hamlet* to the state printing house, but she does not know the fate of this copy [my personal communication on 27 April 2007].

Stylistic Features of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare Translations

A. Cevdet’s Use of Romanticism and the Traditional Ottoman Literary Forms

Süssheim points out that Abdullah Cevdet was influenced by some Turkish poets of the New Literature Group, such as Recai-zade Mahmud Ekrem and Halid Ziya, whose literary elitism could be read from their famous motto “art for art’s sake”. The

preface (*takdim*) Rezaizade Mahmud Ekrem wrote for Abdullah Cevdet's collection of poems *Tuluat* (Poems of Sunrise, 1888) and some other evidence presented below indicate Cevdet's proximity to this elitist literary group. It is a matter of wonder whether one can draw a parallel between the writing style of the new literature group and that of Abdullah Cevdet, though — as far as I know — Turkish literary historiography does not draw such a connection. It is clear that Abdullah Cevdet did not prefer a plain Ottoman which could be defined as the “norm” of the translated dramatic literature of his time (cf. Enginün 1979: 27; Paker 1991: 23). Instead, he tended to use a “heavy” Ottoman-Turkish, thereby indicating a similar attitude in terms of language with the exponents of the new literature group who “relied chiefly on exploiting the elegance and sophistication of Arabic and Persian vocabulary and compounds, thereby going against the more popular movement for plain” (Paker 2006: 332; cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 47). Nevertheless, Abdullah Cevdet seemed to deviate from the path of this group as they were inspired to a great extent by the “French symbolist poets and realists in fiction” and some of them such as Cenab Şahabeddin found Shakespeare's works irrelevant for their time (Paker 2006: 336). Another point in which Abdullah Cevdet differed from this literary group was that they believed that “each nation had its own literary path to follow and should not be forced to imitate another with which it could not identify” (ibid.) whereas Abdullah Cevdet was convinced about the necessity of following the same evolutionary path with the Western nations (cf. Key 1908: 709).

A Cevdet made versions from some romantic poets such as Byron, Shakespeare, Schiller, Alfred de Musset and André Chénier in his life (cf. Süssheim 1987: 56). His selection of these poets for inspiration and to create Turkish versions of them shows that he was a romantic materialist. His interest in romanticism could

be accounted for by his personality as a revolutionary and his passionate dreams of changing his society and its future. “Going against the strong current of antagonism to Romanticism running through Ottoman materialist circles, Abdullah Cevdet remained a passionate admirer of Romanticism” (Hanioğlu 2005a: 47). Some evidence also proves that Abdullah Cevdet was influenced by Abdülhak Hamid who in turn was inspired by the works of romantics and specifically by Shakespeare (cf. Enginün 1979: 157; Turhan 1965: 54; Abdullah Cevdet 1913: 424).

Abdullah Cevdet also utilized the language of the Ottoman “interculture” which was modeled on three languages and cultures which are Arabic, Persian and Turkish (Paker 2006: 343). The major works of traditional Ottoman literature (*divan*) mediated this language of the “Ottoman interculture” (Paker 2002: 137-142). Traditional Ottoman poetry was also refused by some materialists of the period such as Beşir Fuad and Şerafeddin Mağmumi who argued that traditional Ottoman poetry (*Divan şiiri*) which exploited poetic metaphors and vague formulaic expressions contradicted with science, and realist literary works were more convenient to express the modern values of materialism and “scientism” (Hanioğlu 2005a: 45). However, it was the “content”, not the “form”, which, according to Abdullah Cevdet, “must change to conform to the demands of science” (Hanioğlu 2005a: 47). This contention of Abdullah Cevdet could be confirmed by his use of the *aruz* meter and of some stylistic features of traditional Ottoman prose (*inşa*).

Abdullah Cevdet’s use of the classical Ottoman literary style becomes conspicuous when compared to the first known Turkish translation of Hamlet’s soliloquy dated 13 March 1887 / 1 March 1303 (Enginün 1979: 112), about three years before Abdullah Cevdet translated the soliloquy around 1890 (Abdullah Cevdet

1927: 4322). Abdullah Cevdet's translation of the soliloquy differs from this text greatly, though both texts were very close in time.

Abdullah Cevdet's Translation of Hamlet's Soliloquy (37 lines)

- 1 Varlık mı ya yokluk mu?.. Budur mes'ele işte;
- 2 Dîv-i kaderin gadrine etmek mi tahammül,
- 3 Ya karşı gelüp cûşuna seylâb-ı fenânın
- 4 Vermek mi bu tûfân-ı belâya nihâyet!
- 5 Bunlardan acep hangisi îcâb-ı necâbet?
- 6 Bir hâlet-i diğerk değil, ölmek uyumaktır;
- 7 Pâyân bulur ol uyku ile zücret-i kalbin
- 8 Bin zahm ki mîrâs-ı tabîsi bu cismin,
- 9 Olsaydı eğer mes'ele bu tarzda münhal
- 10 Kim cân u gönülden ona olmazdı şitâbân?
- 11 Ölmek uyumaktır; uyumak.... Belki de rü'yâ,
- 12 Zira şeb-i makberde biz oldukda kefen-pûş
- 13 Sonsuz bu ölüm uykusunun var mı ki bir ferd
- 14 Bilsin nasıl evhâmı, ne rüyâları vardır;
- 15 Bunca senelerden beri bu fikrdir ancak
- 16 Temdid eden âlâm-ı siyeh-reng-i hayâtı.
- 17 Devrân-ı sitem-pervere, tahkîr-i zamâna,
- 18 Bîdâdların ettiğî bîdâdî ü zulme
- 19 Ta'rîz ü tasallutlarına ehl-i gurûrun,
- 20 Sevdâ-yı muhakkarla gelen ye's ü fütûra,
- 21 Lâkaydi-i kânûna, hukûmetdeki cebre,
- 22 Alçakların ehl-i hünere ettiğî levme,
- 23 Kim eyler idi sabr, kim eylerdi tahammül,
- 24 Bir hançer ile mümkün iken hâtime çekmek?
- 25 Bir korku uyandırmasa ferdâsı memâtın
- 26 Kim ister idi bâr-ı girân ile hayâtın
- 27 Bin türlü meşakkatde enîn etmek, ezilmek?
- 28 Azmleri hiç dönmez olan âlem-i mechûl;
- 29 Etmekte tereddüde irâdâtı perişân,
- 30 Dünyada bu malûm fenâlıkları nâçâr,
- 31 Muzlim o fenâlıklara ettirmede tercîh.
- 32 Âlemde tefekkürdür eden bizleri korkak.
- 33 Bârid olan ol sarsar-ı fikret eder itfâ
- 34 Her yakdığımız meş'al-i tasmîm ü karârı.
- 35 Bin şevk ü meserretle husûle gelen âmâl
- 36 Ol manzar önünde olarak ric'ate mecbûr,
- 37 Ahar olur ummân-ı hayâlâtta pinhân (1908a:101).

The First Translation of Hamlet's Soliloquy in Turkey (published in the journal *Manzara* 1887, n.1, p. 5-8)

“Olmak yahut olmamak! İşte mesele burada!.. Menhûs tali’in, gaddar bahtın cevr ü ezâsına, taarruzuna katlanıp eziyet çekmek mi ruha daha hoş gelir; yoksa bunca fenalıklara karşı ilân-ı isyan ederek belâ sellerine mukabele etmek ve onları bitirmek mi?. Ölmek—uyumak—başka ne var yapacak; ve bu uykuya hazırlanırken “kalbin tahammül-fersâ olan ızdırap ve elemine ve takat-sûz bunca eziyet ve meşakkate, şu kalbin miras-ı tabîisi olan belâ ve felâkete nihayet veriyoruz” demek. Ölmek—uykuya dalmak. Bunu, ölüm dediğimiz uykuya daldıktan sonra a âlem-i mânâda nasıl rüyalar göreceğimizi asla bilmiyoruz İşte bu değil mi bizi yine meks ve tevakkufa mecbur ediyor. İşte bu fikr-i musibet hayatı idâme edip götürüyor. Böyle olsa feleğin sitemine, zamanın ezâsına, mağrûr ve mütekebbirlerin tahkîr ve şetmlerine, muhakkar aşkın ezâ ve ukubetine, hayasızların tavr-ı bî-edebânesine tahammül etmek ve bu eziyetleri çekmeği, bir küçük hançerle bizzat istihsâl-i rahat mümkün iken hangi adam isterdi? Ölümünden sonraki halden asla bilinmediği için az çok bir korku olmayaydı, hayat dediğimiz o sakîl yük altında kim ezilir kim âh u enîn ederdi? Giden hiçbir seyyahın avdet etmediği o iklimin malûm olmaması değil mi ki bizi müdhiş bir tereddütte bırakıyor ve hissettiğimiz fenalıklara tahammülü tercih ettiriyor! Bir fenalıktan kaçarken diğer bilmediğimiz fenalıklara bizi sevk ediyor. Vicdan kayboluyor. Bizi cebîn ve alçak edip bırakıyor. Akıl ve hikmetin sönmez diye tavsif edilen ziyâsı şu şu muzlim fikirler arasında mahvolur! En akılâne ve cesûrâne tasavvur edilen şeylerin bu halde hatt-ı hareketi sapar! Âlem-i hâyalatta dolaşır durur! (Qouted in Enginün 1979: 112).

The only part where Abdullah Cevdet practised verse in *Hamlet* is the soliloquy where he applied a traditional Ottoman meter³². Indeed, the former translation of the soliloquy includes a number of Arabic and Persian elements such as “menhûs”, “tevakkuf”, “meks”, “sakîl”, “idâme”, “cebîn”, “muzlim”, “akîlâne” and “cesûrâne”. Besides, the text is not free from some Perso-Arabic compounds such as “cevr ü ezâ”, “ilân-ı isyan”, “tahammül-fersâ”, “takat-sûz”, “miras-ı tabîi”, “âlem-i mânâ”, “fikr-i musibet”, “âh u enîn” and “hatt-ı hareket”. Still, Abdullah Cevdet’s text seems to be far less understandable than this previous translation and doubles it in terms of Perso-Arabic vocabulary and compounds. To be more precise, the former translation includes a total of eleven compounds whereas Cevdet’s text has nineteen compounds

³² mef’ûl-ü / mefâ’îlü / mefâ’îlü / fe’ûlün

such as “seylâb-ı fenâ”, “meş’al-i tasmîm”, zücret-i kalb, “sevdâ-yı muhakkar” and “kefen-pûş”. The sophistication of Abdullah Cevdet’s text also manifests itself in the form of long chains of compounds such as “âlâm-ı siyeh-reng-i hayatı” and “devrân-ı sitem-perver”. Apart from the Perso-Arabic compounds which amount to nineteen, Abdullah Cevdet also used many other single Persian and Arabic words which are hardly intelligible to any ordinary Turkish reader today. The number of such words is as high as twenty-six. This number is eighteen for the first translation of the soliloquy. Evidently, Abdullah Cevdet’s version has many stylistic features of the Ottoman prose style of *inşa*, still influential in his time (cf. Strauss 2002: 129). The Ottoman *inşa* style manifests itself in the form of “favoured pleonasms”, “the insertion of Arabic and Persian proverbs and maxims”, “formulaic expressions”, “the obligatory use of certain polite words, honorific epithets” and “a preference for the indirect style” (ibid.). Many of these features exist in Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations. The *İnşa* tradition in the Ottoman literary polysystem, as Johann Strauss would also agree, influenced the translators’ decisions considerably and functioned as a constraint for the final shape of the translations. Yusuf Kamil Paşa’s *Terceme-i Telemak* (1862) is a very good example of such translations since it represented all the characteristics of the “dominant model of the canonized system” and appealed to the tastes of the educated readership (Paker 1991: 21). Şemseddin Sami, on the other hand, deviated from the traditional models, running the risk of disapproval from his readers, and wrote his translation *Sefiller* (from Victor Hugo’s *Les Misérables*) in simple prose, a decision which brought him the chance of republishing his translation in 1934 (Paker 1991: 23). Abdullah Cevdet preferred the “model of the canonized system” in terms of language and style whereas Ahmed Midhat, another passionate culture-accumulator of the period, opted for the “popular literary conventions”

(Paker 1991: 25). Ahmed Midhat popularized his works successfully, whereas Abdullah Cevdet's texts remained relatively "marginal".

Another important characteristic of *inşa* style observed in Abdullah Cevdet's translation is his use of honorific epithets. Due to the fact that four of the tragedies include king or ruler protagonists, the obligatory use of some polite words became a necessity for Abdullah Cevdet. He picked such vocabulary from the formulaic ceremonial language (*teşrifat*) that was traditionally used in the Ottoman palace.

Target Text

Macbeth: [...] Zat-ı haşmet-penahınızın ifa edeceğiniz bir rol varsa o da ihtiramat-ı levazımamızı kabul etmektir. Bu ihtiramat; taht ve şefketinize, muhadim ve bendegânınıza aiddir. Matbu'- tabi'-i tacdarileri ve calib-i şan ve şeref-i haşmetleri olan her şeyi yapmakla muhadim ve bendegânınız vazifelerini ifadan başka bir şey yapmış olmazlar. (Abdullah Cevdet 109a: 25)

Source Text:

Macbeth: The service and the loyalty I owe,
In doing it, pays itself. Your highness' part
Is to receive our duties; and our duties
Are to your throne and state children and servants,
Which do but what they should, by doing every thing
Safe toward your love and honour. (Shakespeare 1994a: 856)

Many expressions in the target text above belong to the above-mentioned traditional language that was used while addressing the Ottoman sultans and high-rank officials.

Abdullah Cevdet's elitism in the form of the sophisticated language of the Ottoman interculture is better perceived when compared to the first Ottoman translations of Shakespeare's works from the English original by Hasan Sırrı: *Venedik Taciri (The Merchant of Venice)* was published in 1884 and *Sehv-i Müdhik (The Comedy of Errors)* was published in 1886. Enginün praises these, stating that they have a "comfortable clean language" (*rahat ve temiz bir dile sahiptir*) and they

still give pleasure with their easily understandable diction (1979: 44). Evidently, translating dramatic works in a plain language was a common tendency in the *Tanzimat* period. However, Abdullah Cevdet's language seems to be a deviation.

Inflated Translations and Inflated Peritexts

Strauss refers to "pleonasms" as a significant element of traditional Ottoman prose. The use of some superfluous words to create an expressive style is a common practice in this tradition (2002: 129). One can often encounter such "pleonasms" in the form of juxtaposed synonyms within Abdullah Cevdet's translations. Enginün also mentions the use of synonymous words (*müteradif kelimeler*, 1979: 59) within the same sentence as a commonly witnessed phenomenon in the translations of the *Tanzimat* period.

Target Text (Act: 4, scene 2)

BRUTUS: Şimdi sen soğuyan sıcak bir dostu tavsif ettin, Lusilyus, şuna dikkat et ki daima dostluk inhitat ve intifaya başladığı zaman, ca'li teşrifat nümayişleri yapar, basit ve saf bir hulus-u kalpte ne sanat, ne riya bulunmaz; fakat boş ve sahte kalpli adamlar o atlara benzerler ki yedinde buldukları vakit, ateşin görünür ve cesaret umdururlar; sonra kanlı mahmuzun altında cesaret lazım geldiği vakit harin hargeleler gibi başlarını aşağı bırakır ve öne doğru eğerler. Ve tecrübe ettiğiniz vakit ümit ve emniyetinizi boşa çıkarırlar. Bütün askeriyle mi geliyor? (1908b: 118).

Source Text (Act: 4, scene 2)

BRUTUS
Thou hast describ'd
A hot friend, cooling: ever note Lucilius,
When love begins to sicken and decay
It useth an enforced ceremony.

There are no tricks in plain and simple faith:
But hollow men, like horses hot at hand,
Make gallant show, and promise of their mettle:
But when they should endure the bloody spur,
They fall their crests, and like deceitful jades
Sink in the trial. Comes his army on? (Shakespeare 2001: 85)

Abdullah Cevdet used some synonymous words in *Jül Sezar*. He rendered “tricks” with two words: “san’at” and “riya”. These words come successively in the same sentence and both give the same meaning. Besides, he conveyed “plain and simple faith” with “basit ve saf bir hulûs-ı kalpte”. Apparently, “simple” corresponds to the word “basit”, and “plain” corresponds to two synonymous words: “saf” and “hulûs”. In addition, the target text seems to be “swelled” since the source text involves sixty-five words whereas the target text includes eighty words. Although such excessive words are rejected today when submitted to the literary norms of modern Turkish, one should keep in mind that the use of *müteradif* words was a conventional practise for the traditional Ottoman literary system (Enginün 1979: 59). Therefore, it would not be very objective to assess a work, indigenous or translated, according to today’s literary value judgements. Mihran Boyacıyan, who was one of the first translators of Shakespeare in Ottoman lands, is criticized by Enginün for swelling his translation with such pleonasm (1979: 59, 62). This manner seems to entail the projection of the *Tanzimat* translations through the ideological and literary paradigms of our modern time. Certainly, such partial comments without any concern for historicity are far from a scientific viewpoint.

Target Text (Act II, Scene II)

Romeo—Senin kuşun, murg-ı esirin olmak isterdim
Jülyet—Ben de onu arzu ederdim, benim dilber dostum, fakat
nevazişlerimle seni bunaltırdım. –Adyö! Adyö! Oh! Bu “adyö”de o
kadar halavetvâr ki sabah oluncaya kadar “adyö” kelimesini tekrar
etmek isterdim. (1909-1910: 257)

Source Text (Act II, Scene II)

ROMEO

I would I were thy bird.

JULIET

Sweet so would I,
Yet I should kill thee with much cherishing:
Good night, good night!

ROMEO

parting is such sweet sorrow,
That I shall say good night, till it be morrow. (Shakespeare 1994c:
65)

Observe another passage above from *Romeo ve Jülyet* where such synonyms are juxtaposed in the same sentence. Abdullah Cevdet transferred “thy bird” as “senin kuşun, murg-u esirin”. The sentence might have been expressed as “senin kuşun olmak isterdim”, a sentence which would supposedly be perceived as less poetic by Abdullah Cevdet. Instead, he used the two synonyms, one in Turkish and the other in Persian, within the same sentence. The passage below also indicates this important characteristic of the Ottoman literary tradition. Romeo’s sentences include two synonyms: “gam” and “keder”.

Target Text (Act II, Scene II)

Romeo—Sohbetinden mahrum olmakla ey bin kere bedbaht olan ben!
Muhabbet bir mektep çocuğunun kitaplarından firar ettiği bir şevk ve şiddetle muhabbete doğru uçuyor; muhabbetden ayrıldıktan ayrıldığı vakit, korkunç muallimi tarafından dershaneye getirilen mektep çocuğunun gam ve kederini hüsn ediyor. (1909-1910: 257)

Source Text (Act II, Scene II)

ROMEO

A thousand times the worse to want thy light,
Love goes toward love, as schoolboys from their books,
But love from love, toward school with heavy looks. (Shakespeare 1994c: 64)

The passage above also indicates another important characteristic of Cevdet's translations: Explication. Shakespeare's twenty-words are swelled into thirty-nine Turkish words. Even though Abdullah Cevdet implies in the preface of *İstibdad* (1899: 9), *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (1908d: 8 the copy without preface) and in the footnotes of *Romeo ve Jülyet* (1909-1910: 135) that he advocated translating word-for-word (*harfiyyen*) there are many cases where he comes up with quite swelled explications of the source text units. Nonetheless, his explications do not from turn his translations into popularized texts since his explications are usually meant to embellish the expression or prevent equivocal situations rather than to descend to the level of an ordinary Ottoman reader. His sophisticated style with Persian and Arabic vocabulary and compounds demonstrates that his target was mostly the educated elite, who would lead the expected transformations in society (cf. Doğan 2006: 175). For instance, the lines "love goes toward love, as schoolboys from their books" was rendered as "muhabbet bir mektep çocuğunun kitaplarından firar ettiği bir şevk ve şiddetle muhabbete doğru uçuyor". Evidently, Cevdet added "firar ettiği bir şevk ve şiddetle" to the sentence to get rid of ambiguity. Again, "but love from love, toward school with heavy looks" was conveyed as "muhabbetden ayrıldığı vakit, korkunç muallimi tarafından dershaneye getirilen mektep çocuğunun gam ve kederini hüsn ediyor". He transferred "with heavy looks" as "korkunç muallimi tarafından" presumably to make the content more precise. Moreover, "muhabbetten ayrıldığı vakit" and "gam ve kederini" are also seen to be additions.

"Domestications" in Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare Translations

Despite his expressed preference of keeping the “integrity” of the original (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 9), some of his deviations from this principle characterize themselves in the form of “domestication” (Venuti 1995: 18).

Target Text I (Act 1 scene 3)

OFELYA: Bu güzel sözlerin manasını hıfz ve melek-i siyane makamında kalbime tevdi edeceğim; fakat aziz kardaşım, insana cennetin sarp ve dikenli yollarını gösteren, kendileri serbaz ve bi-kayud, bir sefih olarak zevk ve safanın çiçekli yollarını dolaşan, kendi mev'izelerini nazar-ı itibara almayan bazı günahkâr vaizler gibi olma. (Abdullah Cevdet 1908a: 34).

Target Text II (Act 1 scene 3)

OPHELIA: Senin bu iyi nasihatlerin kulağıma küpe olacak. Fakat aziz kardeşim sen de bazı sefih papazlar gibi, bir taraftan elaleme cennetin dikenli ve sarp yolunu gösterirken bir taraftan da coşkun ve taşkın bir çapkın gibi zevkin gül bahçelerinde seyran etme. (Adıvar 1943: 16).

Source Text (Act 1 scene 3)

OPHELIA

I shall th' effect of this good lesson keep,
As watchman to my heart: but, good my brother,
Do not, as some ungracious pastors do,
Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven,
Whiles like a puff'd and reckless libertine,
Himself, the primrose path of dalliance treads,
And wrecks not his own rede. (Shakespeare 1994b: 41)

Why did Abdullah Cevdet translate “pastor” as “vaiz” which relates to Islamic terminology, deviating from the Christian connotations of the source text? Abdullah Cevdet represented “pastor” with “vaiz”, “watchman” as “melek-i siyane”, and “rede” as “mev'ize”. Evidently, these words remind readers of an Islamic context, though Shakespeare’s lines entail connotations peculiar to Christianity. As Abdullah Cevdet frequently exercised elsewhere in his translations, he gave a domestic “appearance” to his vocabulary. However, a more faithful translation of the play by

Adivar represented “pastor” as “papaz” and “as watchman to my heart” as “kulağıma küpe olacak”. Most probably, Abdullah Cevdet felt the same psychological obstacle with the contemporary translators in Egypt:

Translators of works written by Westerners had to overcome certain psychological obstacles. Conservative Muslims, who remained indifferent or even hostile towards Western languages, were opposed to cultural transfer from European sources. It must be noted that the translated works, especially when referring to the situation in the Ottoman Empire or in Egypt, contained indeed passages which must have embarrassed the translators. In the translations, we may even detect signs of some self-censorship. But in most cases, the elaborate inşâ-style itself contributed to neutralize these passages. (Strauss 2002: 120)

Such psychological obstacles also existed in Shakespeare’s plays which involved a number of religious references between the lines. Even though Abdullah Cevdet comes up with quite literal renderings in earthly matters, he deviates from this rule when some religious issues come into the agenda. In order to illustrate his different strategies for different contents, I want to start with his verbatim translations of some sentences. A very extreme case for his literal translations is seen in *Romeo ve Jülyet* where Abdullah Cevdet rendered the sentence in which Capulet speaks angrily to the nurse who wants to defend Juliet. “Utter your gravity o'er a gossip's bowl” (Shakespeare 1994c: 105) is transformed into “durub-u emsalinizi gidiniz arkadaşınızın fincanına dinletiniz”. In order to avoid ambiguity, Abdullah Cevdet explains in the footnote that this sentence corresponds to the Turkish idiom “kūlahıma dinlet” (1909-1910: 398). Here are two other Turkish translations of the same unit: “Bu ahmakça sözleri sen git de kendin gibi / Dil ebesine anlat [...]” (Mardin 1945: 108). “Sen git de bu bilgiçliğı dedikoduculara sat” (Ofazoğlu 1968: 104). A comparison between several Turkish translations of the same unit

demonstrates that Abdullah Cevdet rendered it in a radically literal manner at the expense of losing the main point.

Another oddly literal rendering is seen on another page of *Romeo ve Jülyet* when Benvolio addresses Romeo while they are getting prepared to join the banquet at Capulet's house: "Come knock and enter, and no sooner in, / But every man betake him to his legs" (Shakespeare 1994c: 48). Abdullah Cevdet transferred the second line as "herkes kendi bacağına müracaat etsin" (1909-1910: 220) and informed his readers in the footnote that Benvolio is requesting Romeo and Mercutio to dance with these words.

As for some religious references in the plays, Abdullah Cevdet deviated from his "principle" of translating "word-for-word". This time he did not want to transfer literally the greetings and exclamatory phrases that entail Christian connotations. For instance, Friar Lawrence's exclamatory phrase of "Holy Saint Francis!" (Shakespeare 1994: 67) in *Romeo and Juliet* was replaced with the Islamic expression of "fesubhanallah!" which seems to reflect a similar tone of astonishment and excitement (1909-1910: 276). This ecclesiastic's exclamations of "Benedicite!" (Shakespeare 1994: 66) and "Jesu Maria" (Shakespeare 1994: 67) are converted into "sübhhanallah" and "hasbunallah" respectively (ibid.). Besides, his "the heavens" was replaced with "Cenab-ı Hak" (1909-1910: 299). Again, the nurse's exclamatory phrases of "Jesu" and "Lord" are Islamicized as "ilahi yarabbi" and "aman yarabbi" respectively (ibid.). Interestingly enough, Abdullah Cevdet made Friar Lawrence, namely a Christian ecclesiastic, speak like a Muslim *imam*. Abdullah Cevdet's strategy of familiarization is valid for the other plays as well. Expressions such as "fesübhanallah" and "Cenab-ı Hakk" can be encountered in Cevdet's translation of *Hamlet* (1908a: 10) and *Macbeth* (1909a: 121) as well.

Such examples of conversions are quite obvious in *Makbes*. When compared to another Turkish translation by Sebahattin Eyübođlu, Cevdet's interference with the text becomes more evident. The three famous witches of *Macbeth* greet Macbeth and Banquo as "Selamün Aleyküm". This corresponds to "Hail!" (Shakespeare 1994a: 850) in the source text; and "Selâm!" in Orhan Burian's (1946: 11) and Eyübođlu's translations (1962: 15). Observe some conversations from Cevdet's *Makbes* and their correspondences in the English source text and in two other recent Turkish translations.

Example I

Target Text I

Makbes: Durun na-mükemmel nebiler (Abdullah Cevdet 1909a: 18).

Target Text II

Macbeth: Durun, yarım ağızlılar (Eyübođlu 1962: 15).

Target Text III

Macbeth: Durun, yarım yamalak konuşanlar sizi! (Burian 1946: 11).

Source Text

Macbeth: Stay, you imperfect speakers (Shakespeare 1994a: 851)

Example II

Target Text I

Makbes: Yahut fırtınanın yıkmış olduđu bu fundalık üzerinde niçin bizi, bu istikbal-i peygamerane ile durduruyor, yolumuzdan alıkoyuyorsunuz? (Abdullah Cevdet 1909a:19).

Target Text II

Macbeth: ...falcı ağızları, kahin selamlarıyla? (Eyübođlu 1962: 15).

Target Text III

Macbeth: Yahut, bu kavruk fundalıkta kehanete kaçan selamlarınızla neden yolumuzu kestiniz? Eyüboğlu 1946: 11).

Source Text

Macbeth: Or why upon this blasted heath you stop our way with such prophetic greeting? (Shakespeare 1994a: 851)

In the first example, Abdullah Cevdet comes up with a sentence which is relatively more loaded with religious connotations than the other translations. Eyüboğlu rendered Macbeth's call to the witches as "yarım ağızlılar" and Burian as "yarım yamalak konuşanlar sizi". Abdullah Cevdet's choice as "nâ-mükemmel nebiler" seems to include a religious nuance because of the word "nebiler". Besides, these words include no Turkish words unlike the correspondences in Burian and Eyüboğlu's texts.

Abdullah Cevdet exercised the same strategy of familiarization in the paratexts of the plays as well. Even though this strategy is much more conspicuously perceived in his non-literary translations, there are a few examples in his Shakespeare translations as well. These will be presented below:

Target Text (Act IV Scene III)

Makdof: İcra-yı hükümet etmeğe layıkça! Hayır yaşamaya bile layık değildir.... Madem ki meşru varis-i taht o tahta layık olmadığını söylüyor; tahta cülüsundan kendi kendisini men ediyor; ve neş'et ettiği sülaleye lanet okuyor. Ey bir müstebid-i gasıbın kanlı asa-yı şevketiyle idare olunan millet! Mesud günlerini ne zaman göreceksin? – Senin kral pederin pek müttakî bir kral idi ve seni dünyaya getiren kraliçe, ekseriya ayakta bulunmaktan ziyade zanûzede-i taat olarak bulundu ve yaşadığı her günde öldü [*]. (Abdullah Cevdet 1909a: 119).

Source Text

MACDUFF
Fit to govern!

No, not to live. O nation miserable,
With an untitled tyrant bloody-sceptred,
When shalt thou see thy wholesome days again,
Since that the truest issue of thy throne
By his own interdiction stands accursed
And does blaspheme his breed? Thy royal father
Was a most sainted king; the queen that bore thee,
Oftener upon her knees than on her feet,
Died every day she lived. Fare thee well!
These evils thou repeat'st upon thyself
Have banished me from Scotland. O my breast,
Thy hope ends here! (Shakespeare 1994a: 927-928)

In order to back up the meaning of the source text unit above, readers are familiarized through a *hadith* in the footnote. Abdullah Cevdet comments that Macduff's description of Malcolm's mother resembles the command of a *hadith*: "Mÿtÿ úable en temÿtÿ!" ("Die before you die!") [my translation]. He adds that Macduff "tries to say that she [Malcolm's mother] spent all the days of her life withdrawing herself from all else besides God and occupying herself with obedience to God and truth"³³ (Abdullah Cevdet 1909a: 119) [my translation]. Another familiarization could be seen in *Jül Sezar*. Here, Abdullah Cevdet draws a connection between Cassius's words and an Arabic poem which is given without the name of the poet being mentioned.

Target Text (Act I Scene II)

Kasyos: İyi ne yapalım! Azizim, o, cihanın üzerine, muazzam bir dev gibi biniyor, nihayetü'l-emr bir muhakkar mezara vasıl olmak üzere biz kemterler onun azim bacakları arasında, korkarak ve aramsız nazarlarla sürünerek başımızı ileri süreriz. Bazı zamanlar vardır ki insanlar mukadderatının hakimi olurlar. Eğer biz esir isek, sevgili (Brütüs), kabahat yıldızlarımızda değildir, kabahat bizzat kendimizdedir [*]. (1908b: 25-26).

³³ "“Mÿtÿ úable en temÿtÿ!” hadis-i şerifini andırır. Eyyam-ı hayatının her gününü, masivadan müteccerid ve meşgul-i taat-i hak ve hakikat olarak geçirdi demek istiyor.” (Abdullah Cevdet 1909a: 119).

Source Text (Act I Scene II)

CASSIUS

Why man, he doth bestride the narrow world
Like a Colossus, and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves.
Men at some time, are masters of their fates.
The fault (dear Brutus) is not in our Stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings. (Shakespeare 2001: 32)

After the sentence “eđer biz esir isek, sevgili (Brütüs), kabahat yıldızlarımızda değildir, kabahat bizzat kendimizdedir”, he put an asterix and wrote the Arabic poem below in the footnote:

Nuèaybu zamanına velèaybu fînÀ
Velev neüaúazzamÀn leüad hecÀnÀ

We blame our time though the faults are ours
If the time spoke, it would satirize us. [my translation]

Obviously, Abdullah Cevdet tried to familiarize Cassius’s message through these lines. His manner could be read as an endeavor to call his readers’ attention to remarkably close connections between Shakespeare’s and an Arab poets’ way of describing the same idea. This also indicates Abdullah Cevdet’s reconciliation of the Eastern and Western way of thinking in general. In addition, pointing at the counterparts of Shakespeare’s ideas in Ottoman culture, he aimed at facilitating his readers’ internalization of the British author and of Western values.

Critics’ Ideological Denial of the First Full Translations of
Shakespeare’s Tragedies

I consider that the “disregard” or “omission” of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations within the literary histories, reviews and critiques produced after the foundation of the new Turkish Republic points at significant transformations in the literary system due to nationalist bureaucrats’ growing emphasis on “language planning” and linguistic purification. Lefevere’s notion of “patronage”, i.e., “the powers (persons, institutions) which can further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literature” (Lefevere 1992: 15), provides a useful framework to describe and analyze “language planning” (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2001: 75) and purification movements in the early decades of the Turkish Republic and how these efforts paved the way for a new literary “poetics”, that is “the dominant concept of what literature should be, or can be allowed to be in a given society” (1992: 14).

In her Ph. D thesis *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960* Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar draws attention to how the state, as a “patron”, governed and reshaped the poetics of translated literature between 1923 and 1960. She dwells on “language planning” (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2001: 75) that was launched by Atatürk and the other nationalist bureaucrats, with the adoption of the Latin-based alphabet, purification efforts and neologisms introduced by the Turkish Language Society (*Türk Dil Kurumu*). She also refers to other actors in the planning process such as “teachers, authors, translators, journalists, in short, many men and women of letters became agents of planning through their works” (2001: 87). In that sense, many official and anonymous actors worked hand in hand with the “patrons”, i.e., nationalist bureaucrats, for the purification of language. Accordingly, the literary “poetics” of the new Turkish Republic laid great emphasis on the purification of language in literature, both original and translated.

It was mainly because of this newly introduced poetics that Turkish literary critics, reviewers and anthologists, “who secured the [literary] system’s ideology and poetics” (1999: 127), either refused or remained blind to Abdullah Cevdet who produced the first full translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies. In these critical works, one discerns an ideological bias which has been manifested in the form of a “disregard” or “omission” of the role and functions of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations in Turkish literary and cultural history. Therefore, it is not surprising that Abdullah Cevdet’s translations from Shakespeare have not received much critical notice.

In his article “Türkçede Shakespeare ve Özellikle *Hamlet* Çevirileri” (Shakespeare in Turkish and *Hamlet* Translations in Particular) Ali Neyzi compares six different Turkish translations of *Hamlet* among which Abdullah Cevdet’s text is not included (2002: 76). The oldest translation he gives is Muhsin Ertuğrul’s abridged translation which he assumes to be written in 1927. It is known that this translation was meant to be a performance-text which was “stripped of the ‘purple poeticizing’ characteristic of Cevdet’s translation” and was “linguistically [more] intelligible” (Paker 1986: 94-95). It appears that the lack of Abdullah Cevdet’s *Hamlet* version in the Latin-based script and his “persionized poetic diction” (Paker 1986: 94) prevented Ali Neyzi from perceiving it as a “Turkish” text. This bias was fed on the linguistic purification program which gained momentum as early as in the 1910’s with the proponents of the “New Language” movement (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2001: 240). This new poetics was greatly influenced by the ideology of the new Turkish Republic which reserved little space for what had been written and translated before its foundation. Thus, this manner was closely associated with an illusion of rupture between the new Republic and its Ottoman past. The underlying reason was

that the new Republic turned its face completely to the West and intended to remove its ties with the Ottoman past which was largely centered on two “Eastern” lingual and cultural systems: Arabic and Persian.

A similar kind of “omission” could be seen in İnci Enginün’s Ph.D thesis *Tanzimat Devrinde Shakespeare: Tercümeleri ve Tesiri* (Shakespeare in the *Tanzimat* Period: Translations and Their Influences, 1979) where she contextualizes Shakespeare translations and their influences in the *Tanzimat* Period. Enginün states Hasan Sırrı’s translations of the *Merchant of Venice* (*Venedik Taciri* 1884) and *The Comedy of Errors* (*Sehv-i Müdhik* 1887) to be “the first full translations” (Enginün 1979: 30) of Shakespeare’s plays in Turkish to have been rendered from their English original (ibid.). Among all the translations published in the *Tanzimat* period, she praises these translations for being “easily intelligible, even today” (*bugün bile rahatça anlaşılır olması*, 1979: 44). She also emphasizes that Hasan Sırrı does not use “synonymous” words (*müteradif kelimeler*, 1979: 48), a conventional practice in the traditional Ottoman literary system. The nature of Enginün’s evaluation of Hasan Sırrı’s translations suggests that she assesses them according to today’s literary poetics.

It is surprising that Enginün only mentions Abdullah Cevdet’s translations by name few times — and often in the footnotes! — in the whole thesis and never dwells on the literary and linguistic features of these texts. She reserves several pages for the analysis of translations by various translators and compares them in terms of additions, omissions and linguistic qualities. However, she never mentions Abdullah Cevdet’s translations of Shakespeare’s tragedies, though they were the first full translations of these tragedies in Ottoman Turkish. Unfortunately it is not clear which years the “*Tanzimat* period” covers in Enginün’s study. According to many,

Tanzimat is a period in Ottoman / Turkish history covering the years between 1839 and 1876. Obviously this cannot be what Enginün understands of the period, since 1876 is the year when the first translation from Shakespeare appeared in the Ottoman lands. If her understanding of the period covers the years between 1839 and the re-establishment of the constitution in 1908, she should not have included and analyzed Mihran Boyacıyan's translation of *Othello* published in 1912 (Enginün 1979: 67). Then one can hardly understand why she did not include Abdullah Cevdet's translation of *King Lear* published in the same year. Considering that Abdullah Cevdet translated *Hamlet* as early as in 1902, Enginün seems to "close her eyes" to the first full translation of *Hamlet* which was the translation, as described by Halide Edip Adivar, which aroused interest in Shakespeare among Turkish readers (1943: 219).

Enginün never clarifies why she asserts that "Abdullah Cevdet's translations, conveyed mostly from Shakespeare, are away from locating his figure among the men of letters" without supporting her argument with textual analysis (2006: 85) [my translation]. Apparently Enginün has a contention that Abdullah Cevdet is among those who should exist "in cultural rather than literary history" (2006: 10). It is true that A Cevdet had an undeniable role in the intellectual and cultural transformations of the late Ottoman and Republican period (cf. İsmail Hakkı 1932: 5889; Creel 1980: 9). Nevertheless, this role does not necessarily require his non-existence in literary history. Enginün's "omission" of Abdullah Cevdet's first full translations of Shakespeare's tragedies in Turkish literary history is closely related to the new poetics in the literary system which has been governed by the ideology of the state from the outside and by the literary critics, literary historicans, anthologists and reviewers from within. Enginün's bias can be perceived more clearly when we look

at Mehmed Rauf's evaluation of Abdullah Cevdet's translation of *Hamlet*. After seeing the first performance of *Hamlet* in Ottoman lands in 1912, he praised Abdullah Cevdet who rendered the play via the following remarks:

In order to prove the value of the literary banquet last night, I should say that the translator of the work is Abdullah Cevdet who is a true man of letters. It suffices to say how he embellished the translation skillfully and attentively with a diligent hand.³⁴ (Mehmed Rauf in Ertuğrul 1964: 2) [my translation].

It is interesting that Enginün praises Hasan Sırrı for excluding pleonasms from his translations whereas M. Rauf praises Abdullah Cevdet for "embellishing" his version of *Hamlet*. I think it would not be wrong to argue that M. Rauf evaluated the translation according to the literary poetics of its own time whereas Enginün seems to project modern nationalist value judgments on Abdullah Cevdet's works on Shakespeare.

Another form of negation could be observed in İsmail Habib Sevük's critiques. Indeed, he does not neglect Abdullah Cevdet's translations from Shakespeare in his work where he contextualizes Turkish translations from the West (1940, v.1). He appreciates that Abdullah Cevdet was the first "serious" (*esaslı*) Shakespeare translator who "gave speed" (*seri bir şekil vererek*) to Shakespeare translations (1940: 527). However, he criticizes his pen for being "inartistic" (*sanatkârâne olmadığı*) and "awful" (*berbâd*), which leads to a "constipation" (*inkıbaz*) in his translations (1940: 528). He discredits his *Macbeth*, claiming that "it is full of vocabulary and phrase mongering" (*boyuna lûgat ve terkip parçalamak*) and concludes that "not only Shakespeare, but Turkish, too, was assassinated in these translations" (1940: 529). Sevük's harsh criticism of Abdullah Cevdet is by no means

³⁴ "Dün geceki ziyafeti edibiyenin kıymetini isbat için eserin müterciminin edib-i hakîm Abdullah Cevdet Bey olduğunu söylemek lazım gelir. Shakespeare'in bu tercümesini nasıl mûtena, nasıl mahir bir dest-i himmetle tezyin etmiş olduğunu anlatmak kâfidir."

a coincidence. Quite similar to Enginün's Ph.D thesis, a conspicuously ideological manner is observed between his lines. This bias is closely linked with "the emergence of Turkish nationalism as a factor contributing to the critical awareness of (Arabic and Persian) otherness within the [Ottoman] intercultural" (Paker 2006: 343). Abdullah Cevdet's "persianized" poetic style which closely adhered to traditional literary models did not seem to satisfy the expectations of these researchers who had been influenced by the new Turkish Republic's nationalist discourse and advocacy of simplification in language.

Summary

In the present chapter, I tried to describe Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations using Toury's descriptive methodology which enabled me to present an organized picture of the relevant translational issues. Toury's classification of norms related to the factors shaping the decisions made before and while translating and the descriptive tools he provided were very helpful for me to make a comprehensive assessment of Abdullah Cevdet's translations in terms of Abdullah Cevdet's "culture planning".

First, I analyzed Abdullah Cevdet's ideological considerations which affected his decisions before the translation activity, i.e. his translation norms which determined the cultures, personages and texts to be translated. I analyzed these decisions under the rubric of what Toury calls "translation policy" (ibid.).

In this section of the chapter, I tried to find answers to the following significant question: What was the relevance of English culture and Shakespeare's tragedies for Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program. It is an established fact that the

highly praiseworthy comments of some French men of letters on the stylistic qualities of Shakespeare's dramatic oeuvre (cf. Enginün 1979: 72), and the activities of Armenian and Greek theatres in the *Tanzimat* period contributed considerably to the growth of an interest in Shakespeare in the Second Constitutional period (1979: 14). Most probably, these developments had a certain role in Abdullah Cevdet's "exaggerated" admiration for Shakespeare. However, Abdullah Cevdet's preoccupation with the ideas of some Darwinist thinkers is probably the most important reason which accounts for his great interest in the works of the English poet. He believed in the evolutionary "greatness" of the English people (cf. Doğan 2006: 74, 171). It was their "disposition" (*seciye*) that made the English people the "greatest of the nations" (Abdullah Cevdet 1914b: 1982). Abdullah Cevdet considered that the Ottomans needed to borrow their disposition in order to complete their evolutionary progress (cf. Arıkan 2005: 101). The Ottomans needed to be introduced to Shakespeare's works as specimens of the "great" English culture.

Mardin stresses that Abdullah Cevdet was influenced by the ideas of Boutmy and Demolins who found more merits in the English educational system than the French educational system — unlike his contemporaries who were far more conversant with French cultural values (1983: 175). Moreover, Abdullah Cevdet asserted that one of the three reasons for the backwardness of the Ottomans was their adherence to the cultural values of the French rather than to those of the English (Arıkan 2005: 101). Certainly, Abdullah Cevdet and the other Westernist members of the CUP (The Committee of Union and Progress) were well aware of the fact that the education of the masses was a prerequisite if they were to introduce new Western cultural "options" to the Ottoman cultural "repertoire" (Even-Zohar 1997: 2).

Despite Shakespeare's popularity before the Second Constitution in Ottoman lands, his tragedies could not find an ardent and courageous "free-agent" (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45), like Abdullah Cevdet, who would "deliberately" make use of them as instruments of social change and of opposition against the despotic nature of Abdülhamid II's rule (Even-Zohar 1997: 3). For Abdullah Cevdet, Shakespeare was a representative of the so-called "higher" Western world which he considered to be the "sole" disperser of civilization (Abdullah Cevdet in Hanioglu 1981: 359), and the culture that would direct the Ottomans to "the target of hoped-for perfection" (Ahmed Midhat in Enginün 1979: 249). Abdullah Cevdet's statements in the preface of *Julius Caesar* clearly indicate that Abdullah Cevdet had a very exalted image of Shakespeare in his mind, similar to that of a prophet. With the help of Shakespeare's oeuvre, Abdullah Cevdet aimed to "teach" his people the libertarian and cultural values of the "great" Western nations, and of the British who had an even more special importance for Abdullah Cevdet. For him, "a nation who are unaware of Shakespeare and haven't translated him into their language should curl up and die from their shame"³⁵ (1908g: Preface). Because, he argued, "Shakespeare teaches people to be humans" (ibid.) [my translation]. He complains, claiming that if his "confused, aggrieved and indolent Muslim brothers [like himself] had understood this fact and behaved accordingly, they would be a master of virtue and enlightenment for all other nations"³⁶ (ibid.) [my translation].

As was already mentioned, Abdullah Cevdet's translations of Shakespeare's tragedies within the early years of the Second Constitutional period were certainly a kind of "resistance" against Abdülhamid II's oppressive rule (Even-Zohar 2002a; cf.

³⁵ "Arından yerlere geçse revadır o millet ki hala Şekspir'den bi-haberdir, Şekspir'i lisanına tercüme etmemiştir."

³⁶ "Eğer benim sersem, mazlum ve benim gibi miskin Müslüman kardaşlarım bu hakikati anlamış ve bu anlayışla hareket etmiş olsalar idi şimdi bütün milletlere üstad-ı fazilet ve irfan olurlardı."

And 1961: 84-85). It was demonstrated within this chapter that these translations fulfilled an important role for Abdullah Cevdet, as a culture-planner, to promote libertarian and democratic values among his Ottoman countrymen. Extra-textual and paratextual evidence clearly indicates that Abdullah Cevdet identified himself with Shakespeare's protagonists, Brutus and Hamlet, who realize the "injustice" of their kings, "speak, hit and set it right" in order to establish freedom, equality and peace among their people (1908g: 305). *Macbeth*, *Hamlet* and especially *Julius Caesar*, which Enginün reports to have also been translated in Japan with the same political motives, became really influential devices for Abdullah Cevdet and the other CUP revolutionists (Enginün 1979: 119). *Romeo ve Jülyet* is significant since it reflects best Abdullah Cevdet's understanding of translating the "foreignness" of European classics. Compared to *Jül Sezar*, *Hamlet* and *Makbes* which attracted attentions with some critical political messages beside their aesthetic aspects due to the socio-political environment of the period, Abdullah Cevdet's *Romeo ve Jülyet* came to the fore with its aesthetic aspect. Thus, it might be viewed as more closely related to the Ottoman literary system.

In the following sub-section of the present thesis, Abdullah Cevdet's textual-linguistic and matricial norms were analyzed. Before that, I needed to determine the directness of Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations in order to come up with a more realistic description of his translation strategies. Departing from the textual and paratextual clues in the translations and some other extra-textual sources, I argued that Abdullah Cevdet benefited mostly from the French translations of Shakespeare while translating, though he also resorted to some German texts where he felt necessary. Although it is generally acknowledged that Abdullah Cevdet translated solely from French mediating texts (cf. Süssheim 1987: 59; Adıvar 1943: 219), my

analysis has proved that this was not really the case. In fact, Abdullah Cevdet resorted to several French and German translators and “annotators” (*müfesssirler*, Abdullah Cevdet 1910: 220) such as Hugo, Montégut, Voss and Farmer occasionally comparing their texts with the English source text. This finding of mine contradicts what has generally been accepted on Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations. Due to the fact that Abdullah Cevdet drew upon several French and German texts — and rarely the English source text — while translating the tragedies, a comparative study between the source text and target text was nearly impossible during my research. Nevertheless, Abdullah Cevdet’s vocabulary choice and the paratexts of his translations have been very telling. That is why my departure point was generally Abdullah Cevdet’s formal and lexical choices and his discourse in the paratexts, namely the footnotes and prefaces, while analyzing and describing his translations.

An important finding I have reached in terms of translation studies during my analysis of the directness issue is that Abdullah Cevdet did not avoid revealing that he translated “Shakespeare” from mediating languages or texts. What is more, he did not feel any need to designate the name of these mediating texts and their producers in the paratexts. Unlike in his non-literary translations, Abdullah Cevdet does not inform his readers about the directness issue in his literary translations. It seems that Abdullah Cevdet did not have a primary “translation norm” (Toury 2000: 198-211) which strongly impelled him to specify the name of what he used as source text. Despite his “silence” as to the designation of what he used as source language and source text, Abdullah Cevdet did not see any reason to disguise the mediated nature of his translated texts. A very clear justification for this claim is that his translations contain many proper names with French spelling. Besides, Abdullah Cevdet used a number of footnotes in which he made explicit that he made use of several French

and German translations during the translation process. Even though some intellectuals of this period such as Necip Asım exhibited sensitivity about the necessity of rendering Western classics directly from their originals (in Paker 2006: 340), Abdullah Cevdet did not seem to share the same concern (cf. Süssheim 1987: 59).

The second part of this chapter was devoted to Abdullah Cevdet's "matricial" and "textual-linguistic" (Toury 2000: 202-203) norms in his Shakespeare translations. An important question to be raised at this point was related to his choice of prose as a form to represent Shakespeare's four tragedies. There might be several motives behind his preference of prose over verse while conveying Shakespeare. I argued in the preceding pages of this chapter that this could partly be accounted for by the fact that he was largely guided by some mediating texts — mostly in French — which were also written in prose. It is inferred from the peritexts of Abdullah Cevdet's translations of the tragedies that Hugo and Montégut were two translators who seemed to play a major role in the final shape of Abdullah Cevdet's decisions during the translation process. There could also be a practical reason behind his choice of prose, the natural differences between Turkish and any European language — be it French, German or English, which is the least probable compared to the other two. It is my contention that the most determining factor in this selection was related to a literary convention or translation norm of this period. Pointing at Ahmed Midhat's psychological dilemma between preserving the form or content of the play while translating *Le Cid*, and his comment on the impossibility of creating an "identical translation" (*aynen terceme*, Ahmed Midhat in Paker 2006: 330) in verse, Saliha Paker refers to the formation of a new understanding of translating dramatic literature in the *Tanzimat* period which required the translation of the products of

Western drama into prose (Paker 2006: 342). This claim gains further support from the fact that early Shakespeare translators such as Mehmed Nadir and Mihran Boyacıyan also represented Shakespeare in Turkish prose (Enginün 1979). Therefore, this convention could be regarded as a translation norm in the post-*Tanzimat* literary system.

His choice of prose as a form to convey Shakespeare's plays could be seen as a repercussion of his belief in the necessity for preferring "inward virtues over apparent beauty" (1899: 9). Another result of this contention is his extremely literal renderings which made him an extreme "foreignizer" (Venuti 1995: 148). His manner of foreignizing manifests itself in the form of the importance attached to the semantic integrity of the source text, abundantly used footnotes, non-translations, parenthetical notes on the representation of proper names in the corresponding characters of the Latin alphabet, and his effort of rendering the translation units literally, including those with metaphorical meanings. The comparison I made between several target texts of *Romeo and Juliet* demonstrated that Abdullah Cevdet came up with the most "literal" correspondences compared to other later translators. This manner sometimes led him to ignore the metaphorical aspects of some culture-specific idioms while translating, as was illustrated in the previous pages of this chapter. The loss of metaphorical meanings often led to the creation of unfamiliar situations for the Ottoman readers. This could be understood as a deviation from another translation norm of the period in terms of the translations of dramatic literature. This norm was related to a tendency of resorting to "domesticating" (Venuti 1995: 148) strategies for a practical reason, namely to create a performance-text which would appeal to the general and largely uneducated audience, "written in conformity with the domestic linguistic and cultural norms" (Paker 1991: 26). In that

sense, Abdullah Cevdet seems to divert from a translation norm of his period. As Paker would also agree, Abdullah Cevdet's radically literal manner of translating could be viewed as an "innovatory" (Even-Zohar 2000b: 193) "option" (Even-Zohar 1997: 2) introduced to the home polysystem (cf. Paker 1986: 94).

Setting aside the question of how it is ever possible to extract the "inward virtues" of a literary work without taking its figurative and metaphorical meanings into consideration, one can associate his "foreignizing" (Venuti 1995: 148) strategies with his mission as a "messenger" of culture who carried "Suns from the West to the East", as he expresses in one of his poems written in 1911 (Abdullah Cevdet 1931b: 13). His meticulous efforts for the semantic preservation of Shakespeare's works resemble the endeavors of a prophet who wanted to mediate the divine inspirations without any "deficiencies".

We can define Abdullah Cevdet's "foreignizing" strategies as "innovatory" when we compare them to the general tendency of the period in terms of the translations of Western dramatic literature, whereas his adherence to the norms of the conventional Ottoman literary language, which is described by Paker as "Persianized poetic diction" (Paker 1986: 94), could be regarded as "conservatory" (cf. Even-Zohar 2000: 193). Abdullah Cevdet's target group for Shakespeare translations was largely the Ottoman elites who were acquainted with this heavy diction modeled on Perso-Arabic vocabulary and grammar. In that sense, the role of these translations in transforming uneducated readers and "planning" (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45) their culture was probably limited. Unfortunately, Abdullah Cevdet did not enjoy the fruits of his "literal" translations with "full" adherence to the source text unlike Şemseddin Sami who translated *Les Misérables* also with great care for the semantic preservation of the source text but in simple prose, a decision which brought him the

chance of republishing his translation in 1934 (Paker 1991: 23). Although Abdullah Cevdet similarly produced Turkish translations of Shakespeare's plays with full adherence to the source text, his highly sophisticated diction in the form of the traditional Ottoman style led his Shakespeare translations to be cast into oblivion after the language purification movements in the new Turkish Republic. This was why none of his Shakespeare translations were republished after the alphabet reform in 1928. Therefore, one can claim that Abdullah Cevdet's "elitist" manner of representing Shakespeare impeded his influence on the ordinary readers who had difficulty in deciphering his "heavy" language.

Abdullah Cevdet's heavy language which was full to the brim with Arabic and Persian didn't satisfy the new Republic's nationalist bureaucrats and academicians who demanded a simple and pure Turkish. Thus, some literary critics and historians "refused" or ignored Abdullah Cevdet's translations from Shakespeare due to certain ideological motives.

CHAPTER 4: ABDULLAH CEVDET’S NON-LITERARY TRANSLATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR HIS CULTURE-PLANNING

Some Ottoman elites of the post-*Tanzimat* period largely elicited their “tools” from the home culture to draw “strategies of action” (Even-Zohar 2002b: 76) while some Western-oriented minds laid specific emphasis on Western options in order to tackle the problems posed by the “lag and lack” (Paker 2006: 336) of Ottoman society (cf. Mardin 1991: 19, 95-96). It is already known that the period beginning from the *Tanzimat*, which certainly covered the Second Constitutional Period as well, was a “turning point” (Even-Zohar 2000b: 194; Ortaylı 1983: 10; cf. Paker 1991: 30) when Ottoman intellectuals of different ideological and cultural backgrounds sought for and suggested different solutions to save the Empire from its technological, economical and cultural “backwardness”. Accordingly, the concept of progress (*terakki*) became an important “paradigm” with the “Western-oriented reforms of the *Tanzimat*” (Paker 2006: 329-330) and the famous “lag and lack” discourse became an important departure point and a source of “justification” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 46) for the elites in their cultural projects.

Beginning with the declaration of the *Tanzimat* Edict, Ottoman intellectuals, with varying degrees of emphasis on the “necessity” of preserving the national and Islamic identity, began to propose their own “remedy” both for the political “collapse” and the cultural “backwardness” of the Ottomans. In fact, all these elites made their own suggestions on the “ideal” degree of Westernization (cf. Hanioglu

1986: 27-34), at times also considering cohesive religious and / or national ties to keep the members of the Ottoman society together. Emerging and crystallizing according to the political and cultural developments in and outside the Empire, the main solutions that were discussed were *Garpcılık* (Westernism) (cf. Mardin 1991: 13), *Osmanlıcılık* (Ottomanism), *İslamcılık* (Islamism) and *Türkçülük* (Turkism) (Akçura 1976: 6-8; cf. Mardin 1991: 19, 95-96). Although a discussion of these trends will not be relevant for my thesis, I will focus on how Abdullah Cevdet, “the leading ideologue of the late Ottoman materialist ideology” (Hanioglu 2005a: 29) and the most radical exponent of Westernism, introduced and advocated some Western models such as materialism, scientificity and liberalism as a solution to rescue the Ottomans from political and cultural “collapse”.

Abdullah Cevdet belonged to a generation of young Ottomans educated in the military medical school of Gülhane (*Mekteb-i Tıbbiye*) established during the reign of Abdülhamid II. Owing to their academic curriculum, this generation “identified the West with the positivist science developed in the West” (*müsbet bilim*) (Mardin 1992: 18). Certainly, Abdullah Cevdet was one of those who regarded Western values as purely scientific and who had a strong conviction about the necessity of adopting a Western “repertoire” (Even-Zohar 1997: 2) without differentiating between “its roses and thorns” (Abdullah Cevdet 1914b: 1984).

In this chapter, I will describe and analyze Abdullah Cevdet’s non-literary translations published between 1908 and 1910 as significant instruments of his Western-oriented ideological program which entailed materialist, liberalist, anti-religious and evolutionist options. I would also like to draw attention to how some Islamist Ottoman intellectuals looked to the home “repertoire” — in which Islam played a decisive role — for “tools” of “resistance” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 48) against

the materialist and anti-Islamic “options” (Even-Zohar 1994: 3) Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the established Ottoman “repertoire”, especially through his *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. I will deal with the following translations: *Tarih-i İslamiyet* 1908 and 1909 (*De Voornaamste Godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*³⁷ by R. P. A Dozy), *İstibdad* 1899 and 1908 (*Della Tirannide*³⁸ by Vittorio Alfieri), *İngiliz Kavmi* 1909 (*Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais*³⁹ by Emile Boutmy), and *Musiki ile Tedavi* 1908 (*Musicothérapie* by M. Doubresse). *Tarih-i İslamiyet* which represented and exhibited Abdullah Cevdet's project the most clearly and effectively will be described and analyzed in detail in relation to Abdullah Cevdet's planning, and this discussion will constitute the greater part of this chapter.

I argue that Even-Zohar's notions of “active” and “passive tools” (Even-Zohar 2002b: 76)— in other words “explanation models” and “models of action” (ibid.) — in “culture-planning” serve as a useful framework to analyze the different dimensions of Abdullah Cevdet's culture-planning. In addition, Even-Zohar's notions of “culture entrepreneur” and “idea-maker” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 1), as I discussed in the first chapter, will be of great use in explaining the different manifestations of Abdullah Cevdet's role as a “culture-planner”. In addition, “institution” and “market” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31-33), two significant factors that operate within any system, are both significant conceptions that I will benefit from while describing the “resistance” against *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, the translation which

³⁷ Although Dozy wrote his work (Haarlem 1863) in Dutch with this title, Abdullah Cevdet introduces the work on the cover of his translation as *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, which is in fact the title of the French translation by Victor Cauvin (Paris, 1879).

³⁸ The first edition was in 1899.

³⁹ Although this title is seen on the hard cover, Abdullah Cevdet gives a longer title for this work in his preface: *Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais au XIXème siècle* (Abdullah Cevdet 1909b: 8).

reflected Abdullah Cevdet's making of a materialist and anti-religious "repertoire" in the most effective and intensive way.

As for my methodology in this chapter, I will describe and analyze the aforementioned translations of Abdullah Cevdet on the paratextual and extra-textual levels without focusing on Abdullah Cevdet's strategies while translating. Therefore, my departure point will partly be some paratextual evidence which includes Abdullah Cevdet's prefaces, footnotes, epilogues and notices. My reason for choosing these resources is that they offer rich material to analyze the nature of Abdullah Cevdet's planning. Such evidence will enable me to identify "preliminary" (Toury 2000: 202) features, i.e., the "translation policy" and "directness" (ibid.) of translations rather than their textual-linguistic features. Besides, I will also make use of some extra-textual evidence such as secondary sources written on these translations and the "resistant" (2002a: 48) literature against Abdullah Cevdet's project, which will shed light on different aspects of Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program.

Paratextual and extra-textual sources indicate that Abdullah Cevdet's non-literary translations which appeared between 1908 and 1910 exhibited the main pillars of his ideological discourse, namely evolutionism, materialism, "scientifism" (Hanioglu 2005a: 50), and liberalism. I would first like to give some preliminary information on *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, *İstibdad*, *İngiliz Kavmi*, and *Musiki ile Tedavi* before going into the details of their relevance for Abdullah Cevdet's "culture planning" (Even-Zohar 2002a: 45).

Some Preliminary Notes on Abdullah Cevdet's Non-literary
Translations (1908-1910)

İstibdad (1899), *İngiliz Kavmi* (1909) and *Musiki ile Tedavi* (1908)

İstibdad was translated from General Allix's⁴⁰ (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 10) French translation of Vittorio Amedeo Alfieri's (1749-1803) work, entitled *Della Tiranide* (1789). It is a significant and daring critique of Abdülhamid II's absolutism, which had interestingly been published before the dethronement of the Sultan and was re-published after the re-establishment of the Ottoman Constitution in 1908. It represented Abdullah Cevdet's libertarian world-views, his critique of despotism and of Abdülhamid II.

In *İki Emel*, which is an extended version of Cevdet's preface to *Giyom Tel* (translated from Schiller [*Wilhelm Tell*]), Abdullah Cevdet complains that *Giyom Tel* could not be circulated in the Ottoman lands (*Memalik-i Osmaniye*) since it was descriptive of hatred and revolt against despotism. Considering that *İstibdad* was described the same feelings against Abdülhamid II's despotism and was published (1899) when Abdülhamid II was in power, one can predict that *İstibdad* also encountered a similar kind of political "resistance" (Even-Zohar 2002a: 48). It is only due to the politically free atmosphere of Egypt — where Abdullah Cevdet was

⁴⁰ Allix, Jacques-Alexandre-François (Trans) (1834). *De la Tyrannie*. tr. from Vittorio Alfieri. Paris: Le Bailly.

living between 1908 and 1910 — that *Giyom Tel* (1896) and *İstibdad* (1899) could be published and circulated in Egypt, though their dissemination in other parts of *Memalik-i Osmaniye* remained limited.

İngiliz Kavmi (1909b) is the title of another translation by Abdullah Cevdet. He translated this work from the French academic Emile Boutmy (1835-1906). Due to the fact that the work was originally written in French, there is little doubt about the “directness” of this translation. As was already stated in the preceding pages of the present research, Abdullah Cevdet was proficient in French and translated Boutmy’s work directly from the French source text. In this work, Boutmy tries to explain the “mental and moral” characteristics of the English on evolutionary terms (Lowell 1902: 360).

As for *Musiki ile Tedavi* (1908c), this was translated from M. Doubresse’s French text. It will suffice is to say that it reflects the “scientifist” aspect of Abdullah Cevdet’s ideological program in which, as a medical doctor, he wanted to elevate the scientific awareness of his countrymen through the translation of an empirical medical work.

Tarih-i İslamiyet (1908)

Before going into the detail of the crucial role of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* for Abdullah Cevdet’s project, I want to give some preliminary information about the translation and publication of this work. Abdullah Cevdet translated the two volumes of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (1908d, 1909c) from the French version of the Orientalist R. Dozy’s work in Dutch, titled *De Voornaamste Godsdiensten. Het Islamisme* (1863) which was later translated into French. Abdullah Cevdet introduces his translation as a

“complete translation with annotations” (*bazı havaşi ilavesiyle tercüme-i kamilesi*, 1908d) of Dozy’s work *Essai sur l’histoire de l’Islamisme*⁴¹, which is in fact the title of the French translation of Dozy’s work, by Victor Cauvin (1879). Quite contrary to today’s understanding of translation *proper* (cf. Paker 2002: 126; Demircioğlu 2005: 236, 241), Abdullah Cevdet does not seem to be uneasy to reveal that he had translated the work from the French, though he never mentions the name of the French translator.

Abdullah Cevdet wrote a six-page “translator’s preface” (*İfade-i Mütercim*, 1908d: 3-8) to *Tarih-i İslamiyet* which resulted in the far-reaching anger of pious Ottomans. He also appended an “Epilogue” (*Tekmile*) of thirty-seven pages (Key 1908: 685-722) written by an obscure Orientalist⁴² (“A. Key”?) to the end of the second volume of the work in order to cover a “forty-year” period on which Dozy had not had a chance to write⁴³ (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 6). In addition, Abdullah Cevdet added many footnotes to his translation which was already loaded with the

⁴¹ Abdullah Cevdet introduces this title on the hard cover of his translated book as Dozy’s work, he says in his preface that it is the title of the French translation (1908d: 4).

⁴² In fact, Abdullah Cevdet does not give a full name for the writer of the epilogue. He only gives his initials in the preface (“A. Key”?). Ahmed Hilmi also mentions this person with these initials (1971: 552). Hanioglu thinks that this person might have been E. J. W. Gibb (1857–1901) who is mostly known for his comprehensive work on Ottoman poetry (1958). The fact that Gibb was a close friend of Abdullah Cevdet was confirmed by Hanioglu in one of my personal communications on 27 April (2007). Besides, Abdullah Cevdet’s testimony that Gibb translated one of Abdullah Cevdet’s poems on Shakespeare supports this claim (1927: 4320). Besides, according the information Hanioglu gives, Abdullah Cevdet and Gibb communicated by letter while Abdullah Cevdet was in Vienna around 1899 and 1900 (2007, My personal Communication 27 April). Hanioglu adds that there was no Orientalist by the name of “Key” which also strengthens this possibility. Still, Hanioglu admits that he could not see any close similarity and connection between Gibb’s works and this epilogue in terms of style and viewpoint. This is why Hanioglu considers that it would be too bold to say that the epilogue was written by Gibb. Because of this uncertainty, he has presented the epilogue and its author in the following way in one of his recent articles: “[...]an epilogue allegedly written by an obscure French orientalist at Abdullah Cevdet’s behest, and appended to the Turkish translation of Dozy’s *Het Islamisme*” (2005a: 99).

Indeed, Abdullah Cevdet’s description of this person as a “young orientalist” (1908d: 6) contradics with the biography of E. J. W. Gibb who was born in 1857 and was already dead when Abdullah Cevdet wrote the preface. In that sense, it is safer at this point to avoid any definite statement as to the author of the epilogue.

⁴³ Dozy published the work in 1863 whereas its Turkish translation was published in 1908.

French translator Cauvin's footnotes (Küçük 1994: 85). In his footnotes which he distinguished from Chauvin's by means of his initials ("A. C."), he explained some geographical or historical issues for the readers, or provided some supporting remarks often with reference to Islamic sources or to the ideas of some Muslim thinkers such as Ebu'l Ala el-Maarri, Celaleddin Rumi and Sadi (1909c: 341, 433, 439, 695, 704).

With the advantage of living in Egypt⁴⁴ and publishing *Tarih-i İslamiyet* in Cairo which had a relatively freer atmosphere because of its loosened ties with the central Ottoman administration, Abdullah Cevdet published both volumes of the work in 1908. These years were the beginning of very uneasy days for the translator who would later return to Istanbul and be exposed to long years of utmost "active" "resistance" (Even-Zohar 2002a: 48).

Tarih-i İslamiyet is one of the most controversial of texts translated in late Ottoman history, which has frequently been the subject of intensive discussions due to its blasphemous content. Hanioglu describes the translation as "a watershed in Ottoman history, since it was the first time that a book openly critical of Islam and its prophet had been published in Turkish and widely distributed" (1997: 137). It aroused great waves of indignation and provocation among both the conservative intellectuals and the ordinary pious readers whose fierce opposition triggered the political and religious authorities to take censorial actions against its publication and dissemination. Since its publication, there had been many attempts of refutations (*reddiye*) against both the anti-Islamic and "anti-religious remarks" of Dozy (cf.

⁴⁴In *İki Emel*, which is an extended version of Cevdet's preface to *Giyom Tel* (translated from Schiller), Cevdet complains that *Giyom Tel* could not be circulated in "Memalik-i Osmaniye" since it was about the hatred of and revolt against despotism. It is inferred from this statement that Egypt was not reckoned to be a part of the Ottoman lands ("memalik-i Osmaniye") (1906) during the time of the publication of *Giyom Tel*. It is due to this politically free atmosphere that *Giyom Tel* (1896) was freely published and disseminated in Egypt and its impressive preface enjoyed two further editions in Cairo (Süssheim 1987: 56).

Nevşehirli Hayreddin 1910: 2876). Looking at the critical works about Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's book then and now, I can argue that one can still strongly feel that this work has deeply influenced the social conscience of Ottoman and modern Turkish society. Cemil Meriç's statement that "condemning Dozy was the duty of every Muslim intellectual in this period" (*O devirde Dozy'ye çatmak her Müslüman aydınının görevi.*) (1986: 83) indicates the strong psychological and sociological impact of the work on the Muslim elites. Moreover, Meriç adds, Bediüzzaman Said Nursi, a contemporary of Abdullah Cevdet, would consider Dozy as an enemy to be obliterated in the pamphlets he would write long after the publication of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (cf. Mardin 1997: 225-226, Nursi 1990: 219).

Abdullah Cevdet's Non-literary Translations as Cultural Tools for Mobilizing and Modernizing Muslims

In his article "Factors and Dependencies in Culture: A Revised Outline for Polysystem Culture Research", Even-Zohar dwells (1997b: 15-34) on the nature and functions of culture "repertoires" and on "interference" as a strategy of culture. His statements below refer to an event that may happen to a "multiform repertoire" (1997b: 22), which could be defined as a multi-dimensional and "proliferated" repertoire. I consider that one possible situation of "multiform repertoires" described below by Even-Zohar conforms to the nature of the Ottoman cultural polysystem at the turn of the twentieth century, and constitutes a meaningful framework for analyzing the transformations in the Ottoman polysystem through the "interferences" of different agents.

... even when a culture is working with a large and multiform repertoire, a deadlock may occur by blockage of all alternative options. It is then that adjacent, or otherwise accessible repertoires, may be used for replacing the ones people wish to reject. This is how *interference* becomes a strategy of a culture to adapt itself to changing circumstances.” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 22)

Assuming that the Ottoman culture repertoire of the period was a “multiform repertoire” with its long established traditional models and “proliferated” options due to constant interchange among different religions, languages and cultures, I would suggest that such kind of a “deadlock” was prevalent in the Ottoman political and cultural system under focus. Probably the “deadlock” was firstly and most vehemently felt in the political and military spheres due to the technological backwardness of the Ottoman Empire in the face of the “advanced” nations of the West. In fact, the Ottoman political “deadlock” in the post-*Tanzimat* period which manifested itself in the form of a “lag and lack” (Paker 2006: 336) discourse and a paradigm foregrounding the notion of “progress” (*terakki*) (Paker 2006: 329) found its repercussions also in the other co-systems of the Ottoman cultural polysystem. The “classics debate” of 1897 (cf. Paker 2006), for instance, could be evaluated as a reflection of the “deadlock” on the Ottoman literary system, specifically on its sub-system of translated literature. Ottoman intellectuals’ discussions on the *ictihad* issue (cf. Mardin 1997: 227), as will be discussed in this chapter, could also be viewed as a repercussion of the mentioned “deadlock” on the system of religion, namely Islam as the official religion of the Empire. I am not certain whether one can attribute the “blockage” to all existing options in the Ottoman culture repertoire in this period. However, one can safely argue that a large portion of the Ottoman intellectuals already felt and acknowledged the “insufficiency” of the prevailing traditional models to save the Ottomans from political and cultural collapse (cf. Ortaylı 1983:

10). Idea-makers of different ideological backgrounds felt an urgent need to “interfere”⁴⁵ by introducing Western “options” to various fields of the Ottoman cultural polysystem, be it politics, religion, history, sociology, science or literature. Abdullah Cevdet was one of these “idea-makers” who strongly advocated the importation and implementation of Western models. Abdullah Cevdet’s efforts of importing Western options into the field of religion, sociology, history and politics by means of translations will be especially relevant for my arguments here.

Abdullah Cevdet’s *Tarih-i İslamiyet* is especially important among his non-literary translated oeuvre due to the fact that it was a multi-purpose work entailing a variety of options which related to the historical, sociological, religious and political spheres of the domestic repertoire. It proved to be the most controversial among Abdullah Cevdet’s entire oeuvre due to the radically anti-Islamic and materialist “options” it brought to the highly conservative and therefore “resistant” Ottoman religious and culture “repertoire”. In this part of my thesis, I will dwell on the relevance of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* for Abdullah Cevdet’s culture-planning and the ensuing repercussions after its publication in the form of “resistance”, a term described by Even-Zohar as “any kind of unwillingness towards the advocated, or inculcated repertoire” (2002a: 48).

Tarih-i İslamiyet especially intended to mobilize the uneducated Muslim masses, not only the Ottomans but also non-Ottoman Muslims, such as those in Africa, Azerbaijan and Russia and the Suez Canal area (Hanioğlu 1997: 139). Abdullah Cevdet tried to make the copies of this work available at a very low price to the “*foules*” [crowds], especially to the youth (cf. Hanioğlu 1997: 139; 2005a: 53). This may account for the difference between the target readers of his literary and

⁴⁵ According to Even-Zohar, one can speak of “interference” when a certain culture A (a source culture) become a source of direct or indirect transfer for another culture B (a target culture)” (Even-Zohar 2005).

non-literary oeuvre. His Shakespeare translations carried some characteristics of the traditional Ottoman prose style (*inşa*) which was unintelligible and therefore inaccessible for the uneducated. In his works where he assumed the role of a *müctehid*, as I will explain in the following section of this chapter, he also targeted ordinary readers. Dozy's work was used as a tool in his pen in order to attract ordinary men to materialist ideas and scientificity. Interestingly and ironically, Abdullah Cevdet tried to support the materialist and anti-Islamic considerations of Dozy by giving an abundance of references to Islamic sources, as I will elaborate in the following pages of this chapter.

Liberalism and *İctihad* as *Sine Qua Non* for the Evolution
of Islam and Muslims

Abdullah Cevdet's "bio- materialist" ideology (Hanioglu 2005a: 41) was closely interwoven with evolutionism, liberalism and the Islamic notion of *ictihad* in his discourse. These main pillars of Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program are conspicuous in his non-literary translations published between 1908 and 1910: *İstibdad*, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and *İngiliz Kavmi*. I argue that these topics were never a disorderly set of options in Abdullah Cevdet's culture planning project. Instead, his synthesis of these different options reveals his own understanding of the sociological, political and religious realities of the Ottomans and the Muslim world, and his own procedure for their salvation from political and cultural "collapse. Abdullah Cevdet's synthesis of materialism, evolutionism and liberalism with the Islamic notion of *ictihad* could be viewed, in Even-Zohar's term, as a type of "combination" (2005c:

73) of traditional and Western options so as to introduce new items to an extant repertoire.

It is my contention that once we understand the importance of *ictihad* practice for Abdullah Cevdet, we can map textual interconnections between *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, *İstibdad* and *İngiliz Kavmi* more clearly. The Islamic notion of *icithad* also enables us to understand the points of departure for his planning. As an Islamic term, *ictihad* refers to “creative legal reasoning” through the “reinterpretation” of Islamic sources and the bringing of novelties to the Islamic perspective in matters of “practical nature” on which Islamic textual sources do not offer “explicit statements” (Hallaq 1995: 181). The importance of the notion of *ictihad* for Abdullah Cevdet might clearly be grasped in a four-page footnote Abdullah Cevdet gives in *İstibdad* (1899: 115-18).

In the footnote, Abdullah Cevdet voices his “disagreement” with Alfieri (1749-1803), an “Italian tragic poet” (The Columbia Encyclopedia 2000), who proposes that Islam, like Christianity and Judaism, is convenient for absolutist regimes (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 115). Abdullah Cevdet emphatically declares that Alfieri is not “right” (*musib*, 1899: 115) in his claim that Islam is convenient for despotism since, Abdullah Cevdet claims that the political order of the Islamic government in the era of the Prophet was a liberal republic (*hürriyet-perver bir cumhuriyet*, 1899: 115). However, Muslim rulers terminated the liberalism and democracy which prevailed during the Prophet’s life and the reigns of the first four caliphs. Abdullah Cevdet adds that the later Muslim caliphs started to resort to oppression and violence, and, in time their rule acquired a despotic nature. Their political oppressions, Abdullah Cevdet claims, fuelled the emergence of different religious fractions. Some Muslim rulers supposed that they could solve these

fractional conflicts by forbidding the import of philosophical works, which resulted in the reduction of Islamic sects to four and closed the door of *ictihad*. The despotic nature of political orders in Islamic lands and the diminished role of *ictihad* as a source of religious innovation led to a degeneration of Muslims' interpretation and practice of Islam throughout history. Eventually, they found themselves in a vicious circle of "backwardness".

I consider that this footnote manifests Abdullah Cevdet's underlying idea that despotism should be destroyed in order to reactivate the *ictihad* institution which would bring change to Islam and make it compatible with modern ideas, especially with materialism, evolutionism and liberalism. (cf. Hanioglu 2005a).⁴⁶ Abdullah Cevdet's *Tarih-i Islamiyet*, *İstibdad* and *İngiliz Kavmi* must be regarded as textual reiterations of this basic viewpoint. What reactivating *ictihad* meant for Abdullah Cevdet was to return to the *original* sources of Islam and reinterpret them in accordance with the needs and realities of the contemporary Muslim world. Abdullah Cevdet regarded the Islamic institution of *ictihad* as the only aspect of Islam which is open to progress, as the sole instrument through which Islam may "evolve" (*tekemmül*, A. Key 1908: 685) and adjust itself to scientific and social changes (cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 53; Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 115-118).

Due to his biological materialist considerations, Abdullah Cevdet believed that religions, like societies, were subject to the laws of evolution (A. Key 1908: 685; cf. Hanioglu 2005: 53). Nevertheless, the oppressions and despotism of Muslim leaders and, thereby, closing the door of *ictihad*, led Islam and Muslims to "evolve" insufficiently. This is why "reactionary forces" (*geriletlen kuvvvet* A. Key 1908: 702;

⁴⁶ There is no doubt that Abdullah Cevdet's liberalist ideas and his hatred of despotism were closely connected with his position as a member of the Committee of Union and Progress, who regarded despotism as the biggest impediment to the improvement of their society (cf. Ramsaur 1972: 29)

cf. 1899: 115) were dominant in the Islamic lands and resulted in an instinctive and blind resistance to preserve the present (ibid.).

It should be noted that Abdullah Cevdet intended to use *ictihad* as a tool for more than just reforming Islam. His conception of *ictihad* would enable him to utilize Islam as a tool to create a “scientific faith” (Hanioglu 2005a: 50) which would welcome materialist ideas and meet the requirements of modern times. Indeed, Abdullah Cevdet inculcated a flexible conception of *ictihad* which would permit radical changes in Islamic tenets and practices, e.g., monogamy, and even the reduction of the times of the *namaz* to three (A. Key 1908: 715).

The Main Pillars of Abdullah Cevdet’s Ideological Program Reflected on his Non-literary Translations

Now, I want to analyze the options Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the domestic political, sociological and religious “repertoire” with each of his non-literary translations and to demonstrate how these options related to each other in his making of a materialist repertoire. Most significantly, I aim to show how these options justify my characterization of Abdullah Cevdet both as an “idea-maker” and “culture-entrepreneur” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 1).

İstibdad (1899)

In his preface to *İstibdad*, Abdullah Cevdet, as a materialist medical doctor, describes absolutist regimes like a physical disease which needs to be treated. Condemning it as “the most acute and bloody disease that the body of humanity could be afflicted

with”, he proposes that Alfieri exhibited the “nature” of this disease, its “causes”, “diagnosis” and “treatment” in *İstibdad* (1899: 11-12). For Abdullah Cevdet, people who lived in “Turkey” suffered the most from the “oppression”, “violence” and the “misery” of the absolutist regime (1899: 13). Therefore, he invited the elites or those whom he called “the experts of sentiment and comprehension” (*erbab-ı his ve idrak* 1899: 14) to struggle against it. Two major vehicles to reach this goal, he thought, were “enlightening” people (*tenvir*) and “resistance” (*mukavemet*) (ibid.). Abdullah Cevdet declared that he translated Alfieri’s work in order to “display the absolutist regime, to lessen fear of and ignorance about it, to prepare its defeat, thereby, to take a step forward in enlightenment and resistance; two vehicles of salvation” (1899: Preface). In addition, he criticized the elites who remained silent or whose opposition did not exceed empty words or sermons (ibid.).

These statements of Abdullah Cevdet indicate that he “resisted” the absolutist regime of the Ottoman Sultan through his translation of Alfieri’s work, and preached “freedom” and “patriotism” as alternative options to be adopted in the Ottoman political repertoire.

What is especially significant here in terms of Abdullah Cevdet’s culture-planning is that he considered his *İstibdad* as a step forward towards “enlightening” (*tenvir*) people about liberalist ideas, and encouraging “resistance” (*mukavemet*) against the established political model practiced by Abdülhamid II. “Resistance” and “enlightening”, two significant components of Abdullah Cevdet’s discourse and planning, constitute a clear indication that Abdullah Cevdet acted both as an “idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur” as I will discuss in detail in the following pages.

Tarih-i İslamiyet (1908)

Tarih-i İslamiyet clearly manifests of the main pillars of Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program, namely evolution, liberalism, materialism and "scientificity" (Hanioglu 2005a: 50). Through these various options, Abdullah Cevdet intended to transform the political, religious and sociological repertoire of the Ottoman cultural polysystem.

I will start my analysis with the evolutionary options in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. An understanding of religion, society and history in evolutionary terms is a significant option which Abdullah Cevdet inculcated by means of his translations. This aspect is clearly observed in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and *İngiliz Kavmi*. To start with, the epilogue which was written by an obscure French Orientalist ("A. Key"?) and appended to the end of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* involves some considerations about the evolution of societies and religions (1908d: 699, 700). As was already mentioned in the third chapter of the present thesis, Abdullah Cevdet's ideology was greatly shaped by the formulations of some European evolutionists such as Ludwig Büchner (Hanioglu 2005a: 41). Having been affected by evolutionist formulations, Abdullah Cevdet suggested the concept of "evolution" (*tekamül* Key 1908: 685, 703; Abdullah Cevdet 1909b: 10) to explain the reasons behind the peripheral situation of the Ottoman cultural system in the face of the West.

I think that the epilogue in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* could be read as a continuation of Abdullah Cevdet's lengthy footnote I previously mentioned. In this four-page footnote in *İstibdad* (1899: 115-117) where Abdullah Cevdet expressed his

disagreement with Alfieri's claim that Islam was convenient for despotism, he explained that there was a lot to mention on that subject, but he would leave it to another occasion. I consider the epilogue of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* is an expanded version of the discussions in this footnote. Quite similarly, the main issues discussed here are the evolutionary "backwardness" of the Islamic World, the oppression and despotism of the Muslim rulers and the reactivation of *ictihad*. Moreover, I consider that Abdullah Cevdet's translation *İngiliz Kavmi* should be regarded as a continuation of these issues in terms of its emphasis on the biological evolution of English society and how their evolutionary features have determined their "political psychology". Such intertextual connections between the three translations reinforce my claim that Abdullah Cevdet's translations were a part of his systematic efforts of making a new culture repertoire in the Ottoman polysystem.

Elaborating the issues discussed in the footnote of *İstibdad* (1899: 115-18) I mentioned, Key dwelled on the necessity of carrying out reforms in Islam through *ictihad*, a central term in Islamic law, in order to merge modern ideas such as materialism, evolutionism and liberalism with Islam, and thereby, to bring "progress" to the Islamic World. Key made a call to the Muslim *ulema* to initiate reforms in Islam through *ictihad*, which could be defined as the reinterpretation of Islamic sources according to the realities and needs of modern times. The *Ulema* should assume the responsibility for this duty since Muslims are unwilling to change themselves unless they are guided and told by religious authorities. Key strongly emphasized that the Islamic World needed a "Muslim Luther", who was equipped with the knowledge of modern science, to realize reforms in Islam. In Key's opinion, the reactivation of *ictihad* was a *sine qua non* for the "evolution" of Islam and its followers.

Key considers that once a religion appears, it “evolves” parallel to the “historical evolution” of the society it was born in. He states that Dozy’s great emphasis on the emergence of different schisms (*rafza*, Key 1908: 686) in Islam points at how a religion “evolves” as the society changes over time. However, the Muslim *ulema*’s neglect of *ictihad* has posed a major obstacle for the “evolution” of Islam and Muslims.

Key carries on his argument with the “evolution” of Western and Eastern nations. He points out that after the French Revolution every European nation established its own nation state. In order to reach their goals, they generally underwent three stages. The first stage was related to the “education of the individuals” (*terbiye-i şahsiye*, Key 1908: 698). For this, they improved their educational system and shaped the “disposition” (*seciye*) or character of their members in a certain way. Although Key, the author of the epilogue, does not clearly reveal the other two stages and their order, it is inferred from the context that the others are related to the creation of patriotic feelings for the homeland and technological and industrial advancement. According to the author of the epilogue, Muslim nations were in the first stage of their evolution because of what he called “reactionary forces” (*kuvve-i muahhara*, Key 1908: 702). These forces included some stabilizing factors such as firm beliefs, customs which turned into religious rituals, superstitions, and an instinctive and blind resistance to innovation for the preservation of present values (*ibid.*). It is due to the dominance of these “reactionary forces” that Eastern peoples suffered from backwardness. “The Eastern world” who were already “less active bodily and mentally” and deprived of the “noble impulsion of patriotism” (*‘vatani sevmek’in insana verdiği muharrekat-ı necibe*, Key 1908: 694-695) fell far behind the Western world (Key 1908: 695). On the other hand, the

French Orientalist Key argued, European societies achieved a perfect balance between “reactionary” and “progressive forces” (*kuvve-i musarraa* Key 1908: 702). The latter are fed by new ideas, ingenious discoveries, and the character of societies, dangerously fanatic devotions and sometimes even futile fantasies (ibid.). One can observe a clearly evolutionary perspective in the author’s formulations concerning social and historical change.

Abdullah Cevdet inserts a supporting footnote under these explanations, and reminds his readers of one of the Prophet’s *hadiths* praising patriotism to justify Key’s claims: “The love of fatherland is a part of true adherence to Islam” (*Óubbü’ l-vaüan mine’ l imân*, Key 1908: 695). Abdullah Cevdet argues that the Islamic World considers this *hadith* only superficially and that they do not understand the real meaning of “fatherland”. Defining “fatherland” as “the place where a person enjoys freedom and human rights”, Abdullah Cevdet draws attention to how “Turkey”, as a Muslim country, suffered from Abdülhamid II’s “despotism” for thirty-three years and disintegrated in “his grip of oppression and treason” (*pence-i kahr ve ihaneti altında*, in Key 1908: 695).

Looking at the arguments above from Even-Zohar’s systemic perspective, A. Key’s ideas — which Abdullah Cevdet agreed with in his discourse (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 115-18) — are certain Western elements utilized and inculcated for the making of an alternative political and sociological repertoire. Key’s ways of analyzing the Eastern and Western nations with the notions of “progressive” and “reactionary forces” in evolutionary terms foregrounds biological materialism as a significant model to be adopted from the Western repertoire. In addition, Abdullah Cevdet’s emphasis on “freedom” and “personal rights” (*hürriyet-i şahsiyye*, Key 1908: 703) as two essential conditions for the “fatherland” reflects some anti-

despotic connotations in the Ottoman context. The reason is that Abdullah Cevdet ascribes the lack of “freedom” and “personal rights” in the Ottoman lands to the nature of Abdülhamid II’s rule. In that sense, one can argue that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* enhanced the political messages Abdullah Cevdet gave in *İstibdad* and *İngiliz Kavmi*.

Like many other members of the CUP, Abdullah Cevdet was greatly obsessed with Abdülhamid II and his despotism. Thus, Abdullah Cevdet’s pen transformed *Tarih-i İslamiyet* into a political critique of absolutist regimes, though it actually dealt with historical and religious themes. Abdullah Cevdet’s use of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* as a political text could be viewed as what Venuti calls “dehistoricization” (1998: 67), that is detaching the work from its original context. Venuti’s following remarks constitute a suitable framework to understand how and why Abdullah Cevdet conveyed some political “options” in his translation of Dozy’s work:

As translation constructs a domestic representation for a foreign text and culture, it simultaneously constructs a domestic subject, a position of intelligibility that is also an ideological position, informed by the codes and canons, interests and agendas of certain domestic social groups. Whether the effects of a translation prove to be conservative or transgressive depends fundamentally on the discursive strategies developed by the translator, but also on the various factors in their reception, [...] and the uses made of the translation in cultural and social institutions, how it is read and taught (Venuti 1998: 68).

What Abdullah Cevdet did to transform *Tarih-i İslamiyet* into a political critique of despotism was to propose in his preface to the work that no “true histories” had been produced thus far in the “three main languages of Islam” — namely, Arabic, Persian, and Turkish — due to the despotism of Muslim rulers (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 3). He presented this premise as a “legitimation” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 32) of his translation of Dozy’s work, since, A Cevdet claimed, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* carried the

“requirements and qualities” of a “true history” (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 3). For him, only such a history could “disenchant” a people, who, thereby, would learn what “oppression” and “liberty” were (ibid.).

There was a need for presenting a history of Islam and submitting it to the information and consideration of our Muslim brothers, a work which possesses perfectly the requirements and qualities of what is worth being called a true history. [...] History is the most awakening one among the branches of science. It is clear that awakening cannot live with despotism and deception. A disenchanted people see what oppression and liberty are, and they demand justice and truth.
⁴⁷(1908d: 3) [my translation].

As a loyal follower of his mentor Gustave Le Bon, Abdullah Cevdet believed in his famous principle of “for the people, despite the people” (Bürüngüz 2005: 83).

Considering the materialist and anti-religious foundations of Dozy’s thesis, it is ironical to read Abdullah Cevdet’s statement that he felt a strong need to provide a “true history” (*hakiki tarih*) for his “Muslim brothers” (*din kardaşlarımızın*). In fact, what Abdullah Cevdet mainly intended was to radically transform his readers’ perception of religion, or what might be termed as their religious “repertoire” (Even-Zohar 1997: 2).

Dozy’s materialist perspective gave a truly anti-Islamic and anti-religious character to *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. The most radical option in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, one can claim, is related to a provocative conception of Islam which entails a materialist analysis and interpretation of the events in Islamic history. This aspect is most conspicuously observed in one of Dozy’s assertions which constitutes the crucial

⁴⁷ “Hakiki tarih namının levazım ve mahsusatını bihakkın haiz bir [Tarih-i İslamiyet] vücuda getirilerek din kardaşlarımızın pîş-i itla’ ve mülâhazasına arz edilmek lâzımdı. [...] Tarih, aksam-ı ulûmun en ziyade göz açanıdır; göz açıklığıyla istibdat ve iğfalın bir yerde yaşayamayacağı ayandır. Gözü açılan ahali, zulmü görür, hürriyeti görür, adalet ister, hakikat ister.”

basis of his work: The Prophet's illness of "muscular hysteria"⁴⁸ (*histeriya-i adeli* Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 37). This claim constitutes the central part of Dozy's thesis since it allows people to think that all the teachings and sayings of the Prophet stemmed from deliria. It was because of the essential character of this claim that the refutators condemned *Tarih-i İslamiyet* so harshly (cf. Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 74; İsmail Hakkı 1913; İsmail Fenni 1928: 7). As a materialist, Abdullah Cevdet's choice to translate Dozy's study was quite understandable. However, it is clear that such a materialist viewpoint cannot be reconciled with conceptions of divinity and divine revelation (cf. Ahmed Hilmi 1982; Hayreddin 1912: 2876). Thus, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was in diametrical opposition to theological and Islamic tenets. In that sense, one can propose anti-religiosity as another significant feature of Abdullah Cevdet's culture-planning. As his discourse suggests, he saw the Islam that was perceived and practised in his time as an impediment to modernization.

There is no doubt that all the models Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the Ottoman culture repertoire were designed to affect his readers' perception of and "readiness" for his culture planning. In fact, his ultimate aim was to use Dozy's work as a tool to promote materialist values and to fight against many Islamic perceptions and conventions which he thought prevented the modernization of Ottoman society (cf. Hanioglu 2005b).

The readers of the present thesis will most probably be surprised by Abdullah Cevdet's strategy of reconciling an extensive use of Islamic literature and sacred texts — as I will elaborate further in the following pages — with the extremely anti-Islamist content of his translations. Hanioglu notes that Abdullah Cevdet's

⁴⁸ Hysteria is "a psychiatric disorder characterized by the presentation of a physical ailment without an organic cause" (Dorland's Medical Dictionary for Health Consumers 2007). According to another definition, it is a "neurotic disorder characterized especially by emotional excitability and disturbances in sensory or motor functions, as loss of sight, for which no organic cause can be found" (Macmillan Contemporary Dictionary 1988: 507).

ideological program did not manifest clear-cut and well-defined boundaries. Rather, he had a “complex, eclectic and confused” ideological agenda (Hanioglu 2005a: 67). I think that Toury’s statement that “success in culture planning is often a result of certain flexibility whereas rigidity may well lead to failure (Toury 2000: 153)” accounts for the motives behind the “complex, eclectic and confused” appearance of Abdullah Cevdet’s planning. In the light of Toury’s statement, one can claim that Abdullah Cevdet resorted to Islamic sources in order to facilitate his readers’ internalization of the options he inculcated.

Despite the diversity of the cultural tools that Abdullah Cevdet “borrowed” from the Western and domestic stock, Hanioglu argues, his ultimate desire was to create a new “faith” which was compatible with “science” and “the necessities of modern times”.

In order to merge this faith in love with ‘science’, Abdullah Cevdet declared the prophet of his faith to be *le bon sens* [good sense]. Thus he expressed his desire for a ‘scientific faith’ different from all known religions. At the same time, he believed that once existing religions were stripped of their sacredness and unscientific assertions, they would be of much help in the process of creating this new ‘faith’. But only a faith based upon ‘science’ could keep up with the necessities of modern times. In this sense, therefore, it is perhaps possible to speak of Abdullah Cevdet as a Büchner and a Strauss rolled into one. Without understanding this crucial point, it would be difficult to comprehend Abdullah Cevdet’s motivations for translating Reinhart Dozy’s controversial essay *Het Islamisme: De Voornaamste Godsdiensten*. (Hanioglu 2005a: 50).

As stated by Hanioglu, Abdullah Cevdet envisaged to eliminate the “sacredness” and “unscientific assertions” of Islam in order to initiate the process for the constitution of a new “faith” which was only instrumental for keeping the members of a certain society together (cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 43, 65). This “scientific faith” would help Muslims to get rid of “reactionary forces” and to catch “progress”.

İngiliz Kavmi (1909)

İngiliz Kavmi, which “was devoted to the analysis and anatomy of the English psyche” (*İngiliz ruhunu tahlil ve teşriha münhasır*, 1909b: 8), also entails sociological and political options which Abdullah Cevdet introduced to the domestic repertoire. In his preface to the work, Abdullah Cevdet refers to the English as “the historical and natural friends of Turkey” (*Türkiya'nın bir yâr-i tarihi ve tabisidir*, 1909b: 9) and in evolutionary terms, regards them as superior to the other nations of the world, thanks to their “disposition” (*seciye*), which, he believed, determined the degree of a race’s evolutionary excellence rather than “intelligence” (Doğan 2006: 182). In his preface to the work, Abdullah Cevdet praises the English as a nation “who dominated the world from two small islands, and whose moral attributes and dispositions were as hard as steel” (1909b: 9).

In this work, Boutmy explains the “mental and moral attributes of the English” on evolutionary terms. Dependent on the climate and soil of the British Isles, Boutmy argues, “activity” and “self-restraint” (Boutmy in Lowell 1902: 361) became the most marked elements of the British character. He tries to support his argument by referring to English art, literature, philosophy, science and religion. He proposes that the English have an “undoubted great capacity” for “collective action” and “self-government” (Boutmy in Lowell 1902: 362-363). This is why, he believes, the main traits of Englishmen will always “prevent state interference from becoming as universal in England as in France” (Boutmy in Lowell 1902: 362). It is clear that Abdullah Cevdet, as a member of the CUP and therefore an ardent enemy of

absolutist regimes, intended to make his readers familiar with a nation who, by their evolutionary nature, “did not submit” to despotic rulers. In this regard, one can argue that the idea of “self-government” and “collective action” (Boutmy in Lowell 362) (which are closely linked with “republic” and *meşrutiyet* in the Ottoman context) are two options that Abdullah Cevdet intended to introduce to the Ottoman political repertoire as an alternative to the absolutist regimes of the Ottoman sultans. The political options Abdullah Cevdet inculcated in *İngiliz Kavmi* could be conceptualized with Even-Zohar’s notion of “active tools” i.e., “procedures with the help of which an individual can handle any given situation” (2002b: 76). To be more precise, Abdullah Cevdet’s political messages in *İngiliz Kavmi* involved procedures for the Ottomans to “handle” absolutist regimes in a particular way — by showing “resistance” — and derive some “strategies of action” such as “self-government” in the face of these regimes.

İngiliz Kavmi also indicated Abdullah Cevdet’s conviction that the spirit of nations should be analyzed according to the “investigation methods of the Science of the Social Psyche” (*İlm-i Ruh-i İctimainin*⁴⁹ *kavaid-i tefehhüsati*, 1909b: 8), on the findings of which any scheme of social transformation should be based. In fact, *İngiliz Kavmi* could be regarded as a “cultural tool” for Abdullah Cevdet to introduce some bio-materialist options to the Ottoman sociological repertoire. These options were related to a “scientific” and evolutionist way of analyzing and interpreting the dynamics and patterned behaviors of a society, namely those of the English in this case. Inculcating such a “scientific” and bio-materialist perspective, Abdullah Cevdet intended to give his readers some “passive tools” (Even-Zohar 2002b: 76) i.e.,

⁴⁹ *İlm-i Ruh-i İctimai* (1924) is the title of a work Cevdet translated from Gustave Le Bon, whose formulations had a great impact on him. He saw in Le Bon’s works the main motives behind the structure of a society and the clues which would help him to initiate the necessary alterations in Ottoman society.

“conceptual strategies” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 20), to “decipher” (ibid.) or to understand the dynamics behind the evolutionary supremacy of the English.

Paradoxical as it may seem, Abdullah Cevdet stated in the preface that it was very “beneficial” and even obligatory for a citizen of Turkey to become aware of “the secrets behind the superiority and grandeur of this [English] great nation” (Abdullah Cevdet 1909b: 8). I say paradoxical because Boutmy attributes great importance to the influence of geographical environment on the traits of the English and seems to have a more deterministic perspective on the character of a nation. On the other hand, Abdullah Cevdet seems to believe that reading books and and deliberating on them could be a key for the “survival” of the Ottomans and their success in the “struggle for life”. He ends his preface with the following remarks: “Turkey will read, Turkey will deliberate, Turkey will work, Turkey will fight and Turkey will survive. O future! Be a corroborative witness!”⁵⁰ (1909b: 10). For him, a people will have to choose between “reading” or “perishing”, and this state is an important condition of the “struggle for life” (*kavga-yı hayat*) in evolutionary thinking (1909b: 7).

Abdullah Cevdet as an “Idea-maker” and “Cultural Entrepreneur”

In his sociological, political and historical translations, Abdullah Cevdet provided — though did not wholly “invent” (Even-Zohar 1997a: 3) — some alternative political, sociological and religious options by synthesising certain Western and domestic models in a particular way. Abdullah Cevdet combined or presented these options in such a way that he could demonstrate the reasons behind the “backwardness” of the

⁵⁰ Türkiye okuyacak, Türkiye düşünecek, Türkiye çalışacak, Türkiye çarpışacak, Türkiye yaşayacak. Ey istikbal! Şahid-i müeyyed ol! (1909b: 10)

Ottomans and the Muslims, and offer a Western-oriented materialist “repertoire” to get rid of this “backwardness”. In view of Abdullah Cevdet’s particular and innovative way of combining or synthesizing various “options” and introducing them to the Ottoman context as new alternatives to the established ones, I am justified in calling him an “idea-maker” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 9). “Idea-makers” are described by Even-Zohar as “some brainworkers who have mental capabilities of producing new ideas that may be converted to new or alternative options for the repertoire of culture by which the life of societies is shaped and organized” (2005a: 1).

In addition, there is much evidence which demonstrates that Abdullah Cevdet attempted to “implement” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 10) the options he transmitted through translations in the Ottoman context, thereby engaging in “cultural entrepreneurial” (ibid.) activities. The fact that Abdullah Cevdet resorted to some “Islamicization techniques” (Hanioglu 2005a: 42), or what Even-Zohar calls “persuasion” (2005c: 76) strategies by exploiting Islamic sources (as I will discuss in detail in the following pages) indicates that he was a “cultural entrepreneur”, a term suggested by Even-Zohar to describe “active idea-makers” (2005a: 10) who “become active in attempts towards implement[ing]” (ibid.) the ideas they preach. His self-imposed duty as a “physician of the society” () and his undeniable role as a “Young Turk in opposition” (Hanioglu 1995) suggest that he did not produce his translations only for the sake of translating, or to inform his readers on something they would not identify with. Otherwise, he would not have endeavored to promote his ideas so zealously. Abdullah Cevdet’s efforts to legitimize his ideas by means of “Islamization techniques” should be viewed as “attempts towards implement[ing]” (2005a: 10) his repertoire by means of persuasion, hence, as the result of the role he assumed as a “cultural entrepreneur”.

Of course, there is other textual and non-textual evidence which supports characterizing Abdullah Cevdet as a “cultural entrepreneur”. According to Even-Zohar, individual planners are “normally” deemed to be unsuccessful unless they have a “power base” (Even-Zohar 2000c: 401). For “success”, they need to embody a power factor. As part of “an organized group of similar producers” (1997b: 3) they will more forcefully compete with rival repertoires to implement their planned repertoire. Although Even-Zohar fails to clarify what kind of power he means, it is inferred from his statements that it refers to a kind of “organizedness” (ibid.) and institutionalization of the culture planners. Presumably, Even-Zohar points at an “institutionalized” and “organized” (ibid.) entity like that of the Westernist secret society of the Committee of Union and Progress (*İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti*) in which Abdullah Cevdet took part as one of the four founding members.

It is not a coincidence that Abdullah Cevdet’s friends in the CUP recommended that he put a critical footnote under Alfieri’s anti-Islamic reflections in *İstibdad* on the basis that these reflections would lead the readership to reject the work entirely (Hanioğlu 1997: 134-35). This manner was understandable for the CUP members since the liberalist options Abdullah Cevdet preached in *İstibdad* were also the reasons of their existence. In terms of its members’ consensus on the necessity of disseminating and implementing liberalist and anti-despotic models, the CUP could be viewed as an “organized group of similar producers” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31). The fact that this group started to establish itself as the center of political power beginning from 1908 clearly shows that the group members actively attempted to “implement” the ideas they preached. There are also many other non-textual manifestations of Abdullah Cevdet’s cultural-entrepreneurship, but describing all of

them will exceed the limits of this thesis. I will only mention a few of these manifestations.

Abdullah Cevdet's ardent endeavours to mobilize the uneducated Muslim masses such as those in Africa, Azerbaijan, Russia and the Suez Canal area (Hanioğlu 1997: 139) via his seemingly "pious" *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, and his attempts to make the copies of this work available at a very low price to the crowds (cf. Hanioğlu 1997: 139; 2005a: 53) show that he intended to implement his planned repertoire by means of propagation and inculcation. In addition, close interconnections between *İstibdad*, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and *İngiliz Kavmi* and Abdullah Cevdet's systematic way of translating and publishing these works could be seen as Abdullah Cevdet's purposeful efforts of implementing his ideological program in Ottoman society.

Abdullah Cevdet's call to the Islamic scholars to reactivate *ictihad* as a source of innovation in religion, thus to eliminate ideas and practises which hinder Muslims from adopting Western "options", is certainly related to his intention of putting the *ictihad* as an option into practice again in the Ottoman religious repertoire. Therefore, Abdullah Cevdet's great emphasis on the necessity of implementing *ictihad* should also be viewed as an indication of his identity as a "cultural entrepreneur" (Even-Zohar 2005a: 10).

The fact that Abdullah Cevdet set some practical objectives, religious, political, and cultural, to be attained in his non-literary translations under focus is another reason to acknowledge Abdullah Cevdet's position as a "cultural entrepreneur". For instance, in *İstibdad*, he invited the elites to inform people about the damages of absolutism, and to fight against it (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: Preface). In *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, he set the reactivation of *ictihad*, the emancipation of women,

improvement in personal rights, elimination of despotism and establishing liberalism as major targets to be attained (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 3; Key 1908: 685-722). In *İngiliz Kavmi*, Abdullah Cevdet dwelled on the need of the Ottomans to get acquainted with the English as their “historical and natural friend” (1909b: 7) and to learn about their “political psychology” and to draw lessons from their success and their capacity for “self-government” and “collective action” (Boutmy in Lowell 1902: 362-63). He also encouraged the Ottomans to read, to think, to work and to fight in order to “survive” in the “struggle for life” (1909b: 10). Obviously, all these inculcations of Abdullah Cevdet should be viewed as attempts to put his planned repertoire into practice in the Ottoman context.

The Inculcation of Materialism and Scientificity through “Persuasion”
and “Disguise Techniques”

As Şükrü Hanioglu observed correctly, Abdullah Cevdet “presumed he could bridge the enormous gulf separating the atheist doctrine of materialism from the traditional religion of Islam by means of a free reinterpretation of Islamic sources” (Hanioglu 2005a: 53). Quite radically, he tried “to present modern scientific theories ranging from Darwinism to genetics as repetitions of Islamic holy texts or derivations from the writings of Muslim thinkers” (Hanioglu 2005a: 57).

Since he understood well that Ottoman Muslims were unwilling to accept and internalize novelties unless they were wrapped in an “Islamic garb” (Hanioglu 2005a: 54), Abdullah Cevdet frequently resorted to some Islamic references while translating the contents that he thought would be criticized by the conservative intellectuals of his time and his pious readers. Whenever any idea seemed

blasphemous, he found this strategy necessary in order to convince his readers that the ideas in the work had an Islamic basis.

Toury's definition of "disguise techniques" (Toury 2002: 152) which may be applied by "agents of change" (Toury 2002: 151) provides a meaningful and useful framework to interpret Abdullah Cevdet's attempts of "disguising" materialism and anti-religiosity in "Islamic garb" (Hanioglu 2005a: 54):

it is DISGUISE TECHNIQUES which often act as safeguards from losing such a struggle, especially when power has not yet been won: risk smaller when the claim is made that there actually is very little new about what is being advocated, and especially when such a claim can be backed up by (necessarily selective, often so much as distorted) evidence. (Toury 2002: 152).

The scale of opposition against his planning and radical "options" manifests that Abdullah Cevdet initially seemed to have relatively little chance to succeed. That is why, in order to win the "struggle", he tried to convince his audience that he was in fact a "pious Muslim" (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 6) who wanted to translate a "true history" (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 3) of Islam for the information and consideration of his "Muslim brothers" (ibid.). Another "disguise technique" which Abdullah Cevdet seems to have devised was his use of "selective" and sometimes "distorted" (Hanioglu 2005a: 99) Islamic sources, e.g., Quranic verses, prophetic sayings and the poetry of some Muslim poets, not to attract reaction from his readers. In addition, Abdullah Cevdet's insistent emphasis on the "accuracy" and "literalness" of his translation might also be regarded as a "disguise technique".

A provocative act accompanying the already blasphemous and "notorious" content of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was the preface by Abdullah Cevdet who seemed to completely approve of Dozy's explanations:

We have done the Turkish translation of this work, which was translated into French with the title *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, and which is definitely the product of impartial good sense, distinguished by an embracing vision and profound investigation. We will answer an inevitable question like “The author is a Dutch non-Muslim, therefore he is an outsider to the religion. Do his remarks deserve to be found trustworthy?” in the following way: being a Muslim is not having a Muslim name, performing *namaz* and fasting. *Al-din al-mu'amala* means that religion resides in the interaction between humans⁵¹. Learned and virtuous Dozy, who spent all the hours of his life teaching and investigating, who tried to be useful to people and to enlighten the minds of God’s creatures, is a thousand times more Muslim than vagabond Hamids⁵² who have evil ambitions and deeds.⁵³ (1908d: 4-5) [my translation]

Abdullah Cevdet answered a possible question which might be raised by his readers; “The author is a Dutch non-Muslim, therefore he is an outsider to the religion. Do his remarks deserve to be found trustworthy?” by referring to an assumed prophetic saying: “Religion resides in the interaction between humans” (Hanioğlu’s Translation 2005a: 54). Abdullah Cevdet resorted to Islamic sources apparently to persuade his readers that Dozy, with his valuable service to “God’s creatures”, was “more Muslim” than many Muslims, a manner which might be viewed by Even-Zohar as a “persuasion” strategy that is often adopted by culture-planners (2005c: 76). The critiques against *Tarih-i İslamiyet* suggest that Abdullah Cevdet’s efforts of presenting Dozy as a “virtuous” Muslim did not really become convincing. Many

⁵¹ This is Hanioğlu’s translation of the *hadith* (2005: 54).

⁵² Even though this work was published before the dethronement of the Sultan, Abdullah Cevdet saw no drawback in condemning Abdülhamid with this sentence, enjoying the freedom in Egypt where he lived at that time (cf. Hanioğlu 1997: 138). Cevdet referred to the Sultan with this word, note that this word also means “praiseworthy” in Arabic.

⁵³ “Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme” ünvanıyla Fransızcaya mütercem olup büyük bir ihata-i nazar ve derin bir im'an göstermekle mümtaz ve katiyen bi-taraf bir akl-ı selim mahsulü olan bu kitabı Türkçe'ye nakl ettik. “Müellif, Hollandalı, gayr-i müslimdir ve binaen aleyh ayyar-ı dindendir beyânâtı şâyân-ı itimad olur mu?” yolunda bir sual-i mukaddere şöyle cevap veririz: Müslümanlık, isim ile, oruç ile, namaz ile değildir, [eddinu'l muamele]; din muameleden ibaretdir demektir. Bütün saat-ı hayatını tedris ve mütalaa ile geçiren ve ibadullahın tenvir-i ezhanına, halka nafi olmaya çalışan, âlim, fazıl Doktor (Dozy); a'mal ve âmâli kara, âvâre Hamidlerden bin kat ziyade müslümandır.”

devout Muslims criticized these lines of Cevdet on the account that *namaz* and fasting, two of the five pillars of Islam, were ridiculed by the translator who presented “learned and virtuous Dozy” as more Muslim than those Muslims who kept to these duties (1908d: 5).

Considering the “weakness” of Abdullah Cevdet’s assertive sentences above, one can expect that he needed more *hadiths* to support his complimentary remarks on Dozy. The other four *hadiths* are presented below:

Al-óikma êÀllat al-mu’min óaythumÀ wajaðahÀ iltaqatahÀ. (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 5).

Wisdom is the believer’s stray camel; wherever he finds it, he appropriates it. [Hanioglu’s translation 2005a: 50]

Khayr al-nÀs anfaèuhum li’l-nÀs. (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 5).

The best of men is he who is the most useful to people. [Hanioglu’s translation 2005a: 50].

Ûalab al-èilm sÀèatan khayr min èibÀdat alf sana⁵⁴. (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 5).

An hour’s search for knowledge is better than a thousand years of worship. [Hanioglu’s translation 2005a: 50].

Al-dín al-muèÀmele⁵⁵. (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 5).

Religion resides in the interaction between humans. [Hanioglu’s translation 2005a: 54].

A Cevdet cited the first of the *hadiths* above in order to stimulate his readers to read and understand Dozy’s study, as a product of “le bon sens” (1908d: 4) without any reservation about the non-Muslim author, who was, Abdullah Cevdet maintained, in fact more Muslim than many Muslims in the secondary and metaphorical sense of

⁵⁴ İsmail Hakkı indicates this as a fake *hadith* which was fabricated to vilify the Prophet (1913: 26–27).

⁵⁵ İsmail Hakkı claims that this is not an authentic *hadith*. He states that, even if there is such a *hadith*, Abdullah Cevdet misinterprets it (1913: 28–29).

the word. If “wisdom” exists in a Dutch Orientalist’s work, a believer of Islam should not avoid “appropriating” it (ibid.). It appears that Abdullah Cevdet wanted to “sell” and “advertise” Dozy’s study as if it was a work which was totally in line with Islamic teachings. It was a prerequisite to define Islam or any religion as “the interaction between humans” in order to introduce Dozy as a true Muslim. The other three *hadiths* were also used for the same purpose. It is obvious that Abdullah Cevdet firstly needed to establish the significance of the author in order to generate general acceptance for the work. This translation strategy of supporting the content with some sacred texts, Quranic verses and *hadiths*, was used in the footnotes of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* as well (1908d: 338, 533, 661, 667, 695). As I will discuss in the following pages of this chapter, Abdullah Cevdet sometimes resorted to some fictitious Quranic verses in his footnotes to support Dozy’s claims.

It is quite interesting to see that opposing intellectuals generally saw Abdullah Cevdet equally responsible for the content of the translation because of his preface in which he appeared to be in full agreement with the author. However, Abdullah Cevdet strongly and apologetically emphasized that he had preserved the textual integrity of the original with “pious care” and without any interference with the text, supposedly to get rid of the responsibility for the content of Dozy’s essay:

The method we followed in the translation of this work was the very method we have always been following with a pious care, that is to preserve the textual integrity of the original. The only thing that was added by us is related to the parenthetical usage of four letters: (*s.a*) for *sallallahü aleyhi vesellem* and (*r.a*) for *radiyallahü anh*. Some of our remarks and additions are in the form of marginal notes attached to the bottom of the pages and accompanied by the signature “A.C.”, thereby differentiated from the author’s marginal notes.⁵⁶ (1908d: 6-7) [my translation]

⁵⁶ “Tercüme-i eserde takib ettiğimiz usül, dindarane bir itina ile daima takib etmekte olduğumuz usüldür ki aslın temamiyet-i metniyesini muhafaza etmekten ibarettir. Tarafımızdan metn-i kitaba ilave olunan dört harfdir ki mutariza işareti dâhiline mevzudur: *sallallahü aleyhi vesellem* yerine (*s.a*)

Actually it is quite difficult to reconcile the blasphemous content of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* with Abdullah Cevdet's claim that he translated it with a "pious care". He boldly claimed that the only thing that was added to the text by him was the parenthetical usage of four letters: (s.a.) *sallallahü aleyhi vesellem* and (r.a) for *radiyallahü anh*. Abdullah Cevdet's pious discourse seems to be confusing, but Toury's notion of "disguise techniques" will be illuminating here. This notion enables me to interpret Abdullah Cevdet's manner as an endeavor to defend himself underscoring his position as a mediator. Although he persuaded his readers about the "accuracy" of his translation, his pious discourse was not found convincing due to his almost hopeless attempts of compromising materialism with Islam. Accordingly, the "attacks" on Abdullah Cevdet were so harsh that he had to remove the preface from the later copies of the book and incorporated a table of contents instead (Hatiboğlu 1999: 202). This time, the only thing that remained from the preface was a short statement under the heading of "Important Warning" (*İhtar-ı Mühim*) at the beginning of the book where Abdullah Cevdet emphasized that he did a "literal" (*harfiyyen*) translation "without any omissions and additions" (*tayy ve ilaveden beridir* 1908d: 8 the copy without a preface), obviously to get rid of the ever growing criticism directed against the translation and the preface:

Tarih-i İslamiyet was translated literally, as the same. The text is free of any omissions and additions. Some annotations of the translator are in the form of marginal notes which carry the translator's signature.⁵⁷ (1908d: 8, The copy without a preface) [my translation].

radiyallahu anh yerine (r.a) harflerinden ibarettir. Bazı mülâhaza ve ilavatımız; haşiyeye suretinde sehaifin nihayetlerine kayd edilmiş ve zirlerine A.C. imzası konularak müellifin haşiyelerinden tefrik olunmuştur."

⁵⁷ "(Tarih-i İslamiyet) aynen ve harfiyen tercüme edilmiştir! Metin, tayy ve ilaveden beridir. Mütercimim bazı izahatı haşiyeye suretinde ve A.C. harfleriyle mümzadır."

The translator's insistent emphasis on the accuracy and completeness of his translation was taken for granted by many intellectuals of the opposition campaign except for their criticism of Abdullah Cevdet's title. Several critics (İsmail Fenni 1928: 5) accused Abdullah Cevdet of replacing the "original" title with "*Tarih-i İslamiyet*" which suited neither the content of the work nor the author's intention. They stated that the author intended the work to be regarded as an "essay" rather than a "history" of Islam, as the title of the "original" work indicates: *Essai Sur l'Histoire de l'Islamisme* (1879). Actually these critics seemed to ignore that Dozy wrote the work in Dutch (*De Voornaamste Godsdiensden: Het Islamisme* [Great Religions: Islam] 1863), hence they had Victor Chauvin's French title *Essai Sur l'Histoire de l'Islamisme* in mind while criticizing Abdullah Cevdet. Still, they were justified on the point that Abdullah Cevdet's title was a free translation of Chauvin's French title. Apart from their disagreement with Abdullah Cevdet on the title of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, there was almost an unanimous agreement on the idea that Abdullah Cevdet had translated Dozy's work "accurately" (İsmail Fenni 1928: 4). A case in point is İsmail Fenni's words: being aware of the fact that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was translated from the French translation of the Dutch original, he proposed that "the printed Turkish translation of Dozy's work was faithful to [agreed with] the original" (*kitabın matbu olan Türkçe tercümesinin aslına muvafık olduğu*) (1928: 4); therefore, he added, he would quote where necessary from Abdullah Cevdet's translation in his refutation, since this would facilitate his job while criticizing Dozy's remarks, certainly a reasonable choice for the intelligibility of his refutation for the ordinary Turkish target readers (ibid.). The other critics also seemed to take this idea for granted in their critiques and quoted from Abdullah Cevdet's *Tarih-i İslamiyet* freely, though they did not emphasize their agreement with the "authenticity" of the translation. A

remarkable consequence of the analysis of these refutations in terms of translation studies is that the critics were hardly aware of the fact that Abdullah Cevdet's text was a Turkish translation of the *French* translation of Dozy's work in Dutch. Even Babanzade Ahmed Naim, who was exceptionally more conscious of this fact, searched for the *French* "original" on which to base his refutation, suspecting distortions by Abdullah Cevdet while translating (*Siratü'l-Müstakim* 1910: 16).

Abdullah Cevdet resorted to the same strategy of "Islamicization" also in his preface to *İstibdad*. The provocative epigraphic motto he attributed to the Prophet at the beginning of his preface reads: "Despotism is a violation of rights; destroy it!" (*İstibdad hakka taaddidir; Onu tahrib ediniz* 1899: Preface). Following the very strategy he adopted with the preface of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, Abdullah Cevdet seems to have intended to support the ideas in *İstibdad* with Islamic references. Quite interestingly, even though he tries to prove that Alfieri's ideas are compatible with Islamic sources and tenets, he still finds it safer to underscore his position as a conveyor of Alfieri's ideas. Here again, Abdullah Cevdet emphatically "disguises" himself, maintaining that he produced a "literal" (*harfiyyen*) translation of the original (1899: Preface). It is readily understood that he underscores his position as a "mediator" who presented Alfieri's ideas rather than his own. Just as he proposed in his preface to *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, he declares that he "preserved the textual integrity" of Alfieri's work (*eserin temamiyet-i metniyesini muhafaza olunmuşdur*, 1899: Preface).

After having analyzed Abdullah Cevdet's "disguise" and "persuasion" techniques in detail, I want to note that these techniques were generally not found to be cogent as the general discourse of the refutators indicates.

Active Resistance against Dozy, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and

its Translator Abdullah Cevdet

The term “resistance” is described by Even-Zohar as “any form of unwillingness towards the advocated, or inculcated, repertoire” (2002a: 48). It should be noted that “resistance”, that is any “attempt to prevent changes which others are trying to introduce also fall under planning, whether they succeed or fail.” (Toury 2002: 151).

The factors in a system, namely “institution” and “market” must be explained first for the sake of the intelligibility of the issues I will discuss under the heading of “resistance” in the ensuing pages. “The ‘market’ is the aggregate of factors involved with the selling and buying of the repertoire of culture, i.e., with the promotion of types of consumption” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 33). “Institution”, which is never “unified” in any culture, is described by Even-Zohar as “the aggregate of factors involved with the control of culture” which “governs the norms, sanctioning some and rejecting others” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31). While it is the institution which governs the “production” and “consumption” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 32) of a repertoire and makes its “legitimations and restrictions” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 33), “what determines its success or failure is the kind of interaction with which it is able to establish with the market” (ibid.).

I will make use of Even-Zohar’s notions of “institution” and “market” in order to describe the “resistance” of the Ottoman government as an official “institution” as well as that of the non-official institutions and individuals to Abdullah Cevdet’s materialist and anti-religious planning, especially with his

“infamous” *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. The resistance of the official “institution” to Abdullah Cevdet’s planning manifested itself with the suspension of *İctihad* several times, the ban of the work by the government in February 1910, censorship and convictions (cf. Hanioglu 1997: 139, 142, 145). The harshest critiques of the conservative intellectuals published in the pages of the journal *Sirat-el-Mustakim* (Küçük 1994: 70) also point at the existence of a powerful non-official “institution” at the turn of the twentieth century. Apart from the “resistance” displayed by the “institutions” which are theoretically “empowered with the ability to make decisions to last for longer periods of time”, and to “sanction” some and “reject” others (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31), there were also many anonymous cases of “resistance” displayed by individuals. A large number of petitions of complaint to the office of *Sheikhulislâm*, insistent letters of criticism to the journals *Sirat-el-Mustakim* (cf. Küçük 1994: 70) and to Abdullah Cevdet’s own journal *İctihad* are included in this last category of “resistance”. It is true that the “resistance” of the “institutions” somehow determined the “production” and “consumption” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 32) of the “repertoire” Abdullah Cevdet tried to inculcate with *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. For instance, the Ottoman government restricted the “production” and “consumption” of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* by means of censorship, a ban and a committee for refutation. The journal *Sirat-el-Mustakim*, which was an important centre of the Islamists at the time of its publication, also affected the Ottomans’ perception of Abdullah Cevdet’s *Tarih-i İslamiyet* by serializing articles, as I will discuss further in the following pages. Of these three forms of “resistance”, mainly the ones which materialized as textual products in the form of magazine articles and books will be analyzed as parts of “resistant literature” in the following pages.

Abdullah Cevdet's materialist, evolutionist and anti-religious "options" clashed with the agendas or activities of some "institutions" which had a capacity to reject some options introduced by culture-planners. Probably one of the most powerful "institutions" against Abdullah Cevdet's program was that of "official agents" (Even-Zohar 1997b: 32), who were "the most conspicuous" (ibid.) in the "resisting" front. The Ottoman administration often brought limitations to Abdullah Cevdet's translation activities through censorship and convictions. One can also consider *Siratü'l-Müstakim* as an unofficial "institution", empowered with "cultural" and "symbolic capital" (Bourdieu 1993: 7), and one that preferred to perpetuate the existing culture repertoire and compete against the activities of Abdullah Cevdet and the other materialists and extreme Westernists.

However, it was not the "institution", but the "market", "a relational network of power" between "the aggregate of consumers"⁵⁸ (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31) who would determine the success of Abdullah Cevdet's planning. In the context of my thesis, "consumers" who theoretically "understand", "know what it is about" and "decipher" what others "produce" (ibid.), correspond to Abdullah Cevdet's readers or to the Ottomans in general, who somehow got acquainted with *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. It was the negotiation between the "consumers" which was ultimately to determine the "success" or "failure" (Even-Zohar 1997b: 33; 2005c: 77) of the repertoire advocated and inculcated by Abdullah Cevdet.

It is evident that the "consumers" of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* often displayed a vigorous "resistance" to the materialist and anti-Islamic options introduced through *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. The translation was exposed to a fierce campaign of condemnation by the ardent Islamic intellectuals. Hardly any Orientalist account has met with such

⁵⁸ "Consumers" are described by Even-Zoharas the "individuals who handle an already made product by passively operating a repertoire" (1997b: 31)

reaction. Abdürrahim Zapsu, a late Ottoman intellectual who also wrote a history of Islam, gives us a clue about the scale of indignation *Tarih-i İslamiyet* aroused in the Ottoman context: “In those years, no other work attacked the sanctities of Islam to the extent that this one did” (*o zamanlarda bu eser kadar İslam mukaddesatına tecaviüz eden bir eser yoktu*, 1976: 468). A great many refutations have been written in Turkish in response to this work since the publication of its Turkish translation, a recent one being written by Mehmed Ali Derman⁵⁹ in 1972, sixty-four years after the first publication of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. I think this is a clear indication that the translation has been quite controversial in Ottoman and Turkish intellectual history. As was mentioned before, this impact was also felt in the works of Said Nursi who considered Dozy an enemy to be obliterated in the pamphlets he wrote long after the publication of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (Meriç 1986: 83; cf. Nursi 1990).

My research on literature condemning the translation mostly concentrated on the journal *Sıratü'l-Müstakim* (and its sequel *Sebiü'r-Reşad*), the most prominent institution of the Islamist pole at that time. I was able to reach sixty-seven records, fifty-seven of which were written by Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı⁶⁰. Among the others, two articles were by Ferid Kam (1910), and one by the editor of the journal. Mehmed Akif (1990), M. Refik (1910), Vasıf (1910), Mehmed Rüştü (1910) and Midhat Cemal (1910) also wrote an article each, to refute Abdullah Cevdet's translation. *Beyanülhak* was another noteworthy periodical which had a similarly self-imposed

⁵⁹ It is true that there was a long period between the publication date of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (1908) and Derman's critical work (1972). This chronological distance may raise doubts about whether Derman's work could be regarded as a type of “resistance”. I feel I am justified in analyzing Derman's work under this rubric since “[resistance] may take place at any stage of the active endeavors to implement the planned repertoire, i.e., while implemented, or when implementation seems to have been fully done” (Even-Zohar 2005c: 94).

⁶⁰In *Sıratü'l-Müstakim* (20 December 1910–25 August 1911, ns. 72-103) under the rubric of “Tarih-i İslamiyet Nam-ı Müstearıyla Doktor ‘Dozy’ nin Türkçe’ye Mütercem Risalesine Karşı Reddiye”, and in *Sebil’ür-Reşad* (9 March 1912–29 August 1912, ns. 1-26) under the rubric of “Hak ve Hakikat: Tarih-i İslamiyete Dair Doktor Dozy'nin Eser-i Garazkarına Karşı Reddiye”.

mission of “enlightening” its readers through a series of articles under the rubric of “Doktor Dozi’yi Red” (“A Rejection of Doctor Dozy”) worded by Nevşehirli Hayreddin (1910, ns.163-172).

I suppose that it would be naïve to assume that Abdullah Cevdet deliberately translated Dozy’s work in order to “submit it to the “information and consideration” of his “Muslim brothers” (1908d: 3), to inform them about Dozy’s remarks against Islamic tenets, and to invite them to initiate a counter-campaign, as Ebuzziya Tevfik proposed in his article supporting Abdullah Cevdet (1910: 12). Supposedly contrary to what Abdullah Cevdet meant by the work as a defender of Westernist and materialist values, the translation led many conservative Ottoman intellectuals and ordinary readers to ponder deeply on Dozy’s claims, and to generate fierce counter-arguments from Islamic sources. Accordingly, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* led to active resistance among the conservative Ottoman intellectuals. As periodicals of the time suggest, this work further crystallized the polarization between Islamist vs. materialist / extreme Westernist intellectuals who largely gathered around the journals *Sıratü’l-Müstakim* and *İctihad* respectively (cf. Polat 2000: 448).

In addition to the articles, several books were published, too. Among the most important ones which directly aimed at the aforementioned work were those by Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi (*İslam Tarihi* 1910), Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı (*Hak ve Hakikat* 1913) and İsmail Fenni (*Kitab-ı İzale-i Şükük –Dozy’nin Tarih-i İslamiyeti Üzerine Reddiye* 1928).

A key question to be raised here is why the oppositional front felt such an urgency to write many more refutations of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* rather than of works written by other Orientalists with similarly irreligious content⁶¹. It would not be

⁶¹ For instance Namık Kemal wrote *Renan Müdafaaanamesi* (“A Defence against Renan”, 1908) against the Orientalist Ernest Renan and Ahmed Midhad wrote *Müdafaa* (“Defence”, 1900) to oppose

wrong to ascribe these repercussions to Abdullah Cevdet's extremely visible manner of presenting his translation *Tarih-i İslamiyet* so approvingly in his preface and of circulating it so zealously. This argument may be justified by the abundance of pages in the refutations devoted to the criticism of Abdullah Cevdet's preface. It could be argued that the famous (or "infamous") "*İfade-i Mütercim*" ("The Translator's Preface") was the part which led to so much antagonism and resistance to *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, its author, and its translator who thereafter began to be called *Adüvvullah* ("The Enemy of *Allah*"), the exact opposite of the word *Abdullah* (*Allah*'s slave / servant) in Arabic (Küçük 1994: 64).

From Even-Zohar's systemic point of view, the large scale of opposition to Abdullah Cevdet's materialist and anti-religious planning and the scarcity of his supporters (Ebuzziya Mehmed Tefvik 1910) suggest that the repertoire he aimed to introduce to the Ottoman culture repertoire was pushed to a "peripheralized" (Even-Zohar 200b: 193) position in the Ottoman cultural polysystem. I propose that, with regard to the innovative aspects of its "options", *Tarih-i İslamiyet* secured a "primary" (Even-Zohar 200b: 193) position in the Ottoman religious and cultural polysystem compared to the refutations of the oppositional front which possessed a "secondary" (ibid.) position in terms of their conservative concerns. Here, I should note that I am aware of the fact that categorizing a translation as "primary" or "secondary" reflects the researcher's own value judgment (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003: 262). Still, a reader of the present chapter will see that I have much evidence to support my claim.

Şehbenderzade Filibeli A. Hilmi and *Tarih-i İslam* (1910)

another Orientalist, J. W. Draper. However, it would be safe to claim that Renan and Draper's works have never been as influential as Dozy's work translated by Abdullah Cevdet.

Active political “resistance” came from what Even-Zohar calls “the institution of official agents”, namely the Ottoman government who banned the work and asked the Ministry of Education (*Maarif Nezareti*) to establish a committee (*Tarih-i İslam Encümeni*) to write a refutation against Dozy’s work. In Even-Zohar’s terms, the government’s establishment of the committee could be interpreted as an attempt to determine the “production” and “consumption” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 32) of the materialist and anti-religious repertoire inculcated by Abdullah Cevdet.

Ahmed Hilmi, who was chosen as the head of the committee, reports that this group did not prove to be “enduring” (*payidar olamadı* 1971: 8). Therefore, he states, lack of any assistance from the other committee members led him to hesitate about initiating the project. However, he could not “resist his conscience” (*icbar-ı vicdanime mukavemet edemiyerek*) and finally started to write the refutation on his own.

Cemil Meriç describes Ahmed Hilmi’s *Tarih-i İslam* (“History of Islam”) as “genuine anti-Dozy historical work” (*tam bir anti-Dozy* 1986: 84). According to Meriç, the “anti-Dozy” nature of *Tarih-i İslam* is evident in Ahmed Hilmi’s adoption of Dozy’s subheadings and historical divisions. This idea may be proved by Ahmed Hilmi’s own acknowledgement in the introduction (*Medhal*) he wrote for his refutation (Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 77). In preserving Dozy’s headings, he aimed to show which part of his study corresponded to the related topic in Dozy’s work, and more precisely and explicitly “to facilitate reasoning and reciprocation” (*muhakeme ve mukabeleyi kolaylaştırmak için*, *ibid.*). Even though Ahmed Hilmi came up with a more “objective” study than the other refutations and meant his work to be a prominent in its own right on the history of Islam, his work is conspicuously marked

by a feeling of opposition to Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's study. Interestingly enough, Ahmed Hilmi never explicitly criticizes Abdullah Cevdet for translating this provocative work which was regarded to be extremely "destructive" by his contemporaries. The criticism against the author was also considerably toned down in his refutation. I would argue that Ahmed Hilmi's moderate approach to the author and the translator could be viewed as the result of a "scientificity" he aimed to achieve in his analysis. His pursuit of scientificity may be accounted for by his elaboration at the beginning of his work on the definition of history as a discipline, on historical and prehistorical periodisation, on the interrelationship of religion, philosophy and science, and on the definition, necessity and utility of religion (1982: 6-10).

Another important indication of his "scientificity" is that Ahmed Hilmi analyzes Dozy's critical methods before he starts his criticism of Dozy's remarks. The title *Tarih-i İslam* which does not indicate any connection⁶² with Dozy's study or its translator also reveals that the critic aimed at refuting the philosophical grounds of Dozy's essay rather than promoting anger and enmity towards the author and translator on subjective grounds (cf. Meriç 1986: 83; Ahmed Hilmi 1982: xxxii). His statement that "our indignation is not in the name of Islamic fanaticism, but in the name of scientific fanaticism⁶³" points to this fact. The importance Ahmed Hilmi attached to "scientificity" could also be felt in his critique of the early refutations by other conservative Ottoman intellectuals. He states that all of these refutations "lacked any scientific value" (*hiç bir ilmi değeri yoktu*), and that while their only

⁶² In that sense, Ahmed Hilmi's work differs from those of other critics such as İsmail Fenni, Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı, Hayreddin and Derman, since the title of their works reveal their engagement with Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's work.

⁶³"İslami taasub namına değil ilmi taassub namınadır infialimiz" (Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: preface)

merit was being “product of faith” (*iman mahsulü*), they failed to refute or disprove Dozy “scientifically” (Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 4).

It appears that Ahmed Hilmi took all the issues in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* as a whole to be refuted, without differentiating between the three contributors to the work: the Dutch author Dozy, the obscure French Orientalist “A. Key” and Abdullah Cevdet. As was already mentioned, A. Key’s was incorporated into *Tarih-i İslamiyet* under the title of “*Tekmile*” as an epilogue for the sake of filling a periodical gap in Dozy’s essay. Besides, Abdullah Cevdet, who became an extremely visible translator in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, further contributed to the work with his controversial preface which had a far-reaching influence in Ottoman society. This is why Abdullah Cevdet’s remarks in the preface also deserved some paragraphs in Ahmed Hilmi’s criticism. Some main issues proposed in *Tekmile* were also tackled by the critic who expressed his own conception of the terms “*ictihad*” and “evolution” (*tekamül*) of societies and religions.

In his pursuit of creating a scientific work on the history of Islam, Ahmed Hilmi never seems to declare Abdullah Cevdet as an “enemy” to be fought against. The only time he refers to the translator by name is where he introduces him as “Doctor Abdullah Cevdet Bey”, unlike other refutators who often referred to the translator in derogatory phrases such as “insolent and ignorant publisher” (*naşir-i mütecasir ve mütecahil*, Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı 1913: 12). Yet, some of Ahmed Hilmi’s criticism seems to be directed against Abdullah Cevdet’s remarks in the preface, without mentioning his name at all.

One of Ahmed Hilmi’s such criticisms is related to Abdullah Cevdet’s claim that Muslims could not produce significant historical works in the past (1908d: 3). Unlike Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı, Ahmed Hilmi agrees on the lack of great historical

works by Muslim historians. In his introduction (*Medhal*) to the refutation, Ahmed Hilmi contends that the absence of significant historical works in Islamic lands is natural. He argues that the philosophy of history (*tarih felsefesi*), historical analysis (*tahlil*) and criticism (*tenkid*) have emerged quite recently; this is why criticizing Ibn-i Batuta for failing to write a “travel book” (*seyahatname*) like Nachtgal is as meaningless as criticizing Harun al-Rashid for not initiating the invention of the railway (1982: 3). In fact, he argues, early Muslim historians produced significant historical accounts compared to their contemporaries (1982: 4). However, Ahmed Hilmi accuses the Muslims of his own age for being ignorant and unaware of their “national treasures” (*milli hazinelerimizin*) and leaving their own religion of Islam to be analyzed by Europeans who investigate it with the same tools and methods they use for their investigation of Christianity and Judaism (ibid.). It is clear that Ahmed Hilmi does not criticize every statement uttered by Dozy or Abdullah Cevdet. Instead, he expresses both his agreement and disagreement with them. His attitude seems to be quite different from the other refutators who only voiced their disagreements.

Accordingly, Ahmed Hilmi’s attitude towards the translation and dissemination of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* among Muslims is far more moderate than the other conservative Ottoman intellectuals. For instance, İsmail Hakkı regards translating and disseminating this work as a “vicious popularization campaign” (*tervic-i arz-ı fasidiyle*, 1913: front page). In Ahmed Hilmi’s view, even if the Orientalists’ works had not been translated into Turkish, they would still have been influential, since the Muslim youth of his period already possessed the knowledge of European languages (Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 4). Between these lines, one can sense a hidden support for the translator. What seemed necessary for A. Hilmi was to

disprove the logical methods and foundations of the Orientalists' works as a whole, rather than to write a new refutation for each of these works (ibid.).

An important point on which A. Hilmi "resisted" against Abdullah Cevdet's planning is seen where he voices his own understanding of *ictihad* ("creative legal reasoning" in Islamic law [Hallaq 1995: 180]) and the evolution (*tekamül*) of religions and societies. This part of the critic's comments seems to be a response to the ideas in the epilogue. Contrary to those ideas in the epilogue which assert that the Muslim world should undergo the same evolutionary stages with the Western world, Ahmed Hilmi proposed that the evolution of Islamic societies should be of a different character since all the races and nations have their own particular talents, environments and moral values (1971: 4). Imitating what exists in the West would generate harmful results instead of facilitating progress. Besides, the evolution of Islam could be realized through a choice between two options. The first choice is opting for the false ideas assumed to be a part of the religion though they do not exist in true Islam. The second one is related to uncovering the "real truths" of the religion which either remain unknown or have been ignored (Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 3). Obviously, Ahmed Hilmi assumes the latter option to be the better one. Unless it was adopted, educated Muslims would lose their faith in religion. The adoption of the first option would certainly lead Islam to be the religion only of the uneducated masses. This is why the Muslim *ulema* urgently needed to achieve some "renewal" (*teceddüid*) in religion (Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 637). It is highly significant that Ahmed Hilmi devoted a whole chapter of his work to elaborating the necessity of the institution of *ictihad*. This part of Ahmed Hilmi's analysis responds to the ideas in the epilogue appended to Abdullah Cevdet's *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. Similar to Abdullah Cevdet, who called on the *ulema* to initiate the necessary reforms in religion, Ahmed

Hilmi accentuated the necessity of “reopening the gate of *ictihad*” for the modern period. He regarded *ictihad* as an urgent necessity for a compromise between religion and science, and between the preservation of the faith and progress (Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 5).

Quite interestingly, Ahmed Hilmi is very similar to Abdullah Cevdet in terms of his great emphasis on the necessity of reactivating *ictihad* as well as in the importance he attached to the adoption of Western science. Besides, both of them consider *ictihad* in relation to the notion of evolution. In other words, both Ahmed Hilmi and Abdullah Cevdet believed that *ictihad* would play a crucial role for the evolution of Islam as well as that of Muslims. However, Ahmed Hilmi’s understanding of *ictihad* seems to differ from that of Abdullah Cevdet. In addition, Ahmed Hilmi does not agree with Abdullah Cevdet who “found a scientific value” in Dozy’s study. Both of these intellectuals strongly underscored the crucial role of *ictihad* for renewal in religion, and therefore for the progress of Muslims and the Ottomans in particular. Nevertheless, they seem to differ from each other in terms of the consequences they expected from religious reforms performed through *ictihad*. Obviously, Abdullah Cevdet considered it as an instrument of very radical changes which were diametrically opposed to the basic tenets of Islam. For instance, he proposed that the Quran should be regarded as the fundamental of canonical law (*edille-i şer’iyye*) whereas the *hadiths* were not reliable sources as the first *hadith* collections were prepared with primitive methods (Key 1908: 715). He radically proposed that *hadiths* might not be used to deduce canonical ordinance (*ibid.*), an idea that would most probably be refused and found blasphemous by A. Hilmi. Unlike Abdullah Cevdet, Ahmed Hilmi dwelled on a conception of *ictihad* which was compatible with the essence of Islam (Ahmed Hilmi 1971: 9).

Both Abdullah Cevdet and Ahmed Hilmi believed that *ictihad* had a potential to expurgate the false beliefs which had permeated “true Islam” throughout history, and impeded the progress of Muslims. However, in addition to “progress” with the adoption of Western science, what Ahmed Hilmi expected from *ictihad* was the “preservation” of the “true Islam” which was free from any superstitions and false beliefs. In addition, he thought that *ictihad* was a need for the preservation of the faith of Muslims while, as Hanioglu agrees, Abdullah Cevdet proposed *ictihad* for the creation of a new “scientific religion” (2005a: 43). Abdullah Cevdet assumed that “once people comprehended the superior truth of science and the ‘non-sensical’ nature of the assertions of religious philosophers, a new, scientific religion would rise spontaneously from the ashes of Islam” (ibid.). For him, “Islam as a religion must go, but Islam as a philosophy [and as a force to keep the members of its followers together] must remain” (Hanioglu 2005b: 43).

Obviously, A. Hilmi’s idea of scientificity differs greatly from that of Abdullah Cevdet. Unlike Abdullah Cevdet, Ahmed Hilmi questions the “impartiality” and scientificity of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* where he criticizes Dozy for ascribing the illness of “muscular hysteria” (*histeriya-i adeli* Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 37) to the Prophet Mohammed, the idea which provocatively constitutes the anti-Islamic kernel of Dozy’s thesis: “When he was six years old, Muhammed lost his mother Amine, who is understood to have possessed a very nervous and feverish disposition.”⁶⁴ (1908d) [my translation]. Ahmed Hilmi firstly quotes Dozy’s sentence above and criticizes his word “understood” (*anlaşılan*) arguing that the Orientalist distorted true history by adding inventions of his imagination (Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 74). In Ahmed Hilmi’s view, innocent as it may seem, Dozy prepared a so

⁶⁴ “Muhammed (s.a.) altı yaşında olduğu halde pek asabiyü’l-mizaç ve pek hararetli bir kadın olduğu anlaşıl原因 validesi Amineyi kaybetti.”

called “scientific” ground for his later claim that Mohammed’s prophethood and all the other teachings and tenets of Islam originated from the “muscular hysteria” Mohammed supposedly inherited from his mother as a congenital disease. Claiming that Dozy’s history is full of such “lies” and “distortions”, Ahmed Hilmi adds that Dozy might have a right to tell “lies” and “to talk nonsense”, but seeking scientific value and truths among these “ravings” (*hezeyan*) is not something to be pardoned and tolerated (ibid.). Most likely, it was Abdullah Cevdet’s preface, supporting Dozy, which the critic referred to in these sentences.

Another serious criticism that Ahmed Hilmi directed against Dozy’s so-called scientificity is that he considered the author a “false scientist but a pious clergyman” (1982: 116). Ahmed Hilmi tried to prove his assertion, quoting from a sentence where Dozy narrates the events about the first appearance of Gabriel to Mohammed. Here, Dozy mentions that traditionally Gabriel is known as “Cebrail” though he is nothing but what the Christians know as the “Holy Spirit”. For this assertion by Dozy, Ahmed Hilmi describes him to be a “devout person who disguised himself with the veil of science” (*Dozynin ilim perdesi arkasına saklanmış sofu bir kimse olduğunu* ibid.). Ahmed Hilmi also finds Dozy’s explanations unscientific at the point where he elaborates on the trembling of the Prophet during divine revelations (*vahiy*), accusing Dozy of pretending to examine the Prophet as if he were a patient, while it was not possible to have access to such details about events that took place thirteen centuries ago (Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 115).

Ahmed Hilmi categorizes Dozy with some materialist Orientalists who believed that religion was incompatible with science (1982: 72). In fact, in A. Hilmi’s view, there is no harm in investigating Islam from a scientific perspective provided that the historian possesses an impartial judgement and no desire to distort

reality. However, Ahmed Hilmi argues, Dozy failed to come up with a purely scientific analysis. In his *İslam Tarihi*, therefore, Ahmed Hilmi tries to prove the unscientific nature of Dozy's essay, referring to some other Orientalists such as Renan who disproved many of Dozy's ideas in their works (1982: 62).

It is obvious that Ahmed Hilmi tried to disprove Dozy by declaring his work to be unscientific. I think that Ahmed Hilmi's target readers were the elites, rather than uneducated readers, as his great concern for scientificity indicates. Seen from this perspective, I can safely conclude that Ahmed Hilmi's "scientific" "resistance" differed greatly from the other refutation-writers (with whom I will deal with in the following pages) whose efforts usually aroused popular indignation and hatred for *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, its translator and author. In this regard, I regard Ahmed Hilmi's *İslam Tarihi* as the most influential "resistance" (cf. Meriç 1986: 83) which had its repercussions especially among the elites.

Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı and *Hak ve Hakikat* (God and Truth, 1912)

In one of the refutations against Ebuzziya Tevfik Bey, who wrote in favor of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, the editorial of *Sıratü'l-Müstakim* reports how they received many letters from their readers who persistently demanded a "defence" (*müdafaa*) against this work (1910: 16). Then, the editorial decided on initiating a counter-campaign by asking the learned to write a "defence" against *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. I believe that this fact is a clear indication of the intense "resistance" of the "market" forces at the beginning against Abdullah Cevdet's materialist and anti-religious planning, as I will discuss further under the heading "Abdullah Cevdet's Culture Planning: 'Success' or 'Failure'?"

Because of the “market’s” (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31) insistent demand for defence⁶⁵, İsmail Hakkı’s comprehensive work was serialized in the fifty-eight issues of *Sıratü’l-Müstakim* between 1910 and 1912⁶⁶. While he was still publishing his regular critiques of Dozy’s work and its translator, the Ottoman government banned the publication of the translation and its copies were thrown into the sea from the Galata Bridge (Süssheim 1987: 58).

İsmail Hakkı was the person whose refutatory articles against *Tarih-i İslamiyet* were serialized in *Sıratü’l-Müstakim* in the most serious and systematic way. In 1913, he compiled all these articles and published them in book form under the title *Hak ve Hakikat* (God and Truth).

Compared to Ahmed Hilmi, M. İsmail Hakkı did not have much concern for scientificity in his refutation of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, although he claimed that he wrote a “scientific defence” against Dozy’s work (cf. Hatiboğlu 1999: 213). His discourse in the refutation suggests that he wrote *Hak ve Hakikat* for literate Istanbulites rather than for those who were educated in the Western style and only believed in science.

İsmail Hakkı introduces his refutation with the following sentences on the front page:

The present work entails the required reply to each of the assaults and fallacies in a known work translated and published as part of a vicious popularization campaign, and originally written by a Dutchman, called Doctor Dozy, who wrote on Islam and the Disperser of Sanctity [the Prophet Muhammed] in slanderous and humiliating terms. This work also involves a scientific defence

⁶⁵ At the beginning, all the staff in the editorial of *Sıratü’l-Müstakim* agreed on Babanzade Ahmed Naim to do this. However, Ahmed Naim did not want to write his defence without seeing the French “original”. When ultimately the work was brought from Paris, they saw that Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı had already started on his refutation.

⁶⁶ *Sıratü’l-Müstakim* (20 December 1910–25 August 1911) and *Sebil’ür-Reşad* (9 March 1912–29 August 1912).

which warrants satisfactory explications related to the truths of the exalted fundamentals of Islam.⁶⁷ (1913: cover) [my translation]

In the first thirty pages of the refutation, İsmail Hakkı tried to refute Abdullah Cevdet's introduction to *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, quoting some paragraphs from the preface. The most important criticism by İsmail Hakkı is probably related to Abdullah Cevdet's use of fake Quranic verses and his misinterpretation of some *hadiths*, for which Manastırlı often called him "the destitute translator" (*mütercim-i bivaye*), "insolent and ignorant publisher" (*naşir-i mütecasir ve mütecahil*); he also described the translation as a work "he had advisedly chosen to translate and publish" (*bil-itihab tercüme ve neşr eylediği*) "the history of falsifications" (*tarih-i tahrifat*), "the history of damnation" (*tarih-i mel'anel*), "a compilation of lies" (*mecmua-i ekazib*) and "a plaything of ignorance" (*bazice-i cehalet*, 1913: 10, 13).

İsmail Hakkı harshly criticizes Abdullah Cevdet for supporting one of Dozy's considerations with a fake Quranic verse in the footnote (1913: 13). Contextually, this footnote stands for Dozy's statement about the pre-Islamic Arabs' belief in the existence of a "Great God" (*Hüda-yı A'zam*) which had a similar character with humans. Abdullah Cevdet proposes in the footnote that "this primitive belief is conspicuously supported by a Quranic verse "*Óaleúa' l-insâne fı äÿretihi* ("He created human in his appearance" [my translation])" (1908d: 15). For İsmail Hakkı, ascribing a fabricated verse to the Quran, be it on purpose or not, is "an explicit blasphemy" (*küfr-ü sarih*, 1913: 13).

Another issue that İsmail Hakkı dwells on is about Abdullah Cevdet's claim in the preface that no true histories have been produced in the three main languages

⁶⁷ "Doktor Dozi namında bir Hollandalının İslamiyet ile naşir-i kudsiyet müzahiri hakkında gayet müfteriyane ve müzyifane olarak yazmış oldukları bir eser-i telbiskaranenin tervic-i arz-ı fasidiyle tercüme ve neşr olunan kitab-ı mahudun müştemil olduğu tecavüzat ve ebatilin her birine icab eden mukabele ile beraber mebani-i aliye-i İslamiyenin hakayıkına dair tevzihat-ı kafiyeyi müdafeat-ı ilmiyeyi havidir."

of Muslims, namely Arabic, Persian and Turkish (cf. Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 3). Manastırlı İsmail argues that Muslim libraries stored countless historical studies written in the three languages, and that they were the products of a “truly careful and serious investigation” (*kemal-i tedkik ve ciddiyet üzere*, 1913: 10). Besides, Manastırlı illustrates such “trustworthy” and “satisfying” historical accounts written by Muslims such as İbn-i Haldun, Taberi and İbn-i Esir so as to refute Abdullah Cevdet’s claim. In addition, he also emphasized that all the events that took place in the former periods were fully recorded thanks to the “witness / chain of proofs” (*ittisal-i sened*) tradition in Islam (ibid.). Abdullah Cevdet, therefore, was accused of ignoring such works and blindly setting a high value on the works of Orientalists such as Dozy (1913: 11). He frequently invited Abdullah Cevdet and his readers to read his own translation (*Tercüme-i risaleti'l-hamidiyye* 1307-1308 [1891]) from Hüseyin b. Muhammed b. Mustafa el-Hanefi Hüseyin el-Cisr, on the history of Islam instead of reading Dozy (1913: 20).

It is inferred from the peritexts of *İstibdad* and *Tarih-i İslamiyet* that Abdullah Cevdet, the translator seemed to believe — or pretended to believe — that as long as disagreements were pronounced in the marginal notes where necessary, the translator could not be accused of the ideas which go against the general value judgments of a society (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 6-7; 1899: 9).

A translator can even translate a work which is totally incongruous with one’s own ideas and submit it to everyone’s eyes for their judgment and investigation. [...] The book of tyranny, which we are translating today, entails some ideas in the chapters “religious sects” and “The comparison of Asian and European Tyrannies” that are not rejected by us, but are found worthy of investigation and submission. A few passages which included such ideas were also translated literally by putting a brief paragraph of critical remarks in the footnote.⁶⁸ (Abdullah Cevdet 1899: 9) [my translation]

⁶⁸ “Hatta bir mütercim, serâpâ efkarına gayrı muvafık bir eseri de tercüme ederek herkesin nazar-ı hüküm ve tedkikine arz edebilir. [...] Bugün Türkçe’ye naklettiğimiz Kitab-ı İstibdad’ın “Mezheb” ve

It seems that the discrepancy between what Abdullah Cevdet promised in the preface of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* as his translation strategy and his actual translational behavior became an important source for İsmail Hakkı's criticism. He draws attention to Abdullah Cevdet's preface which assures the readers that he will indicate his personal agreements and disagreements with the author in the footnotes as "marginal notes attached to the bottom of the pages and accompanied with the signature 'A.C.'", thereby differentiated from the author's marginal notes" (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 6-7). However, İsmail Hakkı argues, Abdullah Cevdet never criticizes the author in these footnotes, though the footnotes with the above-named signature are quite a lot in number. İsmail Hakkı adds that this is not surprising since the translator considers Dozy's remarks as "the output of good sense" (*akl-ı selim mahsulu*) and he defends them despite their "conspicuous invalidity" (*vazih'ul-butlan*) and their assaults against the basic Islamic tenets (1913: 13). Such criticism by İsmail Hakkı suggests that if Abdullah Cevdet had not written this supporting preface, he would not have been subject to so much criticism. Moreover, if he had written opposing remarks in the paratexts, he might even have persuaded his readers that he had translated the work in order to draw the attention of the Muslims to Dozy's remarks, as Ebuzziya Tevfik proposes in his article supporting Abdullah Cevdet (1910: 12).

It is known that nonsensical publications of the foreigners and strangers have carried on against the manifest religion of Islam due to the known grudges; nonetheless there was nothing to be surprised about this. However, it is a matter of great astonishment and abnormality that this filthy work included quite slanderous and humiliating accusations and assaults against the elevated religion, the Glorious Qur'an, and the glorious prophet, and that he [Abdullah

"Asya ve Avrupa İstibadlarının Mukayesesi" fasıllarında bazı fikirler var ki nazarımızda merdud değil fakat şayan-ı tedkik ve inkiyaddır; o gibi fikirleri ihtiva eden birkaç fıkra, zirine muhtasar bir mütalaa-i intikadiye tahşiye edilerek yine harfiyyen tercüme edilmiş ve bu suretle eserin temamiyet-i metniyesi muhafaza olunmuştur."

Cevdet] dared to take pride in dedicating this fallacious work to his fellow Muslims (!).⁶⁹ (1913: 7) [my translation].

These lines clearly indicate that the critic sees nothing surprising about the anti-Islamic works which have always been written by Orientalists. What bothered him about *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was rather related to the behaviour of the translator who presented the work as an “output of good sense” and its author as a “true Muslim” since he “spent all the hours of his life teaching and investigating” (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 5). Moreover, İsmail Hakkı argues, Abdullah Cevdet claimed in the preface that he meant the work to be of use for his “fellow Muslims” (Abdullah Cevdet 1908d: 7), though he solely aimed at “legitimizing false beliefs” (*terciv-i batıl*, İsmail Hakkı 1913: 24). Abdullah Cevdet’s laudatory remarks about the author and his considerations which often oppose Islamic values and fundamentals appear to be the stimulating factor which led İsmail Hakkı to write a long refutation (*Hak ve Hakikat* 1913, 242 pages) for the translation of Dozy’s work.

Another important issue pointed out in İsmail Hakkı’s *Hak ve Hakikat* is related to Cevdet’s warning in the preface, where he stressed that he never manipulated the source text except for the parenthetical usage of two abbreviated phrases: (*s.a*) for “*ãallallãhu ãaleyhi vesellem*” and (*r.a.*) for “*raøiyallãhü ãanh*” (1908d: 7). The critic depicts Abdullah Cevdet’s behaviour as both “cunning” (*kurnazca*) and “vacuous” (*ahmakça*, *ibid.*). Abdullah Cevdet was “cunning” because he falsely believed that he could persuade his readers via these letters as to the religious legitimacy of Dozy’s remarks; he was also “vacuous” because he expected that his pious readers would superficially judge the

⁶⁹ “Ağyar ve ecanib canibinden din-i mübin-i İslam hakkında ağraz-ı ma’hudedden dolayı neşriyat-ı safsatakaraneye devam olunduğu ma’lum ise de bunun istiğrab olunacak ciheti yoktur. Fakat bu evrak-ı habisenin din-i âli ve Kuran-ı Kerim ile Nebiy-yi Zışan efendimiz hakkında gayet müstehiffane ve müfteriyane tecavüzat ve isnadatda bulunması ve eser-i batılını bir tarih-i hakiki olmak üzere din kardeşlerine (!) ithafla iftihara yeltenmesi fevkal’ade da’i-i hayret ve garabetdir.”

whole work by the external appearances of such abbreviations, turning a blind eye to Dozy's anti-Islamist arguments.

A Jesuit book in Turkish printed in Egypt and published against the elevated religion of Islam with the suppositious name of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* has been encountered coincidentally by [my] humble self. It is said that it had been translated from a foreign language. In case this fraudulent work which is full of impudent attacks and filthy ravings appears before a believer of Islam, he will undoubtedly cast it to the ground with utter abhorrence and aspersion, and curses to be heaped on the translator are innumerable.⁷⁰ (Manastirli İsmail Hakkı 1913: 7) [my translation]

These lines from *Hak ve Hakikat* also reveal that what provoked İsmail Hakkı the most was the translator's ardent efforts to legitimize Dozy's remarks against the prophet, the Quran and therefore the basic Islamic beliefs. That is why he deserved countless "curses" "to be heaped" on him by the readers. It is most probable that these sentences indicate more than İsmail Hakkı's real contention as to the behaviour of "a believer of Islam"; they rather seem to be a part of the lesson the critic gives to his ordinary uneducated readers in order to teach them what to do in the face of Dozy's anti-Islamic remarks.

Another critique directed against Abdullah Cevdet's preface was related to his unconventional interpretation of some *hadiths* which the translator either misspelled or "fabricated". Abdullah Cevdet presented five carefully selected Prophet's sayings in order to legitimize Dozy's assertions. One of them and its translation into English is presented below:

Al-muslim man salima al-nâs min yadihi walisânih (1908d: 5)

⁷⁰ "Tarih-i İslamiyet nam-ı müstearıyla diyanet-i celile-i İslamiye aleyhinde neşr olunan Türkçe, Mısır'da matbu bir Cizvit kitabı müsadif-i ittila'-ı acizi oldu. Lisan-ı ecnebiden mütercem imiş. Taarruzat-ı bi-edebane, türrehat-ı habasetkarane ile meşhûn bulunan bu eser-i kem-ayar hangi bir müminin pişegahına konulsa der-'akab kemal-i teneffür ve istihkar ile yere fırlatacağı azade-i irtiyab, ve mütercim-i naşirine karşı yağdırılacak la'netler de bi-hesabdır."

Muslim is one from whose hand and tongue people are safe
(Hanioğlu's Translation 2005a: 50)

İsmail Hakkı begins his criticism of Abdullah Cevdet's quotation of the *hadith* above by drawing attention to the inaccurate spelling. He gives the precise spelling of the *hadith* as “*Al-muslim man salima al-nâs min lisânih wa-yadihi*”, implying the translator's ignorance about Islam. The crucial point about İsmail Hakkı's criticism is related to Abdullah Cevdet's liberal interpretation of the *hadith* which he quoted in order to legitimize his assertion that Dozy was “a thousand times more Muslim” than many contemporary Muslims (cf. Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı 1913: 24). İsmail Hakkı proposes that Abdullah Cevdet was aware of the unsound basis of this strong claim since theoretically a person who does not believe in the sacredness of the Prophet, that is to say the intermediary actor of the divine revelations, cannot be reckoned as a Muslim (ibid.). In that sense, Dozy, who “claimed that the emergence of Islam resulted from the Prophet's alleged muscular hysteria”, cannot be taken as a Muslim (cf. Hanioğlu 2005a: 50). According to İsmail Hakkı, being aware of the weakness of his argument, Abdullah Cevdet sought a sound basis among the *hadiths* in order to “Islamicize” what was revealed in the work (cf. Hanioğlu 2005a: 42, 50); therefore, he employed the afore-mentioned *hadith* in order to define Islam (*Müslümanlık*) in a metaphorical way (cf. İsmail Hakkı 1913: 24). However, İsmail Hakkı argues, it is obvious how Dozy “offended” (*rencide-hatır*) Muslims with both his tongue and hands by writing such a “poisonous” (*zehr-alud*) and “ominous” (*menhus*) work (ibid.). In this regard, he assumes, one cannot consider Dozy as a Muslim even in the metaphorical sense of the word.

İsmail Hakkı maintains that being a Muslim necessarily requires believing in the fundamentals of Islam (1913: 24) as all these sayings of the Prophet are only applicable to the real believers of Islam. This seems to be the reason why he harshly criticizes the translator for his selective and liberal interpretation of the sacred Islamic texts, and for “attacking” Islam with its own sources.

İsmail Fenni and *Kitab-ı İzale-i Şükuk: Dozy'nin Tarih-i İslamiyyet'i Üzerine* (The Book of Elimination of Doubts: On the History of Islam by Dozy, 1928)

In *İzale-i Şükuk* (“The Elimination of Doubts” 1928), İsmail Fenni explained on the first page that it was a refutation of Dozy’s history of Islam.⁷¹ İsmail Fenni stated that he had read the French translation of the work before. Since he found it “vicious” like most of the works written by “foreigners” (*ecanib tarafından*), he put it aside and left it to the *ulema* to write a refutation of it (İsmail Fenni 1928: 4). However, when he witnessed that one of his acquaintances had been “badly influenced” (*icra-yı sui-te'sir*) by the translation he decided to write a refutation especially on the issues that would “confuse minds” (*zihinlerini teşevvüş*) the most (ibid.). Therefore, he started to write a long refutation which consisted of 253 pages. This testimony of İsmail Fenni indicates that he would not have written a refutation of Dozy’s essay if Abdullah Cevdet had not translated it into Turkish (1928: 3). His reason was that he wanted to protect some of his “Muslim brothers” (*ihvan-ı dinin*), “whose conviction in Islam had not gained strength yet” (*itikadat-ı diniyeleri kesb-i rüşuh etmemiş olan*), from getting confused due to the Turkish translation of the

⁷¹ It is also understood from İsmail Fenni’s preface that he was aware of the fact that Dozy wrote his work in Dutch, and Abdullah Cevdet translated it from its French translation.

work. Interestingly enough, İsmail Fenni wrote this refutation in 1928, that is to say after the foundation of the Turkish republic. Besides, he wrote it twenty years after the first publication of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. This seems to be a significant and meaningful indication of the great influence of this translation on Ottoman and modern Turkish intellectual and cultural history. It might be argued that İsmail Fenni also aimed to “resist” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 48) against secularizing reforms of the new Turkish Republic and materialist ideas which were widespread in this period by means of his refutation.

One of İsmail Fenni’s assertions seems to be quite noteworthy since it reveals that he reckoned Abdullah Cevdet more responsible and “guiltier” than Dozy for what was claimed in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. He drew attention to one of statements where Dozy expressed that he would not assume any responsibility for what he had written on Islam. Therefore, he argued, he is the “lesser of the two evils” (*ehven-i şer*, 1928: 79) compared to the translator who believed in everything Dozy wrote. İsmail Fenni’s view of Abdullah Cevdet as even “guiltier” for the claims in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* is closely related to his idea that Abdullah Cevdet intended to spread “irreligion” among the Ottomans.

What İsmail Fenni does in his refutation is to criticize Dozy’s remarks and to refute them with some Quranic verses and *hadiths* (1928: 22-23), a method which would not be found convincing by those who did not believe in these religious sources. He also gives reference to another Orientalist, Barthelemy de St. Hilaire Jules, who acknowledged the honesty of Mohammed and thereby testified against Dozy (ibid.). This is also the person İsmail Fenni declared as an “impartial, conscientious and honest Orientalist” (*bi-taraf, munsif ve rast-gû*, 1928: 4), a fact which reveals that the critic wanted to validate his ideas through those of what he

called an “impartial” Orientalist in order to produce “objective” explanations while refuting Dozy’s essay. Still, I can say that his refutation is far from being objective and “scientific” due to the fact that he mostly resorted to Islamic sources for evidence.

Other Refutations

Apart from the refutations explained above, there are many other articles of “resistance” against Dozy and Abdullah Cevdet, written by Mehmed Akif Ersoy, M. Refik, Ferid, Mehmed Rüşdi, Vasıf and Midhad Cemal. The majority of these appeared in *Sırat-el-Mustakim* between 1910 and 1912. A considerable deal of confrontational literature was also published in *Beyanü'l-Hakk* and *Hikmet*. Surely, there is the possibility that other intellectuals also wrote on the subject, but their works were inaccessible during the research of the present thesis. An analysis of all such “resistant” literature may be fruitful to understand the boundaries of the controversy and the indignation that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* generated. Unfortunately, such an analysis has not been possible since it would exceed the limits of this M.A. thesis.

Abdullah Cevdet’s Culture Planning: “Success” or “Failure”?

According to Even-Zohar, “free-self nominated agents” are “normally” deemed to be unsuccessful unless they have a “power base” (2000c: 402). For “success”, they need to embody a power factor. However, as part of “an organized group” “in an established way” they will more effectively compete with rival repertoires (Even-Zohar 1997b: 31). Even-Zohar’s formulations shed light on Abdullah Cevdet’s

planning. Due to the fact that Abdullah Cevdet possessed a “cultural” and “symbolic capital” (Bourdieu 1993: 7) with his journal — which became a significant centre for the Western-oriented minds — and printing house, both named “*İctihad*”, one can assume that he had the kind of “power base” Even-Zohar refers to. Moreover, the fact that he was a founding member of the Committee of Union and Progress also strengthens the assumption that Abdullah Cevdet became part of “power” (Even-Zohar 2000c: 402).

A Cevdet, is usually accepted to represent the most “extreme Westernist” (Hanioğlu 1992: 150) inclinations in Ottoman society at the turn of the twentieth century. His anti-religious and materialist formulations together with those of his Westernist friends have been very influential in shaping the secularizing reforms of the Republican era (Hanioğlu 1997: 143). Abdullah Cevdet’s great influence on the secularization and modernization of Turkish society could also be substantiated by a very noteworthy simile Ziya Gökalp drew between Abdullah Cevdet and the big fires which burned the old neighborhoods of Istanbul: “Abdullah Cevdet was sweeping over the field like a wildfire; and we [I and the other reformers] late-comers were easily building up on it” (Gökalp in İsmail Hakkı 1932: 5889). Certainly what Ziya Gökalp meant by “sweeping over the field” was Abdullah Cevdet’s radical and daring manner of inculcating very controversial new options in the Ottoman culture repertoire. Doing this, he contributed greatly to the preparation of a suitable cultural and intellectual ground for the Westernist and secularist bureaucrats of the new Turkish Republic.

Abdullah Cevdet’s translations, especially *Tarih-i İslamiyet* which represented his planned repertoire and worldview in a multi-dimensional and effective way, have been widely read, discussed and criticized. It is true that this

work enhanced the polarization in Ottoman society between those who aimed to “re-make” (Even-Zohar 2002a: 46) the Ottoman culture repertoire and those who intended to “maintain” (ibid.) the existing models. His journal *İctihad* represented the former group whereas *Sıratü'l-Müstakim* became a center of the latter group. Abdullah Cevdet’s influence in this polarization is a significant indication of Abdullah Cevdet’s great role in the Ottoman / Turkish intellectual and cultural history.

It is already known that the “success” or “failure” of a culture-planning activity is a relative notion in Even-Zohar’s systemic point of view (2005a: 2). Thus, being aware of the relativity of my claim, I propose that Abdullah Cevdet’s culture planning through his translations, which actually amounted to about thirty, (of which I was able to analyze only nine in my thesis) was “successful”, since he contributed greatly to the “proliferation of options” (Even-Zohar 2005a: 2) in the Ottoman culture “repertoire”.

It is generally acknowledged that the transformations in Ottoman society in the nineteenth and in the early twentieth centuries prepared the ground for the emergence of the modern Turkish Republic (cf. Ortaylı 1983; Zürcher 1998). A close investigation of the Westernization activities in the Second Constitutional period will demonstrate that Abdullah Cevdet actively took part in the “social transformation project” which was carried on by the Westernists (cf. Hanioglu 1992: 153) using his translations as effective tools. This fact shows the important role Abdullah Cevdet played as one of the leading Westernists in the transformation of Ottoman / Turkish society. Atilla Yargıcı describes Abdullah Cevdet as “the man who radically waved the first conscious, cultural and systematic flag of the Westernization movement in Turkey” (1993: 63; cf. Hanioglu 1992: 151).

In addition, the statement Atatürk addressed to Abdullah Cevdet: “I always did what you wrote and said” (Arıkan 2005: 102) seems to be quite meaningful since it points at the great influence Abdullah Cevdet had produced on his contemporaries, including political “power-holders” (Even-Zohar 2000c: 401). Şerafettin Turan reports that Abdullah Cevdet was one of the six people whose works Atatürk read and was influenced by the most (Turan 1989: 63). He also adds that Atatürk was influenced by Abdullah Cevdet in his understanding of secularism as well (Turan 1989: 72). All these witnesses indicate that Abdullah Cevdet’s planning “creat[ed] a conjuncture with prevailing power-holders”, a state which Even-Zohar refers to as a need for individual planners to be successful (2000c: 401).

Even-Zohar points out that “the prospects of success also depend on an effective utilization of market conditions” and “where resisting forces are strong, failure — either partial or complete — may ensue” (Even-Zohar 2005c: 85). Considering these hypotheses, it could be claimed that Abdullah Cevdet did not utilize “market conditions” effectively enough as indicated by the great scale of “resistance” to his *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. For instance, his “Islamicization” and “disguise” techniques (as I discussed before) were found unconvincing by many Islamist intellectuals. Moreover, A Cevdet was often criticized for not being sincere because of the incompatibility between his pious discourse and the content of his *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. Still, even though Abdullah Cevdet’s “Islamicization” and “disguise” techniques in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* were usually not found plausible by the Islamists, and his materialist and anti-religious options were overtly and strongly “resisted” by many conservative elites, his ideological program later intersected with the agendas of the political “power-holders” of the new Turkish Republic who laid great emphasis on secularization and Westernization. And this seems to be an

important basis for my argument that Abdullah Cevdet's planning became "successful". It seems that "market forces" in the modern Turkish Republic constituted a "fertile" ground for the prospects of the "options" Abdullah Cevdet endeavored to introduce.

It is true that Abdullah Cevdet's contributions to the intellectual basis of the secularizing and Westernizing Republican reforms have been generally "peripheralized" (Even-Zohar 2000) because of large controversy about his personality, works and deeds, which intensified even more with his "infamous" *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. However, though I am aware of the relativity of the term "success, I suggest that Abdullah Cevdet did become "successful" by contributing to the "proliferation of options" in the Ottoman / Turkish culture "repertoire". Abdullah Cevdet's important role in the modernizing and secularizing reforms of the new Turkish Republic, and his great influence on the contemporary intellectuals including Atatürk, points at this fact. In his article "Abdullah Cevdet: A Father of Kemalism", Frank Creel points out that:

...significant elements of Kemalist ideology have clear roots in the writings of Cevdet. [...] some of the outstanding features of Kemalist ideology, if one sees ideological development as the result of the diffusion of ideas among elites, are historically inexplicable without reference to Cevdet's ideas, particularly since many of his ideas were anathema to most Ottoman-Turkish elites up to the time of their adoption and implementation by Atatürk himself (1980: 9).

Creel points at Atatürk "placed considerable weight on the advice of Cevdet" (1980: 12) regarding many Republican reforms such as the adoption of Latin-based alphabet, closing of the religious orders, unification of education and co-education (1980: 13). Despite this, Creel proposes, Abdullah Cevdet's "influence" on Kemalist ideology is "not sufficiently recognized" (1980: 9) though he fails to elaborate on the

reasons behind the “insufficient” recognition of his influence on the Kemalist ideology. Certainly, the “peripheralized” position of Abdullah Cevdet fixed by many scholars does not constitute a legitimate reason for denying his “success” as a culture planner.

Summary

To sum up, this chapter was devoted to the four non-literary translations Abdullah Cevdet published within the first three years of the Second Constitutional period and their important role in his culture-planning project. It was argued that these works introduced a new set of materialist, Westernist, anti-religious and libertarian “options” to the Ottoman culture “repertoire”.

Abdullah Cevdet translated Vittorio Alfieri’s *Della Tirannide* as *İstibdad* using the French translator Jacques-Alexandre-François Allix’s *De la Tyrannie* as a mediating text. Abdullah Cevdet first published *İstibdad* before the Second Constitution in 1899, and republished it in 1908 due to its crucial role for his ideological program. It was quite significant since it was an overt and daring criticism of Abdülhamid’s absolute monarchy. Some evidence proves that this work became quite influential among the members of the Committee of Union and Progress (cf. Hanioglu 1997: 134-135). It was meant to promote libertarian and revolutionary values among the Ottomans. As was presented in the preceding pages of this chapter, such values were an important component of the cultural transformations Abdullah Cevdet envisaged for his Ottoman audience.

Another work worthy of consideration in terms of the translator’s systematic efforts was *İngiliz Kavmi*, which was directly translated from the French academic

Emile Boutmy. It reflected another fundamental aspect of Abdullah Cevdet's world-view: evolutionism. His affiliation with the works of some evolutionists convinced him that the English with the Anglo-Saxons as their ancestors occupied a much better evolutionary position compared to other nations. It is very clear that Abdullah Cevdet intended to exhibit the character of this nation to his Ottoman readers who were expected to "import" some British models for themselves; he also and turned these models into what Even-Zohar calls "transfers", that is "the process whereby imported goods are integrated into a home repertoire, and the consequences generated by this integration" (Even-Zohar 1997: 3-4).

Musiki ile Tedavi, also translated directly from the French of M. Doubresse, is related to the usage of music as therapy. It could be accepted as a medical work which demonstrates Abdullah Cevdet's firm belief in science as a medical doctor and also as a graduate of the military medical school of Gülhane (*Mekteb-i Tıbbiye*) which has been well-known for being the homeland of materialist ideas in the nineteenth century (cf. Mardin 1992: 18; Sağlam 1980).

Tarih-i İslamiyet is certainly and undoubtedly Abdullah Cevdet's most important and controversial translation. It was translated from Victor Chauvin's French text: *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, though it was originally written in Dutch by Reinhart Dozy with the title *De Voornaamste Godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*. An important finding of this research worth mentioning in terms of translation studies and *translation proper* is that Abdullah Cevdet usually gives no signs of concealing the mediated nature of his translations. In fact, he named his mediating text — not the translator! — for *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and the mediating translator—not the translation!—for *İstibdad* in the preface, but it is not clear whether he deliberately did so in order to inform his readers as to the "directness" of

his translation. Nonetheless, it would probably be safe to argue that there was no constraint that would favor unmediated translations and impel him to disguise the mediated nature of his translations.

The views of the refutators give some important clues in terms of how *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and its translator were perceived. It is quite interesting to see that “resisting” intellectuals generally saw Abdullah Cevdet equally or even more responsible as the author for the blasphemous content of the translation because of his preface in which he appeared to be in full agreement with the author. That is why he had to remove this preface from all the later copies of the work and replace it with an emphatic warning that he had only translated the work “literally” without interfering in the source text, obviously in order to escape the growing criticism directed against the translation and himself (cf. Hatiboğlu 1999: 202).

Another important conclusion to be drawn at the end of this chapter is that both Abdullah Cevdet and the critics who refuted *Tarih-i İslamiyet* readily seemed to take it for granted that the translation “accurately” reflected Dozy’s *De Voornaamste Godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*, without taking its mediated nature into consideration. This prejudgment certainly denies the role of the translator in any translation phenomenon. This preconception becomes even more invalid with the interference of two translators: the mediating translator Victor Chauvin, and the final translator Abdullah Cevdet .

As for *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, it was certainly the most influential work among Abdullah Cevdet’s entire oeuvre. “It was the first time that a book openly critical of Islam and its prophet had been published in Turkish and widely distributed” (Hanioğlu 1997: 137). Thus, it has been widely discussed and criticized in different circles since its publication in 1908. One can claim that Abdullah Cevdet’s role as a

quite “visible” translator with his translation strategies, his famous preface and with the epilogue he appended to the end of the work has become a major source of harsh debates and criticism.

I have argued in the present chapter that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* is the translation which reflects best the main pillars of Abdullah Cevdet’s anti-religious, evolutionist and materialist world-view. Abdullah Cevdet’s choice of Dozy’s work is quite reasonable considering the materialist and anti-religious formulations within it. The most explicit manifestation of the materialist perspective is observed where Dozy attributes the illness of muscular hysteria to the Prophet Mohammed and describes all the teachings and sayings of the Prophet as delirium. This claim is of utmost importance for Abdullah Cevdet’s ideological program due to the fact that such a perspective denies divine revelations, therefore Islam, or any religion that originated from the messages a prophet conveyed. As was mentioned before, Abdullah Cevdet considered Islam, as it was understood and practiced during his period, as an impediment to the modernization and progress of the Ottomans and the Muslim world. As was concisely explained by Hanioglu, he aimed to eliminate “sacredness” and “unscientific assertions” in Islam and to initiate the creation of a new “faith” which would only be instrumental for keeping the members of a certain society together (cf. Hanioglu 2005a: 43, 65). For that, Muslims needed to reactivate the traditional Islamic practice of *ictihad*, a concept which was extremely important for Abdullah Cevdet, who also named his journal and the publishing house after this concept. Abdullah Cevdet’s great efforts to make the copies of this work easily accessible for both Ottoman and non-Ottoman Muslims around the world indicate how ambitiously he wanted to persuade them about the role of Islam in impeding their progress in the face of the West.

The idea of evolution, another significant aspect of Abdullah Cevdet's world-view, is also observed in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. The epilogue which was written by an obscure Orientalist ("A. Key"?) "at Abdullah Cevdet's behest" (Hanioglu 2005a: 99) and was appended to the end of the translation involves some considerations by this Orientalist and of Abdullah Cevdet about the evolution of societies and religions (1908d: 699, 700). The epilogue mainly dwelled on the three basic evolutionary stages the Western nations underwent and the need for the Ottomans and the Muslims to undergo the same stages to achieve progress. It was argued that the Ottomans and other Muslims were only at the first stage of their evolution.

A conspicuous characteristic of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* is that Abdullah Cevdet frequently resorted to the strategy of "Islamicization" in the paratexts. One can ascribe such efforts to Abdullah Cevdet's intention of avoiding any accusation of blasphemy from his conservative readers and educated Islamists who largely gathered around the journal *Sıratü'l-Müstakim*. Another reason that must have led Abdullah Cevdet to adopt this strategy is that he tried to exhibit Dozy's ideas as legitimate in terms of Islamic tenets and teachings. It is quite ironical to see that Abdullah Cevdet added some abbreviated expressions of respect for the Prophet and his companions ("s.a.v" and "r.a") though Dozy's remarks contained quite opposite implications. Besides, he quoted a number of Quranic verses, *hadiths* and the sayings of some well-known Muslim thinkers such as Sadi, Mevlana, Ebu'l Ala el-Maarri in the peritexts in order to support Dozy's ideas and to present them in perfect accordance with Islam.

It was demonstrated in the preceding pages of this chapter that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was exposed to ever-lasting active "resistance" from political authorities, conservative intellectuals and ordinary readers. The work was banned (1910) two

years after its publication and the existing copies were either burnt or thrown into the sea from the Galata Bridge. Apart from the abundant petitions of complaint written to the religious and political authorities, a large number of articles were serialized in the conservative journals of the period. Moreover, two committees were established to refute Dozy's and Abdullah Cevdet's ideas in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*; one by the Ministry of Education as the representative of the official "power-holder" (Even-Zohar 2000c: 401), and the other by the editorial of the journal *Sırat-el-Mustakim* as a non-official "institution" which had "symbolic" and "cultural capital" (Bourdieu 1993: 7). The former committee could not really fulfill its mission whereas the latter felt compelled to carry out a self-imposed mission to oppose the claims in Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's work.

Sıratü'l-Müstakim became an important "institution" (Even-Zohar 1997: 31) of opposition and "resistance" to Abdullah Cevdet's "notorious" translation. Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı came up with the harshest critiques in this "institution" about Dozy's remarks and the translator's supporting preface. between 1910 and 1912, he wrote countless articles which were serialized on the pages of *Sıratü'l-Müstakim* to refute Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's study. In addition, Ferid Kam, Mehmed Akif, M. Refik, Vasıf and Midhad Cemal are some other names who also wrote opposing articles in the same journal.

Beyanü'l-Hakk and *Hikmet* are two other prominent Islamist journals which also contributed to a counter-attack already initiated by the ardent Islamists of *Sıratü'l-Müstakim*. Refutations also appeared in the book market, by Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi (*İslam Tarihi* 1910), Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı who collected his previous articles on the subject in *Hak ve Hakikat* 1913), and İsmail Fenni (*Kitab-ı İzale-i Şükük –Dozy'nin Tarih-i İslamiyeti Üzerine Reddiye* 1928).

It was pointed out in this chapter that Abdullah Cevdet's manner of presenting Dozy's work and manner in the paratexts of the translation had a considerable role in the large scale opposition to *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. This argument gains support from the fact that a great many pages in the refutations were devoted to the criticism of the translator on the basis that he conveyed Dozy's messages approvingly.

It has been observed so far that the existing refutations are mostly based on negative feelings about Dozy's anti-Islamic remarks and the translator's adherence to his considerations rather than scientific and objective research. An exception to this generalization is perhaps Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi's *Tarih-i İslam*. Hilmi came up with a relatively impartial study compared to the others and he also meant his work to be a prominent one on the history of Islam in its own right. Still, his work is marked by a feeling of opposition to what had been written in Abdullah Cevdet's translation of Dozy's study. His frequent references to Dozy's study and his subheadings and periodical divisions indicate his engagement with *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. Nevertheless, his tone is moderate compared to the other critics and he explicitly declares that he is in pursuit of creating an objective work on the history of Islam. For instance, he agrees with Abdullah Cevdet on the necessity of reactivating the *ictihad* as a traditional Islamic practice, though they differ in what they expect from the practice of *ictihad*. However, he voices his disagreement where Dozy attributed "muscular hysteria" (*histeriya-i adeli*) to the Prophet.

Another point in which he differs from the other critics is that he does not blame Abdullah Cevdet for publicizing Dozy's blasphemous claims but describes him as a mediator, without whom the work would still have been translated, but by someone else.

Perhaps the most problematic issue which can be reckoned as the “gist” of Dozy’s thesis is related to the Prophet’s illness. The reason is that once the Prophet’s illness was proved, then all the basic Islamic tenets would lose their validity. Because of the significance of this issue that all the conservative critics dwelled on this issue and endeavored to disprove it. Another important issue about *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was Abdullah Cevdet’s liberal use of some Islamic sources such as Quranic verses and *hadiths*, and his use of some misspelled or fabricated ones. An analysis of the discourse of the “resistant” conservatives suggests that they held Abdullah Cevdet to be as responsible as Dozy for the contents of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. It could be inferred from their statements that they saw nothing “strange” about the blasphemous nature of the Orientalists’ accounts. What led them to write extensively to refute Dozy’s claims was rather related to the translator’s manner of praising Dozy as a “good Muslim” and describing his work as a product of “good sense”.

What they did to disprove the claims in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* was mostly to search for Islamic sources to defend Islam and the Prophet. Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi and İsmail Fenni also referred to the accounts of some Orientalists whom they described as more “impartial” and “conscientious” (İsmail Fenni 1928: 4; cf. Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi 1982: 62).

A common aspect of the refutations is that almost all the critics perceived *Tarih-i İslamiyet* as a whole, without excluding the paratexts. Although they introduced their critiques merely as refutations of Dozy’s history of Islam, they frequently tried to disprove Abdullah Cevdet’s ideas in the preface and the obscure French Orientalist’s explanations in the epilogue. The critics’ perception of the work largely as a product of the translator led them to direct their most bitter criticism

against the translator. İsmail Fenni even saw Dozy as the “lesser of two evils” (*ehven-i şer*, 1928: 79) compared to the translator.

The periodicals of the time suggest that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* increased the polarization between Islamist and materialist / extreme Westernist intellectuals who largely gathered around the journals *Sıratü'l-Müstakim* and *İctihad* respectively (cf. Polat 2000: 448).

From a systemic point of view, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* seems to possess an “innovatory” position with its new “options”, whereas İsmail Hakkı and İsmail Fenni’s refutations fall under “conservatory forces” which endeavored to maintain established models in the Ottoman culture repertoire. As for Ahmed Hilmi’s refutation, it emphasized the necessity of synthesizing Western models with domestic ones, but without relinquishing Islam. I would, therefore, conclude that it would be wrong to categorize his refutation as one which solely aimed to strengthen the established models in the Ottoman culture repertoire.

Another conclusion I drew in this chapter in terms of Even-Zohar’s systemic approach is that Abdullah Cevdet acted both as an “idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur” (2005a: 10), using his translations as cultural tools. His capability of “importing” some Western resources and proposing them as alternative “options” for the home repertoire is the reason why I call him an “idea-maker”. His ardent efforts for the “implementation” of these “options” in the domestic repertoire are what make him a “cultural entrepreneur”.

Though I am aware of the fact that determining the “success” or “failure” of a planning activity is not an easy task and something relative, I would still conclude that Abdullah Cevdet contributed to “proliferation of options” in the Ottoman / Turkish culture “repertoire”. Abdullah Cevdet’s important role in the modernizing

and secularizing reforms of the new Turkish Republic, and his great influence on the contemporary intellectuals, including Atatürk, points to this fact. I would also conclude that, although Abdullah Cevdet initially confronted with overt “resistance” from many contemporaries, his materialist and anti-religious discourse later overlapped with that of the political “power-holders” of the new Turkish Republic which laid much emphasis on secularization and Westernization.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

My thesis is an attempt to answer the question how Abdullah Cevdet tried to “plan” a new Ottoman culture repertoire by means of his literary and non-literary translations, focusing on those published between 1908 and 1910. I have made use of systemic theoretical approaches, especially of Even-Zohar, Toury and Lefevere while analyzing Abdullah Cevdet’s translation strategies. This study could be regarded as the first attempt to contextualize specifically the Turkish translation history of the Second Constitutional period within a modern paradigm of translation studies. I hope that it will be a modest contribution towards the understanding of Turkish translation history in connection with the political and cultural developments following the re-establishment of the Constitution in 1908.

Some secondary evidence and my bibliography of the period between 1908 and 1910 has indicated that the free atmosphere of the Second Constitutional period called forth a sudden explosion in the number of both translated and indigenous / original (*teelif*) works. Taking its root from the political and cultural developments since the *Tanzimat* edict, translated literature enjoyed a very fruitful period between 1908 and 1910. It has been argued in the introduction that the absolutist regime of Abdülhamid II and his censorial measures before his dethronement in 1909 restricted the appearance of some translated publications — both literary and non-literary — in the book market. Still, time witnessed the proliferation of translated texts during his reign, especially of the apolitical and “low-brow” ones.

Abdullah Cevdet’s translated books, which are about thirty in number, constitute more than half his total output. His translations consist of a wider spectrum including both literary and non-literary works. The scope of his non-literary translated

oeuvre extends to different areas of social sciences, covering sociological, historical, political and psychological issues. Unlike the other translators of the period (listed in Appendix 6) who usually picked some non-canonical Western titles for translating, Abdullah Cevdet translated from Shakespeare, at the top of the English literary canon. He is the person who produced complete translations of six of Shakespeare's tragedies for the first time in Turkish, which is a significant fact in terms of Ottoman / Turkish translation history. Certainly, this is not the only point which makes Abdullah Cevdet worthy of investigation. Apart from the literary field, he also intervened in many other areas of the Ottoman cultural polysystem: religious, political, sociological and historical. As an intellectual who represented the most extreme Westernist pole in the post-*Tanzimat* period, he endeavored to promote some Western models in the above-mentioned areas of the Ottoman culture repertoire by means of his translations. The dominance of translated works among Abdullah Cevdet's entire oeuvre could be ascribed to his strong conviction about the necessity of systematizing the transfer of the "great" Western works into Turkish for the "progress" (*terakki*) and modernization of the Ottoman society.

As has been stated, Abdullah Cevdet is the first person who systematically published six of Shakespeare's tragedies, two of which were not included in the scope of this study because they were published after 1910: *King Lear* (translated by Abdullah Cevdet as *Kral Lir*) and *Antony and Cleopatra* (*Antuan ve Kelopatra*). My research has shown that systematizing translation of the European classics was an important part of Abdullah Cevdet's culture planning. My study of textual, paratextual and extra-textual evidence on Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations showed that Abdullah Cevdet endeavored to bring alternative options both to the literary field and to the more encompassing culture repertoire. In my

research, I analyzed the options introduced in these translations on aesthetic and pragmatic level. The options which were directly related to the Ottoman / Turkish literary repertoire constitute the aesthetic dimension of Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations. Their "pragmatic" aspect involves the options which were intended to re-shape the overall cultural polysystem.

As my study of Abdullah Cevdet's "translation policy" has shown, his decisions in the process of selecting source culture and text were largely determined by the Westernist, evolutionist and liberalist aspects of his ideological program. My discussion of the motives behind Abdullah Cevdet's selection of source culture has indicated that his evolutionist world-view became an important determining factor. His belief in the evolutionary superiority of the English led him to turn towards English literary works for translation. For Abdullah Cevdet, there were obviously some cultural lessons to be drawn by the Ottomans from Anglo-Saxon culture. In this regard, Abdullah Cevdet could be viewed as "innovatory" since he deviated from his contemporaries who were largely inspired by French works and chose them as source texts (See Appendix 6).

My analysis of paratextual and extra-textual evidence has shown that Cevdet's long and ardent engagement with Shakespeare's tragedies was intimately connected with his liberalist and evolutionist considerations. It has been shown in the third chapter that Abdullah Cevdet's admiration for Shakespeare was closely related to his conviction about the evolutionary supremacy of the British, putting aside the considerable interest already sparked in the Ottoman lands for dramatic performances of Shakespeare's plays before 1908. This seems to be the reason why Shakespeare is one of two writers whom Abdullah Cevdet translated most. In addition, the contents of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* — which he translated

before the dethronement of Abdülhamid II, but could only publish after the re-establishment of the Ottoman Constitution in 1908 presumably because of the Sultan's censorship — enabled him to use these plays as critical tools against Abdülhamid II's absolutist regime. In this respect, I may conclude that Abdullah Cevdet's *Hamlet*, *Makbes* and *Jül Sezar* were intended to transmit some liberalist and anti-despotic options to the Ottoman political repertoire. What lay behind Abdullah Cevdet's so-called "idolatry" for Shakespeare was that, as paratextual and extra-textual evidence indicates, he identified himself with Shakespeare's protagonists, especially with Hamlet and Brutus. *Jül Sezar* was especially esteemed by Abdullah Cevdet who drew a parallel between the conspirators in the play and the Ottoman secret organization of the Committee of Union and Progress to which he belonged. Abdullah Cevdet's preface to the work makes evident that he saw himself, and his Young Turk friends, like Brutus who fought for the cause of "republican" values.

As for Abdullah Cevdet's *Romeo ve Jülyet*, it became more marked with its aesthetic aspect. Thus, it must be viewed in close connection with the Ottoman literary system. My study of Abdullah Cevdet's translation strategies in *Romeo ve Jülyet* has indicated that it reflected best Abdullah Cevdet's approach to the "problem" of translating the "foreignness" of European classics. *Romeo ve Jülyet* is the play in which Abdullah Cevdet came up with the most literal renderings, often at the expense of the loss of metaphorical nuances. This strategy made Abdullah Cevdet's *Romeo ve Jülyet* less intelligible partly because of his expressed preference for the literal meaning of the words rather than their metaphorical or idiomatic implications.

The main translation strategy Abdullah Cevdet adopted in his Shakespeare translations was the very one which he concisely summarized as preferring “inward virtues over apparent beauty”. It was argued and demonstrated in this study that Abdullah Cevdet’s actual practice while working on his literary and non-literary translations was almost always in line with his afore-mentioned translation discourse. In fact, such kind of an understanding of translation suited well his ideological program. Expecting to see him efface the “difference” of the “other” and “domesticate” it in his translations of Shakespeare’s plays would certainly not be what he expected from himself. It has been argued in this research that both in theory and practice Abdullah Cevdet, as a person who is considered to be the most extreme Westernist by many, proved to be a “foreignizing” translator. That is to say, he usually respected the “difference” of the source text and culture and endeavored to keep it in the target text as much as possible.

My investigation has shown that there might be several reasons behind Abdullah Cevdet’s selection of prose to represent Shakespeare’s “blank verse”. A remarkable reason may be related to a new understanding of translating dramatic literature in the post-*Tanzimat* period which necessitated translating dramatic verse in prose. Another reason might be that French and German mediating texts which guided Abdullah Cevdet while translating were probably also in prose. Perhaps the most important determining factor for Abdullah Cevdet’s selection of prose was related to his understanding of translation which entailed transferring “inner virtues over apparent beauty”. In other words, he thought that keeping the semantic integrity of the source text was far more important than representing its aesthetic features.

My analysis of Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations on the textual-linguistic level has enabled me to discover that Abdullah Cevdet’s style resembles

the traditional Ottoman prose style of *inşa* in many respects. This could be accounted for by his heavy language with a lot of Perso-Arabic vocabulary and compounds, pleonasm and formulaic expressions. This style inescapably resulted in an inflation of the target text compared to the source text. That is why his language became very “ponderous” and unsuitable for dramatic renderings. He also applied the traditional Ottoman meter *aruz* in his verse translation of Hamlet’s soliloquy. Abdullah Cevdet’s Shakespeare translations might be viewed as “conservatory” since they carried some main features of the classical Ottoman literary forms. On the other hand, Abdullah Cevdet’s concern for the integrity of the source texts and his close adherence to them made his translations quite “innovatory” for his time due to the fact that his contemporaries generally put more emphasis on creating “performable” texts which appealed to the general audience.

I have argued in this research that Abdullah Cevdet’s translations from Shakespeare reflected his own understanding of conveying the “foreignness” of a Western classical work. In this regard, I have concluded that Abdullah Cevdet responded in his own way to the heated literary discussion, namely the “classics debate” of 1897, which took place at the turn of the twentieth century on the “problem” of translating the European classics. Two main questions posed in the debate were “whom to translate” and “how to translate”. Abdullah Cevdet’s reply to the first question was in favor of European romantics. His translation discourse as well as his translation strategies exhibited that he preferred the works of European romantics unlike some of his contemporaries who found European realist works more compatible with the demands of materialism and scientism. As a romantic materialist, Abdullah Cevdet saw no disadvantage in translating the European

romanticists such as Byron, Schiller, Alfred de Musset, Victor Hugo and André Chénier alongside Shakespeare.

The second question in the “debate” involved determining the “ideal” way of conveying the European works of classical nature into Turkish i.e., whether to “imitate” (*taklid / tanzir*) or translate (*terceme*). I have discovered after my analysis of Abdullah Cevdet’s translation discourse and strategies that Abdullah Cevdet was far more “permissive” towards the European influence and “foreignness” compared to the participants of the “classics debate” who took a relatively more “defensive” position. The fact that Abdullah Cevdet “translated” (instead of “imitating” or “emulating”) by closely adhering to the constraints of the source language and culture while translating Shakespeare, and the “resistant” position he exhibited in his discourse against “assimilating” strategies clearly manifest his “permissive” stance.

A common denominator for all the participants of the “classics debate” and Abdullah Cevdet was a shared concern for the “progress” (*terakki*) of the Ottomans, and contextualization of the “problem” of translating European classics within the framework of “lack and belatedness” of the Ottoman society. Nevertheless, contrary to some participants of the “debate” who thought of translation in relation with “intelligibility”, Abdullah Cevdet did not reflect such a concern because he targeted the elites for his Shakespeare translations. This can be accounted for by the textual-linguistic features of his translations and his use of “high” Ottoman with an abundance of Perso-Arabic compounds. Accordingly, Abdullah Cevdet’s translation strategies while rendering Shakespeare and his fidelity to the source text did not bear the same conclusions with some of the participants of the “classics debate”, whose “principle of fidelity” eventually led to the clarification of the literary language and style, especially in the Republican period.

In retrospect, analyzing the matricial and textual-linguistic features of Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations, I may define Abdullah Cevdet's strategy in the translation process as "full" adherence to the source text without any remarkable additions, omissions and manipulation of segmentation. It becomes evident with the abundance of footnotes in Abdullah Cevdet's translations of the plays that whenever he found no exact correspondence for a translation unit in the Ottoman culture he left it non-translated, or translated with an explanatory footnote, instead of erasing it. I consider that Abdullah Cevdet's great respect for the "foreignness" of the plays is closely linked with his mission as a conveyor who "carried Suns from the West to the East", as one of his poems presented in the epigraph indicates.

From Even-Zohar's systemic point of view, I may conclude that Abdullah Cevdet became both a "conservative" and "innovative" translator with his Shakespeare translations. He was "conservative" since he adopted some established Ottoman literary models such as the traditional Ottoman prose style of *inşa* in his translations of the plays. He also practiced the traditional Ottoman meter (*aruz*) when he translated Hamlet's soliloquy in verse. However, he might also be viewed as "innovative" because of his selection of source culture and texts. In addition, his close adherence to the source text could also be regarded as "innovative" compared to most other translated literature in the post-*Tanzimat* period.

However, as my discussion in the third chapter has shown, Abdullah Cevdet's "ponderous" language and inflated style which was greatly marked by the characteristics of the Ottoman literary tradition did not meet the expectations of the nationalist bureaucrats and scholars of the modern Turkish Republic. That is why his translations of the plays did not have further editions after the foundation of the new

Turkish Republic, and his role as the first producer of the full translations of Shakespeare's tragedies has not been adequately recognized. His "peripheralized" position within literary histories, reviews and critiques written in the Republican period was obviously related to the literary "poetics" of the time which laid great emphasis on the purification of language in literature, both original and translated. Accordingly, Abdullah Cevdet's "ponderous" and inflated translations which targeted the Ottoman elites became more and more unintelligible for the later generations. My survey of literary histories, reviews and critiques has shown that Abdullah Cevdet's Shakespeare translations were usually assessed by scholars according to modern literary value judgments.

In addition to his Shakespeare translations, Abdullah Cevdet also translated some Western non-literary texts by means of which he aimed to transform different fields of the Ottoman polysystem: *İstibdad*, *Musiki ile Tedavi*, *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and *İngiliz Kavmi*. In the third chapter, I argued that some Ottoman intellectuals looked to the home culture repertoire to elicit "strategies of action" in the face of political, military and cultural backwardness of the Ottomans while some others turned their faces toward Western models. A kind of "deadlock" occurred in the Ottoman polysystem and this "deadlock" had its repercussions firstly and vehemently in the political and military sphere. Other spheres such as religion and literature also began to be considered in terms of the Ottoman's "belatedness". Some Western-oriented Ottoman elites already felt and acknowledged the "insufficiency" of the prevailing traditional "models" and they felt an urgent need to "interfere" with the course of affairs by introducing Western "options" to various fields of the Ottoman cultural polysystem, be it politics, religion, history, sociology, science or literature. How Abdullah Cevdet endeavored to import some Western "options" into the field of

religious, political, sociological and historical repertoire by means of his non-literary translations that appeared between 1908 and 1910, and what kind of repercussions his translations produced in the Ottoman society comprise the main topic of the fourth chapter.

I have argued in the fourth chapter that Abdullah Cevdet's "remedy" for the "lag and lack" of the Ottoman society was full Westernization without differentiating between the "roses and thorns" of the Western culture. Besides, being largely inspired by the works of some Europeans such as Ludwig Büchner and Gustave Le Bon, he developed his worldview which was closely interwoven with evolutionism, materialism, scientificity and liberalism. Being a graduate of the medical school of Gülhane (*Mektebi-i Tibbiye*), a significant centre of materialism and scientism in this period, he thought of Western values as purely scientific. The materialist aspect of his cultural project became so apparent that he was regarded as "the leading ideologue" of materialism in the Ottoman society.

My analysis of paratextual and extratextual evidence has shown that the Islamic term of *ictihad* emerged as a significant notion for Abdullah Cevdet's culture-planning. He intended to modernize and westernize the Ottoman society by using *ictihad* as a tool without which, according to Abdullah Cevdet, Islam and Muslims would not "evolve" and achieve "progress". The reason was that he considered people would refuse any innovative perspective in religion unless imposed by religious authorities by means of *ictihad*. In his view, despotism was to be eliminated first in order to reactivate *ictihad* as a source of innovation and modernization. For him, therefore, the notions of liberalism and *ictihad* became *sine qua non* for the "evolution" of Islam and Muslims. I have argued in the fourth chapter that we cannot map the inter-textual connections between *İstibdad*, *Tarih-i*

İslamiyet and *İngiliz Kavmi* without grasping the crucial role of *ictihad* in Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program. The fact that he named both his journal and printing house as "*İctihad*" supports the idea that *ictihad* became an important departure point in his making of a new culture repertoire.

Abdullah Cevdet translated *İstibdad* from the French version Alfieri's *Della Tirannide*. This is the work which represented best Abdullah Cevdet's liberalist and anti-despotic views. As a materialist medical doctor, he stated that *İstibdad* described the "causes", "diagnosis" and "treatment" of absolutist regimes which he regarded as a physical "disease". He set two practical objectives for the elites: "enlightening" (*tenvir*) and "resistance" (*mukavemet*). The "prescription" he gave to his readers for the elimination of absolutist regimes clearly shows that he tried to *implement* his liberalist options in the Ottoman context. His endeavor of putting his new ideas *into practice* as alternative options became an important basis for me to argue that, through his translations, Abdullah Cevdet acted as a "cultural entrepreneur" in addition to his role as an "idea-maker".

İngiliz Kavmi, which was translated by Abdullah Cevdet from the French academic Emile Boutmy, reflected the evolutionist aspect of Abdullah Cevdet's culture planning. In the work, Boutmy tries to explain the "disposition", and the "mental and moral characteristics" of the English in evolutionary terms putting special emphasis on geographical conditions as the most important factor in determining their traits. In the work, "collective action" and "self-government" emerge as two issues for which the English are claimed to have great "capacity". For Boutmy, this is what has made the English a great nation who did not submit to despotic rulers and absolutist regimes throughout history. All in all, Abdullah Cevdet's translation of this work could be accounted for by his evolutionist and

liberalist world-view. It is clear that Abdullah Cevdet expected his readers to adopt many dispositional characteristics of the English — “collective action” and “self-government” in the first place. In other words, Abdullah Cevdet’s political messages in *İngiliz Kavmi* involved procedures for the Ottomans to “handle” absolutist regimes in a particular way — by showing “resistance” — and derive some “strategies of action” such as “self-government” in the face of these regimes.

Abdullah Cevdet also aimed to introduce some bio-materialist options to the Ottoman sociological repertoire by means of *İngiliz Kavmi*. These options were related to a “scientific” and evolutionist way of analyzing and interpreting the dynamics and patterned behaviors of the English. Inculcating such a “scientific” and bio-materialist perspective, Abdullah Cevdet intended to serve his readers with some “conceptual strategies” to “decipher” the dynamics behind the evolutionary supremacy of the English.

Musiki ile Tedavi was translated by Abdullah Cevdet from M. Doubresse’s French text, embodying scientificist aspect of Abdullah Cevdet’s ideological program in which, as a medical doctor, he wanted to elevate the scientific awareness of his countrymen through the translation of an empirical medical work.

Abdullah Cevdet translated the two volumes of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* from the French version of Dozy’s work in Dutch taking the advantage of the relatively free atmosphere in Egypt. This study has shown that the paratexts of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, especially Abdullah Cevdet’s preface to the work, made the translation one of the most — if not the most — controversial and “infamous” of texts translated in the late Ottoman history. Accordingly, Abdullah Cevdet became an extremely visible translator, since he also appended an essay by A. Key to his translation to support his own views. Materialist and anti-Islamic formulations of the author, and Abdullah

Cevdet's supporting remarks in the preface paved the way for large-scale waves of indignation and provocation in the Ottoman context. Fierce opposition by conservative Ottomans triggered the political and religious authorities to take censorial actions against its publication and dissemination.

Tarih-i İslamiyet involves clear manifestations of the main pillars of Abdullah Cevdet's ideological program, namely evolutionism, liberalism, materialism and "scientificity". Here, again, there is a strong emphasis on *ictihad* worded by A. Key in the epilogue. "Opening" the door of *ictihad* would initiate the process for the Ottomans to follow the same evolutional path with the European nations and to catch up with "progress". An important precondition for the reactivation of *ictihad*, however, was the total destruction of absolutist regimes practiced by Muslim rulers who terminated liberalism and democracy which prevailed during the Prophet's life and the reigns of the first four caliphs. After this period, however, Muslim rulers started to establish themselves as despots whose oppressions ultimately paved the way for the closing the door of *ictihad*. The despotic nature of political orders in Islamic lands and the diminished role of *ictihad* as a source of religious innovation led to degeneracy and, thus, a vicious circle of "backwardness" in the Islamic world.

In this context, I have also referred to what Venuti calls "dehistoricization". The reason is that Abdullah Cevdet detached Dozy's work from its original religious context and made it a political critique of Abdülhamid II's absolutist regime. In the preface, for instance, he claimed that no "true" histories were written in the three main languages of Islam, namely Arabic, Persian and Islam, due to the Muslim rulers' despotism throughout history. He praised Dozy's work for carrying the requirements and qualities of a true history.

Dozy's materialist formulations gave *Tarih-i İslamiyet* an extremely anti-Islamic and anti-religious character. The most important claim in the work was related to the illness of "muscular hysteria" attributed to the Prophet. I have argued that the significance of this claim stems from the argument which constitutes a basis for regarding all the Islamic tenets as products of the Prophet's "deliria". It was due to this central aspect of this claim that refutators criticized *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and its translator so harshly.

In the light of my analysis of Abdullah Cevdet's discourse in the paratexts, I have argued that Abdullah Cevdet often resorted to some "Islamicization" and "disguise techniques" in order to persuade his readers to internalize the "options" he tried to inculcate by means of his *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. Accordingly, he usually supported Dozy's remarks which entailed the author's materialist and anti-Islamic formulations with selective and sometimes "distorted" Islamic sources, e.g., the Quranic verses, *hadiths* and quotations from some Muslim poets. One can explain this "eclectic" nature of Abdullah Cevdet's culture-planning by his desire to create a "scientific faith" (as Hanioglu points out,) among Muslims which was in harmony with the needs of modern times and materialist values. Nevertheless, I may conclude that his "Islamicization techniques" were not found convincing since many Islamist intellectuals criticized Abdullah Cevdet's pious discourse in their refutations. Another "disguise technique" applied by Abdullah Cevdet was that he strongly underscored his position as a "mediator" who did not interfere with the text and only conveyed Dozy's ideas. In the light of my analysis of "resistance" literature against *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, I may conclude that the impression Abdullah Cevdet left in his conservative readers' minds was not usually that of an "innocent" mediator. On the contrary, he was found as responsible as the author for the content of *Tarih-i*

İslamiyet. İsmail Fenni even considered him as the “lesser of two evils” (*ehven-i şer*) for the claims in Dozy’s work since, he claimed, Abdullah Cevdet intended to spread “irreligion” among the Ottomans and to “confuse” their “minds” (*zihinleri teşevvüş*) by making its Turkish translation available to them.

An important conclusion to be drawn in terms of Abdullah Cevdet’s culture-planning through translations is that he acted both as an “idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur”. He combined various political, sociological, historical and religious options in such a way that he could demonstrate the reasons behind the “backwardness” of the Ottomans and the Muslims, and offer a Western-oriented materialist repertoire to get rid of this “backwardness”. As a “brainworker” he innovatively synthesized various options into an alternative repertoire, benefiting also from the Islamic notion of *ictihad*, in order to transform the Ottoman repertoire of culture. From Even-Zohar’s systemic point of view, this aspect of Abdullah Cevdet was what made him an “idea-maker”. It has become evident with my research that Abdullah Cevdet also took part in “cultural entrepreneurial” activities as he tried to implement his alternative repertoire in the Ottoman context. His great efforts for the circulation of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* among the youth and Muslim masses are a clear indication of his aim to put his ideas into practice by means of propagation and inculcation. The “Islamicization” and “disguise techniques” he often resorted to also exhibit his aim of implementing his repertoire through persuasion. His position within the Committee of Union and Progress as well as his access to “cultural” and “symbolic capital” with his journal *İctihad* — which became a significant centre for the Western-oriented minds — and printing house, one can assume that he became part of “power”. From Even-Zohar’s systemic point of view, such access to “power” is required for planners in order to *implement* their repertoire.

Another remarkable reason which has constituted a legitimate basis for me to identify Abdullah Cevdet as a “cultural entrepreneur” is that he set many practical objectives to be attained by the Ottomans and Muslims in the paratexts of his translations. For instance, he called for the *ulema* (the doctors of Islamic law) to launch reforms in Islam by reactivating *ictihad* in his translation of *Tarih-i İslamiyet*, which is also an effort of *implementation*.

I have argued in this research that Abdullah Cevdet’s extremely visible presence in his *Tarih-i İslamiyet* with his provocatively radical materialist and anti-religious options was what exposed him to so much “resistance”. Although Abdullah Cevdet emphatically described his position as a “mediator” of Dozy’s ideas, the contention that he, as translator, intended to spread irreligion gained ground, which ultimately led many Muslims to call him *Adüvvullah* (the enemy of Allah). Apart from the “resistance” coming from the political “institution” in the form of withdrawing the copies of *Tarih-i İslamiyet* from circulation and banning it, a large amount of “resistance” literature appeared in the publishing market. The journal *Siratü’l-Müstakim*, as a non-official “institution” which appeared as the center of Islamists at that time, exhibited the harshest opposition on the “resistance” front. Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı was the critic who serialized his refutations in *Siratü’l-Müstakim* in the most serious and systematic way. In my research I have tried to show that *Tarih-i İslamiyet* reinforced the polarization between the extreme Westernist / materialist intellectuals, who were represented mostly by the journal *İctihad* — and Islamists who largely gathered in *Siratü’l-Müstakim*. There were also two other intellectuals who published their refutations in book form: Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi and İsmail Fenni. My analysis of “resisting” literature has indicated that Ahmed Hilmi differed from the other refutation writers with his moderate language

and “scientific” perspective while trying to disprove the ideas in *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. Unlike Ahmed Hilmi, Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı and İsmail Fenni usually came up with the harshest criticism against *Tarih-i İslamiyet* and Abdullah Cevdet, the translator.

Despite the great scale of resistance, I have argued, Abdullah Cevdet’s Westernist and materialist cultural project became influential in the long run. The “market” conditions in the republican period constituted a fertile ground for his Westernist and materialist repertoire. My investigation of extra-textual evidence has shown that Abdullah Cevdet became very influential on the Kemalist ideology and the Westernizing and secularizing reforms of the new Turkish Republic. I have concluded at the end of this research that that Abdullah Cevdet’s culture planning intersected with the agendas of political “power-holders” in the modern Turkish Republic who laid great emphasis on secularization and Westernization.

Abdullah Cevdet’s radical and daring manner of inculcating very controversial new options in the Ottoman culture repertoire was metaphorically described by Ziya Gökalp as “sweeping over the field like a wildfire” so that “late-comers would easily build up on it”. Obviously, what Gökalp meant was Abdullah Cevdet’s significant role in preparing a suitable cultural and intellectual ground for the Westernist and secularist bureaucrats of the new Turkish Republic. In the light of such testimonies and my findings, I have concluded that Abdullah Cevdet, as a culture planner, did become “successful” by contributing to the “proliferation of options” in the Ottoman / Turkish culture repertoire.

It is my contention that, Abdullah Cevdet’s role in re-shaping the Ottoman literary and cultural “repertoire” in the post-*Tanzimat* period should be recognized adequately, like that of A. Ahmed Midhat’s. I hope my study will shed some light on

the textual traditions as well as new orientations —observed especially in Abdullah Cevdet’s strategies in his Shakespeare translations — in the system of Ottoman translated literature at the turn of the twentieth century.

APPENDIX 1

Detailed Information on Abdullah Cevdet's Translations Between 1908 and 1910

Translations	Author and the Source Text Title	Information on the Translator's Preface / Note / Epilogue / Dedications, etc.	The Date and Place where the Translation was Completed	First Publication Date and Place	Total Number of Pages
<i>Hamlet</i> (Kütüphane-i İctihad 12)	W. Shakespeare (<i>Hamlet</i>)	-----	15 October 1902 Vienna	Egypt: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1908	243
<i>Makbes</i> (Kütüphane-i İctihad 23)	W. Shakespeare (<i>Macbeth</i>)	-----	12 February 1904 Paris (France)	Egypt: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1909	154
<i>Romeo ve Jülyet</i>	W. Shakespeare (<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>)	-----	26 March 1905 Annemasse (France)	<i>Şehbal</i> 7-24 (14 July 1909- 14 August 1910 / 1 July 1325-1August 1326)	Covers a total number of 33 pages in the different issues of the journal <i>Şehbal</i>
<i>Jül Sezar</i> (Kütüphane-i İctihad 20)	W. Shakespeare (<i>Julius Caesar</i>)	The Date of the Translator's Preface: 18 April 1907 Egypt	February 1904 Annemasse (France)	Egypt: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1908	165
<i>İngiliz Kavmi First Volume</i> (Kütüphane-i İctihad 22)	Emile Boutmy (1835- 1906) (<i>Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais au XIXe siècle</i>)	The Date of the Translator's Preface: 22 January 1909 Egypt	23 January 1909	Egypt: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1909	100
<i>Musiki İle Tedavi</i> (Kütüphane-i İctihad 18)	M. Daubresse (from the article: "MUSICOTHERAPIE")	-----	12 December 1906 Cairo (Egypt)	First edition: Egypt Matbaa-i İctihad, 1908	63
<i>Tarih-i İslamiyet I</i> (Kütübhanesi-i İctihad 15)	Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy, 1300/1883 (<i>Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme</i>)	The Date of the Translator's Preface: 1 April 1908 Egypt	No information was found	Cairo: Matbaa- i İctihad, 1908	334
<i>Tarih-i İslamiyet II</i> (Kütübhanesi-i İctihad 16)	Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy, 1300/1883 (<i>Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme</i>)	The End of the Epilogue: 20 February 1909 Behvaş (Egypt)	January 1909 Egypt. Beginning: 6 Febr. 1909 Egypt	Cairo: Matbaa- i İctihad, 1909	(336-733)
<i>İstibdat</i> 2nd Edition (Kütübhanesi-i İctihad 19)	Vittorio Amedeo Alfieri (<i>Della Tirannide</i> 1789)	The Date of the Translator's Preface: 6 January 1898 Geneva	30 December 1897 Geneva	First Edition: 1899 (1900 in Süssheim) Second Edition: Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1908	271

APPENDIX 2

Translator's Preface (*İfade-i Mütercim*) in *Jül Sezar* Transcribed in Modern Turkish

Şekspir başlı başına bir cihandır başlı başına bir kainatdır; başlı başına bir gün ve mekândır. Arından yerlere geçse revadır o millet ki hala Şekspir'den bi-haberdir, Şekspir'i lisanına tercime etmemiştir. Böyle bir milletin yere geçmesi için arlanmasına hacet yok: Öyle milletleri tabiat ve ahval zaten çok sürmeden yerlere geçirecektir.

Meşhur Volter ile Rusya imparatoriçesi Büyük Katerina arasında teati olunmuş mektupları vaktiyle okumuşum. Onlardan birinde Volter diyor ki "Türkiye'yi taksim etmeli, Türkleri mahvetmeli, çünkü onlarda zevk-i şiir ve edeb yokdur" Bu bir iftiradır o başka bahis ve fakat ben şimdi az kalıyor ki Şekspir'i sevmeyen Şekspir'i takdir etmeyen milletler yeryüzünden kaldırılmalı diyeyim.

Şekspir adama, torpiller, istihkâmlar, zırhlılar, demiryollar, telgraflar, teleskoplar yapmayı öğretmez. Fakat Şekspir'in öğrettiği şeyin yanında bunlar pek adi, pek oyuncak mesabesinde kalır. Şekspir adamlara insan olmayı öğretir. İnsan olan adam ahkâm-ı mülûke hükümandır. "Li külli şey'in kadir"dir. Kaba sofular, mütedeyyin geçinen ahmak dinsizler istedikleri kadar beni tekfir etsinler. Evet insan-ı hakiki, ezelidir, ebedidir, üzerine galebe çalmak mümkün değildir. Hakiki insan hüda-pesenddir, hüda-nümadır.

Karlayl, koca Tomas Karlayl, koca insan, koca İngiliz: "Ya Şekspir'inizden vazgeçeceksiniz yahud Hind İmparatorluğunuzdan, hangisini feda etmeye razısınız deseler, biz İngilizler, kemal-i tehalûkle ve hiç tereddüd etmeksizin, Şekspir'imizi hıfz etmek üzere Hind İmparatorluğumuzu feda ederiz deriz" diyor.

Bu samedani, bu pek büyük mikyasda kadr-aşinalık,

[Persian Poem, not transcribed]

beytinde münderic gibidir. Karlayl böyle söylüyor, Hafız böyle söylüyor. Çünkü bu hakiki insanlar biliyorlar ki hükümanlık en hakiki, en büyük hükümanlık [...]

Şekspir bir dehadır, deha-i mabud-u ukuldür, Şekspir alem-i ulviyetde bir şehinşah-ı azamdır, Şekspir insan olmazdan evvel İngiliz idi, işte bu şeref İngiltere'ye yetişir. Muhteşem İngiltere!

İspanya'nın Armada donanmasını bitiren, dudvermada kalb eden, Çarın Bahr-i Baltık donanmasını, Aksa-yı Şark-ı Cibal bahriyesini otuz saat zarfında tarumar ve hâksar eden kuvvetler gibi bir kuvvet veyahut birleşmiş öyle birkaç kuvvet; senin dev-endam zırhlılarını, farz et ki batırsın berbad etsin, sen müdafaasız kal, askersiz kal, ticaretsiz kal, altınsız kal: fakat gösterilsin seni Şekspir'siz bırakabilecek bir kudret hangi kudretidir? [...]

hâli kalmayacaktır.

Homerin aferidesi olan Aşil büyük muharipler yetiştirdi. Bu elimizdeki kitapta Şekspir'in arz ettiği Brütüs, selamet-i vatan, hürriyet-i umumiyye yollarında, öz kalbini öz eliyle koparıp atan kahramanlar yetiştirecektir: Efradı arasında Brütüs'e benzer pederler, Burciya'ya benzer valideler bulunduğu sezen bir millet kendisini hür ilan edebilir; çünkü bugün esir olsa da o milletin yarın hür olması muhakkaktır. Şekspir'in azamet ve Kibriya-yı bipayanı önünde ettiğim secdelerden, ibadetlerden biri de bu Jül Sezar tercümesidir. Şimdi kullandığım bu ibadet kelimesi kaba sofuların kulaklarını kabarcaktır; fakat:

[Persian Poem, not transcribed]

beytiyle tavsif olunan ibadetlere hasr-ı ibadet etmek demdarlara kalsın! Bizim mezhebimizde, mezheb-i hakda, hakiki Müslüman mezhebinde efdal-i ibadat nâsa hizmet etmektedir:

[Persian Poem, not transcribed]

nazm-ı dilberinde murad olunan mana dahi budur. Herkes bilsin ki Allah'ın Rasulullah'ın ibadullahın arzu ettiği ibadet bu türdür.

Evet tekrar ediyor ve avaz-ı bülen ile söylüyorum, bizim dinimizce yani Hazreti Muhammed'in (s.a) murad ettiği şeriatca hakikat bu merkezdedir.

[Persian Poem, not transcribed]

Eğer benim sersem, mazlum ve benim gibi miskin Müslüman kardaşlarım bu hakikati anlamış ve bu anlayışla hareket etmiş olsalar idi şimdi bütün milletlere üstad-ı fazilet ve irfan olurlardı. Brütüse,

“Brütüs! Sen uyuyorsun; uyan, kim olduğunu gör, Roma kalacak mı?... Söyle, vur, hakkı yerine getir. Brütüs! Sen uyuyorsun, uyan!”

diye bağırarak Roma ve Romalılar kurtarılmıştı. Ben de Brütüs'ün biintiha büyüklüğü karşısında küçüklüğüme bakmayarak, ey Müslümanlar, ey Türkler, ey Türkiyeli vatandaşlar, sizlere böyle bağırıyorum:

Uyuyorsunuz, uyanınız, söyleyiniz, vurunuz, hakkı yerine getiriniz:

Brütüs, uyanı, Brütüs söyledi, Brütüs vurdu; Roma, hür oldu!

Pür ateş, pür faziler Kaska:

“Şu taraf şark cihetidir, değil mi oradan şafak söküyor? Din-i ihvan ictihad ve halkına:

“Hayır, itiraf etmelisiniz, aldanıyorsunuz, şafak oradan sökmüyor, güneş tam kılıcımı biletiğim mahalden doğuyor... dediği gibi Roma için Şafak söktü. Roma için güneş doğmaya başladı.

Bu muazzam, bu heybetli ve merhametkar, ve şefaat-napezir hakikatleri bir bir göstermek, görmeyenlere ve istemeyenlere göstermek, hilm ile, şiir ile, terennümlerle sayhalarla göstermek; olduramasa da yaralayan ve ölümden kurtaramasa da hayat-ı zilletten muhafaza eden “hecelerle” göstermek, asırlardan beri ölmüş kayaların ölmüş kulaklarına söz işitirmek; imanı kamçılayarak uykudan kaldırmak... Ah. Ey muazzam vazife-i şair: Ben bu mehib ve muazzam vazifenin bir zerre miktarını ifaya çalıştım, çalışıyorum, çalışacağım. Yaşadıkça çalışacağım, öldükden sonra yine çalışacağım ve o zaman daha ziyade metin bir izzet ve afiyetle çalışacağım.

18 Nisan 1907 Mısır Doktor Abdullah Cevdet

APPENDIX 3

Translator's Preface (*İfade-i Mütercim*) in *Tarih-i İslamiyet* Transcribed in Modern Turkish

Tarih; okumak tarikiyle basiraya, işitmek tarikiyle samiaya ve bunlardan biri veya her ikisi ile de vicdan dediğimiz merkez-i idrak ve mülâhazaya ahval ve takallübat-ı cihanı nakl eden adeta bir “sinematoğraf” menzilesindedir. Tarif ve tabir-i diğerle, tarih; “rutüşsüz” yani hutut ve ânat-ı hakikiyesi asla tezyid ve tahfif olunmamış, aslına tamamen ayine-nüma bir fotoğraf levhası gibidir. Hakiki tarih böyledir, böyle olmak lazımdır. Böyle olmayan ve tarih namı verilen kitaplar ya gafilâne yahut gafil-şikârâne asardandır. Hakiki tarih namının levazım ve mahsusatını bihakkın haiz bir Tarih-i İslamiyet vücuda getirilerek din kardaşlarımızın pîş-i ittıla’ ve mülâhazasına arz edilmek lazımdı. Vücuda getirilerek diyoruz, çünkü üç mühim lisan-ı İslam olan Arap, Fars, Türk dillerinde yazılmış böyle bir tarihin bulunmadığını tahkik ettik. Bu yoksulluğun sebebini, ezcümle, Müslüman hükümdarlarının istibdadında aramalıdır: Tarih, aksam-ı ulumun en ziyade göz açanıdır; göz açıklığıyla istibdat ve iğfalın bir yerde yaşayamayacağı ayandır. Gözü açılan ahali, zulmü görür, hürriyeti görür, adalet ister, hakikat ister. Allahın gölgesiyim diyerek zulüm ve hıyanette hilkatin en zalim, en hain ucubelerini gölgede bırakan cebabire-i İslam’ın cehaletleri; Şeyh Sadi’nin

[Persian Poem, not transcribed]

tenbihindeki hakikat-ı müdhişeyi idrak hususunda irfan-nümâdır.

Biz, Müslümanların bir Tarih-i İslamiyete olan ihtiyaçlarını şiddet-i kafiye ile hissetmekte idik. Evsaf-ı matlubeyi haiz bir Tarih-i İslamiyeti Hollandalı müsteşrik şöhretgir Profesör Doktor Dozy’nin asar-ı fazılanesi arasında bulduk. “Al-ôikma êÀllat al-mu’min ôaythumÀ wajadahÀ iltaqatahÀ” hükmüne iktifa ettik:

ESSAI
SUR

L’HISTOIRE DE L’ISLAMISME

ünvanıyla Fransızcaya mütercem olup büyük bir ihata-i nazar ve derin bir im’an göstermekle mümtaz ve katiyen bitaraf bir akl-ı selim mahsulü olan bu kitabı Türkçe’ye nakl ettik. “Müellif; Hollandalı, gayr-i müslimdir ve binaen aleyh ağyar-ı dindendir beyanatı şayan-ı itimad olur mu?” yolunda bir sual-i mukaddere şöyle cevap veririz: Müslümanlık, isim ile, oruc ile, namaz ile değildir, [Al-dîn al-muèÀmele]; din muameleden ibaretdir. demektir. Bütün saat-ı hayatını tedris ve mütalaa ile geçiren ve ibadullahın tenvir-i ezhanına, halka nafi olmaya çalışan, âlim, fazıl Doktor Dozy; a’mal ve âmâli kara, avare Hamid’lerden bin kat ziyade müslümandır.

“Al-muslim man salima al-nÀs min yadihi wa-lisÀnih” ve

“Khayr al-nÀs anfaèuhum li’l-nÀs” ve

“Üalab al-èilm sÀèatan khayr min èibÀdat alf sana”

diyen bizim peygamberimizdir. Âlim, faziletkar olan her ferd, Müslimdir. Cahil, fasidü'l-ahlak olan bir kimse ahfad- Rasulallah'dan bile olsa Müslim değildir. İrfan ve fazilet bütün edyanı dine yani hak ve hakikat dinine irca edecektir ve etmektedir:

(Persian Peom, not transcribed)

Doktor Dozy İslamiyet tarihini bundan takriben kırk sene evveline gelinceye kadar yazmışdı, kırk sene evvelden bugüne kadar İslamiyet'in tarihi muhibb-i fazilamız A. Key Efendi Hazretleri'nin Kırk Seneden Beri İslamiyet ünvanlı makalesinden iktibas olunmuştur. A. Key Efendi genç bir müsteşriktir; ahval-i İslamiyeye ve gavamız-ı din-i İslam'a öyle bir derece-i aliyede muttali ki ulema-yı İslam arasında adili gösterilemez denilse caizdir.

Menabi'i İslam namıyla Fransızca neşr etmek üzere olduğu cild-i azimden genç müsteşrikin ne kadar ta'b-ı napezir bir müdakkik, ne yaman bir himmet-i idrak sahibi olduğu anlaşılacaktır.

Tercüme-i eserde takib ettiğimiz usul, dindarane bir itina ile daima takib etmekte olduğumuz usuldür ki aslın temamiyet-i metniyesini muhafaza etmekten ibarettir. Tarafımızdan metn-i kitaba ilave olunan dört harfdır ki mu'tariza işareti dahiline mevzudur: *sallallahü aleyhi vesellem* yerine (s.a) *radiyallahu anh* yerine (r.a.) harflerinden ibarettir.

Bazı mülahaza ve ilavatımız; haşiye suretinde sahaifin nihayetlerine kayd edilmiş ve zirlerine A.C. imzası konularak müellifin haşiyelerinden tefrik olunmuştur.

Bugün ehl-i İslam için *Tarih-i İslamiyet*'den daha ziyade nafi, mutalaa ve mülahazası daha ziyade kat'i'l-lüzum bir kitap yoktur itikadındayız. Hurafat ve iğfalat ile dolu asar-ı gafilâne veya muğfilanenin mevsim-i revacı, saye-i feyz-ı tekâmülde, çokdan geçdi.

Ne kadar anif olursa olsun, “mü'tekidat ve hissiyat-ı evvelinimize ne kadar mugayir bulunursa bulunsun, hakikat ile yüz yüze gelebilmek cesaretine malik olmalıyız, yiğitlik yalnız düşman kurşununa göğüs germek değildir. Hakikat ve hakkın saltanat-ı samedaniyesi önünde nefis-i cahilemizin izzet-i bi izzetini atıp hakikatın zahm-ı ulviyet nişanıyla nişanlanmaya kudret göstermeliyiz, ve, asıl böyle bir şecaat-ı ruhiye ile bahadır olduğumuzu isbat etmeliyiz. Din muameleden ibarettir demek olduğunu söylediğimiz

Al-dín al-muèÀmele

hadis-i şerifi iyice mülahaza olunursa, umumiyetimiz itibarıyla, biz Müslümanların ne kadar bed-din veyahut bi-din olduğumuz anlaşılır. Efdal-ı ibadat, insan kendi nefsinden başlayarak ve hatta feday-ı nefis ile başlayarak kaffe-i ibadullaha nafi ve hadim olmaktır. Din-i bülend-i İslamın bu dakika-i ictimaiyesine muttali olmayan cehele-i ibadetkarân; Hazret-i Mevlana Celaledin-i Ruminin.

(Persian Peom, not transcribed)

beyt-i meşhuruna masadak olmaktan hâli olmazlar. Cehl ve zulüm ile hakiki Müslümanlık bir yerde yaşamaz. Müslim kelimesi selamet kelimesinden müştak

olduđu nazar-ı itibara alınır, cehalet ve zulmün bulunduđu yerde İslamiyet'in yaşayamayacağı ve İslamiyet'in hükümrân olduđu yerlerde cehalet ve zulüm caygir olamamak olmamak lazım geldiđi bila-müşkilat anlaşılır.

Mazinin muamelat ve inkılabatını mülâhaza ve sergüzeşt-i aba ve ecdaddan istifade ederek hal-i hazırın levazım ve ilcaâtıyla bilmuvazene bu müvazeneden hayat-bahş bir netice, necat-aver bir ders-i intibah almak: Mütalaa-i tarihten maksut, işte budur. Tekrar ve teyid ederiz, bu eserin tercüme ve neşrinden murad; mütalaasından böyle bir ders alınabilecek bir kitab-ı ehl-i İslam'ın huzur-u iz'anına takdim etmektir.

Vesselâmu `alâ menittebe`a'l-hüdâ

1 Nisan 1908 mısır

Doktor Abdullah Cevdet

APPENDIX 4

Translator's Preface (*İfade-i Mütercim*) in *İstibdad* Transcribed in Modern Turkish

İstibdad, hakka taaddidir; onu
Tahrib ediniz. "Hadis-i Şerif"

İtina-yı tam ile tercüme edilen eserlerdeki kemalat ve nekayıs mütercimlerine değil müelliflerine aiddir. Bir kitabda mütercimin efkar ve yakiniyatına mügayır bazı nukatın bulunması, tercüme edilmesine mani olamaz. Hatta bir mütercim, serâpâ efkarına gayrı muvafık bir eseri de tercüme ederek herkesin nazar-ı hükm ve tedkikine arz edebilir.

Bugün Türkçe'ye naklettiğimiz Kitab-ı İstibdad'ın (Mezheb) ve (Asya ve Avrupa İstibdadlarının Mukayesesi) fasıllarında bazı fikirler var ki nazarımızda merdud değil fakat şayan-ı tedkik ve inkiyaddır; o gibi fikirleri ihtiva eden birkaç fıkra, zirine muhtasar bir mütalaa-i intikadiye tahşiye edilerek yine harfiyyen tercüme edilmiş ve bu suretle eserin temamiyet-i metniyesi muhafaza olunmuştur. Tercümemiz daha güzel olabilirdi, fakat o güzellik sadakatsiz, vefasız bir güzelin dilberliğini andırırdı. Biz melahat-ı zahiriye hüsn-I batniye tercih etmedik. (Alfieri)nin en ufak bir fakir ve hissini zayi etmemek yoluna üslub-u beyan letafetini kurban eyledik. Bu tarik-i tercüme (Giyom Tel)in Türkçe'ye naklinde de takib edilmişti.

Kitabın ehemmiyetinden, alel husus numune-i tamm-ı istibdad olan hükümet-i haziranın zir-u kahr ve azabında yaşayanlar için kat'i bulunan elzemiyetinden bahsetmeye hacet bile görmeyiz; bu lüzüm ve ehemmiyet o kadar aşıkardır. Nazar-ı mütalaadan geçirilince tercümemizin kıymet ve fevaidi daha iyi takdir olunur. Nazarımızda kitab, heyet-i mecmuasıyla, kendi kendisine bir takriz-i belîğ ve ateşindir. Bu kitabı, aslı olan İtalyanca'dan ilk evvel tercüme eden Ceneral Alliks'in mukaddeme-i tercümesinde yazdığı şu sözler şayeste-i isma'dır:

"Kitab-ı İstibdad", akl-ı beşerin, belki, en bülend, en amik bir mahsul-u itlaıdır. Benim itikadım bu merkezdedir. Elimde bulunan metn-i asli, müellif tarafından 1801 tarihinde Marango muharebesinden bir müddet sonra ihda edilmiştir. Alfieri'nin lisanında Korney'in üslub-u şedidi, Rasin'in letafet ve nermi-i beyanı, Volter'in zeka-yı barik ve feyza-feyzi mütecellidir. Şimdi tanıdığım muharrirler içinde en ziyade kuvvet-i vahdet-i ifade sahibi olan Alfieri'dir. Bu iddiama isbat olmak üzere *Brutus* ünvanlı faciasını gösteririm. *İstibdad* kitabından, müellifin elinde el yazısıyla olarak altı nüsha vardı; bir nüshasını bana, diğer nüshalarını diğer arkadaşlara tevdi' ve yadigar etmişti; şimdiye kadar tab' ve neşrine müyesseriyet hasıl olmadı. Ben böyle bir iki teşebbüsümde muvaffak olamadım; hükümetin istibdadı Alfieri'nin *İstibdad*'ına gün göstermedi. Alfieri'nin *İstibdadı*, hürriyet lehinde en büyük bir müdafaa, en halli bir müdafaamedir. Bu eser benim hamailim, en'amımdır. Ne menatik-ı harede, ne Rusya'nın karlı, cemudiyeli vadilerinde bir dakika üzerimden eksik olmamıştır.)

Alfieri bu kitab ile insanıyetin bir kariha-i taunisini açıyor; "Ey insanlar! Bu yaranızı görünüz; ivca' ve tahribatını, garip bir uyuşukluk sebebiyle hissedemeyerek bu hun-feşan, yıllanmış yarayı vücut-u ademiyet için arayış addedenleriniz de var! Fakat bu mehib yara vücut-u beşeriyete arız olabilen musibetlerin en vahimi, en kanlısıdır" diyor. Derdin mahiyetini, esbabını, seyr-i marazisini, teşhisini, enzarını, tedavisini gösteriyor.

“Alfieri amalini, efkarını rahimane, vazih, sade bir üslub ile dermeyan ediyor. Bu fikirler, bu emeller, bu hakikatler, ezeli, samimi bir hüsn ve taraveti haizdir; “Hakikat dilber olmak için zinete muftakir değildir.” Askerler, kitabın “Asakir-i milliye” yani alelalde askerlik mebhasını okurken belki rencide-hatır olurlar; fakat bizce hakikatin en şedid darbesi, kizb ve iğfalın en nermin nüvazişlerine bin kere müreccahdır. Bizimle hem-zevk-i idrak olan yaran-ı hakikat:

Ey hakikat, neşve-i telehhükle pürdür ruhumuz
Zevk-yab-ı ıztırabındır dil-i mecrhumuz

zemzemesiyle hakikatin bais olduğu ıztırab-ı ulviyeti takdis ederler.

İstibdad Fransız inkılab-ı kebirinden evvel kaleme alınmıştır. Fransa inkılabına muharrirler, şairler, müverrihler hadd-i layıkından ziyade ehemmiyet verdiler, hala da veriyorlar. Fransa inkılabına bütün cihan- mukaddeme-i hayrı nazarıyla bakılıyor. Evet, 1789 sene-i miladisi tarih-i alemde şanlı, kibriya-perver bir tarihtir; fakat istihsali me’mul ve muntazar olan “makasid-ı ulviye”ye hala vusul müyesser olmadı. Hakimiyet-i ümmet, derece-i mütefavitede olmak her tarafda mefkud:

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

Bütün cihanda, muhtelif derecelerde, yine hükümrân olan iğfal ve istibdaddır. Viktor Konsideran, cabeca hakimiyet-i ümmet, yine hakimiyet-i ümmet namına olarak mezara ilka olunmuştur. (*) demek de muhakkıdır.

Şekspir’in dediği gibi “hakikat deliklerden tekrar girecek olan ve kamçı darbeleriyle dışarı çıkarılan bir köpek muamelesi görüyor. Halbu ki Bişon Hanım⁷² (yani kizb) ocağın başında kalıp etrafa taun neşretmek hakkına malik bulunuyor.” Şunu söylemek isterim, ki istibdadın mahiyetini teşrihan yazılmış olan bu kitaptan tamamen müstağni olacak henüz bir çem’iyet, bir millet yoktur. Hürriyet ve mesudiyetin mana-yı hakikileriyle hür ve mesud bir milletin vücudu farz edilse bile kahr ve istibdad altında ezilen diğer hemcinslerinin âlâm ve ukubatıyla o millet-i mesudun da esir-i tesir olmaması şan-ı hürriyet ve insaniyete muvafık olamaz.

İnsan ona derler ki ede kalb-i rakiki
Âlâm-ı ben-i nevî ile kesb-i melalet

Hakikaten hür ve insan olan bir insanın hürriyet ve mesudiyeti umum ben-i beşerin hürriyet ve mesudiyetine vabestedir. Kelim Hemedani’ nin

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

.....
beyt-i belîği, bu fikri – meyasane olmakla beraber—mutazammındır.

Bin reng-i zahiri-i meşruuiyyet ile poşide olan heva-yı hars ve istibdadlarını mahza teskin ve hoşnud etmek için hükumat-ı mevcude ricali, milletler arasına arızı husumetler ilka ediyorlar. Bu suretle kanlar dökerek, şeref-i insaniyeti, uhuvvet-i

* Lev’i Belan – (Bu günü ve yarın ki mesail Questions d’aujourd’hui et de demain) sahife 340. (Abdullah Cevdet’s Note).

⁷² (Bişon Bichon, ne) uzun tüylü küçük bir nevi melez köpektir.

umumiyye hissiyatını tahrib ve tesmim ediyorlar, bu bed emellerin mürtekib olageldikleri tecavüztatdan mütevellid kıyamet-i gayz ve infialatımızı meskut ve mestur geçmeye mecburuz:

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

Bu babdaki kanaat-ı vicdaniyemizi—bir refik vicdanın tabiriyle—pençelerimizle eziyoruz: Kalbimizi tazyiklerle sükut ve sükuna icbar ediyoruz Göğsümüzü, parçalanmaktan, darbelerle vikaye etmeye çalışıyoruz.

*

*

*

Birkaç hastası olan bir tabibin nazar-ı dikkat ve ihtimamı en ziyade ağır olan hasta üzerine münceleb olur. Tabii olan bu keyfiyet,

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

Hükmü bülendini carih olamaz.

Binaen aleyh, Türkiye nam-ı umumisi altında zencir-bend-i zulm ve esaret olan bir halkın sefalet ve felaketini, makhuriyet ve mazlumiyetini, cemiyat-ı sairenin sefalet ve felaketinden ziyade görüyoruz. Bu sebeple en ziyade bizi mütesir ve dilhun eden o kavm-i bi nasib oluyor.

Bizce “vatanperverliğin” delalet ettiği mana, vatan-ı umumi olan küre-i arz üzerinde tevellüd ve te’ayyüş edilen kıt’a-i arziyeyi ve seknesini zemin ve zamanın tevsiye-i ümran ve refahına mehazi bulundurmamak emelinden ibarettir. Bizim “vatanperverliğimizde” saika-i menfaat ve nefsanîyet ile, masum ve mücavir bir milletin cenazeleri üzerine çıkarmak suretiyle milletini i’la etmek manası olmadığı gibi liva-yı hükümeti altında doğup büyüdüğü bir kıt’a-yı arziyeye, üzerinde insan kanı tabahhur etmekte olan ve top gülleleri, kurşun yağmurları ile yanmış yıkılmış bulunan bir mülk-ü viran ve giryan ilhak etmek manası da hiç yoktur.

Erbab-ı his ve idrak, vasi ‘ müheykel, muazzam, dev-endam bir vazifenin önünde bulunuyor; o vazife “tenvir ve mukavemetden” ibarettir. Bu hakikat mükerreren söylenmiştir. Beşer, zevilhayatın en ziyade musibet-zede olanıdır. Asırlardan beri bu musibetzedelik hemen bila-tenakıs devam ediyor. İnsanların yüz, bin sene evvele nisbetle bugün daha mesud ve masun-u taarruz olduğunu kimse bihakkın isbata muktedir olamıyor. “Birkaç asır evvelki cehl ve zulmet, irfan ve nura meyyal ve ihtiramkar idi. Cahil ve zulmetzedeler, iktisab-ı nur ve marifete hahişker bulunurdu. Zamanımızın gaflet ve zulmeti bir tavr-ı mağrurane ibraz ediyor. Devrimizin “tefelsüfü” tab’ı beşerde mevcut muhabbet-i hemcinsi, ve istisğar-ı hayat, isti’zam-ı namus, himayet-i zu’afa, hıfz-u hakk, redd-i batıl, imtina’ı huzu’ gibi mübeccel hasaili kolayca istihkar ettiren bir tarz-ı garib-i muhamekeyi hemen kaffe-i sunuf arasında neşr etmiştir. Ruh-u beşere ait mehasin ve me’alinin topraklar halinde ayaklar altına düştüğü “bir devr-i temeddünde” bulunmamız bundandır.*

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

.....
(Piyer luru),” bilmem ileri mi varıyorum, dünya gittikçe keder-engiz, solgun, cemudi, ve, bir şarkının dediği gibi, temaşası insanı muazzeb ve dilhun edecek bir

* Madam Dustael –Almanya—Mebhas-ı ahlak.

manzara alıyor. Ben böyle buluyorum arkadaşlar. Siz de böyle bulmuyor musunuz. Evveleri sahnenin üzerinde daha ziyade calib-i dikkat ve mürebbi-i vicdan aktörler bulunurdu. Âmâlde azamet vardı, ihsirasat taha ziyade necibane idi. Şimdi gördüğüm tayflar, bednûma cemaatler, *Curtius*'un salonundaki mütefe'illerin hüküm ve tesirini icra ediyor" diyor. Muhterem ihtiyar ne kadar musib.

Koca İbn-i Sina dahi bu hissiyat-ı mıztarbaneyi ve alem-i tahkikdeki meşhudat-ı elimesini şu kıta ile ne güzel icmal etmiştir:

(Arabic Poem, not transcribed)

İnsan Ebul Ala el Maarri ile

(Arabic Poem, not transcribed)

demekde nasıl muztar olmasın....

*

*

*

Bir tarafda koleraya difteriyaya, kuduza, cedere karşı devalar keşf ediliyor diğer tarafda ise iki dakikada elli kişi öldürecek, beşyüz kişi sakat edecek alat ve mevad-ı harbiye icad ve imal ediliyor. İnsanlara—hak isteyen ta'dadan bizar olan insanlar üzerinde —cinayetler icra ettiriliyor bu kitale bu cinayetlere galebat, fütuhât, muzafferiyat isimleri veriliyor: vaveyl!...

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

Bu azgınlıkların, bu hun-aşamlığın menba'ı, muharriki kenedir: İstibdad!...

Bütün âmâl-i ulviye-i beşer, işte bu kelimenin zir-i malinde titriyor, bütün kulub-u aliye-yi gazab ve teheyyüclerle çuşan ve huruşan eden ancak bu müdhiş kelime... Bu müdhiş kelimenin dehşetli, menfur, müstekreh, dicret-engiz, ejdernüma, duzahî, ifritî, emel-suz, elem-riz ahkam-ı hunini.

*

*

*

Şu tercümeden maksat mahiyet-i istbdadı bitteşhir müstebidler hakkınaki haşyet ve gafleti tenkıs ile inhizam-ı istbdadı ihzar etmek ve vasıta-i vusleti [tenvir ve mukavemet] olan necat-ı umumiye, o kabe-i âmâle doğru ve bir hatve daha atmaktır.

Derd aşınaların vazife ve hizmeti—yazıklar olsun—akval ve mev'ize hududunu geçmiyor vakıan kuşe-i uzlet ve rahatı ihtiyar ile, inhılâl ve mazlumiyet-i umumiye karşı irtikab-ı zill-i sukut edenlere nisbeten va'z ve feryad da bir hıdmet bir himmet addolunabiliyor fakat susuzluktan bitab düşmüş, hal-i niz'a gelmiş bir adama uzakdaki suyu göstermek ne kadar mühim bir fazilet ve himmet olabilir; Azerinin:

(Persian Poem, not transcribed)

hitab-ı bülendi samia-yı canımızda ebedittanin bir sayiha-ı şetm telakki olunsa revadır, ne çare Süleymanların, devlerin görebileceği işleri karıncalar göremiyor,

bununla beraber biz küçükler, Viktor Hugo'nun: "büyüklerin eserleri küçüklerin vazifeleri var" demek olan

« Les grands ont leur oeuvre et les petits ont leur tâche »

Sözleriyle müteselli olmayalım.

Hamiyyet, hürriyet, hakikat yollarında müsaraa edenlerin hudud-u vezaifi, saha-i icthadı, ancak hudud-u hayat geçildikten sonra payan bulur. Hürriyet ve hakikat yolunda cenk eden gazat mütekaidlik kabul etmez.

6 kanun-u sani 1898 cenevre
DOKTOR ABDULLAH CEVDET

APPENDIX 5

Translator's Preface (*İfade-i Mütercim*) in *İngiliz Kavmi*

Transcribed in Modern Turkish

İngilizler, Türkiye'nin bir yar-i tarihi ve tab'isidir: Zavallı Lehistan'a yaptıkları gibi Türkiye'yi dahi mahv ve taksim ile ortadan kaldırmak yoluna devlet devletlerin iki defa vaki olan teşebbüsü İngilizlerin red ve muhalefeti sayesinde akim kalmıştır. Birinci taksim teklifi, Büyük Katerina zamanında, Rusya'dan, ikincisi Türkiye'nin en haris ve müsta'cel hasmı olan Avusturya'dan gelmişti. Bu haysiyet-i elime ile, Türkiye devleti, tarihte, hayatı bakisini, iki defa, İngilizlere medyun olmuştur.

Hakiki ve payidar dostluk, bahusus politika âleminde, menafi'-i mukabele üzerine müessesdir ve bu kaide gittikçe kesb-i huşunet ve şiddet eden ve esas-ı tekâmül olan "kavga-yı hayatın" hem sebebi hem neticesidir. Gayrin himayet ve muavenetiyle payidar olan ferdlerin veya cemiyetlerin mevcudiyetleri meşkûk ve bi-ıtibardır. Servet ve saadet-i vataniye, şevket-i askeriye, mukadderat-ı ilmiye, faikiyet-i ahlakiye üzerlerine müesses olan mevcudiyettir ki hakiki ve emindir; akvam veya düvel-i mütecaverenin harekât ve hissiyatına kible-nümalık eden de ancak bu mevcudiyetdeki hakikiyet ve emniyetin su'ud ve nuzülüdür.

Dostlar, düşmanlara, düşmanlar, dostlara, bu kible-nümanın delaletiyle, münkalib olabilir. Dostlarımızı da düşmanlarımızı da iyi tanımak ve belki dostlarımızı daha ziyade tehalük ve müsara'atle tanımak lazımdır. *İlm-i Ruh-i İctimai*'nin kavaid-i tefahhusatını takib ederek İngiliz Kavmi'ni mütalaa etmek, bizim için, müzaaf bir istifade ve ehemmiyeti kafil ve şamildir.

*

* *

Institu Dö Frans aza-yı fazılasından muallim şehir-i merhum Emil Butmy'nin

Essai

d'une

Psychologie politique du Peuple anglais

au XIXe siècle

yani "On Dokuzuncu Asırda İngiliz Kavminin Bir Psikolociya-yı Politikisini Yazmakda Tecrübe-i Kalem" ünvanlı kitabı, doğrudan doğruya İngiliz kavminin ruhunu tedkike hasr olunmuş bir eser-i bi-adildir. Bu muazzam milletin esrar-ı ulviyet ve azametine vakıf olmak bilhassa, Türkiye vatandaşı için o kadar vacib, o kadar müfid ve bu vücut ve faide o kadar kat'i ve aşikardır, ki bu babda hiçbir kelime ilave etmeye lüzum yoktur. İşte böyle umumi bir vücut ve faidenin önünde, güzide erbab-ı kalemimiz tarafından ibraz-ı gayret ve himmet olunmasına şimdiki kadar beyhude intizar etdik: *İctihad* mecmuasının 1'inci senesinin 11'inci nüshasında Emil Butmy'ye hasr olunan makalemize şu satırla hitam vermiştik: "Manş Denizi'nde, cihana nisbeten, iki küçük ada üzerinden cihanın yarısına hükümferma olan İngilizlerin ahlakları, seciyeleri, çelikleri gibi sert ve metindir: kırılır, fakat eğilmek bilmez. Ezcümle bu faziletleri sayesinde ki efdal ve akva-yı akvam oluyorlar; memleketlerinde, sa'idin, bi-karar olan ancak heva-yı te'ali ve hakimiyettir. Avrupa pay-i tahtlarını ziyaretimizin eser-i ilham-ı hatıratı olan bir manzumemizde

“Londra perdud-u kavga-yı maişet, bîkarar,
Müstakar keşur, heva-yi hâkimiyet bîkarar »

demişdik.

İngiliz ruhunu tahlil ve teşrihe münhasır ve Emil Butmy'nin, şehname-i asarı denilmeye şayan olan bu kitabını (yani *İngiliz Kavmi* kitabını) ba-kemal-i sıdk ve itina tercümeyle himmet eden bulunursa Matbaa-i İctihad hisbeten lil-irfan-ı umumi münasib ücret ile iştirak ve kendi hesabına tab' edecektir. Makalemize bu teşvik ve tahhüd ile hitam veriyoruz (İctihad – Nisan 1906 Mısır).

İngiliz Kavmini kavmimize, Emil Butmy'nin kitab-ı mübecceli vasıtasıyla takdim etmek şeref ve hizmeti bizim aciz kalemimize nasib oluyor.

Jül Sezar tercüme-i mükerreresi Halide Salih Hanım Efendi'ye yazdığımız vecihle, bir tercümenin vücudu, aynı eseri tercüme etmek salahiyetini daha muktedir bir kaleminden nez' edemez. Hizmet-i kalemiye meydanı herkes için açık ve hazırdır. İş, şu hakikati, müessir bir surette, ekseriyet tarafından musaddak ve mer'i görmektir:

“Tarihi bir lisan ile söylemek lazım gelirse, kitab; mefkûre-i beşerin abidesidir. Her nerede kitab artarsa orada mefkûre büyür. Bugün bir kavim; ya okumak yahud helak olmak şıklarından birini kabule mecburdur. Bu keyfiyet; tekâmülün mevki-i azamı olan mübarezenin şeraitinden biridir.”

Fakat Türkiye okuyacak, Türkiye düşünecek, Türkiye yaşayacak! Beş altı ay evvel vatka ki Erzurum'da, Kastamonu'da, Trabzon'da, daha sonra Resne'de Uhri'de, Kırçuk'da kılıçlar kınlarında titredi, kılıçlar kınlarında artık zabt olunamadı, vatka ki Mesih-i müstekreh-i istibdada bir cümle-i esedullahâne ile savlet etmeye amade olduğunu göstermiş oldu. Müsellâh sınıfın gösterdiği bu istibdad; gayr-i müsellâh, hayud fikir ve itkan ile daha ziyade mehib ve müsellâh olan “gayr-i asker” vatandaşların yakaza-i kıyametnemoduyla takdis ve teyid olunacaktır...

Evet, tekrar ediyoruz: Türkiye okuyacak, Türkiye düşünecek, Türkiye çalışacak, Türkiye çarpışacak, Türkiye yaşayacak. Ey istikbal! Şahid-i müeyyed ol!

23 Kanun-u Sani 1909 Mısır

Doktor Abdullah Cevdet

APPENDIX 6

A General Bibliography of Translated Literary and Nonliterary Works Published

within the First Three Years of the Second Constitution (1908-1910)*

A. Enver

1325 (1909) *Mağaza Sârikleri* (Baskervillerin Köpeği) tr. from Arthur Conan Doyle (The Hound of the Baskervilles?), From Şarlok Holmes Series, Tercüman-Hakikat'in Küçük Roman Kütüphanesi, İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası. (ÖZEGE: 11895) [English Fiction]

A. K. R.

1326 (1910) *Hasbe'l-kader* (By Chance) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Müşterekü'l-Menfaa Osmanlı Şirketi Matbaası, 10 pages. (ÖZEGE: 6975) [Fiction?]

A. L.

1909 *Bahr-i Muhit-i Kebir'de Seyahat* (Travel in the Enormously Ambient Sea) tr. from ??, Publisher: Kazan Maarif Kütüphanesi, Kazan N. M. Çijuvî Hurufat ve Taş Matbaası, 32 pages. (ÖZEGE: 24085) [Fiction?]

A. R

1325 (1909) *Gılandiye Cinayeti* (Gılandiye Murder) tr. from Gaston Leroux, İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası, 156 pages. (ÖZEGE: 6205) [French Fiction]

A. Vicdanî

1325 (1909) *Casus Memleketi* [The Country of Spies] tr. From ??, Manastır: Başkım-i Kombit Matbaası, 31 pages. (ÖZEGE: 2814)

A. Zeki

1326 (1910) *Faüsta* tr. from Michel Zévacco, İstanbul: Manzume-i Efkar Matbaası, First vol., 608 pages. (ÖZEGE: 5422) [French Fiction]

* All of the entries I had found from different sources and put in this bibliography were checked with a recent and comprehensive database prepared by the Turkish Ministry of Culture: *The bibliography of Turkish works printed in Non-Latin (Arabic, Armenian and Greek Characters) 1584-1986*. (2001) Ankara: Milli Kütüphane. Those entries that I encountered only in this database will be referred to with the following abbreviated letters TMC (for Turkish Ministry of Culture).

Some abbreviations that will be used in this bibliography are as follows:

İSAM (İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi / Center for Islamic Research)

KERMAN (Kerman, Zeynep [1978]. *1862-1910 yılları arasında Victor Hugo'dan Türkçeye yapılan tercümelere üzerinde bir araştırma*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.

ÖZEGE (M. Seyfettin Özege, *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu I-V*, İstanbul, 1971-1979.)

SEVÜK (Sevük, İsmail Habip [1940]. *Avrupa edebiyatı ve biz: Garpten tercümelere*. 2 vols. in one, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.)

ENGİNÜN (Enginün, inci [2006]. *Yeni Türk edebiyatı Tanzimat'tan cumhuriyet'e (1839-1923)*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.)

Abdullah Zühdi

1324 (1908)b *Va'de* (Grace) tr. from Paul Bourget, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ahmed İhsan, 106 pages. (ÖZEGE: 22452) [French Fiction]

1326 (1910) *Parmak İzi* (Fingerprint) tr. from ?? Istanbul: İkdam Matbaası, 810 pages. (ÖZEGE 16183) [Fiction?]

Abdullah Zühdi

1324 (1908)a *Muharririn Zevcesi* (The Writer's Wife) tr. from ??, Küçük Hikayeler Kütüphanesi 1, Istanbul: Karabet Matbaası, 64 pages, (ÖZEGE: 14129) [Fiction?]

Abdürrahim

1324 (1908) *Donanmada Bir Geminin İdaresi* [A Guide for Operation and Maintenance of Ships in Navy] tr. from ??, İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası, Meziyet Kütüphanesi 1, 16 pages. (ÖZEGE: 4352) [Military]

1325 (1909) *Donanmada Nöbetçi Zabiti* (Duty Officer in Navy) tr. from Wander Decan, Meziyet Kütüphanesi: 2, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Bahriye, 83 pages. (ÖZEGE: 4353) [Military]

Abidin Paşa

1324 (1908) *Tercüme ve Şerh-i Kaside-i Bürde* (The Translation and Annotation of the Encomium of Bürde) tr. from Şerefü'din Ebu Abdullah Muhammed b. Sa'id Bûsîrî (695/1296) Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 168 pages. (ÖZEGE: 20570) [Arabic Literature]

1324 (1908) *Tercüme ve Şerh-i Mesnevî-i Şerif* (The Translation and Annotation of Holy Mesnevi) tr. from Muhammed b. Muhammed b. Hüseyin Mevlana Celaleddin-i Rumi (672/1273), Istanbul: Kütübhan-e-İrfan, 2 vols, (TDV İSAM) [Turkish Literature]

Âdil

1325 (1909) *Kızıl Sultan yahud Heykel-i İstibdad* (The Red Sultan or the Statue of Autocracy) tr. from Georges Doris, Kastamonu: Kastamonu Matbaası, 127 pages. (ÖZEGE: 10800) [Abdülhamit the Second Era, 1876-1909]

Adil Nami

1326 (1910) *Gümüş Kutu Hikayeleri. İlk Hlikaye: Sezarın Yahud İspiritizme ile Âtisi Keşf Edilen Bir Kadının Sergüştü* (Silver Box Stories: First Hlikaye Sezarın or the Woman whose Future Was Discovered with Spiritualism) tr. from Alexandre Dumas, Istanbul: Arşak Garoyan Matbaası 144 pages. (ÖZEGE 6455; TDV İSAM) [French Fiction]

Ahmed Ali

1325 (1909) *Piyade ve Süvari Sınıfına Mahsûs Dizi ve Manganın Avcılık Talim ve Terbiyesi* (Rank for Infantry and Cavalry and Education and Training of Hunting for Squads) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 176 pages. (ÖZEGE: 25394) [Military]

Ahmed Muhtar

1324 (1908) *Amelî İktisad Dersleri (Practical Economics Lessons)* tr. from Maurice Block, Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 136 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 616) [Economics]

Ahmed Raşid

1324 (1908) *Pednâme-i Lokman Hekim Tercüme-i Manzumesi, [Lokman Hekim'in Öğüt Kitabı'nın Manzum Tercümesi / A Translation-in-Verse of Lokman Hekim's (physician) Advice]* tr. from?? Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 30 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 16216) [Medical]

Ahmed Sahib

1908 (or 1912) *Rahibe (Nun)* tr. from Denis Diderot (*La Religieuse*), Istanbul: Kader Matbaası, 47 pages. (SEVÜK: 16466) [French Fiction]

Ahmed Salahaddin, Mehmed Cemil BİLSEL

1325 (1909) *Hukuk-u Umumiyye-i Düvel* [Universal Jurisprudence of States] tr. from Henry Joseph Francois Xavier Bonfils and Paul Fauchille, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Jirayır ve Keteon, 174+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 7916) [Law]

Ahmed Tevfik

1326 (1910) *Küçük İlm-i Heyet (Booklet of Cosmology)* tr. from Camille Flammarion, Kütüphane-i Ziraat ve Fünun 2, Istanbul: İkdam Matbaası, 162+6 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 11423) [Astronomy]

Ahmed Tevfik (AKBAŞ) - Osman Şevki

1324 (1908) *Riyaziye Eğlenceleri* tr. from ??, İstanbul: Matbaahane-i Kütübhanesi-i Cihan, 4+176 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 17023) [?]

Ahund Mir Mehmed Kerim El-hac Mir Caferzâde El-Alevi ül-Musevi ül-Bakuvi

1326 (1910) *On Yedi Ramazan (Seventeen Ramadans)* tr. from Corci Zeydan, Baku: Matbaa-i Biraderan-ı Orucof, 374 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 25357; TDV İSAM) [Islamic History-The Chaliph Ali's Biography]

Akif Tevfik

1910 *Teskerecilik – Vakt-i Harbde Mecruh Nakli* [Stretcher Bearing – The Transportation of the Injured at War-Time] tr. from Dr. Villard, Gülhane Seririyatı Külliyyat-ı Mesaisi 10, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriye ve Şürekası, 18 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 20820) [Military]

Alâeddin Cemil

1325 (1909) *Gençlerin Düşündüğü* [About What Youngsters Think] tr. from Maurice de Feraudy-Jacques Rouché, Istanbul: Şuray-ı Ümmet Matbaası, 21 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 6188) [Sociology?]

Ali Fuad

1326 (1910) *İstanbul'un Kara ve Denizden Hücum ve Müdafası Hakkında Birkaç Söz* [A Few Remarks on Maritime and Territorial Attacks to Istanbul and Its Defence] tr. from Mahmud Muhtar Paşa, Istanbul: Artin Asaduryan Şirket-i Mirettibiye Matbaası, 63 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 8327) [Military]

- Ali Nazima
1327 (1909) *İdman* (Training) tr. from Pelissier, Istanbul: Artin Asaduryan Basımevi, (illustrated) 77 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Education]
- Ali Neşet
1324 (1908) *Kaplanlar Memleketinde* (In the Land of Tigers) tr. from Louis-Henri Bousсенard, 284 pages. Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE: 10136) [Fiction?]
- Ali Nusret
1326 (1910) *Bir Sergüzeşt-i Hunîn* (A Bloody Adventure) tr. from Catulle Mendès (1841-1909), Muhtar Halid Kütüphanesi Külliyyatı Mütercem Romanlar kısmı 2, Istanbul Tanin Matbaası, 152 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 2399) [French Fiction]
- Ali Reşad
1324 (1908)b *Altın Volkanı* (The Volcano of Gold) tr. from Jules Verne, Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 430 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 566) [Fiction]
- 1324 (1908)b *Tarih-i Siyasî. 1814-1896'ya Kadar. Asr-ı Hazırda Avrupa* tr. from Charles Seignobos, third vol., Istanbul: Ahmed Saki Bey Matbaası. (TMC) [History]
- 1325 (1909)a *Maryan* tr. from Thomas Mayne Reid, Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 212 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 12272) [Fiction]
- 1325 (1909)b *Vilyam* tr. From (Mayn Red) Meine Reid, Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 189 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 22753) [Fiction]
- 1325 (1909)c *Kenyon* tr. from Wallace Cook, Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 190 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 10560) [Fiction]
- 1325 (1909)d *Tarih-i Siyasî* tr. from Charles Seignobos, Istanbul: Kader Matbaası, second vol., 469 pages; third vol.: 1326 (1910) (Istanbul: Ahmed Saki Bey Matbaası, 264 pages), (ÖZEĞE: 19899) [History]
- Ali Reşad-Ali Kemal
1324 (1908)a *Tarih-i Siyasi 1814'den 1896'ya Kadar Asr-ı Hazırda Avrupa* (Political History, Contemporary Europe from 1814 to 1896) tr. from Charles Seignobos, 1st volume Istanbul: İkdam Matbaası (421 pages); 2nd Volume Istanbul: Kader Matbaası [(1325 (1909), 469 pages); 3rd Volume Istanbul: Mehmed Saki Bey Matbaası [1326 (1910), 264 pages]. (İstanbul Millet Kütüphanesi Ali Emiri Kısmı) [European History]
- Ali Rıfat (Dr.), Selanikli
1326 (1910) *Emraz-ı Dahiliye* (Internal Diseases) tr. from Federic Justin Collet, 1st Volume Istanbul: Necm-i İstikbal Matbaası; 2nd and 4th Volumes (1325/1909); First, 3rd, 5th and 6th Volumes (1326/1910); 7th Volume (1327/1911); Second and fourth volumes (1325/1909). (ÖZEĞE: 4848)

Ali Rıza

1324 (1908) *İngilizce'nin Şive-i Ef'ali* (Pronunciation Rules of English) tr. from Aleko, İstanbul: Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası, 405+1pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9177) [Language]

Ali Suavi

1324 (1908) *Hukuk uş-Şevari'* (Büyük Yolların Kanunları / The Laws of Mainroads) tr. from Ebu Hamid b. Muhammed el-Gazali, İstanbul: Uhuvvet Matbaası, Sırat-ı Müstakim Kütüphanesi: 3, 16 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 7925) [Mysticism]

Ali Vasfi

1325 (1909) *Efrad-ı Cedide Talim ve Terbiyesine Mahsus Hafta Cetveli* (A Weekly Schedule for Education and Training of Beginner Soldiers) tr. from Von Biyrn, İstanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 48 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 4663) [Military]

ALTINAY, Ahmet Refik

1325 (1909)a *Manga Başı* [The Head Squad] tr. from F. Culmann, İstanbul: Artin Asaduryan Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası, 64 pages. [Military]

1325 (1909)b *Fatih Sultan Mehmed ve Ressam Bellini* (Mehmed the Second – the Conquerer - and the Painter Bellini) tr. from Thuasne, (Illustrated), İstanbul: Ahmed İhsan ve Şürekası Matbaacılık Osmanlı Şirketi, 63 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5411) [Ottoman History]

Asmaî (Pen Name: Yusuf Samih)

1326 (1910) *Tahrir 'ül-Mer'e Yahud Hürriyet-i Nisvan* [Kadının Özgürleştirilmesi / Liberalisation of Women], tr. From ?? Cairo: Osmanlı Matbaası, 15+244 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 19262) [Women-Freedom]

ATATÜRK, Mustafa Kemal

1324 (1908) *Takımın Muharebe Talimi* (Fighting Training of the Team) tr. from Litsmann, Selanik: Asır Matbaası, 64 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 19311) [Military]

B. E.

1326 (1910) *Terbiye-i İnsaniye* (Human Education) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Tanin Matbaası, 14 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 20533) [Education]

Baha Tevfik

1325 (1909) *Bas-i Badelmevt* (Resurrection Afterdeath) tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, Saday-i Millet Kütüphanesi 1, İstanbul: Sada-yı Millet Matbaası, 167 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 1691) [Russian Fiction]

BEGOVIÇ, Adem Sırrı

1326 (1910) *Gölge Fısıltısı* (Shadow Whisper) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Kader Matbaası, 14 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 6279) [Fiction?]

Bursalı Mehmed Tahir [BASMAN] (1344/1925)

1324 (1908) *Delilü't-Tefasir* (The Testimony of the Quranic Exegeses), İstanbul: Hilal Matbaası, 63+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 3731) [Quranic Exegesis]

C. N.

1910 *Doğru Hilekâr* (The Honest Cheater) tr. from ?? Publishers: Biraderan-ı Kerimoflar, Kazan: Matbaa-i Kerimiye, 19 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 24394) [Fiction]

Cemâl Fazıl

1325 (1909) *Oğullarıma Terbiye-i Ahlakiye, Siyasiye ve İctimaiye* [An An Ethical, Political and Social Education Book for My Sons] tr. from Paul Doumer, Istanbul: Ahmed Saki Bey Matbaası, Kitabhane-i İslam ve Askeri, 351+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 15642) [Children Education]

K. Hakopyan

1326 (1910) *Hayvanât ile Hüsn-i Muamele Hakkında On İki Ders* [Twelve Lessons on the Friendly Treatments of Animals], tr. From??, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Agop Matyosyan, 63 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 7161) [Animals]

DURAN, Faik Sabri

1324 (1908)b *Müntahab Parçalar Müsavver* tr. from ??, Istanbul: Cihan Matbaası, First Part, 128 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 14851) [?]

1324 (1908)b *Müntahab Parçalar Müsavver* tr. from ??, Istanbul: Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete Matbaası, Second Part, 135+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 14851) [?]

1324 (1908)c *Sinn-i Sevda* (The Age of Love] tr. from Pierre Wolff, Istanbul: ?, 90 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 18094) [French Theatre]

1325 (1909)a *Onbeş Yaşında Bir Kaptan* (A Fifteen-Year-Old Captain] tr. from Jules Verne, Istanbul: Asır Matbaası, 300 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 15672) [French Fiction]

1325 (1909)b *Musavver Dilenci* tr. from Arthur Conan Doyle, Istanbul: Asır Matbaası, 54 pages. (TMC)

1326 (1910) *On Sekizinci Asır Ve Kanlı İhtilal Vekayii* (The Eighteenth Century and the Occurences of the Bloody Revolution) tr. from Isaac, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Kader, Kütübhane-i Nusret Aded: 2, 223+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 15701) [European History]

Enver

1326 (1910) *Hilyet ül-Ebdal (Tercümesi)* [Ermişlerin Güzel Sıfatları / Great Attributes of Saints] tr. from Muhiddin Ebu Abdullah Muhammed ibn Ali el-Arabî, Istanbul: ??, 14 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 7633) [Islamic Mysticism]

ERSOY, Mehmed Akif

1325 (1909) *Müslüman Kadını* [Muslim Women] tr. from Muhammed Ferid Vecdi, Sırat-ı Müstakim Kütüphanesi 5, Istanbul: Ahmed Saki Bey Matbaası, 165 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 14970) [Customs and Traditions]

ERTEGÜN, Mehmed Münir

1325 (1909)a *Akd-i Cemiyete Mütteallik 1 Temmuz Tarihli Fransa Kanunu* (French Law Concerning Social Contract Bearing the Date of June 1), Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, Meclis-i Ayan-ı Osmanî Kütüphanesi, 26 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 336) [Law]

- 1325 (1909)b *Belçika Kanun-ı Esasisi* (Belgium Constitutional Law), Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire Matbaası, Meclis-i Âyan-ı Osmanî Kütübhanesi 20, 19 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 1810) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)c *Flemenk Kanun-ı Esasisi* (Dutch Constitutional Law), Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire Matbaası, 56 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5450) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)d *Fransa Kavanin-i Esasiyesi*, (French Constitutional Law) Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, Meclis-i Âyan-ı Osmanî Kütübhanesi 17, 13 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5875) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)e *Fransa'da Serbesti-i İctima ve İştirak* (Freedom of Social Organisation and Cooperation in France) tr. from Berthélemy, Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 17 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5889) [Law]
- 1326 (1910)f *Fransa'nın Matbuat Kanunları* (Newsprinting Laws in France), Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, Meclis-i Âyan-ı Osmanî Kütübhanesi 13, 32 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5890) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)g *Fransa'nın Tatil-i Eşgale Dair Ahkâm-ı Kanuniyesiyle Amele ve İş Sahiplerinin Birleşmelerine Müteallik 25 Mayıs 1864 Kanunu* (25 May 1864 French Law Concerning Strike Act and the Unification of the Employers and Employees) Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, Meclis-i Âyan-ı Osmanî Kütübhanesi 15, 13 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5891) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)h *Hükümet-i Müttehide-i Amerika Kanun-ı Esasisi* (The Constitution of the United States of America), Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 35 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 8061) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)j *İspanya Kanun-i Esasisi* (Spanish Constitutional Law), Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 24 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9411) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)k *İtalya Kanun-i Esasisi* (Spanish Constitutional Law), Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 16 pages. (ÖZEĞE 9561) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)l *Avusturya Heyet-i Ayanının Vezaif-i Muamelatına Dair 25 Kanun-i Sani Sene 1875 Tarihinde Takarrür Eden Nizamnamenin Tercümesidir*, Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 26 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 1334) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)m *İngiltere Hukuk ve Müessesat-ı Esasiye ve Medeniye ve Adliyesi Tarihinden: 1-Kraliçe ve Hükümet-i Merkeziye*, Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 101 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9180) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)n *İngiltere Hukuk ve Müessesat-ı Esasiye ve Medeniye ve Adliyesi Tarihinden: 2-Parlamento*, Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 101 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9180) [Law]
- 1325 (1909)o *İngiltere Hukuk ve Müessesat-ı Esasiye ve Medeniye ve Adliyesi Tarihinden: 3-Lordlar Kamarası*, Istanbul: Amire Matbaası, 101 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9180) [Law]

1325 (1909)p *İngiltere Hukuk ve Müessesat-ı Esasiye ve Medeniye ve Adliyesi Tarihinden: 4-Avam Kamarası*, İstanbul: Amire Matbaası, 101 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9180) [Law]

1325 (1909)q *İngiltere Sınai İttihad Cemiyetleri ve Tatil-i Eşgal Hakkında Ahkam-ı Kanuniye*, İstanbul: Amire Matbaası, 26 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9191) [Law]

1325 (1909)r *Nazmü'l-leâli*, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 24 pages. (TMC) [Law]

1326 (1910)a *Bütçe* (Budget) tr. from Alphonse Bertrand, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 8 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 24209) [Law]

1326 (1910)b *Fransa'da Hürriyet-i Matbuat ve Matbuat Nizamnameleri* (Freedom of Newsprinting and Newsprinting Regulations in France) tr. from Léon Deguit, İstanbul: Amire Matbaası, 15 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 5887) [Law]

Fazlı Necip

1325 (1909) *Roman Hazinesi / Arsen Lüpen* (Novel Treasure / Arsen Lüpen) tr. from Maurice Le blanc, İstanbul: Yeni Asır Matbaası, First vol., Second volume in 1326 (1910), Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth 6 volumes in 1325 (1909). (ÖZEĞE: 17047) [French Fiction]

Fazlullah Rahimî

1326 (1910) *Gülzar-ı Hakikat* (The Rose Garden of Sooths) tr. from Mevlana Celaleddin-i Rumî, İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Askeriye Matbaası, 1st Volume 12+254+5 pages; 2nd Volume 12+283+2 pages; 3rd Volume 13+346+4 pages (1327 / 1911). (ÖZEĞE: 6435) [Islamic Mysticism]

Fuad – Saim

1325 (1909) *Madam Pantolon* (Madam Trouser) tr. from Charles Paul de Kock, İstanbul: Uhuvvet Matbaası, 208 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 11875) [French Fiction]

Fuad Talak (tr)

(1326) 1910 *Londra Cinayetleri* (London Murders) tr. from H. Ranbold, 2 vols. İstanbul: Hilal Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE: 11738) [Fiction?]

Gafur Reşad Mirzazâde

1909 *Karyede Üç Suâl* (Three Questions in the Village) tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, Baku: Kaspi Matbaası 28 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 10280) [Russian Literature]

H. Hüsni

1325 (1909)a *İsviçreli Aile Robenson* (Swiss Family Robenson) tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, İstanbul: İkdâm Matbaası, 67 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9515) [Russian Literature]

1325 (1909)b *Kafkasya'da Bir Esir* (A Captive in Caucasus) tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, İstanbul: İkdâm Matbaası, 55 + 16 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 9907) [Russian Literature]

H. Hüsni

1325 (1909) *Mazlum İvan* (Oppressed Ivan) tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, İstanbul: İkdam Matbaası, 16 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 12351)[Russian Literature]

Halil

1324 (1908) *Tasvir ve Taklidde Evza-ı Bedra Yahut Tiyatro Fenni* (Perfect Acting in Depiction and Imitation or Theatrical Skills) tr. from Aristippe Bernier, İstanbul: İkbâl-ı Millet Matbaası, 48 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Theatre]

Halil Edib

1325 (1910) *Etfal* (Children) tr. from Victor Hugo, *Sıratü'l-Müstakim*, n.78, 3 March. (KERMAN) [French Fiction]

1325 (1910) *Tasadduk* (Giving Alms) tr. from Victor Hugo, *Sıratü'l-Müstakim*, n. 80, 17 March. (KERMAN) [French Fiction]

Hasan Fehmi Zaim Zade

1324 (1908) *Devlet-i Aliyyenin Zaif ve Kuvveti* (The Weakness and Power of the Ottoman State) tr. from Von der Goltz, Cairo: Matbaat ül-Fütûh, 61 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Ottoman State]

Hasanzâde Ali Aka

1325 (1909) *Tanrıya mı Yoksa Karuna mı Hizmet Etmelidir* (Should One Serve to the God or to Karun?) tr. from L. Tolstoy, Baku: Füyuzat Matbaası, 23 pages. (ÖZEĞE: 19714)

Haydar Rifat

1908 *Sosyalizm* (Socialism) tr. from George Turner, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriyye, 124 pages, [TDV İSAM] [Political Science]

Hayri

1325 (1909) *Avcının, Dizinin, Manganın ve Takımın Muharebe Terbiyesi* (Hunter, Squad, Batch and Team's Fighting Training) tr. from Beusen, İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 2+110+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) (Military)

Heyet-i Âyan Tercüme Kalemi

1324 (1908) *Fransa Hükümetinin Teşkilatına Dair Heyet-i Âyan Katibi Mösyö Alfons Bertran (Alphonse Bertrand) Tarafından kaleme alınıp 1882 Tarihinde Neşr Olunan Kitabın Heyet-i Âyan ve Mebusana Müteallik Kısımının Tercümesidir* (The Translation written by the Secretary of the Notables' Committee of the Organisation of French Government [Alphonse Bertrand] and Published in 1882 Concerning the Notables' Committee and the Committee of the Deputies) tr. from Alphonse Bertrand, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 32 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Law]

Hüseyin Hüsni

1325 (1908) *Küçük İlm-i Heyet* (A Booklet of Cosmology) tr. from Camille Flammarion, Kastamoni: Kastamoni Matbaası, (illustrated), 4+264 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Astronomy]

Hüseyin (Nrş)
1908 *Musavver Bulgaristan* (An Illustrated Book on Bulgaria) tr. from Ragıb Rıfki, Istanbul: Artin Asaduryan Basımevi, 184 pages, (TDV İSAM) [European History]

Hüseyin Nuri
1325 (1909) *Karadeniz ve Boğazlar Meselesi* (Black Sea and Straits Questions) tr. from Renée Pithon, Millet Kütüphanesi 1, Istanbul: Artin Asaduryan Matbaası, 48 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV; TDV İSAM) [Ottoman History]

İbnurrefik Ahmed Nuri (Sekizinci)
1325 (1909) *Hoşkadem Gebe* [The Auspicious Pregnant] tr. from Henri Boujaue, Istanbul: Karagöz Matbaası, 40 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Fiction?]

İbrahim Latif Cevdet Paşazade
1325/1327 (1909) *Rusya Devlet-i Aliye-i Osmaniyeye Karşı Olan Vaziyet-i Siyasiye ile Bağdat Şimendüferi ve Almanya Devleti'nin Hafayay-ı Siyaset-i Şarkiyesi* (Political Stance of Russian State towards the Ottoman State, Baghdad Railway and Concealed Orient Policies of Germany) tr. from Paul Rohrbach, Istanbul: Metin Matbaası, 84 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Ottoman State]

İbrahim Süleyman
1325 (1909) *Sefain Makinelerinin Üsul-ı İdaresi* [Operation and Maintenance Guide of Ships' Machinery] tr. From John Lyvrsic, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ahmed İhsan, 1st Volume, 461+25 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Technical]

İdris Bağdanef
1909 *Adamlar Ni Uçun Türlü İsertgeçler İstimâl Kılalar?* (Why do People Use İsertgeçs) Tr. from Leon Tolstoy, Tritsk: Energrye Matbaası, 26 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Russian Literature]

İsmail Faik
1328 (1910) *Miftah ve Tatbikatlı Yeni Usül Mükemmel Hesap* [New Methods of Perfect Computation with Introduction and Application] tr. from William James, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Cihan, 1. Kısım, 2. Basım. (ÖZEĞE) [Mathematics]

İsmail Hakkı Ankaravi
1910 *Zübdetü'l-Fuhus fi Nakşi'l-Fusus* (The Essence of the Words in the Embroidery of Wisdom) tr. from Ebu Abdullah Muhyiddin Muhammed b. Ali İbnü'l-Arabi (638/1240), Istanbul: Metin Matbaası, 127 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Islamic Mysticism]

İsmail Hemeti
1325 *Usûl-i Tadrîs-i Arabî* (Arabic Teaching Methods) tr. from Ahn, Istanbul: Mahmut Bey Matbaası, 188+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Language Education]

Kadriye Hüseyin
1324 (1909) *Mühim Bir Gece* (An Important Night) tr. from Leopold Kampf, 142 pages. Cairo: Osmanlı Matbaası.

KARLIDAĞ, Abdullah Cevdet

1908a *Musiki ile Tedavi* [The Treatment of the Sick with Music] tr. from M. Doubresse, Kütübhaneye-i İctihad: 18, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad, 63 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Psychology-Music]

1908b *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (Islamic History) tr. from Reinhart Piener Anne Dozy (1300/1883), (Original Name: Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme), Kütübhaneye-i İctihad: 15-16, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1st Volume 334 pages.; 2nd Volume 336+733 pages. (ÖZEĞE I; TDV İSAM) [Islam-Islamic History]

1908c *İstibdat* (Autocracy) tr. from Vittorio Amedeo Alfieri, 2nd ed., City?: Matbaa-i İctihad, Kütübhaneye-i İctihad 19, 271 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Political Sciences]

1908c *Hamlet* tr. from William Shakespeare (Hamlet), 154 pgs, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad. (ÖZEĞE II: 496) [English Theatre Play]

1908d *Jül Sezar* tr. from William Shakespeare date is 1909 on the front cover, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad. (ENGİNÜN) [English Theatre Play]

1909 *Makbes* tr. from William Shakespeare (Macbeth), Kütübhaneye-i İctihad 23. Kitab, 154 pgs, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad. [English Theatre Play]

1909b *İngiliz Kavmi* (English Society) tr. from Emile Boutmy ((1835–1906), Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad, 100 pgs. (TMC) [English Society]

1326 (1910) “*Romeo – Juliet*” tr. from William Shakespeare, Şehbal, n. 7-24, 1 June 1325 – 1 August 1326. (ENGİNÜN) [English Theatre Play]

KASTELLİ, Raif Necdet

1326 (1910) *Bir İzdivacın Romanı* (The Novel of a Marriage) tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, İstanbul: Yeni Şafak Kütüphanesi. (ÖZEĞE III: 831) [Russian Fiction]

KASTELLİ, Raif Necdet and Sadık Naci

1328/1910 *Anna karenina* tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, İstanbul: Kitabhaneye-i Askeri, 683 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Russian Literature]

KÖPRÜLÜ, Mehmed Fuad

1325 (1910) *Sadaka* (Alm) tr. From Victor Hugo, Musavver Sebab, n. 2, 14 Kanun-ı Sani. (KERMAN) [French Fiction]

1326 (1910)a *Paris Kadını* tr. [Parisian Women] from Henry Becque, İstanbul: Ahmed İhsan ve Şürekası Matbaası, 28 pages. Servet-i Fünun Tiyatro Kütüphanesi Aded: 2, Servet-i Fünun'un 1022 Numaralı Sayısına İlave. (ÖZEĞE) [French Theatre Play]

1326b *Ruh-i Siyaset ve Müdafaa-i İctimaiyye* (The Spirit of Politics and Social Defence) tr. from Gustave le Bon (1841-1931), İstanbul: Ahmet İhsan ve Şürekası, 74 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Political Science]

KÖPRÜLÜ, Mehmet Fuad and Sadrettin Celal ANTEL
1909 *Ruhü'l-Cemaat* (The Spirit of Communities) tr. from Gustave Le Bon (1841-1931), Istanbul: Uhuvvet Matbaası, 285. (TDV İSAM) [Social Sciences]

M. Ali Vaizzade
1326/1328 (1910) *Musavver Engizisyon Esrarı* [An Illustrated Book on the Mystery of Inquisition] tr. from Du Freal, Istanbul: Bekir Efendi-Karagöz Matbaası, 372 pages. (ÖZEĞE I; TDV İSAM) [French Literature]

M. Asaf Esad
1325 (1910) *Han Disland* tr. From Victor Hugo, Adana: İtidâl Matbaası, 1st Volume, 136 pages. (ÖZEĞE II: 497) [French Fiction]

M. F.
1326 (1910) *Kahraman Kız* (The Heroine) tr. from Michel Zévacco, Istanbul: Mürettibin-i Osmaniye Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE III: 1110) [French Fiction]

M. Sunbulî
1326 (1910) *Kuyruklu Yıldız Yahut Âlem-i Şemsde Seyahat* (The Comet or Travel in the Solar System) tr. from Jules Verne, (Illustrated), Istanbul Asya Matbaası, 286 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [French Fiction]

Mahmud Celaleddin
1909 *Ahlak Vazife-i Şahsiye ve İctimaiye Fennidir* (Morality is a Personal Duty and a Social Skill) tr. from Jules Payot, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriyye, 189 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Ethics]

Mahmud Sadık
1325 (1909) *Madmazel İris'in Kısmeti* (The Prospect of Ms. İris) tr. from Vilki Kolens, Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 419 pages. [Fiction?]

1326 (1910) *Milyoner Çocuk* (Millionaire Child) tr. From Katarina Grin, Istanbul: Mihran Matbaası, 267 pgs. [Fiction?]

M. Servet
1325/1327 (1909) *Piyade Kıttaat-ı Sagiresinin Gece Harekatı* (Night Operation of of Small Infantry Corps] tr. from??, Istanbul: Edeb Matbaası, 69 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Military]

M. Şükri
1324 (1908) *Hutbe-I Haydar Nuhbe-i Rehber* (Güzide Rehber Haydar'ın [Hz. Ali'nin] Hutbesi / The Eminent Guide Haydar's Sermon) tr. From Ali İbn-i Ebi Talip, Cairo: Matbaa-i Mısriyye, 23 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Islam]

Mahmud Esad Seydişehirî
1326 (1910) *Hukuk-ı Düvel* [The Laws of States] tr. from Henry Bonfils-Paul Fauchille, medhal kısmı Istanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye 192 pages., Kısm-ı Salis Istanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye 336 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [State Laws]

Mahmud Nedim

1326 (1910) *Muhabbet-i Vataniye* [Patriotism] tr. from Sallier, Istanbul: Asya Matbaası, 144 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Sociology?]

Mazhar Osman (Usman)

1326 (1910) *Sıcak Çarpması ve Donma* (Heat-stroke and Freezing) tr. from ??, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriye ve Şürekası, 25 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Medical]

Mehmed Ali

1326 (1910) *Üç Etekli Kız* (The Girl with Three Skirts) tr. from Paul de Kock, Istanbul: Şems Matbaası, 262 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1309) [French Fiction]

1324 (1908) *Zevcem Şık Değil* (My Wife Is Not Dressy) tr. from William Busnach – Henry Derbay, (Illustrated), Istanbul: Matbaa-i Kütüphane-i Cihan, 125 pages. [Fiction?]

Mehmed Ali Nesafet

1326 (1910) *Nazarî Ve Amelî Sefain Pusulalarının Tashih ve Tanzimi* [A Theoretical and Practical Guide for Correcting and Regulating the Ships' Compasses] tr. from Prof. Valleri, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Bahriye, 184+7+4 pages. [Technical]

Mehmed Arif

1326 (1910) *İpek Böceği Besleme Usulü* (Methods for Feeding Silkworms) tr. from Alphonse Blanchon, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ahmed İhsan, 132+4 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Agriculture]

Mehmed Arif (1315/1897)

1325 (1909) *Bin Bir Hadis* (One Thousand and One *Hadiths*), Cairo: Ceride Matbaası, 5+468 pgs. (TDV İSAM) [Hadith]

Mehmed Cemil

1909 *Eşcar-ı Kaime ve Maktua'nın Te'kibi* (The Maintenance of Erect and Cut Trees) tr. from Rvıv, Istanbul: Cihan Matbaası, 159 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Agriculture]

1326 (1910) *Güzel Madam Donis* (Dionis) [Beautiful Dionis] tr. from Hector Malot, Istanbul: Müşterik ül-Menfaa Osmanlı Matbaası, 192 pages. (ÖZEĞE II: 473) [French Fiction]

Mehmed Eşref

1324 (1908) *Süâl Cevaplı Maksud Tercümesi* (Maksud Translation with Questions and Answers) tr. from Maksud??, Istanbul: Şirket-i Mürettibiye Matbaası, 104+2 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Arabic Language]

Mehmed Faik

1325 *İngiltere'de Meşrutiyetin Terakkisi* (The Development of Constitutional Monarchy in England) tr. from Emile Boutmy (Original: Le development de la

constitution en Angleterre), Istanbul: Uhuvvet Matbaası, 222 pgs. (TDV İSAM) [The History of England]]

Mehmed Fatih el-Kerimi

1909 *Gerikler* (Grekler) [The Greeks] tr. from F. F. Potsikoviç, Orenburg: Vakit Matbaası, Neşriyat-ı Kerimî, Cüz: 21. (ÖZEĞE II)

1909 *Mısırlılar* [Egyptians] tr. from F. F. Potsikoviç, Orenburg: Vakit Matbaası, Neşriyat-ı Kerimî, Cüz: 22. (ÖZEĞE) [History]

Mehmed Galib

1909 *Evlâd-ı Vatana* (To the Children of the Motherland) tr. from Paul Doumer, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ebuzziya, 141 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [?]

Mehmed Halid

1325/1927 (1909) *Borjiya* tr. from Michel Zévacco, Istanbul: Hilal Matbaası, 479 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1109) [French Fiction]

Mehmed Hayri

1326 (1910) *Piyadenin Gece Talimleri* [Night Drills of Infantrymen] tr. from Von Kraft, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 7+146 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV). [Military]

Mehmed Hilmi

1325 (1909) *Tercüman-ı Hakikat'in Garaib Cüzdanı Kütübhanesi* (Tercüman-ı Hakikat's Curious Pocket Library), 1 (128 pages.), 3. (128 pages.), 5. (127 s), 7. (63 pages.) numaralar, Istanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE III: 992) [Fiction?]

Mehmed İbrahim

1326 (1910) *Şerh-i Esmâ ü'l-Hesna* (The Annotation of God's Names) tr. from Istanbul: Ahmed Kamil Matbaası, 64 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Islam]

Mehmed Macid

1325 (1909) *Şimdiye Kadar Yapılan Münakaşa Usüllerinin İras Eylediği Mazarrat ve İslahı Zımında Amelî Usuller Beyan –Mütalaat* (Description and Observations as to Disadvantages Resulting from Discussion Methods Used So Far and Their Improvement) tr. from Pavl Mihail, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ebuzziya, 42 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV)

Mehmed Nazım

1326/1328 (1910) *Nizam ü'l-Has fi ehl il-İhtisas* [İhtisas Sahiplerinin Pak Düzeni / Pure order of the Specialists]] tr. from Seyyid Ahmed b. Ali el-Mekki B.Yahya er-Rifai Ahmed er-Rifai, Istanbul: Şems Matbaası, 80 pages. [TDV İSAM] [Islamic Mysticism]

Mehmed Rauf

1909 *Hatırat-ı Alem-i İslam: İstanbul, Girit, Mısır, Cezair* (The Memoirs of Islamic World: Istanbul, Crete, Egypt, Algeria) tr. from Charles Mismar, Bursa: Matbaa-i Vilayet, 304 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Ottoman History]

Mehmed Refik

1325 (1909) *Tercüman-ı Hakikat'in Garaib Cüzdanı Kütüphanesi* (Tercüman-ı Hakikat's Curious Pocket Library), 2nd Book (64 pages.) and 4th Book (112 pages.) numaralar, İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE) [Fiction?]

Mehmed Tevfik

1324 (1908) *Bahr-i Muhit Yolcuları* (The Passengers of the Enormous Sea), tr. from ??, İstanbul: Seadet Matbaası, 400 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Fiction?]

1325/1328 (1909)a *Hançer Ucu* (The Nib of the Dagger) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 116 pages. (ÖZEĞE II: 497) [Fiction?]

1325 (1909)b *İki Yüzlü Kadın* (Two-Faced Woman) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 112 pages. Amerikalı Bir Polisin Mehareti 4, İkbal Kütüphanesi Cep Romanlarından: 4. (ÖZEĞE III: 1085) [American Fiction?]

1325 (1909)c *Nekre Bir Kıyafet: Amerikalı Bir Polisin Mehareti* [A Funny Costume: Ingenuity of an American Policeman] tr. from ??, İkbal Kütüphanesi Cep Romanlarından İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 2, 117 pages. (ÖZEĞE 15334) [American Fiction]

1325 (1909)d *Cehennemli Kadın* (The Woman from the Hell) tr. from ??, Nikola Karter Amerikalı Bir Polisin Mehareti 3, tr. from ??, İkbal Kütüphanesi Cep Romanlarından 3, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 116 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1085) [American Fiction?]

MENTEŞ, Hasan Vasfi

1326 (1910) *Liberalizm Yahut Hürriyet Perver Bir Hükümet Nasıl Hareket Eder* [Liberalism or How do a Liberalist Government Act] tr. from Emile Faquet, İstanbul: Sancakçıyan Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE) [Political Science]

Mir Mehmed Kerim Elhac M. Caferzade

1325 (1908) *Azrâ-i Kureyş* (The Beloved of Kureyş) tr. from Corci Zeydan, Bakü: Bakü Gazetesi Matbaası, 534 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [The Prophet Muhammed?]

MİRGÜNLÜ, Hamdi Mustafa

1325 (1909) *Ameli Piyade Keşf Kolu* (The Duties of the Exploration Team of Infantry) tr. from Von Helfeld, İstanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 75 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Military]

Muhammed Nazım

1909 *İbn-i Farız Hazretlerinin Yaiyye, Mimiyye, Raiyye Kasidelerinin* (İbni Farız' Encomiums of Yaiyye, Mimiyye, Raiyye) tr. from Ebü'l-Kasım Şerefeddin Ömer b. Ali b. Mürşid İbnü'l-Farız (632/1234), İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 159 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Arabic Literature]

1326 (1910) *Piyade ve Süvari Bölüğünün Muharebe Andahtında Talim ve Terbiyesi* (Education and Training of Infantry and Cavalry in the Discharge of the Weapons during the War) War) tr. from Von Biren, İstanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 271 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Military]

Musa Abdullah

1908 *Mayışet Yolları, Sa'y, Amel, İktisad* (Ways of Sustenance, Ardour, Work and Saving) tr. from Nikola Hadad, Kazan: Örnek Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE) [Economics]

Musa (Carullah) Bigiyef

1910 *Divân-ı Hafız Tercümesi* (The Translation of Hafız' Collection of Poems), Kazan: Örnek Matbaası, 145 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Persian Literature]

Mustafa Refik

1325 (1909) *İstifadeli Seyahat* (A Beneficial Travel) tr. from ??, Istanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası, 119 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [travel?]

Mustafa Refik et al (tr)

(1324) 1908 *Lirpirin Kurnazlığı* (Lirpir's Cunning), tr. From??, Istanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası. [Fiction?]

1325 (1909) *Puvarenin Serveti* (Puvare's Fortune) tr. from ??, Istanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası. [Fiction?]

Mustafa Şekib

1326 (1910) *Geçici* (Temporary) tr. from François Coppée, Üsküb: Birinci Sırp Vardar Matbaası, 31 pgs. (ÖZEĞE) [French Literature]

Müfid Ratib

1326 (1910) *Güzel Dost* (Nice Friend) tr. from Guy de Maupassant, Istanbul: Tanin Matbaası, 501 pages. (ÖZEĞE II: 471) [French Literature]

Naci Şeyh

1326 (1910)a *Gavs ül-Azam-ı Rabbanî Cenab-ı Şeyh Abdülkadir-i Geylanî Kuddise Sirreh ül-Âli Hazretlerinin Evrad-ı Şerifeleri ile Tercümesini Havidir* [the Translation of The Greatest Muslim Saint, Sagacious Sheikh Abdulkadir-i Geylani's Prayers (May God sanctify his verity and presence) tr. from Abdülkadir-i Geylanî, Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 26+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Islam - Liturgy]

1326 (1910)b *el-Evradü'ş-Şerifiyyetü'l-Kadiriyye* (The Holy Prayers of Abdulkadir Geylani) tr. from Muhyiddin Abdülkadir b. Musa b. Abdullah Abdülkadir-i Geylani, Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, pages. (TDV İSAM) [Islam - Liturgy]

Namık Kemal

1326 (1910) *Renan Müdafaaanamesi* [Renan Plea Of Defendants] tr. from Ernest Renan, Istanbul: Birinci Tertib Mahmudbey Matbaası, 56 pages. (TDV İSAM) [French Literature?]

Nazım

1326 (1910) *Muallim Ober Bey'in Erkan-ı Harbiye Mektebinde Tabiye Dersleri* (The Teacher Ober's [Mr.] Strategy Lessons at the Military School) tr. from Ober, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 334 pages. [ÖZEĞE] [Military]

Necib Halifeyn

1908 *Kazan Tarihi* (The History of Kazan) tr. from ??, City?: Sabah Kütüphanesi, 32 pages. (TDV İSAM) [European History]

Nuri Bekir (Dr.)

1326 (1910) *Rüyalar* (Night Dreams) tr. from Nisiyen, Tebabet-i Hazıra Kütüphanesi, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriye ve Şürekası, 68 pages. (ÖZEĞE III; TDV İSAM) [Night Dreams]

Nuri İbrahim

1325 (1909) *Tarih-i Arz* (The History of the Earth) tr. from ??, İzmir: Keşişyan Matbaası, 117+2 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Geography?]

Ohanes Agopyan

1909 *Avâlim-i Felekiye* (Astrological Sciences) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Boyacıyan Agop Matbaası, 1+247 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Astrology]

Osman Mazhar Hersekli Dede Paşa Zade

1326 (1910) *Benaluka Sahrası Muharebesi* (The War of Benaluka Field) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Ruşen Matbaası, 17 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV)

Osman Nuri – Hüseyin Neş’et

1323-1324 (1908) *İlm-i Teşrih-i Tatbik-i Hayvanat-ı Ehliye* (Comparative Anatomic Knowledge of Domestic Animals) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Şahane Matbaası, 1st Volume 478 pages; 2nd Volume 348 pages; 3rd Volume 342+8 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Agriculture]

Osman Vefik

1325 (1909) *Sarik Arsen Lüpen* (The Thief Arsené Lupin) Aded: 1 (Garip Yolcu [A Miserable Traveller]– Kupa Yedilisi [Cup] – Malaki Sayfiyesi [Malaki Cottage]) tr. from Maurice Leblac, İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası, 64 pages. Tercüman-ı Hakikatın Âsâr-I Müntahabe Kütüphanesi 1. (ÖZEĞE III: 900) [French Fiction]

1325 (1909) *Sarik Arsen Lüpen Aded: 2* (Bir Milyon Franklık İkramiye [One-Million Franc-Bounty]), tr. from Maurice Leblanc, Tercüman-ı Hakikatın Âsâr-I Müntahabe Kütüphanesi 2, İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası, 29 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 900) [French Fiction]

Ömer Lutfi

1325 (1909) *Fenn-i Manazıra Nazaran Kakubü Münasip Olan Eşkâl Tersimatı* (Drawing Figures which Are Suitable in Terms of Landscape Art) tr. from ??, İstanbul: Mekteb-i Sanayi Matbaası, 43 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Painting?]

1326 (1910) *Zeman-ı Hazır Zirhluları, Drednavutlar* (Contemporary Armor-Bearers, Drednavuts) tr. From Krvnv, İstanbul: Mühendishane-i Berr-i Hümayun M. 65+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Military]

Ömer Ziyaeddin

1326 (1910) *Hadis-i Erbain fi Hukuk is-Salatin* [Forty Hadith In the Sultan's Laws] tr. from Hz. Muhammed, 31 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Hadith]

1326 (1910) *Hukuk-ı Salâtin* [The Sultan's Laws]compiled and tr. (toplayıp çeviren) from?? - - 31 pages (ÖZEĞE II) [Law]

Ösman Nuri

1325 (1909) *Piyade Terbiyesi ve Rus Japon Seferinden Alınan Dersler* [Education of Infantry and Lessons to Be Taken from Russian-Japan Expedition], Istanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 35 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Military]

ÖZĞÜREL, Ragıb Rıfkı

1325/1909 *Sis İçinde Yahut Bir Nişanlının Suret-i Garibede Firarı* (In the Mist or the Escape of an Engaged Person in an Odd Way) tr. from??, Amerikalı Bir Polisin Mehareti Nik Karter İkbal Kütüphanesinin Cep Romanlarından İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 138+6 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1325) [American Fiction?]

1325/1328 (1909)a *Hidemat-ı Seferiye Müzakereleri* (The Negotiations of Expeditionary Services) tr. from ??, Publisher: İkbal Kütüphanesi, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 45 pages seen, (ÖZEĞE IV) [Military]

1325/1328 (1909)b *Siyah Elin İntikamı, Amerikalı Meşhur Polis Haftiyesi Nik Karter'in Harikkul'ade Sergüzeştlerinden 6* (The Revenge of the Black Hand or Famous American Detective Nik Karter's Extraordinary Adventures 6), tr. from Conan Doyle??, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 59+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1325) [American Fiction?]

1326 (1910) *İstilay-ı Cihan* (Occupation of the World) tr. from Danryt, İstanbul: Artin Asaduryan ve Mahdumları Matbaası, 1036 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [?]

1326/1328 (1910)a *Piyadenin Harb Nokta-i Nazarından Tedrisine Rehber* [A Guide for the Warfare Education of Infantry] tr. from Pierron, 1st Book, second Edition İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 115 pages; 2nd Book İstanbul: Hilal Matbaası 1325 (1909) 118 pages. (ÖZEĞE) [Military]

1326/1328 (1910)b *Maceray-ı Aşk* (The Adventure of Love) tr. from Michel Zévacco, (Pardayyanlar's Sequel) İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 404 s. (ÖZEĞE III: 1110; TDV İSAM) [French Fiction]

1326/1328 (1910)c *Pardayyanlar* tr. from Michel Zévacco, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası, 300 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1110?) [French Fiction]

RAHMANKULI, Sultan

1910 *Toyonga Karşı Togan Yahut Vicdan Azabı* [Toyong against Togan or Guilty Conscience) tr. from Victor Hugo, Yol Kitabhanesi Neşriyatından 18, Kazan: İ. N. Haritonef Taş ve Hurufat Matbaası, 62 pages. [French Liteature]

Receb İrfan

1325 (1909) *Plan Üzerine Harp Oyunlarına Mahsus Muhtıra* [A Special Memorandum of War Tricks on Plan] tr. from Imhoff Paşa, Istanbul: F. Lefler Matbaası, 12+1 pages. [Military]

Rıza Nur (Dr.)

1326 (1910)a *Hitân ve Emraz-ı Zühreviye* (La Circoncision et les maladies veneriennes) [Sünnet ve Zührevi Hastalıklar / Circumcision and Venereal Diseases] The Turkish Part was Published in Istanbul: Karabet Matbaası, 14 pages., The French Part was Published in Istanbul: G. S. Keşişyan Matbaası, 13 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Medical]

1326 (1910)b *Atlas-Manüel Fenn-i Cerrahi-i Ortopedi* (A Manual Atlas for Surgical Orthopedy) tr. from Luning and Shutless, Istanbul: Matbaa-i Hayriye ve Şürekası, 293 pages. (ÖZEĞE III) [Medical]

Sadri

(1326 (1910) *Melburn Cinayeti, Allan Dickson* (Melbourne Murder, Allan Dickson) tr. from Arnould Galopin, Istanbul: Yeni Osmanlı Matbaası, 40 pages. [Australian Fiction?]

Sadullah İzzet

1326 (1910) 1325 (1909) *Halt-ı Elvan* [Renklerin Karışımı / The Mixture of Colours] tr. from Zander, Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası. (ÖZEĞE II) [?]

Selanikli Tevfik

1324 (1908) *Amerika'da Çöl Avcıları* (Desert Hunters in America) tr. from ??, (Illustrated), Istanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 148 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [American Fiction?]

SEYİTOĞLU, Mehmed Emin

1325 (1909) *İbtal-i Hiss-i Mevzii* (Anaesthesia of Emplacement), tr. from Witting Paşa, Gülhane Seririyat-ı Külliyyat-ı Mesaisi 5, Istanbul: Publishing House? (ÖZEĞE IV) [?]

Süleyman İzzi

1910 *Makamat-ı Muhammed Bahaeddin en-Nakşibendi = Enisü't-Talibin ve Uddetü's-Salikin* (The High Positions of Muhammed Bahaeddin en-Nakşibendi = The Comrade of the Disciples the Necessary Provision of the Followers) and tr. from Salah b. Mübarek Buhari, Istanbul : Bahriye Matbaası, 215 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Islam-Biography]

Süleyman Nazif

1908 *Sefillerin İtalyanca'ya Çevirisini Ta'b Eden M. Dailli'ye Victor Hugo'nun Bir Mektubu* (Victor Hugo's Letter to the Translator who Published the Italian Translation of Misearables), Istanbul: Matbaa-i Vilayet, 13 pages. (KERMAN) [Letter-Literature]

Süleyman Tevfik

1908 *Haramon Gönüllüleri* tr. from Alexandre Dumas. (ÖZEGE) [French Literature]

1909 *Jozef Balsamo* tr. from Alexandre Dumas (Jozef Basamo) (ÖZEGE) [French Literature]

1325 (1909) *Yıldızdan Yıldıza Seyahat* tr. from Voltaire (Micromégas), Istanbul: Publishing House? (ÖZEGE) [French Fiction]

Tahsin

1326 (1910) *Esnay-ı Muharebede Endaht Kavaidi ile Ateş İdaresi* (The Methods of Discharging the Weapons and the Conduct of the Artillery during War) tr. from Von Birn, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Fünun-ı Şahane Matbaası, 30 pages. (ÖZEGE IV) [Military]

Tevfik Mustafa (Halebli)

1324 (1908) *Kimyay-ı Hayâtî* (Essesntial Chemistry) tr. from Mausice Artus-Hygnk and Jules Letien, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Şâhâne Matbaası, (ÖZEGE III) [Chemistry?]

Tevfik Nadir

1324 *Babialinin İç Yüzü* (The Real Face of the Sublime Porte) tr. from ??, Istanbul: Artin Asaduryan Matbaası, 32 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Ottoman History: Stagnation and Collapse, 1687-1922 – Ottoman Administrative Organisation]

TUGAY, A. Asaf

1326 (1910) *Efrad İçin Terbiye-i Fikriye ve Maneviye Dersleri* [Intellectual and Moral Lessons for Individuals], tr. From Kapin Romen, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 240 pages. (ÖZEGE II) [Ethics-Education]

ÜLGEN, Mazhar Mustafa

1327 (1910-1911) *Laburatuvarıda İlm-i Ensac ve Hucerât Ameliye-i Fenniyesi* (Scientific Investigation of the Tissues and Cells in Laboratory) tr. from Rvben Tahler, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Askeriye Matbaası, 4+139 pages. (ÖZEGE IV) [Biology]

Yakub Şevki

1326 (1910)a *Osmanlı-Yunan Seferi (1313-1897)* (Ottoman-Greek Expedition [1317-1897]) tr. from C. F. Von Der Goltz, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Fünun-ı Harbiye-i Osmanî Matbaası, 297 pages. (ÖZEGE I; TDV İSAM) [Ottoman History]

1326 (1910)b *Osmanlı-Rus Seferinden Halyas-Zıvın-Kars Muharebeleri* (Halyas-Zıvın-Kars Battles of Ottoman-Russian Expedition) tr. from ??, Istanbul: Mekteb-i Harbiye Matbaası, 181 pages. (ÖZEGE IV) [Ottoman History]

YALMAN, Ahmed Emin

1325 (1909) *İngiltere Lordlar Kamarası Nizamnamesi* (England House of Lords Regulations) tr. from ?? İstanbul: publisher?, 40 pages. (ÖZEGE I) [Law]

YANBOLULU, Mustafa Şevki

1324 (1908) *Deniz Banyoları* [Curative Sea Baths] tr. from Dr. Duvil, İzmir: Keşişyan Matbaası, 961 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Medical]

Yazıcızade Ahmed Bican

1324 (1908) *Envarü'l-Aşikin: Tercüme-i Megaribü'z-Zaman* (Glory of the Adorers: The Translation of the Evenings of the Time] tr. from Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed Efendi (857/1453), İstanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 482 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Islamic Mysticism]

YURTMAN, Abdulgani Seniy

1325/1327 (1909) *Minhac-ı Hikmet- i İdari Ahidname- i İmam Ali* (Hikmetli İdare Etme Yolu / İmam Ali'nin Şartnamesi; Wise Methods of Governance / Imam Ali's Specifications) tr. from Ali ibn-i Ebi Talib, San'a: Vilayet Matbaası; İstanbul: Yeni Osmanlı Matbaası, 53 pages. (ÖZEĞE I) [Islam-Governance]

Yusuf

1325 (1909) *Piyade Acemi Nefer Nasıl Yetiştirilir* [How Are beginner Footsoldiers Trained] tr. from Rokker, Kitabhane-i İslam ve Askeri Yeni Tabiye ve Seferiye Külliyyatı Aded: 2, İstanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 187+5 pages. (ÖZEĞE IV) [Military]

Yusuf Kenan

1325 (1909) *Napolyon'un Esfarından 1805 Seferi* [1805 Expedition Among Napolyon's Expeditions] tr. From Rvmanyi, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ahmed İhsan, 4+84 pages. [French History]

Yusuf Ragıp Köse- Mihalzade

1325 (1909) *Hıfzıssıhha-i Askeriye* [Askerin Sağlığının Korunması] [The Protection of Military Men's Good Health] tr. from ?? İstanbul: Mühendishane-i Berr-i Hümayun Matbaası, 8+502 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Military-Medical]

Z. Adil

1326 (1910) *Kapitan* tr. from Michel Zévacco, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Arşak Garoyan, 670 pages. (ÖZEĞE III: 1110) [French Fiction]

Zakir el-Kadiri

1908 *El-meret ül-Cedide Yahut Yana (Yeni) Kadın* [The New Women] tr. from Kasım Emin, Kazan: Örnek Matbaası, Aile Kütüphanesi: 2, 18+1 pages. (ÖZEĞE II) [Fıkıh: Islamic Jurisprudence of Islam]

1908 *Medeniyet ve İslam* [Civilisation and Islam] tr. from Ferid Vecdi, Kazan: Örnek Matbaası. [original in TDV İSAM] [Islamic Theology]

Ziyaeddin Nahşebi

1325 *Tuti-name: Papağanın Hikayesi* [The Story of the Parrot] tr. from?? İstanbul : Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 240 pages. (TDV İSAM) [Indian Literature]

?

1325 (1909) *Sefil Çocuklar (Musavver)* (Misearable Children) [illustrated] tr.

from Jules Mary, Istanbul: Asır Matbaası, 152 pages. (ÖZEGE: 17679) [Fiction?]

??

1910 *Mesihinin Seyahatnamesi / Bu Dünyadan Gelen Dünyaya* [The Travel Book of the Christian / From This World to the Coming World] tr. from John Bunyan, Filibe: Avidaranyan'ın Çaphanesi. [Christian Life]

??

1326 (1910) *Kitab-ı Hülasat ül-Beyan Fi Hükm-i Nev' il-İnsan* (The Book of the Essence of the Statement on the Arbitrament of Human Race)tr. from Mehmed Ebülhüda Sayyadî Zade, Istanbul: Kelimetü'l-Hak Matbaası, 28 pages. (ÖZEGE: 10941 [?])

??

1910 *Lisan-ı Umumî Esperanto* (A Common Language Esperanto) tr. from L. L. Zamenhof, Istanbul: Ahmed İhsan ve Şürekası Matbaası, 1st Part 11+80+4 pages.; 2nd Part 126 pages. (ÖZEGE: 25112) [Language]

??

1909 *Budapeşte Hâtırat-ı Ziyareti Sene 1909 Budapest* [Memoirs of the Visit to Budapest, Year 1909] tr. from Bâlint, 2nd Edition, Budapest: Publisher?, (İllustrated, Turkish-French), 161 pages. (ÖZEGE: 2597) [Memoirs]

APPENDIX 7

The Portrait of Abdullah Cevdet



Dr. Abdullah Cevdet

REFERENCES

- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1888). *Tuluat*. Istanbul: Alem Matbaası.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1899). *İstibdad*. tr. from Vittorio Amedeo Alfieri (*Della Tirannide*), Kütübhanesi-i İctihad 19, Geneva: Osmanlı İttihat ve Terakki Matbaası, 2nd Edition: 1908, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1906). *İki emel*. 2nd Edition, 1st Edition in 1898, Cairo: Osmanlı İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti Matbaası.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1908a). *Hamlet*. tr. from William Shakespeare (*Hamlet*), Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 12, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1908b). *Jül Sezar*. tr. from William Shakespeare (*Julius Caesar*), date 1909 on the front cover, Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 20, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1908c). *Musiki ile tedavi*. tr. from M. Doubresse (*Musicothérapie*), Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 18, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1908d). *Tarih-i islamiyet*. tr. from Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy (*De Voornaamste Godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*), 1st volume, Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 15, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1908f). *Kahriyat*. Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 7, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1908g). Şekspir hakkında / *Jül Sezar* tercümesinde ifade-i mütercim. *İctihad*, n. 8, 303-306.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1909a). *Makbes*. tr. from William Shakespeare (*Macbeth*), Kütübhanesi-i İctihad 23, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1909b). *İngiliz kavmi*. tr. from Emile Boutmy (*Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais au XIXe siècle*), Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 22, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (1909c). *Tarih-i İslamiyet*. tr. from Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy (*De Voornaamste Godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*), 2nd volume, Kütübhanesi-i İctihad: 16, Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) [trans.] (14 July 1909-14 August 1910 / 1 June 1325 – 1 August 1326). “*Romeo – Juliet*”. tr. from William Shakespeare (*Romeo and Juliet*), *Şehbal*, ns. 7-24.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1912). “*Tarih-i islamiyet*”. *İctihad*, n. 47, 1103.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1913). Abdülhak Hamid. *Türk Yurdu*, n. 13, 420-425.

- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1914a). “Hamlet.” *İşhad*, n. 116, 306-308.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1914b). Şime-i muhabbet. *İctihad*, n. 89, 1979-1984.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1924). *Im-i ruh-ı ictimai*. tr. from Gustave Le Bon, Istanbul: Amidi Matbaası.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1927). Shakespeare ve *Hamlet*. *İctihad*, n. 226, 4319-4323.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1930a). *Hamlet*’in tahlili. *İctihad*, n. 309, 5509-5511.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1930b). *Jules Cezar*’ın tahlili. *İctihad*, n. 310, 5520-5522.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1931a). Shakespeare’ın şaheserlerinden Macbeth’in tahlili. *İctihad*, n. 323, p. 5480.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1931b). *Karlı dağdan ses*. Kütübhaneye-i İctihad: 59, Istanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası.
- Abdullah Cevdet (Karlıdağ) (1931c). *Üçüncü Richard*’ın tahlili. *İctihad*, n. 318, 5621-5622.
- Adıvar, Halide Edip (1943). *İngiliz edebiyatı tarihi: Elisabeth devri ve Shakespeare*. v. 2, Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Ahmed Midhat Efendi (1900). *Müdafaa*. 3 volumes, Istanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası.
- Akçura, Yusuf (1976). *Üç tarz-ı siyaset*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Alfieri, Vittorio Amedeo (1949). *Della Tirannide*. 1st edition: 1789, Milan, Rizzoli.
- Allix, Jacques-Alexandre-François (Trans.) (1834). *De la Tyrannie*. tr. from Vittorio Alfieri (*Della Tirannide*), Paris: Le Bailly.
- And, Metin (1961). II. Abdülhamit ve tiyatro. *Türk Dili*, n. 122, 84-85.
- And, Metin (1972). *Tanzimat ve istibdat döneminde Türk tiyatrosu: 1839-1908*. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası.
- Arıkan, Zeki (2005). Doktor Abdullah Cevdet’in bir mektubu ‘Gazi Paşa ile dört saat görüştük’. *Toplumsal Tarih*, April. n. 136, 98-103.
- Arıkan, Zeki (2006, February 26). Dr. Abdullah Cevdet. *Radikal 2*, Retrieved August 24, 2007, from: http://www.radikal.com.tr/ek_haber.php?ek=r2&haberno=5589

- Atila, Vedat [transcriber into modern Turkish] (2006). *İslam tarihi*. tr. from Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy, Abdullah Cevdet (trans.), Istanbul: Gri Yayınevi.
- Bardakçı, Murat (2005, August 21). Yazarlar. *Hürriyet*. Retrieved August 25, 2007, from: <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/2005/08/21/690082.asp>
- Bengi-Öner, Işın (1990). *A Re-evaluation of the concepts of equivalence in the literary translations of Ahmed Mithat Efendi: A linguistic perspective*. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Hacettepe University.
- Bengi-Öner, Işın (1991). The eloquent mediator. Ahmed Midhat Efendi. In Douwe Fokkema (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*. vol. 5, Iudicium Verlag, Munich.
- Bengi-Öner, Işın (1999). Bir Söz Ustası ve Devrimci: Ahmed Midhat Efendi. *Çeviri Bir Süreçtir... Ya Çeviribilim?* (pp. 45–66). Istanbul. Sel Yayıncılık.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1993). *The field of cultural production*, Randal Johnson (Ed.), Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boutmy, Boutmy (1900). *Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais au XIX^e siècle*. Paris: A. Colin.
- Burian, Orhan (Trans.) (1946). *Macbeth*. tr. from William Shakespeare, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Bürüngüz, Refik (2005). *Abdullah Cevdet and the garpçılık movement*. M.A. Thesis. Istanbul: Fatih University.
- Chauvin, Victor (Trans.) (1879). *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*. Leyde, E.J. Brill; Paris, Maisonneuve.
- Creel, Frank W. (1980). Abdullah Cevdet: a father of Kemalism. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, v. 4, 9-26.
- Demircioğlu, Cemal (2003). 19. yüzyıl sonu Türk edebiyatında 'tercüme' kavramı. *Journal of Turkish Studies (Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları)*, Kaf Dağının Ötesine Varmak, Günay Kut Armağanı, vol. 2, n. 27, 13-31.
- Demircioğlu, Cemal (2005) *From discourse to practice: Rethinking "translation" (terceme) and related practices of text production in the late Ottoman literary tradition*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Boğaziçi University.
- Derman, Mehmet Ali (1972). *Reddiye: Hazreti Peygamber'e dil uzatan Dr. Duzi, Dr. Şiprenger*. Garanti Matbaası.
- Doğan, Atila (2005). *Osmanlı aydınları ve sosyal Darwinizm*. Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Dorland's Medical Dictionary for Health Consumers (2007). W.B. Saunders (Ed.), Elsevier, Inc, Retrieved August 27, 2007, from:
<http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/hysteria>
- Dozy, Reinhart Pieter Anne (1863). *De voornaamste godsdiensten: Het Islamisme*. Haarlem: A.C. Kruseman.
- Ebüzzıya Mehmed Tefvik (1910). *Muallim Doktor Dozy'nin tarih-i islamiyet ünvanlı kitabı ve mütercimi hakkında tenvir-i efkâr*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Enginün, inci (1979). *Tanzimat devrinde Shakespeare: Tercümeleri ve tesiri*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Enginün, inci (2006). *Yeni Türk edebiyatı Tanzimat'tan cumhuriyet'e (1839-1923)*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Ersoy, M. Akif (1990). *Mehmed Akif Ersoy'un makaleleri: (Sıratü'l-Müstakim ve Sebilü'r-Reşad mecmuaları'nda çıkan)*. Abdülkerim Abdülkadiroğlu, Nuran Abdülkadiroğlu (Eds.), Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Ertuğrul, Muhsin (1964). Shakespeare'le nasıl tanıştım. *Türk Tiyatrosu*, nos: 351-361, 24-26
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1978). Universals in cultural history. *Papers on Poetics and Semiotics*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, n. 8, 38-43.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1979). Polysystem theory. *Poetics Today*, v. 1, Fall, 287-310.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1994). Culture planning and the market: Making and maintaining socio-semiotic entities. *The Making of Culture*. Dartmouth Colloquium, Dartmouth College, 22-27 July.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997a). The making of culture repertoire and the role of transfer. *Target*, vol. 9, no. 2, 373-381.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997b). Factors and dependencies in culture: A revised outline for polysystem culture research. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, v. 24, n. 1, 15-34.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2000a). The making of repertoire, survival and success under heterogeneity. In Guido Zurstiege (Ed.), *Festschrift für die Wirklichkeit* (pp. 41-51). Darmstadt: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2000b). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In Lawrence Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 197-192). London and New York: Routledge.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2000c). Culture repertoire and the wealth of Collective Entities", In De Geest, Dirk et al., (Eds.), *Under construction: Links for the*

- site of literary theory. Essays in honour of Hendrik Van Gorp* (pp. 389-403). Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2002a). Culture planning and cultural resistance in the making and maintaining of entities. *Sun Yat-Sen Journal of Humanities*, n.14, 45-52.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2002b). Literature as goods, literature as tools. *Neohelicon* XXIX, n. 1, 75–83.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2005a). Idea-makers, culture entrepreneurs, makers of life images, and the prospects of success. *Papers in Culture Research* (pp. 1-19), Retrieved August 24, 2007, from: <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers>
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2005b). Polysystem theory (revised). In Itamar Even-Zohar (Ed.), *Papers in culture research* (pp. 1-11).
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2005c) Culture planning. In Itamar Even-Zohar (Ed.), *Papers in culture research* (pp. 72-97). Tel Aviv: The Porter Chair of Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (2005d). Laws of cultural Interference. In Itamar Even-Zohar, *Papers in Culture Research* (50-67). Tel Aviv: The Porter Chair of Semiotics, Tel Aviv University. Retrieved September 2, 2007, from: <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/EZ-CR-2005.pdf>
- Eyübođlu, Sabahattin [Trans.] (1962). *Macbeth*. tr. from William Shakespeare, Istanbul: an Yayınları.
- Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi (1910). *Tarih-i İslam*. 2 vols. in one, Istanbul: Hikmet Matbaası.
- Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi (1971) *İslam tarihi*. Dođan Güneş Yayınları A. Ş. (Ed.), 2 vols. in one, Istanbul: Dođan Güneş Yayınları.
- Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi (1982). *İslam tarihi: Hazreti Peygamberden zamanımıza kadar*. Ziya Nur (Ed.), 2nd Edition, Istanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson (1958) *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. Edward Granville Browne (Ed.), 2nd Edition, 6 volumes, London: Lowe-Brydone Ltd.
- Göçmen, Muammer (1995). *İsviçre’de Jön Türk basını ve Türk siyasal hayatına etkileri 1889-1902*. Istanbul: Kitabevi.
- Hallaq, Wael B. (1995). *The Oxford encyclopedia of the modern Islamic World*. John L. Esposito and *et al* (Ed.), New York: Oxford University.
- Halman, Talat Sait (1953). “Shakespeare’in manzum tercümesi meselesi ve aruz”, *Tercüme*, v. 10, n. 55, 63-73.

- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1981). *Bir siyasal düşünür olarak Doktor Abdullah Cevdet ve dönemi*. İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1986). *Bir siyasal örgüt olarak Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türklük*. v.1, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1992). Batılılaşma. *Türkiye diyanet vakfı İslam ansiklopedisi* (pp: 148-152). v. 5, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1995). *The Young Turks in opposition*. New York: Oxford University.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1997). *Garbcılar: Their attitudes toward religion and their impact on the official ideology of the Turkish Republic*. *Studia Islamica*, n. 86, pp.133-158.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (2005a). Blueprints for a future society / Late Ottoman materialists on science, religion, and art. In Elisabeth Özdalga (Ed.), *Late Ottoman society: The intellectual legacy* (pp. 28-116). London: Routledge Curzon.
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (2005b, September 15). Dindar bir dinsiz ya da dinsiz bir dindar: Dr. Abdullah Cevdet ve modern Türk toplumu (1). *Zaman*. Retrieved August 25, 2007, from: <http://www.zaman.com.tr/webapp-tr/haber.do?haberno=210358>
- Hatiboğlu, İbrahim (1999). Osmanlı aydınlarınca Dozy'nin *Tarih-i İslamiyyet'*ine yöneltilen tenkitler. *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, n. 3, 197-213.
- Hermans, Theo (1995). Revisiting the classics--Toury's empiricism version one. *The Translator*, v. 1, n. 2, 215-223.
- Hermans, Theo (1999). *Translation in systems descriptive and systemic approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hermans, Theo (2002). The production and reproduction of translation: System theory and historical context. In Saliha Paker (Ed.), *Translations: (Re)shaping of literature and culture* (pp. 175-94). İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Hüseyinzade Ali (1932). Aptullah Cevdet. *İctihad*, n. 358, 5895-5897.
- İsmail Fenni (Ertuğrul) (1928). *Kitab-ı İzale-i şükuk: Dozy'nin tarih-i İslamiyyet'i üzerine*. İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası.
- İsmail Hakkı (1932). Aptullah Cevdet Şahsiyeti. *İctihad*, n. 358, 5889-5890.
- Lowell, A. L. (1902). A review of *Essai d'une Psychologie politique du Peuple Anglais au XIX Siecle*. *The American Historical Review*. vol. 7, n. 2, 360-363.

- Kaplan, Ramazan (1998). *Klasikler tartışması (Başlangıç dönemi)*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi.
- Kerman, Zeynep (1978). *1862-1910 yılları arasında Victor Hugo'dan Türkçeye yapılan tercümelemler üzerinde bir araştırma*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Key, A. (1908). Tekmile: Son kırk sene zarfında İslamiyet. In Abdullah Cevdet (Ed.), *Tarih-i İslamiyet* (pp. 685-733). 2nd vol., Cairo: Matbaa-i İctihad.
- Kefeli, Emel (2006). Türk edebiyatında çeviri (1860-1923). In Talat Sait Halman *et al* (Eds.), *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (pp. 43-52). Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı yayınları, v. 3.
- Koç, Haşim (2006). Osmanlı'da tercüme kavramı ve Tanzimat dönemindeki edebî tercümelere dair çalışmalara yönelik genel literatür değerlendirmesi. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, n: 8, 351-381.
- Küçük, Hülya (1994). Dozy'nin "Het Islamisme" adlı eseri üzerine. *Diyanet İlmi Dergi*, v.30, n. 4, 63-89.
- Lefevre, André (1992). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Macmillan Contemporary Dictionary (1988). İstanbul: ABC Yayınevi.
- Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı (1913). *Külliyat-ı İsmail Hakkı Manastırlı: Hak ve hakikat*. İstanbul: Sıratı Müstakim Matbaası.
- Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı [Trans.] (1891). *Tercüme-i risaleti'l-hamidiyye*. tr. from Hüseyin b. Muhammed b. Mustafa el-Hanefi Hüseyin el-Cisr, 4 vols, İstanbul.
- Mardin, Şerif (1981). *Jön Türkler'in siyasi fikirleri: 1895-1908*. 2nd Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Şerif (1997). *Bedüzzaman Said Nursi olayı: Türkiye'de din ve toplumsal değişme*. Metin Çulhaoğlu (Trans.), 6th Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Yusuf [Trans.] (1945). *Romeo ve Juliet*. tr. from William Shakespeare. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Mazhar Osman Bey (1932). Abdullah Cevdetin tabutu önünde. *İctihad*, n. 358, 5875-5876.
- Meriç, Cemil (1986). *Kültürden irfana*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.
- Namık Kemal (1908). *Renan müdafaaanamesi*. İstanbul: Mahmud Bey Matbaası.
- Nevşehirli Hayreddin (1910) Doktor Dozy'yi red. *Beyanülhak*, v. 7, ns.163-172.

- Neyzi, Ali (2002). Türkçede Shakespeare ve Özellikle Hamlet Çevirileri. *Varlık*, v. 70, n. 1141, 76-79.
- Nursi, Said (1990). *Risale-i nur külliyatı müellifi Bediüzzaman Said Nursi: hayatı-mesleki - tercüme-i hali*. 3rd Edition, Istanbul: Sözler Yayınevi.
- Oflazoğlu, A. Turan [Trans.] (1968). *Romeo ile Juliet*. tr. from William Shakespeare, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınları.
- Oflazoğlu, A. Turan [Trans.] (2001). *Romeo ile Juliet*. tr. from William Shakespeare, Istanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- Özdemir, Mehmet (1994). Dozy, Reinhart Pieter Anne. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam ansiklopedisi* (pp. 513-514). v. 9.
- Özege, M. Seyfettin (1991). *Eski harflerle basılmış Türkçe eserler kataloğu: (Yazar adına göre)*. Ahmet Eryüksel (Ed.), Istanbul: TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, 4 vols.
- Ortaylı, İlber (1983). *İmparatorluğun en uzun yüzyılı*. İstanbul: Hil Yayınları.
- Paker, Saliha (1986). 'Hamlet' in Turkey. *New Comparison: A Journal of Comparative and Literary Studies*, n.2, 89-102.
- Paker, Saliha (1987). Tanzimat döneminde Avrupa edebiyatından çeviriler, çoğuldizge kuramı açısından bir değerlendirme. tr. from English by Ali Tükel, *Metis Çeviri*, v. 1, 31-43.
- Paker, Saliha (1991). Turkey. In Robin Ostle (Ed.), *Modern Literature in the Near and Middle East 1850-1970* (pp. 17-32). London and New York: Routledge.
- Paker, Saliha (2002). Translation as *terceme* and *nazire*: culture-bound concepts and their implications for a conceptual framework for research on Ottoman translation history. In Theo Hermans (Ed.), *Crosscultural transgressions: research models in translation studies ii historical and ideological issues* (pp. 120-143). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Paker, Saliha (2003). Tanzimat döneminde Avrupa edebiyatından çeviriler: Çoğuldizge kuramı açısından bir değerlendirme. In Mehmet Rıfat (Ed.), *Çeviri seçkisi 1: Çeviriyi düşünenler* (pp. 26-42). Istanbul: Dünya Yayıncılık.
- Paker, Saliha (2006). The 1897 'classics debate' as a focus for examining change in Ottoman conceptions of translation and its practice. In Theo Hermans (Ed.), *Translating Others* (pp. 325-349). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Polat, Nazım H. (2000). "İctihad." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam ansiklopedisi* (pp. 446- 448). v. 21, Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

- Popovic, A. (1970). The concept 'shift of expression' in translation. In J. Holmes (Ed.), *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation* (pp. 78-87). Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- Raif Necdet (Kastelli) and Sadık Naci (1910 / 1328). *Anna karenina*. tr. from Lev Nikolayeviç Tolstoy, Istanbul: Kitabhane-i Askeri.
- Ramsaur, Ernest Edmondson (1972). *Jön Türkler ve 1908 ihtilali*. Nuran Ülken (Trans.), Istanbul: Sander Yayınları.
- Rushdie, Salman (1988). *The Satanic verses*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd; New York: Viking Penguin Inc.
- Sağlam, Tevfik (1979). *Nasıl okudum*. H. Hüsrev Hatemi and Aykut Kazancıgil (Eds.), 3rd ed., Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Cerrahpaşa Tıp Fakültesi Atatürk'ün Yüzüncü Doğum Yılı'nı Kutlama Yayınları.
- Saru, KAmuran Şerif [Trans.] (1927). *Hamlet*. tr. from William Shakespeare, Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası.
- Sevük, İsmail Habip (1940). *Avrupa edebiyatı ve biz: Garpten tercümelere*. 2 vols. in one, Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Shakespeare, William (1994a). *Four tragedies*. T.J.B. Spencer et al (Eds.), London; New York: Penguin Books.
- Shakespeare, William (1994b). *Hamlet*. G. B. Harrison (Ed.), Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Shakespeare, William (1994c). *Romeo and Juliet*. G. B. Harrison (Ed.), Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Shakespeare, William (2001). *Julius Caesar*. London: Penguin Books.
- Strauss, Johann (2002). Turkish translations from Mehmed Ali's Egypt: A pioneering effort and its results. In Saliha Paker (Ed.), *Translations: (Re)shaping of literature and culture* (pp. 108-147). Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Süssheim, K. (1987). Abd allah Djewdet. In M. Th. Houtsma and et al (Eds.), *E. J. Brill's first encyclopaedia of Islam 1913-1936* (pp. 55-65). *Supplement*, v. 9, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Sıratü'l-Müstakim* Editorial (1910 / 1328). Tarih-i İslamiyyet eser-i ma'huduna EbuZZiya Tefik Efendi'nin yazdıkları Takriz Hakkında Tedkikat. *Sıratü'l-Müstakim*, v.4, n. 79, 10-18.
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz (2001). *The politics and poetics of translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Ph.D. Thesis, Boğaziçi University.

- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz (2003). Çoğuldizge kuramı. Uygulamalar. Eleştiriler. In Mehmet Rifat (ed.), *Çeviri seçkisi I, Çeviriyi düşünenler* (pp. 243-268). İstanbul: Dünya Yayıncılık.
- Tanar, İlhan Siyami [Trans.] (undated). *Romeo ve Juliet*. tr. from William Shakespeare, 2nd Edition, Dünya Klasikleri Tercüme Serisi: 7, İstanbul: Semih Lütüf Kitabevi.
- The bibliography of Turkish works printed in Non-Latin (Arabic, Armenian and Greek Characters) 1584-1986. (2001) Ankara: Milli Kütüphane.
- The Columbia Encyclopedia (2000). Alfieri, Vittorio, Conte. General Reference Center Gold. Gale. Bogazici Üniversitesi. Retrieved August 28, 2007, from: <http://0find.galegroup.com.seyhan.library.boun.edu.tr:80/itx/start.do?prodId=GRGM>
- The Language Realm (2007). Quotes. Retrieved May 11, 2007, from: <http://home.comcast.net/~r.chriss/index.html>
- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Toury, Gideon (2000). The nature and role of norms in translation. In Lawrence Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 198-211). London and New York: Routledge.
- Toury, Gideon (2002). Translation as a means of planning and the planning of translation: A theoretical framework and an exemplary case. In Saliha Paker (Ed.), *Translations: (Re)shaping of literature and culture* (pp. 148-163). İstanbul: Bogaziçi University.
- Turan, Şerafettin (1989). *Atatürk'ün düşünce yapısını etkileyen olaylar, düşünürler*. 2nd Ed. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Turhan, Vahit (1965). Shakespeare in Turkish. *Litera*, n. 8, 49-61.
- Uluğtekin, Melahat Gül (2004). Ahmet Vefik Paşa'nın çevirilerinde Osmanlılaşan Moliere. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Bilkent Üniversitesi
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1935). *Uyanış devirlerinde tercümenin rolü*, İstanbul: Vakit Gazetesi Matbaası.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1994). The translator's invisibility: The evidence of reviews. In *Other Words: Journal of the Translator's Association*, n. 4, 16-22.
- Willems, Michèle (2007). *Hamlet* in France. May 11, 2007, from:

[http://www.leoyan.com/globallanguage.com/ENFOLDED/BIBL/HamFr
a.htm](http://www.leoyan.com/globallanguage.com/ENFOLDED/BIBL/HamFr
a.htm)

Yargıcı, Atilla (1993). *Kemalizmin fikir kaynakları*. İstanbul: İttihad Yayıncılık.

Yusuf Kamil Paşa [trans.] (1862). *Tercüme-i Telemak*. tr. from Fenelon, İstanbul: Tabhane-i Amire.

Zapsu, Abdurrahim (1976). *Büyük İslam tarihi*. İstanbul: Sebil Yayınevi.

Zürcher, Eric Jan (1998). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin tarihi*. 3rd Edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.