

THE QUEST OF AN OPPOSITIONIST
YOUNG OTTOMAN: NAMIK KEMAL'S
SYNTHETICAL MODERNISM IN HIS THEATRE PLAY
VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE (1873)

ECEHAN KALE

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY

2014

THE QUEST OF AN OPPOSITIONIST
YOUNG OTTOMAN: NAMIK KEMAL'S
SYNTHETICAL MODERNISM IN HIS THEATRE PLAY
VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE (1873)

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in History

by

Ecehan Kale

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY

2014

“The Quest of an Oppositionist Young Ottoman: Namik Kemal’s Synthetical Modernism in
His Theatre Play *Vatan Yahut Silistre* (1873)”

Muhallif bir Osmanlı’nın Arayışı: Namik Kemal’in Tiyatro Oyunu *Vatan Yahut Silistre*’de
Sentetik Modernizm

Ecehan Kale
111671007

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Bülent Bilmez
Jüri Üyesi: Prof. Dr. Arus Yumul
Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Başak Tuğ Onaran



Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 16.09.2014

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 132

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Namik Kemal
- 2) Vatan Yahut Silistre
- 3) Vatanseverlik
- 4) Vatan
- 5) Genç Osmanlılar

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Namik Kemal
- 2) Vatan Yahut Silistre
- 3) Patriotism
- 4) Fatherland
- 5) Young Ottomans

An abstract of the Thesis of Ecehan Kale, for the degree of Master of Arts in
History
From the Institute of Social Sciences to be taken September 2014

Title: The Quest of an Oppositionist Young Ottoman: Namik Kemal's Synthetical
Modernism in His Theatre Play *Vatan Yahut Silistre* (1873)

This thesis studies the life of Namık Kemal who is a famous poet and an author of the *Tanzimat* era (1839-1876), 'Young Ottomans' and their activities, and additionally, a broad research on Kemal's most known work '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*'. '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' not only became a phenomenon at the time it was staged, but also has a reputation which had endured today. The play, has titled Namık Kemal for being the poet of 'fatherland' and 'liberty' and accepted as one of his first literary work that eternized the concept of 'patriotism'. Namık Kemal created a new movement of literature with this work. Terms of 'fatherland' and 'patriotism' began to find their places in literature and started to influence a mass of people. 'Young Ottomans', which Namık Kemal was known as one of the founding member, was accepted as the first modern opposition group in the Ottoman politics developed by the Ottoman elites and intellectuals. Their requests, apart from an establishment of a constitutional monarchy, were to create a constitutional government, a '*meşveret*' system. However, these requests and objectives put them against to the Sultan and his government from time to time. As intellectuals, they distributed their ideas via newsletters and other publishings. As a consequence of their intentions, they were banished several times and escaped abroad and spent most of their lives being an officer of the state and an oppositionist against government in charge. Namık Kemal, as one of the leading figure of 'Young Ottomans', maintained his struggle for his ideas, encouraged by his articles, novels and poems. He kept his policy as an opponent and consequently spent most of his life on exile. Namık Kemal was a patriot and an intellectual, he tried to write on behalf of the fatherland and the society; he aimed to inform the society through his works. From time to time, Namık Kemal got carried away by the political events and his struggle and stated his ideas with an intense manner aiming at the current regime. Despite all, Namık Kemal shall not only to be seen as an oppositionist against the Ottoman Government and the regime, but also should be seen as an Ottoman intellectual who basically aimed to work for the favor of the society.

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'nde Tarih Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Ecehan Kale
tarafından Eylül 2014'te teslim edilen tezin özeti

Başlık: Muhalif bir Osmanlı'nın Arayışı: Namık Kemal'in Tiyatro Oyunu
Vatan Yahut Silistre'de Sentetik Modernizm

Bu çalışmada, *Tanzimat* dönemi (1839-1876) ünlü şair ve yazarlarından Namık Kemal'in hayatı, Genç Osmanlılar Cemiyeti'nin kuruluşu ve faaliyetleri yanı sıra, yazarın en bilinen eserlerinden biri olan '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' üzerine kapsamlı bir inceleme yapılmıştır. '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' sadece gösterildiği dönemde bir fenomen olmanın dışında günümüze kadar gelen bir üne sahiptir. Oyun, Namık Kemal'e 'vatan' ve 'hürriyet' şairi olma sıfatını kazandırmış, 'vatanseverlik' duygusunu ölümsüzleştiren ilk eserlerinden biri kabul edilmiştir. Namık Kemal, bu eseriyle, edebiyatta yeni bir akım yaratmıştır. 'Vatan' ve 'vatanseverlik' kavramları artık edebi alanda yer bulmaya başlamış, kitlelerin etkilenmesine yol açmıştır. Namık Kemal'in kurucu üyelerinden biri sayıldığı; 'Genç Osmanlılar', muhalif bir grup olmanın dışında, Osmanlı elitlerinin kurduğu ilk modern muhalif grup olma niteliğini taşımaktadır. İstekleri, bir 'meşveret' sistemi kurulması dışında meşruti monarşi ve anayasaya dayalı bir yönetim sistemi oluşturmaktır. Bu istekleri kaçınılmaz bir biçimde kendilerini Sultan ve Osmanlı hükümeti ile karşı karşıya getirmiştir. Birer Osmanlı entelektüeli olarak, fikirlerini çıkardıkları gazeteler ve eserler vasıtasıyla halka duyurmaya çalışan grup, hükümet ile fikir uyuşmazlığı sebebiyle zaman zaman 'sürgün' cezalarıyla karşılaşmış, bu sebeple yurtdışına kaçmış ve ömürlerinin önemli bir kısmını hem hükümet görevlisi ve hem de muhalif olarak geçirmenin sosyal ve siyasal zorluklarına katlanmışlardır. Genç Osmanlılar'ın başta gelen üyelerinden biri olan Namık Kemal, kendi fikir mücadelesini yazdığı sayısız makale, roman ve şiirler aracılığıyla aktarmış, sürgün ve benzeri uygulamalara rağmen fikirlerini savunmaktan vazgeçmemiştir. Namık Kemal, vatansever bir aydın olup, devletin ve milletin fikrince yararına eserler ortaya koymaya çalışarak, toplumu bilgilendirmeyi amaçlamış, zaman zaman dönemin siyasi temposuna kapılıp, fikirlerini yoğun ve hükümeti hedefleyen bir biçimde belirtmiş olsa dahi, kendisini sadece düzene karşı gelen bir muhalif olarak değil, nihayetinde topluma fayda sağlamayı hedeflemiş bir Osmanlı entelektüeli olarak saymak gerekliliğini vurgulamak isterim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
PART I HISTORICAL AND THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK	8
CHAPTER 2 NAMIK KEMAL; LIFE OF THE POET OF VATAN UP TO 1863 ..	8
Childhood and Youth	8
Education and Professional Life	12
CHAPTER 3 NAMIK KEMAL AS A YOUNG OTTOMAN.....	16
The First Reaction to The Young Ottoman movement; ‘Exile’	26
Namik Kemal Returns Homeland; Istanbul, a Forgiven Writer	37
The First Exile of Namik Kemal, a Memorable Place; Gallipoli	40
Namik Kemal Writes ‘ <i>Vatan Yahut Silistre</i> ’	42
PART II ANALYSIS OF ‘ <i>VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE</i> ’	44
CHAPTER 4 A FOREWORD BEFORE ANALYSIS	44
CHAPTER 5 THEMES OF FATHERLAND AND PATRIOTISM.....	51
CHAPTER 6 ISSUES AND THEMES ON GENDER	65
CHAPTER 7 MIZANCI MURAT'S CRITIC	75
PART III THE AFTERMATH OF ‘ <i>VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE</i> ’	98
CHAPTER 8 MORE THAN A THEATRE PLAY; A SOCIAL PHENOMENON, ‘ <i>VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE</i> ’	98
Namik Kemal’s Banishment; An Exile to Famagusta	101
Sultan Murat; Expectations of Namik Kemal.....	105
An Exile to Lesbos and the Last Destination; Chios Island	110
CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSION	113
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	118
APPENDICES	124
A..... Chronology of Significant Events in Namik Kemal’s Life	
124	

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

*“Ne efsusnkâr imişsin âh ey didâr-ı hürriyet
Esir-i aşkın olduk gerçi kurtulduk esaretten”¹*

The French Revolution (1789) was not only an event that had ended an era, but also effected and changed the old habits of all minds into new understandings; ‘equality, freedom and human rights’. ‘Nationalism’ rose from the people who searched for justice as an inevitable ending. Nationalism influenced the west and then the east; eventually the Easterners could not help themselves against the sense of what was coming. The Ottoman Empire, the dominant power of the East and the West, could not stop the coming wind of the modern and renewed ideas, which were the opposite of the accustomed thoughts and habits. The French revolution affected all the powers but mostly the empires, especially the multicultural ones; such as the Ottoman Empire.

Selim III (1789–1807), was on the Ottoman throne at the time of The French Revolution. The Sultan needed to deal with not only the coming movement of thoughts but also an empire that had entered into a period of decline. Selim III was a reformist Sultan and wished to create certain reforms called as ‘Nizam-ı Cedid’, meaning the new order. He planned the military and the civil structure of the empire; also he made significant reforms on the economic structure of the empire. In addition to this, “education” was an important fact that had not been dealt for a long time and consequently caused the empires’ exhaustion on many aspects. The quality of the

¹ "Vatan Kasidesi". Kurdakul, Şükran Namık Kemal, P: 106. 2003.

education affected the society and directly the ruling class, The Ottoman bureaucracy.

To create a more qualified and modern education system, French officers were brought to train the Ottoman military students. The French language was obliged for all students. In this way, a new class had been revealed as a consequence of those reforms; this class was called as “enlightened” who had been familiar with the western culture and understanding. This class was about to take their place on the stage of history. Selim the III could be accepted as a sultan that had understood the empires’ situation in real terms. The spirit of the French Revolution had created its reflection on the Ottoman Empire.

The determination on reforms continued during the time of Mahmut II. (1808–1839), and Sultan Abdulmecid (1839–1861). “Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayun” or known as “*Tanzimat*” (1839), considered as the first document of the constitutional rights. It was the document that provided a guarantee in terms freedom, life and property. “*Tanzimat*” was referred as an Ottomanism policy which aimed to unite people who had lived in different states of Ottoman Empire disregarding their race, ethnicity and religious beliefs.

In this thesis I focused on the period after the declaration of the “*Tanzimat Fermani*”. The *Tanzimat* era, was the time of new understandings at every aspect of the empire. The Ottoman reform movement, propounded the term “Justice” but, there was a different group were about to gather around the idea of “Liberty”, raised by The French Revolution. The term “*Hürriyet*”, was the Ottoman form of “Liberty”, raised by this group. They were mainly impressed and inspired from the idea of liberty and they used this idea as the motto of their group. They were called “Young

Ottomans” and planned to establish a constitutional monarchy for the sake of the Ottomans and the empire. They were accepted as the first organized modern civil group. The Young Ottomans had never satisfied with “*Tanzimat*”, they had not accepted that it would be enough for the complete reform of the empire; they wanted more reforms especially on politics. Actually, it was not the *Tanzimat* they were against to, it was its implementation. And they saw it as an apery.

The Ottoman modernization meant series of reforms created by several Ottoman groups that formed by the Ottoman elites; a set of people who were referred to a small class of the society. They aimed to rearrange the balance power between the Ottoman Empire and the West. Eventually they thought the only way of modernization could become true with the acceptance of the elite and bureaucracy groups instead of the society itself. On the other hand from the perspective of the Young Ottomans, this acceptance could be a reason of the failure of *Tanzimat*. This was one of the reason why the Young Ottomans tried to find an answer to the question “what should be done to save the empire?”, because the attempts seemed to be failed. So, Young Ottomans questioned the *Tanzimat* and its outcome. For them, it was nothing but a series of reforms done for the sake of the West and could not enhance the empire. They wanted the establishment of “constitutional monarchy” in order to limit the individual powers of the Ottoman Sultan. In addition to this, there had to be a constitution which could secure the basic rights and the freedom of all the Ottoman people. Those changed were essential and inevitable for the Young Ottomans.

In the second chapter, I studied the biography of Namık Kemal. Knowing the essential details of his life helped me to understand his works and vision. There,

it could be seen that he had lost his mother at a very early age and his grandfather became his guardian. Kemal's childhood and youth was shaped by his grandfather. Later, his job at the central Translation Bureau of Government and meeting with Şinasi could be considered as the high-points of Kemal's life. First of all, he improved his writings and power on both his mother language and French. Secondly, it was the beginning of his first attempt to be a journalist.

The third chapter depicts, The Young Ottomans as intellectuals and journalists, and the consequences of raising their voices. The chapter will deal with their escape to Paris and London and presents adequate reasons for their escape. The newspaper "Muhbir" that they published and their writings angered the government of Ali Pasha and the Ottoman Sultan Abdülaziz. The members were banished in order to be kept away from Istanbul, especially from their readers and followers. The Ottoman government wanted to end their activities and reduce them to silence. But, it was obvious that the Young Ottomans had a tendency on rebellion and courage which somehow associated them with being adventurers. The chapter also discussed Namık Kemal's return to his homeland and began to write his best known drama; "*Vatan Yahut Silistre*" at the end of 1870. The play was an exception; it centered on the commitment and loyalty to "Vatan", fatherland, which had never been shown so sacred and valuable before. The Ottomans as the Sultans' *tebaa* accustomed to see their fatherland and themselves as a "property" which the Ottoman Sultan owned; which is a common acceptance in every absolute monarchies. "*Vatan Yahut Silistre*" created a sense which the Ottomans were not accustomed to. The drama was accepted and appreciated by the audience as well as its writer, Namık Kemal. Simply, the reason that made the drama so special and unique was its loyalty to the "fatherland and nation" rather than the Ottoman Sultan or the World of Islam.

‘Vatan’ became an understanding that worth sacrifice and to die for. Namık Kemal’s approach and understanding of patriotism made him called as the poet of fatherland and liberty, even today he is a well-known poet who had inspired and still inspires his readers.

On Part II, a deep analysis of ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ will be studied by giving examples, in addition to this, a criticism of the drama will be made under the conditions of the related era. The following chapter is about the concepts of ‘Fatherland and Patriotism’ which are the major issues of the drama, and will be studied with examples and Namık Kemal’s views on ‘*Vatan*’. ‘Issues and themes on gender will depict İslam Bey’s and Zekiye’s relationship under the moral principles of the society also Zekiye’s leaving her home for attending the war, which was a different perspective to women at that time being, Zekiye’s role on the drama and the gender problems on the related era. Namık Kemal wrote down a woman that became a soldier and fought for her country which was a different role for a woman in the society but it should have been noted that Zekiye claimed herself as ‘male’, hiding her real gender. The seventh chapter is all about a different criticism of the drama by Mizancı Murat. His work was accepted as one of the first critic that was done on drama itself. He argued the drama under the ‘moral principles’ and stated that it was poor in theatrical techniques.

Part III of my thesis, demonstrates the outcomes of ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’. The reactions of the audience and the critics about the drama published on the *İbret* newspaper annoyed the Ottoman government and Sultan Abdulaziz. The newspaper had been shut down and Namık Kemal was sent to Famagusta in Northern Cyprus where he spent his three years of his life. There, he wrote his best known

masterpieces. Apart from my primary source, “*Vatan Yahut Silistre*”, I used multiple references as secondary sources during the progress of this study. First, Mithat Cemal Kuntay’s three-volume book “Namık Kemal”, which can be accepted as the most detailed study on Namık Kemal. Secondly, Ebuzziya Tevfik’s “Yeni Osmanlılar”; and thirdly, Şerif Mardin’s study, “The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought”. Apart from those, I have used number of journal articles, books and the academic studies’ reports on the subject.

The approach of this thesis based on Namık Kemal and his patriotic work, ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’. With the help of ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ and afterwards; people, especially Ottoman Intellectuals, authors, journalists had started to have an understanding that they were living under an oppression. The drama revealed the hidden feelings of the society. Their reaction was nothing but an obvious proof of a need for a relief. In this thesis, I have not only studied Namık Kemal, and his play ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ but also the historical background of The Young Ottomans’ in order to make an accurate study of the related era. There are some current publications arguing the intensity of patriotism of the Young Ottomans and Namık Kemal. Some of those studies accept their purposes but some critics describe them having a harmful approach toward the empire’s integrity. Instead, Young Ottomans had an aim toward the empire to keep its power and continuum alive. It should not be argued about their intention, whether the outcome was the welfare or damage to the empire. It is not the major aim for this thesis to search or comment on the true intentions of the historical figures or events; instead, this thesis mostly focused on the life of Namık Kemal and ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ which are needed topics in order to understand and make an analysis on the related era. After all is said and done,

theatrical plays and the writers are the major topics that reflect the spirit of the late 19th century Ottoman Empire.

PART I
HISTORICAL AND THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

CHAPTER 2

NAMIK KEMAL; LIFE OF THE POET OF VATAN UP TO 1863

"Ne gam pür-âteş-i hevî olsa da gavgâ-yı Hürriyet

*Bize hâk-i mezâr ehven gelir hâk-i mezelleten"*²

Childhood and Youth

Namık Kemal, who had become the symbol of patriotism and freedom, was born on 21st December 1840 in Tekirdağ. Even though he was known as "Namık Kemal", his name given at birth was "Mehemmet Kemal". His father Mustafa Asım Bey was a literate man who could speak Arabic and Persian and became a *Müneccimbaşı*.³⁴ His mother Fatma Zehra Hanım was the daughter of Abdülatif Pasha who was a *muhassıl*⁵ in the Ottoman Empire and would going to be the person who took all the responsibilities of raising Kemal. Abdülatif Pasha was a wealthy man and was very fond of his grandson Mehmet Kemal. In his biographical work on

²Kolcu, Ali İhsan. "Hürriyet Kasidesi." In *Namık Kemal'in Poetikası*. Salkımsöğüt Yayınları, 2010. P: 29.

³ In Abdullah Uçman's article; '*Kısa bir ömrün uzun hikayesi*', he studied Namık Kemal's son Ali Ekrem's work '*Ruh-i Kemal*', and says that Ali Ekrem states that his father did not enjoy hanging together with his father, Mustafa Asım Bey who had superstitious beliefs. in Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. Uçman, Abdullah. "Kısa Bir ömrün Hikayesi." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 13-14.

⁴In Ottoman Empire, *Müneccimbaşı* is the title given to the chief astrologer of the court; similar interpretation to fortune teller

⁵*Muhassıl*, a senior public official under the Ottoman Empire charged with tax collection

Namık Kemal, Abdullah Uçman says; “Namık Kemal had parents who were both sophisticated and worked at administrative duties at The Ottoman Government. Additionally he was coming from an important family which had produced significant figures. Kemal used to mention about them very proudly.”⁶

When Kemal was born, his grandfather was a *muhassıl* in Tekirdağ; he was originally an Albanian and also a Bektashi.⁷ Kemal grew up in his grandfather’s house with his father and mother. After five years, his grandfather Abdüllatif Pasha was assigned to Afyon as *muhassıl*. The family moved to Afyon where Kemal lost his mother at a very early age. Edip Ali Bakı’s book about Namık Kemal’s life in Afyon⁸ gives details on his life and mentions that, the information on Kemal’s childhood can be studied by his own son, Ali Ekrem’s book, ‘Namık Kemal’ which was published on 1930 by the Turkish Republic Government Printing Office. Ali Ekrem stated in his book; “Kemal’s mother died when he was a child, Kemal was motherless at the age of two and was in need to his father, who could no longer stay with his father-in-law”. Edip Ali Baki states that, information about Kemal’s mother is insufficient at the time she was passed away.⁹ Kemal's father Mustafa Asım Bey at first, wanted to live with his son at his father-in-law’s house, but later he could not stay alone any longer and looked for another wife. The permission was given by the

⁶Uçman, Abdullah. "Kısa Bir ömrün Hikayesi." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 13.

⁷ In addition to this, Memet Fuat adds that, “Namık Kemal’s assuming himself as an Albanian, calling himself as an Albanian in *Tahrib-i Harabat* and tending towards Sufism and Mevleviyeh were the direct influence of his grandfather.” Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*.Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 12.

⁸Bakı, Edip Ali. *Namık Kemal Afyon’da*, Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1949. P: 7.

⁹ Ibid. p: 7.

grandfather Abdülatif Pasha but he wanted to take care of Kemal and did not give him to his father. Neither Kemal nor his grandfather wanted to leave each other. First, Abdülatif Pasha was appointed to Kütahya and later moved to Istanbul where he and his family started a new life.

At the age of nine, a new era had started in Kemal's life. His grandfather had so many friends, and one of those friends was very close to him; Eşref Pasha. Eşref Pasha who was a well-known poet of the time, did not favored Kemal's first name as 'Mehemmet' and wanted to give another name to this young and promising poet, he started to call him the name, "Namık",¹⁰ and since then he used that name. Abdullah Uçman in his articles states that; "Namık Kemal had written various and large amount of poems here again with the insistence and encouragement of the figures that had interest in literature and under the leadership of the grandfather and Eşref Pasha who was one of the well-known poets of the era. As Eşref Pasha appreciated Namık Kemal's poems, he gave him the nickname 'Namık'."¹¹ Namık Kemal went to Beyazıt Rüştüye for three months which was an Ottoman junior high school. Afterwards, he went to Valide Mektebi for a year. Kemal's education at school had ended there but with the help of his grandfather he continued his education. Abdülatif Pasha was taking care of his education properly.¹² When Kemal was thirteen, Abdülatif Pasha had appointed to Kars as *mutasarrıf*. So, the family had

¹⁰ 'Namık' means writer, typer in Ottoman Turkish

¹¹ Uçman, Abdullah. "Kısa Bir ömrün Hikayesi." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 16.

¹² Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*.Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık. 1999. P: 13.

moved to Kars on 1853. Edip Ali Bakı states; “Leaving for Kars was beneficial for Kemal. He saw mountains, stones, plains, fields, cliffs, rivers, towns, villages, people and the enormous fatherland! This kid fell in love with the fatherland while he was travelling from Istanbul to Kars.”¹³ In Kars, Kemal found the chance to take his literature education from Vaizzade Seyit Mehmet Efendi; he was one of the famous poets that had visited the Pasha's mansion.

Meanwhile, The Ottoman Empire was having difficult times. On March 1854, France and the Great Britain declared war against Russia and with the support of the Ottomans; France had attacked Crimea¹⁴. There was another longstanding war between the Ottoman and Russia in the Rumelia and the Ottoman government has decided to relieve all the administrators of duty because of the failures on the east fronts. Abdüllatif Pasha was among them and he returned Istanbul on March 1854. Few months later, on May 1855, Abdüllatif Pasha was appointed to Sofia as a district governorate. Kemal strengthened his Arabic and Persian with the help of the instructors whom his grandfather had arranged.¹⁵ He continued writing poems and started to assume himself as a poet. Edip Ali Bakı says that Kemal had three joys in Sofia; reading poems, riding horse and going hunting.¹⁶

¹³Bakı, Edip Ali. *Namık Kemal Afyon'da*, Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1949. P: 31.

¹⁴Russell, William Howard. *The British Expedition to the Crimea*. G. Routledge&Company. 1858

¹⁵ Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 15.

¹⁶ Bakı, Edip Ali. *Namık Kemal Afyon'da*, Ulus Basımevi. Ankara. 1949. P: 33.

Namık Kemal grew up and his grandfather Abdülatif Pasha decided to marry Kemal. Therefore, Namık Kemal married with the daughter of *Kadı* Mustafa Ragıp Efendi, Nesime. The couple was not appropriate to each other and it resulted in failure and brought unhappiness for both Kemal and Nesime¹⁷. First Feride, the eldest daughter was born, and then Ulviye. After three years, Ali Ekrem was born who wrote down his memoir about his father. Today, we can analyze this memoir to figure out their father and son relationship. Ulviye passed away at a very early age, and only two other children left alive. Namık Kemal's son was raised by his grandfather Mustafa Asım Bey while he was in Europe. Mustafa Asım Bey took care of Nesime Hanım and his grandchildren.

Education and Professional Life

Kemal's grandfather Abdülatif Pasha's work in Sofia has ended and the family moved to Istanbul again. Namık Kemal started to work at the Translation Bureau at 1857.¹⁸ He was only 17 but he could overcome this occupation. This helped Kemal to advance his skill over the French language and helped him to create some close intellectual friends. Memet Fuat states in his book; "The facts that Kemal learned from the Translation Bureau affected his thoughts directly and changed his

¹⁷ Memet Fuat states that, Namık Kemal's wife was illiterate and also a nervous woman that failed to domesticate Namık Kemal. Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*.Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 16.

¹⁸ According to Memet Fuat, Namık Kemal started to work as an assistant of the famous poet Leskofçalı Galip Bey at the customs house for two years later he was transferred to the Translation Bureau. But there are other sources that do not accept this information, according to those sources, Namık Kemal directly started working on the Translation Bureau and met with Leskofçalı Galip with the help of Rifat Bey. Ibid., p: 17.

opinions to a Westerner point of view. But he did not have modern thoughts on the art and literature.”¹⁹ Namık Kemal was following Leskofçalı Galip as his guidance on literature which affected his artistic view, to become more traditional. By the year 1861, Kemal had become a well-known young man who liked reading and researching. Perhaps, this process could have been longer for Kemal if he did not meet with Şinasi. Şinasi directly influenced him on becoming a writer and a journalist; this fundamental meeting and working with Şinasi as his colleague put his life into a very different direction instead of being a common translator or a writer. Şinasi was an Ottoman intellectual who published *Tasvir-i Efkar*. Belkıs Ulusoy, in her article about Turkish press and journalism at the *Tanzimat* era, makes comments on the newspaper; “*Tasvir-i Efkar* had been a newspaper that showed the importance of public opinion and the need for a dynamic public opinion, which was mandatory element for the benefit and interest of the government. So that, Şinasi had published an article on the first issue of the newspaper stating that; ‘having a newspaper is essential for every nation that is defending the benefits and interests, being an interpreter for them’”²⁰.

This meeting resulted with a partnership, and became his colleague. Memet Fuat states; “Kemal learned a lot of things while working

¹⁹ Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*.Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 17.

²⁰ Nalcioğlu, Belkıs Ulusoy. "*Tanzimat* Dönemi Türk Gazeteciliği Ve Türk Basınının İlkleri." 2005, P: 257. Accessed July 30, 2014. http://journals.manas.kg/mjsr/oldarchives/Vol07_Issue14_2005/453.pdf.

voluntarily with Şinasi. He worked at the newspaper, wrote articles and became a popular and wanted newspaperman.”²¹

Namık Kemal’s writing and publications had managed to create an impression around the government and community. Furthermore, *Sadrızam Ali Pasha* awarded him with a badge. At that time, heir of the Ottoman Throne, Murat Efendi who was the eldest son of Sultan Abdülmecit, became close friends with Namık Kemal. Namık Kemal started to give literature lessons to Murat Efendi. This was the beginning of a friendship that will last long.²²

The era of the Sultan Abdülaziz (1861-1876) was the time of the pressures and restrictions over journalism. Just at that moment, there was a rumor which came out about an assassination attempt to Sultan Abdülaziz by a bunch of people including Şinasi. The oppressive regime of the Sultan, also took the liberty of press. So, the Journalists and writers could not help themselves without feeling that pressure on their journalism activities. It was only a rumor but it could be an inadequate reason for Şinasi to look for another place to run away. Those were the days that even a rumor could be enough to be sentenced to death. Şinasi had decided to escape to Paris²³, leaving his newspapers' all responsibility to Namık Kemal.

²¹Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*.Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 27.

²² Mithat Cemal Kuntay gives detailed information on Namık Kemal and Murat Efendi’s friendship, he adds, “Murat Efendi was Kemal’s friend only when he was at Istanbul, his friendship was poor and even none when Kemal was in Europe.” Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010.Vol.I p: 79.

²³Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2006.

Kemal felt the joy and the freedom of having a newspaper; it was going to be the beginning of his social aspects of journalism.

CHAPTER 3

NAMIK KEMAL AS A YOUNG OTTOMAN

“*Senindir şimdi cezb-i kalbe kudret setr-i hüsn etme*

Cemâlin tâ ebed dûr olmasın enzâr-ı ümmetden”²⁴

Newspapers had been the most influential and effective way of communicating with the society and the Ottoman intellectuals had already started to publish their own newspaper. *Muhbir*²⁵ was published by Ali Suavi and Ziya Pasha²⁶, who would be going to be on the front burner sometime soon. Namık Kemal was still working at the Translation Bureau. He had four close friends; İskender Beyzade Reşat, Menapirzade Nuri Bey, Sağır Ahmet Beyzade Mehmet and Suphi Paşazade Ayetullah. They were all able to speak French like their mother tongue and they became close friends at the Translation Bureau. They were arguing about the same topics; the fatherland and liberty. In other words, they were a bunch of young men who were still under the influence of the French Revolution. Sometimes they were making lively discussions about the Ottoman policy and the government. The solution was a fundamental change of the Ottoman throne and the regime. Those friends were all impressed by the French Revolution and could not help themselves without thinking it again and again, dreaming for a reform to save the

²⁴ "Hürriyet Kasidesi." Kolcu, Ali İhsan. *Namık Kemal'in Poetikası*. Salkımsöğüt Yayınları, 2010.

²⁵ 'Muhbir' means messenger, journalist in Ottoman Turkish literally

²⁶ Mithat Cemal Kuntay mentions about Ziya Bey as Pasha because he believes that Ziya Bey deserves the title as 'pasha'. Ziya Pasha was 'Bey' when he escaped to Europe but before that he was 'Beylerbeyi' and later became 'Vezir' (Vizier). Ziya Bey was honored with the title 'Pasha' for twice. So for Kuntay he is 'Poet Ziya Pasha'. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. I p: 425.

empire.²⁷ Ramazan Hurç makes a comment on the Young Ottomans' inspirations in his article on the idea of movement in the last period of the Ottoman Empire; "Young Ottomans had adopted the theories from XVIII. Century French philosophers', 'Separation of Powers' by Montesquieu and 'Natural Rights' by Rousseau. Merely, they have tried to match these western ideas with 'Şeriat' (Sharia)."²⁸ The Young Ottomans was a group of people who had a deep intellectual knowledge of the West which gave them a different perspective from the Ottoman intellectuals of the current time.

The publishers of the *Muhbir*, Namık Kemal and his close friends from the Translation Bureau gathered together on June in 1865²⁹ and decided to establish an organization that would help them find an answer to the question; "how could we survive the empire?"³⁰ They were partially inspired by the other groups in Italy and

²⁷ In his master thesis Fetthullah Güner states that; "From a different viewpoint, The Young Ottomans is an opposition group which was not an objective of the reformists but established as a consequence of their administrations. The concepts of fatherland, liberty and patriotism indicates that the aim of the group was to indemnify the loss of the empire as a result of the nationalism movement." Güner, Fetthullah. (2008) Milliyetçilik Akımına bir Alternatif Olarak "Osmanlılık" Hareketi. Postgraduate Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu. P: 46.

²⁸ Hurç, Ramazan. "Osmanlılarda Son Devir Fikir Hareketleri." *Fırat Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 2 (1997): 263-75. Accessed May 20, 2014. http://portal.firat.edu.tr/Disaridan/_TEMP/278/file/1997-1/OSMANLILARDA SON DEVIR FKR HAREKETLER.pdf. P:268.

²⁹ In Ferhat Kaplan's thesis, he states that; "In respect the meeting of some young intellectuals who were sad and mad about the situation of the country in a picnic in the Forest Belgrade in 1865 to discuss the ways to bring remedies for the recent problems of the Empire, is interesting. According to Ebuzziya, who is the first author to write about the Young Ottoman movement, first fire of the Young Ottoman movement was ignited in this picnic."

Kaplan, Ferhat. "The Role of the Young Ottomans in the Transformation of Mentality in the Ottoman Empire." 25. <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12608358/index>.

³⁰ Kasalak, Kadir. 2009. "Cumhuriyet Fikrinin Öncüleri." *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Aralık: 69-72.

Poland that prepared their revolutions secretly. Şerif Mardin gave a detailed information; “Ali Suavi specifically states that; ‘Young Spain, Young France, Young Italy were the organizations after which the secret society of 1865 had been modeled.’”³¹ They called themselves as "Young Ottomans" and the number of members of the group increased during time. Ernur Genç in his article mentions; “The first significant organization made of intellectuals which aims to have a constitutional administration system at Ottoman Empire were the ‘Young Ottomans’.

At the beginning they were calling themselves as ‘İttifak-ı Hamiyet’; those young revolutionists drew together a set of reasons; the general information that they had gathered about European civilization and a common concern of fragmentation and dispersion of Ottoman Empire.”³² In reality, Young Ottomans wanted ‘the system of consultancy’ rather than the Sultans inviolable authority. There should be a representative government and it should have considerable power on the Sultan's management over the empire. Kenan Çağın states in his article; “Namık Kemal’s understanding of constitutional monarchy is a system of administration with a president who is legitimately accepted by the society and this president has put in charge of the state without election but appointed with a rightful way.”³³ Some Ottoman officers and several Pashas participated in the organization. This empowered the Young Ottomans, and took the attention of the Ottoman intellectuals

³¹ Mardin, Şerif, . *The Genesis of Young Ottoman thought*. Syracuse University Press. 2000. P: 22.

³² Genç, Ernur. "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Kimlik, Misyon Ve Vizyonu Bağlamında Türk Aydını." *Sakarya SBE Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* 2, no. 1 (2007): 138.

³³ Çağın, Kenan. Namık Kemal'de Devletin Niteliği ve Temel Dayanakları. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* Volume 7, issue 1, year 2012. P: 268. <http://asosindex.com/journal-article-abstract?id=23677>

who were observing the west closely. Lord Kinross in his book, ‘*Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*’, defined the group; “A group of antagonists were existed here in Ottoman Empire which admired European Nations’ effort for achieving the ideal of freedom by using nationalism ever since 1848 revolution. Those groups of Young Turks, who had educated in a modern and secular method. They had found a new brave way of implementing nationalism.”³⁴ Young Ottomans were accepted as the first organized group of the Turkish intelligents that used the media as a tool. Şerif Mardin defines³⁵ their purpose in one of his primary work and says; “The major aim was to have an installation of parliament inside Ottoman Government named ‘*Meclis-i Meşveret*’³⁶. With this, sharing of the political potency would be established and the separation amongst powers will be provided. The balance amongst powers would be ensured with an execution committee that was reporting to the parliament. By ‘execution’; ‘Young Ottomans’ were referring ‘Bab-ı Ali’ instead of Sultan Abdülaziz.”³⁷ Since The Young Ottomans had started to declare their perspective and intention, they took the attention of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. Pasha had a close interest on the Young Ottomans. He was the brother of the Khedivate of

³⁴ Kinross, Lord. Ağustos 2009. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi. P: 517.

³⁵ Şerif Mardin also states; “(“usul-ü meşveret”). This method, they stated, was a Turkish forerunner of European parliamentary practice which had developed independent of European advances and prepared Ottomans for parliamentary rule.” Mardin, Şerif, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*. Syracuse University Press. 2000.s:134.

³⁶ To consult (v.)

³⁷ Mardin, Şerif. 1964. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*. İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları p:8-9.

Egypt İsmail Pasha.³⁸ He was wealthy and lived in Istanbul. The Ottoman Sultan Abdülaziz sometimes honored him with sensitive positions in the government. But suddenly he was dismissed without any certain reason.³⁹ It became obvious that the Ottoman regime was acting arbitrarily and depended on the Sultan's wishes and his surroundings. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha was left out from the Ottoman Empire and then went to Paris. During this time, Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Pasha declared his autonomy on Egypt. Egypt had gained some rights to govern, under the authority of the Ottoman Empire. The right of succession on governorship of the Egypt was not like the one in the Ottoman Empire. The right of succession passed to the eldest member of the family. If Khedive İsmail Pasha would ever die, his brother Mustafa Fazıl would become the new Khedive. But, this system was about to change.

At the beginning of 1866, after Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's discharge from Istanbul, Sultan made some changes over the "canon of inheritance".⁴⁰ According to

³⁸Ferhat Kaplan mentions in his thesis; "Mustafa Fazıl Pasha was the descendant of Mehmet Ali Pasha who captured the administrative hold of Egypt from the Ottoman Empire. The governors of the Egypt were called *Khedive*. The administrative right of the Egypt passed to the elder member of the family. At the period the governor of Egypt was the brother of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, Khedive İsmail. Mustafa Fazıl was raised in Istanbul and held important posts. However his ultimate goal was to occupy the throne of Egypt." Kaplan, Ferhat. (2007). *The Role of the Young Ottomans in the Transformation of Mentality in the Ottoman Empire*. Postgraduate Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara. p: 27.

³⁹Mithat Cemal Kuntay states; "Sultan Aziz and Mustafa Fazıl Pasha had a disagreement on a topic about France on the divan. Pasha stated that he can't do anything about the topic. Sultan became furious at Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. The next day Sadrazam Fuat Pasha was called by the Sultan and he said Mustafa Fazıl Pasha was jealous. Two days later at the Ramadan, Fuat Pasha did not send an invitation letter of the Sultan to Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, therefore the Sultan got angry of Pasha for not attending his invitation, and asked for the reason. Fuat pasha had already planned the others to discredit Mustafa Fazıl Pasha to the Sultan. They told the Sultan that Mustafa Fazıl Pasha got furious because Fuat Pasha was welcomed after him and Sultan Aziz displaced Pasha from the empire." Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010.Vol.I p:311.

⁴⁰Mithat Cemal Kuntay states; "Mustafa Fazıl Pasha was about to be incapacitated from becoming the Khedive of Egypt by changing the system. The Khedive of Egypt was going to be continued only by

the rules of this law application, the right of succession passed by consanguinity; passed from father to his son. This automatically eliminated Fazıl Pasha's possibility of becoming a Khedive. The Ottoman government gave Pasha an amount of money to console him, but Pasha wanted the old system to act which could give him the chance to become Khedive. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, tried new ways to make his wish come true and decided to change his plan to a new strategy; 'The enemy of my enemy is my friend.'⁴¹ So, he supported the Young Ottomans against Sultan Abdülaziz, because they were already known as an oppositional group.⁴² Pasha, wrote a letter to a Belgium newspaper, 'Nord', his concerns about the situation of the Ottoman Empire, there were major weaknesses on the administration and he was planning to support a young group that had adopted a progressive understanding. In addition to this, Pasha declared that he got in touch with the group, which had impact on society. So, the Young Ottomans wanted to announce the support of the Pasha by *Tasvir-i Efkar*⁴³ newspaper which was under the administration of Namık Kemal. They had citations from the letter written by Mustafa Fazıl Pasha mentioned above. In addition to that matter, Namık Kemal had written some other articles supporting

the first son. And in return of becoming the Khedive of Egypt, four and a half English pound from the Egypt treasury had been given to the Mustafa Fazıl Pasha." Ibid., p: 311.

⁴¹ Proverb, anonymous

⁴² Mithat Cemal Kuntay states; "Since, Mustafa Fazıl will not be the Khedive nor the *Sadrizam*. So, there was one thing to be, being the revolution friend of Kemal. And he did; even more, he became the hero of *Hürriyet*." Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. I. P:314

⁴³ Mithat Cemal Kuntay states; "Newspaper completes the politician virtue of Kemal at most, and three of the newspapers: *Tasvir-i Efkar*, *Hürriyet*, *İbret*. He was new while at *Tasvir-i Efkar*, was terrible at *Hürriyet* and was mature at *İbret*". Ibid., P:54

the letter.⁴⁴ Namık Kemal was defending the idea that government business must have more priority over personal matters and that was the main reason for him to support a change over the system of administration. Namık Kemal was strictly against to an arbitrary regime. Sultan's wills and obeying them without questioning was inevitable in autocracies but Kemal's vision of modernism was rejecting this idea for sure.

According to Namık Kemal, *Tanzimat* was a social and cultural imitation that influenced the society negatively.⁴⁵ In order to have those new regulations effective, there should be a work to make a synthesis between Islam and Westerner ideas. *Tanzimat* regulations could be proper to the society only if they were inspired by the Islamic roots and arranged to the society. Namık Kemal tried to protect Islamic believes and rules against the West. He accepted that the west was superior to the east on science and technology but weak at the moral and ethnic values compared to the East. Islamic societies had to be modernized but accepting every western regulation blindly would be a mistake. Kemal, tried to find evidences from Islam so

⁴⁴ Şerif Mardin in his book; 'The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought' gives the comments of Namık Kemal which he wrote in *Tasvir-i Efkâr* on 23 February 1867, under the letter of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha; "In short, those who hold new opinions are the future salvation of the nation. It is our opinion that whatever is achieved by them, the chances of bettering the conditions of the fatherland will increase proportionally. It is for this reason that those who are cognizant of the state of affairs in the capital will never abandon hope in the well-being of the people regardless of the obstacles that are encountered by the Empire. Let the Europeans believe that the Ottoman Empire is on the way to the grave. We know that it is not in the midst of a cemetery but in its mother's womb." Mardin, Şerif, . *The Genesis of Young Ottoman thought*. Syracuse University Press. 2000. P: 37-38.

⁴⁵ Ercan Eryiğit states in his thesis; "The Young Ottomans claimed that the *Tanzimat* reformists has failed to understand the concept of exploitation, created an upper circle, ruined their own culture by forgetting the sharia and they claimed they were only a superficial westerners. But according to the Young Ottomans, the *Tanzimat* administration could not understand the central of the westerner ideas which are the liberty and the parliamentary system." Eryiğit, Ercan. 2009. *İttihat Terakki'nin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Siyasete ve Yönetime Etkileri*. Postgraduate Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya. P: 39

as to strengthen his reformist ideas. Şerif Mardin comments on the argument; “The necessity to establish constitution in the Ottoman Empire the ‘system of *meşveret*’ the word coined by Kemal for ‘representitive government’ thus, starting from the premise that freedom was a divine grant, he would go on to state that a community could be free only when it had been assured of its personal rights (*hukuk-u şahsiye*) and of its political rights (*hukuk-u siyasiye*).”⁴⁶ He found evidences to the idea that he defended ‘system of *meşveret*’ meaning a ‘representative government’, from a verse of the Koran.⁴⁷ Kemal tried an intellectual searching to fulfill his statement, tried to find the Islamic expressions⁴⁸ to the western understandings and values. Mümtazer Türköne makes a different comment on the Islamic search of the Young Ottomans; “While searching for a solution inside the established balances of Ottoman society, spokesmen of religious matters are also have the position and the right of representing the society; ‘Young Ottomans’ had the chance of killing two birds with one stone.”⁴⁹ The Young Ottomans understanding of Islam was a search for a poof for their modern and western thoughts.⁵⁰

⁴⁶Mardin, Şerif, . *The Genesis of Young Ottoman thought*. Syracuse University Press. 2000. P: 309.

⁴⁷Akşin, Sina, *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi*, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2011. P: 37.

⁴⁸ ⁴⁸ According to Birol Emil’s article, Namık Kemal was inspired by the Prophet Muhammad’s sayings and created a perception toward consultancy and expressed in a poetic style; “Barika-i hakikat müsademe-i efkardan doğar”, “Çıkar asar-ı rahmet ihtilaf-ı re’yi ümmetten”. Emil, Birol, *Hürriyet, Medeniyet, İrade in Ölümünün 100. Yılında Namık Kemal*, Marmara Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1988. P: 15.

⁴⁹Türköne, Mümtazer. *Siyasi İdeoloji olarak İslamcılığın doğuşu*. 1994. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul. P: 86.

⁵⁰For further reading; Altundere, Ahmet. (1992) Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Özgürlüklerin Doğuşu. Doctoral Thesis, İstanbul University, İstanbul.

The Ottoman Empire was dealing with the Crete rebellion (1866-69) that broke out unexpectedly, in addition to this an Egypt problem came out. The Khedive İsmail Pasha desired for more authority over the district of Egypt. It meant to turn the Khedive of Egypt into an independent power. This claim was not approved by the Ottoman government. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, who was observing the emerging developments from Paris, wrote a letter to the Sultan in French and sent a copy of it to the Young Ottomans. Namık Kemal read the letter and enjoyed to see the Pasha's ideas were similar to theirs. The Young Ottomans wanted to declare the letter immediately and printed it on their newspaper. Ebuzziya Tevfik in his book; 'The Young Ottomans',⁵¹ wrote down the story of the Young Ottomans from the perspective of a member of the group also a very close friend of Namık Kemal. In his book, a copy of the Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's letter can be read.⁵² Ebuzziya Tevfik comments on the Pasha's letter and says; "Pasha's letter was making an anatomical structure of the illness in a way that both the intellectuals and illiterate people could understand. It was noteworthy that the recovery of the illness was shown without any hopelessness. Also, there were cures and precautions were given which the countries and the governments were dealt with this illness, could be practiced by us and possibly could end with the recovery of our sickness."⁵³ Ebuzziya Tevfik adds that the effect of the letter to the society were quite important because it could awaken the

⁵¹ Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. Istanbul: Pegasus, 2006.

⁵² Ibid., p: 27-40.

⁵³ Ibid., p.40

government but the authorities failed to understand the importance and the possible effects.⁵⁴

Events that irritated the Ottoman Government acted out over and over at the same time as Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's repercussive letter had been exposed to the publicity. On the other hand, newspapers published demands of the Khedive İsmail Pasha, which could eventually decreased the dignity of the Ottoman Government. It was a diplomatic problem which was reflected on the press. As a result, after a chain of events occurred publicly and Government directed it's reaction to the *Muhbir* newspaper and shut it down. There were already a law on press but it became harder to control the new awakenings of the society. Shutting a newspaper down by using courthouse was taking a long time. The government was in an intention to get the authority to shut a newspaper down quickly. Beyhan Kanter in her article on Namık Kemal's journalism says; "Namık Kemal had struggled for expressing his ideas freely in the press world of Ottoman Empire; therefore, he also used his newspaper articles in this effort."⁵⁵ So, this act of the government was going to affect Kemal negatively, he was no longer a free journalist writing down his ideas depending on his actual thoughts. Babiali published a document named '*Ali Kararname*'⁵⁶ on 28th of February 1867. The rules of the document basically forbid every publishing

⁵⁴ Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2006 p.40

⁵⁵ Kanter, Beyhan. "Tanzimat Döneminde Muhalif Bir Gazeteci: Namık Kemal." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 409.

⁵⁶ Also see; Tezcan, Asuman. "Ali Kararname Ve Basın." *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi* 3, no. 4 (2005). Accessed May 16, 2014. <http://josc.selcuk.edu.tr/josc/article/download/294/288>.

against the benefit of the Government or criticizing the Government, in other words they were aimed to stop any possible corruption in the current regime. After the document ‘*Ali Kararname*’ was declared, newspapers started to be shut down one and after. Beyhan Kanter defined the regulation on her article; “By using this regulation, Ottoman Government aimed to oppress newspapers that publish articles against the state, government officers or government itself; additionally they have had the opportunity to legitimacy of their censorship.”⁵⁷ The government had right to interfere press by every mean with the help of the new regulations of press. Also Belkıs Ulusoy states in her article; “Additionally, in the regulation it is stated that newspapers that publish without permission or creates disturbances on internal peace and governmental security, would be shut down permanently or temporarily.”⁵⁸ The freedom of writing was nearly ended in the empire which meant the restriction of declaring the ideas and thoughts.

The First Reaction to The Young Ottoman movement; ‘Exile’

Ziya Pasha, Namık Kemal and Ali Suavi was aware that a decision was about to be made concerning themselves. Immediately after, Ziya Pasha exiled to Cyprus, Namık Kemal exiled to Erzurum, Ali Suavi exiled to Kastamonu. The major reason for those exiles and banishments were basically their being against to the government and the current policies. Servet Tiken in his article, states a comment on

⁵⁷Kanter, Beyhan. "*Tanzimat* Döneminde Muhalif Bir Gazeteci: Namık Kemal." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 411.

⁵⁸Nalcıoğlu, Belkıs Ulusoy, ‘*Tanzimat* Dönemi Türk Gazeteciliği ve Türk Basımının İlkleri’ http://journals.manas.kg/mjsr/oldarchives/Vol07_Issue14_2005/453.pdf p: 260.

the exile judgment of the authorities; “Exile became an effective tool for governments to intimidate and guarantee the continuum of its authority.”⁵⁹ It was nearly impossible to ignore the Sultan’s decision about them, but they got unexpected news from Mustafa Fazıl Pasha with a letter. Pasha was calling them to Paris instead of respecting the Ottoman government’s judgment. He made his offer and mentioned that he would support them financially. Ahmet Bedevi Kuran in his book gives detailed information; “In his letter, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha mentioned that he would support the expenses in Europe and additionally stated that he did not forget the families. Therefore, Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha had confirmed the intentions of *Sadrizam* Ali Pasha on their appointments of being government officers. So, they had accepted the invitation of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha and left Istanbul on 1867 by a French flagged steamboat and went to Paris.”⁶⁰ As a result, Ali Suavi, Agah Efendi, Menapirzade Nuri Bey, Sağırzade Mehmet Bey, Kayazade Reşat Bey, Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha ran away to Paris. They were all aware that they were no longer be able to make their jobs as a ‘journalist and writer’ if they ever accepted their exile. After leaving Istanbul, the society learned about their escape from the newspapers. It was quite obvious that the Ottoman government was about to arrest all the members of the Young Ottomans, but there was no certain list of those members. Ebuzziya Tefvik on his book states; “The escape of Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha instead of going to their services was heard by the people of Istanbul few

⁵⁹ Tiken, Servet. ‘Sürgün, Edebiyat ve Namık Kemal’in Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. *Namık Kemal*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 95.

⁶⁰ Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi. Ocak 2012. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri ve Milli Mücadele*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.p:74.

days later. Because of the fact that no one was aware of the real reason of their escape and even the place, everyone was making up stories as a reason.”⁶¹ A new journey was about to begin for the Young Ottomans. They were going to have difficulties as well as some experiences that developed their points of views about their claims that they had been stood up for.

As soon as the Young Ottomans arrived at Paris, they searched for Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. Their first plan was to cooperate with Pasha as they both had the same purpose; the acceptance of a constitutional monarchy by the Ottoman Sultan. Namık Kemal wanted to continue writing; it was the only way to make his ideas announced to his readers and the society. He wanted to speak from abroad to his country and continue struggling. On the other hand, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha had already announced that the Ottoman patriots were going to come to Paris; the press of Paris started to write that the Young Ottomans were going to continue their mission at here. But, the Young Ottomans were going to hear some news that bothered them. The Ottoman Sultan Abdülaziz was going to come to Paris for the invitation of Napoleon III with his committee.⁶² Most probably the French officers were not going to be pleased by the Young Ottomans’ appearance. Thus, the French interior minister called them for a meeting. During that time, Fazıl Pasha was not in Paris, who already had close relationship with the French officers, he had gone to Toulon to declare his loyalty to

⁶¹ Ebuzziya Tefik, *Yeni Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2006. P: 62.

⁶² Mardin, Yusuf. *Namık Kemal’in Londra Yılları*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1974. P: 11.

the Ottoman Sultan Abdülaziz. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha surprisingly left to meet with the Sultan.⁶³

The Foreign Minister welcomed Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha; Namık Kemal primarily spoke out and told they could not be in Paris during the Ottoman Sultan's visit because they were going to be in London. In truth, they were aware that the French officer was not going to let them stay in Paris, so they intended to leave by their own decision.⁶⁴ The Foreign Minister, Marquis de la Valette, was pleased to hear their leaving, adding that this decision was appropriate because they could not had a role on this case. The request was made by some other authority; it was the Ottoman ambassador Cemil Bey. After figuring out this, the Young Ottomans understood that they should leave the city. So, Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, Agah Bey and Ali Suavi headed for London.⁶⁵

London was the new destination of the Young Ottomans whereas Mustafa Fazıl Pasha had gone to Paris with the Sultan after appealing for mercy. It was Mustafa Fazıl Pasha who was deported by the Sultan and it was again him that wrote letters and called the Young Ottomans to cooperate in his plans; to change the Ottoman regime and also the Sultan. The Young Ottomans could stay in Paris with the help of Pasha, as Pasha was supporting them financially. After his visit to Paris

⁶³Mardin, Yusuf. Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1974. p: 38.

⁶⁴ According to Yusuf Mardin's book, The French foreign minister told; "You made the right decision, I was going to tell the exact thing to you. The imperial government wants to minimize everything that may bother our magnificent guest." Ibid.,p: 9-10.

⁶⁵Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2006. P: 112-113.

the Sultan decided to go to London as the guest of the Queen Victoria. The Young Ottomans thought that they had to leave again but they were not asked to leave by the government. Yusuf Mardin states that Britain was far more different than France; “The three rebellious young Turk could wander freely in Britain.”⁶⁶ But, in the meantime, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha and Sultan Abdülaziz became close and the Sultan allowed him to turn back to Istanbul with him. Pasha, wanted to stay two months longer to finish his works, did he wish to continue his cooperation with the Young Ottomans? The answer was yes but, he had his own purposes again. Ahmet Bedevi Kuran simply defines the situation in his book, “Mustafa Fazıl Pasha had returned to Istanbul after a while from the succession of Sultan Abdülaziz to the throne; and then became a minister. It seems, *Veliaht* Mustafa Fazıl who was proud of being very wealthy, had used Turkish revolutionists like a flag in his hands.”⁶⁷ The Young Ottomans unfortunately used as a means of taking revenge by Fazıl Pasha, and money was his trump.

The Usage of Press as a Means of Propagation

The Young Ottomans tried to continue on their missions in London. Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi, Ziya Pasha and Agah Efendi wanted to publish a newspaper. But sometime later there occurred a disagreement amongst them. Ali Suavi wanted to publish ‘*Muhbir*’ in London whereas Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha wanted to publish a new newspaper called ‘*Hürriyet*’. Mustafa Fazıl Pasha clarified that he was

⁶⁶ Mardin, Yusuf. *Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1974. P: 41.

⁶⁷ Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri Ve Milli Mücadele*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012. P: 79.

not in favor of '*Muhbir*' and wanted Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha publish '*Hürriyet*'.⁶⁸ Pasha was supporting them financially by paying salaries to them. But, there were conflicts about to happen among the Young Ottomans. Ali Suavi wanted to change his position into a different aspect. His aim was to create an Islamic organization addressing the Muslim population in the India. Suavi did not use the title 'Young Ottomans' but was mentioning '*Cemiyet-i İslamiye*' instead.⁶⁹ Ahmet Bedevi Kuran comments on the subject; "The first issue of "*Muhbir*" newspaper published at London on 1867. However, the content was not disliked by Jön Turks. Suavi Efendi, who was a very ambitious and a pro-individualist person; he was writing articles with his understanding of reforms conducted in country should be done according to the religious principles."⁷⁰ Neither Namık Kemal nor Ziya Pasha was approving his policy, soon after Mustafa Fazıl Pasha indicated that they should publish '*Hürriyet*'. It was the beginning of separation between the Young Ottomans. Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha wrote a letter to Ali Suavi demanding him to remove the name and the signature of the Young Ottomans. So, the first disagreement among the Young Ottomans ended up with a separation.

Namık Kemal returned Paris in September 1867. He sent his writings to *Hürriyet* from there. On 29 June 1868, The First Issue of *Hürriyet* Newspaper was

⁶⁸ Yusuf Mardin states; "Mustafa Fazıl Pasha gave the order of publishing *Hürriyet* newspaper to Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha in Grand Millioire hotel in Brussels." Mardin, Yusuf. *Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları*. Milliyet Yayınları. İstanbul. 1974. p: 90.

⁶⁹ Those content I've mentioned are included in Mithat Cemal Kuntay's *Namık Kemal*, in '*Suavi Efendi*' chapter between pages 466-505. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. I.

⁷⁰ Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri Ve Milli Mücadele*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012. p:75.

published in London; the newspaper was under the administration of Agah Efendi. Articles published at '*Hürriyet*' newspaper were authored by Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha. Right after the fifth issue of the newspaper was published, Reşat Bey who was the representative manager of the '*Hürriyet*' left the management to Namık Kemal and went to Paris. '*Hürriyet*' newspaper had started to find an audience in Istanbul; but the newspaper was clearly an opposition to the current Ottoman government. So, the government tried to suppress the distribution and started to make a propaganda of the newspaper amongst the society.⁷¹ But, the newspaper was appreciated and read by the society. According to Ebuzyiya Tefvik the reason was; "One of the reason of the success of *Hürriyet* was the two major writers' strong authorship and vigorous minds. These two heroes were stirring the blood of the patriotic people by their writings and impassioning them for a positive direction. This showed that their efforts were not wasted, their political views were going to muster up more supports in a short time."⁷²

Namık Kemal returned London on March 1868; together with Ziya Pasha, Reşat Bey and Nuri Bey and continued to write articles to *Hürriyet*. Afterwards, they passed to Ostend which was located in Belgium; where Namık Kemal witnessed a very unpleasant event. Eflatun Pasha who was actually sent by İsmail Pasha, Khedive of Egypt arranged an appointment to meet with Namık Kemal. İsmail Pasha would like to earn 'Young Ottomans'; his brother was supporting 'Young Ottomans'

⁷¹ Ebuzyiya Tefvik mentions about an incident took place in Istanbul about the policeman that wanted to prevent the people to read the newspaper *Hürriyet*. Ebuzyiya Tefvik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. Pegasus Yayınları. 2006. p: 205-206.

⁷² Ibid., p: 196-197.

and the competition between brothers was the main motivation for him to do this; so, he would like to take ‘Young Ottomans’ on his own side. Eflatun Pasha went to meet with Namık Kemal on behalf of Khedive İsmail Pasha.⁷³ During this meeting Eflatun Pasha tried to offer bribe to Namık Kemal in order to create a collaboration between İsmail Pasha and ‘Young Ottomans’; he asked for two matters in exchange of money.⁷⁴ Firstly, asked about supporting the side of İsmail Pasha on articles published at *Hürriyet* newspaper. Secondly, demanded him to criticize the current Ottoman Government’s policy on Egypt stating that Khedive was right about his demands.⁷⁵ Namık Kemal refused him very clearly; he got very frustrated and right after his return, he wrote a harsh article to be published on *Hürriyet* newspaper. Namık Kemal mentioned about this event that he had witnessed on his article.⁷⁶

He wrote down that the Young Ottomans were not a group that could be bought or deceived at any cost.⁷⁷ It was impossible for them to write about any topic which was not appropriate to their understandings. In the meantime; Mustafa Fazıl

⁷³ Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. Pegasus Yayınları. 2006. P: 274-275.

⁷⁴ Mithat Cemal Kuntay states; “Khedive İsmail Pasha believed in money too much. There were no one that he could not buy with the help of his money, including Kemal and Ziya.” Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol.I p:572.

⁷⁵ Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol.I. p: 574.

⁷⁶ Ebuzziya Tevfik presents this article on his book. It can be read on; p: 276-277.

⁷⁷ Mithat Cemal Kuntay states in his book that the incident between Eflatun Pasha and Namık Kemal could be exaggerated by Ebuzziya Tevfik because of his identity as a journalist. Moreover, Kuntay is not sure about the incident, for him the reality of the case is minimized because the article published on the *Hürriyet* newspaper is incomplete. The part that starts with “The Young Ottomans” till “they prove their rights” is completely given but the continuity of the article is deficient. But Kuntay is sure that Kemal had rejected the money because he did not write any single word in favor of Khedive İsmail. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol.I p:574.

Pasha was aiming to be the Khedive of Egypt and made peace with the Ottoman Government in Istanbul and he did not seem to need the support of ‘Young Ottomans’. Additionally, he was thinking to put an end to the *Hürriyet* newspaper.⁷⁸ *Hürriyet* was the only mass medium that was prepared by ‘Young Ottomans’ to publish their ideas and voices. In Abdullah Uçman’s article on Namık Kemal he says; “Namık Kemal’s writings published at *Hürriyet* with his own title, were generically mentioning dysfunctional aspects of the administrative and social issues and their countermeasures; ultimately he was pointing the need and the requirement of a constitutional monarchy regime.”⁷⁹ Pasha, sent Namık Kemal, Ziya

Pasha and Agah Efendi a letter, stating that he was in an intention to shut ‘*Hürriyet*’ down. Namık Kemal decided to resign from the ‘*Hürriyet*’ newspaper. Namık Kemal clearly stated that his idea of ‘Young Ottomans’ did not assemble to support Mustafa Fazıl Pasha’s politics, additionally they did not need any support from a person or a group. Therefore, Namık Kemal returned back to London because of his idea about the press independence. Namık Kemal refused to write as a proxy of someone else’s ideas or opinions, especially on political topics just in exchange of tangible support for maintaining the newspaper. Therefore, Namık Kemal published his last article in ‘*Hürriyet*’ on September 6 1869 and left the administration of the ‘*Hürriyet*’ newspaper. Mithat Cemal Kuntay indicates on Kemal’s decision and states;

⁷⁸ Mithat Cemal Kuntay states in his book that Mustafa Fazıl Pasha informed Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha that if they insist on publishing *Hürriyet*, he would end their financial support. Kuntay adds that since Mustafa Fazıl Pasha became the minister of treasury, he was right to get frustrated and want to shut *Hürriyet* on July 1868, no matter it has started published with his own will on June 1868. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010.Vol.I p:440

⁷⁹ Uçman, Abdullah. "Kısa Bir ömrün Hikayesi." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 25.

“Kemal’s distress about Mustafa Fazıl Pasha’s decision and Ziya Pasha’s act was invalidated. And after four months of silence, it was informed that Kemal resigned from *Hürriyet* and stopped working with Ziya Pasha.”⁸⁰

Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha had been close friends since the establishment of the Young Ottomans. But Ziya Pasha’s decision was going to give harm to their relationship.⁸¹ Ziya Pasha changed his side; he started to support Khedive İsmail.⁸² He wanted to continue to publish ‘*Hürriyet*’ and searched for the ways to continue its publishing.⁸³ And he published the newspaper in Geneva by his own, without Kemal.⁸⁴ The audience of the ‘*Hürriyet*’ newspaper were not informed about the resignation of Namık Kemal; current administration of the ‘*Hürriyet*’ newspaper did not declare that Namık Kemal had resigned since their intention was also keeping the audience uninformed of Namık Kemal’s leaving. Namık Kemal wrote a letter to inform the audience of the ‘*Hürriyet*’ and declared his resignation from the newspaper.⁸⁵ Namık Kemal had this letter distributed all over the country. Ebuzziya Tevfik states; “Ali Pasha was not allowed any paper written by the Young Ottomans but it was strange for him to print Namık Kemal’s letter all over the country. This

⁸⁰ Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. I p: 444.

⁸¹ Mithat Cemal Kuntay states; “Ziya suddenly started to like Khedive İsmail. And Mustafa Fazıl Pasha who was the hostile of Khedive İsmail ordered to make Kemal leave Ziya.” Ibid., p:441

⁸² Mithat Cemal Kuntay cites from Ziya Pasha “As we have served enough for the minor pharaoh, it is the turn to serve for the major pharaoh”. Ibid., P:561

⁸³ Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2006. P: 300-301.

⁸⁴ Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. I. P: 446.

⁸⁵ Further reading: Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2006. P: 299.

announcement was printed forty or fifty thousand times. Ali Pasha believed that this was the document of the misery of the Young Ottomans.”⁸⁶ The ‘Young Ottomans’ was expected to be disbanded. After all, the newspaper could not endure for a long period; the newspaper was shut down after the 100th copy.

Namık Kemal was at London while there were major changes happened in France. He was demoralized because of the decomposition of the Young Ottomans⁸⁷ which he was so hopeful and enthusiastic after the establishment. It was difficult to continue struggling for freedom from abroad. Moreover, it was difficult to reach people without the help of the press. He felt he had nothing left to do in London and decided to return Istanbul.⁸⁸ In the meanwhile, he received a letter from the minister of security, Hüsnü Pasha.⁸⁹ Hüsnü Pasha was proposing Namık Kemal to return to his fatherland if Namık Kemal wrote a letter to Ali Pasha submitting his apologies; Hüsnü Pasha also stated that he would be pleased to be the peacemaker on the forgiveness of Namık Kemal.⁹⁰ Hüsnü Pasha wrote down that Namık Kemal was a true patriot and hoped him to realize that he was in a wrong direction. Kemal was not expecting such letters especially from the people near Ali Pasha. Few days later Namık Kemal received another letter from the executive assistant of the *Sadrizam*

⁸⁶Further reading: Ebuzziya Tefvik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. Istanbul: Pegasus, 2006. P: 298.

⁸⁷Further reading: chapter “*Yeni Osmanlılar Dağılıyorlar*” starting on page 562. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. I

⁸⁸Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/I p: 83.

⁸⁹Namık Kemal’s returning back to his fatherland is detailed on Mithat Cemal Kuntay’s book, Vol. II chapter I, titled as “How did Kemal returned from Europe”.

⁹⁰Mithat Cemal Kuntay gives detailed information and added the letters to his book which were written in French on chapter; “How did Kemal returned from Europe” between pages 1-80.

Ali Pasha, again proposing him to return to his fatherland with the regards of Ali Pasha. During the time, Namık Kemal received another letter from the Vienna ambassador Halil Şerif Pasha who was Mustafa Fazıl Pasha's nephew. He was suggesting Namık Kemal to return fatherland again and also invited him to Vienna. After receiving those assurances, Namık Kemal decided to return in October 1870. He first visited Vienna and then planned to return Istanbul. Kemal was returning to the place where he left for achieving his aims.

Namık Kemal Returns Homeland; Istanbul,

a Forgiven Writer

The Return of Namık Kemal was dramatic for his family.⁹¹ His daughter and son longingly welcomed their father. But Kemal was depressed because he was thinking his return could mean his defeat. Namık Kemal had gone to abroad because of his contrast with the Ottoman Government. He returned to Istanbul; the situation of the empire was still the same at the time he had left. Abdülaziz was still the Sultan and Ali Pasha was still the *Sadrizam*. Therefore, return of Namık Kemal could mean as he was regretting his actions and he accepted to apologize. Surely this action was unacceptable for Namık Kemal. On the third day of his return, Ali Pasha invited him for an *iftar*. Namık Kemal had concerns about this invitation to *iftar* but also he was aware that he returned because of Ali Pasha's act to convince him to return to fatherland. So, Kemal decided to accept his invitation. He was kindly welcomed by the Pasha and they talked about the France-German war. Pasha tried to get benefit

⁹¹ Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/I p: 87

from Kemal's ideas and experiences. So, he asked Kemal to write a report about the war and about the situation of the Europe.⁹² Ali Pasha did not want to announce him and Namık Kemal's meetings and relationship to the society in order not to show Kemal as his supporter. They were on good terms with each other until Ali Pasha's death in 1871.⁹³

Namık Kemal only wanted to start doing journalism again, he was not a high flier person who desired for a position on the government. Mithat Cemal Kuntay states the reason of publishing '*İbret*'; "The commander of revolution who had returned from the war did not have any weapon except from his journalism",⁹⁴ He discussed with Ebuzziya Tevfik and Reşat Bey and decided to publish '*İbret*' newspaper. *İbret* was published in June 1872, and became one of the most popular newspaper of Istanbul.⁹⁵ Tevfik Sütçü states in his article; "Namık Kemal wrote his best and the strongest articles of his life. Kemal's and his friends' articles who returned from Europe attracted attention of everyone including Mahmud Nedim Pasha. Mahmud Nedim Pasha was afraid from the writings in the newspaper and showed '*Garaz Marazdır*' article as an excuse of the newspaper's closure on the 19. copy. This caused Namık Kemal's exile as *mutasarrıf* to Gallipoli on 10 July 1872."⁹⁶ But, the

⁹²Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. Namık Kemal. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/I p: 98.

⁹³Ibid, p: 95.

⁹⁴Ibid, p: 103.

⁹⁵For further reading; Dođramacıođlu, Hüseyin. 2011. "Namık Kemal'in İbret Gazetesinde Sıraladıđı Sosyal Tenkitler ve Çözüm Önerileri." Turkish Studies. Volume 6/1 winter 2011, p. 975-986. http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/38949957_do%C4%9Framac%C4%B1o%C4%9Fluh%C3%BCzeyin.pdf

⁹⁶Sütçü, Tevfik. Namık Kemal'in Yaşamı ve Eserlerinde Gelibolu, Turkish Studies, Volume 8/13 fall 2013, p. 1411-1426, Ankara. P: 1414.

newspaper was closed based on the reason that the newspaper was confusing the society. Only four days later, Namık Kemal and his friends were exiled and his other friends were sent to the different parts of the country. Then, they all gathered and went to see Mahmud Nedim Pasha, who was *Sadrizam*, to talk about their exile. But Pasha welcomed them warmly and tried to persuade them that they should be officers for the sake of the empire. He added, people like you were needed and he expected a national service from all of them. Mahmud Nedim Pasha sent Kemal to Gallipoli on purpose. He believed that Kemal could rise just like the Ottoman Empire that started to develop after conquering Rumelia. So, he sent him to Gallipoli as the first conquered land of the Ottomans.⁹⁷ Namık Kemal and all others were impressed by Pasha's sayings and decided to leave for their duties. Mithat Cemal Kuntay states, "Pasha's words conquered Kemal. Revolutionary Kemal willingly wanted to be the *mutasarrıf* of Gallipoli."⁹⁸ However, Kemal could not leave Istanbul and constantly postponed his duty to Gallipoli. Meanwhile he was continuing his relationship with the apparent *Şehzade* Murat Efendi.

There happened a major change on the position of the *Sadrizam* of the Ottoman Empire. Mithat Pasha became the new *Sadrizam*. Could this ever change Namık Kemal's banishment? Mithat Pasha did not want to be seen as the protector of the

http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/356051628_88S%C3%9CT%C3%87%C3%9C%20TEVF%C4%B0K%20ARM-1411-1426.pdf

⁹⁷ Mithat Cemal Kuntay cites from Mahmut Nedim Pasha, "Mister Kemal, do you know the reason why I have appointed you as *mutasarrıf* to Gallipoli? Because, Gallipoli is the beginning of the Rumelia conquest of the Ottomans; as it will also be the beginning of your governmental duty." Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/I p: 117.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p: 117.

Young Ottomans, so, Kemal's exile became certain.⁹⁹ Namık Kemal went to Gallipoli as *mutasarrıf* in September 1872. While doing his duty, he started to write the 'Ottoman History' and '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*'. Meanwhile, the Sultan allowed the newspaper '*İbret*' to start publishing again and Namık Kemal started to send his writings under the signature of '*B.M.*' (*Baş Muharrir*)¹⁰⁰. Tevfik Sütçü mentions in his article; "Namık Kemal wrote his articles on *İbret* which started republishing again, without his signature on the 20th issue, and beginning from the 24th issue he used the nickname '*B*' for *Baş* and '*M*' for *Muharrir* which refers to '*B.M.*' Kemal rarely had some unsigned articles as well as the ones written under his signature as 'Kemal'."¹⁰¹ Meanwhile, Mithat Pasha's term of office lasted only eighty days as *Sadrizam* and he was discharged by Sultan Abdülaziz. Kemal was displeased to hear this but continued his service. But an incident was going to happen that would make him return Istanbul unexpectedly.

The First Exile of Namık Kemal, a Memorable Place; Gallipoli¹⁰²

Gallipoli was under the responsibility of Namık Kemal until he was discharged on 2 January 1873. According to the sources, the reason of his removal

⁹⁹ Mithat Cemal Kuntay adds the statement; "And the oddest thing was the attendance of Namık Kemal to Gallipoli is asked by the new *Sadrizam* Mithat Pasha, as the same thing was also asked by the former *Sadrizam* Mahmut Nedim Pasha. With a slight difference, Mahmut Nedim Pasha asked this himself, Mithat Pasha is asking by the name of third persons." Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/I p: 117. p: 126

¹⁰⁰ Scriptwriter, secretary duty

¹⁰¹ Sütçü, Tevfik Namık Kemal'in Yaşamı ve Eserlerinde Gelibolu, Turkish Studies, Volume 8/13 fall 2013, p. 1411-1426, Ankara. P: 1417.

¹⁰² Tevfik Sütçü mentions in his article; "The grave of Namık Kemal who passed away in December 2nd 1888 in Chios (and was buried to a mosque burial area) was transferred next to Gazi Suleyman Pasa mausoleum in Bolayir town of Gallipoli three days later according to his will which he had left

had several reasons. But one of the reasons became prominent among others; Kemal's dealing with the hydrophobia epidemic which resulted in the death of two boys bitten by the dogs. In order to deal with it, Kemal sent all the stray dogs and sent females to Kalata, a place near to Gallipoli and sent males to shore across to the Lapseki.¹⁰³ By doing so, he aimed to stop their reproduction. But, Ahmet Pasha who was the governor of Dodecanese Islands had taken this action as an insult and asked *Sadrizam* Rüştü Pasha to dismiss Namık Kemal off his duty. Pasha's intention on Namık Kemal's dismissal was rejected again; but he tried to proceed for a second time. He wrote a letter to Pertevniyal Sultan, the mother of the Sultan Abdülaziz, about Namık Kemal's dismissal from his duty. Pertevniyal Sultan insisted on the subject to his son, Sultan Abdülaziz. As a result, Namık Kemal was dismissed from his duty. According to Tevfik Sütçü's article¹⁰⁴; there was another reason of Kemal's removal; "The other reason of Namık Kemal's removal from his duty was the foreign newspapers that was published in Istanbul. According to an article which was published on the newspaper 'Levant Herald', and to the owner of the newspaper, 'the

to his journalist friends. In this respect, the direct relation of Namık Kemal with Gallipoli which started when he was 33, continued after the transfer of his grave following his death." Sütçü, Tevfik Namık Kemal'in Yaşamı ve Eserlerinde Gelibolu, Turkish Studies, Volume 8/13 fall 2013, p. 1411-1426, Ankara. p.1412.

¹⁰³ Mithat Cemal Kuntay gives an example from a letter about the incident. The letter were from *Courrier d'Orient* and it says; "Sabık mutasarrıfımız Kemal Bey, buraya vürudunda, ahalinin, sokaklarda serseri dolaşan ve birkaç kişi ısırmiş olan kudurmuş köpeklerden iştikası üzerine, şehri bu menhus ve muzır hayvanlardan tahlis etmek için mütaassıpları iskat babında istifta ettikten sonra köpekleri, Gelibolu'nun karşısında Çardak karyesinin kurbüne defeyledi." . Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/ I. p: 141.

¹⁰⁴ Tevfik Sütçü's argument was based on Mithat Cemal Kuntay's work on Namık Kemal. According to Kuntay, two Jewish grave was opened, both Namık Kemal and the authorities researched the case and found out that, some animals dug up the graves. But the chief Rabbi was not satisfied and the Jews became displeased. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/ I. p: 138-139.

dead Jews were not rest at peace because of Namık Kemal's inability of management'." ¹⁰⁵ But, Mithat Cemal Kuntay mentions; "According to the newspaper *Hadika*, the main reason of Namık Kemal's removal was 230 dogs." ¹⁰⁶ This was the perspective of the media. In short, the dissatisfaction of the Jewish People on the grave issue and the rabies problem created a predicament and this ended up with the removal of Namık Kemal by Sultan Abdülaziz. At the end, Kemal returned to Istanbul on 23 December 1872. Returning back to Istanbul was an advantage for Kemal, he immediately started writing for *İbret* by using his own name. In his articles, he was writing mainly about the censorship applied to the books and was criticizing ' *Basmahane Nizamnamesi*'. For him, those regulations were against the freedom of expression. Kemal insisted on that issue and wrote it strictly. As a result, the newspaper was ceased to be published for a month.

Namık Kemal Writes ' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*'

Namık Kemal started to be known as 'the poet dedicated to his fatherland' as his every poem was about patriotism and making sacrifices for the sake of the fatherland. His patriotic poetry was filled with sentences attributing a meaning to save the fatherland. Actually, the concept of ' *Hürriyet*' was an invention of Kemal. He wrote his first ' *Vatan coronach (mersiye)*' ¹⁰⁷ which was a popular topic amongst the society. Also he was meeting with *Şehzade* Murat Efendi and frequently talked

¹⁰⁵ Sütçü, Tevfik Namık Kemal'in Yaşamı ve Eserlerinde Gelibolu, Turkish Studies, Volume 8/13 fall 2013, p. 1411-1426, Ankara. P: 1419.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., Vol. II/I, p: 140.

¹⁰⁷ Poetical mourning

about theatre. Kemal had seen many theatre plays in London and Paris that helped him to have a perspective. In those times, theatre business was occupied by the Armenians and also theatre plays mostly conducted by them. The upcoming trend at theatre business pushed the theatre players to act also in Turkish, too.¹⁰⁸ Therefore an entrepreneur named Agop Vartoviyani established a company named ‘Güllü Agop Theatre’ in Gedikpaşa. This company had a management committee and Namık Kemal was a member of this committee. The committee, wanted Turkish plays from Namık Kemal, Recaizade Ekrem, Ebuzziya Tevfik and Şemseddin Sami. Kemal presented his recently written play ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’. The play was appreciated and approved by the committee and on 20 March 1873, it was played at Gedikpaşa Theatre. It was a sensational night and it put Namık Kemal’s name in a significant place in history. Namık Kemal left impression not only on his own generation but also on the further generations about perception of ‘fatherland’ and ‘patriotism’. On following chapters, topics and subjects of ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ will be studied in detail.

¹⁰⁸ Further reading: Uslu, Metin Fatih. 2011. *Melodram ve Komedi: Osmanlı’da Türkçe ve Ermenice Modern Dramatik Edebiyatlar*. “<http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0005019.pdf>”

PART II
ANALYSIS OF ‘*VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE*’

CHAPTER 4
A FOREWORD BEFORE ANALYSIS

“*Felek her türlü esbâb-ı ceâsın toplansın gelsin*

Dönersem kahpeyim millet yolunda bir azîmetten”¹⁰⁹

The drama was staged on 1 April 1873 at Gedikpaşa theatre. The drama consisted of four acts. The actual name of the drama was ‘*Vatan*’, but the fear of a possible censor to the drama caused a change and it was renamed as ‘*Silistre*’. The usage of both titles ‘*Vatan*’ and ‘*Silistre*’ changed the title of the drama to the combination of them, to ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, which became the name of the drama since then.¹¹⁰ Namık Kemal was inspired from the Crimean War ‘The defense of Silistre’. The main inspiration of the play was from the veterans of Turk-Islamic heroes returning from the Crimean war.¹¹¹ It was told that there were real figures that

¹⁰⁹“*Hürriyet Kasidesi*.” Kolcu, Ali İhsan. *Namık Kemal'in Poetikası*. Salkımsöğüt Yayınları, 2010.P: 29.

¹¹⁰Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.

¹¹¹“The fundamental of Namık Kemal is to enlighten the public using literature. He uses the theatre as an instrument to reach his objectives. His play *Vatan Yahut Silistre* (Homeland or Silistre) purtraying the Crimean War, is one of the most typical models of the romantic theatre in Turkish Literature history. The play tells the sacrificing story of the soldiers fighting For the Silistre Castle. Through the story the writer tries to settle the ideas of patriotism, love of motherland and fighting for it by emphasising the concepts of sacrifice and heroism.’ Çılgın, Alev Sinar. “*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’de *Vatan Kavramı*.” *U.Ü. Fen- Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 6, no. 9 (2005): 135-45. Accessed July 9, 2014. http://uvf.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvf/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebSCO&ano=65754_4f49a07d3f745c4499ba9b09e226c903&? p:135.

had really experienced these events such as; Abdullah Çavuş and İslam Bey. Namık Kemal wanted to issue the defense of Silistra because the Ottoman forces defended the castle no matter how they were outnumbered by the Russian forces. The main reason was the spiritual power and their patriotism. The Silistra defense could be the right decision for Kemal to show and create characters that reflected patriotism directly. Kemal chose the characters of his play from the Albanian society which was a reflection of him feeling himself as an Albanian, being the grandson of an Albanian, Abdüllatif Pasha.¹¹²

Namık Kemal as one of the leading writer and poet of his era had seen theatre which could be used as a means of spreading his ideas and thoughts. Therefore, topics included at dramas of Namık Kemal were already issued at his articles. Veysel Şahin states in his article; “According to Kemal, theatre should educate the society, additionally it should serve to the language of the society.”¹¹³ Kemal had seen ‘theatre’ as a way to reach to the society that could not clearly understand his message on his writings. According to this aspect, there was a connection between his article ‘*Vatan*’ and drama ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’¹¹⁴. Both are about ‘the love of fatherland’ and the importance of ‘saving and defending’ the

¹¹²Memet Fuat adds that Namık Kemal was found of Albanian traditions because he was raised by his mother’s family until his age of seventeen. Actually, Namık Kemal was not an Albanian, her father was Turkish originally and his mother was an Albanian, full blooded Ottoman. Fuat, Memet, Namık *Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıları*.Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P:12.

¹¹³Şahin, Veysel. 2010. “Namık Kemal'in Mektuplarında "Şiir, Tiyatro ve Gazete "Üzerine Tenkitler.” Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 13: 1-18. P: 12. hutad.hacettepe.edu.tr/index.php/hutad/article/download/105/54

¹¹⁴*Vatan Yahut Silistre* literally means ‘Fatherland or Silistra’. Fatherland synonyme with motherland and homeland.

fatherland. The drama represented a patriotic play that was inspired from the defense of the Silistra castle which was occupied by the Russian forces during the Crimean war. ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ was based on an unforgettable victory; the drama was unique and accepted as the first theatre work that features the concept of fatherland. Bilge Seçkin in her master thesis, ‘Staging the Revolution: The theatre of the revolution in the Ottoman Empire 1908-1909’ studied ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ and point out the reason of Kemal’s writing his drama on the defense of Silistra; “He chose the subject in order to create a play that would awaken the love of homeland among the public. By highlighting this event that had happened 30-35 years before, he provided a fertile ground for propagating the love of homeland, which became an inseparable part of being an Ottoman.”¹¹⁵ So, Namık Kemal, as a Young Ottoman wanted to remind the glorious days of the empire which was full of patriotic heroes aiming to reveal patriotism among the society again. An enthusiastic and inspired person, Namık Kemal and his inspirations encouraged him to write glorified dramas like ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ Bilge Seçkin adds that; “Namık Kemal and his play *Vatan Yahut Silistre* and its performance at Gedikpaşa Theatre was an event considered to be one of the first acts of resistance against the İstibdat.”¹¹⁶ *İstibdat*, is an Ottoman word meaning oppression. So, the drama could be regarded as a resistance toward the current Ottoman regime, Sultan Abdülaziz. ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ poured the societies’ heart out and proved Namık Kemal’s influential authorship on the society.

¹¹⁵ Seçkin, Bilge. 2007. *Staging the Revolution: The Theatre of the Revolution in the Ottoman Empire 1908-1909*. Istanbul. . P:81.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p:78.

The plot of the drama was principally about İslam Bey.¹¹⁷ In the first act, İslam Bey secretly entered into Zekiye's room in order to say farewell because he was leaving to join the war to save Silistra. His entering to the room suddenly without any permission was Mizancı Murat's first and the main critic of the play. Surprisingly, Namık Kemal ignored the moral rules and obligations of a man and a women relationship without marriage. Zekiye was one of the main characters of the drama. She was a brave girl and daughter of a soldier who had lost his degree undeservingly and became lost after that. Unfortunately Zekiye did not know her father and this was one of the turning points of the drama. Here, loving İslam Bey could help her to find his father. Namık Kemal used an irony of fate in his drama by bringing together the father and the daughter. Zekiye had lost her mother and therefore she was living with her nurse.

The first act of the drama ended with the farewell of İslam Bey and Zekiye disguised herself as a man and went after İslam Bey. İslam Bey volunteered for the war without knowing Zekiye, the woman that he loved was following him. The other acts of the play settle on Silistra. İslam Bey was wounded and Zekiye was keeping her gender as a secret and because of her little appearance, she was called as a 'child'. She was the one who was taking care of İslam Bey who was wounded on the battle. In the meantime, the audience realizes that Sıtkı Bey, the commander of the castle was the father of Zekiye by his statements. But now he had changed his name to Sıtkı and entered the military service again because he admired to be a soldier and served for his fatherland. His actual name was Ahmet who was a desperate man that

¹¹⁷ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.

lost his family. Unexpectedly, Rüstem Bey, who was a friend of Ahmet in Bitola, overidentified Sıtkı Bey with Ahmet Bey and asked whether he had a brother or not. But he rejected and still wanted to hide his true identity. Then, Sıtkı Bey told him what happened to Ahmet Bey, whom he admitted that someone he had known before. Ahmet Bey lost all his family and recently he had a letter telling that his daughter gone missing for a long time and he thought she was dead like the other members of his family. Sıtkı Bey advised Rüstem Bey not to recognize Ahmet Bey if he ever saw him, he was an unfortunate man but still patriot and ready to die for his fatherland at any time. Sıtkı Bey's lost daughter was no one but Zekiye. There, Zekiye and Sıtkı Bey were the two main characters that refrained from their real identities. Zekiye was a woman and women were only supposed to marry and bringing up children, but in the play, she was fighting with the enemy bravely which was against to the general opinion. Sıtkı Bey disobeyed a command, rejected to execute his friend by shooting and dismissed from the military service. Both father and daughter were seen as symbols of 'disobedience'.

In the third act İslam Bey realized that the 'child' was no one but Zekiye. On the other hand, the war was getting serious, the castle under siege was hardly resisting. Some of the soldiers even the volunteers offered to be surrendered but Sıtkı Bey had a plan to save the castle from the enemy and declared this plan to İslam Bey. İslam Bey accepted and left the castle to assault the enemy's front line secretly with Abdullah Çavuş who was a brave soldier as well. Zekiye started to follow him again. At this point of drama her desire was to save the fatherland even if it was dangerous or an inappropriate action. Zekiye loved İslam Bey with a similar feeling that she felt for her fatherland. Those strong feelings bind them together and both of them ended up with making self-sacrifices. Tacettin Şimşek in his article says that; "It is equally

important to be dedicated to the sacred values as well as being dedicated to the society. This requires a mystical understanding of the society. In other words, Namık Kemal accepts the idea which states; to save the whole society, it is right to sacrifice only one being”¹¹⁸ So, the characters of the drama, has enough courage and sense of making sacrifices for the remedy of their nation.

At the end of the drama, İslam Bey and his friends were succeeded and saved the castle bravely. Sitk1 Bey was very grateful and hugged İslam Bey fatherly and asked about the boy who had known as a ‘child’ was survived or not. İslam Bey confessed that the boy was a young girl from Bitola and followed him to defend the fatherland without his knowledge. There İslam Bey realized that she could be his missing daughter whom he was already overidentified with his son. Father and daughter found each other and İslam Bey and Zekiye decided to marry. In the end of the drama, we witnessed that the people who came to save their fatherland achieved happiness and victory. The happiness of the lovers and the father and daughter who found each other after many years increased the joy of the victory. Therefore, it should be noted that the feeling of love and loyalty towards the fatherland requires making sacrifices, being brave and even putting life in danger with no hesitation.

The drama ends with the characters singing an anthem¹¹⁹ all together and shouting out ‘Long live the Sultan!’ which reflects Namık Kemal’s thoughts on the

¹¹⁸ Şimşek, Tacettin. ‘*Bir Hüzün-I Umumi Şairi: Namık Kemal*’ in *Namık Kemal*. Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. 2011. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P:194.

¹¹⁹The first stanza of the anthem in Turkish Literally taken from Kemal, Namık. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012. P: 13

Ottoman administration and his loyalty to the Sultan. No matter how he wished for a constitutional monarchy for the empire, he still believed the presence of a Sultan was a need for the continuity and the power of the empire and attributed him by addressing his existence at the celebration scene. The drama was full of patriotic statements like ‘Long Live Fatherland’ and did not contain any negative or critical statement about the Ottoman sultan or the government on the current time. The drama and the characters became immortal and legendary and influenced the audience sensually. Namık Kemal proved his opinion that theatre was influential on the society. He saw theatre as a way of revealing certain thoughts and ideas.¹²⁰ His ideas on theatre were the general acceptance of the *Tanzimat* writers who accepted new understandings inspired from the Western world.

İşte düşman, silahlarıyla hazır karşıda
Yürüğün yiğitler, vatan imdadına!
Yürüyün ileri, kurtuluş bizimdir
Yürüyün yiğitler, vatan imdadına!
Hepimizin anasıdır vatan
Herkesi cömertlikle odur besleyen
Bastı düşman göğsümüze biz sağken
Yürüyün yiğitler, vatan imdadına!

¹²⁰ Yetiş, Kazım. *Namık Kemal'in Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Üzerine Görüşleri ve Yazıları*. Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım. 1996. P:49.

CHAPTER 5

THEMES OF FATHERLAND AND PATRIOTISM

Namık Kemal wrote ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ aiming to create a loyalty and love toward the fatherland where the Ottoman people should live equally and free in return of saving their fatherland at the cost of their life. A land that only belonged to the Ottoman Sultan would not create a sense of sacrificing and loyalty since the empire was multicultural and ‘nationalism’ was becoming a threat. In this sense, Kemal wanted to create a sense of a strong patriotism, which also meant the fatherland was equally belong to the people not only as a land but also as a dedication. It should be noted that Namık Kemal issued ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’s theme in his article ‘Vatan’ before in newspaper ‘*İbret*’,¹²¹. The article was the summary of Kemal’s patriotism and his opinions on the concept of fatherland. In his article, he made a distinction on the fatherland concept and divide it into two; the fatherland exists in our conscious and the fatherland which resides as an external entity.¹²² ‘*Vatan*’ was a far more than a concept that defined only as a piece of land. Then, Namık Kemal, described the fatherland as a virtual entity that could not only identified with geographical definitions, it would be insufficient, it was an integrity that was in occurrence with the life and history of the society, a unity materially and

¹²¹ ‘Vatan’ in Namık Kemal, *Osmanlı Modernleşmesinin Meseleleri Bütüin Makaleleri 1*, Hazırlayanlar: Nergiz Yılmaz Aydoğdu, İsmail Kara, İstanbul: Dergah Yay. 2005.p: 474.

¹²² In the original article by Namık Kemal; “*İşte insaniyeti bu nokta-i nazardan temaşa edenlerdir ki vatan fikr-i mukaddesinden bahs olundukça buldukları yerin ya hudud veya haritasını tasavvur ederek ‘vatani tayin eden madde birkaç bin mazlumun kanı veya birkaç rical-i devlerin kalemiyle çizilmiş bir hatt-ı mevhumdan ibaret değil midir? Böyle akıl ve tabiatla hiç münasebeti olmaksızın sırf mevzuat-ı beşerden olan ve insanların uhuvvet ve itilafına sed çekmekten başka dünyada bir tesiri görülmeyen bir vahimenin insaniyet nazarında ne hükmü olabilir? Derler.*” Ibid: p: 474.

morally with the nation. Didem Ardalı Büyükarman studies the concept of fatherland in her article and says; “The definition of the concept of motherland as being ‘the invasion of a common land determined by a specific nation and the province of a common dominant authority’, which was influenced by movements in western culture, rather than being ‘the place where a person was born’ in Turkish conception was established with the declaration of *Meşrutiyet*.”¹²³ So, it was a western origin concept had been converted to our culture by Namık Kemal. Kemal had some inspirations from some western thinkers and writers. Shakespeare¹²⁴ and Montesquieu influenced on his thoughts while defining the concept of ‘*vatan*’. Especially, Montesquieu’s ‘Spirit of Laws’ was an inspiration for Namık Kemal as he defined the love of fatherland was both a virtue and a duty which could clearly be seen on every work of Namık Kemal’s on patriotism.¹²⁵ In addition to this, Namık Kemal, defined the fatherland existing in our consciousness’ was more than a physical part of a simple soil, it was way more than that. For him, love for the

¹²³ Büyükarman, Didem Ardalı. ‘*Vatan Kavramının Türk Tiyatro edebiyatındaki seyri üzerine bir inceleme*.’ A.Ü.Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi. Issue 37. Erzurum 2008. P: 127.

¹²⁴ Abdulhalim Aydın states in his article; “It is certain that, it is impossible to find which creations of French author (Victor Hugo) are read by Namık Kemal. However, by using the expressions of authors from the same era, writings about Namık Kemal and his own statements; we can conclude with a list. We know that he had admiration for *Les Misérables* and *Les Chatiments*. For Theatre, we reach information from his own expressions and statements about him (Namık Kemal) that he read significant plays of French author (Victor Hugo). Furthermore, according to Tanpınar, he (Namık Kemal) read all dramas of Hugo, *William Shakespeare* and *Les Burgraves*. At a letter to he sent to S. Paşazade Sezai, it can be understood that he read *Hernani*, *Cromwell*, *Ruy Blas*, *Le RoiS’amuse*. It can be concluded that he read *La Légende des Siècles*, *Les Contemplations* and *Mary Tudor* with the help of similarities with those creations between his creations and from the detections of several other researchers.” Aydın, Abdulhalim. "Namık Kemal’in Sanat/Sanatçı Algısında Romantizm Ve Victor Hugo Etkisi." *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 7, no. 3 (2012): 369-79. Accessed September 10, 2014. http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/1267668141_22Aydın Abdulhalim_S-369-379.pdf.

¹²⁵ Yalçın, Fatih, ‘Vatan Yahut Namık Kemal’ In *Namık Kemal*. Ed.Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P:444.

fatherland was similar to the love between mother and child, which was already embedded into human being. Also, only an independent land could help the identities that create the whole society survive and continue their existence. Birol Emil in his article defines Namık Kemal's concept of fatherland in a detailed way; "The dynamics; political regime, the freedom of mind; '*Hürriyet*', the principle of civilization; mind and progresses, and the creator of all, 'the will of the people'. Namık Kemal attached a new notion to these four concepts; '*Vatan*' ... this notion was new because the fatherland was unknown until it became endangered. The fatherland was in danger in those days."¹²⁶ So, the creation of the concept of fatherland partly emerged as the consequence of the fatherland being in danger.

'*Vatan Yahut Silistre*', was not the only example for the patriotic theatre plays that was put on stage on the time of the *Tanzimat* era. Şemseddin Sami's '*Besa Yahut Ahde Vefa*' was another example for the theatre plays about patriotism, heroism and bravery. Zeki Taştan in his article; '*Türk Ve Arnavut Kültürüne Ortak Bir Bakış: Besâ -Yahut- Ahde Vefa*' gives detailed information about the play; "The tragedy called, '*Besa Yahut Ahde Vefa*', was on stage on 1874 at Güllü Agop's theatre. The play did not take an attention on the year it was performed but it was protested by the audience by 'laughing and whistling' which caused an argument among the newspapers. The play was staged many times on the II. Constitutional Era, and applauded by some writers for the name of liberty"¹²⁷. The play was performed only a year after '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' at the same theatre. They were

¹²⁶ Emil, Birol, *Hürriyet, Medeniyet, İrade in Ölümünün 100. Yılında Namık Kemal*, Marmara Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1988. P: 13.

¹²⁷ Taştan, Zeki. "Türk Ve Arnavut Kültürüne Ortak Bir Bakış: Besâ -Yahut- Ahde Vefa". 1. Uluslararası Dil Ve Edebiyat Çalışmaları Konferansı. 2012.P: 250.

both centered on the ‘Albanians’ and similar themes. George Gawrych comments on this subject in his book; ‘The Crescent and the Eagle’, “*Vatan Yahut Silistre* and *Besa Yahut Ahde Vefa* both played upon the theme of *Vatan* or motherland. *Vatan* still carried its traditional meaning of one’s hometown or place of birth and upbringing. But it also came to be associated with patriotism, and the notion of a trinity of ‘religion and state and fatherland’, and this influence gained in popularity certainly by the end of 1870s.”¹²⁸ Under the influence of these two theatre play, the concept of fatherland, associated with religion, Islam became the popular topic of the related era.

Şemseddin Sami¹²⁹ (1850- 1904) was an Ottoman Albanian writer¹³⁰, the writer of ‘*Besa Yahut Ahde Vefa*’, wrote a similar theatre play like Namık Kemal which was about patriotism and heroism. But on the contrary to ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, Sami’s play was emphasizing the Albanian culture and values, creating an understanding of patriotism with loyalty of the Albanians¹³¹. George Gawrich in his book makes a comment on Şemseddin Sami’s reason for writing his play is similar to Namık Kemal’s aim at writing ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, he states; “Conversely, Şemseddin Sami, as an Albanian conscious of his ethnicity, saw a danger in an

¹²⁸Gawrych, George. 2006. *The Crescent and the Eagle: Ottoman Rule, Islam and the Albanians, 1874-1913*. <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=wPOtzk-unJgC&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false>. P:19

¹²⁹Uçman, Abdullah. "Şemseddin Sami." İslam Ansiklopedisi. 2010. <http://www.islamansiklopedisi.info/dia/pdf/c38/c380319.pdf>.

¹³⁰Bilmez, Bülent. "Şemseddin Sami Frasherî (1850–1904): Contributing To the Construction of Albanian and Turkish Identities." *Cas Working Paper Series*, no. 3 (2011). Accessed August 7, 2014. <http://www.cas.bg/uploads/files/We the People/B. Bilmez.pdf>.

¹³¹Egro, Dritan. "Arnavut Milliyetçi Doktrininde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Ve Avrupa’nın Algılanışı." *OTAM* 33 (2013): 31-41.

Ottoman patriotism designed at the expense of cultural and ethnic diversity. In this sense, *Besa Yahut Ahde Vefa* appeared as a corrective to *Vatan Yahut Silistre*.” So, Şemseddin Sami, and Namık Kemal had the same aim to write their theatre plays; ‘to strengthen the Ottoman patriotism by sublimating the Albanian people who had honorable qualifications. Namık Kemal and Şemseddin Sami, highlighting the Albanian peoples’ loyalty and patriotism wanted to emphasize on the need of bravery to protect the fatherland. Their dream of ‘Ottomanism’ was the unity of Islam which could make all the Ottoman people as the defender of their fatherland and brought the patriots to the theatre plays from the real life.

‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ was accepted as a patriotic drama that aimed to strengthen the bond between the fatherland and the society. So, the drama was a clear reflection of Namık Kemal’s thoughts on patriotism. It could be helpful to understand İslam Bey’s sayings to Zekiye at the beginning of the drama when Zekiye refused to leave him. “Fatherland is in danger; don’t you hear what I am saying? God created me but Fatherland raised me. God feeds me for Fatherland. I was hungry when I was born, Fatherland fed me. I was naked, Fatherland dressed me. My fatherland’s blessings were all over my bones. My body was from Fatherland’s lands; my breath was from Fatherland’s air. If I would not die for my fatherland, why was I born? Didn’t I have a duty?”¹³² Here, İslam Bey explains why he has to be grateful to his fatherland; these sentences are the reflection of Kemal’s intense

¹³²Namık Kemal, *Vatan Yahut Silistre*, p: 31. Original Text: “*Vatan tehlikede diyorum, işitmiyor musun? Beni Allah yarattı, vatan büyüttü. Beni Allah besliyor, vatan için besliyor. Ben ananın karnından vatana geldiğim vakit açtım, vatan karnımı doyurdu. Çıplaktım, vatan sayesinde giyindim. Vatanımın nimeti kemiklerimde duruyor. Vücutum vatanın toprağından... Nefesim vatanın havasından... Vatanım uğruna ölmeyeceksem, ya ben niçin doğdum? Ben adam değil miyim? Vazifem yok mu?*”

patriotic feelings. Namık Kemal believes that everyone should have an awareness of their fatherland. An awareness of the concept of fatherland, requires ‘*Hürriyet*’, liberty and it cannot be implemented without a fatherland. So, they are bond with each other.

Namık Kemal was accepted as the writer and poet of freedom and fatherland. Nergiz Aydoğdu’s article on the Namık Kemal’s thoughts on freedom represents some details on the subject. She says that Şerif Mardin accepts that the concept and the wording ‘*Hürriyet*’ was created and used by Namık Kemal. “Namık Kemal used many words and notions to describe the concept of freedom; *serbestiyet, istiklal, istiklal-i zatiye, nefter-i esaret* and defined them as a need of every individual, the principle of civilization, the reason of happiness and humanity of the humans, aimed to realize their desires without affecting adversely the others’ freedom.”¹³³ Namık Kemal, says ‘*İstiklal*’ is a need for freedom, but it needs independence too which is required only by a presence of a fatherland which is independent with strict boundaries. So, Namık Kemal’s understanding of fatherland and liberty has to be interpreted and understood together in order to make true comments. In Ertan Engin’s article, he mentions about the concepts of Namık Kemal’s theatre plays and says; “In *Vatan Yahut Silistre*, the fatherland was shown as a sacred place which feeds and raises its people like a mother and also imitated to the women who was legitimated with honor and purity. In order to protect the fatherland, there should be courage, bravery and self-sacrifice which were mainly

¹³³ Aydoğdu, Nergiz. ‘Namık Kemal’de *Hürriyet* Kavramı’ In *Namık Kemal*. Ed.Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P:459-460.

identified with men. So, the mentality of the protection of the fatherland was somehow shown as a debt that needed to be paid.”¹³⁴ Namık Kemal, glorified the concept of fatherland and emphasized on the importance of self-sacrificing for the protection of the fatherland.

According to Namık Kemal, fatherland is not a value that you would strive against a danger and make sacrifices with no exchange in return. For him, freedom and the laws that protected honor and welfare of the people, were protected by the fatherland too. So, the people should protect their lands in order to be in comfort. It is clearly understood that the main argument is the relation between the fatherland and freedom. His aim was nothing but to create a concept of *Vatan*, which all the Ottoman people can live equally, in this case *Vatan* will deserve to be guarded and making sacrifices to be protected. For Kemal, sacrificing own life is an important manner that truly shows the purity of patriotism. İslam Bey, in ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ had never thought a single moment whether going to protect Silistra, the representation of the fatherland. Moreover, he could easily gave up a probable future with his lover for the sake of protecting the fatherland. Because there was no such love which was higher than the love of fatherland. The conversation between İslam Bey and Zekiye before his going to the war clarify his patriotism. Namık Kemal created such a character, İslam Bey to prove his idea that no men should love a women before his fatherland therefore patriotism was the key stone of being a ‘man’. In addition to this, their future depended on the mankind power and Namık Kemal wrote down the main characters that had certain qualifications. According Alev Sınar

¹³⁴Engin, Ertan. "Namık Kemal'in Tiyatrolarında Kavramlar." *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 7, no. 29, 352-261.

Çilgın's article on the concept of fatherland in *Vatan Yahut Silistre*, "For Namık Kemal, mankind should prepare the future, and it is a task which needs a strong will. İslam Bey, Zekiye and Sıtkı Bey are strong willed people and also responsible. They listen and obey their ideas instead of their feelings, therefore their ideas reunite them around the concept of patriotism."¹³⁵ The main characters in the drama do not hesitate any moment about sacrificing their lives for the fatherland and they become the symbols of patriotism at the defense of Silistra which represents the whole fatherland.

Sıtkı Bey was one of the main character who also represented patriotism. But for him, 'friendship' and 'fidelity' came before the love of fatherland. By rejecting to execute his friend by shooting he both lost his family and his job at the military service. He admired to be a soldier but his nature was being a truthful person, eventually made him to lose the most precious things in his world. Eventually, his returning to the military service and deciding to attempt to the war to defend Silistra became the reason of him to find his daughter. Sıtkı Bey was an honorable man, he could not return to his family, because he was ashamed of being dismissed from his job. This sadness caused the death of his wife and son. And at the second time his decision of returning to the military service, and bravery to defend the fatherland, gave his daughter back. So, Namık Kemal wanted to point out that a

¹³⁵ Çilgın, AlevSınar. "Vatan Yahut Silistre'de Vatan Kavramı." *U.Ü. Fen- Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 6, no. 9 (2005): 135-45. Accessed July 9, 2014. http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebSCO&ano=65754_4f49a07d3f745c4499ba9b09e226c903&? . p:139.

patriot who could do any sacrifice for his fatherland would gain the chance of being happy. In the third act of '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*', the war got serious and the defenders began to lose the battles, an officer offered to be surrendered but he was rejected by the other patriots especially Sıtkı Bey. But, Sıtkı Bey was aware of the fact that the defend of the castle was becoming difficult and says; "There is no help coming or any supply, we are out of money and officers, only God knows but it is clear that the government already discarded the castle."¹³⁶ Yaşar Şenler in his article says; "After the Pasha martyred because of a cannonball, a lieutenant colonel, Sıtkı Bey and İslam Bey talked about the possible precautions, but a lieutenant colonel offered to be surrendered because the castle could no longer be defended. This meant a betrayal for İslam Bey and he called him a traitor. Instead of giving up defending the castle, they preferred to defend Silistra until their last breath; it was a brave action that an Ottoman soldier would take."¹³⁷ For Namık Kemal, it was an obligation to die for your fatherland if it was in danger, our ancestors shed blood for the fatherland to give us the chance and right to live deservingly so, the main characters on '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*', completed Kemal's thoughts properly.

Abdullah Çavuş was another character on the drama that Namık Kemal was inspired from the real life. He was pure in heart and the most enthusiastic character of the drama. Abdullah Çavuş was a common man and used to repeat a sentence

¹³⁶ Namık Kemal, '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' İnkılap Yayınevi, 2012. P: 72. Original Text: "Ne yardım gelir ne erzak; ne para kaldı ne subay. Allah bilir ama devlet bu kaleyi gözden çıkarmış"

¹³⁷ Şenler, Yaşar. *Namık Kemal'in Tiyatrolarında Sosyal Tenkit*. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. 2011. in *Namık Kemal*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 226.

during the drama again and again. He says; ‘Is this end of the world?’ throughout the drama. Namık Kemal used this statement to show that anything could be achieved only if you were determined to do it. Abdullah Çavuş was a very brave man who did not hesitate to die for his fatherland. No matter how dangerous the situation was, by saying his statement, he accepted any kind of difficulty for the sake of defending the fatherland. ‘Is this the end of the world?’ referred to his courage and ready to accept any duty to serve the fatherland. There, Namık Kemal wanted to strengthen his idea that all segments of the society had patriotic feelings.

There was an another important point that Namık Kemal emphasized in ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, the concept of patriotism is not only a duty but also an obligation for the believers. So he composed being a ‘Muslim’ with patriotism and making sacrifices to protect the fatherland. Kemal, used his characters again to indicate his thoughts on the subject. İslam Bey, talked to the volunteered soldiers before going to a battle and says; “*Allah* commends people to love their fatherland”.¹³⁸ So, for Kemal, defending fatherland is a religious obligatory. He not only tried to make a synthesis between his patriotic ideas and Islamic beliefs but also tried to show his faith in Islam and the sacred relation between fatherland and Islam. Sıtkı Bey in ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ said after the victory; “We can stand blamelessly in the presence of God. God loves the ones that love their fatherland. Fatherland is pleased with you. If this land knew your bravery, it would tremble when it touches your body with joy and happiness like mothers find in their children. People are

¹³⁸ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012. P: 39. Original Text: “*Allah, vatan sevgisini emrediyor.*”

pleased with you. Your name will remain forever at the glorious pages of history. God is pleased with you.”¹³⁹ So, Namık Kemal simply meant if you served your fatherland, god would be pleased with you. Also, Zekiye’s sentences on fatherland and God were influential when she was not chosen for the battle because of her childish looking; “What else I can do? Isn’t the fatherland the monastery of God? Is it right to discuss a sacrifice whether weak or not that came to that monastery? Allow your children to die for the sake of the country.”¹⁴⁰ For Zekiye, the fatherland was the place of God’s and your appearance was not important when the subject was making sacrifices for the fatherland. In addition to this, İslam Bey said after he found out that Zekiye had followed him to defend Silistra; “Did you ever know that fatherland was along with faith. If you didn’t love your fatherland, therefore you didn’t love your god.”¹⁴¹ This was a clear statement of ‘*Hubbul vatan minel iman*’¹⁴² which meant the love of the fatherland was based on faith. Namık Kemal believed it was a divine duty to love and defend your fatherland.

¹³⁹ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012. p: 102. Original Text: “Allah huzurunda da alınımız açıktır. Vatanını sevenleri Allah’da sever. Vatan sizden hoşnuttur. Şu taşlar, topraklar gösterdiğiniz kahramanlığı bilseydi araya araya çocuğunu arayan analar gibi vücudunuza dokundukça mutluluktan, coşkudan titrerdi. İnsanlık sizden hoşnuttur. Elbette adınız, asrımızda tutulan tarih defterlerinin şanlı yapraklarına yazılır. Allah sizden hoşnuttur.”

¹⁴⁰ Ibid: p: 52. Original Text: “Benden ne istersiniz? Vatan, bir Allah tekkesi değil midir? Tekkeye gelen kurbanın semizliğine, zayıflığına bakılır mı? İzin verin çocuklarınıza da devlet yolunda ölmeye izin verin.”

¹⁴¹ Ibid: p: 69. Original Text: “Bilir misin, bence vatan, iman ile beraberdir. Vatanını sevmeyen Allah’ını da sevmez!”

¹⁴² In Turkish Literally; ‘*Vatan sevgisi imandandır*’. Also, it is one of the name of Namık Kemal’s articles in newspaper ‘*Hürriyet*’ on the first issue of the newspaper on 1868.

“*Vatan Yahut Silistre*”, is a play that clearly reflects the Ottoman patriotism. The play is not about a fictional event or people; it is about true events which makes the play more influential. George Gawrich in his book, ‘The Crescent and the Eagle’ states; “*Vatan Yahut Silistre*, centered on the empire’s struggle to defend the province of Silistra from invading Russian army in the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828. Namık Kemal chose Islam as the name for the play’s hero, thereby providing a religious tone to the story line. For him, the Islamic religion stands as a bond between the Ottoman and the vatan.”¹⁴³ Islam was the force that empowered the ‘Ottomanism’ and united the people together. It was the bond between the people, the most important common point of them. Namık Kemal, by using the Islamic elements in his theatre play, created an understanding between being an Ottoman and the fatherland. Islam was one of the reason, the order and the belief that created the sacred understanding of the fatherland. Namık Kemal, strengthened the ‘Ottoman patriotism’ and revealed the keystones to be a true patriot; ‘believing in Islam and its orders to protect and love the fatherland’, ‘self-sacrificing’ and ‘being a true patriot’. Islam Bey was the hero of the play, representing the power of Islam for defending the fatherland.

In order to understand the concept of fatherland that had been issued in ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, there should be enough knowledge and opinion about the conditions of the relative era. The drama was a reflection of the era when the Ottoman Empires’ glorious days was about to end. The Empire had already started to lose land and prestige. The differences and the gap between the western world and

¹⁴³Gawrych, George. 2006. *The Crescent and the Eagle: Ottoman Rule, Islam and the Albanians, 1874-1913*. <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=wPOtzk-unJgC&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false>. S: 18.

the Ottoman Empire seemed clearly. As a Young Ottoman, Namık Kemal wanted to emphasize the ‘love of fatherland’ and ‘patriotism’ for the strengthening the Ottoman Empire’s integrity. Didem Ardalı Büyükarman in her article points out this comment and says; “In the *Tanzimat* play, the main purpose was to look for solutions to keep the Ottoman Empire unite and integrated in addition to enable its improvement. The authors wanted to make the Ottoman people conscious about the love of fatherland and its protection.”¹⁴⁴ Namık Kemal, certainly defended the idea that the society could lose any kind of love if there was no attachment and love to the fatherland. Individuals could only be happy and free to love anything they wished, only if there was an independent fatherland. Such a land that their fathers sacrificed their lives while defending it. On the other hand, Namık Kemal had some conflicts on his comments on the concept of fatherland. Şerif Mardin, mentions in his book, ‘The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought.’; “He made comments that creates a sense of controversy. First, he talked about the brave attempts and the successes of the old Ottomans in order to survive and maintain their civilization, and then he says that there should be a personality formed as ‘Ottoman’ whose religion or nation was not the main concerns for sustaining the associated state.”¹⁴⁵ This is a different perspective to the subject and a hidden detail because throughout ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, Namık Kemal mentioned the story of the braveries and the blood of the ancestors indicating the Muslim Turks whereas he later admitted to the committee of preparing ‘*Kanun-i Esasi*’ which accepted ‘Ottomanism’ that promoted equality

¹⁴⁴ Büyükarman, Didem Ardalı. ‘*Vatan Kavramının Türk Tiyatro edebiyatındaki seyri üzerine bir inceleme*’. A.Ü. Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi Issue 37. Erzurum 2008. P: 127.

¹⁴⁵ Mardin, Şerif, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman thought*. Syracuse University Press. 2000. P: 366-367.

among the community. So, highlighting the Turkish identity in his drama, could weaken the aim to create an Ottoman society refusing the differences.

CHAPTER 6

ISSUES AND THEMES ON GENDER

Namık Kemal explained the needs and the expectations of the era in his writings, novels and plays. He dealt with many social problems and aspects. He analyzed and also provided new opinions on his debates. One of the concepts that he had worked on was ‘gender discrimination’ in his drama ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’. ‘Patriotism’ and ‘the love of fatherland’ were not the concepts that were special to man. Women should also love their country and should require enough courage to defend it. In other words, Namık Kemal’s vision of women was not passive; she could vigorously love and attach to her fatherland at heart. So, Kemal created ‘Zekiye’ to present a new role model for the society. Yavuz Pekman states; “Parallel to İslam Bey who can sacrifice anything for the sake of the fatherland, it can be seen that Zekiye is a heroic woman who can make sacrifices for her lover and fatherland. So, the man and the women seems to be gradually equal in the social concept.”¹⁴⁶ ‘Zekiye’ was a heroic and devoted woman who followed the man she loved and gave the same value to İslam Bey and her love for the fatherland. In ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, when İslam Bey bided farewell to Zekiye and left for defense, he shouted at the volunteers that attended to the war and said; “The ones who love me, would never stop following me.”¹⁴⁷ Accidentally, Zekiye heard it while looking through the window and she said; “The ones that loves him, would never stop following him! He

¹⁴⁶ Pekman, Yavuz *Tanzimat* Dönemi Oyun Yazarlığında Batılılaşma Olgusu p: 19. <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/13/179/1382.pdf>

¹⁴⁷ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.P: 39. Original Text: “*Beni seven, hiçbir vakit arkamdan ayrılmaz.*”

thought nothing but his fatherland. Had he ever wondered there was a wretch here? He knew it was so difficult to leave him but could not find a way not to leave! Is it true that the ones that love you never leave your side? I would never leave, too. I was not a man... who would know?”¹⁴⁸ Zekiye was not only a brave woman but also determined to what she had decided. This has two important meanings; first, she is brave enough to follow İslam Bey to defend Silistra, second, she appreciates İslam Bey’s patriotism and values in addition to this, she admires his patriotism. This scene is debatable, because İslam Bey’s sayings to the volunteers were misunderstood by Zekiye and she was offended. So, it is not so clear whether İslam Bey included Zekiye in his sayings or not. But, Zekiye followed him to the war as a proof of her love to him.

‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, not only represents the Ottoman people but also stands for the Albanians. The play indicates many cultural elements of the Albanian people including their sayings and some traditions. Zekiye represents a brave young Ottoman girl under an Albanian identity. At the beginning of the first act of ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, Zekiye wears a dress which is special to the Albanian culture which shows the culture that she is belonged to. Wearing an Albanian dress shows which culture she belongs but she considers herself as an Ottoman and never hesitates to leave to defend her fatherland. George Gawrich in his book; ‘The Crescent and the Eagle’ states; “Two Turks, Sıtkı Bey and Abdullah Çavuş, stood out as heroes. But

¹⁴⁸ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012. P: 40. Original Text: “*Beyi seven hiçbir vakit ardından ayrılmazmış! Bak, lafı söylerken vatandan başka bir şey düşünür mü? Bak, hiç aklına gelir mi ki, burada bir biçare var. Kendinden ayrılmayı canından ayrılmaktan beter biliyor da ayrılmamaya çare bulamıyor! Seni seven hiçbir vakit ardından ayrılmaz, öyle mi? İşte, ben de ayrılmayacağım... Ama erkek değilmişim... Kim bilecek?*”

the play opened with Zekiye Hanım, İslam Bey's love, dressed in an Albanian costume. Zekiye followed her man into battle disguised as a male soldier. She was on and off, but forcefully presence throughout the play reinforced the theme that all Ottomans should feel a strong bond and loyalty to the empire.”¹⁴⁹ Zekiye, not only represents the patriotic, brave and devoted women of the fatherland but also the Albanian women who except themselves as Ottoman and fearlessly defend their fatherland. Zekiye was introduced as an Albanian girl at the beginning of the drama but throughout the play, Namık Kemal did not highlighted her Albanian identity, moreover she was accepted as an Ottoman. Namık Kemal, wanted to strengthen the Ottoman patriotism which seemed to be in danger and with the help of the Muslim community, the bond of Islam, he aimed to motivate the people to unite and strengthen their patriotism. George Gawrych in his book; ‘The Crescent and the Eagle’, points out this detail in the play; “And in this play, Namık Kemal portrayed Zekiye's father as Turk, even though she appeared at the beginning of the play dressed in an Albanian costume.”¹⁵⁰ Namık Kemal wanted to show clearly the different cultural elements of the Ottoman Empire but, he called their ethnicity as ‘Turk’, the general population, in order to create the ‘Ottomanism’ movement in his patriotic play. According to the play, ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, defending Silistra was the outcome of Ottoman patriotism and the bravery of the characters without noticing their sub-identities. Namık Kemal, basically aimed to emphasize the unity under the common religious believe, Islam. ‘Zekiye’ was a young girl raised with Albanian and

¹⁴⁹Gawrych, George. 2006. *The Crescent and the Eagle: Ottoman Rule, Islam and the Albanians, 1874-1913*. <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=wPOtzk-unJgC&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false> P:18

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. P: 19.

Islamic traditions and accepted herself as an Ottoman, defended Silistra for the sake of the empire. So, she was an example of an Albanian girl who had a strong bond to her fatherland which was the Ottoman Empire.

‘Zekiye’ was a real character that Namık Kemal was inspired from real life like the other main characters of the drama. It is known that Kemal moved to Kars with his grandfather because of his grandparent’s duties when he was young. There, he witnessed an event inspired him to create ‘Zekiye’ character in his drama. This was stated by his own writing in a letter which was written to Abdülhak Hamit. A brave girl, who attended the military service as a volunteer after her fiancé, was martyred.¹⁵¹ Kemal should be impressed by the girls’ courage and decided to create a character, similar to her in his drama. For Kemal, ‘patriotism’ did not need any gender gap. Alev Sınar Çılgın in her article gives an additional information on Zekiye’s actions on the drama; “Müjgan Cumbur in her article; ‘Military and army for Namık Kemal’, accepts Zekiye as the first example of army nurses regarding to Zekiye’s looking after the injured İslam Bey and help with his treatment during the war.”¹⁵² Zekiye was an example of the value of the Ottoman women in the society.

Zekiye seemed to be an educated woman of her time. She knew how to read and write, which was noticeable at the beginning of the drama. She started her monolog putting her book on her chest and says; “Mommy, mommy, why did you

¹⁵¹ Çılgın, Alev Sınar. "Vatan Yahut Silistre’de Vatan Kavramı." *U.Ü. Fen- Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 6, no. 9 (2005): 135-45. Accessed July 9, 2014. http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebSCO&ano=65754_4f49a07d3f745c4499ba9b09e226c903&? p:141.

¹⁵² Ibid. P: 141.

give me so much compassion? Why did you extend my opinions that much? If you ever saw your daughter like that, you would regret for educating me.”¹⁵³ So, Zekiye’s mother educated her and changed her perspectives toward life. This was not common among the women of the related time. Namık Kemal, who had reformist ideas, defended the idea that the female children should be educated in order to become a developed country.¹⁵⁴ Gülay Arıkan in her article states; “Namık Kemal analyzed the social status of women in his works. He blamed women illiteracy and ignorance were the reasons that women had been humiliated, and faced with inferior treatment in Ottoman society. For this reason, he called for a modernization of education to promote the attendance of girls in schools in order to be loved and respected by the society with contemporary values.”¹⁵⁵ Namık Kemal was aware of the fact that illiteracy was making a huge gap between men and women in the society which created an abasement toward women. Women without an education could not find a respected place in the society. If the case was the illiterate and ignorant women in the society, a modern education and the attendance of the girls to the schools would be the solution for the reformist Namık Kemal. In ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, Zekiye at least could read and write, which seemed well accepted by Namık Kemal. She was mature

¹⁵³ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.P: 25. Original Text: “Ah! Anneciğim! Anneciğim! Gönlüme niçin bu kadar merhamet verdin? Fikrimi niçin bu kadar açtın? Sende şimdi kızımı görse okuttuğuna pişman olurdun...”

¹⁵⁴ Mustafa Karabulut states in his article; “Novelists of *Tanzimat* era attach great importance to the topic of ‘woman’. Turkish Novel, which is appeared during *Tanzimat* era, plays a great role in the change and development on social life of Turkish women. Novelists of *Tanzimat* era frequently mentions about the significance of women on the education of infants. It is stated in novels that, women shall self-develop themselves to be good housewives and to well educate their children.”Karabulut, Mustafa. "Tanzimat Dönemi Türk Romanında Kadın Üzerine Tematik Bir İnceleme." *Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Erdem Dergisi* 10, no. 64 (2013): 49-69. Accessed September 12, 2014. http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/pdf/mustafa_karabulut_tanzimat_donemi_roman_kadin.pdf. P:50.

¹⁵⁵ Arıkan, Gülay. "The Opinions of the Reformation Writers about Women during the Ottoman Era." *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 15, no. 1, 15-23.

enough to make her own decisions as a literate woman. So, in other words being a literate person can give you the freedom of deciding. She did not hesitate to decide going after İslam Bey and attend as a volunteer to defend Silistra. There, Namık Kemal wanted to create a sense that ‘freedom’ would affect every aspect of life. If you are living on an independent land therefore you can be free at deciding, free to go after what you want and free to love anybody you desire. In this understanding Zekiye’s love for İslam Bey was the outcome of her freedom. She represented Kemal’s vision of women who is free and patriot like men as well. In addition to this, Zekiye was educated enough to perceive the priorities of her life and nation. Love towards her fatherland and her love for a man were completely different feelings. But her love to the fatherland was the major one. When İslam Bey explained why he had to leave Zekiye for defending Silistra, Zekiye, answered him; “If only the matter was the fatherland, what else I should say? What else I could say? You should go! Go Mister! Everything in life for us! I knew *vatan*, I heard *vatan* statements before!”¹⁵⁶

This meant that Zekiye grew up in a patriot family and knew what fatherland really meant. Also, Zekiye appreciated İslam Bey’s patriotism and bravery to defend his fatherland; she accepted to leave her love if only for defending the fatherland.

Namık Kemal defended the idea that it was men that should educate women as well as making them to be conscious of patriotism and love their fatherland. At the beginning of the drama we witnessed İslam Bey’s conversation with Zekiye explaining why he should enter the war to defend his fatherland. At first, Zekiye

¹⁵⁶Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.P: 32. Original Text: “Eğer... Vatan.. Vatan olunca... Ben ne derim? Ben... Ben ne diyebilirim?Git! Git beyim! Dünyanın bu hali de varmış! Ben vatani bilirim, vatan sözlerini işitmişim... Fakat iki kalbi birbirinden koparır sanmazdım!”

could not understand his farewell and expostulated on him for leaving her. İslam Bey explained his love of fatherland and how it was valuable for him then she accepts that he had to leave her because the fatherland needed to be defended. Here, Kemal chose İslam Bey to awake Zekiye's patriotic feelings. Zekiye seemed as a role model whose patriotism awakened with the help of İslam Bey. Yaşar Şenler in his article points that; "Namık Kemal gave Turkish women a task to criticize the situation who was brave enough to go after her lover to the war. Otherwise it meant an escape from the war, giving up struggling for the sake of the interests."¹⁵⁷ So, Zekiye made her choice and proved her independence on her decisions. Namık Kemal did not want to create a female character that was under the control of men or any other person. İslam Bey could be regarded as the person that educate or help her to figure out the valuable facts. Zekiye was a free woman that decided to leave her home without taking any permission or İslam Bey's approval. Also, at the beginning of the drama, Zekiye said that her father educated her mother,¹⁵⁸ therefore she died because of the sorrow he left behind. Men could only educate women if only they were educated enough. Namık Kemal emphasized on the importance of education on his articles and believed on the educated men and women for a modern society. In addition to this, Merve Bağcı states in her article; "The writers of the *Tanzimat* era, mainly focused on the life of the urban women. They tried to find the ways to make the single and bored women more active in the society by mentioning them. According to them,

¹⁵⁷ Yaşar Şenler, *Namık Kemal'in Tiyatrolarında Sosyal Tenkit*, Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, . 2011.in *Namık Kemal*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 227.

¹⁵⁸ Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.P: 25.

education should be the first priority for the reformations about women. They tried to disproof that Islam was against the social rights of women by giving proofs from Islam.”¹⁵⁹ Namık Kemal tried to find the Islamic evident to show that women should be equal to men. According to him, Islam should not be regarded as a religion against women; it should be read and understood truly. Namık Kemal, not only tried to find an evidence on Islam about the ‘*meşveret* system’ but also tried to find an evidence for women. Finding Islamic evidences, would eventually help him to achieve his attempts to make the women have a life with dignity. The society, would not reject a religious statement easily.

Namık Kemal, believed that the society can be westernized in an appropriate way only if the reforms suit both to the norms and the religious values. At the beginning of the drama, we saw İslam Bey secretly entered into Zekiye’s room, which was not acceptable according to unwritten rules of the society. Moreover, they talked to each other while they were alone in a room without marriage. Marriage was seemed as the obligation for men and women to become intimate. This was a common rule for communicating and even for seeing each other. So, Namık Kemal’s act on the drama was the reflection of his aim to start a new understanding for the society. Women and men could have the chance to see, talk and get along with each other. That could be a way to a modern society which not just created compatible marriages. Namık Kemal was married to Nesime Hanım, which was an arranged marriage planned by his grandfather. But it was obvious that they were not suitable for each other and this affected their marriage badly. They

¹⁵⁹Bağcı, Merve. "*Tanzimat* Fermanı Sonrası Osmanlı Kadını Ve Sosyal Yaşantısı." *AFASAM*. <http://www.afasam.org/tr/makale/Makale - 13.pdf>. P: 7.

stayed at different houses as long as Kemal wished. So, Kemal and his ideas about pre-marriage relationship is reasonable. A couple who would know each other before marriage, can make a healthy decision on their future. Could his opinion come from his failed marriage or his modern thoughts on men and women relationship? This is debatable. His ideas could come true only in societies with a free will. Only in a free country with independent boundaries, you will be allowed to be free at thinking and deciding. If you want to live free by every mean, you should love and protect your fatherland. Your living on an independent fatherland is your key to have a free mind and will.

Zekiye was a young girl who was aware of the value of her fatherland. İlkay Özküralp states in her article; “In this respect, Zekiye is shown as a girl who realizes her duties toward the fatherland and well aware of her priorities. In this new era, women will raise patriotic children and has to affirm their desires with ‘mind’ which is the image of men. Men will create a brotherhood of patriotic men. Patriotic feelings become a criterion of the hierarchy among men.”¹⁶⁰ Namık Kemal’s *Vatan Yahut Silistre*, was his vision of a new society. In this society all men and women were patriots. Men would have a status in the society according to their braveness and courage on defending the fatherland. Whereas women would be wiser mothers that use their minds and knowledge which were the qualifications ascribed to men. Patriotic women would raise her children with those values and minds which create a cycle of patriots among the society.

¹⁶⁰Özküralpli, İlkay. "Bir Desideratum Olarak Vatan Kavramının *Tanzimat* Dönemi Erkeklik Kavramı İnşasındaki Rolü." *Fe Dergi: Feminist Eleştiri* 5, no. 1 (2013): 32-42. <http://cins.ankara.edu.tr/>. P: 36.

Namık Kemal, like the other reformist writers of the era, emphasized on the women issues which has been a problem for a long time. Sibel Dulum states in her thesis; “According to Namık Kemal the main reason of the uneducated and badly raised children is illiterate mothers or women. Also Kemal believed, illiterate women could raise illiterate children but beside this, they could easily diverse to amoral actions that could cause men to dislike marriage. It would end up with a decrease of population.”¹⁶¹ For Kemal, education was more than a necessity of the society; it was an obligatory for the future of the society. Women should be educated properly for morally and informed generations. Men, who have a potential to dislike marriage by the actions of the amoral women would eventually affect the population of the society. So, morally justified women can keep the institution of marriage and help to maintain a moral society. In addition, Gülay Arıkan in her article states; “To conclude, during the period from the Reformation to the War of Independence, the only objective of the writers who defended women, was to elevate women to the level of having equal rights with men, to prove that women are by no means inferior to men, and to work to rise educated, virtuous, good mothers and wives, together with good Islamic generations.”¹⁶² Arıkan’s statement, summarizes the intention of Namık Kemal about the women. So, Zekiye, the heroic female character of *Vatan Yahut Silistre*, stands for Kemal’s vision of the expected women in the society.

¹⁶¹Dulum, Sibel. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kadının Statüsü, Eğitimi Ve Çalışma Hayatı (1839-1918)." http://www.manevisosyalhizmet.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/08/osmanlida_kadin_tez.pdf.P: 27.

¹⁶²Arıkan, Gülay. "The Opinions of the Reformation Writers about Women during the Ottoman Era." *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 15, no. 1, 15-23. P: 22.

CHAPTER 7

MIZANCI MURAT'S CRITIC¹⁶³

Mizancı Murat¹⁶⁴ was a politician, a journalist and a writer who lived at the *Tanzimat* Era and II. Constitutional period. He was a defender of ‘Ottomanism’ and ‘Islamic union’ as his cultural ideology.¹⁶⁵ In this sense, he adopted a literary movement called ‘*Edebiyat-ı Ahlakiye*’ which supported the idea that the only aim of literature should be improving moral virtues.¹⁶⁶ Mizancı Murat, made many textual critics for ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ under his work ‘*Übepamızın Nümune-i İmtisalleri*’¹⁶⁷. In his critic, he strongly wrote down that İslam Bey’s and Zekiye’s meeting without marriage was against the ‘*Adab-ı İslamiye*’¹⁶⁸. Also Mizancı Murat criticized that ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ was weak at its plot. Additionally, Alpay DoğanYıldız in his article ‘Namık Kemal’s theatre’ says that; “The literary structure of the drama is weak but it is acceptable because of its being the first trying of the

¹⁶³ Mizancı Murat’s criticism was published on the issues 41. 42. and 43. in the newspaper ‘Mizan’ on 1888 under the title ‘Silistre’. His criticism can be read on Namık Kemal’s ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ edited by Hacer Er as an afterword edited to the book published by İnkılap Yayınevi on 2012.

¹⁶⁴ For further reading, Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri Ve Milli Mücadele*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012.p:172.

¹⁶⁵ Emil, Birol. "Mizancı Murad Bey’in Edebiyat Ve Tenkide Dair Görüşleri." *Türk Dili Ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 19 (1971): 119-43.
<http://journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iutded/article/viewFile/1023017660/1023016903>.

¹⁶⁶ Hanioglu, Şükrü. *Bir Siyasal örgüt Olarak "Osmanlı İttihad Ve Terakki Cemiyeti" Ve "Jön Türklük": (1889-1902)*. İletişim Yayınları, 1985. 219.

¹⁶⁷ Mizancı Murat, wrote textual criticisms under the title ‘*Übepamızın Nümune-i İmtisalleri*’ on the Mizan newspaper in 1888.

¹⁶⁸ In Turkish Literally; *İslami Edepler*. Mehmet Kanar ‘Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü’, Say Yayınları,2011.

writer and the first example in our literature. But, writing Zekiye as a woman, giving Sıtkı Bey a tragic life story and humorousness to Abdullah Çavuş, the writer aims to prevent this insufficiency.”¹⁶⁹ For Mizancı Murat, Namık Kemal did not write down any villain as a contrast to the protagonists of the drama. But still, Mizancı Murat found the drama successful and accepted that it has achieved the desired aim. He was strictly attached to the moral rules and regulations but Namık Kemal ignored those rules and strengthened the message and the details on the play. The literary structure of the drama could be accepted as weak for Mizancı Murat because of his being a traditionalist in every aspect. Kemal wanted to create a new approach to the old traditions as a result of his thoughts on westernization.

At the beginning of his criticism, Mizancı Murat named ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ as a nation-wide and a successful drama that had become famous at Europe. But he urged that, it was essential to make a critic of the drama by its own originated nation before any other commentaries would be done by the Europeans. Society accepted the drama’s title as ‘Silistra’ from the first performance at the theatre. It was acceptable for him because the drama was written in a new style which was suitable for the society. Mizancı Murat added that, anything new could take the attention of the society but it was not valid for ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’. The drama was already successful in its story and impressive enough to take attention. He commented that even if the drama was published at his time, it would still create the same impressions as before. So, Mizancı Murat accepted the drama was influential.

¹⁶⁹ Yıldız, Alpay Doğan. *Namık Kemal’in Tiyatroları*, in Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. 2011. In *Namık Kemal*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P:198.

Mizancı Murat believed that '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' took an intense public attention because of the important and sensitive values it mentioned. It was no doubt that the drama was fully accepted because it had been referred to the 'Crimean War' which was glorious and an unforgettable war in the Ottoman history. A nation that believes in the statement; 'devotion to one's nation comes from faith'¹⁷⁰ could make the drama embraced by the society in any case. For Mizancı Murat, It was hard to read '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' without moving to tears in its related time and it would make the reader feel the same sensation again if it has been read in his time. In addition to this, according to Mizancı Murat, Namık Kemal had a unique ability to write and the two martial songs that appeared during the drama; could be unforgettable among people for ages. Because of those qualifications of the drama and Namık Kemal, it was obvious that the drama was going to take a deep public attention. On the other hand, Mizancı Murat admitted that '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' deserved its fame but if an objective and a sharp criticism would be made about the drama, it would be clearly seen that there were some deficiencies in the drama.¹⁷¹

Mizancı Murat tried to defend his claim throughout his criticism on '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' by giving examples from the drama. At the beginning of his criticism, he found the plot of the drama quite simple; 'Russia, who declared war for no reason during the Crimean war, agitated the Muslim community'¹⁷². Then, the writer chose İslam Bey among the agitated Albanians and sent him to Silistra as the head of the

¹⁷⁰ In Turkish Literally; '*Vatan Sevgisi İmandan Gelir*'.

¹⁷¹ Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Acaba bu eser, edebi bir yöntemle tarafsız olarak incelenecek olursa, o kadar şöhrete layık görülebilecek midir?*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 106.

¹⁷² Ibid. P:106.

volunteers. Later, İslam Bey fought, got wounded and stayed in bed for months only before going to a secret mission to burn the enemies' armory. Mizancı Murat saw İslam Bey's story quite unbelievable or extreme and he continued to add that at the time İslam Bey returned back, he confessed Zekiye his love and proposed to her and she accepted. Later, they got married on the battle field. Mizancı Murat, found many extreme points and instantaneous events throughout the drama especially on İslam Bey's actions. According to him, Namık Kemal's narration of events seemed to be digressed from the reality. This, was not irritating because Kemal's narration was very close to the reality and it did not confused the readers.

Mizancı Murat continued his criticism by saying that the drama did not contain a villain character against the good community. It was hard to accept some officers who offered to be surrendered during the war as villains of the drama. So, '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' did not contain a plot which was an essential in great literary works. He offered Namık Kemal to complete his work by every mean, starting from the weak plot. But it should be noted that, Mizancı Murat believed that a literary work that had developed a plot and a story would also improve its moral qualifications.¹⁷³ Moreover, '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*', would be accepted as weak in literary sense no matter it was criticized by some important figures of the developed countries. It was a sensational drama and awakened the national feelings but failed to make the readers and the audience gain deep thoughts in the long term.

¹⁷³ Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Ayrıca Silistre'de büyük eserlerde en önemli noktayı oluşturan 'dram entrikası' yoktur. Halbuki yazar, yapıtını, edebi eserlerde ahlaki güzelleştirmeye yardımcı olan bu yönden çıplak bırakmayabilirdi.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 107.

Mizancı Murat continued his writing with some character analysis from the drama adding that those characters were described and wished to become role models for the readers. He started with ‘Zekiye’ and said she was the most precious character of the drama and took an attention through her ‘monolog’,¹⁷⁴. In her monolog, it was obvious that she was an informed and realistic person. Also, with the help of her long monolog, we got to know about her life story. She was an orphan, she had no one but her nanny and she had been mourning for her lost father for fifteen years. Unfortunately she also lost her mother and brother, which caused her pain became worse. Mizancı Murat found Namık Kemal successful at mentioning ‘love at first sight’ in his drama, Zekiye fell in love with İslam Bey at the very first sight and from that time she forgot to mourn for her losses and began worrying about her love. She was regretted for forgetting her losses and got ashamed of thinking only him but no other fact, in other words, she felt self-reproach. Mizancı Murat, called her excitement as nonsensically adding that Namık Kemal gave her some qualities to cover up her ‘frivolous act’¹⁷⁵. These were her confidence in herself and being a literate young woman. Zekiye was an educated woman compared to other women of Bitola and her time. Falling in love could excite her as a young woman and this was not a shameful feeling. Zekiye was feeling sorry for thinking only about İslam Bey. But, her feelings toward him were so naive and pure that made her mind full of thoughts formed of İslam Bey.

¹⁷⁴Mizancı Murat adds that ‘monologue’ is the western term meaning ‘*tirat*’ in Turkish. *Tirat* means, a long running talking in a drama.

¹⁷⁵Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Fakat Zekiye Hanım’ın bu ‘hafiflik’i başkalarinki gibi göze çarpmıyor, çünkü Zekiye Hanım başkalarıyla kıyaslanabilecek biri değildir.yazar bunu ustaca açıklayıp okuyucuyu kandırıyor.’Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 109.

Zekiye should not be accused of loving a man or dreaming about him, which was a mistake according to Mizancı Murat. Zekiye got herself too deeply into the matter and Mizancı Murat described this as an inappropriate act. This was an exaggerated approach to Zekiye's acts. Mizancı Murat's vision of a young woman was unimpassioned and insensitive. There was no concrete evidence to accuse Zekiye with being in an affair until İslam Bey secretly came in from the window. Mizancı Murat called İslam Bey, a burglar because of his coming from the window like a broke in, similar to a common thief. İslam Bey entered into the room without knowing the reaction of his letter which he had sent with the help of Zekiye's nanny. Mizancı Murat criticized İslam Bey's act as inconsiderate and contrast to the moral rules of the society. According to him, Zekiye had failed to ignore and dismiss İslam Bey which could make her seen as a behaved woman.

Mizancı Murat, accused Zekiye for not dismissing İslam Bey out of his room and called her a two-faced woman. Zekiye could be the representative of the social ethics if she would have dismissed İslam Bey and later could feel regret or not. Mizancı Murat was acting as if he was the only guardian of the moral principles.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁶ In Hale Biricikoğlu's article, she states; "From *Tanzimat* to *Meşrutiyet*, 'woman' was always an argument topic amongst supporters of westernization and traditionalists. Demands from westernization supporters about the topic of 'women' are always seemed as assault to moral values by the traditionalist circles. As they have expressed at their statements, relations between man and woman should be regulated by rules of sharia as they are. On the other hand, westernization supporters were stating that position of woman in the society is one of the major causes of underdevelopment and women shall be encouraged to contribute more to social life. The debate on the topic of 'woman' is formed around those discussions mentioned above." Her argument is a clear example of Namık Kemal and Mizancı Murat's different understandings to the 'women' issue on the society. Zekiye was the idol woman according to the westernization supporters' perception. On the other hand, as a traditionalist, Mizancı Murat, would never except a women like Zekiye who is social and active in every aspect of life. Biricikoğlu, Hale. "Türk Modernleşmesinde Kadın." *2nd International Conference on Women's Studies*, 2006. Accessed September 12, 2014. http://cws.emu.edu.tr/en/conferences/2nd_int/pdf/Hale_Biricikoglu.pdf. P:4.

He criticized Namık Kemal, as if he was not giving any value to the moral principles of the society. It should be known that Namık Kemal was only in favor of modernism only if it was suitable for the society. Mizancı Murat said the writer of ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ tried to cover İslam Bey’s indecent behavior was an inaccurate act. Mizancı Murat also added that Namık Kemal did not hesitate to show Zekiye’s taking pleasure in seeing İslam Bey.¹⁷⁷ Zekiye shouted out when İslam Bey entered from the window and said; ‘what would happen if someone has ever seen me?’¹⁷⁸ Mizancı Murat found this unnecessary because Zekiye, has ignored the moral rules before and shouldn’t have thought what the other people would think about her this time. He sometimes made extreme comments on this acts and said İslam Bey insulted her by entering her room. Moreover, he claimed that this act of Zekiye was even acceptable for any kind of women who lost their honor and morality.¹⁷⁹ Mizancı Murat clarified that this kind of an act would be accepted as rude even in the European countries where women and men can see each other freely. His argument was exaggerated because it was a theatre play and he should accepted some part of it as a fiction, far from the current reality.

Mizancı Murat appreciated İslam Bey’s patriotic speech to Zekiye but still saw Zekiye has been failed in moral values and rules. To sum up, he accepted that

¹⁷⁷Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Aslına bakılırsa yazar, bu çirkinliğin üstünü örtmek için bir hayli çaba sarf ediyor ve kalemini konuşturuyor. İslam Bey’in hareketini kendi tarafından kabahatli bulduruyor ve Zekiye Hanım’ı ‘memnuniyet’ini gizlemeye zorluyor.*’ *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 111.

¹⁷⁸In Turkish literally; ‘*Biri gördüyse bana ne der?*’.

¹⁷⁹Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Zekiye Hanım’ın işte bu hareketi namus ve erdemini yitirmiş basit bir kadından bile beklenir.*’ Ibid p: 111.

İslam Bey and Zekiye Hanım, were the writers' success except from the moral deficiencies in the meeting act. Mizancı Murat decided to ignore Zekiye throughout the drama because according to him, she had been a lost character as she had lost her moral values. He said Zekiye acted senseless by going after İslam Bey to war by hiding herself into a man appearance adding that Zekiye's attending to the war was not acceptable, far from our norms and standards.¹⁸⁰ Mizancı Murat seemed as if he was obsessed with rejecting 'Zekiye', who was appreciated because of her courage by many other writers and critics. The most important qualification of Zekiye was her bravery, so ignoring her at the beginning of the drama would eventually give the reader a wrong and an incomplete message of the play.

Mizancı Murat made an important critic on 'Zekiye', according to him, her becoming a soldier was meaningless and her hiding the truth about her gender could not and should not be an example for the daughters of our nation. If the writer's aim was to show Zekiye's patriotic virtues, it could be done by writing her stitching and knitting at her house. He also said that there was a saying in our culture; 'doing as much as one can even if it's only a little.'¹⁸¹ Could have been remembered by the writer. Mizancı Murat wanted to see Zekiye, as a woman who stayed in her house and tried to help the war by knitting a sweater. Zekiye's leaving for the 'Defend of Silistra' was meaningless and wrong. Namık Kemal did not want to mean that women should not stay at their houses and do housework but instead tried to make

¹⁸⁰ Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Savaşta Zekiye Hanım gelenek ve göreneklerimize, milletimize tabiatımıza uzak, yabancı bir varlıktır. Bizce tanımamak, bilmemek, reddetmek gerekir.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 112.

¹⁸¹ In Turkish literally; '*Karınca Kararınca*'

them active in real life like men. His vision of women was patriotic and fearless to defend their fatherland if needed. Mizancı Murat, pointed out that the writer's aim was different, he did not want to show Zekiye's patriotic virtue but some other thing.¹⁸² It was not appropriate for girls under the age of sixteen to be in or near the army. Any literary work defends this idea could harm its fame. Mizancı Murat said, no matter how the writer of the drama wanted to attribute Zekiye's leaving her home to İslam Bey's saying; 'The ones who love me, would follow me'¹⁸³ but he still found Zekiye made a mistake by taking it personally. A patriot İslam Bey should have used the phrase 'the ones who love their fatherland' instead of 'the ones who love me'. Mizancı Murat ended his criticism on Zekiye which he did not agreed and confirmed in many ways.

Mizancı Murat continued his criticizing on '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' by making an analysis on İslam Bey. İslam Bey was one of the main characters and the hero of the drama. Our critic, Mizancı Murat, said that İslam Bey should be deeply analyzed because he was needed more as an example for the society rather than showing women as examples who were only obliged to do some duties as a result of motherhood. Mizancı Murat is not in favor of the women whom are socially active and has a place in the society. It is clear from his statements on his criticism. Namık Kemal and he was in an opposition on the subject of women's respect in society. This is the most important difference between the westerner and the traditional

¹⁸² Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Zekiye Hanım'ın zaten lekeden geçilmeyen 'hanımlık' yönü 'erkeklik' yönüyle mahvedilmiş olduğundan, yazar biri sayesinde ün kazanırken diğeri yüzünden milli adetlere saldırmış oluyor.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 113.

¹⁸³ In Turkish literally; '*Beni seven arkamdan gelsin!*'

thinkers on the women issue. Namık Kemal's vision of women was socially active but Mizancı Murat's would become only a mother and stay at her house doing housework.

İslam Bey was a patriot who had very strong feelings for his fatherland that even made him forget Zekiye's love. His courage made him make sacrifices without hesitating. İslam Bey was a young man and the commander of the military volunteers. He was wise enough to know about patriotism and he mentioned old literary works written about the subject during his speech. According to Zekiye Hanım, he was a well looking man. Mizancı Murat said that the writer of the drama wanted us to imagine 'himself' in his descriptions.¹⁸⁴ He promised to make an effort to make the writer's will but if his efforts would not satisfy him, the writer could blame them for being ignorant or blame the ones that has criticized his work. Mizancı Murat was obviously annoyed by reading those descriptions and makes a comment that Namık Kemal wanted the readers of the drama to imagine his appearance by reading those sentences. This is an argumentative statement because there is no evidence of this throughout the drama. So, it can be right to say that this is a reflection of Mizancı Murat's dissatisfaction on the drama.

Mizancı Murat continues his criticism and says at the beginning of '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*', the writer showed İslam Bey's unpleasant side which was not

¹⁸⁴ Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Yazar da kendini bize böyle göstermek istiyor. İstedğini elimizden geldiğince yerine getirmeye çalışırız. Ama çabamız yazarı memnun etmezse, cehaletimize versin veya suçu 'eleştiri'yi bulanlara yüklesin.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 115.

appropriate for a drama. The writer should show his main character much better in order to create a first impression. Because first impressions are important in dramas and musicals. But the writer skipped over this aspect. For him, İslam Bey made a terrible mistake by entering an honorable Muslim girl's room that might not be covered properly. He listened not only the girl's talking to herself but also entered her room without even thinking whether it was appropriate or not. Mizancı Murat must have been very upset by Namık Kemal's vision of imagining two lovers meeting alone without marriage because he mentioned this subject again and again. He continues and adds that Zekiye Hanım did not invite İslam Bey or even encouraged him to. She had no guardian to save her honor and İslam Bey did not think about the consequences of his act; he made Zekiye to be ashamed of herself forever. That was an important point for Mizancı Murat because that happened thirty years ago before on a place that had not been morally corrupted. Mizancı Murat not only claimed this act was against every moral rule but also left Zekiye in a shame which would last forever. No matter how İslam Bey's action was not appropriate of the related times' moral system, it was obvious that they did nothing but just talking and saying goodbye to each other, Mizancı Murat shouldn't be that insensitive about the act. The reader probably wouldn't see the act as inappropriate because they were all sentimental and became wholly absorbed in the drama. Mizancı Murat could have seen the act as sensitive and ignore the moral principalities after all it was a separation of the lovers. Namık Kemal wanted to give some subliminal messages to the readers and he was successful.

Mizancı Murat tried to give some suggestions on the specific acts of the drama. For him, the writer could have other possibilities rather than showing İslam Bey like a thief. İslam Bey could have made his farewell to Zekiye Hanım through a

letter which he had wrote before to tell his feelings also he could say he wished her to wait for his return from the war. Even if İslam Bey was fully sure about Zekiye Hanım's love for him, he should never make a mistake by entering her room. This was an act that should be condemned regretfully. Mizancı Murat at this point started to talk about some possibilities which are far from the drama. What if İslam Bey was not sure of Zekiye's love to him and secretly made her fallen in love with him, wouldn't that be the worst thing ever could be done to Zekiye? İslam Bey had a high possibility of dying in the war so; to leave a girl under a sorrow and an obligation to wait for his return would not be an appropriate act for a man who was aware of heartbreak.¹⁸⁵ İslam Bey could better sent someone and ask for the girl for a marriage. Mizancı Murat, throughout his critic failed to realize that "*Vatan Yahut Silistre*" was a theatre play and a creation of inspiration. So, if Namık Kemal would be far away from his inspirations and only think about the actual facts, the play would not fulfill his thoughts and moreover it would not be impressive enough with no usage of fictional material.

Mizancı Murat was limitless on criticizing '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*'. He said the writer of the drama tried to show the inner worlds by showing them together. If his aim was to copy from a European work, we could say it was a waste of time and effort. Even though his aim was not to make such a comparison but to set a good

¹⁸⁵ Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Zaten kederli olan kızın gönlüne girip savaşa girmek ve kızı, kara haberlerini beklemek zorunda bırakmak, özellikle gönül bağı belasının ne demek olduğunu bilen bir erkeğin şanından değildir.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 116.

example for the society, it was rejected.¹⁸⁶ According to Mizancı Murat, İslam Bey's attraction to Zekiye Hanım for the first time he saw her was inappropriate because she was a covered girl as a young lady. It was not possible for him to see her to be fallen in love. If she was seen clearly that would mean her moral had been already corrupted which could make her inappropriate to be an honored wife for İslam Bey.

Mizancı Murat's approach of criticizing the drama, under the moral virtues was his vision of looking toward literary works. But still, he ignored Namık Kemal's vision of a modern woman in every mean. According to Mizancı Murat's views, 'falling in love for the first time' was an acceptable fact for Zekiye Hanım but not İslam Bey because women could see men clearly. Moreover, women did not have an extensive view about life and limited by their duties. A young women mostly thought nothing but her unknown lover which she would meet in the future. On the other hand, men's world is far more complicated and wise. His duties and works didn't allow him to think and dream about a possible lover. And if he did not have an image on his mind, he would not have fallen in love to somebody for the first time he had met. Man who was wise enough could not be shocked by having an affair. Mizancı Murat found it possible for Zekiye Hanım to fall in love for the first time according to his reasons but could not even see it as a possibility for İslam Bey. From the point of Mizancı Murat, a man should not fall in love to a woman for the first time because it was a sign of foolishness or blindness. Man had more important duties to do

¹⁸⁶Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Amaç Avrupa eserlerini taklitse, boş bir çaba olduğunu söylemekten başka bir diyeceğimiz yoktur. Öyle değil de topluma örnek olması amacıyla gösteriliyorsa, reddedilmiştir.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 116.

whereas women were free to fall in love for the first time, because she had no other responsibilities except from becoming a wife and a mother.

Mizancı Murat defended the idea that the main purpose of the writers was to glamorize the morality. The writers, who fail to do this task, would not be respected and their works would be lost in the old wives' tales. The plot of the story should be appropriate to the moral and national understandings of its belonged culture. Mizancı Murat claimed that there was no literary work that could properly fit into the national values and moral rules; because they could not escape from imitating the West.¹⁸⁷

Mizancı Murat again made definite judgments on the subject which he made throughout his criticism. Regarding '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' as an imitation of Western literary works, would be a wrong comment. Rather, he could think the drama was inspired from various works but a unique piece of literary work that was appreciated by many people. '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' the most known work of Namık Kemal, still keeps its importance on the literary classics of our history.

Mizancı Murat exaggerated the subject and did not stop making certain comments on the moral and national values of our country. Also, he claimed that it was an insult to our national values to make any mention of a mutual love and improve it by making them to meet with each other.¹⁸⁸ Writers should not write down

¹⁸⁷Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Ahlaki eserler bakımından tamamıyla milli değerlerle örtüşen eser yok gibidir. Hiçbiri kuru taklitten kurtulamamıştır.*' *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 118.

¹⁸⁸Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Hele yapıtlarda karşılıklı bir sevgiyi anlatmak ve o sevgiyi görüşüp konuşmalarla büyütmek hiç kuşkusuz ahlaki ve milli değerlere hakarettir.*' Ibid: P: 118.

about a couple that met and talked to each other without marriage.¹⁸⁹ Mizancı Murat shouldn't have chastised Namık Kemal on the subject. Kemal's main message that he wanted to give by his drama was nothing but patriotism and the courage to defend the fatherland even self-sacrifices were needed. This was obvious that he wanted a character that will represent patriotic women of the society and Zekiye was the brave and patriotic women of the drama. Mizancı Murat seemed as if he had ignored Zekiye's patriotic virtues and only wanted to see her morality which could mean nothing without defending the fatherland for Namık Kemal.

Mizancı Murat remarked that all national literary works had to obey the moral rules under any circumstances. He added that, the public morality could not be changed according to the setting or the time and he didn't have any intention to say to the honorable writer¹⁹⁰ that he should have obeyed the moral principles. If he would ever warn any talented writers who were the representatives of national

¹⁸⁹ Hale Biricikoğlu states in her article; "The struggle for modernization has been reflected to the social life after 1860s with newspapers, novels and dramas too. Those three significant tools were effective at transferring westerner models of living to the Ottoman. The passive state of women in society was reflected on 19th century literature with Şinasi's drama, "Şair Evlenmesi". In the drama, prearranged marriages are criticized and stated healthy marriage can only be done with mutual acquaintance and agreement of man and woman. Additionally, Namık Kemal, in his novels, analyzed and criticised the general state of the woman in the society from different viewpoints." The writers of the *Tanzimat* era, wanted to give messages to the society including the importance of men and women relationship before marriage. A successful marriage could be arranged only if the couple agree with each other. Marriage was accepted as a must between men and women who want to be together or love each other. It was seen as a permission for women to feel free to talk, see and close to men. Without getting married, women was not allowed to be free at talking or meeting with men so, marriage was and still a social contract for men and women to be together. It is a ticket for a togetherness. It is still seen as a need for women to be accepted by the society and law. The only difference from those times would be 'flirting', which can't mean the exact meaning of Namık Kemal's understanding of a relationship before marriage. For Kemal, a couple should have a similar understanding of life which Zekiye and İslam Bey already had, can be understood only by knowing each other by interaction. Biricikoğlu, Hale. "Türk Modernleşmesinde Kadın." *2nd International Conference on Women's Studies*, 2006. Accessed September 12, 2014. http://cws.emu.edu.tr/en/conferences/2nd_int/pdf/Hale_Biricikoglu.pdf. P:4.

¹⁹⁰ Here, Mizancı Murat wrote in original copy; 'Şerefli yazar hazretlerine'

success about this obligation, he would eventually inhibit them from their authoring. Mizancı Murat, made a statement including the reason why he was making those comments. He only wanted to make suggestions to the genius writers not to exceed the Islamic principles could not be demolished by any power including the writers. According to Mizancı Murat, he was trying to give suggestions without being the defender of superstitious and detrimental ideas. But it seems that he has failed to criticize ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ by ignoring to see the whole picture. He seemed as if he was obsessed with only the romantic relationship on the drama rather than seeing the whole concept. Moreover, he claimed that religious principles did not change according to time, any literary work; whose writer ignored those principles could not be on the national literature library.¹⁹¹ On the other hand, today it is well known that ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ is one of the principle literary works that is read by the children and teens of our time. So, Mizancı Murat’s claim did not come true about ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’.

Mizancı Murat wanted his criticism to be understood clearly by Namık Kemal. For him, if the plot of the drama would ever make us suspicious about Islamic principles it would be right to critic the drama in detail. From this point of view, Mizancı Murat wanted Namık Kemal to forgive him because his aim was to argue about some aspects that was shown as examples to the Muslim youngsters. Later, he states that Zekiye Hanım could not be accepted as a proper example

¹⁹¹Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Dini hükümler zamanla değişmeyeceğine göre, bunlara uymayan yazarların eserleri de milli edebiyat kütüphanesinde kendileri için raf bulamazlar. Konunun özü budur.*’ *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 120.

because, she thought what her neighbors would think if they had witnessed İslam Bey's entering her room but still went after her lover hiding under a boy appearance and also slept among the other man in the army for months. On the other side, Mizancı Murat did not accept İslam Bey as a proper example too because, he entered into an honored girl's room without permission and kept his lover in the army, made her to follow him to the enemy's military camp and risked her and his life. It appeared that Mizancı Murat was unpleasant because of the drama's main characters were not worried about any other facts except from defending 'Silistra', the 'Fatherland' whereas Namık Kemal's only aim was to show the greatness of patriotism and its supremacy on every other fact. Mizancı Murat blamed the characters for ignoring the moral principalities but Namık Kemal originated those characters as pure hearted who only wished to defend Silistra. Namık Kemal wanted the society to understand the importance of the fatherland, which is an obligation for the societies to become their protector of rights and ensure their freedom. Without freedom and independence there would be no way to continue moral or national virtues or beliefs. Mizancı Murat seemed as if he could not or ignored to understand Namık Kemal's message given in his drama.

At the beginning of the drama, İslam Bey and Zekiye Hanım had a conversation on patriotism. Mizancı Murat found this madly and also İslam Bey's farewell to Zekiye Hanım too long. And, İslam Bey did not say the reason why he was leaving her until the end of the conversation. He was going to defend Silistra as a volunteer. The writer of the drama made the reader wonder about where İslam Bey would go and then surprised them. Mizancı Murat continued and said, praising for something and announcing it enthusiastically was something unique for Namık Kemal. He made another comment on İslam Bey which could be accepted as the only

descent qualification of him. Except from İslam Bey's parts with Zekiye Hanım, he could be called as a hero and deserved to be appreciated. He represented the Ottoman heroism, Muslim patriotism and the bravery of the Albanians. İslam Bey's only fault was ignoring his own life, because this could lower the honor of his sacrifices.¹⁹²

Mizancı Murat added that the writers should make their characters that value their lives and do sacrifices if it was needed for a specific aim. That would make the sacrifice more sacred and appreciable. It was clear that Mizancı Murat was impressed by İslam Bey's patriotic virtues but not Zekiye's courage or patriotism. This approach can be called as 'gender segregation'. Namık Kemal's main character on the drama, 'Zekiye' represented the patriots as women but Mizancı Murat ruined his message by ignoring Zekiye's patriotism. For Namık Kemal, women as well as men could be patriots and defend their fatherland neglecting their loved ones. This was Namık Kemal's understanding of patriotism.

Mizancı Murat continued his criticism and said his approach would be 'sentimentalism'¹⁹³, and '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' was written under this approach.¹⁹⁴

In this sense, İslam Bey and Zekiye Hanım were the figments of the imagination and the writer showed us that they were perfect individuals that needed to be shown as a

¹⁹²Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Zaten İslam Bey'in Zekiye Hanım bölümleri ayrı tutulursa bundan sonra kahramanlıklarından başka bir şey yoktur. Söz ve davranışları, her zaman örnek gösterilip alkışlanmaya layıktır. Kendisi Osmanlı kahramanlığının, Müslüman vatanseverliğinin, Arnavut yiğitliğinin vücut bulmuş halidir.*' Namık Kemal, *Vatan Yahut Silistre* Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 122.

¹⁹³ "The practice of being sentimental, or the tendency to be governed by feelings instead of reason." Oxford English Dictionary.

¹⁹⁴Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*İşte bizde Kemal Beyefendi Hazretlerinin Silistre eserini 'santimentalizm' akımı içinde değerlendiriyor ve Silistre oyununun esasen anlatılan tarza uygun olarak yazıldığını doğruluyoruz.*' Ibid. p:125.

model to the society because both were clever, hardworking, honored and heroes. Mizancı Murat appreciated the writer's wish but could not help himself without mentioning that they were not so perfect and their faults were noticeable and he unwillingly made a heavy criticism on the drama. The heroes of the drama, were deeply criticized because they became idols for the society. Then, Mizancı Murat made another comment and created a confusion. He said, "Even the critics should not find any flaw on the heroes which was described by the greatest writers, otherwise, the heroes would lost their heroism and would not be taken as role models."¹⁹⁵ Mizancı Murat made various comments on the heroes of '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' so, depending on his statement, he admitted that neither Namık Kemal nor his work or were great. He confessed his main ideas about the drama at the end of his criticism. 'Greatness' is a relative concept that depends on everyone. Mizancı Murat's criticism, should not be accepted as a neutral work. He had a certain point of view on the literature and he made his criticism depending on this.

Mizancı Murat found 'Sıtkı Bey' and 'Abdullah Çavuş' were the other characters that were labeled under goodness. They were not the figments of the imagination like Zekiye Hanım and İslam Bey, they were the characters that had been realized by a good observer of the Ottoman society and carried exactly to the drama. According to him, such characters that appears on a literary work should not be considered to be perfect. If the characters would obey the moral principalities of the society they would not be seen as a deficiency of the write. 'Sıtkı Bey' and

¹⁹⁵Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.P: 125.

‘Abdullah Çavuş’ who Namık Kemal directly taken from the society do not have any fault. For Mizancı this perfection did not create a fault for the writer since the characters were common among the soldiers in the real life.¹⁹⁶ So, Sıtkı Bey’s and Abdullah Çavuş’s faults could be reasonable and acceptable because of their relation to the real life.

Mizancı Murat called Sıtkı Bey and Abdullah Çavuş as the true reflection of the Ottoman morality in their every act. Sıtkı Bey had a life full of bravery but he accepted it as the outcome of his morality which could be seen on every Ottoman and did not see it as a special gift. Sıtkı Bey’s morality did not accept any kind of iniquity action not only for himself but also for the others. He was punished as a result of his goodness and this caused him to be agitated as an honored man, unfortunately this made his life a living hell for himself. It was his great belief of God and Islam that saved him from a possible suicide. So, Sıtkı Bey decided to change his identity and returned to the military service. In other words, he was hiding from himself because he was ashamed from his past. If he had never met with Zekiye, he would never confess about his true identity. Mizancı Murat said that this was a kind of madness but something to be proud of. ‘Keeping a secret’, was the part of the Ottoman morality, which was an appreciated virtue.¹⁹⁷ Mizancı Murat admired Sıtkı Bey’s keeping his true identity because of feeling ashamed. For him, this was a true and a

¹⁹⁶Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Oysa Kemal Beyefendi’nin toplumumuzdan aynen aldığı Sıtkı Bey ile Abdullah Çavuş’un hiçbir kusurları yoktur. Bu kusursuzluk da yazar için bir kusur olmuyor. Zira askerler arasında her zaman Kemal Beyefendi Hazretlerinin Sıtkı Beylerin gibi Sıtkı Beyler ile Abdullah Çavuşlar çoğunluktadır.*’ Namık Kemal, *Vatan Yahut Silistre* Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 126.

¹⁹⁷Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Bu bir çeşit deliliktir, fakat övülmeye değer bir deliliktir. Olmasa bile Osmanlı ahlakının herhalde anlatılmaya layık olan önemli bir yönüdür. Kim bilir nice Sıtkı Beyler sırlarını beraberlerinde mezara kadar götürmüşlerdir..*’ Namık Kemal, *Vatan Yahut Silistre* Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 127.

proper act for an Ottoman. Sıtkı Bey was feeling ashamed because he was dismissed from the military service, only because he did what he know best. Mizancı Murat wanted to appreciate an honored man who did his right under the moral and Islamic principles without any hesitation of the possible outcomes. For him, this made Sıtkı Bey, a true example of the Ottoman morality. Mizancı Murat, accepted the character as a reflection of the society. Here, Mizancı Murat made a gender segregation again. A man with a solid character could be a perfect example of the society whereas brave Zekiye would be a shame. This very strict gender segregation would slow the pace of the society towards the modernism.

Mizancı Murat placed a particular importance on Abdullah Çavuş. According to him, Abdullah Çavuş was the most common Ottoman character of the drama. His local talking throughout the drama was real among the Ottomans.¹⁹⁸ His saying; ‘Would it be the end of the world?’ showed his courage to face with any kind of danger. Abdullah Çavuş escaped death in many times. He was a brave man and did not hesitate a moment throughout the war. Abdullah Çavuş did not brag about his successes or waited for a reward. This was an obligation for a man who went to a war and it was part of the Ottoman culture and morality. Mizancı Murat gave an example by using a saying from our culture; ‘*Ya gazi, ya şehit*’¹⁹⁹ to prove that Abdullah Çavuş was the vision of the true Ottoman who was respected to his moral and national principles. Sıtkı Bey and Abdullah Çavuş were real characters from Ottoman army. The writer showed them clearly and drew a true parallel between the

¹⁹⁸ Mizancı Murat says in the original text; ‘*Kıyamet mi kopar?*’ sözleri milli ahlakımızı her yönüyle bilen eleştirmenlerin bile itirazlarına uğrayamaz, çünkü “gayru”, “ne bileyin” den başlayarak “şey” ve “teres” lere varıncaya kadar çok ve çeşitli konuşmalar Türklere vardır.’ Namık Kemal, *Vatan Yahut Silistre* Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 127.

¹⁹⁹ To be a ghazi or martyred while battling on the war.

drama and the real world. Mizancı Murat said that was the meaning of becoming a successful writer and appreciated Namık Kemal for creating those characters. It is noticeable that Mizancı Murat was not against to the patriotic literary works, he was just very sensitive about the moral and national principalities. He appreciated and glad to witness İslam Bey's, Sıtkı Bey's and Abdullah Çavuş's patriotic virtues but failed to understand the courage and love of fatherland of a woman. He wanted to see them at their homes, not at any field separated for only man. This understanding would never encourage the women in the society. As a result, the society and the women shall stay in an underdeveloped state.

At the end of his criticism, Mizancı Murat said that both Sıtkı Bey and Abdullah Çavuş were the honors for the writer. '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' was deficient in ingeniousness but completed itself by successful descriptions. The absence of the villain characters and a plot²⁰⁰ weakened the drama's value.²⁰¹ Mizancı Murat believed that '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' would eventually lose its fame in a short time because of the lack of a proper plot. Today, Mizancı Murat's criticism on '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' and his specific claims failed to become true. His foresights about the drama would be forgotten as well as its writer became a false and wrong statement.

²⁰⁰The technique of mentioning the events in a more complicated state to improve thrill and attractiveness for works of story, novel and theatre. The plot takes an important place at novels of detective and adventure. At those types of works, the narrative becomes prominent over aesthetic concern. The reader, shall be content with the 'thrilling' event.
Source: Prof.Dr.Turan Karataş / Edebiyat Terimleri Sözlüğü

²⁰¹Mizancı Murat says in the original text; '*Sonuç olarak Sıtkı Bey ile Abdullah Çavuş yazar için büyük bir şereftir. Bu nedenle Silistre tiyatrosunda "yaratıcılık" kısmının eksikleri "tasvir" kısmıyla tamamlanıyor, fakat "tasvir" in de tam olmaması, yani kötü kişilerin yokluğu ve dram entrikasının eksikliği Silistre'nin değerini azaltıyor.*' Namık Kemal, *Vatan Yahut Silistre* Edited by Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi. 2012 P: 128.

'Vatan Yahut Silistre' is still accepted to be a glorious patriotic literary work. Namık Kemal wanted to awaken 'patriotism' and 'the sense of belonging to the fatherland' in order to find a way to rescue the empire from a possible collapse. In order to provide the continuity of the empire, Namık Kemal was aware that someone should remind the Ottomans their patriotic virtue which seemed to be forgotten. *'Vatan Yahut Silistre'* was the masterpiece of Namık Kemal that reflected his character and vision, the drama was enthusiastic and impassioned like Kemal's own personality.

PART III

THE AFTERMATH OF ‘VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE’

CHAPTER 8

MORE THAN A THEATRE PLAY; A SOCIAL PHENOMENON,

‘VATAN YAHUT SİLİSTRE’

“Sen oldun cevrine ey dil-şiken mahzûn ben mahzûn

Felek gülsün sevinsin şimdi sen mahzûn ben mahzûn

Ölürsem görmeden millet ümmid ettiğim feyzi

Yazılsın seng-i kabrimde vatan mahzûn ben mahzûn”²⁰²

‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ was appreciated by the society. The drama was welcomed enthusiastically as a way that had never been before. The reaction of the society was because of Namık Kemal’s sensitive approach to ‘patriotism’. When the drama has ended, the audience called for Namık Kemal screaming out; ‘Long live fatherland!’ ‘Long live Kemal!’, ‘May you live long Kemal!’. Mithat Cemal Kuntay points out that, “Those attributions were only used for the Sultan in the east and that night they were all called for Namık Kemal. Sultan Aziz could never hear such attributions throughout his reign for fifteen years.”²⁰³ But, Kemal had already left the theatre long before the applauses had ended.²⁰⁴ Neither Kemal nor the Ottoman government could expect such a reaction; it was awkward to see the society shouting

²⁰² “Dörtlükler.” Kurdakul, Şükran. *Namık Kemal*, p: 118. İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın, 2003.

²⁰³ Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I p: 152.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*,P:150-152. 158-159.

for someone except the Ottoman Sultan. The audience was searching for Namık Kemal on the streets.²⁰⁵ It was certain that Kemal was favored by the audience. The crowd was poured out into the streets and a bunch of people started to scream out; ‘Allah muradımızı versin, muradımızı isteriz’²⁰⁶. Mithat Cemal Kuntay makes a clear comment on this case; “Didn’t Sultan Aziz understand that their intention was nothing but Şehzade Murat.”²⁰⁷ They walked through the newspaper building of *İbret* and put their ideas down on a paper and left a letter headed; ‘Long live Kemal-i Millet’. They were not an organized group; the events were all unexpected and unplanned. That night the reaction of the audience could not be estimated by Namık Kemal. It was not planned but at the end, Namık Kemal paid the penalty for writing the drama because of the unexpected reaction of the people whom were not happy from the current regime and the policies.

‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ did not contain any statement about the government or the Sultan. But, the government was concerned about the drama. The government understood the secret message from the slogans. The audience, actually the Ottoman

²⁰⁵ Mithat Cemal Kuntay makes a statement in his ‘Namık Kemal’ book about Kemal’s leaving the theatre, “Kemal, was afraid that ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ could create a rebellion that could make the Şehzade Murat a Sultan, and left the theatre, escaped to his house. But in his subconscious it was something he was waiting to become real” Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. Namık Kemal. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I p: 159.

²⁰⁶ The statement means “we want our desire”, creates an irony in the Ottoman Turkish because desire and intention means ‘Murat’ which is the name of the Şehzade Murat Efendi. The crowd could not shout out clearly the name of the Şehzade Murat instead made an inexplicit expression for their wish and expectation. But, the Ottoman Government understood the hidden message and took precautions for a possible revolt.

²⁰⁷ Ibid. P: 155.

intellectuals who were exhausted from the pressure wanted *Şehzade* Murat. The letter which the crowd left to the newspaper building of *İbret*, was published on the next day. This was not acceptable for the government and Sultan Abdülaziz. Moreover, the drama was played for fifteen times. The Ottoman government bended over backwards to shut the unwanted voices. '*İbret*' was closed down only five days after the first run of the play. Sadullah Bey, who was the interpreter of *Divan*, published a writing saying that '*İbret*' was confusing people, and was against the current Ottoman government.²⁰⁸ As a reaction to the decision of the closure of '*İbret*', Namık Kemal wrote an article '*Umuma Veda*'²⁰⁹ which published in its last edition. Kemal criticized that decision and the restrictions toward the press. Kemal's last sentences were no matter how the newspaper were closed, his aims for the sake of patriotism would never end, 'Long live fatherland!'

Namık Kemal was in the room of the Theatre committee with Menapirzade Nuri Bey, when the *Zaptieh* Minister came in and told Kemal that he was called by İzzet Pasha. He was immediately taken to the jail, which was the statement and will of Sultan.²¹⁰ Not only Namık Kemal but also, Ahmet Mithat, Ebuzziya Tevfik and Hakkı Efendi were there, too. None of them knew the actual reason but soon after

²⁰⁸ Mithat Cemal Kuntay gives Sadullah Bey's official declaration in his book in detail; "...böyle bir gazetenin bekasında ise mehazir-i mülkiye müselleme bulunduğuna binaen ber mücib-i kararname tarih-i ilandan itibaren külliyyen ilga kılınmıştır." Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I p: 148.

²⁰⁹ Mithat Cemal gives Namık Kemal's article on his book. Kemal says; "*İşte, İbret vatanperverlik yolunda, mahvoluncaya kadar, sebat etti. Akıbet bir kuşe-i sükuta çekildi. Beis yok. Dünyada kim kalmış! Ne baki olmuş! Yaşasın vatan.*" Ibid., p: 148.

²¹⁰ Ibid., p: 164.

they faced with the same destiny again; exile.²¹¹ On 10 April 1873, Namık Kemal was exiled to Cyprus, Ebuzziya Tevfik and Ahmet Mithat were exiled to Rhodes, Menapirzade Nuri and Hakkı Efendi were exiled to Acre.²¹² Namık Kemal paid the penalty of being very enthusiastic at his works and statements. Turan Karataş, in his article about the personal qualifications of Namık Kemal studied on Mithat Cemal Kuntay's book and says; "While describing him as a romantic and an enthusiastic person, "There are three passion for Namık Kemal" says Mithat Cemal, 'Fatherland, soldier and literature'"²¹³ 'Vatan Yahut Silistre' was the document of Namık Kemal's passions.

Namık Kemal's Banishment; An Exile to Famagusta

Namık Kemal was brought to a fort where was used to be the house of the artillerymen. He was locked down to the basement. He tried to be optimistic even though the conditions were quite poor. There, he wrote lots of letters to his friends, which was the only way of communication. Veys Pasha, who was the *Mutasarrıf* of Cyprus, learned that Kemal was in Famagusta. He arranged Kemal's residence; Kemal was able to move from a dungeon to a room, which was an information that had been written on a letter from Kemal to Ebuzziya Tevfik.²¹⁴ Veys Pasha knew that

²¹¹Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I. p: 164-165.

²¹²Ibid., p: 167.

²¹³Karataş, Turan, 'Namık Kemal'in Mizacı, kişilik özellikleri, alışkanlıkları' in *Namık Kemal*. Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 58.

²¹⁴In a letter Kemal says; "... Zaten, Magosa, bir harab- abad olduğu gibi, kale topçularına mahsus olan bu daire dahi oturmaktan müberra berbat bir binadır. Üç gün sonar Veys Paşa'nın lütfü

Namık Kemal had to stay in the basement but did not want to leave the writer in such bad conditions. Life was hard in Famagusta but Kemal was trying to take pleasure even though he was away from his friends and his job as a journalist. In Bedri Aydođan's article on Namık Kemal's exile on Famagusta, he says that Kemal's letters²¹⁵ can give us clues about his life at exile, "The information about life at exile is obtained from the letters of Namık Kemal. Sometimes Namık Kemal is giving that information directly or sometimes giving it hidden between his lines."²¹⁶ In the meantime, Kemal's father Mustafa Asım Bey was doing his best to help Kemal. Also, Şehzade Murat was helping financially, too. Bedri Aydođan states; "Namık Kemal's life at Famagusta mostly was full of struggles. Kemal did not face with any major financial problem. Şehzade Murat was supporting him from Istanbul, in addition to many other issues. His friends, who were also at exile, were having difficulties in financial matters."²¹⁷ Meanwhile, Kemal's alcohol addiction was becoming worse and started to harm his health. Beşir Ayvazođlu states in his work on Namık Kemal; "News about life of Namık Kemal were reaching to his family and friends; one of those were stating that Namık was drinking too much *Rakı* so, he became sick because of alcohol and one time he even vomited blood. The major

imdadına eriřti, bizi de řimdi oturduđumuz odaya is'ad ettiler." Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İř Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I p: 213.

²¹⁵ Further reading: Akyıldız Ali and Azmi Özcan, *Namık Kemal'den Mektup var*. Türkiye İř Bankası Kùltür yayınları, 2003. The work is a current collection of Namık Kemal's letters with the ones that has not been published.

²¹⁶ Aydođan, Bedri. "Namık Kemal'ın Magosa Sùrgünlüđü." *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12, no. 12 (2008): 15-28. Accessed June 16, 2014. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/cusosbil/article/view/5000000974/5000001665>. P: 15.

²¹⁷ Ibid., p: 25.

reason for him to be wasteful was his interest on alcoholic drinks.”²¹⁸ His drinking habit could be because of his disappointment on his struggle or a reaction to his anger toward the authorities that exiled him as a consequence of his being inspirational.

Nazif Pasha, who was appointed to Cyprus as *Mutasarrıf*, arranged a house for Kemal so, no matter being far away from Istanbul, he was in comfort. Abdullah Uçman says in his article; “Namık Kemal was literally experiencing a life of a *kalebent* in Famagusta; in exchange of being sent to exile, firstly the *mutasarrıf* (governor of the city) or the Pashas at the city were showing him their interest closely and sincerely. Therefore he managed to quit from the psychology of being exiled in a short term and started to work on his studies.”²¹⁹ Namık Kemal’s exile was *kalebentlik*, which means an imprisonment in a castle.²²⁰ Abdullah Acehan in his article on the exile policies of the Ottoman government defines *kalebentlik*; “Being exiled is a punishment that obliges a person to move into a different location; *Kalebentlik* differs slightly from that because, it does not only obliges you to move to a distant region, but also imprisons you inside a fort; so, leaving the castle is prohibited. The only difference is to be sentenced to a prison.”²²¹ Unexpectedly,

²¹⁸ Ayvazoğlu, Beşir. ‘Namık Kemal, Babası, oğlu ve torunu’ in *Namık Kemal*. Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 29.

²¹⁹ Uçman, Abdullah. "Kısa Bir ömrün Hikayesi." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011. P: 39.

²²⁰ Kanar, Mehmet. *Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Say Yayınları. 2011.

²²¹ Acehan, Abdullah. "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Sürgün Politikası Ve Sürgün Yerleri." *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 1, no. 5, P: 12-29. http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt1/sayi5/sayi5pdf/acehan_abdullah.pdf. P: 15.

Kemal got a disease called malaria and started to have serious health problems. It was inevitable to stay away from bugs and flies, because he was staying in a verdant island. Bedri Aydođan mentions in his article; “Passing thirty eight months of his life with no actual crime had eroded Namık Kemal physically and psychologically. However, he tried to resist to the conditions on the psychological side. He was managed to succeed this thanks to his strong character and the support from his friends. Literature was one of the significant subjects that gave him the strength.”²²² Namık Kemal wrote his best known works at Famagusta.²²³ It was obvious that only two incidents could make Kemal’s returning back to Istanbul, first one was the death of Sultan Abdülaziz and the second one was the *Sadrizam* Mahmut Nedim Pasha’s relieve of duty. Kemal was aware that both of them did not like him and his works.

Namık Kemal wrote a letter to Süleyman Hüsnü Pasha on 12 January 1879, he was going to make an analysis of the situation with him and Sultan Abdülaziz based on his experiences, and said, “in his country, the ones that had been punished and showed as negative was propitious than the ones that has been on the administration”; “While I was in Famagusta, I had valid ideas on Abdülaziz. The

²²² Aydođan, Bedri. "Namık Kemal’in Magosa Sürgünlüğü." Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi 12, no. 12 (2008): 15-28. Accessed June 16, 2014. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/cusosbil/article/view/5000000974/5000001s665>. p: 26.

²²³ “Zavallı Çocuk, Akif Bey, Gülnihal, Kara Bela, Behar-ı Daniş, İntibah yahut Ali Bey’in Sergüzeşti, Kanije, Terceme-i Hal-i Emir Nevruz, ‘Mes Prisons’ Muahezenamesi, Tahrib-i Harabat, Takip, İrfan Paşa’ya Mektup.” Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I P: 297.

reason was the fact that the society disliked the authority but liked the oppression”²²⁴. According to his criticism, the society seemed to like Namık Kemal rather than the authority of Sultan Abdülaziz. After a long wait, Kemal took a letter from Ali Efendi on May 1876. The letter had some good news, the *Şehzade* Murat, became the Sultan.²²⁵ This was a very favorable event for Kemal. He started to return back as it was the announcement of the end of his exile.

Sultan Murat; Expectations of Namık Kemal

Sultan Murat was a liberal; the society was expecting a relief after *İstibdat*. The former Sultan Abdülaziz committed suicide which also created many rumors about whether he was committed suicide or assassinated. This is acceptable as a debate topic.²²⁶ This caused Sultan Murat to start fearing and nearly lost his mind. The Sultan could not think anything else but death. Namık Kemal met him and saw his situation clearly.²²⁷ Kemal was in sorrow to see his oldest friend to have a mental

²²⁴“*Tecerrübüme istinaden söylüyorum, emniyet buyurunuzki, bizim memleketimizde menfilik, müşirlikten hayırlıdır. Bendeniz Magosa’da iken her tarafa Abdülaziz kadar ve belki de Abdülaziz’den ziyade hükmüm cari idi. Bunun sebebi is şudur, halk hükümeti sevmiyor, hükümetin mazlumlarını seviyor.*” Akyıldız Ali and Azmi Özcan, *Namık Kemal’den Mektup var*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür yayınları, 2003. P: 8.

²²⁵The letter says; “*Şehzade Murad’ın Sultan Murat olarak, Abdülaziz’in yerine, Osmanlı tahtına oturduğunu, sahici bir sevinçle, size bildiririm.*” Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/I p: 698.

²²⁶See also; Öztuna, Yılmaz. *Bir Darbenin Anatomisi*. Babiali Kültür Yayıncılık 2012.

²²⁷Mithat Cemal Kuntay states an incident that had happened between Namık Kemal and Sultan Murat during Kemal’s visit. Sultan Murat was shouting; “Keep those insects off from me, they are coming towards me.” But, there were no insects in real and Kemal could not see them. He became so sad and got out of the room with crying. Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I p: 717.

illness. It was clear that the Sultan could not do his obligations properly.²²⁸ Mithat Cemal Kuntay says; “Here, Sultan Murat is getting mentally ill, means that the day that Abdülhamit Efendi becomes the Sultan was coming closer in time.”²²⁹ The state affairs had already been affected in negative way by the Sultan’s illness. Also, with the leadership of Mithat Pasha, preparation of a new Ottoman constitution was planned. But the establishment seemed not possible because of the illness of the Sultan. Lord Kinross in his book, ‘*Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*’ makes comments on the expectations; “The event of Sultan Murat’s succession to throne received positively by the liberal elements of society. Additionally, many administrative positions at the palace were filled with members of ‘Young Ottomans’. Namık Kemal was a leading figure amongst them and had returned from Cyprus. He assigned as the private secretary of the Sultan. Sultan Murat had known with his sympathy to their intent; it was seemed as a hope for the “*Kanun-i Esasi*” reform amongst Empire.”²³⁰ Unfortunately, this was not going to happen. So, Mithat Pasha went to talk with the *Şehzade* Abdülhamit. Abdülhamit welcomed Mithat Pasha and accepted his wish to summon Namık Kemal to the palace and start working on the new constitution. He promised Mithat Pasha that he would do everything to maintain his plan only in the time of his becoming the following Sultan. Abdülhamit wanted them all to become his consultant including Namık Kemal. Ahmet Bedevi Kuran says; “Sultan Abdülhamit did not forget the efforts that

²²⁸Yılmaz Öztuna mentions Sultan Murat V. became insane and this caused a disorder among the state and the foreign affairs. And Sultan’s illness could no longer be a secret. Öztuna, Yılmaz. *Bir Darbenin Anatomisi*. Babıali Kültür Yayıncılık 2012. p: 256-258

²²⁹Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/I p: 717.

²³⁰Kinross, Lord. Ağustos 2009. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi. P: 157.

had spent while getting himself to the Ottoman throne and show no omission while giving reciprocation. Right at the first days, he began to criticize and review the project of ‘*Kanun-i Esasi*’ and pointed out names like Namık Kemal, Mithat Pasha, and Ziya Pasha who were in the group that was responsible for the creation of this Kanun-i Esasi.”²³¹ So, it would be right to say they became hopeful on their struggle was about to end.

Abdülhamit II’s reign began on 31 August 1876. Namık Kemal was appointed as a member of the council. Later, he was merged to a commission with Ziya Pasha; the goal of the commission was to progress for the preparation of a new constitution. But an unexpected reaction of Sultan Abdülhamit came along; he accepted the new constitution only if an article that he wished was added. The article 113th was added despite the objections especially given by Namık Kemal. Mithat Cemal Kuntay says; “Kemal and Ziya got furious but Mithat Pasha answered them; ‘What can we do? Kanun-i Esasi is in our hands just for now, there is nothing more can be done.’”²³² On 24 December 1876, Sultan Abdülhamit ratified ‘Kanun-i Esasi’. Sultan Abdülhamit decided to use his authority which was secured by the article 113, the right to exile any person in case of a danger to the government and the authority and appointed the members of council to their new positions which were far away from Istanbul. In other words, it was an exile. Memet Fuat states on the subject, “The ones that were struggled for Kanun-i Esasi, thought they were going to fight for the

²³¹ Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri Ve Milli Mücadele*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012.p:113.

²³² Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. 2010. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları. Vol. II/II p: 60.

constitution again, they were all suspended from Istanbul. Mithat Pasha was exiled and Ziya Pasha was charged for the governorship of Syria.”²³³

On February 1877, Namık Kemal was taken as a prisoner and was interrogated. Servet Tiken in his article stated the actual reason of Kemal’s banishment; “Namık Kemal was arrested at 6 February on 1877 and his trials were started at 11th of April, the same year, because he announced a couplet²³⁴ implying the current sultan of the era, Sultan II. Abdülhamit would be overthrown similar to Sultan V. Murat and Sultan Abdülaziz.”²³⁵ According to Mithat Cemal Kuntay, the verses were only an excuse and Kemal’s banishment was a need for Sultan Abdülhamit. His banishment were decided long before its so called reason.²³⁶ Regrettably he was maligned by a spy and Namık Kemal was planned to be exiled to Crete or Chios. But later his exile place had changed to Lesbos.²³⁷ Kemal was put on monthly salary and he was obliged to be an officer. On 19 July 1877 he

²³³ Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçılık Şiiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 105.

²³⁴ “In Servet Tiken’s article, it is mentioned that Namık Kemal read in a council; “*Bade arak tükendi saki getir müselles/Eş’şey’ü la yüsenna illa vekad yüselles*”, meaning that it can be repeated again for the third time as it happened for two times before. Namık Kemal’s sentences was understood as a treat toward Sultan Abdülhamit II.” Tiken, Servet. ‘Sürgün, Edebiyat ve Namık Kemal’ in Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. *Namık Kemal*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 102.

²³⁵ Ibid., p : 102.

²³⁶ Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/II p: 169.

²³⁷ Namık Kemal wrote a letter to Mithat Efendi while he was in Lesbos; it is clear that Kemal is reproachful, “*Mahpus bulunduğum sırada sözden zat-ı hakimaneleri kadar makul manalar istihracına muktedir bazı zevat bir mecliste “Bade arak tükendi saki getir müselles/Eş’şey’ü la yüsenna illa vekad yüselles” beytini okumaklığım, sokak başlarında nutuklar irad ederek ve yaftalar yapıştirarak halkı müsallahan isyanı davet kabilinden olduğundan, nefy-i ebed ile ceza görmekliğim lazım geleceğine zahip olmuşlardı. Şimdi zat-ı müdekkikanelrei de bizim gazeli alem-i- hayalde zuhur etmiş bir isyan kabilinden tutuyorsunuz.*” Ibid.,p: 169.

was exiled to Lesbos. Memet Fuat states that; “It is told that Namık Kemal placed emphasis on education in Lesbos, he opened primary schools where the Muslims and non-Muslims could educate together. However, his Ottomanism disturbed some minorities that gained privileges under the protection of some European countries; he struggled with the Rum and had disagreements with the Italian and Greek missionaries.”²³⁸ Namık Kemal was on *mutasarrıf* duty at Lesbos and he tried to do his best at his service. He opened the first *İdadi* outside Istanbul which showed his importance on the education of the society. According to İnci Enginün; “It would be right to categorize Namık Kemal’s writings on education into three aspects, a. articles b. letters c. literary works. In addition to this, he found the chance to practice his personal opinions mainly in Lesbos.”²³⁹ Living away from Istanbul, keeping himself away from what is going on, consumed his energy as a reformer but this did not stop him from serving to the society which he is used to do by his writings and works. Servet Tiken in his article on Namık Kemal says, “Namık Kemal’s adventure of exiles can be evaluated in three sections; first, voluntary exile to the Europe; second, the exiles of Gallipoli, Lesbos, Rhodes and Chios with his government services; and the third, his exile to Lesbos which took two and a half year and exile to Famagusta which took more than three years of his life.”²⁴⁰ Namık Kemal placed a

²³⁸ Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 107.

²³⁹ Enginün, İnci. Namık Kemal’in Eğitim Konusundaki Görüşleri in Ölümünün 100. Yılında Namık Kemal. Marmara Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi. 1988. P: 25.

²⁴⁰ Tiken, Servet. ‘Sürgün, Edebiyat ve Namık Kemal’ in Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, 2011. *Namık Kemal*. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. P: 104.

great importance on his work ‘The Ottoman History’ which was going to be 14 volume and 750 pages.²⁴¹

An Exile to Lesbos and the Last Destination; Chios Island

On 20 October 1884, Namık Kemal left Lesbos and exchanged his position with Agah Efendi according to the reason that Kemal was in disagreement with the Greek delegates.²⁴² Kemal was sent to the Rhodes Island. Living on islands for such a long time made severe damage to Kemal’s health. He went through pneumonia in Lesbos, unfortunately his illness became worse at Rhodes. However, Kemal started to write ‘The Ottoman History’. On the other hand he tried to be an effective *mutasarrıf*; he established schools and built railroads. This, eventually made the people love and respect him. Then his location had changed again to the Chios Island due to the fact that the center of the state was relocated. Namık Kemal was assigned as the *mutasarrıf* of the Chios Island²⁴³. Kemal continued to write his history work and even published the introduction part of it. But, that activity was informed by a spy and his work was collected and its printing was banned by Sultan Abdülhamit II.²⁴⁴ This was very upsetting for Kemal, because his work was a clear outcome of

²⁴¹Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 109.

²⁴²There is a chapter on Mithat Cemal Kuntay’s book, ‘Namık Kemal’ about the people complaining about Namık Kemal. The chapter is called; “*Midilli Sürgün Mutasarrıfı Midillideki Düşmanlarının Saraya ve Hükümete Şikayetleri*.”Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010.Vol. II/II p: 430- 450.

²⁴³Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. p. 109.

²⁴⁴Mithat Cemal Kuntay gives the document that has been sent to Namık Kemal which was the announcement about the decision on the prohibition of his book; “*Osmanlı Tarihi’ne methal olarak Roma Tarihi namıyla saha-arayı-intişar olan eser-i- alileri maruz-ı- ali ve mucib-i- takdirat-i-ceab-ı-*

his patriotism. The book was called “Ottoman History”²⁴⁵. As a writer, he dreamed about his work as an inspiration for the coming generations on patriotism and history of their fatherland. Some researchers argue that the incident weakens his health and his illness causes his death. Memet Fuat agrees on this opinion; “Prohibition of his book, destroys his work and this distresses Kemal very much, he is not even allowed to write as an historian.”²⁴⁶ But it is clear from a letter of him that he was not healthy. On 29 November 1888, he wrote a letter to Ebuzziya Tevfik which was accepted as the last letters of him. Namık Kemal wrote that he was depressed for ten days. He got cold and had indigestion problems in addition to bronchitis. He could no longer write because his unhappiness was overstrained him.²⁴⁷ Unfortunately Namık Kemal got pneumonia again but he had no power to struggle with the illness. On 2 December 1888, the inventor of the ‘*Hürriyet*’ and ‘*vatan*’ died way early at the age of forty eight. Lately, on 2011, Soner Yalçın wrote an article on Namık Kemal, the title was ‘Who killed Namık Kemal’²⁴⁸. For Yalçın, Namık Kemal was a victim of a murder.

*Hilafet- penahi olup ancak te'lif-i-Atufi'lerinin bazı tabirat-ü-elfazı bir takımları tarafından süi-i-tefsirat-ü-ta'lilata uğratılarak hakk-ı-Samilerinde berkemal olan teveccühat-ı- Seniyye-i-Şahane'nin zevaline sebebiyet verebileceği mütalaa kılınmakta olmasına mebni mezkur Tarih'in men'i-neşri ile beraber mevcut nüshalarının ortadan kaldırılması için lazım gelenlere taraf-ı-alilerinden hemen ifayı-tebliğat olunması lüzumu iş'ar ve cevaba intizar olunur, olbapta*Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. Vol. II/II p: 656-657.

²⁴⁵ Mithat Cemal Kuntay says; “In his book, ‘Ottoman History’ Namık Kemal has begun writing it as ‘History of Military’...” and states that, in a letter from Namık Kemal to his son-in-law; Kemal mentions about how this book becomes successful surprisingly which is derived from a military history into a book of Ottoman history in general. Ibid, Vol. II/II p: 642.

²⁴⁶ Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999. P: 109.

²⁴⁷ Topuz, Hıfzı. *Vatanı Sattık Bir Pula*. Remzi Kitapevi. 2013. P: 245.

²⁴⁸ Yalçın, Soner. 2011. “Odatv.”*Namık Kemal’I*. 14 Mart . Accessed Ocak 5, 2014. <http://www.odatv.com/n.php?n=namik-kemali-kim-oldurdu-1403111200>.

He was accusing the exiles caused Kemal's death. In other words, he was accusing the sultans that banished Namık Kemal throughout Kemal's struggle between his lines. This could be debatable but it was for sure that Namık Kemal was a great value of his time and got lost in the struggles of the current time.

Namık Kemal left his will about where he wanted to be buried; Bolayır, Gallipoli. Bolayır was going to be the place where Turkish nationalist poet Namık Kemal's grave would be located. Ebuzziya Tevfik, conveyed this to Sultan Abdülhamit II and the funeral of Namık Kemal brought to Bolayır. Namık Kemal, was buried at the grave of the Rumelia conqueror Süleyman Şah who was one of Kemal's inspired person. Later, a mausoleum was built for the writer with the support of Abdülhamit II. Today, there is a university in Tekirdağ called 'Namık Kemal University' and also his house has converted into a museum. Namık Kemal, made many achievements during his short life. He wrote many novels, poems and theatre plays that still has an important place on the Turkish literary history. The writer and poet of *vatan*, is remarkable with his works, life story and struggle which makes him unique even today.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

Namık Kemal, was not only one of the leading novelist, poet and journalist of his era but also became an inspiration for the next generations who searched for the origin of the notions of ‘fatherland’ and ‘liberty’ in the Ottoman Empire history. Namık Kemal was a founding member of the Young Ottomans which was a group of people aimed to find the ways for the progress and recover of the empire by using their intellectual backgrounds. They had declared their mission through the media and their literary works. But eventually those actions that they had taken put them in the position of an oppositional group against the current regime. The mentality of the Young Ottomans was against the regime of Sultan Abdülaziz, not directly to the sultan himself or his own authority. Instead they were against the government of the sultan which was formed by Ali and Fuat Pashas who were not supporting their ideas. They wanted to prevent The Young Ottomans from doing their works and achieve their objections. In order to make it easy, Namık Kemal and the other members of the Young Ottomans were banished to be kept away from the capital and end their activities. The era of Sultan Abdülaziz with his *Sadrâzâm*s, was an era of oppression on the media and prohibitions over any idea criticizing their policies. That dissatisfied the intellectual class who was already unhappy about the current policies, and directed them to make use of their literary works to impose their views and broadcast their criticism to the society.

Namık Kemal used literature as a means of informing and improving the society. His best known work ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ can be regarded as a theatrical reflection of Kemal’s thoughts who wanted to awaken the notions of ‘fatherland’ and

‘patriotism’ which seemed to be necessity understandings for the sake of the empire. The drama was accepted as the first work that made references to some unknown concepts which made Namık Kemal known as the poet of the fatherland and liberty. Kemal was an enthusiastic artist and a patriotic man of his time who was dedicated himself to his nation and country. It should be noted that Namık Kemal had two sides; first, he was a journalist with the ability of thinking critically; second, he was a man with effective writing skills. Both sides of him had a direct influence to each other, which made his understandings, values and perspectives intense and passionate. Namık Kemal and his works should be analyzed under the circumstances of his time. Kemal was a revolutionist who was misunderstood or misconceived by the current administration because Kemal’s ideas were contradictory to their understandings and interests.

In this concept, this thesis studied the life of Namık Kemal, his play; ‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’ and the Young Ottomans under the circumstances of the related era, within its internal dynamics and as a whole chain of events rather than analyzing them as respective concepts or events in the flow of time. In addition, this thesis also tried to depict an Ottoman elite Namık Kemal, whose works can be analyzed from different viewpoints; first, they can be seen as oppositions against the current policies of Sultan Abdülaziz and then Sultan Abdülhamit II. Second, they can be regarded as the reflection of his thoughts about the constitutional monarchy and Islamic concepts, trying to find the ways of Westernization of the society.

‘*Vatan Yahut Silistre*’, has been understood as a literary work that gave an indirect message to the society; an alteration of the Ottoman Sultan with the heir apparent ‘*Şehzade*’ Murat instead of keeping Sultan Abdülaziz as the remaining

sultan. Namık Kemal was exiled after the first performance of the drama because of his close relationship with the *Veliâht* Murat. The current Ottoman Government of the era had concerns about Namık Kemal. His articles and his play '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' had some possible effects on thoughts of young *Veliâht* Murat, in other words; they had worries about those influences might provoke *Veliâht* Murat to have actions to get to the throne. The Young Ottomans were waiting for a possibility of a change in the Ottoman throne because they were aware that their demands and expectations were not going to be accepted by Sultan Abdülaziz. This could be regarded as an attempt of the Young Ottomans as Ottoman elites that seek for the welfare of the society and wish for an end of the crises of the empire. So, their act should not be regarded as a wish of a possible change of the Ottoman throne instead they wished for a Sultan whom would realize their demands and needs of the empire. The Young Ottomans needed a Sultan whom they could be in solidarity with.

'Vatan Yahut Silistre' became a phenomenon among the society. The reaction of the audience was unexpected. Literature and arts could instigate the society with the concepts they represented. So, an answer is needed to the question; did the drama cause any disturbance amongst the Ottoman administration or not? In autocracies, some reactions towards the literary works may not be predicted by the writer before making their works. The consequences and aftermath could be out of the control of the writer or they could not be planned beforehand. The consequences of the performance of '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' was not planned by Namık Kemal. It was not an organized group; hence, it was a group of thirty or forty people who were gathered after the performance. The drama created an atmosphere of excitement amongst a handful of Ottoman elites whom were already unpleasant about the oppression and the current regime. '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*', revealed the hidden

sentiments and the reaction was a reactive approach of the Ottoman elites. The elite class had a different understanding and thought which made them unique among the society. So, the drama was an opportunity for them to express their unhappiness and desires. They created an activist movement toward the current administration. Namık Kemal paid the increasing penalty of audience's reaction as the owner and writer of '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*'. In this sense, Namık Kemal's appreciation by the society made him seen as a potential threat against the Ottoman government, because he was successful at writing and had a great influent towards society.

Throughout some political and social changes of the societies, some unexpected sociological events that can result from a common sense may happen. These may change the dynamics or some understandings of the society. '*Vatan Yahut Silistre*' and the reactions for the drama can be considered as a sociological event or only an appreciation for the emotions which the drama had created. The concept of '*vatan*' was a new understanding, brought out from Namık Kemal to his audience and readers.

The Young Ottomans were an intellectual group who aimed to change the current regime into a constitutional monarchy. They were group who were mainly inspired by the French Revolution. This changed their understandings and perspectives into a more democratic alignment. On the other hand, The Sultan and the government did not encourage their works or attempts instead they wanted to be stopped and banished. They were banished and became officials in order to make them end their activities toward the policies of the government. In other words, Namık Kemal and the other Young Ottomans wanted to be kept in control and near in that case they could avoid them from betraying to the Ottoman Sultan or the

politicians. The Young Ottomans were not comprehended as enemies but regarded as a danger that could create a dangerous situation toward the Ottoman administrative by influencing the society. This was one of the main reasons for their exiles and trying to keep them at the distance. On 1876, the First Constitution was declared and the '*Kanun-i Esasi*', was written by the members of the Young Ottomans. Unfortunately, this period did not last long and the Young Ottomans were suspended and their creation, mission and dream were failed. Namık Kemal and his vision seemed to be failed by an ultimate power; Sultan Abdülhamit II.

Finally it should be known that 'Young Ottomans' and also Namık Kemal who became the symbol of fatherland and patriotism, created an intellectual movement among the society, they were a unique group of people who had many qualifications that made them more than an intellectual and writers. They were thinkers and journalists whom later inspired the following generation; 'Young Turks'. The Young Ottomans were the creators of the idea of the westernization and modernization of the Ottoman Empire, which enlarged the power of the empire for a limited time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acehan, Abdullah. "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Sürgün Politikası Ve Sürgün Yerleri." *Uluslararası Sosyal Arastirmalar Dergisi* 1, no. 5 (2008): 12-29. Accessed June 9, 2014. http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt1/sayi5/sayi5pdf/acehan_abdullah.pdf.
- Akşin, Sina. *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2011.
- Akyıldız, Ali, and Azmi Özcan. *Namık Kemal'den Mektup Var*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2013.
- Altundere, Ahmet. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Özgürlüklerin Doğuşu." Doctoral Thesis, İstanbul University, 1992. İstanbul.
- Arkan, Gülay. "The Opinions of the Reformation Writers about Women during the Ottoman Era." *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 15, no. 1 (1998): 15-23. Accessed June 11, 2014. <http://www.edebiyatdergisi.hacettepe.edu.tr/index.php/EFD/article/view/471/336>.
- Aydın, Abdulhalim. "Namık Kemal'in Sanat/Sanatçı Algısında Romantizm Ve Victor Hugo Etkisi." *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 7, no. 3 (2012): 369-79. Accessed September 10, 2014. http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/1267668141_22Aydın Abdulhalim_S-369-379.pdf.
- Aydoğan, Bedri. "Namık Kemal'in Magosa Sürgünlüğü." *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12, no. 12 (2008): 15-28. Accessed June 16, 2014. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/cusosbil/article/view/5000000974/5000001665>
- Aydoğdu, Nergiz. 'Namık Kemal'de Hürriyet Kavramı' In *Namık Kemal*. Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.
- Ayvazoğlu, Beşir. 'Namık Kemal, Babası, oğlu ve torunu' In *Namık Kemal*. Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.
- Bağcı, Merve. "Tanzimat Fermanı Sonrası Osmanlı Kadını Ve Sosyal Yaşantısı." AFASAM. Accessed August 30, 2014. <http://www.afasam.org/tr/makale/Makale-13.pdf>.
- Bakı, Edip Ali. *Namık Kemal Afyon'da*, Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1949.

Bilmez, Bülent. "Shemseddin Sami Frasherî (1850–1904): Contributing To the Construction of Albanian and Turkish Identities." *Cas Working Paper Series*, no. 3 (2011). Accessed August 7, 2014. <http://www.cas.bg/uploads/files/We the People/B. Bilmez.pdf>.

Biricikođlu, Hale. "Türk Modernleşmesinde Kadın." *2nd International Conference on Women's Studies*, 2006. Accessed September 12, 2014. http://cws.emu.edu.tr/en/conferences/2nd_int/pdf/Hale Biricikoglu.pdf.

Büyükarman, Didem Ardalı. "Vatan Kavramının Türk Tiyatro Edebiyatındaki Seyri üzerine Bir İnceleme." *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi* 15, no. 37 (2008): 127-45. Accessed August 7, 2014. <http://e-dergi.atauni.edu.tr/ataunitaed/article/view/1020001963/1020001962>.

Çağın, Kenan. "Namık Kemal'de Devletin Niteliđi ve Temel Dayanakları." *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* 7, no. 1, (2012). Accessed May 5, 2014. <http://asosindex.com/journal-article-abstract?id=23677>

Çılgın, Alev Sınar. "Vatan Yahut Silistre'de Vatan Kavramı." *U.Ü. Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 6, no. 9 (2005): 135-45. Accessed July 9, 2014. http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebsco&ano=65754_4f49a07d3f745c4499ba9b09e226c903&?

Doğramacıođlu, Hüseyin. "Namık Kemal'in *İbret* Gazetesinde Sıraladıđı Sosyal Tenkitler ve Çözüm Önerileri." *Turkish Studies* 6, no.1, (2011). Accessed May 5, 2014. http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/38949957_do%C4%9Framac%C4%B1o%C4%9Ffluh%C3%BCzeyin.pdf.

Dulum, Sibel. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kadının Statüsü, Eğitimi Ve Çalışma Hayatı (1839-1918)." http://www.manevisosyalhizmet.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/08/osmanlida_kadin_tez.pdf.

Ebuzziya Tevfik. *Yeni Osmanlılar*. Pegasus yayınları, 2006.

Egro, Dritan. "Arnavut Milliyetçi Doktrininde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ve Avrupa'nın Algılanışı." *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma Ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, no. 3 (2013): 31-41. Accessed August 16, 2014. <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/19/1859/19544.pdf>.

Emil, Birol. "Hürriyet, Medeniyet, İrade." In *Ölümünün 100. Yılında Namık Kemal*. Marmara Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1988.

Emil, Birol. "Mizancı Murad Bey'in Edebiyat Ve Tenkide Dair Görüşleri." *Türk Dili Ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 19 (1971): 119-43. <http://journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iutded/article/viewFile/1023017660/1023016903>.

Engin, Ertan. "Namık Kemal'in Tiyatrolarında Kavramlar." *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 7, no. 29 (2014): 352-261. Accessed June 22, 2014. http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt7/sayi29pdf/engin_ertan.pdf.

Enginün, İnci. "Namık Kemal'in Eğitim Konusundaki Görüşleri" In *Ölümünün 100. Yılında Namık Kemal*, 28-38. Marmara Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1988.

Eryiğit, Ercan. "İttihat Terakki'nin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Siyasete ve Yönetime Etkileri." Postgraduate Thesis, Selçuk University, 2009. Konya.

Fuat, Memet. *Namık Kemal Yaşamı, Düşünce Yapısı, Sanatçı kişiliği, Seçme Yapıtları*. Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999.

Gawrych, George. 2006. *The Crescent and the Eagle: Ottoman Rule, Islam and the Albanians, 1874-1913*. <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=wP0tzk-unJgC&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

Genç, Ernur. "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Kimlik, Misyon ve Vizyonu Bağlamında Türk Aydını", *Sakarya SBE Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* 2, no. 1 (2007): 133-174. Accessed May 8, 2014. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/akademikincelemeler/article/view/5000067648>.

Güner, Fetthullah. "Milliyetçilik Akımına bir Alternatif Olarak 'Osmanlıcılık' Hareketi." Postgraduate Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, 2008. Bolu.

Hanioğlu, Şükrü. *Bir Siyasal örgüt Olarak "Osmanlı İttihad Ve Terakki Cemiyeti" Ve "Jön Türklük": (1889-1902)*. İletişim Yayınları, 1985.

Hurç, Ramazan. "Osmanlılarda Son Devir Fikir Hareketleri." *Fırat Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 2 (1997): 263-75. Accessed May 20, 2014. http://portal.firat.edu.tr/Disaridan/_TEMP/278/file/1997-1/OSMANLILARDA SON DEVIR FKR HAREKETLER.pdf.

Kanar, Mehmet. *Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Say Yayınları. 2011.

Kanter, Beyhan. "Tanzimat Döneminde Muhalif Bir Gazeteci: Namık Kemal." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Kaplan, Ferhat. "The Role of the Young Ottomans in the Transformation of Mentality in the Ottoman Empire." Postgraduate Thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2007. Ankara. Accessed May 12, 2014. <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12608358/index>.

Karabulut, Mustafa. "Tanzimat Dönemi Türk Romanında Kadın Üzerine Tematik Bir İnceleme." *Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Erdem Dergisi* 10, no. 64 (2013): 49-69. Accessed September 12, 2014. http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/pdf/mustafa_karabulut_tanzimat_donemi_roman_kadin.pdf.

Karataş, Turan. "Namık Kemal'in Mizacı, kişilik özellikleri, alışkanlıkları" In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Kasalak, Kadir. "Cumhuriyet Fikrinin Öncüleri." *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no. 20, (2009): 69-72.

Kolcu, Ali İhsan. *Namık Kemal'in Poetikası*. Salkımsöğüt Yayınları, 2010.

Kuntay, Mithat Cemal. *Namık Kemal*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010.

Kuran, Ahmed Bedevi. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri Ve Milli Mücadele*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012.

Kurdakul, Şükran. *Namık Kemal*. Evrensel Basım Yayın, 2003.

Lord Kinross. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, 2009.

Mardin, Şerif, . *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*. Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Mardin, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*. İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1964.

Mardin, Yusuf. *Namık Kemal'in Londra Yılları*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1974.

Nalcıoğlu, Belkıs Ulusoy. "Tanzimat Dönemi Türk Gazeteciliği Ve Türk Basınının İlkleri." 2005, Accessed July 30, 2014.
http://journals.manas.kg/mjsr/oldarchives/Vol07_Issue14_2005/453.pdf.

Namık Kemal. "Vatan." In *Osmanlı Modernleşmesinin Meseleleri Bütün Makaleleri*, Ed. Nergiz Yılmaz Aydoğdu and İsmail Kara, 474. Vol. 1. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.

Namık Kemal. *Vatan Yahut Silistre*. Ed. Hacer Er. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2012.

Özkürüplü, İlkay. "Bir Desideratum Olarak Vatan Kavramının Tanzimat Dönemi Erkeklik Kavramı İnşasındaki Rolü." *Fe Dergi: Feminist Eleştiri* 5, no. 1 (2013): 32-42. <http://cins.ankara.edu.tr/>.

Öztuna, Yılmaz. *Bir Darbenin Anatomisi*. Babıali Kültür Yayıncılık 2012.

Pekman, Yavuz. "Tanzimat Dönemi Oyun Yazarlığında Batılılaşma Olgusu." *Ankara Üniversitesi Tiyatro Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14, (2002). Accessed May 5, 2014. <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/13/179/1382.pdf>.

Russell, William Howard. *The British Expedition to the Crimea*. G. Routledge&Company, 1858.

Şahin, Veysel. "Namık Kemal'in Mektuplarında "Şiir, Tiyatro ve Gazete" Üzerine Tenkitler." *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13, (2010). Accessed May 8, 2014.
hutad.hacettepe.edu.tr/index.php/hutad/article/download/105/54.

Seçkin, Bilge. "Staging the Revolution: The Theatre of the Revolution in the Ottoman Empire 1908-1909." Master Thesis, Bogazici University, 2007. Istanbul. Accessed April 12, 2014. www.ata.boun.edu.tr/bilge-se-kin-staging-revolution-theatre-revolution-ottoman-empire-1908-1909

Şenler, Yaşar. "Namık Kemal'in Tiyatrolarında Sosyal Tenkit." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Şimşek, Tacettin. "Bir Hüzn-I Umumi Şairi: Namık Kemal" in *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Karataş, Turan and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Sütçü, Tevfik. "Namık Kemal'in Yaşamı ve Eserlerinde Gelibolu." *Turkish Studies* 8 no. 13 (2013): 1411-1426. Accessed May 22, 2014.
http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/356051628_88S%C3%9CT%C3%87%C3%9C%20TEVF%C4%B0K%20ARM-1411-1426.pdf.

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2006.

Taştan, Zeki. "Türk Ve Arnavut Kültürüne Ortak Bir Bakış: Besâ -Yahut- Ahde Vefa". 1. Uluslararası Dil Ve Edebiyat Çalışmaları Konferansı, Tirana. 2012. Accessed April 8, 2014.
<http://academy.beder.edu.al/Conferences/UDEK%202012/FULL%20ARTICLE/27Doc.%20Dr.%20Zeki%20TASTAN%20%20Turk%20Ve%20Arnavut%20Kulturene%20Ortak%20Bir%20Bakis.pdf>.

Tezcan, Asuman. "Ali Kararname Ve Basın." *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi* 3, no. 4 (2005). Accessed May 16, 2014.
<http://josc.selcuk.edu.tr/josc/article/download/294/288>.

Tiken, Servet. "Sürgün, Edebiyat ve Namık Kemal" in *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Karataş, Turan and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Topuz, Hıfzı. *Vatanı Sattık Bir Pula*. Remzi Kitapevi, 2013.

Türköne, Mümtazer. *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu*, 2nd ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994.

Uçman, Abdullah. "Kısa Bir ömrün Hikayesi." In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Turan Karataş and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür Ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Uçman, Abdullah. "Şemseddin Sami." *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. 2010.
<http://www.islamansiklopedisi.info/dia/pdf/c38/c380319.pdf>.

Yalçın, Fatih. 'Vatan Yahut Namık Kemal' In *Namık Kemal*. Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

Yalçın, Soner. 2011. "Odatv." NAMIK KEMAL'İ KİM ÖLDÜRDÜ. 14 Mart. Accessed Ocak 5, 2014. <http://www.odatv.com/n.php?n=namik-kemali-kim-oldurdu-1403111200>

Yetiş, Kazım. *Namık Kemal'in Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Üzerine Görüşleri ve Yazıları*. Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım. 1996.

Yıldız, Alpay Doğan. "Namık Kemal'in Tiyatroları" In *Namık Kemal*, Ed. Karataş, Turan, and Orhan Kemal Tavukçu, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2011.

APPENDICES

A. Chronology of Significant Events in Namık Kemal's Life

1 December 1840 – Namık Born in Tekirdağ

10 December 1846 – Namık Kemal and his family moved to Afyon

1848 – His mother deceased; they moved to İstanbul

1849 – Namık Kemal was started to attend Beyazıt Rüştiye; dropped out from Beyazıt Rüştiye and then started to attend Valide Rüştiye

1852 – Namık Kemal and his family moved to Kars

12 September 1855 – His grandfather is appointed to Sofia

1856 – Famous Poet Eşref Pasha gives him the nickname, Namık

1857 – Married with Nesime Hanım

1857 – Started to work at Babiali Translation Bureau

1860 – Met with Şinasi and Ebuzziya Tevfik

1863 – Became the Muharrir at Tasvir-i Efkar newspaper

4 December 1864 – Şinasi went to Paris left the administration of newspaper to Namık Kemal

February 1867 – The community of 'Young Ottomans' has founded

1867 – Muhbir newspaper has published

13 April 1867 – Mustafa Fazıl Pasha called him to escape to Paris

17 May 1867 – Namık Kemal escapes to Paris

29 June 1868 – *Hürriyet* newspaper was started to publish at London

25 November 1870 – Namık Kemal returns to İstanbul

13 June 1872 – Namık Kemal has taken the administration of *İbret* newspaper

26 September 1872 – Assigned for *Mutasarrıf* duty at Gallipoli

1873 – Returns back to İstanbul again

1 April 1873 – First play of *Vatan Yahut Silistre* on stage, at Gedikpaşa Theatre

10 April 1873 – Punishment, exile for Namık Kemal begins at Famagusta

1873 – 1875 – Writes his works; Akif Bey and İntibah

19 March 1877 – Meclis-i Mebusan has opened

1877 – Assigned to government duty at Lesbos

1878 – Writes ‘Cezmi’

1881 – Promotes to *Bala* rank

1884 – Became ill from pneumonia

26 October 1884 – Assigned to *mutasarrıf* duty at Rhodes

3 September 1887 – Started to write ‘The Ottoman History’, one of his major works

2 December 1887 – Assigned to *mutasarrıf* duty at Chios

1888 – His pneumonia relapsed

1888 – ‘The Ottoman History’ published partially, then banished

2 October 1888 – Namık Kemal deceased in Chios Island