



TANPINAR'S DIARY: FICTION OR NON-FICTION?*

M. Ahmet DÜZDAĞ**

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

Since its publication in 2007, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's diary has been critiqued only in terms of showing Tanpınar's personality. However, the diary entries possess literary value as its rhetoric, organization, and literary techniques hold some idiosyncratic characteristics attributed to Tanpınar and his writing style. There was surely a distinguished portrayal of Tanpınar, and it has been mentioned by almost all critics, but it was for the sake of analyzing Tanpınar's personality. The literary techniques used to assess Tanpınar's novels, poems, and articles have never been applied to evaluate the diary, which confines the diary to a few shallow discussions. However, as *Huzur* has Mümtaz, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* has Cemal, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* has Hayri İrdal, *Muhur Beste* has Behçet Bey, and *Aydaki Kadın* has Selim as protagonists, the diary has a hero too – that is Tanpınar himself. This article aims to question the authenticity of Tanpınar's diary as Tanpınar creates a fictional universe in the diary, and as the editors, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, contribute to this world by controlling and channeling the interpretation of readers.

Diary writing has specific characteristics; it allows for change and growth, giving diarists some area of freedom. Diarists can, therefore, decide by themselves on how to behave and then change the rules of diary keeping as they go along. All these characteristics of diary writing, however, give diarists or the editors of the diaries some opportunities for changing the so-called objective account into fictitious texts, as the authors can create pseudo-identities as well. This article analyses Tanpınar's diary from the given perspective, that is, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* might be considered as a fictional text, in which Tanpınar created a projected identity and which the editors controlled and channeled the reader to some interpretations through guidance in the preface and the footnotes.

This article focuses on two major points: the authenticity of and the editorial interference in Tanpınar's diary. The issue of authenticity can be questioned through a close analysis on Tanpınar's references to audience in the diary and on his literary motivations. There are a few remarks about the publication of the diary, the most important of which reads how Tanpınar thinks his diary would be read after his death. The

*Bu makale Crosscheck sistemi tarafından taranmış ve bu sistem sonuçlarına göre orijinal bir makale olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

** Yrd. Doç. Dr. Süleyman Şah Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı, El-mek: ahmetduzdog@hotmail.com



editors interpret Tanpınar's explicit declaration of public audience as that he in fact wanted his diary to be read by only his close friends and that Tanpınar was keeping his diary as an autocue. On the other hand, Tanpınar's use of images, symbols, allusions, and recurring themes that convey his private thoughts and experiences prove the literary quality of the diary. His literary motivations, which most likely stem from his intention of publication, somewhat clash with the authenticity of the document since a diary is either a spontaneously produced text or a carefully crafted one. To better understand the literary quality and its impact on the diary, this article surveys a broad range of theoretical distinctions between the private and public diaries. This section finalizes with an assertion that if Tanpınar took audience-oriented notes and planned the publication of his diary, this would inevitably lead him to have some aesthetic concerns in the entries. A close analysis of the distinguished use of language and the ambivalent presentation of the content in the diary would raise questions about authenticity because the supposedly true personal account might become a fictional text representing a fictional self.

The second consideration in this article is editorial interference; it is likely that editors of diaries might study manuscripts according to their stereotypes or prejudices and in some cases according to the image that they want to project. In that case editors hold a great deal of power, and a distorted version of a text is possible. This article analyzes the editors' likely interference in Tanpınar's diary since whether the diary is a fiction or non-fiction is based – secondarily if not primarily – on the editing process of the diary. There are various points about the editorial job in the diary. The title of the diary, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*, sounds like an academic study; Tanpınar's diary could have been "Tanpınar's Diary." The names of the editors, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, are on the cover with no sign of that they are the editors, not the writers. The footnotes added by the editors sound like insertions to justify and back for Tanpınar's negative remarks about several people in the diary. The preface is controversial; the editors draw the attention of readers to certain points as well as they include their interpretations on some remarks of Tanpınar. Perhaps the most obvious editorial interference with the manuscript is the form of presentation. The original manuscript cannot be read thoroughly but can be seen amongst the comments or the summaries of the editors. It is to a certain extent acceptable to see the commentaries of the editors in the preface and footnotes, completing missing words and phrases in the diary entries, but that the diary entries were merged with the instructive comments of the editors is very controlling and turns the diary into a false academic study.

Since its publication in 2007, Tanpınar's diary has brought into question many discussions, most of which were based on Tanpınar's sore remarks about the people around him. However, the diary was a literary work, another text written by Tanpınar; his plans, novel and poetry drafts, his inner conflicts, his feelings and opinions about his surroundings, depressive moments, and even his sexual desires are all recorded in the diary in passing. It hand, possesses literary value not only because of its rhetoric, organization, or literary techniques but also in terms of Tanpınar's distinguished portrayal of himself. This article

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



aims to prove that Tanpınar creates a fictional universe in his diary, and the editors, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, contribute to this world by controlling and channeling the interpretation of its readers.

Key Words: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Tanpınar's Diary, *In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar*, Diary as a Fictional Text.

TANPINAR'IN GÜNLÜĞÜ: KURGU MU GERÇEK Mİ?

ÖZET

2007'de basıldığından beri, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın günlüğü sadece Tanpınar'ın kişiliğini gösteren bir eser olarak incelenmiş, edebi yönü göz ardı edilmiştir. Hâlbuki günlükler, Tanpınar'ın yazı stiline ait birçok özellik taşımaktadır ve bir nevi edebi eser olarak da değerlendirilebilir. Günlüklerde farklı bir Tanpınar profili olduğu söylenebilir ve araştırmacılar tarafından da sadece bu söylenmiştir; fakat günlükler bu değerlendirmeye, farklı bir Tanpınar'ın sergilendiği bir metin olmanın ötesine geçememiştir. Tanpınar'ın romanlarını, şiirlerini ve fikir yazılarını değerlendirirken kullanılan edebi teknikler, günlüklerin değerlendirilmesinde ihmal edilmiş, bu da günlükleri, birkaç sığ müzakerenin konusu olmaktan öteye geçirememiştir. Hâlbuki *Huzur*'daki Mümtaz, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler*'deki Hayri İrdal, *Mahur Beste*'nin Behçet Bey'i ve *Aydaki Kadın*'daki Selim, bu romanlar için ne ifade ediyorsa, günlükler için de Tanpınar odur. Tanpınar'ın, günlükleri basılması niyetiyle mi tuttuğu yoksa günlüğün önsözünde editörlerin belirttiği gibi, bir akıl defteri olduğu ve ölümünden sonra sadece yakınlarının okuyacakları bir takım notlar olarak mı düşündüğü önemlidir; zira günlüklerin edebi yönü ve dolayısıyla da kurgu mu gerçek mi olduğu bu durumla alakalıdır. Bu makalede iddia edildiği gibi, eğer günlükler basılması fikriyle yazılmışsa, bir takım edebi teknik ve düzeltmelerle eser kurgusal bir metine dönüştürülmüş ve romanlarından belki biraz farklı bir kıvamda yeni bir eser haline getirilmiş olabilir. Diğer taraftan günlükler, Tanpınar'ın ölümünden kırk beş yıl sonra basılması sebebiyle, günlükleri hazırlayan editörlerin tasarrufunda olmuş olup, belli tashih ve düzenlemenin ötesine geçen bir müdahaleyle, gerçek manasını kaybetme tehlikesiyle karşı karşıya kalmıştır. Bu makale, Tanpınar'ın, günlüklerinde ne derece gerçek bir dünya oluşturduğunu sorgulamaktadır. Tanpınar'ın günlüklerde kurguladığı evren, notları bir araya getirip yayımlayan İnci Enginün ve Zeynep Kerman tarafından yönetilmiş ve okuyucu, sınırları belirli bir algiya doğru yönlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Tanpınar'ın Günlükleri, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*, Kurgusal bir Metin Olarak Günlükler.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



Introduction

The diary is taken as a more modest but more intense genre, “which sculpts life as it happens and takes up the challenge of time” (Lejeune 2009: 209). It allows for change and growth, which produces a kind of freedom. Diarists, therefore, can decide by themselves on how to behave and then change the rules as they go along. Starting and stopping, writing anything desired, keeping the written text private or sharing it with intimates or publishing it all depend on the writers of the diaries. All these characteristics of diary writing, nevertheless, give diarists or the editors of the diaries some opportunities for changing the so-called objective account into a text, perhaps rather called a fiction, or into a text misrepresenting the identity of authors; instead of a direct and true account of experiences, a fictional narration of events and experiences might be given. This article aims to prove that Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar’s diary was not a non-fictional text, but it was rather a fictional text, in which Tanpınar created a projected identity and which the editors controlled and channeled the readers to some interpretations through guidance in the preface and the footnotes.

Born in 1901 in İstanbul, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar was recognized in his lifetime as a poet, a scholar, and an essayist; after his death in 1962, he began to be appreciated as a novelist and short story writer. Considered by the Nobel laureate Orhan Pamuk as “Turkey’s greatest twentieth-century novelist” (2005: 225), Tanpınar offers in his books “the deepest understanding of what it means to live in a rapidly Westernizing country amongst the ruins of Ottoman culture, and shows how it is, in the end, the people themselves who, through ignorance and despair, end up severing their every link with the past” (Pamuk 2005: 189). Like Orhan Pamuk, several critics saw Tanpınar’s works indispensable for anyone who is interested in modern Turkish society because Tanpınar drew attention in his works “to the psychological effects of the Kemalist cultural revolution of the 1920s and 1930s, [he recognized] the persistence of an Ottoman Islamic cultural legacy, and [he depicted] the individual alienated and divided by modernization” (Gökner 2003: 647).

“This Diary will be Read after Me”

Tanpınar is often acclaimed as a novelist. Through his novels, he wanted to bring a new perspective to understanding his social milieu and to introduce new forms into Turkish literature. Tanpınar says that he is after himself in his poetry while in his novels he is after himself, life, and people – “after people rather than myself” (2006: 352-53). Even though he writes in his diary that “my poetry is my essential,” the proceeding sentence explains why he is known as a novelist: “But the novel will bring me popularity and recognition” (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 309). Tanpınar’s novels and essays have been much analyzed; however, his reactions toward drastic social changes have almost never been studied in association with his psychological depression. For this very reason, Tanpınar’s diary, rather than his novels, hold great significance to show his conflicts between aesthetics and politics, as well as his inner struggle to define his role as an artist in the literary community. Tanpınar’s diary is full of his impressions, plans, novel and poetry drafts, his inner conflicts, his feelings and opinions about his surroundings, depressive moments, and even his sexual desire; all are recorded in the diary in passing. He made long lists of essays and books he planned to write – some of which materialized and some of which remained a projection jotted in the diary. This obviously significant characteristic of the diary gives the idea that the best possible text in which Tanpınar’s reactions as well as their depression can be analyzed is his diary.

Tanpınar started keeping his diary in 1953 in Paris. His remarks in 1951 in an interview give important clues about why he decided to keep a diary: “what upsets me most is that I have not kept a diary; my only advice to my young friends is that they keep diaries. A person can produce

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



everything out of himself, out of his life. Keeping a diary means keeping oneself in the view all the time. There is no greater economy than that" (Tanpınar 2006: 308). Tanpınar wanted his diary to be published as he noted in 3 December 1958: "I think this diary will be read after me. I like this feeling. People will see how I have lived" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 134). However, the editors of the diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman,ⁱ claimed that Tanpınar was keeping his diary as an "autocue" (2007: 6) and that Tanpınar's consideration does not necessarily mean that he wanted his diary to be read by the public, but rather he was expecting those close to him read his notebooks, not a public audience (2007:8). There are indeed several evidences that Tanpınar had an intention of the publication of his diary. He wanted his diary to hold some aesthetic characteristics; therefore, he revised and edited the entries, and even added some explanatory footnotes. His direct address to readers should be considered his propensity of being read. His most frequently discussed sore remarks about people around him can be explained as his desire to take revenge from people who do not reciprocally show friendship. There were on the one hand Tanpınar's audience-oriented notes and intention of the publication of the diary, and on the other hand there was editorial guidance that controls readers' interpretation of the diary. The authenticity of Tanpınar's diary is now in question.

Public or Private?

The diary is often studied as a source of biographical information about a famous author rather than as a literary text in itself. However, analyzing Tanpınar's use of images, symbols, allusions, and recurring themes that convey his private thoughts and experiences might be a new approach to reading and interpreting the diary as a literary text. His literary motivation, which most likely stems from his intention of publication, somehow clashes with the authenticity of the document since a diary is either a spontaneously produced text or a carefully crafted one. Therefore, Paul Bowles defines keeping a journal as "making faces at oneself in the mirror," and comments, "if it's oneself, it's obviously a farce. If it's for publication, then it's immediately censored [...]" (1995: 380). It obviously leads to a crisis because the definition of the diary as literature, as Elizabeth Podnieks points out in her *Daily Modernism*, "necessarily hinges on its conception as an aesthetic work; but if the diary in question is artistically motivated, it cannot be a diary per se" (2000: 4). A diary might be revised and edited for the sake of audience, but then, it may not even be called a diary after all. Diaries might be welcomed for their articulation of an author's chronology, for what they reveal the character of the diarist, and for the social and historical phenomena of the time; however, its dilatory nature may make the reading less attractive and its lack of formal unity might cause the work not to be considered as a classic realist text either. Those literary qualities on the other hand might be considered as works of art but raise questions of authenticity.

Many studies on diaries have raised theoretical distinctions between the "pure" diaries and consciously produced ones: while the former is often considered authentic the latter is considered a conscious production and even called insincere.ⁱⁱ In his *Private Chronicles*, Robert A. Fothergill comments on the likely corruption of utterance: "To endeavor to write well, to consider the formal structure of the book one is writing, to address oneself to a putative reader or think of publication, to edit or rewrite one's own entries – all these practices appear to corrupt the pure spontaneity of utterance that should mark the 'true' diary" (1974: 40). Fothergill furthers his discussion by bringing a different perspective to the relationship between diary-writing and literary forms and claims that "the major achievements in diary-writing [...] have been produced out of a conscious respect for the diary as a literary form" (1974: 40). While there are thousands of people who keep diaries, the diaries of artists and authors are written with a heightened consciousness of literary

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



form, and thus those diarists might be aware of the aesthetic opportunities of the diary. Lynn Z. Bloom, in the chapter titled “‘I Write for Myself and Strangers’: Private Diaries as Public Documents,” holds a similar point of view and asserts that “for a professional writer there are no private writings [...]. The writer’s mind is variably alert to the concerns of an audience and shapes the text, even letters and diaries, to accommodate these” (1996: 24). Bloom regards the audience-oriented considerations of authors in writing as a habit: “Once a writer [...] is audience-oriented, such considerations as telling a good story, [...] supplying sufficient detail for another’s understanding, can never be excluded. All writers know this; they attend to such matters through design and habit. A professional writer is never off-duty” (1996:24).

It is traditionally considered that diaries are private records of people’s lives. In contrast to private, hidden diaries, autobiographies, if considered within the boundary of a separate genre are often written for a possible audience, like a novel. This distinction is not rigid but holds true in many cases. However, some texts, considered as diaries in theory and genre can be seen as autobiographies or even be read as a fictional text. Even though many scholars take the diary-like autobiographies – or autobiography-like diaries – to discuss how boundaries of genres can be blurred, in Tanpınar’s case, this article draws attention to how diaries are converted into fictional texts for a specific purpose, that is, to project an identity.

In order to understand whether Tanpınar turned his supposedly-objective account into a fictional text, some aspects of the diaries should be considered. The first one is the diarist’s concern for audience: if Tanpınar took audience-oriented notes and planned the publication of his diary, this would inevitably lead him to have some aesthetic concerns in the entries. A close analysis of the distinguished use of language and the ambivalent presentation of the content in the diary would raise questions about authenticity because the supposedly true personal account might become a fictional text representing a fictional self. The second consideration is editorial interference since it is likely that editors of diaries might study the manuscripts according to their stereotypes or prejudices and in some cases according to the image that they want to project. In that case editors hold a great deal of power, and a distorted version of a text is possible. Analyzing Tanpınar’s diary in terms of whether the text is authentic or fictitious require a close look at the editing of the text.

The Diary of an Artist

Tanpınar does not have many references to audience in his diary. His most important remark about the publication of his diary is dated 3 December 1958: “I think this diary will be read after me. I like this feeling. People will see how I have lived” (Enginün at al. 2007: 134). Although some critics interpret this statement of Tanpınar as his intention of the publication of his diary, the editors of the diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, claim that Tanpınar’s consideration does not necessarily mean that he wanted his diary to be read by the public but rather he was expecting those close to him read his notebooks, not a public audience (2007: 8). According to the editors, Tanpınar was keeping his diary as an “autocue” (2007: 6). As will be explained in detail in the subsequent pages of this article, this attitude of the editors might stem from how they wanted to project the Tanpınar image; it is a clear intervention to the interpretation of readers.

In his article “Kırtıgil mi değil mi? Evet, Hangi Tanpınar?” [Is he Grotty or not? Yes, Which Tanpınar?], Hilmi Yavuz asserts that Tanpınar’s diary is not a “*journal intime*” but a “*journal extime*,” that is, Tanpınar planned the publication of his diary. Yavuz points out that “If he enjoys thinking about the publication of his diary, that feeling is very much strengthened by the revenge he would like to take on his friends who call him ‘grotty’” (2008). This revenge might be related to his desire for being reinterpreted after his death. Tanpınar planned to take revenge on his

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



contemporaries who had alienated Tanpınar from his surroundings.ⁱⁱⁱ His sour remarks and feeling of humiliations from his friends show that he dared not to say his thoughts in his lifetime but entered them in his diary so that he could take revenge after his death. His plan did not work since the editors did not publish the diary until 2007 after keeping the entries for decades. People who were the object of his accusations and hatred in the diary had already passed away when the diary was published in 2007, more than four decades after Tanpınar's death in 1962.

Tanpınar took some notes about the publication of his diary. Even though he speaks of the public reception of the diary, he says his loneliness is never told in those lines: "I like this notebook. I think it will be read after me. I like the idea though. I think people will see what I have experienced. However, I am on the edge of my table. In front of me is my shining copper ash tray on the coffee table. My ash tray, coffee cup, and drafts of the novel are all in front of me. It is 10. I am home alone" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 134). He gives messages to readers, directly talks to them. In the early entries of his diary, on 14 August 1953, after writing his comments on how France would become again one of the most powerful countries of Europe, he says in parenthesis, "I will come back to this" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 83); or on another page he writes, "I hope I will continue tomorrow" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 121); or he closes one subject by writing "I am tired; I might continue this another day" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 134), as if he was talking to his reader. In another diary entry he announces how he will give more details about a reported incident: "Ülfet and Sevim have gone to Ankara tonight. I will elaborate on this. I have a fever, 37-8" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 205). On another page he shares with his reader what seems weird to himself: "Is it not weird that the other never came to my mind?" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 103). There are some notes written either for an audience or for himself to be checked back later. While he was writing about Jean de Vatteville, he could not collect his thoughts about a date and he notes in parenthesis, "will be checked from Hammer" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 231).

Literary Motivations in the Diary

If Tanpınar took audience-oriented notes and planned the publication of his personal notes, this would inevitably lead him to have some aesthetic concerns. About the literary value of the diary, one can easily assume that it is not Tanpınar's exquisite work, compared to his other works, especially compared to his "distinguished poetry" (Balçı 2009: 9) and novels. However, some diary entries show Tanpınar's concern of literary qualities. He was not as reckless in form as he seems, for he was periodically revising his diary. On 14 August 1953, after writing "bad administration makes this grudge something newsworthy," he does not like the expression and notes in parenthesis, "not well expressed" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 89). In another entry, he complains about his incorrect use of Turkish and says, "Now, a torment has appeared inside me [*sic*], is it correct? I was going to say I have felt a torment; it has torn my heart out. We do not know Turkish" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 135).^{iv} Seven years after he started keeping his diary, he was still complaining about his lack of writing habit: "It is bad not to still be used to writing in the notebook, not to revise; I am writing horribly. I need to write tidily or give it up" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 214).

The motivation for turning his diary into a literary text proves that Tanpınar saw his diary as works which could be improved and which would satisfy his professional sensibilities. He was well aware of the diary tradition and wrote with the knowledge of the diaries published before him. His literary motivation on the other hand raises some questions about the matter of authenticity since by revising, editing, and polishing his remarks, Tanpınar wanted to project a self that he wanted people to see after his death. Tanpınar's diary as not a spontaneously produced one, but a carefully crafted text raises questions on whether Tanpınar turned his so-called personal text into a

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



fictional work of art. The issue of authenticity is related to occasional editorial intervention in the original manuscript as well. Tanpınar's diary suffered from even greater interference by its editors: from its title, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*, to footnotes that protect Tanpınar's image, to the editors' misleading interpretations, the editors had full control of the diary. Editorial interference in Tanpınar's diary raises questions about the authenticity of the diary.

Editorial Interference in the Diary

The diary's status as a finished work raises another point to be considered in terms of authenticity and text manipulation. Some diarists edit their texts themselves; this editing may vary from selecting what to include and exclude to omitting words and revising passages. As broadly discussed in the previous section, Tanpınar edited and revised his diary, which raises questions on the sincerity of the texts. Far more questionable than the revision by the diarist himself, however, is interference in the text by someone other than the writer. In some cases the editors might tend to make changes according to their stereotypes or prejudices and sometimes according to the image that they want to project. In that case the editor holds a great deal of responsibility, and a distorted version of a text is at stake. Analyzing Tanpınar's diary in terms of whether the text is authentic or fictitious requires a close look at the editorial interference in the texts.

In the preface to Tanpınar's diary, the editors, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, informed readers of the editorial process. In a letter written right after the death of Tanpınar, Necmettin Halil Onan, a friend of Tanpınar, wrote to Bedrettin Tuncel about how he felt terrible due to his death and mentions that he had the responsibility to straighten up all the things, the house, the books, the writings, and such. He also complains that he could not manage to collect all the written texts scattered around the house. Even though the editors mention his complaints only to claim Onan as the first person who saw the manuscript, it appears that Tanpınar's notes were all in tatters. This pile of Tanpınar's writings remained for a long time although some entries were dug out by Mehmet Kaplan in 1963 – one year after Tanpınar's death – for his *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası* [Tanpınar's World of Poetry]. He published them by including some excerpts from Tanpınar's personal account with a thank-you note to Tanpınar's brother Kenan for the entries. Eight years after Kaplan's study on the entries, the papers were still dispersed, as suggested in a letter of 21 June 1971 by Kaplan to İnci Enginün, where he mentions how he, with Kenan, looked over the pile.

Kenan Tanpınar left his brother's six notebooks to Mehmet Kaplan and also let him decide whether to publish them or not. Kaplan had some worries about the publication but some remarks of Tanpınar in his diary entries, especially the one that reads, "thinking about the publication of what I am writing now after me [...]" (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 130), changed his mind. Besides, Kaplan's students, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, had great influence to change Kaplan's mind: "In Europe, the most intimate letters and diaries of scholars are published, which leads new texts to be produced and gives some impression of the relationship of text and author. Artists need these sorts of texts for making films, theatrical productions, and especially documentaries. Why don't we let that happen?" (2007: 7). After Kaplan handed over the documents, it took another twenty years for the diary to be published since the editors did not have time to collate the texts due to their university responsibilities; secondly, they had some difficulty reading Tanpınar's handwriting, and there were several notes all around the manuscript which complicated the transcription process (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 8). Nevertheless, the editors took advantage of having the manuscripts in the meantime by presenting some written-out texts at conferences and by publishing some of them in journals. Editors decided to publish the diary when

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



they thought “to have only a few left to transcribe” (2007: 9). The un-transcribed parts have not yet been published or made available, which raises questions about editorial interference.^v

The title of the diary, *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* [In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar^{vi}], is significant in terms of the editorial influence. “Kendimle Başbaşa” [In Private with Myself] was already a title Tanpınar had planned to give to one of his texts. The editors were inspired by Tanpınar's intention for the title and gave a similar name to the diary. One of the remarks of the editors is striking: it says, “In Private with Myself” was an appropriate statement for explaining the occasional zingers in the diary” (2007: 9). We can raise an issue about the name given to Tanpınar's diary; there is no doubt that İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, as the editors, spent enormous effort on the publication process; however, the title could have been “Diaries” or “Tanpınar's Diary.” *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* sounds like it was an academic study based on Tanpınar's diaries. However, the writer was Tanpınar himself, not Kerman and Enginün as their names are on the cover as the writers of the text.

“We have not tampered with the language of the diary” (2007: 13), the editors say. The underlined words are left as they are on the manuscript and published with an indication on the footnote. Hundreds of first names were completed with their last names given in brackets, but some were not recognized and left as they were in the manuscript. Tanpınar had some crossed out words and sentences in his diary, which were not analyzed and identified, but only the crossed out words in poems were transcribed as much as possible. We can raise another question about some of the footnotes. Some people's opinions of Tanpınar are given in the footnotes, some harshly criticizing, even insulting Tanpınar. They are not originally included in Tanpınar's diary; therefore, they sound like insertions to justify and back for Tanpınar's negative remarks about several people in the diary.

The editors had some thoughts on authenticity and audience, given in the preface to the diary. They mention how Tanpınar has a “sore” (2007: 8) tone in his diary, even sharper than that in his letters. The editors assert, “He was not addressing anybody this time. Besides, we do not assume that Tanpınar was censoring himself. These were the notebooks in which loneliness was reflected” (2007: 8). By mentioning their opinions on the issues of censorship and audience, Enginün and Kerman were in fact leading readers of the diary. Even Tanpınar's own remarks on the prospective audience of his diary are interpreted by the editors and given in advance in the preface. Tanpınar says, “I think this diary will be read after me” (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 134). This statement of purpose on its publication and his expectation of an audience has been interpreted by the editors as if Tanpınar were expecting those close to him to read his notebooks, not a public audience (2007: 134).

The editors seem to be in full control; in the preface they draw the attention of readers to certain points: “Tanpınar is unaware of the world he lives in” (2007: 10) say the editors; however, in the diary, Tanpınar is quite aware of the life he experiences; he was aware of the world, his life, and his struggle: “I wish I can say all my thoughts before I die; Turkey! You have drained me” (Enginün ad Kerman 2007: 321). In another diary entry he writes, “the truth is that I am new in Turkish but not in the world” (Enginün and Kerman 2007: 301). Another misleading aspect of the preface is the editors' feelings about Tanpınar: “while we were reading these diary entries, we felt both pity and anger toward him” (2007: 12). There are some other similar remarks of the editors in the preface; these lead and mislead readers and affect their interpretation of Tanpınar and his diary. Perhaps the most obvious interference with the manuscript is the form of presentation. The original manuscript cannot be read thoroughly but can be seen amongst the comments or the summaries of the editors. It is to a certain extent acceptable to see the commentaries of the editors in the preface and footnotes, completing missing words and phrases in the diary entries, but that the diary entries

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



were merged with the instructive comments of the editors is very controlling and turns the diary into a false academic study.

We can comment precisely on the editors' influence and interpretation of Tanpınar and his diary. Like all literatures around the world, Turkish literature, too, has its canonical writers and canonical texts. Especially in the second half of the twentieth century, several literary circles in Turkey have their 'own' writers and scholars, publicized and acclaimed and popular. Mehmet Kaplan and his students, including Zeynep Kerman and İnci Enginün, are authorities in Turkish literature on Tanpınar. Therefore, the way they represent Tanpınar determines the standard interpretation of Tanpınar and influences most of the studies about him. Furthermore, sometimes anomalous opinions have been considered marginal and labeled as invalid.

Conclusion

Since its publication in 2007, Tanpınar's diary has brought into question many discussions, most of which were based on Tanpınar's sore remarks about the people around him. However, the diary was a literary work, another text written by Tanpınar; his plans, novel and poetry drafts, his inner conflicts, his feelings and opinions about his surroundings, depressive moments, and even his sexual desires are all recorded in the diary in passing. His remarks in the diary about his other texts, especially about his novels,^{vii} surely bring new interpretations for his fictional world. The diary, on the other hand, possesses literary value not only because of its rhetoric, organization, or literary techniques but also in terms of Tanpınar's distinguished portrayal of himself. Tanpınar's image in the diary has already been mentioned by almost all critics, but for the sake of analyzing Tanpınar's personality. The literary techniques used to assess Tanpınar's novels, poems, and articles have never been applied to evaluate the diary, which confines the diary to a few shallow discussions. However, as *Huzur* has Mümtaz, *Sahnenin Dışındakiler* has Cemal, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* has Hayri İrdal, *Muhur Beste* has Behçet Bey, and *Aydaki Kadın* has Selim as protagonists, the diary has a hero too – that is, Tanpınar himself. This article has proved that Tanpınar creates a fictional universe in his diary, and the editors, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, contribute to this world by controlling and channeling the interpretation of its readers.

REFERENCES

- BALCI, Yunus. "Bir Sanatkârın Bilim Adamı Olarak Potresi". *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, ISSN: 1308-2140, Vol. 4/-I, (Winter 2009): 5-28.
- BATUR, Enis. "Tanpınar'la Başbaşa". *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, 24 July 2008.
- BLOOM, Lynn Z. "‘I Write for Myself and Strangers’: Private Diaries as Public Documents". *Inscribing the Daily: Critical Essays on Women's Diaries*. Ed. Suzanne L. Bunkers and C.A. Huff. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.
- BOWLES, Paul. *In Touch: The Letters of Paul Bowles*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995.
- DÜZDAĞ, M. Ahmet. "‘I Felt Like I Saw the Novel’: Tanpınar's Novels Revisited". *The Journal of International Social Research* 35 (December 2014): 95-104.
- . "‘They will Return to me One Day’: Tanpınar's Self-Isolation". *Civilacademy: Journal of Social Sciences* 12 (December 2014): 107-121.

- ENGİNÜN, İnci and Zeynep Kerman. *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2007.
- FOTHERGILL, Robert A. *Private Chronicles*. Cambridge, Oxford UP, 1974.
- GÖKNAR, Erdağ. "Ottoman Past and Turkish Future: Ambivalence in A.H. Tanpınar's *Those Outside the Scene*". *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102 (2003): 647-661.
- KAPLAN, Mehmet. *Tanpınar'ın Şiir Dünyası*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2013.
- LEJEUNE, Phillippe. *On Diary*. Trans. Katherine Durnin. HI: University of Hawai'i, 2009.
- PAMUK, Orhan. *Istanbul: Memories and the City*. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.
- PODNIIEKS, Elizabeth. *Daily Modernism: The Literary Diaries of Virginia Woolf, Antonia White, Elizabeth Smart, and Anais Nin*. Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
- SATAR, Nesrin A. "Mahremiyet Bölgesinde Kimlik İnşası: Günlüklerin Türsel Özellikleri ve Tarihi Gelişimi". *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, ISSN: 1308-2140, Vol. 9/6, (Spring 2014): 117-132.
- TANPINAR, Ahmet H. *Yaşadığım Gibi*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2006.
- YAVUZ, Hilmi. "Kırtıpıl mi değil mi? Evet, Hangi Tanpınar?". *Zaman*, 30 January 2008.

Citation Information/Kaynakça Bilgisi

DÜZDAĞ, M.A., Tanpınar's Diary: Fiction Or Non-Fiction?, *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* Volume 10/4 Winter 2015, p. 477-488, ISSN: 1308-2140, www.turkishstudies.net, DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7968>, ANKARA-TURKEY

NOTES

ⁱ Even though the writer of the *diary* is Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, I cite the editors of the diary, İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman, as the writers for two reasons: First, the editors put their names on the cover as the writers and with no indication of the editorial job on the cover. Secondly, they turned the collection of Tanpınar's diary entries into an academic study by including several comments and footnotes, which makes them writers rather than the editors.

ⁱⁱ On the issue of conscious/unconscious production of a diary, see a recent article: Nesrin Aydın Satar. "Mahremiyet Bölgesinde Kimlik İnşası: Günlüklerin Türsel Özellikleri ve Tarihi Gelişimi". *Turkish Studies* 9/6 (Spring2014): 127.

ⁱⁱⁱ Most of the people with whom Tanpınar was trying to establish friendship were dedicated to the official ideology of the new Turkish Republic. However, Tanpınar never rejected the past and traditions, which the Republican ideology was radically uprooting. For a detailed analysis on Tanpınar's alienation due to his ideas about the past and tradition, see my article: "They will Return to me One Day": Tanpınar's Self-Isolation". *Civilacademy: Journal of Social Sciences* 12 (Spring 2014): 107-121.

^{iv} I have deliberately translated this sentence incorrectly because the original was also written incorrectly by Tanpınar as he in the next sentence criticizes himself. The Turkish original text reads: "Şimdi içimde bu azap belirdi, doğru mu? Azap duydum, içim birdenbire yandı diyecektim. Biz Türkçe'yi bilmiyoruz."

^v In his column in *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, Enis Batur has some negative comments on the publication of the diary: "the published form of *Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* is almost shameful: if it were not edited by two professors but by two university students, they would not have been graduated. Beside their awkward interventions, the book is full of errors and missing parts. [It is] not difficult to prove what I say; give the manuscript to me and Ekrem Işın for the second edition, let us show them how a decent work is done." ("Tanpınar'la Başbaşa". *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, 24 July 2008.)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015



^{vi} The title of Tanpınar's diary was first translated into English by me and used in my PhD dissertation. I translated *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* as "In Broad Daylight: Face to Face with Tanpınar." See also my as-yet-unpublished PhD dissertation titled, "The Diaries of Virginia Woolf and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: Culture and Disillusionment."

^{vii} Tanpınar's diary holds great significance in terms of various interpretations of their novels. The diaries might be taken as hyper texts for their novels since several remarks in their diaries give clues about the novel-writing process, the influences, the motives, and the preparations for the novels are significant and shed light on the interpretation of the novels. For a detailed analysis on Tanpınar's diary entries about his novels, see my article: "'I Felt Like I Saw the Novel': Tanpınar's Novels Revisited". *The Journal of International Social Research* 35 (Fall 2014): 95-104.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/4 Winter 2015

