

**THE SERPENT'S FANGS EMBEDDED IN THE HEEL: THE
DIALOGIZATION OF AUTHORITY IN NAMIK KEMAL'S
İNTİBAH
EZEN AYAĞA YILANIN ÖCÜ: NAMIK KEMAL'İN İNTİBAH
ROMANINDA OTORİTER SÖYLEMİN SÖYLEŞİMSEL ALANA
ÇEKİLMESİ**

Fırat KARADAŞ*

Abstract

The Turkish novelist Namık Kemal's *İntibah* indicates how a character struggles against misrepresentation. In the novel, Ali Bey, a 22-year old educated boy, meets a very beautiful woman, whose name is Mehpeyker, as he walks in Çamlıca, and he falls in love with her. The narrator says that Mehpeyker does not have a virtuous background and he does his utmost to make the addressee hate her and believe that she is not a suitable partner for Ali Bey. However, the reader interestingly sympathizes with her throughout the novel because with her speech and actions Mehpeyker represents herself differently from what the narrator says about her. The present article studies the relationship and struggle between the narrator's and Mehpeyker's discourses based on the theory of the Russian critic Mikhail Bakhtin. Since in *İntibah* the narrator's discourse appears as patriarchal discourse and another's word as femininity which struggles against misrepresentation by patriarchy, a feminist reading of Bakhtin is also employed in the analysis of the novel. In *İntibah* Mehpeyker represents the voice of the other that disseminates the male authority of the narrator.

Keywords

feminine other, narrator, dialogization, subversion of authority, Mehpeyker

Öz

Namık Kemal'in *İntibah* romanı bir karakterin anlatıcının okuyucuyu yanlış yönlendirmesine karşı sözlü mücadelesini ele alır. Romanın iki ana karakterinden biri olan Ali Bey Çamlıca'da gezinirken Mehpeyker adında çok güzel bir kadınla karşılaşır ve ona aşık olur. Romanın anlatıcısı Mehpeyker'in 'temiz' bir geçmişe sahip olmadığını söyler ve Ali Bey'e uygun bir eş olmadığını okuyucuya inandırmak için elinden geleni yapar. Ancak anlatıcının bütün çabasına karşın okuyucu Mehpeyker'e sempati duyar, çünkü Mehpeyker davranış ve söylemiyle anlatıcının anlatımından farklı olduğunu gösterir. Böylece ötekiliyi temsil eden Mehpeyker'in söylemi anlatıcının otoriter söyleminin merkezileşme çabasını sekteye uğratar. Bu çalışma, anlatıcı ve Mehpeyker arasındaki ilişkiyi ve

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı. Eposta: fkaradas@mku.edu.tr. ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7546-717X>

mücadeleyi Rus kuramcı Mikhail Bakhtin'in edebiyat kuramından hareketle incelemektedir. İntibah'ta anlatıcı baskıcı eril söylemi, Mehperker de buna karşı mücadele eden dişil söylemi temsil ettiği için çalışmada Bakhtin'in feminist yorumları da kullanılmıştır. İntibah'ta eril söylemi zayıflatan ve okuyucu nazarındaki inandırıcılığını bozan Mehpeyker'dir. Bu çalışma, anlatıcının otoriter söylemini ve ona karşı Mehpeyker'in bozan söylemini ele almaktadır. •

Anahtar Kelimeler

dişil öteki, anlatıcı, söyleşim, otoriteyi yıkma, Mehpeyker



INTRODUCTION

"A huge human foot d'or, in a field azure; the foot crushes a serpent rampant whose fangs are imbedded in the heel," which is the Montresors' family arms in Edgar Allan Poe's "The Cask of Amontillado," is one of the most memorable expressions in the story. It is also a useful metaphor that represents the deathly grip of another's discourse with authority against misrepresentation. In *Unspeakable Sentences* Ann Banfield proposes that "any subject confronting the world necessarily adopts a position from which he perceives what will constitute his visual field, his experience, and any point of view is thus a limited one" (2000, p. 517). This limitedness of view can also be seen in narration and in the representation of the other, whether this narration be first person, third-person or any other kind. Narrators exert different levels of authority in narratives, but since every view is to a certain extent partial, every speaker's speech also includes what the Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin calls another's speech. In the Turkish novelist Namık Kemal's *İntibah* the narrator exerts with his internally persuasive discourse utmost authority to silence another's word. However, another's word rejects the narrator's effort at totalization and dialogizes the narrator by establishing another, alien discourse, through which the reader can arrive at 'another' understanding of the narrative. Namık Kemal's *İntibah*, an important novel of the Tanzimat Period of the late Ottoman history, represents the struggle and inseparability of the narrator's authoritative discourse and the subversive discourse of the other. What is distinguishing in *İntibah* is that another's speech is the discourse of the feminine other and thus its interpretation requires a feminist reading of Bakhtin. When studied in terms of the Montresors' family arms in Poe's story, the serpent that is almost always represented as the female other is in a deathly grip with the crushing foot of the speaker and by embedding its fangs in the foot it paralyzes the foot and devoid it of its function to act. This article studies the deadly grip between the narrator and another's speech in *İntibah* and explores how another's speech deprives the narrator's word of its power by offering the reader 'another' discourse based on dialogue and inviting him/her to look at events from 'another' angle. The article also studies the feminine character of another's speech in *İntibah* and re-reads Bakhtin against the background of feminist criticism.

Namık Kemal and his Work

Namık Kemal was one of the most outstanding literary and political figures of the Tanzimat period of the Ottoman history. He was born in 1840, and throughout his life he played an important role in the political and literary lives of the late Ottoman history. He also played a key role in the ideological and literary formation of the Tanzimat period, a period of reform in the late Ottoman history which began in 1839 and ended in 1876. He was a poet, a playwright and a novelist, and he wrote all his works with a social intent. Such popular ideas of the period as freedom, nationalism and patriotism are the main themes of his works. For instance, his "Hürriyet Kasidesi," which can be translated as "Ode to Freedom," is one of the key poems of the period. His play *Homeland or Silistra (Vatan yahut Silistre)*, first performed in 1873 during the revolt in Bosnia and Herzegovina against the Ottoman Empire, was about the heroic defense of the Silistra Castle by the Ottomans during the Ottoman-Russian War in 1828. As such, the main themes were patriotism and heroism. He wrote only two novels, *İntibah* and *Cezmi*, both of which experiment in the structure of the novel. In terms of structure *İntibah* is accepted by many as the first novel of the Ottoman-Turkish history of literature. Namık Kemal is even said to have

written this novel as an example for the novel genre (Uçman, 2006, p. 255)¹. In his *Mukaddime-i Celal*, he says “by the novel we mean the description of an event with a moral standpoint, with custom and sensibility, and with all its details; the event may not have happened but is possible to happen” (in Tanpınar, 2001, p. 400). He “saw the novel, as he did with the other genres, as a useful entertainment by which he could spread his ideas to the large masses” (Uçman, 2006, p. 253). In his preface to *Son Pişmanlık*, which was the original title of *Intibah*, he states, there is another task for writing a story; and that is saying everything that comes to mind, whether it be reasonable or unreasonable, to reform and to please the readers and to study human nature in a way different from what past great authors did” (Tanpınar, 2001, p. 400). Thus, in his novel he experimented with the novel genre and attempted at incorporating western elements in his work, without eliminating tradition.

Intibah

Namık Kemal wrote *Intibah* with the above-mentioned intent: that is, to reform and to please, and to present an example for the novel genre. *Intibah* was written in 1876, as already said, in the Tanzimat period. Tanzimat was a modernization and westernization period in which the clash between the old and the new reached its climax. Fearing from a social disintegration, Namık Kemal thought that taking only the scientific side of the West and adapting it to Islam was the only solution to the regression in the Ottoman socio-economical life (Moran, 1983, s. 16). In art he criticized old literature because it separated the individual from the life (Tanpınar, 2001, p. 421). He was for the imitation of the great works in the West; in his preface to *Intibah*, he says, “we imitate the great works and try to marry the supreme ideas and novel imaginations of the east and the west” (in Enginün, 2006, p. 230). He was for the preservation of the moral values and the superstructure of Ottoman life and thought that modernization should only take place in the economical and scientific planes. In terms of moral values he was a conservative thinker and represented in *Intibah* the patriarchal morality of the period. In that period “the moral values allowed woman minimal role in social life. She was seen only as a housewife serving for her husband. She was expected to be either her husband’s odalisque, his love doll, or mother to his children” (Akyol, 2006, p. 12). Those who did not conform to that image were labelled as evil, monstrous or whore. Thus, In *Intibah* Kemal presents the morality of the period by focusing on the family and on the disintegration of the family, but without questioning the role of the woman in that family. Though female characters play an important role in the novel, Kemal does not criticize the patriarchal morality that shaped the roles assigned to women and he condemns such women as Mehpeyker that do not fit into that morality.

Intibah relates the traumatic love story of Ali Bey and Mehpeyker. Ali Bey, who is the son of a wealthy family, is a 22 year-old educated boy. As he walks in Camlica, a famous 19th century holiday resort, he meets a very beautiful woman, whose name is Mehpeyker, and falls in love with her. From the very beginning the narrator tells how a bad woman Mehpeyker is. Mehpeyker, the narrator says, is not a ‘chaste’ woman and does not have a ‘virtuous’ background. Without knowing that, Ali Bey begins a love affair with Mehpeyker and wants to marry her, which she rejects due to her secret life. Their love affair continues until Ali Bey learns her ‘unchaste’ background, abandons her, and gets married with an odalisque named Dilaşub, an ‘angelic’ woman ‘bought’ by his mother to challenge Mehpeyker’s effect on her son. With the extremity of her love and sense of maltreatment, Mehpeyker, with the help of Abdullah Effendi—a base man and her patron—takes her revenge first by arousing suspicions in Ali Bey about Dilaşub’s chastity and virtue, and second, upon being unable to win Ali Bey

¹ Translations belong to the the author of the present article.

back, by plotting to kill Ali Bey. However, she herself dies in the end, together with Dilaşub who sacrifices herself for saving Ali Bey's life.

Mehmet Kaplan defines *İntibah* "as a dramatic and psychological work that narrates and studies a personal life experience" (1997, p. 124). From the very beginning to the end, the novel is a series of events that develop according to the psychology of the characters and that, after a point of crisis, turn in an opposite direction that leads to catastrophe (p. 124). Kaplan criticizes the novel stating that "the novel describes the psychological states of the characters in a simple and superficial way;" he is not able to present emotions or states that are beyond the commonplace (p. 127). In the same vein, Uçman states that "*İntibah* is the love story of Ali Bey who is passionate and who, though he had a good educational background, is brought up as ignorant and inexperienced about the realities of life"² (2006, p. 256). In this respect, the novel is about the defects in the marriage and family institutions of the period and in the education of the children in the family. For Uçman, the novel also aims to show how character psychology changes and is affected in the progression of events (2006, p. 264). Uçman, however, mentions mainly Ali Bey's psychology. About Mehpeyker, he just criticizes the author in passing, stating that the author openly takes sides because though he knows and explains Mehpeyker is not to be blamed for her being 'fallen woman', he blames her and punishes her in the end. Enginün focuses more than Uçman on the problematic presentation of Mehpeyker. She says that Namık Kemal attempts at psychological analyses in *İntibah* without trying to understand his characters. Characters are never allowed to go beyond the limits set by the author. In this regard, he is most unfair towards Mehpeyker. Mehpeyker, who is the liveliest character of the novel, is not allowed to speak for herself (Enginün, 2006, p. 231). For Enginün, Namık Kemal analyzes the psychological states of his characters, creates events accordingly, and these events prepare a background for new psychological analyses; but he cannot avoid taking sides while presenting his characters and shows his personal ideas and emotions in his choice of words. Thus, the position of Namık Kemal as narrator is replaced with one of a moralist (2006, p. 232).

Prof. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar was the first critic to focus on the narrative weaknesses of the novel and on the problematic presentation of Mehpeyker. For Tanpınar, the liveliest character of the novel is Mehpeyker (2001, p. 401). However, he argues, we should handle her not as the author presents her but as she speaks for herself. Throughout the novel we see her objecting to the author's statements about her. She is as if saying "I am not what you say...I have never been the person you say! Let me tell myself" (2001, p. 401). However, Namık Kemal always cuts her speech and does his utmost to frame her in the mind of the reader. He is hostile to her because of her background, but Mehpeyker is not to be blamed for her background; not only she but also the author tells it. He presents her to us in the beginning saying that she grew in a quite base family (2006, p. 403). Tanpınar also criticizes Ali Bey for his maltreatment of Mehpeyker in the second half of the novel. He beats and abandons her, Tanpınar says, to stay alone with Dilaşub who his mother finds for him. Dilaşub, who falls in love with Ali Bey as soon as she sees him while he is with Mehpeyker, who faints in all occasions and is docile as a lamb, and who, though a bit pornographic, is quite beautiful, remains weak and unobtrusive in spite of all the efforts of the narrator.

As can be seen so far, the problematic presentation of Mehpeyker by the narrator and her relationship with the other characters of the novel have been central concerns for some critics. However, what is missing in the literature is a theoretical analysis of the power struggle and relationship between the narrator, Mehpeyker, and the other characters of the novel. The

² Translation belongs to the author of the present article.

present article aims to contribute to the literature by studying these from a Bakhtinian perspective.

Bakhtinian Dialogics and *Intibah*: the Serpent's Fangs in the Heel

In the first volume of *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* the German Philosopher Ernst Cassirer argues that consciousness is a symbolizing, “form-giving activity, through which the simple presence of the phenomenon assumes a definite ‘meaning,’ a particular ideational content” (1953, p. 78). Narrators are fictional minds (Cohn, 2000, p. 253) that, in accordance with the above-mentioned definition, form a certain ideational content in the narrative, create a certain perspective about the characters, and frame the boundaries for the reader’s interpretation of the narrative world. Mikhail Bakhtin calls this ‘form-giving,’ ‘symbolizing’ process ‘discourse’ and points out that the fundamental condition, which makes a novel a novel and which is responsible for its stylistic uniqueness, is *the speaking person and his discourse* (1981, p. 332). The speaking person ‘constructs’ his discourse artistically and expects the addressee to view his discourse from his lens; he is always, to one degree or another, “an ideologue, and his words are always ideologemes. A particular language in a novel is always a particular way of viewing the world, one that strives for social significance” (1981, p. 333). For this reason, the speaker’s discourse is an internally persuasive one, which “may literally be *omnipresent* in the context” (1981, p. 347), exerting its authority by speaking *instead of* and *in spite of* the other. However, for Bakhtin, language—like the concrete living environment in which the consciousness of the verbal artist lives—is never unitary. The other of the speaker’s discourse responds this silencing and de-voicing process with his/her own speech by causing refractions in it. Another’s discourse, which is introduced into the speaker’s discourse in “*concealed form*, that is, without any of the *formal* markers usually accompanying such speech, whether direct or indirect” (1981, p. 303), breaks through the speaker’s authoritative discourse by either openly speaking or giving hints about its own side/view of the same story.

Highly reminiscent of this definition, in Namık Kemal’s *Intibah* the narrator’s discourse and another’s word are locked together in a death embrace, just like the serpent and the crushing foot in “The Cask of Amontillado”; they are inseparable and interrelated; each exists *because of* and *in spite of* the other. Moving from this stand, on the one hand, we have the narrator’s effort to suppress another’s voice with his authoritative discourse, and on the other we have another’s word that subverts the narrator’s discourse. The struggle between and inseparability of these two discourses represent the dialogic nature of novelistic discourse: a speaker trying to dominate another’s word and another’s word responding it with its own terms.

Mehpeyker is a woman who does not conform to the patriarchal image of woman, and so “*the author shows his agreement with the morality of the period by presenting her as evil and unchaste*” (Akyol, 2006, p. 11). The narrator/author does his utmost to make the addressee believe that Mehpeyker is not a suitable partner for Ali Bey, and he shapes all his novelistic discourse for her victimization in the reader’s eyes. Constantly using the time-honored woman-serpent identification in patriarchy, he represents her as the serpent.

Ali Bey is the ‘hero’ of the novel, and he is the main stylistic tool through which the narrator/author transmits his idea of woman and silences another’s word. In *Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Poetics*, as he discusses the relationship between author and hero in Dostoyevsky’s novels and the extent the hero depends on the author, Bakhtin points out that in Dostoyevsky’s novels “*the hero interests Dostoyevsky as a particular point of view on the world and on oneself...What is important to Dostoyevsky is not how his hero appears in the world but first and foremost how the world appears to his hero, and how the hero appears to himself*” (1984, p. 47). What is important about

the hero, for Bakhtin, is not "his fixed image", but "the sum total of his consciousness, ultimately the hero's final word on himself and on his world" (p. 48). In *Intibah*, Ali Bey represents a certain worldview, which also the narrator shares, and in the end of the novel he speaks his final word both on himself and the world by deciding to abandon Mehpeyker and the 'base' life she represents and by taking revenge from her. However, he is not the type of self-conscious character Bakhtin praises to exist in Dostoyevsky's novels. Though until the end he seems to fall asunder from the narrator's point of view, his view gravitates towards the author's/narrator's throughout the novel, and his final word on himself and the world suggests his convergence with the narrator's point of view and his total dependence on him. How he appears in the gendered world is more important to him than how the world appears to him. In the almost monologic world of the novel, he, together with his friend and family circle, functions as a mouthpiece for the author. For the author of such a novel, according to Bakhtin, "it is important only that a given true idea be uttered somewhere in the context of a given work" (1984, p. 79), and Ali Bey is chosen for this function. A thought that gravitates towards the author's consciousness is not represented, but affirmed and the whole novelistic world serves to this function. As a stylistic tool, the characters who play the most important role for this affirmation are Ali Bey, his friends Mesut and Atif beys, his mother Fatma Hanim, and Dilaşub.

The sole self-conscious character who is independent of the narrator and who realizes herself in spite of the ideological bombardment of the narrator is Mehpeyker. Bakhtin claims that "a monologic artistic world does not recognize someone else's thought, someone else's idea, as an object of representation... Thoughts and ideas—untrue or indifferent from the author's point of view, not fitting into his worldview—are not affirmed" (1984, p. 80). If an unaffirmed thought is to enter into the artistic world, it must be repudiated and deprived of its power to mean. Throughout the novel the narrator tries to obstruct the reader's affirmation of Mehpeyker's idea and discourse and deprive them of their power to mean. However, in spite of all the stylistic tools and ideological bombardment to de-power her word, Mehpeyker strives for social significance against the narrator's misrepresentative discourse, makes the reader sympathize with her, and proves herself to be different from the narrator's representation of her. As in her introduction to the novel Selda Akyol says, "the author does not want us to love Mehpeyker but we feel pity for her as we read the novel. We do not want to believe that she is the embodiment of evil because the reader no longer believes that people can be totally good or bad" (2006, p. 12). For Akyol, Mehpeyker is the only humane character in the novel, with flesh and blood and resembling us. By making the reader sympathize with her, her discourse disrupts the author's and she speaks the final word both on herself and the world, from which she takes revenge in her own accord.

Though in this work, like all other novelistic discourses, another's word strives for self-representation against the ideological bombardment of the narrator, what is at issue in this novel is the feminine other and so, to delve further into its analysis, a feminist reading of Bakhtin should be employed. In her article "Gender in Bakhtin's Carnival" (1991) Dale Bauer reinterprets Bakhtin's dialogism according to feminist theory and criticizes Bakhtin for ignoring the role of women as "another's word" in dialogue and the subversion of authority. A similar criticism is also made by D. P. Hernall, who in "The Dilemmas of Feminine Dialogic" (1991) argues that Bakhtin excludes women and women writers from his discussion of novelistic discourse, though what he says about this discourse best fit women's writing. According to Hernall, "multivoicedness is a feminine characteristic" and "dialogism is largely a gender-, rather than genre-, marked trait." Thus, Bakhtin's exclusion of women shows that he was not "merely culturally backwards, but was ignorant about the very nature of the genre" (1991, p. 17). Dale Bauer

pinpoints this essentially ‘feminine’ aspect of Bakhtin’s dialogism arguing that in many literary works ‘the feminine’ subverts the power of language. Employing Luce Irigaray’s term ‘disruptive excess’, she points out that this ‘excess’ is “*the voice of gender—which moves beyond the atomic self or body into the larger discursive corpus and which cannot entirely be accounted for in Bakhtin’s dialogic model*” (1991, p. 675). She formulates her effort in re-interpreting Bakhtin as “*to read the woman’s voice—excluded and silenced by dominant linguistic or narrative strategies—back into the dialogue in order to re-construct the process by which she was read out in the first place*” (1991, p. 673).

In *Intibah* Mehpeyker represents ‘disruptive excess’ that disseminates the male authority of the narrator and plays a major role in the dialogization of the novel and de-centralization of authority. The patriarchal ideology of the narrator identifies this ‘disruptive excess’ with monstrosity and represents Mehpeyker as the kind of monster woman Susan Gubar and Sandra Gilbert mention in *The Madwoman in the Attic*. Gilbert and Gubar point out that in the 19th century the dominant literary images of femininity are male fantasies, in which women are represented either as docile, submissive and domestic, or as monsters, that is, as sweet dumb Snow White and the fierce mad Queen. As Moi puts it, “*woman was assumed to be a vision of angelic beauty and sweetness; the ideal woman is seen as a passive, docile and above all a selfless creature*” (1985, p. 58). Behind this angel there is the monster woman, who represents “*the obverse of the male idealization of women*” and “*the male fear of femininity*”. The monster woman is the woman “*who refuses to be selfless, acts on her own initiative, who has a story to tell – in short, a woman who rejects the submissive role patriarchy has reserved for her*” (1985, p. 58).

In *Intibah*, Mehpeyker is the feminine other, the monster/serpent woman whose word the author/narrator, with the help of Ali Bey and his friend and family circle, aims to de-power, whereas Dilaşub is the angel, “*the sweet dumb Snow White*” who sounds like the king/the narrator and imitates his tone and viewpoint. At her first appearance in the novel the narrator introduces Mehpeyker as:

*She was a lady who, in sharp contrast to Ali Bey, was a quite unchaste woman, grown in a low family and had become master of masters in every kind of disgracefulness as soon as she got matured. Since she was literate and spent most of her time in the company of famous lewd women, she had become twice cunning in her mischievous acts so that she would not be craftier in the domination of men if she were created as beautiful as an elf and cruel as an Arab sultan.*³ (Kemal, 2006, p. 49).

To make his discourse more effective, the narrator/author also uses the mythical woman-serpent association and imagery and puts Mehpeyker in the same line with serpentine female figures in Greek and religious mythologies such as Medusa, Lamia, Lilith, and Eve. When he introduces her, he says: “*She [Mehpeyker] loved beauty, but did it as a serpent loved a flower or as a serpent embraced a man by encircling him. She embraced as a grave enclosed a body*” (2006, p. 49). This description of Mehpeyker with serpent imagery continues throughout the novel. When Mehpeyker commissions a man to take revenge from Ali Bey and Dilaşub after Ali Bey abandons her, the narrator tells: “*Mehpeyker, whose awareness of her skill of mischief was like a serpent’s awareness of the effect of its poison or a hangman’s awareness of the effect of his rope, heartily said to the man [whom she commissioned for revenge]: ‘Why those casting spells hope for help from the devil instead of you!’*” (p. 137). During the plot she has organized to create doubt in Ali Bey about Dilaşub’s chastity, the narrator describes Mehpeyker’s attitudes as: “*Mehpeyker, curling like a serpent that wrathfully set eye on its prey and changed colors from anger, walked up and down. Ali Bey*

³ Translation of quotations from *Intibah* belongs to the author of this article.

thought that these attitudes of the wicked woman were caused by her inability to take revenge and lay her serpentine poison on her prey" (p. 139). Another example for Mehpeyker-serpent association exists towards the end of the novel when, after she has been unable to win him back, she plots the killing of Ali Bey in the mansion of Abdullah Effendi but herself being killed by Ali Bey. After she says her last word to Ali Bey and turns back to her hiding place, the narrator says: "After poisoning his [Ali Bey's] spiritual pains with these words, pleased—like a serpent—to have sucked its victim's blood, she swung back to her hole, when Ali Bey, all of a sudden, assaulted her with fury" (p. 185).

Serpent imagery is accompanied throughout the novel with words and simile that aim to affirm Mehpeyker's 'evil' character for the reader. For instance, while talking about her, the narrator uses such Ottoman Turkish words as *habise* (wicked woman), *mel'une* (mischievous woman), *haine* (malevolent woman), and *facire* (immoral woman). Sometimes the narrator tries to make his discourse more efficient by using simile that is in some way or the other also based on the religious/mythological conception of the feminine other as serpent. For instance, he resembles the effect of her pleasure to "oleander" (Kemal, 2006, p. 140) and uses the expression "poisonous smile" to describe her smile as she takes revenge (p. 141); words flow from her mouth like poison; and she, like blood-thirsty animal sets her eyes on her prey. These words are accompanied with words focusing on Mehpeyker's 'unchastity' and 'unvirtuous' life, which seem to be the main reasons that make her serpentine for the narrator.

As said above, in a monoglot artistic world, where the hero mirrors the author, the author tries to affirm his idea by putting it in the mouths of the hero and other characters. In *İntibah*, the narrator's/author's discourse is affirmed with the speeches and attitudes of the hero and the other characters. The whole artistic world serves for the affirmation of the author's idea of Mehpeyker and for constructing her in the mind of the reader as she-devil. Ali Bey, who is not aware of Mehpeyker's background at the beginning, begins to behave her differently when he learns it and abandons her at her first 'fault,' when she goes to Abdullah Effendi to beg him not to disturb her love affair with Ali Bey. He replies a letter she sends him to ask his forgiveness using the narrator's terminology and mouthing his idea: "Lady! You have begun to challenge the devil with your skill of deception...From my relationship with you I've come to see that it is impossible for man to go on well with a serpent; neither is it possible for loyal character to co-exist with immorality" (2006, p. 131). When his mother speaks with him about his malaise after he abandons Mehpeyker, he says: "May God damn the evil woman in the most horrible way. If she died before being born, the devil would be deprived of an important helper" (p. 126). His speaking of Mehpeyker in this way, leaving her for her 'unchastity' and 'unfaithfulness,' his scornful and pitiless attitude towards her, and his killing her in the end are all affirmative of the narrator's discourse.

In the socio-textual context created for Mehpeyker's ideological and physical victimization, the role played by Mesut Effendi is of special importance and requires some elaboration here. Ali Bey gets acquainted with Mesut Bey in Camlica, where he fights with him because Mesut Bey makes a pass at Mehpeyker. Mesut Bey shows the hypocritical aspect of patriarchal morality; he behaves *immorally* to Mehpeyker by making a pass at her but begins to mouth the narrator's idea of her and tells how *immoral* she is as soon as he hears that Ali Bey is in love with her. Upon hearing from Atif Bey, his nephew and Ali Bey's close friend, that Ali Bey aims to get married with Mehpeyker, Mesut Bey exclaims:

—He is going to get married with her! How a virtuous person he is!

[...]

— *Hasn't this man ever been in the company of men and asked about this woman to anybody.*

[...]

— *If he had done, he would have learned that she is a prostitute, a waste of almost half of the men in Istanbul.* (2006, p. 71).

After he, with Atif Bey's mediation, reconciles with Ali Bey, he sets to save Ali Bey from his 'fallen state' and warns him as: "*Mehpeyker is such a famous prostitute that perhaps except you nobody left in the country without being present in her company*" (2006, p. 72). Mesut Bey continues to voice the narrator's point of view also in the following parts of the novel. For instance, when Fatma Hanim, Ali Bey's mother, becomes suspicious about Ali Bey's state and talks to him to learn the reason of her son's malaise, Mesut Bey tells her: "*He is blindly in love with a slut. The malevolent woman he is addicted to is not the sort of person to be mentioned in your presence. Her attraction with deceit is not a kind of trouble one can easily cope with and so, when you are in her clutches, she makes you impotent to withstand her*" (p. 102).

Mesut Bey is also the character who mouths the narrator's view that the she-monster can only be challenged with 'angelic woman'—who Gilbert and Gubar call the white dumb Snow—and brings to Fatma Hanim's mind Dilaşub. Highly reminiscent of Gilbert and Gubar's discussion, he tells Fatma Hanim: "*To defeat the devil one needs to ask help from the angel; the effect of deceptive beauty can only be annihilated with a beauty sublimated with chaste and virtue*" (Kemal, 2006, p. 102). Upon this conversation, Fatma Hanim 'buys' Dilaşub who, in contrast to Mehpeyker, is described by the narrator to be the embodiment of spiritual beauty that she tries to save from the evil eye (p. 106). This shows how the female body functions in the male world as a battleground on which male ideology tries to drive the female body to the confinements of docility, and the feminine 'other' rejects this confinement on her body, using her body, symbolically speaking, as a mode of expression and as 'disruptive excess.' Dilaşub is the kind of woman who is imprisoned in the confinements of docility. In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault defines docility against the background of the socio-symbolic power exercised on the body. Foucault argues that the body has been an object for pressure investments throughout history, but the eighteenth century was outstanding with its ideology of docility. Docility is the socio-symbolic constraints, prohibitions and obligations imposed on the body. "*A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved,*" so that it becomes a political puppet, a small-scale model of power (Foucault, 1995, p. 136). What is important here is not the signifying elements of behavior or the language of the body, but the economy, the efficiency of movements, their internal organization" (1995, p. 137). The methods, "*which made possible the meticulous control of the operations of the body, which assured the constant subjection of its forces and imposed on them a relation of docility-utility, might be called 'disciplines.'* Many disciplinary methods had long been in existence—in monasteries, armies, workshops. But, in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the disciplines became general formulas of domination" (1995, p. 137). Thus, discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline makes a body docile by dissociating power from it, by reversing the course of its energy, the power that may result from it, and turning it into a relation of strict subjection (1995, p. 138). In sharp contrast to Mehpeyker who rejects the confinements of docility, Dilaşub is represented as the 'angelic beauty,' as "*a political puppet, a small-scale model of power*" for the patriarchal discourse in the novel. As Tanpınar puts it, "*she is created just as a contrast to Mehpeyker. She is the clean one against the prostitute*" (2001, p. 403). The narrator, using his full skill of metaphor, tries to sublimate her in the mind of the reader as follows:

Her hair was bright golden yellow, her brow limpid white like a mirror reflecting her purity of

conscience, her eyebrows auburn and a bit curved, her eyes bluish and love-provokingly languid, her face lovably pale white and ornamented with the pink color of a bright rose; the purity in her face color and harmonious beauty was like a lily bud having only one day left to bloom; with their delicacy and pink color her lips were like two rose leaves embracing each other and her pearly teeth appeared in-between them like dew drops; and her chin was like an unwasted white layered rose[...] Her neck was as delicately long as best fit a woman; her waist, which could attract the love of any man, was so slim that a child could embrace it with two arms. (Kemal, 2006, p. 103-4).

This idealization of Dilaşub bears amazing similarity to Gilbert and Gubar's description of the angel in 19th century literature and it presents Dilaşub as a pallid-faced, thin, and ill woman, with seemingly no blood in her veins. She is idealized by being not only de-womanized but also de-humanized. Gilbert and Gubar think that the idealization of woman by patriarchy and its institutions made the women of the 19th century both physically and psychologically ill. They state, "it is not surprising to find that the angel in the house of literature frequently suffered not just from fear and trembling but from literal and figurative sickness unto death" (1979, p. 55). Dilaşub totally suits this definition. She faints and trembles whenever she confronts a problem. For instance, she faints when Ali Bey gets angry with his mother's effort to impose her on him. Also when Fatma Hanim, after Ali Bey abandons home, tells her that she is from now on her daughter, "poor Dilaşub, not being able to keep her tears of sorrow and her emotions of sorrow and happiness to emerge, fell in a heavy faint on the ground" (Kemal, 2006, p. 123-4). When she is sold as a result of Mehpeyker's plot of revenge, she faints several times. After Mehpeyker buys her for revenge, she also faints so that everybody thinks she is dead; the narrator says: "Her body, being more delicate and slimmer than a rose, was petrified" (2006, p. 153). Her constant fainting makes Mehpeyker say: "Nothing's happened to her! She is a slim and dainty lady! She feigns to faint!" (2006, p. 153). When Mehpeyker, with the help of Abdullah Effendi, organizes a plot to kill Ali Bey, "poor Dilaşub was spiritually happy to do all she can for saving Ali Bey's life; she was even ready to sacrifice herself for his well-being." However, afraid of being murdered herself, she "began to feel cold and heavily tremble" (2006, p. 179). She also faints from happiness when Ali Bey says he is going to get married with her after he abandons Mehpeyker. These examples support Gilbert and Gubar's discussion of the death-in-life and life-in-death state of the angel in the house. Dilaşub's pallid appearance and constant fainting suggest "her figurative sickness unto death" caused by her effort to purge herself from her 'base' feminine self—which Mehpeyker represents—and be the angelic beauty and docile person demanded of her for acceptance into patriarchal society.

Her words in the end of the novel after Ali Bey leaves her behind to save his own life show the motivating force behind her docility and 'angelic' beauty: "Holding her head with two hands and tearing her hair from extreme longing, she exclaims: 'Ah master, master! Dying for your well-being is a festivity, a nuptial celebration for me'" (Kemal, 2006, p. 179). Dilaşub's presence and the way she conceives herself and is conceived by patriarchal society also call into question patriarchal morality. Dilaşub, being aware that she has been bought for Ali Bey, heartily thinks that if there is happiness in the world, it lies in making Ali Bey happy. In contrast to Mehpeyker's untamed beauty, Dilaşub is a tamable woman; in a way showing the hypocritical aspect of patriarchal morality and the fact that real 'prostitution' lies in the patriarchal values represented in the social context of the novel, Fatma Hanim tells her son: "This is your odalisque. Take her to bed and tame her if you like her" (2006, p. 108); Fatma Hanim is "decided to give Dilaşub to her son's bed" (p. 127). Dilaşub's only function is to serve Ali Bey, appease his sexual needs, make him happy, and, if possible, die for him. Thus, she is the disciplined docile body in Foucault's definition, the

body whose power is dissociated from, whose energy is reversed, whose existence is based on a relation of strict subjection.

Since, according to Gilbert and Gubar's argumentation, the king's voice is the chief one, the question arises as to whether the Queen tries to "sound like the king, imitating his tone, his inflections, his phrasing, his point of view," or "talk back to him in her own vocabulary, her own timbre, insisting on her own viewpoint" (1979, p. 290). In *Intibah*, Mehpeyker—the fierce mad Queen—"talks back" to him with her own voice and view. In spite of all the ideological bombardment and stylistic tools to affect the reader's view of her, Mehpeyker responds the narrator's discourse with her counter-discourse. For Bakhtin, meaning is not created through a single voice, but in the interaction of voices, that is in dialogue. "*Discourse lives, as it were, on the boundary between its own context and another, alien, context*" (1981, p. 284). Mehpeyker strives for significance in the novel by creating another, alien, context; that is, another speech different from that of the narrator and calling into question the narrator's authoritative and misrepresentative discourse. An important place where she establishes her counter-discourse is when she tells her side of her story upon Ali Bey's learning her 'vicious' background from Mesut Bey. She states,

You've learned my secret; no problem. It would anyhow come to light. Perhaps what you don't expect from me is my cowardice to tell you my state [...] Now that you've learned my story from others, let me tell it myself. Yes, what they've said about me is maybe less than what I've experienced. I was born in a quite unvirtuous house and brought up there. Before I became thirteen, my relatives tried to be rich by selling my chastity. How a child at that age would know what was chaste, what humanity was, and how a person could protect herself. Once a person gets on this track, as if having fallen on infinite sand, sinks as she tries to get off. Fate put me on this track and I had to go onward. Few things left in the world that I haven't done. Until I came to know you, for me life was wandering around in excursion spots and being present in companies of entertainment. I didn't believe in the existence of love in the world. Among those I know there was an elderly woman named Atike. She always said: 'We, too, love and our love exceeds that of chaste women thousand times.' What a truth lies in these words! Once I saw you, I began to feel something very different in my heart. As the grass look upwards when seeing the sun, so I feel elevated when I see your face. I wanted to look backwards but was detested from my past state [...] I lived a worldly paradise in those days with you [...] I am sure that you will no longer want to look at my face. Be easy. I can sacrifice myself for your happiness and will never disturb you with my presence. (Kemal, 2006, p. 82-3)

After Mehpeyker's speech, fearing that the reader may sympathize with her, the narrator intrudes as: "The evil woman, after telling the most effective events and emotions and boiling them up in one pot by skillfully adding lies, pretended to leave to show the sincerity of her last words, and she made her speech so effective that Ali Bey's anger turned into compassion" (2006, p. 83-4). In her alien discourse Mehpeyker refutes the narrator's authoritative discourse and shows that she is sincere in her words of love. The reader sympathizes with her as she shows herself to really love Ali Bey. When Ali Bey visits her house after the above-quoted speech of her, she behaves with the excitement of a lover and does her utmost to please Ali Bey. She prepares a good dinner table for him and has a drink. Intruding here, the narrator says that together with her unchastity Mehpeyker's being as saucy as to be used to alcohol quite displeased Ali Bey. However, a few lines later, disproving the narrator's speech, Ali Bey also begins to drink and says: "*I have had much experience and come to learn that drink brings man's real self to light*" (2006, p. 93). In their next meeting in Camlica, Ali Bey sees that "*Mehpeyker came before him to the meeting place and was craving for his coming*" (p. 97). The narrator intrudes again

and tries to prevent the reader from sympathizing with her saying: *"This conciliatory attitude of Mehpeyker showed her desire for rather than her addiction to him"* (p. 97).

She shows the extremity of her love when she goes to beg Abdullah Effendi not to disturb her love affair with Ali Bey and reveal himself to him. *"She told Abdullah Effendi her love affair, told him that she would cut her ties with him due to that love affair and would no longer accept his money"* (Kemal, 2006, p. 116). Upon being late that night because of her talk with Abdullah Effendi, Ali Bey, who waits for her until her coming in the early morning, gets furious, totally abandons her, and gets married with Dilaşub. Her extreme love for Ali Bey and the inability, reluctance or denial of Ali Bey and other upholders of patriarchy to understand her situation turn Mehpeyker into 'mad' and draw her to revenge. Seeing her state, Abdullah Effendi, to whom she goes to ask help for revenge, says to her: *"Alas! Mehpeyker who cares about nothing other than laughter and entertainment before is now burning with the idea of revenge! [...] Don't heed him [Ali Bey] Let him please himself with whoever he likes"* (2006, p. 135). She heartbrokenly replies:

—It seems as if you've never loved before.

[...]

—I think that a person loves only once in this world, just as s/he lives only once in it. If you knew what love is, you would not tell "let him please himself with whoever he likes." This means that you would not feel sorrow when you lose your love. (p. 135-6)

Due to her anger for those who serve for her victimization, Mehpeyker really becomes monstrous towards the end of the novel and behaves hysterically both to Ali Bey and Dilaşub. About hysteria, the character trait of the so-called she-monsters of 19th century literature, Gilbert and Gubar say: *"Patriarchal socialization literally makes women sick, both physically and mentally"* (1979, p. 295). Her victimization by patriarchal socialization draws Mehpeyker to behave 'insanely' in the end and take revenge from Ali Bey and Dilaşub, the representatives of patriarchal socialization. With the help of Abdullah Effendi, Mehpeyker plots two revenges towards the end of the novel. The first one is directed at Dilaşub and bears close similarity to Bertha Mason's tearing up Jane Eyre's wedding dress to take revenge from 'the angel in the house' and the image of woman imposed by patriarchy in Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*. Here Mehpeyker victimizes Dilaşub by arousing suspicions in Ali Bey about her chastity and virtue, the very patriarchal weapons that also caused her victimization. Mehpeyker plots the second revenge upon her inability to win Ali Bey back after she has victimized Dilaşub. Her love and sense of maltreatment bring her to the edge of killing Ali Bey but she herself dies in the end.

Conclusion

With a close reading of the passages in which Mehpeyker speaks for herself, the reader can see that two discourses clash in the novel for significance: the narrator's discourse and Mehpeyker's alien/another discourse. It follows that there are two representations of Mehpeyker: the evil, serpentine woman in the narrator's discourse and the humane, lovable and ill-fated woman in Mehpeyker's discourse. Though the whole novelistic discourse aims to victimize Mehpeyker in the mind of the reader and de-power her speech, her discourse calls the narrator's discourse into question and annihilates its power to mean. In spite of all the ideological bombardment of the narrator and the stylistic tools used for this purpose, the reader sympathizes with Mehpeyker and his view gravitates towards a more understanding position. *İntibah* shows the way authority is dialogized with the counter, alien discourse of another's word. In the work, the speaker tries to dominate another's word by creating a perspective about it and framing the reader's outlook of it. However, another's word, which exists *because of* and

in spite of the speaker's discourse, responds the speaker's act of framing by creating a counter and alien discourse and thus offering the reader the opportunity to look at events from 'another' angle.

Differently from many other literary texts in which another's word strives for significance, the serpent in deadly grip with the crushing foot in *Intibah* is the voice of the feminine other, and Mehpeyker is overtly associated with the serpent (perhaps because she represents the feminine other) and put in the same line with serpentine female figures in Greco-Roman and religious mythologies as Medusa, Lamia and Eve. Since the speaker represents patriarchy, another's word fights back authority with the 'disruptive excess' of femininity. Mehpeyker causes refractions in the speaker's discourse and makes the reader sympathize with her by proving to be different from the narrator's representation of her and showing her humanly feminine side and the excess of her love for Ali Bey. Even her monstrosity towards the end of the novel does not affirm the narrator's discourse that she is evil; instead, it represents this humanly side and can be associated with Bertha Mason's monstrosity in *Jane Eyre* and read with reference to Gilbert and Gubar's discussion as a hysterical reaction to patriarchal morality. In the end, she proves to be the dangerous female serpent of Greco-Roman and religious mythologies, but in the reader's lens she shows herself to be the maltreated serpent and the reader understands her 'monstrous' actions in this accord. Thus, in *Intibah* another's word disproves the speaker's discourse by offering the reader another discourse and providing him/her with the opportunity to look at events from another angle. So doing, the maltreated serpent depowers the crushing foot with its poisonous fangs.

KAYNAKÇA

- Akyol, S. (2006). İntibah'a dair. In *İntibah*. Ankara: Ozgur Yayinlari.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination*. Michael Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoyevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Banfield, A. (2000). From unspeakable sentences: narration and representation in the language of fiction." Michael McKeon (Ed.), *Theory of the novel* (515-536). Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins UP. .
- Bauer, D. (1988). Gender in Bakhtin's carnival. Robyn R. Warhol & Diane Price Herndl (Ed.), *Feminisms: an anthology of literary theory and criticism* (671-684). New Brunswick-New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Cassirer, E. (1953). *The philosophy of symbolic forms: language*. R. Manheim (Trans.). New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Cohn, D. (2000). Transparent minds: narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction. M. McKeon (Ed.), *Theory of the novel* (493-514). Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins UP.
- Hernall, D. P. (1991). The dilemmas of a feminine dialogic. Dale Bauer & S. Jaret McKinstry (Ed.), *Feminism, Bakhtin, and the dialogic* (7-24). Albany: State University of New York Press. 7-24.
- Enginün, İ. (2006). *Yeni Türk edebiyatı/ Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline & punish*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gilbert, S. & Gubar, S. (1979). *The madwoman in the attic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kaplan, M. (1997). *Türk edebiyatı üzerinde araştırmalar*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Kemal, N. (2006). *İntibah*. Ankara: Ozgur Yayinlari.
- Moi, T. (1985). *Sexual/textual politics*. New York: Methuen
- Moran, B. (1983). *Türk romanına eleştirel bir bakış I*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2001). *19cu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*. İstanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi.
- Uçman, A. (2006). Namık Kemal. Prof. Dr. İsmail Parlatır (Ed.), *Tanzimat edebiyatı* (201-288). Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Voloshinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik (Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.