



FROM MASNAVI TO THEATRE: TWO STAGE PLAYS THAT DRAW UPON *HÜSN Ü AŞK**

Nur GÜRANİ ARSLAN**

ABSTRACT

Today it is taken for granted that every text produced exists in a state of interaction with every text that was written before it. Jean Genette, in his work *Palimpsests*, examines various dimensions of intertextual relations that are more 'official'. In this context Şeyh Galip's *Hüsn ü Aşk* - a work that he said was 'stolen' from Mevlana's *Masnavi* - constitutes a very interesting example. In this article, two plays that derive from *Hüsn ü Aşk* will be analyzed in terms of how they interact with Galip's masnavi, using *Palimpsests* as a guide.

Turan Oflazoğlu's radio play *Güzellik ile Aşk*, described as an 'allegorical stage poem' follows the narrative and plot of *Hüsn ü Aşk* closely. It is mostly loyal to the masnavi but the text has been reduced to one twentieth the length of the hypotext. On the other hand, Kenan Işık's *Aşk Hastası*, in addition to *Hüsn ü Aşk*, draws on the poet's other poems and life story. The work takes place in present time, though the play also travels to Şeyh Galip's time with dramatic techniques.

When we examine Oflazoğlu and Işık's works together we see that both authors have taken as their starting point the love story in Şeyh Galip's work, which can be read as both ethereal and worldly. Despite some differences in form, both works have conceptual points in common with their hypotexts while at the same time adapting them so as to appeal to the modern reader. As a result, no matter how one reads the two works - whether from the point of view of Sufism, of Nietzsche's concept of the overman, or of Bergson's theory of intuitionism - each one tell the same story of man's adventure towards maturity as *Hüsn ü Aşk* does.

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

Today it is taken for granted that every text produced exists in a state of interaction with every text that was written before it. Theorists such as Bakhtin, Barthes and Kristeva point out that every new text that is produced enters into an intertextual relationship with those that came before it. Jean Genette in his work *Palimpsests*, however, deals with the 'sunnier' side of intertextuality dubbed 'hypertextuality'. (Genette, 1977, 9) Genette explains that, in using the term 'hypertextuality', his intent is to refer to any and all types of

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

** Doç. Dr. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı, El-mek: arslannu@gmail.com

relationship which exist between a text B, which he calls the 'hypertext', and a previously written text A, which he identifies as the 'hypotext'. This article will use Genette's work as a guideline to examine one of the most important works of Classical Turkish poetry, *Hüsn ü Aşk*, and two hypertexts which enter into a 'relatively holistic and official' relationship with it and examine the choices which Turan Oflazoğlu and Kenan Işık have made in their plays that have an impact both on content and meaning.

Here we will examine two works in their context as a resetting of the original text, making reference to the particular concepts mentioned above where necessary: Turan Oflazoğlu's *Güzellik ile Aşk* (literally *Beauty and Love*; the title is a modern Turkish translation of the Ottoman *Hüsn ü Aşk*) and Kenan Işık's *Aşk hastası* (*Lovesick*). *Güzellik ile Aşk* was written in 1970 as a radio show for Turkish Radio and Television's radio drama generation (Coşkun, 2011, 35) and published as a book in 1986, while *Aşk hastası* is currently still being performed in theatres.

The most obvious and unavoidable distinction between the hypotext on the one hand and *Aşk hastası* and *Güzellik ile Aşk* on the other is that the language of *Hüsn ü Aşk* has been simplified so as to appeal to the modern observer. A second noteworthy difference is in the size of the works. *Güzellik ile Aşk* is only 200 verses long, as opposed to *Hüsn ü Aşk*, which is composed of 2101 couplets. Yet despite this, Oflazoğlu's work follows the storyline of the hypotext from beginning to end. It begins with the members of the 'Sons of Love' tribe, to which Beauty and Love belong, introducing themselves and ends with the two lovers finding one another. Oflazoğlu does not engage in any significant discussion of poetry-one of the main concerns of *Hüsn ü Aşk*. *Aşk hastası* on the other hand tells the story of Mehmet, a member of a modern day theatre troupe who plays the lead role in work about the life of Şeyh Galip, as he struggles to comprehend the meaning of love and life in prose.

In this way, Işık takes the adventure of *Hüsn* and *Aşk* and situates it outside of time and space. Oflazoğlu does the same thing saying "... whatever country, whatever era you might live in you will recognize them." (Oflazoğlu, 2010, 12) He mentions that there is a single human culture developing across the entire globe; therefore, all the artists of the world must try on an overarching human consciousness, and only then will a superconsciousness dawn upon our world, awakening human beings to universal citizenship. (Oflazoğlu, 2001, 136) The author's appeal to universality through concepts such as 'overarching human consciousness' and 'superconsciousness' recall Nietzsche's 'overman'. Oflazoğlu believes that the topics discussed in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, which he translated into Turkish, are universal.

In his authoritative work titled *A Hunter of the Absolute: A. Turan Oflazoğlu (Bir Mutlak Avcısı A. Turan Oflazoğlu)*, Sezai Coşkun explains that 'the primary origins of the author's ideas' were European and mystic thought more generally and Nietzsche more specifically. He then attempts to analyze the author's relationship to Sufism in the context of these strains of thought. He states that, as Oflazoğlu's two favorite poets, "the two big names in Sufi poetry, Yunus Emre and Şeyh Galip [are distinguished] not by their 'Sufi characteristics' but by artistic

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



personalities in search of the absolute". Of course, it would be absurd to think of *Güzellik ile Aşk* as an entirely Sufi work. However, in limiting the entirety of Oflazoğlu's art to a 'hunt for the absolute' and the concept of the 'overman', Coşkun has neglected to compare the work in question to its hypotext. Furthermore, given that the author employs concepts, such as 'overcoming oneself' and 'absoluteness', which share an intimate relationship with Sufism and mysticism, the position that Sufism exists only in the work's use of language is untenable. Quite the contrary, the language and choice of words exhibited by the text are the foremost clue to its meaning.

At this point brief mention must be made of the originality of *Hüsn ü Aşk*. Despite of the masnavis written before Şeyh Galip, Beauty (the girl) is the one that confesses her love for Love. Speech who helps the couple to unite together finds her behavior strange but does not judge her for it. He thinks that the youths have created a new way and assists Beauty. On the other hand Oflazoğlu and Işık were both insistent that virtue, modesty and shame are traits particular to women. Oflazoğlu had no qualms about including the verse which states that what the woman is doing is wrong, in contrast to all the other verses which he has chosen to leave out. In the end, one might claim that Oflazoğlu and Işık specifically and contemporary society more generally do not depart from tradition and its view on women, whereas Şeyh Galip displays a bravery and openness to new ideas not only in his writing of poetry but in his contribution of novel commentaries on the customs of his time.

If we attempt to analyze the reasons for Kenan Işık's appeal to this extensive intertextuality, we must make mention of the author's admiration for Şeyh Galip's poetry and, perhaps, his personality. Işık's work talks not only of *Hüsn ü Aşk* but of the poet's other works as well. Furthermore, it portrays Galip as a proud poet but a humble sheikh and human being. The theme of the timelessness and physical boundlessness of love, both worldly and ethereal, that exists in *Hüsn ü Aşk* assists Kenan Işık in building these relationships within the text. Tracing the steps of modern man's attempt at integration and being himself back to Sufism, the author sees nothing objectionable in bringing together the emotional turmoil of a young man living at the end of the 20th century and the events and discourse of a hundred and fifty years prior. In his work, Işık deals with the nature of the poet, with love, and with maturity; he has come to the conclusion that poetry cannot be thought of as separate from love, and that love, the problems that love causes, and thinking about love are what lead a human being to maturity – even if the cost of maturity is death.

When we examine Oflazoğlu and Işık's works together we see that both authors have taken as their starting point the love story in Şeyh Galip's work, which can be read as both ethereal and worldly. Despite some differences in form, both works have conceptual points in common with their hypotexts while at the same time adapting them so as to appeal to the modern reader. As a result, no matter how one reads the two works – whether from the point of view of Sufism, of Nietzsche's concept of the overman, or of Bergson's theory of intuitionism – each one tell the same story of man's adventure towards maturity as *Hüsn ü Aşk* does.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



Key Words: Intertextuality, *Palimpsests*, *Hüsn ü Aşk*, *Güzellik ile Aşk*, *Aşk hastası*.

MESNEVİDEN TİYATROYA: HÜSN Ü AŞK'TAN YARARLANAN İKİ TİYATRO OYUNU

ÖZET

Günümüzde artık her üretilen metnin önceki metinlerle etkileşimde olduğu kabul görmektedir. Jean Genette *Palimpsests* adlı çalışmasında metinler arasındaki daha bütüncül ve 'resmi' ilişkilerin çeşitli safhalarını inceler. Bu bağlamda Şeyh Galip'in, Mevlana'nın *Mesnevi'sinden* 'çaldığını' söylediği *Hüsn ü Aşk* adlı eseri ilginç bir örnek oluşturmaktadır. Bu makalede *Hüsn ü Aşk'tan* yola çıkan iki tiyatro oyununun Galip'in mesnevisi ile nasıl bir alışverişe girdiği *Palimpsests'in* kılavuzluğunda tartışılacaktır.

Turan Oflazoğlu'nun *Güzellik ile Aşk* başlıklı manzum radyo oyunu *Hüsn ü Aşk*'ın olay örgüsünü takip eden, mesneviye oldukça sadık kalarak yazılmış ancak yine de hacim olarak yirmide bir oranında azaltılmış bir eserdir. Kenan Işık'ın *Aşk hastası* ise bir yandan *Hüsn ü Aşk'tan* yararlanmış, diğer yandan şairin diğer şiirlerinden ve hayat hikayesinden de ilham almıştır. Eser zamansal olarak günümüzde geçse de oyun içinde oyun tekniği ile Şeyh Galip'in zamanına da gidilir.

Oflazoğlu ile Işık'ın eserlerini birlikte değerlendirdiğimizde her iki yazarın da Şeyh Galip'in eserindeki gerek uhrevi gerek dünyevi şekilde okunabilecek aşk hikayesinden yola çıktığını, şekilsel değişiklikler dışında kaynak metin ile önemli kavram ortaklıklarına gittiklerini ancak bunları günümüz insanının ilgisini çekecek şekilde uyarladıklarını görürüz. Her iki eser de çeşitli okumalara açıktır ancak nasıl okunursa okunsunlar -tasavvufi, Nietzsche'nin üst insan kavramı rehberliğinde ya da Bergson'un sezgicilik kuramı eşliğinde- tıpkı *Hüsn ü Aşk* gibi insanın olgunlaşma serüvenini anlatmaktadırlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Metinlerarasılık, *Palimpsests*, *Hüsn ü Aşk*, *Güzellik ile Aşk*, *Aşk hastası*.

Today it is taken for granted that every text produced exists in a state of interaction with every text that was written before it. Theorists such as Bakhtin, Barthes and Kristeva point out that every new text that is produced enters into an intertextual relationship with those that came before it. Jean Genette in his work *Palimpsests*, however, deals with the 'sunnier' side of intertextuality dubbed 'hypertextuality'. (1977, p. 9) Genette explains that, in using the term 'hypertextuality', his intent is to refer to any and all types of relationship which exist between a text B, which he calls the 'hypertext', and a previously written text A, which he identifies as the 'hypotext'. The so-called 'sunny side' is the relatively holistic and official relationship between the two texts. Genette, who conducted detailed investigations into the difference which can arise when a text is rewritten, examined a large number of formal and contextual elements that could prove useful during the analysis of the hypertext. This article will use Genette's work as a guideline to examine one of the most important works of Classical Turkish poetry, *Hüsn ü Aşk*, and two hypertexts which enter into a 'relatively holistic and official' relationship with it.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



Hüsn ü Aşk, written in 1197/1782-83 by Şeyh¹ Galip (whose original name was Mehmet Esat) constitutes an interesting text from the point of view of the elements highlighted by Genette's *Palimpsests*. For a poet who claims that the universally beloved *Hayrabad* of Nabi is stolen, Şeyh Galip in endeavoring to write an original masnavi (and, in many ways, ultimately succeeding in doing so) did not shy away from openly admitting that he made use of previously written works: ² “[while writing *Hüsn ü Aşk*] I took the secrets of [Rumi's] *Masnavi*. Yes, I stole; but what I stole was public property.”³ (2002, p. 407)

On the other hand, compelled by the fact that Şeyh Galip's language is something of a foreign language to the reader of modern Turkish, various academics have translated *Hüsn ü Aşk* first from Arabic letters into Latin, then into Modern Turkish – generally as prose.⁴ One notable exception is Victoria Holbrook, who chose the hard way out and rendered her English translation of the text in verse.⁵

However, as stated above the purpose of this article is neither to research the intertextuality of Galip's text, nor to concentrate on its intralingual or English translations. Here we will examine two works in their context as a resetting of the original text, making reference to the particular concepts mentioned above where necessary: Turan Oflazoğlu's *Güzellik ile Aşk* (literally *Beauty and Love*; the title is a modern Turkish translation of the Ottoman *Hüsn ü Aşk*) and Kenan Işık's *Aşk hastası* (*Lovesick*). *Güzellik ile Aşk* was written in 1970 as a radio show for Turkish Radio and Television's radio drama generation (Coşkun, 2011, p. 35) and published as a book in 1986, while *Aşk hastası* is currently still being performed in theatres.⁶

¹ When writing the name of Şeyh Galip, we have chosen to remain faithful to the modern Turkish spelling, whereas the word 'sheikh' as a title is written in standard English Romanization.

² In addition to theoretical terms originating in the West, such as 'parody', 'pastiche', and 'travesty', the Ottoman Turkish term *nezire* has bearing upon discussions of the ways in which a text is rewritten. In the Ottoman Empire, masnavi inspired by Arab and Persian literature, as well as other works produced as rewritings of those masnavi with the goal of paying respects to master poets (and perhaps showing off a bit) are examples of this. The classic definition of the *nezire* tradition is the attempt “of a poet to produce a work, similar to that of another poet whom he likes and admires, with the same meter and rhyme scheme as the poem he likes”. However, among the various studies which have been conducted on the topic, Fatih Köksal's expanded definition will prove most important for the purposes of this study. Köksal notes that works “whose 'style' is similar, even if their meter, topic, and organization are different” are also considered *nezire*. (2003, p. 216) This definition of the term overlaps with the terms intertextuality and resetting mentioned by Genette.

³ As we shall see below, there are a number of different studies on the Latin-script adaptations of *Hüsn ü Aşk*, which was originally written in the Arabic script. The edition used for this article is that prepared by Muhammet Nur Doğan, who first converted the work to Latin characters then translated it into modern Turkish prose. For those interested in the original text, in addition to a comparison of the language of the works, this article will provide examples in English with the Latinized versions original verses from *Hüsn ü Aşk* in the footnotes. The original form of the verse above is: “*Esrârını Mesnevi'den aldım/Çaldım velî mîrî malı çaldım.*” (Galip, 2002, p. 406)

⁴ Among those who have produced prosifications of *Hüsn ü Aşk* in this way are Ahmet Necdet, Vasfî Mahir Kocatürk, Orhan Okay, Hüseyin Ayan, and Muhammet Nur Doğan.

⁵ In the foreword to her translation of the masnavi, titled *Beauty and Love*, Holbrook provides the reader with information regarding the masnavi tradition and Sufism, in addition to making changes while translating the verses themselves that take into account the readers level of knowledge of the subject.

⁶ Of course, one can also find other works which draw inspiration from *Hüsn ü Aşk*. In his article, “Türk edebiyatında ilginç bir eser: Manzum *Hüsn ü Aşk* tiyatrosu” (“An interesting work of Turkish literature: The poetic theatre of *Hüsn ü Aşk*”) Mustafa Erdoğan mentions a short text of the same name written by the last sheikh of the Mevlevi Sufi Lodge in Yenikapı, Abdülkâfi Baykara, as one such example. Baykara (1883-1935) had begun to write his work of poetic theatre in *aruz* meter but very likely, as Erdoğan suggests, was forced to abandon it before delving deeper into the actual subject matter. Indeed, in the first part of Baykara's text, we see Şeyh Galip speaking with Esrar Dede about poetry and the Mevlevi Order, and in the second part we see him conversing with Sultan Selim III. Galip then dedicates his finished work to the Emperor, whom he praises for his institution of the Nizam-ı Cedid ('New Order') reforms and his codification of the Ottoman musical mode 'Suz-i Dilâra' (whereas Selim's name does not appear in *Hüsn ü Aşk*). It is difficult to imagine the text ending in such a way. (2003, pp. 247-258) For more information regarding Şeyh Galip's

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



The texts of both *Güzellik ile Aşk* – described as an “allegorical stage poem” (Ofazoğlu, 2010, p. 310) – and *Aşk hastası* furnish examples of the topics researched in *Palimpsest* in a number of different ways. In his analysis of a resetting of a text, Genette pondered the way in which the style and language of the hypertext could be transformed. He placed particular emphasis on the difference in genre between the hypertext and the hypotext, the changing of the meter of a poetic text, the translation of a poetic text into prose and, vice-versa, the transposition of a prose work into poetry. *Güzellik ile Aşk* is, by its very nature, a poetic translation of an already poetic masnavi, albeit shortened into a radio show and accompanied by music. It does not, however, stay true to the ‘aruz’⁷ meter of *Hüsn ü Aşk*. On the other hand, *Aşk hastası* is a prose stage play which transposes the temporal setting of the work into the present day. In so doing, it goes beyond a resetting of certain parts of *Hüsn ü Aşk* and enters into an intertextual dialogue with a number of other works.

In keeping with the tradition of the masnavi, *Hüsn ü Aşk* begins with a tribute to the Prophet and Rumi, as well as passages explicating the reason for which the work was written. These are then followed by accounts of the stories of Beauty (Hüsn) and Love (Aşk). However, in addition to this Şeyh Galip occasionally delays the development of the plot, sometimes entering into debates on poetry and other times providing couplets in *tardıyya* meter that have nothing to do with the events of the story. When the events of the story come to a conclusion, the poet then takes the opportunity to praise himself. All the same, though the plot contains some important deviations introduced by the poet, in many ways one can say that it is in keeping with the classic masnavi tradition. Beauty and Love are childhood friends. They study at the same school. When they discover that they are in love with one another, a number of obstacles stand in their way. The tribal leaders tell Love that being together with Beauty comes at a price, that everyone wants her, and that all those who wish to be with her must pass a number of tests. Thus, Love sets out with his guardian Struggle (Gayret),⁸ does battle with all manner of supernatural creature and – with the help of Speech (Sühan),⁹ who comes to his aid and shows him the way in times of need – emerges victorious. At the end of his journey is Beauty.

At the same time it is certainly not sufficient to read *Hüsn ü Aşk* as a simple love story. Galip’s work holds an important place in the tradition of Divan literature as one of the most successful examples of Sufi allegorical masnavi. In addition, a number of the changes which the poet made to the text have enabled critics to assess the work from several different vantage points.¹⁰ This article will necessarily touch upon the relationship of the hypertexts to Sufism without, however, entering into a debate regarding allegory.

The most obvious and unavoidable distinction between the hypotext on the one hand and *Aşk hastası* and *Güzellik ile Aşk* on the other is that the language of *Hüsn ü Aşk* has been simplified so as to appeal to the modern observer. Beginning with Ofazoğlu’s work, the rendering of the title

impact on Turkish authors and poets from the era of the Tanzimat reforms until the present, see (Enginün, 2000, pp. 117-136; Ayvazoğlu, 2010, pp. 143-149).

⁷ The term ‘aruz’ refers to a particular system of poetic meter which originated Arabic and Persian, but was particularly popular among poets writing in Turkic languages, such as Turkish.

⁸ The word ‘gayret’ encompasses both the meaning of the English word ‘struggle’ and the effort expended in order to overcome that struggle.

⁹ Here we have preferred the more literal translation of the Persian/Ottoman ‘sühan’ as ‘speech’; alternative (and perhaps more contextually appropriate) English translations will be discussed below.

¹⁰ In “Death of the allegory”, Victoria Holbrook enters into a number of discussions on allegory. Necmettin Türinay’s essay titled “Klasik hikâyenin son merhalesi: Hüsn ü Aşk” (“The last phase of the classic story: *Hüsn ü Aşk*”) speaks of a need to tell a story in addition to writing poetry. (1995, p. 88) In Şerif Aktaş’s “Bir anlayışın romanı: *Hüsn ü Aşk*” (“A novel of an understanding: *Hüsn ü Aşk*”), he posits that the text “is one of the literary genres which meets the need for a novel within our society”. (1995, p. 123)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



of the play as *Güzellik ile Aşk* and the changing of the names of some of its characters are differences evident even upon superficial observation. The name of Beauty is changed from the Arabic-derived *Aşk* to the Turkic *Güzellik*; Speech, the one who shows Beauty and Love the right path, changes from Persian *Sühan* to modern Turkish *Söz*; Beauty's nanny Chastity – Ottoman *İsmet* – becomes the more contemporary *İffet*, and the name of the tribe to which Beauty and Love belong is changed from the Ben-i Muhabbet to the *Sevgioğulları* – Arabic and Turkish, respectively, for 'Sons of Love'. A second noteworthy difference is in the size of the two works. *Güzellik ile Aşk* is only 200 verses long, as opposed to *Hüsn ü Aşk*, which is composed of 2101 couplets. Yet despite this, Oflazoğlu's work follows the storyline of the hypotext from beginning to end. It begins with the members of the Sons of Love tribe, to which Beauty and Love belong, introducing themselves and ends with the two lovers finding one another.¹¹ Oflazoğlu does not engage in any significant discussion of poetry.¹²

Aşk hastası on the other hand tells the story of Mehmet, a member of a modern day theatre troupe who plays the lead role in work about the life of Şeyh Galip, as he struggles to comprehend the meaning of love and life. The young man's girlfriend Dilara has committed suicide in an act that mirrors that of a character in the play that they have been rehearsing. Mehmet cannot comprehend the reason behind this suicide. The young man, who had until that day preferred to act in plays by Western authors, then becomes interested in Şeyh Galip. In a scene with no other actors he begins to act out the play in his mind. The work ends when Mehmet, ignorant of the fact that a fire in a nearby hospital has spread to the theatre building, performs an expert 'sema' (whirling dervish dance) accompanied by the traditional flute (ney) and drum (kudüm). This contrasts with the beginning of the play, when Mehmet was just a neophyte.

There are several different layers within the play. Dilara commits suicide after Mehmet – the hard rock listening, pot smoking, foul-mouthed actor who plays Galip – breaks up with her because he finds her boring. Dilara's death is treated as parallel to the suicide of the Dilara who was gifted to Şeyh Galip as a concubine. Mehmet's girlfriend's suicide appears on stage first. Immediately after this, we see the young man rehearsing on stage. Generally, Mehmet appears alone on stage; however, "a group of intellectuals from the second half of the 1750's" (Işık, 1998, p. 7), five male actors, "Şeyh Galip's male lover who accompanied him on his ascetic pilgrimage to the Mevlevi lodge in Konya" (Işık, 1998, p. 22), Yunus of Sütlüce, Şeyh Galip, and the Ottoman Sultan Selim III are all transported from the actor's mind to the stage. At the same time, the audience does not understand if these people are actual characters portrayed in the play or not. Mehmet, who plays the lead role, at times seems to recite Love's lines by rote; whereas towards the end of the play the actor has internalized what he emotes and, at times, becomes Şeyh Galip himself. The same actress plays Mehmet's lover and Galip's concubine. The rehearsal and real life become so intertwined throughout the course of the play that in the end the work what is being rehearsed becomes Mehmet's life. The parallel nature of the work is reinforced by the fact that Şeyh Galip's real name is generally encountered as Mehmet, and more rarely as Mehmet Esat.

Aşk hastası begins with the disclaimer that: "The author of this play, which recounts the life of Şeyh Galip, has drawn on his work *Hüsn ü Aşk*." (Işık, 1998, p. 7) In fact, the main plotline consists of the quest for self-discovery – assisted by *Hüsn ü Aşk* – of the lead actor in a theatre

¹¹ Without engaging in a Sufi reading of the text, Yunus Ayata interprets the end of the play as suggesting that "love does not end in union, and that those who think that love does end in union will find bewilderment". (2009, p. 270) However, as one of the steps on the road to union with God in Sufism, 'bewilderment' is personified both in *Hüsn ü Aşk* and in *Güzellik ile Aşk*, and it disappears behind the curtain of union along with the two lovers. Victoria Holbrook shares a similar opinion. (1994, p. 149)

¹² Without harming the integrity of the plot line, Oflazoğlu has made partial use of the verses in *tardıyya* meter that lie outside the flow of events, but nevertheless describe the main topic of the text: love.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



troupe that is putting on a play about the poet's life. In this sense, this multilayered play does contain some flashbacks and anticipations; however, it is possible to interpret these as a back-and-forth occurring entirely within the mind of Mehmet as he rehearses the play. At the same time, we witness the suicide of the young man's lover Dilara once at the beginning of the play, then once again at the end when Mehmet is part Şeyh Galip, part Love, and part himself. Furthermore, the fire which breaks out in Mehmet's own time comes to be framed in a different way during the time of Selim III. Thus, one can say that time follows a structure which is simultaneously linear, cyclical, and nested in upon itself.

Unlike Oflazoğlu's work, Kenan Işık's play begins with several discussions of poetry. The First Player, who takes the works of Shakespeare and Euripides as classics, fails to understand *Hüsn ü Aşk* and belittles it, stating that "what we used to call a poem" is dead. The Player understands neither the language of the text, nor the world of imagery. This is in contrast to Mehmet, who – prompted, it would seem, by Dilara's death – strives to find himself and the meaning of life between the verses of Şeyh Galip's poetry. He is at once rehearsing and coming to terms with himself. Though he is alone in the building he begins to act out the section of *Hüsn ü Aşk* on "The explanation of the reason for which this work was written"¹³ (Galip, 2002, p. 53) with a number of other actors who have roles in the play. Just as Galip did, Mehmet – as Şeyh Galip – argues against his friends, who praise the poet Yusuf Nabi's *Hayrabad*.

Later on, the topic turns to the birth of Beauty and Love, and then to the story of how they fell in love. The dialogue between Mehmet and Dilara replicates the verses in *Hüsn ü Aşk* in which Beauty and Love confess their love for one another. Dilara sometimes plays the role of Beauty, whereas her nurse is played by another actress. Later on there is a lengthy retelling of the section titled "How the tribe jeered: 'Oh what a sweet boy!'"¹⁴ (Galip, 2002, p. 251) After these lively and lighthearted scenes, the curtain on the first act closes with a scene in which Mehmet as Galip and his friend Yunus listen to the advice of a Sufi in the dervish lodge to which they have embarked on their ascetic retreat (çile).¹⁵

When the curtain opens on the second act, we see Love's encounter with the Witch on his journey towards maturity. Love escapes the great peril that has befallen him when, upon remembering Beauty, he vanquishes the Witch and reaches the end of his voyage. Love's escape

¹³ "Der Beyân-ı Sebeb-i Telif" (Galip, 2002, p. 54)

¹⁴ "İstihzâ-yı Kabîle Ki Zihî Genc-i Bî-renc" (Galip, 2002, p. 250)

¹⁵ Sedit Yüksel states that Seyh Galip went on his ascetic retreat to the Mevlevi Sufi lodge suddenly and without the permission of his family, and that there were rumors that he left in part "for the 'love and companionship' of his 'male lover' by the name of Yunus Bey". He also relates a number of discussions on this topic. (1980, pp. 11-13.) Kenan Işık has also upheld this rumor, and attempted to conjure up an association with this homosexual relationship during a 'sema' scene by having Galip touch Yunus' sweaty body with his finger, then bring the finger to his mouth. In the play, Yunus chooses to leave the ascetic abode after listening to the Sufi. Furthermore, there are also suggestions of such a relationship between Galip and Selim III. It is said that the Emperor loved the poet very much, and that he once lay at his knee and listened to him recite poetry. (Yüksel, 1980, p. 20) *Aşk hastası* contains a similar scene. In addition, the Emperor gifts Galip with a concubine in order to stem the tide of these rumors. Towards the beginning of the play, one actor also refers to Galip as 'o biçim' – a Turkish phrase equivalent to the word 'so' as used in older British gay parlance. (Işık, 1998, p. 3) Gölpınarlı, on the other hand, references Faik Süleyman: "Galip had a beautiful voice and a penchant for poetry and music. He loved İbrahim Han-zâde Yunus Bey very much. When his father Reşid Efendi understood this he invited him to their house in Sütlüce and, seeing that there were no bad relations between them, praised him by saying that temporary love would prove true love. It was for this reason that Galip went to Konya and took up the mantle of the ascetic." Gölpınarlı says that this story is entirely fabricated. According to Gölpınarlı, it is similarly unlikely that Selim would have lain in Galip's lap and listened to him recite poetry: "According to legends circulated by word of mouth among the Mevlevi Sufis, Selim used to call Galip 'my Cotton Sheikh' on account of the latter's white skin. He would even lay at Galip's knee as they conversed. [...] These are fabrications without the slightest grounding in reality. It is entirely outside the realm of possibility that such a thing would have been seen and gossiped about, as it would have been unthinkable for an emperor to lay at the knee of a sheikh. (1976, pp. 18-20)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



from the Witch and Galip's completion of his period as an ascetic and acceptance into the dervish lodge as a sheikh are presented in parallel. After this the influence of *Hüsn ü Aşk* in the work is much less palpable. It goes on to talk about Selim III and Galip's conversations regarding the state of the people and the Empire, as well as the events that unfold as a result of the gossip that developed around the relationship between the two men. In order to stem the tide of gossip brought about by Galip's close relationship with both the Emperor and his sister Beyhan Sultan, the Emperor gives a concubine by the name of Dilara to Galip and asks him to marry her.¹⁶ However, this second Dilara is in love with another and, like the present-day Dilara, commits suicide. The audience witnesses one more suicide as the present-day Dilara's is shown a second time. She shoots herself in response to Mehmet's actions, in keeping with his line: "Hard rock and a joint are more effective at turning me on than your breasts or thighs." (Işık, 1998, p. 59) The play then ends with the image of Mehmet in the present day performing 'sema' amid the rising flames as the fire engulfs the theatre building.

It is clear from the above that *Aşk hastası* contains a different structure and storyline than either *Hüsn ü Aşk* or *Güzellik ile Aşk*. As a result, it does not lend itself to a direct comparison with the hypotext in terms of storyline. From the point of view of format, however, if we take into account the fact that the verses taken from *Hüsn ü Aşk* are translated into prose, it could be said that Işık's work is an appeal to prosification. Genette states that "[p]rosification must either analyze images and become commentary [...] or else it must find a prose equivalent for the poem by resorting to entirely different means." (1997, p. 224) We see a number of instances of switching between these two options in *Aşk hastası*. In general, the author has attempted to preserve poetic rhythm: "... White as a hart, dark as its inner eye. The sky;¹⁷ the sky of glass in pieces falls like shattered remnants of a sea of ice..."¹⁸ (Işık, 1998, p. 31) At times the author seems successful in his endeavor, though at some points he could not progress without providing a meager summary:

Cupbearer, please give me wine. My sorrow is without remedy as the sea of words is without shore. Aid, cupbearer. I am peddling sorrow in the market of calamity. My words have sold out. My stocks of Woe have run dry. Do not silence the Jesus in my heart. I need coins of words to buy fine woe. Give me wine, oh rose of grace. Give me wine and ask what tale I tell. (Işık, 1998, p. 31)¹⁹

As a result, we are hard-pressed to say that the author's efforts have resulted in a successful prosification. On the other hand, with this work the author must have chosen to target an audience relatively familiar with the poetic meters of Divan literature. Indeed, even if he chose to include

¹⁶ Sedit Yüksel confirms that there were rumors of love between the poet and Beyhan Sultan. He says that "there is not the slightest shred of evidence in historical sources to indicate such a relationship", though on the whole the poems Galip wrote to Beyhan Sultan are significant. (1980, p. 21) Gölpınarlı similarly states that the rumors are baseless, adding that the source of the rumors is likely to be found in the poet's writings in praise of Beyhan Sultan. Despite this, both Kenan Işık in his work discussed here and Turan Oflazoğlu in his *III. Selim kılıç ve ney (Selim III: The sword and the flute)* have made use of this legend.

¹⁷ Here Işık summarizes these two couplets from the *Hüsn ü Aşk*: "The darkness has become a white gazelle / the desert filled camphor wrapped in musk; in other words, the darkness wrapped in snow / is like the pupil of the eye entrapped". The original Ottoman reads as follows: "Ahu-yı sefide döndi deycür/Sahra dolu müşğ içinde kâfur / Bir bakıma berf içinde deycür / Mânend-i sevâd-ı dîde mahsûr" (Galip, 2002, pp. 272-274)

¹⁸ "As if the glassy heavens so filled with ice / shattered and fell in pieces to the ground". Modern Turkish as it appears in Işık: "Beyaz bir ceylan gibi, gözün içindeki gözbebeği gibi karanlık. Gökyüzü; sırçadan gökyüzü bir buz denizi gibi kırılıp dökülmekte parça parça" (Işık, 1998, p. 31) Original: "Buzdan kırılıp sipih-i minâ/Düşdi yere rîze rîze guya." (Galip, 2002, p. 272)

¹⁹ "Saki lütfen şarap ver. Derdimin dermanı söz denizinin kıyısı yoktur. Saki medet. Bela pazarında dert saçıyorum. Sözüm bitti. Gam sermayesi tükendi. Gönümdeki İsa'yı susturma. Gam'ın iyisine müşteri olmam için bana söz akçesi gerek. Bana şarap ver ey letafet gülü. Şarap ver ve neyi hikâye ettiğimi sor." This quotation is a summary of the twelve-couplet section of *Hüsn ü Aşk* (couplets 530-541) "Call to the Cupbearer". (Galip, 2002, pp. 127-129)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



verses from *Hüsn ü Aşk* in his work that were not particularly rich from the point of view of imagery, concepts such as the “market of calamity” and the “stocks of woe” would be lost on the modern reader.

By contrast, as a masnavi transformed into a piece of radio theatre, *Güzellik ile Aşk* is a fitting example of transmodalization – what Genette defines as “any kind of alteration in the mode of presentation characterizing the hypotext”. (1997, p. 277) Here we are dealing with a dramatization, a lengthy poem centered on a dramatic narrative. Genette states that among such transformations one frequently encounters a situation in which there “is the need to compress the duration of the action so as to bring it as close as possible to that of the performance.” (1997, p. 228) As I have demonstrated above, *Güzellik ile Aşk* has undergone precisely such a process. Here the text has been reduced to one twentieth the length of the hypotext. At the same time, the chronological nature of the storyline in *Hüsn ü Aşk* must have made Oflazoğlu’s job much easier. As Genette claims, “... it is quite evident that the temporal flexibility of narrative has no real equivalent on the stage” because, he adds, “... it cannot easily accommodate flashbacks or anticipations, since it is hard to present markers of the past or the future.” (1997, p. 279) In point of fact, we do not encounter any flashbacks or instances of anticipation in *Hüsn ü Aşk*.

Genette describes another aspect that creates some difficulties for these sorts of literary transpositions and forces the author to engage in reduction: “[A]ll speeches are in direct discourse except those reported by one of the characters, who is then placed in the position of a narrator and enjoys the freedom of choice inherent in narrative.” (1997, p. 280) In transforming *Hüsn ü Aşk*, in which the voice of the poet is felt with equal weight to that of the story’s protagonists, the author is unavoidably confronted with this issue. In addition to the stage directions and interactive lines between the actors that necessarily accompany a play, the chorus plays a functional role in terms of overcoming this issue within the work. While Oflazoğlu has his characters recite a portion of the lines that Şeyh Galip had written in the third person, the narrative portions of the hypotext are largely conveyed by the chorus. Composed of the leaders of the tribe, the chorus and the choir master at once serve both to communicate an abbreviated version of the portions of the source text which are recited in the third person and to encourage Love on his path as one of the play’s protagonists. In this context, one might say that it serves to set the scene. By the same token, the chorus is also partially charged with the task of ensuring a pleasurable experience of the text. In addition to his efforts at developing a rhythmic language through the repetition of certain sounds and words, one of the methods which Oflazoğlu employs is to have the choir master recite some lines in pairs: “The earth laughs, the earth laughs”, “the heavens laugh, the heavens laugh.”²⁰ (2010, p. 22) Also noteworthy as an element which maintains the rhythm of the scene is the use of similar sounds at the end of verses, though not adhering to any particular rhyme scheme. Another method employed to enhance theatricality is the addition of lines which do not exist in *Hüsn ü Aşk*. Though he remains largely faithful to the plot of the hypotext, Oflazoğlu has taken measures to enrich a number of scenes. One example of this Beauty and Love’s initial meeting with their teacher, the Mullah of Madness (Çılgınlık Mollası). The scene also introduces an element of comedy by evoking a realistic classroom environment:

MULLAH OF MADNESS:

Your tongues are tied, this much I can see.

You, with the pale face like white roses, what’s your name?

BEAUTY (trembling):

Beauty, sir.

(Whispers, giggles)

²⁰ “Gülüyor toprak, gülüyor toprak”; “gülüyor gökler, gülüyor gökler.” These lines do not appear in *Hüsn ü Aşk*.

MULLAH OF MADNESS (guffawing):
 Hush now, children!
 I want total silence
 When talking about Beauty. Come now, girl,
 Read us something from that book you've got.
 BEAUTY (shyly):
 I don't know how to read yet, sir.
 (Wiseman Madness guffaws, the children laugh.)
 MULLAH OF MADNESS:
 Hush now, children!
 (silence)
 Soon you'll learn to read and to write!
 You there, next to Beauty, state your name!
 Why are you silent? Cat's got your tongue, boy?
 Or have what the dreams said frightened you?
 Alright, alright. You tell me, Beauty,
 What's your friend here's name?
 BEAUTY (tenderly, shyly):
 Love, sir.
 (hushed giggles)
 MULLAH OF MADNESS (guffawing):
 I should have known from how distraught you looked.
 ...” (Oflazoğlu, 2010, pp. 17-18)

It should also be noted that in Oflazoğlu's intralingual translations from *Hüsn ü Aşk*, we can see that he has translated some verses almost word-for-word, that he has attempted to convey the rich world of symbols contained within the hypotext, and that in so doing he has unavoidably made use of some poetic themes from Divan literature.²¹ Indeed, as İnci Enginün says in her article “Turan Oflazoğlu ve Divan şiiri” (“Turan Oflazoğlu and Divan poetry”): “The Divan literature, folk literature, and western literature upon which he draws anticipate a certain level of culture from those who read his works. It is for this reason that those who are unfamiliar with these cultures do not readily enjoy Oflazoğlu's work.” (1991, p. 379) At the same time, as a poet well versed in Divan poetry,²² Oflazoğlu not only created an intralingual translation of the text, but produced a high-quality piece of poetic theatre.²³

²¹ For example: “Your languishing look has set up an ambush for my soul.” (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 21). In order to understand this line, one must know that the eyebrow represents a bow, and the eyelashes arrows.

²² That Oflazoğlu has drawn from *Hüsn ü Aşk* and Divan literature more generally is evident not only in *Güzellik ile Aşk* but in a number of his other works and poems. See (Enginün, 1991, pp. 368-379) and (Coşkun, 2011, pp. 171; 217). In her work on *Turkish literature in the Republican era (Cumhuriyet dönemi Türk edebiyatı)* İnci Enginün places *Güzellik ile Aşk* in the category of symbolic plays, which she defines as plays that “reveal the cruel and the afflicted within a human being and lend themselves to different interpretations”. (2007, p. 232) Enginün identifies Divan poetry as the second major Turkish resource feeding the author's work after folk poetry. She adds that Oflazoğlu integrates the pieces he has taken from the Divan poets with the dramatic structure of the work, and that this is an aspect of the author's style. He relates them “within the entirety of the work, with [his own] delicate touches or tied to the storyline”. (1991, p. 379) Sezai Coşkun, however, says that “[the author] did not think of Divan poetry as the continuation of tradition, such as it was”. He continues: “[W]hen we look at the way in which the Divan poets are fictionalized in his plays, we can see that the author does not take the approach of a revival of the Divan poet, nor does he act with any great concern so as to present the audience with a text from Divan poetry.” (2011, p. 76) If we consider this alongside İnci Enginün's comments, it could be said that the author does not approach the work as a revival of Divan poetry; however, it is clear that in *Güzellik ile Aşk* specifically the author is relating to the audience a text from Divan poetry with his own touches.

²³ We know that *Hüsn ü Aşk* is written with a particular poetic meter, and it follows the *aruz* formula Mef'lü Mefailü Feülün. In contrast, *Güzellik ile Aşk* was penned in free verse. Genette points out that “the transposition of a poem from

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



We can see that the author has employed various methods so as not to lose the interest of the listener, and it is clear that he has used his knowledge of theatre to do so. There is no dearth of action and excitement in Oflazoğlu's work.²⁴ We see, for example, that the author has left out some sections appearing in *Hüsn ü Aşk* which would have impeded the action of the play, such as the poem in praise of the Prophet Muhammed, the section memorializing Rumi, the section in which Şeyh Galip explains why he has written his work, and Love's supplication to God. He devotes only two or three verses each to elements like Beauty and Love's physical beauty, the sword and horse which Love uses during his journey, the garden, and the winter – subjects which Şeyh Galip describes at great length. On the other hand, the author has chosen to include every phase of Love's adventure, albeit with significant truncation. However, though most of these events are conveyed through the actions of the characters in *Hüsn ü Aşk*, in Oflazoğlu's play they are described by the chorus. In this regard, it could be suggested that the choice of a radio play was a more effective vehicle for this work.

In this context, we also observe that the author has attempted to rescue the characters of the masnavi from a descent into flat tropes by imbuing them with human characteristics. In addition to parenthetical stage directions such as 'enraged, hopeless', he supports his characters with a number of lines not appearing in the hypotext. Some interesting examples are the line which Beauty utters in a rage when Bewilderment (Hayret) prevents her from meeting with Love: "I'll burn it down [...]; before I burn to ashes / I'll level this place to the ground!"²⁵ (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 29), or Love's bragging "(ebulliently) Indeed I did!"²⁶ in response to the flattery ("You really washed the floor with those giants!")²⁷ of the character Mindtricks (Akılçelen), who looks exactly like Beauty. (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 64)

Clearly certain parts must be chosen and others weeded out in order to transform a masnavi into a stage play. However, the process of choosing some things and weeding out others is not only limited by concerns regarding length, nor is it a particular requirement of the genre of theatre. Genette points out that a number of features which appear to be stylistic do in fact have an effect on content: "To reduce or augment a text is to produce another text, briefer or longer, which we crudely name reductions and augmentations only in view of their global effect, which is indeed to reduce or augment length – but at the cost of introducing changes that quite evidently affect not only length but also structure and substance." (1997, p. 229)

At this point if we examine those choices which Oflazoğlu has made that have an impact both on content and meaning, we see that he has at times made certain additions to the hypotext or changed the degree of emphasis placed on certain aspects thereof. Even at the very beginning of the text, in the verses in which the choir master is introducing the Sons of Love to the listener, we see this sort of intervention: "... whatever country, whatever era you might live in you will recognize them." (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 12) In this way, Oflazoğlu takes the adventure of *Güzellik ile Aşk* and situates it outside of time and space. In fact, this particular device appears in *Hüsn ü Aşk* as well. The section of *Hüsn ü Aşk* titled "The births of Beauty and Love"²⁸ says that Beauty is no different

one meter to another [...] is no serious challenge". (1997, p. 225.) In any case, Oflazoğlu had no other choice but to change the meter. Since modern Turkish lacks the distinction between long and short vowels, employing Arabo-Persian aruz meter would be nearly impossible – especially in a work of this length.

²⁴ To quote Enginün: "Oflazoğlu is creating a new work, and the genre he has chosen is theatre. In so doing, he has chosen not just narration but events and behaviors that serve to bring [the story] to life before one's very eyes. To this choice, the author must also add his own personal style – for which he is, perhaps, partially indebted to Şeyh Galip." (2000, p. 132.)

²⁵ "yakacağım...; Ben yanıp kül olmadan/ yerle bir edeceğim bu yapıyı!"

²⁶ "(kabarak) kazdım ya!"

²⁷ "O devlerin kökünü kazdım ya!"

²⁸ "Vilâdet-i Hüsn ü Aşk" (Galip, 2002, pp. 76-79)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



from Leyla, Şirin, or Azra, and that Love is no different from Mecnun, Ferhat, or Vamık. In so doing, Şeyh Galip is attempting to convey the idea that the words to which he alludes can be read in a similar fashion, and that the feelings of ethereal and worldly love which they ultimately describe are timeless and without physical boundaries. However, it is important that Oflazoğlu has chosen to emphasize this point at the beginning of the text. In his essay, “Gelenekten Yararlanma Sorunu” (“The Issue with Drawing on Tradition”), he discusses the idea that those who write should not close themselves off to cultures other than their own, saying:

In our era, there is a single human culture developing across the entire globe; therefore, all the artists of the world must embrace the successes of the whole of humanity as a shared legacy; for only then will there be an overarching human consciousness, and only then will a superconsciousness dawn upon our world, awakening human beings to universal citizenship. (2001, p. 136)

In addition to explaining the reasons behind the author’s reliance on intertextualism, this quote can be interpreted as a claim on the part of the author that the whole of tradition – or perhaps more correctly, all works written before his own – would act as his guide. At the same time, the author’s appeal to universality through concepts such as ‘overarching human consciousness’ and ‘superconsciousness’ recall Nietzsche’s ‘overman’. Oflazoğlu believes that the topics discussed in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, which he translated into Turkish, are universal. He says that, in having Zarathustra ask the question “If there is a god, why should it not be me?”, Nietzsche becomes a close relative of the Persian Sufi Mansur al-Hallaj, who was tried and executed for his espousal of a similar sentiment. The philosopher announces that god is dead and replaces him with the overman – that is, a man endowed with god-like attributes. (2001, p. 193)

In his authoritative work titled *A Hunter of the Absolute: A. Turan Oflazoğlu (Bir Mutlak Avcısı A. Turan Oflazoğlu)*, Sezai Coşkun explains that ‘the primary origins of the author’s ideas’ were European and mystic thought more generally and Nietzsche more specifically. He then attempts to analyze the author’s relationship to Sufism in the context of these strains of thought. He states that, as Oflazoğlu’s two favorite poets, “the two big names in Sufi poetry, Yunus Emre and Şeyh Galip [are distinguished] not by their ‘Sufi characteristics’ but by artistic personalities in search of the absolute”. (2011, pp. 75-76) Furthermore, he adds that Oflazoğlu’s works contain “a type of Sufism or mystic elements which go above the Divan poets and beyond primary sources [...] in order to bolster the dramatic aspect of the play”. (2011, p. 76) Coşkun also says that, through the author’s emphasis on the garden of meaning and his occasional use of “Sufi vocabulary”, the metaphysics of *Güzellik ile Aşk* in particular contain “a mystical concept formed under the shadow of an emphasis on the absolute [...] that expands to include Nietzsche’s overman” – something outside the scope of Sufism.

According to Coşkun, Oflazoğlu’s concept of the absolute “has gained an original character with descriptions of its own, wherein the understanding of existence goes beyond Islamic Sufism and the metaphysics of which form under a mystic identity centered on Nietzsche’s idea of the ‘overman’”. (2011, p. 77) In the context of these, *Hüsn ü Aşk* is fictionalized and reproduced based “on the awakening to consciousness and the knowledge and overcoming of existence”. (Coşkun: 2011, p. 385) Coşkun further states that the author “transports the idea of overcoming the ego – a theme which he perceives as universal – from the realm of Sufism to the realm of ‘universal human reality’”. He claims that the play “by way of its layers of discourse and meaning, makes references similar to those in the masnavi”, but that the work as a whole centers on an imagination of existence and in so doing “is not a modern masnavi but a symbolic play”.²⁹ (2011, pp. 148-149)

²⁹ Remember that İnci Enginün places *Güzellik ile Aşk* within the category of symbolic plays. See footnote 22.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



Undoubtedly the work uses Sufi language in some places. It is possible to read the text in different ways on the basis of this language. However, because Oflazoğlu did not write this work as a Sufi treatise, in this analysis we will not read it as such. Given the author's avoidance of the boundary between action and existence and his emphasis on arriving at the truth of unified existence through action we have focused our analysis primarily on this topic. However, were one to set aside the intentions of the author and proceed based on the language of the text, other readings might be possible. (2011, p. 391)

Modern critical theorists follow Barthes in considering in depth the role of the author and the reader in assigning meaning to the text, beginning with the discussion of 'the death of the author'. Umberto Eco suggests that one must "not speculat[e] about the author's intentions but about the text's intentions". However, he does say that we can speak of a situation in which it would be interesting to appeal to the intentions of the empirical author:

There are cases in which the author is still living, the critics have given their interpretations of his text, and it can then be interesting to ask the author how much and to what extent he, as an empirical person, was aware of the manifold interpretations his text supported. At this point the response of the author must not be used in order to validate the interpretations of his text, but to show the discrepancies between the author's intention and the intention of the text. (1992, p. 73)

This passage from Eco points out that the author himself is also not fully aware of his own intentions, and that what is important is the intention of the text as a sort of living organism in and of itself. We cannot know how Coşkun arrived at such a definite conclusion – that is, whether he asked what the intention of the author was or not. However, when we examine the text of *Güzellik ile Aşk* it is clear that Sufi-related elements are not limited to the author's choice of words. Both the hypotext and Oflazoğlu's text are peppered with the sorts of phrases to which Coşkun refers, such as 'excursion of meaning' and 'pool of plenty'. The author naturally does not make the plethora of references to Sufi concepts that Şeyh Galip does. Be that as it may, in a text which has been so redacted every concept borrowed from the hypotext is important, and 'meaning' and 'plenty' are both Sufi terms. The epilogue of the work is the same as that of the hypotext: Speech retreats, and Bewilderment ensures the lovers' union. In Sufism, however, Bewilderment is a stop along the path which a Sufi must take in order to achieve maturity: "Bewilderment is the stop between being passionate about God and being hopeless [...] Bewilderment is a state which befalls the hearts of the truth-seekers and wise men in the presence of God and deep thought [...] In a word, bewilderment is an extreme desire which one feels in opposition to God's power, command, and profound wisdom." (Cebecioğlu, 1997, p. 338) Clearly this concept would hold no meaning for the reader/listener with no knowledge of Sufism. The presence of Bewilderment in the work only means something to those who are familiar with Sufism.³⁰ Of course, it would be absurd to think of *Güzellik ile Aşk* as an entirely Sufi work. However, in limiting the entirety of Oflazoğlu's art to a

³⁰ Moreover, the author's comments on language and literature all lead us in the direction of Sufism. Oflazoğlu ends his essay on "Language and theatre" ("Dil ve tiyatro") with these words: "... It could be said that the stage is the environment in which the *levh-i mahfuz* [the secret book of fate] enters into the light of shared consciousness, where the seen meets the unseen, the known meets the unknown, the natural meets the supernatural, and man meets God ..." (1985, p. 413) Furthermore, it is no coincidence that the author's two favorite poets are the Sufi poets Yunus Emre and Şeyh Galip, and that he appealed to intertextualism involving their works: "I love Şeyh Galip because he is, in Western parlance, a visionary [...] poet [...] I love him because he wrote *Hüsn ü Aşk*, which explains the reality of Sufism in the best, most beautiful language; because he is among the greatest hunters of the absolute." (Oflazoğlu, 2001, p. 274) İnci Enginün also says "... It was no coincidence that he chose *Hüsn ü Aşk*. If we remember Oflazoğlu's other works, we can see the similarity between their protagonists and Love." Enginün comments that "we could even say that this work is an exaltation of the will". (1986, p. 59)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



'hunt for the absolute' and the concept of the 'overman',³¹ Coşkun has neglected to compare the work in question to its hypotext. Furthermore, given that the author employs concepts, such as 'overcoming oneself' and 'absoluteness', which share an intimate relationship with Sufism and mysticism, the position that Sufism exists only in the work's use of language is untenable. Quite the contrary, the language and choice of words exhibited by the text are the foremost clue to its meaning.

Furthermore, the 'idea of action' that Coşkun takes as the basis for interpretation and which the author 'fictionalizes as a path on the road to consciousness' exists in *Hüsn ü Aşk* as well. (Coşkun, 2011, p. 388) The line that Coşkun provides as an example of this – "An action brings to close a thousand thoughts." (2011, p. 389) – is nothing more than a rewritten version of the line "To see a work done yields more results than a thousand thoughts" from *Hüsn ü Aşk*.³² Of course, the fact that Oflazoğlu has decided to adopt the line for his play is important. However, it does not seem appropriate to interpret this as a thought which is particular to the author. At the same time, we must also point out a line added to the work by the author which may vindicate Coşkun in terms of the emphasis he places on action. When Love expresses the hope that his struggle will make that of all other lovers easier, the chorus responds: "Divine Love! His young heart has no idea that / to love is to vanquish those giants; that is, every lover / will vanquish those giants with his own power."³³ (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 59) On the other hand, at the end of the play the author makes this addition to the scene in which the two lovers are united: "[...] let the infinite reign of Beauty begin!"³⁴ (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 70) A simple reading of this line, which does not appear in Şeyh Galip's work, can be interpreted to mean that the reign of woman or – taking into consideration the Sufi references – of mankind upon the world has begun. Read differently, we may arrive at the interpretation to which Coşkun has alluded. In this reading, we can understand the mention of an infinite kingdom as the ultimate beginning of the infinite era of man – overman, perfect man, or otherwise – on earth. Be that as it may, only a few lines earlier just after they are reunited, the writer has proclaimed that Beauty is Love, and Love is Beauty, thereby completing the divine union. Beauty no longer represents man, nor Love God. Indeed, the equation of the reign of Beauty with the reign of man on earth requires knowledge of Sufism.

Though one of the most important differences between the works of Oflazoğlu and Işık is that Oflazoğlu has remained faithful to *Hüsn ü Aşk*, while Işık has merely used it as a vehicle for a number of philosophical debates, the two works also differ in the way they make use of Sufism. Oflazoğlu remains faithful to the hypotext and steers clear of any debate regarding Sufism. In so doing, he opens his work up to interpretations outside the realm of Sufism. Işık's work, on the other hand, has openly commented on a number of topics that fall under the heading of Sufism and the unity of existence. Towards the beginning of the play, Mehmet's line, "I don't know the infinite. I can only sense it. [...] It's impossible from the perspective of a finite being like me for the infinite to exist. [...] That is why I am weak."³⁵ (Işık, 1998, p. 7) and the debate which he launches by bringing up the subject of mortality are reinforced particularly by the Sufi, who often recites lines originally belonging to Speech in *Hüsn ü Aşk*. The Sufi provides Mehmet Esat various ways of 'rescuing man from the prison of the material' so that he might "coalesce with everything living

³¹ "Oflazoğlu's poem [...] expresses the idea that the feeling of love offers the poet the opportunity to exit the state in which he exists and exist in some other way, and that one approaches the lover having obtained the 'absolute' in this way." (Coşkun, 2011, p. 181)

³² "Bin re'ye olur netice bir kâr" (Galip, 2002, p. 243)

³³ "İlahi Aşk! Genç gönlü bir türlü bilmiyor ki/sevmek o devleri yenmektir; yani her seven/o devleri kendi gücüyle yenecektir."

³⁴ "...başlasın Güzellik'in sonsuz saltanatı!"

³⁵ Kenan Işık ties his work and the *Hüsn ü Aşk* together through his use of the word 'failure' (acız). He first provides the second couplet of the masnavi in the original Ottoman, then has Mehmet repeat it in modern Turkish.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



and non-living in the universe; be one with it, belt away with it..." (Işık, 1998, p. 26) He gives the following advice: "If you want to know yourself, look for love... take refuge in the unadulterated friendship of nature, become whole with it. [...] only then will you feel God in your heart." In the context of this statement, if death cannot be thought of as "like unto disappearing" it is not frightening. At the end of the text, Mehmet embraces his own death while performing 'sema'.

At the same time the Sufi's statements alluding to the necessary role that the soul plays in leading man on his quest to rediscovering himself cause Mehmet to question the function of the mind on this journey. Of course, 'the mind as the leader of the body' is important. "Everything that we know we owe to our minds. But sensing comes before and goes beyond knowing. [...] Knowledge [...] does not pass change from person to person [...] whereas feeling is not the same for everyone..." (Işık, 1998, p. 27) As we see here, God and the quality of God whereby knowledge of Him can be reached through intuition – upon which Sufi thought places great emphasis – is presented in the same fashion by Işık. At this point, we might also touch upon the philosophies of Bergson and later Deleuze, which might be summarized as claiming that the path to definite knowledge is not through the mind but through intuition.³⁶

After analyzing the author's contribution of ideas not found in the hypotext for both Işık and Oflazoğlu's works, we can now begin to examine the function of some of the verses in each work which have been selected and copied over from *Hüsn ü Aşk*. At this point brief mention must be made of the originality of *Hüsn ü Aşk*. By arguing that *Hüsn ü Aşk* is innovative not only in its diction but in the storyline which it follows, Necmettin Türinay states that "*Hüsn ü Aşk* is, above all else, a classic story and a novel penned in the style of a masnavi. That is, it is a story or novel before it is a poem!" (Türinay, 1995, p. 89) His most important piece of supporting evidence for this is the fact that Beauty is the one that confesses her love for Love. On the other hand, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı argues that:

"... [I]n *Hüsn ü Aşk*, however, the avoidance of imitation is a particular goal for Galip, and he starts on the path towards his goal first and foremost by making Beauty a girl and Love a boy. Be that as it may, his upbringing, his knowledge, the times in which he lived, and tradition would have made it impossible for him to write a novel; by no means would this have been possible. Any masnavi he wrote would still conform to the techniques and aesthetic of Divan literature." (1976, pp. 35-36)

Indeed, traditionally in all previous masnavis within the Divan literary culture, the man falls in love with the woman and confesses his love; whereas in *Hüsn ü Aşk* it is Beauty who first confesses her love. This situation seems strange to Speech, who is wise in the ways of the masnavi:

I could scarcely believe how Beauty became a slave to Love's countenance. [...] The path of her thoughts was blocked off, as if her mind had stopped. Could a flame burn up and disappear in the fire of a moth? [...] It was customary within the tribe for young lads to show their interest for beautiful girls [...] Thus was the way of this land; such a thing had never happened, nor had anyone ever heard of it happening. [...] Speech understood that these two

³⁶ "...Bergson's intuition, which emerges as the struggle to obtain that which is absolute, is called internal knowledge or perception..." (Gündoğan, 2010, p. 88) Gündoğan's use of the concept of the 'absolute' recalls the term 'hunter of the absolute', which Oflazoğlu uses for Şeyh Galip. At the same time, we must also keep in mind Bergson's thoughts on mysticism: "Bergson thinks that the God revealed by mysticism is very much nearer to the living and communicating God of ordinary thought than is the abstract and changeless God of the philosophers ..." (Lacey, 1989, p. 215). As we see here, the primacy of intuition in the intuition-intelligence hierarchy is a common point between mysticism, Sufism, and Bergson's theory of intuitionism – all of which are immensely intricate concepts. For Bergson, see: *An Introduction to Metaphysics*; for Deleuze, see: *Bergsonisme*.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



miscreants had invented some other way; he took pity on Beauty and protected her, called her to a private place and talked with her.” (Galip, 2002, pp. 180-182)

Speech finds her behavior strange but does not judge her for it. He thinks that the youths have created a new way and assists Beauty. He delivers the letter the young girl has written to Love and ensures that Love falls madly in love with her. By contrast, Beauty’s nursemaid Chastity upon learning of the situation flies into a panic and begins to counsel the girl: “Don’t wail so loud; don’t throw your virtue and modesty to the wind”³⁷ (Galip, 2002, p. 212) “... He won’t like this idea much either; you’ll be the wanter and he the wanted!”³⁸ ... “Want him if you must but hold your tongue; you’re a girl, show some restraint!”³⁹ Beauty, on the other hand, cares about neither virtue nor modesty. The only thing she cares about is “the risk of her lover losing his happiness”. (Galip, 2002, p. 218) It is for this reason the Beauty decides to feign disinterest.

In Oflazoğlu’s work, on the other hand, the scene in which Speech realizes that Beauty is in loves is explained differently: “It’s just, this situation seems a bit off to me. / Beauty has become a slave to Love’s face, / I can’t even believe it. / They’ve taken a wrong path, they have; / that’s why the lad’s not having any of it / while the girl’s burning up inside. Poor thing!”⁴⁰ (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 26.) Here the author has clearly used the words of Speech from *Hüsn ü Aşk* as a point of departure, but in having him comment to himself the author has placed the emphasis on a number of other factors. The line “they’ve taken a wrong path” and the exclamation “poor thing”, which do not appear in the hypotext, are two striking examples. While it is true that Speech in *Hüsn ü Aşk* has, of course, directed the youths to conduct their love within the framework of their tribe’s customs, he has not said that they have done anything wrong.

Oflazoğlu has also taken Chastity’s recommendations regarding this topic from entirely from the text: “Don’t let go of your virtue, your sense of shame. / Hold your tongue, don’t give up your secret; ...” (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 37), “But, my pet, is it appropriate / for you to be the wanter and he the wanted?” ... “Know this: / Love will be angry that you’re burning up inside.”⁴¹ (Oflazoğlu, 2010, p. 34) Furthermore, the author has chosen to take one of the few passages in *Hüsn ü Aşk* regarding womanhood and use it in *Güzellik ile Aşk*: “What could I do? However many swords a woman may brandish / the lyre of her efforts will always be out of tune.”⁴²

We encounter a similar choice in *Aşk hastası*. In order to assist in incorporating scenes from the life of the author, Kenan Işık has similarly borrowed in a more limited fashion the passage regarding Beauty’s decision to hide her love and resort to coyness: “1st actress: [...] but he’s not pleased with you being the wanter and he the wanted. You’re a girl. Do yourself a favor and show some restraint. Don’t mention your secret.” (Işık, 1998, p. 16) At the same time, the only adventure from *Hüsn ü Aşk*’s more than seven-hundred verse-long description of Love and Beauty’s journey to find one another that is used *Aşk hastası* is limited to their winter-time encounter with the Witch. Furthermore, the Witch only has two lines. In light of this, Işık’s choice is particularly striking.

On a related note, it is interesting that Holbrook, in her translation of the masnavi into English, has chosen to render the name of Speech (Ottoman *Sühan*) – the one who comes to Love and Beauty’s aid at every step along their journey to find one another – as ‘Poetry’. Indeed, while

³⁷ “Efgânını eyleme ziyâde / Nâmus u hayâyı verme bâda” (Galip, 2002, p. 212)

³⁸ “Gelmez ana da bu kâr mahbub / Sen tâlib olup ol ola matlub” (Galip, 2002, p. 218)

³⁹ “Hâhiş-ger isen de bî-zebân ol / Kızın kerem eyle sen girân ol” (Galip, 2002, 218)

⁴⁰ “Yalnız, durum bana biraz çarpık görünüyor./Aşk’ın yüzüne kul olmuş Güzellp. ik./buna bir türlü inanamıyorum. Yanlış bir yol tutmuş bunlar;/Bu yüzden delikanlı hiç oralı olmuyor/kız yanıp tutuşurken. Yazık!”

⁴¹ “İğzâb oluyor figândan ol mâh / Çeşmi kararır ger eylesen âh” (Galip, 2002, p. 220); “That moon faced one (Aşk), grows angry at your wails. / Should you sigh so, his eyes will shut to you”

⁴² “Zen her ne kadar ki tiğ-zendir/Saz-ı emeli bozuk düzendir” (Galip, 2002, p. 190)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



listing the names of those who came before him whom he considers to be real poets, Şeyh Galip also uses the word 'sühan' to mean 'poetry':

Ferdowsi, and Khosrow, and Nizami
Have found the exalted name of poetry⁴³ (Galip, 2002, p. 176)

and elsewhere:

Now naught remains of works of poetry
There is no king of poetry but me⁴⁴ (Galip, 2002, p. 406)

If we examine the content of the text, it is clear that Speech is a wise man who always tells Love the truth. When we consider Holbrook's use of the word 'poetry' for 'sühan', as well as Şeyh Galip's claims to novelty in the realm of poetry, we might say that Speech acts as the voice of the poet. The fact that he finds Beauty's actions strange without disparaging them and, on the contrary, assists Beauty (even if he does so only so that she stays within the realm of societal norms) could be seen as an indication that he does not have a particularly negative view of those who would challenge this tradition. Be that as it may, Oflazoğlu and Işık were both insistent that virtue, modesty, and shame are traits particular to women. Oflazoğlu had no qualms about including the verse which states that what the woman is doing is wrong, in contrast to all the other verses which he has chosen to leave out. In the end, one might claim that Oflazoğlu and Işık specifically and contemporary society more generally do not depart from tradition and its view on women, whereas Şeyh Galip displays a bravery and openness to new ideas not only in his writing of poetry but in his contribution of novel commentaries on the customs of his time.

In *Aşk hastası*, the scenes containing Selim III also project upon the audience the problems of a great empire in decline through just such a dominant male discourse. The Emperor condemns the lavishness of Istanbul's rich when there is not much money left in the treasury. He touches upon the Janissary revolts, the establishment of a new army, and the French Revolution. Of particular note are the words spoken by Melling, who painted the Emperor's portrait, to the effect that the French Revolution had rocked Europe. The Ottoman Empire had begun this new era, but had satisfied itself with conquest. These words anger Selim: "But Europe didn't stop at conquering; it colonized!" (Işık, 1998, p. 43) Here Işık adopts the cliché position that the Ottomans had never been colonizers, summarizing the situation thusly: "Europe made the lands it seized its mistress, whereas we were betrothed to it. Now our betrothed is betraying us." (Işık, 1998, p. 44)

In addition to *Hüsn ü Aşk*, Kenan Işık also employs some lines from Galip's *Divan* (collection of poems) and goes one step further in quoting a number of derisory poems about the author written in his own time. After journeying through *Hüsn ü Aşk*, Şeyh Galip's other poems, and biographic information/gossip regarding the Şeyh Galip, the play ends with a line in *tardiyıya* meter from Şeyh Galip's *Divan*: "The candle of the soul hath such a flame / the bell jar of the heavens cannot contain" (Şeyh Galip, 1994, p. 216) Mehmet pronounces these words in modern Turkish before beginning his 'sema', and this is the last line of the play: "The soul's candle has a flame so bright that even if we put it under that bell jar we call the sky..." (Işık, 1998, p. 61) This verse refers simultaneously to the fact that Mehmet – who interprets his death as a reunion, as unity with the infinite⁴⁵ – is physically incapable of escaping from the fire, and to Şeyh Galip's idea of

⁴³ "Bulmuş sühan-ı bülent-nâmı / Firdevsi vü Hüsn ü Nizami" (Galip, 2002, p. 176)

⁴⁴ "İn dem ki zi şâirî eser nîst / Sultan-ı sühan menem diğêr nîst" (Galip, 2002, p. 406) However much Doğan may prefer to render the word *sühan* as modern Turkish 'söz' (speech), it is clear in these couplets that what Şeyh Galip means is that he is the sultan of poetry, not speech.

⁴⁵ "Death, for me, is a reuniting. A motly revelry with the earth, with the seeds, with the flowers, with the reeds. It carries our finite existence into the infinite [...] I cannot know the infinite, but I can sense it. I can identify with it, too; because I am a part of the infinite. Of nature, of the universe..." (Işık, 1998, p. 60)

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



the ‘burning’ of the divine grace that the Sufi reaches upon achieving spiritual maturity. Mehmet’s mastery of the ‘sema’ is an indication of this maturity.

Another work upon which Işık has drawn is the *Amak-ı Hayal (The Depths of the Dream)*. One of the lead roles in this Sufi work, written by Şehbenderzâde Ahmet Hilmi of Plovdiv, is Aynalı Baba (the Mirrored Father). The character of the Sufi, who plays a role in Mehmet’s journey towards maturity, is likewise described as “one whose abnormality was apparent from his strange clothing [...] the skullcap on his head decorated with tens of pieces of broken mirror glued onto it [...] Maybe he is the Aynalı Baba of legend, maybe al-Hallaj...”. (Işık, 1998, p. 23) The work contains a number of names, from Socrates to Rumi and from Shakespeare to Hallaj al-Mansur, some of which have nothing to do with Sufism. Here we see that the theme of universality in Oflazoğlu’s work, which we discussed earlier, is repeated. Noting that most of these characters were anarchists and were killed because of this fact, the Sufi speaks of the development of mankind as indebted to these rebellions: “Remember also that only the person who rebels can reach this universal dimension [...] can more correctly perceive his own existence.”⁴⁶ (Işık, 1998, p. 25)

Now, if we attempt to analyze the reasons for Kenan Işık’s appeal to this extensive intertextuality, we must make mention of the author’s admiration for Şeyh Galip’s poetry and, perhaps, his personality. As I touched upon previously, Işık’s work talks not only of *Hüsn ü Aşk* but of the poet’s other works as well. Furthermore, it portrays Galip as a proud poet but a humble sheikh and human being.⁴⁷ The theme of the timelessness and physical boundlessness of love, both worldly and ethereal, that exists in *Hüsn ü Aşk* assists Kenan Işık in building these relationships within the text. Tracing the steps of modern man’s attempt at integration and being himself back to Sufism, the author sees nothing objectionable in bringing together the emotional turmoil of a young man living at the end of the 20th century and the events and discourse of a hundred and fifty years prior. In his work, Işık deals with the nature of the poet, with love, and with maturity; he has come to the conclusion that poetry cannot be thought of as separate from love, and that love, the problems that love causes, and thinking about love are what lead a human being to maturity – even if the cost of maturity is death.

When we examine Oflazoğlu and Işık’s works together we see that both authors have taken as their starting point the love story in Şeyh Galip’s work, which can be read as both ethereal and worldly. Despite some differences in form, both works have conceptual points in common with their hypotexts while at the same time adapting them so as to appeal to the modern reader. As a result, no matter how one reads the two works – whether from the point of view of Sufism, of Nietzsche’s concept of the overman, or of Bergson’s theory of intuitionism – each one tell the same story of man’s adventure towards maturity as *Hüsn ü Aşk*.

REFERENCES

- AYATA, Y. (2009). *Turan Oflazoğlu’nun oyunları*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- AKTAŞ, Ş. (1995). Bir anlayışın romanı: *Hüsn ü Aşk*. In Beşir Ayvazoğlu (Ed), *Şeyh Galib kitabı* (pp. 123-130). İstanbul: Büyük Şehir Belediyesi Atatürk Kitaplığı.

⁴⁶ Işık continues: “The poet who rebels against the established aesthetic, he is a good poet. The believer who rebels against mysticism comes closer to God”. As our primary topic is not Sufism and/or mysticism we will not delve deeper into the second sentence here. Kenan Işık added to the play a number of small anecdotes probably taken from Sufi texts; however, since these have nothing to do with *Hüsn ü Aşk* they have not been traced back to their origins.

⁴⁷ At the start of the play, the First Player uses the expression “... the man is ‘so’, but if you ask our director he’s a genius...” [Işık, 1998, p. 3]. In later sections of the text, references are made to the poet’s homosexual relations with both the Emperor and Yunus. Mehmet, on the other hand, goes on to say that his homosexuality does not prevent him from being a genius.

- AYVAZOĞLU, B. (1995). Yaşayan Şeyh Galip. In Beşir Ayvazoğlu (Ed.), *Şeyh Galib kitabı* (pp. 143-149) İstanbul: Büyük Şehir Belediyesi Atatürk Kitaplığı.
- BERGSON, H. (1999). *An introduction to metaphysics*. Trans. T.E. Hulme. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub.
- CEBECIOĞLU, E. (1997). *Tasavvuf terimleri ve deyimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Rehber Yayınları.
- COŞKUN, S. (2011). *Bir mutlak avcısı*. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları.
- DELEUZE, G. (1991). *Bergsonism*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson. Barbara Habberiam. New York: Zone Books.
- ENGİNÜN, İ. (1987). Güzellik ve aşk. *Milli Kültür*, 56, 59.
- ENGİNÜN, İ. (2000). Şeyh Galip'in bugüne tesiri. In *Araştırmalar ve belgeler* (pp. 117-136). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- ENGİNÜN, İ. (1991). Turan Oflazoğlu ve Divan şiiri. In *Yeni Türk edebiyatı araştırmaları* (368-379). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- ERDOĞAN, M. (2003). Türk edebiyatında ilginç bir eser: Manzum *Hüsn ü Aşk* Tiyatrosu. *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi*, 28, 247-258.
- GALİP. (2002). *Hüsn ü Aşk*. Ed. Muhammet Nur Doğan. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- GALİP. (1992). *Hüsn ü Aşk*. Ed. Orhan Okay, Hüseyin Ayan. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- GENETTE, G. (1997). *Palimpsests*, trans. Channa Newman, Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- GÖLPINARLI, A. (1976). *Şeyh Galib seçmeler ve Hüsn ü Aşk*, İstanbul: Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı Yayınları.
- GÜNDOĞAN, A.O. (2010). *Bergson*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- HOLBROOK, V.R. (2005). *Beauty and Love. Translated from the Ottoman Turkish with an introduction and key*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- IŞIK, Y.K. (1998). *Aşk hastası*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- İPEKTEN, H. (1991). *Şeyh Galib*. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- KÖKSAL, F. (2003). Nazire kavramı ve klâsik Türk şiirinde nazire yazıcılığı. In M. F. Köksal & A. N. Baykoca, (Eds.) *Diriözler Armağanı* (pp. 215-290). Ankara: Bizim Büro.
- LACEY, A.R. *Bergson*. (1989). London and New York: Routledge.
- OFLAZOĞLU, A.T. (1994). *III. Selim kılıç ve ney*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı.
- OFLAZOĞLU, A.T. (1985). Dil ve tiyatro. *Türk Dili Dergisi*, 408, 407-413.
- OFLAZOĞLU, A. T. (2010). *Güzellik ile Aşk*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- OFLAZOĞLU, A. T. (2001). *Mutlak avcıları*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- TÜRİNAY, N. (1995). Klasik hikâyenin son zirvesi. In Beşir Ayvazoğlu (Ed.), *Şeyh Galib kitabı* (87-122). İstanbul: Büyük Şehir Belediyesi Atatürk Kitaplığı.
- YÜKSEL, S. (1980). *Şeyh Galip eserlerinin dil ve sanat değeri*. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Citation Information/Kaynakça Bilgisi

GÜRANİ ARSLAN, N., (2015). "From Masnavi To Theatre: Two Stage Plays That Draw Upon Hüsn ü Aşk / Mesneviden Tiyatroya: Hüsn ü Aşk'tan Yararlanan İki Tiyatro Oyunu", *TURKISH STUDIES -International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic-*, ISSN: 1308-2140, (Prof. Dr. Şefik Yaşar Armağanı), Volume 10/12 Summer 2015, ANKARA/TURKEY, www.turkishstudies.net, DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8412>, p. 473-492.

Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015

