

Article history: Received 20 August 2016 Accepted 1 November 2016

Uneven Temporalities of Modernity: The Portrayal of Modernisation in E. M. Forster's Howards End and Füzüzan's 47'liler

Burcu Alkan[‡]

Abstract

Arguably a cultural consequence of the extensive societal transformation that is modernisation, the novel is a literary form that bears witness to, embodies and reveals its extent. Each literary tradition has its own version of the modern novel that seeks to make sense of the complexities of such an immense force. This paper compares two novels, E. M. Forster's Howards End (1910) and Füzüzan's 47'liler (1974, Generation of '47), in order to explore some of the similarities and differences between the English and Turkish literary responses to modernisation. The incentive for such an uncommon comparison comes from the uneven temporalities of the modernisation process in varying geographies that accentuate unique probabilities alongside general patterns. By choosing two temporally disparate novels from cultures that have differing experiences with modernity, it aims to challenge conventional approaches and encourage alternative perspectives in both literary traditions.

Keywords: *Modernity and the Novel; Portraying Modernisation; E. M. Forster's Howards End; Füzüzan's 47'liler*

Introduction

Gripped by globalising forces, many societies of today continue to struggle with the conflicts between the promises of modernity and the concomitant risks of the erosion of value-forming traditions that hold the society together. As those whose lives are destabilised by the demands of the modernisation process reassert tradition in an attempt to regain a sense of normality, these societies are riddled by challenging problems. Therefore, discussing modernity is as relevant as ever for contemporary cultural issues. As the socially normative traditions whiplash against the modernising forces, Jürgen Habermas's assertions on "deep-seated reactions against the process of societal modernization" prevail (1985: 8). Frequent manifestations of clashes within the modernising or so-called modernised societies reveal the "incompleteness of the project of modernity," or rather its lack of closure.

Modernisation is a "juggernaut" as Anthony Giddens describes it in *The Consequences of Modernity*: "it is not an engine made up of integrated machinery, but one in which there is a tensionful, contradictory, push-and-pull of different influences" (1990: 139). Thus, it can lead to both progress and peril, and often

[‡] Dr Burcu Alkan, Bahcesehir University, Istanbul, Turkey. E-mail: burcualkan@yahoo.com.



both at the same time. The tensions of such a dramatic change as modernisation create fault lines within the way the societies adopt or adapt to the modernising forces. These fault lines also pervade the literary representations of modernity, particularly in the novel genre. According to Cyril Black, the novel is a highly suitable form to explore “the infinitely complex problems characteristic of the modern age” (1966: 12) and it could be argued that it stands out as a way of smoothing out the ride of the juggernaut and tackling the strain resulting from it.

This article presents an atypical comparative outlook on the diversity of experiences within modernity and the correspondingly diverse literary representations arising from them. To this end, an unusual pair of works, one from England and one from Turkey has been chosen for comparison: E. M. Forster’s *Howards End* (1910) and Füzuran’s *47’liler* (1974, *Generation of ’47*). Whilst the former work is an epitome of the novelistic representation of modernisation in the English context, the latter underscores the problematic aspects of a systematised modernisation project as they seep into the fault lines of the modern Turkish novel. Accordingly, in their disparities and similarities, these novels provide the literary critic with valuable examples of the minefield of experiences that lies beneath their varied portrayals of the juggernaut that is modernisation.

At first glance the gap between the years in which the two novels were published, 1910 and 1974, seems anomalous. Füzuran’s novel in particular belongs to a period that is not usually discussed in relation to modernity. However, the temporal disparity makes the comparison between the two works all the more crucial. In “Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities,” Patrick Williams argues for “the continued trajectory of modernity and modernisation, with no postmodern break, but rather an intensification or upsurge in the second half of the twentieth century” (2000: 31-33). He also describes such a trajectory in terms of a “combined and uneven development.” Seen from this perspective, a comparative analysis of the said novels of Füzuran and Forster highlights the “particular rhythms” evident in the ways, in which the two different cultures experience modernity. An analysis of those experiences, as depicted in the novels, reveals similarities that reflect some of the elements essential to the notion of modernity. Yet, it also exposes unique case-specific manifestations that are dependent upon the origins and the methods of modernisation integral to each culture within its particular historical circumstances.

English modernity is a societal development, resulting from a specific form of economic transformation in the form of industrialisation and is shaped by scientific and technological advancement. Modernisation in Turkey, however, has been part of a project that was actively employed top-to-bottom by the intellectuals and the state in the late Ottoman era. It particularly increased in momentum, becoming a state policy, after the foundation of the Republic in 1923. The consequences of such a difference in the ways modernity transpires become manifest in literary works. While various modern English novels depict

the contradictory but nevertheless now-typical effects of modernity on the English society, the modern Turkish novels tend to portray the problematic social psychology of modernisation as an actively designed project pervaded by its embedded problems. The ghost of Turkey's history hovers over modern authors like Füzün, influencing their discourses as writers. Accordingly, despite its more blatant political themes, *47'liler* is similar to the many novels written after 1971 in that it is haunted by the birth trauma of the new Republic and the subsequent modernisation project.

Howards End is a portrait of the socio-economic transformation prevalent in England as represented by the intermingling of the lives and lineages of three families: the Schlegels, Wilcoxes, and Basts. The Schlegels; Margaret, Helen and Tibby live in London surrounded by a life of arts, books, and intellectual debates. Their surname reveals their continental European heritage. The Wilcoxes; Henry, Charles, Paul, Evie, and Mrs (Ruth) Wilcox also live in London, engaged in business. They own a home in the countryside as well. This country home, Howards End, technically belongs to Ruth Wilcox who stands somewhat separated from the rest of the Wilcoxes and what they represent. The Basts; Leonard and Jacky are two people brought together by a shared sense of being on the socioeconomic margins, Leonard a minor clerk and Jacky a former prostitute. The lives of these families intermingle through distant relations, coincidences, and random encounters, transforming for all, the life that they had known.

Although Helen's brief romance with Paul creates unease between the Wilcoxes and the Schlegels, the departures of Paul and Helen for their separate ways settle the tension, and Ruth and Margaret become close friends. With Ruth's passing, the friendship between Henry and Margaret evolves into marriage. An impulsive personality, Helen, who meets Leonard at a concert, has a one-night affair with him that leads to her pregnancy and Leonard's accidental death. Charles, the young, assertive representative of the Wilcox family is arrested for causing the death of Leonard, despite the fact that it was due to a heart attack. By the end of the novel, Margaret, Henry, Helen, and her child are depicted at Howards End, having settled down to a quiet life, to which they all seem to submit.

As the Wilcoxes rise in social status with their financial and commercial power, the Schlegels are represented as the intellectual and artistic conscience to counter the moneymaking classes. The differences in the value systems of the two families result from the changes associated with the economic and social modernisation of England. The Basts stand for the lower-middle classes who seek a space for themselves in the changing social structure, for they are at the margins of their class-specific position in a way that an unexpected mishap can easily push them towards destitution. According to the novel's particular humanism, these families from the different classes of the English society need "only connect," as the novel's epigraph suggests.

The connection Forster promotes in *Howards End* becomes manifest in the merging of the various middle classes, as the couplings amongst the three families and their future representatives demonstrate. Margaret's marriage to Henry Wilcox after the death of Mrs Wilcox connects the social middle classes with the commercial middle classes. Helen's illegitimate affair with Leonard Bast links the middle-middle classes with the lower-middle classes. By the end of the novel, when Charles Wilcox faces prosecution, the commercial power of the Wilcoxes is threatened, because he is the leading male figure in the next generation of his family. Yet, Forster already has an alternative in place, answering Lionel Trilling's often quoted question: "Who shall inherit England?" (1965: 118). At the end of the novel, the illegitimate yet very healthy child of Helen Schlegel and Leonard Bast rules the gardens of Howards End where the whole story had begun. Forster thus places the future of England metaphorically in the hands of a robust child with the added ironic implication that the heir is a bastard son, transposing a cultural tradition. An illegitimate versus a legitimate heir for England is a common theme in English literature; however, unlike the earlier works which were influenced by medieval theories of the Chain of Being, in *Howards End* the order is not restored.¹ In a world shaped by the juggernaut of modernity, wherein, as Marx and Engels defines its transforming powers, "all that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned" (1998: 38), a new England with new values awaits a new generation of the Bast, Schlegel and Wilcox families.

Forster's novel thus provides an ironic portrayal of modernity, setting up a map of social relations for the future of England. British law – a truly modern superstructure – separates Charles Wilcox from his rightful place. British colonialism – a key economic provider for British modernity – keeps Paul Wilcox, the second alternative heir, busy overseas away from home. Tibby is out of the question with a surname that signifies his German lineage. The only remaining potential male heir of Howards End, the house that symbolises England, is a child whose illegitimacy enables him to transcend class boundaries. According to Trilling, Forster's perception of class is linked to a liberal humanist morality: "on the one hand class is character, soul and destiny, [...] on the other hand class is not finally determining. [Forster] knows that class can truly be represented only by struggle and contradiction" (1965: 18). Leaving Howards End's future to a child who blurs and crosses class boundaries by his mere existence is the novelist's ironic realisation of a progressive and modern Britain.

47°liler tells the story of a generation of university students, who were born in or around 1947, i.e. the generation of '68, through the perspective of one of them, Emine Kozlu. The members of this generation are brought up with an idealistic vision of the Republic, which includes the progressive modernisation of the society in all walks of life. However, they are disillusioned because of the

¹ For instance, many of William Shakespeare's plays are preoccupied with ideas of legitimacy and inheritance, such as *King Lear*, *The Tempest*, and *Hamlet*.

failure of that idealistic vision in practice. They thus pursue their own path of “revolutionary” social change. Yet, with the 12 March intervention of the military in Turkish politics, they encounter the brutal practices of an oppressive martial regime. The novel gives a dramatic account of how these students were traumatised by the arrests, tortures, and deaths of their friends, along with who they were, where they were coming from and what they were trying to do. Although the political activities of the students appear to be the main theme in the novel, the depictions of their sufferings under state oppression dominate the narrative.

Emine is the second child of the Kozlu family. She has an older sister and a younger brother. Her parents are teachers who are appointed to a small town in eastern Turkey. Presented in a particularly harsh critical light in the novel, they are the representatives of the enlightened, idealist teachers of the new and modernising state that strive for the education of the rural public in a secular and nationalistic vein. Emine’s father, Selâhattin has an indistinct presence in the narrative in contrast to his wife’s domineering characterisation. Emine’s mother, Nüveyre is an ambitious woman who desires to be appointed to the capital and her ambitious nature manifests itself in an elitist condescension toward the locals around her. Emine grows up with the conflicts between the values of the rural Anatolian people and the urban class perceptions of her mother. Nanny Leylim’s fairytales and the kindness of the townsfolk clash with her mother’s superciliousness and discrimination against Nanny Leylim’s granddaughter Kırız, forming the basis for the protagonist’s bitterness and enmity towards her mother and the values she upholds. Shaped by a nostalgic yearning for an idealised Anatolian culture, these negative feelings carry on to Emine’s university years and mark her attitude as a student revolutionary.

Fürüzan’s *47’liler* has been called a “12 March” novel by literary critics, placing it in a class of works that depict the 12 March 1971 military intervention and its aftermath. Therefore, it has been predominantly studied in relation to this theme. Even then, despite the fact that it is considered one of the most substantial novels on the topic, it is also criticised by scholars such as Cemil Meriç and Murat Belge for apparent weaknesses in its representation of the period. Meriç argues that the students of the ’47 generation

speak as if in a delirium. We don’t understand what they are saying. Before them stand malignant and cruel ghosts. The book is not convincing, it is revolting. With each step you sink into a swamp. [...] It’s not a novel, it’s a nightmare. The writer is deepening the chasm, the chasm between person and person. However, she could have made us like the generation of ’47 more. She could have prepared a platform for dialogue between generations.

(47 liler sayıklar gibi konuşuyorlar. Ne söylediklerini anlayamıyoruz. Karşılarında da habis ve kıyıcı hayâletler. Kitap inandırmıyor, isyan ettiriyor. Her adımda bir bataklığa gömülüyorsunuz. [...] Bir roman değil, bir kâbus.

Yazar uęurumu derinleřtiriyor, insanla insan arasındaki uęurumu. Oysa 47 lileri daha ęok sevdirebilirdi bize. Nesiller arasında bir diyalog zemini hazırlayabilirdi.) (1975: 6-8)²

What Merię defines as the nightmarish nature of the novel might well be an inevitable formalistic defect arising from the work's traumatic content. Nevertheless, the lack of a "platform for dialogue" is indeed obvious in the novel. As homage to the youth of the 1960s, the tone of *47'liler* is explicitly sympathetic to the student revolutionaries and this sympathy is heightened by the predominantly negative portrayal of the early Republican generation preceding them. In fact, the representation of the generation of '47 essentially serves to antagonise the early Republican generation and their social project. The intensity of the clashes between the two generations is augmented by the prevalent physical brutality of the military. Accordingly, "the malignant and cruel ghosts" that Merię mentions could be interpreted as the vicious embodiment of modernity in the form of the military as a Repressive State Apparatus, serving a modern, yet highly defensive nation-state.³

Another criticism to the novel comes from a critic, who is himself one of the leftist revolutionaries of the time. Murat Belge takes issue with the depiction of the generation itself. He posits that

The revolutionary people [Füruzan] created have nothing to do with real revolutionaries. [...] The revolutionaries do not digress from the legal framework: either at the level of action or ideology. Their revolutionarism remains as a populism that does not go outside the boundaries of Atatürk's principles. Hence, everything is placed in the discourse of a humanist patriotism with moral roots.

(Yarattığı devrimci kişiler geręek devrimcilerle ilgisi yok. [...] yasal çerçevenin dıřına ęıkıyor, bu romandaki devrimciler de: ne eylem, ne de ideoloji düzeyinde. Devrimcilikleri, Atatürk ilkelerinin dıřına ęıkmayan bir popülizm olarak kalıyor. Dolayısıyla, ahlaki kökenli, hümanist bir yurtseverlik sorunsalı olarak konuyor herşey.) (1998: 123-124)

Belge's criticism reflects his own Marxist stance during the 1960s. However, his main point is not necessarily unique in terms of the representation of the 1968 generation in *47'liler*. In his introduction to Max Horkheimer's *Critical Theory*, Stanley Aronowitz argues that the "underlying basis" of the politics of the "new left of the early 1960s" was "the transformation of the content of the social life while retaining its ideological and institutional forms" (1972: xi). Their

² Translations from Turkish are my own.

³ Louis Althusser asserts that the military is a crucial Repressive State Apparatus that guarantees and protects the reproduction of the status quo where Ideological State Apparatuses fail to do so, in "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (New York: Monthly Review P, 1971), pp. 127-186.

“symbolic politics” was founded on morality rather than Marxism. This view sheds a different light upon the issue raised by Belge. When contextualised within the global 1968 movement, Füzuzan’s revolutionaries seem to fit into a shared attitude as opposed to just bearing a weakness in literary representation.

Still, the present comparative analysis argues that the suggested representational inadequacies in *47’liler* stem from the evident presence of issues regarding modernisation in the discourse of the novel. The perception and the execution of modernity is another very important theme in Füzuzan’s work, but it is overshadowed by its principal theme of the ’68 movement. It can be argued that there are two major traumas haunting the narrative: that of the modernisation project and that of the 1971 intervention. *47’liler* is Füzuzan’s attempt at tackling the latter trauma whilst the former one is also dramatically present, if not more pervasive. This double ordeal both complicates the narrative, which is thus ridden with nightmarish manifestations and strains it, causing defects in the depictions of the generation of ’47. Essentially, in Füzuzan’s work, the “12 March” theme does not only overshadow the problematic modernisation, the problematic modernisation itself does not allow much space for a proper representation of the generation of ’47 either.

In addition to such a highly politicised and mainly negative depiction of modernity, there are other more traditional portrayals of modernisation in *47’liler* that parallel those in *Howards End*. The discussion will therefore continue with the examination of the dynamic and complex nature of modernity as experienced against diverse temporal and spatial backgrounds. It will also identify the ways in which its core elements permeate its varying manifestations regardless of temporal and spatial differences. As such, the analysis challenges the conventional approaches to the dominant theories of literary modernity by including a complicated Turkish perspective, as well as providing an alternative to the limited ways of looking at the Turkish novel, which often maintain thematic generalisations.

Ways of analysing modernity are multifarious, yet, the city-country duality particularly stands out as a site where the clashes within modernity are accentuated. In his work *The Country and the City*, Raymond Williams outlines the dichotomies within the perceptions of the city and the country. He writes:

On the actual settlements, which in the real history have been astonishingly varied, powerful feelings have gathered and have been generalised. On the country has gathered the idea of a natural way of life: of peace, innocence, and simple virtue. On the city has gathered the idea of achieved centre: of learning, communication, light. Powerful hostile associations have also developed: on the city as a place of noise, worldliness and ambition; on the country as a place of backwardness, ignorance, limitation (1993: 1).

The complexities and the contradictions in the perception of the city and the country are reflective of the complexities and the contradictions within the modernisation process itself. Consequently, they shape *Howards End* and *47'11er* equally in their respective cultural contexts.

Whether London, Ankara or Istanbul, the urban centres are depicted in both novels as places where cultural and intellectual wealth accumulate, alongside political and social power. In *Howards End*, the Schlegel house in London is portrayed as a protected sphere where life revolves around concerts, art galleries, and debates. The Schlegels and their social circle care about politics “in their own fashion” and their debates take place on the higher plane of the intellect. They are pursued mainly for the sake of social and intellectual stimulus, not necessarily leading to any practical results. The one and only time when they put theory into practice, which is in the case of Leonard Bast, proves disastrous. The Schlegels bestow a great value upon the high culture of their urban life; hence, Margaret is scandalized when she hears Mrs Wilcox say “there is nothing to get up for in London” (Forster, 1995: 94). For people like Helen and Margaret, the city is rich and exuberant. Mrs Wilcox’s remark is thus an injustice to London and its “autumn exhibitions” and classical concerts. The city is central in the lives of such cultured people as a fertile place for a diverse range of intellectual and artistic experience. It represents civilisation and is the embodiment of an idealised, progressive concept of modernity.

Yet, the attitude of the Schlegel sisters carries an elitist undertone. For example, the narrator announces that Margaret, “[l]ike many others who have lived long in a great capital, [...] had strong feelings about the various railway termini. They are our gates to the glorious and the unknown. Through them we pass out into adventure and sunshine, to them, alas! we return” (Forster, 1995: 16). Passages like this position London as the centre of the world. There are different lives out there. Their existence is acknowledged and they are viewed with a certain degree of curiosity, but in the end, one returns to London, the superior modernity of which is epitomised in “the various railway termini.” Hidden between the lines of Margaret’s pride, there is the loud silence of imperialist ideology with overtones of the industrial revolution, the rapid economic and technological development of the British Empire, and the exploitation of societies that provided the raw materials and labour for the achievement of British imperial wealth and advancement. As Walter Benjamin astutely states, “There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism” (1999: 248). This double-sidedness is as second nature to modernity as its juggernaut quality, underlining both progress and peril at the same time.

In fact, the portrayal of Margaret’s perception of London is reminiscent of the beginning of Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899), a novel appreciated by many as a classic of colonial literature. As the boat Nellie awaits the tide to set sail, the narrator observes that “the old river in its broad reach rested unruffled at the decline of day, after ages of good service done to the race that

peopled its banks, spread out in the tranquil dignity of a waterway leading to the uttermost ends of the earth” (1994: 6). The Thames, which has an almost subliminal presence at the beginning of Conrad’s novel, is also a pivotal element of *Howards End*. In the latter novel, it is consistently reiterated that it flows “inwards from the sea,” towards London. Forster’s positioning of the river in this way makes its role in the novel similar to that of the railway terminals of the English capital, stressing the centrality of the city from an imperialist perspective. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said defines imperialism as being “the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory.” As “the enterprise of empire depends upon the *idea* of *having an empire*” the literature maintains the ideological and ideational dominance of the centre over the periphery (1994: 9-14). The emphasis on the vitality of the Thames and London in *Howards End* thus points to the British imperialist hegemony through a contrast between London and everywhere else.

This sense of London’s centrality manifests itself domestically in the portrayal of Helen at Howards End, the Wilcoxes’ house in the countryside. Her elitist, city-centred view is clear in her first letter to Margaret. Helen observes life at Howards End as an outsider, as if watching a different kind of species being examined at a laboratory. In this context, the difference between life at Wickham Place and life at Howards End, that is, between the urban centre and the rural periphery, stands for the differentiation between two social classes as well. Yet, London is also central to the lives of the burgeoning middle-classes like the Wilcoxes. To borrow Pierre Bourdieu’s terms, Henry Wilcox possesses economic, and to a certain extent social capital in the chief field of power, i.e. London, to the extent that he can feel the world in his grasp.⁴ Rather tellingly, this moment of epiphany also takes place by the Thames: “The world seemed in his grasp as he listened to the River Thames, which still flowed inwards from the sea” (Forster, 1995: 177). For people like Henry Wilcox, London is the centre for commerce, finance, and thus, power. This perspective upon the city, although based on a different angle, still underscores its superstructural centrality in relation to the rural periphery, just as its global centrality predicated upon its difference from the rest of the world.

The viewpoint that London is vital for the survival of the Wilcoxes, who represent the burgeoning middle-classes, is paralleled in *47’liler* in the characterisation of Emine’s mother. Nüveyre is an idealist teacher of the early Republican period. Although her economic well-being is not directly connected to a life in the city, the urban centre still has a crucial relevance to the symbolic and social capital she is trying to accumulate. In one of the most emotionally powerful scenes in *47’liler*, Nüveyre is depicted as being quite upset about her

⁴ Pierre Bourdieu expands economic capital, which maintains financial power in society, towards what he calls social and cultural capital, whereby the former provides a form of power linked with social networks and relationships, and the latter does so through the possession of knowledge and skills, in “The Forms of Capital,” *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), pp. 241-258.

daughter Seçil's friendship with a married man. Her distress due to such a socially unacceptable friendship leads her into an uncontrollable hysterical fit, as she questions her daughter: "Are you not a virgin any more, her mother was shouting; Seçil, have you slept with that man? What would we do if you had! How would we clean up such disgrace! Just when we're expecting our appointment to Ankara" (Yoksa kız değil misin? diye bağırıyordu annesi, yoksa yattın mı Seçil o adamla? O zaman ne yaparız! Bu rezaleti nasıl temizleriz! Tam Ankara'ya naklimizi beklerken...) (Füruzan, 2002: 42). Nüveyre seems to be more concerned about the effect of such a "disgrace" upon their "appointment to Ankara," and hence, their promotion to the state capital, than she is about her daughter's psychological state or her feelings. It is very important for Nüveyre to move to the state capital or send her daughters to study in Istanbul, the city that is also central in the depictions of the generation of '47. As in *Howards End*, in *47'liler* the city emerges as a most desirable place, a centre of learning and social prestige. Nüveyre's worries underline her determination, as she ambitiously climbs up the social ladder.

At the other end of the spectrum, the negative effects of the overtaking expansion of the city and the consequent transformation of the peripheral regions are also presented in both works. The speed of the changes instigated by modernisation and the way the once familiar world is transformed emerge as major disruptions to old balances. Although London occupies the spotlight in the Schlegels' way of living, the disruptions of modernisation are hinted at in the earlier pages of the novel. The new buildings around the Schlegels' "estuary," i.e. the Wickham Place, are described as "lofty promontories" (Forster, 1995: 10). The contrast between the connotations of "estuary" and "promontory" is accentuated by the usage of the adjective "lofty." This contrast invokes the notion of protuberance: the buildings disrupt the cityscape of the "precious London soil." Even though London appears more illuminated and colourful than before with its electric lamp posts, the "stench of the motorcar" and its noisiness represent threats to the old ways of living (1995: 164). London also devours the surrounding areas by its constant expansion. The "satanic" city pushes out its monstrous tentacles and pollutes, deforms, and violates the earth (1995: 145).

There is a similar depiction in Füruzan's work wherein the protagonist points out to her father how dusty and dirty Ankara is and how, seen from the hill, the shanty houses can be viewed in their multitude (Füruzan, 2002: 46). The difference between these two urban expansions is crucial, however. London, which is the English capital, is depicted as expanding from centre to periphery, and thus points to a growth based upon economic progress and financial wealth. As Raymond Williams argues, London's development is "a case of a capital city drawing the character of an economy and society into its extraordinary centre" (1993: 147). The Turkish capital, Ankara, however, is expanding at its perimeter not from within but from outside, with shantytowns being built to accommodate immigration from rural areas. The change in its

urban layout is thus not due to richness but poverty. Such a difference in the depiction of urban expansion in the two novels encapsulates a significant divergence within a superficial similarity. This divergence results from the disparate ways in which modernity originates in the contexts of the novels, particularly along the lines of economic development. The depictions of urbanisation in *Howards End* emphasise the emergence of modernity in correlation with industrialisation and concomitant economic growth, whereas those in *47'liler* draw attention to the lack of the economic base that modernisation would ideally rest upon.

The portrayal of the rural is also complicated in both novels. As John Kolars argues in “The Integration of the Villager into the National Life of Turkey,” Turkish modernisation has always been an urban movement: “The city has led; the country followed” (1973: 182). This element of modernity dominates the intellectual and literary psyche in Turkey and shapes literary representations accordingly. Nüveyre, for instance, with her urbanism in the rural setting, presumes to possess a hierarchical superiority, which results in her elitism. Her presumption is based on, what Deniz Kandiyoti calls the “civilizing mission of the village teacher [...] portrayed as the struggle of science and enlightenment against ignorance and obscurantism” (1997: 122). Her elitist viewpoint overrides her seemingly humanist idealism. When, for example, she hears that her little son has made an “improper offer” to his classmate at school, she expresses her distress in a way that discloses her belittling attitude towards the local setting: “How can it be? How can it be? If our children are to grow up like this on this mountain in Anatolia... Especially the child of the two members of our education army.” (Nasıl olur? Nasıl olur? Anadolu'nun bu dağında bizlerin çocukları da böyle yetişirse... Üstelik eğitim ordumuzun iki görevlisinin çocuğu) (Füruzan, 2002: 14). Her reference to Erzurum as “this mountain in Anatolia” conveys the strong derogative feeling that she nurtures for the town. Her contempt is revealed in the antagonism between her urbanity (enlightenment) and the rural environment (ignorance).

Nüveyre's disdain is contrasted with Emine's admiration of the rural culture. The romantic tone employed in the depictions of the locals of Erzurum discloses the writer's positive attitude towards them. In Emine's dreams of a happy life, their images are definitive, as opposed to those of her own family. Furthermore, an old peasant woman, Nanny Leylim, and her stories provide the protagonist with a rural idealism to counter her mother's elitist patriotism. For the child Emine, the world of stories is embedded in the very geography of Erzurum, which has “a great share of fairytales” with its “merciless winters” (2002: 22). In this sense, Nanny Leylim's tales are highly influential in her character formation. They help her, while under torture, to maintain that the “merciless winters” of her own narrative will end as well. She gains a rustic romantic viewpoint from these stories. They give her a place of refuge, from where she can oppose her mother's modern values and also find the strength to do so. Besides, as a dominant form of folklore in pre-modern societies,

storytelling itself has an antithetical position in relation to the rapid changes catalysed by modernisation. The storytelling of Nanny Leylim in *47'liler* and Emine's regard for it become a sort of resistance to what Walter Benjamin defines as "the secular productive forces of history" removing the "narrative from living speech" as a form of wisdom and counsel (1999: 86).

In *Howards End*, there is an analogous depiction of the perceived superiority of the urban over the rural. In the scene where Charles Wilcox is driving his motorcar on the country roads, a dust cloud arises and becomes a nuisance to him (Forster, 1995: 119). In addition to the obvious conflict between the modern and the pre-modern in the country setting, between the car and the road, the way this scene is depicted also suggests an ironic causal relationship between them. The country road is, indeed, dusty, but it only becomes a nuisance when the motorcar raises the dust. It is the intrusion of the modern that catalyses the disturbance of the pre-modern. Charles's resentment is an indication of deeper clashes, which themselves represent a dialectic ideological struggle, in which a new order is seen to be replacing an older one that is dying out. As modernity is in ascendance, the modern generation takes upon itself the privilege of finding the country backward and dirty.

The Schlegels' view of the countryside, however, is quite different from that of the Wilcoxes. Its depiction carries a rustic romantic tone similar to the one employed in Emine's perception of Erzurum. Margaret in particular sees an ideal, natural and unviolated life in the "backwardness" of the country. As "the mask of the city" falls and "the peace of the country" permeates her, Margaret Schlegel gradually evolves into Mrs Wilcox (1995: 376 & 423). Ironically, later in the novel she herself becomes a second Mrs Wilcox and comes to reside at Howards End, which she technically inherits from her predecessor but does not know it. Margaret herself does not see any irony in this succession. Instead, she continues to perceive modernity as speedily overtaking the world, leading to the disconnection of human beings from each other and from nature.

Although the depictions of Emine and Margaret are analogous in terms of their affinity to the countryside, they differ in their relationships with nature. In the portrait that Forster draws, the countryside has significance in terms of the human nature or the human's relation to nature, whereas in *47'liler* the importance of the country for Emine is social and cultural. It is the honesty, sincerity, and modesty of the rural people that are precious, against the ambitious, worldly, and condescending nature of Nüveyre's kind. This distinction once again results from the different origins of the modernisation process in the two novels. In Turkey, as befits the modernisation project, in which the superstructural elements of modernity are adopted from a non-native material base, its priorities manifest themselves in concomitant superstructural principles. In England, on the other hand, representations of modernity often take the form of an investigation of the human condition in relation to nature in the form of a nature-civilisation conflict.

These differences and similarities in the two novels have a point of intersection: the concept of “home.” *Howards End* is “only a house” for the Wilcoxes, but for the Schlegels, as for the late Mrs Wilcox, it is “home.” It gives Margaret and the rest of her family a sense of security and rootedness. At the end of the novel, *Howards End* is the home, to which the three different families finally move. It thus becomes the place where Forster “connects” his disparate parties. In contrast, the Kozlu family move away from their village house in Erzurum to a newly built flat in the town centre. This abandonment of the old for the new is the crucial breaking point in *47’liler*. It is the traditional village house that gives Emine a sense of security through the warmth of the hearth not the new, modern flat. As the romanticised narration describes it, “the house, which is emptied of people and things, was being purified, making its choice on the side of beauty and engraving itself in the heart of Emine.” (İnsanlardan, eşyalardan boşaltılmış ev onların bırakışıyla arınıyor, geçmişin ayrımını güzelden yana yaparak Emine’nin içine kazılıyordu.) (2002: 374) The Schlegels in *Howards End* experience an analogous disruption when they move from Wickham Place, which is likewise personified: “Houses have their own ways of dying, falling as variously as the generations of men, some with a tragic roar, some quietly, but to an after-life in the city of ghosts while from others – and thus was the death of Wickham Place- the spirit slips before the body perishes” (1995: 345). The fundamental difference in the depiction of the relocation of the two families is clearly manifest in the personification of the houses. Whilst the old, village house in *47’liler* embodies the romantic idealisation of the countryside, the Wickham Place in *Howards End* represents lifelessness. Still, whether it is a new destination or a place that is left behind, in both novels the “home” is the place that is most connected with the country.

While the stripping of the houses from their human content is depicted similarly in both cases, their symbolic references are different. The Schlegels’ life is changing and moving towards a form of unification in *Howards End*. Wickham Place is left to decay, as it is going to be pulled down to make space for a new block of flats. It becomes a ghost of the past, symbolising changing times. The village house Emine leaves behind in *47’liler*, however, continues to live cleansed from its human content, which maintains the novel’s rustic romanticism. Furthermore, unlike the Schlegel sisters, the lives of the Kozlu sisters are destabilized with the move: they will never feel “at home” again. The manifold ruptures in Emine’s life in particular are set off with this move.

A comparative analysis of E. M. Forster’s *Howards End* and Füzuzan’s *47’liler* highlights the influence of the sources of the modernising forces and the manners in which they take form on the viewpoints of the authors and their authorial tones. Forster’s contextual circumstances allow him to suggest to “only connect” as a reasonable response to the changing social structure in England. The same background also allows him to distance himself as a writer from his subject matter and to depict the new social order in an ironic way. In contrast, the tone in *47’liler* is strongly anti-modernisation. The negative

consequences of the top-to-bottom nature of the modernity project in Turkey haunt the novel. The novelist has been forced thereby to engage with the troubling aspects of such a project and the consequent backlash of its forceful application. Heavily influenced by these conditions, her authorial position seems to have made it difficult for her to adopt as tolerant and liberal a viewpoint as Forster.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971). "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses". In: *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Aronowitz, S. (1972). "Introduction". In: M. Horkheimer. *Critical Theory*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Belge, M. (1998). *Edebiyat Üstüne Yazılar*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Benjamin, W. (1999). *Illuminations*. London: Pimlico.
- Black, C. (1966). *Dynamics of Modernization: A Study in Comparative History*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). "The Forms of Capital". In: J. G. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Conrad J. (1994). *Heart of Darkness*. London: Penguin.
- Forster, E. M. (1995). *Howards End*. Bath: The Bath Press.
- Fürüzan. (2002). *47'liler*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (1985). "Modernity – An Incomplete Project". In: H. Foster (ed.) *Postmodern Culture*. London: Pluto Press.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1997). "Gendering the Modern: On Missing Dimensions in the Study of Turkish Modernity". In: S. Bozdoğan and R. Kasaba (eds.) *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Kolars, J. (1973). "The Integration of the Villager into the National Life of Turkey". In: K. Karpat (ed.) *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural Historical Analysis*. Leiden: Brill.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1998). *The Communist Manifesto: A Modern Edition*. London: Verso.
- Meriç, C. (1975). "47liler yahut bir Romanın Düşündürdükleri". *Hisar*, 138: 6-8.
- Said, E. W. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Trilling, L. (1965). *E. M. Forster*. New York: New Directions Books.
- Williams, P. (2000). "'Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities': Theorising Modernism and Empire". In: Booth, H. J. and Rigby, N. (eds.) *Modernism and Empire*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Williams, R. (1993). *The Country and The City*. London: The Hogarth Press.