

READING AN ARMENO-TURKISH NOVEL AS ANOTHER PHENOMENON: A NARRATOLOGICAL APPROACH TO *BİR SEFİL ZEYCE* BY HOYSEP MARUŞ (1868)¹

ARİF TAPAN (ariftapan@gmail.com)

INTRODUCTION

This paper examines an Armeno-Turkish² novel, *Bir Sefil Zevce* (Պիղ Սէփիլ Չէվճէ [A Miserable Wife]),³ authored by Hovsep Maruş. It studies the novel as a literary text in itself and analyzes it in view of especially two main narratological elements: narrator⁴ and focalization⁵, and time and space. Such an analysis may help for a better literary understanding of the novel and for determining its place among 19th C. Armeno-Turkish novels. Besides, this paper may increase awareness and visibility of Armeno-Turkish novels in literary theory studies, since these are, above all, literary texts in their own right.

A reason why this author chose to deal with *Bir Sefil Zevce*, the third published novel of modern⁶ Ottoman literature, is that it has not been subjected

¹ This article is derived from my unpublished MA thesis, “Reading Armeno-Turkish Novels Narratologically in the Context of the Nineteenth-Century Modern Ottoman Novel: *Akabi Hikayesi* and *Bir Sefil Zevce*,” Istanbul Şehir University, 2018.

² Turkish texts written with the Armenian alphabet.

³ Hovsep Maruş, *Bir Sefil Zevce*, Asitane, H. Mühendisyan Tabhanesi, 1868.

⁴ The term “narrator” refers to the narrative voice that does not belong to the author in a story (Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1997, p. 18).

⁵ Focalization is “a term coined by Genette (1972)” as a replacement for ‘perspective’ and ‘point of view’.” However, Genette’s formulation is slightly different from these traditional concepts (Burkhard Niederhoff, “Focalization”, in Peter Hühn et al. (eds.), *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, Hamburg, Hamburg University; <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/focalization> [view date: 5 June 2020]).

⁶ By “modern,” I mean the “Western-style” fictional, polyphonic, multi-layered, long literary texts that first emerged after the first half of the nineteenth century in the Ottoman Empire. Turkish literary historiographies point to Şemsettin Sami (Frashëri)’s *Taaşuk-ı Tâl’at ve Fitnat* (1872) and Namik Kemal’s *İntibah: Sergüzeşt-i Ali Bey* (1873-76) regarding the first local-modern novels in Ottoman-Turkish. However, some literary texts, which are pre-modern or in which traditionality and modernity are intertwined, should also be taken into consideration regarding the modern Ottoman-Turkish novel, such as *Hançerli Hanim Hikâye-i Garibesi* (1851), Aziz Efendi’s *Muhayyelât* (1852), Ahmet Mithat’s *Letâif-i Rivayat* (1870-71), or Emin Nihat’s *Musameretnâme* (1871-75).

to a purely narratological reading so far, even though it is one of the most-studied texts of 19th C. Armeno-Turkish novels.⁷ Another reason is that it has always been assessed in the framework of 19th C. *Tanzimat*-period novels. However, does it have to be read only in its historical, political, and sociological context? How fair is it to assess a literary text only as a tool for the ultimate purposes of its author? Would it not be better to consider such texts *per se* before seeking a secondary and tertiary meaning between the lines of the novels?

SOME PERCEPTIONS OF THE TANZIMAT NOVELS

It is not wrong to call 19th C. Ottoman-Turkish novels “*Tanzimat* novels” or “*Tanzimat*-period novels” since the first “modern,” “original” Turkish novels appeared during the *Tanzimat* period, which started after 1839. These novels display some similarities, like the prevalence of similar conflicts, the intermingling of author-narrator identities, and are perceived as instruments to educate people. It is not useful, however, to study them with a reductionist approach in the narrow context of similarities and messages. In fact, until recently, most of the studies define modern Ottoman novels as novels written in the Arabic script by Ottoman-Muslims, excluding the texts written in different scripts (Armeno-Turkish, Karamanlidika, Latino, etc.) by non-Muslim Ottoman authors.⁸

Interestingly, the most studied texts in the context of the 19th C. modern Ottoman novel are *Taaşşuk-i Tâl’at ve Fitnat* (1872), *Felâatun Bey ile Râkım Efendi* (1875), *İntibah* (1876), *Cezmi* (1880), *Sergüzeşt* (1888), *Turfanda mi Yoksa Turfa mi?* (1892), *Araba Sevdası* (1898), and *Udî* (1899). These studies mainly problematize the limits of Westernization, snobbery, East-West conflict, morals, and patriotism. On another note, as already mentioned, studies of Armenian-Ottoman authors and Armeno-Turkish novels are rare. Republican Turkish literary historiography ignored Armeno-Turkish novels and their

⁷ Erkan Erginci, “The Other Texts, the Other Women: Turkish Novels in Armenian Scripts and the Image of Women in These Works,” MA Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2007; Murat Cankara, “Empire and Novel: Placing Armeno-Turkish Novels in Ottoman Turkish Literary Historiography,” Ph.D. Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2011; Cankara, “Türkçe Romanın Emekleme Yıllarında Bir Kadın Kahraman: ‘Bir Sefil Zevce’nin Vartug’u,” *Roman Kahramanları* 19:2014, pp. 6-11.

⁸ For instance, Şemsettin Sami (1850-1904), Ahmet Mithat (1844-1912), Namik Kemal (1840-88), Samipaşazade Sezai (1860-1936), Nabizade Nazım (1862-93), Mizancı Mehmet Murat (1854-1917), Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem (1847-1914), and Fatma Aliye (1862-1936) are also studied using such reductionist approaches.

authors, while recent studies have the tendency to “otherize” these novels and authors since they do not address a wide audience in the empire.

This negligence takes on a serious shape when we gauge the mass of the published materials. The earliest known example of Armeno-Turkish books is from 1727. Hasmik A. Stepanyan lists 1856 Armeno-Turkish books and 366 theatrical plays, while 99 printed periodicals and 20 handwritten newspapers and magazines published after 1840.⁹ These publications came to light “in nearly fifty different cities around the world and in some 200 different printing houses.”¹⁰ “Between 1850 and 1890, about 100 periodicals were published by Armenians, in Istanbul alone. Of these 54 were partly or completely Armeno-Turkish.”¹¹

List of the first Armeno-Turkish literary books ¹²					
Author	Title	Place of Publication	Printing House	Year	# of Pages
Hovsep Vartanyan	<i>Akabi Hikayesi</i>	Istanbul	Hovhannes Mühendisyan	1851	438
	<i>Boşboğaz Bir Adem Lafazanlık ile Husule Gelen Fenalıkların Mukhtasar Risalesi</i>		Mühendisyan	1852	31
Haçadur Oskanyan	<i>Veronika Hikayesi</i>		Noyan Ağavni	1853	32
Hovhannes Balıkcıyan	<i>Karnig, Gülünya ve Dikranın Dehşetli Vefatları Hikayesi</i>		Harutyun Minasyan	1863	218
Hovsep Maruş	<i>Bir Sefil Zevce</i>		Mühendisyan	1868	303

⁹ For more detailed information on Armeno-Turkish, see Murat Cankara, “Rethinking Ottoman Cross-Cultural Encounters: Turks and the Armenian Alphabet,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 51/1:2015, pp. 1-16; Cankara, “Armeno-Turkish Writing and the Question of Hybridity,” *An Armenian Mediterranean* (İds.), Kathryn Babayan and Michael Pifer, Palgrave Macmillan, Michigan, 2018, pp. 173-91; Bedross Der Matossian, “The Development of Armeno-Turkish (Hayatar T’rk’eren) Language in the 19th Century: Marking and Crossing Ethno-Religious Boundaries,” *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World*, 2019, pp. 1-34.

¹⁰ Hasmik A. Stepanyan, *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Kitaplar ve Süreli Yayınlar Bibliyografyası, 1727-1968*, Turkuaz Yayınları, Istanbul, 2016, pp. 21-22.

¹¹ Rober Koptaş, “Ermeni Harfleriyle Türkçe,” in *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Metinler Ermeni Kaynaklarından Tarihe Katkılar – II* (Kevork Pamukciyan), Osman Köker (ed.), Aras Yayıncılık, Istanbul, 2002, p. XVIII.

¹² This table is based on the information given in Cebe’s chapter on “19th Century Armeno-Turkish ‘Modern’ ‘Original’ Works”, Ibid.

Viçen Tilkiyan	<i>Gülünya yahut Kendi Görünmeyerek Herkesi Gören Kız</i>		Vezir Han	1868	540
	<i>Mezarlıkta Yuvarlanan Eski Kafa</i>		Mühendisyan	1870	20
	<i>Seda-i Nahak</i>				10

One needs to focus on this output and assess its place in 19th C. Ottoman literary production. It is noteworthy that these Armeno-Turkish literary texts were not surveyed or traced only by Armenians. For instance, Ahmet Mithat's novel *Felâtun Bey*, which was published in Turkish with Arabic script, was also published in Armenian script in 1879.¹³ His other novel, *Müşâhedât*, published in 1891, indicates that the author was aware of Ottoman Armenian authors, readers and Armeno-Turkish texts.¹⁴ It seems demand for Armeno-Turkish texts was higher than expected among the non-Armenian readership that a booklet, *Method of Reading Armenian in Four Days for Those Who Know Ottoman*,¹⁵ written by Hacı Beyzâde Ahmed Muhtar, was published in 1892. Indeed, contrary to what has been claimed, 19th C. Armeno-Turkish texts had a sphere of influence which included not only the Armenian community but also Ottoman-Muslim readers and authors. According to Ayaydin-Cebe, between 1851 and 1893, forty "copyrighted," "modern" Armeno-Turkish literary texts were printed in Istanbul, Izmir (Smyrna), and Aleppo alone,¹⁶ which shows the geographic breadth of these books and that their sphere of influence was not as limited as thought.

One should note that the first modern Turkish novel printed in Arabic script, *Taaşuk-i Tâl'at ve Fitnat*, was published in 1872 in contrast to the first Armeno-Turkish novel, which was published in 1851.

Generally, Armeno-Turkish texts attracted the interest of the Turkish scholars after 2000.¹⁷ However, some of the studies have a number of

¹³ M. Orhan Okay, "Felâtun Bey ile Râkım Efendi", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi c.12*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, Ankara, 1995, pp. 302-3.

¹⁴ Ahmet Mithat Efendi, *Müşâhedât*, ed. Necat Birinci, TDK Yayınları, Ankara, 2000, pp. 46-7.

¹⁵ Hacı Beyzâde Ahmed Muhtar, *Osmanlıca Bilenlere Dört Günde Ermenice Okumanın Usulü*, Nişan Berberiyân Matbaası, İstanbul, 1892.

¹⁶ Günil Özlem Ayaydin Cebe, "19th Century Ottoman Society and Printed Turkish Literature: Interactions, Exchanges, and Diversity", Ph.D. Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı, Bilkent University, 2009, pp. 374-75.

¹⁷ For these studies, see Güzin Gonca Gökalp, "Traditional Elements in Tanzimat Literature (The Analysis of Structure in 19th Century Written Narratives with Special Analysis of the Oral Culture: Theme, Plot, Story, Characters)," Ph.D. Thesis, Hacettepe University, 1999; Selin Tunçboyacı, "19th Century Ottoman Modernization

weaknesses, particularly when they examine Armeno-Turkish texts in the context of the *Tanzimat*-period novel:

a) It is difficult to locate these novels precisely in the set of *Tanzimat* novels. Should these novels be included among the *Tanzimat*-period novels? If yes, is it enough to examine them with the usual framework of forms and themes used for the *Tanzimat*-period novels? Or, does the fact that they originate from a different ethnic group locates them elsewhere?

b) One may assess the studies of these novels in two ways: a) while studied separately, they have been assessed through the prisms of identity and modernization, and have been problematized due to their exclusion by republican Turkish literary historiography and their re-positioning in the context of the *Tanzimat*-period novels. b) On the other hand, when they are studied as *Tanzimat*-period novels, they are presented in a cause-effect relationship as if they were only the manifestation of a purpose, or, again, revolve around certain themes only related to the *Tanzimat*-period novel (e.g. religious conflict, social disintegration, Europeanism, dandyism). In fact, notwithstanding the significant contribution the studies of these novels have made in elaborating them, these studies have considered the novels as merely social and political documents of their times. As will be shown in the following parts of the article, 19th C. Armeno-Turkish novels, on the other hand, are a part of modern Ottoman literature.

Bir Sefil Zevce has been read only in the *Tanzimat*-period novel paradigm. Let us see what it tells us when it is approached narratologically. Will this narratological reading support the present history-oriented analysis of the novel, or will it also show some of the deficiencies in these analyses? Can we say that this novel has all the common features of the *Tanzimat*-period novel,

with Respect to the Novels *Akabi Hikayesi*, *Boşboğaz Bir Adem* and *Temaşa-i Dünya*,” MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2001; Erkan Erğinci, “The Other Texts, the Other Women: Turkish Novels in Armenian Scripts and the Image of Women in These Works,” MA Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2007; Ayşegül Utku Günaydin, “Public Sphere and Leisure Activities in the *Tanzimat* Novel,” MA Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2007; Şeyda Başlı, “From 'National Allegory' to Metaphor of Empire: Multi-layered Narrative Structure in the Ottoman Novel,” Ph.D. Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2008; Murat Cankara, “Empire and Novel: Placing Armeno-Turkish Novels in Ottoman Turkish Literary Historiography,” Ph.D. Thesis, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2011; Ömer Delikgöz, “Identity in Turkish Novels in Turkish and in Armenian Script During the *Tanzimat* Period,” Ph.D. Thesis, Istanbul University, 2016.

or does its particularity put it in another place among the other 19th C. Ottoman novels?

BİR SEFİL ZEVCİ

Bir Sefil Zevce was written by Hovsep Maruş and first published in Istanbul in 1868. There is no reliable information about the author. Whatever we know (or what we think we know) about him is based on the fact that he is the author of *Bir Sefil Zevce*. Murat Cankara, one of the earliest scholars in Turkey to study Armeno-Turkish texts, offers no information on Maruş. Naturally we can only make inferences about the author by looking at the text itself. It can be speculated that Maruş was Catholic, knew languages (alongside Armenian and Ottoman Turkish maybe French, Russian, and English), and that “he was familiar with European culture” and open to improvement and modernity.¹⁸

The characters in *Bir Sefil Zevce* are:

1. Hagop Muhib, Sebuhan Muhib, Tereza
2. Irani Melkon Agha, Irani Mardiros Agha, Vartug Dudu (Roz)
3. Hovhannes Bahriyan, Veronika Bahriyan, Hodja Artin
4. Mikayel Agha Krikoryan, Mesrob Agha
5. Armaveni, Diruhi, İsbir, other servants and collaborative persons
6. Sergey Petroviç, Olga İvanovna, Pavlo Andreiç.

Thus, there are six separate sets of characters in the novel, classified according to their families or affinities, social class and living places. In the first set, in the Muhib¹⁹ family, Sebuhan is one of the main characters of the novel. In the Irani²⁰ family Vartug Dudu (Roz),²¹ Mardiros Agha’s wife, is the main character. In the third set, Hodja Artin is one of the important supporting characters of the novel along with his family. The fourth set includes the arch-

¹⁸ Murat Cankara, “Ermeni Harfleriyle İlk Türkçe Romanlar Üzerine,” in *Tanzimat ve Edebiyat Osmanlı İstanbulu’nda Modern edebi kültür*, Mehmet Fatih Uslu, Fatih Altuğ (eds.), İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul, 2014, p. 121.

¹⁹ It is originally *Muhibb* and means one who has a conversation or one who is affectionate, a lover.

²⁰ *Irani* means Iranian. The family is called *Irani* because they came to Istanbul from Iran. Even though the word *Irani* might be translated as Persian, in this context, *Irani* indicates a region.

²¹ Her names are both *Vartug* and *Roz*, which no doubt come from the word “rose” and symbolize beauty and purity. Despite these meanings, Vartug turns into *A Miserable Wife* in the title of the novel. While she gets the Armenian name *Vartug*, after she comes to Istanbul, *Roz* is the name given by her stepfather.

villain of the novel, Mardiros Agha's collaborator and friend, Mikayel Agha.²² The employees, servants, and others, who belong to the lower class of society and who take care of the main characters' dealings, are in the fifth set. The last set, includes Vartug Dudu's family and her close friends, who are from St. Petersburg.

Vartug, the daughter of an Istanbul-Armenian family, disappears in a boat accident when she is three years old. She is rescued by a ship heading for Crimea and is adopted by Sergey Petroviç. After growing up, she returns to Istanbul and marries an Armenian moneychanger, Mardiros Agha. Mardiros has a gambling habit, his business fails, and gradually he loses his wealth and owes money to the state. He asks one of his friends, Mikayel Agha, for help. The latter had proposed to Vartug Dudu prior to her marriage to Mardiros. But since Mikayel did not have a good reputation, he was refused. Now, Mikayel conspires with Mardiros, and both try to seize the wealth she has inherited from her stepfather, Petroviç. In this manner, Mikayel aims to take revenge on Vartug as she had previously refused his proposal. Meanwhile, Vartug meets Sebuhi Muhib, who had seen her at the opera and had fallen in love at first sight. Sebuhi is a well-educated, wealthy, and reputable businessman who has newly returned to Istanbul. Vartug reciprocates Sebuhi's love and becomes pregnant. Mikayel, who knows that Vartug is pregnant by Sebuhi, with Mardiros' help succeeds in abducting Vartug, and scheme to legally acquire Vartug's fortune. They plan to gain the right to inherit the fortune and, after the birth, get rid of both Vartug and the baby. Sebuhi, who somehow learns Vartug's whereabouts, succeeds in saving her. But after the childbirth Vartug dies. Before her death, however, it is disclosed that she is the sister of Hodja Artin, one of Sebuhi's most loyal assistants. Veronika, who finds and loses her daughter Vartug, after twenty-three years, loses her mind and dies a year later. Sebuhi, with his newborn daughter and servants, leaves for St. Petersburg.

DOES THIS SOUND COMMON TO OTTOMAN NOVELS OR NOT?

In order to make a narrator analysis of *Bir Sefil Zevce*, Wolf Schmid's narrator categorizations and criteria are used to reveal the narrator profile of the novel.²³ I will start by trying to reveal the narrator profile of *Bir Sefil Zevce*:

²² The Armenian word *Krikoryan* comes from the Late Greek name *Grēgorios*, which means "watchful" and "alert." It is not a coincidence that the "bad" character of the novel is given this name.

²³ Wolf Schmid, *Narratology: An Introduction*, trans., Alexander Starritt, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2010, pp. 66-67.

Criteria	Narrator Type in <i>Bir Sefil Zevce</i>
Diegetic status	Non-diegetic
Hierarchy	Primary
Degree of markedness	Marked
Evaluative position	Subjective
Ability	Omniscient
Spatial fixing	Omnipresent
Access to characters' consciousness	Expressed

The novel consists of a three-part preface (*Evveli Kelam*), thirty-two separate main chapters, and a closing chapter (*Son Kelam*). Throughout these chapters, we are met by a single narrator, who is not involved in the story. Thus, the novel has one *primary* and *non-diegetic* narrator,²⁴ as he is the only one “narrating exclusively about other people.”²⁵ Because the narrator is non-diegetic, the narration can already belong solely to the level of *exegesis*, but not *diegesis*.²⁶ This narrator can also be called *extradiegetic*, to use Gérard Genette’s terminology.²⁷

Concerning the degree of markedness of the narrator, one may check whether the narrator’s presence is clear enough throughout the text, where and how he shows himself and whether he²⁸ merely tells the story or does more than that.²⁹

Obviously, the narrator in this text is *marked*, but not *strongly marked*.³⁰ Throughout the novel the narrator speaks of himself as “we/us”. This “we/us” voice is heard in particular when the narrator intervenes in the narration or for the addressee. Unlike several other *Tanzimat*-period novels, the narrator of this novel does not include the addressee in the narration process. The fact that he is well aware of himself being the only narrator underlines the degree

²⁴ While a *diegetic* narrator “narrates about himself,” a *non-diegetic* narrator narrates “about other people” in a story. In classical terminology, this distinction is also known as “first-person narrator” and “third-person narrator.” *Ibid.*, p. 68.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ In this context, the *exegesis* corresponds to “the narration” itself, and the *diegesis* corresponds to “the narrated story.” *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69.

²⁷ Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans., Jane E. Lewin, Cornell University Press, New York, 1983, pp. 227-28.

²⁸ I call the primary narrator of *Bir Sefil Zevce* “he” for two reasons: a) the primary narrator has an author-narrator profile throughout most of the novel, b) the primary narrator does not have a “female narrator call” anywhere in the novel.

²⁹ Schmid, pp. 61-4.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

of his markedness: “*Our basic intention is only to narrate the incident, and we hope that we will not be obliged to suppose which side is righteous.*”³¹ Indeed, the narrator emerges and becomes marked wherever his voice is heard throughout the text.

Another evidence of markedness is that at certain points the narrator stops the flow of the story and speaks directly to the *reader*, not to the *presumed addressee* (interlocutor).³² At these points, it is clear that the narrator is replaced by the author, Hovsep Maruş, as we cross from the *narrated world* to the *represented world*.³³ In fact, both the narrator, the presumed addressee, and the act of narration are represented fictional elements in a fictional narrative.

In order to distinguish between the narrator and the author, we should look at the text and see whether he states “me as author;” otherwise we should infer it. However, to be on the safe side, we may claim that whenever the author is talking the narrator is present too.

The narrator distinguishes himself from the author in two significant ways: a) by *providing direct information*, b) through the *narrator’s subjectivity*.³⁴

Although we take our friend readers from one house to another, we hope that if they first trust what we are saying, and secondly then if we have no doubt that they wish to deeply understand this story, because their participation is so important here, we would keep visiting other houses by leaving the child’s enemies where they are ... Since incidents related to the infant in the cradle happened in that house, we should be present at the place.³⁵

This quote is a good example of how the narrator first determines his and the other side’s (the reader/addressee) positions in the initial sentence. With this mode of address the narrator tries to justify his act of narration to make the novel more plausible for the readers. Hence, the information presented belongs to the narrated world. There are other examples, which provide direct information about the presented world:

There were not many people who knew European languages in this century. Reading and writing Armenian was considered sufficient, with a basic [knowledge of] numbers’ background and without a complete education. And if one would read and write Ottoman language, he would be considered completely educated.

³¹ Maruş, p. 27. All translations from the novel are mine.

³² For the difference between these two concepts see Schmid, pp. 51-88.

³³ Schmid, pp. 32-5.

³⁴ This situation not only pertains to 19th century Armeno-Turkish novels, but also to 19th century Ottoman literature in general.

³⁵ Maruş, p. 8.

But, how much time would be lost by a student for so little education.

First *Keragan*,³⁶ then *Hencharan*, followed by *Sağmos*³⁷ and then *Avedaran*,³⁸ all of these were for the purpose of learning Armenian and would take at least four or five, sometimes six years.³⁹

Some sayings, which are called old-wives' tales, are not total nonsense. They say the destiny decides about marriage. In fact, sometimes contrary examples of marriages unlike what is expected may happen, and many were such [cases] at the time of this story.⁴⁰

Even if dancing seems to be meaningless in appearance, after giving a good thought, it is understood why the creator's ideas is not nonsense. Because it helps both women and men to show their conditions with grace, it also causes people to stay away from anxieties, at least for a period of time.⁴¹

This information about the represented world belongs to the author and is not included in the story itself, yet it shows the presence of the narrator.

One of the ways the narrator reveals himself is through statements he makes throughout the text, giving direct information, mostly about situations, human relations, human nature, and psychology:

Many people think that, in general, if there is a disagreement between husband and wife, the fault is caused by the wife; however, when carefully and objectively considered, actually it is the husbands who are at fault.⁴²

Undoubtedly it is obvious that if one suddenly sorts out a difficult situation despite no hope existing to make it happen, [he] will be grateful to whoever bestows that favor, in case [he] is not completely ungrateful.⁴³

In addition to its several virtues, affection also provides (enables – A.T.) mastering eloquence. If an awful situation exists between the lovers, it is resolved immediately. Because the language of the heart acts to show the true path, and as lovers talk only this language, they do not have any difficulty silencing each other.⁴⁴

Human nature is very strange. If someone resides in a place for a long time, gradually [he] forgets about the city he was born, and becomes familiar with the place, and is determined to settle there.⁴⁵

³⁶ *Keragan* (Թերական) is Armenian primer.

³⁷ *Sağmos* (Սաղմոս) is Psalm.

³⁸ *Avedaran* (Ավետարան) is the New Testament.

³⁹ Maruş, pp. 56-7.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 60.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 104.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 63-4.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 112.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 244.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 144.

While providing direct information from those worlds and through different narrative perspectives, sometimes the author jumps out of the story, and offers, for instance, footnotes! He deems it necessary to explain, define and describe some terms, foreign words, and places.⁴⁶

The need for such extra explanations is answered by a footnote from the novel: "*Since we think that some of our friends reading [this] may not have any information [about the subject], we notify [them]...*"⁴⁷ Thus, we are told that the presence of this extra information is for a very pragmatic reason (though it violates the narratological norm). Usually it is the author who interferes during the narrator's narration and provides extra information, thus suddenly shifting the level of narration from the narrated world to the represented world.⁴⁸

As already mentioned, the first thing that indicates the degree of markedness of the narrator who has the "we/us" voice is the provision of direct information. This provision, carried out for different purposes and through different narratological methods, levels and diegetic statuses makes the text richer and multilayered in terms of narratology. This in turn suggests a more careful look at the questions to be asked about the novel.

The fact that the narrator presents himself to the addressee as if he is not included in the narrative construction process is evidence that he is not strongly marked in the novel. However, the fact that he pretends he only narrates his story, and nothing more, is directly related to the narrator's evaluative position: "*Our basic intention is only to narrate the incident, and we hope that we will not be obliged to suppose which side is righteous.*"⁴⁹ Although the narrator explicitly states his job, there is no doubt that he is also *subjective*, as, throughout the text, he tries to justify each of his actions and treats every situation in a causal relation.

⁴⁶ For examples of these footnotes and explanations, see *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 13, 31, 100, 128, 129, 162, 185, 244, 291.

⁴⁷ Maruş, p. 291.

⁴⁸ Schmid, p. 35. "Accordingly, Schmid distinguishes between the 'concrete author,' who creates the literary narrative work for the 'concrete reader(s),' the 'abstract author,' (more commonly called the 'implied author'), who creates the 'represented world' for the 'abstract reader(s),' the 'fictive narrator,' who creates the 'narrated world,' for the 'fictive reader(s),' and the characters in the 'narrated world,' who can communicate narratively as well, creating merely 'quoted worlds' (Schmid, pp. 34-88)" (quoted from Jan-Noël Thon, *Transmedial Narratology and Contemporary Media Culture*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London, 2016, p. 125).

⁴⁹ See note 31.

We witness the conflict between the Catholic and Orthodox denominations of Istanbul Armenians in Hovsep Vartanyan's *Akabi Hikayesi*, the first Armeno-Turkish novel, published in Istanbul in 1851. However, this intra-Armenian conflict is transformed into an intra-Catholic conflict in *Bir Sefil Zevce*.⁵⁰

This intra-Catholic conflict spilled over into the Catholic Armenian public. Students taught in the schools of the Mekhitarist congregation reacted strongly against Hasunyan. Mgrdich Beshigtashlian, S. Hekimyan, and G. Karakash established the *Hamazkyats Engerutyün*⁵¹ in 1846 with the aim of raising the educational level of the community through schools and strengthening the community's relations with Europe.⁵²

Both the author and the narrator of the novel are on the side of the *Hamazkyats*:

At the time this story [is being] narrated it was common knowledge to everybody that there had been great enmity among Armenian Catholics; that is, the Catholic community had been divided into two parts. And this schism was caused by an association named *Hamazkyats Engerutyün*, which essentially aimed at building a school for girls and making an effort to promote knowledge. However, the majority opposed this association, arguing that there were other reasons behind the founding of this association.

...As we related earlier, people often appeared to have quarrels. In many houses fathers and sons, wives and husbands, and sisters and brothers looked at each other

⁵⁰ In this context, apart from being Armeno-Turkish novels, one of the first resemblances between *Akabi Hikayesi* and *Bir Sefil Zevce* is the existence of a division based on an understanding of religion in the text. *Akabi Hikayesi* is built on a conflict based entirely on the understanding of religion, and this novel is completely *roman à thèse*. It shouts at us a suggestion, another option, a different way and promises us that another world is possible. In this context, it is not wrong to claim that *Akabi Hikayesi* is highly reformist in terms of the period it was published and the milieu it addressed since it emphasizes the needlessness of the separation between the Catholic and Orthodox Armenians and suggests a secular, progressive Armenian society. This situation also answers the question why *Akabi Hikayesi* was published without an author name, anonymously and why after a little, it was banned and confiscated. It was "reported by Cardinal Andon Hasunyan and forbidden by the Vatican Inquisition on the grounds that it was contrary to Catholic belief" (quoted from Suren Shdigyan, by Murat Cankara, "Hovsep Vartanyan'a ve Boşboğazlığa Dair," *Boşboğaz Bir Âdem*, Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 10-11).

⁵¹ *Hamazkyats Engerutyün* means in Armenian "Pan-National Association."

⁵² "According to Kevork Pamukciyan, the writer of *Akabi Hikayesi*, Hovsep Vartanyan, is also among the founders of this association." From Pamukciyan, Cankara, "Empire and," pp. 341-42.

with long faces. Even in trade, both parties hesitated to deal unless it was necessary. This fact was considered a priority in marriage relations.⁵³

In the passages above, the narrator clearly states that the dissension among the Catholic Armenians due to the *Hamazkyats* association created divisions within the community. Despite all the significance of the matter, the narrator does not offer a solution to the crisis, though some implications make us feel that the narrator/the author criticizes this division and tries to seem as neutral as possible. He never states that he is *anti* or *pro-Hamazkyats* even if we may guess which side he is on.

We should first state [here] that Sebuḥ's nice behavior was not because of his acquaintance. Likewise, on our behalf, [we should say that by telling this] we also did not aim at ill-treating the members of the *Hamazkyats* association.⁵⁴

The narrator clearly states that his intention is simply to narrate the story, and nothing more. Besides, it is only reasonable for the author not to create a narrator who is biased, bearing in mind the ban imposed on *Akabi Hikayesi*.⁵⁵ Therefore, it is highly unlikely that *Bir Sefil Zevce* is a *roman à thèse*.

Notwithstanding the explicit statement of the narrator, the latter is highly subjective due to the conflict between *anti*- and *pro-Hamazkyats* groups as this intra-communal conflict overlaps with the basic conflict between the characters of the novel, even though the novel does not revolve around it.

The conflict between the main characters of the novel is displayed through good and evil personalities. While Sebuḥ, Vartug and those on their side are the good, Mardiros, Mikayel and their collaborators are represented as villains. The narrator's subjectivity is obvious from the contrast he makes: "*Whoever saw Muhib Bey and Vartug Dudu, would clearly see how much God the Almighty is great and perfect, because both were perfect – one more than the other – without any deficiency.*"⁵⁶ Both are depicted as "perfect" and "flawless" figures. Sebuḥ has studied in Europe and Vartug in Russia. Both are educated, multilingual, honorable, and are loved by people. According to the narrator, one has to be born "evil" in order not to love these two characters. On the other hand, Mardiros and Mikayel are portrayed as extremely "vile,"

⁵³ Maruş, pp. 27-8.

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 31-32.

⁵⁵ See footnote 50. There may be those who oppose this because the author's name is explicitly on the novel. However, "Hovsep Maruş" might be a pseudonym, since we still do not have any confirmed knowledge about the author.

⁵⁶ Maruş, p. 104.

“dishonest,” “cowardly,” and “evil” figures. The narrator explains why these two characters are “bad”, and act together:

(...) Because perpetrators of evil bond together to realize their wicked thought, and Irani, besides his meanness, was a coward and was afraid of Krikoryan.⁵⁷

As we know Mardiros Agha was both a coward and a villain...⁵⁸

These two, namely, Irani and Krikoryan, were expelled from God’s gate and [had] surrendered to Evil ...⁵⁹

What makes Mardiros and Mikayel evil is not them being against *Hamazkyats*, but that they are inherently evil: “*Just as mean tempered people burst with anger when their guilt became vivid, Irani’s anger exploded excessively...*”⁶⁰ The fact that the narrator presents the evil characters as inherently evil makes him more “objective” (even if he is not) and the story more convincing. Obviously, however, the narrator is on the side of the good ones and, thus, highly subjective.

As already mentioned, there is a parallelism between the conflict based on *Hamazkyats* and the conflict based on the characters. While those who oppose *Hamazkyats* are “bad” characters in the novel, those who support it are “good” (Sebuh is a member of *Hamazkyats*). However, there is not enough information in the text to infer that all good characters of the novel support *Hamazkyats* and vice versa.

We will better know the aforementioned young man later, but for now we inform the following about him that he had come to Istanbul a short time before and he went to the meeting with his friends just for their sakes even though he did not know much about the matter.⁶¹

It is not expected that Sebuh, who was born and raised in Peru and came to Istanbul in his twenties after studying in Britain and France, will turn into an ardent fan as soon as he comes to the city. We cannot read every situation in the novel through the *Hamazkyats* dissension,⁶² as Sebuh participates in the meetings only at his friend’s insistence.

Alongside the fact that the narrator is quite subjective, his *omniscience* and *omnipresence* enable us to reveal the narrator typology of *Bir Sefil Zevce*.

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 257-58.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 125.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 252.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 116.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 29.

⁶² According to Cankara, “the ‘bad’ characters are anti-*Hamazkyats* and the ‘good’ characters are pro-*Hamazkyats* in the novel.” But, as stated above, we do not have enough information to make such an inference (Cankara, “Empire and,” p. 343).

A NARRATIVE STRUCTURE FROM SINGULARITY TO PLURALISM

In this part of the paper, I will try to reveal the focalization model and the time and space structure of the novel by using Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan's model.⁶³

The Perceptual Facet	The Psychological Facet	The Ideological Facet
Temporal Focalization External: Panchronic Retrospective Internal: Synchronous	The Cognitive Component External: Omniscience Internal: Limitedness	Narrator-focalizer's ideology
Spatial Focalization External: Panoramic view Simultaneous Internal: Limited observation	The Emotive Component External: Objectivity Internal: Subjectivity	Other ideologies

I would like to begin with the perceptual aspect by addressing the temporal focalization process of the novel. While external temporal focalization is related to a primary non-diegetic narrator who has knowledge of all temporal dimensions, internal temporal focalization is related to a narrator who has temporal knowledge only of the present or of the characters within the text.⁶⁴ Indeed, the temporal knowledge of the narrator in the novel is externally *retrospective* since he does not have "at his disposal all the temporal dimensions of the story."⁶⁵ He starts to narrate his story from the present, and through flashbacks to the 1810s and 1820s we are able to see what happened in the past. However, his flow of time is not chronological; the narrator makes chronological mistakes.

The narrator's main story begins with: "*Three years before the Orient [Crimean] War, during the reign of Sultan Abdülmecid Han, one night in Naum's theatre, an announcement stated that La Straniera would be staged.*"⁶⁶ The Crimean War was fought from 1853 to 1856, and "three years before the Crimean War" means that we are in 1850 (narrative tense), taking into account the date of the beginning of the war. But Cankara, citing Emre Araci's statement notes that the Italian opera composer Vincenzo Bellini's *La Straniera* was performed at Naum Theater in the 1852-1853 season in Istanbul. Accordingly,

⁶³ Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, Routledge, New York, 2002, pp. 73-87.

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 79-81.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 80.

⁶⁶ Maruş, pp. 20-21.

the events in the novel should start from 1852 or 1853.⁶⁷ In fact, chronological problems in the novel begin at this point. Had the novel begun in 1852 or 1853, we would have been far beyond the date stated at the end of the novel, which is January 24, 1852. Therefore the events of the novel should have started before 1852. However, if this conforms with the statement “three years before the Crimean War” it is incompatible with the staging date of *La Straniera*.⁶⁸ There are mistakes too in the chronological flow of time. The narrator narrates the story with ambiguous datings such as “three or four months later,” “soon after,” “for a space,” and “within a few years.” Even when he gives exact dates, such as “three months later,” “the day after,” or “next week,” he cannot follow the chronological progress economically. Thus, there are other temporal problems and mistakes from 1850 to 1852.

Indeed, the external narrator-focalizer of *Bir Sefil Zevce* has *unreliable*⁶⁹ retrospective temporal knowledge. The limited temporal knowledge of character-focalizers, on the other hand, is *synchronous*, as they transmit only the temporal knowledge of the moment they are in.

While the external narrator-focalizer uses *panoramic view* focalization (spatial focalization), more often he shows us the scenes *simultaneously*. In line with the definition of panoramic focalization, the narrator-focalizer presents panoramic views at the opening and closing scenes of the novel, and at the beginning of certain sections, especially in the flashback scenes.⁷⁰

(...) even child's hostiles were wake and came close to the doorstep. At the same time, in a house a block away two men were having the following conversation.⁷¹

Although we take our friend readers from one house to another, we hope that if they first trust what we are saying, and secondly then if we have no doubt that they wish to deeply understand this story, because their participation is so important here, we would keep visiting other houses by leaving the child's enemies where they are ...

⁶⁷ From Emre Araci (Cankara, “Empire and”, p. 343.)

⁶⁸ On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the author-narrator does not have to be faithful to any historical truth in a fictional narrative.

⁶⁹ “The, not entirely clear, concept of the ‘unreliable narrator’ was created by W. C. Booth (1961). According to his definition, we are dealing with an unreliable narrator when the norms of the narrator and of the implied author do not coincide.” Schmid, p. 60.

⁷⁰ “This is the classical position of a narrator- focalizer, yielding either a panoramic view or a ‘simultaneous’ focalization of things ‘happening’ in different places. Panoramic views are frequent in the beginning or end of a narrative or of one of its scenes (Uspensky 1973, p. 64).” Rimmon-Kenan, p. 79.

⁷¹ Maruş, p. 5.

Since incidents related to the infant in the cradle happened in that house, we should be present at the place.⁷²

In this excerpt, the external narrator-focalizer allows his addressees to accompany him everywhere by making instant moves between different places and scenes.

As the last point of the perceptual facet, I would also like to give an example of internally limited observation from the text. Internally spatial focalization belongs to the character-focalizers, and their knowledge comes from each character's limited visual-spatial ability.⁷³ We can see in the example below a limited observation-based focalization; the narrator tells us what the characters see and know about what is in Sebuğ's secret mansion:

Those who saw him leaving late at night waited till the morning, they thought he had been crying when they looked at his eyes, but others saw him several times leaving the house in a cheerful mood, although they were in two minds. The villagers' hearsay was divided in two.

Some said there was a treasury room, because the door was so reinforced and the windows had bars, supposedly he was afraid thieves. Besides if there was no money inside, then why was he afraid of them? In addition, he had supposedly been going there to count the money.

It seemed that some have paid attention to the mansion at the time of construction, and as they remembered, there were a few stoves, so they assumed the building was a kind of factory or workshop. In short everyone interpreted this fact differently.⁷⁴

The external narrator-focalizer narrates what others think about Sebuğ's villa through their eyes. Even though the narrator is omniscient and knows what is inside Sebuğ's villa, he makes this observation internally limited as he narrates this information through the characters' eyes.

As for the psychological facet of focalization, we need to examine both the narrator's and the characters' knowledge cognitively.⁷⁵ We have already stated that the external narrator of *Bir Sefil Zevce* is omniscient. He is able to access the characters' minds and their past and to know exactly what they feel.⁷⁶

⁷² See note 35.

⁷³ Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, p. 80.

⁷⁴ Maruş, pp. 148-49.

⁷⁵ Rimmon-Kenan, pp. 81-2.

⁷⁶ The fact that the narrator has retrospective temporal knowledge should not be attributed to his omniscience. The narrator provides knowledge only of the present and past, but being omniscient he does not base this knowledge solely on temporal knowledge competence.

Although this fact is clear enough in the text, the narrator sometimes acts as if he does not know everything:

Those who get married become lucky. We are not sure how true is this saying.⁷⁷

But we cannot prove if Vartug Dudu's heart was filled with gratitude when she realized that Muhib Bey had not forgotten her again this time.⁷⁸

Eventhough we do not know after that moment how the lovers spent their time, we are at least sure of the fact that any sorrow or grief was far away from them.⁷⁹

We can explain these examples in two different ways: an intentional "digression strategy,"⁸⁰ and "rhetorical considerations."⁸¹ In order to make his story more interesting and convincing, the narrator tries to direct his addressees and to attract their attention. A second explanation about the narrator's "act as if" attitude is that it is a mode of self-control. Sometimes he prefers to mention things that he does not consider appropriate to tell us by using other words, or simply he does not present any information about these "inappropriate" things by saying that he has no idea about them. In the third quotation above, one can see that the narrator chooses not to talk about the night Vartug and Sebuğ make love and Vartug gets pregnant. The reason why the narrator needs to develop such a self-control mechanism, may be explained by the author's ideological and religious stance, or as the result of a basic socio-cultural concern.

Alongside the characters' internal focalizations, one may repeat that the competence of the character-focalizers based on the cognitive component is not unrestricted since s/he "*is restricted by definition: being a part of the represented world, s/he cannot know everything.*"⁸² The information in the text

⁷⁷ Maruş, p. 56.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 180.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 228.

⁸⁰ "A digressive and multiple narration, one that is 'dispersed into many trickles', is a strategy deliberately adopted by the narrator in order to preserve the narrative possibilities at his disposal... By avoiding a focus on a single story, the narrator has the advantage not only of handling the story with more detachment but also of not exhausting its potentiality... Through digression the novel recharges itself and becomes a 'machine for multiplying narratives'" (Olivia Santovetti, "Straight Line or Aimless Wandering? Italo Calvino's Way to Digression," *Digressions in European Literature: From Cervantes to Sebald*, Alexis Grohmann and Caragh Wells (eds.), Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2011, p. 173; Italo Calvino, *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1988, p. 120).

⁸¹ Rimmon-Kenan, p. 81.

⁸² Ibid.

conveyed by the characters and the actions and words of the characters in the text are all examples of this limited internal focalization.

The narratological problem for the emotive component of the psychological facet encountered in *Bir Sefil Zevce* is the following: While the narrator with an external focalization position throughout the text is expected to be objective and “uninvolved,” the narrator of *Bir Sefil Zevce* is quite subjective and “colored.”⁸³ It is obvious that the narrator is on the side of the “good” characters of the novel, although his explicit statement of “neutral”ity.⁸⁴ There are other issues that the narrator refers to in the love story. He criticizes the intra-Catholic division, the education system, the ways that parents give away their daughters in marriage, and “bad” habits such as gambling.⁸⁵ These might be seen as necessary indicators for an intervening narrator. We need to see how and why this intervention emerges.

The second element of the emotive component, the subjectivity based on the internal character focalizations, originates in the basic conflict between the “good” and “bad” characters of the novel. While Vartug and Sebuğ see each other “*come un’angelo celeste*,”⁸⁶ they are an enemy to be eliminated for Mardiros and Mikayel. It is not expected that these characters should be neutral, since there is a conflict between the characters in the text. Since the emotive component is directly related to the focalizer’s mind and his or her emotions and reactions, the more focalizers there are in the text, the more minds and represented worlds there exist. Hence, we see each character, especially the main ones, as coloured, subjective elements of different represented worlds.

The last facet of the focalization model I use here is the ideological facet, and before finishing analysis of the focalization structure of *Bir Sefil Zevce* we need to consider “the norms” of the text. At this point, it is useful to consider how Rimmon-Kenan describes the ideological facet by referring to Uspensky:

This facet, often referred to as ‘the norms of the text’, consists of ‘a general system of viewing the world conceptually’, in accordance with which the events and characters of the story are evaluated... In the simplest case, the ‘norms’ are presented through a single dominant perspective, that of the narrator focalizer. If additional ideologies emerge in such texts, they become subordinate to the dominant focalizer, thus transforming the other evaluating subjects into objects of evaluation.⁸⁷

⁸³ Ibid., 82.

⁸⁴ Maruş, p. 27.

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 56-7; 60-1; 65-7, 136-37.

⁸⁶ Means “like a celestial angel”, Ibid., p. 24.

⁸⁷ Rimmon-Kenan, pp. 83-84.

We may claim that there is dominance of a narrator-focalizer in this novel. This dominance does not mean drubbing an idea into the characters, the addressees, or even the readers. The narrator-focalizer does not try to transform the community. He does not offer “a dream world.” He is simply uncomfortable with the religious divisions in the community. But he allows us merely to feel this discomfort and does not go beyond that.

Even when he explicitly criticizes issues, he does not provide solutions or remedies. He tries not to cross the borders thanks to his own self-control, as he has set himself a boundary, and always tries to stay within that boundary. This attitude of the narrator, as mentioned earlier, may be explained by the likelihood that he was aware of what happened after *Akabi Hikayesi* was published. He may be trying not to seem overly “reformist” or “marginal.” Throughout the novel one barely sees the domination of the narrator-focalizer’s ideology. Nonetheless, the narrator tries to legitimize the “forbidden” love of Vartug, a married woman, and Sebu: they secretly meet and talk, Vartug cheats on her husband and gets pregnant. Interestingly, however, the narrator does his best to show that this relationship is inevitable.

CONCLUSION

Bir Sefil Zevce does not have a happy ending. Vartug and her mother Veronika die, Sebu is left alone with his newborn daughter and leaves for St. Petersburg, while Mardiros and Mikayel do not attain their goal. In other words, at the end of the novel there are no winners, everybody loses. The reason for such an ending can be explained by the paradigm of the 19th C. modern Ottoman romance.

The novel is partly a *Tanzimat*-period novel and has common features with novels published in Istanbul in the same century, and at the same time it is an example of the modern Ottoman novel. However, the novel should not be assessed solely through these standpoints. Unlike previous studies of the novel, this study argues that there is a need to consider its narratological analysis in order to reveal its narrative structure as a literary text.

**ՅՈՎՍԷՓ ՄԱՐՈՒՇԻ ՀԱՅԱՏԱՌ ԹՐՔԵՐԷՆ ՊԻՐ ՍԷՖԻԼ ԶԷՎՃԷ (1868) ՎԷՊԸ՝
ՊԱՏՄՈՂԱԿԱՆ ՄՕՏԵՑՈՒՄՈՎ**

(Ամփոփում)

ԱՐԻՖ ԹԱՓԱՆ (arifltapan@gmail.com)

Ընդհանրապես օսմանեան վէպի ուսումնասէրներ կը կեդրոնանան ատենի թրքատառ վէպերուն վրայ, անտեսելով յոյն, հայ եւ այլ փոքրամասնութիւններու հեղինակներու կողմէ գրուած թրքերէն վէպերը:

Յովսէփ Մարուշի *Պիր Սէֆիլ Զէվճէ* հայատառ թրքերէն վէպը հրատարակուած է Կ. Պոլիս, 1868ին եւ չէ արժանացած համապատասխան հետազօտութեան: Ուսումնասիրութեան մէջ հեղինակը երկին կը մօտենայ պատմողական ելակէտերէ, կը քննարկէ պատմողները, լուսարձակի տակ կ'առնէ դիպաշարին դէպքերը, ժամանակը եւ տարածութիւնը:

Այս իւրօրինակ մօտեցումով յօդուածագիրը կը ջանայ ամբողջացնել գրավերլուծական մօտեցման բացը եւ այլ մեկնաբանութիւն տալ երկին, եզրակացնելով որ կարելի չէ զայն դիտել լոկ իբրեւ ԺԹ. դարու օսմանեան վէպ: Միաժամանակ, հեղինակը կը կարեւորէ ԺԹ. դարու հայատառ թրքերէն վէպերուն ընդգրկումը օսմանեան վէպի ուսումնասիրութեան ընդհանուր տեսադաշտ:

