



Image and Responsiveness: Melih Cevdet Anday's Poetry

Melih Cevdet Anday Şiirinde İmge ve Duyarlılık

Melih Levi¹ 



¹Assistant Professor, Bogazici University,
Western Languages and Literatures, Istanbul,
Turkiye

ORCID: M.L. 0000-0002-0485-0024

Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:

Melih Levi,
Bogazici University, Western Languages and
Literatures, Istanbul, Turkiye
E-mail: melih.levi@boun.edu.tr

Submitted/Başvuru: 14.02.2022

Revision Requested/Revizyon Talebi: 15.04.2022

Last Revision Received/Son Revizyon: 25.04.2022

Accepted/Kabul: 25.04.2022

Citation/Atf:

Levi, M. (2022). Image and responsiveness: Melih Cevdet Anday's poetry. *TUDED*, 62(1), 143–164.
<https://doi.org/10.26650/TUDED2022-1073053>

ABSTRACT

This article studies the evolution of Melih Cevdet Anday's poetic style with a particular emphasis on his use of imagery. Traditional accounts of Anday's poetry have tended to call attention to the beginning of his poetic career as part of the Garip (Birinci Yeni) movement and eventual alignment with the aesthetic sensibility of the İkinci Yeni. Recently, critics have complicated this picture by demonstrating continuities in Anday's early and late poetic styles, as well as calling into question the categorization of Anday with the İkinci Yeni. This article builds on this recent criticism by demonstrating continuities and changes in Anday's descriptive practices across the different stages of his poetic career. A thorough examination of Anday's imagery requires assessment of the careful distance he maintained from the other image-oriented practices in the modern era. To that end, Anday's linguistic and philosophical approach to imagery are analyzed, as well as the tenor of the relationship Anday establishes between language and objective reality. Finally, the centrality of Wallace Stevens's influence on Anday's poetic style needs to be emphasized, since both poets challenge dominant image-oriented trends in modern poetry. Thus, Stevens's influence on Anday proves instructive for an analysis of the poet's changing style within the modernist context. The article builds on existing scholarly comparisons of the two poets by analyzing Anday's 1965 translations of Stevens. Finally, it offers a detailed analysis of the formal, linguistic, and descriptive aspects of Anday's poem "İstasyon" to demonstrate the nature of the poet's philosophical negotiations between language and reality.

Keywords: Melih Cevdet Anday, poetry, imagery, modernism, Wallace Stevens

ÖZET

Bu makale, Melih Cevdet Anday'ın şiirsel üslubunun gelişimini, özellikle şairin imge kullanımına vurgu yaparak incelemektedir. Anday şiirinin incelemelerinde, genellikle şairin Garip (Birinci Yeni) akımının bir üyesi olarak kariyerine başladığı ve sonradan İkinci Yeni'nin estetik ilkeleriyle uyum geliştirdiğine dikkat çekilmiştir. Son zamanlarda birçok eleştirmen, Anday'ın erken ve geç dönem üslubundaki devamlılıkları göstermiş ve Anday'ın İkinci Yeni'yle sınıflandırılmasını sorgulayarak bu resmi karmaşıklaştırmıştır. Bu makalede, Anday'ın edebî kariyerinin farklı aşamalarında betimleyici üslubunda yaşanmış dönüşümleri ön plana çıkarılmaktadır. Anday'ın imgeye yaklaşımının kapsamlı bir incelemesi için şairin modern dönemdeki imge yönelimli diğer şiir üsluplarından nasıl ayrıldığını değerlendirmek gerekir. Bu doğrultuda, Anday'ın imge inşa süreci dilbilimsel ve felsefi yaklaşımlarla incelenmektedir. Anday'ın betimleyici üslubu aracılığıyla nesnel gerçeklikle kurduğu ilişkinin doğası tanımlanmaktadır. Ayrıca, Wallace Stevens'in Anday'ın üslubu üzerindeki etkisinin önemi vurgulanmaktadır.



Stevens'in, Anday gibi, modern şiir geleneğinde yaygın olarak karşılaşılan nesnel imge eğilimlerine mesafeli durmuş olması, şairin Anday üzerindeki etkisini daha da önemli kılmaktadır. Bu etkiyi daha detaylı incelemek adına, Anday'ın 1965 senesinde Stevens'tan yaptığı şiir çevirileri analiz edilmektedir. Son olarak, şairin söz/dünya ve dil/gerçeklik arasındaki felsefi arayışlarının doğasını ortaya koymak adına Anday'ın "İstasyon" şiirinin biçim, dil ve betimleyici üslup yönünden ayrıntılı bir analizi sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Melih Cevdet Anday, şiir, imge, modernizm, Wallace Stevens

Melih Cevdet Anday was initially affiliated with the Garip (Birinci Yeni) poets along with Orhan Veli Kanık and Oktay Rifat. Together they transformed Turkish poetry by introducing quotidian subjects, minor affects, and colloquialisms. They refused to write about idealized notions, exaggerated emotions, and turned instead towards the deliverances of everyday life. Among their topics were a man who suffered from a callus and a woman who could not care less about the world war. Their language was resolutely devoid of abstractions and ornamentation, while they did away with established poetic or prosodic forms. When examined retrospectively, we can appreciate how Anday's affiliation with Garip provided the disruption that was necessary for the development of his idiosyncratic poetic style. It is important, however, to be cognizant of the fact that Anday's poetic style, from its very inception, had significant idiosyncrasies that distinguish him from the rest of Garip. As Pelin Batu shows, "[e]ven in his earliest work, Anday's partiality towards the quixotic questions in philosophy could be detected." (2005, p. 18). After his involvement with Garip, Anday, an avid reader of English and French poetry, began to experiment with the constructivist and imagist tendencies developed by such modernists as Wallace Stevens, T.S. Eliot, and Ezra Pound.

Many critics recognize this turn as Anday's approach to the literary style of the next major Turkish poetic movement, İkinci Yeni (The Second New). While the image-oriented movements of modernism, commonly associated with the descriptive conventions of the İkinci Yeni, also had a clear influence on Anday's poetry, the changes in his style need to be studied as an individual journey with its unique philosophical stakes. As Yalçın Armağan indicates in his detailed study of Anday, "İkinci Yeni, Türkçe şiirde estetik özerkliğin yerleşiklik kazanmasını sağladığı için her türlü modernist şiir İkinci Yeni'ye bağlanır. Oysa özellikle Melih Cevdet Anday ve Behçet Necatigil'in değişimleri, doğrudan İkinci Yeni şiirine bağlanamaz. Bu şairler farklı yollardan geçerek kendi şiirlerini değiştirmişlerdir" (2007, p. 189). In addition, Anday's flirtation with modernism and turn toward concrete imagery are important because they tell the story of how certain branches of modernism were introduced to the Turkish poetry scene. Most importantly, a study of Anday's image-oriented practices disturbs certain cherished critical conventions regarding comparative timelines of modernism on a global scale.

Many comparatists wish to believe that modernism came to Turkey in a belated manner, often singling out the İkinci Yeni as the late manifestation of a modernist poetic style. While it is true that the linguistic and poetic attitudes popularized by the İkinci Yeni align with some aesthetic priorities of various modernist movements, this timeline is more deceptive than useful. A revolution in poetic style, especially concerning imagery, aestheticism, and formal experimentation, picks up pace in Turkish poetry much earlier, near the end of the nineteenth century. Symbolist, decadent and Parnassian influences, also important precursors of modernist innovation across the world, had also already triggered the inception of proto-modernist practices in the Turkish context. While the revolutionary period in the first half of the twentieth century and the related linguistic reforms did have an impact on the continuity of these modernist practices, it is problematic to see their impact as causing delays or obstructing the journey of an emergent modernist style.

The prevailing poetic attitudes in the first half of the twentieth century, exemplified by such poets as Cenab Şahabettin, Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Ahmet Haşim, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, and Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı, offer powerful comparative models to the work of High Modernist poets around the world. In addition, such accounts of belated modernism, often work with a limited definition of modernism as an experimental, form-breaking, and avant-garde movement. This is not always the case. In the Anglophone tradition, even the most seemingly-experimental modernists maintained formal or traditional alliances. To give one example, while syllabic verse in the early twentieth century is often cornered into a nationalist or traditionalist paradigm in studies of Turkish literature, in reality, it sponsored many experimental and linguistically-innovative attitudes in the works of such poets as Ziya Osman Saba and Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı. In a similar way, syllabic verse features prominently in what is considered modernist writing in the Anglophone tradition (e.g., Marianne Moore).

We need correctives to such misleading critical accounts of a belated Turkish modernism. Three possible approaches might allow us to fine-tune this narrative of literary influence: Offering more specific accounts of what we mean by modernism in different contexts through rigorous examinations of poetic lineages and the philosophical stakes of rhetorical innovation; deconstructing our cherished notions of modernism by, for example, examining the centrality of formal or traditionalist impulses in the emergence of different modernist traditions across the world; and finally, historicizing – through biographical or sociocultural approaches - the seemingly modernist elements in literature to be more mindful of the differences in aesthetic concerns which stem from context. Kenan Sharpe's recent work (2021) on the İkinci Yeni is a good example of the ways in which an incisive sociocultural analysis of poetic style might disturb certain established critical notions of modernism. My approach here follows the first mode with an eye to the developments in Anday's stylistic journey. I consider the modernist inflections in Anday's imagery by paying attention to the continuity and transformations in style across the different stages of his career. In particular, I shall be interested in the manner of his turn to concrete imagery, which is often celebrated as a trademark of modernist description. A careful analysis of Anday's imagery within the context of his particular trajectory allows us to make meaningful distinctions between modernism's versions of concrete imagery and Anday's unique aesthetic concerns.

Finally, I wish to join Pelin Batu in foregrounding the stylistic similarities between Anday and one particular modern poet, Wallace Stevens. I turn to Anday's 1965 translations from Stevens's short poems. These translations have not received much critical attention but, having been produced during the transitional years of Anday's literary career, they offer powerful insights into the philosophical stakes of Anday's poetic journey. A study of the kinships between the two aesthetic sensibilities reveals Stevens as more than just another mid-career modernist influence on Anday which routed him toward the modernist İkinci Yeni. Rather, through his carnivalesque celebrations of the imagination and fashioning of poetic syntax to harmonize sensuousness and plain ideation, Stevens – himself skeptical about image-oriented modernist trends - brings out the latent aesthetic priorities in Anday's early work. Just as these priorities

distinguished Stevens from the more urban and experimental traditions of modernism, they also distinguish Anday from the İkinci Yeni poets, whose attitudes toward poetic imagery (imge) would quickly gain cultural legitimacy [“meşruriyet”], as demonstrated astutely by Yalçın Armağan’s recent research (2020).

Though the turn to concrete imagery happens most decisively in Anday’s 1962 volume *Kolları Bağlı Odysseus*, to understand his idiosyncratic attitude toward imagery, we need to start from the beginning and pay attention to his poetic style during the Garip period. It is in this period that Anday learns to develop a sincere, intimate, and down-to-earth poetic voice through playful celebrations of subjectivity. In this regard, Anday differs from many celebrated High Modernists such as Eliot, Pound and Moore, who, especially in their imagist phases, aimed at more impersonal attitudes. Anday, however, matured as a poet through a rejection of impersonal verse. In that sense, it also tells a very different story of modernism than the conventional accounts relating to Anglo-American and European modernisms. Anday’s poetry deserves scholarly attention in order to ease the crystallized boundaries which inform our discussions of modernism and of the hardened poetic movements and categories under which Turkish poetry is often studied.

In current scholarship, there is a curious lack of interest in Anday’s imagery, which strikes me as constituting the very philosophical core of his poetics. Some criticism categorizes his later poetics as a primarily “cerebral” (Halman, 2006, p. 27) or “intellectual” (‘zihni’) (Enginün, 2009, p. 93) pursuit endeavoring to state a universal truth about the human mind and culture. These readings reduce Anday’s poetry to one of the following operations: Sensually- and grammatically-demanding image networks *or* a set of epigrammatic maxims. These hard distinctions come up because most criticism of Anday’s poetry sticks to paraphrasing rather than considering the intricate grammatical or syntactical processes by which Anday develops images to foreground and psychologize the sensuous investments which make images available to perception in the first place.

In contrast to these general accounts of Anday’s poetry, scholars such as Yalçın Armağan, Orhan Koçak, and Pelin Batu invest considerable energy in explicating Anday’s images. For example, “Güneşte Çözülenler Anday’ın Şiirinde İmge,” Koçak writes:

Her iyi yapıtta olduğu gibi Anday’ınkinde de bir mantık, bir zihinsel tutarlılık vardır elbet; ama bu tutarlılık felsefeyle değil, şiirin kendi ‘teknik’ aletleriyle gerçekleşir. Anday’ın şiirini anlamak ve tad almak istiyorsak, yapıtındaki felsefeyi (böyle bir felsefeden söz edilebilirse eğer) meydana çıkarmaya çalışmak yerine, şiirin teknik özelliklerine yaklaşmamız gerekir. İmge bunların en önemlilerindedir. (1995, p. 116).

Koçak suggests that a closer study of the technical elements in Anday’s writing - construction, structure, and primarily the image - would yield other possible poetic philosophies which have been completely overlooked in previous criticism. Koçak’s study of Anday must be applauded for recognizing this gap, though he does not go far enough down the constructivist

route. In other words, while he recognizes the variety of Anday's images and the various demands they make of the reader, he is too quick to explain the various image-networks through dense psychoanalytical and post-structuralist theories. While Koçak's explanations are always theoretically exciting, they do not so much attend to the perspectival and sensuous negotiations that the images themselves engender and how Anday's constructivist process works with or against the resources of linguistic syntax. Accordingly, after providing a brief synopsis of Anday's poetic development, this article will show how Anday engendered a new lyric possibility in Turkish poetry which, despite growing painfully conscious of the growing separation between the word and the world, still privileges an individual's desire for social connection and identification as well as a plain poetic articulation of these desires as the necessary foundations for a poetic style invested in concrete imagery.

One must start from the beginning of Anday's oeuvre to understand the nature of his interest in imagery. Identifying some of the psychological currents which underlie his early poetic production allows a sharper understanding of his eventual obsession with disfiguration and transference as key mechanisms for developing imagery. As stated, Anday began his poetic career as a member of the Garip poets and his first few collections (*Rahatı Kaçan Ağaç*, *Telgrafhane*) feature poems that are similar in tone and attitude to those of his cohort, Orhan Veli and Oktay Rifat. These poems use simple diction, address social issues often with a tinge of mockery and sarcasm, assume a playful distance and naiveté, and for the most part, refrain from traditional verse forms. Anday's initial themes are personal and juvenile. Take, for example, these two early poems:

Yolculuk Şiirleri

Bir kere ben
Çok uzun bir tren yolculuğunda
Evimdeki yatağımı düşünüp
Uyuyamamıştım.
Bu gece neden uyuyamıyorum
Evimdeki yatağımda? (2021, p. 31).

Bir Misafirlğe

Bir misafirlğe gitsem
Bana temiz bir yatak yapsalar
Her şeyi, adım bile unutup
Uyusam... (2021, p. 37).

Both poems articulate a craving by distancing themselves from the present and invoking memories that might perchance bring some quiet to a distressed mind. A specific problem, dilemma or source of anxiety is not announced. The young poet is interested in more ephemeral

subjects: How desire invents its own gestures and how the aftertaste of certain memories sustains the imagination. There are no images. Memories do not evoke any specific arrangements of place, time, or things. Hence, there is no volume. The speaker, however, still maintains a charming innocence throughout both poems. He does not hesitate to let his mind dwell on the most impulsive and unrefined questions. He seems to be asking, “oh, what is about tonight?” and “oh, how great it would be...” Most importantly, the speaker does not want explanations, or at least, he is convinced that associations will suffice. “Bir Misafirliĝe” does not necessarily express a desire to leave one’s immediate surroundings, but rather communicates that sweet exhaustion which follows an episode of wishful thinking. The final word - the totalizing wish (“uyusam”) - takes up a whole line and shows how much weight such momentary hankerings can impose on the mind.

Though devoid of objects, Anday’s early verse testifies to his growing interest in the idea of dominion: How does a clue, a thought, an impression provide all the necessary energy for a poem while at the same time gathering the various sensuous intensities developed throughout the poem? In the above pieces, there is something to be gained by the *plain* articulation of desire, even though the speaker is fully conscious that the poem can only be that and nothing more: Plain expressions of momentary desires. This idea was explored by Wallace Stevens throughout his entire career, but “The Anecdote of the Jar” is helpful due to its similarly unadorned plain diction. In this poem, the speaker “place[s] a jar in Tennessee” which organizes the entire landscape around it, to the point where its round shape begins to gather perspective (Stevens, 2015, p. 81). If the poem is read as a response to Keats’ “Ode on a Grecian Urn,” Stevens seems to be affirming Keats’s romantic sensibility while mocking its heroic attitude. A simple jar in Tennessee, an everyday object in an everyday, barren landscape, can still impose a perspective on our imagination.

Many critics describe Anday’s poetic production during this period as “toplumcu” (Fuat, 2004, p. 131) or as a poet with realist inflections (“insanları bulunduĝu gerçeklik içinde görür” (Kurdakul, 2005, p. 221). Halman argues that Anday’s early poetry “dwelt on the socio-economic plight of the man in the Street” (2006, p. 26). Despite their down-to-earth style and focus on quotidian themes, all three Garip poets were aware of the ideologically powerful yet deceptive premises of a realist attitude. For example, in the manifesto for the Garip movement, Orhan Veli notes: “19’uncu asırda yaşamış realist muharririn anlattığı tabiat original değildir; zekâ tarafından taklit edilmiştir. Onun için eser kopyenin kopyesidir.” (2014, p. 20). Indeed, any artistic project which makes an explicit point about orienting its attention towards the people, towards society without pretention is fated to arrive at this realization. There always remains, at the end, something hysterical about the motivating premises of realism.

Elin Diamond argues that “realism is more than an interpretation of reality passing as reality; it *produces* ‘reality’ by positioning its spectator to recognize and verify its truths: this escritoire, this spirit lamp, affirms the typicality, the universality of this and all late Victorian bourgeois drawing rooms” (1990, p. 61). Unsurprisingly, Diamond’s attention rests on the

material world, since the fate of materialism is not very different than that of realism. Both promise a faithful representation of their chosen subjects and require intense efforts to define what they mean by reality or by context. Even an aesthetic ambition to describe the world objectively 'as it is' has to determine certain contexts in which to arrest the concrete details or objects. Of course, one should not underestimate realism's capacity to disclose the ways of seeing that are deeply engrained in social consciousness. However, the effort to define what the artist means by 'real' and what constitutes sufficient reality are dead-ends, if not wholesale returns to idealism or symbolism. The nature of the *effort* or *struggle* to maintain a realist attitude often provides the pleasure of experiencing an aesthetic object committed to realism.

Before *Kolları Bağlı Odysseus*, especially in *Telgrafhane*, Anday partly subscribes to Garip's socially motivated style with poems that at times veer closer to social commentary. Take, for example, Anday's "Çare Yok":

Anladık ölüme çare yok
 Kazaya belaya çare yok
 Saç dökülmesine
 Yüz buruşuğuna çare yok
 Anladık çare yok
 İşsizliğe de mi yok
 Açlığa da mı yok
 Anlamadık gitti
 Çare yok. (2021, p. 9).

With such poems in mind, the critical association of early Anday with social realism makes sense. However, I turn to the relationship between realism and hysteria in order to show that Garip poets were always conscious of the shortcomings and deceptions of a realistic attitude. They soon discovered that any turn to social issues and quotidian themes has to be supplemented with poetic effects which can enhance readerly desires for that reality. In other words, the aura of realism often associated with Garip poetry ended up pushing the Garip poets to foreground those aspects of their poetry which least subscribed to realistic conventions.

During the six-year gap between his departure from the Garip movement and celebrated turn towards a style heavily informed by modernism, Anday must have confronted his own realist legacy. What he retained from his previous style is the awareness of intentionality as the more supreme poetic subject. Rather than the objects which draw the poetic gaze, the mode of desire elicited by that relationship, the affective attachments developed in relation to objects, must receive priority in poetic description. How one articulates a wish, how one sees an object or hears a rhythm must receive priority over what one wishes, sees, or hears, since the latter ends up becoming inseparable from the former. Hence, the dynamics of wishing, seeing, and hearing ought not be made readily available to the reader and instead demand an active participation through disfiguration, reconfiguration, and sensory transference. Only

through constructing an object through language can the reader participate in reality's manners of givenness.

I need to provide a brief overview of *Kolları Bağlı Odysseus* and its importance in Anday's career. This 'epic' announces Anday's commitment to various modernist sensibilities which he will develop throughout the rest of his career. His choice of the epic mode, his revisionist desire to write a new mythology, his turn to Odysseus and the Tennysonian dramatic monologue are all significant because they are exactly what modernists did while searching for a new style: Eliot in *The Waste Land*, Pound in *The Cantos* and Wallace Stevens in "Sunday Morning." The afterword to Anday's *Kolları Bağlı Odysseus*, which aims to help readers navigate the text and identify some of its sources, pays direct homage to these modernist figures, in particular *The Waste Land*. Anday quotes an entire line from Stevens's poem "The Owl in the Sarcophagus" and tells the readers that certain decisions – formal and related to content – were inspired by Pound's "The Alchemist" and Eliot's "The Waste Land," although they might not immediately stand out to the reader (Anday, 2021, p. 166-168).

Kolları Bağlı Odysseus comprises four sections. The first is about the capacious and non-categorizing perspective of childhood. Everything is available to the senses without being exhausted or divided into forms and categories. The second section is about growing up. Now things are named, they take shape, they are forced into certain forms, ways of seeing, and the speaker realizes how these forms can deceive. How, on the one hand, the multiplicity of available perspectives can be reduced to singularity, and how on the other, the singularity we perceive in things by putting them in forms can produce their own multiplicities. Eventually, the speaker runs into a bit of a bind in the third movement of the epic, now that the world has made itself available for concrete transfiguration/disfiguration, how can the speaker not see his own emotions as part of that very process of materialization?

If the self can be studied, in an almost Hegelian manner, through its extensions and concrete manifestations in the world, and through the observation of its own inner-sensuality via these objects, how can the speaker not come to see his own self also mediated through such categorical and structural ways of seeing? The speaker goes so far as to declare: "Artık bendeki insandan kurtuldum / Sevgisiz yaşayacağım sevgiyi" (2021, p. 160). He also says, "Şimdi saltanatımda yapılmızım" (2021, p. 158). Now that he is completely alienated from nature, he has to find a way out of the dominion of his limiting and defining consciousness. The modernist epic is the perfect mode for this poem because the individual parts act as an engine for a larger narrative, whose completion depends on hermeneutic exercise.

Accordingly, the various struggles with unity and alienating subjectivity subvert the mythological story. Odysseus is not a hero because he risks his life despite the warnings he receives from others, but he is a hero, in a modern sense, because he fights with those structures that are embedded in his consciousness and that actively alienate him from the rest of the world. Yet, this alienation does not result in the granting of a complete autonomy

to poetic language. Anday's mid-career style, even in the *Odysseus* poem, still preserves the plain, referential, and syntactically coherent aspects of his Garip period. As Necati Cumalı argues in relation to this poem, "Şiirin ilk sözünden son sözüne kadar gelişen bir bütünlüğü vardır. Gene açık, anlaşılır bir şairdir, somuttur, günlük konuşma dilinden uzaklaşmamıştır. İkinci Yeni'nin Melih'e kattığı olsa olsa 'Şimdi saltanatımda yapayalnızım' dizesindeki beğeni değişikliğidir. Şiiri birbiriyle ilişkisinin ne olduğu çözümlenemeyen imgelerde kurulu değildir. Anday gene güçlü bir Birinci Yeni şairidir" (2004, p. 136-137).

In Anday's version of this myth, Odysseus does not hear the sirens from the outside on his way to Ithaca, as he was warned, but the source of this sound is now located deep inside Odysseus himself:

Yüreğim kopacak gibiydi, ama
Sirenlerin izi bile yoktu ortada.
Yalnız bir ezgi, ta derinden
Ta içerimden gelen bir ezgi
Başladı yavaş yavaş yükselmeğe (2021, p. 165).

The question of choosing between inside and outside is crucial to the entire poem and it has an obvious poetic resonance. The dilemma Odysseus faces in this scene in locating the source of the sound (he expects it to come from outside, but it is clearly coming from inside) is a pressing question for all poets and readers of poetry. It concerns the relationship between form and content. It is nearly impossible for readers to resist the temptation of assimilating the poem's sounds into its content and meaning. Stevens once formulated this problem in "The Idea of Order at Key West":

And when she sang, the sea,
Whatever self it had, became the self
That was her song, for she was the maker. Then we,
As we beheld her striding there alone,
Knew that there never was a world for her
Except the one she sang and, singing, made (2015, p. 138).

The motivating idea here is akin to the one Stevens had developed in "The Anecdote of the Jar." Just as the jar in Tennessee catches everything around it in the perceptual rhythms it develops for the eye, the song she sings in the above stanza also acquires a totalizing presence (2015, p. 81). As the speaker hears her singing, everything is made anew but in an inseparable connection to the song. His poem, in its grammar and syntax, grows increasingly more conscious of its dependence on the creative rhythms which are rooted in her song and distributed across the canvas of perception.

Stevens and Anday describe the impossibility of extricating the song from the singer. Both ultimately find that the articulation of this inextricability is exactly what is necessary for art

to involve the reader in the process of production. Just as post-impressionist art identifies the struggles and efforts of perception as the primary activity that the work of art has to animate and dramatize, both poets also realize that, without partaking in this dramatization, description keeps falling back on the premises of realism. While discussing the post-impressionist painter Paul Cézanne, Orhan Koçak argues that “sanat, her şeyi sıfırdan başlattığına inanmak zorundadır” (2004, p. 157). This statement recognizes that the idea of starting from zero, starting from scratch, is always necessarily an illusion. Just as realism perpetuates hysteria, so does the search for origins. No perspective can claim to be originating. But the work of art can convince its audience that they have started from zero. In other words, a poem can convince its readers to travel a certain distance even before they can become conscious of a song heard, an object seen, a space felt. This way the problem of inextricability does not disappear, but it is now joined with the readerly consciousness of having exercised perspectival and perceptual possibilities before the presence of a song could even be inferred. This realization for Anday becomes the primary problem he has to work through to develop his images and to orient himself in relation to the material world. In the poems he wrote after *Odysseus*, Anday grappled with this challenge not only on a thematic level (as he did for the most part in *Odysseus*) but also on the level of form and imagery.

“Güvercin,” a short poem - included in Anday’s next collection, *Göçebe Denizin Üstünde* - exemplifies Anday’s fascination with concrete imagery. It demonstrates the way in which Anday atomized his newly-found poetic and descriptive concerns in *Odysseus*. It also calls to mind the syntactic playfulness and sensory transfer typically encountered in İkinci Yeni poets’ descriptive strategies. “Güvercin / Pencerede kopan alkış” (2021, p. 204). In this short poem, Anday describes, or rather prepares for presentation, a sound which may be associated with a pigeon’s quick flight away from the windowsill. However, by leaving the nature of the connection between the two lines ambiguous, Anday also calls attention mimetically to the readerly construction of this relationship. Just as we cannot grasp the pigeon amid its flight away from the window, we cannot grasp the sound described in this poem other than through conceptual pairing. In other words, the poem also dramatizes the way in which the work of poetic description often also entails the negation of that very description. An elegiac tone pervades this very short poem because it is simultaneously a celebration of life and an acceptance of its transience.

Just as the loud flapping of the pigeons’ wings fills the human observer with the melancholy experienced before a transient intensity, the realization of the poem’s sensuous potential depends on the readerly activation of the two lines. What does it mean to hold the world together? What does it mean to hold the words together? Anday foregrounds this relationship between the word and the world starting with *Kolları Bağlı Odysseus*. This connection between the word and the world is also at the very center of Wallace Stevens’s poetics. David Kleinberg-Levin discusses how Stevens’s interest in activating the world through language, while making the readers self-aware of the linguistic exercise, leads to a melancholy consciousness: “So it is, rather, the language of poetry, or language in and as poetry, with which he is concerned: language as

formative in its materiality; but also language in its deformations” (2012, p. 53). Language does not mean a complete departure from the world, as most accounts of poetic melancholy wish to suggest. In other words, language does not lose the world. Rather, in Stevens and Anday, language measures the degrees of rootedness and separation that the imagination needs to be able to bring more dynamic engagement with the world. Just as Melih Cevdet says, “[g]ördüğümüz dünya, yemin ederim, aslına benziyor,” (2021, p. 518) Wallace Stevens declares that “[t]he real is only the base. But it is the base” (1989, p. 160).

Connections between Anday's and Stevens's poetry are most compellingly presented in Pelin Batu's Master's Thesis *Wallace Stevens & Melih Cevdet Anday: The Poetics of Supreme Fiction*. This connection is especially important in assessing Anday's mid-career trajectory as a poet. In addition to Stevens being an obvious influence on Anday's transitional period and later poetic style, Anday also translated several Stevens poems in 1965, right when he was trying to ascertain the role imagery ought to play in his poetic universe. One of the most important interventions that Batu makes in her thesis concerns Stevens's distance from the Imagist traditions within modernism:

If Stevens or Anday were to be subjected to a test of Imagism they would certainly not fulfill the criteria, but neither did most of the alleged group members of Imagism for that matter. However, although the movement may have failed or contradicted itself, Imagism highlights an obsession that can be seen in many a modern artist with the objects around him/her. (2005, p. 36).

Accordingly, the object-oriented attitudes and desire for concrete imagery were pervasive motivations across many traditions of modernism. Nonetheless, as Batu argues, even those poets originally associated with the imagist movement, quickly departed from its principles. For poets like Ezra Pound and H.D., Imagism provided the building blocks or descriptive techniques of their larger works. However, Stevens maintained a purposeful distance from Imagism from the very beginning of his career, often parodying its exclusionary emphasis on the objective or the concrete in such poems as “The Man on the Dump” (2015, p. 214).

Stevens's carefully- and, often, ironically-managed distance from Imagism is important because what Anday finds especially appealing in his poetry is the commitment to going beyond the empirical and always foregrounding the mind's subjective valuation of its physical experiences. Stevens refused a descriptive methodology that purported to stage illusory distinctions between the objective and the subjective. Our grasp of the concrete, for Stevens, depended on the imagination's ability to create and sustain certain desires for our attachments in the concrete world. Similarly, Anday, in his own assessments of poetic language - early and late - emphasizes the importance of plainness and a poetry that is not thoroughly subordinated to the work of imagery. As early as 1953, Anday raises doubts about the rising obscurity of poetic language: “Son günlerde şiirin karanlığı içinden çıkılmaz bir söz oyunu olmasını isteyenlerin çoğaldığı görülüyor. Bu içe kapanış, şuuraltı modası. Gözlerimizin önünden akıp geçen hayat

artık şairi düşündürmez, duygulandırmaz mı oldu?” (2015, p. 151). Later, in 1995, Anday complains about the plentitude of imagery in modern poetry: “... benim için imge bir araçtır; oysa genç şairlerimizin şiirlerinde onun amaç olarak kullanıldığını görmek beni durduruyor ve düşündürüyor” (2015, p. 249).

The Stevens translations that Anday published in 1965 in *Yeni Ufuklar* offer an interesting selection. Though they are from the different periods of Stevens’s career, most are short poems from *Harmonium*, which is also where Stevens refines his descriptive methodology and distinguishes his style from Imagism. Even those poems from Stevens’s later career are selected as short lyric which focus on instants or rework the same image in different ways and through multiple aspects. Here below I provide Anday’s translation of “Gubbinal” which conveys Stevens’s celebratory belief in language and poetic utterance as capable of bringing dynamism to concrete reality and to the objectual relations that the world holds in store. The poem reveals how Stevens supplements objective reality by foregrounding the attitudes and responsiveness of the mind. He makes this constructivist responsiveness a part of the landscape itself. Whereas in a typical Imagist poem such valuations are hidden in the syntactic or sensuous construction of concrete imagery, for Stevens the effect of the imagination is necessarily a part of how we experience reality.

Gubbinal	Acaip Çiçek
That strange flower, the sun, Is just what you say. Have it your way.	Güneş, acaip çiçek, Dediğin doğru. Yolunun yolcusu.
The world is ugly, And the people are sad.	Çirkin bu yaşam Ve insanlar sıkıntılı
That tuft of jungle feathers, That animal eye, Is just what you say.	Şu tüy demeti Şu hayvan gözü, Dediğin doğru.
That savage of fire, That seed, Have it your way.	Şu ateş yabanisi Şu tohum Yolunun yolcusu.
The world is ugly, And people are sad.	Çirkin bu yaşam Ve insanlar sıkıntılı.
(Stevens, 2015, p. 91).	(Anday, 1956, p. 9).

“Gubbinal” produces an objectual composition and supplements it with idioms representing the mind’s responsiveness. It gives readers a chance to compare the act of putting things together in a poetic setting and weaving their names together in poetic language. In other words, Stevens is interested not only in putting things together, but he explores the kinds of playful activations of the imagination that become possible as a result of poetic utterance. “Gubbinal,” according to Eleanor Cook, comes from “gubbins” which means “trash” or “scraps.” (2007, p. 71). This derivation fits the primary affective disposition of a grumpy mind that refuses to see any beauty in the world. Yet, even the very title of the poem forces the reader to experience poetic utterance as an event that produces meaning and imaginative responsiveness. The poem itself is a combination of dismissive statements – “Have it your way” – and curious combinations of words, things, and metaphors that blazon the “strange flower.” These two are not always in synch, however. The speaker of the poem seems to have – or aspires to have - a different kind of receptiveness than the addressee, who, we are led to believe, will not be moved by this scenery. In that sense, the idiomatic negations here work as a way of augmenting the sensuous potentiality of the scenery. As Altieri says, “[i]magination might use negation to understand its own dissatisfactions and find there a thin but potentially powerful direction for struggling against ‘things as they are’” (2013, p. 91). Rather than describing things objectively or in a concrete manner, which would be more in line with Imagist principles, Stevens records the plain and idiomatic responses of a negating and unwilling mind. Paradoxically, this negation charges the scene with potential, showing us the effort of a mind as it makes a purposeful attempt to evade the attractions – visual and linguistic – of the scenery at hand.

Anday decides to translate the title as “Acaip Çiçek,” rather than using words like ‘garip’ or ‘tuhaf.’ In so doing, he conveys the sense of quirkiness that Stevens characteristically builds into his diction since the double vowels in ‘acaip’ immediately call attention to the utterance, inviting the reader to cultivate a self-conscious relationship to the poetic language. This self-consciousness is central to Stevens’s poem: Though the addressee is not in a mood to engage with the pleasant offerings or metaphorical invitations of the world, they cannot escape uttering or overhearing the playful energies stored in poetic language. Furthermore, Anday translates the idiomatic phrases conveying a dismissive attitude masterfully. The most interesting choice here is to render “have it your way” as “yolunun yolcusu.” Here, Anday repurposes an idiomatic phrase in Turkish which conveys a judgmental attitude toward those who make questionable decisions or choose dubious paths. This Turkish phrase works especially well here because it conveys judgement, continuation, and a recognition of subjective states. This recognition is precisely the element which distinguishes Stevens, especially in his earliest collection *Harmonium*, from the Imagist claims of objectivity. Stevens aspires to obviate the subjective states which motivate our negation, affirmation, or celebration of the world. Finally, Anday preserves the deictic impulse in Stevens’s blazon, using the “şu” pronoun to bring a sense of immediacy to parts of a scenery that are made to appear emotionally or psychologically distant from the addressee. By repeating this deictic marker and transforming the seemingly mundane

details of the flower into exciting metaphors, the speaker implicitly negates the dismissive attitude of the addressee, revealing that the addressee must somehow already be invested in the objects of description.

I argue that these translations prove crucial for Anday's poetic trajectory for two reasons. First, Stevens's language teaches him ways of supplementing reality in a way that returns us to that very reality with more imaginative and affective dynamism. As such, Stevens's poetry has a more ambitious way of animating concrete reality than Imagist methods which fetishize concrete and sensuous presentation. Second, Anday finds in Stevens an attitude that recalls his earliest experiments with poetry as part of the Garip circle. Stevens's interest in the mundane, his playful assortment of quotidian compositions, the joy he derives from chance combinations in poetic utterance, and his plain and idiomatic celebration of the primacy of the imagination all find resonance with Anday's poetic background. Therefore, the kinship Anday finds in Stevens's poetry is not mere coincidence. In addition, this kinship proves instructive for distinguishing Anday's version of modernism and descriptive technique from the various poetic sensibilities of the İkinci Yeni.

I now turn to a later Anday poem, "İstasyon," to demonstrate how he harmonizes all these different strands of sensibility and influence in his later lyric verse. "İstasyon" was first published with ten other poems in the literary magazine *Yeni Dergi* in May 1974 without any specific titles (Anday, 2021, p. 281). The "İstasyon" title was given later, upon the publication of these poems in Anday's 1975 book *Teknenin Ölümü*. In their initial conception, then, they were part of a larger sequence of poems called "Lirik Şiirler" (Lyric Poems). Each poem has a similar formal structure: Four stanzas of three lines followed by a single line stanza, which, in this and some other cases, is a refrain. This stanzaic organization and the compositional drive behind the poems immediately recall Stevens's influence. Though there is no overarching rhyme scheme, most poems in the sequence reward reading out loud because they quietly activate non-insistent but essential rhymes and alliterations.

"İstasyon" is a poem about disorientation in all senses of the word, spatial, temporal, and sensual. Even though the title prompts the reader to think about the station as a framing device and the first stanza creates fields of association around the idea of a train station, the image is used to initiate a series of associative improvisations. Anday utilizes the psychological vocabulary triggered by the state of suspense one might feel at a train station. The first line brings the senses to an immediate pause: "Peronu kocamış bir istasyonun" (2021, p. 290). The grammatical operation performed by *kocamak* is debilitating and full of surprises. At first, it seems to carry the central weight of the line because it calls attention to the peculiar combination of registers. *Kocamak* means to age, to grow old and is almost exclusively used to refer to people. The peculiarity results not from its promotion to the metaphorical realm (the platform has aged like a human), but from its self-conscious disfiguration of a grammatical tendency. While it is common to use *kocamak* to refer to an aging person (*adam kocamış, kocamış kadın*), it is atypical to use it to talk about the aging of a specific feature or part of

a person. In other words, it suggests a relationship between a part and a whole (the platform and the station) by adapting a verb that wouldn't readily yield such distinctions. In addition, the repetition of the round sounds ('o') intimates a more participatory and totalizing visual experience, in which the sense of agedness belongs to the observation as a whole and does not agree with the distinction drawn out by the inflecting verb, *kocamak*. The insistent sound pattern also molds the noun compound into a firm structure, whereby "peronu kocamış bir istasyon" suddenly begins to sound like a fact, rather than the realization of a gradual process (say, for example "peronu *eskimiş* bir istasyon" and see how different it feels in the lack of an adamant sound pattern).

However, this isolated reading of the first line deflates when we proceed to the next line. The first line does not connect to the second line effortlessly because it does not find a mirroring syntactical structure that could further specify or adjust what initially sounded like a noun-compound: "Peronu kocamış bir istasyonun, / Bilmediğim akşam saati, hüznün / Yanımda, şaşırdım yönleri" (2021, p. 290). We learn that the initiating phrase of the poem was *not* a noun compound. Now a subtle pause needs to be introduced after "kocamış" to make this sound like a flowing sentence. The line needs to be inflected in such a way that can resurrect it as a main clause. Now, it will sound like a breathing observation *despite* the sound structure. In fact, now, the repetition of "o" adds a spooky and mysterious sense to the whole line. The attention moves from the verb "kocamak" to "bir" which blurs the distinction between reality and imagination. Is the speaker actually observing a platform or is he imagining it, overhearing it? Is the station a part of a landscape completely imagined? The operation is almost geometrical: Words are like forms that continuously suggest new semantic combinations. From the very first line, Anday manages to dramatize the relationship between subjectivity and objectivity. How we see and what we see inevitably change but the poem still introduces grammatical perspective from the vantage point of which the semantic operation acquires some objectivity. Once we, as readers, witness this construction of objectivity, we can then explore the rhythms of our subjective perception. To quote Orhan Koçak again, "sanat, her şeyi sıfırdan başlattığına inanmak zorundadır" (2004, p. 157), and it is exactly this production of make-believe that the artist relies on to develop the claims of his objectivity through their mediation by the material world.

The station is not a mere object, nor a setting, nor a symbol. It is a place that enters the poem from all directions and demands that the reader undertake, in an increasingly conscious manner, a variety of perceptual negotiations. When an object enters the poem without much perceptual demand, it risks disappearing into the larger meaning. However, when the object, insistently organizes the semantic field around it, it begins to gather a certain concreteness. For example, in the above stanza, after the platform and the station reconfigure meaning by kindling a range of semantic possibilities, the idea of space in language emerges more powerfully. In *Signs*, Maurice Merleau-Ponty calls attention to how language is more "like a being than a means":

Because meaning is the total movement of speech, our thought crawls along in language... At the very moment language fills our mind up to the top without leaving the smallest place for thought not taken into its vibration, and exactly to the extent that we abandon ourselves to it, it passes beyond the 'signs' toward their meaning (1964, p. 43).

Merlau-Ponty shows how meaning materializes in our minds and calls attention to the decisive turn in language which facilitates this process. There's a fatalistic tone in Merlau-Ponty's description because, like most phenomenological theorists, he detects the commencement of a Platonic network in the turn towards meaning. In other words, once meaning forms in the mind, the individual signs become a part of the meaning-making machinery. But the Platonic network is only the beginning of a dialectical process because in poetry, in order to keep producing meaning out of signs, we have to return to the signs in their matter-of-factness. Diana Coole argues that "the phenomenological task is to show how consciousness emerges from, yet remains enmeshed in, this material world," while acknowledging that "our apprehending nature/matter entails a raft of bodily accomplishments, linguistic practices, and cultural assumptions that are integral to nature's unfurling and to our own place within it" (2010, p. 101).

The first stanza introduces a general unease with direction. Just as the syntax remains open and plastic in the first stanza, the poem prompts us to enter into the meaning-making process from various directions, not unlike a train arriving at and leaving a station. The speaker also experiences disorientation. He has lost track of time - "bilmediğim akşam saati" (2021, p. 290) - and expresses a sense of melancholy alienation: "hüzün / yanımda" (2021, p. 290). The speaker is not *in* a certain mood, but rather, next to it. That this affective disposition is established through a line-break further complicates our sense of direction and calls attention to the growing separation between sensory and linguistic operations. It is significant that the speaker recognizes melancholy almost like a travel companion, also trying to figure out the right platform. While the speaker locates it "next to" himself, in the structure of the poem, it hovers above.

The directional tension initiated by this single line-break will be the defining source of confusion for the rest of the poem, and hence the refrain, which will arrive in the next line: "Yukarıda bırakmıştım seni, gökte. / Karanlıkta ağaçlar ve yol, / Karanlıkta ak giysilerin" (2021, p. 290). While reading the first line out loud, the ear immediately catches a rhyme with the previous line. Read the following lines again: "Yanımda, şaşırdım, yönleri" and "Yukarıda bırakmıştım seni." The only difference is that now, there is an additional word - "gökte" - which stretches the syntax and, coming after a caesura, makes temporal and spatial demands on the readers' attention. The word is tacked on to the line like a detail, but it is quite the opposite: It is the place towards which the speaker's turns; it is the new surface from which the speaker will try to extract the beloved. This line is also the refrain and will be repeated at the end of the poem.

This repetition can be visualized as a horizon which gathers depth as the speaker variously turns towards and away from it. Ironically, as the speaker's eye turns upward, the poem turns in the opposite direction. The time between the refrains is devoted to the night and its ability to overwhelm perception, once again confusing the relationship between the part and the whole. "Karanlıktı ağaçlar ve yol, / Karanlıktı ak giysilerin." (2021, p. 290). Surely, the tree, the road and the "white clothes" of the beloved are all encapsulated in darkness, but they do not disappear. Despite the sameness that the night wants to indoctrinate in all fields of perception, Anday develops various perceptual rhythms which suggest quite the opposite. The anaphora (the repetition of "karanlıktı a...") announces the night's desire for sameness. However, as the speaker looks deeper and further, objects begin to gather clarity. The repetition of "a" within the anaphora records the movement of the eyeball as it develops a network of perception among various entities. Movement is explored not by contrasting objects as static or dynamic entities (tree/road vs. dress), but by how various objects stage dynamic compositions. As "ağaçlar" continues the repetition of the vowel "a," it develops a different sense of continuity (as distribution) than "yol," which twists and turns our attention onto the next line.

The third stanza brings more volume to the images introduced in the second stanza: "Gece, o hazne, yabancı taş, / Ağaçların üstündeydi penceren, / Artık ses ve demir onamaz beni" (2021, p. 290). On the one hand, the lack of connectives (like, as, such as) invite readerly participation. On the other hand, they highlight the speaker's inability to connect scenes and images which seem so eager to turn into metaphors. It is hard to tell if "hazne" and "yabancı taş" are likened to the night or if they are the objects which most resonate with the night. The lack of a desire, or more properly, a will to engender such relations through metaphors, similes, or other such rhetorical devices, recalls the state of Anday's *Odysseus* in the third part, where a growing consciousness of his own alienation suddenly erupts into a neurosis on the level of language. In an effort to disassemble previously established forms of consciousness, the speaker gets more and more tangled up. In *Odysseus*, the metaphorical tendency that the speaker works so hard to keep at bay begins to invade his own language: "Olağan biçimlerin / Yerce yenilenmelerinden / Olağanüstü yabancılıkları" (2021, p. 159) or "Bilgisiz inanım, inansız bilim / Töz bir yerde, bir yerde öz / Duyumsuz duygu, duyusuz duyum / Gerçekle ülkü arasındaki" (2021, p. 161). Similarly, in the third stanza of "İstasyon," the speaker tries to avert the relational or metaphorical impulse. But this effort proves unsustainable unless the speaker can make an epic leap to create his own fiction or mythos. Is this effort conceivable in a short lyric poem, where various relations typically cohere around a single subjectivity?

We might dilute this question and focus on the ending of "İstasyon" to observe how Anday resists such ideals of unity that the lyric historically strives for. "İşte burda saatlardayım, / Saatlar hiçbir yerde değil, değil / Ne bu yönde, ne de o yönde, / Yukarıda bırakmıştım seni, gökte" (2021, p. 290). Anday concludes "İstasyon," and the other lyric poems in the sequence, with a stand-alone line, which in this case also happens also to be the refrain. There are no concrete images. Rather, these lines are abstract and filled with mental negations. Ironically,

however, they begin by asserting sense of place with a firm deixis: “İşte burda...” After situating himself right here, in this lyric space, the speaker shifts the focus from space to time in an affirmative stance: “saatlarda” (in various times). Nonetheless, right after this affirmative temporal placement, the speaker negates all possible distributions across conventional notions of time. Instead, he establishes a self that is embedded in a new lyric temporality.

Both Yalçın Armağan and Hulki Aktunç emphasize this poetically created lyric temporality. Hulki Aktunç argues that Anday is trying to shatter time: “Zamanı çatlatmaya uğraşmaktadır. Kısıtlarını zamanın, sınırlarını zamanın, çevrenini zamanın, kırmaya çalışır. Öncesiz sonrası oluşumlar, zamanın dikeyliğini, yataylığını, sarmallığını, her konumdaki integrallerini bozup yeniden kurar” (2004, p. 296). Likewise, in his detailed study of temporality in Anday’s poetics, Armağan argues that “Anday’ın şiirinde başka bir uzam, başka bir Zaman ve başka bir bilinç yaratılmak istenir” (2003, p. 11-12). Though Anday does indeed construct new temporalities in his poetry, it is very important to note that his poetry does not completely abandon attachment to the physical world, nor does it aspire for a radical autonomy. As I will show in my analysis of the final line of the poem, Anday emphasizes, with great effort, the importance of returning to physical reality and of the referential functions of language.

The speaker is aware, at the end, of having distributed his consciousness throughout the poem and his images now can only survive in lyric time, in the “iterable now” of the lyric (Culler, 2015, p. 294). Just like time, at the end of “İstasyon,” the concept of space is also reimaged. The refrain, when it appears a second *time*, resists being categorized as mere repetition, or as a mere symptom of return or progress. For the first time in the poem, a stanza does not close at the end and spills onto the next stanza, suggesting an alternate conception of construction and space. The final stand-alone line, the refrain, then stretches the poem (across space *and* time), especially through the rhyme at the end: yönde/gökte. It is significant that the only end rhyme in the poem comes at the conclusion where the speaker can barely hold together anymore due to the dearth of images and the increasing abundance of abstract ideation. The world theorized in the abstractive maneuvers of the penultimate stanza builds up to a dynamic responsiveness which sends the reader back to the poem, to its concrete jungle, activating its rhythms and perceptual possibilities in new ways. As Ahmet Oktay argues, “[b]üyük şiir hemen ve kolayca gündelik dile ve gündelik beklentilere çevrilebilen bir anlam üretmez; tam tersine; o dili olumsuzlayan gündelik anlam dünyasının ötesini öngören, daha doğrusu böyle bir dünyayı bir anda yangın alevi gibi görünür kılan bir anlam üretir.” (1982, p. 3). Hence, Anday’s constant oscillation between spatial and temporal situatedness and his final withdrawal from the concrete into the space of the abstract. In Anday’s poetics, there is no contradiction in this dual gesture of situatedness and withdrawal. There is rather continuity and poetic language is there precisely to manage the traffic between the two.

Anday is most successful as a poet when he challenges singular perspectives and performs the inevitable repudiation of an impartial reality. In other words, with every poem, Anday confirms the value of individual creation and celebrates the subjectivity of perception. In

an essay about Stevens, J. Hillis Miller writes, “The discovery of the identity of all the elements of life means a redefinition of poetry. Words are not pictures of reality. They are a part of the thing, tangled inextricably with the event they describe” (1964, p. 98). What makes Anday's poetry continuously delightful is the word-for-word measuring of the mind's responsiveness to the concrete world. Each attempt at precise description is also inevitably the translation of the affective dispositions which make us want to get closer, dig deeper, and capture the things as they are. Each descriptive attempt at specificity is implicitly supplemented with the modes of desire which draw our senses toward the thing described. Anday insists on everyday objects and the concrete despite his awareness of the unavertable inclination of concrete description toward metaphor. As a result, in addition to his rigorous descriptive pursuits to contextualize imagery in specific physical settings and temporalities, the imagery simultaneously disrupts and ceaselessly recalibrates the poem's lyric sense of time, duration, and space by charting the metaphorical journeys made possible and frustrated by each descriptive maneuver.

CONCLUSION

An investigation of the various transformations in Anday's use and construction of imagery over the course of his career reveals important continuities between his early Garip phase and the later modernist inflections of his poetry. This later style has often been related to his eventual alignment with the descriptive tendencies of the İkinci Yeni and his wider interest in the Imagist and constructivist modes which stem from the modernist tradition. However, such a critical narrative fails to recognize important signs of Anday's reluctance toward certain modernist principles and, in particular, toward the pervasive privileging of *imge*, or concrete imagery in the newly evolving literary climate of the 1960s. When we study the manner and grammar of his image constructions, we notice an almost Romantic celebration of poetic abstraction and imaginative responsiveness. Starting with *Kolları Bağlı Odysseus*, Imagist influences, montage, mythic imagination, and concrete description all begin to inform his descriptive technique. However, Anday always maintains interest in the plain expressions of fleeting desires and how these expressions, along with the possibility of their utterance, add to the structure of concrete reality, inevitably becoming inextricable parts of what we might characterize as concrete in the first place.

While distinguishing the idiosyncrasies of Anday's descriptive style from the more prevalent image-oriented practices of the İkinci Yeni, his interest in the work of the American poet Wallace Stevens proves especially instructive. Although Stevens was a part of the modernist moment in literary history, he was never associated with coteries or organized poetic movements. More importantly, Stevens maintained an ironic distance from the modern fascination with concrete imagery, instead remaining an enduring champion of the Romantic imagination and the inextricability of our desires from the versions of reality that make concrete demands on perception. Anday's 1965 translations of Stevens's short poems offer the best evidence for the shared literary sensibility between the two poets. Given their mutual reluctance toward the

prevalent image-oriented practices of their respective contexts, a comparative consideration of their works offers important insights into Anday's descriptive rhetoric. Therefore, continuities in Anday's career and a more precise contextualization of his attitude toward modernist practices allow us to trace the poetic style and descriptive techniques of his later periods, where abstraction becomes a necessary step in the perpetual revitalization of concrete reality. Pulling Anday's poetry further into the comparative context allows for a more nuanced appreciation of his poetic style as well as a more layered conceptualization of the divergent forms of modernism within the Turkish poetic tradition.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

REFERENCES

- Akatlı, F. (1998). Melih Cevdet Anday şiirinde tarih ve zaman. *Zamanı yaşatan roman, zamana direnen şiir* içinde (s. 143-151). İstanbul: Boyut Yayıncılık.
- Aktunç, H. (2004). Zamanı korkutan şiir. O. Kahyaoğlu (Ed.), *Güneşte ayıklanmış: Melih Cevdet Anday şiiri* içinde (s. 295-297). İstanbul: neKitaplar.
- Altieri, C. (2013). *Wallace Stevens and the demands of modernity: Toward a phenomenology of value*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Anday, M. C. (1965). Acaip çiçek. *Yeni ufuklar*. 13(152), 8-9.
- Anday, M. C. (2015). Y. Armağan (Ed.), *Şiir yaşantısı: Şiir yazıları*. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.
- Anday, M. C. (2021). M. S. Aydın (Ed.), *Sözcükler: Bütün şiirleri*. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.
- Armağan, Y. (2003). *Melih Cevdet Anday şiirinde zaman*. (MA Thesis). Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Armağan, Y. (2007). *Türk şiirinde modernizm*. (PhD Thesis). Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Armağan, Y. (2020). *İmgenin icadı: İkinci Yeni'nin meşruiyeti*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Batu, P. (2005). Wallace Stevens & Melih Cevdet Anday: The poetics of supreme fiction. (MA Thesis). İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Coole, D. (2010). The inertia of matter and the generativity of flesh. In D. Coole and S. Frost (Eds.), *New materialisms: Ontology, agency, and politics* (pp. 92-115). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Culler, J. (2015). *Theory of the lyric*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cumalı, N. (2004). Anday'ın Odyssea'sı. O. Kahyaoğlu (Ed.), *Güneşte ayıklanmış: Melih Cevdet Anday şiiri* içinde (s. 133-142). İstanbul: neKitaplar.
- Diamond, E. (1990). Realism and hysteria: Toward a feminist mimesis. *Discourse*, 13(1), 59-92.
- Enginün, İ. (2009). *Cumhuriyet dönemi Türk edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Fuat, M. (2004). Kolları Bağlı Odysseus. O. Kahyaoğlu (Ed.), *Güneşte ayıklanmış: Melih Cevdet Anday şiiri* içinde (s. 129-132). İstanbul: neKitaplar.
- Halman, T. S. (2006). Melih Cevdet Anday: Kolları Bağlı Odysseus. In J.L. Warner (Ed.), *The Turkish muse: Views & reviews (1960s-1990s)* (pp. 26-28). New York: Syracuse University Press.

- Kanık, O. V. (2014). *Garip: Şiir hakkında düşünceler ve Melih Cevdet, Okay Rifat, Orhan Veli'den seçilmiş şiirler*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Kleinberg-Levin, D. (2012). *Redeeming words and the promise of happiness: A critical theory approach to Wallace Stevens and Vladimir Nabokov*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Koçak, O. (1995). Güneşte çözülenler Anday'ın şiirinde imge. Ş. Erbaş (Ed.), *Melih Cevdet Anday günlükleri* içinde (s.115-127). Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği Yayınları.
- Koçak, O. (2004). "Melih Cevdet Anday'ın şiirinde ten ve tin. O. Kahyaoğlu (Ed.), *Güneşte ayıklanmış: Melih Cevdet Anday şiiri* içinde (s. 143-176). İstanbul: neKitaplar.
- Kurdakul, Ş. (2005). Melih Cevdet Anday. *Çağdaş Türk edebiyatı III: Cumhuriyet dönemi I (Şiir)* içinde (s. 220-229). İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *Signs* (R. C. McCleary, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Oktay, A. (1982, 28 Nisan). Zamanı tersinden okumak. *Cumhuriyet*, s. 5.
- Sharpe, K. (2021). Combined and uneven modernism: Turkey's İkinci Yeni poets. *Dibur 10*, 165-197.
- Stevens, W. (1989). Milton J. Bates (Ed.). *Opus posthumous*. New York: Vintage.
- Stevens, W. (2015). *Wallace Stevens: The collected poems*. New York: Vintage.