

Men who Desire to Conquer:
Romantic Love and Masculinity Among Some Young Professionals

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts
in
Sociology

by
Umut Sari

Boğaziçi University

2004

Bogazici University Library



39001102311241

14

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Prof. Nükhet Sirman, my thesis advisor, for everything she did for me during the last two years. Without her invaluable ideas and comments, and her continuous support, this thesis would not be completed.

I would like to thank Prof. Ferhunde Özbay and Prof. Belgin Tekçe for their productive criticism and encouragement.

I am grateful to Deniz for believing in me...

I also thank my brother Doğa and my parents for all the emotional support they provided to me.

Infinite thanks to my friends Andaç, Ayşe, Behlül, Cem, Cumhuri, Çağla, Güneş, Jale, Murat, Petek, Serap, Serdar, Şule, Ufuk for their helps and for understanding me.

ABSTRACT

Men who Desire to Conquer:

Romantic Love and Masculinity Among Some Young Professionals

Umut Sarı

The aim of this study is to understand how *masculinity* is constructed in the way some well-educated male professionals in their early adulthood in contemporary Turkey describe *love*. The study is based on seven in-depth interviews conducted between May 2003 and July 2003 in Istanbul.

This study analyzes romantic love first at the level of *emotions*, and second at the level of *couple relationships*. Passion and powerlessness were found to be the two constitutive *emotions* in the participants' definition of love. The desire *to conquer* was identified as the primary leitmotif in their narratives. The participants wish to end their relationships as they think that they conquered the loved women, and to fall in love as many women as possible. The way that participants describe love is inherent with a specific form of male power that objectifies women.

The participants imagine their gender identities as *modern* masculine arguing that their couple relationships are based on equality. As a way of performing this modern masculinity, they condemn the controlling of women's sexuality through the codes of honor in Turkey and introduce trusting one another to replace the code of honor. The fact that women will be sanctioned if they live according to the same definition of love based on conquest due to the patriarchal structure of Turkish society was never thought of.

ÖZET

Fethetmeyi Arzulayan Erkekler:

Bazı Genç Profesyoneller Arasında Aşk ve Erkeklik

Umut Sarı

Bu çalışmanın amacı, günümüz Türkiye'sindeki bazı iyi eğitilmiş genç profesyonel erkeklerin aşkı anlatış biçiminde erkekliğin nasıl kurulduğunu anlamaya çalışmaktır. Çalışma, Mayıs ve Temmuz 2003 tarihleri arasında İstanbul'da yapılan yedi tane derinlemesine mülakata dayanmaktadır.

Bu çalışma aşkı ilk olarak duygular düzeyinde, ikinci olarak da ilişkiler düzeyinde incelemektedir. Tutku ve güçsüzlük, katılımcıların aşk tanımlarındaki iki temel duygu olarak bulunmuştur. Fethetme arzusu katılımcıların aşk anlatılarındaki en önemli tema olarak gösterilmiştir. Katılımcılar, kadınları fethettiklerini düşündükçe ilişkilerini bitirmeyi ve mümkün olduğunca çok kadına aşık olmayı dilemektedirler. Katılımcıların aşkı anlatış biçimi kadınları nesneleştiren özel bir erkek gücü biçimini göstermektedir.

İlişkilerinin eşitliğe dayandığını iddia eden katılımcılar kendi cinsel kimliklerini modern erkek olarak hayal etmektedirler. Bu modern erkekliği bir icra etme yolu olarak, namus kavramı üzerinden kadınların cinselliklerinin kontrol edilmesini kınamışlar ve namus kavramı yerine karşılıklı güven kavramını ortaya atmışlardır. Fakat ataerkil toplum yapısından dolayı kadınların fethetmeye dayanan bir aşk tanımını paylaşmaları durumunda cezalandırılacakları hiç düşünülmemiştir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	4
CHAPTER1: ROMANTIC LOVE AND MASCULINITY	7
◆ Love and Modernity	8
◆ Love and Gender	15
◆ Masculinity in Turkey	18
◆ Changes in the Meaning of Love in Republican Turkey	24
◆ Conclusion	26
CHAPTER 2: EMOTIONS OF LOVE AND THE CONQUERING SUBJECT	28
◆ What is Love?	29
◆ Fragments of Being in Love	30
• <i>Passion</i>	31
• <i>Powerlessness</i>	43
• <i>Madness</i>	47
• <i>Being Hurt & Fears (of Being Hurt)</i>	49
• <i>Pain</i>	53
• <i>Liveliness</i>	54
◆ Reuniting the Fragments: Love as Discovery/Conquest	54
◆ Conclusion	63

CHAPTER 3: GENDER AND POWER	64
◆ Gender, Representation and Performance	65
◆ Love and Power: Power in the Nature of Love	67
◆ The (Love) Relationship: Doing Modern Masculinity	74
• <i>Opposition</i>	76
• <i>Trust rather than Honor</i>	78
• <i>Privacy, Expressing Feelings & the Code of Honor</i>	85
◆ Conclusion: Love and Marriage?	88
CONCLUSION	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	94

INTRODUCTION

Being in love and the feelings associated with being in love as described by some well-educated male professionals in their early adulthood in contemporary Turkey is the main subject of the present thesis. The aim is to understand how masculinity is constructed in the way this social category of men describes love.

Gender is present in every aspect of everyday life. The gender of the subject who speaks about romantic love, therefore, matters. The men of a certain social category who participated in the present study told me about their ideas and experiences concerning romantic love. Their stories are important for providing insights to the gender representations and performances in contemporary Turkey. Their ideas about and description of the nature of romantic love contains a considerable amount of assumptions regarding men's and women's nature. Such assumptions are part and parcel of gender representations present in Turkey. In what they explain as their experiences there is again a considerable amount of data concerning how they perform masculinity by invoking, enacting and remaking the often-polarized images of the two genders. The primary aim of this thesis, in this respect, is to explore the place the love that the men of a certain social category describe occupies in the cultural ideals of masculinity and the broader gender order in contemporary Turkey.

As feminist studies reveal, power is present everywhere where gender is present. Love is, therefore, a site of gendered power relations. One of the peripheral aims of this thesis is, for this reason, to evaluate the love that the men describe in terms of the power relations that are present in the broader gender order in Turkey, especially in comparison with the power relations that the feminist scholars remark for love

relationships in the West. I will try to reveal the differences and discuss the sociological implication of these differences. The code of honor will be taken as the primary reservoir shaping the nature of gendered power relations and cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey.

Romantic love is a subject that received little attention from sociologists. The existing literature of Western mainstream sociology focuses mainly on the functions of romantic love in modern industrial societies, such as its provision of security by being loved. This literature has a basic weakness, among others, for equating romantic love with being loved and dismissing loving. However, love is explained by the men who participated in this study as an emotion, like many men and women elsewhere in the world. For this reason, taking into account the emotions of men and women are important for a thorough sociological analysis of romantic love in a given society, since the construction of emotions is a basic site of construction of gendered subjectivities. The other peripheral aim of the present thesis, in this respect, is to depict the fragments of the subjectivities of the men who participated in this study and to evaluate their subjectivities in connection with the broad discourses in Turkey, such as nationalism.

This thesis consists of three chapters. In the first chapter, the existing sociological and anthropological literatures on romantic love and masculinity will be reviewed in order to set the basic problematic of this thesis in the cleanest way. First, the connection between romantic love and modernity will be explored and its relevance for Turkey discussed. Second, the different meanings romantic love carries for women and men will be brought under close scrutiny especially in the light of the power relations present in heterosexual couple relationships. Third, the code of honor will be discussed

in terms of how it shapes the cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey as a Middle Eastern – Mediterranean culture.

In the second chapter, I will try to analyze the love that the men who participated in this study describe by exploring the emotions they say they feel when in love. The primary emotions they say that they feel when in love are passion, powerlessness, being hurt and fears of being hurt, pain, and liveliness. These emotions are put by the participants in a seemingly coherent way, all of which are explained by the employment of the word ‘conquest’. Conquest as the main theme of their stories will be analyzed in terms of the insights it offers to their subjectivities.

In the final chapter, I will seek to explore how masculinity is constructed in relationship with this subjectivity and to identify the forms of male power stemming from the gender representations and gender performances of the participants of this study in the contexts of love and relationship. First, power that the feminist scholars remark for love relationships in the West will be compared with the power inherent in the way that the participants define love around the theme of conquest. Second, the love relationship will be elaborated as a place where the participants perform masculinity. The forms of power coming out of their performances will be identified in relationship with the code of honor in Turkey. Finally, the Western romantic ideology in which love is constructed as not only the prerequisite but also the basic initiative for marriage will be investigated to see if it is relevant in the case of the participants of this study.

METHOD

The aim

The aim of the present thesis is, as mentioned before, to understand the kind of masculinity that is constructed by looking at the way a social category of men in contemporary Turkey describe love. The social category of men who are targeted is well-educated professionals in their early adulthood. In order to grasp the meanings romantic love carry for them, the men were selected by a snowball sampling method. Then, the data were gathered through personal interviews. Seven in-depth interviews were conducted in the summer of 2003 in Istanbul.

Participants

The men who participated in the interviews ranged in age from 27 to 38 years. Their education level is four years of undergraduate study. Five graduated from universities in Istanbul, while the other two graduated from universities in Ankara and Kocaeli. Three were married, while the other four were not married at the time when the interviews were conducted. Some brief information about them is below.

Mustafa was twenty-seven at the time when the interview was conducted. He graduated from the Management department at a university in Istanbul. He was working as a financial analyst in a bank in Istanbul. He was single at the time. He had recently separated from his two-year long girlfriend.

Emre was twenty-eight. He graduated from the Communication faculty at university in Istanbul. He was working as an editor in one of leading publishers in Turkey. He was married for about a year.

Mert was thirty-eight. He graduated from the Mechanical Engineering department at a university in Ankara. He was working in a tourism company at the time. He was married for about two years. He had a child.

Ömer was thirty-three. He graduated from the Chemistry department at a university in Istanbul. He had recently founded an international-trade company in chemistry sector. He was not married but had a relationship with a woman for two and a half years.

Özgür was twenty-eight. He graduated from the Communications Engineering department at a university in Kocaeli. He was working in a transnational corporation in mobile phones sector. He was not married but had a relationship with a woman for three years. He was traveling around Turkey for work for most of the time.

Serkan was thirty-four. He was a psychiatrist. He was not married but had a relationship with a woman for more than a year.

Faruk was twenty-eight. He graduated from the Textile Engineering department at a university in Istanbul. At the time of the interview, he had recently resigned his work in a textile company. He was married for about a year.

Interviews

Four of the interviews took place at the participants' houses, while the three occurred at their workplaces. The duration of the recorded interviews ranged from one hour to two and a half hours. The shortest interview was that with Serkan. He constantly emphasized that it was difficult for him to tell his feelings about romantic love. The longest interview was that with Mert. He willingly tried to detail his descriptions with several examples.

The primary focus of the interviews was on the experiences of the participants which they consider as love and the corresponding relationship between self conceptualizations of masculinity and feelings in love. The interview questions consisted of three topics. The participants were first asked if they had ever fallen in love, and if so to describe them in detail. My strategy was to notice what the participants say they feel when in love, and make them tell those feelings in detail, rather than asking directly what they felt. In responses to the first question, there was a deliberate attempt by the participants to categorize their feelings about romance and to define what love indeed is. Faced with the attempt of the participants to conceptualize love, I also asked them what they implied with the words they used, such as seriousness, passion, etc. Second, I asked them questions about the dynamics of their current relationships or marriages, aiming at learning about in what ways the (male) power can be present in their relationships. Only Mustafa was not in a relationship at the time. I asked him questions about his recent relationship. Finally, I asked them questions about what they consider as manly in being love and the course love takes in time and if they consider themselves as different from other men in society in general.

CHAPTER 1: ROMANTIC LOVE AND MASCULINITY

Romantic love entered into the scope of social scientific analysis mainly in three ways. First, the relationship between the emergence and spread of romantic love and the industrial organization of *modern* societies has been the mostly elaborated aspect of romantic love in the social sciences. Second, feminist theorists argued that the meanings and functions of romantic love differ for men and women, and argued that any analysis of romantic love must take into account *gender* as a basic category for identifying these differences. Third, the relationship between romantic love and the self has been investigated from a *psychoanalytic* perspective, evaluating romantic love in terms of its basic dynamics which stem from the relationships of the (gendered) child with her/his mother and father. Below, I will try to outline these theoretical approaches by identifying their importance and shortcoming, in reaction to which I will try to set the main issue of this thesis.

Love and Modernity

It is commonly argued by many social scientists that romantic love is a Western and relatively modern phenomenon. The argument holds that romantic love emerged at the time of industrial revolution when Western societies underwent a dramatic transformation. Romantic love, according to these views, provides a new form of communication in the atomistic environment of modern Western societies, in which social integration and communication were at a minimum. According to Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, industrial society is a risk society where the security of the interpersonal relationships of the pre-modern age, guaranteed especially by kinship and religion, faded away (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 1995). In such a social universe, love provides the security and attachment to individuals who, in the emptiness left by kinship and religion,

were seeking their self-identity. Hence, love became a “secular religion” (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 1995:184). Simmel, in a similar way, suggests that love became a basic way for the atomized individuals in the densely populated and variegated industrial society to establish a sensible relationship between the self and the world (Simmel, 1999). For Luhmann, like others, romantic love serves as an important means of symbolic exchange in the modern “market society” marked by impersonal relationships. With the transition from feudal society to industrial society, love became a mass phenomenon facilitated especially by the expansion and diffusion of the literature on love in the 18th and 19th centuries (Luhmann, 1986). In modern societies, according to Bauman, individuals, who are oppressed in various different impersonal contexts on which they are dependent to sustain their livelihood, feel the need to realize their self-identity more than ever. In a loving relationship, one who is treated as the same as all others in the impersonal world of exchange, achieves the chances of being treated as unique, as unlike any other (Bauman, 2000). To sum up, it was the common argument of all the social theorists above that love provides self-identity in the risky, atomistic and impersonal social universe of modernity.

The emergence and diffusion of romantic love was associated with modernity in a second way: “Erotic love”, in Weber’s terms, came into life in Western societies as a result of a change in Christianity. According to Weber (1948), modernity created an ever more rational ethic which rejected any kind of “other worldly salvation”. The Ethics of Puritan Salvationism, which is among one of the most basic precipitators of modernity for Weber, was “overrational” and undermined the basic tenets of spirituality of Christianity replacing them with an approach to daily life which was “formal, regulatory, instrumental and sexually repressive” (Langford, 1999: 2). Paradoxically,

individuals' need for an "inner-worldly salvation" from the "cold-skeleton hands of rationality", however, made love to be the only available way for personal fulfillment. Thus, for Weber, love is both a way of looking for personal salvation in this world, and a reactive assertion to modernity, a resurgence of the irrational against the rational.

Both genres of the explanation of romantic love in modern societies do not only propose that romantic has become a means of realizing self-identity, they also implicitly introduce reasons for why romantic love is a very common phenomenon in modern societies. In other words, they suggest that there is a *functional* correspondence between love and modernity. As Lindholm puts it for the first genre of explanation, love is a "functional resource for increasing social integration and communication", while for the second genre, it is an "instrumental aid for the maintenance of an ever more rationalized society" (Lindholm, 1999: 243). This, as claimed by Solomon (in Lindholm, 1999: 243), means that "we should expect to find romantic love arise in precisely those epochs and cultures where self-identity is in question, when traditional roles and relationships fail to tell a person 'who I am'".

There are four significant implications of these theories for the present thesis. The first concerns when, how, and why romantic love arose in Turkey. In other words, was there really such a functional correspondence between romantic love and social organization in Turkey, at the time love first appeared? The appearance of romantic love in the Ottoman Empire was dated back to the period after the Tanzimat Edict of 1839 by several scholars, especially in the novels of the period. (Mardin, 1974; Duben & Behar, 1991; Sirman, 2000a). Tanzimat novels, written in the wake of modernizing reforms, had as their main themes the improvement of social status of women, eradicating arranged marriages, and satirizing over-westernization of upper class men (Mardin,

1974). In these novels, love was used as a strategy to criticize the widespread prevalence of arranged marriages that would in turn thought to emancipate women from their poor social conditions, and provide freedom to both men and women as well (Mardin, 1974).

Romantic love had, in the post-Tanzimat period in general and in the novels of the period in particular, another, perhaps deeper, meaning than just criticizing arranged marriages. This meaning concerns the idea of freedom which was very influential in the intellectual circles of the Ottoman Empire of the time. According to Mardin, love represented the idea of freedom in Young Ottoman thought which was aiming to reconcile with Islamic law the notions of free individual and natural law, which were persistent in the liberal post-enlightenment ideology (Mardin, 1996). Similarly, Duben and Behar argue that love stood for a political passion to undermine the absolutist regime of Abdulhamid-II (Duben and Behar, 1991). According to them, upper class intellectuals of the time associated the Ottoman state “with the father, and autocratic, backward political arrangements with patriarchalism and restrictive marriages. *Amour* and *liberté*, then, went hand in hand” (Duben and Behar, 1991: 88). Sirman also argues that love in the novels of the period served to “delegitimize the structure of hierarchy among men in the household and in society at large” (Sirman, 2000a: 163). According to her, freedom in these novels is a sort of freedom that Mardin explained for Young Ottomans. Love is not in this respect a freedom for individuals in the liberal sense, but a different sort of freedom which obtained its unquestionable authority from God’s will.

As it may easily be detected, the importance of romantic love with its different meanings was the case for upper and upper-middle classes who had been influenced by the post-enlightenment ideas which had originated in Western Europe. However, there is really a lack of evidence about how the ideal of love diffused to the larger segments of

society. The most plausible answer for this question, according to Duben and Behar (1991), is that the impact of novels and other forms of fiction such as drama in the transmission of ideas about love is great, especially for the Turkish case, since a transplantation of a Western cultural institution into a “foreign soil” is present.

This aspect of the genesis of romantic love in Turkey is very important for the present study. Romantic love is a phenomenon that came with modernity, as in the case for the West. However, as the discussion in the above two paragraphs reveal, romantic love appeared in Turkey with different meanings than the ones in the West. First, romantic love came into being with a very political meaning in Turkey in contrast to the apolitical meaning that love carried in the West, as depicted by aforementioned theorists. Second, it is not possible to consider the Turkey of the time as a society marked by atomization of individuals and impersonal relationships, which stemmed mainly from industrialization, such that romantic love would have occurred as the only available way for providing individuals self-identity. On the contrary, Turkey of the time is mentioned by various scholars to have very low rates of industrialization. Similarly, it is also impossible to look for an over-rationalization stemming from Puritanism, against which love would have occurred as a reaction, among Muslim Turks. On the contrary, it was the very aim of Ottoman upper classes to adopt the notions of the enlightenment such as reason (Mardin, 1974). Consequently, romantic love is a modern phenomenon for Turkey, too, but in a fundamentally different sense. For this reason, any analysis of romantic love in contemporary Turkey, including mine, must always take into consideration this overtly different relationship of love with modernity as a ground on which the later meanings, which romantic love took up in Turkey, have been constructed.

The second significant implication of the aforementioned sociological theories about love for the present study concerns the occlusion of gender as an analytical category. All the theories which are outlined above use the non-gendered *individual* as their basic unit of analysis. Love is presented as providing either security and attachment (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim), or a unity between the self and the world (Simmel), or a symbolic exchange (Luhmann), or self-identity (Bauman); or an inner worldly salvation and a way for reacting against rationalization (Weber) to atomized individuals, without considering whether there is a difference in terms of gender in love's so-called *function* of providing for some need in the social universe following industrialization. For any of these scholars, romantic love is, thus, a monolithic thing that has the same meaning and function for everyone. However, as feminist theorists show, the meanings and functions of love differ for men and for women. For this reason, any analysis of love including mine must take gender into consideration as a basic category. The analysis of the present thesis will focus on what meanings romantic love implies for a social category of men in contemporary Turkey.

The third implication of these theories concerns the analysis of romantic love at different levels. Stevi Jackson argues that while romantic love has drawn the attention of social scientists at the levels of conjugality, its cultural meanings as an emotion is a neglected point of analysis (Jackson, 1993). The present thesis agrees with Jackson's argument and proposes that romantic love must be analyzed at two different levels: first, love as a couple-relationship based on intimacy and, second, love as an emotion. When the aforementioned theories are scrutinized with this two-level analysis, it may easily be detected that their basic assumptions as well as arguments operate at the level of love as a couple relationship based on intimacy. Let us consider the passage taken from

Zygmunt Bauman in order to show the distinction between the two levels (Bauman, 2000: 85):

Niklas Luhmann presented the search for self-identity in terms of our overwhelming need for love – of loving and being loved. Being loved means being treated by the other person as unique, as unlike any other; it means that the loving person accepts that the loved ones need not invoke universal rules in order to justify the images they hold of themselves or their demands; it means that the loving person accepts and confirms the sovereignty of their partner and their right to decide for themselves and to choose of their own authority. It means, in essence, that they agree with the emphatic and stubborn statement of their partner: “here is what I am, what I do, where I stand.”

Being loved also means being understood in the sense in which we use it whenever we say, “I want you to understand me!”, or ask with anguish “Do you understand me? Do you really *understand* me?”. This craving for being understood is a desperate call to someone to put themselves in our shoes, to see things from our point of view, and to accept without further proof that we have a point of view that ought to be respected for the simple reason that it is ours...

In these paragraphs, Bauman describes what he calls “our overwhelming need for love” as loving and being loved. Yet, just after this description, he begins to explain only the being loved part of love. In the lines following this description, and in the other parts of the book which are not quoted here, he never attempts to analyze the loving part. Hence, he reaches his conclusion regarding the relationship between modernity and romantic love solely on the analysis of being loved while simply dismissing loving. I argue that loving and being loved correspond to the two different levels at which romantic love operates. Being loved, by definition, requires the presence of a *relationship* between lovers; while loving concerns mainly about the subjective feelings and experiences of lovers, and does not require a couple-relationship between them. Loving, which all the aforementioned theorists ignored, is the aspect of romantic love

that is about emotions. In this respect, the present thesis aims to analyze the meanings of romantic love for a category of (gendered) Turkish men both as an emotion and as a couple-relationship based on intimacy.

The final implication of these theories concerns the further changes in the organization of contemporary societies. Today, many scholars, including Bauman, claim that contemporary societies may be described as *postmodern*. Through the transformation of modern societies into postmodern ones, romantic love has also transformed. Giddens (1996) argues that the state of romantic relationships in the contemporary postmodern world is unimaginably different than the one in the first half of the twentieth century. According to him, beginning from the 1960s, the status of women in social life increased dramatically. The result of this is that men are no more able to demand women to conform with men's expectations from romantic relationships. They are now demanded by women to reciprocate in romantic relationships at the same level in terms of intimacy, which, he argues, is the expectation of women.

Love and Gender

The second way through which romantic love came under the gaze of sociology was opened by feminists. Beyond showing the relationship between romantic love and the abstract individual, feminists show that the meanings of love differ for men and for women on the basis that love is another site where the power relations which oppressed women throughout history are in operation. In feminist theory, romantic love is seen mainly as an ideology which legitimates women's oppression by making them want a thing which would facilitate their own exploitation by men (Jackson, 1993). The following quotation by Simone de Beauvoir has been a classical reference in feminist

writing in order to underline that love is a trap into which women are called: “She chooses her enslavement so ardently that it will seem to her the expression of her liberty” (de Beauvoir, 1952: 653). Some authors such as Firestone (1979) even suggest that romantic love is the central point in contemporary societies on which women’s oppression is based. The mechanism of the relationship between romantic love and women’s oppression lie in the fact that women devote themselves to men much more than men to women in love relationships (Jackson, 1993; Langford, 1999). And the uneven devotion of women and men to each other is institutionalized in marriage in modern societies. Therefore, feminist theorists conclude that femininity and masculinity are constructed in romantic love always in relationship with the power relations between men and women that have always served for the subordination of the latter.

Feminist theory has a very significant implication for the present study. My aim in this thesis will not only be to show the meanings of love for a category of men from contemporary Turkey. I will also attempt to evaluate the relationship between romantic love and masculinity which has been constructed on the basis of the power relations between men and women. In other words, I aim to understand, by looking at the meanings of romantic love for some Turkish men, the construction of masculinity through love and how this implicates the power relations between genders.

Masculinity, however, is not an abstract and universal category. On the contrary, it is highly cultural, historical, and contextual. For this reason, the present thesis will analyze a masculinity as being situated in Turkey, and as having been constructed within the web of cultural meanings and relations which existed in Turkey at different times, as elaborated by the social anthropologists whose studies I will outline below.

Masculinity has been a recent focus of attention in sociology. The most influential study that regarded masculinity as a social construct and drew attention to the relationship between masculinity and power came from Connell (1987). Connell imports the concept of “hegemony”, originally introduced by Gramsci in order to analyze class relations, to the study of gender such that one definition of masculinity claims and sustains a leading position in society. He defines hegemonic masculinity as “the configuration of gender practices which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (Connell, 1987: 77). By the usage of the term hegemony, it is self evident that there are other forms of masculinity, giving rise to what Connell calls “multiple masculinities”. Other masculinities are connected with hegemonic masculinity through relations of either subordination, or complicity, or marginalization. According to Connell, hegemonic masculinity shapes the overall framework of gender relations such that the hegemonic definition is “constructed in relation to women and to subordinate masculinities (1987: 186).

Many studies from within the discipline of sociology followed the framework provided by Connell in order to elaborate the construction of different masculinities and femininities in different spheres of life in relationship with the hegemonic masculinity in the United States. To cite a few examples, Bird investigates how hegemonic masculinity is sustained by homosocial interactions among men, and argues that emotional detachment, competitiveness (among men themselves), and sexual objectification of women are the three basic elements that are carried on within male homosocial environments (Bird, 1996). Cooper looks at how the impact of context affected the form and content of hegemonic masculinity in the case of the Silicon Valley, and argues that a

new masculinity is constituted among the professionals in Silicon Valley which impacts how they think about fatherhood and manage their family lives (Cooper, 2000). Leahy uses Connell's concept of emphasized femininity, a mode of conduct and set of practices by which women comply with hegemonic masculinity, in order to grasp how the discourses of femininity and adolescence are constructed in the context of adult man – adolescent girl romantic relationships. She argues that the voluntary participation of adolescent girls in sexual relationships with adult men, which has been socially constructed as a departure from emphasized femininity, is a form of resistance (Leahy, 1994).

There are two implications of the sociological studies that followed Connell's approach. First, romantic love is neglected as a site of analysis where masculinities are constructed vis-à-vis power relations among men and women. Many different spheres of life have been elaborated in terms of their relationship with hegemonic masculinity except romantic love. Second, as mentioned before, hegemonic masculinity and its derivations are historically and locally contingent. In this respect, can we talk about the presence of a hegemonic masculinity in Turkey and the different masculinities and femininities that are either subordinated or marginalized by it? The present thesis aims to fill the gap about these two points.

Masculinity in Turkey

Even though the topic of masculinities in Turkey is not investigated from a sociological point of view, social anthropologists provided very important data about how masculinities are constructed in Mediterranean and Middle Eastern contexts for long years before Connell's work. In social anthropological literature, Turkey is treated

as a country being in the Mediterranean-Middle Eastern culture area (Gutmann, 1997; Lindisfarne, 1994; Davis, 1977; Gilmore, 1990). It is generally argued that particular qualities and aims about masculinity are more significant in the Mediterranean culture area than elsewhere in the world (Gutmann, 1997). Among these qualities and aims, the idea of manliness with its “obsession with female virginity” is outstanding (Lindisfarne, 1994: 84). Gilmore, for example, writes that “three moral imperatives” are present among men of Mediterranean: “first, impregnating one’s wife; second, provisioning dependents; third, protecting the family” (1990: 48). However, in recent years, this notion of taking the peculiarities of Mediterranean and Middle East regions too far and creating a myth of Mediterranean culture was severely criticized (Gutmann, 1997). Lindisfarne proposes that the ethnographic literature of the Mediterranean and the Middle East should be reanalyzed such that any particular social context within the region should be regarded with its own peculiarities (Lindisfarne, 1994). Similarly, Herzfeld argues that “[e]thnographers may have unwittingly contributed to the creation of a stereotype” with regard to the idea of Mediterranean culture (Herzfeld, 1987: 76, cited in Gutmann, 1997). The approach of this thesis, as that of Lindisfarne, will be a middle-point among these two views. I, on the one hand, admit that many similarities in the ideals of manhood are present between Turkey and other places of the region, which I will depict below. On the other hand, there are peculiarities of Turkey which stem from its historical differences, especially those in the twentieth century.

Based on the findings of this literature, there are three basic cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey. The first is the oppositional character of the relation between masculinity and femininity. A man’s perception and definition of his gender as masculine relies to some extent on his answer to the question of what is feminine.

However, it is very important to bear in mind that masculinity and femininity are not always constructed in opposition (Cornwall and Lindisfarne, 1994). In fact, various different examples of the opposition between men and women abound in the literature on the region; yet, among these them, I took three as significant. The first significant opposition is withholding expressions of feelings. As Herzfeld argues for the Greek men, men describe themselves as “rational and self-controlled”, in contrast to the “affectionate” women (Herzfeld, 1987: 90). To express feelings is generally seen as a weakness while withholding them is constructed as maintaining control. Similarly, Sirman reports that men, as head of households, are supposed to behave in accordance with the proverb *ağır ol da molla desinler* (be grave, so people think you wise), which underlines the importance of withholding expressions of feelings (Sirman, 1990). Abu Lughod also mentions for Bedouin men of ‘Awlad Ali that the abstaining from emotional needs and passions is seen as self-mastery as the case of a man whose aunt died reveals. The man said: “men don’t cry” (Abu-Lughod, 1986: 90). The second opposition concerns the straightforwardness of the will. In the different parts of the Mediterranean, it is reported by many scholars that men portray themselves as loyal and constant while they depict women as deceitful and weak-willed. For example, Malti-Douglas suggests that medieval Arab anecdotal literature is full of depictions of women as treacherous to the extent that women were essentialized as a social category. The sphere where women’s deceit reaches its maximum is that of sexuality. She writes that “the idea of women’s trickery (*kayd al nisa*), with all of its sexual overtones, entered into the Muslim unconscious” (Malti-Douglas, 1986: 53). Herzfeld, also, claims that the same is present for Greek men: “Men portray ... women as incontinent and often weak-willed” (Herzfeld, 1987: 90). The final significant opposition, among many others, is

that men are regarded by themselves as well as women as independent in contrast to the belief that women are by nature dependent. Abu-Lughod describes for the Bedouins of 'Awlad Ali that the most important value for men is the "complex of values associated with independence" while women themselves believe, as she depicts, that they are dependent (Abu-Lughod, 1986: 87). She cites many examples of this. For instance, women claimed that "'real men' control all their dependents and beat their wives when the wives do stupid things" (1986: 89). Another old woman told Abu-Lughod that "[w]hen a man is really something [manly], he pays no heed to women" (1986: 94). Sirman, similarly, writes for Western Turkey that men are independent by virtue of their being of head of households, while women are dependent (1990).

The second cultural ideal of masculinity in Turkey concerns the controlling of women's sexuality through the local codes of honor and shame. According to the widespread concepts of honor in Turkey, similar to those elsewhere in the Mediterranean, women's sexuality must be strictly controlled by men (Kandiyoti, 1987; Lindisfarne, 1994; Davis, 1977; Pitt-Rivers, 1977). Kandiyoti argues that the control over women's sexuality is a corporate one, stemming from a large number of categories of individuals included in the control process: parents, siblings, cousins, near and distant relatives, even the neighbors (1987). Yet, as she emphasizes, this corporate control is mainly related to the lineage honor which men consider themselves to be the basic representatives. According to Kandiyoti, "[w]omen are vested with immense negative power because any misbehavior on their part can bring shame and dishonor to the male members of a whole community, lineage, or family" (1987: 326). These controls may range in form from veiling to work outside the home (Davis, 1977), and from severe restrictions for accessing to public spaces (Kandiyoti, 1987; Sirman, 1988) to the

selection of friends. Sanctions in the case of violation of such restrictions again range (Lindisfarne, 1994).

The control of female sexuality is very much related with the making of gendered subjectivities, both male and female. Kandiyoti argues that the mode of control has “a direct bearing on how gender is internalized” (1987: 325). As she rightly put it, not only the feminine but also the masculine genders are internalized within this process of control. Men are supposed to control the sexuality of their kinswomen, but there is not a rigid precept about what to do under conditions of contravention. Men’s willingness and ability to conform to the code of honor vary. Therefore, “nuanced masculinities” come into being in everyday life by conforming to the code of honor in varying extents. Hence, notions of honor and shame are “a mode of interpretation through which inequalities are created and sustained” among men (Lindisfarne, 1994: 85).

Another important point about honor is that it is a broad-ranging concept not completely restricted to the issue of controlling women’s sexuality. Davis, when describing the codes of honor in the Mediterranean region, argues that honor is not primarily to do with sexual intercourse but with the performance of sexual roles: “to be good of your kind is to have honor and that may include the ability to protect women from the sexual advances of other men” (Davis, 1977: 77). A man dependent on others, or less powerful than his wife are examples of shame (Abu-Lughod, 1986). Other examples of shame stemming from the spheres other than the sexual abound in the literature: inability to drink alcohol and eat meat (Herzfeld, 1987); to gossip (Davis, 1977); etc.

The third cultural ideal about masculinity in Turkey concerns the roles associated with the status of head of household. Being unmanly does not only stem from

the violation of the code of honor. A man must complete various stages during his life cycle in order to come to the position of head of household, to become really a man. As Kandiyoti underlines for Turkey, like many scholars for elsewhere, “masculinity is not an ascribed but an achieved status, one that is never permanently achieved, because the danger of being unmanly is ever present (1987: 327)”. A man must first attain the position of head of household to be a real man (Sirman, 1990). Yet, it is a long, effortful and never ending process.

The roles associated with being head of household are twofold: first, being the provider for other members of the household, and second, to be able to act as the representative of the household in the public sphere, including relations with the state. These roles are closely connected to the notions of honor. First, a man, as head of household, is responsible for the material well-being of the other members of his household. The role of provider has been so much associated with masculinity in the anthropological literature that the relationship between them is naturalized. Gilmore (1990) sees provisioning dependents as an essential characteristic of masculinity such that he implied masculinity is an answer to natural and systemic necessities (Loizos, 1994). Nevertheless, Loizos underlines that provision is a value of hegemonic masculinity.

More interesting than the role of provision is the role of head of household as representative in hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. Since the classical Ottoman period, men, as heads of households, have been taken as representative of the other household members in public sphere on the ground that they are responsible for them. For instance, Peirce (1997: 187) wrote that “a man’s personal honor derived in considerable part from the honor of his household. The law recognized this by penalizing the male head-of-

household for social or sexual infractions in which members of his household were involved either as complicit actors or as unwilling victims. For example, the law code of Süleyman imposed a cuckold tax (*köftehorluk*) on a married man whose wife was involved in an adulterous situation, and required that the father of an underage boy yielding to a pederast be punished for not guarding the son". Similarly, for contemporary rural Turkey, Sirman argues that men, as heads of households, are responsible for all its members with respect to village politics and morals, the state, and God (1990).

To sum up, cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey as revealed in the anthropological literature is based on three ideals: first, the oppositional construction of masculinity and femininity; second, controlling women's sexuality through local codes of honor; third, roles associated with men's status as head of household. These ideals of masculinity have their portion in the creation and maintenance of the subordination of women by men. As Connell argues, most men utilize from this power relation in ranging amounts (1987). The cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey serve for men's interests at the expense of women's. In the light of the above, it is now time to ask how the cultural ideals of masculinity and romantic love are related to each other in contemporary Turkey, and how power operates within the relationship between masculinity and romantic love.

Changes in the Meaning of Love in Republican Turkey

In the fifty years after the period of the Tanzimat novel, romantic love came to be regarded increasingly as a thing disrupting social harmony on the grounds that love undermined family stability (Duben & Behar, 1991). Romantic love was depicted in the novels of the early Republic as degrading Turkish women. The newspaper *Cumhuriyet*

described the “girl of 1930” in the following way: “Love is merely an experiment for her, marriage a temporary friendship, home a hotel she shares with the men she loves” (Duben & Behar, 1991: 103). Love, therefore, seen as rendering once innocent Turkish women into *femmes fatales*. What happened in this fifty years of time to make romantic love, which was once associated with emancipation of women, to the completely opposite?

Kandiyoti proposes that “anyone working on questions of modernization and women’s emancipation in the Middle East must inevitably come across those ‘enlightened’, pro-feminist men who were often the first to denounce practices which they saw as debasing women” (Kandiyoti, 1994: 197). The authors of Tanzimat novels, who were all male, are the very examples of such men. In other words, the import of romantic love in Turkey was realized by enlightened and pro-feminist seeming men of the time. Several scholars including Kandiyoti herself suggest that these men were in fact rebelling against their own lack of liberty in the hands of paternal power under the guise of emancipating women (Kandiyoti, 1988; Sirman, 2000a; Duben & Behar, 1991). Between the Tanzimat and the 1930s, a major change had occurred in the ruling class of society. Those men, who had been in opposition at the time of Tanzimat, came to power in Ottoman Society and then founded the Republican Turkish state. In other words, they completed their own process of emancipation from the rule of father (Sirman, 2000a). Hence, it was now time to make a compromise between the code of honor and the reliance on so-called liberties that allowed the emancipation of the men from their fathers.

Sirman’s analysis of the novels of Halide Edip, an important novelist woman of the period following World War I and the Turkish War of Independence, reveals

important insights about how this compromise was negotiated. She argues that passionate love (*aşk*) was transformed into a deep attachment between intimate persons (*sevgi*) by which women and men would be the subjects of companionate marriage. According to Sirman, “The modern Turkish woman is a subject with a specific agency, a socially competent individual who as a result of her education, is able to cultivate her mind, but who also, through love, learns to sacrifice self and desire for the care and guidance of others in the family and in the nation” (2000b: 263). Hence, romantic love transformed from something associated with liberty for both men and women into something which demanded women to sacrifice themselves for men both as husbands and as rulers of the nation.

Conclusion

The aim of the present thesis is to understand the kind of masculinity that is constructed by looking at the way a social category of men in contemporary Turkey describe love. In this chapter, I have first reviewed the existing sociological literature on romantic love. The primary focus of this literature is on the relationship between modernity and romantic love. However, the Turkish case is dramatically different in terms of the relationship between modernity and romantic love than the West. For this reason, analyzing romantic love by looking at what it provides individuals would be misleading. Furthermore, this literature ignores the feelings of loving person. I have offered in this respect to analyze romantic love in terms of the emotions of loving person since exploring the emotions can provide insights to the construction of subjectivities in a given society.

Second, I have reviewed the literature on the relationship between love and gender. This literature is based overwhelmingly on feminist studies which looked at the meanings of love for women. On the other hand, the studies that analyzed masculinity neglected romantic love as a site of exploration. This thesis aims to fill the gap in studies on romantic love and masculinity.

Third, I have elaborated the cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey by reviewing the social anthropological literature on Mediterranean and Middle East regions. The code of honor is identified in this literature as the primary reservoir of the cultural ideals of masculinity with its implications about male power in society. In this respect, this thesis aims to analyze how the cultural ideals of masculinity and romantic love are mutually constructed in contemporary Turkey, and how power operates within the relationship between masculinity and romantic love.

In the following chapter, I will try to explore the emotions some well-educated male professionals in their early adulthood in contemporary Turkey said they felt when in love.

CHAPTER 2: EMOTIONS OF LOVE AND THE CONQUERING

SUBJECT

What is Love?

The object of enquiry in the present thesis is romantic love, as mentioned before. Yet, I believe I have to clarify what is aimed to analyze as love. There are two words in Turkish that correspond to English word love: *Aşk* and *sevgi*. The Dictionary of the Turkish Language Institution defines *aşk* as “**the emotion of excessive love and attachment¹**” and *sevgi* as “**the emotion that orients one to show close interest and attachment to a thing or a human being²**”. Usages of both³ of the words are not limited to the sense of romance. *Sevgi* may be oriented to friends, parents, motherland, God, a city, even any objects such as a book. The set of objects to which *aşk* is oriented is much limited compared to *sevgi*: God, to some extent motherland, or a sports team, but certainly not friends, or parents, or any object. *Aşk* may be associated with English idiom ‘being in love’, and *sevgi* with companionship and longer term affection, within the distinction made in English as being in love with someone versus loving someone. It is *aşk* which is aimed to be brought under close scrutiny in this thesis. In this respect, my questions during the interviews focused overwhelmingly on *aşk*. The participants nevertheless explained *sevgi* especially for clarifying what they meant by *aşk* through comparisons.

Jackson argues that most analyses of love desist from defining the object of enquiry because of taking for granted the common sense idea that love is an individual experience which is essentially undefinable and mysterious (Jackson, 1993). What I take as the object of enquiry of this thesis, *aşk*, is not clear yet. Like the definition of the

¹ Aşırı sevgi ve bağlılık duygusu.

² İnsanı bir şeye veya bir kimseye karşı yakın ilgi ve bağlılık göstermeye yönelten duygu.

³ There is also a synonym for *aşk*: *sevda*, which is again passionate love used overwhelmingly in romantic sense. However, *sevda* is a very rarely used word in everyday life.

Dictionary of the Turkish Language Institution, the participants of this study explain *aşk* to be an emotion. They frequently use the word *aşk* together with the verb ‘to feel’. For this reason, *aşk* as the object of enquiry of this thesis will be taken to be an emotion. However, emotions cannot be observed. As Jagger puts, the social scientists cannot access to the emotions of others independent of the mediation of the culture (Jagger, 1989). The only way available for social scientists to analyze emotions is, therefore, to look at how they are talked about.

Going one step further, it is unknowable even the existence of a thing called emotion. We cannot measure scientifically if the thing called emotion really exists. Rather than coming up with a psychological definition of emotion, in this respect, this study will use a discursive definition of emotion. A good discursive definition of emotion is provided by Abu-Lughod. She defines sentiment as “what people say they feel” (Abu-Lughod, 1986: 34). The object of enquiry of this thesis is, therefore, *aşk* as an emotion as defined by the participants of the study.

Fragments of Being in Love

The word ‘fragment’ in the heading is borrowed from Barthes. He introduces it in the title of his book ‘fragments of a lover’s discourse’ for the effect that there are words about love which are usually disconnected from one another but which we all know. In order to clarify this he offers the term ‘figures’: “These fragments of discourse can be called *figures*. The word is to be understood, not in its rhetorical sense, but rather in its gymnastic or choreographic acceptance: ... the body of athletes, orators, statues: what in the straining body can be immobilized. ... A figure is established if at least someone can say: *That’s so true! I can recognize that scene of language.*” (Barthes,

1979: 4). In this respect, I take what the participants of this study say they feel when in love as the fragments of a discourse about love. The emotions which I will depict below are well-recognizable to many of us who read these pages, like the figures in Barthes' sense. Indeed, most of the emotions I will depict were already depicted by Barthes himself. However, there is an important difference between the approaches of Barthes and mine to fragments. Barthes solely depicts the fragments refraining deliberately from analyzing them from a social scientific perspective. To the contrary, the fragments are explored in the present thesis in so far as they provide insights about the culture within which these emotions are talked about. Even though the emotions depicted below as fragments may be well-recognizable to many of us, they are not experienced by everyone in the same way⁴. For this reason, the so-called emotions are gates to the subjectivities of the participants who talk about them. So, below are what the participants tell they feel when in love:

Passion: All of the participants categorize their romantic feelings and define the feeling they call *aşk* by comparing it with the other feelings within their categorization. The most stressed comparison by which they define love is the one between emotions of *aşk* and *sevgi*. All of them define *aşk* within its perceived difference from *sevgi*. As an instance of defining *aşk* within such categorizations, Ömer cites three different romantic feelings, namely liking, *sevgi* and *aşk*, which he reported to feel for women, when I asked him how many times he fell in love in his life: **“Let me think. In, I fell in love with six women. I have felt emotions to other women, I have experienced relationships with other women, but there were not *aşk* in them. I liked many**

⁴ I believe that the only thing we recognize about emotions is their names.

women, I felt *sevgi*, but there was not *aşk*. I mean *aşk* is a very intense thing, you feel a very intense feeling”⁵.

In all the instances where the participants define *aşk* by comparing it with *sevgi*, they refer to the presence of what they call ‘feeling passion’ in *aşk* but not in *sevgi*. They argue that *aşk* is a state of emotion in which one feels passion for the beloved in contrast to *sevgi* which they argued to be absent of passion. This distinction between *aşk* and *sevgi* and the central place that passion occupies in it, I observed, are such central ones for them that they appeared within the very first minutes of the interviews even though I had not asked them to make such a distinction. My first question that came immediately after the demographic questions was “How many times did you fall in love and can you tell me about them in detail?”. I asked Ömer what he meant by the word ‘intense’ after his reply for this question which has already been mentioned in the above paragraph. He said “**I mean you want her very intensely. I mean there is passion when you are in love. I mean you passionately want her, you want her like crazy. You want to be together with her. You want to have her in an egoist and obsessive manner**”⁶.

Like Ömer, Emre defines *aşk* by comparing it with *sevgi* in terms of the presence of passion. Answering the first question, he states that he fell in love three times in his life and the common point in all was “**the situation of inability to reach**”⁷ the beloved, which he also defines as “**uncomfortability**” or “**the feeling of being uncomfortable**”⁸. He then said “**I mean I think that *aşk* comes into being also as a result of a sort of**

⁵ Bir düşünüyüm. 11, hayatım boyunca 6 kadına aşık oldum. Evet. Onlar dışında başka kadınlara da duygular besledim, başka kadınlarla birlikte oldum ama onlarda aşk yoktu. Hoşlanmalarım oldu, sevgi hissettim ama aşk yoktu. Yani bence aşk çok yoğun bir şey, çok yoğun bir his duyuyosun.

⁶ Yani çok yoğun bir istek var. Yani tutku var aşıkken. Yani tutkuyla onu istiyorsun, deli gibi onu istiyorsun, onla birlikte olmak istiyorsun. Bencil ve saplantılı bir biçimde ona sahip olmak istiyorsun.

⁷ ulaşamama durumu

⁸ rahatsızlık, rahat olmama duygusu

power struggle. Being comfortable makes me, it is something which kills the passion. I mean a comfortable relationship kills the passion. It is like a sexual relationship or *sevgi*, but *aşk* is definitely not like that”⁹. As another example of the participants’ defining of love in comparison with *sevgi* in terms of the presence of passion, Mustafa argues, again at the very beginning of the interview, “In my opinion *aşk* is based upon passion, and what creates passion is the physical qualities. I mean if you do not share physically much, it may be *sevgi*, you may feel respect, but you are not passionate. ... *Sevgi* is something removed from passion, based more on being accustomed. I can say that it is to feel attachment in a tranquil fashion that is too far from passions to a human being, but love is not like this”¹⁰. Hence, passion is the constitutive feeling of *aşk* according to the participants of this study, as the aforementioned extracts reveal the pattern.****

Even though they all argue that any romantic feeling devoid of passion cannot be defined as *aşk*, what each of them describe as ‘feeling of passion’ is different. There are two different ways of defining passion in the interview material. Passion is first defined as a desire the causes of which are in one’s own body (sexuality) and the object of which is the other’s body. In the second definition of passion, its causes are explained to be rooted in one’s own mind and its object to be the other’s mind. These two different explanations will be taken as like-ideal types: One of the participants, Mustafa, defends the former and narrates his past *aşk* experiences completely through sexuality, while

⁹ Yani bir tür iktidar mücadelesiyle de ortaya çıkıyor bence. O rahatlık beni şey yapıyor, tutkuyu öldüren bir şey benim açımdan. Tutkuyu öldürüyor yani rahat bir ilişki. Bir cinsel ilişki yada *sevgi* gibi bir şey ama diğeri öyle değil.

¹⁰ Bence *aşk* daha çok tutkuya dayanıyor, dayanır gibi geliyor, yani tutkuyu yaratan da bence coganlukla fiziksel özellikler gibi geliyor. Ve yani fiziksel olarak çok fazla paylaşamıyorsanız etkilenmiyorsanız tutku da uzun süreli olmayabilir gibi geliyor bana, *sevgi* olur saygı duyarsınız ama tutkulu olmazsınız. ... Tutkulardan uzak daha dingin bir halde bir insana bağlı olmak gibi diyebilirim ama *aşk* böyle bir şey değil.

another interviewee, Emre, defends the latter and narrates his past romantic experiences mainly around ‘capturing the mind of the beloved’. The other participants regard body and mind as two inseparable things. I will now try to depict these two ideal types, through which I also hope to explore what the other participants regard as two inseparable elements of passion. Before getting started, there is one thing to bear in mind: neither Mustafa nor Emre ignores completely the mind and body respectively. In their stories they only take one of these two elements of passion as the main problem.

Mustafa defines passion as **“a physical drive that stems from one’s sexual needs and is directed towards the beloved’s sexual qualities”**¹¹. He constantly emphasizes that what creates passion is one’s own sexuality, and uses the word passion frequently in the sense of physical attraction that he reports to experience usually in the initial days of a relationship. This is best seen in his consideration of *aşk* and *sevgi* as what he calls ‘two different dimensions’ [of a relationship]. According to him, there happens a dimension change as a relationship settles down such that the dimension characterized by the presence of feeling of *aşk* transforms in a short period of time into the dimension of *sevgi*, which he argued to be long-lived: **“A dimension change really happens after *aşk*. *Sevgi* is different. *Aşk* is a passion but *sevgi* is more long lived. It may be cliché but it is really like this. I think *sevgi* is a phenomenon that spreads into a long period of time”**¹². Describing *aşk* as a short-lived feeling as opposed to *sevgi* is not peculiar to Mustafa among participants. What is peculiar to him is his claim that it is only because one’s being attracted physically by a woman, i.e. passion, is

¹¹ karşı tarafın fiziğine dayalı ve senin fiziksel ihtiyacından kaynaklanan bir şey.

¹² Gerçekten bir boyut şeyi oluyor aşktan sonra sevgi, sevmek daha farklıdır; aşk bir tutkudur ama sevmek daha uzun süreli, belki biraz klasik oluyordur ama gerçekten böyle sevmek daha uzun süreye yayılan bir olay gibi geliyor bana.

destined to expire in a short period of time that the dimension of *aşk* transforms very quickly into the dimension of *sevgi*: **“After a time, I mean after you make love with that human being for a time that is enough to end your passion, it really turns out to be a matter of being accustomed. So, you come to know everything about her, she comes to permeate completely into your life. So, you no more feel *aşk* for her but there is a point in which you cannot give up her. I mean you cannot give up her in some way. That point is *sevgi*”¹³.**

Emre, on the other hand, argues that the roots of feeling passion are not in sexuality but in one’s own mind. He said **“It is a problem of inability to conquer. It is not about sexuality. In fact it has to do with the mind. I mean I am a man whose urge to conquer someone is excessive. I mean to conquer someone is not to be together or to sustain a relationship. It is the feeling that the other may always leave or the feeling that a problem may always arise. You are not comfortable. This feeling of being uncomfortable soon transforms in to an obsession, and this is *aşk*”¹⁴.** As these extracts reveal, Emre describes passion to be a thing always-arising in the context of a relationship, while Mustafa describes it as a unilateral thing, i.e. stemming from one’s own sexual needs.

The body-mind difference that is present in what Mustafa and Emre respectively argue to be the source of passion is again present in what they define as the object of

¹³ Yani bir süre sonra, yani yeterli o insana yetecek o insanla senin tutkunu bitirmene yetecek bir şekilde seviştikten, birlikte olduktan sonra gerçekten artık alışkanlık olayına dönüyor. Dolayısıyla herşeyini biliyorsun herşeyiyle hayatına tümüyle intikal etmiş oluyor dolayısıyla artık aşk duymuyorsun ama ondan vaz geçemeyeceğin bir nokta var yani bir şekilde ondan vazgeçemiyorsun o nokta da bence sevgi.

¹⁴ Elde etme meselesi. Cinsellikten çok kafayla ilgili. Yani ben öyleyim sahip olma güdüsü çok fazla olduğu için öbür türlü rahat vermiyor insana yani elde etmek birlikte olmak, bir ilişkiyi sürdürmek değil, o ilişki sürerken karşı tarafın yani her an gidebileceği ya da ilişkisinde bir takım sorunların ortaya çıkabileceği duygusu farklı bir durum yaratıyor. Rahat değilsin. Bu rahatsızlık, rahat olmama duygusu bir süre sonra takıntıya dönüşüyor ve bu da aşağı yukarı aşk.

passion. Mustafa reports that he feels passion for the beloved's body: **"Passion is something that is dependent absolutely on sexuality. I mean, can there be a situation where passion is felt for the mind? I don't know. I at least think that it is not a passion. It is something deeper. Passion is not that deep. It is a fleeting thing"**¹⁵. Mustafa's definition of the object of passion as the beloved's body is clearly seen in how he describes his feeling of aşk expires in time as he engages in sexual relationships with the other: **"You discover the beauties of making love with the other. You live it. It is a thing that you have never experienced at the beginning. It is a disaster. It is something that you are very curious about. But at the end you conquer her. You come to conquer that extremely unattainable, irresistible thing. Naturally, it stops being what it was"**¹⁶. Emre, on the other hand, reports that he has felt passion in his past love experiences much more for the mind of the other than for her body. When I asked him if he implied sexuality with passion he replied in the following way: **"It has not to do with only body. Conquering her mind is as important as conquering her body. Perhaps it has more to do with mind than body. I mean my problem is that. I mean I am very obsessed with that. What she thinks about me? I am more interested in this. Because I am more interested in this I am not happy. I mean you get together, you have some pleasure, and it ends. But my image in her mind is more important"**¹⁷.

¹⁵ Dedğim gibi bence tamamen fiziğe dayalı bir şey. Yani akla duyulan bir tutku olabilir mi bilemiyorum. Yani en azından ben onun bir tutku olduğunu düşünmüyorum. Daha derin bir şey bence. Tutku o kadar derin değil. Gelip geçici bir şey bence.

¹⁶ Karşı tarafla sevişmenin güzelliklerini keşfediyorsun. Onu yaşıyorsun. Başta hiç yaşamadığın birşey. Çok felaket. Çok ilgi duyduğun bir şey. Ama sonuçta onu elde ediyorsun. O çok ulaşılmaz karşı konulmaz şeyi elde ediyorsun. Doğal olarak ilk anki şey olmuyor.

¹⁷ Sadece bedenle ilgili değil. Düşüncelerini elde etmek de bedenini elde etmek kadar önemli. Belki daha da önemli. Yani benim derdim, yani o insanın, ona çok fazla takıyorum ben yani. Beni hakkımda ne

Even though Mustafa and Emre define the object of passion differently as revealed in the above extracts, there is a common point in their definitions which provides us with a key to explore the nature of what the participants define as ‘emotion of aşk’. Both Mustafa and Emre, as well as all the other participants, employ the same vocabulary when defining and arguing about aşk. As may be seen in the above extracts, the verb ‘to conquer’ is common in both. All the participants use the Turkish verbs *elde etmek*, *ele geçirmek*, *sahip olmak*, and *fethetmek* very frequently throughout the interviews, all of which are translated into English as ‘to conquer’. I argue that the verb ‘to conquer’ reveals what kind of relationship is present between what the participants define as the feeling of passion and its object. Passion, in their accounts, is felt **for conquering** the body, or the mind, or both in varying combinations, of the beloved. Bringing this together with the aforementioned finding that passion is the constitutive feeling of the emotion aşk in the participants’ definition, aşk appears in the interview material as a state of emotion where one feels passion for conquering the body or/and mind of the beloved. The participants regard themselves to be in love only when they feel a desire for conquering the other. In other words, they define their feeling for a woman as aşk in so far as the other is not (yet) conquered.

Mustafa’s categorization of his feelings for the other as aşk is a matter of time. He regards himself to be in love until he senses that he conquered the other by making love with her for a time that he considers long enough, as the above-given extracts reveal. He argues that the unattainability of the other expires in time as he makes love with her. The relationship between ‘to conquer’ and aşk, on the other hand, is more

düşünüyor? Bunu daha çok önemsiyorum. Bunu daha çok önemseydiğim için de mutlu değilim. Ama yani işte birlikte olmuşsun belli bir haz almışsın bitmiş o. Aynı anda kafasındaki benim imgem benim için çok önemli.

complicated in Emre's definition. Emre defines his feelings for the women whom he thinks that he has never been able to conquer as aşk and reports that he still feels aşk for those women. He said at the very beginning of the interview that 'to conquer' is his main problem: **"In fact, I have thought about this before when you told me the subject of the interview. About what you can ask. In all my aşks there was a situation of inability to conquer the other, or the emergence of something that does not work well. Perhaps, this is my problem. I think this is one of the factors that give birth to aşk"**¹⁸. Inability to conquer is therefore what creates the passion and what makes an emotion aşk, according to him.

In order to elaborate the complicated relationship between (inability) to conquer and passion in Emre's definition of aşk, it will be enlightening to tell his past two aşks. In the first one, he and the woman he loved were in a relationship. Her friends and her world view, he says, were very different from his. It can even be said that he hates them. He felt she was living in a dramatically different world of which he could not feel to be a part. He perceived her relationship with her friends as a threat in the way to **have** her. He demanded that she give up her relations with them, and the woman rejected this. Her rejection meant that he could not conquer her and created passion in him. **"There is no possibility for you to have her when she was continuing that life with her friends. This is a very serious problem. You do not want her to be there, you want her to give up her relations with them. It is a sort of all or nothing situation. I mean you cannot say let her live in any way she wants and our relationship will go on. What**

¹⁸ Aslında ben konuyu siz söyleyince kafamda da düşündüm. Neler sorabilirsiniz diye. Onlarda şey vardı yani bir ulaşamama durumu. Ya da çok sağlıklı yürümeyen birşeylerin ortaya çıkışı. Belki de benim meselem bu. Aşkı doğuran faktörlerden biri gibi geliyor bana.

you see here again is the inability to conquer the other”¹⁹. As the idiom ‘all or nothing’ indicates, the beloved has never been conquered according to Emre if he realizes that there is even one aspect in which he has not been able to conquer her. Thus, ‘always’ is always challenged.

The problem of failing to conquer the other is even more complex in his second love. When the interview was done he was married to a woman who felt *aşk* towards him but for whom he did not feel *aşk*, but *sevgi* for about a year. Before marriage, he and his wife, he reports, had already begun to live together, yet they did not wish to marry. With the pressures and the initiatives of the families of either side, they found themselves in an environment where the preparations for marriage began about a year before the marriage. During the preparations he started a relationship with another woman. He described that period as a time full of problems with his prospective wife and defined his new relationship as an escape. That relationship, he said, turned out to be *aşk* in time. He argues that what caused him to fall in love was his knowledge that he would not be able to conquer that woman because he was about to get married and was not brave enough to say “I am breaking the engagement”. He considered all this as a ‘state of impossibility’: **“The thing that initially began as escape soon transformed into *aşk*. This is perhaps because it coincided with my process of marriage. There was a state of impossibility, too. I mean it fits the story that I have told you at the beginning. I mean there has to be an impossibility, or one has to make very serious decisions to get what he wants. I mean our families, everyone expects that we are**

¹⁹ O diğer arkadaşlarıyla o yaşamı sürerken ona sahip olmana imkan yok. Bu çok ciddi bir sorun yani. Orada olmasını istemiyorsun, o insanlarla ilişkisini kesmesini istiyorsun. Ya hep ya hiç gibi bir durum. Benim açımdan öyle yani. O öyle takılsın ilişkimiz sürsün değil yani. O benim hiç hoşlanmadığım ya da hiç görüşmediğim insanlarla bu yaşam biçimi içerisinde yaşamını sürdürürken bu ilişkinin sürmesi kolay olmuyor. Yine bunda şey var ele geçiremem.

going to marry. There is about six months to my marriage. At this stage, [I cannot say] ‘No. I fell in love with another woman, I am leaving the house and breaking the engagement’, making this decision was very hard. It is for this reason that this is an impossible aşk. I mean the condition of impossibility may have resulted in aşk”²⁰. In Emre’s definition of aşk, what creates the passion is not failing to conquer the other but the realization that conquering the other is indeed impossible. In his first aşk, a particular event in the course of the relationship –the beloved’s rejection to end her relations with her friends- makes him feel that conquering her is impossible. In the second, he falls in love with the other only because conquering the other is overtly impossible from the beginning, for he elsewhere suggests that sensing impossibility to conquer is a reason to fall in love.

The extracts given above from the interview with Emre also reveal how a (once) loving subject is speaking. Emre describes aşk rarely in relationship with his subjectivity, his feelings and experiences, but more as a universal phenomenon whose dynamics were investigated by some sciences. He uses a scientific language containing terms like factors and conditions. He constantly points to some cause-effect relationships between aşk and its perceived initiators. Furthermore, he hesitates to narrate his feelings and experiences with the first person singular. As I will elaborate further below, describing love as a universal phenomenon and refraining from using the first person singular are present in the other participants’ rhetoric.

²⁰ Bir kaçış gibi bir şeydi. O mesela bir süre sonra şeye dönüştü, ben aşık oldum. Belki de bu bir yandan evliliğe doğru giden bir süreç olduğundan. Orada da bir imkansızlık durumu var. Yani ilk baştan tarif ettiğim meseleye uyuyor. Yani ulaşılamazlık var ya da ulaşmak için ciddi bir takım kararlar vermek gerekiyor. Yani aileler tam herkes evleneceğimizi düşünüyor ve hazırlıklar da başlamış. 6-8 ay var evliliğe. Bu aşamada hayır ben başka birine aşık oldum, evden de ayrılıyorum, şudur budur. Bütün bu kararları verme meselesi de çok zor olduğu için, bu yüzden de imkansız aşk. İmkansızlık durumu bir aşka yol açmış olabilir yani.

There are two additional points of opposition in terms of the features of passion between the two types of passion described by Mustafa and Emre. The first concerns the time when passion arises in their souls. As the aforementioned extracts reveal, Mustafa uses the word passion frequently in the sense of physical attraction that he reports to experience at the beginning of falling in love. The time when passion arises, he says, is always before the beginning of a relationship. Emre, on the other hand, argues that feeling passion is always relational, occurs during a relationship. He never had experiences like love at first sight, he reports, but felt passion always after a relationship has begun: **“I fell in love always after a time. I mean you experience a problem, for example there is first a separation but you get together again. There occurs a disconnection, which was present in my case. It transformed into something which we may describe as *aşk* even though I was not in love initially. I mean the emergence of a problem has always been during or at the end of a relationship. But not before it began”²¹.**

The second point of opposition concerns the impact *aşk* makes on their souls. Mustafa informs that his past *aşks* did not leave traces on him since passion as the cause of *aşk* is purely sexual: **“Passion is experienced for some time and then it ends. It does not leave many traces on one. You may well find that passion in another human being”²².** He defines passion, and therefore *aşk*, as a fleeting thing because of its purely sexual nature. Since the root cause of passion lies in one’s own sexuality, many other women match, he says, his expectancies in terms of physical qualities and thus he

²¹ Hep bir süre sonra aşık oldum. Yani bir sorun yaşanmıştır, mesela bir ayrılık olmuştur fakat tekrar biraraya gelinmiştir. Bu bir kopukluk yaratır ve mesela bende öyle oldu yani. Aşık değilken bir anda aşk diye tarif edebileceğimiz bir şeye dönüştü. Yani o ilişkinin bitmesi ya da bir sorun olması hep ilişki süresince oldu. Başlamadan önce değil yani.

²² Tutku bir süre yaşanıyor ve bitiyor daha sonra çok fazla iz bırakmıyor, başka bir insanda o tutkuyu tekrar bulabiliyorsunuz.

may find passion in another woman. His point that *aşk* does not leave strong traces on one's soul is apparent from his assertion that his past *sevgis* had deep impacts on him. **“With the words ‘the woman I loved’ I imply those human beings with whom I experienced long term relationships on the basis of the distinction between *aşk* and *sevgi* that I previously made. They all have left an ache and a bruise in me”²³**. He argues that his long term relationships, which were all marked by the presence of *sevgi* according to him, **“deserve to be noted”²⁴**. Unlike Mustafa, Emre suggests that the traces of passion on him are permanent as he reports that he still feels *aşk* for the two aforementioned women.

Feeling passion is constitutive in the *aşk* definition of the participants of this study. However, each of them describes what passion is, what its causes and object are, and how its nature is differently. Even though what they report feeling is considerably different, they all name those different feelings as passion, and only when they feel passion, they say, they sense that they are in love. I argue that the fact that they commonly name different feelings as passion, therefore *aşk*, has to do with the Turkish language. There are two different words that categorize one's romantic attachment to the other in the Turkish language, namely *aşk* and *sevgi*. Such a distinction does not exist in other languages such as English, or French. Lacanian theory may provide useful insights at this point: According to Lacan, language is a very powerful source in the construction of human emotions. For him, language is the medium through which human beings as subjects are constituted in such a way that language –the symbolic- creates the emotions –the reality-, since language organizes reality so that it can be thought of and talked

²³ Sevdiğim insan derken *sevgi* ve *aşk* arasında daha önce ayırım yaptığımız için daha uzun süreli ilişkiler yaşadığım insanları söylüyorum o insanları kastediyorum hepsinin ayrı bir sızısı ve yarası var içimde.

²⁴ kayda değer

about. Human beings learn to categorize their feelings according to the possibilities provided by the language. For the case of the participants of this study, they have learned throughout their lives to categorize their feelings about attachment to others as *aşk* and *sevgi* depending on the presence of passion, even though what they subjectively experience as passion is different, because the language provides these words as available tools.

Powerlessness: Feeling powerless is the other constitutive element in the *aşk* definition of the participants of this study. As I will elaborate further below, some of the participants consider only those relationships in which they report feeling powerless as *aşk*, and the others consider the relationships in which they report feeling powerless as the ones in which they felt *aşk* most intensely. They define powerlessness as feeling relatively weaker than and vulnerable to the loved women. Emre, for example, argues that to be in love means to be relatively powerless than the other: **“I mean as I said *aşk* comes into being as a result of a sort of power struggle. I mean it is a struggle in which the powerless side is the loving one. Or we can say that it is a struggle in which the loving side is the powerless one.”**²⁵ Ömer, similarly, associates *aşk* as feeling weaker than the beloved: **“Despite being an egoist thing, *aşk* is a very pure thing at the same time. It may be a cliché but you are in front of the other with your purest emotions. I mean you are naked in front of her, of course in an metaphorical sense. You show her your sides that you never show others. I mean you are really weaker in front of her, she may play with you, use you I mean. Her**

²⁵ Yani dediğim gibi *aşk* bir tür iktidar mücadelesiyele ortaya çıkıyor. Yani güçsüzün *aşk* olduğu bir mücadele. Ya da şöyle diyebiliriz *aşk* olanın güçsüz olduğu bir mücadele.

pettiest behavior may carry greatest meanings for you. For this reason, it is something that hurts you most of the time”²⁶.

The participants constantly underline that feeling powerless is the outcome of a state of imbalance in the feelings of each of the lovers to one another. They define the biggest and longest love as the one in which they sense that conquering the other is an impossible aim to achieve. They tell the stories of those of their love experiences in which they did not find reciprocity to their feelings as the ones in which they felt *aşk* most intensely.

Mert’s case illustrates very well how the impossibility of conquering the other makes him feel powerlessness, and in turn passion intensely. When I asked him how many times he fell in love, he replied more than 10 times. He said that he “**felt like flying**” in 5 or 6 of the 10, and added that one of the 5 or 6 was the most intense among all but the most hurtful at the same time. He described that love experience as the one in which he sensed that it was impossible to conquer the other after a very long period of being hurt: “**It was about 4 or 5 years ago. My age was permitting at that time. I was 33 or 34. I was of an age to understand what is what. But I fell in love to such an extent that it took a very long time to save myself from that dangerous wheel. I do not know if I can explain. I mean I saw what would happen to me, like a fortuneteller. But a stupid fortuneteller. I mean he sees that he would crash into something, but he goes ahead and crashes. All I predicted happened. But I could**

²⁶ Yani bencil birşey olmakla birlikte bence aşk çok saf da olan bir şey. Biraz amiyane bir tabir olacak ama en temiz duygularınla onun karşısındasın. Yani karşısında çırılçıplaksın, tabi kelimenin mecazi anlamında. Başkalarına hiç göstermediğin yanlarını ona gösteriyorsun. Bazen böyle dışardan bakınca ‘Allah’ım ne kadar da salakmışım’ falan dersin ya. Yani onun karşısında gerçekten çok zayıfsın, o senle oynayabilir seni kullanabilir falan yani. Onun küçük bir hareketi senin için çok büyük anlamlar ifade edebiliyor. Bu yüzden çoğu zaman insanı inciten de birşey

not get away from her. Then she went²⁷. The one in which he failed to conquer the woman is, thus, the one he felt passion and *aşk* most intensely. In the *aşk* definition of the participants, an unevenness is present on each side in terms of the idealization of the beloved. The lover is the one who idealizes the beloved very much, while the beloved probably does not idealize the lover to the same extent. This unevenness makes the lover (man) to feel relatively weak and vulnerable vis-à-vis the beloved (woman).

The powerlessness resulting from imbalance of feelings is exemplified by Barthes (1979) in the case of waiting: The lover would meet with the beloved in a café. He goes there earlier than the decided time, but the beloved does not come during that time and then he speculates about why she is late. At the end he says: “I am the one who waits. The other does not wait”. If one waits for anyone else other than the beloved, such as a friend, in everyday life, he does not come to the conclusion that he is not loved by that person, while when the beloved makes him wait, the waiting soon transform into the problematic of ‘You do not love me!’. Thus, powerlessness is the feeling of being hurt on the basis of the conclusion that one is not loved when the beloved acts in ways that other human beings around him act in everyday life.

The powerlessness stemming from the imbalance between the feelings of each side is symbolized in the idiom *the one who runs away is always followed* to which all the participants referred. Emre says that the imbalance between feelings is itself a reason to fall in love: **“I mean such a thing [love] suddenly comes into being as a result of the thought that she may flee from your hands. You feel it. A separation is not**

²⁷ Bundan 4-5 sene önceydi tahmin ediyorum yani. Evet o kadar bir sene önceydi. Yaşım da müsaitti o zaman. 33-34 yaşındaydım. Neyin ne olduğunu anlayabilecek yaşıydım. Ama o kadar aşık oldum ki kendimi o zararlı çarktan kurtarmam çok uzun sürdü. Anlatabiliyor muyum bilmiyorum yani gördüm başıma gelecekleri tıpkı bir kahin gibi ama salak bir kahin gibi. Yani görüyor orda bir şeye çarpacağını ama gidiyor çarpıyor orda. Onun için diyordum o olacak ordan şuraya dönücez üç aşağı beş yukarı hepside çıktı. Fakat gidemiyordum o kızın etrafından gidemedim yani. Ondan sonra o gitti.

necessary, it may be for any reason. It may be a gesture. Or it may be in the absence of reciprocity of feelings. I mean what is present for me is a situation in which one side loves while the other does not love equally. For me, *aşk* is like this. This is a reason to fall in love for me. I mean one runs away and the other follows. There are such words but they are verified by experience. I mean it sounds very cliché, but you realize that it is not so complex when you experience it. This is something that anyone can say but everyone experiences this. I mean if someone is running away, the other runs after her/him. And the one who does the running after, falls in love²⁸.

The powerlessness that the participants describe is not specific to each love experience. It has nothing to do with the particular course of a relationship. Rather, it is inherent in their definitions of love and passion. The participants fall in love with women vis-à-vis whom they feel already powerless. This is best exemplified in the extract from Emre just above and embodied in the idiom *the one who runs away is followed*. They do not fall in love with women who run after them because they feel they already conquered those women without any struggle. In their definition of love, what makes love meaningful is the struggle to conquer the other. Hence, they regard the experiences in which they feel powerless, through failing to conquer the other, as real love.

²⁸ Yani elinden kaçırma düşüncesinin ağır basması sonucu böyle bir şey çıkıveriyor bir anda yani. Onu hissediyorsun. İlla bir ayrılık olmayabilir, herhangi bir neden olabilir, bir jest de olabilir. Ya da genelde çok karşılıklı olmaması durumunda belki. Benim açımdan şey var yani bir tarafın sevdiği bir tarafın aynı oranda sevmeyişi bir durum. Benim açımdan öyle aşk. Aşık olmak için bir sebep o yani. Yani biri kaçırır öbürü de takip eder. Böyle çok şey laflar vardır ama bunlar deneyimle doğrulanıyor aslında. Yani çok klişe gibi geliyor ama yaşayınca çok da karmaşık olmadığını görüyorsun yani. Bu mesela herkesin söyleyebileceği bir laf ama herkes de bunu yaşar. Yani biri kaçırırsa öbürü de onu kovalar ve kovalayan aşık olur yani.

Madness: Barthes (1979) argues that the loving subject frequently thinks that he/she is mad or going mad. The words mad (deli), crazy (çılgın), mania (manyaklık), irrational (mantıksız) are frequent in the interview material, employed to describe how the state of being in love is different from what the participants call normality. There are two aspects to the madness that the participants describe. First, they indicate enthusiasm and fervor by the word madness. Second, they say that when they are in love they behave in an irrational way that they would not behave so if they were not in love. However, madness is not defined as an emotion by the participants. The reason why what they describe as madness is elaborated here is that they see it to be related very much with the feelings of fear, which I will explore in the following section.

Mustafa likens being in love to drugs in order to explain the opposition he sees to be between being in love and not being in love. He regards himself like a man who takes drugs and becomes enthusiastic and happy. He describes his mood in love as ‘mania’ and reports himself to be unable to make ‘rational’ decisions. **“It is a mania, it is not a normal thing, it is not a normal mood. It is a beautiful, nice state of sweetness. What is normal is to be rational, not to transgress the borders of rationality”**²⁹. To illustrate how he behaves ‘irrationally’ when in love, he said that he spent all his money for a telephone call when the beloved was away and lived close hunger for the rest of the month.

Mert, similarly, likens being in love to drugs that prevents making rational decisions: **“Aşk prevents making true judgments. If you were not in love with a woman you would not stay with her. For example, you wish her not to laugh or**

²⁹ Bir manyaklık yaa normal bir şey değil yaa normal bir ruh durumu değil. Güzel hoş bir tatlılık şeyi yani hali zamanı. Normal olan durum mantıklı olmak, yani kendi mantık sınırlarını çok fazla zorlamamaktır.

speak in the way she actually does. *Aşk* is like an anti-depressant oppressing these. When you take an anti-depressant you do not react”³⁰. To describe what happens when love dies, he uses another analogy, that of the tide: “*Aşk* is in fact a nice thing but we find things that get stuck on our feet when the tide ebbs away”³¹.

The two extracts above indicate that falling in love is an interruption of the normal flow of life which is based on rational behavior. It is a common theme in the interview material that it is not possible to control life through reason all the time. For instance, Mustafa, who argues that one who is in love behaves irrationally, replied in the following way when I asked him if it is nonsense to desire behaving irrationally: “[Love] **is of course a delightful phenomenon. I mean one needs to engage in mania. It is otherwise impossible to live. ... I desire to be always in love. If I know I can always be in love and sustain my life in spite of irrationality I would prefer it. But it is metaphysical. Therefore, I mean, I would like to fall in love in periods”³². The participants, thus, define love as a need of human beings for getting out of the cold skeleton hands of rationality, at least temporarily.**

This extract also indicates how the desired and undesired aspects of irrationality of love are reconciled. Mustafa invents a middle way to hold both sorts of aspects together: to fall in love in periods. This middle way has also an important implication:

³⁰ Aşk doğru karar vermeyi engeller.. Vardır ya hani ne gıcık gülüyor. Aşık olmasak o kadına o kadının yanında durmayız. Aşk bunları baskılayan anti-depresan gibi bir şey. Anti-depresanlar da öyledir ya alırsınız tepki gösteremezsiniz.

³¹ Aslında aşk hoş bir şeydir ama bu kadar yanlışları görmemizi engellediği için gelgitin giti olduğunda geride kalan şeyler arasında ayağımıza batacak şeyler buluruz.

³² Tabi ki nefes bir şey yani onu yapmak lazım o manyaklıkları yapmadan olmaz, başka türlü yaşanmaz zaten. ... Her zaman aşık olmayı isterim. Devamlı kalacağımı bilsem öyle olurdu ama evet o mantıksızlıkları, hayatımı o şekilde devam ettireceğimi bilsem yapardım yani. Ama bu tamamen fizik ötesi, kural dışı bir şey yani. Dolayısıyla en azından belirli periyotlarda aşık olmayı isterim yani.

what is desired about love is not a particular human being but love as a state of emotion itself. The desire to fall in love in periods is by definition to fall in love with different women.

Being Hurt & Fears (of Being Hurt): Jackson argues that feeling insecure is a result of being in love and fundamental to its continuance. She explains what she terms as “the chronic insecurity of the lover” as the lover’s “playing hard to get as a means of arousing the other’s interest” and receiving little attention in turn, which is followed by feelings of being hurt on the part of the lover (1993: 211). The participants of this study describe the same feeling which Jackson calls insecurity despite the fact that they do not name it insecurity. They rather use the word fear. The Turkish verbs *incinmek*, *yaralanmak*, *zarar görmek*, *canı acımak*, all of which are translated to English as ‘being hurt’, are used frequently by the participants.

The participants define being hurt in two related ways. First, some of them define being hurt as feeling cheated, or used, by the other in a way that the beloved seems to love the lover but she does not in reality. Ömer, for example, argues that inherent in being in love is the risk of being used by the other, as mentioned in an earlier extract. **“I mean you are really weaker in front of her, she may play with you, use you I mean. Her pettiest behavior may carry greatest meanings for you. For this reason, it is something that hurts you most of the time”**³³. Serkan, similarly, reports that he is afraid of being cheated by the other when he is in love. **“Even if he dares to take this fear on [fear of rejection] the fear does not end for it will make him experience a**

³³ Yani onun karşısında gerçekten çok zayıfsın, o senle oynayabilir seni kullanabilir falan yani. Onun küçücük bir hareketi senin için çok büyük anlamlar ifade edebiliyor. Bu yüzden çoğu zaman insanı inciten de birşey.

more intense pain if the woman wants slightly, she will give him false hope but he will lose himself in this hope, and then realize the truth. He knows this, he experienced it before”³⁴.

These extracts from Ömer and Serkan also provide insights about the subjectivity of the participants. In both, the subjects refrain from explaining their feelings and experiences with the first person singular. Especially Serkan speaks always with the third person singular and third person plural throughout the entire interview. He also hesitates to reply to my questions in a subjective way by arguing at the beginning of each answer that he would not be able to explain being in love as an emotion in one hour. The effects of refraining from using first person singular is to render being in love unrelated with their own subjectivities and to depict it as if a universal phenomenon.

Separating emotions from one’s own subjectivity is not restricted to refraining from using the first person singular. As mentioned earlier employing a scientific language composed of terms like conditions, factors, etc. is another way common among the participants. An additional way used by them to this effect is to treat being in love as a thing belonging to the past. The participants argue about being in love always on the basis of their past experiences. They describe love in a retrospective way. In the extract from Serkan above, for instance, he explains that his past relationships become obstacles in his efforts to look for new ones. His rendering being in love to belong to the past makes him able to universalize his feelings and to set being in love apart from his own subjectivity.

³⁴ Ayrıca bu korkuyu göze alsa bile kadın öylesine istiyorsa, birazcık umut verecek ama o bu umutla kendinden geçecek ve sonra gerçeklerle yüzleşmeye başlayınca daha yoğun bir acı yaşatacağı için korku bitmiyor. Bunu yaşadığı daha önce biliyor.

More striking examples of treating love as a thing belonging to the past are present in the cases of Emre and Mert. Emre was in such a state during the interview that he could discuss an event that happened five years before as if it happened five minutes ago. I thought that he was still in love with the woman with whom he had fallen in love before his marriage, and asked him if this is true. His answer was: **“Yes. There is perhaps an attenuation but I still want her. I mean all this is a very strange story. It is weird to be so passive. You cannot overcome it. I am very passive. A man who makes his own decisions, who is brave enough could make different decisions. But I could not do that. I do not want to act. Let me not decide, let someone else decide for me. ... Love does not end for me. ... I always make them [the two women with whom he fell in love] live inside me. This is not something like hoping to be together again. I mean when something makes me remember them, such as a place or a detail, I experience very intense feelings in me. I mean I have a retrospective view”**³⁵.

In this extract, I argue, being in love is separated from the realm of relationships and treated at a different level from that of the real. It is constructed as if imaginary. In other words, it is defined to be a thing existing never in a relationship but always in one's own mind, not in the present but in the past. In such a definition, one is in love in so far he stays out of a relationship. Being in love is the frozen in time image of the

³⁵ Evet yani belki biraz azalma oldu ama şu an bile istiyorum yani. Yani bütün bunlar acaip bir hikaye yani. Burada bu kadar edilgen olmak tuhaf yani. Aşamıyorsun. Edilgenlik bende çok fazla olan bir şey. Kendi kararlarımı kendi verebilen bir insan, cesur bir insan başka kararlar verebilirdi. Ben onu veremedim. Ben hareket etmeyeyim falan istiyorum. Ben karar vermeyeyim de biri karar versin benim yerime. ... Benim için bitmiyor. ... Yani sürekli yaşıyorum onu içimde. Yani bu umut gibi birşey değil tekrar birlikte olabilme meselesi. Yani herhangi birşey bana hatırlattığında, herhangi bir yer, ayrıntı bana o ilişkiyi hatırlattığında ben yine çok yoğun şeyler kendi içimde yaşayabiliyorum. Öyle yani geçmişe dönük bir bakış açım var.

moment when the desire to conquer the other emerged in one's soul. It is an image living in the past. Hence, this extract is a tribute to *non-relationship*.

Another example of the participants' depiction of being in love as a thing belonging to the past and separating it from the realm of relationships is present in Mert's case. Mert reports that he still feels in love with the woman who left her and whom he defines as his biggest love. **"I destructed it [love] consciously. There is another very interesting thing. I talked this with another one recently. We were chatting. Yes, it should not have ended theoretically. It has not ended in reality either. But the only thing that prevents me to do craziness for her is the memories of being hurt and the fear of being hurt again if I approach her again"**³⁶. In this extract, too, being in love is an image of the arousal of the desire to conquer the other in his soul. It is an image living in the past.

Having put the insights that the first way of defining being hurt provide to explore the subjectivities of the participants, it is now time to tell the second way in which being hurt is defined. Some of the participants describe the feeling of being hurt as a result of the madness which they associate with being in love, as the extract from Mert above reveals. They describe it feeling regret for behaving in an irrational way that they would not do if they were not in love. Mustafa, as an additional example, argues that he feels being hurt because of the irrational mood of being in love. **"In fact, it is not rational at all. You know but you still do. I mean one cannot persuade himself. You**

³⁶ Ben onu bilinçli olarak yıktım. Şimdi çok enteresan bir şey daha var, geçenlerde onu başka biriyle de daha konuştum. Tırmandırıyorduk gene. Eh evet bitmemesi gerekirdi teorik olarak. Aslında bitmiş de değil. Ama beni onun için çılgınlık yapmaktan alıkoyan tek şey zarar verdiği anılar ve hakikaten bundan sonra da yanına yaklaştığım anda tekrar zarar göreceğim korkusu.

know that doing that is irrational and will hurt you. But you do not want to think of it³⁷.

Pain: Pain is referred frequently as another feeling felt when in love by the participants of this study. They describe it as emerging when they cannot conquer the other in spite of all their efforts for this cause. The importance of pain for this study is the performance of experiencing pain like a ritual. These rituals include drinking alcohol while thinking about the beloved, writing poems, watching the light coming out of the beloved's window in secret.

Mert, for instance, argues that there are some patterns of behavior common among lovers who feel pain because of failing to conquer the other, which he terms as "the lover's states". He used this term when explaining how he behaved when his attempts to conquer the woman whom he defined as his biggest love. **"She is marrying someone else. I am waiting in front of her door, I am smoking. You know there are such lover's states, I would do these. Please imagine: I did these at that time. I went on my motorbike and watched the light coming out of her window"**³⁸. He describes these patterns of behavior not simply as what he did in his past love experiences but also as what he could do thereby showing the ritualistic and performative aspects of pain.

The rituals of pain, I argue, allow the participants to create special times in which the presence of pain can be intensely sensed. The performance of pain, thus, is a part of the performance of being in love.

³⁷ Aslında hiç mantıklı bir şey değil yani bunu yapmak aslında hiç mantıklı değil. Hem biliyorsun hem yapıyorsun. Ama durum böyle değil yani insan kendine söz geçiremiyor. Mantıksız olduğunu ve sana zarar vereceğini biliyorsun. Ama bunları düşünmek istemiyorsun.

³⁸ Bir de o başkasıyla evleniyor, ben onun kapısının önünde bekliyorum, sigara içiyorum vardır ya hani aşık halleri, bunlardan yapardım kesin. Ki düşünün o zaman bile yaptım. Motorla giderdim bakardım ışığına bilmem ne.

Liveliness: The fragments that have been explored until now are those that carry negative connotations, such as powerlessness, fear, pain, irrationality. In spite of all the negative feelings, the participants say, they prefer to be in love because they feel lively in love. They associate being in love with living, and not being in love with death. Mustafa, for example, defines love as to live. **“Love is to live. It is to feel the every moment you live. It is to be crazy for the other”**³⁹. Mert, too, says that he came to think of himself as a dead person after his marriage. **“After I married, I came to think ‘Cannot I conquer any woman after this moment? Have I died?’. The first six months of my marriage was very problematic for this reason. This was because of desires”**⁴⁰.

Reuniting the Fragments: Love as Discovery/Conquest

The fragments of being in love which the participants describe as their feelings were depicted in the preceding pages. The participants put all these fragments in a seemingly coherent way, producing what I call ‘their own theories of love’. Apart from reporting their feelings, the participants explained to me their own theories of love during the entire interview. They told me what love in fact was. A theory, or an assertion of what a thing is in fact, is based upon an argument. The most interesting point about their theory is that all the participants’ theories are based upon one single argument. Now, I aim to state what this argument is and to explore how what they describe as their feelings are set within this theory.

³⁹ Aşk her an hissetmek yaşamak belki onun için çılgın olmak gibi bir şey.

⁴⁰ Evlendiğim de ulan ben bundan sonra başka hiçbir kadını fetedemeyecek miyim ? Öldük mü yani şimdi biz? Hakikaten evliliğimin ilk 6 ayı çok ciddi sarsıntılarla geçti bu yüzden. Bu şeylerden olabilir. Arzulardan dolayı.

The main argument of the theory put forward by the participants asserts that love is a process of discovery and/or conquest of the beloved. And the following is their theory: A man feels that he has fallen in love. The emergence of this emotion in one's soul happens suddenly such that he does not notice it but suddenly finds himself in love (being out of control). The way love begins may take different forms: it may come in a platonic way, or may be due to a transformation of a friendship or of an already existing relation into love. A man, who realizes that he has fallen in love, comes from that very moment on to desire very intensely to discover/conquer that woman (passion). He devotes in an irrational way all his time to discover/conquer her (madness). If he fails to conquer her, he feels powerlessness, vulnerability, being hurt and pain. However, his passion only becomes more intense. He comes to desire her more than before. If he senses that he has begun to conquer her, the intensity with which he desired to conquer her begins to decrease, since he realizes that he **can** conquer her. The attractiveness of the desire to conquer disappears immediately. Even though he realizes that he can conquer the woman, he still engages in the relationship only because there are still undiscovered things in her. Yet, there comes a moment when all the undiscovered things become discovered and the woman is completely conquered. At this moment, there is not even a gram of passion left in him: *Aşk* ends. If he stays still together with her, *sevgi* rules in his soul, instead of *aşk*.

Some of the participants use the word 'discovery' while the others use 'conquest' when narrating this theory. I consider both to be the same, since conquest can be seen as the final stage of discovery. Only when all the unrecognized places are discovered the conquest is completed. If there are still *terra incognita* that place is by definition unconquered.

What may be the basic characteristic of a theory? It answers the main questions about its subject, generally defined by itself, in a coherent way. The participants' theory of love answers the questions that may arise about love in a coherent way. One of the main questions that their theory answers is why one's feeling of love expires. This question was the basic problematic in some of the participants' accounts. It seemed that they constructed their theory of love as an answer to this question. According to their theory, love is an emotion destined to expire since the lover's goal is to conquer the beloved. If the lover realizes that he will succeed, then the goal ceases to be meaningful.

Most of the participants explain a perceived cause-effect relationship between the expiration of love and discovery on the basis of biological reasons. They argue that there is scientific evidence supporting this cause-effect relationship. Mustafa, for instance, says **"It really does not last long. It is said scientifically that the longest aşk is for a few years. There is really some truth in this. I mean it does not last"**⁴¹. He argues that behind the fact that love is destined to expire is present the fact that *aşk* stems from physical attraction and sexual desire which are determined by hormones. The emphasis on the biological basis of feeling *aşk* and passion is made stronger as Mustafa explains that it is not possible to prevent love from dying even if he would prefer to do so. **"You know when love ends, I do not know, perhaps there is something that is a result of conquering the other. I mean you do not always want to do such things. You do such things very rarely. You may make sweet surprises. For example, you may meet her in an unexpected way, or you may do beautiful things when she is not**

⁴¹ Gerçekten uzun süreli devam etmiyor. Belki bilimsel olarak söylenir. En büyük aşk birkaç senedir diye söylenir ama bu gerçekten bence bunda bir doğruluk payı var sürmüyor yani.

expecting anything. But you do these much more when you are in love. I wish it were not like this, but you do not feel like that, there is nothing to do”⁴².

The reference to the scientific evidence about the expiring of love is a theme present in Mert, too. He says **“Being in love has a life. You know it is said, we see in newspapers a hormone was discovered, that love’s life is for two years. I do not know how many years love’s life is. But I think we gnaw at it. We gnaw at it, and when we find something good, we can continue. But I really think that we consume love”⁴³**. In order to explain the dynamics of love’s expiration in a detailed way, he refers to explanations from sociobiology: **“On the other hand I also think in the following way, I do not know if it is true. When we ask the woman we fell in love with ‘hi, may I have your telephone number?’ or ‘can we have breakfast tomorrow’, or ‘can we go out in the next week’, or whatever the question, I feel that we begin to eat that love when we receive a positive answer to our question. Because, we are going toward conquest. I mean it is our work. I believe in such a thesis in the distinction between man and woman: Man will leave offspring in as many women as possible, he will reproduce himself in as many women as possible. This is his aim. Woman will take the strongest man for her. This comes from the past. The instinct to hunt”⁴⁴**. He argues that human beings’ behaviors in romantic relationships, both as men

⁴² Hani aşk bittiği zaman, bimirorum belki de elde etmiş olmanın verdiği bir şey var yani çok da fazla bunları en azından her zaman yapmayı istemiyorsun yani. Çok daha nadir yapıyorsun bu tip şeyleri. Tatlı sürprizler yapabilirsin, mesela hiç olmayacak bir şekilde karşısına çıkabilirsin hiç beklemediği bir anda güzel bir şeyler yapabilirsin ama bunu aşıkken daha fazla yapıyorsun. Keşke böyle olmasa ama içinden gelmiyor. Yapacak birşey yok

⁴³ Aşkın bir ömrü var. Hani söylenir ya gazetelerde filan görürüz bilmem ne hormonu bulunmuş. Aşkın ömrü 2 yıldır filan diye. Bilmiyorum ben kaç yıl olduğunu, oralardan buralardan kemirdiğimizi düşünüyorum. Bunun yerine onu kemirdiğimizde kazı kazan gibi düşünün, bunları kazığımızda iyi bir şey çıkıyorsa altından buna devam edebiliriz. Ama aşkın hakikaten kendimiz tarafından tüketildiğini düşünüyorum.

⁴⁴ Bir yandan da ben şöyle bir şeyde düşünüyorum çok doğru mu bilmiyorum aşık olduk ama aşık olduğumuz kadına “merhaba telefonunu alabilir miyim? Yarın kahavaltı edelim mi haftaya şöyle bir şey

and as women, are determined by evolution and are governed by the instincts that our antecedents gained thousands of years ago.

The second question that the theory of love put forward by the participants aims to answer is why their way of experiencing love as men is different from that of women. This question was the basic problematic in some of the participants' accounts and one of the two basic problematics in others' accounts. It is seen in the interview material that the participants see three ways in which men experience love differently from women. First, men's love is short lived as opposed to women's long lived love. Second, men want to be together with more than one woman at a time and have many women during their lives as opposed to women who love a single person at a time and know fewer men during their lives. Third, men are the active party in love while women are passive. My interviewees underline these three differences as if they were proving something to women. They seemed to be saying 'Women complain about us because of these differences. They want us to experience long term and less numbered loves, to love only them. But we cannot do what they want. They must accept us as we are, because these differences are natural ones. They are in our nature'. From the tone of their voice they seemed to be in an argument with women. During the interviews, it seems they addressed women, especially those women who criticized them or those who they think will criticize them.

The first of these differences, i.e. the short-lived character of men's love, has already been explored above. About the second difference, falling in love with another

var gelir misin sorusunu her ne soruyorsak ilk adımımızda yani olumlu cevap aldığımızda o aştan yediğimizi hissediyorum. Çünkü fetetmeye doğru gidiyor bizim işimiz bu yani. Kadını avlamak gibi bir güdümüz var ya bizim. Kadın erkek ayrımında şöyle bir şeye inanıyorum tezlerden şu o olanına inanıyorum: işte erkek mümkün olduğunca çok kadına döl bırakacak mümkün olduğu kadar kadında üreyecek amacı bu, kadında kendisi için en kuvvetli olan erkeği alıcak. Geçmişten gelen. Avlanma iç güdüsü

woman while loving one is a common theme in the participants' narratives. Mustafa, who defines love as a process of conquering a woman sexually, says **"You may fall in love with one, while loving [sevmek] another"**⁴⁵. Emre, who defines love as a process of conquering the other's mind, says **"A relationship in the state of *sevgi* may end when *aşk* interrupts. It is perhaps normal to prefer an *aşk* relationship that could last a few months breaking a relationship that would otherwise last for years. Or those who prefer it are in majority"**⁴⁶. Mert, who describes both body and mind to be equally important in the process of conquest, says **"How nice it would be if we thought in such a way: it would be easier for men to live if women's desire for fidelity did not exist. You know we have sayings like 'I love you but I cannot give her up. If we were able to actualize these thoughts, there would be lesser problems in life. But they don't have such a thing. Women do not want to share their man with others"**⁴⁷. All the three not only agree that it is normal to fall in love with another woman while loving one, but also had actually experienced this. Yet, Mustafa and Emre think that it is not in one's control not to fall in love while in relationship. Mert, on the other hand, explicitly blames women for not understanding men.

This second difference between men and women is again explained by reference to the biological roots of the human species. It is, they argue, because of the biological differences which came into being in the long process of evolution that men prefer having relationships with as many women as possible. It is for this reason that one may

⁴⁵ Birini severken başka birine aşık olabilirsiniz.

⁴⁶ Sevgi durumunda bir ilişki sürerken aşk devreye girdiğinde ilişki bitebilir. Belki bıraksan yıllarca sürebilecek bir ilişkiyi kesip birkaç ay sürebilecek bir aşk ilişkisini tercih eden insanlar belki daha fazla, belki normal budur

⁴⁷ Aslında şöyle düşünüyor olsak ne güzel olurdu... Bu kadınların sadakat arzuları gibi bir şey olmasaydı hayatta erkekler için yaşamak daha kolay olurdu. Seni de seviyorum ama ondan da vazgeçemiyorum gibi cümlelerimiz vardır ya bunları hayata uygulayabiliyor olursaydık hakikaten daha problemsiz olurdu işler.

fall in love with one while loving another. It will be useful, I think, to quote Mert at length in order to demonstrate how the explanation of sociobiology is employed: **“I believe with a high percentage that women care for themselves, use make-up etc. to be more supreme than their rivals. They want to get the strongest man. Where she can find the strongest? Strength may be in money, charisma, physical appearance, social position, love, or anything else. Whatever her criterion of strength, she regards herself as deserving it. She says ‘I can take only this sperm’. She chooses it and takes it. Women are such interesting beings. They say ‘But I took you inside me’ when the situation becomes bad. So what! For my part, I entered in you. I mean if you made self-sacrifice, so did I. They pay attention to their sexual identities too much. They have such a thing: ‘I let you to enter! Look, it was useless! You cheated me’. So what! If you opened the doors, if you let me in, so I entered for my part. I made self-sacrifice too. Do you mean haven’t I been affected by this! ‘Men make sex, women love’. For God’s sake, this is not true! Why you are the good one and I the bad one, for our loves are short-lived and much in number and their loves are long-lived and less numbered. Woman does not want to have another woman steal her man. But she can be friends with her man for life if the man declares that he is homosexual. Can I explain this? There is nothing a woman can do if she finds her husband with another man in bed. You lose the man in this situation too. There is no difference. But if she finds him with another woman, then a scandal happens. ... There is not such a thing for men. Man acts with an instinct like ‘Let me reproduce in this and in that’. You know 3 billion sperms in an orgasm and an egg in a month are different things”⁴⁸.**

⁴⁸ Şöyle söyleyeyim çok büyük bir yüzde ile inanıyorum ki kadın erkeği için değil, diğer rakiplerinden

The third difference between men and women posed by them is that men are active while women are passive. What is implied by the words active and passive is that men are the ones who initiate romantic relationships and run after women, while women are those who choose the men who will conquer them and run away. They explain this difference, again, with the arguments of sociobiology. Özgür argues, by pointing the documentaries he has watched, that there is something common in both humans and animals in terms of the difference between the sexes. The ones who attempt to obtain a partner to reproduce with, he says, are males, while females choose the ones with whom they will reproduce. This inherent difference, according to him, provides the two sexes with the proper roles in terms of mate selection, and human beings today act according to these roles to the extent that they even order social life. He says **“I like, indeed, the existence of this [the difference between men and women]. I am not religious. I am an atheist. But there is something due to the creation of male and female. I watch the documentaries about animals. This [the biological differences between males and females] provides an order to human beings. When you look at social life, you see that women try to get men to look at them, they try to be attractive. All the poems,**

üstün olmak için kendine iyi bakar, makyaj yapar, şunu yapar bunu yapar. Bir erkek, ne diyorduk en güçlüleri almak istiyordu ya kadın buna inandığımızı var sayıyorum her şeyi bunun üzerine kuruyorum. En güçlüleri almak istiyor. En güçlüleri nerden bulabilir güç parada olabilir, karizmada olabilir, yakışıklılıkta olabilir, mevkide olabilir, aşkda olabilir her neyse evet onu kendine layık görüyor. Ancak diyor bu spermi alabilirim ben Her neyse onun kıstası orada, her kadının ki farklı olmak üzere. Onu seçiyor ve alıyor. Şimdi kadınların böyle enteresan bir şeyi vardır. Şey söylerler işler bozulduğu zaman, ama ben içime aldım derler mesela. Ne yaptım yani. Ben de senin içine girdim. Yani sen bir özveride bulduysan ben de buldum. Çok önemserler kendi şeylerini. Cinsel kimliklerini. İzin verdim ki sen girdin. Bak boşa çıktı. Sattın beni şeklinde bir takım şeyler. Ne var yani? Sen açtıysan, kapılarını açtıysan, sen izin verdiysen ben de girdim. Benim de verdiğim bir özveri var yani. Ben bundan etkilenmemiş mi oluyorum yani. Erkekler seks yapar kadınlar aşk yapar. Ne alakası var canım Allah Allah! Bizim aşklarımız kısa süreli ve çok sayı da onlarınki uzun süreli ve az sayıda diye niye sen iyi, ben kötü oluyorum ki. Kadın kendi erkeğini başka bir kadına kaptırmamak istiyor. Ama kendi erkeği eşcinsel olduğunu ifade ederse onunla dost kalabilir ömür boyu. Anlatılabilir muyum? Bir kadın kocasını yatakta bir erkekle yakalarsa yapabileceği hiçbir şey yoktur. Gene gidiyor adam elden. Farketmez. Başka bir kadınla yakalarsa rezalet çıkar. ... Ama erkek için böyle bir şey yok. Erkek ondan da üreyim, bunda da üreyim, şeklinde bir iç güdüyle hareket ediyor ya zaten hani bir orgazmda 3 milyar sperm başka bir şey, ayda bir yumurta başka bir şey.

all the artistic things came into being in this way in my opinion. This came into being because a similar order was present in the past. Otherwise there would not be [gender] roles. There would not be difference between men and women in terms of emotions. This [difference] is the cause of many things. For example, it affects men's way of speaking; man can speak in proper way. He tries to speak, does many things in order to influence the women. This has not got only to do with 'let me run after a woman'. In order for women to be attractive, they should try too. What I want to emphasize is that in order for both sides to have their proper personalities in relationships, women will attract and men will run after. One who does not run away will not be run after”⁴⁹.

Michel Foucault's concept of discourse is a useful analytical tool to explore the participants' theory of love. As it can easily be seen in the extracts above, the answers their theory offers to both questions are based on the explanations of biology and sociobiology about human nature. According to Foucault, discourses are composed of arguments that make serious truth statements about human nature. Biology and sociobiology are in this respect discourses in the Foucauldian sense. I argue that the participants become subjects by taking up a position in the discourse of sociobiology.

⁴⁹ Ben bunun olmasını, aslında şey, hoşuma gidiyor. Sebebi de şu ya ben şey değilim. Ateistim. Ama şey var dişi erkek yaratılışından dolayı şey var. Belgeselleri falan da izlerim, hayvanlar falan. Bu çünkü insana bir düzen getiriyor. Sosyal yaşamda baktığın zaman erkeğin kendine bakmasını sağlıyor; bayanların kendilerini çekici kılmalarını sağlıyor. Bu şeyler var ki bu kadar şiir, bu kadar sanatsal şey böyle çıkmış aslında bana kalırsa. Bu geçmişte de böyle bir düzenin olmasından dolayı böyle çıkmış. Ya öteki türlü roller olmazdı. Dişi erkek şeyi, yani duygu bakımından dişi erkek farklılığı olmazdı. Böyle olması çoğu şeyi ateşliyor aslında. Ne bileyim erkeğin konuşma şeyini etkiliyor. Düzgün konuşabiliyor erkek. Konuşmaya çabalıyor, etkilemek için birşeyler yapıyor. Sırf şey değil bu tabii ben kovalayayım şeyi değil. Bayanlarında bir çekiciliğinin olması için onların da çok çaba göstermesi lazım. Benim kastettiğim bir kişiliğinin olması için, yani bu oyun sırasında her iki tarafında öyle bir ilişki kişiliğinin olması için bayan çekecek , erkek de kovalayabilecek. Kaçmayan şey kovalanmaz

Conclusion

In the previous chapter, I offered an analysis of romantic love in terms of the emotions of the loving person rather than the functions of love in modern society and what it provides to the abstract individual. Exploring the emotions of the loving person provides insights to subjectivities in a given society. In the present chapter, I have tried in this respect to analyze romantic love by exploring the emotions of some men in contemporary Turkey said they felt when in love. I have considered the fragments of the participants' discourse of love as corresponding to the fragments of a subjectivity.

The subject the present chapter has delineated is first of all a subject who passionately tries to conquer. Falling in love is an attractive thing for him insofar as he imagines himself as a conqueror (of women). This subject is secondly a subject whose power rests upon the conquest of women. For him easily conquerable women are not objects of love. Third, he is a subject who does not desire a relationship with women. For him, love and relationship are irreconcilable things. Finally, he is a subject for whom a 'scientific' approach to life is the highest value.

In the next chapter, I will try to explore how masculinity is constructed in relationship with this subjectivity. The focus will be on the code of honor as the primary reservoir of the cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey, and on the way the participants describe love.

CHAPTER 3: GENDER AND POWER

Gender, Representation and Performance

In this chapter, I will seek to identify the forms of male power stemming from the gender representations and gender performances of the participants of this study in the contexts of love and relationship. As elaborated in the first chapter, this study admits the feminist argument that power operates in any sphere of life where gender is present. Love and relationship are sites where cross-gender relations, and thus power, are present. Of course, analyzing male power is not restricted to exploration of cross-gender relations. Intra-gender relations are sites of male power, too. Yet, the focus of this chapter will be cross-gender relations, since the concern of the present thesis is restricted to heterosexual love.

When looking for male power in the contexts of love and relationship, I take representation and performance as the most appropriate analytical tools for the data of this study. Representation is “the process by which members of a culture use language to produce meaning” (Hall, 1997: 61). The reason for why it is chosen for this study is that the interview material contains a large number of theoretical arguments about love, masculinity and femininity. One of my aims in this respect will be to see how men construct and imagine relations of love with women. Performance is the embodiment of representation in every day life practices. Since the interview material also contains men’s reports about their experiences, though limited in comparison with theoretical arguments, my other aim will be to examine how they do gender in romantic relationships.

The impact of Theresa de Lauretis on this study is particular for her method of evaluating gender as a representation. She defines gender as “the representation of each

individual in terms of a particular social relation which pre-exists the individual and is predicated on the conceptual and rigid (structural) opposition of two biological sexes”

(1987: 5). Gender represents each individual for the category he or she belongs to.

Gender, to illustrate, represents all women as real historical beings with their peculiar race, ethnicity, class, etc. positions for ‘Woman’, with capital letter, which has been culturally constructed to have an essence, be it nature, or mother, or evil, etc. depending on the cultural construction. The (cultural) construction of gender as a representation is never disconnected from patriarchy. For this reason, she argues, the power of gender and the gender of power are one and same thing (de Lauretis, 1987). The present study, in this respect, will take gender as representation not only constructed by power, but especially constructing power. In the ways the participants describe the nature of love and assume what women’s and men’s nature is, the gender representations they use create their own specific forms of power.

Another study that has considerable impact on the framework of the present chapter belongs to West and Zimmerman. They argue that men and women constantly “do gender” in their daily lives by invoking, enacting and remaking the often-polarized images of the two genders, through which the male power is reproduced (West and Zimmerman, 1987). When doing gender, men and women engage in gender-linked behaviors in contingent situations which represent and (re)construct cultural scripts. Such gender-linked behaviors are especially functional in the making of one’s own sense of gender for they are tools to judge oneself in view of the cultural meanings and practices. This chapter will see romantic relationships as a place of doing gender in which the cultural ideals of masculinity are either enacted or resisted but reshaped in any case. My aim, in this respect, will be to identify in what form power is present in the

way the participants perform masculinity in the way which they describe the course love takes.

The following section will scrutinize the way participants define love, and emphasize the power stemming from the representational aspects of gender. Then, what the participants describe as (love) relationship will be examined, and male power will be explored in the performance of masculinity. In the conclusion section of this chapter, how the participants construct marriage will be inspected to see if there is a relationship between love and marriage.

Love and Power: Power in the Nature of Love

The first scholar who pointed to the connection between love and power is Weber (1948). He argues that it is a characteristic of love relationships that “the most intimate coercion of the soul of the less brutal partner” happens (1948: 348). However, the most elaborate analysis of the connection between love and power came from within feminist theory. Simone de Beauvoir argues that the ideology of romantic love in Western societies demand women to devote themselves completely to men in order to attain a transcendence in love (1952). Subsequent feminist scholars argue that the less brutal partner, whose soul is punished, in Weber’s statement, happen usually to be the woman, because of the patriarchal relations that characterize Western societies, especially when romantic love undergoes transmutation into established coupledness and marriage. Some scholars like Millet regard the overall subordination of female sexuality as being sustained by the ideology of romantic love (1977).

The main argument of Western feminist writing on love is that love rests upon the emotional labor of women without reciprocity by men. Several feminist scholars

report that women are dissatisfied with the decrease of intimacy on the part of male partners as their relationships settle down (Mansfield and Collard, 1988; Duncombe and Marsden, 1993; Langford, 1999; Hite, 1988). The accounts of women in such studies reveal that men lose the emotional openness to, the willingness to communicate with, and sexual interest in their partners. Men's emotional withdrawal becomes a source of confusion for the women, since being emotional, communicating and devoted are the very reason for the women to engage in love relationships with their actual partners, whom women initially regard as being different from other men, other men being unemotional, rude, and distant (Langford, 1999). Faced with such a confusion about the legitimacy of their expectations from a relationship, women come to take all the responsibility onto their shoulders in order to make the relationship work, it is reported, since they do not want to lose love in which they invested much hope. Thus, women become the 'emotional provider' of the relationship. It is the holding of the emotional labor of a love relationship by women which Firestone (1979) calls "feeding on the emotional strength of women without reciprocity", Hite (1988) names "the unequal emotional contract" and Langford (1999) describes as "holding it all together". Hence, Western feminists remark that love relationships are sites of male power because the maintenance of the relationship is dependent on the emotional labor provided by female partners.

The reasons for why women still continue the relationship even after they become the emotional provider are argued to be first that it is totally in contradiction with their hopes for transcendence through love (Langford, 1999), and second that they feel that all the emotional investment they made into love would be wasted if they end it (Duncombe and Marsden, 1993). Unequal emotional investment is itself a form of

exploitation, but not the only one. Men also exploit women's devotion to love through the transformation of the emotional provider role into becoming provider for the many other mundane activities in a relationship such as housework and economic labor (Millet, 1977).

How is the women's complaint that men withdraw emotionally as their relationships settle down seen from the men's perspective? Langford reports that men seem not to feel that there is a decrease in the amount of intimacy they feel for their partners and are surprised when their partners become upset. They do not acknowledge that there is a problem in the relationship. If the female partners continue to complain they become angry and defensive (Langford, 1999). Mansfield and Collard, on the other hand, argue that men acknowledge that there is a problem but they see it to be resulting from women's unending demands (Mansfield and Collard, 1988). In any case, men regard the course of the relationship as normal and continue to engage in it seeing no reason to change their behavior.

The participants of this study, unlike their Western counterparts, say that they do not feel intimacy in the same way as when they fell in love and acknowledge this as a problem in their relationships. Their emotional withdrawal can be deduced from the description in the previous chapter. There, it was shown that they view love as a process of struggle to conquer the beloved woman. As they become successful in their struggle, they report a loss of the feeling which they defined as love. Their initial interest in their partners, hence, comes to be extinguished as they sense that they achieve their goal. Mustafa's words from the previous chapter should be remembered. He says that he does not want to be as intimate as he did in the initial days of the relationship: **"You know when love ends, I do not know, perhaps there is something that is a result of**

conquering the other. I mean you do not always want to do such things. You do such things very rarely. You may sweetly surprise her. For example, you may appear before her in an unexpected way, or you may do beautiful things when she is not expecting it. But you do these much more when you are in love. I wish it were not like this, but you do not feel like it”¹.

Their emotional withdrawal can also be detailed by further examples present in the interview material. Faruk, for example, says that his feelings towards his wife Sude are not the same way as the initial days of their relationship: “**Such things [being in love and passion] get extinguished in time. You cannot behave passionately to a thing which is always available to you, because it is always available to you. How can there be passion!**”². To give another example, Ömer says that his girlfriend Sibel’s complaints about the decrease of intimacy on his part are among the problems in his current relationship: “**The greatest problem between me and Sibel is that she always complains that I do not love her as I did before. She says that we no more do things together as we did before and that I prefer watching matches with my friends to going out with her and the things like that. She is right in a way, we have been together for two and a half years and after that time you can not show the same care. Yet it does not mean that I don’t love her**”³.

¹ Hani aşk bittiği zaman, bimiyorum belki de elde etmiş olmanın verdiği bir şey var yani çok da fazla bunları en azından her zaman yapmayı istemiyorsun yani. Çok daha nadir yapıyorsun bu tip şeyleri. Tatlı sürprizler yapabilirsin, mesela hiç olmayacak bir şekilde karşısına çıkabilirsin hiç beklemediği bir anda güzel bir şeyler yapabilirsin ama bunu aşıkken daha fazla yapıyorsun. Keşke böyle olmasa ama içinden gelmiyor. Yapacak birşey yok

² Böyle şeyler zamanla yok oluyor. Her zaman elinin altında olan bir şeye tutkulu davranamıyorsun. Çünkü zaten elinin altında, ne tutkusu olacak!

³ Sibel’le aramızdaki en büyük sorunlardan biri o sürekli olarak sen beni eskisi kadar sevmiyorsun diyor. Yani mesela artık eskisi gibi birlikte bir şey yapmıyoruz, sen arkadaşlarınla maç seyretmeye gitmeyi benle birlikte dışarı çıkmaktan daha çok seviyorsun falan gibi şeyler söylüyor. Bir derecede haksız sayılmaz yani iki buçuk yıldır birlikteyiz biz ve tabiki iki buçuk yıldan sonra aynı ilgiyi gösteremiyorsun. Ama tabi bu demek değil ki onu sevmiyorum

The most interesting point about the participants' view about their emotional withdrawal from the relationship is their strategy for dealing with emotional withdrawal. They neither put more labor to sustain the relationship, as in the case of Western women, nor ignore the existence of a problem, as in the case of Western men, but see to end the relationship as soon as possible as the best strategy. The extract from Mustafa below well exemplifies the pattern.

“After one year, when she went to her hometown for a holiday, I had some time to think. ... At this time I had noticed that this relationship would not go on far. While we were so warm to each other at the beginning, I recognized that we had lost all this warmth. When I look at the relationship as an outsider, maybe it was because the passion has faded out. ... You miss each other when you stay away. Okay, you assess things more objectively at the beginning yet after a while that thing pulls you into the relationship again. When the time passes by, your habits come to the surface. You make yourself believe that you can't do without her. I seriously say that you can restart everything. It is hard to believe but we went on for one and a half years after that two or three months. Knowing that it won't go on. Yet I learned that a relationship is over when the passion is over”⁴.

The point that I am trying to make is that there is a very different type of gender-power relationship resulting from the way the participants define the nature of love than

⁴ Bir sene sonra o tatil için memleketine gittiğinde benim iki üç düşünme gibi bir sürem oldu. O esnada ben bu işin o kadar ileri gidemeyeceğini farketmişim. ... Başlarda birbirimize çok sıcak davranırken o eski sıcaklığımızı kaybettiğimizi farkettim. Biraz böyle ilişkiye dışarıdan baktığımda yani bilmiyorum tutkunun bitmesinden kaynaklanıyordu herhalde. ... şimdi şöyle söyleyeyim bir süre ayrı kaldıktan sonra özlüyorsunuz. Tamam bir takım şeyleri objektif değerlendiriyorsunuz ilk zamanlarda ama o şey sizi biraz daha çekiyor ilişkinin içine. Zaman geçtikçe alışkanlıklarınız su yüzüne çıkmaya başlıyor. Ondan vazgeçemeyeceğinize inandırmaya başlıyorsunuz kendinizi. Ciddi söylüyorum tekrar sıfırdan alabiliyorsunuz olayı. Yani inanılır gibi değil biz o iki üç aydan sonra bu ilişkiye bir buçuk sene daha devam ettik. Yürümeceğini bile bile. Ama bu bana ders oldu tutku bitmişse ilişki bitmiş demektir.

the one Western feminist scholars remark for love relationships. The participants wish to end their relationships when they feel that what they define as love expires. The reason why they wish to end their relationships when love expires is within their own definition of love. They define love as a struggle to conquer the other. When the other is conquered, what they define as love dies. What they *desire* in love relationships, I argue, is to experience the feelings at the time of falling in love, which I described in the previous chapter, rather than the feelings and mundane activities of a relationship, i.e. security, approval of one's unique self by another, etc as argued by scholars like Luhmann, Beck, Bauman, Simmel. Thus, they desire to fall in love with as many women as possible. I then argue that the way through which male power operates which Western feminists remark for love relationships is not present in the case of the participants of this study since the participants wish to end their relationships even before the female partners do not come to be the emotional provider of the relationship. The male power that the feminists analyze rests upon the willingness of both male and female partners to sustain the relationship. It is the male partners in this study who is missing in the relationship, as I showed in the previous chapter that the participants' definition of love is a tribute to *non-relationship*.

This point can be further refined. When the love definition of the participants is carefully scrutinized it is seen how it becomes possible for the participants not to see love as a site of male power, which is the point of Western feminists. As it is demonstrated in the previous chapter, the participants say that they feel powerless when in love. They regard themselves as relatively weaker than and vulnerable to the loved woman. In other words, they consider love as a site of female power, in contrast to the Western feminists. The existence of such a view becomes possible only by exiling the

idea of relationship from the definition of love. A definition of love that is constructed exclusively on the idea of conquest, therefore, enables men to deny their power which patriarchal society provides them.

There is also another form of male power, I argue, in the way they define the nature of love. To define love relationships as a process of struggle to conquer a woman is in fact not to desire that special woman but to desire love itself. Their definition renders women to be *objects* of conquest. By conquering the woman whom they idealize, the participants prove their own power to themselves. In other words, love provides them ability to say 'I am powerful enough to conquer such a superior woman'. This argument is most meaningful when their own theory of love on the basis of evolution is considered. In their explanation based on evolution, a woman chooses the strongest one among the rival men as her lover, whatever the criteria of power are. A love relationship provides the place for the participants to grasp the opportunity to feel that they have been chosen by a woman as the most powerful man. When they become chosen by a woman, they come to think that they are the strongest, and then, they begin to look for other women on which they will admire their power again. Hence, love relationships are arenas in which the participants demonstrate their power, at least to themselves.

It is widely accepted that hegemonic masculinity objectifies women sexually in various ways (Connell, 1987; Bird; 1996). Even though the participants of this study do not explicitly say that they view women as objects, their doing masculinity around love as a performance by always looking for the feelings of falling in love and attempting to end their relationships when they deem that love has expired turns women into objects.

Yet, the objectification of women is not sexual⁵, but romantic. Nevertheless, the objectification of women is still present and inherent in their definition of love, even if in a different form.

The most overt objectification of women can be found in pornography⁶. MacKinnon (1987) argues that pornography is one foundation of male dominance in the United States because it portrays women in a dehumanizing fashion as the playthings of men. As she argues, pornography shows the very nature of men's desire, i.e. to control sexuality and women. What MacKinnon says for pornography can be adapted to romantic love. In both dehumanization and objectification are present, with a slight difference: overt in the former and covert in the latter. As a result, romantic love in the form that I described for the participants of this study is a basis of male dominance in Turkey as it is a site in which women are objectified, dehumanized and rendered into the playthings of men in a very sneaky fashion. Therefore, the representational aspect of love is not free from gendered power.

The (Love) Relationship: Doing Modern Masculinity

I have tried to elaborate so far what the participants describe as the nature of love, and its implication about gendered power. However, what they describe as 'relationship' has not been addressed yet. As they consistently emphasize, love does not end as soon as they enter into relationship with the beloved, or as soon as they sense that they will be successful in their quest to conquer her. Even if their emotion of love

⁵ All the participants stated that they dislike one night stands

⁶ Pornography has overtly different aspects than romantic love such as promoting violence against women. Furthermore, pornography is aimed at women's body and the dehumanization of women is explicitly physical. I am well aware of these differences. The reason why I use it here is that pornography offers a site in which objectification of human beings, dehumanization and being rendered into playthings are more evident than anywhere else.

continuously diminishes when they sense it, they nevertheless continue to stay in the relationship until their feeling of love get totally exhausted, i.e. until they come to think that they conquered the beloved completely. They argue that there is a considerable amount of time between falling into love and its exhaustion. There is the 'relationship', they say, in that time. It is the relationship as described by the participants that will be brought under close scrutiny in the remaining part of this chapter.

The (love) relationship, as everything in everyday life, is a site where men enact infinite gender-linked behaviors that either conform to, or resist, or stay in complicity with the cultural ideals of masculinity. They perform, in other words, masculinity. By performing masculinity, men not only construct their own masculinities, but also reconstruct the gender order in society. As evaluated in the first chapter, one of the most effective analytical tools of masculinity is Connell's 'hegemonic masculinity'. However, I believe that employing Connell's concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' to analyze the cultural ideals about masculinity in Turkey is tricky. This is for two reasons. First, for practical reasons, there is currently no social scientific reference about hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. Second, for empirical reasons, ideals about masculinity in Turkey do not constitute a discourse by themselves, which I will demonstrate below, unlike those which Connell remarks for Australia. The ideals of masculinity in Turkey, such as oppositional imagination of two genders, status of head of household, are rather parts of separate discourses. Even though these ideals might have been hegemonic for a long time, they are contested now in contemporary Turkey, as the current controversy about

the 'adultery legislation' reveals⁷. Instead of hegemonic masculinity, therefore, the code of honor will be taken as the main ideology shaping the cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey, though challenged.

Below, I will try to delineate how the participants of this study perform masculinity with respect to the cultural ideals of masculinity in Turkey, which I delineated in the first chapter. I name the participants' performance of masculinity as 'doing modern masculinity' because 'being modern' is one of the recurrent themes in most of the interviews. The participants, who are all university graduates, define themselves as modern and tell the importance of approaching women in a modern way. In the performance of modern masculinity in the (love) relationship, they sometimes explicitly challenge the cultural ideals of masculinity which had long been hegemonic, while they sometimes conform to them. By delineating this modern masculinity, my aim will be to identify the male power emerging out of this masculinity.

Opposition: As mentioned in the first chapter, the oppositional imagination of masculinity and femininity is one of the main ideals in the code of honor in Turkey. Indeed, not only in Turkey, but also in every gender order around the world, the oppositional imagination of masculinity and femininity is integral in the making of gendered subjectivities in varying extents. Many scholars underlined that men view their gender identities in comparison with female identities for most of their lives (Brandes, 1987; Bird, 1996; Gutmann, 1997, Herzfeld, 1985). Particularly for the case of masculinity, being masculine means to a considerable extent not being feminine. The most significant opposition, through which masculinity is imagined as being not-

⁷ In September 2004, there was an attempt by the government party to legislate a law banning married people to engage in extra-marital liaisons. This attempt received fierce opposition from different segments of the society.

feminine, in the gender representation of the participants of this study about romantic relationships is that women are biologically monogamous while men are polygamous. Below I will try to explore how this opposition is integral in their gender representations.

This belief about women's nature is one of the basic building blocks in what I call their own theory of love. Mert, for example, uses this dichotomy to explain that to conquer is the only motivation for all the men around world to engage in relationships with women: **"I think a woman should have been done with a man in order to get into a commitment with another man. Women behave very slowly. They act according to a plan and they don't return. Yet a man goes and returns. There are a lot of men who return to their wives. I mean for a man sleeping with his wife after sleeping with another woman is a normal thing. If a woman sleeps with another man, she does not return to her husband or ex-boyfriend. If she has scrapped the idea of sleeping with a man, it means that the relationship is over"**⁸. Özgür refers to this dichotomy, too, to explain why his current girlfriend Pelin accepted to be together with him: **"I am sure that many men have behaved in that way. I mean in a way that I didn't want to behave. They may have talked a lot, insisted a lot. And so on... As I have said it is due to the nature of men that they want to go after every woman they like. I wanted to behave differently from other men. I didn't want to insist. I think every woman wants to feel that she is special. They look for the men who make them feel that she is different from other women"**⁹.

⁸ Yani kadının bir başka erkekle commitmenta girebilmesi için bir erkeği silmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Kadınlar çok ağır hareket ediyor. Çok planlı hareket ediyor ve geri de dönmüyorlar. Ama erkek, gidiyor geliyor. Karısına dönen erkek çok. Yani bir başka kadınla yatıp, karısıyla yatmayı erkek normal sayıyor. Kadın, bir başka erkekle yattıysa kocasına ya da bir önceki sevgilisine geri dönmüyor. Bir başka erkekle yatma fikrini oluşturduysa tamamen bitti o ilişki

⁹ Eminim ki çok erkek ona öyle yaklaşmıştır. Yani o benim yaklaşmak istemediğim biçimde yaklaşmıştır. Çok konuşmuşlardır, sıkboğaz etmişlerdir. Şudur budur. Yani dedim ya dışı erkek yaratılışından dolayı

That women are by nature monogamous is a very serious assumption about women's agency. It implies that women do not engage in sexual or romantic relationships with other men in so far as their current partners do not undermine the trust women feel at their hands. Mert, in this respect, believes that once a woman is conquered it is easy to make her stay in the relationship: **"Making my wife stay with me is different from conquering her everyday. Conquering her everyday requires a different effort and so does making her stay. You should not walk around with a long beard, you should not neglect caring yourself. It does not mean that I may be disrespectful since she is my wife. You should still behave her like a gentleman. If besides there is love [sevgi], there isn't any reason for her to leave"**¹⁰. This dichotomy about the nature of men and women enables men to construct romantic relationships as a site in which men are active while women are passive. In this construction, women never initiate an act but always react after men's actions.

Trust rather than Honor: As mentioned in the first chapter, the control of women's sexuality is another of the main ideals in the code of honor in Turkey. Now, I will try to explore the place that the controlling of women's sexuality through the codes of honor and shame occupies in doing masculinity by the participants of this study in the context of couple relationships.

The interviewees were not explicitly asked questions about the notion of honor. However, Faruk, Ömer, Özgür and Mert came to explain their ideas about it throughout

sey var. erkekler gözüne kestirdiği her kadının peşinden koşarlar. Ben diğer erkeklerden farklı davranmak istedim. Onu sıkboğaz etmek istemedim. Kadınlar sanıyorum, her kadın kendini biraz farklı hissetmek ister. Kendilerini hemcinslerinden farklı hissettiren, kendilerini yücelten özel kişiyi arar bayanlar

¹⁰ Çünkü şimdi karımı evden gitmemek üzere tutmak başka, karımı her gün fethetmek başka. Karımı her gün fethetmek başka bir çaba istiyor, onu evde tutmak başka bir çaba istiyor. Yani onu evde tutmak statükonun devamı aslında. Yani işte her gün 5 karış sakalla dolaşmayacak, bakımımızı ihmal etmeyecek, karımız diye sonuçta saygısızlık edecek halmiz yok. Gene efendi gibi davranılacak. Ve sevgi de zaten varsa karınızın gitmesi için bir sebep yok.

the interviews. It is present in the interview material that the local codes of honor and shame in Turkey represent traditionality, with all the negative connotations of the word. Faruk and Ömer, for instance, consistently use the adjectives such as “primitive” and “non-modern” for describing the codes of honor in Turkey. The following extracts from the interviews with Faruk and Ömer illustrate the case respectively.

“A married man of 40-50 gets into relationship with more than one woman. ... Society says the man wanted and did so, yet the woman is bad, she is immoral and unchaste, it is normal for a man, it is the dirt of his hand. Yet for me this is a contradiction of the society. It is a result of the patriarchal structure of the society which considers men to be always powerful and right; and society doesn’t think about this. Of course religion has an impact on this. The man thinks that his honor is stained. ... It is a primitive thing as a result¹¹”.

“We are living in a country which is very backward in the issue of men and women relations. I mean there is something like honor in Turkey. Can you imagine? People are killing each other by saying “you looked at my wife” or “your daughter is not virgin”. The ideas of 1500 years ago, still prevail in Turkey so powerfully¹²”.

The participants argue that a *modern* man should not control his partner’s sexuality explicitly. The reason for this is, they explain, that a human being does not

¹¹ 40-50 yaşında evli bir adam birden fazla kadınla ilişki yaşıyor. ... Toplum erkek istedi yaptı, kadın kötü, ahlaksız namussuz, erkek normal yapabilir, elinin kiridir falan neyse diye bakabiliyor. Ama bu bana göre toplumun bir çelişkisidir. Toplumun üzerinde düşünmediği, ataerkil yapıdan gelmesinin, erkeğin güçlü her zaman haklı olmasından, gelen bir yapı. Tabi burda dinin de etkisi var. Adam namusum lekelendi diye düşünüyor. ... İlkel bir şey sonuç olarak

¹² Kadın erkek ilişkileri açısından çok problemlili çok geri kalmış bir ülkede yaşıyoruz. Yani Türkiye’de namus diye bir şey var. Düşünebiliyor musunuz? İnsanlar sen benim karıma baktın, yok kızın bakire çıkmadı gibi nedenlerden birbirlerini öldürüyorlar. 1500 sene öncesinin fikirleri bugün hala çok canlı bir şekilde yaşayabiliyor yani Türkiye’de.

have the right to intervene in another's freedom, even if they are partners in a love relationship. Attempting to control the partner's sexuality is definitely a case of intervening into another human being's freedom, according to them. This argument has a very liberal tone with its emphasis on rights and freedom, as illustrated in the words of Ömer: **"Nobody has the right to interfere in the other's choices. I don't have the right to interfere in Sibel's choices about her friends and clothes, her relations with her boy friends as I don't have the right to interfere in the life of a woman in the street. Leave being her boyfriend aside, I can't say "see that person and don't see this" or "wear this and don't wear this" even when I am her husband. Wouldn't I be jealous of her, of course I will. Yet you can't preclude anything by interfering. There is only one thing to do: trusting each other. If you don't trust the person you are with, it is meaningless to get into a relationship with her. Because jealousy and distrust will end up in paranoia"**¹³.

The participants' doing masculinity is based upon doing modernity by a discourse rejecting the codes of honor in Turkey. They *imagine* their gender identities not solely as masculine but more precisely as modern masculine. In their view, attempting to control women's sexuality by deploying the codes of honor in Turkey is not a manly behavior; it is in fact a non-humane behavior. They *imagine* their masculinities taking up a subject position from within the discourse of being modern, not from within the discourses of masculinity in Turkey that had long been hegemonic.

¹³ Kimse kimse seçimine karışmaya hakkı yok. Benim nasıl sokaktaki her hangi bir kadının ne yaptığına karışma hakkım yoksa, aynı şekilde Sibel'in de arkadaşlarını seçmesine, giydiklerine, kendi erkek arkadaşlarıyla ilişkisine falan karışmaya hakkım yok diye düşünüyorum. Yani bırakın sevgilisi olmayı ileride kocası bile olsam ona sen onla görüşme bunla görüş, şunu giyme bunu giy diyemem. Onu kıskanmaz mıyım, tabiki kıskanırım ama onun ne yaptığına karışarak bunu engileyemezsin ki. Yapılabilecek tek bir şey var, o da birbirinize güvenmek. Güvenemiyorsan karşıdaki insana zaten onla bir ilişkiye girmenin bir manası yok diye düşünüyorum. Çünkü kıskanmanın, karşıdakine güvenememenin sonu paranoyaktır.

To put it more accurately, they in effect do modernity when performing what they imagine as proper masculinity.

The key strategy in their doing modernity with respect to the codes of honor in Turkey is hidden in the above extract from the interview with Ömer. The participants introduce 'trusting each other' as the most proper way for dealing with the risk of being cheated by their partners instead of the codes of honor in Turkey. They claim that the only thing a modern man can do is to trust his partner for she will not cheat him. 'To trust' is one of the leitmotifs present in the stories of all the participants. The participants imagine their relationships as sites of equality by describing them as based on reciprocal trust. Such an imagination, in turn, enables them to assume that their romantic relationships are free of male power.

Even though the participants describe their relationships as sites of equality and reciprocal trust, what they describe as 'to trust one another' is not as altruistic as it may seem at first sight. Their definition of trust is based on the assumption that there ceases to be any reason for the female partner to look for sexual or romantic experiences with other men in so far as men make women believe that they will not have sexual or romantic relationships with other women. In other words, the participants' trust of their partners depends on the pre-existence of the latter's trust for the former. Özgür, for example, describes his trust for his girlfriend Pelin always with reference to her trust to himself: **"Of course, she says between the lines that I should be careful, too.**

Underneath these, there is the idea that "be careful about the girls, don't do things, you know..." Yet there is also trust. I believe that I know Pelin very well. I don't think of this much, so you don't get suspicious. I am working, she knows the place I work, that my work is busy. I know her. She is trying to do something, trying to

graduate from the university. ... This trust is the result of that: she knows how I behave when I like someone from the beginning of our relationship. She has seen it. She knows how I behave toward a person I like as I had done so. So she can feel it whether I am there or not”¹⁴. Mert, in a very similar fashion, explains his trust for his wife Banu as knowing that she will never develop an interest for another man in so far as he himself does not undermine her trust toward himself: **“Do I not feel jealousy for my wife? Of course I do. Doesn’t she? Of course she does. There is nothing like “we are a very modern couple and we don’t feel jealousy”. Yet I believe that there is a more controlled jealousy. First of all I trust my wife and I know the conditions I have to create so that she would act so. It is when a woman is dissatisfied with her conditions that things change. Yet she changes them in such a way that, it becomes a radical one. Yet I know that she knows that I won’t create these conditions. She trusts me, too”.** Hence, if they succeed in making their partners trust themselves, then there is no reason, they believe, to be afraid of women to look for sexual or romantic experiences with other men.

Such an assumption that women do not commit adultery if men make them believe men will not commit adultery either is based on another assumption about the nature of women. As elaborated before, the participants assume that women are by nature monogamous. But what if women share the same definition of love based on

¹⁴ Tabii şey var, konuşurken kelimelerde kendine dikkat et o da bana söyler. Onun altında şey gizli dikkat et kızlara, şeylik yapma falan var hep bunların altında. Ama şey de çok var. Güven de çok var. Ben Pelin’i çok tanıdığımı inanıyorum. Yani aklıma çok fazla takmıyorum, şüphe olmuyor o zaman. Zaten ben çalışıyorum, çalıştığım ortamı, çalışmanın yoğun olduğunu biliyor. Ben onu biliyorum. Birşeyler yapmaya çalışıyor, üniversiteden mezun olmaya çalışıyor. ... Bu güven şeyle sağlıyor yani sonuçta, eee, Pelin’le ben ilk beraberliğimiz başladığı zaman ilgi duyduğum birisine nasıl davrandığımı çok iyi biliyor. Çünkü o gördü. İlgi duyduğum karşı cinsten bir insana nasıl hareketlerde bulunduğumu zaten biliyor. Çünkü ona uyguladım ben zaten. Ve herhangi bir şekilde ben olayım ya da olmayayım yanında, bunları çok rahat sezineleyebilir.

conquest? To trust does not in fact prevent women from committing adultery. Then how can the participants believe this? What makes this possible? It is the patriarchal structure of Turkish society, I argue, that guarantees men to already know that women cannot share such an understanding of love based on conquest. It is the confidence stemming from the knowledge that women will be sanctioned severely if they commit adultery, and hence that men and women are not equal, which makes the participants argue that their romantic relationships are based on equality. However, due to the male power which oppresses women, the participants never think of that women cannot commit adultery. It is their denial of their power, which I have elaborated earlier, that therefore makes men attribute women's abstaining from having sexual or romantic experiences with other men to women's nature.

To sum up the point about doing of masculinity in love relationships with reference to the hegemonic notion honor, it is first found that the participants of this study condemn the controlling of women's sexuality through the codes of honor in Turkey, regarding it as a violation of human rights and describing it with adjectives such as primitive and non-modern. They speak from within subject positions in the discourses of modernity and liberalism and argue that their romantic relationships are based on equality. However, after further analysis I have come to argue that trust, introduced to replace the codes of honor to deal with the risk of women's engagement in sexual relations with other men, is not a way of sustaining relationships based on equality, but rather a way of disguising male power in Turkish society. The most obvious implication of this, needless to say, is the overall reproduction of male power in society. Thus, the participants stay in complicity, in Connell's sense, with the codes of honor in Turkey which have long been hegemonic.

There is another and stealthier implication of the participants' wish to replace the codes of honor in Turkey with the notion of trust, on which I will focus further. I argue that eliminating the codes of honor which oppress women in contemporary Turkey gives men the opportunity of experiencing love relationships with more than one woman. As I have demonstrated earlier, it is the ultimate desire of the participants of this study to fall in love with as many women as possible. This desire is best seen in Mert's words: **"How nice it would be if we thought in such a way: it would be easier for men to live if women's desire for fidelity did not exist. You know we have sayings like 'I love you but I cannot give her up. If we were able to actualize these thoughts, there would be lesser problems in life'"**¹⁵.

Just as Turkish feminists argue that it was the aim of male Tanzimat reformers to redistribute the power from the heads of extended households to men in lower ranks in the household by criticizing the arranged marriages rather than diminish women's oppression, I argue that the participants' critique of controlling of women's sexuality through codes of honor aims to eliminate the threats the codes of honor pose to their own romantic 'adventures' rather than diminishing women's oppression. Men are interested more in the threats the codes of honor pose to themselves than in those to women. Mert, in this respect, explains the relationship between the codes of honor in Turkey and his theory of love as a process of conquest: "I know it is impossible to

¹⁵ Aslında şöyle düşünüyor olsak ne güzel olurdu. Bu kadınların sadakat arzuları gibi bir şey olmasaydı hayatta erkekler için yaşamak daha kolay olurdu. Seni de seviyorum ama ondan da vazgeçemiyorum gibi cümlelerimiz vardır ya bunalrı hayata uygulayabiliyor olursaydık hakkatten daha probelemsiz olurdu işler.

conquer a woman when her husband is with her, and it will result in death. Because I live in this country. I take (into consideration of) such details”¹⁶.

Privacy, Expressing Feelings & Code of Honor: In kinship based societies the honor code is a very important reservoir for regulating the everyday practices of men and women. Kinship is a very important social structure in contemporary Turkey (Sirman, 2000a). In Middle Eastern and Mediterranean countries like Turkey, the honor code regulates how people behave in certain contexts according to their gender, age, social status, etc. (Abu-Lughod, 1986; Gutmann, 1997; Herzfeld, 1985; Lindisfarne, 1994). Particular practices in particular contexts are reserved for particular persons, while engaging in those practices means violating the code of honor, and thus are sources of shame. As Abu-Lughod describes for Bedouins of North Egypt, for instance, young men are ashamed to express sentiments in front of men of higher status, while sentiments can be expressed among peers (Abu-Lughod, 1986).

Even though the participants of this study explicitly condemn the code of honor in Turkey for controlling women’s sexuality, it is found that the code of honor still regulates their practices in romantic relationships. I argue that love relationships constitute a context in which the expression and withholding of feelings are regulated by the code of honor. As the data collected for this study reveal, men conform to their partners’ demand to be intimate and express their feelings in the *privacy* of a love relationship, i.e. only when they and their partners are present. As in the case of young Bedouin men in Abu-Lughod’s study, expressing feelings is not imagined as a feminine quality in the context of a love relationship. However, it is present in the interview

¹⁶ Yani işte yanında kocasıyla giden bir kadını fetetmenin imkansız olduğunu ölümle sonuçlanacağını biliyorum. Bu ülkede yaşadığım için. Bu tür detayları da şeye alıyorum tab

material that men are in a deep anxiety about revealing their expressions of feelings in public, especially in the presence of other men. When such expressions are revealed in public, the participants are ashamed. Ömer cites his girlfriend Sibel's revelation of how he behaved in the privacy of their relationship to her friends, for example, among the major problems in their relationship: **"Once, Sibel, one of her female friends, her boy friend, and I were hanging around together. Sibel, for no reason, started to talk about nicknames that we use for each other. You know there are nick names that you call each other when you are alone. For example, people call each other "baby". We've got such nick names that we, Sibel and I, created. And Sibel told her friend that we called each other this and that. At that moment, I got so embarrassed. In no case, in the presence of other people, I behave in such ways that others may see as loose. But when the only person who has seen this side of me revealed it to other people, I felt very annoyed. That is why for a long time we kept on arguing."**¹⁷. Ömer is ashamed when what he thinks his private behavior is revealed in public. He thus, wishes to preserve the image of 'man who withholds his feelings' in front of other men, thus aims to seem honorable in accordance with the code of honor.

Making the intimate aspects of the relationship visible in front of other men constitutes a threat to men's image of their masculinities in the eyes of other people. In other words, men are expected to perform a particular masculinity by withholding expression of feelings in public, which is a way of conforming to the honor code in

¹⁷ Bir keresinde Sibel, ben, onun bir arkadaşı ve onun erkek arkadaşı birlikteyiz. Sibel durup dururken arkadaşına bizim birbirimize taktığımız isimlerden bahsetti. Hani böyle yalnızken birbirinize sesleniş biçiminiz vardır ya. Mesela insanlar birbirlerine bebek falan gibi şeylerle seslenirler. İşte bizim de ona benzer ama bizim kendimizin yarattığı şeyler vardı. Ve Sibel arkadaşına biz Ömerle birbirimize şöyle şöyle sesleniyoruz dedi. O an ben o kadar çok utandım ki. Hiç bir şekilde başkalarının yanında böyle laubali olarak görünebilecek şeyler yapmam, yada söylemem. Ama bu yönümü görmüş olan tek kişi onu başkalarına da gösterince ben gerçekten çok rahatsız oldum. Ve bu yüzden uzunca bir süre biz tartışıp durduk.

which masculinity and femininity are imagined in opposition (Abu-Lughod, 1986). It is exactly for this reason that a discrepancy in terms of the expressions of feelings between the privacy of a relationship and public is present for the participants. In the latter, they perform masculinity by withholding their feelings, while expressing feelings and showing intimacy are not imagined to be in contradiction with masculinity.

As Abu-Lughod underlines for the Bedouins, these seemingly contradictory ideals of self can stay together thanks to the structuring of experience in the contexts of public and private with two different discourses. She argues that the honor code is the discourse of everyday life in public, while poetry is the discourse of privacy. In the discourse of everyday life in public, independence and denial of vulnerability are the highest values. Expressing sentiments in the contexts which are constructed as public, such as in front of elders, is seen as weakness and constructed as violating the honor code. For this reason, the weak, women and young men, conform to these discourses in the proper contexts.

The participants of this study, like their Bedouin counterparts, maintain the discrepant images in public and privacy of the relationship in line with the high value they place on independence. Mustafa, like Ömer, use very similar terms, such as “the presence of others”, when he explains the disappearance of respect in a relationship, which he take as particularly important to maintain a relationship: “[The fact that a relationship goes on] **depends on a thin line. You can lose your desire even though you are used to her and love her much. Something said, I mean an act that is against you, can finish everything. ... I am trying to say it frankly, I think respect is... Where and whenever it is, saying or doing something that will humiliate your partner is... maybe I have a very tender point of view yet I think a person who is**

my girlfriend can maybe make fun of you when you are alone but she should not do that especially when you are with people you don't know well."¹⁸. In this extract, Mustafa defines respect, which he took as the thin line on which the continuation of a relationship depends, as the thing that distinguishes between the private and the public.

The code of honor in Turkey, hence, is a very important reservoir for the performance of masculinity in romantic relationships of the participants of this study who describe themselves as modern men. However, the code of honor cannot explain the structure of gendered experiences and subjectivities in all the contexts of everyday life in contemporary Turkey. The analysis of this study, which is parallel to that of Abu-Lughod, reveals that a discourse than the code of honor is available for men to speak from in other contexts than those belonging in public.

Conclusion: Love and Marriage?

It was argued in the first pages of this chapter that contrary to the West, male power does not result by turning women into the emotional providers of the relationship. However, women do become the emotional providers of the relationship. But this happens not in their definition of love but in the context of marriage. In order to identify the dislocation of this gendered power, a fruitful question would be 'which other desires the participants have?'. A recurrent desire in the interview material is to marry. Mert, Emre and Faruk are already married. All the other participants stated that they want to

¹⁸ [İlişkinin devamı] Çok ince bir çizgiye bağlıdır. Bence bütünüyle sorguyabilirsiniz ne kadar alışkan olsanız da sevseniz de daha önceden ne kadar aşık olsanız da herşeyi bitirebilir size karşı söylenmiş yapılmış bir hareket demek istediğim bu. ... Çok basit bir şekilde söylüyorum bence saygı her ne ortamda olursa olsun karşındakini küçük düşürecek şaka vari bir şekilde de olsa küçük düşürecek duruma sokmamak şaka yollu da olsa bunu yapmazsın. Belki çok alıngan bir bakış açısı ama benim için öyle. Sevgilim olduğunu düşündüğüm bir insanın belki benimle başbaşayken benimle dalga geçebilir bir sürü şey söyleyebilir ama başka özellikle de çok samimi olmadığımız bir ortamda bunu yapmaması gerekir.

marry in the future (Özgür, Mustafa, Serkan, Ömer). What they desire by marrying?

How do they then construct marriage?

There are two related aspects in men's desire to marry. Firstly, and fundamentally, men seem to want care from their (prospective) wives. Repeatedly in the interviews, men speak of their wives as having to provide emotional support, friendship and respect. They explain their expectations in marriage with phrases like "to support one another", "to be friends", "not to be selfish", "to respect one another". Ömer, for example, believes that marrying a woman who provides emotional support will order his disordered life: **"To say it frankly I want to get married. 3 or 4 years ago I thought that it was unnecessary and that it meant to give up your own freedom. Yet now I am 33 and I want to put my life into order. Maybe I won't be as free as I was but now I have other needs. I mean there is not much in life that I should do. I have finished the university, worked for 9 years and have recently set up my own work. There is also a woman in my life who loves me, understands and stands by me. I want to know where I belong, I want a home, a wife. I want warmth in my life. This does not occur when you live in different houses. You are fragmented. You stay sometimes in her house, sometimes in your house; like a student. I tell Sibel that we have been together for two and a half years and we should get married"**¹⁹.

The second aspect of the desire to marry concerns their imagination of a wife to accept and wait for his husband under any condition as her essential role. The

¹⁹ Açıkcası artık evlenmek istiyorum ben. Yani 3-5 sene öncesine kadar evlenmeyi gereksiz bulurdum, özgürlüğünden kendi ellerinle vazgeçmek diye düşünürdüm. Ama artık yaş 33 oldu ve hayatımı bir düzene koymak istiyorum. Belki eskisi kadar özgür olmayacağım ama şimdi başka gereksinimlerim var. Yani yapmam gereken fazla bir şey kalmadı hayatta, üniversiteyi bitirdim, 9 sene çalıştım ve yeni de kendi işimizi kurduk. Beni anlayan, seven, bana hep destek olan bir kadın da var hayatımda. Artık yerim yurdum belli olsun, bir evim, bir karım olsun. Hayatımda bir sıcaklık olsun istiyorum. Bu ayrı evlerde yaşayarak olmuyor. Böyle bir bölünmüşlük içindesin. Bazen onun evinde bazen senin evinde. Sanki hala öğrenci gibi. Bunu Sibel'e de söylüyorum, 2,5 senedir beraberiz artık evlenelim diye.

participants demand their wives to preserve their caring attitude and status of being a wife under any condition even if doing so will hurt them. The desire to marry, in other words, is in fact a desire to have a woman who will essentially be a wife and behave as a wife in public. The following extract from Mert is a good example of how a wife should accept and wait for him: **“She knows that I am a rake. She accepts that and knows that I am not in her hands totally. For example, my friends say that they have seen me with a girl on the motorbike. It did not occur, they mistook my motorcycle for another one. She says “my husband does that”. What does it mean? It means he takes a girl on his motorbike, it doesn’t mean that he sleeps with her. She knows that I won’t do that. She considers these normal. This is not a normal thing for a woman. My wife can say ‘my husband flirts with other women’. It is for this reason that I am married to that woman”**²⁰. Mert came to feel a desire to marry when he sensed that he found a woman who could accept to be his wife under any condition, because during the 9 years of their relationship he had other relationships with many women, and his wife left him each time, and when he turned back to her after each of those other relationships, she accepted him.

The sociological importance of the dislocation of the gendered power, which Western feminist scholars spoke of, from love to marriage is that it reveals that there is not a connection between romantic love and marriage for the men interviewed. In other words, the (Western) romantic ideology in which love is constructed as not only the

²⁰ Benim çapkın bir adam olduğumu biliyor. Bunu kabul ediyor. Ve hakikaten tümüyle onun elinde olmadığını biliyor. Mesela, diyorlar ki biz Mert’in motorunu gördük arkasında da bir kız vardı diyorlar. Yok öyle bir şey de. Benim motoruma benzetmişler. Yapar benim kocam. Yapar ne demek arkasına kız alır demek. Gider o kızla yatar demek değil. Onu yapmayacağımı biliyor. Ama hani bunları normal karşılıyor. Normal karşılamak aslında bir kadın için hiç normal bir şey değil. Karım benim kocam başka kadınlarla da flört eder, aslında recover etmek kolay değil. Onun için bu kadınla evliyim. Bunun için bu kadınla evliyim.

prerequisite but also the basic initiative for marriage is not present for the Turkish well-educated young professionals, who define themselves as modern. They imagine love and marriage to be separate. They desire marrying *after* love expires, perhaps after they had many (love) relationships with other women, as the cases of all the three married participants show. They are married to women for whom they did not feel love at the time of marriage. Mert married a woman to whom he felt love 9 years before the marriage and he had love relationship with many other women during those 9 years after his love expired. The other two married men, Emre and Faruk, got married to women with whom they did not fall in love. The other respondents who were unmarried at the time of interviews do not explain their desire to marry by reference to love. For instance, Ömer does not explain his desire to marry Sibel by saying 'I am in love with her' or 'I was in love with her, we shared many things during our two and a half years of relationship'. On the contrary, he explains his desire by saying 'she understands me, she always supports me', that is, 'she is and will always be willing to care for me'. The absence of a relationship between love and marriage, for the men interviewed, is especially clear in his account of Ömer's need to marry because of his age: what brought him to the idea of marriage is not his love for Sibel, but his aim to order his life. Hence, love and marriage, this thesis argues, are the objects of two separate desires and imagined by men separately.

CONCLUSION

This thesis should be seen as an attempt to contribute to the narrow literature on romantic love as an emotion against the widespread functionalist approach to romantic love in sociology. The functionalist approach does not take into account the emotions of loving person. However, emotions, especially desire, are among the basic aspects of the construction of subjectivities in a given society (Sirman, 2000a). This approach is also universalistic with its dismissal of culture and gender as two analytical categories. The focus in this thesis, in this respect, has been on the analysis of emotions of the men of a certain social category in contemporary Turkey.

The emotions elaborated in this thesis show how the participants define love. Passion and powerlessness have been found to be the two constitutive elements in their definition of love. The participants regard themselves to be in love only when they feel passion to conquer the other and think that they will not be able to conquer her. A major consequence of the participants' casting of love in terms of discovery and conquest has been found to be the exclusion of relationship from the definition of love. They do not consider themselves to be in love in so far as they engage in a relationship with a woman. The first argument of this thesis, in the light of this finding, has been that love is a site where a different form of gendered power than the one remarked for the West is present. The main form of gendered power in love in the West is argued to be that the emotional labor paid by women for the maintenance of a love relationship is not reciprocated by men. The very idea of a 'love relationship' is not present in the case of the men this thesis investigates. Instead, the particular way that the participants define

the nature of love by employing terms of conquest is concomitant on rendering women into *objects* to be conquered.

This thesis has also found that love and marriage are objects of two different desires. The participants' desire for love has been found to be for conquest through which they grasp the opportunity to admire their own power rather than show admiration for a special human being. Their desire for marriage, on the other hand, has been found to be based on the desire to be cared for by a woman who will always accept that being a wife is her major role. On the basis of this finding, the second argument of this thesis has been that the Western romantic ideology in which love is constructed as the primary reason for marriage is not the case of the participants.

This thesis has offered to analyze love at two different levels: as an emotion and as couple-relationship based on intimacy. The two arguments above have been done on the basis of analyses at the level of emotions. The couple-relationships of the participants have also been inspected in order to understand how masculinity is performed in these relationships. To imagine masculinity and femininity as opposites, to condemn the controlling of women's sexuality through the code of honor, and to maintain discrepant images in public and in the privacy of the relationship have been identified as the three main aspects of the performance of masculinity in relationships. The final argument of this thesis, on the basis of the exploration of these three aspects, has been that the code of honor and discourses on being modern in Turkey are nested in the structuring of the performances of masculinity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1986). Veiled sentiments: Honor and poetry in a Bedouin society. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barthes, R. (1979). A lover's discourse: Fragments. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). Thinking sociologically. Malden: Blackwell.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1952). The second sex. New York: Knopf.
- Beck, U. & Beck-Gernsheim E. (1995). The normal chaos of love. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bird, S. R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. Gender & Society. 10 (2), 120-132.
- Brandes, S. (1987). Sex roles and anthropological research in rural Andalusia. Women's Studies. 13. 357-372.
- Connell, R.W. (1987). Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Cooper, M. (2000). Being the "go-to-guy": Fatherhood, masculinity, and the organization of work in Silicon Valley. Qualitative Sociology. 23 (4), 379-408.
- Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne, N. (1994). Dislocating masculinity: Gender, power and anthropology. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies (pp. 11-47). London: Routledge.
- Davis, J. (1977). People of the mediterranean: An essay in comparative social anthropology. Routledge & London: Kegan Paul.
- Duben, A. & Behar, C. (1991). Istanbul households: Marriage, family and fertility, 1880-1940. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Duncombe, J. & Marsden, D. (1993). Love and intimacy: The gender division of emotion and 'emotion work'. Sociology. 27 (2), 221-241.
- Firestone, S. (1979). Cinselliğin diyalektiği: Kadın özgürlüğü davası. İstanbul: Payel Yayınevi.
- Foucault, M. (1994). The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences. New York: Vintage Books.
- Giddens, A. (1996). The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love, and eroticism in modern societies. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilmore, D. (1990). Manhood in the making: cultural concepts of masculinity. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gutmann, M. C. (1997). Trafficking in men: The anthropology of masculinity. Annual Review of Anthropology. 26. 385-409.
- Hall, S. (1997). Representations: Cultural representations and signifying practices. London: Sage Press.
- Herzfeld, M. (1987). The poetics of manhood: Contest and identity in a Cretan mountain village. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hite, S. (1988). Women and love: A cultural revolution in progress. London: Viking.
- Jackson, S. (1993). Even the sociologists fall in love: An exploration in the sociology of emotions. Sociology. 27 (2), 201-220.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1987). Emancipated but unliberated?: Reflections on the Turkish case. Feminist Studies. 13 (2), 317-338.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Slave girls, temptresses and comrades: Images of women in the Turkish novel. Feminist Issues. 8 (1), 35-50.

- Kandiyoti, D. (1994). The paradoxes of masculinity: Some thoughts on segregated societies. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies (pp. 197-213). London: Routledge.
- Langford, W. (1999). Revolutions of the heart: Gender, power and the delusions of love. London: Routledge.
- de Lauretis, T. (1987). Technologies of gender: Essays on theory, film and fiction. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Leahy, T. (1994). Taking up a position: Discourses of femininity and adolescence in the context of man/girl relationships. Gender & Society, 8 (1), 48-72.
- Lindholm, C. (1999). Love and structure. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), Love and Eroticism, (pp. 243-263). London: Sage.
- Lindisfarne, N. (1994). Variant masculinities, variant virginites: Rethinking 'honour and shame'. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies (pp. 82-96). London: Routledge.
- Loizos, P. (1994). A broken mirror: Masculine sexuality in Greek ethnography. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies (pp. 66-81). London: Routledge.
- Luhmann, N. (1986). Love as passion. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1987). Feminism unmodified: Discourses on life and law. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mansfield, P. & Collard, J. (1988). The beginning of the rest of your life: A portrait of newly-wed marriage. London: Macmillan.
- Malti-Douglas, F. (1991). Woman's body, woman's word. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.

- Mardin, Ş. (1974). Superwesternization in Urban Life in the Ottoman Empire in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century. In P. Benedict & E. Tümertekin (Eds). Turkey: Geographical and Social Perspectives. (pp. 403-447). Leiden: Brill.
- Mardin, Ş. (1996). Yeni Osmanlı düşüncesinin doğuşu. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Millett, K. (1977). Sexual politics. London: Virago Press.
- Peirce, L. P. (1997). Seniority, sexuality, and social order: The vocabulary of gender in early modern Ottoman society”. In S. Faroqhi & H. İnalcık (Eds.). The Ottoman Empire and its Heritage: Politics, Society and Economy (pp. 169-196). Leiden: Brill.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1977). The fate of Shechem or the politics of sex: Essays in the anthropology of the Mediterranean. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmel, G. (1999). On the sociology of the family. In M. Featherstone (Ed.). Love and Eroticism (pp. 277-293). London: Sage.
- Sirman, N. (1990). State, village, and gender in western Turkey. In A. Finkel & N. Sirman (Eds.). Turkish State, Turkish Society (pp. 21-51). London: Routledge.
- Sirman, N. (2000a). Gender construction and nationalist discourse: Dethroning the father in the early Turkish novel. In F. Acar & A. Güneş-Ayata (Eds.) Gender and Identity Construction: Women of Central Asia, the Caucasus and Turkey (pp. 162-176). Leiden: Brill.
- Sirman, N. (2000b). Writing the usual love story: The fashioning of conjugal and national subjects in Turkey. In V. A. Goddard (Ed.). Gender, Agency and Change (pp. 250-272). London: Routledge.

Weber, M. (1948). Religious rejections of the world and their directions. In H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Eds.). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (pp. 343-350).

London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. Gender & Society. 1. 125-151.