

TEMPORAL STRUCTURES OF KEMAL TAHİR'S DEVLET ANA AND TARIK BUĞRA'S OSMANCIK

Ramazan GÜLENDAM*

Özet: Bu çalışmada, Türk romanının önemli temsilcilerinden Kemal Tahir ve Tarık Buğra'nın, Osmanlı'nın kuruluşunu konu edinen ve üzerinde en çok konuşulan romanlarından olan Devlet Ana ile Osmancık'ta, roman sanatının en önemli unsurlarından biri olan zaman'ın nasıl kullanıldığı incelenmiştir. Farklı dünya görüşlerine sahip bu iki romancımızın, bu romanları kurgularken zaman unsurundan nasıl yararlandıklarını, roman kahramanlarını tanıtmada veya yazarların vermek istedikleri ideolojik mesajları okurlarına kabul ettirmede zaman unsurunun fonksiyonu ve bu konuda romancılarımızın izledikleri stratejiler, 'anlatılabilmek' bir üst dil olarak kullanılarak gösterilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kemal Tahir, Tarık Buğra, Devlet Ana, Osmancık, zaman, sıra, süre, sıklık, geriye dönüş, ileri fırlama, anlatılabilmek.

Abstract: Kemal Tahir and Tarık Buğra, who are two of the famous novelists in modern Turkish literature, lived roughly in the same era. Although they had different political views, they dealt with the same historical periods. This work studies temporal structures of Kemal Tahir's Devlet Ana and Tarık Buğra's Osmancık that are both on the establishment of the Ottoman Empire. In this study, in which time constructions of these novels will be analysed, I shall consider the textual arrangement of the events in Devlet Ana and Osmancık. In this regard Genette's threefold distinction will be followed: order, duration and frequency. By using narratology as a metalanguage, I will try to indicate the way by which the authors lead their readers to accept their ideological messages.

Keywords: Kemal Tahir, Tarık Buğra, Devlet Ana, Osmancık, time, order, duration, frequency, analepsis, prolepsis, narratology.

Kemal Tahir and Tarık Buğra are two of the leading novelists in modern Turkish literature. Both lived roughly in the same era: Kemal Tahir was born in 1910 and died in 1973; Buğra was born in 1918 and died in 1994, and they have dealt with the same historical periods, using similar materials in some of their novels¹. However, they had different political views. Buğra took a 'right-wing' point of view, whereas Kemal Tahir was a socialist,² but both use the novel as the medium to

* Yard. Doç. Dr., 18 Mart Üniversitesi.

¹ Tarık Buğra explains these similarities in the following sentences: "It is true that there is a parallelism. I think Kemal Tahir was also of the same opinion, he said so. Important topics, events, and people are for every author. They are no one's monopoly. They must be dealt with through different understandings and interpretations. I wrote *Küçük Ağa* (The Little Agha); two years later, Kemal Tahir wrote *Yorgun Savaşçı* (The Weary Warrior). Kemal Tahir had written *Yol Ayrımı* (Cross-Roads) fifteen years before, though I had not yet read it when I wrote *Yağmur Beklerken* (While Waiting for Rain). When *Devlet Ana* was published, I was working on *Osmancık*. We saw each other at Bayramoğlu, and I said, 'See here, you killed me off!' and mentioned *Osmancık*. He said, 'Of course you will write: you, me and someone else too...' It is not right to interpret it as if it were a competition." (Can and Doğan, 1993)

² According to Kemal Tahir, socialism is the best model for the Turkish society. For more details,

communicate many ideas about the world and about what it means to be human. Their novels are both entertaining and intellectually stimulating.

In this paper I will try to analyse the temporal aspects of *Devlet Ana* (Mother State) (1967) and *Osmancık* (Little Osman) (1983). I will use the second edition of *Devlet Ana* (Bilgi Yayınevi, 1969) and the first edition of *Osmancık* (Ötüken Yayınevi, 1983). *Devlet Ana* and *Osmancık* are both about the foundation of the Ottoman Empire³ and the most widely known and criticised novels of their authors. For instance, after being published in 1967, as Uturgauri (1989: 105) points out, *Devlet Ana*, which is the best known novel of the author, caused much controversy in the press, and there were many discussions and many publications on it during the first four years after its publication. Both novels were written primarily in order to provoke a certain response from their readers. Kemal Tahir explains his aim to write *Devlet Ana* as follows⁴:

“You see, there is a huge slackness in the society... There is lack of confidence, anxiety, and a weltering in despair amongst the people!. I will try to erase this despair and give confidence to the society, and try to blow a new breath to the spirits with my new novel. That is why I chose the first years of the establishment of the Ottoman State as my subject.” (Bozdağ 1980: 103)

“We are searching for the precious essence in our history, which will praise our people and our nation in the future... *Devlet Ana*, which narrates what happened 600 years ago, was written with the hope that it would enlighten the events of today, in one sense, of the future.” (Tahir 1990: 39-40)

The purpose of the author of *Osmancık*, Tarık Buğra, for writing this novel, is as same as that of Kemal Tahir. Buğra stresses that he has dedicated himself to this subject and has tried to write about it since the 1950s. Buğra explains his aim as follows:

“This dedication stemmed from the well-known ingratitude of the history, and also from slogans like ‘The others go to, the moon, but we go on foot’ or ‘One step forward, two steps backwards’, some of which were naïve or undignified yet all aimed to draw the society into an inferiority complex by strangling the great reality.” (Tunalı 1984: 47)

Tarık Buğra also asserts that *Osmancık* is not a reaction to a specific person or work but it is a reaction to those who criticise the Ottomans unfairly:

“‘Osmancık’ would not be written at all, perhaps and partly because of *Devlet Ana*. I was afraid that it would be seen as a reactionary novel.” (Tunalı 1984: 47)

see Kemal Tahir (1992: 364); Kemal Tahir (1989: 231, 238, 241); Hilav (1995: 75-102), Yavuz (1996: 65-79); Miyasoğlu (1998: 32-33). However, it should be noted that he cannot be classified along the stereotypical intellectual lines of ‘the left’ or ‘the right’.

³ It is worth noting that after *Devlet Ana*, Kemal Tahir has been popularly nicknamed ‘the writer of the Ottoman state’.

⁴ See also Kemal Tahir 1968.

"Osmancik is novel of reaction. The Ottomans were criticised too heavily. There was almost a negative campaign. Everybody was denigrating them. Then, how could such a denigrated empire have survived such a long time and established a civilization? These questions stimulated me and I began to search its main elements. And I tried to catch these elements." (Can-Doğan, 1993)

He (1992: 71-72) claimed that he found the elements such as justice, tolerance, etc. on Osman Beg's personality.

The ideology, which is aimed to be imposed on the readers by the authors of these novels, is basically 'the superiority of the Ottoman society than Western society' by all means. Both authors commonly stress some factors such as *justice*, *tolerance*, *attaching importance to science and technology*, but instead of *religion* Kemal Tahir, as a Marxist, puts a special emphasis on the *economic system* in his novel. Whereas the author of *Devlet Ana* does not lay so much stress on religion, it is a dominant factor in the social life in *Osmancik*. Therefore, the religious leader (Edebâli) plays an important role in the lives of the characters. In sum, these novels are structured in such a way as to show the positive features of the Ottoman Turkish society so that the confidence of Turkish people in themselves against the West might be strengthened and deepened. These purposes should be kept in mind –even in a narratological analysis- in order to facilitate the reading of the texts that might be termed adequate in terms of the textual structure and (self-)stated purpose.

No doubt authors have certain habitual practices, and what is true of one novel is likely to be true of other novels by the same author. However, this is not entirely so. An author's habits may vary at different times of his/her career; s/he may vary his/her procedure according to the demands of his/her subject. Therefore, in this paper, discussions will not be restricted to *Devlet Ana* and *Osmancik*, since it is necessary to utilise information from the other works of the authors in order to understand their narrative strategies.

1. Theoretical considerations

The analysis of the temporal aspects of narrative texts is based on the distinction between 'story-time' and 'text-time'⁵ Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 46) considers the best theoretical discussion of the relation between story-time and text-time is the one presented by Genette (1980: 33-160),⁶ and relies on him in her discussion of the procedure for the analysis of the temporal aspects of a narrative text, although she introduces some modifications. The following three aspects will be considered:

* *Order*: The relation between the succession of events in the story and the succession of events in the narrative text.

* *Duration*: The relation between the time the events are supposed to have taken

⁵ "Text" refers to the narrative text as it lies before us. "Story" refers to the narrated events, abstracted from their disposition in the narrative text and reconstructed in their chronological order, together with the participants in these events.

⁶ Genette's distinctions are also used by other narratologists. For example, see Chatman (1978: 63-84); Bal (1985: 51-78); Cohan & Shires (1988: 84-89); and Funk (1988: 187-206).

to occur in the story, and the time devoted to the narration of events in the narrative text.

* *Frequency*: The relation between the numbers of times an event appears in the story and the number of times it is narrated in the narrative text.

1. a. Order

In order to discuss this aspect of the temporal organisation in the text, the order in which the events occur in the *story level* is compared with the order of events in the *text*. Genette (1980: 35) distinguishes between two basic kinds of discrepancies (“anachronies”):

* *Prolepsis* –that is, a narrative manoeuvre that consists of narrating or evoking in advance an event that will take place later.

* *Analepsis* –that is, an evocation of an event that took place earlier in the story.

For example, if the following series of events at the story level:

A B C D E F G H I J,

is narrated in the following order in the narrative text:

A B E C D G H I F J,

E is classified as a prolepsis and F as an analepsis.

Although the issue of chronology is not a tool to decide literary quality (as a matter of fact, narratology helps understanding, not evaluation), in the practical analysis of narrative texts it is essential not only to indicate the various analepses and prolepses, but also to determine whether there is any reason for the changes that were made by the author. This kind of manoeuvre in the narrative texts –particularly the very conspicuous and drastic changes- can be very significant and may sometimes be used to communicate an important ideological perspective.

1. b. Duration

Of the three aspects to be analysed as part of the temporal organisation of a text, the analysis of duration is the most difficult, since it is not possible to measure the duration of events in a narrative. Accordingly, the only way of comparing the duration of events in the narrative text with that in the story is by analysing the “steadiness in speed” within a narrative text (Genette 1980: 87-88). This means that the duration of events in the narrative text should be measured in terms of the number of lines or pages used in narrating each event or group of events. This should then be compared with the duration of events in the story (measured in terms of seconds, minutes, hours, days, months or years). On the basis of this comparison, it will be possible to determine accelerations or slow-downs in a narrative text. Genette (1980: 94-95) distinguishes between the following four⁷ possible types of relationships between story-time (ST) and text-time (TT):

⁷ Bal (1985: 71) adds a fifth category called “slowdown” and indicates it as TT > ST.

- * Pause: $TT = n$, $ST \leq 0$. Thus, TT infinitely $>$ ST .
- * Scene: $TT = ST$.
- * Summary: $TT \dot{>} ST$.
- * Ellipsis: $TT = 0$, $ST \leq n$. Thus, TT infinitely $>$ ST .

In the case of a *narrative pause*, a segment occurs in the text without a corresponding segment appearing in the story. In *scenic representation* the duration of events in the narrative text and the duration of events in the story seem to be identical. The purest form of scenic representation is dialogue (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 54). In a *summary* the events in the narrative text are condensed and fill a shorter space in the text than would have been the case if they had been presented by means of scenic representation. In the case of an *ellipsis*, an event is not narrated in the narrative text, although it is clear that it must have happened in the story.

1. c. Frequency

Frequency refers to the relation between the number of times an event is narrated in the narrative text and the number of times it occurs in the story. In this regard Genette (1980: 113-116) distinguishes between three kinds of frequency:

* *Singulative frequency*: What happens once at the story level is narrated once in the narrative text. Singulative frequency may also occur in those cases where an event is narrated more than once in the narrative text, but the narration still corresponds to an equal number of occurrences of the same event at the story level.

* *Repetitive*⁸ *frequency*: What happens once in the story is narrated more than once in the text.

* *Iterative frequency*: What happens more than once in the story, is narrated once in the narrative text.

For example, if the following series represents a number of events in the story:

A B C B D B E F,

and is represented in the narrative text in the following way:

A B C A D E A F,

C, D, E and F are examples of singulative frequency; A of repetitive frequency; and B of iterative frequency.

2. Analysis of temporal structures of *Devlet Ana* and *Osmancık*

2. a. Order in *Devlet Ana* and *Osmancık*

Devlet Ana is, like in folklore, faithful to the chronology of story-events; its discourse tells the events exactly in the order in which they occur in the story. However, it has been observed that the author is selective in the ordering of the events which occur simultaneously. The return of Kaplan Çavuş from Konya is the

⁸ I prefer the word "repetitive", used by Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 57), to "repeating" used in the translation of Genette's work (1980: 117).

best illustration of this. The chronological order of this event can be shown as follows:

- A: Aslıhan, the daughter of Kaplan Çavuş, and Kerim are talking about the time Kaplan Çavuş returns from Konya to Bacıbey's house.
- B: The arrival of Kaplan Çavuş at Osman Beg's house.
- C: Kaplan Çavuş sends İrin Kız to Aslıhan in order to inform her of his arrival.
- D: The message of Kaplan Çavuş is conveyed by İrin Kız to Aslıhan.

However, in the novel these events are presented in the following order:

A-D-B-C.

What is (are) the rhetorical purpose(s) behind this selection? At first glance, it seems that the author had no special purpose for this rearrangement. However, if we examine the text closely, it will be seen that the author's rearrangement is deliberate. There are several reasons for doing this. First of all, the author achieves *continuity* of the narration. This also shows that the narrator of the novel is not intrusive. If he cut the conversation between Kerim and Aslıhan in order to present the arrival of Kaplan Çavuş, the romantic atmosphere created between these two would be damaged. This also shows that the author pays great attention to the relationship between characters. Apart from this important reason, there are also others such as to excite the readers' curiosity by creating a dramatic scene, and to present their inner lives in order to help their characterisation.

In *Devlet Ana* the present time is dominant. Flashbacks in *Devlet Ana* are used at just story level (in characters' speeches), either in order to express the identities of the characters or in order to give historical background information and also to give an ideological message by mentioning certain historical events [i.e. the incident of Cimri (The Stingy)] to the reader. In their conversations, however, the characters of *Devlet Ana* often talk about the past in small flashbacks and the reader sometimes finds it difficult to establish a relationship between developing (present) events and those past events mentioned by the characters. This situation arises both from not understanding the relationship being established between the past and the present and from the frequency of the flashbacks.

Some of these flashbacks in the story level of *Devlet Ana* (especially those which describe people) are realized by the narrator. On the other hand, some of them –events that are not mentioned by the narrator because of their simultaneous nature– are done by the characters who took part in them and are given from their perspectives. That is, the time is used to get clear identities of the characters and to create atmosphere.

Arrangement of story-events is an important narrative decision, one of the most pressing, as the narrator sets out to tell his tale. *Osmançık* takes the narratorial privilege of rearranging the events of the story to an extreme to suit the rhetorical purposes of the narrator. In *Osmançık*, events are narrated in the following order:

- Osman on his deathbed (the last minutes before his death)
- Osman's years as Kara Osman or Osmancık (his childhood and youth)
- Osman's growing-up years and transformation
- Osman's years as a 'beg' (ruler)
- Osman's years as a ghazi (his war years)
- Osman's years as a ghazi khan (his years as a more powerful ruler)
- Osman's final days after leaving the leadership to his son, Orhan
- Osman's death
- Osman's funeral

As can be seen, there is no proper chronological sequence of the events. Hence, the time is broken down and as a result of this, there are two narrative levels in the novel: the primary text (or frame narrative) and the embedded text. After getting the news about the conquest of Bursa, Osman Beg, on his deathbed, feels relieved, goes back in his thoughts and remembers all his vivid and colourful past from his childhood to the present time. This flashback (situation) continues from page 8 to page 430. In the last section (section 6), we return to the story-time (present time). So, not until the chapter six do we leave the retrospective mode. When Osman Beg dies, the external focaliser replaces himself with Osman Beg.

When the original order in which these events occurred (the so-called 'story level') is reconstructed, it looks as follows:

- A: Osman's years as Kara Osman or Osmancık (his childhood and youth)
- B: Osman's growing-up years
- C: Osman's years as a 'beg' (ruler)
- D: Osman's years as a ghazi (his war years)
- E: Osman's years as a ghazi khan (his years as a powerful ruler)
- F: Osman's final days after leaving the leadership to his son, Orhan
- G: Osman on his deathbed (his last minutes before his death)
- H: Osman's death
- I: Osman's funeral

Instead of being narrated in the original order

A B C D E F G H I

the events were narrated in the following order:

G A B C D E F H I.

Whereas the present time is dominant in *Devlet Ana*, flashback (analepsis) is an essential strategy rather than use of the present time in *Osmancık*. The flashback in the narrative text level of *Osmancık* is utilised in order to show the development of Osman Beg's personality and the improvement of society under the leadership of Osman Beg. The narrative begins towards the end of the action, and then breaks off to recount what happened before the novel began, and finally continues with the main issue from the point of interruption to the end. In Genette's words (1980: 60-66), this is a *complete analepsis*: the analepsis joins the primary narrative without leaving any gap between the two sections. According to Mendilow (1952: 269), this is one of the demands of epic theory. As a matter of fact, when Tarık Buğra wants

to focus on a character's life in his novels such as *Osmancık* and *İbiş'in Rüyası*, he uses 'the chronological looping method,' more commonly known as 'the time-shift technique' (Mendilow 1952: 270). His practice is to present the character first with a strong impression, and then work backwards and forwards over his past. As Mendilow (1952: 270) asserts, the novelty of this technique lies in the exposition being treated as part of the main action, not as a subordinate adjunct to it. That is, time is used by the author to create clear identities of the characters and to create atmosphere like the author of *Devlet Ana* did. For example, in order to give biographical and psychological information about the knight, several flashbacks are used in the first section (Tahir 1969: 12, 14, 42). Besides biographical and psychological information, the flashbacks about Alışar and Hophop Cadi help to create a social setting in the novel. (Tahir 1969: 264-268, 276-281)

Finally, I would like to mention Tarık Buğra's noticeable strategy in relation to the order. In *Osmancık* (Buğra 1983: 18, 21, 225, etc.), the narrator mentions the existence of the event before going into detail of it. His aim in doing this is to draw the attention of the reader. This style is common in his other novels. Furthermore, he sometimes (Buğra 1983: 9, 12, 218) gives the result and a very brief summary of the event, and then he deals with it in detail. He prefers going *from result to effect (cause)*. Besides the fact that the author attracts the attention of the reader, he also places great emphasis on the importance of the event in the plot of the novel. The first meeting of Osman and Edebâli at Sivrikaya (Buğra 1983: 12) is the best example in the novel. This shows the author's interference in the chronological order of events and also in the ideological perspective of the novel.

2. b. Duration in *Devlet Ana* and *Osmancık*

In *Devlet Ana*, the speed of the narrative is much slower than in *Osmancık*. The story-time of the novel, as mentioned in the novel itself (1969: 573), covers two and a half months. In other words, the events, which occur in two and a half months in the novel, are presented by making small *summaries* and *ellipses*. In *Devlet Ana*, we see the *second (or moment) style* ('saniye üslûbu') (Aytaç 1990: 493), which is seen generally in psychological novels -especially in realistic and naturalistic novels; and it seems like 'slow motion' in cinema. The main property of the second style is to enact the actual chronological occurrence of events in detail. The author likes to present each scene fully enough to give the reader a clear picture of the action. In the novel, the past, which prepares the present time, is given with flashbacks that are done by using characters' conversations (*scenic presentation*) and *summaries*.

One of the most important and frequent uses of flashback is to convey rapidly a stretch of *past* life in *Devlet Ana*. The author, having excited our interest in his characters by describing a *scene* to us, suddenly whizzes his pageant backwards, then forward, giving us a rapid *summary* of their past history -i.e., in the cases of Hophop Cadi (Tahir 1969: 276-281) and Notüs Gladyüs (Tahir 1969: 12).

The placing and introduction of the summary is a matter requiring great skill. In *Devlet Ana*, all summaries occur between two scenes. For instance, the author

sufficiently excites the readers' curiosity about Notüs Gladys to make them want a summary about him in the first chapter of the novel and, accordingly, such summaries appear on page 12 and page 14.

Kemal Tahir employs certain devices to make summaries: they appear as a scene, and thus he prevents tedium by casting it in the guise of one character's reflection, and by also using dialogues between the characters (i.e. Kaplan Çavuş's past is presented by conversation between Yunus Emre and him).

Briefly, because of shortness of time in which the action takes place in *Devlet Ana*, the summaries of events are rare and where they occur, they include short time periods. In the novel, all events are described in detail (*scene*) and the summaries are made either to avoid repeating previous events (i.e., Tahir 1969: 145) or in order to mention some unimportant events that do not take up too much time (i.e., Tahir 1969: 292). As a matter of fact, Kemal Tahir (1990: 78) believes that having achieved depth in the psychological narration, a 'slow pace', that is to say going into detail, is a necessity in the real novel: "In a sense, a novel consists only of details." (Kemal Tahir 1990: 163). Furthermore, he says

"The great novel must develop slowly. To achieve this pace, the novel must stop from time to time. What I mean by stopping is like Brecht warning the audience in his plays when he says 'this is a game, be careful, do not lose your attention'. Likewise, from time to time, the novel must stop, the reader has to digest what he has read, and re-motivate himself. Therefore, this is the main reason for the transition from exciting events to stable events or from dramatic events to comic. Otherwise it is almost impossible to read 600 pages easily, no one could bear it. Even if the novel is considered by everybody as a masterpiece. [...] We narrate a two-month period in *Devlet Ana*. The materials we collected during these two months are not found in history books, encyclopaedias, and articles. All of these materials were brought together as if we were digging a pit with a needle. If we had been able to add more material, we would definitely have done so. We used what we found. This approach does not damage this book, because the materials we collected are not enough. The details, in my opinion, are not enough. Despite the fact that the book narrates an unchanging period of history (in other words, although everybody knows the story of this period), why does it have enormous positive-negative impact? Because, [...] this novel also tells something to today's people. Of course, this is the central issue of this novel." (Seyda 1969: 82-83)

There are some ellipses in the novel, but they both cover a short time and are filled by the characters' speeches later in the novel. For instance, on page 248, there is an ellipsis, which covers ten days. What happened during this time is not given by the narrator, but is given by the speeches of Pervane Subaşı on page 256. One can see the same situation later in the novel. On page 584, the sudden attack of Oynaşhisar is omitted. However, on page 585, this attack is presented through Notüs Gladys's eyes. What is the purpose for the author of using this narrative strategy? There can be two main reasons for this:

- a. The narrator of the novel does not want to be intrusive by narrating every

event, which occurs at different places.

b. The psychological analysis of the character narrating the event can be easily presented by this strategy. For instance, the psychology of the knight as a Westerner is perfectly shown between page 585 and page 601.

As for *Osmancık*, the external time (story-time in the primary text) of *Osmancık* is about two days, but internal time (story-time in the embedded text) covers about sixty years with the flashback. So, in total, the length of the story-time portrayed in the narrative is more than sixty years in *Osmancık*. That is, time in the novel can divide into two dimensions: 1. The present time that Osman Beg lives on his deathbed and after his death. 2. Osman Beg's past life before his death. The second dimension helps to complete the first and extends the narrative time. In the embedded narrative, which occurs with the flashbacks, we see the chronological time sequence. However, sometimes this long period, approximately sixty years, is given with *summaries* and *ellipses*. These *ellipses* and *summaries* of the events cover a greater amount of time than *Devlet Ana* does. The author of *Osmancık* shortened some events by mentioning them within a few lines, as if he does not want to extend the length of the novel. In fact, this is opposite to the effect of 'the second style' in *Devlet Ana* and is also one of the weaknesses of *Osmancık* as a novel. According to Tuncer (1994: 178), this technical weakness of *Osmancık* might be due to the fact that the novel is considered as a scenario.⁹ Whereas there are some ideologically important scenes, such as the ceremony about Bay Koca (Buğra 1983: 170-179), the presentation of Osman's encounter with the dervish, Uruz, and his dog (Buğra 1983: 37-39), the scene which shows Osman's visit to the dervishes' families at Harlak (Buğra 1983: 127-134), and the capturing of Aydos Castle (Buğra 1983: 292-309) that are portrayed by means of scenic representation, most of the events in the novel are portrayed by means of summaries, such as the deaths of Osman's father, Ertuğrul, (Buğra 1983: 225) and of Malhun Hatun (Buğra 1983: 428). It is safe to assume that in *Osmancık*, the important side of Osman's life is his social one rather than his personal life. In addition, the birth of Osman's first son (Orhan), right after the death of Ertuğrul, causes the narrator to present the death of Ertuğrul just in one line, because Orhan's birth signifies the continuity of the Ottoman state. As a matter of fact, Orhan plays a very important role in the following parts of the novel.

Presentation of Mihail's transformation can be given as example of this issue. Whereas the childhood of Osman Beg is mentioned just in one sentence and then moves immediately on to his youth, which means that at least fifteen years are given in three sentences (Buğra 1983: 8), Mihail's thoughts that took, as mentioned in the novel, five or ten seconds are presented in eleven lines (Buğra 1983:295). Briefly, the author of *Osmancık* uses the time device for ideological purposes.

The introduction of *Osmancık* covers from the beginning to the second subsection. The development part of the novel is continuously expanding up to the sixth section. The sixth section is the conclusion part of the novel. In 'introduction'

⁹ Actually, at first *Devlet Ana* was considered as a scenario as well. See Refiğ 1971: 77-78.

and 'conclusion', events are narrated in the present time, although the 'development section' is related in past time. Tarık Buğra wrote *Osmancık* by taking into consideration the techniques of 'past time' and 'recollection'. The novel is structured totally in 'past time' except for the first three pages (I/1) and the last seven pages (VI/1-2). That is to say, the novel, covering 436 pages, is formed with Osman Beg's last minute memories. The novel is concerned mainly with the past of the character *qua* past tense; nevertheless it reveals that past as present (which is fictionally present) in the immediate consciousness of the character. On the other hand, this 'recollection' is narrated by the extra-heterodiegetic narrator, not through Osman Beg's own words and statements. This 'past time' (or 'recollection') shows a chronological order except for a few recollections in it (i.e., Buğra 1983: 151-152). The 'present time' is so short, less than two days: the moments of Osman Beg's death, his burial at Söğüt, and the declaration of his will. In the novel, the narrative is organised in such a way that, in the frame(primary)-text of the novel, the speed of the narrative is slow but at the very beginning and towards the end of the embedded narrative it is speeded up. However, in the middle of the embedded narrative, which presents Osman Beg's transformation in detail, the speed of the narrative is slowed down again.

Having a short 'present time' in *Osmancık* is an essential feature of the modern novel, and especially the novels concerning characters' psychology. This strategy can be seen in his other novel, *Ibiş'in Rüyası*, which is about Nahit's life. For example, in that novel, the author devotes 78 pages to one hour (Buğra 1983: 1-79). Generally, what is important in Tarık Buğra's novels and stories is that the individuals come first in importance. Because of that, both 'story time' and 'text time' are formed according to the development of the characters.

In addition, both narrator-focalisers stop the stories while continuing the discourse (*pause*) by giving a description of setting and identifications and definitions of the characters. In *Devlet Ana*, one can see, this kind of pause occurs more often than in *Osmancık*. By using this technique, Kemal Tahir either gives information about the identification of some characters, such as Notüs Gladys (Tahir 1969: 12, 14), Alışar (Tahir 1969: 264-268), Hophop Cadi (Tahir 1969: 276-281), and Çudaroğlu (Tahir 1969: 294-296) or describes the settings (Tahir 1969: 68, 176, 295-296) or characters (Tahir 1969: 39, 41-42, 118-119, 158) or characters' clothes (Tahir 1969: 23-24, 297). The following quotation is a good illustration of pause in *Devlet Ana*:

"Kıbrıs manastırında, Sen-Jan papazı olmaktan vazgeçip, tarikatın şövalye adaylarına katılarak, kılıç kuşandığı gün, falına baktırmıştı. Çingene karısı, arkadan vurulmazsa yüz yıl yaşayacağını, çok şanslı işler yapıp başına çok büyük bir taç giyeceğini söylemişti. O zamandan beri, sırtını güvene almadan oturmuyor, insanlara, kapılara, köşebaşlarına arkasını dönmemeye dikkat ediyordu. Döğüşlerde, kimizaman, aşırı korkak, kimizaman, kudurmuş gibi cesur davranması bundandı."

"At the monastery of Cyprus, he gave up the idea of being the priest of St John and became a candidate for knighthood in the sect. The day he girded his sword, he had his fortune told. The gypsy woman told him that

if he did not get shot from behind, he would live for a hundred years, he would be very lucky and would wear a big crown on his head. From that time on, he never sat without securing his back, and was especially careful not to turn his back on people, doors, and corners. This was why when in combat, he would behave extremely cowardly at times and at other times he would be fearless, worked up into rabid frenzy." (Tahir 1969: 14)

It is also worth remembering that, in both novels, the crisis (the climax) of a sequence of actions is always narrated in the scene. In other words, whenever an important action occurs, whenever an important decision is taken, it is presented in a scene. The scene gives the reader a feeling of participating in the action very intensely, for he is hearing about it contemporaneously, exactly as it occurs and the reader that is hearing about it is occupied by the narrator's voice telling it. For example, in *Osmancık*, the speed of the narrative is virtually slowed down to a stop during the time before Osman finds his identity or understands his mission; after that, it accelerates.

2. c. Frequency in *Devlet Ana* and *Osmancık*

Kemal Tahir, who devotes a lengthy explanation to the different narratological devices in the novel, also deals with frequency and its function in his notes:¹⁰ "Repetitions must be used with great discretion only in places that are necessitated by the topic." (Tahir 1990: 75)

In *Devlet Ana*, the narrative proceeds in a straightforward manner and events that happened once are narrated once (*singulative frequency*), although in characters' speeches analepses are frequently used to call attention to events, which occurred. The main frequencies in *Devlet Ana* occur when the same events are narrated by different characters more than once to reflect the existence of different focalisations to emphasise different messages. For example, the incident of Cimri (Tahir 1969: 213, 428-431) and the proposal of marriage to Balkız and the attempt of AlıŖar to kidnap her (Tahir 1969: 261-263, 327-328) are told by two different characters in different times and places more than once. Apart from the ideological focalisation of the author, the character-narrators' personalities, sexes, and intra-fictional narratees (or, the narratee-characters) (the listeners being told in the story) are also the main factors in this process. The reasonable answer to the question of why the Cimri incident is narrated by both Kaplan Çavuş (Tahir 1969: 213) and Kel Dervish (Tahir 1969: 428-431) is to show that the ordinary people cannot be statesmen; and Osman Beg (and the following leader of Ottomans) are, therefore, outstanding people. Besides this main ideological message, there are other opinions that these frequencies suggest such as that 'statesmen should not be stingy' or 's/he should be noble and generous'.

As for *Osmancık*, the main frequencies in the novel occur where the same

¹⁰ It is noteworthy to mention that, unlike Kemal Tahir, Tarık Buğra does not talk so much about technical features or problems of the novel. However, it does not mean that his novels or stories are less successful than Kemal Tahir's. On the contrary, even Naci (1994: 159, 164) and Moran (1991: 135-136), who are ideologically much closer to Kemal Tahir, claim that, from a technical perspective, Tarık Buğra's novels are more successful than Kemal Tahir's.

sentences play an important role in describing Osman's transformation from Osmancık (or Kara Osman) to Osman Beg. These sentences, which mostly belong to Edebâli and Gökçe Bacı, often come to his mind, either words by words or in a different format during his search for an identity. It is worth mentioning that these sentences form the vital structure of the ideological facet of focalisation in this novel. Therefore, because of these ideological emphases, the novel displays a didactic nature occasionally and also these parts bring the novel more to the oratory level (Gülendam 1999). I give two examples of these sentences, which also reflect the influence of Dede Korkut on *Osmancık*:

"Hey Osmancık; yiğit yiğit, tek yiğit öfkesini...benliğini yenendir."

"O, Osmancık! Brave man, brave man! The only real brave man is he who overcomes his anger, ...and ego." (Buğra 1983: 15, 18, 22, etc.)

"Ayın ondördü Malhun Hatun... gökçek Malhun Hatun, dilerim bencileyin ak pörçekli karıcık olun da oğullarının beyliğini de görün."

"O! Malhun Hatun, as beautiful as the full moon, pretty Malhun Hatun, I hope when you become a woman with white tufts of hair like me, and that you see your sons becoming Beks." (Buğra 1983: 133, 141)

Moreover, in *Osmancık* there are some *iterative frequencies*. The best example for this type of frequency in the novel is where Orhan tries to persuade his mother for three days to take the embroidered purse in order to give it to Holofira. However, this incident is narrated once in the narrative text within three lines (Buğra 1983: 342).

There are *repetitive frequencies* in *Devlet Ana*: I can give as an example the marriage proposal to Balkız and Alışar's attempt to kidnap her. This event occurs once in the story but is narrated twice (Tahir 1969: 261-263, 327-328). In the first narration by Pervane Subaşı, the event is used to present Alışar's side, whereas in the second narration by Aslıhan the event presents Osman Beg's side. As a result of this event, Osman and Alışar become enemies. Consequently, the scene becomes more complicated and vivid: the Mongols, the Westerners and Turkish enemies of Osman are united against Osman. In contrast to Osman's honest personality, which represents the Turcomans' pure spirituality that will be kernel of the foundation of the Ottoman state, this event shows Alışar's spoiled identity whose existence in the novel represents the Seljuks. In other words, the Ottoman is given high privilege against various Turkish elements. Thus, the reason for the detailed and repetitive narration of this event is understandable.

Finally, I would like to stress that although it is not a proper repetitive frequency, there are some repeated words that show the transformation of Osmancık to Osman Beg in *Osmancık*: 'artık' ('now', 'after this'), 'değişmek' ('to change'), 'gene' ('again'), etc.

3. Conclusion

a. While Tarık Buğra –as in his *İbiş'in Rüyası*– prefers going from result to effect (cause) in *Osmancık* as a narrative strategy in terms of time arrangement, in

Devlet Ana, as in his other novels, Kemal Tahir mostly lets the story-events unfold in their natural sequence (order) and tempo (duration).

With regard to the overall temporal organisation of *Devlet Ana* it is clear that the events are nearly narrated in the same order as they occurred in the story. Only a few examples of anachrony can be found. Analepses and prolepses in *Devlet Ana* are mostly used at just story level; in other words, most of them occur in the characters' speeches (*embedded* analepses/prolepses). Most of these are used to convey new information about some issues or characters. Whereas some of these anachronies are classified as internal (for example, the raid of Karacahisar), some of them refer to events outside the range of the primary narrative (for example, the incident of Cimri). On the other hand, *Osmancık* takes the narratorial privilege of rearranging the events of the story to an extreme to suit the rhetorical purposes of the narrator.

With regard to the way in which *duration* is handled in *Devlet Ana*, the overall impression is that scenic representation is used as the dominant technique. The dominance of scenic representation enables the author to portray events vividly. This is, as mentioned before, also accompanied by a diminished degree of perceptibility on the part of the narrator. In *Devlet Ana*, the story time covers two and half months, and the length of the text is 625 pages. On the other hand, in *Osmancık* summary and ellipsis are dominant technique and the presence of the narrator is indicated by means of narrative pauses and summaries. In *Osmancık*, the story time is about sixty years, and the length of the text is 436 pages.

With regard to the temporal aspect *frequency*, whereas *Devlet Ana* is presented almost totally by way of singulative frequency, the main frequencies in *Osmancık* occur where the same sentences play an important role in describing Osman's transformation.

b. Finally, but most importantly, I would like to mention a common narratological mistake. From the way analepses and prolepses are identified by the narratologists such as Genette, Bal, and Rimmon-Kenan, to my knowledge, it is obvious that no distinction is made between what I would like to call "anachronies in the *narrative text*" (proper analepsis/prolepsis) and "anachronies embedded within the *story level*" (*embedded* analepsis/prolepsis). In order to show the difference between these two types of anachronies, the following example may be considered:

If a series of events is represented in a narrative text in an order corresponding exactly to the story level, namely

A B C D E F G,

but event C consists of a speech event which includes, amongst other information, a reference to or a prediction with regard to event F by the speaker, this could be interpreted in such a way that event C is classified as a prolepsis. However, strictly speaking, this is not correct, since event C (the speech event) is not placed in a position different from that which it occupies at the story level -thus, no anachrony. The fact that event C consists of a speech event which includes a reference to an

event later in the story, is an example of anachrony embedded in the story level. It is already part of the underlying story level and merely duplicated in the narrative level.¹¹

This often happens when events such as a prophecy or recollection are narrated. Actually, each of these events includes two temporal aspects: the *act* of prophecy or recollection, and the *content* of prophecy or recollection. For instance:

- A On Monday Osman went to Edebâli's dervish lodge and spoke to Edebâli.
- B On Tuesday Osman visited his friend, Mihail.
- C On Wednesday Osman joined in a party which was given by the beg of İnönü.
- D On Thursday Osman went to Edebâli's dervish lodge again.
- E On Friday Osman remembered that he had spoken to Edebâli on Monday.

A closer analysis of event E shows that it actually includes two temporal aspects:

On Friday Osman remembered that he had spoken to Edebâli on Monday.

E₁

E₂

Since E₁ is narrated in the narrative text at a stage corresponding to the time at which this event originally occurred, it cannot be classified as an analepsis. In the case of E₂, it *seems* as if it may be analeptic since it refers to an events narrated earlier in the narrative. However, since the basic action (E₁) is not located in a place that differs from its position in the original order of events, this is not a proper analepsis. This is an *embedded* analepsis.

On the other hand, in the case of "anachronies in the *narrative text*" (proper analepsis/prolepsis), the author places an event in a position in the narrative text that does not correspond to the place it occupies in the story level.

If this distinction is not kept in mind, a narrative or a part of a narrative may be wrongly described as abounding with anachronies, when, in fact, most of these anachronies are embedded within the story level. This is the case in *Devlet Ana* where a large number of so-called anachronies may be found, but when these are considered closely, it is clear that only a few of them are examples of anachrony in the narrative text. The rest of the anachronies were already embedded within the story level and merely duplicated in the narrative text.

References

AYTAÇ, Gürsel (1990) *Çağdaş Türk Romanları Üzerine İncelemeler*. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

¹¹ Even if event F were omitted from the narrative text, event C still would not need to be classified as a prolepsis in the narrative text, since it is placed in the same position in the narrative text and occupies at the story level. What has happened is that an ellipsis is found in the text where event F should have been narrated.

- BAL, Mieke (1985) *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Van Boheemen, Christine (trans.). London: University of Toronto Press.
- BOZDAĞ, İsmet (1980) *Kemal Tahir'in Sohbetleri*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- BUĞRA, Tarık (1972) *İbiş'in Rüyası*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi. Org. publ. in 1970.
- BUĞRA, Tarık (1983) *Osmancık*, İstanbul: Ötüken.
- BUĞRA, Tarık (1992) *Politika Dışı*, İstanbul: Ötüken.
- CAN, Eyüp and Doğan, Rıdvan (1993). "Ekmek parası yüzünden çalışmalar geri kalıyor", *Zaman Gazetesi*, 8.3.1993.
- CHATMAN, Seymour (1978) *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- COHAN, Steven & Shires, Linda M. (1988) *Telling Stories. A Theoretical Analysis of Narrative Fiction*, London, NY: Routledge.
- FUNK, R. W. (1988) *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, Sonoma: Polebridge.
- GENETTE, Gérard (1980) *Narrative Discourse*, Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Org. publ. in French in 1972.
- GÜLENDAM, Ramazan (1999) "Kuruluş'un 700. yıldönümünde bir 'mefkûre insanı'nın romanı: Osmancık", *Dergâh*, 114, 8-10.
- HILAV, Selahattin (1995) *Edebiyat Yazıları*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- MENDİLOW, A. A. (1952) *Time and Novel*, London, NY: Peter Nevill Ltd.
- MIYASOĞLU, Mustafa (1998) *Roman Düşüncesi ve Türk Romanı*, İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- MORAN, Berna (1991) *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış-II*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- NACI, Fethi (1994) *40 Yılda 40 Roman*, İstanbul: Oğlak Yayıncılık.
- REFİĞ, Halit (1971) *Ulusal Sinema Kavgası*, İstanbul: Hareket Yayınları.
- RİMMON-KENAN, Shlomith (1983) *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, London, NY: Routledge.
- SEYDA, Mehmet (ed.) (1969) *Türk Romanı*, İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.
- TAHİR, Kemal (1968) "Kemal Tahir'e 5 Soru, Kemal Tahir'den 5 Cevap", *Kitaplar Arasında*, 1: 5.
- TAHİR, Kemal (1969) *Devlet Ana*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi (Org. publ. in 1967).
- TAHİR, Kemal (1990) *Notlar/Sanat Edebiyat 4*, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- TUNALI, Yağmur (1984) "Osmancık Üzerine Tarık Buğra ile Bir Sohbet", *Töre Dergisi*, 154.
- TUNCER, Hüseyin (1994) *Edebiyat Araştırma ve İncelemeleri*, İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi.
- UTURGAURİ, Svetlana (1989) *Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine*, İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- YAVUZ, Hilmi (1996) *Osmanlılık, Kültür, Kimlik*, İstanbul: Boyut Kitapları.