

SEEING MODERNIZATION THROUGH THE EYES OF
PERIPHERY: A NARRATOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF NAZIM
HİKMET RAN'S MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI

A Master's Thesis

by

Ece Büşra Türközü

Department of Turkish Literature
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

August 2022

*Dünyanın anlatılarına yenilmemeyi, kendi anlatıma sahip çıkabilmeyi öğreten, beni
tek başına büyüten canım anneme*



SEEING MODERNIZATION THROUGH THE EYES OF
PERIPHERY: A NARRATOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF NAZIM
HİKMET RAN'S MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI

The Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences of İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent
University

A Master's Thesis

by

Ece Büşra Türközü

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN TURKISH LITERATURE

DEPARTMENT OF TURKISH LITERATURE
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

AUGUST 2022

ABSTRACT

READING MODERNIZATION THROUGH THE EYES OF PERIPHERY: A NARRATOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF NAZIM HİKMET RAN'S MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI

Türközü, Ece Büşra

M.A., Department of Turkish Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hacer Esra Almas

August 2022

This thesis examines the narratological structure and characteristics of Nazım Hikmet Ran's *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* (*Human Landscapes From My Country*). The poem is a critique of Turkish modernization followed by the foundation of the Republic due to its ignorance towards the periphery, mainly, the peasants. Not only the events narrated in the text, but also how they are narrated embodies the ideology of the poem. The thesis aims at demonstrating the use of narratology in political and cultural readings not being limited to superficial theme analysis. Theoretically based on Mieke Bal's practice of narratology in cultural readings, this thesis explores the possible ways of analyzing the narratology of the text in a way supporting Hikmet's concern in writing the poem. The poem consists of five books and the thesis focuses on each of them considering a different theme and a different kind of analysis, including the change in the narrator-focalizer, the use of description, the space in relation to characters, the movie-like features of the text, and the snapshot effect created by the narration. The thesis also aims at taking the notion of self-narrative into

the scope of analysis of narratology and use it in a way to offer a more individual-focused alternative for reading a non-western modernity to Gregory Jusdanis' model of belatedness and Daryush Shayegan's model of disfiguration.

Keywords: Nazım Hikmet, narratology, ideology, modernity, modernization, periphery



ÖZET

MODERNLEŞMEYİ TAŞRANIN GÖZÜNDEN OKUMAK: NAZIM HİKMET’İN MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI ADLI ESERİNİN ANLATIBİLİMSEL İNCELEMESİ

Türközü, Ece Büşra

Yüksek Lisans, Türk Edebiyatı Bölümü
Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Hacer Esra Almas

Ağustos 2022

Bu tez Nazım Hikmet Ran’ın Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları adlı eserinin anlatıbilimsel yapısını ve özelliklerini inceler. Söz konusu eser, cumhuriyetin kuruluşunu takip eden modernleşme sürecini, özellikle köylüyü ihmal ettiği teziyle eleştirir. Sadece eserde anlatılan olaylar değil, bu olayların anlatılış şekli de eserin ideolojisini yansıtmaktadır. Tez, anlatıbilimin, eserin teması gibi yüzeysel bir okumaya indirgenmeden, politik ve kültürel okumalar yapabileceğini göstermeyi amaçlar. Mieke Bal’ın anlatıbilimsel kültürel okumalarını teorik temel olarak alan bu tez, söz konusu metni, anlatıbilim araçlarını kullanarak Hikmet’in eleştirilerini yansıtacak şekilde okumanın yollarını inceler. Eseri oluşturan beş kitap farklı tema ve analizlerle okur, bunlar: anlatıcıdaki değişiklikler, tanımlamaların kullanım şekli, mekanların karakterlerle ilişkisi, eserin filme benzeyen ve fotoğraf etkisi yaratan anlatı özellikleridir. Tez, aynı zamanda, kendilik anlatısı kavramını da anlatıbilim inceleme alanına taşımayı ve bu kavramı, Gregory Jusdanis’in “gecikmişlik” ve Daryush Shayegan’ın “okunmazlık” üzerinden modellediği batı-dışı modernitelere alternatif bir model getirecek şekilde kullanmayı amaçlar.

Anahtar kelimeler: Nazım Hikmet, anlatıbilim, ideoloji, modernite, modernleşme,
taşra



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Hacer Esra Almas for her patience and understanding in guidance on this thesis. I would like to thank the head of our department Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Kalpaklı, for his guidance during the last three years. I am grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cenk Saraçoğlu, for generously agreeing to be a part of my thesis committee, for his valuable feedback and support.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Peter Cherry for his support during the last three years. His classes have always opened my mind to reading the texts and theories in different ways. His excitement at hearing, generating and discussing new ideas and new perspectives has become my motivation to pursue a career in academia.

I would like to thank my professors in Bilkent. Dr. Etienne Charrière, Dr. Zeynep Seviner, Dr. Nil Tekgöl, Prof. Özer Ergenç, Kudret Emiroğlu and Dr. Suavi Aydın. I am grateful that I had a chance to attend their classes. I would also like to thank TUBITAK for supporting young scientists and academicians, including me in my MA years.

I am grateful to my amazing cohort for making my MA years the happiest period in my life. Elif Su Işık and Irmak Ulaş's friendship has healed me more than they could

imagine. I feel lucky to have met Mert Ünver and Gizem Ünal. I want to thank to Cansu Kutlualp, for her support, her amazing sense of humor and incredible editing skills. each and every one in my cohort, I am grateful for their companionship.

My special thanks go to dear Costantino Costantini. If I had not met him six years ago, I would be a very unhappy lawyer now. I want to thank him for introducing me to the endless ocean of ideas, guiding me in my path in academia and helping me discovering my potential. I will be grateful to him all my life.

My deepest gratitude is for my family. Erkan Yıldız has always been with me since high school. I have learned and am still learning from him what friendship is. I would like to thank to my amazing comrades: Zeki Avcı, Merve Turgan, Nüket Gelegen. I am happy that I met each and every one of them. Özgür Gençkurt has been an essential part of everything I wrote and I thought in the last eight months. He has been a source of inspiration for me. I would like to thank my uncle Nebi Serbes for his endless and incomparable support. My dear grandfather, Sabri Modan, has taught me reading and thinking in my very young ages. Anything I write will always carry pieces from our conversations. I wish he could read these lines. My deepest love and gratitude are for the women in my family: my grandmother Gülhan Modan, my aunts Nurhan Modan and Ferhan Serbes, for their love and support. And finally, my mother Nihan Türközü, I owe all I am to her, and I know that I cannot be thanking her enough all my life.

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	I
ÖZET	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
INTRODUCTION	1
TURKISH MODERNISATION AFTER THE REPUBLIC	16
Reading Turkish Modernity as Belatedness	31
Reading Turkish Modernity as Being-in-between	35
NARRATOLOGY	42
THE ANALYSIS OF MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI	55
Books I-II: Confusion	64
Books I-II: An attempt to read a more individual-focused way	95
Book III: Limitation- Isolation	102
Books IV-V: Inevitable Witnessing	118
CONCLUSION	131
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143

INTRODUCTION

“Not books, or word-of-mouth propaganda or my social condition brought me where I am. Anatolia brought me where I am. The Anatolia I had seen only on the surface, from the outside. My heart brought me where I am.” (2013,31). Nazım Hikmet refers to his nineteenth year -when he had experienced the reality of the Anatolia for the first time- by these words in his autobiographical novel *Yaşamak Güzel Şey Be Kardeşim* (*Life's Good Brother*). These four short sentences give us the full story of Nazım Hikmet's narrative: it stems from the people and aims giving their unheard stories a sound. Moreover, the sentences build the connection between seeing, experiencing and narrating, which are the main themes that will be followed throughout the thesis.

This thesis, to bring the forgotten experiences surface and to give voice to a silent group in the history of Turkey, reveals the deep connection narratology and politics have by making a narratological analysis of Nazım Hikmet's *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* (*Human Landscapes From My Country*), an epic criticizing the ideology of the republic and the Turkish modernization on the basis that it ignores those in periphery.

The modernization period that followed the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, has been a subject to many studies ranging from history to sociology and anthropology. This thesis analyzes the early republican era and the modernization after its foundation from the periphery's view, by focusing on the different ways Nazım Hikmet's text is narrated. Using elements of narratology the thesis aims to

develop an alternative critique of Turkish modernization as a non-western modernization.

Monika Fludernik (2009), defines the narratology as “Narrative theory – or to use the internationally accepted term narratology– is the study of narrative as a genre.” (p.8) Narratology is interested in how a story is narrated instead of what the story narrates. The story narrated shows the politics of a text directly on its surface, however, the way the story is narrated, which requires a much closer look to discuss its politics, might give us much more than what is on the surface.

Narratology asks a text “who speaks?” and “who does not get to speak?” reminding us Spivak’s famous question “Can the subaltern speak?”; Bakhtin adds “heteroglossia” to narratology, which focuses on the different voices within a society; the actors keeps clashing the powers against them on their way to achieve their goal; events are considered as events dependent on the ideology accepting them worth seeing; the tightness of time that we can measure by the rhythm of the text is a reflection of our experience of time; the causality in a narrative text demonstrates how we make sense of the world; continuity and coherence of our self-narratives make us question our identities; our brain tends to work structure anything in narratives and understand the world through the stories. While the art of narration is significantly interwoven with the politics, only looking at the themes of a book to search for ideology would fall short in examining the full potential of the text particularly when it has a definitive socio-political reception.

That is why, by focusing on narratological elements, I want to re-analyze one of the most political texts from one of the most valuable poets: Nazım Hikmet Ran and his epic work *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*, *Manzara* from here on after.

An epic in verse, the poem was published in Turkish in 1963, consists of five books, the last one of which is half-written. It offers several portraits of different people in small narratives, making up a panorama of Turkish history. By panorama, I am referring to the fact that the reader can read all narratives in small pictures that when brought together paints a whole portrait, that is, a portrait of Turkey. The first two books take place in a train, where different people from different classes reveal their stories as they chat amongst themselves. The third book takes place in a prison and a hospital, signaling a change in the tones of the narratives told, this time, where the lives of people that are serving time on working in these places are told. The fourth book's focus is on two cities and the relation in the exploitation triangle between the peasants, the ağas -the landlords and the heads of the known families in periphery- and the state. The fifth book, which is much shorter than the rest of the books, gives us some scenes from İstanbul, focusing on the poverty the people that inhabit. My research aims to analyze all of these books by a different narratological theme that I nominate to best suit the book which ultimately reveal political story-telling. Nazım Hikmet's concern in writing the epic is to critique the republic of the ways it ignored the peasant, how periphery, that is neither Ankara, the supposed hero of the new state nor İstanbul, had a chance to follow the process from beginning to the end. Just as the title suggests the poem shows different portraits of Anatolian people from different stages of life, who could not play the role nor could follow the modernization transformation the state is in, and therefore, were left aside in a state of misery.

The reason why I chose this text is that first, it includes several narratives that have Turkish modernization and history as their background. Second, these narratives are told in a way to draw the general portrait of modernization; which

creates the perfect textual space to read narratology and politics together. Third, it is a highly political work criticizing the promises and the reality of the modernization project starting from the foundation of the republic, which makes it a source for reading periphery narratives. And finally, by telling the narratives of people from different classes, it offers a space to compare the republic's reflection on different groups.

Throughout the thesis, the term “ideology” will be used, therefore, it needs to be clarified what is meant by that term. The term “ideology” dates back to Antoine Destutt de Tracy and his intention to create a field studying the ideas. His intention might be considered as a result of the positivism movement in the sense that the movement evokes an effort to classify and “scientify” any type of study. Marxism is the movement giving ideology more political sense as it is understood today. In the *German Ideology*, Marx and Engels resembles ideology to a “camera obscura”, on the basis that both the ideology and the camera obscura demonstrates the world and the reality upside down. In that sense, ideology is a sublimation making people disconnect from the realities of life. Antonio Gramsci took the term “ideology” from the field of the powerful groups and the state and argued that the ideology is produced in a non-state field, by the individuals. Louis Althusser considered the ideology as a “new reality” and focused on what tools a state uses to execute its ideology, calling these tools as “ideological state apparatuses”. (Freeden, 2003)

Marxist tradition on the notion of ideology could be summarized as explained below. However, by the term ideology, the thesis will simply refer to a set of ideas and values that show a pattern, held by a group have plans for public policy (Freeden, 2003). Therefore, the state's ideology will refer to its set of executions in an effort to create a modern nation ignoring the realities of the people. Nazım

Hikmet's ideology, on the other hand, is explained the best by Memet Fuat. As he argues, Nazım Hikmet's ideology refers to his belief that a world providing every human being a better life is possible. Life is worth living and anything keeping people away from living humane and moreover, being able to life in a way honoring the beauty of life should be erased from the world. Nazım Hikmet's communism stems from its promise that an equal and humane life for the people is possible. (Fuat, 2001)

Nazım Hikmet describes his poems written in Moscow as “communist poems”, and declares that he is a communist. One of his friends, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, referring to Nazım Hikmet, argues: “He was not interested in the rigors of theory or in the practical problems of changing the social structure... It seemed that, for him, communism was one perpetual, revolutionary excitement- revolution was something that had to rage like the seas or roar like tempests.” (Akgül, p. 227) (as cited in Blasing, 2013, p.14) In his own words, Nazım Hikmet argues that Marxist is not a “machine-man, nor a robot”, it is a human being “with its flesh, blood, nerves, head and heart and history” (Fuat, 2001, p.197). The communism he sees is human and human experience focused, lively and far away from being structured and shaped by tradition or theory. Therefore, throughout the thesis, my take on Nazım Hikmet's ideology will be the same: neither as a political action nor as a theoretical structure, but as a duty of making the reality of the people heard.

The politics in Nazım Hikmet's writing is not about politic action nor a set of ideas, but rather an ethical stance. It is being able to see the reality of the people and obtaining a position embracing the humanistic values. Therefore it has a moral dimension according to which people have to be observed in their conditions and judged regarding their choices in their given conditions among the possibilities

offered to them. The judgement has to follow a true and sincere observation. Unfortunately, people judging him acted on the contrary of the politics he defends. The trial resulting with the decision of his imprisonment was regarded by the press as a “crime without a law and a punishment without a crime” (Fuat, 2001, 442). Being judged and imprisoned by an ideology distorting the reality of Nazım Hikmet makes the theme of observing and judging in *Manzaralar* -the poem he has written in prison- more crucial.

When the first decades of the republic and the ideology it possesses is the subject of the discussion, many other novels and poems reflecting and critiquing the mentality of the time could be chosen; Kemal Tahir, Yaşar Kemal and Fakir Baykurt penned novels and stories laying bare the truth of the periphery and disenchanting the romanticized lives of the villagers. However, Nazım Hikmet’s *Manzaralar* manages to create the same effect by not focusing on the periphery and their lives. The strength of the text comes from the rejection of making the periphery the object of the view. Nazım Hikmet tells their stories by small pieces, allowing the reader to throw small looks but not letting them objectifying the periphery. Moreover, different techniques Nazım Hikmet uses in the narration makes *Manzaralar* a great field for a narratological study.

Nermine Mouvafac, (1932) the first translator of Hikmet’s poem into English, defines Hikmet as a poet “poised between East and West.” (as cited in Göbenli, 2021) The fact that he embraces the national values and stories and the fact that tells them in a way to connect to fundamental universal concerns makes him belong to two different worlds at the same time. Yet, his poems’ belonging to world literature has been echoed by many literary scholars such as Mediha Göbenli (2021), Kenan Behzat Sharpe (2021) and Azade Seyhan (2003). Göbenli (2021) focuses on the

circulation of Nazım Hikmet's poems through different languages whereas Sharpe (2021) discusses his political stance and his call for fraternity in Turkish-Greek literary circulation. Azade Seyhan (2003) compares Hikmet and Assia Djebar, highlighting the common values they praise. Özen Nergis Dolcerocca (2016), similarly, compares Hikmet to Pablo Neruda in the new approach they bring to the notion of epic, simply, challenging epic as a form of a creation of heroic figures. The discussions related to world literature can be considered as new compared to the analysis about the politics of Nazım Hikmet's text, but they deepen the way his works are perceived.

Nazım Hikmet Ran is a communist who argues that the Republic offers only a limited democracy, which is held again by bourgeoisie and keeps the people in the system exploiting them. (Lekesiz, 2007, p.17) Ali Galip Yener (2007) argues that *Manzaralar* is an attempt to re-write Anatolian history on the basis of class struggles. (p.37)

Özen Nergis Dolcerocca (2016) takes Nazım Hikmet Ran's text as an "alternative history centered on the lives of ordinary people, bringing everyday human experience into the center of the historical narrative which spans nearly half a century from 1908 to 1950".(p.112) Dolcerocca analyzes the epic elements in the text and argues that it has a "political function as collective and historical memory" (2016, p.112) As she quotes Nazım Hikmet from his letters to Kemal Tahir: "I want to give a concrete representation of these people coming from different social strata... my intention is to draw a landscape of my country" (Hikmet, 1991, p.173) (as cited in Dolcerocca, 2016, p.112) By writing "the epic of the defeated" (Dolcerocca, 2016, p. 114), Nazım Hikmet reveals how the general narrative of

modernization does not work, since the *defeated* ones make up the majority of the nation itself.

The political emphasis in the poem has been discussed by other critics as well: Kazım Yetiş (2018) argues: “Nazım Hikmet makes his characters speak of the society. These conversations or the activities help us understand their situation and mind-set” (p.54) By making people speak, he centers their experience and tells the story of the country. He chooses to call the text “epic” since this term refers to the nation-building characteristic of it. (Dolcerocca, 2016). In this sense, his text might be read as an attempt to write a more subject-based history of the nation. His work is inseparable from his political stance. Dolcerocca (2016) mentions the “anti-imperialist and humanist overtones” of the text. (p.117) Beyond its tone, its content is also political. Throughout the *Manzaralar*, Nazım Hikmet criticizes the republican modernization idea by saying that in reality, the economic conditions of peasants have not changed. Those who are privileged in the Ottoman, have somehow continued living the same under new names, whereas the peasant only has seen the regulatory face of the republic. The promise was a change of the world, but their life did not get better.

Özlem Fedai (2007) argues that *Manzaralar* is written to honor the people of Anatolia, who have sacrificed a lot and saved their country, yet remained as unknown heroes. (p.238) After portraying the unknown heroes of his country, Nazım Hikmet goes further and argues that it is communism that the geography needs, and the narratives of the people further justifies this need. (Ateş, 2007, p.333)

Hikmet does not only portrays the peasant, the bourgeoisie is also depicted in great detail in the text. Gökhan Atılğan (2019) defines this phenomenon as an opportunity and declares: “This opportunity enables us to look at the Turkish

bourgeoisie by means of such rich materials as unlikely to be found in memoirs, interviews, corporate records, economic journals, reports or financial documents.” (p.230) The richness is due to the socialist view they are observed from, giving us a more detailed and analyzed portrait of the way the bourgeoisie mind works. Mutlu Konuk Blasing emphasizes that the poem is less about the portraits of different people but the effort is put on “webs of interrelationships that constitute (a) larger unit” (2013, p.132). This effort differentiates the portraits from the landscape in the sense that portrait is stable whereas a landscape reveals the connection between its elements. The poem’s movement and lively characteristic is due to the importance it attaches to the interrelations.

As we can see, a significant amount of the research and analyses have been done on Nazım Hikmet’s poetry in general, from discussing its place in world literature to the ideology it advocates. Looking at Nazım Hikmet’s poetry does not only reveal his mastery of literature but is an important point of view to understand the political framework from which he is writing. The reason why I chose to add one more analysis on one of his texts is due to the “inseparability of the content and style of Hikmet’s poetry from his worldview or politics.” (Göbenli, 2021) The content of his poetry has been analyzed in a variety of ways and his style has generally been considered as taken from Russian futurists but yet localized. Narratological analysis, which is also related to the form, has been missing among these studies. The ideology that the form may reveal is as significant as the ideas that the content reflects. Moreover, I argue that any form- focused analysis not making a connection to the way the story is narrated falls short in explaining the world the text is written in.

Research on the literature reveals that theses written on Nazım Hikmet's poetry have a focus on the relation between his political views, life and the narration on the surface. There is not a study on the narratological methods Nazım Hikmet uses and the choices he makes in narrating his poems and stories. Narratology is a field distanced itself from the field of poetry on the basis that it does not provide enough elements for such an analysis. (Çıraklı, 2015) This thesis would provide an analysis that has not been in the literature of Nazım Hikmet poetry and also prove that narratology should be considering poetry as a fruitful subject for narratological discussions.

My thesis uses narratology as a framework to analyze Nazım Hikmet's poem. By delving into theoretical framework, I underline the deep connection between narratology and cultural readings. Although I have chosen to apply some models that Mieke Bal has offered, she is not the only scholar paying attention to the increasing need for narratological readings in understanding cultures and lives of the people. Carlisle (1994) argues that any narrative has something to say regarding the issues of mastery in the mutability of its characters, reflects social relations of its world, and its society's beliefs. Moreover, the narrative plays a significant role in revealing the power relations and repressions dominating the society both by its context and the relations it builds between the events and the people. The narrative can liberate those who are oppressed by giving them a voice. Therefore, narratology has a crucial role in interdisciplinary studies.

The narrative reveals the world it is produced in, but also, it is a tool to construct that world. Nünning (2010) takes narrative as a world-making process by its ordering of events, depicting the environment and introducing characters in that environment. Those worlds that narratives create have their own ideologies

Therefore, narratives have a political value; they produce and negotiate different worlds.

Narratological analysis becomes a ground for ideological discussions not only in their power to create new worlds but also in their ability to detect the specifics and universals in a text's claim. (Genette, 1983) Each characteristic of a text can be taken as a signal of ideology embedded in a text, therefore, making narratology an effective tool to understand the world it is revealing.

Thon (2016) highlights the meaning making characteristic of the narrative and thus argues that any narrative is interwoven with culture and socioeconomic realities of the society it is produced in. To summarize, all the scholars I have mentioned above see a connection between narratology and ideological/cultural readings. Mieke Bal is the scholar who, beyond detecting the connection, produces possible tools to apply to texts. She looks for ways to expose a text's connections to the realities of the world it is a product of. In her own words, "increasing awareness of the cultural embeddedness of narrative" (Bal, 2009, p.322) is what leads her to combine narratology and cultural/ideological readings in a more effective way. Therefore, in my analyses, I will mainly be referring to Mieke Bal, an innovative narratologist who argues that narratology is not away from politics and should be used to make cultural and political readings of any text around us.

The first chapter of the thesis will focus on the historicity of Turkish modernization after the Republic was founded, with main critiques made about it. After Turkish Republic was founded in 1923, the young republic had several tasks to accomplish before it: to build a state with its all institutions from the ground, recovering the effects of many wars made in last decade, to build a nation and erase its connection to Ottoman Empire, and last but not least, to transfer all the ideas and

values that is the base of republican state to all citizens. About this last goal, around the 1930s, the founding elite group, unwillingly, started to admit that they kept failing. Political and practical reasons behind this unsuccessful transfer have been discussed in different areas, such as history, political science and sociology. These sciences have developed their own critical tools to read the history of modernization in Turkey. What literature can add to these discussions is, for me, reading the same phenomena with its own tools and thus, providing alternative ways of reading it. The modernization journey of Turkey has not started with the foundation of the republic. It is possible to date this history back to the Selim the Third, to the modernization of Ottoman army in 1793. (Telli&Yılmaz, 2020) However, with the foundation of the republic, the modernization journey has taken another path with its merge with the nationalization and secularization. The focus of the thesis, thus, will be the modernization after the foundation of the republic.

In the sub- chapters titled “Reading Turkish Modernity as Belatedness” and “Reading Turkish Modernity as Being-in-Between” I touch upon two popular ways of reading non-western modernities: modernity as belatedness and modernity as being-in-between. Through the analysis of politics of the poem, I will be referring back to these two kinds of reading and compare them in relation to the text. This chapter aims to demonstrate at which points these two models fail in understanding periphery and why different interpretations of these are necessary.

The second chapter is titled “Narratology”, in which I introduce narratology as a field and analyze both, the ways of making a narratological analysis as well as the elements of a narrative. Here, I will also mention the term self-narrative -as a subtitle of narration, is as both a process and a production in which the subject builds the story of its own life- with which, I will, bring another dimension to the relation

between politics and narratology. This chapter underlines that narration can never belong to the individual. Narration has to carry pieces, notions, schemes of a general system: that could be society, history or ideology. In a world where “the personal is political”, no single piece of narration can be isolated from a system anymore. Therefore, any self- narrative, focusing on only one’s life reflects the narrative mechanisms of its society and time. The chapter leads the question of what narratology can offer us as a tool to the next chapter which analyzes the poem’s books in three different groups:

The first group involves Books I and II. Both of them take place in the train and in these two books, half of the characters are introduced to the reader from different angles. The constant change of the narrator, who is telling the story, and the focalizer, who is seeing the object narrated, is used as a way to claim a political stance. By changing narrator-focalizer levels, the narrator keeps creating or abolishing varying stages of awareness between the characters themselves and the reader. By playing with the episteme, first, the narrator creates the common theme for these two books: “confusion”, and makes his political position clear among the characters. This chapter will also focus on the effect of description on the way the characters are perceived. As a further step for using narratology in revealing the culture of the society, I will also focus on self-narratives in the chapter, and try to show how the peasant lost the connection from the world they are in.

The second analysis will focus on Book III only, with the theme of “limitation-isolation”. The space, as a narratological element is crucial in this chapter, since, the prison and the hospital, two spaces the book focuses on define the limits of the actors and construct a space of isolation. Limitation will also be discussed in the field of agents, as the obstacles put between them and their goal they

wish to achieve. This chapter will demonstrate the ways in which ways the state positions itself against the people.

Finally, Books IV and V will be analyzed under the theme of “inevitable witnessing”. In this analysis, Mieke Bal’s reading of narratology and photography, and the effect of photography created by the narrative will be discussed. These books are where the narration style changes and the strong images of the characters stand out. The narrator does not intervene in the scenes and keeps its distance from beginning till the end. The ethics of not intervening is an approach utilized in the art of photography as well; which makes the discussion of narrative as snapshots, the politics and the ethical crisis that witnessing creates more meaningful. This final theme will reveal the relationship between the state and the people have on the periphery where the conditions are: unchanging and uncomfortable, and the end result is always dehumanization caused by the state.

The conclusion will briefly look at all the discussions introduced throughout the thesis. After having discussed the themes of confusion, limitation- isolation and inevitable witnessing, the fact that the state leaves the periphery unseen and unheard will be underlined. The methods used in narrating the text reveals these themes as the experience of the periphery, moreover, makes the reader experience the same through reading the text which also goes for the readers of this thesis. The narratological analysis of the text will show how the political claim of the narrator is embodied by the text, and also show how narratology becomes an important tool in reading culture and politics. As a final goal, I propose using narratology as an alternative method of reading Turkish modernization, from a more individual-focused perspective. My inspiration is Nazım Hikmet, who writes “the epic of the

defeated” (Dolcerocca, 2016, p.114), and the story of the modernization that the defeated faces is a field that needs to be further highlighted.

For the title of the thesis, I chose to keep the original name of the text instead of the translated name since this is a study trying to find ways to give voice to the very experience of this country and the translated name of the novel would not do justice.

My aim is not to take literary texts as case studies for social arguments, on the contrary, to let literature speak for itself. Literature’s value lies in its power to make the unheard stories heard. In this thesis, I want to go back to the roots of the history of invisibility that a group in this country have been experiencing, and let their stories be heard.

TURKISH MODERNISATION AFTER THE REPUBLIC

Nazım Hikmet's text is a critique of Turkish modernization and the ideology behind it considering the situation the peasant is living in. Before analyzing the text by the tools of the narratology, in this chapter, I will historicize the process the text is criticizing. This chapter will build the historicity of the reasoning of my argument, and also, discuss the position of the peasant in relation to state:

The modernization history of this country goes back to the 18. Century. Niyazi Berkes, for example, in *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (1999) takes the modernization history of this country from 18. Century and makes a survey of all attempts till the revolutions after the foundation of the republic. He highlights the secularization emphasis in the revolutions after the republic. Berkes argues that this emphasis makes the revolutions to be about all aspects of daily life, since, Islam is a religion that has regulations about many things ranging from clothing to education, from law to daily routines. Therefore, as Berkes (1999) states, in the quest of secularization, the solution is clear: "If we want to survive, we have to secularize our view of religion, morality, social relations, and law." (p.465) This solution extends the limits of reforms to any field touching the daily lives of the people. Metin Heper (1993), also makes a list of these areas where the revolutions took place:

Often called a 'cultural revolution', it quickly brought in secularization of government and education (1924-1925), the Latin alphabet to replace the traditional Arabic-Islamic script (1928), European theatre and music, and a Western educational system from elementary schools to the universities, with many of the professors at first recruited from Europe. As it has been aptly argued, these were bold and radical moves: the reform of the alphabet demolished the last relic of past Turkish culture as the Latin alphabet was the common origin of European culture. As a consequence of the legal revolution, the civil code no

longer constituted the point where there would be constant communication between God and his community through divine law, and the unequivocal recognition of the sovereignty of the people paved the way for the emancipation of man from religion. These reforms were consolidated during the first five decades of the Republic as Turkey lived under the dominance of ‘throughgoing Westernizers’ (p.9)

Secularization, modernization and westernization are entangled in a way that it is no longer possible to decipher one among the others. These three movements are merged into “civilization” and civilization is put as a goal that must be accomplished. There was no “it would be better” or “if”, it was a “must” to reach the level planned for society. Ahmet Agaoglu’s (1928) book *Üç Medeniyet* is crucial to understand the perception of “must” in this desire to change (as cited in Berkes, 1998): “This is possible only by accepting openly and unconditionally the mind as well as the behavior of the civilization which we are bound to imitate.” (p.465) There are two important points in this sentence: first one is the use of the phrase “to be bound to imitate”, which shows that the change, in the form of imitation, is seen as the only solution and the only way to follow. And the second one is the acceptance of the mind. It is obvious that transferring only the behavior or institution would not be enough to reach the level of civilized societies. It was also needed to be able to transfer the mind of it to our society. This is the point where the expectation of the state from the citizens gets complicated. The difficulty of satisfying this expectation makes us question according to whom the expectations are set, who is the object and who is the subject of them.

In the preamble of the civil code, made as a result of modernization of the law system, it stated: “We must never forget that the Turkish nation has decided to accept modern civilization and its living principles without any condition or reservation...

The Turkish nation, which is moving with determination to seize contemporary civilization and make it its own, is obliged not to make contemporary civilization conform to the Turkish nation, but to adjust its steps to the requirements of contemporary civilization at all costs” (Berkes, 1998, p. 471) These sentences give us the answers asked above: according to the preamble, it is the Turkish nation that has decided to realize all these reforms. The subject is the Turkish nation who set the expectations and also the object is the Turkish nation from whom it is expected to meet them.

Berkes highlights another point here, that the regulations are not made according to the customs and cultures of the society. On the contrary, regulations put a formula and a level that the society should reach and meet even if it is at the cost of their culture. (Berkes,1998, p. 471) Here the portrait demonstrated is a society unified around a goal of getting civilized and determined to accomplish this goal at all costs.

However, the reality was different than how it wanted it to be. To begin with, there was not a unified society from two different perspectives: first one is the distance between the elite group and the illiterate peasant. And the second one is the distance between the state and the people. I will elaborate on these two points where the unified society picture is falling apart.

The excitement of building a new state and enlightening people did not last long for the elite group taking this responsibility on their shoulders. There were different reactions from the first encounter with peasants and people in the villages. Feroz Ahmad (1998), quotes from Berkes’ *Bazı Ankara Köyleri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma (Research on Some Ankara Villages)* (1942, p.93) a passage about Berkes’

ideas after visiting some villages. Since it is Ahmad's translation, I will quote it here without changing or paraphrasing. In this passage, Berkes states: "My great gain from this first introduction to the peasant was to learn that he was the most sensible person in the land The Turkish peasant (perhaps like peasants the world over) is not reactionary. There is no peasant who says: 'I don't want to change; it is a sin to make progress.' The ones who say this are the true reactionaries and liars." (as cited in Ahmad, 1998, p. xviii) Berkes' confusion is because of seeing how a peasant is different from how he is told and thought about. He was a part of an educated group that most of whom was officially or unofficially assigned with educating illiterate peasants, even though Berkes was not one of them, his thoughts can show us how these groups of elites were thinking about people in the villages.

Tanıl Bora (2020), exhibits a survey about the disappointment of the elite group to society. Şükrü Kaya, who is one of the key statesmen involved in the formulation and implementation of the Kemalist reforms", was one of these taking up the responsibility of educating people. Around the end of the 1930s, he states: "The people whose lives we have secured are "mute" "they do not know that we are struggling for them." (Bora, 2020, p. 133)¹ The phrase "mute" is crucial for my further discussions on the first two chapters of *Manzaralar* since the question regarding who gets to speak is one of the main grounds to consider the state's relation to the people.

Yunus Nadi, a representative in the parliament and also the founder of the newspaper *Cumhuriyet* (Republic), in a letter he writes around the end of 1930s,

¹ : Unless otherwise is stated, Turkish translations are mine: "Bu milletin bütün fertleri bizim fikirlerimizi anlayacak hale gelene dek, hiçbirimizin müktesebatı ve fikriyle övünmeye hakkı yok" 1937'de "Hayatım, hukukunu temin ettiğimiz kitle"nin "dilsiz" olduğunu söyler; o kitlenin kanunları ve "bizim onlar için çalıştığımızı bilmeyişi"

states: (about all the reforms done since the foundation) “...we have made propagandas as if the people understand, our country understands them. It seems now that we have made ourselves believe in our propaganda... Now we understand what is missing in this country: it is the principles that keep the revolution alive.”² (Bora, 2020, p. 134) What Yunus Nadi states are an open confession of the existence of a discourse in early republican era in the sense that a narration different from the reality is used as a tool for reaching a goal the state determined. The more this narration is advertised, the greater the gap between the reality and the narration becomes.

The second point where the unity is broken and turns into a hierarchical structure is where the state put a distance from the people. Metin Heper, (1985) makes a survey of how the state is considered throughout the history of Turkey. In the chapters following the foundation of the republic, he highlights the transference and the diffusion of the reforms, the way followed is “from above” since the people are not educated. In fact, Heper (1985) argues: “Atatürk thought that consulting the public really amounted to shaping it.” (p.50) It was an accepted argument that the mission of “elevating people to the level of contemporary civilization” I mentioned above could be only achieved by making decisions for the people. Heper clarifies what Atatürk has in mind in thinking such: “He assumed that the people had great potential. It was necessary, however, to activate this potential. The people by themselves were neither willing nor capable of achieving this basic goal. During the

² Bunların hepsini memleket anlıyor ve milleL anlıyor diye propaganda yaptık. Anlaşılan, yavaş yavaş kendi propagandalarımıza kendimiz inanmışız... Memlekette... Eksik olan şey anlaşıldı: O başarılan istiklal ve inkılabı yaşatacak prensiptir.”

long centuries of the personal rule of the sultans, the people had lost their capacity to take the initiative.” (Heper, 1985, p. 50)

At this point, I would like to add a notion into these discussions. In the last sentence of the paragraph above, the phrase “the capacity to take the initiative”, I argue, has different reflections on the elite group and the people. For the elite group, the lack of capacity to take the initiative is because of being illiterate and till the education elevates the people up to a point that people finally make their own decisions, as a temporary measure, only for a short time, state should be the one deciding and taking actions for them. The effect of this idea on the people, and therefore, the reflection of this thought on people is the realization of the inexistence of and the ignorance toward their agency by the state. I am not using the word “loss” for depicting this effect since people had no agency in terms of political initiative in the Ottoman era either. Something inexistent cannot be lost. Agency is that subject sees the effect of its actions on the external world. Making decisions, building reason-result; cause-effect relations between actions and outcomes are what supports the sense of agency. What the state and the elite group ignores and what the people cannot obtain is the agency of people, considering decisions are made for them and they cannot follow the changes in the external world.

Heper’s (1985) further explanations on Atatürk’s thoughts about revolutions also make the distance between the state and the people clearer:

The true revolutionaries and populists were those who could discover ‘the real orientations and the collective conscience of the people.’ Atatürk talked about people’s genuine or real feelings, orientations and goals; it follows that he did not consider every feeling, orientation and goal as genuine or real... Those tendencies not conforming to the collective conscience could not be taken as genuine or real. The

‘artificial’ ideas which sometimes were presented as public opinion, could only be taken as personal tendencies. (p.50)

In both cases, the people are a group different from the elites and the state. Elite groups and states are the ones making criteria for being civilized, then making decisions to reach them and determining what has to be done and implementing them on people.

Kadir Dede (2021), in *Edebiyatın Ulusu Ulusun Edebiyatı* makes a deep survey on how one of the tools of nation-building process with the republic is determined as literature and highlights the entangled relation between literature and politics. He argues that the phrase “from above” and the determination put in this phrase shows the hierarchy put between people and state. The determination put in this phrase, he argues, also shows us a radical and concrete will on shaping people. To exemplify the hierarchy placed in this phrase, he quotes Ahmet Ağaoğlu from Shissler (2005, p.301): “people do not know who they are, therefore it is needed to show them who they are, to show them they are Turkish.”³ (as cited in Dede, 2021, p.106)

Dede points out the sentence structure used by the state mentions people, peasants and citizens in passive voice. At this point, he uses a striking analysis made by Ahmet Yılmaz (2022, p.221), as: “Kemalist nationalism is a self-colonial attempt to build a nation from the ground, where the people are the object and the Kemalist enlightened group is the subject.”⁴ (As cited in Dede, 2021, p. 107)

³ Ahmet Ağaoğlu’nun kullandığı “halk kendisinin ne olduğunu bilmez, bu nedenle ona kim olduğunu, yani Türk olduğunu göstermek. gerekir.” İfadesinin (Shissler, 2005, 301) (Dede, 2021, 106)

⁴ Ona göre Kemalist milliyetçilik, nesnesini “halk” öznesini “Kemalist aydınlanmışlar”ın oluşturduğu bir selfkolonizasyonlar yeni baştan bir toplum inşa ameliyesi girişimidir (2002, 221) (Dede, 2021,107)

The argument about colonialism takes us to different discussions, of some of which I will come back later. Here, I want to focus on the fact that people become a passive object of this process in the sense that it is defined and shaped by the state. People are seen as a group that needs to get educated both to elevate to a certain level and also to take the responsibility of acting and deciding for nations' good from a small founding group. It is important to highlight the temporariness of this position projected by the state.

Coming back to the issue of having an effect on this modernization process, Hale Yılmaz's (2016) *Becoming Turkish* gives us an alternative answer. This valuable book is a project that fills the gap in the literature of the modernization process in terms of analyzing its being a cultural and social phenomenon. She researches how reforms took place in everyday lives, how they are realized, what were the reactions given to them and were they able to be perceived in the way the state wanted the people to perceive. Yılmaz mentions Erik-Jan Zürcher's argument from his *Turkey: A Modern History* on the reforms and its effect on people. Zürcher (2008, p.194) argues: "The reforms hardly influenced the life of the villagers who made up the great mass of the Turkish population." (as cited in Yılmaz, 2016, p.7) Yılmaz (2016) agrees with Zürcher to the point where the change in peasants' daily life has changed less than what was expected, but she also disagrees with this statement and argues that since the reforms are more than being about concerning the look but "...extended to other symbols of his ethnic, religious, local and tribal identities", the reforms have changed the daily lives of the people in several ways. (p.7) She argues: "The reach of the state in the lives of small town and village communities was uneven, irregular and incomplete, but it was not nonexistent." (Yılmaz, 2016, p. 7)

This era was also a fight over private and political areas. Kadir Dede, in analyzing the nation building process of Turkey points out that it is mandatory for a citizen to go out and get involved in public life to be a subject in this process. The subject cannot be a citizen, cannot be a part of this building action unless they do not leave their own private area. (Dede, 2021) What we can get from this analysis is that for the periphery, there were two separate worlds. There is a world that the peasants have known and been living in, the world, I think, where they still have agency and power; and there is a public world, which is completely new, full of change and inspectors (state figures) to check whether they have embraced the changes.

In this private world, all the customs had their own cause-effect-result relation that made sense within this world. Metin Heper (1985), about Hat Law, argues: “the changing of head covering did indeed symbolize an important change in mentality for the peculiar circumstances of the Turkish case. For a century the fez had symbolized fears, superstitions, and prejudices. When a man clapped anything, however ridiculous, on his head and called it a hat, he was, in effect, declaring his freedom from all inhibitions.” (p.473) Thus, in a sense, there was an intervention of public life into private life. Now, for the villagers, there are two worlds, in the first one, the private one, there are symbols that are losing their meaning and a new set of values trying to intervene in any field, and there is the public world, in which they are a passive object of the changes and expected to accept and apply reforms in their lives. As Yılmaz (2016) points out, the elite group sometimes “tried to minimize the scale and the importance of the practice.” (p.100) However what they missed is that the practice is not only about phenomenon, it is also a production and reflection of a world of values. So, we have a subject living in two different worlds where one is about to dominate the other.

Yılmaz (2016) makes a conclusion about the embracement process of the revolution as reasons such as “question of finances' ' and “lack of interest” led to some revolutions, such as the alphabet change and campaigns for increasing literacy to achieve limited success. (p.177) What is more interesting is that a survey made after the alphabet revolution shows that “For many of these people, the questions of approval of or resistance to the new alphabet were irrelevant.” (Yılmaz, 2016, p. 161) Dress reforms caused “...a much more complicated picture than either total compliance or total resistance.” (Yılmaz, 2016, p. 74) What is common in the process of transferring the revolutions to the public is that cultural, economic and class factors led to uneven reactions among people and barriers put by these factors sometimes could not be overcome. I think this might be a result of the sync-existence of two different worlds. It is not a co-existence since they cannot exist together but only for a time, it was possible to capture them existing at the same time. Differences in reactions towards the revolutions show us the points where the new world introduced by the public could or could not beat the private world.

Discussions about whether republic and empire were a story of continuity or a complete change takes an important place in the Turkish modernization process. Faroz Ahmad, (2008) states: “Some have argued in favor of continuity, claiming that the architects of the Republic belonged to cadres who had acquired their experience of politics after 1908. That is true, though the transitions from empire to nation-state, from monarchy to republic, from theocracy to a laicist/ secular state and society, seem sufficient reasons to strengthen the claims for change, even for revolutionary change.” (p.226) The fact that the intellectual development regarding a nation was planned and done by a center and executed on the nation, the people make these changes something closer to a break and revolution rather than continuity. (Dede,

2021, p. 101)⁵ Selçuk Çıkla (2021) , similarly, in *Türkiye’de Rejim ve Edebiyat* uses the phrase: “Republic is both to look forward and the absolute denial of going back to the past.”⁶ (p.7) On the other hand, Niyazi Berkes, in *Cereyanlar* highlights the fact that the argument that Kemalism, in that context, the transition to republic and the revolutions following this transition, means a break is generally supported by a more conservative group of intellectuals who look for finding the roots of the revolutionary thoughts in late Ottoman era to claim a continuity from empire to republic. The claim of continuity based on an Ottoman heritage, makes us reconsider the relation between the change and continuity from a dialectic perspective.⁷ (Berkes, 2020, p. 24)

It is also interesting to see colonial discussions in this context. Berkes mentions Ali Bulaç and Samiha Ayverdi’s thoughts on Turkey’s not being colonized. According to these thinkers, the “wounds” that the colonized subject carries lead it to think, and to produce. Ali Bulac argues that the pain creates an advantage. On the contrary, Turkey, deprived of such pain, is also deprived of intellectual creativity. Samiha Ayverdi, similarly, argues that the colonized, in front of the colonizer, embraces its own identity and defends it, and that is what the Turkish nation is deprived of. (Berkes, 2020, p.96)

There is another argument linking Turkish modernization and coloniality. Erdağ Gökner (2012) claims: “Even though Turkey was never colonized, the official discourses of the republic fabricated a clear distinction between the new national

⁵ “Buna karşılık ulusa dair düşünsel gelişimin tek elden uygulanan bir politikaya dönüşesi, bu doğrultuda yeni yöntemlerin ve mekanizmaların tatbiki ile ulusa dair muhtevanın değişimi göz önüne alındığında, sürekliliğe nazaran bir kopuştan ve yenilikten bahsetmek kolaylaşmaktadır.” (101)

⁶ “Cumhuriyet hem ileriye bakıştır hem de eskiye dönüşün kesin reddidir.” (7)

⁷ “Muhafazakar ve İslamcı tarih anlatısı, Osmanlı’nın sadece parlak geçmişinde değil bu geç dönemde de define arar, Kemalizmin kopuş kurgusuna karşı, devamlılığın izini sürer... eleştirel düşünce tarihçiliği, dikkatimizi kopuşla süreklilik arasındaki diyalektiğe çekiyor” (24)

formation and what had come before, casting the Ottoman state centered in Istanbul as the “colonizer” of Anatolia and Turks.” (p.310) Indeed, the young republic, to legitimize the revolutions, claimed that they were made to give the Turks the place they actually should have among other countries. To make people believe that they are changing to maximize their potential and be able to finally get what they deserve. “finally being free”, “getting free from all chains” were among main messages given to the public frequently. The idea of being kept before and now being free goes beyond enemies who invaded and planned to share Anatolia after WWI. It is because these messages were accompanied with a sense that it is Turkishness that had been chained and by going back to the roots of Turkishness, Turkish people and Turkey will earn the success and praise they deserve. The Republic put the blame of keeping Turkishness weak on the Ottoman Empire since against enemies it was only a war about territories. It was the Ottomans who were the reason that Turkishness is underestimated and depowered. The war was against different countries and was done to protect the territories, Anatolia. The Republic, by changing the narrative slightly shifted the enemy from other countries to the Ottoman Empire.

To summarize, Turkish modernization goes back to the late Ottoman era where changes in society are seen as crucial, however, the center's inability to reach out to the periphery has not allowed the center to accomplish this goal. The Republic of Turkey, which was founded after the Independence War, is built on the idea of building a nation. As Dede (2021) quotes from Kadioğlu (1995), the Republic of Turkey is “a state looking for its nation”. (p.103) Building a state and its nation at the same time caused the founding group to take the duty of shaping and deciding for the nation on their shoulders. The periphery, which has been a periphery for centuries, had its own world, own culture and own meaning. With the foundation of a modern

state, the public sphere has emerged. It became a place where the state set the expectations from its modern citizens, where the state produced its mechanisms of introducing revolutions to people and also of controlling whether the revolutions are applied to their lives. It was, to me, the meeting of two different worlds that one of them should collapse.

The modernization revolutions are done to elevate the state to a level that is planned by the state. The level is justified by the argument that it is what our great nation deserves. As it can be seen, the narration of development and the narration of the nation has merged in the field of modernization. However, this great narration could not be followed by the periphery, nor could the state speak to them. As a result, the peasant and the elite group had two different worlds of experiences. For the former, the economic and the social conditions have not changed, yet the state developed a different way of relating to it than it was in the Ottoman era. For the latter, the program of the state was easy to follow and also it was beneficial to adapt to. So, it can be said that within a great narration of building a nation and a republican state, there were completely different experiences. Thus, it is not possible to apply one single model to read the modernization progress of the country.

Since Turkey is also an example of a non-western country meeting modernity and modernization coming from the western world, generally, the models explaining non-western experiences of modernity are helpful in understanding the era. However, as we will see in the discussion of these models, such great models miss the unique ways of perceiving modernization in a state. The example of Turkey includes different groups facing modernity in different ways and it is significant to see the points where the reading modernity models correspond to and fall short in explaining.

In the analysis of the two of the models used in reading non-western modernities, I will analyze their eligibility in reading the periphery's encounter with modernization and detect the points they miss. I am aware of the fact the words "modernization" and "modernity" refer to two different concepts: the former is a process of changes and revolutions done to achieve a state defined as "modern" and the latter is the quality of being modern. However, they cannot be separated while analyzing a nation's relation or reaction to being modern. The history of modernization of a state reflects how the modernity is perceived by it; the paths taken to achieve modernity also shapes the modernity that the state will arrive at. Thus, these concepts have to be used together in analyzing a society's conditions, understandings and projections in the concept of modernity.

Among different ways of reading non-western modernity, I chose Gregory Jusdanis' model of belatedness and Daryush Shayegan's model of being-in-between-or, disfiguration- since these two models include dominant feelings that can be used in reading a society's meeting modernity. The feeling of lack from Jusdanis' model and the feeling of loss of the reality in Shayegan's model are useful for describing the people's experience in such a condition. However, the models are not limited to these two examples. Before moving onto the analysis of them, I have to mention two more models that I will not be using in my analysis, explaining why I did not choose them:

In the discussion of nation and modernity, the first thinker to be considered is Benedict Anderson. In his *Imagined Communities*, he explains the process of inventing the notion of nation. As the modernity comes into the public life as technology, the publishing sector was among the ones which benefited from it the most. The newspapers published and distributed across the state, as well as the books

circulated, caused the individuals to meet a new epistemological object: an imagined sphere whose members share common history, similar experiences and characteristics. The emergence of the idea of nation, then, is a result of unification of the lives of people living within certain boundaries. Modernity adds new ways of relation between the state and people as citizens, and between the residents as belonging to the same nation. Modernization, then, is a process of unification and resemblance in that context.

Nergis Ertürk (2010) considers the Turkish alphabet reform, that is, replacing Arabic characters with the Latin alphabet, as a practice of phonocentrism and argues that it is a suppression movement, destroying inner differences and guaranteeing a unitary society. The modern has a violence character in it, and under the name of “purity”, the hybridity of the population is annihilated. Unification is achieved at the cost of the erasure of multi-ethnicity. Modernity as the emergence of the unitary and the nation is an efficient critique of the modernization of Turkey, however, it should be directed to the politics of the state. The people are the object to that transformation. That critique falls short in explaining the periphery’s experience since it reflects the practice led by the state rather than its effect on the people.

Another policy-related modernity critique may be done centering on the translation campaign held in the early republican era. The Translation Bureau, which is supported and funded by the state was active between 1940 and 1966 and the activities of the bureau was “a part of the project to westernize and modernize Turkey during the first decades of the Republic.” (Gürçağlar, 2008, p.14) Here, modernization is planned to be achieved by translating western ideas into Turkish, by importing western concepts that are thought to be shared by humanity. Translation of a work can never be considered as the original, it is not said to degrade the

translation of a work, but to emphasize that through translation, a new text emerges. However, the state has an impossible mission in mind: to copy the exact work into the local intellectual world. The dilemma here is the wish to have the original yet choosing the only way that does not lead to the originality. The modernity in this context reflects an ideology according to which the transference of the ideas would be enough to equalize Turkey to the West. Such an ideology is the combination of neglecting the local uniqueness and the feeling of lack with an urge to fill it. This valuable consideration of modernity speaks to the intellectual elite of the country and does not involve the periphery who stands outside of this intellectual circulation.

The literary and intellectual modernity discussions done mostly by the literary scholars miss the experience of the periphery, and this is the reason why Jusdanis and Shayegan's models should be considered for achieving a more experience- focused reading.

Reading Turkish Modernity as Belatedness

Gregory Jusdanis, in *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature* (1991) makes a strong analysis of Greece's modernization process. He argues that Greece modernization was "imperfect" since the majority of Greece did not consider themselves belonging to Europe and its values. (Jusdanis, 1991, p. xiii) Jusdanis (1991) argues: "Belated modernization, especially in nonwestern societies, necessarily remains "incomplete" not because it deviates from the supposedly correct path but because it cannot culminate in a faithful duplication of western prototypes." (p.xiii) Here, he makes a distinction between the path and the

result. Even though the “right” path is taken, there are other factors causing the final picture to be different from the western example. Since those factors are the traditional values and habits of the country, the difference in the result should not be seen as a mistake or inability of taking the prototype. The thing seen as “flaw”, that is not being complete, is not actually a flaw: “Ironically, however, the flaw lies not in modernity's absence but in its purposeful introduction, ignoring autochthonous exigencies.” (Jusdanis, 1991, p. xiii) When the final picture is targeted, then, a real embodiment of the values behind the picture cannot occur. Moreover, when the goal is determined as a fixed state taken from outside, then, the uniqueness of the state trying to become “modern” neglects itself. Considering the fact that it is the events and movements that made modernity possible, it is not realistic to expect from a society that has not gone through the same to achieve the same results. Also, it is impossible to expect a foreseen, stable picture of modernity. I find the Greek example quite valuable, although having different steps, we have followed similar paths considering building a nation-state and developing identity in relation with the west.

Jusdanis (1991) argues that the idea that tradition and modernity cannot coexist is an argument based on a belief, however, “belated” societies, such as Greece, and we can add Turkey into the list, “...exhibit an uneasy fit between traditional and modern construct.” (p.xvi) According to him, “It is possible to see modernity and tradition as continuous” (Jusdanis, 1991, p. xvi).

Jusdanis proves that West modernity is something quite different from what nonwestern societies experience. The modernism movement we have discussed above is a result of a long intellectual history that West shares. The values it produces have both a superficial phenomenon and deep meaning- worlds behind

them. Also, what they go through is a result of specific socio-economic conditions and developments. Nonwestern countries, just by adapting themselves to the phenomenon of it, cannot add its values into their world. The contemporariness used to define modernity make things more complicated and make the modernization to be considered not simply as an intellectual movement or period but a set of values that need to be imported to be able to experience present-ness. Here, this phrase has two meanings interwoven: both being in the present and also being present, existing. Jusdanis, in the example of Greece, argues that it is possible to maintain traditional values and the advantages of modernism. Greece example is close to us in the sense that it wants to consider itself Western. However, it also differs from Turkey since Jusdanis defends a consensus for the traditional and western modern, whereas for Turkey such an agreement has not been reached.

The sense of belatedness demonstrates itself in different ways. Nurdan Gürbilek (2003) detects “statements of lacks” as a result of being a society “belatedly modernized” referring to Jusdanis. (p.599) The Westernization discussions did not start with the foundation of the republic; it dates back to the Tanzimat era. The discussions had the clash of the ideas that “the original is elsewhere” (Gürbilek, 2003, p. 600). The discussions led to two different poles: that anything writers create lack originality and that anything related to the West should be left aside to go back to our roots. Whether it is west or east, the dominant sense here is the sense of following a “trace” (Mattar, 2020, p.x) that cannot be reached and therefore always there is something missing.

Jale Parla, in her book *Babalar ve Oğullar: Türk Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri* (2009), explains this feeling with the sense of the loss of the father. As an epistemological experience, it defines the unreachability of originality, here, the

origin refers to the root, the beginning point. About republican thought, she argues that the east-west opposition that the authors has fallen into since the Tanzimat era was a comment made by Republic defenders to claim the legitimacy of the republic by claiming their roots back to these arguments and to claim that the foundation of the republic has offered the best solution to this dilemma. (Parla, 2009, p. 37)

Belatedness defines never achieving the point that should be achieved and never being in the form that should have been. The lack, the loss, the trace, all of these notions define some place to arrive, and that is what we have seen the most in the Turkish modernization chapter. The state, by regulating daily lives of people, by giving them responsibilities with a new definition of citizenship, defining a level that has to be reached by education, putting out models according to which the citizens should adapt. From this point of view, Turkey's modernization in the era starting with the republic can be explained by Jusdanis' model of belatedness. However, to focus on the periphery, it is necessary to extract something that could define the feeling that periphery feels: the lack. The lack that the state enounces becomes both an observation and an accusation towards the people. The reflection of this accusation on the people might be felt as a distance from the state and the feeling of lack, whose reason and the solution are unknown. The ambiguity hidden in the relation between the periphery and the state obscures the epistemological world of the periphery.

Reading Turkish Modernity as Being-in-between

To analyze another important example of modernism in a nonwestern context, I refer to Daryush Shayegan's book *Cultural Schizophrenia: Islamic Societies Confronting the West* (1997). In this book, Shayegan introduces an important key in reading Islamic world- West encounters: disfiguration. By this notion, he deepens the cliché readings of being in between east and west. I think his analysis would help us to understand Turkey's modernization from a different perspective than Jusdanis, yet we can take it as a complement of it.

In this book, he discusses "mental distortions" that the countries having the crisis of experiencing modernity without going through the processes of building it. Non-comprehension is the key to understanding this distortion in adapting or applying modernity. He argues that the West has always been seen as an invader rather than a trader of new ways of thinking or ideas. As a result, the imported thing about modernism was just the external reflection of it, the mental changes behind this reflection were never completely comprehended. He defines a split, a double reality, in a sense, in which the subject experiences both worlds at the same time. However, he uses the term "wrestling" for defining this experience. The old world the subject knows still exists with its totality and all its institutions built in every single way of comprehending the world, and on the other hand there is the promise of a new way of being, coming from a new world, and the world is pushing the subject to accept this newness. He draws a striking portrait of the subject experiencing it (Shayegan, 1997):

It is true that I perceive them, that I make use of them, that I exercise command over them as well as having to endure them, but somehow they remain apart, suspended in abeyance amid the flux of my memory. I cannot trace their genesis, nor was I present at their birth. I played no part in

the succession of crises which preceded their fabrication, or in the modes of production which made them possible. They are strange, outlandish things that I cannot avoid, things that upset my habits and constrain me in inescapable ways. But there is something in them which I find seductive, which attracts me, something whose support I can hardly do without, even by making every effort. (p.5)

So, “being-in-between” is not that easy to define nor experience. Analyzing nonwestern countries’ modernization process requires understanding the relation between the ideas, the notions and the world. The paragraph below reveals the link between the object and the status of mind that makes it an object (Shayegan, 1997):

The world of objects, the world in which they exist and from which they derive their functions, does not have the same solid reality for my mind as it does in the eyes of someone who conceived and experienced it. I inhabit a world of absence: my thought is concerned with ideas which have no hold on reality. Internal content and external forms are no longer linked organically. (p.6)

The thing creating a world in its fullness is the link between the object and the mind perceiving it. Nonwestern cultures have two worlds with missing pieces, the mind of their traditional world but not the object that it can perceive, and on the other hand, there is the object of the new world but they do not have the ideas that can fully make sense and contextualize the object. It is therefore, a world of absence. That is also why, there is a delay but this delay in reaching the meaning is not temporal but an ontological delay, which leads us to the point I mentioned above: present is both temporal and an ontological term. Jusdanis’ belatedness is a delay, although having ontological results, primarily temporal, whereas in Shayegan, it is completely ontological and epistemological. Shayegan, again, talking as a subject experiencing this absence, states: “I am no more familiar with its genesis than I am

responsible for its results. All I know is that this new world has an implacable logic, that it imposes its ready-made structure upon me, and that I can neither influence its course nor retrace the road it followed to reach the place in which I now find myself” (Shayegan, 1997, p 6). The term agency I have mentioned in the Turkish modernization chapter may be recalled here. In the world of absence, the subject neither knows nor affects the external world. The absence in episteme causes an absence in agency; the notion of self is lost in this absent world. His description of the world around him shares similarities with the peasants’ witnessing revolutions. They neither know why and from where these changes are coming nor do they feel themselves as a subject in its applications. The sense of being lost here is different from what a subject facing modernity would feel in being lost. In modernity, the subject witnesses the collapse of its belief in society, in totality and in the trust of human reason. The world, as a totality, has collapsed and the subject has felt its fragility in the world. There was one reality that has broken and changed. On the contrary, the subject experiencing modernity in a nonwestern country suffers from having more than one reality. The reality his mind is living in and the reality in the external world place on the two poles that cannot coexist together. The subject loses the sense of normality, the world does not collapse as totality, the part the subject knows is invaded by another world.

He uses the term “hurt” to define the confusion here since the schizophrenia is not suffered only in psyche, but “maintained by a whole network of signs which come to me from life, from school, from the streets, from politics, from the bottomless stupidity which turns my days into an eternity of stunned boredom.” (Shayegan, 1997, p. 9) The nonwestern subject is surrounded and the only thing it can do is to experience these two different worlds of paradigms at the same time:

their own paradigms and western paradigms. Here, he disagrees with Michael Foucault since Foucault argues that at a given time there can be only one episteme limiting and shaping the knowledge in a society. Shayegan argues, on the contrary, for nonwestern societies, it is the problem of having two epistemes and two different systems at the same time. It is possible to have more than one episteme, however, the results are; subject's vision is "fractured or scrambled in relation to reality" (Shayegan, 1997, p. 26), two epistemes "constitute a world of sub-reality, of non-lieu" (Shayegan, 1997, p. 60), makes the subject "fragile" (Shayegan, 1997, p. 63), "blind(s) him (the subject) and paralyzes his critical faculties" (Shayegan, 1997, p.72), creates a "a split which is especially crippling" (Shayegan, 1997, p. 72). Why two epistemes create such a destruction rather than a harmonious mixture that we can celebrate is because they distort each other. Shayegan (1997) argues: "...modernity is measured with the yardstick of Tradition, while Tradition is subjected to the violent stresses of modernity." (p. 54)

The problem is that two different worlds are in touch without a bridge that can introduce them to each other smoothly, and as a result, like scripted mirrors facing each other, they make the writings unreadable on one another (Shayegan, 1997):

The paradigm conflicts opposing the third world to the West have now reached an intermediate stage in which two epistemes are intersecting and disfiguring each other. A conflictual, inter-epistemic situation has arisen...Our painful experience demonstrates the contrary: that however variable and incommensurable epistemes may be as a result of the discontinuities which separate them, they are not monolithic, mutually exclusive blocs each of which monopolizes a given period; that they can coexist, at the cost of reciprocal deformation. (p.71)

Distortions make it difficult, almost impossible to live in a consistent world, and this is the most important effect of disfiguring the subject. This is a state where the actions might not follow the ideas and the results might not be calculable in the paradigms it is used in. It is a world of incompleteness, this is a point where we can make connection with Jusdanis, like the example of modernity's incomplete execution in Greece, becomes an incompleteness in the world of ideas and values in Islamic world.

Coming back to modernity, Shayegan (1997) argues: "Modernity was the outcome of an exceptional process, the only one of its kind in the history of humanity" and therefore it is almost impossible to embrace and comprehend it for a nonwestern society not going through the same process. (p.70) In such a society "...ideas which could find no counterparts in social reality could only become masks or ideologies. They became screens shutting off the subject and his vision from reality, and this led to a divorce between ideas and attitudes: the ideas may be the very latest thing in political fashion, but the attitudes remain rooted in stubborn atavism" (Shayegan, 1997, p. 45). Nothing is fully applicable nor could be tracked or followed, ideas and actions remain superficial. Shayegan explains it with the term "graft" and argues: "The graft is a thin veneer covering the unevenness of things: scratch the surface and the faults and defects are revealed." (Shayegan, 1997, p. 76) Modernity's comprehension and application in Islamic societies is, therefore, "only half' finished, only half' functional; half fig and half grape, things which have no sooner come into being than they are old enough to pass away." (Shayegan, 1997, p. 108)

The idea that modernism could be comprehended only by going through the same process has also found supporters from Turkish intellectuals. Tanıl Bora

(2020), in *Cereyanlar* quotes from İhsan Bilgin, states that the hope for an easy and fast modernization is actually an expression of the expectation for a modernization without cost.⁸ (p. 81) The cost is the pain that the subject suffers in modernization, the collapse of the world, the disappointment and the mourning for the world lost. At the end of this long process, what we have is a subject tracing its own identity through pieces found in different moments and a world whose only characteristic is its indeterminacy and deep connection with contingency, where the subject has no power over. Also, modernism comes with new practices defining modern citizenship in which the subject's relation to state is regulated by bureaucracy, the subject, in its individuality, a complete world in itself and society is the existence of different single worlds together. Pain has created an autonomous subject realizing its own existence in the world.

It is clear that the imitation of the institutions creating subject does not guarantee the result of achieving it. However it is not fair to claim that in the Turkish example, the peasant was going through an easy path. Shayegan shows us that the pain of nonwestern is something quite different than the western, and this is our point where the fragmented life of a subject from Turkey is the result of a different process. The western modernism and the nonwestern modernism require completely different analyses. What gets more complicated here is that Turkish modernization also has different characteristics than Shayegan's fundamental nonwestern analysis. Shayegan's subject who is invaded and attracted mostly by global market and economic circulation is different than Turkish subject who is classified, regulated and controlled by the state under the name of "nation", which is similar to Jusdanis'

⁸ "...kolay, çabuk, kısa yoldan modernleşme ümitlerinin yansımasıdır; mimar-yazar İhsan Bilgin'in (doğ. 1953) tanımıyla bedelsiz modernleşme beklentisinin bir ifadesi." (Tanıl Bora, 2020: 81)

Greece example due to their similar histories of building nation after separating themselves from the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, while Jusdanis defines an agency in subject's following a trace, Shayegan declares the loss of agency, and his point is what I find closer to Turkish example. Therefore, I argue that, Turkish subject has similarities with both Shayegan and Jusdanis, and both of them are more complicated than an Anglo-American modern subject. Where things get complicated, we should go back to roots, and that is why I am looking at the narrations told by the subjects of that era. I argue that both of the models I have discussed above have some points corresponding to the experience of the periphery, however, there are some nuances they cannot catch in the reality of Turkey. Narratology as a method fills the gaps of these two models and deepens the readings they offer.

NARRATOLOGY

Any written or spoken expression might be defined as narrative and the act of it as narration, therefore in the context of this research when talking about narrative, I am referring to the telling of an event or a series of event as a meaningful unit. This specific usage of narrative is so close to the notion of “story” that has an important place in narratology terminology, however, at the same time, its distinction is critical, as we will see in Bal’s argument of three levels of a narrative.

A story might be defined as a series/ sequence of events. This term is, in a sense, introduced by Plato in *Republic*, where he differs the matter (logos) from the manner (lexis) (3.392c). Here, *logos* is the story and the manner is how this story is told. A similar distinction, later, made by Aristotle in *Poetics*, who, narratologists deem to be the writer of the first narratology pieces. (Liveley, 2019, p. 26) In *Poetics*, he differs story from plot. According to him, a story is vastly different from the plot: there is a totality of events and there is plot, a selection and narration of events selected from this totality. (Liveley, 2019, p. 26) In that sense, plot is an arrangement of events. For Aristotle, for a plot to be successful, it is necessary to follow the rules of coherence, unity, and a probable or necessary sequence of events. Then, he argues that causal and logical connection is as crucial as temporal connection. (Liveley, 2019, p. 36) However, the way Aristotle builds narrative becomes even more interesting considering the fact that the audience is expected to build the connections not given: “...where there are no real or logical causal connections between two random or coincidental events (Poetics, 9.1452a 4–10), an audience will itself invent or supply some kind of causal connection.” (Liveley, 2019, p. 38). The fact that the

audience builds the connection when it is not explicit in the narrative proves, in a way, that narration is how we make sense of the world.

Narration, as Genevieve Liveley (2019) highlights, the act of choosing pieces and eliminating the parts that do not fit in the totality of the narrative. (p.6)

Therefore, it might be distorting and changing the sequence of events in order to reach its goal or give its message. Story is the material and the plot is how we want to make sense of it, in that sense, plot is the production. When it comes to narrative, since it is an expression of an event or series of events and it has a narrator, we can say that any narrative is a production as a whole: with its election, combination and being directed to a final or a message.

As Genevieve Liveley makes a survey in *Narratology* (2019), the difference of the way that event happens and the way that they are narrated is a point agreed on through the history of narratology. For Russian formalists, for example, fabula (story) and syuzhet (plot) are totally different two terms. (p.114) And the logic in the series of events, and as a result, allowing the reader to find a narrative plausible or not, maintains its place in the definition of narrative through centuries.

Liveley talks about how Russian formalist kind of follow the Aristotelian sense of narrative in the sense that Russian formalists highlights the crucial role of a given world in narratives. They argue that narratives "... presuppose an understanding of the world, rather than producing it." (p. 164) This means that a narrative is seen as probable by the audience only if it fits in the world the audience knows. We can also say that, in this context, narrative and the world in the mind of the audience takes a role of checking each other: every time a narrative agrees with the world, both the world and the narrative is checked and considered as accurate.

Narratives, then, also ways of controlling the accuracy and legitimacy of the ways we comprehend the world.

I have argued that narrative is first: elects and depicts the pieces it is going to tie; and second, reflects the world of the narrator by applying its plausibility in the ways it ties the events. These two arguments lead us to have our first conclusion that connects narrative and politics: by the way a narrative connects the events, we can decode the ways people make sense of the world, and which is shaped by the ideology of its time. Claude Bremond, a semiologist working on narratology, emphasizes the relation between the rules regulating the events in a narrative and ideology: "... the narrated universal is regulated by the same rules as those which control human thought and action. These rules are determined by logical and conventional restrictions... Conventional restrictions are based in ideological and political assumptions." (as cited in Bal, 2009, p. 280)

According to Aristotle, a good plot "must represent one action, a complete whole." (Puckett, 2016, p. 30) Then, he states: "Where raw events rarely announce their ultimate significance in history or in everyday life, literary form allows us to imagine them as merging to produce a single significant whole; as a result, the brute fact of stuff happening is converted, as if by magic, into something meaningful." (Puckett, 2016, p. 30), and there is another sentence that can be read together with this quote: "...the fact that, although we see men and women at different moments in time, those moments will come to make sense within the larger context of a whole life" (Puckett, 2016, p. 41). Going back to Peter Brooks' (1992) definition of narrative as our mode of understanding and finding meaning, then we come to a conclusion that, "life, (is) the matter out of which he forms his narratives, is naturally continuous, unbroken, and total" (p.128), the act of narration is the act of making

sense of the whole. By bringing different pieces together, by enabling us to control the type of relations that we can apply to pieces of events, and by offering us a finite piece of life, narrative encourages us to understand more.

These are the reasons why, narrative theory also deals with “the enabling difference and relation between events... the capacities of narrative to give meaning and order to events and to explore how those capacities seem inevitably to come up against certain apparently necessary limit” (Puckett, 2016, p.121) and as Puckett (2016) observes, theories emerge “...in response to periods of social transformation or social crisis; they emerge when the relation between events and the shared meaning of events seems to have become strained and thus visible.” (p.121)

In another light, Seymour Chatman (1978) highlights the “contextual forces” in plausibility perceived by the audience. Referring to Aristotle’s “probability and necessity”, he argues that it requires and brings a contextual configuration. (p. 45) He argues that prior knowledge and beliefs, familiarity with the language, as well as the characteristics of genre, and prior knowledge of the traditions and prior perceptions about how things should go or be in general (Liveley, 2019, p. 219). That is also why, Puckett (2016) defines narrative theory as “...a study of relations without losing sight of its connection to other efforts to understand and to make stories.” (p.2)

Whereas antiquity focuses on the terms story, plot and their accuracy according to the real world, we now have the “discourse” factor, which is the hidden hero behind story and plot. It is a key element especially when social/historical events are tried to be read from literary texts, since the discourse of the time is absorbed by the text and can be found in any adjective used to describe things, any relation designed between events, any characterization and any classification hidden in the text.

Narratology is interwoven with politics and ideology by its nature thus is an applicable field to make cultural readings. After highlighting the political characteristic of the field, we can move onto the fundamental elements of narratives and basic tools of narratology:

Mieke Bal (2009) defines story as “... the content of that (narrative) text, and produces a particular manifestation, inflection, and ‘colouring of a fabula; the fabula is presented in a certain manner.” and fabula as: “A fabula is a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors.” (p.28) Here, she detects three layers: the text, the story and the fabula. A reader sees the text, reads the story and gets the fabula out of it.

Bal (2009) defines the elements of fabula as events, actors, time and location. Events cause changing the state and actors are the agents causing or experiencing an event. (p.29) She argues that thinking through scenes shows human tendency to spatial thinking, therefore space is an important element. (p.315) The span a fabula occupies is called “duration” (p.307), and events follow a chronology, in an order or an interrupted way. (p.311) When it comes to the elements of a story, that is, the final production of narrating a fabula in a certain way, the elements become more sophisticated and ready to be used to manipulate the reader. The actors are individualized and turn into characters, locations are put in relation to the characters and become spaces, both the characters and the spaces are visualized through descriptions, the time element becomes a material that by slowing down or fastening, defines the rhythm of the story, and the focalization becomes an important part of the story. (Bal, 2009)

The relationship between the focalizer, the narrator and the knowledge will build my analysis of the first two books of *Manzaralar*, thus, they are significant

elements of narrative to discuss. The narrator is the answer to the question “Who speaks?” whereas the focalizer answers the question “Who sees?”. Bal (2009) defines focalization as “the relation between the vision and that which is seen.” (p.217) It is slightly different than “point of view” in the sense that focalization puts the distinction between who sees and who speaks. The narrator and the focalizer, then, could be different. (p.218) Focalization is more about the position with respect to the object perceived. It is “the relationship between the vision, the agent that sees, and that which is seen.” (p.221). The focalizer can be a character, it is called character-bound focalization (CF), and sometimes, the focalizer position is shifted among them, and in such cases, Bal (2009) argues, “we may be given a good picture of the origins of a conflict. We are shown how differently the various characters view the same facts.” (p.225). If the focalizer is an anonymous agent, then, it is, external focalization. (p.225)

For the narrator, Gerard Genette defines narrative distance as the relation between characters’ speech and the narrator’s narration of them and defines three types of distance: in the first one, the narrated is in the most distant position regarding the character’s speech, we hear what the characters say not as quotations, but as the narrative told by the narrator. Genette calls it “narrated speech”. In the second model, we have “transposed speech”, in which the speech is narrated in indirect way. The third one is “reported speech”, in Gerard’s (1983) words, “where the narrator pretends literally to give the floor to the character.” (p.172)

The confusion of the narrator and the focalizer becomes visible in Tzvetan Todorov’s *Introduction to Poetics* (1981); although the concept he prefers, “perspective” causes an undifferentiation of the narrator from the focalizer, the connection he makes builds between the perspective and the knowledge is important.

He makes the difference between the subjective and the objective knowledge of the events narrated, that is, the type of knowledge that a reader can get from a narrative. Both a narrative in the first person and in the third person can give us these two types of information. The reader can see the events from an internal or an external vision, that is either “from inside” or “from outside”, however, this does not guarantee the “depth” of the knowledge a reader can receive.

Monika Fludernik, in her two important books *Towards a Natural Narratology* (1996) and in *An Introduction to Narratology* (2009) makes her own definitions of the field, the narrative and lists the elements of narrative. She prioritizes “experientiality”, in which she talks about the existence of an experiencer and experience for narrativity, even before the plot. According to her, narrativity should be defined as “qua experientiality” (1996, p. 9). Experientiality might be understood as “quasi-mimetic evocation of ‘real-life experience’” (1996, p. 9). She argues that narrativity and therefore narrative “centers on experientiality” (1996, p. 19). In that context, she describes human experience as “typically embraces goal-oriented behavior and activity, with its reaction to obstacles encountered on the way.” (1996, p. 21) and argues that this path that human action follows is what we find in narrative schemas. To summarize her view on experience, we can say that human experience and narration follows the same structure and therefore it should be taken as the center of the narrative. This is the second point we can relate narration and politics: we can read a text by centering on experientiality and get a better sense of the world letting such an experience to happen. But what about self-narrative and the discussion of the theories on self-narrative allowing a reproduction of narratology as an efficient field?

In *An Introduction to Narratology*, Fludernik (2009) argues: “As research is showing increasingly clearly, the human brain is constructed in such a way that it captures many complex relationships in the form of narrative structures, metaphors or analogies.” (p.1) Beyond its match with how our brain works, it is in our nature to turn stories into plots in narrating events to highlight important moments for us:

In reconstructing our own lives as stories, we like to emphasize how particular occurrences have brought about and influenced subsequent events. Life is described as a goal-directed chain of events which, despite numerous obstacles and thanks to certain opportunities, has led to the present state of affairs, and which may yet have further unpredictable turns and unexpected developments in store for us.” (p. 1)

Here, we see the parallel she draws between experience and narrative. She takes a self-narrative as a story that the subject chooses and eliminates from their own experiences and makes it a meaningful unit.

Peter Brooks (1992), a literary theorist who applies psychoanalytic perspectives into his analysis, builds the link from narratology to the next subtitle on self-narrative. He argues that the plot “...hold(s) the promise of progress toward meaning.” (p. xiii) It is because social and historical conditions have led the human mind and expectation to understand things when they are offered in a plot. Therefore, narrative becomes “... the necessary mode of explanation and understanding” (p. 7) In plots we seek for meaning and thus, narrative discourse is “... the organizing dynamic of a specific mode of human understanding” (p. 7). By doing so, he argues that it becomes possible for us to link literary criticism to humans. Liveley (2019) argues that Brooks’ model of narrative “... is the awareness that plots are not passively received but actively processed—together with the comprehension that certain narrative structures prompt and shape those processes” (p.230). Considering what has been discussed till now, it can be said that since our minds work in

narratives, the rules governing a narrative -coherence, unity, plausibility- are the rules explaining how our brain works while trying to understand the world.

Beyond their commonness in making-sense, the narrative and the self have a deeper connection. In the field of philosophy of memory, it is agreed on that there are basically two types of memory: first one is semantic memory which is used to store and use propositional memory, in other words, facts and knowledge. The second type is episodic memory, which is related to the moments that the subject has experienced. Autobiographical memory is based on episodic memory, however, researches have shown that it is developed later than episodic memory, considering the power of the sense of self in this type of memory, concludes that it is narrating a subject's who it is, by electing and connecting pieces for episodic memory. (Fivush, 2020) "Our sense of self is intricately linked to our memories of our personal experiences; what happened, how we understand and interpret these experiences and how we link them together into a coherent narrative of how I became the person I am." (p. 20). Then he gives an example of a patient, whose hippocampus, the part of the brain responsible for memory, was destroyed, and who, after this illness started not being able to connect his moments and had to live only in moments and cannot produce a self with a past and a present anymore. (p. 20) This example shows us what autobiographical memory is, it is a general structure connecting our past, present and future projections about ourselves. By these connections, he argues that we "...create meaning from and about our lives; we begin to construct an overarching sense of coherence and purpose as we link events into longer timelines that relate our experiences to our developing values and beliefs" (p. 22).

H.E Barnes (1998) defines the term autobiographical memory as "a coherent story of me" (as cited in Fivush, 2020, p.22). Underlining narration as an act of

choosing and eliminating events according to previous meaning structures, how one tells its own story shows us which connections between events and which paths fits into meaning-production mechanisms. Referring back to the notion of agency, the capability of making changes in the external world, can be read together with the existence of a coherent story of the self. Since events are seen in reason-result chains, an agent being able to narrate his life in such connections, is also able to detect his effect on the external world. A break in self-narrative, then, might result in the loss of agency. This is an important discussion considering the periphery's questionable agency against the state. Deprived of being an agent, the periphery might be experiencing such a break in their self-narratives. A narratological analysis focusing on these narratives would reveal this connection, contributing to the ideology of the text that narratology can reveal and support.

Another political dimension of the self-narratives is that it is not only the subject but also the social environment who produce self-narratives of each individual. Fivush (2020) argues:

It is through co-narrating our past with others that our memories move from accounts of what occurred to layered interpretations of what these events mean for self and for others. When we remember the personal past, we do not simply recall what happened; we recall what we now remember happening then as seen through the prism of dynamically evolving perspectives on the event over time. (p.22)

This perspective also supports the idea that what is seen as making sense is one of the factors, and maybe, actors in narrating our own story. Then, the society, beyond manifesting which structures are meaningful, re-produces its manifestation in every single self-narration again and again.

Self-narratives share the same criterias with any narratives, therefore, can be subject to an analysis made by using the same tools. Self-narrative aims to give the sense of continuity and coherence. (King, 2000, p. 2) For continuity, it connects yesterdays and today's subject and also the subject from the future regarding future projections and plans. Considering the patient example given in the beginning of this chapter, we can say that by connecting past, present and future, self-narratives save us from getting trapped in today. There is a temporal quality to it that it connects events in diachronic order to get meaningful explanations and causations from them. It also provides an understanding how things have happened in the way they happened. Dan McAdams (2016) argues that we connect events from different times in a sense of continuity and evolution because in this way "...although self-elements are separated in time (and in content quality), they can be brought meaningfully together in a temporally organized whole." (p.188) Nicola King (2000) gives the example of the traumatized subject, who cannot connect two selves before and after the traumatic event. In a sense, the narrator has changed after the traumatic event, another subject emerges and the result is "the human subject whose identity and sense of life-continuity have been profoundly disrupted by trauma might be in need of the restoration of the kind of 'wholeness'" (p. 4)

Coherence is one of the keys to make the subject believe that events can be linked in some way and there is no absurdity in life, which can be circled back to Aristotle's argument in *Poetika* that the audience would connect the events even if there is not. Andrea Smorti (2020) states: "This is because narrative is able to construct a frame that makes all of these "absurdities" plausible within a certain type of world." (p.3), "...when the reconstruction of events is inconsistent and incomplete, he feels the need to repair the faults and to provide a more plausible answer." (p.6)

The need for coherence reveals itself in self-narrative's following narrative's elements. Dan McAdams (2016) mentions that life story, or self-narrative, meets temporal, biographical, causal, and thematic coherence. (p.190) Causal coherence is important for making sense of life in general. McAdams (2016) defines it as "...to provide narrative accounts of one's life that explain how one event caused, led to, transformed, or in some way is meaningfully related to other events in one's life. Traits, attitudes, beliefs, and preferences may now be explained in terms of the life events that may have caused them." (p.192)

Self-narrative is a construction in which the consciousness and the actions are united in a way to offer the subject a unique self-history. However, this unique history shares many pieces of it with other self-histories. Both the way we connect the events and the content of this order is given by the society. Social changes are reflected in our self-narratives as context, but beyond that, the way they occur might change the ways we make sense of the world. Going beyond the probabilities we have in mind, they might change our limits of expectations and future predictions, which are, as we have seen in this chapter, a part of our identity. The way we tell our own story, therefore, reflects how we think of the world, our lives and what is our mechanisms in making sense of the events happening to us. Which is why self-narrative is important to consider when regarding the connection between narratives and politics.

Mieke Bal, especially in *Narratology in Practice* (2021) makes cultural readings by using the lenses that narratology gives us and her argument is to save literature from being read only in themes when it comes to cultural and political analysis. I want to further her argument here, and suggest going into the self-narratives to discover the realities of the world offered to subjects. Peasants, left

aside during the early modernisation period of the republic, are also lost in the way they make sense of themselves and the world around them. Their self-narratives lack coherence, causality, continuity, and unity; therefore, they are lost. This is why I find the search in self-narratives useful to understand how they are lost, which is a reading supporting Nazım Hikmet's critique of losing periphery. My next chapter delves into the connection between narratological elements I have discussed in this chapter and the ideology and the politics of Nazım Hikmet's *Manzaralar*.



THE ANALYSIS OF MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI

Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları is a critique of the unevenness of the modernization after the republic and the periphery's loss of meaning in the fast-changing country. In previous chapters, first, I have tried to historicize the failure of modernization in distributing its advantages to the people evenly; then, to discuss the alternative way that the text offers to reading modernity, I have introduced the existed ways of reading non-western modernities; and, since I will be using narratology as my method in reading the poem, I have drawn the narratological structure as a frame. In this chapter, I will use the tools I have chosen to prove my argument and connect the poem, the modernization of the early Republican era and the narratological analysis.

To introduce the text before reading it through a narratological lens, I will give some information regarding the text, its politics and its translation. 17.000 lines long, epic in verse, the text offers a panoramic view of the country, through small pictures of different characters who have seen the end of the empire, the wars, and finally, the republic. Nazım Hikmet started to write the text in 1941, when he was in Bursa prison, and sent pieces from the poem to his friends to keep. It was completed by 1945 and he kept revising them until 1950. When he was finally released, he was sent to exile. In the Preface to the Russian translation of the poem, in 1961, he states that he has left Turkey in 1951 without the scripts of *Manzaralar* since he feared that they would get destroyed if he got caught. The text was left to different friends of him in pieces. Some of the pieces were destroyed by the police and some friends of him has burnt the pieces they have due to their fear of getting caught to the police.

Until the year 1966, the publication of the poem, the parts of it circulated among the readers of Nazım Hikmet. (Blasing, 2013, p.136). His stepson, Memet Fuat published the manuscripts that his mother, Piraye, who was married to Nazım Hikmet, contrary to what Nazım Hikmet believes, managed to preserve without losing a piece, in 1966. (Fuat, 2001, 701) Till that year, his poetry was banned in Turkey and therefore the poem's first publication appeared in Italy in 1960, and then in USSR in 1962. (Blasing, 2002, 11)

The text includes five books in total. The story begins at Haydarpaşa Garı in Istanbul and continues on the train going to Ankara. The first two books are the story of this journey and people on this train. The third book takes place in prison and hospital, and as if the characteristic of the place they are in determines how the narratives are built, while the narratives in the train are fluid, the narratives in the prison and hospital are about acceptance of the situation and trying to make connection, in a desire for achieving stability. The fourth book focuses on two cities and narrates the peasant's situation against the ağas and the state. The fifth book is shorter than the others, which gives us a scene of poverty and misery from İstanbul that is hard to forget.

I am going to analyze all the books, choosing a different narratological theme that it suits best to reveal the uniqueness of it. The Book I and II will be analyzed under the theme of confusion, the Book III's theme is limitation-isolation and finally, Book IV and V will introduce us with inevitable witnessing.

Introducing this text also requires a brief look at text's relation to the modernist literary tradition. This is not only because the text, by its themes, deal with the modernization of Turkey, but because by its form, it has a connection with the modernist writing techniques. Marian Aguiar (2007) takes this relation as a response

both to the idea of modernity and to the modernism movements in Turkey. She highlights the role of literature in analyzing modernism by its reveal of “the fraught cultural affiliations of modernity” (p. 105). As a poet from a country of which the national modernization project is one of the famous (p. 105), his re-telling of the history of the nation becomes important in reading a non-western modernity.

Aguar (2007) defines modernity as “a mode of relating to contemporary reality.” (p.106) The fact that modernity rejects the past becomes complicated in the example of Turkey, since Atatürk reformatations, as Aguar (2007) argues, ask for “an amnesia as the cost for modernity” to erase the connection to Ottoman times. Aguar (2007) also takes Hikmet’s text as a “challenge to Kemal’s version of modernity”. (p.108) The unevenness of reforms and modernization process that Aguar argues can be seen in Reşat Kasaba’s (1997) comment on Turkish modernization in “Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities” as “the old and the new existing side by side and contending with, but more typically strengthening, each other.” (p.17) *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*, by letting different narratives from people and portraying them in an opposition instead of harmony, reflects the reality of the world it is written in.

Another connection of *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* to modernity is that it might be taken as a modernist text since it rejects old narrative traditions and as Saime Göksu and Edward Timms (1999) argue “modern technique of montage” (p.236). Not only its technique but also its context that “depict(ing) modern space as a place of internal contradiction” (Aguar, 2007, p. 114) enables us to read the text in literary modernism context. Moreover, it reflects the inner thoughts of people, sometimes in a stream of consciousness, for example, Galip, after seeing a young

girl, suddenly starts thinking that he could have had a granddaughter (Ran, 2002, p.5), making the text fit in literary modernism tradition.

Nazım Hikmet sees realism as the most fundamental movement in art, and defines his art under the title social realism, which is connected to his political view, in the sense that social realism aims at reflecting the reality of the society, the peasants' and the workers' (Şakar, 2007, p.57)

Selahattin Hilav (1993, p.28) argues that Nazım Hikmet has a connection with the futurism movement, yet he turns this style into a more traditional, realist way and uses it to reveal the relation between the world and the people. (as cited in Doğan, 2007, p.177)

Talat Halman (1968) explains Nazım Hikmet poetry as such:

Nazım Hikmet was perhaps the most in-fluential innovator of poetic techniques in modern Turkey: he launched free verse and established it as a viable vehicle of expression. He proved that rhetoric can be blended into lyricism, that social protest is not antithetical to poetry and that a rhythmic structure can be based on broken or jagged lines. (p.368)

Nazım Himet has both influenced other poems and be influenced by them. “Nazım’s heart and mind has always been open to be influenced. Even later on, neither the effect of Yahya Kemal nor Pushkin, nor Mayakovski nor Blais Cendrars, nor Nezval and Meyerhold’s influence on him has faded away; but that his poetry has its own sincere story has differed him from the imitated desires.”⁹ (Temizyürek, 2014, p.92) In this sense, his desire for telling and revealing the truth stems from searching for ways of telling it in others’ writings. Zekeriya Sertel, similarly, tells that when he hears Nazım’s poem from his voice, realizes that he is witnessing a

⁹ “Nazım’ın akli ve yüreği etkilenmeye daima açıktır. Daha sonra da, ne Yahya Kemal ne Puşkin, ne Mayakovski ne Blais Cendrars, ne Nezval ne de Meyerhold’un üzerindeki etkisi sönmüştür; ama şiirinin doğrudan kendi gerçek hikayesi olması, önceki taklit arzuların hepsinden farklılaştırır onu.” (Temizyürek, 2014, p.92)

poetry that has never seen or heard before. (1991, p.164) Ahmet Haşim, after the publication of *835 Satır*, draws the attention of intellectuals to the supposed originality that Nazım Hikmet has and argues that Nazım Hikmet's poem has been among the poetry circulated in different parts of the world. (Özarslan, 2003, p.263) Peyami Safa reviews his poetry as “something stemming from the tradition but being shaped by a new construction style”. According to Safa, Nazım Hikmet is an architect. (Özarslan, 2003, p. 292) Özarslan (2003) mentions that in the time Nazım Hikmet's poem started to be known and circulated, Yahya Kemal, Ahmed Haşim, Faruk Nafiz ve Necip Fazıl had great number of readers. From the last generation, Abdülhak Hamid and Cenab Şahabettin also had a wide circulation. (p.239) These were the figures of idolization, according to Hikmet, and any idol should be destroyed in the quest for narrating and reading the truth. Yakup Kadri and Nazım Hikmet became two poles of the clash between the old and the new; Yakup Kadri blamed Nazım Hikmet for rejecting the past and Nazım Hikmet invited him to setting free from the boundaries of the past and to focus on the reality of the present. (Özarslan, 2003, p. 251)

The urge of telling the sincere stories is embodied in giving voice to those unheard, according to Nazım Hikmet. In *Yaşamak Güzel Şey Be Kardeşim*, Hikmet says: “Anatolia brought me where I am. The Anatolia I had seen only on the surface, from the outside. My heart brought me where I am.” (2013, p.27) His concern for the people of Anatolia has not found similar echoes in the politics of the republic. Vâlâ Nureddin narrates the scene where Nazım Hikmet meets Mustafa Kemal and Mustafa Kemal tells him to write poems with strong purposes. As he states, their conversation does not take too long Mustafa Kemal leaves after receiving a telegraph. (Nureddin, 2011) In 1921, Nazım Hikmet goes to Moscow, to observe what has been happening

there and to get a better education. After his return to Turkey in 1924, in 1925 he learns that he is going to be imprisoned for 15 years, then, he goes back to the Soviet Union. In 1928, he is brought to İstanbul handcuffed, but he is released. Until 1940, he is wanted to be imprisoned several times, but every trial has come out in favor of him. In 1940, he is sent to the Bursa Prison, where he pens *Manzaralar*. Orhan Kemal, an esteemed writer in Turkish literature, who has spent the three and a half years with Nazım Hikmet in Bursa prison, tells that Nazım Hikmet took some of the portraits from the stories he heard from other prisoners, from their own stories. This information takes us back to a traditional genre of Turkish literature, which is called “sergüzeşname”, the memoirs written generally after being a subject to imprisonment or slavery in a war, or sent to an exile. The authors of such memoirs pen what they see and heard when they come back to the city they inhabit. From this perspective, it can be said that Nazım Hikmet continues a tradition in a much-modernized way since he does not narrate the stories he hears with the emphasis of the strangeness, on the contrary, he argues that what he listens from these people is the reality of the country.

Manzaralar has a connection with Nazım Hikmet’s other poems in its themes aiming reflecting the reality of people. For example, his poems such as “Yalınayak” and “Açların Gözbebekleri” centers the lives of the villagers and the conditions they inhabit. (Uysal-Gliniecki, 2020, p.15) This link goes beyond sharing theme, however, with one of his poems, *Kuvayi Milliye Destanı* since Nazım Hikmet deconstructs his own poem and places it into the *Manzaralar*. Erkan Irmak argues that *Kuvayi Milliye Destanı* -which is written between 1939-1941- is written from a point of view determined by Atatürk’s *Nutuk*; the re-written *Destan* inside the *Manzaralar*, on the other hand is a strong critique of the republic and its execution

due to its failure in resolving the poverty and the misery of the periphery. (2011, p.206) This re-writing process involves leaving some parts of *Destan* aside, taking the element of heroicism from some figures, such as Karayılan, and making some normal figures in *Destan* a heroic character, and taking outside of the *Destan* and placing into the *Manzaralar*, such as Kambur Kerim. In Karayılan example, *Manzaralar* focuses on his life before becoming Karayılan as well, in an attempt to humanize this hero. In the example of Kerim, on the contrary, he adds lines talking about an alternative reality in which his efforts would lead him to an end he deserves: becoming a hero. By deconstructing a *Destan* he has written in a way to see the same stories from different perspective, Nazım Hikmet actually applies what he aims at in a small scale. *Manzaralar* deconstructs the notion of epic and changes the perspective from which we see the history of the country. He does the same to a poem he has written before in changing and adding it into *Manzaralar*. This is a move going beyond the classical intertextuality, in which the presence of a text is felt in other text. The intertextuality in *Manzaralar*, changes how the *Destan* and *Manzaralar* can be read completely, and the fact that it is the ideology behind the opportunity of such a re-writing and re-interpreting makes the aim of this thesis more valuable. Decoding the ideology behind the way the story is narrated would add more to the intertextual characteristic of the *Manzaralar*.

After the foundation of the republic, the intellectual group takes the responsibility of educating the people. The word “aydın” in Turkish is closer to “enlightened” rather than “intellectual”. The “enlightened” has a mission and to accomplish it s/he goes to Anatolia to share the light s/he has with the people. Such a mission differs Turkish “enlightened” from a western intellectual, as Murat Belge (1983) suggests. (p.84) Göksel Aymaz (2007) claims that such a mission is a result

of the long history of the people living under a “patriarchal ethic” since the Byzantine. (p.50) In this long history, the center, to be able to control the territory, has put an effort to keep the people in their places living under the same conditions. In Ottoman era, the first novelists are among the “enlightened” taking the mission of enlightening the people. In that sense, the duty placed on the shoulders of the enlightened group has merged the politics and the literature in that territory. Looking at the Anatolia and looking from the eyes of Anatolia are the results of this ethical concern of the enlightened group. Therefore it is not a surprise that from Nabizade Nazım’s *Karabibik* to Ferit Edgü’s *O*, the novels focusing on Anatolia centers the meeting of the enlightened with the Anatolian people. (Aymaz, 2007, p.53) Around 1950s, the first wave of Anatolian-centered literature, which either romanticize the peripheral life either criticize the people’s conservatism has changed. The focus has shifted to the reality of the people, living under “feudal” ağa’s rules, in unchanging conditions and surrounded with unsuccessful attempts of the center’s communicating with them. Nazım Hikmet’s *Manzaralar*, is both the pioneer and the most successful literary piece of this second wave. (Aymaz, 2007, p. 55) Nazım Hikmet’s first shock in his meeting with the reality of the Anatolia was due to the literary tradition of pastoral and simple lives of the people in periphery. His poetry, thus is, in a way, an answer to the reality distorted by such literary texts. By the time he writes “Yalınayak”, in which he narrates barefoot peasantry, for example, Orhan Seyfi’s “Anadolu Toprağı”, Faruk Nafiz’s “Bizim Memleket” are among the poems published, both of them highly romanticize the peripheral life and draw unrealistic portraits of it. (Gürsel, 2001, p.63)

Manzaralar, then, is a dialectic production of the conditions of the day it is written and a literary tradition that is an embodiment of an ethical concern between

the enlightened group and the people. With this poem, Nazım Hikmet comes to a solution and offers an alternative way of reading people's history of this geography: revealing their conditions in binaries they are stuck -state-people, enlightened-people, center-periphery-. Creating a periphery-focused text in a completely new way is similar to what he does by writing a new kind of epic: By highlighting the experientiality characteristic of a narrative, he writes a revolutionary poem that is a continuation of a tradition and a strong rejection of it at the same time.

The translation I will be referring to through the thesis is the one made by Randy Blasing and Mutlu Konuk and published in 2002. Although Nazım Hikmet's poems were started to be translated in 1932, translations made by Nermine Mouvafac, the publication of his first book into English dates 1952, a selection of his poems were translated by Nilüfer Mizanoğlu- Reddy and Rosette Avigod- Coryell. (Göbenli, 2021, p.117) In 1967, a selected translation was made by Taner Baybars. (Göbenli, 2021, p. 118) Blasing and Konuk put a significant effort in translating the poem's texts into English. In the 2002 version of the *Human Landscapes*, they declare that they published one-third of the book in English 20 years ago, and now they finally published the whole poem. (Konuk, 2002, p.vi)

Now, we can move onto the analyses of the five books of the text through different lenses that narratology offers us. For the first two books, I will be using the focalizer-narrator changes as a way of contributing knowledge, and power among the reader and characters; focalization and depiction as ways of revealing the political stance, and the movie-like feature of these books in taking the reader into the text. The theme of this chapter is confusion, which is common in all three lenses I will be using in my analysis. It is not surprising to come across such a theme since Nazım Hikmet's argument regarding the experience of modernity by the periphery is the

confusion. For the third book, I will be focusing on the theme of limitation, which can be taken as another experience of modernity by the periphery, which can be found in those narratological lenses used in this book: the depiction of senses, places and actors' struggle for reaching their aims. The fourth and the fifth book will analyze the change in the narration from being movie-like to creating a snapshot effect and take the narratological tool of snapshot effect with the ethics of witnessing.

Books I-II: Confusion

In this sub-chapter, I will analyze the focalizer-narrator change made throughout the first two books of the text. I argue that every change in these two elements creates a balance or unevenness regarding the knowledge, and as a result, the power between the reader and also the characters. These choices are made to reflect Nazım Hikmet's political stance in his own relation to the characters. Therefore, these changes that are the subject of narratology become a subject of ideology as well. To further my argument, I will also focus on the depiction of the characters that support the idea that Nazım Hikmet wants the reader to have about them.

To move onto the terms focalizer and narrator, it is necessary to define different levels of a text. Mieke Bal (2009), differentiates the terms narrative text, story and fabula. The narrative text is the text telling a story to the reader, a story is the "content of that text" whereas the fabula is "a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors." (p.28) The definition of fabula includes the elements of actors and events. She defines an event

as “the transition from one state to another state.”, and actors as “agents that perform actions.” (p.28)

By text, story and fabula, she defines three layers of narration in regard to the relation between the reader and the event sequence, fabula. These layers reveal the manipulative characteristics of a story. For example, in making the story, the events might be arranged in an order different from the chronological sequence. Or the time of the events might be shortened or lengthened and since the reading experience would take the same time for each page, let us say, the length of the narrative of an event might change its importance for a reader. Descriptions might lead the reader to have some opinions or bias toward characters. Finally, different points of view, which is called focalization, might result in changes in the way the reader perceives the event. So, it should be said that when a fabula turns into a story, the author, as the root of the word suggests, takes the authority to represent the events as it wishes. However, this authority also leads the reader to be able to read the world of the author from the fabula it manipulates. Therefore, as Bal (2009) suggests, narratology and literature is never away from politics. The politics is hidden between the lines and by reading them we can reveal the politics behind any text we read. The politics on the surface of the text, or in the content have been discussed by many thinkers, as I mentioned earlier. Such a political, yet highly valuable literary text should be read through the lens of narratology to reveal its ideology that is interwoven with the experience of the people.

Bal (2009) argues: “the reader first ‘sees’ the text...The fabula is really the result of the mental activity of reading.” (p.34) Considering the structure of the text, written in the form of a “stepped line”, the text itself includes a movement. Therefore, the first interaction of the poem with the reader is an invitation to join the

poem's world, which is fast-changing, sometimes repetitive, and also, broken. In Books I and II, I argue, by playing with the knowledge level of the characters and readers, the narrator creates a similar sense that these characters go through: confusion.

The first lines of the poem are description, the description of Haydarpaşa Garı, the classical train station in İstanbul, for a long time, those leaving İstanbul or arriving at the first time would be the inevitable guests of it. Description has a significant effect on the ideology and aesthetic of the text and moreover, it is a unique way of focalization, which is, making an object seen from a perspective. When focalizer, who directs attention to an object, or, who sees the object is a character, we see the object from the character's point of view. Then, our thoughts about this character may change how we react to the focalized object as well. The focalizer's descriptions may result different feelings depending on who sees it. When the focalizer is at the same time the narrator, like in this poem, a rank of truth is made; the narrator's focalization would be the closest to the truth. It is because when the narrator gives the focalizer position to a character, the degree of the truth decreases due to the personification made for this character. A non- character narrator, an external narrator, on the other hand, has the claim that it is the truth s/he speaks.

Having these discussions in mind, we can compare the two descriptions of Haydarpaşa Garı. In the first two books of the poem, Haydarpaşa has been described twice, which are completely different from each other.

The first description is given in the first lines of the poem, which is also the first lines of the first book focusing on the peasants and transferring prisoners mostly:

Haydarpaşa garında	Haydar Pasha Station,
1941 baharında	Spring 1941,
Saat on beş.	3 p.m.
Merdivenlerin üstünde güneş	On the steps, sun
Yorgunluk	Fatigue
Ve telaş.	And confusion.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.11)	(Hikmet, 2002, p.3)

The second book starts with the same Haydarpaşa Garı, too, but this time, the description has completely changed, as well as the passengers. The second book tells the stories of the elite group among the passengers:

Güliden güzel kokan Arnavutköy çileği	Spring comes to the Haydar Pasha station café
Ve asma yaprağına sarılı barbunya ızgarasıyla gelir	With Arnavutköy strawberries smelling sweeter than roses
Haydarpaşa Gar'ının büfesinde bahar. (Hikmet, 2020, p.113)	And grilled red mullets wrapped in grape leaves. (Hikmet, 2002, p.93)

Sun, fatigue, and confusion versus strawberries, red mullet and grape leaves. The description of the same Haydarpaşa Garı changes according to the passengers experiencing it. The first book is the “the epic of the defeated” in Dolcerooca’s (2016, p.114) terms; whereas the second book is about the elite group. However, Hikmet tells the epic of the defeated not only in the first book, rather, the whole epic belongs to the defeated, which signals us that even this elite class is considered as defeated by Hikmet, which I will elaborate on later in this chapter.

As we have seen from the description, external narrator (EN) sets the tone of the chapter from the beginning. What we can also get from these descriptions is a confusion versus stability: the confusion is the state the peasants and the prisoners

are living in, whereas for the elite group, there is certainty, or at least, they believe so.

As I have mentioned, I will be focusing on the focalizer-narrator changes and their relation to knowledge and power. To do this, I have chosen the characters of Galip Usta, his depiction and his meeting with Fuat; the depiction of Kerim and Basri and their dialogue; and finally, the depictions of Hasan Şevket and Nuri Cemil.

The first character we meet is important, since it is focalized by the narrator on purpose. Just after the lines about confusion, we meet Galip Usta. In the lines depicting him, he is introduced to us by his thoughts found strange by the others throughout the years. The change of focalizer and narrator here is used to introduce the reader to know more than the other characters can see, as a result, sensing the ideas of Nazım Hikmet regarding Galip Usta's situation, which is, the economical fragility that has not been solved by the republic and the narrowing world of Galip Usta as a symbol of people from periphery. The confusion is due to the world that has changed to others but maintained Galip Usta's concerns as it is. Galip Usta is first described by the external narrator-focalizer:

Bir adam	A man
Merdivenlerde duruyor	Stops on the steps,
Bir şeyler düşünerek.	Thinking about something.
Zayıf. Korkak.	Thin. Scared.
Burnu sivri ve uzun	His nose is long and pointed,
Yanaklarının üstü çopur.	And his cheeks are pockmarked.
Merdivenlerdeki adam	The man on the steps
-Galip Usta-	Master Galip,
Tuhaf şeyler düşünmekle meşhurdur: (Ran, 2020, p.11)	Is famous for thinking strange thoughts: (Ran, 2002, p.3)

The description of Galip starts with his place: the steps, which almost draws a picture of him with Haydarpaşa we have just introduced. He is not separate from the place just as has been described, the place he is in completes the situation he is in, helps us to know him better. His description starts with a focalization that can also be seen from outside. If the focalizer would not be the external narrator but one of the characters in the book, s/he could also see his physical traits and that he is thinking something. Then, the first focalization of Galip, that is, being an object of the focalization, is through a Character-bound focalization, giving us the sense that the narrator might be one of the characters. However, in the last line, the information given to us cannot be observed by any other character, then, the narrator goes back to the external-focalizer point and makes the reader change his position back to an external place. Then, he clarifies these strange thoughts, putting the reader in a more knowledgeable position than the other characters:

Kaat helvası yesem her gün” diye düşündü

5 yaşında.

“Mektebe gitsem” diye düşündü

10 yaşında.

“Babamın bıçakçı dükkanından Akşam ezanından önce çıksam” diye düşündü

11 yaşında.

“Sarı iskarpinlerim olsa kızlar bana baksalar” diye düşündü

15 yaşında.

“Babam neden kapattı dükkanını? Ve fabrika benzemiyor babamın dükkanına” diye düşündü

16 yaşında.

Gündeliğim artar mı?” diye düşündü

20 yaşında.

“Babam ellisinde öldü, ben de böyle tez mi öleceğim?” diye düşündü

21 yaşındayken.

“If I could eat sugar wafers every day,” he thought

when he was 5.

“If I could go to school,” he thought

at 10.

“If I could leave Father’s knife shop before the evening prayers,” he thought

at 11.

“If I could buy a pair of yellow shoes so the girls will look at me,” he thought

at 15.

“Why did Father close his knife shop? And the factory is nothing like his shop,” he thought

at 16.

“Will my pay go up?” he thought

at 20.

“Father died at fifty- will I die early, too?” he thought

when he was 21.

“İşsiz kalırsam” diye düşündü
22 yaşında.
“İşsiz kalırsam” diye düşündü
23 yaşında.
“İşsiz kalırsam” diye düşündü
24 yaşında.
Ve zaman zaman işsiz kalarak
“İşsiz kalırsam” diye düşündü
50 yaşına kadar.
51 yaşında “İhtiyarladım” dedi
“babamdan bir yıl fazla
yaşadım.”
Şimdi 52 yaşındadır.
İşsizdir.
Şimdi merdivenlerde durup
Kaptırmış kafasını
Düşüncelerin en tuhafına:
“Kaç yaşında öleceğim
Ölürken üzerimde yorganım
olacak mı?”
diye düşünüyor.(Hikmet, 2020,
p.11)

“What if I get laid off?” he thought
at 22.
“What if I get laid off?” he thought
at 23.
“What if I get laid off?” he thought
at 24
And out of work from time to time,
he thought “What if I get laid off?”
till he was 50.
At 51 he thought: “I’m old-
I’ve lived one year longer than
my father.”
Now he’s 52.
He’s out of work.
Stopped on the steps now,
he’s lost
in the strangest of thoughts:
“When will I die?
Will I have a bed to die in?”
he thinks. (Hikmet, 2002,
p.3)

After reading these lines, the first question we might ask is what is strange about his thoughts. The common thing in all these thoughts is their being related to the possibility of another reality. Sentences starting with “If I could” reflect desires, and with the age of 20, desires turn into “what if?” questions related to needs, the need for earning his life. At the end, his thoughts turn to his end, his death. Paul Goodman (1954, p. 14), in *The Structure of Literature*, contends: “...in the beginning anything is possible; in - the middle things become probable; in the ending everything is necessary.” (as cited in Chatman, 1978:46) His desires about other possibilities comes down to probabilities about earning or not earning money and at the end he thinks about his necessary end, which is his death. Thinking about things that might have been different is common in these thoughts and the fact that they are seen as strange by the people around him shows us that the acceptance of the given life builds the normality of the people around him.

Erkan Irmak (2011), in his book *Kayıp Destan'ın İzinde*, after making a similar comment on these lines, goes on and does some little math. Since he is 52 in 1941, Galip Usta was born in 1889, meaning he was 34 in 1923, an age that he can compare Ottoman and the republic. Since he is 21, he has been dealing with the fear of losing his job, and it is the republic's 18 years of failure that it cannot erase this anxiety from Master Galip's mind.¹⁰ (p.162) Therefore, he takes these lines as a critique of the republic. The early republican economic politics of fast-industrialization held by either the elite group or the state cannot resolve Galip's economic fragility. (Pamuk, 2019, p.1129) Applying this to the discussion about the moment of confusion I would like to underline that the confusion starts with the closure of their small shop. His worries about his life are about his connection to the external world. He has a stable point he trusts and therefore turns his face toward the attention from girls, spending less time working in the shop. However, when the shop is closed, his worries become focused on only himself, whether he will be able to continue earning his living or will he die like his father. We see that, with the things he worries about, his limits of agency also get narrower, and his confusion drowns him. This was the external narrator-focalizer observation of Galip. The external-focalizer aims at sharing its knowledge, and as a result, its critique of Galip's situation with the reader.

Then, the external narrator gives the focalizer space to one of the characters, Fuat. Now an external narrator (EN) narrates that Fuat focalizes Galip, this means, EN narrates that Fuat sees Galip. This change reveals that what the external narrator and the reader knows is also known by Fuat, a young figure who is imprisoned only

¹⁰ "Galip Usta 1941 yılında 52 yaşında olduğuna göre 1889 doğumludur. Yani, 1923'te 34 yaşında olan ve yaşarken her iki dönemin de muhakemesini yapabilecek olgunluktadır...21 yaşından itibaren işsiz kalma korkusuyla uğraşıp durmuştur... 18 yıllık Cumhuriyet de bu korkuları giderememiştir. (2011:161-162)

because of his political thoughts. The fraternity common in Nazım Hikmet's poems is seen in a very small scale here; he wants to build a fraternity between the reader,

Galip and Fuat :

Kelepçeli Fuat
Seslendi Galip Ustaya:
“-Usta,
Yine tuhaf şeyler
düşünüyorsun.”

“-Düşünüyorum evlat.
Geçmiş olsun.”
“-Eyvallah usta.
Düşünmek değiştirmez
hayatı.”
(Hikmet, 2020, p.18)

Handcuffed Fuat called out:
“Master Galip,
“You are thinking strange things again.
“Just thinking, son.
You take care.”
“Thanks.
But thinking doesn't change life.” (Hikmet, 2002, p.9)

Now, the external-narrator gives the information that Galip has strange thoughts to the character focalizer. Information changes the level of narration. It is the external narrator's sharing its authority with the characters, making something only it can know into an info that can be known by the character itself. Any change in the level of the focalizer or narrator is done on purpose. The last change we will see in the dialogue between these characters is the external narrator-focalizer's taking its position back and sharing what is going on inside Galip Usta's mind with the reader. This final change, I argue, is the last step of fraternity, creating a dialogue between the reader, Galip Usta and Fuat, completing the knowledge circle going on between these three actors:

Galip Usta
Bu sefer
Dehşetli bir şeyler düşünerek
Bakıyor kelepçesine Fuat'ın.
Bugüne dek
Farkına varmadan biriken şeyler

Galip looks
At Fuat's handcuffs
And has a scary thought this time.
Things that have built up unknown
Until this moment

Yığınla
Üst üste
Hep beraber
Tıkacını atan bir çeşme suyu gibi
Bulanık
Berrak
Akıyordu kafasının içini
doldurarak:
...
Ne kadar çok adam, ne kadar çok
adam
İşsiz kalırsam, işsiz kalırsam, diye
düşünüyor. (Hikmet, 202, p.18)

Rush
All together
In torrents
Like water bursting from a capped spring
-muddy, clear-
And floor his head:
So many people, so many people
thinking,
'What if I get laid off? What if I get
laid off?' (Hikmet, 2002, p.9)

Galip, after their conversation, gets lost in his thoughts. But before doing that, for a short time, he becomes the focalizer, letting the reader see Fuat's handcuffs. It was something we know from Fuat's description as "handcuffed Fuat", but only when Galip looks at them do they become an object of the focalization. Then, the external narrator becomes the focalizer again and we see Galip from this external narrator's perspective. This time, the external narrator shares his knowledge with the reader, so we can see what other characters cannot see. Normally, anytime an external narrator narrates something, it means that the narrator is sharing it with the reader. However, here, the external narrator, by making a character a focalizer first, and then taking the focalizer position and telling what Galip has been thinking, invites readers to be a part of this communication.

The communication with the reader is also done by the long depiction done in the second chapter of the first book. The knowledge sharing circle is complete thanks to the dialogue between Galip and Fuat. Epistemological ground is founded. Now, the external narrator- focalizer aims at sharing the experience of the reader with the characters. He chooses to do this by playing with the tool of depiction and the element of time. Depictions, as Bal (2009) argues, sometimes adapt to the rhythm of

the text. The long description of the Kızıltoprak station here makes the reading experience of the reader simultaneous with the passing time of the passengers. During these 54 lines of long description, the train arrives at the stop. The time that has passed for the passengers between Haydarpaşa and Kızıltoprak is experienced by the reader while s/he was reading the description of the places between these two.

In the first focalizer-narrator shift, Nazım Hikmet grounds the fraternity with the reader, almost like an agreement that they will be on the same page throughout the poem. The next dialogue between the two characters and the shift of narrator-focalizer taken place in this dialogue is given to the reader as a test on their loyalty to the agreement. Here, he first describes a figure that he does not approve of, Basri. Then, he moves onto a character he adores, Kambur Kerim. In the introductions of these characters, the external narrator-focalizer shares his knowledge with the reader, placing the reader in his level of knowledge. Then, he lets the reader know what Basri thinks of Kerim, with his lack of knowledge about him. By doing so, he makes a division between what the reader has felt so far for the Kerim and how wrong Basri thinks about him. The level of knowledge, and thus the power, is enough for the reader to condemn Basri one more time for things he thinks about Basri. By this shift he uses here, Nazım Hikmet wants the reader to understand his political position clearer and invites the reader to think in the same way.

As I have mentioned, in the second chapter of the first book, this important shift in the focalizer and the narrator occurs between Basri and Hunchback Kerim.

First, Basri is described to the reader:

Basri Şener.
Camgöbeği renginde iri
sürmeli gözler,
Buruşuk, zeytunî bir deri.
Ağzı küçük, burnu
kocaman. (Hikmet, 2020, p.58)

Basri Shener.
Big, dark-lined, glass-green eyes
And wrinkled olive skin.
Small mouth, long nose. (Hikmet,
2002, p.44)

This part is what other characters may observe. It is a knowledge that is not under the authority of the author. But then, the narrator, and the focalizer tells Basri's story. He is a long story starting in Macedonia. He is a witness of important events of Turkey's history. As a child, he sings march in front of Sultan Reshat in Florina in 1911. In 1916, Basri is drafted to Çanakkale War. He stays alive, goes to Istanbul. In 1918, during the great Fatih fire, he is there. He goes to Aksaray, Söğütler Köyü till the Armistice of WWI. Then he moves to İzmir when the Greek army invades there. He joined Çerkez Ethem's gang and leaves them stealing gold. Bursa is occupied by enemies when he opens there a coffee-shop and he gets married there. He now has a good life. His voyage through the history of Turkey without getting hurt by any incident that has hurt many others is already enough to make Basri an unlikeable character. However, the external narrator-focalizer chooses some phrases to narrate his story leading the reader not liking Basri. This is a moment when the author uses its authority to lead the reader:

Ve korku gibi Kurnaz
Korku gibi cesur
(Hikmet, 2020, p.59)
Korku gibi uzun
Ve emin bir yol.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.59)

And cunning like fear,
Undaunted like fear.
(Hikmet, 2002, p.45)
A road as long
And safe as fear. (Hikmet,
2002, p.45)

The narrator says that it is fear that drives him. However, his fear is not like confusion or fragility. Rather, fear makes him brave enough to do all the things a scrupulous man would not do. In the quotation below, the external narrator-focalizer is harsh towards Basri's past, and invites the reader to feel the same:

Ve merhaba ey Akhisa'ın
Söğütler Köyü.
Söğütler Köyünde elbette
bir Hasan vardı,
Hasan'ın da elbet anası
olur.
Ve cephedeki Hasan'dan
Malûl gazi Basri
Çavuş
Selam getirdiği zaman
Hasan'ın kara kaşlı fakat
bir gözü dul anası
Basri Çavuşu elbette
evinde konuk eder.
...
Yaşadı Söğütler Köyünde
mütarekeye kadar.
Ve müjdeyi aldığı gün
Düşünmeden yaşartacağım
diye
Bir dul kadının
Biri açık, biri kör gözlerini
Götürüp pazarda sattı
kendi korkusunu
Ve onun kağnısıyla öküzlerini.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.61)

And hello, Willows Village in
Akhisar.
There's sure to be a Hasan in the village,
And Hasan will have a mother for sure.
And when the disabled veteran
Basri
Brings word from Hasan
At the front
Hasan's widowed mother, black-
browed but blind in one eye,
Will surely ask Basri to be her
guest.
...
And lived in Willows till the
Armistice.
The day he got the good news,
Without thinking of the tears
In a widowed woman's
eyes
-one good, one blind-
He sold his fear at the bazaar
Along with her oxen and ox
cart. (Hikmet, 2002, p.47)

The events narrated are hard to stomach: he deceives a mother whose son is in the war to defend the country, and, while leaving her, Basri sells her oxen, something that will probably make her life difficult financially. Beyond the events about him, how it is narrated also makes the reader hate Basri. The word choice “there's sure to be a Hasan”, “and Hasan will have a mother for sure”, as well as “without thinking the tears in a widowed woman's eyes” lead us to feel a towering rage towards Basri.

He not only deceives the widowed mother of a young soldier, but he also finds a way to use Çerkez Ethem's gang for his advantage. Çerkez Ethem is among the Revolutionaries for local resistance who have defended the country as small

mobile troops since the Armistice of Mudros left Anatolia undefended. He betrays, in a way, his country. He uses fear as a way to rationalize and legitimize his actions.

Narrator then moves to another character: a tiny hunchback sitting next to Basri. Place, according to Bal (2009), “situates the characters and forms the backdrop or stage of the events. It can even inflect the events in such a way that they are unthinkable without the space as their stage.” (p.131) In the case of Basri and the hunchback we will be introduced soon, sharing the same place becomes an important tool to compare these two. If they were traveling in different cars, then, such a meeting, from which we learn a lot about the narrator’s intention, would not have occurred.

The description of hunchback is more positive than Basri’s, this is the first point that the narrator wants to highlight. Second, although his physical appearance is visible to the other characters, the final lines about him, that he thinks no evil yet there is a curse hidden in his mouth is not what the others can know. Here, the external narrator-focalizer informs the reader about his story, and also explains why s/he will make hunchback’s story sound. About the focalized object in front of a focalizer, Bal (2009:64) argues “Who does not get to speak?” is a question that suits better. The narrator compares Basri and hunchback, who do not get to speak.

Vagonda karşısında Basri’nin
Ufacık bir kambur oturuyordu.
Fakat bu ufacık adam
Cesaretle taşıyordu kamburunu.
Her nedense onda
Yaşlı bir kız hali var:
Mahzun
Sevimli
Narin.
Ve “Fedâkar Evlat” romanının
yazdığı gibi
Hasta, ihtiyar babasına bakmak
için
Evlenmemiş olan.

Across from Basri in the car
Sat a little hunchback.
But this tiny man
Bore his hunch bravely.
For some reason
He looked like an old maid:
Sad
Lovable
Fragile.
Like the one in “The Loyal Child,”
Who didn’t marry but took care
Of her sick father.

Ve kocaman ağır kapakların
altında
 Uslu çocuk gözleri vardı.
 Bu gözler
 Kötülük düşünmezler.
Fakat bu kalın dudaklı ağız
 Korkunç bir küfrü
saklayabilir içinde.
 Bir küfür ki ses olup
edilememiş
Edilemiyor. (Hikmet, 2020, p.63)

And under his big heavy lids
 He had the eyes of a
well-behaved child.
 Those eyes
 Could think no evil.
But his full-lipped mouth
Hid an awful curse.
 A curse that wasn't voiced
 And couldn't be. (Hikmet,
2002, p.49)

Before moving onto the analysis of this comparison, I have noted one important difference in translation that can be useful for us to deepen the comparison. In the lines describing Basri, the word “cesur” is translated as “undaunted” whereas for hunchback, the same word, “cesur” becomes “brave”. The difference here is crucial and perhaps makes the translation more suitable to what the narrator suggests. Basri is not brave, he is determined and being undaunted defines the relationship between the subject and the deed it does; brave, on the other hand, is more inherent to the subject itself, therefore, has a different connotation than undaunted, which makes the distinction between these two characters clearer.

Then, the external narrator-focalizer tells us the story of Kambur Kerim, a story that none of the other characters may know. Again, Nazım Hikmet shares his knowledge only with the reader to have the power to make comment on the encounter of Kerim and Basri that will occur soon:

Adapazarlıydı Kambur Kerim.
Seferberlikte ölen babası
marangozdu.
...
335'te Kerim Eskişehir'e gitti,
...

Hunchback Kerim came from Adapazari.
His father, a carpenter, died in the Great
War.
...
In 1919 Kerim went to Eskişehir,
...

Düşman elindeydi Eskişehir.
Kerim 14 yaşındaydı.
Kamburu yoktu,
Dümdüzdü fidan gibi
Ve dünyaya meraklı bir çocuktü.
....
Zeybekler gelince Eskişehir'e
Dayısı Kerim'i elinden tutup
Verdi onlara.
Ve işte o günden sonra
-bu güne kadar-
Kahraman bir türküdür
ömrü Kerim'in.
Onu namlı bir "kaptan" gibi saydı
çeteler,
Bir oyun arkadaşı gibi sevdi
çeteleri o.
Ve bir fidan gibi düz,
Bir fidan gibi cesur,
Bir fidan gibi vaadeden bir
çocuğun
Sevinçle oynadığı bu müthiş oyun
Sürdü 1377'ye kadar... (Hikmet,
2020, p.65)

The enemy held Eskişehir.
Kerim was 14.
He didn't have a hunchback;
Straight as a sapling,
He was a boy curious about the world.
...
The next day, when the guerillas...
entered Eskişehir,
Kerim's uncle took him by the hand
And delivered him to them.
And from that day
To this,
Kerim's life has been a heroic song.
The guerillas respected him like a famed
"Captain";
He loved them like playmates.
And the boy, as straight
Brave
And promising as a sapling,
Played this terrible game with joy
Till 1921... (Hikmet, 2002,
p.53)

We see the narrator's sympathy towards hunchback Kerim, in the adjectives he chooses to describe him "straight as a sapling", "promising as a sapling", "brave". The narrator tells his "heroic song" that no one knows, sharing his knowledge with the reader, rationalizes why he is telling Kerim's story. The level of the knowledge of the narrator, the reader and other characters are marginalized on purpose. The purpose is to explain the reason behind the curse that Kerim hides. The

counterfactual scenario he puts after this narration is something only the narrator, Kerim and the reader knows:

Kerim'in İstiklal madalyası olabiliirdi, Yok. Kerim'in kamburu olmayabilirdi, Var. (Hikmet, 2020, p.67)	Kerim might have had an Independence Medal; he doesn't. He might not have had a hunchback; he does. (Hikmet, 2002, p.52)
--	---

The reader realizes how more s/he knows than other characters. And the difference becomes even more visible in the next following interaction of Kerim with

Basri and Nuri. Basri Şener, looking at Kerim, thinks:

"-Kambur felek," diye düşünüyor, "kambur felek, kim bilir ne muzur şeymiş ki Allah onu bu hale koymuş." (Hikmet, 2020, p.68)	"Fate," he thinks, "cruel, hunchbacked Fate- who knows what mischief caused God to make him this way?" (Hikmet, 2002, p.53)
---	---

Bal, discussing the detective fiction, argues that an external narrator knows more than the detective character. The detective as a character feels excluded due to this lack of knowledge. In such a position "that subject, now an actor, is the narrator's opponent." (Bal,2009, p.56) Just like the case of a detective, Nazım Hikmet makes a political choice here. He leaves the character, Basri, excluded, being deprived of knowledge. And Basri does not realize that there are things he does not know. The contradiction between the knowledge the narrator and the reader has makes them an opponent of Basri. So, here, beyond the word choice used in description, by changing the knowledge level of the reader, Nazım Hikmet claims a political stance and invites the reader to accompany the narrator in that stance. In that scene, the narrator is still external, but the focalizer becomes Basri, with his lack of

knowledge, occupies a position he is not capable of. And more importantly, this incapacity is made explicit by narrator's informing the reader.

There is another shift in focalizer in the chapter focusing on Kerim, and this time, Nuri Öztürk is the character looking at Kerim. Nuri Öztürk is also a character that Nazım Hikmet does not approve, but this shift is done to explain the system that has made Kerim silent and forgotten. By this final shift, Nazım Hikmet both reveals the world Kerim is living in and make Kerim's thoughts heard, for he cannot have a chance in voicing them:

Nuri Öztürk
Kambur Kerim'e baktı.
Anladı Kambur Kerim:
Çekilip yerini bıraktı
Sol yanını pencerenin.
Kerim alışmıştı senelerdir
İnsanlarla bir acayip
maceraya girmeye:
Hiçbir şey istemeyip
onlardan
Her isteneni vermeye.
(Hikmet, 2020, p. 69)

Nuri Ozturk
Looked at hunchback Kerim.
Hunchback Kerim understood:
He got up from his seat,
The window seat on the left.
For years, Kerim had dealt
With others in a strange exchange-
To want nothing from them
And give them everything they wanted.
(Hikmet, 2002, p.54)

The final scene we see Kerim explains why the curse he hides is growing but yet, due to his well-behaved feature, not made sound. Kerim knows more than the people know about him and the distance between their knowledge pushes Kerim into a crisis. Bal (2009), about traumatic narratives, argues that such narratives narrate "a tragedy without crisis" (p.114) the phrase I find quite fitting in describing Kerim's narration. By choosing to narrate him, by comparing him with Basri and by letting us see Kerim from Basri's ignorant view, the narrator manages to weave the politics it wants to manifest with narratology.

The two dialogues that were ground for the shift of narrator-focalizer aimed at sharing the same ideological ground and applying it to the analysis of the characters. The final shift of focalizer-narrator will show us that the world the text is written in is not a world of black and white; and there are characters who can be perceived differently from different point of views, which, can be said to support the theme of confusion. There are those who have already lost, for example Hasan Şevket, there are those who have never lost, the elite group, and there are also those who think he has not lost but actually lost, for example Nuri Cemil, who will be explained by the shift of narrator-focalizer. The shift used here aims at inviting the reader to a conversation with these characters. Therefore, it is different from the first two examples. There is not a domination of the narrator, rather, the characters, the reader and the external narrator are at the same level.

The final comparison is between Hasan Şevket and Nuri Cemil and takes place at the beginning of the second book. Just like Master Galip's depictions completing the description of Haydarpaşa Garı like a painting, Gar's description in the second book is colored by Hasan Şevket's depiction. Since I have quoted the description of the Gar, I will continue with Hasan Şevket, coming right after Gar depiction:

Buna rağmen

Hasan Şevket

Rakıyı bir tek dilim beyaz
peynirle içiyordu

...

Hasan Şevket düşünüyor

Gözleri kadehinde:

“Beş parmak boyundaki adam

Vicdanımız yani.

Yet

Hasan Shevket

Drank raki with a single slice of cheese.

...

Hasan Shevket stared into the glass

And thought:

“The thumb-size man-

Which is to say Your conscience

...

Hasan Şevket diyor,
Hasan Şevket,
Sen mahvolmuş bir insansın.
Nasıl bu hale düştün?
Seni kimler bu hale soktu?
Ne zamandan beri bu haldesin?
Halbuki nasıl yol aldı bazıları.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.114)

...

And says: 'Hasan Shevket,
Hasan Shevket,
You're a wreck.
How did you get this way?
Who did this to you?
How long have you been like this?
And some of the others have gone so far!
(Hikmet, 2002, p.9)

The external narrator-focalizer depicts Hasan Şevket but gives us things the other characters might see as well. Then, at the moment when we hear his thoughts, the narrator invites the reader to his knowledge level. With the narrator, we meet a Hasan Şevket that no other character can know. His inner thoughts are dark, he is drowning in his melancholia. Suddenly, the narrator leaves its position to Hasan Şevket, from that point, for a short time, Hasan Şevket becomes a focalizer and lets the reader see Nuri Cemil, and also, becomes a narrator telling us Nuri Cemil's story. Bal (2009) defines quotation as: "a form of collaboration...engaging in dialogue with others." (p.35) Then, here, the narrator wants to engage with Hasan Şevket in dialogue. By letting him speak, the narrator also tells the reader that he cares about what he will say, since, as we will see later, the comparison of Hasan Şevket and Nuri Cemil is not as strict as the one between Basri and Hunchback Kerim. We first see and hear about Nuri Cemil from Hasan Şevket, from his biased point of view, since although they share the same past, now Nuri Cemil has a much better life than Hasan Şevket:

“Bak,-dedi Hasan Şevket,
Nuri Cemil’e bak.
Yazlık ev tutmuş Suadiye’de.
Kazancı beş yüzden aşağı değil.
Sen de çoktan unutmuşsundur
Bir sefil,
Bir umutsuz ve perişan gece
yarısı,
Tepemizde,
Çok yukarıdaki yıldızlara
karıştırıp yalnızlığımızı,
Galatasaray’ı dönünce orda
İş Bankası’nın eşliğinde
sızdığımızı,
Ben rakıdan, sen kokainden
Sen kahrolası
Sen topal...” (Hikmet, 2020,
p.116)

“Look,” Hasan Shevket said
To his thumb-size man,
“look at Nuri Jemil.
He’s rented a summer house in Suadiye.
He makes at least five hundred a month.
You, too, have long forgotten
That desperate
Wretched night
We shared our loneliness
With the stars above
And passed out under the bank sign at the
corner of Galatasaray
Me from raki,
You from cocaine.
You damn
Cripple...” (Hikmet, 2002, p.96)

It is clear from these lines that Hasan Şevket thinks Nuri Cemil has a life that he does not deserve. Talking about their history, he makes it clear that among the people who “have gone so far” there is Nuri Cemil. Hasan Şevket makes the reader think that Nuri Cemil is also a person unlikeable, just like Basri we have met before. Then, the external narrator takes the lead and both as a narrator and as a focalizer introduces Nuri Cemil to the reader. By doing so, he leads the reader to access into the reality of Nuri Cemil, and to understand him better. He tells the reader about the poor childhood of Nuri Cemil and how he hated the rich people since his childhood, and how he climbed the ladders to be one of them to take revenge of his childhood. His narration reveals that Nuri Cemil is aware of his choice but yet does it to compensate for an injustice he believes to have experienced in his childhood :

Nuri Cemil

Banliyö tireninde

Birinci mevkiye girdi.

...

Memnundu Nuri Cemil

Kadife vagona rastladığından.

Babasız

Fakir

Hastalıklı geçti Nuri Cemil'in
çocukluğu.

Kendinde olmayan her şeyi
kıskanarak

Ve ancak

Çocukların duyabildikleri

Yanık acısı gibi
maddî bir imrenme içinde

(fakir doğuş değil fakir
düşmüş çocukların),

Belki biraz da bundandı

(sonraki yıllarından da dolayı)

Bütün ömrünce nefreti
fakir olandan

Ve saygısı zengin olana

...

Kadife vagona kavuşmak için

On beş yıl boğuştu Nuri
Cemil,

Tıpkı kendine benzeyen
insanlarla çevrili olarak:

...

Onlarda düşmanlık ikiyüzlüydü,

Dostluk

Hazırdı ihanete.
(Hikmet, 2020, p. 121)

Nuri Cemil entered

A first-class car

Of the commuter train.

...

Nuri Cemil was pleased

He'd run into a velvet car.

Nuri Cemil grew up

Without a father,

Sickly

And poor,

In poverty that hurt him like a burn,

-poverty that only kids can feel

(not those born into it but those who
become poor)-

And made him envious of all he lacked.

Partly that

(and partly his later years)

May explain his lifelong hatred
of the poor

And respect for the rich

...

To make it to a velvet car,

Nuri Cemil had fought for fifteen years

Surrounded by people just like
himself

....

Their hostility was two-faced,

And their friendship always stood

Ready for betrayal.

(Hikmet, 2002, p.101)

These lines, first, keeps the reader in a position of a character, since things we read about Nuri Cemil are also be seen by other characters, but with the lines telling how and why Nuri Cemil is happy to find the velvet car, the narrator elevates the reader to his knowledge level. We learn much about Nuri Cemil, things that Hasan Şevket could not tell us since he also did not know. By referring to Nuri Cemil's poverty as "not being born into it but becoming poor", the narrator, by giving details behind Nuri Cemil's rationalization, in a way, makes the reader, at least, understand him. For Basri, for example, the reader has no knowledge other than fear driving him. The narrator's introduction of Nuri Cemil is not yet over, goes on and describes the world Nuri Cemil is living in:

Ve tıpkı onun gibi,
Hepsi teker taker,
Dehalarının inkar olunduğuna
emindiler
Göze gözükmeyen
Lanetli kuvvetlerle dolu bir
dünyada. (Hikmet, 2020, p.122)

And just like him, they all
Were convinced that their genius
Wasn't being recognized
In a world full
Of unseen
Evil forces. (Hikmet, 2002, p.101)

The external narrator, by this information, continues to change the level of the reader from Hasan Şevket's. Living "in a world full of unseen evil forces" is a phrase that takes us back to a notion we have seen in the first lines of the poem: confusion. The world, even for Nuri Cemil, is a mystery keeps creating unforeseeable events, this is his justification for his actions: since he realized that there are forces he cannot overcome, the thing he can do, is to act according to the ones he knows. As we may remember, Basri's fear, the source of his power, was described as "sure", whereas for Nuri Cemil, even though he has a good life now, the world is full of unseen forces, which makes it, far from being sure. In the basis of

Nuri Cemil's fragility facing such a life, the narrator invites the reader to feel sympathy for him with these lines:

Uyuyordu Nuri Cemil	Nuri Cemil slept,
Ufacık	Dwarfed
Küçücük	And shrunken. (Hikmet, 2002,
Uyuyor.	p.106)
(Hikmet, 2020, p.127)	

Nuri Cemil, in a world of undefeatable forces, is a small man; the narrator adds these lines before the reader's final judgement about Nuri Cemil. This meeting of Hasan Şevket and Nuri Cemil, starts with the narrator's description of Hasan Şevket and after the reader feels that Hasan Şevket is not a bad man, Hasan Şevket directs us to Nuri Cemil, whom he hates, affecting reader's decision about Nuri Cemil. The narrator leaves the narrator position to Hasan Şevket, to invite him into the conversation, I think, since he thinks Hasan Şevket has a point. However, their situation is much more complex than being good or bad. Therefore, after Hasan Şevket's introduction, the narrator takes his position back and tells us about Nuri Cemil he knows, and as a final point, the narrator blames the world, instead of Nuri Cemil, for the political stance he has.

Having looked at these particular meetings it is important to note the three reasons how the first two chapters have political concerns. The first reason is that they create heterogeneity, a term coined from Bakhtin's *heteroglossia*. M.M. Bakhtin, in his famous essay "Discourse in the Novel" (1982) argues that the success of the novel is depended on its involvement in different languages: "language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past,

between different-socio- ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form.” (p.280) Language is not something stable, it is a living being and the duty of the novel is to reflect it. The text then becomes a base for all these contradictions and differences to become visible. Heteroglossia, then, has also a political function in making different groups in the society be heard.

According to Bakhtin (1982), heteroglossia is associated with the novel since the novel is the form involving different personal experiences from different groups. He eliminates epic from being considered as having the characteristic of heteroglossia due to its “strong sense of absolute past” and its distance from “contemporary reality” (p.41). In Nazım Hikmet’s text, however, the epic becomes a suitable ground for letting all the differences in the society speak. All the characters in the first two books of the book come from different lives, different backgrounds and social strata. Including all the differences in an epic form is another political argument, since the epic is always seen equal to the narrative of the sources of a nation, the nation-building process; then, Nazım Hikmet argues that the nation built by the republic is the totality of these people, with all contradictions, all differences and different economic conditions separating them.

The text, although being a poem, resembles a novel not only in the sense that it’s being an example of heteroglossia, Edward Hirsch (2002), in the “Introduction” he writes for the English translation of the poem, states: “Hikmet shared Pound’s concept of the epic as “a poem including history.” (p.viii) The people so brilliantly characterized are ordinary people, and the exalted epic style becomes something playful and daily, something musical but also social and even novelistic in Hikmet’s

pen. His portrayal of the poem's characters is as in-depth and well-executed as a novel.

The second reason is that their stories are narrated in a multi-temporality. Bal (2009) refers to the multi-temporality as “heterochrony” and argues that it “contributes to the temporal texture of our cultural world and thus, our understanding and experiencing it is a political necessity.” (p.117) She argues that for people going through different experiences, the heterochrony is tangible. The speed of time is different to every single person depending on the social, as well as political and economic situation they are in, here she gives an example of the time of a refugee, s/he has a time that never passes waiting for the papers and flows differently in a foreign country. Basri's whole life is narrated in three pages whereas for Hunchback Kerim, three pages refers only to his five years. The time has passed differently for these two, and the narrator wants to highlight by slowing down or letting the flow of time. Heterochrony, Bal argues, represents the time of those who are on the move. I will reflect on the movement of the poem after discussing the third engagement of the poem with politics.

I think we can also add people living in the past, staying at the moment and those living for the future into the definition of heterochrony since also they do not experience the same time. Giving example from the characters we have analyzed, for example, Basri always lives for the future whereas Hunchback Kerim's life is over since his life was his past; Galip has to stay at the moment to survive whereas Fuat thinks of the future; Nuri Cemil lives for the day whereas Hasan Şevket cannot rescue himself from his past. All these different times within the same narrative reflect how the society is far from being united and homogenized, contrary to what the state argues.

The final point about the relation between poetics and politics of the text is a highly narratological one: the narrator reflects its political claim by changing the narrating levels, that is, by playing in the knowledge levels of the characters and the reader. The levels of the narrator have a deep connection with epistemology in the sense that the level determines the limits of the knowledge and, at the same time, the credibility of the knowledge. Referring back to the concept of “confusion”, and that the narrator is fighting with “being sure”, -as we have seen in Basri’s case and in the justification of Nuri Cemil’s attitudes-, the narrator wants to challenge the knowledge of the characters. It shares its knowledge only on purpose to make a claim. Through the stories, it lets the reader see the failure of those sure and praises those unsure and confused. Referring back to Dolcerocca reading the text as an “epic of the defeated”, then, the narrator argues that those unsure are already defeated, defeated by the fast-changing conditions of the day and their disconnection to the present; but also those who are sure are defeated, since they stuck themselves in the world they think they know. When we leave, Basri is about to be led by his fear again, this time, a fear related to his son, and Nuri Cemil is sleeping with small political tactics in his mind.

The first two book of the poem takes place in a train, and with the pattern of broken lines, we get the sense of movement from the text in general. This poem belongs to those on the move. When the writing process of the poem is analyzed, we see an important change reflecting that the movement is an important element of it.

In 1940, Nazım Hikmet had writing a “The Encyclopedia of Famous Men” in mind. Mutlu Konuk (2002), the translator of the epic into English, describes the project as “...a series of portraits, ranging from two-or-three-line epitaph-like notations to more fleshed-out life stories...” (p.x), whose heroes are not “generals,

sultans, distinguished scientists or artists, beauty queens, murderers or billionaires; they were workers, peasants, and craftsmen” as Hikmet writes in the introduction he wrote for the Russian translation of the text. (Irmak, 2011, p.118) Then the project changes to a panorama, which, according to him, makes the text better in its narrative, persuasiveness and effect it creates.” (Irmak, 2011, p.125)¹¹

Ahmet Oktay (2008), in “Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları Üzerine Notlar” mentions the similarity of the poem with a scenario. Indeed, the cinematic characteristics of the poem has been discussed by several authors. This is mainly because of Nazım Hikmet’s own analysis of his poem in his letters to Kemal Tahir. He states that the text he is writing is not a poem, it includes poetic elements as well as cinematic scenario elements. (Hikmet, 2002, p.119) (as cited in Özer,2013, p.221) Nilay Özer (2013), argues that the elements of cinema in this text are: the use of scenario writing technics, the fact that the focus on the characters seems like done by a camera instead of eyes and the similarity between the way scenes change in a movie and the way Hikmet starts narrating another character or event. She argues that the text is a mixture of photographic/static images and cinematic/moving images. (p.221) She mentions the time flow in the first two books of the text, which can be followed through the characters by the reader. Necip Tosun (2007) argues that Nazım Hikmet uses his pen like a camera.

The movement of the text parallels with the theme of “confusion” I have mentioned and leads us to the engagement of the politics and narratology in this poem. Referring back to one of the elements of the narrative, we can say that Nazım Hikmet puts the actor in the center of his text and leaves the events as background.

¹¹ “...hem anlatım hem inandırıcılık hem de etki açısından çok daha yetkin bir metin haline gelmiştir.” (2011:125)

Focusing on characters enables him to create a more fluid text. In the first two books, the opposition he builds is between confusion and being sure, in other words, between fragility and fixity.

The fragility he sees is due to the socio-economic structure of the state. He criticizes Turkish modernization and reflects the unease of life in this system. Today is confusing, tiring and keeps creating new fragility. The problem of today makes his critique closer to Shayegan's critique of modernism. Moreover, he reflects the confusion that the people have been facing by questioning the knowledge and opinions of the characters by changing the narrator-focalizer levels and revealing the impossibility of reaching a truth. The characters show that it is impossible to stay clean in such a system and it is hard to live in the time of the poem. (Irmak, 2011, p.172)¹² I think the portraits narrated in the poem proves Irmak's argument since the characters are either in a state of being-in-between or have already chosen to be corrupted. It is impossible to find a strong figure who is both the embodiment of the values praised and at the same time manages to survive in life in the right path s/he has chosen.

The characters live in different times, even those living the day are not doing it for the sake of experiencing today, it is due to their hopelessness towards the future and the loss of their past. Living in the day is impossible, by reading Shayegan's words, today is "disfigured" and the only time that one cannot be present. The nostalgia we have here is not towards the past, either, since it is also not a good time to go back to.

¹² "Bir başka deyişle bu düzende temiz kalmak mümkün değildir." (Irmak, 2011:172)

The narratological lens that I have used, the shift of the focalizer-narrator supports and elevates the ideological characteristic of the poem. These shifts, as I have argued: first, defines a common ground between the external narrator and the reader; second, tests that the reader is thinking the same way as the narrator does; and third, by allowing the characters to speak, creates a lively dialogue between the narrator, the reader and the characters. By doing so, the narrator both shares and defends his political view and invites the reader to see the world through the eyes of the characters it creates. The distribution of the knowledge and therefore the power among the characters and the reader reveals how Nazım Hikmet wants to criticize the existing power structures since he makes the unheard voices heard and make the disadvantaged people speak for themselves by making shifts in focalizer and narrator positions. Since these shifts aim at such a change, they reveal the reality they want to alter. What we can understand from these alterations is that the world the text is written in, that is, the early-republican era, is a world where the elite group from the Ottoman times keep their power. Moreover, the periphery has remained silent and deprived of knowledge to understand the changes around them. Therefore, it is necessary to let them speak and to let them share the knowledge that others have. Being able to speak is linked with power and knowledge and those who cannot speak are left aside in their fragile worlds.

To use the analysis of these two books in making a critique of modernity, I will refer back to the two types of reading non-western modernities: the sense of belatedness and the disfiguration of two worlds. The first two books of the text have revealed a sense of confusion and the reality that there are people who have remained silent. The confusion is the experience of those in the periphery facing a modernity that has not changed their situation but benefited from by some others. As they

cannot understand, they lose their ability and also their chance to speak, and as they become silent, they disconnect from the external world. The silence-disconnection circle they are in cannot be explained by Jusdanis' model of belatedness and lack of originality since those in the periphery have no model in front of them to follow. Their search for meaning cannot lead them forward, nor they can return back since the past is erased. Their experience is not being late, but, being stuck in the meaningless of today. Those in the periphery, in that sense, are doomed to be timeless. They have no reference to their past, nor any connection to their present, nor any projection for their future.

Shayegan's model of disfiguration does not fit in the explanation of their situation, either; since this model requires at least two different meaningful worlds to disfigure each other. The shift of focalizer and narrator has shown us that those in the periphery cannot make sense of their present due to the inability to access the world they are living in. In their perception, there is only one world that cannot be read. If they could have access to their past and also their present, then, we could talk about a challenge to survive in between them. the challenge they are facing, however, is to live in nowhere in timelessness.

Then, we need another way of reading the modernity that the periphery is experiencing. The reason why a narratological lens gives us an alternative way of reading modernity will be explained in the next sub-chapter where I focus on this alternative way using narratology. The uniqueness of the timelessness and meaninglessness has led me to go back to the roots of any narrative, to the elements of it, and look for a new way by using these elements:

Books I-II: An attempt to read a more individual-focused way

As I have introduced under the title of “Self-narrative”, narration, beyond being an action of telling stories, defines how our minds work. Moreover, the narratives we make about ourselves construct self-narratives, which are the basis of our identities.

An important external change, such as the foundation of the republic and the modernization following it would definitely affect the self-narratives, not only the experience of it, but also the ways people build their own stories. A closer look on some self-narratives, I believe, will reveal the points the periphery is excluded and lost, since, the way they understand the world they live in is embodied in their self-narratives.

I argue that a fundamental narratological analysis would deepen the reading modernization process of a non-western country. The two ways of reading modernities I have discussed, the modernity as belatedness and as being-in-between, focus on a more general process and might be neglecting the unique experiences of individuals. That is why, focusing on self-narratives of people, on the very way they reflect the world they are living in might prioritize the point that greater ideas miss: the experientiality of social changes in people’s lives. Narratology, then, without using any lens, might be enough for making cultural readings by centralizing the narratives of the people about themselves.

By the fundamental elements of narratives, I mean, first: the agency, that is, the actor and its capacity to affect things happening in his life; and second, the way the events are connected: as examples for these ways of connections, I will be considering, To be able to use fundamental elements of narratives, causality - is the

logic connecting events to build a reason-result chain- and coherence - how the events, people and results are built in a natural and probable way. To be able to use these elements, I am going to make the narrative lines of the stories I have discussed above and then, I will analyze them by the elements I have introduced above:

The narrative line for Master Galip: I used to work in my father's shop- It is closed, for a reason I do not know- I started to work in a factory- I do not want to lose my job- I will die.

Causality: For him, the reason behind the closure is not known. The possibilities his world offers to him, could be, for example, death of his father, a debt that his father owns or the building could have been burned down, etc. The fact that he cannot build a causal link show that the reason was something beyond the ones his world can offer to him.

Coherence: For coherence, it is easy to detect two different coherent worlds in the same story, which are separated by the changing economic conditions that force Galip's father to close his shop.

The narrative line of Basri: I went to the Çanakkale War- A fierce bombardment killed all the people around me- I hid under the dead bodies- I stayed alive- I sold war medals to earn money- I prepared illegal papers to not to go to war again- I went to a small village- I deceived a widow and lived with her- When the war is over I sold her oxen and ran away with her money- I joined Çerkez Ethem's gang to get more money- I went to Uludağ- I opened a coffeehouse- I earned more.

Causality: The causality between his actions is put clearly. He makes every move to earn more, and by taking advantage of the chaos of his time, he moves one step forward. All of his steps link in causal chains that leave nothing out of the frame. We have seen that causality can be constructed through temporal indicators

such as “then, and” etc., In the case of Basri, however, there are no such indicators. It is his motivations that cause us to build causal links between events. Then, it is his strong agency that makes us tie the events in a causal order.

Agency: He is one of the strongest agents in all narratives. All of his actions can be explained by his motivations and goals. He gives us a whole picture of himself with ambitions, desires, and plans throughout the narrative. He takes his own decisions and acts according to his own plans, which complete his agency.

The narrative line for Kerim: My father died in the Great War- I moved to my uncles- He took me to guerillas to defend my country- I fell off the horse- I got a hunchback- I am an officer now

The counterfactual narrative line for Kerim: I did not fall off the horse- I do not have a hunchback- I have an Independence Medal

Causality: That Kerim’s father dies and that he moves to his uncle is linked through causality. Since he has an accident, he has a hunchback, we know there is a direct causality between the accident and hunchback. But the narrative is constructed in a way that is as if the hunchback is not linked to the accident, but rather, a mystical bad luck or misfortune. The sense of misfortune also can be sensed in the counterfactual thinking of Kerim. The causality sometimes falls short in explaining why such a thing happened. In the case of Kerim, the sense of meaninglessness covers even the straightest causality in his narration. The lines describing him reveal how Kerim cannot explain what has happened to him, that is why a curse is growing inside him but yet, remains unvoiced:

Coherence: His story cannot be narrated in a coherent unit in which all the events are plausible. The injustice remark in his story, the curse he holds inside and the counterfactual scenario that does not leave him alone shows that his narrative is

not coherent in the way he sees the world. The part before the accident flows in a coherent series of events, and since it was coherent, Kerim experienced his own agency. However, after the accident, he turned into a silent and invisible man since the incoherence in his story let him neither define himself as a subject nor define life as something worth going for.

Kerim's accident gives him a hunchback, but it is the new world that erases Kerim's past. There are two counterfactual lines each of which happens as a result of something else. The fact that he might not have a hunchback is something due to the accident. The fact that he might have had a Medal is due to a new world that destroys anything related to the old one. After the wars, a new world emerged, in which many heroes of the past have been forgotten.

Hunchback Kerim, a hero defending his village, does it to protect the world he knows, but an accident makes him unable to continue his fight. How his all efforts and his heroic past is degraded, and forgotten show us that the country has moved to a new system where things belonging to the old system suddenly lose all their meanings. The counterfactual thinking of the author about Kerim, where he might have been awarded a Medal, is the comparison of these two worlds in a sense. Instead of becoming a hero, he becomes a regular officer and nothing related to his heroic past has any value.

Hasan Şevket's line of narrative: I used to be with these people- they "sold" their brains- they earn their life- I am miserable

Causality: The causal link between his situation, the misery he is in and the reasons for it is not explainable according to Hasan Şevket. He keeps asking "Why?" question. First, he looks for the cause in others being better than himself but finds out that it is not the case. Then, by focusing on Nuri Cemil, Hasan Şevket blames those

who are now rich but used to be poor with him. The damnation of these figures makes him conclude a causality by comparison: he is wretched since he is not like him. Yet, this explanation is not a sufficient one and therefore cannot solve his misery.

Coherence: It is not a plausible end for Hasan Şevket, and again, with the interruption of the contingency of the result, the coherent picture is broken. This time, Hasan Şevket's projection of himself ending up in a better place is what keeps interrupting his reality in which he is wretched. He cannot tell a mistake that can explain this fall, and to him, it is not a coherent world to live in. It is not fair to end up like this by following a good path.

The narrative line for Nuri Cemil: I used to be poor, then I survived around people like me- now I earn enough to have a good life

Agency: He exercises his full agency in that he determines his goals, follows the path necessary to be taken to realize his motivation, and he faces the result of it. In short, he is able to follow the effect of his actions in the external world from beginning till the end. Yet for Nuri Cemil, it is not a scary life, since he knows from his young ages that it is not the skills or qualifications that will determine for someone how he is living, it is, being open to the winds of change. That is, being able to exercise his agency any time in life. For example, he describes himself as a democrat, but when he realizes it does not earn him anything and people who can help him have a good life are the ones against democracy, then he changes his ideas immediately.

Coherence: It is a coherent world since his childhood in poverty taught him to do whatever it takes to be rich one day. At that time, he feels the anger about the

injustice of his situation. When he grows up, this time, he becomes the agent of this injustice system. Both his life and his values are coherent.

The results of the search for the elements of a narrative in self-narratives can be concluded as such:

1. For Galip, there are two different coherent worlds in the self-narrative of the same person, and where the causality line is broken, that is, he cannot explain an important thing happening in his life, the old coherent world collapses and the new one emerges.
2. Basri can detect his agency in any moment of his life; all the events in his self-narrative can be explained by his goals and motivations. As a result, he has only one coherent world in his self-narrative.
3. Kerim's coherent story is interrupted by an event, an event causes so much change that his past is forgotten. The results are much more than being explained by the accident.
4. Hasan Şevket can define his agency, yet his actions lead him to a world he does not want to accept. The sense of injustice is what keeps him reject the coherence of the world he is living in.
5. Nuri Cemil, just like Basri, is fully capable of controlling his life and therefore describes his story as coherent: that is, the results of his actions are plausible to him.

These self-narratives draw a world that is coherent for some and incoherent to others. Neither Jusdanis' nor Shayegan's model of modernity define such different worlds depending on the people experiencing it. Both of these models deal with what happens after meeting "the Other", that is, the west for the east. For Jusdanis, the non-western feels an urge to follow the trace of the west, in the feeling of never

being complete and on time. His model reflects two meanings of the word “present”, present as the moment, and being present as existing. The world the non-western lives in is only one, the other world can be defined by its trace. For Shayegan, two worlds exist at the same time, for everyone in the society, that is why it creates a cultural schizophrenia. In *Manzaralar*, however, we see two different experiences at the same time. For those not having only one coherent world, there is a moment when they are pushed into a new world, a new reality.

The Turkish modernization process shares both the sense of belatedness, the feeling of being incomplete and also, to some extent, disfiguration of the mentality and the actualization. However, there is a unique part about the Turkish experience that the modernization’s attempt to reject the past and republican attempts to cut the connections between Ottoman and the republic make each other more complicated. As a result, the world of those in the periphery, which has remained the same for centuries, changed only on an abstract level: that is, the notions, institutions and the values have changed but their reality, the poverty they live in has remained the same. The general narration was that everything has changed, but the people in the periphery were deprived of the tools to make their sound heard, make themselves understood in that their reality has not changed. They experienced being thrown to another world as the same subject. The world has changed without giving them the opportunities to change with it and to understand it.

This is a conclusion we have arrived at thanks to a narratological analysis, and also, a conclusion that greater readings of modernities neglect due to the reasons I have discussed above. The conclusion also proves that narratology might be an effective way of reading the society and the culture.

Book III: Limitation- Isolation

I detected “confusion” as the theme of the first two books, and for the third book, the theme of “limitation” enables us to develop a better understanding of the book. Also, limitation and isolation are the second set of notions to connect the experience of peasants in the fast-modernizing republic. Book III the first book that does not take place on a train. As the space, prison and hospital are chosen, which had led me to use space as a narratological element in my analysis of the third book.

We come across the “limitation” in three ways in the third book: the first one is being limited by the space, and the second one is the limitation of the actor by a different power. Also, the limitation in senses is dominant through the book. I am going to analyze these three perspectives by referring to Mieke Bal’s narrative elements.

Space is a narrative term that is slightly different than place, an element of the fabula. Bal (2009) places space between “focalization, which the representation of space constitutes in a way a specialized case” and “place”, where events happen and/or characters are in. (p.201) So, it can be said that space “is connected to the characters who live it.” (p. 204) The ways the character engages in with the place it is in builds and defines the space. The actions of a character in a place turns the place into a space, in other words, the place becomes more than a background for events but rather, takes part in either happening or perception of them.

Space, beyond being a meaningful element for the perception of the events and characters, also has a deep connection with the senses: especially to sight, hearing and touch. (Bal, 2009, p.205) Bal (2009) defines two types of relation

between characters and space due to their relation through senses: the first one is that the space can be regarded as a frame for the characters in it. And second, through senses “the way in which that space is filled can also be indicated.” (p.205) which gives us the feeling the character is engaged in with the space. Space occurs through the sense of the character, but also has the power to limit the character, it is not dependent on the character after its emergence. The limits of the space define the range of actions the character can do.

The limitations we will see throughout this sub-chapter will be regarding first: the limitation put by the space between an actor and the reason of its action; second, the limitation, again made by the space on the senses of the characters; third, limitation put by the state as restriction; and finally, space as isolation.

Such an appearance of the space reminds us Foucault’s elaboration on Bentham’s architectural model. The project is designed as an effective prison where the guardsman on the center could observe the prisoners placed in a peripheral circle with the least effort. Foucault (1995) takes this model and turns into a structure of ideology and power. Such a structure, according to Foucault, disassociates the observer and the observed: “ in the peripheric ring, one is totally seen, without ever seeing; in the central tower, one sees everything without ever being seen” (p.190). The design enables the center control the periphery depriving them of their contact with the center, -a contact which could create a force field to at least negotiate or clash against the power imposed on them-. From this perspective, the space as we will see in this sub-chapter is the symbol of the state’s power on the people. Considering panopticon’s relation with seeing and observing, further connections with the model and the text could be made, however, it is also important to stay

within the scope of the thesis. Therefore, after this introduction of space, we can move onto the analysis of space in the third book of *Manzaralar*:

As being the first space after the train, the prison has an importance in the sense that the narrator, after leaving the train, chooses this space to focus on. The choice of the space, beyond defining our theme, also introduces a new critique of the modernization followed in the early-republican era, new restrictions and limitations placed on people without being explained to them clearly:

The first limitation we will see takes place in prison and here, not only the space but also what this space signifies is a source of limitation. Being placed in here is due to a judge's decision applying the law; the characters there see the law as a limitation put between them and the justice they have intended to exercise. The characters in the prison, in the very first meaning, are limited by the prison between its walls. However, beyond this physical limitation, it also creates a different sense of limitation: the characters do not regret due to the crimes they commit and they feel that it is not fair that they are prisoned and their case is not closed for them. It is the limitation put between them and reaching a just result. In the following lines, the narrator makes it clear that the only thing the prisoners do not feel is regret.:

Hapiste Allah,
Hapiste sineklerin çeşidi,
tahtakurusu, pire, bit,
Yeniden görülecek hesaplar,
İnsanı hırsından ağlatacak kadar
ümit,
Dostluk ve düşmanlık,
Hapiste kuşku, hapiste vefa,
Fakat girmiyordu hapise
inadetmiş bir defa:

In prison you find God,
All manner of flies, bedbugs, fleas
and lice,
Accounts to be resettled,
Enough hope to make a man cry
with rage,
Friendship and hatred,
Loyalty and suspicion,
But one thing refuses to enter
prison:

Pişmanlık.
Kabahat ölenin,
Dışarıda kalanın,
Cezayı verenin. (Hikmet,
2020, p.275)

Regret.
It's the dead man's fault
Or the fault of those outside
Or the judge's fault. (Hikmet, 2002,
p. 234)

Prison keeps the prisoners away from resettling their accounts, since they believe being sent to the prison is not how the narrative cycle should be completed. Bremond (1973) defines narrative as “a succession of events...are integrated into the unity of this same act.” (p.186) Bal (2009) calls this as “narrative cycle” which includes the possibility, the event and the result. (p.282) Or a similar narrative she builds consists of “the improvement to be achieved... process of improvement...improvement achieved” (p.285). In these cases, completing the cycle is the result. Thus, here, prison builds an obstacle between the actor and the result he wants to achieve. That is why the actor keeps planning to resettle his accounts and does not feel regret at all.

The barrier put between the actor and the result is done by the legal system and the laws. A limitation put by the state shows itself as a regulation that cannot be understood by the people on whom it is exercised. The knowledge regarding the values behind the regulation or the need for it cannot be rationalized by those who see their actions as something that must be done. The laws, the very symbol of modernization, do not manage to enter into the world of justice of these people. It is, therefore, also a limitation put between the actor and its rationalization mechanisms in compliance with the realities of the world. The confinement, thus, is connected with the physical limitation as well as an epistemological limitation.

We have made the connection between the senses and the space, but in this book, the space itself limits the senses to be achieved. The physical obstacle that space creates becomes something limiting the ways of perceiving the world, and the senses are the fundamental examples of it. This can be understood best from the letters of Halil to his wife Ayşe, and his readings of Ayşe's letters in return.

In Halil's letters to Ayşe, he focuses on only two senses: sight and hearing. The domination of these two does not compensate for the impossibility of touch. He focuses too much on sharing what he sees and hears with his wife, the only thing he cannot share is the touch. Below the lines are taken from his letter:

Sevgilim,
Maskelenmiş masmavi
yanıyor bak
Elektrik lambası
Beyaz evin önünde.
Şubenin bahçesinde
cephanelik,
Ve ağaçlar
...
Bir de kameriye olacak,
Göremiyorum.
Jandarma düdükları
Böyle hışımla gelen
Zonguldak tirenidir.
Ağaçların arasında mavi
mavi ışıkları.
Bir kadın sesi duydum.
Çocuk çığlıkları.
Sızladı burnum direği,
Kızımı dehşetli özlemişim.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.325)

My love,
See how the electric light
Outside the white
House down the road burns blue.
In the induction center yard, the armory
And the trees-
...
There's also an arbor,
Which I can't see.
The guardsmen whistle
That's the Zonguldak train
Roaring by.
Its blue lights glow through the
trees.
I hear a woman's voice,
Kids crying.
I got a lump in my throat:
I miss my daughter so.
(Hikmet, 2002, p.277)

The loss of a sense can be understood not only by the lack of it in the text, but also the emphasis put too much on the other senses leads us to the same conclusion. When one of the ways of understanding the world is limited, alternative ways gain too much power, and in the example of sense, touch is replaced by sight and hearing. As a result, any narrative reflecting the world perceived by the other instruments reveals the change, as we have seen in Halil's letters.

The fact that space, which is constructed by the senses can also limit the very senses it is built by takes us back to the struggle between the people and the state. It is said that the state is made up by the people and is for the people, yet it possesses the power to work against the people.

The limitation put on the actions of actors is not limited to space. Another type of limitation we can observe occurs among different actors in a narrative cycle: it is the relationship between the actor and the power. The model that structuralist Greimas constructs for an actor is much more complex than any model constructed. To understand his model, it is required to add the element of intention into the definition of actor. Bal (2009) argues that the actors "aspire towards an aim". (p.291) The model is based on the relationship between the actor and the aim it pursues. The actor becomes a subject-actant and the aim becomes an object-actant. However, pursuing an aim does not guarantee the result of achieving it. Then, the elements of power and receiver come into play. There are powers "either allow it (the subject-actant) to reach its aim or prevent it from doing so." (p. 293) Power does not have to be human, indeed, "society, fate, time etc" (p. 293) might be given as possible examples of power. The receiver, who is on the other side of this relation, is the subject-actant pursuing its aim. Then, the relationship between the subject-actant and

the power can be defined as a field of struggle, a place that enables us to connect the narratology and politics. The limitations we have seen in the third book are also due to the power placed against a subject-actant's desire for its aim.

The analysis of power and actors is completely narratological. What will add the ideological/political perspective to this analysis is what is chosen by the narrator as power working against the actor's aim. The text places the state and the figure of the statesman as the power and puts the peasant as the actor who has to struggle. We should remember that this narrative reflects how the actor, in this example, the peasant sees the events. The external narrator-focalizer narrates the events and dialogues as they occur in the world of these people, therefore, it is not directly the opinion of the narrator; however, we should also take into account that it is Nazım Hikmet who chose to tell a struggle between the peasant and the state. His choice, therefore, reflects his ideology and critique of the experience of modernization of the peasants. Having these comments in mind, we can analyze the first encounter of actor and power. And the first power figure we encounter is the figure of a statesman:

The women coming to see their husbands, sons, or relatives in prison want to give the food they bring to people they know in there. However, guardsmen there do not allow them to do so, and by the power they get from the rules regulating visiting, they attack the women, who insist on giving yogurt pots to the ones they know.

Şubenin bahçesinde mecalsiz
yalvarmalar:

“-Candarma, oğlum,
Candarma efendi ağa.
Şu bakracı veriver.
Versene, niye vermiyon?”

Weak pleas in the induction center yard:

“Son, guardsman-
Guardsman, effendi agha.
Take him this pot of yogurt.
Why won't you take it, why?”

...

Dipçikle yürüdüler karılara:

“-Yasak...”

Kadınlar dağıldı çığırarak.

Bu “yasak”,

Bu örtüleri ve peştemalları
yırılarak

Devrilen

Kadınlar, (Hikmet, 2020, p.319)

...

They went at the women with rifle butts.

It’s forbidden...”

The women screamed and scattered.

...

The “It’s forbidden,”

The women

Knocked down,

Shawls and scarves
torn- (Hikmet, 2002, p.272)

“It’s forbidden” is the power against subject-actant women wanting to deliver the pots to the people inside. Although it is the rule preventing them from doing what they want, a rule regulated by the state, the women take the guardsmen as the power preventing them. Here, as Yılmaz (2016) argues, we see that the state is visible to peasants only in the form of statesmen, therefore they direct their anger or disappointments to these people, and this is also why their objection is shaped in a personal way. They do not claim that the guardsmen do not apply the rules correctly nor discuss the justification of these rules. What they do, is expressing their anger in a personal treat, as a wish for a personal experience that the guardsmen could relate to and feel their anger. However, it is contradictory that the reasoning behind the guardsmen’s actions is not personal or subjective, “it is forbidden” as the justification of this rule is the word of the state. Actually it is the state making its relation to people based on the limitations and regulations. The word reaches to the peasant as the actions of statesmen and since such a mechanism has no equivalent way of thinking in peasant’s world, they continue to see it as a personal matter:

Bir kadın bir dipçik yedi.
Düştü, doğruldu.
Ağzının içinde kan.
“-kavaklar gibi boyun devrilsin,”
dedi,
“benim oğlum da candarma olur
elbet,
Senin köyüne gider,
Bana ettiklerini anana eder!”
(Hikmet, 2020, p.317)

A woman got hit with a rifle butt.
She dropped and sat up,
Her mouth full of blood.
“I hope they cut you down like a poplar,”
she said.
“My son will be a guardsman, too,
someday-
He’ll go to your village
And do to your mother what you did to
me!” (Hikmet, 2002, p.270)

Just like statesmen, the state buildings are the places regulating the relation between the people and the state. To ground this argument, Nazım Hikmet first chooses to depict this relation in the dialogue between Doktor Faik Bay and Halil. Doktor Faik Bey, about the wide stone steps in front of the hospital, tells Halil:

“-İyi ki bu taşlar böyle
geniş ve Rahat.
Hastane hükümet kapısıdır
bizim köylüye göre,
Ve hükümet kapısında
duvar diplerine çömelirler,
Burda taş merdivenlere
otururlar hiç olmazsa.” (Hikmet,
2020, p.349)

“It’s good these steps are so wide
and comfortable.
For our peasants a hospital is the
government, too.
And at the government’s door
they have to squat against a wall;
At least here they can sit
on the stone steps.” (Hikmet, 2002, p.298)

In these lines, we see the peasants’ inaccessibility to the state. It is either statesmen or the states’ buildings that the people can connect to the state. And also, the description of a peasant in front of a building is important, having to wait squatting, as a picture, reflects the peasant’s desperate relationship with the state: the peasant cannot get their job done quickly and there are no places allocated to them

for waiting. This relationship is highly uncomfortable, and there is no other way that a peasant can reach the state.

The hospital, as the second place chosen after the train, becomes a space of hope and anger. However, restrictions are also the theme of the hospital. As an example of a state building, the hospital becomes an element of power against peasant's will by forcing him into the procedures he cannot understand.

Dümelli Memet takes his wife to hospital since the woman's intestine is blocked. He wants Doktor Faik to give some medicine and send them away, but the doctor says that an operation is necessary, and there is no other possible cure. Dümelli keeps asking whether she will die during the operation and the doctor answers back saying she is going to die if he does not let her have an operation. His permission is required for the operation and since he is illiterate, the doctor asks him to put his thumb on the permission paper as a sign of approval. Halil is a witness watching all the dialogue. After Dümelli goes away to think, Faik turns to Halil and says:

“Beni hiç sevmiyor.
Bana düşman.
Ve ümitsiz.
Ben, bu büyük yapıdaki
efendiyim.
Sari bir hap verecek yerde
Ona inadına kötülük
eden insan.
...
Parmak basacak,
Inandığı için değil,
Ben emrettiğim için.
...

“He does not like me at all.
I'm the enemy.
And he's desperate.
I'm the effendi in this big building,
The man who gives him out of
sheer spite
Instead of giving him a yellow pill.
...
He'll put his thumb on the paper,
Not because he believes in it
But because I ordered him to.
...

Ben,
Ben, bu büyük yapının
efendisi.
Beni sevmiyor
Bana düşman.”
(Hikmet, 2020, p.353)

Me,
The effendi of this big building.
He doesn't like me,
I'm the enemy.” (Hikmet, 2002,
p.301)

The figure of Dümelli against the doctor who is making things hard on purpose represents how the peasant sees the state. Since, as we have discussed in “Turkish Modernization” chapter, the reasoning behind the modernization is kept away from the peasant and the elite founders have decided for them, the state remained as a figure of power and mystery to peasant. The state and anything symbolizing the state became the figures of the limits of understanding or rationalizing. Since the state is not transparent to peasants, where the state's actions and decisions started, the boundary of making sense has ended for them. Just like the mysterious evil forces governing Nuri Cemil's world in the second book, the state becomes the source of contingent evil: whose reasons behind actions cannot be questioned and never understood. Therefore, the way of communicating with the state is either forcing all the possibilities not to obey the rule, as the visitor women do in prison's yard, or following the order as Dümelli does. The peasant's relation to the state is limited only in these two types of reactions.

Doktor Faik, as a figure of “the effendi of the big building” signals an isolation from society. His isolation resembles the isolation of the hospital. The depiction of the hospital from outside gives a better picture of it:

Hastane şehrın dıřında,
kırın ortasındaıdı.

Civarda bir karıřtan boylu
nebat yoktu

Bir ahlat ağacından başka.

Yüksek yeřillikler, uzakta
bir dağın

-bir acayıp dağın-

Kayboluyordu arkasında.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.349)

The hospital stood in an open field outside
the city.

Nothing grew much above the
ground

Except a wild pear tree.

In the distance, some tall greens
disappeared

Behind a mountain,

A strange mountain. (Hikmet,
2002, p.298)

This isolation becomes an important theme for Doktor Faik, at the end of the book III, he commits suicide. His isolation is the boundary he put between himself and the people. He is, in a sense, away from the reality of people who keep visiting the hospital every day. He limits himself in his lonely world and has no one to cry after him when he dies.

An isolation ending up with committing suicide does not contradict with Nazım Hikmet's ideology as a communist who have been defending and living for a society living in solidarity. I am aware of the fact that reading Faik's situation in relation to Nazım Hikmet's ideology might be an analysis of the content rather than the form, however, it is the narratological tools that led us to make such a reading. Therefore, it might also be argued that narratological analysis builds a way to connect the form and the content in a way to deepen the readings of both of them.

The isolation does not have to be between the subject and other people. One's isolation in his own mind also brings destruction. This time, the isolation is due to being in prison. Raif Ağa, described as "deaf, cross-eyed and toothless." (Ran, 2002, p.277) is lost in thoughts, in a literal sense, he is stuck in his mind. He tells about conspiracy theories made by his family against him:

“Benim karı ilaç katmış yemeğe:

Kalkamaz oldum

Gidemez oldum

Konuşamaz oldum

Çıkamaz oldum

çarşıya.

Zulüm ettiler bana, zulüm ettiler,
zulüm ettiler.

...

Kardeşimin karısı bana bu
hakareti yapan.

Herkes onlarla birlik:

Karakol kumandanı filan.

Kardeşimin karısı bana bu
hakareti yapan

...

Mustantığa vardım,

Almadı ifademi.”

(Hikmet, 2002,327.)

“My wife poisoned my food:

I couldn't get up

I couldn't walk

I couldn't talk

I couldn't go to the market.

They did me wrong, they did me wrong,
they did me wrong.

...

My brother's wife did me this dirt.

Everyone was on their side:

The police chief, everybody.

My brother's wife did me this dirt.

...

I went to the magistrate,

He wouldn't take my
statement.” (Hikmet, 2002, p.279)

The space, prison, becomes where he is isolated, and also, his access to the outside world, the real world, is limited. Therefore, he turns inside and keeps destroying his sense of reality. The reality is away from him. The level of his narration also supports this distance from the validity of his narrative. Halil becomes the narrator and focalizer in the narration of Raif Ağa's story. As a character-narrator/focalizer, he quotes Raif Ağa's story in the letter he writes to his wife. Compared to being narrated by an external narrator, and being quoted by it, being narrated by Halil degrades the level of validity of this narrative.

One final connection between isolation- limitation and reality is in the reason why Halil we have met in the prison comes to the hospital is the illness in his eyes,

an illness that leads to him to blindness day by day. The hospital becomes the space where he accepts his situation:

Halil artık biliyordu
hastalığının adını:

Göz damarlarının dumura
doğru gitmesi.

Yıllardır ağır ağır, birike
birike

Ve bir gün, bir anda, bir
sıçrayışla: körlük (Hikmet, 2020,
p.382)

Halil now knew the nature of his
disease:

Atrophying blood vessels of the
eyes.

For years building up slowly, little
by little,

And one day, one instant, in a
single leap: blindness. (Hikmet, 2002,
p.326)

In the isolated hospital building, Halil accepts that he will be blind one day, and will close his eyes to the sky and to her daughter forever. This ending completes the relationship cycle built between the themes of limitation-isolation and truth/reality in the third book, representing the isolation of the state from the people and the limits put between the peasant and the state.

Before moving onto the conclusion of this subchapter, it should be mentioned that Nazım Hikmet chooses blindness as a theme for Halit for a reason. Blindness is the last step of one's sacrifice for the people, according to Hikmet. In *Yaşamak Güzel Şey be Kardeşim* (2013), one of the four novels Nazım Hikmet has written, Hikmet narrates Ahmet's story, placing several autobiographical pieces into it. Ahmet, while he was in Hotel de France in Batum, thinks about how far he can go for his ideology and says:

Let's put the questions on this table, right next to Anatolia here. What can you sacrifice for this cause? What can you give? Everything. Everything I have. Your freedom? Yes! How many years can you rot in prison for this cause? All my life, if necessary... Okay but what about getting hanged, killed or drowned like Mustafa Suphi and his friends if I became a Communist... Are you afraid of being killed? I am not afraid, I said... Okay, are you ready to be disabled,

crippled, or made deaf for this cause? I asked. And TB, heart disease, blindness? Blindness? Blindness... Wait a minute-I hadn't thought about going blind for this cause. (p.27)

Blindness is the greatest sacrifice for the people and for the cause. Halit has brought to the final stage of dedication, as the greatest power against the actor and it is the isolated hospital where he has to face and accept it.

The modernization project leaves the peasant out of the picture. They are either the figures limited by the state or the figures seen from an isolated "big building". The isolation, as a result of republican modernization, creates figures in isolation, in a sense, their touch to the external world is limited. Nazım Hikmet makes a connection between the space and life and this link is parallel to Bakhtin's notion of *chronotope*, which is, the merging of time and space into a unity; where this merge is a key element of experiencing the world. He first argues that literature, by its nature, is *chronotope*, that is, the time and space create a locality for reading experience. Then he goes further and argues that not only the world of the narrative but also the world of the reader is the same: "a definite and absolutely concrete locality... this is a piece of human history, historical time condensed into space" (1988, p.49). The time experienced in a space and with the space builds the life of humanity, and according to Nazım Hikmet, a life experienced in an isolation cannot be considered as a life lived. Even in the time he was in prison, he kept hearing other people, writing and sending what he is doing and thinking to the external world. In his own experience, he is never isolated by the space, however, it does not contradict with the controlling power of the space on people. In that sense, one's being imprisoned and keeping itself in isolation are two completely different relation of the individual with the space.

The power of the state over the people, “it’s forbidden”s and the “you have to put your thumb”s can be read closer to Jusdanis’ modernization model, in which, there is always something lacking, something flaw in the ways the peasant communicates the state. The lack in performance results in a limitation imposed on them. The state buildings are made in isolation with the hope that soon the fields will be filled with buildings and the state building will remain in the middle. One day people will be literate and learn that they have to sign to get their wife operated on, and they will know that sometimes pills do not cure the illness. One day the prisoners will say that they got the just punishment, they will learn to obey the rules of the state. The people are limited till the moment they learn how to be “civilized”, so, they have to follow the model determined for them to be taken seriously by the state. The state accepts and also plans a delay of being understood by the peasants, but this attitude also leads to a delay in the access of the peasants to the reality they are living in. This planned delay possesses a form of limitation in the lives of the periphery. In this sense, what the state has in mind becomes a “west” for the periphery “east” to try to catch up.

Shayegan’s reading of modernity as disfiguration also corresponds with the narratological reading we have made. The invisible state and the visible state figures and buildings make each other unreadable for the periphery and therefore, the periphery encounters a power of which the source is unknown. The unidentifiable power renders the periphery disabled in responding to it. The disfigurement of what is an obstacle to them makes periphery illiterate in reading their own lives.

Although in the books I and II, these great readings of modernity misses important points that narratology is able to capture perfectly, that is, the experience

of the periphery in Turkey; in book III we see that narratology enriches the analyses that can be made by these two models.

Books IV-V: Inevitable Witnessing

Book IV is slightly different from Books I,II,III in the sense that it has a much narrower focus. The narrative in this book takes place in “üç nokta” şehri (city of X) and D... şehri (city of D) and the relationship between the Agriculture Office and peasants in a time when they negotiate to buy peasants’ products. The element that differs Book IV from the others is its successful but also disturbing reality of painting the reality of bribery and corruption in unforgettable pictures. The flow of the characters one after another slows down in this chapter and we have more memorable scenes and moments. The change might even be described as a shift from movie to a series of snapshots taken one after another. The snapshot effect of a text, which is among the narratological lenses in analyzing it, therefore, will be my main theme in making the analysis of Book IV and V.

The snapshot effect that a text creates opens up a space for using photography and narratology in analysis. It is not a surprising combination considering that these two fields have so much in common considering their common notions such as focalization, perspective, scene and focus. In analyzing Proust’s *Remembrance of the things Past*, Mieke Bal (2006) uses techniques of photography and by doing so, enriches the tools of narratology for further analyses. She argues that photography effects can be created through narrative and then it becomes possible to analyze a narrative through the techniques attributed to photography.

A narration of events, by its nature, is lively and fluid; thus, any choice made to turn the scenes and characters into stable pictures has a meaning. Moreover, we know from the previous chapters that Nazım Hikmet uses a special technique to make his narrative have a movie-like technique, which makes such a shift to photographic features enable a more meaningful analysis.

We can list the effect of photography in a narrative as: it gives stability, it creates scenes hard to forget, the characters tend to become flat and it becomes easier to judge them and the situations they are in, also, it enables to stir strong feelings towards them. The last three effects, I argue, engage with ethics, both in the relationship between the reader and the viewed characters, and in the choice of the narrator to turn the narrative into photographs. Therefore, the last two books of *Manzaralar* reflect an ethical battle that Nazım Hikmet wants the reader to get involved in.

To start with, the first ethical equation of the viewer and the observed characters takes place, both between the reader and the character; and also, between the external narrator and the narrated character. Bal (2006) states, “where there is visibility, there is a viewer.” (p.71) The viewer, the person who is doing the gaze, differs in the text and story levels. We need to remember the three layers that Bal distinguishes as narrative text, story and fabula. Narrative text is what the reader sees, therefore, at this level, the reader becomes the viewer; whereas in the story, where the narrator tells the narrated characters, the viewer is the external narrator. The portraits are narrated by an external narrator throughout the IV. and V. Books, meaning that the external narrator keeps his position as a viewer with the reader through its reading process. Nazım Hikmet places the narrator and the reader as observants at the same level, equalizing their experiences. Contrary to what he does

in Books I and II by changing narrative levels as a tool to accept and think upon the existence of different possible views, he is certain in Books IV and V that there is only one view that should be possessed facing the scenes he tells in these books. This certainness also highlights the ethical value embedded by them. It is an ethical choice to draw the characters as snapshots, objectifying them to be able to witness, feel disgust towards and to judge them.

The snapshot effect is described as a technique that “constitutes a subset of the photographic effect and comes about when the representation takes the form of an album of multiple “takes”, and moves in the direction of photographic seriality.” (p.70) It denies the depth, the existence behind the surface, and makes the object exist only as a visual. In that sense, the characters in this chapter: Koyunzade Şerif Bey, Kemal, Ali Çâviş are flat characters. Şerif Bey is a typical Ağa, who earns his fortune from exploitation of the peasants. Ali Çâviş does illegal transactions and by the money he gets from there, he becomes someone important in the village; and Kemal is an idealist statesman who, under the first pressure, gives up his values and accepts the bribe. Unlike the chapters before, no other explanations or justification is made behind the actions of these characters. Their image in the minds of the readers do not change from beginning till the end. Since they have such stable images, the scenes they are in are also stable images that are hard to forget.

In this sub-chapter, I will analyze the pictures of Koyunzade Şerif Bey, Ali Çâviş and Kemal. Koyunzade Şerif Bey and Kemal’s pictures involve the peasants almost any time they are narrated, signaling us how to read these characters: by their relations to the peasants. Ali Çâviş, on the other hand, is portrayed in his personal relationships with his son and his wife, described in a way to feel a strong dislike for him. I argue that his role in this book is to strengthen the discomfort that dominates

the chapter. In these three cases, Nazım Hikmet leaves the reader no choice but to witness and experience the restlessness of the world they live in. However, none of these characters are the victim of such a world, the peasants in the pictures of Koyunzade Şerif Bey and Kemal are the ones experiencing the consistent restlessness. Nazım Hikmet, by changing our focus from the peasant to the dominating powerful group, leads the reader to see the reasons for the unease the peasants live in. The peasants have to live with, to witness and to remember every day the unchanging sources of their misery, and to focus on these powerful figures, make the reader do the same. To see the discomfort through the eyes of the periphery, Nazım Hikmet once more creates a resembling experience for the reader by using narratological techniques.

What the peasant sees is an unchanging domination, being impersonalized by the powerful group and the discomfort and unease. Koyunzade Şerif Bey will introduce us to the first feeling, whereas Kemal will dehumanize the peasant, and finally, Ali Çâviş will give us the discomfort not the way that peasant feels, but in a way to resemble a similar strong feeling with its short presence.

The picture of the entrance of Koyunzade Şerif Bey tells us about the situation of peasants, the contrast between Şerif Bey sitting and the villagers standing behind is what the narrator wants us to keep in mind every time when he refers to Şerif Bey:

Koyunzade Şerif Bey girdi salona:
Yanında ortanca oğlu ve iki kâtip,
Arkasında simsarı ve
yirmiden fazla köylüyle Yürük
...

Koyunzade Sherif Bey entered the hall,
Flanked by his middle son and two
accountants
And followed by his broker and
twenty-odd peasants and Nomads
...

Tahta sıraların başında, ayakta
kaldı köylülerle Yürükler,
Haşın, esmer elleri kuşaklarının
üstünde kavuşmuş
Ve kuşkulu başlarını salıverdiler
göğüslerine,
Bıyıklarının altında dudakları
kıpırdıyor,
Alınlarında keder,
Cenaze namazına durmuş
gibiydiler. (Hikmet, 2020, p.402)

The peasants and Nomands
Remained standing by the wood benches
As if at funeral prayers:
Rough dark hands folded over their sashed,
Worried heads drooping on their chests,
Lips moving under their mustaches,
Foreheads creased with grief... (Hikmet,
2002, p.345)

Koyunzade Şerif Bey, as we also might guess from the “-zade” in his name, meaning coming from a recognizable family, is a figure of domination and his position does not change due to the power he has both in the monetary sense and with the solid relations he has built with other strong groups in the town. The peasants are standing behind him, and they stand like “funeral prayers”, a certain position done as a last duty for the dead person. It is a stance signifying an unavoidable and irreversible end, the death and the living one’s position in front of the dead one, the respect towards the dead and acceptance of the death. The unchanging situation, respect as a boundary for the actions and the acceptance of the reality, these are what peasants feel in front of Koyunzade Şerif Bey, since they are bound to him economically and there is nothing that can change it. The modernization, the new state has only changed the titles yet the reality of the periphery has remained the same. The unchanging reality gives even more power to people like Koyunzade Şerif because they realize it is their power and strategies they can rely on and benefit from. This realization makes them justify their actions and practices and destroys the hope of the peasants, if they have, for a change in their lives.

It is not only the actors but also the system supporting the existing power relation, and to demonstrate it, the narrator chooses to depict the scene one more time without taking Koyunzade Şerif in the picture:

Zahire Borsası'nın salonu doldu
ağız ağza:

Parmaklığın bu yanında,
masalarında “ağalar”,

Vilayetin beş büyük
efendisi,

Katipleri ve simsarları,

Ve masadan masaya birbiriyle
şakalaşır

Parmaklığın ötesinde Yürüklerle
köylüler,

Hala ayaktaydı çoğu... (Hikmet,
2020, p.408)

The floor of the Grain Exchange was
packed:

On one side of the railing, the “aghas” at
their tables

-the five big effendis of the province-

With their brokers and accountants

Joking with one another across the tables

On the other side, Nomads and peasants,

Most still standing... (Hikmet, 2002,
p.350)

Zahire Borsası, the accountants and the brokers waiting for the officer, the government's representative symbolizes the state's supportive role in the relationship continued between the Ağas, the dominators, and the peasants, the dominated ones. The officer they are waiting for, Kemal, who will be a symbol of the system dehumanizing the peasant, is introduced to us in a scene where he speaks to one of them questioning why they sell their products to ağa knowing that they will get much less in return:

Kurumuş ceviz içi gibiydi
köylünün yüzü

Ve kederle boyuna gülüyor
gibiydi.

Delikanlıydı Kemal

The peasant's face looked like a dried-up
walnut

And seemed to be smiling through tears.

Kemal was a young man

Ve ilk memuriyetiydi bu.
(Hikmet, 2020, p.409)

At his first government job.
(Hikmet, 2002, p.350)

The peasant he is talking to is “smiling through tears” but Kemal is ignorant and cannot understand that it is a system that the peasants cannot escape from. He first takes the peasant as an actor with full agency, that is, making his own choices able to affect his own life. However, after this conversation ending without a result, he seems to accept that it is not the case there. Instead of blaming the system, he starts to dehumanize peasants and see them only as a mass of beings causing problems. We see this change clearly in the scene where “ağa”s send the peasants to occupy the state's buildings when Kemal does not want to come to an agreement with them. In this scene, the way Kemal sees the peasant changes suddenly.. From figures he thinks he is going to help by enlightening them, they turn into figures out of control and impossible to deal with. The narrator takes the picture of the moment seen by Kemal in a way to reflect Kemal’s feelings:

İnsanla doluydu:
Ofis kapısının önü, Borsa salonu,
merdivenler.
Yüz yüz elli kişi kadar vardılar
Fakat Kemal’e
milyonlarcaymışlar gibi geldi.
Kadın, erkek, çoluk çocuk,
Yalınayak, takunyalı, kasketli,
başörtülü, baş açık
Uzamış tıraşları ve fıldır fıldır
gözleriyle
Milyonla karınca gibi milyonla
insan.” (Hikmet, 2020, p.419)

Outside, crowds of people
Mobbed the Exchange floor and the
steps.
They numbered about a hundred and fifty
But looked like millions to Kemal.
Men, women, and children-
Bare feet, wood clogs, caps, scarves, bare
heads,
Unshaven faces, feverish eyes,
Millions of people like millions of ants.
(Hikmet, 2002, p.359)

Nazım Hikmet, gives us two pictures of Kemal with peasants: one is from the time he talks to one of them, and the other one is the one with millions of them facing Kemal. Taking photographs and narrating an event are similar due to the election process they involve. Both the narrator and the photographer choose what to represent and from which angle to represent. The ideology hidden behind the act of election is described by Sontag (2005) as choosing “something worth” to talk about. (p.14) What we see as an event is constructed by ideology. These two photographs are taken one after another to tell a change in Kemal’s view towards the peasants. How he sees them is not only a personal opinion, he is a representative of the state in its ignorance and dehumanizing point of view towards the periphery. As we may remember from the chapter discussing the state's struggle in modernizing the periphery, the state sees the peasant as either a mass to educate or as a group that cannot be controlled. Both of the views dehumanize them and as a result, the state continues to turn its back to the periphery leaving it in its own problematic circle.

Finally, Kemal gives what the “ağa”s want and takes the bribe. Seeing Kemal’s snapshots taken one after another becomes a way of witnessing an event. Sometimes, even, a witnessing done unwillingly, and inevitably. The narrator, in Book IV, invites the reader to witness inevitably to the moments of bribery and corruption. Through the scenes the reader cannot stomach but also cannot look away, the narrator completes a series of snapshots. He does it by changing the narrative style he has been using throughout the book. The depth of the characters was spread in their actions in a flow in the first three books, but here, they appear as snapshots, flat and disturbing. The photos leave an ethical dilemma behind them: the ethics of not intervening, but watching things happening. Susan Sontag (2005) states: “Photographing is essentially an act of non-intervention.” (p.8) The heaviness of

non-intervening these moments makes the narrator direct his anger towards the way he is photographing them, that is why we have strong and sometimes disturbing images.

Ali Çâviş is a figure stirring strong negative emotions in the reader. He is introduced not with his relation to the peasant, but with details of his marriage life, in which his son is having affair with Ali's wife:

Güldü Ali Çâviş:	Ali Chavish grinned-
Bembeyaz dişlerle bölündü yağlı, pörsük bir karanlık:	A greasy, wrinkled darkness split with pure white teeth.
Zebella gibi zenciydi Ali Çâviş.	Ali Chavish was a gigantic black.
...	...
Almanya'da hukuk tahsil etti oğlan,	The boy studied law in Germany;
Şimdi ticaret yapıyor	Now he's in business,
Babasına ortak,	Partners with his father-
Fakat yalnız ticarete değil,	And not only in business
Yatağında da üvey anasının.	But in his stepmother's bed
...	Once, they hinted about his son to Ali Chavish.
Bir gün Ali Çâviş'e oğlunun işini ima ettiler.	...
...	He licked his thick purple lips with his pointed pink tongue:
Kalın mor dudaklarını yaladı sipsivri pembe zenci diliyle:	"yes" he said, "y-e-e-e-s,
"-Malum," dedi, "maalum,	My son is my partner." (Hikmet, 2002, p.349)
Ortağımdır oğlum." (Hikmet, 2020, p.407)	

The depiction of Ali Çâviş includes words such as "greasy, wrinkled" and the way he reacts to his son and his wife's affair creates a discomfort which is followed

by him taking Kemal to city of D, a city where any women living there can sell themselves while their husbands and children are also at home. He takes Kemal there to make him accept the bribery, and at the end, Kemal gets involved in the corruption circle. The way Ali Çâviş is narrated carries no effort in creating sympathy or understanding in the reader towards him. I argue that it is done on purpose. First, it is an ethical action due to the heaviness of non-intervention I have discussed above, second, to raise the level of discomfort to resemble the experience of the periphery, and third, to highlight the inevitability of the witnessing, since this inevitability becomes clear when the scene is disturbing instead of comforting. The inevitability here also raises the feeling of helplessness since it closes all the possible exit doors.

One last picture of inevitable witnessing and helplessness I will analyze is from the Book V, which is generally considered as unfinished. Before that scene, we learn that a family commits suicide due to the poverty they are living in. After the police and doctors leave the scene, the scene below is narrated. A poor man steals the bread coupons of the dead family:

Gittiler.
İçerde ihtiyar bir erkek
kaldı yalnız
Karşı odanın insanlarından
biri.
Yalınayaktı.
Ve biten bir şey gibi
suçsuz ve hazindi yüzü.
Eğildi üstüne kalın kara
kaşlı erkeğin,
Soktu ellerini ölümün
ceplerine.
Bulup çıkardı ekmek
karnesini.

They left.
Only an old man stayed behind,
One of the tenants in the room across.
Barefoot,
And his face looked innocent and forlorn,
like something abandoned.
He bent over the man with the
bushy black eyebrows
And rifled his pockets.
He found the man's bread coupons.
...

...
Mahalle mümessiliydi
giren.
Bakıştılar.
Mümessil uzattı kolunu,
Karneyi devretti ihtiyar.
Elleri titremiyordu,
Yalnız bir kat daha suçsuz
ve hazindi yüzü. (Hikmet, 2020,
p.535)

...
It was the neighborhood alderman.
They stared at each other.
The alderman held out his hand,
And the old man turned over the
ration coupons.
His hands didn't shake,
But his face looked twice as
innocent and forlorn. (Hikmet, 2002, p.461)

Mieke Bal (2006), referring to the snapshot effect of a narrative, uses the phrase “instantaneous arrest”. (p.71) The word “arrest” is used as “to stop”, but the word’s first connotation includes criminality, since it also means to catch a criminal after committing the crime, which fits much better to this scene. However, although there is stealing, there is no crime. There is an arrest for a non-existent crime. As we can understand from that the old man looks innocent and forlorn, he is forced by the conditions he is living in to take the bread-coupons of a dead man. That is also why, when he sees the other person coming to do the same thing, he gets more innocent, since, it is not them but the economic system making them live like that.

The narrator, as well as the reader, is the owner of a quiet gaze in this scene as well, the narrator does not make a comment, does not give more information than any other character can see. I think this is because the picture of him here is self-explanatory, and does not need any extra information to understand. What remains to the reader is then, the heaviness of an unwilling, inevitable witnessing of the situation of the people.

Peasants, those in peripheries are left to witness the misery they are in, and this is something they cannot look away or save themselves from. The final theme reveals the heaviness of living in, as well as, being have to witness the lives of others in misery.

Photographs turn a moment into a meta that can be circulated and used. Book IV and V has a significant focus on the economic conditions of the disadvantaged groups, the periphery and the poor populations living in big cities. Both of them can be considered as the people ignored by the state. The real conditions they are living in are chosen to be narrated as photographs of the limited number of people taken in a restricted space, as unforgettable images rather than flowing dialogues. Such a choice supports the materiality quality of photographing a scene. In the final two books, we complete the circle that Nazım Hikmet wants the reader to consider. The periphery, left in its own destiny, is dehumanized, therefore its problems are thought to be caused by them and cannot be resolved without their own intentions. Such an understanding leads the state to blame the victim and attribute a so-called lack of capacity to the periphery. Both the plan of enlightening them and accepting and blaming the established rules of life there separates the periphery from the center and makes it a “there” described against “here”, the center. The experience of the periphery, then, being have to continue to live as they have been, a constant dehumanization and the feeling of unease and fragility. Nazım Hikmet, by placing the reader in a position that it cannot look away, makes the reader see and experience the same in Books IV and V. What is unique and amazing in his way of succeeding is that he does not directly focus on the periphery, but rather, making the dominating powers objects of the viewer and creates a similar experience for the reader with the periphery, by objectifying the advantaged powerful group. He uses narratological

techniques to equalize what the periphery and the reader feels. He makes the reader see the periphery through the peripheral's eyes, instead of telling it directly from a peasant's view. He is aware of the fact that he cannot put the peasant in dialogue with an "ağa" since it would not be realistic considering their relations. And when the peasant cannot be included in a dialogue to narrate himself, then, there would be two choices to voice them: first one is to narrate the whole scenes from a peasant narrator and the second one, the difficult one, is to make the reader understand his situation by feeling the same. If Nazım Hikmet would have chosen a peasant as a narrator, he would be, in a way, exoticize him, since, he had to make the peasant speak in a way to make the reader identify with him. Such a language would be something stranger to the peasant's world. Being able to use the language of the others to be understood is not giving the periphery a voice, but rather, destroying its own voice. That is why Nazım Hikmet focuses on the identification aim and looks for a new way to achieve the same result. He slows down his narration, turns the scenes into photographs and creates strong feelings that the reader can have a similar experience with the peasant.

The way he chooses also explains why things we have seen here cannot be explained by two modernity models we have discussed before. Both the belatedness model and the in-between model is about how a change is experienced. The periphery narrated in Book IV and V experiences the opposite; they get stuck in their own reality, only the titles and the procedures have changed yet their unease remains the same. Narratology, as a way of reading experiences of modernity, therefore, gives us what is missing here: the heaviness of unchanging conditions.

CONCLUSION

In *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* (*Human Landscapes From My Country*), Nazım Hikmet Ran draws a panorama of the people to re-write a history, but now, a more individual-centered one. He builds up a great narration with small pieces of self-narratives of the characters, with the dialogues between them and unforgettable images of crucial scenes. In this great epic of a society made up of different experiences, he critiques the republic due to its ignorance towards the periphery. The events narrated are sufficient in reflecting the poet's ideology, however, the way he narrates opens up new ways of reading his critique. The techniques he uses allow the reader to experience the periphery's modernization struggle. Centering the experientiality, I argue, enables a deeper reading of the process that the periphery goes through than the general models of modernity might offer. I have compared the results of narratological analysis with two main models of reading modernity: Jusdanis' model of belatedness and Shayegan's model of disfiguration. Both of these models offer important readings of east modernization compared to the west experience. However, sometimes they miss unique experiences of different modernizations. As they both argue, how non-west countries meet and apply modernity differs in various ways. As a non-western country, the example of Turkey might be analyzed with these two lenses, but, for the inner uniqueness, we need a more experience-centered reading. Narratology, I argue, helps us to develop a better lens for the specificity of the process. I do not mean that what narratology shows us contradicts these two important models, on the contrary, it strengthens the results of them by filling the lacks they have.

As we have seen in the chapter analyzing Turkish modernization, the center and the periphery go through different processes in which the center easily adapts itself to the modernization and makes plans for the whole nation whereas the periphery is forced to accomplish the goals that the center has put for it. As we might remember, Erdağ Gökner (2012) claims that the young republic had the argument that the Ottoman was the colonizer and Turkey freed itself from the colonization. We might further this argument that the center of the young republic, after the Ottoman Empire, replaced this colonizer position as an elite-bourgeois group and dominated the periphery under the justification of development. Such a scenario is not something unique to the young republic, Ranajit Guha (1982), while defining Indian subaltern, argues that they are ignored not only by colonial foreign elites, but also by indigenous bourgeois- nationalist elites. He criticizes Indian nationalist history on the basis that it centers on the elites and heroic figures, not the people. Similarly, Touraj Atabaki (2007) highlights that the state's effort to overcome underdevelopment places the state in a position against the society in the modernization process in Iran. These examples show us that since national states and nationality are interwoven with the modernity and the modern states, the idea of development and modernization is seen as something that must be followed for the nations' good to reach a place where the nation deserves. The narration of development and the narration of nation cannot be separated in the countries who have met these two changes at the same time. In these scenarios, the state, who is the natural defender of the nation, takes the position of leading people, sometimes, to the developments they do not wish to achieve or do not understand. It is, then, inevitable that the state and the people become the two opposite poles of the system. The epic of the nation and the epic of the people, then, turns into two completely different narratives; the former

is written and circulated by the state whereas the latter is not known and not heard, but only experienced. What Nazım Hikmet does, by writing the epic of the people, is to make the epic of the reality circulated and read beside the official epic, that is, the history told and published by the instruments of the state.

An important characteristic of *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* is that it is written, as I have mentioned, as a way to build up a panorama. Panorama enables the reader or the observer to be in a position to see a great picture without missing out important details. However, it is also a position that the observer cannot focus on one single detail and channels its perception to a more context and relation-focus path. Details that can be seen but cannot be lost in forces the observer to think of them in relation to the others and the way they connect to each other. An epic written as a panorama, then, aims at destroying one hero-focus narrative and to consider people and events in a chain, one leading or causing the other. The text includes a variety of portraits, yet does not allow the reader to get lost in only one. The reader can get the information s/he could get by focusing on a character by going with the flow and observing its relation to the others. The static epic is replaced by a lively panorama without losing its capacity to reflect the reality.

Creating such a lively text, Nazım Hikmet's first aim might be to tell a more realistic story of the country. His text, however, cannot be restricted to this aim. The text's critique of early-republican era modernization and the modernity experience of the people is significantly valuable in the sense that he does it not only by the context but also by the form of his narration. The ideology of the text is embodied by any piece and element of the text. The narratological analysis of the book revealed that the way the story is narrated is as ideological as the story chosen to be narrated.

Mieke Bal (2021) argues that narratology provides us with cultural and political readings, since it focuses on the ways a narrative is constructed, and the narrative is, basically, everywhere. From the ways we find meaningful for ordering and relating the events to the epistemological power we attribute to the narrator, narratology has a power and ability to reveal the way we see the world, and the structures we read the outside world through. Narratology is, by its nature, eligible to be a tool to make ideological, social and cultural readings. When its elements and tools are used to support a political stance, then, it becomes such a strong instrument that neglecting it in the analysis would be a mistake. That is why, I have chosen to make a narratological analysis of Nazım Hikmet's *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*. A text that has been analyzed by its context in many different researches needs to be supported by an analysis of its narrative structures and applications as well. I argue that *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* is a critique of the uneven modernization process and the state's relations to peasants; and, the way the narrative is told also reflects the ideology as well as the story narrated.

To prove my argument, I have used different narratological analysis in reading five books of the text. For the books I and II, I have focused on the shift between the narrator and focalizer levels since it provided us the relation between knowledge and ideology, in the sense that Nazım Hikmet uses it in a way to claim his political stance by leaving the elite figures ignorant and by calling the reader and some of the mute characters into the conversation. By changing the knowledge level of the reader, Nazım Hikmet, first, invites the reader to observe with him, then, he shares his political view with the reader in characters' descriptions, and expects the reader to see the way he sees them. At the end of this chapter, we also see that Nazım Hikmet, in the cases where it is hard to judge the situation, invites both the reader

and the characters in the same level to create a democratic dialogue where it is normal to have different opinions about the situation analyzed. I have also touched upon the movie-like features of the text in general, but specifically, of the first two books. These features, such as the changes of the scenes, zooming in the characters one by one, and scenario-like dialogues, creates a feeling that is dominant in these two books, and that is: confusion. By confusing the reader Hikmet resembles the experience of the reader to the experience of the periphery: being in between different knowledge and claims but not being able to have a role in judging or changing them.

After analyzing the first two books with the lenses I have discussed above, I have also gone to the roots of narratology and analyzed the small narratives within the books using the fundamental elements of a narrative. The narrative is everywhere, and one's reading of its own life is not an exception. How the individual narrates his own life reveals the ways he perceives the world, which demonstrates the problematic points in that narrative, signaling the individual's connection to the world he is living in. The reading in that chapter proved us that the self- narratives in Books I and II lack the basic elements of narrative: the causality in relating the events and the coherence of it for building one single identity. As a result, the feeling of agency differs from character to character; the ability of constructing an identity around a coherent story parallels the character's seeing itself as an agent. Most of the individuals in the periphery, beyond being unable to follow the changes around them, cannot build a coherent story about themselves and lose their agencies in their minds. This loss is supported with the fact that the state, either by deciding for them or by neglecting their reality, ignores the periphery's agency.

Book III introduced us to analyzing the notion of space with the experiences of those who are either limited or isolated by it. However, as we have seen, limitation is not only placed upon the people by the place, the state as a power figure limits the boundaries of the actors. The limitation also comes with the notion of separation, as we see in the examples of states buildings and states agents, the distance of the state from the people is felt by the periphery by the state's existence in their world only as a figure of pressure or authority. The periphery, as an actor, is limited by a power that it cannot argue with or object to. The power is invisible, but does not shy away from revealing itself when working against the people. The law, the state's figures and the buildings were the figures of power we have encountered in Book III, and we have seen these figures from the eyes of the periphery.

Book IV and V invited us to a disturbing yet inevitable witnessing. These books were highly related to photography, in the sense that they were a series of strong snapshots of the limited people in a limited space rather than a flow of connections of events in a wider scope. Using the snapshots, Nazım Hikmet provides the periphery's experience for the reader. He does not focus on the peasants, rejects to make them the objects of viewing. It is the powerful groups and the state the ones that are observed, and focusing on them reveal the process that dehumanizes the periphery, the system that has not changed from Ottoman to the republic of Turkey and the feeling of unease and discomfort dominant in the life of periphery. Photography also means being unable to intervene in the scene captured. The ethical heaviness of being have to watch channels the urge to do something about it to the descriptions of the powerful characters in these books. They are narrated in a way to leave no space for justifying their actions and understanding them. With these books,

Nazım Hikmet completely reflects the experience of the periphery into the world of the reader and by doing so, he tells the epic of the people of this country.

After going through this experience, the need for a new model of explaining the modernization of the republic becomes urgent. Both Jusdanis and Shayegan create excellent models for explaining non-western modernities including the dual reality these societies have been facing. Jusdanis focuses on the feeling of lack and delay, the dual reality occurs between the model put forth for the society to achieve and the reality of the society. The time of these two realities is different, the model is in the future and the reality is about the present. However, in this model, the society lives in a time that is not today nor the future. Today is already late and the future is the one that has to be present. The impossibility of the present defines Jusdanis' model best. We can use this model to understand the mentality of the state while making plans for the people despite the people. The center has felt the urge to keep up with the modern western states and is never satisfied with the results it gets. However, this model lacks understanding of the periphery since they have never felt such a rush towards the future or to a model aimed at. The struggle for surviving everyday had already rendered the periphery timeless. Therefore, this successful model lacks the experience of periphery.

Shayegan defines a cultural schizophrenia in which both the reality of the country and the reality of the "Other" is experienced at the same time. While Jusdanis' model defines a timelessness, Shayegan's model describes a "nowhere" since these two worlds experienced at the same time disfigure each other. The world of the objects and the world of the signals do not correspond to each other. Being in nowhere also means losing the reference points. This model, I think, explains best the life of the ones living in the city, close the center but unable to intervene in the

changes happening in the external world. This model, too, lacks an explanation of the periphery's life.

The embodiment of the “west” by a group in a non-western society complicates the modernity models we have come across so far. The experience of the periphery, or to use a more colonial- connotated term, the subaltern has been ignored to have a “unified” history and the modernity models we should be using in reading such societies, therefore, must be more experience-focused. As we have seen, explaining the state and center does not help us understand the periphery. Narratology, by focusing on self-narratives and details in greater narratives, completes reading the modernity of a non-western society.

The themes of the chapters were a sum of the experience of the periphery, however, with an attempt to read self-narratives, we had a chance to discover how the periphery lost its connection to the external world. The result of the analysis was that the reality of the external world was incomprehensible for those ignored since the republic and changing conditions following it broke the ways they make sense of the world, and the ways they build their identities within a coherent and continuous whole. For those keeping their privilege, on the other hand, such an experience is not the case. They can connect different parts of their life in plausible ways. Models providing general readings miss the uniqueness of the individual experiences. To have an epic reflecting the reality of the society as a whole, an individual-centered model should be obtained.

Nazım Hikmet, in *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*, critiques the republic on the basis that the modernism it brings is distributed unevenly and the relation of the state to the periphery ignores the reality of it. The promise of modernism was a change, however, the peasants' economic conditions have not changed. Moreover,

since the old structures started to be destroyed by the modernist movement, the periphery remained fragile facing all the changes. Their reality has not changed, but the ways they can build connections within the limited agency defined by their tradition are destroyed. Their narratives lost continuity and coherence. Those privileged, on the other hand, kept their positions during the republic as well. To those people, both the republic and modernization re-shaped their limits of agency, in which they discovered the power of legitimization. What is surprising in arriving at these results, is that, we have reached them only by using the ways the narrative is built, we did not read any narrated event by using our previous knowledge of the history. This success makes us agree with Bal, in her argument that narratology is a productive and innovative field offering us new ways of reading.

Since Turkish modernization is a non-western example, and we already have smart models to analyze a non-western modernization: Jusdanis' belatedness and Shayegan's disfiguration of reality. However, since Nazım Hikmet wanted to write a history centralizing the human experience, I wanted to develop an alternative way of reading by combining narratology and the experience of the people.

My aim in this thesis was to make a small reading of the history of disconnection and meaninglessness that the periphery has been experiencing in Turkey, and also, to develop a tool that I find useful in analyzing it. Narratology, as a study of narratives at any levels, has the power to equalize the great narratives of the states and the self-narratives of the individuals and I argue that we need such an equalization to re-write our histories. Such equalization also occurs between the experience of the periphery and the reader in the journey of reading *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları.*, which I find extraordinary and intelligent in Nazım Hikmet's writing.

I am aware of the fact that this thesis goes through two different ideological lenses: the first one is Nazım Hikmet's ideology embodied in the text and the second one is my ideological stance in reading and analyzing Nazım Hikmet's text. As I have elaborated on in the previous chapters, Nazım Hikmet has a communist world-view stemming from humanism and thus his texts aim revealing the distorted reality of the people, especially of those who are not privileged. My ideological lens parallels with his world-view since I think that the known and circulated history of this country is shaped by the ideology of the state and only the narration of the unheard stories would enable us to reach to the reality of the country. Therefore, my analysis had a narratological focus. However, *Manzaralar* is a perfect ground for a Marxist literary reading as well considering the fact that according to this school of critique, a literary text is beyond a reflection of the society, but is itself an event occurred in the society. The literature, in that sense, neither is an independent being free from the social reality nor completely dependent on it. Marxist critique of literature places itself between a strong singularity of art and a concrete determinism, making literature a subject rather than a passive product.

Raymond Williams and Pierre Bourdieu coin significant terms for understanding the place of literature in relation to society. Williams focuses on the notion of mediation, which is, the change from one status to another one. The mediation is between the literature and the social reality; thus, literature is a part of a dialectic relationship. The notion of mediation gives literature an active position, and Bourdieu's notion of habitus defines how literature may flow with the power it has. According to Bourdieu, habitus is a total of connection, and as a result, a field defining the opportunities and possibilities. The conditions of a society create a habitus limiting and shaping the possible ways of a literary text to occur. However, it

is the author who is making the choices among the possibilities and creates the literary piece. (Özarslan, 2003) I argue that the fact that *Manzaralar* takes its content from the social reality it is produced in and is shaped by Nazım Hikmet in a unique way is a perfect example of how literature works and what literature is according to Marxist critique.

As a final note, I am aware of the fact that throughout the thesis, I have taken the periphery as individuals who are deprived of their agency. Some of the recent researches have the opposite arguments, that the periphery had its own resistance where they create a force-field, as an opportunity to clash with the state over the state's authorial executions. Hale Yılmaz refers to James C. Scott's everyday resistance models in the reactions of the peasants in the early republican era. Similarly, Murat Metinsoy, in *The Power of the People*, argues that the peasant was not misled by the slogans emphasizing on the role of the peasants for the state and raised their voices to inform the state about their conditions and ask for their rights. As a further discussion, the binary classification of the center against the periphery might be the subject of a criticism that such a structure does not allow for a struggle and change for the individuals restricted by the class they are in. Such a valuable discussion would further my argument that there is a need for focusing on the single individual narrations to be able to write a more realistic of the people and the country. Every time one general model or argument arises, misfitting experiences would find a space to object. I argue that further investigations on the experience of the periphery would reveal such stories we have not heard of before, thus, we need to create a space for different experiences to be known, which leads us to the significant role that the literature has.

The power of the literature is not only in its ability to narrate events occurred but also lies in its embodiment of the ways we make sense of the world in its form. We should remember that literature frees the neglected groups by giving voice to them. It is the duty of the literary scholars to support literature's equalizing power in any way to make unheard voices heard and circulate the unknown stories of the subaltern. Narratology connects literature to cultural readings without damaging the unique chemistry of it. Analyzing a literary text only by its content makes the literature a case study for other social sciences. As literary scholars defending our field's connection to society, we should be using and improving narratology more to use our valuable tools to read the human experience in different ways that the other social sciences cannot achieve. As a field keeps nourishing from human life and experiences, I believe, this is the way literature pays its debt to humanity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aguilar, M. (2007). Nâzım Hikmet's Modernism of Development. *Journal of Modern Literature*, 30(4), 105-121. <https://doi.org/10.2979/JML.2007.30.4.105>
- Ahmad, F. (1999). Introduction. In Berkes, N. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315022581>
- Ahmad, F. (2008). Politics and political parties in Republican Turkey. In R. Kasaba (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey* (Cambridge History of Turkey, pp. 226-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[doi:10.1017/CHOL9780521620963.010](https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521620963.010)
- Aristotle,&Hutton, J. (1996). *Aristotle's Poetics*. London: Penguin Books.
- Ateş, D. (2007). Nazım Hikmet'te Bir İz Olarak Anadolu ve Memleket. *Hece*, 121, Ocak 2007, 332-338.
- Atılğan, G. (2019). 'Manzaralar'daki Burjuvalar: Nâzım Hikmet'in Kaleminden Türkiye Burjuvalarının Dünyası (The Bourgeois in the Landscapes: The World of the Bourgeoisie in Turkey as penned by Nâzım Hikmet). *Çalışma Ve Toplum*, 1(60), 231–257.
- Aymaz, G. (2007). *Sanatsal Üretimin Toplumsal Oluşumu: Nazım Hikmet'in Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları Örneği*. (Publication No. 208979) (Phd Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi) Council of Higher Education Thesis Center Database
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1982). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Texas: University of Texas Press.

- Bal, M. (ed.). (2004). *Narrative Theory, Vol. 1_ Major Issues in Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Bal, M. (2006). *A Mieke Bal Reader*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bal, M. (2009). *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bal, M. (2021). *Narratology In Practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Barthes, R., & Duisit, L. (1975). An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative. *New Literary History*, 6(2), 237–272. <https://doi.org/10.2307/468419>
- Belge, M. (1983). *Tarihten Güncelliğe*. İstanbul: Alan Yayınları.
- Berkes, N. (1999). *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315022581>
- Blasing, M. K. (2013). *Nâzım Hikmet : the life and times of Turkey's world poet* (First edition.). Persea Books.
- Bora, T. (2017). *Cereyanlar: Türkiye'de siyasi ideolojiler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Brooks, P. (1992). *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Harvard University Press.
- Butler, C. (2010). *Modernism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Carlisle, J., & Schwarz, D. R. (1994). *Narrative and culture*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Cornell University Press.

Çıkla, S. (2021). *Türkiye’de Rejim ve Edebiyat*. İstanbul: Kitabevi.

Çıraklı, M. Z. (2015). *Anlatıbilim : kuramsal okumalar*. Hece Yayınları

Dede, K. (2021). *Edebiyatın Ulusu Ulusun Edebiyatı*. Ankara: Nika Yayınevi.

Dolcerocca, Ö. N. (2016). Reimagining the Epic: Historical and Collective Memory in Nazım Hikmet and Pablo Neruda. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi/Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 33(2), 111–121.

Doğan, M.H. (2007). Nazım Hikmet ve Şiiri. Hece, 121, Ocak 2007, 174-185.

Ertürk, N. (2010). Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey. *Boundary 2*, 37(2), 155–185. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01903659-2010-007>

Fedai, Ö. (2007) Orkestranın Sesinden Destanın Çılgılığına. Hece, 121, Ocak 2007, 236-246.

Fivush, R. (2020). The Emergence of Autobiographical Consciousness and the Construction of an Autobiographical Self . Gülgöz, S., Acar Şahin, B. (eds) *Autobiographical Memory Development: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches*.

Fludernik, M. (1996). *Towards a Natural Narratology*. London: Routledge.

Fludernik, M. (2009). *An Introduction to Narratology*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books.

Genette, G.(1983). *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. NY: Cornell University Press.

Gliniecki-Uysal, A. (2020). *Nazım Hikmet’in Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları adlı yapıtında metinlerarası bir yolculuk ve çevrilen Türk insanı: Etnografik bir*

İnceleme (Publication No.630446) (PhD Thesis, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi).

Council of Higher Education Thesis Center Database.

Göbenli, M. (2021). Nâzım Hikmet's Reception as a World Poet. In B. Alkan & Ç.

Günay-Erkol (Eds.), *Turkish Literature as World Literature* (pp. 112–128).

Bloomsbury Publishing.

Göksu, S., Timms, E. (1999). *Romantic Communist*. London: Hurst.

Gökna, E. (2012). Secular Blasphemies: Orhan Pamuk and the Turkish

Novel. *Novel* 1 45 (2): 301–326. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1215/00295132-1573985>

Guha, R. (Ed.).(1982). *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and*

Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gürbilek, N. (2003). Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the

Turkish Novel. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102(2–3), 599–628.

<https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-102-2-3-599>

Halman, T. S. (1968). Nazim Hikmet: Selected Poems Taner Baybars. *Middle East*

Journal, 22(3), 368–369

Heper, M. (1985). *The State Tradition in Turkey*. Florida: The Eothen Press.

Heper, M., Öncü, A., & Kramer, H. (Eds.). (1993). *Turkey and The West: Changing*

Political and Cultural Identities. London: I.B.Tauris. Retrieved June 27, 2022,

from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9780755612536>

Heper, M. (1993). Political Culture as a Dimension of Compatibility. In Heper, M.,

Öncü, A., & Kramer, H. Turkey and west: changing political and cultural

identities, I.B. Tauris.

Hikmet, N. (2020). *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları*. İstanbul: YKY.

Hikmet, N. (2002). *Human Landscapes From My Country*. New York: Persea Books

Jusdanis, G. (1991). *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National*

Literature (NED-New edition, Vol. 81). University of Minnesota Press.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttsdx0>

Kasaba, R. (1997). *Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities*. Sibel Bozdogan,

& Resat Kasaba. (eds). *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*.

Washington: University of Washington Press

King, N. (2000). *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self*. Edinburgh

University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrtxm>

Lekesiz, Ö. Nâzım Hikmet, Kemalizm, Komünizm ve Sosyalist Yönelimler. *Hece*,

121, Ocak 2007, 16-30.

Levenson, M. (Ed.). (1999). *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism* (Cambridge

Companions to Literature). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

doi:10.1017/CCOL0521495164

Liveley, G. (2019). *Narratology*. Oxford University Press.

Mattar, K. (2020). *Specters of World Literature: Orientalism, Modernity, and the*

Novel in the Middle East. Edinburgh University Press)

McAdams, D. P., Josselson, R., & Lieblich, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Identity and story:*

Creating self in narrative. American Psychological

Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11414-000>

Memet Fuat. (2001). *Nazım Hikmet : yaşamı, ruhsal yapısı, davaları, tartışmaları,*

dünya görüşü şiirinin gelişmeleri : yaşantı (1. baskı). Yapı Kredi Yayınları

Michael Freeden. (2003). *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*. OUP Oxford.

Metinsoy, M. (2021). *The Power of the People: Everyday Resistance and Dissent in the Making of Modern Turkey, 1923-38*. December 2021 titles.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009025775>

Nâzım Hikmet, & Blasing, M. K. (2013). *Life's good, brother : a novel* (1st ed.). Persea Books.

Nelson, K., & Fivush, R. (2020). The Development of Autobiographical Memory, Autobiographical Narratives, and Autobiographical Consciousness. *Psychological Reports*, 123(1), 71–96.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294119852574>

Nureddin, Vala. (2011). *Bu Dünyadan Bir Nazım Geçti*. İstanbul: İlke Basın Yayım.

Nünning, A. (2010). Making Events – Making Stories – Making Worlds: Ways of Worldmaking from a Narratological Point of View. In V. Nünning, A. Nünning, B. Neumann & M. Horn (Ed.), *Cultural Ways of Worldmaking: Media and Narratives* (pp. 189-214). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110227567.189>

Oktay, A. (2008). Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları Üstüne Notlar. *İmkânsız Poetika*. İstanbul: İthaki.

Orhan Kemal, & Kemal, O. (1996). *Nazım Hikmet'le üç buçuk yıl*. AD Yay

Özarslan, E. (2003). *Nazım Hikmet: Hayatı ve Şiiri*. (Publication No. 132761) (PhD Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi). Council of Higher Education Thesis Center Database.

- Özer, N. (2013). *Nazım Hikmet'in Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları'nda İmajlar: Toplum, Tarih ve Sinema*. (Publication No. 327617) (PhD Thesis, Bilkent University). Council of Higher Education Thesis Center Database.
- Parla, J. (2003). *Babalar ve Oğulları: türk Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Plato (1998). *Republic* R. Waterfield (Ed.). (Oxford World's Classics). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Oxford Scholarly Editions Online (2019). doi:10.1093/actrade/9780199535767.book.1
- Puckett, K. (2016). *Narrative Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139522502
- Rüya TELLİ, & Ayşenur YILMAZ. (2020). Geç Dönem Osmanlı Modernleşmesine Genel Bir Bakış. *Liberal Düşünce*, 25(100), 9–35.
- Sertel, Zekeriya. (1991). *Mavi Gözlü Dev*. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.
- Seyhan, A. (2003). Enduring Grief: Autobiography as “Poetry of Witness” in the Work of Assia Djebar and Nazım Hikmet. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 40(2), 159–172
- Sharpe, K. B. (2021). The Internationalist Left and World Literature: The Case of Nâzım Hikmet in Greece. In B. Alkan & Ç. Günay-Erkol (Eds.), *Turkish Literature as World Literature* (pp. 129–147). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Shayegan, D. (1997). *Cultural Schizophrenia: Islamic Societies Confronting the West*. Syracuse University Press.
- Smorti, A. (2020). *Telling to Understand*. NY: Springer.

- Sontag, S. (2005). *On Photography*. NY: Rosetta.
- Susan, B. (2003). *Autobiographical memory: Exploring its functions in everyday life*. Memory (Hove, England). 11. 113-23. 10.1080/741938206.
- Temizyürek, M. (2014). *İm Bilse Er Ölmes*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Tew, P., Murray, A. (2019). *The Modernism Handbook*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Thon, J.-N. (2016). *Transmedial Narratology and Contemporary Media Culture*. University of Nebraska Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1d8h8vn>
- Todorov, T. (1981). *Introduction to Poetics*. University of Minnesota.
- Touraj Atabaki. (2007). *The State and the Subaltern : Modernization, Society and the State in Turkey and Iran*. I.B. Tauris
- van Vuch Tjissen, L., Berting, J., Lechner, F. (ed). (1995). *The Search for Fundamentals: The Process of Modernisation and the Quest of Meaning*. NY: Springer.
- Yener, A.G., Gelenek, Tabu ve Eleştiri: Nâzım Hikmet Şiirinin Algılanış Sorunu. Hece, 121, Ocak 2017, 34-40.
- Yetiş, K. (2018). Nazım Hikmet'in Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları Kitabındaki Kişiler/Tipler* (Vol. 4). Vol. 4. *Aydın Türklük Bilgisi*.
- Yılmaz, H. (2016). *Becoming Turkish*. NY: Syracuse University Press.

