

***A STUDY OF THE DEPICTION OF HISTORY,
POLITICS AND CULTURE IN THE NOVELS OF
ORHAN PAMUK***

Minor Research Project

Submitted to

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

WRO, PUNE

By

Dr Rajendra R. Thorat

M.A., M. Phil., Ph.D.

Venutai Chavan College,

KARAD 415 124, Dist. Satara

Maharashtra State

September,2017

Acknowledgement

At the beginning I extend my sincere thanks to University Grants Commission, Western Regional Office, Pune for giving me an opportunity to investigate the works of the Orhan Pamuk. I am also obliged to the Chairman of Shri Shivaji Shikshan Sanstha, Karad, Hon. Shri Balasaheb Patil, Hon. Prakashrao Patil, the General Secretary of the Sanstha and other members of the Management for encouraging me to pursue my project work. Thanks are also due to Prin. B. N. Kalekar and Dr P. B. Chaugule for their full support and cooperation in the pursuit of this research.

This study is possible because of inspiration and help rendered to me by my well wishers and friends like Dr. Satish Ghatge, Dr. Ujjvala Tathe, Prof. Dr. Shivaji Sargar. I must thank all my senior colleagues in the College P. M. Chavan, Dr. R. A. Kengar, T. S. Bangar, Dr. N.A. Patil, Dr. S.R. Sarode, Sou. M. A. Shinde, Sou. S. P. Patil and all others who were supportive in my endeavor.

I must express a deep sense of gratitude to the librarians of University of Goa, University of Mumbai, Mumbai, IACIS (Formerly ASRC), Hyderabad, Central University, Hyderabad, NMU, Jalgaon, Shivaji University, Kolhapur. My special thanks are to the librarian and support staff of Venutai Chavan College, Karad.

I thank my parents Ramchandra and Lilawati and my brother, Satish, who always remained a source of inspiration in my life. Last but not the least, I must thank my wife, Sou. Pramila who shouldered the

responsibility of house during my studies; my son Saurabh and daughter, Pranita for bearing with me during my busy schedule of research work.

Karad

Dr. Rajendra R. Thorat

September, 2017

D E C L A R A T I O N

*I hereby declare that the minor research project entitled **A STUDY OF THE DEPICTION OF HISTORY, POLITICS AND CULTURE IN THE NOVELS OF ORHAN PAMUK** completed and written by me has not previously formed the basis for the award of any Degree or Diploma or other similar title of this or any other University or examining body.*

Dr Rajendra R. Thorat

Investigator

Place: Karad

September,2017

CONTENTS

Declaration

Acknowledgement

<i>Chapter I</i>	<i>Introduction: From the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey</i>	1
<i>Chapter II</i>	<i>Depiction of History, Politics and Culture in Orhan Pamuk</i>	25
<i>Chapter III</i>	<i>Conclusion</i>	91
	<i>Select Bibliography</i>	97

A Study of Depiction of History, Politics and culture in the Novels of Orhan Pamuk

INTRODUCTION

Ferit Orhan Pamuk (known as Orhan Pamuk (1952), born in Istanbul in a large family, is a major voice in the globalised world of literature. He is a prominent Turkish novelist, screenwriter, academician and a winner of the 2006 Nobel Prize in Literature. He is also awarded with many notable literary awards such as International IMPAC Dublin Award (2003) and Sonning Prize (2012). He is Turkey's best-selling author as his work has sold over million books in 60 languages. The influences of James Joyce, Franz Kafka, Thomas Mann, Nabokov and Marcel Proust can be seen in Pamuk's works.

Pamuk is the central figure in the understanding of the new Turkey. He is a "cultural" Muslim rather than a religious one. He educated in elite secular American high school in Istanbul with exposure to secular culture of the American's in the 1980's. Though he is Turkish writer, he is celebrity modern writer whose post-modernity is very American. He is a global celebrity winning the 1991 Prix de la Decouverte Europeanne for the French translation of the *The Silent House*. *The White Castle* was awarded the 1990 Independent Award for Foreign Fiction. His global celebrity status is acknowledged and unpinned by his Nobel Prize of 2006 given for his political concern.

Pamuk had been among the writers who tried to write essays that criticized the Turkey's treatment of the Kurds and official denial of the Armenian genocide, as well as the question of political repression in contemporary Turkey. He was indicted for his comments about the Armenian genocide and became the international focus of the debate about the freedom of expression. As a result Khomeini issued a fatwa for writing on the political issues of the day concerning Islam, human rights and the Middle East. Pamuk is both Turkish writer and *poeta*

en Nueva York, both postmodern and Turkish national in a global sense, as noted in his global speech: “my world is a mixture of the local- national --and the West.”

Orhan Pamuk is well aware of society around him and his novels deal with the themes of history, politics and culture – East-West encounter, tradition and modernity, secularism and blasphemy. He is one of the pioneers of the “Postmodern historical novel” flourished after 1990. In this direction, his *The White Castle* (1985) is the remarkable novel as it uses the historical backdrop of the seventeenth century as a forum to deal with the question of national identity and interchangeability. He uses the history as a medium to bring social and cultural awareness. He also deals with the political ups and downs in the life of Turkey. His most controversial political novel is *Snow* (2002) for which he has been criticized as ‘a political person’. But while speaking in an interview with Alexander Star, he says: “I was not a political person when I began writing 20 years ago... But later, as I began to get known both inside and outside of Turkey... that the Turkish state was damaging democracy, human rights and the country. So I did things outside of my books”.

All his novels depict the cultural life of Turkey in the past and present and this cultural consciousness is the main concern in most of his novels. He describes himself as a Cultural Muslim who associates the historical and cultural identification with the religion while not believing in a personal connection to God. The main focus of the study is depiction of history, politics and culture in Pamuk’s select novels: *The Silent House* (1983) , *The White Castle* (1990), *The Black Book* (1994), *The New Life* (1998), *My Name is Red* (2001) , *Snow* (2004), and *The Museum of Innocence* (2008).

From the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey

In order to trace the origins of Turkey's identity crisis, it is essential to consider the country's past and the historical facts. The problem of perplex identity has long formed a conundrum for the people of Turkey. Patriotic Turkish nationalism came into being in the form of a forced homogenization during the creation process of the nation-state. The hybrid cultural heritage of the polyglot and multicultural Ottoman rule had a Turkic foundation. In his opening paragraph of *"Beloved Istanbul": Realism and the Transnational Imaginary in Turkish Popular Culture*, Martin Stokes makes a striking comparison between the funeral ceremonies of the two former Turkish presidents, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1923-1938) and Turgut Özal (1989-1993) in order to demonstrate that Turkey is a "multi-souled" country. His comparison highlights the main difference between the places where they were then buried. Atatürk, the founding father of Turkey, was buried in Anıtkabir, a distinct mausoleum specially built for him in the new capital, Ankara. Özal's coffin was carried to the Süleymaniye Mosque; an Ottoman mosque built for the Ottoman sultan Süleiman the Magnificent, after the burial service in Fatih, known as a conservative Islamist neighborhood in Istanbul. By underlining the places of burials, Stokes actually addresses the different characters of the two cities and the two faces of the country, Istanbul was stigmatized as the old city inherited by the demised empire; and Ankara became the new imago and symbol of the secular and modern republic. In this context, Stokes states that:

If modernist republican aspirations were clearly focused on Atatürk's capital, Ankara, Istanbul was condemned as an unpromising site for national regeneration; the labyrinthine complexity of the streets, it was largely fed by Persian, Byzantine and Arab art, ethics and traditions.

224

Istanbul was no longer considered to be the centre of attention. Its cosmopolite history was ignored. Ankara turning into the symbol of recently arisen

nation and the victory against the Allies, and Istanbul as the reminder of a decadent empire and a dismissed past; the new and the old capitals were portrayed as one another's antithesis. In this respect, it can aptly be claimed that the clash of past-present plays a crucial role already by the beginning of the nation-building period. As a colonizer-imperial power, the Islamic background for the Ottomans was always a significant characteristic to be glorified. The transition period from the multilingual, hybrid and heterogenized Ottoman realm to the targeted monolingual and homogenized nation-state was a mismatch between the Islamic grounded society taking its power from its colonialism, monarchy and cosmopolitanism and the republican nation-state established upon a state-imposed secularism and Westernization. It was this mismatch that resulted in a dislocated identity.

The transition period started right after the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923) which waged against the Allies who occupied the Ottoman territory by the end of the WWI. By transition, I refer to the reformations materialized by Ataturk following the victory gained in 1923. During his 15-year presidential regime, Ataturk made several reformations as a part of the Westernization-modernization project. This project remained incomplete. After his death in 1938, Turkey's development drastically slowed down. What the republican intelligentsia meant by Westernization was to catch the level of the contemporary Christian West under the name of modernization.

This denial of the Ottoman past can be put forth as the major reason of present-day's identity perplexity. The new country felt the urge to write a new history in order to push down the Ottoman past. In *The Black Book*, Pamuk explains this urge with a metaphor of asphalt. He describes how "the cobblestones along the streetcar line disappear under a layer of asphalt for which he could see no reason" (BB 12). In this quotation, while the cobblestones represent the Ottoman heritage and past, the new asphalt refers both to the Westernization-modernization

project that took hold of Turkey and to the urge to break away from the past. A similar metaphor appears also in *The New Life*: “. . . taking the cue from the new highways . . . where the recent paving obscured youthful memories, everything seemed busily anxious to forget us and our memories . . .” (239).

Turkey was literally compelled to oscillate between two selves which should be addressed as the authentic self and the imposed other. By authentic-self, I refer to the originary self. This is in fact the cultural heritage – Islamic Eastern identity using the Ottoman alphabet and Ottoman garments (fez) -- which is inherited from its imperial background. The imposed other is the new costume that the new nation-state tries to put on. The latter was a secular Western identity adapting Latin alphabet and French hat. In the hands of revolution and the Westernization-modernization process, the authentic-self turned into a negative-self. Two main arguments can be considered when regarding the Ottoman heritage as negative-self. First of all, the mission of the nation-state was defined as winning recognition from Western civilization. The remnant of a decadent empire, which was compared to an underdeveloped Eastern civilization, was the last thing new Turkey would have wanted to be linked up with. Correspondingly, the West was determined as the model civilization whose modes of living were accepted as standards to be achieved. For Turkey, it was not likely to deny the deep-seated Ottoman past immediately and entirely. And therefore this transformation could nevertheless escape turning into an identity problem which individuals have to settle up with.

The relation between the Islamic Ottoman identity and the secular Turkish identity function also as palimpsest: The traces of memories are almost erased, yet they are still visible. The newly established identity that Turkey tried to internalize included the unwanted partial presence of the Ottoman culture while it drifted Turkey to a cultural exile in the country of origin itself. In that sense, it can be suggested that the monarchic, religious body of government as well as the culturally Eastern-

laden past were canopied with the redefined national secular Turkish and cultural (Westernizing-modernizing) identities.

Referring to the clear-cut distinction made between the imperial past and the republican nation-state, Nergis Canefe argues, “the founding narratives of Turkish national history were efficiently institutionalized, popularized and canonized under the aegis of a Turkish nation-state” (137). Therefore, it is apt to claim that the performers of the nation-building project chose for a deliberate and internalized rejection of the Ottoman past. Canefe explains further how this nation-building project took the shape of a clash between forgetting and rewriting history. By accentuating the power of Kemalist ideology, she argues, what is peculiar about the Turkish case is that patriotic Turkish nationalists have gone to great lengths to silence the Ottoman heritage of the new nation and its state in virtually every area of life, including memories of the previous demographic and cultural make-up of Asia Minor. It is in this context that the Turkish Independence War is deemed as the new beginning for the historic Turkish nation.

This internalized denial of the past, Canefe observes, was “an alarming degree of amnesia institutionalized by the Turkish nation-state” (139) which aimed a collective loss of memory and “officialised and popularized forgetfulness” (*ibid*). This “officialised and popularized forgetfulness” was encouraged also in the shape of concrete objects such as the thousands of statues and busts of Ataturk spread all over Anatolia where “the concrete apartment building . . . besiege the statues of Ataturk like prison walls” (NL 273). They were there in order to remind the tenets of Ataturk who aimed to give a modern imago to Turkey. However, Ecevit argues, these Ataturk busts and statues have turned into emptied pop images that do not contain any real meaning (57).

Identity, Stuart Hall claims, is formed through the consciously regulated “historical and institutional” (4) processes. In the case of Turkey, it can be claimed

that serious modifications made under the name of the nation-building project. One of these reforms was the alphabet reform made in 1928. This symbolical turnaround from the Ottoman alphabet, which is an amalgam language and written from right to left, to the Latin alphabet, which is identified with the Western culture and written from left to right, indicated a literal U-turn in mentality. The interstitial mind which is stuck in-between cannot better be described than the preface of *The White Castle* narrated by Faruk Darvinoğlu:

I found this manuscript in 1982 in that forgotten ‘archive’ . . . at the bottom of a dusty chest stuffed to overflowing with imperial decrees, title deeds . . . At first I didn’t know what I would do with the book, other than to read it over and over again. My distrust of history then was still strong . . . after reading a couple of sentences from the manuscript I kept on one table, I’d go to another table in the other room where I kept my papers and try to narrate in today’s idiom the sense of what remained in my mind”. Gökner. 35

The act of pending between the rooms and writing over what *The New Life* reminds in his mind is not the new life, an animation of the break between past and present; but it is also an example of the liminal identity. The act of Faruk confirms the impossibility of a full access to the text, so does the impossibility of a full access to the past. Gökner interprets this as having to shuttle between two desks in two separate rooms and record in the Turkish Latin alphabet *The New Life* what is retained of the Ottoman-Arabic script is an apt metaphor to describe the unstable, in-between position of the nationalized body among other historical texts . . . The novel is one of identification; the “gap” between “texts” is in a sense the elision and the erasure of the Kemalist cultural revolution. The subtext is the messy, uncatalogued archive or the seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire, a kind of wildly signifying unconscious.”³⁴ As Bhabha notes, gaining identity is parallel to the

accession to the past: “as far as this consciousness can be extended *backwards* to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person . . . (69). As mentioned before, the past was blocked and the old writings had limited access as a result of the change of the alphabet, reaching to the authentic-self was also not possible. In that respect, I suggest that the reforms of Atatürk should be touched on in order to gain a deeper view to this U-turn in mentality of the citizens of the new nation-state. The markers of the Ottoman reign such as the Sultanate, the Caliphate, dervish lodges, the Ottoman language and the traditional clothing, which constituted the backbone of the Ottoman culture, were the ceremonies of the empire that got lost or left during the transition period. During the Westernization-modernization process, Turkey experienced the “‘loss’ of meaningfulness” (Bhabha 179).

With the replacement of the abovementioned ceremonies, the social system and the way of thinking of the society turned upside down. Having been deprived of their centuries-long habits and rituals, people experienced the effacement of the memories, which embedded deep in their unconscious. This experience boiled down to cutting the umbilical cord of an entire nation. Having been eradicated from their parent culture, the war-torn people were symbolically situated in an environment, which was quite unfamiliar as well as incompatible in comparison to the previous one. For, the Republican Turkey chose laicism and accepted it as its role model for the basis of the new regime. The nationalist elites who stood for a progressive Turkey and who expelled religion from the state affairs by way of the abolishment the Caliphate in 1924, strove to expurgate the nation from its negative-self and went for an enforced adaptation of a Westernized and modernized mode of living.

Having aimed to remove itself from the wrecks of the Ottoman Empire, which was stringently identified with the – irrational, backward, exotic and

superstitious- East while “the recognition that tradition bestows a form of identification” (Bhabha 3), Turkey gave the impression of being a nation that had no link with the past. However, the members of the new nation-state ignored the fact that they brought some internalized, engrafted problems with them. The rejection of the parent culture, namely the Ottoman cultural heritage, prevented Turkey from creating an organic culture. Individuals have suffered from, as it were, a “part-culture” syndrome- looking maybe externally Western while being mentally stuck in the liminoid space. This relation of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey is such a metonymic one that both have become each other’s signifier.

Huntington summarizes the liminal status of Turkey and its oscillation between an Eastern soul and a Western costume as follows:

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk . . . had created a new Turkey out of the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, and had launched a massive effort both to westernize it and to modernize it. In embarking on this course, and rejecting the Islamic past, Ataturk made Turkey a “torn country,” a society which was Muslim in its religion, heritage, customs, and institutions but with a ruling elite determined to make it modern, Western, and at one with the West. 112

It is seen that Ataturk’s reforms were aiming “technical modernization through a cultural Westernization” (Huntington 74). As suggested above, the Kemalist ideology considered Westernization as a prerequisite to achieve modernization. While rejecting the physical heritage – whether it is the old capital Istanbul, Ottoman language, dervish lodges, traditional outfit-of the Ottoman Empire, Turkey became canopied and colonized by the cultural values of another empire.

Huntington claims that there are three key requirements to call a country ‘torn’. The first requirement is a full support from the political and economic elite

of the country. Secondly, the common citizens have to be eager to redefine their identity. Thirdly, the core values and the fundamental institutions of the imported culture should be kept acknowledged and adapted. Huntington does not forget to add that the process of conversion is indispensable to be experienced as painful both politically and socially as well as, in fact the most, culturally (139).

Huntington observes the present-day situation of Turkey as follows:

The obstacles to Turkey's becoming fully European, the limits on its ability to play a dominant role with respect to the Turkic former Soviet republics, and the rise of Islamic tendencies eroding the Atatürk inheritance, all seemed to insure that Turkey will remain a torn country. (149)

In other words, he claims that Turkey will maintain its betwixt and in-between identity. The problem of internalizing the imported identity, according to Huntington, turns into a (Western) virus. He states that "once it is lodged in another society, is difficult to expunge. The virus persists but is not fatal; the patient survives but is never whole" (154). He alleges that the torn countries go through a cultural schizophrenia which emanates from the clash between the imported culture and the rejected indigenous culture.

As Huntington argues that "the spread of pop culture and consumer goods around the world represents the triumph of Western civilization" trivializes Western culture. The essence of Western civilization is the Magna Carta not the Magna Mac. The fact that non-Westerners may bite into the latter has no implications for their accepting and internalizing the former" (58) and it has also no insinuations that the non-Westerners are 'becoming' Westerners through the Westernization. This argumentation summarizes the situation in which the problem of identity situates itself. In short, on the way to create a new identity, Westernization-

modernization project set as the major goal-to-be-achieved, has turned into an “over determined process” (Hall 5) and since it could not be internalized, the imposed identity remained as an unfitting costume

A Review of Turkish Literature

In their long history, the Turks have gone through more changes than most nations, and yet they have preserved most of their basic cultural traits. Through the centuries, they lived as nomadic tribes, built small and large states in parts of Asia, created the Selcuk state in Asia Minor and later the sprawling Ottoman Empire, which endured from the thirteenth to the early twentieth century, and finally established the modern Turkish Republic. At different stages of their history, Turkic communities embraced Samanism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, Manichaeism, Zoroastrianism, and other creeds until most of them accepted the Islamic faith more than a thousand years ago. Their language, one of the world’s most regular in grammar and also one of the most agglutinative, have used five separate scripts: Kopturk, Uyghur, Arabic, Cyrillic, and since 1928 one based on the Latin alphabet.

The pattern of the main ages of Turkish literature follows the foregoing outline of the major periods of Turkish history. But scholars have pursued a variety of approaches to the periodization of Turkish literary development. The simplest approach sets up two stages: early and modern. Another breakdown involves three periods: pre-Islamic (until the eleventh century), Islamic (eleventh to mid-nineteenth century), and modern (mid-nineteenth century to the present). A different three pronged (thirteenth to twentieth century), and twentieth century to the present. A more elaborate – also more meaningful – approach sets up five stages pre – Islamic (until the eleventh century), pre-Ottoman Islamic (eleventh to thirteenth century), Ottoman (thirteenth to mid-nineteenth century), transitional

(mid-nineteenth century to the 1920s) and modern (1920s to the present). All these periods have their subdivisions, on which however, there is no unanimity among literary historians.

Few cultures have changed as drastically and still remained as intact as has Turkish culture throughout history. As stated by Talat S Halman in his work *'Poetry and Society: Propaganda Functions of Poetry in Turkish Experience'*, Turkish history has included "some cataclysmic transformations in terms of locale, cultural orientations. Faith system of government, allegiance"(159). Language is particularly a compelling example of transformation and continuity. From the tenth to the twentieth century, Turkish intellectuals and men of letters voraciously absorbed Persian and Arabic vocabulary as well as some of the grammatical devices of these two languages. Yet despite the elitist enthusiasm for such borrowings, the language spoken by the masses remained remarkably to generation, but also in folk literature. As a result, in terms of morphology, syntax, and a substantial portion of vocabulary, the Turkish language is essentially the same as it was a thousand years ago.

Because the Turks originated in the "Ural – Altaic," region of Central Asia, their language is often referred to as "Ural – Altaic," together with such other Turkic language as Uzbek, Azeri, Chaghatal. Kirghiz, and Yakut. It is an agglutinative language rich in rhythmic effects and rhyme potential, with a mellifluous phonological structure ideally suited for poetic utterance. It is, however, with the Orhon inscriptions of the eighth century A.D. that we get the most significant document of early Turkish literature. These inscriptions as well as the oral epics and a large body of oral lyric verse constitute the best work of the nomadic and settled Turkish communities until the later part of the eleventh century.

Thus, the Turkish migration that started around the sixth century A.D.-a migration into China, India, Persia, the Caucasus, and Asia Minor – brought with it a rich oral tradition. Between the ninth and early thirteenth centuries, a vast majority of the Turks who settled in Asia Minor accepted Islam as their faith. By the end of the eleventh century, much of Turkish literature, oral and written, had already acquired an Islamic flavor. This orientation, together with the influence of Arabic and Persian cultures, was to continue throughout Ottoman history.

Epic literature evolved as a collective creative endeavor and was kept alive, with substantial changes over the centuries, by minstrels-often called *ozans* or sometimes *bahsis*-who, accompanying themselves on a stringed instrument referred to as a *kapuz*, narrated stories and chanted poems. The legend of creation, perhaps the earliest of Turkish legends, traces the origin of the universe to a single creator, the god Kara Han, who finds his inspiration in the appearance of White Mother's face emerging out of water. Kara Han's first creature is man, who attempts to soar higher than his creator. Man is therefore deprived of the power to fly and remains condemned to earthbound life. The devil is shown in the legend as stronger than man but powerless before God.

The early Turks had animistic and pagan forms of worship. Shamanism held sway in many communities. Most of the moral themes in pre-Islamic Turkish legends appear as metaphors that seek to contrast good and evil. The dominant view is anthropomorphic. Among the oldest specimens of written literary works are memorial tablets, stone monoliths, and stelae found in the Yenisei Valley of northeastern Mongolia as well as documents unearthed in the Sinkiang region of modern China. Dating from the seventh to the ninth century, these works include stories of the battles the Turks fought against the Chinese, a variety of legends, and

numerous specimens of verse found mostly in Chinese translation written in Uyghur Turkish.

The epic literature that evolved in the Uyghur period is a narration of the emergence of tribes, their fight for survival of brave deeds and social disintegration, of victory and enslavement. Some fine accomplishments of early Turkish poetry have been preserved in the comprehensive survey of Turkic languages compiled under the title *Divanti Lilgati't Turk* by Kasgarli Mahmud in the late eleventh century. This first work of 'national cultural consciousness' contains many lyrics of love and sorrow, as well as of hero worship and lament:

Is *Alp Er Tunga* dread and gone

While the evil world lives on?

Has time's vengeance begun ?

Now hears are torn to shreds. (41)

In the *Divanii Liigati't Turk*, Kasgarli Mahmud, whose birth one thousand years ago was celebrated in 2008, cited a probably apocryphal hadith conferring God's blessing on the Turks' military and political power: "God Almighty said: I have an army to which I gave the name Turk, I had the Turks settle in the East, Whenever a nation displeases me, I send the Turks against that nation." Mahamud also made the statement: "Learn Turkish, for Turkish sultans will rule for many years to come" (42).

The earliest identifiably Turkic groups of Central Asia were settled communities with a distinctive culture and oral literary tradition. Most of them became peripatetic tribes after leaving their homeland under the pressure of natural hardships perhaps droughts or floods or marauding enemies, some resettled in nearby regions, others moved on to the distant Far East or the Near East. The

exodus brought them in contact with diverse cultures and communities, from which they acquired tools and terms, concepts and concrete objects-thus indicating their receptivity to anything useful that would serve their purposes.

The individual and the conglomerate nomadic tribes migrating into Anatolia – engaging in combat on the way, intermingling with other people, carrying their values of survival and mobility – evolved into principalities, into small and major states until the end of the thirteenth century. They conquered Beghbad in 1055 and gained control of Anatolia in 1071 as a result of the victory of Manzikert against the emperor of Byzantium. The Turkish Selcuk state emerged with a high culture of its own-affluent, excelling in theology and the arts.

Turkish communities, through many centuries, experienced the duality of the *gazi* (warrior, conquering hero) and Sufi (mystic) spirits. Whereas the raiders and the soldiers of Islam kept waging war to expand the frontiers of the faith, the Sufis – men of peace, humanism, and love – preached the virtues of tranquility in the heart and all over the world. The mystic philosopher whose thoughts and spiritual guidance were to dominate Anatolia from the thirteenth century onward and to inspire many nations in modern times was Mevalna Celaleddin Rumi (1207-73). With his poetic celebrations of love and the art and life itself, he heralded in the thirteenth century a new glittering age of humanistic mysticism. His ideas – which stressed the deathlessness of the loving soul, the joys of passion, the inherent worth of the human being, the loving soul, the joys of passion, the inherent worth of the human being, the aesthetic and ecstatic imperative of faith, the need to go beyond the confines of scholasticism and to transcend schisms, and, above all, the godliness of man-not gave renewed vigor to Islamic mysticism, but also represented for the Islamic religion in general a counterpart of the Renaissance, which was to emerge in Europe a century after Rumi's death.

The Ottoman State had a life span of more than six centuries, from 1299 to 1922. A single dynasty reigned in unbroken continuity. Islam was not only the religious faith, but also the political ideology of the basically theocratic Ottoman state. The empire was multiracial, multinational, multi-religious, multilingual. In ruling over these disparate elements, the Ottoman establishment achieved remarkable success in administrative, military, and fiscal organization.

Ottoman literature, which stressed poetry as the superior art, utilized the forms and aesthetic values of Islamic Arabo - Persian literature. The educated elite, led by the sultans (many of whom were accomplished poets themselves), produced a huge body of verse whose hallmarks included refined diction, abstruse vocabulary, euphony, romantic agony, dedication to formalism and tradition, and the Sufi brand of mysticism. Although prose was not held in high esteem by the Ottoman literary establishment, it nevertheless accounts for some excellent achievements, mentor Evliya Celebi. The Ottoman Empire also nurtured a rich theatrical tradition, which consisted of *Karagoz* (shadow plays), *Meddah* (storyteller and impersonator), and *Orta oyunu* (a type of *commedia dell'arte*).

Three main literary traditions evolved: (1) *Tekke* (sect, denomination) literature; (2) oral folk literature; and (3) *Divan* (elite) literature. Oral folk literature and *Divan* literature hardly ever influenced each other; in fact, they remained oblivious of one another. *Tekke literature*, however, had an easy intercourse with both, utilizing their forms, prosody, vocabulary, and stylistic devices in a pragmatic fashion.

Religious (*Tekke*) poetry flourished among the mystics, the Muslim clergy, and adherents of various doctrines and denominations. It served as the main repository of theological sectarianism and was in itself poetry of dissent and discord. It embodied the schism between the Sunni and Shiite segments of the

Muslim - Turkish population and embraced a spate of unorthodox doctrines (*tarikats*), from *tasavvuf*, libertarian mysticism, to anarchical Bektashiism and the Hurufi, Yesevi, Mevlevi, Byrami, Alevi, Kadiri, Halveti, and Melami sects that were often hotbeds of political oppositions within the theocratic system and contributed to unrest and strife in Anatolia. Members of *the tekkes* (sect lodges, theological centers) were particularly prolific in the domain of religious verse. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, Sultan Veled (son of Mevalan Celaleddin Rumi), Asik Pasha (also a fervent advocate of developing the literary resources of Turkish), and Gulsehri and seyyad Hamza both early masters of Islamic poetry set the inspirational tone that would remain the hallmark of this voluminous literature.

The fourteenth century produced a remarkable collection of religious epics, tales, and stories in verse marked by didacticism rather than by lyric artistry. These poems, composed principally for uneducated listeners, served to spread the Islamic faith. Oral folk literature, created by the collective poetic and narrative faculty of the common people of Anatolia, has been kept alive through the centuries by ozans (minstrels), saz poets (poet musicians), asiks (troubadours).

Folktales in the Turkish experience, as elsewhere, are notable not for their ways of overcoming a weakness or frustration, bringing about the fulfillment of dreams and wishes, and even achieving the impossible, but also for their serving as a continuing critique of and a challenge to entrenched authority, especially against unjust rule. They are not merely a type of refoulement, but a form of resistance against tyranny, inequality, or any iniquity. Because most of them possess freedom from time and place, they function in terms of eternal and universal validity. But because they are narrated at a specific moment and locale and are couched in the

vocabulary of a particular culture, they have as their targets the symbols of an identifiable society (sultan or vizier, religious judge or feudal lord).

Folktales hold a special place in Turkey's culture and mass communication. Their transcription came much later than comparable work in the West and took place on a much more limited basis. As a consequence, the oral tradition has continued well into our time without becoming frozen on the printed page: it remains alive with new versions and adaptations as well as completely new oral narratives. Even today, despite the intrusions of radio and television, storytelling is alive in many parts of rural Turkey.

The Ottoman Turks, proud of their faith and conquests, felt superior to the West until decline set in. From the seventeenth century onward, there were defeats at the hands of European powers, deterioration of moral and official institutions, and eventually armed rebellions of the empire's non-Muslim minorities. The Ottoman ruling class gradually became impressed with Europe's growing strength and technological achievements. The Renaissance had wielded no influence on the Turks. The printing press was not introduced to Turkey until the third decade of paper in Turkish came out in 1831. The political and ideological impact of the French Revolution was felt decades later, and the Industrial Revolution and its effects eluded the Turks for an even longer time.

By the mid-nineteenth century, the shrinking Ottoman Empire had started to turn to the West for ideas and institutions. After a series of limited innovations in the military, administrative, educational, and technical fields from eighteenth century on, the Ottoman elite plunged into an extensive transformation usually referred to as "Westernization." In 1839, the Tanzimat (Reforms) Period was ushered in: legal, administrative, and cultural changes were introduced in quick succession. Literature was both a concomitant to and a major catalyst of these

changes. The conservative religious establishment waged all out war against Westernization, however. Cautious reformers recommended a synthesis of Eastern culture and Western technology: *ex Oriente lux, ex Occidente frux*. But progressive intellectuals pressed for extensive changes patterned after European models. The decline of the Ottoman Empire reached a critical point by the middle of the nineteenth century. Younger Turkish intellectuals started seeking the empire's salvation in technological development, political reform, and cultural progress fashioned after European prototypes.

New genres, adopted from Europe, gained ascendancy: fiction, drama for the legitimate stage, journalistic writing, the critical essay, and others. Translations and adaptations accelerated the Europeanization of Turkish literatures and values. Although *aruz* was not abandoned, Turkish poets experimented with forms, rhythms, and styles. A reaction began to set in against excessive use of words of Arabic and Persian origin.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, poets were the principal champions of fundamental rights and freedoms - the conveyors of the concepts of nationalism, modernization, social and political reforms. Poetry acquired a social awareness and a political function in the hands of some poets who endeavored to gain independence from external political domination. Ziya Pasha (1829 -80), Sinasi (1826-71), and Namik Kemal (1840-88) emerged as literary advocates on nationalism. Rezaizade Ekrem (1847-1914) and Abdülhak Hamit Tarhan (1852-1937) echoed the French romantics. The latter, a prolific poet and author of numerous verse dramas gained stature as a ceaseless innovator. His poetry covered a wide range of topics and had a philosophic bent as well as a dramatic impact.

When the Ottoman state collapsed after nearly 625 years and gave way to the Turkish Republic in 1923, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk devoted his prodigious

energies to the creation of a homogeneous nation-state dedicated to modernization in all walks of life, vowing to raise Turkey to the level of contemporary civilization (meaning the West) and higher. In image, in aspiration, in identification, the official and cultural establishment became largely Europeanized. Education was made secular, and reforms were undertaken to divest the country of its Muslim orientation. The legal system adapted the Swiss Civil Code, the Italian Penal Code, and German Commercial Law, Perhaps the most difficult of all reforms, the Language Revolution, was undertaken with lightning speed in 1928, and since then it has achieved a scope of success unparalleled in the modern world. The Arabic script, considered sacrosanct as Koranic orthography and used by the Turks for a millennium, was replaced by the Latin alphabet. This procrustean reform sought to increase literacy, to facilitate the study of European languages, and to cut off the younger generations from the legacy of the Ottoman past. Ataturk also launched a “pure Turkish” movement to rid the language of Arabic and Persian loanwords and to replace them with revivals from old Turkish vocabulary and provincial patios as well as neologisms. Reforms and all, the single common denominator of Turkish identification has significantly been the language. It has provided for social cohesion, cultural continuity, and national allegiance.

Although many of these sweeping reforms did not have a strong impact in the rural areas until the latter part of the twentieth century, in the urban centers drastic changes took place the political system religious faith, national ideology, educational institutions and method intellectual orientation daily life, and language - all underwent transformation. All stage of modern Turkish history has been marked by the thrust of literary modernization.

Today’s Turkey is homogeneous in population more than 99 percent Muslim and integrated in political and administrative structure, yet it is diversified, full of

inner tensions, a battleground for traditionalists versus revolutionaries, fundamentalists versus secularists. In its reorientation, Turkey seems to have traded the impact of Islamic civilization for the influences of Western civilization - at least in the urban areas. During its *vita nuova*, Turkish culture was influenced by Europe, but it has little kinship with the Judeo - Graeco - Christian world despite the concepts, forms, and values it has adopted from that tradition. It has become a new amalgam of traditions - ancient Turkic, Anatolian, Selcuk, Ottoman, Islamic, Arabic, Persian, European, American- a bridge between two continents, like the two dramatic bridges in Istanbul that now link Europe and Asia. This synthesis, its culture, and literature are enchorial, an original creation of modern Turkey. Whatever the strengths and weaknesses of this synthesis might be, there is no other like it.

Literature was caught in the maelstrom of reforms. Turkish literature is vibrant with ideologies and the feverish search for values old and new, for styles and tastes, for elements of traditional national culture that may be valid enough to revive, and significant borrowings from the West as well as from other traditions. The early novels of the republic depicted the disintegration of Ottoman society, ferocious political enmities, and the immoral lives of some members of religious sects, as well as the conflicts between urban intellectual and poverty - stricken peasants - as in the novels of Yakup Kadri, Karaosmanghu (1889-1974). Turkey's major female intellectual and advocate of women's rights, Halide Edib Adivar (1883-1964), produced sagas of the War of Liberation, psychological novels, and panoramas of city life. Her novelistic art culminated in *Sinekli Bakkal* (1936), which she originally published in English in 1935 under the title *The Clown and His Daughter*.

Fiction about the urban poor shares some of the strengths of the Village Novel- engrossing plot, effective narration, and realistic dialogue - and suffers from some of the comparable flaws-lack of subtlety and of psychological depth. The leading writer of fiction depicting the tribulations of working class people is Orhan Kemal (1914-70). Necati Cumali (1921-2001), a prolific poet and playwright, wrote tellingly about poverty stricken individuals in rural and coastal areas. Orhan Kemal Keygih (1890-1945) penned poignant stories of the lumpenproletariat and the gypsies. The short - story writer Said Faik (1906-54) is admired for his meditative, rambling romantic fiction, full of intriguing insights into the human soul, capturing the pathos and the bathos of urban life in a style unique for its poetic yet colloquial flair. Cevat Sakir (1886-1973) produced novels in English about fishermen on the Aegean coast.

Oktaç Akbal (b. 1923) shares with this group a Kafkaesque sense of reality and utter despair although he departs from them in his use of a simple staccato-almost pointillist-style. But both the *nouveau roman* writers and Akbal chart the phantasmagoria of man's tormented soul and his alienation from nature and society.

In Turkey and abroad, Orhan Pamuk (b. 1952) has emerged as a compelling precursor of new dimensions in the Turkish novelistic art. His major works have been successfully translated into nearly fifty languages, the English versions attracting wide attention and winning a number of major international awards. Pamuk's meteoric rise culminated in his winning the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2006. It is significant that this first Nobel Prize won by a Turk in any field went to a literary figure because literature remains the premier cultural genre among Turks. Pamuk himself asserted that the prize was awarded principally to Turkish language and literature. Although some intellectuals acknowledge this to be a fact, many

believe that the prize was awarded in recognition of Pamuk's own creative work; some claim he received the prize because he made damaging remarks about incidents in Ottoman history and contemporary life, Pamuk's formula for success has been postmodernism plus some Turkish exoticism. He has been likened to several giants of modern literature. Such kinships tend to provide a fairly easy passage to fame abroad. The risk involved, however, is that similarities may not sustain the inherent value of the oeuvre for long - the writer from the other culture finds of voice uniquely his own, explores new forms, and creates a synthesis beyond a pat formula base on what is in fashion.

In a thousand years, Turkish Literature, which is known for oral tradition in verse and narration as well as its written legacy in all genres, stretched from Asia to Caucasus, the Middle East, the Balkans, and point beyond. It embraced influences from the East and the West, the North and the South. As a consequence, it created its own synthesis, which came to include the aesthetic strategies of Europe and the Americans. Its explorations and diversity of accomplishments are admirable. Its universal work was "certified" when the Nobel for 1 Prize for Literature was awarded to the novelist Orhan Pamuk in 2006.

In the early part of the third millennium, the literature of the Turkish Republic can justifiably boast of a prodigious creative energy and some impressive success in many genres. It has yet to reach the threshold of greatness. It is faced with some impediments *cultural convulsion* (cataclysmic changes in sociopolitical institutions, faith and technology); *language crisis* (a vast transformation broader than the language reform undertaken by any other nation, in which a vocabulary that consisted of 75 percent Arabic, Persian, and French words in 1920 increased its ration of native words to 80 percent and reduced borrowings to 20 percent by 1970, and the language functioning at the turn of the twenty-first century has about

one hundred thousand dictionary entries); *critical gap* (despite some fine critical writing, Turkish literature still operates by and large without the guidance of coherent aesthetic theories and systematic critical analysis): *traditional lacunae* (the noticeable absence of philosophy, of the norms of tragedy, of psychological analysis in depth): and *excessive imitation* of models, movements, and major works that have evolved in the West.

The dynamism, quality, purpose, diversity, and impact of modern Turkish literature seem impressive. There is a fertile versatility at work. Turkish literature has never been more varied or more inclusive. Following many decades of conscious experimentation, questing for new values, acquisition of deeper literary and human insights, and stronger expertise in blending form and content, Turkish authors are creating an authentic synthesis of national and universal elements.

Chapter II

Depiction of History, Politics and Culture in Orhan Pamuk

Depiction of History

Orhan Pamuk has recorded several events from the history of Turkey as a background in his novels like coups, castles, and several events of the Ottoman Empire. Pamuk's work has become a metaphor for Turkey. In her 2004 review of *Snow*, for the *New York Times*, Margaret Atwood refers to Pamuk as a writer whose project is to "narrate his country into being." An incontestable example of Pamuk's international political appeal maybe found in a speech given by George Bush. Speaking at a NATO summit in Turkey, held in June 2004, Bush hailed Pamuk as a great writer whose "work has been a bridge between cultures": His work has been a bridge between cultures, and so is the Republic of Turkey. The people of this land understand, as Pamuk has observed, that "What is important is not a clash of parties, civilizations, cultures, East and West. What is important," he says according to George Bush, is to realize "that other peoples in other continents and civilizations are 'exactly like you.'

A year after the US troops invaded Iraq, Bush's speech attempted to legitimize the war through a discourse of equality that is here elaborated through the metaphor of the bridge. The US stance considered, the bridge here reduces both sides equally from a distance rather than leading to an understanding of their equality. The metaphor of the bridge, in other words, served as ammunition to wage a polemical debate on a black and white understanding of sameness. Bush's speech portrays Pamuk as a writer whose work bridges 'troubled waters' and may be used in conflict resolution. Pamuk's status, in other words, stems from his role as an intermediary between East and West. Pamuk's self-positioning relates to the

reception of his work, the image of the city, and the country. Unsurprisingly, Pamuk was not pleased.

When asked in an interview what he thought of Bush's remark, Pamuk responded that it was yet another instance of his words being vandalized, "used as a sort of apology for what had been done. And what had been done was a cruel thing" (2004-13). These comments by George W. Bush are used in reviews of Pamuk's work. One such example is the *London Review of Books* review of his latest novel, *The Museum of Innocence* (2010).

Pamuk's significance in Turkish politics has followed a similar pattern, in which he is regularly identified as an intermediary figure between Turkey and Europe. A turning point, however, came in 2005, a year after Bush's speech. In an interview with Swiss newspaper *Tages-Anzeiger*, Pamuk noted that he was the writer to comment on the deaths of one million Armenians and thirty thousand Kurds in Turkey. His statement made headlines in Turkey and was followed by public protests, legal action, and an indictment under Turkey's criminal code on the basis that he had insulted the country's national character. The case sparked an international uproar. More significantly, it cast doubt on Turkey's bid for membership in the European Union. For example, an article by Salman Rushdie published in *The Times* (October 2005), is tellingly entitled "How can a country that victimizes its greatest living writer also join the EU?" Rushdie's comment alludes to the idea of the Fortress Europe, with Turkey waiting at its gate. Referring to the case as a "test for the east and the west," Rushdie concluded his article with the Bosphorus as trope: "On both sides of the Bosphorus, the Pamuk case matters". The reference was to Turkey's precarious position as a country that straddles Asia and Europe.

In the interim, Pamuk himself frequently appeared in the Turkish media to apologize for his highly 'misunderstood' views; he blamed the journalist for

‘inciting’ him to speak without premeditation, and then twisting his words. He also stated that although his intent had been to draw attention to issues concerning freedom of expression. One example of the public protest against his work occurred in March 2005, in the formal circular by the governor of Sütçüler, a village in Isparta, ordering a ban on his books in the village. The circular was condemned by the national government.

The White Castle, which also gives the narrative its title, is a highly symbolic *construction*. The white castle is the Doppio Castle, which the sultan aims to conquer during his campaign into the Balkans. As the Venetian sets his eyes on the castle he cannot hide his admiration:

It was at the top of a high hill, its towers streaming with flags were caught by the faint red glow of the setting sun, and it was white; purest white and beautiful. I didn’t know why I thought that one could see such a beautiful and unattainable thing in a dream. In that dream you would run along a road twisting through a dark forest, straining to reach the bright day of that hilltop, that ivory edifice; as if there were a grand ball going on which you wanted to join in. The name of the castle is not arbitrary as the word ‘doppio’ means ‘double’ in Italian. This choice alludes to the duality that runs throughout the narrative.

The castle, as described by the Venetian, appears to be a fantastical creature with an impressive beauty. Based on this depiction the castle seems not merely a military target but a symbol for an ideal definition of identity. With its white color the castle emerges as a pure and untainted entity that can the new life be seen in a dream. Its perfection makes it impossible to reach thus limiting it into the space of fantasy. Defined as such the castle reflects a metaphysical, ideal definition of identity, which is pure and uncontaminated. While the ideal portrayal of the castle appears evocative of an answer to Hoja’s initial question ‘Why am I what I am?’ the impossibility to reach the castle undermines an eventual resolution.

The castle appears so perfect that the Venetian believes that it is not even a real sight. This level of perfection can be attained through the castle's unreachable status because it is then that it can be established as an ideal, originary and pure construction. The ideal depiction of the castle, associated with the purity of the colour white, symbolizes identity as an ideal construction that is pure and absolute, yet unattainable. As opposed to the 'I' of the narrative that gradually unfolds through the Venetian and Hoja who compose its different representations as 'an other', the castle offers an ultimate model that can be defined through the impossibility to attain it. Hoja's weapon emerges as a dangerous tool for the castle as with its amorphous shape and its accessibility, it challenges everything that the castle stands for. The weapon that Hoja invents, the definition of identity as suggested by *The White Castle*, is unidentifiable, fragmented, and heterogeneous thus obliterating all attempts at a unifying identification. Identity as defined in the novel, the pure white castle is marked by ambiguity and perpetual displacement that obliterate all attempts to a conclusive definition.

The symbolism of the castle is also relevant in Lacanian terminology; according to Lacan the castle symbolizes the 'I' in dreams. Correlatively, the formation of the *I* is symbolized in dreams by a fortress, or a stadium – its inner arena and enclosure, surrounded by marshes and rubbish-tips, dividing it into two opposed fields of contest where the subject flounders in quest of the lofty, remote inner castle whose form (sometimes juxtaposed in the same scenario) symbolizes the id in a quite startling way. (Lacan, 2006: 5)

Although the distinction between the two areas of the castle is absent in *The White Castle*, the symbolism of the castle still echoes in relation with identity. According to Lacan the castle as the representation of the 'I' plays an important role in the protection of the id. This protective role of the castle turns into an ideal with the Doppio Castle, which represents the 'I' as an unattainable ideal of unity.

Towards the end of the narrative, the initial similarity between the Venetian and Hoja gradually disappears. Hoja is the one who first notes the changing appearance of the Venetian:

On one of those winter nights during which we spoke very little, often drifting off into our own thoughts, Hoja said:

I had much changed, that *I had finally become a completely different person*. My stomach burned, I began to sweat; I wanted to make a stand against him, to tell him he was wrong, tell him that I was as I had always been, *that we were alike*, that he should pay attention to me the way he used to do... but he was right; my eye was caught by the portrait of myself I had brought home that morning and left leaning against a wall. I had changed: I'd grown fat from stuffing myself at feasts, I had a double chin, my flesh had become slack, my movements slow; worse, *my face was completely different...* (Pamuk, 2001: 110, *myemphasis*)

At the beginning of the narrative where both the Venetian and Hoja had perceived themselves as alike, they both agree that they look distinct from one another. This shift is not merely engendered by the physical transformation of the Venetian but rather reverberates within the framework of identity formation.

The novel *Museum of Innocence* is set in a period that spans the second half of the 1970's through the end of coup of 1980, a period when Turkey's social and economic structure was solidified. The novel depicts the fascinating world of objects surrounded by the dark realities of patriarchy, political repression and loss. When Kemal's brother explains that he was the first to bring a transistor radio in turkey, a friend adds that her mother claims that she is the first to food processor to Istanbul. "Thus with the company of a nice music from those times, it was seen how the leading Istanbulite bourgeoisie ended up cutting their hands, faces just to

become the first to use electric razors, meat cutting knives, can openers and other strange and scary tools” (141). The world of these imposed foreign objects is far removed from the social realities of Turkey. Pamuk has established a museum, the idea of collecting and hoarding things, housed in a building in Cukurcuma displays a collection evocative of everyday life and culture of Istanbul.

Depiction of Politics

Politics is inescapable component of his work. In this study motivated by power of Pamuk's issues, I take a slightly different route in reading the politics of his work on Istanbul. My perspective here follows Jacques Rancière's take on aesthetic experience as “a specific sphere ..., which invalidates the ordinary hierarchies incorporated in everyday sensory experience.” (2004:1). Here the definition of aesthetics, emphasizing its revolutionary and unsettling aspects, loads the concept with a power that is usually ascribed to politics, which, for Rancière is also about unsettling 'ordinary hierarchies'. He contends: "Politics is first of all a way of framing, among sensory data, a specific sphere of existence" (10). Politics, like literature and aesthetics, is concerned with the reconfiguration of space. In the same vein, literature is political not because of its content, but because of its aesthetics. Rancière accordingly views literature as a way of “framing the relation between the sayable and the visible, of enabling words with the power of framing a common world” (13). The political work of my study is primarily aesthetic, related not to ideology and culture wars, but to their reconfiguration. My reading of Pamuk's politics is based on his use of the space of the novel, and on a more general recognition of the transformative aspect of literature as its definitive characteristic. The politics I trace in this study lies in the unusual or new viewpoints the novels introduce.

In sum, with Pamuk's literary cityscape as its focus, this thesis deals with a number of issues that arise by virtue of Istanbul's location on the periphery. Having introduced the themes that mark Istanbul as a literary capital, I now return to my six terms, my selected conceptual 'lenses' through which I show Pamuk's positioning within international literary space. My approach here is inspired by Mieke Bal's definition of cultural analysis in *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities* (2002). Bal posits concepts not simply as a tool of analysis, but as "embodiments of the cultural practices we seek to understand through them"(21). Since I trace how each concept-lens is practiced in the novel, my lenses become the objects of my inquiry. In other words, Pamuk's construction of Istanbul and my construction of both mark the back and forth movement that forms this thesis. As such, my findings are also my objects, the cultural and especially literary relevance of which I aim to articulate in this study. Furthermore, as Pamuk's persona as a master-writer is one of the objects that runs through this study, I make use of his views on his books as additional objects of analysis which contribute to the reception and positioning of his work, rather than as markers of authorial or authoritative intention. There are many Istanbul's in this work and this is how I map them on to my six keywords.

Pamuk witnesses the deterioration of his cities in different way; however, he expresses how the respective cultures have been transformed and how the change that takes place is multifaceted and includes external changes in the architecture, neighborhoods, and everyday life, and internal changes in the authority structures of the cultures, which have been split up into different forms. For example, in Pamuk's novel *Snow*, the main character Ka returns to Istanbul after being exiled to Germany. He returns because he has learned of a wave of suicides among girls forbidden to wear headscarves at school. He is struck by the

condition of Kars; a city that was once a province of the, Ottoman Empire and Russia's glory is now a zone of poverty and destitution. His journey motivates him to examine and evaluate Turkey's crisis as a result of Islamic radicals and the debate about the secular. *Snow* is an important novel that reveals a relationship between fanaticism and Islam and the need for change within Islam, although this change relies upon the interpretation of Islam. Pamuk foreshadows the doom of religious fervor by questioning the religion itself, both existentially and spiritually. In *Snow*, Ka is vulnerable, yet a strong believer in love and faith, which he justifies through his encounter with his long-lost love, Ipek. Similarly justice and equality prevail in the nexus between faith and fanaticism. Ka is a westernized character who discovers the enigma of fanaticism.

Ka returns to Kars looking for a story about the girls who have been committing suicides and finds him turning to religion when he encounters a Shaykh. As he says:

A feeling of peace spread through me; I had not felt this way for years. I immediately understood that I could talk to him about anything, tell him about my life, and he would bring me back to the path I had always believed in, deep down inside; even as an atheist: the road to God almighty. I was joyous at the mere expectation of this salvation. (55)

Ka's character and inner struggle bring up the dialectic of religion and extremism which is echoed in Turkey. The novel serves as an introspective look at what takes place in a country that confronts the secular, the West and extremity of religious fanaticism.

Many events in *Snow* illustrate the tensions between the Islamic fundamentalists and the more liberal people of Kars. The plot darkens

throughout the novel, and the reader encounters violent scenes as people from the village create internal tensions that lead to killing and death. Pamuk's novel represents the conflicts within Islam, which are filled with local contradictions that arise when traditional attitudes are faced with those of modern Islam. It also presents a view of Muslims who are faithful to God and are fearful of extreme secularists and fanatics. Pamuk suggests that there is the slightest possibility that a balance can be maintained between both the religious and the secular. For example, in *Snow*, Ka has a conversation With Necip, a young religious student, who eventually dies when the growing tensions between secularists and Islamists explode during a televised event at the National Theater. Before Necip dies, Ka has a conversation with him in which he testifies not oThe New Life y to a belief in God that sustains many of the locals, but also to the fear that arises from this tension and the idea that oThe New Life y Westerners can question God. Necip tells Ka about a dream he has had, in which he fears his own disbelief in God and that if it is true he will die. He further illuminates his fear by confessing:

I looked it up in the Encyclopedia once, and it said that word *atheist comes from the Greek athos*. But *athos* doesn't refer to people who don't believe in God; it refers to the lonely ones, people whom the Gods have abandoned. This proves that people can't ever really be atheists, because even if we wanted it, God would never abandon us here. To become atheist, then, you must first become a Westerner. (57)

In the works of these literary writers, there is always the presence of a colonizer, an outsider, a stranger who has somehow not created a crisis, but also caused confusion about what modern Muslim identities are today. Pamuk's

version of Turkish Islam encourages questions of religion and the gaze of the colonial traveler in Turkey, which creates a modern dilemma for Turks, as Turkey is the secular country in the Islamic world. These writers shed light on struggle taking place over questions that lie deep within each Muslim culture, and encourage reflection on both religious and modern ideas.

The Issue of 'Otherness' is foregrounded by the Hoja as the narrator when he speaks of the Italian scholar as "Him" with a capital "H." This "Him" represents and becomes the other, albeit an Occidental one, and the power that the West holds, as well as an assumption of a direct connection with the source of truth. The novel suggests that the Assumptions made during the seventeenth century about the power and knowledge that the West possesses and the desirability of their possession by the then Ottoman Empire, then as now, affect the exchange between the East and the West. *The White Castle* that appears at the end of the story becomes a symbol of the West and the origin of "Him." Such unfulfillable aspirations as to be like the West, then as now, are reflected in the description of the "White Castle" that the sultan's forces attempt to overtake:

I didn't know why I thought that one could see such a beautiful and unattainable thing in a dream. In that dream you would run along round twisting through a dark forest, straining to reach the bright day of that hilltop, that ivory edifice; as if there were a grand ball going on which you wanted to join in, a chance for happiness you did not want in miss, but although you expected to reach the end of the road at any moment, it would never end. (143)

The Hoja is the intelligent Turk who is interested in and inspired by the knowledge of the West, but who is never able to completely fulfill promise of

knowledge and concomitant control because the goal of fulfillment, like the white castle, is a fiction.

The production of fictions is central to questions about the skewed discourse of Orientalist texts. Pamuk introduces passages in the conversation between the Italian visitor and Hoja that caricature and idealize the assumptions made by the West about Turks. A popular Western opinion of the Turks is characterized by the statement of what "He" had written about them and is injected into the dialogue by the Italian visitor.

He was not a true friend of the Turks... He'd written unflattering things about them. He'd written that we were now in decline, described our minds as if they were dirty cupboards filled with old junk. He'd said we could not be reformed, that if we were to survive our alternative was to submit immediately, and after this we would nor be able to do anything for centuries but imitate those to whom we had surrendered. "But he wanted to save us," I put in." (154)

It is "He" who wishes to help the declining Ottomans who do not seem¹ to be able to help themselves, and whose time is past, and who need reform and guidance from the West.

The novel *My Name Is Red* includes numerous discussions of the Koran and the Islamic canon that form the basis of the interdict against portraiture, refracted through its kaleidoscope. For example, Satan, voiced by the storyteller in Chapter 47, refuses to be associated with portraiture. Boasting that he "never bowed down before man," at the cost of banishment from heaven, this Miltonian Satan is now resentful that painting, portraiture, and perspective are attributed to the angel that refused to acknowledge man's superiority (MNR 352). Satan attributes human vanity to God's ways, thus transforming the understanding of

right and wrong, virtue and sin. Is this a paradox, or a critique of Islamic precepts? From Satan's perspective, the proscription of painting seems contrary to Islam as a religion where human beings are considered superior to angels. Satan's final words provide another twist: "It's not the content, but the form of thought that counts. It's not what a miniaturist paints, but his style" (MNR 353-354). The kaleidoscope moves once more to shift the pattern: the highly charged argument about religion turns into a question of aesthetics.

Satan's inquisitiveness stands diametrically opposed to Islamic fundamentalism, as portrayed through Erzurumi Effendi's adherents. As shifting perspectives and fleeting identities are considered heresy, an affront to "true" Islam, the Erzurumis seek ways to destroy the multiplicity of meanings that they associate with the art of miniature. Throughout the novel, the Erzurumis symbolize the threat that Islamic fundamentalism poses to any encounter between East and West. Indeed, religious bigotry is the underlying reason for the murders: Olive kills Elegant because he fears Elegant will report the heretical miniatures to Erzurumi Hodja. The Erzurumis kill the storyteller, who gives voice to the drawings of the miniaturists in coffeehouses to entertain his audience through responding to the course of events and thereby criticizing fundamentalism. The ensuing mayhem ultimately leads to the waning of the art of miniature.

Perhaps the most striking reference to the Koran is an allusionistic one. In this novel about Islamic precepts, the Koran is the divine masterpiece, the book that characters refer to when in need of self-justification. In the final dialogue between Olive and Black, however, a quote from Kipling's "The Ballad of East and West" (1895) seem to make more sense than the Koran when discussing East-West relations:

To God belongs the East and the West," I said in Arabic, like the late Enishte."But East is east and West is west," said Black. (MNR 488)

To include the Koran as ultimate masterpiece in the context of the characters' multiple discussions about masterpiece is to introduce the divine as a mere perspective. In contrast to Kipling, Black does believe in the meeting of East and West as a means of creating a new space. The novel allows that encounters between the two are wrought with distress and destruction, but it does not adhere to a strict East-West opposition.

Neither Osman nor Dr. Fine can come to grips with the disconnect between what they want the world to be like and what they experience the world to be. Osman remembers his disappointment that the worlds and adventures in Rifki's comics ended, and that the "magical realm was just a place made up by Uncle Rifki."(12) When Osman discovers that there is no ultimate meaning, he feels sad, but also feels free. He concludes, "Now that I had no more hope and desire to attain the meaning and the unified reality of the world, the book, and my life, I found myself among the fancy free appearances that neither signified nor implied anything."(289) He no longer has to search; he can embrace the ordinary life of being a husband and a father who liked to watch soccer on TV and take his daughter to the train station to watch tin-trains and to buy candy. Ironically, when he begins to come to terms with his search for a future and accept an earthly present, he is transported through the windshield of a crashed bus into that future, the new life that he once sought.

Neither Osman nor Sal follows the classic model of the hero or what traditional myths ascribe to be the archetype of heroic action. They venture beyond the ordinary experiences of life and encounter a variety of demons,

but they do not return enriched or more powerful or able to share what they have learned with others. Unable to overcome these threats, they wait for the emergence of someone who can banish or eradicate the evil and restore the community back to a harmonious paradise. They cannot transform society, banish the demons of growing older, and find their guiding angel or an affirming belief in a creator, who is more than what Sal characterizes as a "Pooh Bear." Osman eventually returns home to his mother where, "We breakfasted quietly as in the old days"(234) and finishes his university degree. His mother never asks him about his loss of Janan after Osman introduced her as his wife during a brief check-in phone call I from a small-town bus station. Sal retreats to his aunt's house in New Jersey and laments the loss of his father figure and traveling companion Dean Moriarity.

Osman and Sal don't attempt to organize a resistance for or against the forces that influence their lives. Osman doesn't harbor hostilities toward the West and carries a nostalgic appreciation of the past and the future as experienced in his childhood reading of Uncle Rifki's stories. When Osman receives Dr Fine's offer to become a replacement for Fine's presumed dead son, Mehmet, and take over his business in the small town where ads proclaim that circumcisions are performed in "the good old way" without using lasers, he declines to return to a small town and returns to Istanbul.

The higher state of authority Pamuk attains throughout *Snow* is especially notable in his full consumption of the Turkish past from the margins of his imaginary retreat— first, in the role of his protagonist and then through his narrator— Pamuk observes the multitude of complications on Turkey's political scene that Kars embodies: he ventures into a journey of what Bakhtin identifies in the novelist as an "*authoritative discourse*, and an *internally*

persuasive discourse" As the sole authoritative speaking person—or, "an ideologue" in Bakhtin's terms—Pamuk sets out to represent his story through what Bakhtin identifies as "*ideologemes*." Transforming the self into the "voice of conscience," he, thus, participates historical becoming and in social struggle—taking on the privilege that Bakhtin discusses as an integral element of the novelistic art. Pamuk adjusts his work as a historical novel. With this alteration, he accomplishes a unique representational discourse in which a "modernizing, an easing of temporal boundaries, the recognition of an eternal present in the past" dominate.

Throughout his historical accounts, Pamuk blankets himself with a distinct aura of detachment positioning himself as an outsider, all along representing the past and the present through what Said considers in Conrad to be "equivalent, in Sartre's terms, to the magical alteration of the objective reality." His laborious struggles toward the construction of his fictional autobiography of exile involve "what Foucault once called "a relentless erudition,' scouring alternative sources, exhuming buried documents, reviving forgotten (or abandoned) histories." With his tireless resourcefulness, he discovers alternative sources, unearths buried documents, and resuscitates forgotten or abandoned histories.

In Snow, Ka, a struggling poet returning from a decade-long self inflicted exile in Germany, is commissioned by a national newspaper to report on young, religious girls committing suicide in Kars in Eastern Turkey. Once a cosmopolitan city with thousand-year-old churches, and large Armenian community, Persians, Greeks, Kurds, Georgians, and Circassians, Kars is now changed as a poverty-stricken provincial outpost suffering from "destitution, depression, and decay." As Ka makes the journey on a bus in the thick winter,

it begins to snow, which he sees as "a promise, a sign pointing back to the happiness and purity he had once known as a child" (4); he is inspired to write a poem, titled "The Silence of Snow." The "inner peace" that the poet initially feels, however, is gradually replaced by an apprehension brought about by the escalating snowstorm; it becomes "tiring, irritating, terrorizing," creating "a fearful silence" among the passengers (5). As the bus continues its journey, it literally distances Ka from the familiarity of the Western values of Istanbul. Upon arrival, he feels culturally displaced in "a ghost town" of idleness and extremism, where human rights are violated and privacy laws are meaningless. Most importantly, the journey to the periphery of the nation forces Ka to enter into the ongoing political struggle between secularists and Islamists, and to rethink the rhetorical depiction of this struggle.

The silence of snow—both the actual backdrop of Kars as well as the poem Ka continues to work on throughout the book—can be viewed as an extended metaphor for the silence, the lack of dialogue, between Eastern and Western Turkey, as well as between the different factions of Kars, which act as microcosm of the nation.

In his portrayal of the relationship between Islamists and secularists, Pamuk is diligent about not depicting either camp in a monolithic way; rather, characters reveal complex subject positions, subscribing to various, even contradictory, tenets. Consider, for example, the way the author separates pious believers who fear "falling under the spell of the West," at the expense of "forgetting [their] own stories" (81), from political Islamists, who seek power by feeding on the fears of religious groups (their slogan: "Give your vote to the Prosperity party, the party of God, we've fallen into this destitution because we've wandered off the path of God" [26]). He also avoids presenting

the secularists as a unified group, differentiating between moderate secularists who are "prepared to live" with the Islamists "as long as [they] don't use intimidation or force to make Westernized women wear scarves" (151), and fanatics "who detect [...] a political motive every time [they see] a covered woman in the street" (22). This nuanced portrayal of characters allows the reader, especially the Western reader, to recognize that the political "binary" is something of an illusion, and that more radical members of each side seek to silence the dissonant voices within in order to simulate unanimity.

The most controversial aspect of the novel has been its treatment of fundamentalism. The idea of "fundamentalism" is particularly vexed in the Turkish context; though 97 percent of the population identify themselves as Muslim; there is a tendency in the secular media to label any public displays of faith as "fundamentalist." Furthermore, as some scholars have pointed out, fundamentalism—a concept deeply rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition—can be a misleading term when it comes to describing certain aspects of current Islamic movements even though, as Bobby S. Sayyid argues in his book *A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism*, "Islamic fundamentalism has (now) become a metaphor for fundamentalism in general (8)." And, of course, there is no consensus even among believers about what fundamentalism actually means. As Talal Asad in *Formation of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* states, "Yet, while Islamic fundamentalism clearly cannot be regarded as a coherent and consistent *strategy*, what does unify the *movement* at a very basic level is, first of all, a desire to promote "the principles of religion" over those values that are seen as offshoots of Western modernism"(196). This anti-Western sentiment is of central concern to Turkish authors and scholars, and is

especially alarming for secularists who fear that the deprivatization of religion will eventually present a threat against individual freedom, endangering the democratic structure of a state surrounded by nondemocratic neighbors. Taking its cue from these ongoing debates, *Snow* presents a philosophical conundrum: what is at stake when a state committed to secular guarantees of individual rights decides it must limit the rights of Islamic fundamentalists who support the desecularization of civic life? Is it legitimate to silence one group so that another may speak freely? If so, are universal and democratic rights in permanent opposition to each other?

Both sides, in other words, have been trying to silence the other; the author must let them speak. Pamuk does just this through the dialogic form of the novel. By representing a dissonant array of voices, he draws attention to the complexity of identity, politics, and consequently articulates the dilemma of the modern progressive Muslim nation attempting to impose secular values upon a religious population. This generates a question whether the civil rights of a particular group be sacrificed in order to uphold the dignity of others.

At the heart of *The Black Book* lies a search, a search for a beloved, for an ideal, and for an authentic self. The plot is deliberately simple. A young lawyer, Galip, returns home one evening to find out that his beautiful wife Riiya has left him. He then embarks on a literal journey to search for his runaway wife in the backstreets of Istanbul. Riiya's disappearance coincides with that of Celals, Galip's cousin and the famous newspaper columnist. When Galip's physical search proves futile, he embarks on a more intellectual journey. He moves into Celal's apartment to read his archive, literally to acquire his memory banks, and find clues as to where Riiya and Celal might be hiding. Eventually, he loses Riiya and Celal—they are murdered—which is a necessary

stage in his bildung in order to assert his self and emerge as a writer. Pamuk inserts this simple plot into a complex structure: he writes a polyphonic, polyvalent, allusive, obscurantist, and an unstable narrative in which chapters of storytelling alternate with chapters of Celal's newspaper columns. The novel is a labyrinthine quest through the city of Istanbul, encompassing an encyclopedia of Turkish life past and present with its cultural delights and historical shames.

The opening of *The Black Book* as well as the entire novel suggests a double plane of illusion and reality, which is the major concern of the book. Every story, allusion, pun, and even color connects with this double plane. The title of the first chapter reads "When Galip saw Riiya for the First Time". For the Turkish reader, the pun on the name Riiya, which also means "dream", is obvious. In Turkish, the title of this chapter reads "when Galip saw *Riiya* for the first time" and "when Galip saw *the dream* for the first time" (emphasis mine). This is also justified by the fact that the character Riiya does not have a physical presence in the text, and the question of whether she belongs to the world of reality or that of illusion remains unclear throughout the novel. Similar to the writings of postmodernist writers, Pamuk denies us anything that might read as a clear clue to an unequivocal reading. The narrative point of view is unreliable. The search is circular and multilayered. The frame story is Galip's search for his lost wife, which merges with the search for a lost older cousin, Celal, Galip's alterego, second-self, double, and his literary father. These two searches run parallel to merge with a more existential one, that of Galip's search for his self. The multiple acts of storytelling make the novel a metafiction, and all the stories merge into one to make the novel an allegorical tale of Platonic search.

Pamuk has seen himself as the Istanbul novelist and has claimed to be the first novelist who has seen the city in its full depth, through its history and geography. He prides himself to have represented the city as part biography and part autobiography. In retrospect, he views *The Black Book* as "a personal encyclopedia of Istanbul:

In *The Black Book* I did something I have wanted to do for years, a sort of collage, bits of history, bits of future, the present, stories that seem unrelated... To juxtapose all these is a good technique for signifying a meaning that should be intimidated, indirectly alluded to.

40

That is, Pamuk's Istanbul is a text and not a verifiable reality. It is a stage of stories and histories that are projected to the present in retrospect. The novel and the city represented in it are archives of remembrance and recollection, which, like memory, almost always entail a certain lack or loss.

The trope of the city is one key element that makes this novel important. In his study of national languages of developing nations, Charles Ferguson writes in his work "Language Development" *Language Problems of Developing Nations* that the language of "minor" cultures at some point of their history is regarded by their own native speakers as "backward" and "inadequate" and believed to require "modernizing" among other aspects (21). In an effort toward language, literature, and culture modernization, the ultimate criterion is to bring the allegedly "backward" nation to a stage of "translatability" among the "modern" nations of the world. As Ferguson writes, the modernization of a language is the process of its becoming "the equal of other developed languages as medium of communication." It requires the process of joining the world community of increasingly

"intertranslatable languages recognized as appropriate vehicles of modern forms of discourse." However, languages do not become "intertranslatable" through equal processes of transformation. "Weaker" languages and literatures are expected to "achieve" one-to-one correspondence with "stronger" ones. Implicitly, translatability is sought by the former and demanded by the latter. This "achievement" or, in other contexts, "modernization" more often than not means serious language, social, and cultural engineering for "developing" countries. The city of Istanbul as an image and literary trope achieves this translatability in Pamuk. It connects him to other international authors such as James Joyce, who capitalizes on the city of Dublin, and the modern flaneur, Charles Baudelaire. As scholar Irzic has pointed out, being a novelist of Istanbul involves making the city readable for the globalized culture of the West (735). This also explains why Pamuk's first two novels, *Cevdet Bey and Sons* and *The Silent House*, have not been translated into English. The former is an extremely long family saga written in modernist style, and the latter is Pamuk's first experiment with unreliable narration, both of which thematize culture-specific concerns. They do not fit with the author's projected image and therefore "do not translate" into the West.

The Silent House maintains the same three-generation "Empire to Republic" periodization. In contrast to the generational saga of the Isikci family, however, it portrays the dysfunctions of the Darvmoglus (lit., Son-of-Darwin), often in a mode of black humor. The three main time periods late Ottoman, early Republican, and 1970s Istanbul, covering a period from 1905 to 1970, are again represented, this time extended to the eve of the 1980 coup. However, Pamuk's second novel makes use of a Faulknerian style that revises

these periods, so they appear synchronically through limited first-person points of view. Instead of providing the dominant scaffolding for the novel, the Empire-to-Republic framework in *The Silent House* is appropriated and fragmented through a retrospective focus on memory both personal and Ottoman archival. The novel tells the story of three grandchildren who make a weeklong summer's visit to their grandmother's house near Istanbul, which proves to be the empty abode of the imagined community. The weeklong narrative-present opens to 70 years of late Ottoman and Republican history through a multiperspectival technique that gives prominence to subjective notions of time. Fatma Hanim, the matron and grandmother, stewes in bitter memories of her husband, Selahattin, a deluded European-educated modernizer and atheist who aspired to write an encyclopedia that would close the gap between "East" and "West." The traditions of the pre-Republican past, no longer the basis for social change through the secularization thesis, persist forcefully as an indictment of revolution through the narration of five characters: Recep, the illegitimate and "dwarfed" child of modernizer Selahirtin Darvinoglu; Fatma Hanim, Selahittin's bitter wife and devour matron of the Darvinoglu family; Hasan, the young, ideological convert to extreme Turkism who harbors ill-fated love for Nilgiin, the young socialist; Faruk, the Republican intellectual and a professor of history at the state university; and Metin, the young entrepreneur who wants to leave Turkey to live out the American dream. All of these characters suffer from social alienation and are involved in relationships of unequal affection or unrequited love. As a novel that intertwines the legacy of revolutions with articulations of cultural memory, *The Silent House* focuses on the third Republican generation, represented by Selahattin's three grandchildren, Metin, Nilgiin, and Faruk, and an "illegitimate" fourth grandchild, Hasan.

Allegorically, they each represent ideological aspects of contemporary Turkish society and politics,

The Silent House irreversibly breaks down the omniscient voice of Republican social history. Multiperspectivalism interrupts the progressive narrative by making the value to be derived from progress contingent on social position and point of view. The appearance of the satiric figure of "the historian," Faruk Darvinoglu ("Truth-Seeker Son-of-Darwin"), is the first indication of the derisive black humor that will dominate Pamuk's later novels. *The Silent House* ends weeks away from the 1980 military coup in a context of alienation and community fragmentation. Of the three grandchildren, one is a lonely alcoholic (and parody of the Republican intellectual), another dies after a politically motivated beating by ultranationalists, and the third dreams of leaving for the United States in pursuit of the American dream. Unmistakably, Pamuk's second novel declares the bankruptcy of any unified vision of national or social progress.

The novel presents the positivism of the Cultural Revolution and its present-day legacy in modes of the tragic and the grotesque. The first generation of late Ottoman revolutionary enlightenment is represented by Selahattin Darvinoglu, a medical doctor. Around 1912, Selahattin is exiled by Talat Pasha of the "Young Turk" Union and Progress Party from Istanbul for his involvement in politics. He settles with his wife Fatma in nearby Gebze. The temporary exile becomes permanent as Selahattin grows increasingly obsessed with authoring an encyclopedia that will prove "Allah is dead" and bring the ideals of the scientific revolution and Enlightenment to Turkey, enabling it to "catch up with Europe." He spends 30 years writing the encyclopedia but is

unable to complete it, in part, he complains, due to the 1928 Alphabet Reform that changed the Ottoman script to Latin letters.

Fatma is persecuted then haunted by her atheist, modernizer husband, and a symbol of authoritarian positivism. Selahattin, an inquisitor figure, attempts to force the ideological conversion of those around him, in particular, his wife. She resists his arguments and logic, later claiming at his grave that she has succeeded in avoiding the brave new world of his future "atheist state." Through her interior monologue, which becomes a confessional testimony, Fatma ridicules him as an obsessed alcoholic. Meanwhile, Selahattin claims that Fatma is frigid, demonstrates the nonexistence of Allah, fathers two illegitimate children with the maidservant, and determines that the fear of death and nothingness is the vital element that separates "East" from "West." In short, Pamuk has begun a multilayered parody of the revolution trope, In a night of retaliation for her husband's transgressions, Fatma severely beats both of his illegitimate children, leaving one (Ismail) crippled and the other (Recep) stunted.

Faruk discovers that he cannot avoid the temptation of story as a medium for causality and emplotment: "Returning to its old habit, my brain demands, as always, that I come up with a short story summarizing all these facts, a convincing narrative (56). This gives rise to an epistemological problem that he resolves through experimentation in narrative form. "This insane longing to hear a story fools us all pulling us into a dream universe when we live in a real world of flesh and blood." The ambivalence between a materialist, realist perspective and a romantic, literary one is evident. Faruk believes that the archive itself can be a model for such a new history of non-causal "endless description." His thinking applies to a revision of literary modernity as well,

that is, one based on a model of intertextuality and an innovation in literary form that moves away from the realist dialectic of social history that dominated Republican literature between 1960 and 1980. Faruk is convinced that the work of a historian is "that of a storyteller,"(143) and that "history is nothing but stories (115)." Later, he thinks that breaking the chain of causality will enable him to "get rid of the moral motive and of everything that is apodictic/true, (161)" which will allow him to attain freedom and potential in his work. It is not hard to read this historical debate as one about the liberation from confinements of Republican discursive space. The dilemma, predicated on narrative, is both historical and literary, with the site of authority moving from the historiographic to the literary.

Through Faruk, Pamuk exposes the potential for a new aesthetics of literary modernity. The Ottoman archive, the Republic's wildly signifying collective unconscious, provides the perfect laboratory for such narrative experimentation with texts that will lead to historiographic, and, in turn, identity-based transformations. Clues in *SH* reveal that this new narrative aesthetic will be fragmentary, multiperspectival, metahistorical, and open to interpretation (this is borne out in *The White Castle* and Pamuk's subsequent postmodern works). Faruk's meditation approaches a treatise on the theory of the novel that emerges from the heteroglossia of countless archive stories. The type of novel Pamuk produces, again through the vehicle of the historian-cum-author Faruk, is reflected in Faruk's "historian's dilemma" regarding narrative and disciplinary method. By distinguishing story from historical fact, Pamuk is able to transcend the confines of the national tradition. This type of deconstruction in the Republican literary field, in turn, leads to an international, intertextual space—an archive of world literature.

Faruk's concern is nothing but a literary one. Finally, he settles on a Calvino-esque "deck of cards" metaphor: events are the cards and among them are, like jokers, a number of "story" cards that meaningfully assemble and organize the textual events. It is in this process of breaking down history that Pamuk, through Faruk, is attempting to transcend Republican ideology.

Depiction of Culture

Westernization as a Negative-identity: The Plague of Westernization

With the arrival of republic state in Turkey, many changes have taken place. People of the country are haunted by the desire to western culture and their ways of living life rapidly. As a result, the problems like identity crisis, conflict of tradition and modernity, clash of the East and the West, depression, and melancholy emerged in Turkey. These issues arising out of multiculturalism find prominence in the writings of Turkish writers. This clock automatically settles the Westernization-versus-Islamization question through a modern device: Instead of the usual cuckoo bird, two other figures had been employed, a tiny imam who appeared on the lower balcony at the proper time for prayer to announce three times that "God is Great!" and a minute toy gentleman wearing a tie but no mustache who showed up in the upper balcony on the hour, asserting that "Happiness is being a Turk, a Turk, a Turk." (NL 88).

Turkish sociologist Emre Gökalp discusses national pride in Turkey and the negative and positive reactions that Orhan Pamuk received in the Turkish media after he had received the Nobel Prize for literature (2006). Gökalp argues that the historical paradox of Turkish national identity stems from the tension between the emulation of the West/Europe that is regarded as the unique address of civilization, modernization, wealth and prosperity, and the hostility towards the same West/Europe that is, at the same time, considered as the cultural/political 'other',

or at times the ‘enemy’. In other words, the sentiments for Europe oscillate between two extremes: on the one hand the West/Europe is admired as the ideal or level of contemporary civilization which is in the core of Republican ideology; on the other hand resentment is nourished against the West/Europe as an insidious political enemy.

By ‘white’ and ‘black’, I metaphorically refer to the colors; not to any race. For Turkish people, the West is white, positive and ideal as well as it is black, negative and alien. For that reason, the West has become Turkey’s both negative and positive other with which Turks compare and identify themselves. In her book *National Identity Reconsidered: Images of Self and Other in a “United” Europe*, Triandafyllidou makes use of two notions in order to define the construction of identity from within and outside. She calls them ‘internal significant other’ and ‘external significant other’. Triandafyllidou argues that the external significant other may switch its position as inspiring and threatening significant other in the eye of a nation. She asserts that this inscription of the external significant other as threatening or inspiring is mostly determined “during the periods of social, political or economic crisis. The positive significant other may . . . be seen as a model to follow for resolving the crisis, while the threatening other may serve to overcome the crisis. Because it unites the people before a common enemy, it reminds them ‘who we are’” (Triandafyllidou 44). The post-WWI period was still not the end of war for contemporary Turkey. The Independence War lasted till 1923. The country was then an amalgam of the leftovers of a decadent empire and the springs of a newborn nation-state. Suffering from instability and also a geographical in-between, the republican intelligentsia of Turkey had decided to follow Europe as their inspiring significant other which was during the WWI the threatening significant other.

The main problem emanates from the immediacy of the revolution and the incapability of Turkish citizens to internalize it. In this context, *The New Life* should be read as a book which illustrates Turkey's negative experience in the course of the Westernization process, regarding the effects of this forced change in Anatolian towns. It also deals with the arrival of capitalism to these towns and it portrays how local brands of Branch soda pop were replaced by their Western mostly American equals Cola Cola, Pepsi and Schweppes. The protagonist Osman, is worried about this increasing popularity of Western brands. That is why he became happy to see that a local drink, Branch soda pop, is still popular in this small Anatolian town called Viranbağ: "I observed without too much concern that Branch soda pop still persisted here against all sorts of assaults from Coca-Cola, Pepsi, and Schweppes" (NL287). The existence of Branch soda pop is inspiring for Osman. This drink, just as the new life Caramels, represents the last traces of the indigenous culture. The indigenous culture of Turkish people living in these Anatolian towns is getting slowly assimilated to Westernization. Besides, Pamuk juxtaposes an Islamic figure, Sheikh, with Pepsi-Cola, the drink which is strongly identified with West. In a mountain town called Alacaelli, Osman visits the Sheikh and tells about his so-called miracles in a sarcastic way:

The miracles of the Sheikh performed, such as curing the sick or bestowing fecundity on barren women, his real talent was . . . opening a Pepsi-Cola bottle by simply touching the cap. (NL 181)

The invention of Istanbul has more intimate implications as well. Pamuk writes from the city where he has lived all his life. Yet, he is also a stranger in his home city, as the Istanbul of the moment of writing is considerably different from the Istanbul of childhood.

The population of the city increased tenfold in the past fifty years due to waves of immigration from Central and Eastern Anatolia. In contrast, the advent of

the republic marks the emigration of non-Muslim inhabitants who composed the half of the city's population as late as 1920s. This change in ethnic and cultural makeup of its inhabitants turned Istanbul into a city of alienation, where no one feels "completely at home" (103). At the same time, Pamuk's identification with the city shows that despite the drastic transformations the city has undergone in the past century, it offers a space of self-realization. If home is where no one feels at home, then being at home is also defined differently.

Pamuk's account shows how locality may act on the self in question. By giving an account of how he invents the self and the city, Pamuk presents the act of inventing as yet another everyday practice. In other words, he makes familiar not the self and the city, but also the act of inventing. And that invention, Pamuk shows us, multiplies the I of the narrator, not because giving any account of oneself involves making I another but because the history and location of the city are constantly reinvented by other voices and narratives.

Within the context of Turkish language, narration points foremost to a void. Language was already the site of a verbal chasm between the Ottoman seat of power and its subjects. In the same vein, the plans for language reform, to close, in the Turcologist Erik Jan Zürcher's words, "the chasm between the written Ottoman of the literate elite and the vernacular of the Turkish population," date back to the mid-nineteenth century (189). The bridging of this gap took place as part of the Kemalist reforms that sought to modernize the country. In 1928, five years after the advent of the Republic, and four years after the abolishing of the Caliphate, the State implemented a reform of the alphabet, giving up Arabic script in favor of the Latin alphabet. This was followed by the language reform of 1936, which purged the Turkish language of its Ottoman vocabulary and syntax, introducing newly coined words from Turkic language. These policies, accompanied by a new historical thesis that bypassed the Ottoman past, aimed to sever the remaining ties

with Islamic heritage and the Ottoman Past, in order to facilitate processes of Westernization.

This chasm between the language and its speakers, the old and the new, the past and the present, is considered to be the major problem in Turkish cultural identity after the advent of the Republic in 1923. Traced back to the government enforced move from the use of Arabic letters to Latin alphabet, Turkish modern history is marked by a rupture, famously referred to by Jacques Derrida as a “coup de lettre” in his postcard from Istanbul.

In an article on contemporary Turkish cultural identity and Europe, Kevin Robins refers to the same problem: “There has been a creative void at the heart of modern Turkish culture. The elite put the old order into question, but it was not able through this process to liberate new meaning of a creative kind” (68). Ironically, the same void also characterizes Pamuk’s work and notably his memoir, which might be considered a response to the lack of creativity find that the way to know myself is precisely through a meditation that takes place outside of me, exterior to me, in a norm or convention that I did not make, in which I cannot discern myself as an author or an agent of its making” (23).

Pamuk presents a self and a city, which are formed through others’ accounts. Just as self-knowledge always entails the other, so does knowledge of the city. The two sources of knowledge, the self and the other, are intertwined in such a way that the self is, is not an other but others. Pamuk’s memories of the city are constructed through others’, ranging from his immediate family to painters and men of letters. Just like family and the city, literary lineage emerges as another family that Pamuk loves, and he shares with the reader his reasons for this love. The inclusion of different accounts of the city in the autobiography is not simply a sign of erudition; Pamuk privileges other accounts over his own feelings and experiences. P’s

literary family is not exclusively Turkish. He allocates a chapter each to his favorite Western artists and gives reasons for their inclusion in his artistic family. The otherness of Istanbul is not simply a problem inherent to literature or autobiography; it is historiographic. There are few chronicles by its Muslim inhabitants and the actual histories of the city are produced mostly by Westerners, a problem voiced in the memoir, as well as by historians of the city (Eldem). Pamuk, with his westernized upbringing and education feels obliged to read about his city-self through visitors' accounts, some of whom I mentioned above. The result is a further split in the objectifying of his subjectivity: reflecting on the self through an 'other,' seeing the self through an 'other' eye constituted by western discourse. The self, an interior text at the crossroads of other selves and texts, is shaped around an east-west axis.

Whatever we call it—false consciousness, fantasy, or old-style ideology—there is, in each of our heads, a half legible, half secret text that makes sense of what we've done in life. And for each of us in Istanbul, a large section of this text is given over to what Western observers have said about us. For people like me, Istanbul with one foot in this culture and one in the other, the 'Western traveler' is often not a real person—he can be my own creation, my fantasy, even my own reflection. So whenever I sense the absence of Western eyes, I become my own Westerner. Knowledge of the self entails adopting the discourse of the other, and thus becoming an other to the self. Istanbul's location, however, adds different undertones to discussions of otherness. Pamuk incorporates material on historical and contemporary Turkey into his account. The foregoing passage questions the implicit understanding of the split self as something negative, introducing it instead as a means of generating abundance within the 'I.'

Pamuk poeticizes the split subjectivity and otherness of the self in a text that traces Istanbul's varied trajectories. Neither the East-West duality nor the

persistent effort to adopt the European model to the point of a break with the past are negative; both become a privilege that enables the Istanbul to consider the past self as “exotic” .

Pamuk reads the singularity of the city and its tradition within the dynamics of post colonialism, as a privilege that allows the inhabitants of the city to have a dual perspective: especially when reading the Western travelers of the nineteenth century—perhaps because they wrote about familiar things in words I could easily understand—I realize that my ‘city’ is not really mine. [...] [At once object and subject of the Western gaze] I waver back and forth, sometimes seeing the city from within and sometimes from without, I feel as I do when I am wandering the streets, caught in a stream of slippery, contradictory thoughts, not quite belonging to this place, and not quite a stranger. Here the question of the Westerner’s gaze takes a different turn, tending towards alienation from one’s own culture, as well as identification with the colonizer’s gaze. Pamuk celebrates the cities, and accordingly his own positioning on the periphery of the West as a means of generating further possibilities of textual stratification.

This note on being homeless at home necessitates a detour to establish the notion as an important theme in literature. The lines cited above resonate with the feeling of homelessness and exile that characterizes Istanbul as a literary capital. In recent discussions of world literature, Istanbul is regularly viewed as the ‘birthplace’ of comparative literature

Auerbach’s remark on Istanbul is notable not because it contextualizes his work, but also because of the place Edward Said assigned to him. Said has referred to Auerbach’s *Mimesis* on numerous occasions and indeed, *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (1982) opens with a discussion of Auerbach’s composition of *Mimesis* as a product of exile. Istanbul, Said notes, is not just anywhere outside Europe:

Istanbul represents the terrible Turk, as well as Islam, the scourge of Christendom, the great Oriental apostasy incarnate [...] for centuries Turkey and Islam hung over Europe like a gigantic composite monster, seeming to threaten Europe with destruction. To have been an exile in Istanbul at that time of fascism in Europe was a deeply resonating and intense form of exile from Europe. (6)

For a scholar of medieval and Classical literature like Auerbach, Istanbul as the seat of “the Turk,” represents the antagonistic other of Europe, evolving throughout centuries from “the scourge of Christendom” to the Oriental despot, the sick man of Europe, and finally the Eastern question. Istanbul provides the vantage point from which Auerbach can reflect on the European literary tradition as a whole. Yet, the location complicates Auerbach’s position as a humanist and scholar of European culture who, exiled by a product of that culture, now attempts to rescue it in the very city that has been for centuries represented as Europe’s greatest enemy.

Melancholy

In the popular sense of the word, melancholy, denoting deep, pensive and long lasting sadness is a recurrent theme in Pamuk’s work. His novels recount bitter oppositions between the main characters and their surroundings; all protagonists are desolate characters who have something to feel sad and gloomy about and they are progressively more so as their stories unfold. The first novel, *Cevdet Bey and His Sons* (1982)⁶³ tells the story of three generations, Cevdet Bey, his son Refik and later the grandson Hasan, all being at odds with the newly emerging Turkish bourgeoisie; the former strives to whereas the latter members resist to take part in. In *The Silent House* (1983), Pamuk’s second novel, a group of childhood friends suffer from the alienating effects of the struggle between the new rich, the middle classes, and the poor. In *The White Castle* (1985), the struggle

between different cultures is transposed to an international level through the two protagonists of the novel, the Venetian captive and his Ottoman master. In later novels, melancholic disposition becomes an attribute of the main character: Galip in *The Black Book* (1990) in search of a lost lover; Osman in *The New Life* (1994) on a quest to find Canan, the object of his unrequited love; Kara in *My Name Is Red* (1998) commissioned to revive a fading art and solve a murder case as well as to rekindle an old love; Ka in *Snow* (2002) reconciling bitter oppositions to win the heart of beautiful İpek, an old flame from university in the derelict city of Kars in the northeast Turkey; Kemal in *The Museum of Innocence* (2008) realizing the power of his love for a distant relative after he loses her.

Melancholy appears as a leitmotif that marks the plot and the main characters; it is perhaps in its most intense in the endings of the novels. The novels almost always end in mayhem. An obvious theme is the death of either the protagonist; Osman in *New Life*, Ka in *Snow*, Kemal in *The Museum of Innocence*, and/or the beloved; Rüya in *The Black Book*, Nilgün in *The Silent House*, Füsün in *The Museum of Innocence*. The quests the novels relate end in futility: In *White Castle*, the cannon that the Hoja and the Slave have worked on for years cannot even be put to use; in *My Name is Red* the art of the miniature fades and masterpiece miniatures are lost; Kemal and Füsün, the secret lovers of *The Museum of Innocence* cannot unite; a mysterious and life-changing book is lost in *New Life*, as are Ka's dates refer to original publications in Turkish.

Melancholy as such entails or results from futile quests or searches that end in vain. This loss, however, does not simply convey sadness or pessimism; it leads to a generative urge that accompanies the feeling of loss. All novels end with a character transfiguring the story into a novel. In *The Museum of Innocence* the act of transfiguration is carried one step further and accompanied by the protagonist opening a museum devoted to his lost love. Writing as such appears as a solace, as

Galip at the end of *The Black Book* announces, and as a means of triumphing over the aforementioned struggles. Melancholy as such is not simple sadness. With a further twist, the creativity that accompanies loss is itself melancholic, in line with the tradition of scholarly melancholy.

Pamuk's use of melancholy that relates to Islam is a hallmark of his writing. In his analysis on the role of Sufism and Islam in *The Black Book*, Ian Almond delineates a similar understanding of melancholy. Almond identifies a tripartite understanding of melancholy in the novel: the futility of the quest and the death of mystery, the dissolution of identity with the failure of the quest, and finally the need for meaning or story that nevertheless remains (78). Melancholy, according to Almond is a defining element of Pamuk's work, and its elaboration his major accomplishment:

The success of Pamuk as a novelist lies in the skill with which he explores the Metaphysical echoes of certain sadness' -homesickness, aimlessness, unhappiness in love-a skill which transmutes sequences of concrete events and sufferings into speculatively post metaphysical parables.

For Almond, the ultimate origin of the metaphysical echoes is Islam. The civic melancholy of the book in other words, is religious. The novel alludes to Islam as a marker of melancholy and resignation, symbolized in "sad, concrete minarets" (*Black* 306). Pamuk's melancholy indeed draws from both the popular and the traditional understanding of the word to develop. In Almond's words, by playing with the form and critiquing its content, Pamuk's representation of Islam simultaneously celebrates the tradition and attacks it (84).

It is in his Istanbul that the aesthetics is explored in terms of its cultural implications. The memoir offers Istanbul as the space and the story; the "concrete" and the "parable" in Almond's words, making the city landscape a mythical and distant one. Melancholy becomes the definitive element of the city and of its

inhabitants. The act of transmutation belongs to the city: it is not a literary skill exclusive to him but part of the city's history and topography. Pamuk's deployment of melancholy, containing a history of the city and of Islam and literature, is a trademark of his writing.

Osman also mentions people who try to turn their backs to their roots in an attempt to escape from the plague of Westernization under the name of globalization in big cities of Turkey: "Like people who used to flee the plague once upon a time . . . they were trying to escape from the gaudy consumer products with foreign names which, thanks to the support of advertisements and TV, arrived from the West and infected the whole country like a deadly contagious disease" (N L 272).

Osman's dialogue with the manufacturer of the New Life Caramels, Süreyya Bey, about the chess game reflects again the confusing relation of the East with the West from a sarcastic perspective:

Süreyya stirred in his chair, his face turned to the gray light that came in through the shady garden, and he asked me out of the blue if I knew German. Without waiting for an answer, he said "Schachmatt." Then he explained that the word "check-mate" was a European hybrid made of the Persian word for *king*, "shah," and the Arabic word for *killed*, "mat." (221)

We were the ones who had taught the West the game of chess. In the worldly arena of war, the black and white armies fought out of good and evil in our souls. And what had they done? They had made a queen out of our vizier and a bishop out of our elephant; but this was not important in itself. What was important, they had presented chess back to us as a victory of their own brand of intellect and the notions of rationalism in their world. Today we were struggling to

understand our own sensitivities through their rational methods, assuming this is what becoming civilized means. (N L 281)

Moreover, in another chapter, Pamuk tells the story of a man who had showed him “the face cards on which he had drawn with his own hand, changing the king into “sheikh” and the jack into “disciple,” (NL 91). This is an example of Islamization of a Western object. It is meant to be a sort of defense mechanism and reaction against Westernization.

In *The Black Book*, the criticism for the blindfolded Westernization comes from the ex-husband of Rüya. Galip pays a visit to the ex-husband of Rüya, hoping that he can find her in his flat. Rüya’s ex-husband invites Galip to his flat and these two have some words together. Galip never reveals that he visits him for Rüya. The ex-husband starts talking about a conspiracy theory planned against Turkey which aims “ripp[ing] away our memories, our past, our history” (127). Describing the negative effects of the movies and television on people, he further tells that Turkish people were “so entranced by the streets and clothes and women they’d seen on the silver screen that they’d been unable to go on living as before” (128). Back in the days, when he was still with Rüya, they both “devoted their lives to the propagation of ideas; this had meant taking manifestos from a distant country they’d never visited . . . all they’d wanted all along was to be someone other than the people they were” (128).

The expansion of Istanbul in the last fifty years clearly reflects the city’s recovery of its status as a cultural and economic, if not an administrative, capital, on both local and global scale. A study on Istanbul as 2010 European Cultural Capital refers to the compulsive use of the metaphor of the bridge by social scientists and creative artists to locate the city in global maps and cultural imaginaries (Göktürk et al. 3). These views are echoed in not the cultural but also in the political imaginary of the city as well. The most recent example is the city’s

selection as 2010 European Capital of Culture. This official acknowledgement of the city as a part of European heritage, while Turkey's candidacy to EU and its European identity are a constant question of debate, separates the city from the rest of the country. The city is again a zone of contact, a gateway to Europe, as well as a bridge between Europe and Turkey. In short, the Ottoman door, closed with the demise of the Empire, gave way to the symbolism of Istanbul's bridges with advent of the Turkish Republic. The shifting symbolism resonates with the changes in the cultural politics of the city and the country, blending in with unusual harmony with its foremost writer, Orhan Pamuk.

Pamuk represents a highly complex sense of Turkish cultural identity. This is an identity fully laden with its Ottoman, Islamic, and European legacies, demonstrated in his fiction by showing the impact of religion and westernization on his characters. Pamuk's current international significance, with the exception of the Nobel Prize, derives from his political and politicized stance concerning Turkish identity, as the overview of responses will reveal. What appeals is the recurrence of the imagery of the bridge to describe his work, his persona, and the controversy around his persona.

Husband realizes that he cannot manage to 'become an other' through distributing the leftist manifestos of unknown lands, he decides to adapt the Turkish middle-class family life-style, which he assumes as his original self. However, these middle-class families, living in the suburbs of Istanbul, usually with two kids, having more or less same sort of furniture and knickknacks in their flats, build a lifestyle that is based on what they see on TV. As they all watch the same channels and see the same stuff on TV, from the inner decoration of their flats, their ideas till their daily talks start to be fashioned all by TV. As a result, this middle-class Turkish family prototype turned into 'kitsch' (Vetter 109). Therefore, it can be claimed that the ex-husband of Rya lives in a dream. His desire for a

local-original identity cannot go far than imitating what he has seen on TV. Through the ex-husband character, Pamuk makes also a reference to the fact that identity, in the case of Turkey, cannot escape from being an adaptation. It maybe because of this impossibility that this ex-husband finally acknowledges that “after becoming a new person, and then another . . . , there was less and less hope of returning to the happiness they had known as the people they’d been at the beginning” (BB 129).

At the end of their conversation, the ex-husband of Rüyâ feels sad for Galip, as he returns to Istanbul. He states, “Istanbul was the touchstone; forget about living there. Just to set foot in this city was . . . to admit defeat. What had begun in a handful of darkened movie houses had now spread far beyond; the frightful city was now awash with images of decay: hopeless crowds, old cars, bridges sinking slowly into the sea . . .” (BB 130-131).

Our identity is at once plural and partial. Sometimes we feel that we straddle two cultures; at other time, that we fall between two stools . . . Salman Rushdie -- “Imaginary Homelands” This was life in its essence; it was neither one thing nor the other, neither in heaven nor in hell, it was right here, in the present, in the moment, life in all its glory.

The journey-quest motif that Pamuk constructs as the backbone of his plots both in *The Black Book* and *The New Life* has two dimensions. The superficial plotline revolves around the chase after a woman, while a more deep-seated identity problem, embroidered with different motifs and references to this problem, is placed in the center of the story. This motif provides Pamuk with the opportunity to analyze the central problems revolving around the problem of liminal identity. It is actually the starting point of both plotlines. Besides, adding the detective-story effect, this motif enables protagonist and reader wander in the text simultaneously. Moreover, it refers to duality and dividedness in the sense that both protagonists go

through two different adventures. While they search for the woman they love, Galip and Osman simultaneously seek for the meaning of life and their 'true' self. In *The New Life*, the manifestation of journey-quest is depicted through bus journeys. Pamuk portrays these voyages as the main metaphor of transition. During his random bus journeys, Osman always wishes for an accident to happen through which he can pass to a new life. He travels mostly at night which makes this journey more mysterious and causes him to feel melancholic. The half-lit interiors of these buses remind the reader of the image of 'twilight' that dominates both BB and *The New Life*. During his journeys, Pamuk writes, Osman goes into a world of twilight where the "faint light inside the bus" (293) is lit up by the headlights of other buses passing by. This 'half-life half-light'⁶⁹ is always existent in Pamuk's fiction. In *Other Colors*, Pamuk asserts that BB and NL are books of 'twilight' where his personal fears, paranoia and mysteries coincide (*Other Colors* 139). It is obvious that Osman's and Galip's quests do operate as a quasi-religious journey including several mystical, mythical symbols.

If the plotlines of BB and NL are seen from the vantage point of "death" of Rüya-Celâl-Janan-Nahit/Mehmet-Osman, the characteristics of "invisibility and darkness" of the labyrinthine streets, underground ateliers, wells, the depths of the Bosphorus, the dark air shaft, the black book, "womb" (beginning, birth of a nation, the origin, the new life) or "eclipse of the sun and the moon" (trance, hallucinations, twilight) can be listed as the common metaphors of these two books. After one of many bus accidents, Osman confesses that he is stuck in an in-between state of being: "Peace, sleep, death, time! I was both here and there, in peace and waging a bloody war, insomniac as a restless ghost and also interminably somnolent, present in an eternal light and also in time that flowed away inexorably" (47).

The quests of the protagonists, Galip and Osman show parallelism. Both experience their lives in both physical and metaphysical dimensions. We witness one of the most striking cataleptic experiences of Osman, when he first encounters with “the book” within the novel:

This was the kind of light within which I could recast myself; I could lose my way in this light; I already sensed in the light, the shadows of an existence I had yet to know and embrace . . . as if I had been stranded in a country where I knew neither the lay of the land nor the language and the customs . . . In the light that surged from the book into my face, I was terrified to see shabby rooms, frenetic buses, bedraggled people, faint letters, lost towns, lost lives, phantoms. A journey was involved; it was always about a journey. (N L 35)

We witness this “moment of in and out of time” already at the very beginning of the novel foreshadowing the other metaphysical moments that we come across in the rest of the book. In that respect, it can be claimed that if bus journeys of Osman are the indicators of his physical quest, the moments of accidents are the “moment[s] in and out of time” during which Osman experiences a trance in its literal sense. He experiences the suspension of life in every moment of accident during which he goes through the temporary absence of the physical realm and the temporary presence of the metaphysical world. In *The New Life*, Osman starts his successive journeys right after he plans to find the writer of the book. In the course of time, Osman’s physical journey transforms to a metaphysical pilgrimage. Osman moves from ‘the secular realm’ to ‘the realm of the sacred’. The more he travels, the more alienated he becomes from himself. This alienation is physical in the sense that he is far from his family and friends during his journeys. It is also metaphysical, as he becomes estranged from his inner world. At this point, Osman chases double meanings and existences of every person and

object. Janan exists as a woman and a desired sexual object in the real world and also impersonates a superhuman and an angel. She supersedes God in the imaginary world of Osman. She is actually the reenactment of an earlier figure of the literature world. What Beatrice was to Dante Alighieri, is Janan to Osman. In other words, Janan operates both as a physical and as a metaphysical character in *The New Life*.

As a consequence, we witness that the physical journeys of the protagonist Osman turn into a metaphysical allegory. Osman wavers between physical and metaphysical realms. Following every accident that he experiences as a moment of trance, he switches his identity which is symbolized by stolen identification cards. At the very end of NL, in the very moment of the accident, an eventual chance for transition to a new life, Osman confesses to himself that he “absolutely had no wish for death or for crossing over into the new life” (296).

Orhan Pamuk demonstrates the conscious understanding of the line between the “the West and “the other” and describes the oscillation of East and West in Turkey. The main characters, circumstances, and situations in different places and times provide illustrations of characters who oscillate between Islam, and the modern dimensions of their identities. Pamuk defines his relationship with religion as one that is based on his imagination of God and one that is ignored in his secular family life in Istanbul. His focus is on Islam as a means to understanding modern Muslim identity which raises questions related to literary themes centered on society, morals and politics. He is significant in demonstrating this new vehicle of expression for Muslims. He exemplifies the tension between tradition and modernity in the context of Islamic culture- Turkey being the threshold of Ottoman Empire and the cradle of Islamic civilization.

Clash of tradition and modernity

Pamuk witnesses the deterioration of his cities in different way; however, he expresses how the respective cultures have been transformed and how the change that takes place is multifaceted and includes external changes in the architecture, neighborhoods, and everyday life, and internal changes in the authority structures of the cultures, which have been split up into different forms. For example, in Pamuk's novel *Snow*, the main character Ka returns to Istanbul after being exiled to Germany. He returns because he has learned of a wave of suicides among girls forbidden to wear headscarves at school. He is struck by the condition of Kars; a city that was once a province of the, Ottoman Empire and Russia's glory is now a zone of poverty and destitution. His journey motivates him to examine and evaluate Turkey's crisis as a result of Islamic radicals and the debate about the secular. *Snow* is an important novel that reveals a relationship between fanaticism and Islam and the need for change within Islam, although this change relies upon the interpretation of Islam. Pamuk foreshadows the doom of religious fervor by questioning the religion itself, both existentially and spiritually. In *Snow*, Ka is vulnerable, yet a strong believer in love and faith, which he justifies through his encounter with his long-lost love, Ipek. Similarly justice and equality prevail in the nexus between faith and fanaticism. Ka is a westernized character who discovers the enigma of fanaticism.

Ka returns to Kars looking for a story about the girls who have been committing suicides and finds him turning to religion when he encounters a Shaykh. As he says:

A feeling of peace spread through me; I had not felt this way for years. I immediately understood that I could talk to him about anything, tell him about my life, and he would bring me back to the path I had always

believed in, deep down inside; even as an atheist: the road to God almighty.
I was joyous at the mere expectation of this salvation. (55)

Ka's character and inner struggle bring up the dialectic of religion and extremism which is echoed in Turkey. The novel serves as an introspective look at what takes place in a country that confronts the secular, the West and extremity of religious fanaticism.

Many events in *Snow* illustrate the tensions between the Islamic fundamentalists and the more liberal people of Kars. The plot darkens throughout the novel, and the reader encounters violent scenes as people from the village create internal tensions that lead to killing and death. Pamuk's novel represents the conflicts within Islam, which are filled with local contradictions that arise when traditional attitudes are faced with those of modern Islam. It also presents a view of Muslims who are faithful to God and are fearful of extreme secularists and fanatics. Pamuk suggests that there is the slightest possibility that a balance can be maintained between both the religious and the secular. For example, in *Snow*, Ka has a conversation with Necip, a young religious student, who eventually dies when the growing tensions between secularists and Islamists explode during a televised event at the National Theater. Before Necip dies, Ka has a conversation with him in which he testifies not to a belief in God that sustains many of the locals, but also to the fear that arises from this tension and the idea that Westerners can question God. Necip tells Ka about a dream he has had, in which he fears his own disbelief in God and that if it is true he will die. He further illuminates his fear by confessing:

I looked it up in the Encyclopedia once, and it said that word *atheist* comes from the Greek *athos*. But *athos* doesn't refer to people who don't believe in God; it refers to the lonely ones,

people whom the Gods have abandoned. This proves that people can't ever really be atheists, because even if we wanted it, God would never abandon us here. To become atheist, then, you must first become a Westerner. (57)

In the works of these literary writers, there is always the presence of a colonizer, an outsider, a stranger who has somehow not created a crisis, but also caused confusion about what modern Muslim identities are today. Pamuk's version of Turkish Islam encourages questions of religion and the gaze of the colonial traveler in Turkey, which creates a modern dilemma for Turks, as Turkey is the secular country in the Islamic world. These writers shed light on struggle taking place over questions that lie deep within each Muslim culture, and encourage reflection on both religious and modern ideas.

The modernization or failure of the Ottoman Empire is hinted throughout the novel *The White Castle*. The failure of the Ottomans to capture Dobbio is described as failure to attain something pure and perfect. The issue of Otherness is foregrounded by the Hoja as the narrator when he speaks of the Italian scholar as "Him" with a capital "H." This "Him" represents and becomes the other, albeit an Occidental one, and the power that the West holds, as well as an assumption of a direct connection with the source of truth. The novel suggests that the Assumptions made during the seventeenth century about the power and knowledge that the West possesses and the desirability of their possession by the then Ottoman Empire, then as now, affect the exchange between the East and the West. The White Castle that appears at the end of the story becomes a symbol of the West and the origin of "Him." Such unfulfillable aspirations as to be like the West, then as now, are reflected in the description of the "White Castle" that the sultan's forces attempt to overtake:

I didn't know why I thought that one could see such a beautiful and unattainable thing in a dream. In that dream you would run around twisting through a dark forest, straining to reach the bright day of that hill top, that ivory edifice; as if there were a grand ball going on which you wanted to join in, a chance for happiness you did not want in miss, but although you expected to reach the end of the road at any moment, it would never end. (143)

The Hoja is the intelligent Turk who is interested in and inspired by the knowledge of the West, but who is never able to completely fulfill promise of knowledge and concomitant control because the goal of fulfillment, like the white castle, is a fiction.

The production of fictions is central to questions about the skewed discourse of Orientalist texts. Pamuk introduces passages in the conversation between the Italian visitor and Hoja that caricaturize and idealize the assumptions made by the West about Turks. A popular Western opinion of the Turks is characterized by the statement of what "He" had written about them and is injected into the dialogue by the Italian vision.

He was not a true friend of the Turks... He'd written unflattering things about them. He'd written that we were now in decline, described our minds as if they were dirty cupboards filled with old junk. He'd said we could not be reformed, that if we were to survive our alternative was to submit immediately, and after this we would not be able to do anything for centuries but imitate those to whom we had surrendered. "But he wanted to save us," I put in." (154)

It is “He” who wishes to help the declining Ottomans who do not seem¹ to be able to help themselves, and whose time is past, and who need reform and guidance from the West.

The novel *My Name Is Red* includes numerous discussions of the Koran and the Islamic canon that form the basis of the interdict against portraiture, refracted through its kaleidoscope. For example, Satan, voiced by the storyteller in chapter 47, refuses to be associated with portraiture. Boasting that he "never bowed down before man," at the cost of banishment from heaven, this Miltonian Satan is now resentful that painting, portraiture, and perspective are attributed to the angel that refused to acknowledge man's superiority (352). Satan attributes human vanity to God's ways, thus transforming the understanding of right and wrong, virtue and sin. Is this a paradox, or a critique of Islamic precepts? From Satan's perspective, the proscription of painting seems contrary to Islam as a religion where human beings are considered superior to angels. Satan's final words provide another twist: "It's not the content, but the form of thought that counts. It's not what a miniaturist paints, but his style"(353-354). The kaleidoscope moves once more to shift the pattern: the highly charged argument about religion turns into a question of aesthetics.

Satan's inquisitiveness stands diametrically opposed to Islamic fundamentalism, as portrayed through Erzurumi Effendi's adherents. As shifting perspectives and fleeting identities are considered heresy, an affront to "true" Islam, the Erzurumis seek ways to destroy the multiplicity of meanings that they associate with the art of miniature. Throughout the novel, the Erzurumis symbolize the threat that Islamic fundamentalism poses to any encounter between East and West. Indeed, religious bigotry is the underlying reason for the murders: Olive kills Elegant because he fears Elegant will report

the heretical miniatures to Erzurumi Hodja. The Erzurumis kill the storyteller, who gives voice to the drawings of the miniaturists in coffeehouses to entertain his audience through responding to the course of events and thereby criticizing fundamentalism. The ensuing mayhem ultimately leads to the waning of the art of miniature.

Perhaps the most striking reference to the Koran is an allusive one. In this novel about Islamic precepts, the Koran is the divine masterpiece, the book that characters refer to when in need of self-justification. In the final dialogue between Olive and Black, however, a quote from Kipling's "The Ballad of East and West" (1895) seems to make more sense than the Koran when discussing East-West relations:

To God belongs the East and the West," I said in Arabic, like the late Enishte."But East is east and West is west," said Black.
(488)

To include the Koran as ultimate masterpiece in the context of the characters' multiple discussions about masterpiece is to introduce the divine as a mere perspective. In contrast to Kipling, Black does believe in the meeting of East and West as a means of creating a new space. The novel allows that encounters between the two are wrought with distress and destruction, but it does not adhere to a strict East-West opposition.

Neither Osman nor Dr. Fine can come to grips with the disconnect between what they want the world to be like and what they experience the world to be. Osman remembers his disappointment that the worlds and adventures in Rifki's comics ended, and that the "magical realm was just a place made up by Uncle Rifki." (12) When Osman discovers that there is no ultimate meaning, he feels sad, but also feels free. He concludes, "Now that I had no

more hope and desire to attain the meaning and the unified reality of the world, the book, and my life, I found myself among the fancy free appearances that neither signified nor implied anything."(289) He no longer has to search; he can embrace the ordinary life of being a husband and a father who liked to watch soccer on TV and take his daughter to the train station to watch tin-trains and to buy candy. Ironically, when he begins to come to terms with his search for a future and accept an earthly present, he is transported through the windshield of a crashed bus into that future, the new life that he once sought.

Neither Osman nor Sal follows the classic model of the hero or what traditional myths ascribe to be the archetype of heroic action. They venture beyond the ordinary experiences of life and encounter a variety of demons, but they do not return enriched or more powerful or able to share what they have learned with others. Unable to overcome these threats, they wait for the emergence of someone who can banish or eradicate the evil and restore the community back to a harmonious paradise.⁴¹ They cannot transform society, banish the demons of growing older, and find their guiding angel or an affirming belief in a creator, who is more than what Sal characterizes as a "Pooh Bear." Osman eventually returns home to his mother where, "We breakfasted quietly as in the old days"(234) and finishes his university degree. His mother never asks him about his loss of Janan after Osman introduced her as his wife during a brief check-in phone call I from a small-town bus station. Sal retreats to his aunt's house in New Jersey and laments the loss of his father figure and traveling companion Dean Moriarity.

Osman and Sal don't attempt to organize a resistance for or against the forces that influence their lives. Osman doesn't harbor hostilities toward the West and carries a nostalgic appreciation of the past and the future as

experienced in his childhood reading of Uncle Rifki's stories. When Osman receives Dr Fine's offer to become a replacement for Fine's presumed dead son, Mehmet, and take over his business in the small town where ads proclaim that circumcisions are performed in "the good old way" without using lasers, he declines to return to a small town and returns to Istanbul.

The higher state of authority Pamuk attains throughout *Snow* is especially notable in his full consumption of the Turkish past. From the margins of his imaginary retreat— first, in the role of his protagonist and then through his narrator— Pamuk observes the multitude of complications on Turkey's political scene that Kars embodies: he ventures into a journey of what Bakhtin identifies in the novelist as an "*authoritative discourse*, and an *internally persuasive discourse*" As the sole authoritative speaking person—or, "an *ideologue*" in Bakhtin's terms—Pamuk sets out to represent his story through what Bakhtin identifies as "*ideologemes*." Transforming the self into the "voice of conscience," he, thus, participates historical becoming and in social struggle—taking on the privilege that Bakhtin discusses as an integral element of the novelistic art. Pamuk adjusts his work as a historical novel. With this alteration, he accomplishes a unique representational discourse in which a "modernizing, an erase of temporal boundaries, the recognition of an eternal present in the past" dominate.

Throughout his historical accounts, Pamuk blankets himself with a distinct aura of detachment positioning himself as an outsider, all along representing the past and the present through what Said considers in Conrad to be "equivalent, in Sartre's terms, to the magical alteration of the objective reality." His laborious struggles toward the construction of his fictional autobiography of exile involve "what Foucault once called "a relentless

erudition,' scouring alternative sources, exhuming buried documents, reviving forgotten (or abandoned) histories." With his tireless resourcefulness, he discovers alternative sources, unearths buried documents, and resuscitates forgotten or abandoned histories.

In *Snow*, Ka, a struggling poet returning from a decade-long self-inflicted political exile in Germany, is commissioned by a national newspaper to report on young, religious girls committing suicide in Kars in Eastern Turkey. Kars which was an affluent city in the past is now a poverty-stricken provincial outpost suffering from "destitution, depression, and decay. As Ka makes the journey on a bus in the thick winter, it begins to snow, which he sees as "a promise, a sign pointing back to the happiness and purity he had once known as a child" (4); he is inspired to write a poem, titled "The Silence of Snow." The "inner peace" that the poet initially feels, however, is gradually replaced by an apprehension brought about by the escalating snowstorm; it becomes "tiring, irritating, terrorizing," creating "a fearful silence" among the passengers (5). As the bus continues its journey, it literally distances Ka from the familiarity of the Western values of Istanbul. Upon arrival, he feels culturally displaced in "a ghost town" of idleness and extremism, where human rights are violated and privacy laws are meaningless. Most importantly, the journey to the periphery of the nation forces Ka to enter into the ongoing political struggle between secularists and Islamists, and to rethink the rhetorical depiction of this struggle.

The silence of snow—both the actual backdrop of Kars as well as the poem Ka continues to work on throughout the book—can be viewed as an extended metaphor for the silence, the lack of dialogue, between Eastern and

Western Turkey, as well as between the different factions of Kars, which act as microcosm of the nation.

In his portrayal of the relationship between Islamists and secularists, Pamuk is diligent about not depicting either camp in a monolithic way; rather, characters reveal complex subject positions, subscribing to various, even contradictory, tenets. Consider, for example, the way the author separates pious believers who fear "fall[ing] under the spell of the West," at the expense of "forgetting [their] own stories" (81), from political Islamists, who seek power by feeding on the fears of religious groups (their slogan: "Give your vote to the Prosperity party, the party of God, we've fallen into this destitution because we've wandered off the path of God" [26]). He also avoids presenting the secularists as a unified group, differentiating between moderate secularists who are "prepared to live" with the Islamists "as long as [they] don't use intimidation or force to make Westernized women wear scarves" (151), and fanatics "who detect [...] a political motive every time [they see] covered woman in the street" (22). This nuanced portrayal of characters allows the reader, especially the Western reader, to recognize that the political "binary" is something of an illusion, and that more radical members of each side seek to silence the dissonant voices within in order to simulate unanimity.

The most controversial aspect of the novel has been its treatment of fundamentalism. The idea of "fundamentalism" is particularly vexed in the Turkish context; though 97 percent of the population identify themselves as Muslim; there is a tendency in the secular media to label any public displays of faith as "fundamentalist." Furthermore, as some scholars have pointed out, fundamentalism—a concept deeply rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition can be a misleading term when it comes to describing certain aspects of

current Islamic movements even though, as Bobby S. Sayyid argues in his book *A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism*, "Islamic fundamentalism has (now] become a metaphor for fundamentalism in general (8)." And, of course, there is no consensus even among believers about what fundamentalism actually means. As Talal Asad in *Formation of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* states, "Yet, while Islamic fundamentalism clearly cannot be regarded as a coherent and consistent strategy, what does unify the movement at a very basic level is, first of all, a desire to promote "the principles of religion" over those values that are seen as offshoots of Western modernism"(196). This anti-Western sentiment is of central concern to Turkish authors and scholars, and is especially alarming for secularists who fear that the deprivatization of religion will eventually present a threat against individual freedom, endangering the democratic structure of a state surrounded by nondemocratic neighbors. Taking its cue from these ongoing debates, *Snow* presents a philosophical conundrum: what is at stake when a state committed to secular guarantees of individual rights decides it must limit the rights of Islamic fundamentalists who support the desecularization of civic life? Is it legitimate to silence one group so that another may speak freely? If so, are universal and democratic rights in permanent opposition to each other?

Both sides, in other words, have been trying to silence the other; the author must let them speak. Pamuk does just this through the dialogic form of the novel. By representing a dissonant array of voices, he draws attention to the complexity of identity, politics, and consequently articulates the dilemma of the modern progressive Muslim nation attempting to impose secular values upon a

religious population. This generates a question whether the civil rights of a particular group be sacrificed in order to uphold the dignity of others.

At the heart of *The Black Book* lies a search, a search for a beloved, for an ideal, and for an authentic self. The plot is deliberately simple. A young lawyer, Galip, returns home one evening to find out that his beautiful wife Riiya has left him. He then embarks on a literal journey to search for his runaway wife in the backstreets of Istanbul. Riiya's disappearance coincides with that of Celals, Galip's cousin and the famous newspaper columnist. When Galip's physical search proves futile, he embarks on a more intellectual journey. He moves into Celal's apartment to read his archive, literally to acquire his memory banks, and find clues as to where Riiya and Celal might be hiding. Eventually, he loses Riiya and Celal—they are murdered—which is a necessary stage in his bildung in order to assert his self and emerge as a writer. Pamuk inserts this simple plot into a complex structure: he writes a polyphonic, polyvalent, allusive, obscurantist, and an unstable narrative in which chapters of storytelling alternate with chapters of Celal's newspaper columns. The novel is a labyrinthine quest through the city of Istanbul, encompassing an encyclopedia of Turkish life past and present with its cultural delights and historical shames.

The opening of *The Black Book* as well as the entire novel suggests a double plane of illusion and reality, which is the major concern of the book. Every story, allusion, pun, and even color connects with this double plane. The title of the first chapter reads "When Galip Saw Riiya for the First Time". For the Turkish reader, the pun on the name Riiya, which also means "dream", is obvious. In Turkish, the title of this chapter reads "when Galip saw *Riiya* for the first time" and "when Galip saw *the dream* for the first time" (emphasis mine). This is also justified by the fact that the character Riiya does not have a

physical presence in the text, and the question of whether she belongs to the world of reality or that of illusion remains unclear throughout the novel. Similar to the writings of postmodernist writers, Pamuk denies us anything that might read as a clear clue to an unequivocal reading. The narrative point of view is unreliable. The search is circular and multilayered. The frame story is Galip's search for his lost wife, which merges with the search for a lost older cousin, Celal, Galip's alterego, second-self, double, and his literary father. These two searches run parallel to merge with a more existential one, that of Galip's search for his self. The multiple acts of storytelling make the novel a metafiction, and all the stories merge into one to make the novel an allegorical tale of Platonic search.

Pamuk has seen himself as the Istanbul novelist and has claimed to be the first novelist who has seen the city in its full depth, through its history and geography. He prides himself to have represented the city as part biography and part autobiography. In retrospect, he views *Kara Kitap* as "a personal encyclopedia of Istanbul:

In *The Black Book* I did something I have wanted to do for years, a sort of collage, bits of history, bits of future, the present, stories that seem unrelated... To juxtapose all these is a good technique for signifying a meaning that should be intimidated, indirectly alluded to.

40

That is, Pamuk's Istanbul is a text and not a verifiable reality. It is a stage of stories and histories that are projected to the present in retrospect. The novel and the city represented in it are archives of remembrance and recollection, which, like memory, almost always entail a certain lack or loss.

The trope of the city is one key element that makes this novel important. In his study of national languages of developing nations, Charles Ferguson writes in his work "Language Development" *Language Problems of Developing Nations* that the language of "minor" cultures at some point of their history is regarded by their own native speakers as "backward" and "inadequate" and believed to require "modernizing" among other aspects (21). In an effort toward language, literature, and culture modernization, the ultimate criterion is to bring the allegedly "backward" nation to a stage of "translatability" among the "modern" nations of the world. As Ferguson writes, the modernization of a language is the process of its becoming "the equal of other developed languages as medium of communication." It requires the process of joining the world community of increasingly "intertranslatable languages recognized as appropriate vehicles of modern forms of discourse." However, languages do not become "intertranslatable" through equal processes of transformation. "Weaker" languages and literatures are expected to "achieve" one-to-one correspondence with "stronger" ones. Implicitly, translatability is sought by the former and demanded by the latter. This "achievement" or, in other contexts, "modernization" is more often than not means serious language, social, and cultural engineering of "developing" countries. The city of Istanbul as an image and literary trope achieves this translatability in Pamuk. It connects him to other international authors such as James Joyce, who capitalizes on the city of Dublin, and the modern flaneur, Charles Baudelaire. As scholar Irzic has pointed out, being a novelist of Istanbul involves making the city readable for the globalized culture of the West (735). This also explains why Pamuk's first two novels, *Cevdet Bey and Sons* and *The Silent House*, have not been translated into English. The former is an extremely long family saga written in modernist

style, and the latter is Pamuk's first experiment with unreliable narration, both of which thematize culture-specific concerns. They do not fit with the author's projected image and therefore "do not translate" into the West.

The Silent House maintains the same three-generation "Empire to Republic" periodization. In contrast to the generational saga of the Isikci family, however, *The Silent House* portrays the dysfunctions of the Darvmoglus (lit., "Son-of-Darwin"), often in a mode of black humor. The three main time periods late Ottoman, early Republican, and 1970s Istanbul, covering a period from 1905 to 1970, are again represented, this time extended to the eve of the 1980 coup. However, Pamuk's second novel makes use of a Faulknerian style that revises these periods, so they appear synchronically through limited first-person points of view. Instead of providing the dominant scaffolding for the novel, the Empire-to-Republic framework in *The Silent House* is appropriated and fragmented through a retrospective focus on memory both personal and Ottoman archival. The novel tells the story of three grandchildren who make a weeklong summer's visit to their grandmother's house near Istanbul, which proves to be the empty abode of the imagined community. The weeklong narrative-present opens to 70 years of late Ottoman and Republican history through a multiperspectival technique that gives prominence to subjective notions of time. Fatma Hanim, the matron and grandmother, stewes in bitter memories of her husband, Selahattin, a deluded European-educated modernizer and atheist who aspired to write an encyclopedia that would close the gap between "East" and "West." The traditions of the pre-Republican past, no longer the basis for social change through the secularization thesis, persist forcefully as an indictment of revolution through the narration of five characters: Recep,

the illegitimate and "dwarfed" child of modernizer Selahirtin Darvinoglu; Fatma Hanim, Selahittin's bitter wife and devour matron of the Darvinoglu family; Hasan, the young, ideological convert to extreme Turkism who harbors ill-fated love for Nilgiin, the young socialist; Faruk, the Republican intellectual and a professor of history at the state university; and Metin, the young entrepreneur who wants to leave Turkey to live out the American dream. All of these characters suffer from social alienation and are involved in relationships of unequal affection or unrequited love. As a novel that intertwines the legacy of revolutions with articulations of cultural memory, *The Silent House* focuses on the third Republican generation, represented by Selahattin's three grandchildren, Metin, Nilgiin, and Faruk, and an "illegitimate" fourth grandchild, Hasan. Allegorically, they each represent ideological aspects of contemporary Turkish society and politics,

The novel *The Silent House* irreversibly breaks down the omniscient voice of Republican social history. Multiperspectivalism interrupts the progressive narrative by making the value to be derived from progress contingent on social position and point of view. The appearance of the satiric figure of "the historian," historian Faruk Darvinoglu ("Truth-Seeker Son-of-Darwin"), is the first indication of the derisive black humor that will dominate Pamuk's later novels. *The Silent House* ends weeks away from the 1980 military coup in a context of alienation and community fragmentation. Of the three grandchildren, one is a lonely alcoholic (and parody of the Republican intellectual), another dies after a politically motivated beating by ultranationalists, and the third dreams of leaving for the United States in pursuit of the American dream. Unmistakably, Pamuk's second novel declares the bankruptcy of any unified vision of national or social progress.

The novel presents the positivism of the Cultural Revolution and its present-day legacy in modes of the tragic and the grotesque. The first generation of late Ottoman revolutionary enlightenment is represented by Selahattin Darvinoglu, a medical doctor. Around 1912, Selahattin is exiled by Talat Pasha of the "Young Turk" Union and Progress Party from Istanbul for his involvement in politics. He settles with his wife Fatma in nearby Gebze. The temporary exile becomes permanent as Selahattin grows increasingly obsessed with authoring an encyclopedia that will prove "Allah is dead" and bring the ideals of the scientific revolution and Enlightenment to Turkey, enabling it to "catch up with Europe." He spends 30 years writing the encyclopedia but is unable to complete it, in part, he complains, due to the 1928 Alphabet Reform that changed the Ottoman script to Latin letters.

Fatma Hanim is persecuted then haunted by her atheist, modernizer husband, and a symbol of authoritarian positivism. Selahattin, an inquisitor figure, attempts to force the ideological conversion of those around him, in particular, his wife. She resists his arguments and logic, later claiming at his grave that she has succeeded in avoiding the brave new world of his future "atheist state." Through her interior monologue, which becomes a confessional testimony, Fatma ridicules him as an obsessed alcoholic. Meanwhile, Selahattin claims that Fatma is frigid, demonstrates the nonexistence of Allah, fathers two illegitimate children with the maidservant, and determines that the fear of death and nothingness is the vital element that separates "East" from "West." In short, Pamuk has begun a multilayered parody of the revolution trope, In a night of retaliation for her husband's transgressions, Fatma severely beats both of his illegitimate children, leaving one (Ismail) crippled and the other (Recep) stunted.

Faruk discovers that he cannot avoid the temptation of story as a medium for causality and emplotment: "Returning to its old habit, my brain stubborn demands, as always, that I come up with a short story summarizing all these facts, a convincing narrative (56). This gives rise to an epistemological problem that he resolves through experimentation in narrative form. "This insane longing to hear a story fools us all pulling us into a dream universe when we live in a real world of flesh and blood." The ambivalence between a materialist, realist perspective and a romantic, literary one is evident. Faruk believes that the archive itself can be a model for such a new history of non-causal "endless description." His thinking applies to a revision of literary modernity as well, that is, one based on a model of intertextuality and an innovation in literary form that moves away from the realist dialectic of social history that dominated Republican literature between 1960 and 1980. Faruk is convinced that the work of a historian is "that of a storyteller,"(143) and that "history is nothing but stories (115)". Later, he thinks that breaking the chain of causality will enable him to "get rid of the moral motive and of everything that is apodictic/true", (161) which will allow him to attain freedom and potential in his work. It is not hard to read this historical debate as one about the liberation from confinements of Republican discursive space. The dilemma, predicated on narrative, is both historical and literary, with the site of authority moving from the historiographic to the literary.

Through Faruk, Pamuk exposes the potential for a new aesthetics of literary modernity. The Ottoman archive, the Republic's wildly signifying collective unconscious, provides the perfect laboratory for such narrative experimentation with texts that will lead to historiographic, and, in turn, identity-based transformations. Clues in *SH* reveal that this new narrative

aesthetic will be fragmentary, multiperspectival, metahistorical, and open to interpretation. Faruk's meditation approaches a treatise on the theory of the novel that emerges from the heteroglossia of countless archive stories. The type of novel Pamuk produces, again through the vehicle of the historian-cum-author Faruk, is reflected in Faruk's "historian's dilemma" regarding narrative and disciplinary method. By distinguishing story from historical fact, Pamuk is able to transcend the confines of the national tradition. This type of deconstruction in the Republican literary field, in turn, leads to an international, intertextual space—an archive of world literature.

Faruk's concern is nothing but a literary one. Finally, he settles on a Calvino-esque "deck of cards" metaphor: events are the cards and among them are, like jokers, a number of "story" cards that meaningfully assemble and organize the textual events. It is in this process of breaking down history that Pamuk, through Faruk, is attempting to transcend Republican ideology

Islamic Culture

My Name Is Red involves multiple perspectives not the new life with its narrative, but also with its representation of Islam. The novel includes numerous discussions on *The Koran* and the Islamic canon that form the basis of the interdict against portraiture, refracted through its kaleidoscope. Elegant Effendi, whose voice from the bottom of a well starts the novel, ushers in a set of morbid themes that the novel is associated with. His call for vengeance, his hesitation to speak of his current existence in a purgatory-like space and the mention of his pain because of the murder, however, is rather reminiscent of the most renowned ghost in literature: the Ghost of Hamlet's Father. Yet, in this contemporary novel, Elegant's hopes as a ghost reside not in his offspring, but in the reader. He thus beckons the reader to avenge his foul murder, and to beware of the text he has just started to

read. In Enishte's death, on the other hand, giving voice to a corpse becomes an outlet to recount Koranic images of the afterlife and purgatory. Enishte's experiences after death validate all the Islamic literature he has read about the matter. He asks God about the meaning of earthly existence, and he cannot clearly hear the answer; it is either "Mercy or mystery." The response he receives, however, is nevertheless in line with the humanist tradition of Islam that he represents. With Satan, voiced by the storyteller in Chapter 47, the kaleidoscopic narrative is at its most unusual. Satan refuses to be associated with portraiture as it contradicts what he stands for. Boasting that he "never bowed down before man," at the cost of banishment from heaven, Satan is now resentful that painting, portraiture and perspective are attributed to the new life that angel refused to acknowledge man's superiority (*MNR* 352). Satan attributes human vanity to God's ways:

Was it not you who instilled man with pride by making the angels bow before him? Now they regard themselves as your angels were made to regard them; men are worshipping themselves, placing themselves at the centre of the world. (353)

Satan's voice thus transforms the understanding of right and wrong, virtue and sin. Is this a paradox, or a critique of Islamic precepts? From Satan's perspective, banishment of painting seems contrary to Islam as a religion where human beings are considered superior to angels. Satan's words ends with another twist on the matter of style and form: It's not the content, but the form of thought that counts. It's not what a miniaturist paints, but his style. (353-54)

The kaleidoscope moves once more to shift the pattern: the highly charged argument on religion turns into a question of aesthetics as a means of meaning making. Diametrically opposed to Enishte's humanism and Satan's inquisitiveness stands Islamic fundamentalism, portrayed through the adherents of Erzurumi

Effendi. As shifting perspectives and fleeting identities are considered heresy, an affront to ‘true’ Islam, Erzurumis seek ways to destroy the pluralism that they associate with the art of miniature.

Throughout the novel, the Erzurumis symbolize the threat that Islamic fundamentalism poses to any encounter between the East and the West. Indeed, religious bigotry is the underlying reason for the murders and the ensuing tribulation: Olive kills Elegant because he fears Elegant will report the heretical miniatures to Erzurumi Hodja, the leader of an extremist Muslim sect, and ensue trouble. The Erzurumis kill the storyteller, who acts out, by giving voice to the drawings of the miniaturists, inanimate characters in coffeehouses to entertain his audience through responding to the course of events and criticizing fundamentalism. The ensuing mayhem ultimately leads to the waning of the art of miniature (Chapter 55). Thus the bigoted adherents to the Islamic canon set the stage for the apparent encounter between Islamic and Western art.

The primary hue that the novel adopts in its representation of Islam is the destructiveness of religious fundamentalism. The encounter between Islamic and Western aesthetics wreaks havoc on those involved: two miniaturists and Enishte are killed; the remains of the book are confiscated and placed in the Imperial Treasury; Master Osman blinds himself; his workshop is closed and the art of miniature evanesces as the Ottoman Empire is increasingly under the influence of religious extremism. One of the final images of the novel, Sultan Ahmed demolishing the monumental clockwork, eerily evokes another enemy of clocks and time, the Imam in Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses* (1988), who destroys all the clocks in his city (214).

As unusual intertextual elements, the verses from *The Koran* quoted in the epigraph and within the novel serve a double purpose. According to Yıldız Ecevit, Koranic verses are “an aesthetic element, ripped from its sacredness by Pamuk as

an innovation in Turkish literature” (155). Koranic verses are not completely stripped from their sacredness, however, since the *Koran* maintains its ethical and religious power within the story. The verses are rather pluralized, as they are included into the dialogue on masterpieces. The most striking reference is an anachronistic one. In this novel on Islamic precepts, *The Koran* is the divine Masterpiece, the Book that characters refer to for rhetorical purposes, when in need of self-justification. In the final dialogue between Olive and Black, however, a quote from Kipling’s “The Ballad of East and West” (1895)¹²⁴ seems to make more sense than the Koran when discussing East West relations: “To God belongs the East and the West,” I said in Arabic, like the late Enishte. “But East is east and West is west,” said Black. (488)

In this novel on Islamic precepts, the inclusion of *the Koran* as the ultimate masterpiece to the characters multiplies the discussions on masterpiece, introducing the divine as a mere perspective. In *The New Life* Black does believe in the meeting of East and West as a means of creating a new space. The conflicts that the novel depicts suggest the encounters between the two are wrought with distress and destruction. Nevertheless, the aesthetics of the novel does not adhere to a strict opposition, framing the East, but also the West. *The White Castle* combines these two registers by showing how the stories that the narrator invents to define his ‘self’ also emerge as the weapon that Hoja invents to fight against ‘the white castle’ which is the symbol of a pure, intact and homogenous definition of identity. The invention of identity as displacement is the invention of a weapon that would undermine the definition of identity as ‘the white castle’.

The search for meaning becomes more important for Osman than any other thing. He and his fellow students also seek to escape from old routines and familiar possessions binding them to an “old world.” They travel without specific plans or a specific destination. Their search, which requires travelling across Turkey by bus,

that provides distraction, an opportunity to focus upon the moment. Traveling by bus is an adventure in Turkey as your future is no longer in your hands, which brings a sense of freedom. There are no strict rules and regulations for the drivers' training and sleep time; hence the passengers have their lives in order. Pamuk describes this: "whenever the driver slams on the brake or the bus whips road, trying to figure out if the zero hour is upon us. No, not yet"(54-55). Each trip promises the ultimate answer to life, but becomes just another search, just another bus trip. Ultimately students have learnt that they have watched thousands of kissing scenes and hundreds of action films feature car chases, crashes, and lots of blood and gore that dominate the world of male movie attendance in the Middle East. The town possesses similar crowded bus terminals where people carry "plastic bags, cardboard suitcases, and gunnysacks."

Pamuk describes in *The New Life* students being fascinated by the romantic idea of death explained in Uncle Rifki's book. From their youthful perspective, death is not finality, but is a crossing over into a plane of existence better than their current life with platters of meat and potatoes and predictable green salad prepared by their mothers who as desexualized beings fall asleep every night in front of the TV sets. The students hope to travel from the present created world into a world of the Creator. Like many seekers, they seek a guide, the angel or the shaykh, who will guide them on their journey in the presence of God. For Osman the angel appears in female form, whereas in Islam angels are genderless. The angel appears in Osman's life at the last moments is a bright light that doesn't show any compassion or intervene in events. Angel doesn't absolve Osman for shooting Mehmet, his competitor for the love of Janan. It observes from a distance and does not resemble any of the European and Ottoman artists' depiction of angels as beautiful beings.

Characters in the novel believe that union with God occurs not in life but rather through the experience of physical death. They don't seek the second Sufi option of annihilation of the self, of the ego. The three students from their expectations about death and life through their individual interactions with a text that promises a new life, a better plane of existence, rather than from participation in the collective experience of the Mosque. Osman muses: "if life was indeed like what I read in the book, if such a world was possible, then it was impossible to understand why people needed to go to prayer"(14). None of the characters observe prayer times, study the Qur'an, or attend services on Friday.

In this way history, politics and culture is depicted in almost all works of Orhan Pamuk. In *The Silent House* Pamuk writes: the details and environment of the novel, their car racing, their getting drunk in house gatherings, their going to discos and going to beach and killing time are from the real stories of my friends in Sahil neighborhood in the 1970's.... while writing this story I remember them with a smile on my face (132).

CONCLUSION

The study of the novels of Orhan Pamuk in the light of history, politics and culture reveals that author is well aware of these things that are happening and happened around him. All the novels discussed in this research project describe secular modern characters or protagonists who are either assassinated, killed, or commit suicide. Often they are representatives or products of Kemalist, socialist, or nationalist ideologies. They are professional representatives of secularism. Osman is an architect, Blue is an engineer, Ka is a leftist secular intellectual, and Sunay aim is to be a state theater artist. These are all literary representations of homos seculars.

The dominant tropes of Turkishness in *The New Life* and *Snow* are conversion, coup, and conspiracy. These tropes are often presented in a mode of parody and demonstrate the development of Pamuk's work as a vehicle for political critique. The historically grounded representations of revolution that appeared in his early novels now serve as the object of satire in the coup. The logic of Middle Eastern national self-determination presented in *Cevdet Bey and Sons* has devolved in the Middle Eastern conspiracy. Concomitant to these developments, the text and the author are presented through mystical and redemptive processes. The "book" in *The New Life* has transformative properties in the promise of the new life of an "other world" that transcends secular modernity. The moment of poetic inspiration in *Snow* is presented as a mystical experience of the divine. In both novels, the trope of the beloved is conflated with the possibility of social change through textual production. Both texts *The New Life* and *Snow* emerge out of the Sufi context of the quest and the story of unrequited love. As such, both redefine secularism through contexts of sacredness and mysticism that promise redemption.

Though writing about coup, conspiracy and contexts of *devlet*, Pamuk's authorial project reveals itself as an inscription of secular-sacred texts. In other words, in their critiques of ideology, they are expressions of post secularism because they contradict and deny the Republican secularization thesis. They are furthermore articulations of postorientalism because they reject the internalized orientalism of Kemalism. They accomplish this through serious consideration of mystical experiences.

Novels, in their settings of Istanbul and Anatolia, juxtapose city to nation. In this juxtaposition, and in keeping with the traditional representations of Anatolia in the Republican novel, the nation is poor, ignorant, neglected, and deceived. In short, the same opposition between intellectual and provincial that occurs in the earliest Republican novels present themselves in Pamuk's ostensibly postmodern novels. However, Pamuk's fiction is a decidedly post secular, postorientalist response to the secularization thesis of the early Republican novel. The tropes of coup and conspiracy in his novels identify a crisis in secular modernity that can be traced in the secular-sacred spaces of *The Black Book* and *The Museum of Innocence*.

In *The Museum of Innocence*, however, Pamuk works towards some degree of reconciliation with this class he cannot keep from ridiculing. The first character that fits the trope of the misfit or black sheep is Refik in *Cevdet Bey and Sons*, who aspires to ideals that will improve the plight of Anatolia. Other characters fall or drop out of secular society much the way Pamuk did to become an author. This is true for Faruk Darvtnoglu the historian, Galip the lawyer, Osman the engineering student, Ka the journalist-poet, and Kemal the lovelorn collector. Failed, broken, or unrequited relationships are the instigation for these characters to undertake a

redemptive quest. The quest leads to redemption through the process of writing. The journey, with its constantly deferred or unattained goal, is sacred not least of all because it constructs the self in all its complexity and contradiction.

The occulted redeemer of the crisis of secular modernity in Pamuk's world is the author. Shadowing Pamuk's protagonists, indeed, is the figure of the author as a double. At the end of each novel he appears, sometimes subtly like the ambiguous narrator of *The White Castle*, or the first-person intrusions in *The Black Book* and *The New Life*. But the author-figure becomes increasingly more prominent. He appears as an autobiographical character Orhan in *My Name is Red*. In *Snow*, he is beside the reader the entire journey looking over his shoulder as Ka's friend, "Orhan Pamuk," and in *The Museum of Innocence* he assumes the narrative voice rather obtrusively: "Hello this is Orhan Pamuk!" The protagonist and the narrator are not always entities in the Pamuk novel. Furthermore, the autobiographical strain of representing the self, as I have argued, is a legacy of secular modernity that places Pamuk's work between the modern and the postmodern. As a gesture of political dissidence, the author-figure is the voice and expression of post-Kemalism, the local variety of post secularism.

Thus we realize that Pamuk, as with the political authors of his youth, remained engaged in the text, long after that text has been complicated and decentered by doubles, metanarrative, and intertextuality. This major contradiction makes sense once Pamuk's work has been properly contextualized in the Istanbul literary tradition. Though he describes Kemal's world he ridicules it mercilessly, placing it on display, much as Kemal exhibits the fetishized objects of his beloved.

Pamuk's work began to represent both the secular modernist approach as well as one that was mystical and from the perspective of the state anachronistically "pre-modern." The former appeared through tropes of revolution, coup, and the

"modernizing" author-figure. The latter appeared through tropes of Sufism, the Ottoman past, the archive, and redemption. The antimony between *din* and *devlet* that gave rise to could find a natural habitat in the depiction of cosmopolitan spaces of Istanbul. Often, the pairing of these seeming opposites could be tragicomic and easily captured in strains of melodrama and conspiracy as reflected in Pamuk's mature novels.

The Black Book is a very inward-looking novel that excavates the city of Istanbul to find connections between European and Middle Eastern cultures and forms. The protagonist, as is common in Pamuk's world, undergoes various transformations from lawyer to detective, from reader to nonfiction journalist, and finally to author. These personas trace a development from secular Republican professional to creative writer. In this process, the military coup is transformed from a violent intervention into the promise of Revolution and Judgment Day as marked by the (blasphemous) coming of the messiah/author. This savior is responsible for the revelation of a secular-sacred holy book, homage to city, psyche, and the East/West intertext. This book doesn't have light surging from its pages (as in *The New Life*), it is black.

Similarly, *The Museum of Innocence*, focused on Istanbul in the first instance, expands to include museums throughout the world. This transnationalism is bound to cultural history in *The Black Book* and part of a globalizing context in *The Museum of Innocence*. Whereas *The Black Book* is specific to Istanbul, what happens in a corner of Istanbul in *The Museum of Innocence* resonates with myriad other places in the world.

Pamuk's innovation is to not excavate a lost world of Republican kitsch, it is to set everyday popular culture - from local soda to insect spray, from popular Yesilcam films to street food, from military coups to bourgeois hotels and

restaurants - in opposition to the somber and national military culture of the Republican state that regularly manifested itself in the military coup from 1960 to 1997, Though materialism is emphasized in many aspects in both novels, it is also linked to Pamuk's dominant mystical and secular-sacred theme of textual production.

In terms of form, Pamuk began writing in the late 1970s with an almost socialist conviction in narratives of historical realism as in *Cevdet Bey and Sons*, adopted multiperspectival modernism after the 1980 coup as in *The Silent House*, introduced an aesthetic of metafictional deconstruction as in *The White Castle*, established new forms of East/West intertextuality as in *The Black Book*, updated the forms of the Sufi quest as in *The New Life*, elevated material culture such as Islamic art to a model of form as in *My Name is Red*, and leveled political critiques against the secular state as in *Snow*, before returning, cyclically, to the era of his formation as an author and Republican objects of unrequited love in 1970s Istanbul as in *The Museum of Innocence*. In Pamuk's case, the crisis of modernity that the novel engages and revises emerges out of the unresolved and irresolvable tensions between the cultures of *din* and *devlet*, which define a modernity that is not just national, but literary.

I have argued that the literary modernity traced by the authors in this study reflects cultural and political slippage between Turkish tradition and modernity, between Islam and secularism, between Sufism and materialism, and between the Ottoman past and national present. The shorthand script for these tensions is conveyed in the various relationships between *din* and *devlet*, where the former represents narratives of realism, existentialism, and secularism, and the latter narratives of tradition, redemption, and the mystical. Tropes of the modern Turkish novel, as examined in this study, emerge from the intersection of secular

and sacred contexts that include Istanbul, the Ottoman Islamic past, the secular state, conversion, Sufism, coup, Cultural Revolution, and lover/beloved. Through various re-inscriptions of these contexts, the novels under consideration here perform re-enactments of the formative dilemmas of Turkish modernity. In other words, the novelistic performance dramatizes negotiations between *din* and *devlet*.

The literary innovations of his work emerge from an archive of regional cosmopolitan forms distinct from "Western" literature. I have argued throughout this book that the literary spaces opened by Pamuk's work double –is the vantage point for a number of sustained cultural and political critiques. Writing from a triangulated position - represented in Pamuk's work by Istanbul, I lie city of two continents - the author critically engages both the national tradition and traditions of world literature. One major outcome of such an invention is the revision of "Turkishness" beyond any fixed nationalist, secularist or orientalist essentializations. Read together, Pamuk's novels can thus be described as post secular, postorientalist fiction that traces the transformation of homo *secularis* into a liberated figure of the secular and the sacred. Pamuk's socio-political culture is clearly visible in the novels under study. The success of Pamuk as a novelist lies in the skill with which he explores the Metaphysical echoes of certain sadness' --- homesickness, aimlessness, unhappiness in love-a skill which transmutes sequences of concrete events and sufferings into speculatively post metaphysical parables.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Pamuk, Orhan. *The White Castle*. Trans. Victoria Holbrook. Manchester (UK) Press Ltd., 1990. Print

---. *The New Life*. Trans. Guneli Gun. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux, 1997. Print

---. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdag M. Goknar. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001. Print

---. *Snow*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004. Print

---. *The Black Book*. New Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006. Print

---. *The Museum of Innocence*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009. Print

---. *The Silent House*. Trans. Robert Finn. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012. Print

Secondary Sources:

Afridi, Mehnaz and Buyze, David. *Global Perspectives on Orhan Pamuk Existentialism and Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. Print

Boyar Ebru and Fleet Kate. *Social History of Ottoman Istanbul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print

Goknar Erdag. *Orhan, Pamuk, Secularism and Blasphemy: The Politics of the Turkish Novel*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013. Print

Hans, Lukas, Kieser. *Turkey Beyond Nationalism: Towards Post-Nationalist Identities*. London: I.B.Tauris and Co.Ltd.,2013.Reprint

McGaha, Michael. *Autobiographies of Orhan Pamuk: The Writer in His Novels*.University of Utah Press, 2008. Print.

McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1987. Print.

Nilgun, Anadolu_Okur. *Essays Interpreting the Writings of Novelist Orhan Pamuk*. Edwin Mellen Press, 2009. Print

Pamuk, Orhan. *Istanbul Memories and the City*.Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005. Print

Pamuk, Orhan. *Other Colors: Essays and a Story*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007. Print

Raw, Laurence. *Exploring Turkish Cultures: Essays, Interviews and Reviews*, UK:Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011. Print

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Book,1979. Print

Wells, Charles. *The Literature of the Turks*.General Books LLC,2012.Print

Zurchner Erik. J. *Turkey a Modern History*.London:I.B.Tauris and Co.Ltd, 2005.Print

Articles:

Heyking, John, von."Mysticism in Contemporary Islamic Political Thought: Orhan Pamuk and Abdolkarim Sorough."Humanities 19. 1-2 (2006).

Smith, Wendy. "Orhan Pamuk: Outspoken Turk," *Publishers Weekly* 251.34,2004.

Web References:

www.britanica.com

www.gorgiaspress.com

www.ottomaThe New Life Literature.com

www.orhanpamuk.net

www.turkishculture.org

http:// nobelprize.org 2006 pamuklecture_en.html