

I. Pamuk and Socio Political Context

The present research is an inquiry on Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City* which is a review of significant moments of Turkey's history, through which the writer addresses the issues of national; historical events and identity. Pamuk's book is located in a transformed city which analyses a global interaction and twentieth century globalization from the time of Ottoman Empire, since Turkey as a republican country. The book is firmly connected to actuality and can be called worldly, since it is involved in complicated situation. Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City*, presents the circumstance, time, place and society of Turkey. Pamuk reinvents himself in his book as Orhan, the narrator who recounts his experience of city in terms of autobiographical anecdotes, personal impressions as well as dreams. The uses of photos in the text which is a strategy that Pamuk uses to underline his experiences of the city, invites the reader to experience Turkey.

Orhan Pamuk, born in June 7, 1952 in Istanbul, Turkey, writer whose works have been translated into more than twenty languages. Pamuk's novels and other writings are characterized by a loss or confusion of identity brought on in part by but the conflicts between European and Islamic values and shows his influence towards west. The secularism and such binary concepts often get elaborated treatment in Pamukian literature. Pamuk's work often touches on the deep-rooted tensions between East and west and tradition and modernism or secularism. Pamuk's early books met with critical success. His first novel, *Mr. Cevdet and his Sons*, is a family saga in tradition of Thomas Mann's *Buddenbrook* which won a number of literary prizes in Turkey; including the Milliyet press Novel contest Award and the Orhan Kemal Novel prize. His next book *The Black Box* was controversial in Turkey due to

its references to sufi mysticism and stylistic break with the social realism dominant in other Turkish literature.

In 1995, Pamuk published *The New Life*, an immensely popular allegorical novel about a book which can change the life of whoever reads it, which propelled his career to further fame in his country. *The New Life* is not only a poetic story of the power of fiction, but also about obsession and a false concept of reality, derived from written words. The narrator is a young man, whose whole life is changed by a book. In 1998 Orhan Pamuk, published *My Name is Red* was a huge success in Turkey, selling 85,000 copies in three weeks. In the murder mystery, set in sixteenth century, Istanbul the narrators vary from one chapter to the next, among them are a dog, a tree, a dead master miniaturist and his murderer. "I am nothing but a corpse now, a body at the bottom of a well", tells the murdered man, who had violated the teachings of Islam by creating representational, figurative art.

Orhan Pamuk's writing has been characterized as post modern, with primary tensions centered on the "westernization" of the Islamic world, of the traditional versus the secular. He explores the lives of those marginalized by the increasing globalization of western, Eurocentric ideas and cultures and sometimes presence adoption or rejection by Eastern traditional cultures. His characters often possess dual identities or even doubled identities are regularly exchanged. Many characters represent the creative arts: poets, painters and writers striving for the universal human right of free expression. Often, they are set against the social and cultural or political environment in deep unrest which threatens their creativity. On 12th October 2006, the Swedish Academy announced that Orhan Pamuk has been awarded the 2006 novel prize in literature.

Pamuk's outspoken commentary on Turkish and Islamic policy has contributed to make him renowned. He is the first writer in the Islamic world to condemn fatwa against Salman Rushdie. He has publicly supported the rights of Kurds in Turkey, and in 2005 was charged with insulting the Turkish state, a serious crime which is punishable by prison. Pamuk made comments in a Swiss newspaper regarding Turkey's refusal to acknowledge the genocide of one million Armenian in 1915 and its continuing prosecution and alleged murder of 30,000 Kurds (Time). He was brought to trial in December 2005, but the charges were subsequently dropped in the light of international outcry condemning Turkey's ambivalence on freedom of speech in the midst of its application to join the European Union.

Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City*; applies a first person narrator to provide us a panorama of different descriptions of individual history, geographical authenticity, cultural transformations, aesthetic evaluations and above all the inevitable nostalgia of traumatic memories. His book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* is a narrative that is defined by the impossibility to define it within fixed term. Thematically and structurally, it stands on slippery grounds that are constantly moving, hence, obliterating any definition that would confine it within predetermined boundaries. The book portrays the first twenty two years of Pamuk's life using various approaches; autobiographical details, childhood memories, photographs from the family album, newspapers details, painting as well as writing on Istanbul by some artist such as Nerval, Flaubert and other Turkish writers. Pamuk's constructs his experience of the city as a state of being 'in-between', both culturally and geographically. The book has thirty seven chapters that compose the place randomly without following a thematic order.

Istanbul: Memories of a City, where Pamuk writes the beginning years of his artistic development. The first person narrator Orhan, a lonely and troubled character who is also a main character describes so much in philosophical and literary writing of the nineteenth century. At the same time, Orhan the narrator is continuously faced with the historical and social remainders of Istanbul legacy as economically and culturally globalized urban center. Pamuk's book revises Turkish cultural memory at a crucial moment of the country's history. In the book, Pamuk includes history and globalization tries to expose himself as a worldly intellectual writer.

As a theoretical framework the concept of Worldliness, Edward Said clearly writes in his famous book *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, "Texts have always of existing, both theoretical and practical, that even in their most rarified forms are always enmeshed in circumstance, time, place and society-in short they are in the world and hence worldly" (4). Therefore any text has specific situation. Texts have written in certain circumstance, time, place and society. For Said, "All texts are worldly because all texts are involved in "particular historical situations" (qtd in Hazard Adams 1210). So text is produced in a specific cultural context. Criticism should acknowledge these cultural specificities. It is the worldliness of literary texts, as Said calls it that allows them to produce and convey meaning. Said claims that text place themselves in the world and thereby "place restraints upon what can be done with (and to) them interpretively" (9). For Said, "A text is not the heteroglossia of Mikhail Bakhtin's novel, rather discursive situations are more like the unequal relation of colonizer and colonized, for many texts are characterized by self-confirming will to power. This means that text's voice may dominate or suppress other voices" (qtd Hazard Adams 1210). The distinct place any drama, poem or novel takes in the world however derives from "a discursive situation involving speaker and

audience; the designed interplay between verbality and textuality” (9). In short it is the performative quality of texts that instates their worldliness and constitutes their links with” the world of discourse. Where they become “facts of power not a democratic exchange” (14). Said reminds of Foucault’s discovery that discursive agents simultaneously recover, re-circulate and disguise dominate power relations. Said focuses on socio-cultural situation or context. So, Said says that texts are only as a “silent printed object” (qtd Hazard Adam 1210). For Said, criticism should be “secular” and “skeptical”.

The World, the Text, and the Critic provides the most systematic and accessible entry to those concerns which had been established in Said work. One of the starting points of Said takes for considering the worldliness of the text is a record released by Mercurial Canadian pianist Glenn Gould, including an interview in which he explained his reasons for abandoning live performances. Gould strategy seems almost parodic of the complexity of the relationship between the world and the textual object. As Said describes in the book *The World, the Text, and the Critic*:

Here was a pianist who had once represented the ascetic performer in the service of music, transformed now into unashamed virtuoso, supposedly little better than a musical whore, and this form a man who markets his record as a first and attaches to the attention getting immediacy of a like interview. (31)

Gould’s record, a text of particular kind, indicates the ways in which texts manage to confirm their link with the world and resist what post-structuralist would claim to be the endless deferral of signification.

Said adds the critics’ worldliness to the notion of a text’s worldliness in *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, while worldliness derives from exile of the critic

generally need not endure a physical dislocation. Rather, for the worldly critic, exile is a state of mind. Said concept of worldliness, is the “experience of exile that ultimately leads us to a new investment in the local [.....] Makes a place where action can be accomplished” (Robbins 76). As Catherine Gallagher puts “Said’s work presents us with a paradigmatic attempt at integration the roles of the literary critic and political advocate at giving them a joint foundation (37).

One of the crucial binaries which characterizes the worldliness of texts and which illuminates different possibilities for critical reading is that of ‘filiation’ and ‘affiliation’ Said suggests that patterns of ‘filiation’ (heritage and descent) which had acted as a cohering force in traditional society become increasingly difficult to maintain in the complexity of contemporary civilization and were replaced by pattern of ‘affiliation’ while filiation refers to the lines of descent in nature, affiliation refers to a process of identification through culture. As Edward Said *The World, the Text, and the Critic* Writes:

It has developed through the art and critical theories produced in complex ways by modernism, filiation gives birth to affiliation.

Affiliation becomes a form of representing the filiative process to be found in nature, although affiliation takes validated non-biological social and cultural forms. (23)

Said promotes affiliation as a general critical principle because it frees the critic from a narrow view of texts connected in a filiative relationship to other texts, with very little attention paid to the world in which they come into being. For Said, an affiliative reading allows the critic to see the literary work as a phenomenon in the world, located in a network of non-literary, non-canonical and non-traditional affiliations. In this sense, affiliation is seen positively as the basic view of a new kind of criticism in

which recognition of the affiliative process within text may free criticism from its narrow basis in the European canon.

Affiliation is a feature of worldliness. While filiation suggests a utopian domain of texts connected serially, homologously and seamlessly with other texts. Affiliation is that which enables a text to maintain itself as a text the status of the author, historical moment, conditions of publication, diffusion and reception, values drawn upon, values and ideas assumed. The affiliations of text constantly lead us back its worldliness.

Edward Said's book *Culture & Imperialism* writes a strong argument about the nineteenth century British novels in the imperial process and in the political reality of the Empire from which they emerged. Said writes that imperial power laid some grounds for the globalized world. Said asserts:

I am per mentally and philosophically opposed to vast system building or totalistic theories of human history. But I must say that having studied and indeed live within the modern empires. I am struck by how constantly expanding, how in exorable integrative they were the British Empire integrated and fused things within its, and takes together it and other empires made the world one. (4)

Said highlights recent process of globalization and how their impact on the literary realm changed the quality of writer's political engagement. Here, Said foregrounds the process of globalized publishing and especially the speed of global news coverage on the internet that offers, great possibilities but also put enormous pressure on authors. Said writes:

A more interesting type of secular interpretation can emerge, altogether more awarding than the denunciations of the past, the expression of

regret for its having ended, or even more wasteful because violent and for too easy and attractive the hostility between western and non-western cultures that leads to crises. The world is too small and interdependent to let these passively happen. (19-20)

Edward Said focuses on globalization, the writer turned into a public intellectual. From this perspective, the writer turned intellectual, cannot avoid political involvement and is thus worldly.

Orhan Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City*, the narrator Orhan observes Istanbul. Orhan observes geography, topography, history and culture. He is an interstitial identity, lives geographically between the European and Asian continents, lives culturally between the orient and west, topographically between an urban center and a great decentered web of village like neighborhoods, politically between a military regime and a democratically elected government and religiously between Islam and secularism. Lascinger and Blaxell write:

But Pamuk's representation of the idiosyncrasies of his home town highlights similarities rather than difference. Pamuk defies outdated stereotypes which Istanbul continues to trigger to this day. Istanbul's bi-continental geography and heritage as an intercultural enter pot is seductive. The city temps us to imagine it as both a material and symbolic space where crossing the Bosphorus from kabatas to Uskudar crosses two radically opposed cultural traditions. Pamuk's Istanbul emerges from dialogical acts in which Istanbul takes up their otherness and turn back as hybrid. (8)

Pamuk and Istanbul are completely intertwined in the book. Pamuk proceeds more or less chronologically from his earliest childhood until his university day'sculminating

in his decision to become a writer, all the while always situating almost everything that happens against the backdrop of Istanbul. It is not a single locale, indeed, Pamuk's Istanbul is ever shifting and changing not least because Orhan and his family seem to be constantly moving from apartment to apartment, but also because Orhan constantly explores and observes the city. Verena Laschinger and Vivian Blaxell write, "Orhan, the first person narrator is a figure of "betweenness" shifting between being a self-absorbed artist and a worldly writer. Pamuk seems as an inner exile of his culturally detached, yet locally attached alter ego"(6). In the book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* Orhan Pamuk intersects the autobiographical narration with long paragraphs of literary and cultural criticism, the writer achieves Saidean worldliness with the text. He writes historiography of the city. Istanbul, presents descriptive native and historical colonial observations of extremely poor and lacking means to exist long after the fall of the Ottoman Empire. Pamuk's detailed depiction of Istanbul and his childhood memory effectively convey the complex emotions, he maintains for Istanbul. His home and neighbourhood are presented along side rare and glaring descriptive colonial narrative by Gerard de Nerval, Gustav Flaubert and Theophile Gautier. He creates a dialogical performance between the young narrating figure and the adult worldly critic, whose analytical praxis will eventually lead to political engagement. Alternating chapter on family life, with chapter about urban life in Istanbul, intersecting with literary, cultural and political analysis. In the opening chapter "Another Orhan", the young narrator suggests the adult critic take turn in telling the story from their respective points of view, one being private, the other worldly. There by the reader is taken on a passage moving from the narrator's inner landscape to the outer cityscape, the one continually intertwined with the other. A

third narrative space is created by a large number of photographer, among them are he himself and famous Armenian born Ara Guler.

Said concept of *worldliness* is appropriate in Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City*. The writer Pamuk guides us through the movements and lost paradises, dilapidated ottoman villas, back street and water ways of Istanbul-the city of his birth and home of his imagination. The work reflects the circumstance and the social phenomena of Istanbul at the time of Ottoman Empire. Pamuk's detailed depiction of Istanbul and his childhood effectively convey the complex emotions he maintains for Istanbul, his home, and are presented alongside rare and glaring descriptive colonial narratives. As Edward Said opines in *The world, the Text and the Critic*, "a text has a specific situation, placing restraints upon the interpreter and his interpretation not because the situation is hidden within the text as a mystery, but rather because the situation exist at the same level of surface particularly at the textual object itself" (39). Istanbul is presented as a textual object in Pamuk's text. Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a city*, includes two empires and a republic. By using autobiographical, literary and cultural episodes, Pamuk explains the conditions of Istanbul. Therefore Saidean concept of *worldliness* can be useful in the text.

Istanbul: Memories of a City has been able attract the attention of many scholars and critics when it was published in 2005. Different critics have approached the text from various angles which have helped to bring forth the new ways in dealing and commenting on the book, David Mitchell in Guardian writers; "An addictive childhood memoir, a museum-in-prose of a city with west in its head but East in its soul, and a study of the alchemy between place and self". (Cover Page)

In David Mitchell takes the book as childhood memoir. Mitchell observes the book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* as the conflicting force between west and East. Mitchell

finds Pamuk writes this book as West in head East in soul. Pamuk writes public as well as private issues. Therefore David Mitchell views as the conflicting force between East and West. The book should be analyzed from the alchemy between place and self. Yen-His Lee writes in article Language as obsession: Deciphering Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City*:

Diversity in a narrative represents the multitude of narrative perspectives and similarities that co-exist in different dimension of a single story. [...] Pamuk's remembrance of things past ranges from an obsessive language full of incessant repetition of words, images and phrases, to a kind polyphonic representation of a variety of voices symbolizing the revelation of synchronic and diachronic events and to visual illustrations of more than one hundred photographs. While the memoir focuses on deciphering historical Ottoman Empire and individual melancholy, readers can encounter an unaccustomed reading experience by examining the barriers and challenges associated with different language related descriptions. (81)

In Yen-His Lee observes the book through language. Yen-His Lee writes that the book presents autobiography and history. Pamuk ideas are combined with nostalgia of traumatic memories. Pamuk describes Istanbul that the city Istanbul lost its capacity because the city lost its past glory of Empire after they fall. Yen-His Lee reads the book from the perspective of language. Yen-His Lee sees that Pamuk uses obsessive language. Another critic Jan Morris interprets the book as:

An irresistibly seductive book, and its seduction lies not in the author's self portrait but in his poetical identification with Istanbul ... His novel have already made him celebrated throughout the world, but perhaps

he will be longest remembered for this wistful memorial to the city of his heart. (Cover Page)

Jan Morris writes that *Istanbul: Memories of a City* is an irresistibly seductive book. Pamuk's representation of Istanbul lies with the poetical identification. He said that Pamuk should be remembered for long age because of the wistful memoir of the city. Therefore Jan Morris takes this book as a memoir of Istanbul City. The famous newspaper Irish Times writes as,

In his short book Pamuk manages to array for us a richly detailed history of the city and those before him who have written about it, painted it, photographed it. The research the underpins *Istanbul* is meticulous and flawlessly handled the breadth of reference and allusion is matched by flowing ease with which Pamuk combines it with his personal responses to the city ... With rigour and flair, he has crafted here an honest and loving which will rank among his finest works and among the finest books to have been written about Istanbul. It should be read and then the city visited. (Book Page I)

Irish Times describes the book from the of history. Pamuk combines personal photos as well as cityscape photo. Irish Times writes that *Istanbul: Memories of a City* as finest works and among the finest book. This book should be read and who read this book, they are interested to visit Istanbul. So, this book is about history of Istanbul and beauty of Turkey.

In this way, the book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* has been analyzed from different perspectives. Some critics take the book as an oriental text, as a memoir and national memory. In this research work, the researcher has studied contextual reading of Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City*. In this book, Pamuk's compares the

city Istanbul with worldly activities. He compares Istanbul with western cities. Pamuk includes writer that how western writers like Flaubert, Nerval and other present the Istanbul. So this research has studied the book from the perspective of contextual reading. *Worldliness* as a theoretical frame work deals with time, place, circumstance and society of Istanbul city. As nobody has analyzed the book from the perspective of context, this research will be important to dig out the hidden meaning and motives of writing and to give new life to the text.

This research work has been divided into three chapters. The first chapter includes the introduction of the text, problem that lies in the text, researcher's hypothesis, view on the text by other critics, researcher's point of departure, methodological tool, which the researcher uses in the researches. Second chapter is all about textual analysis. In this chapter, the researcher mainly focuses on the issues embedded in these chapters: Another Orhan, Black and white. Exploring the Bosphorus, Huzun, Four Lonely Melancholic writers, Conquest or Decline? The Turkification of Constantinople, Under Western Eyes, Flaubert in Istanbul: East, West and Syphilis and others chapter will be discussed. And the third chapter derives the conclusion of the thesis.

II. Contextual Reading of Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul: Memories of a City*

Orhan Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* presents historical aspects of Turkey. By presenting history with personal experience, Pamuk tries to present himself as a worldly writer. Turkey is a country which falls in both continents, Europe and Asia. This country has both cultural influences between oriental and western culture. Pamuk's Istanbul emerges from dialogical acts in which Istanbul takes up their otherness and turns it back as hybrid. Pamuk represents Istanbul the city of his birth and the home of his imagination.

Orhan Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* begins with a chapter of 'Another Orhan'. In this chapter, Orhan presents himself as a stranger. Pamuk writes about the condition of Istanbul and his family life as well. Orhan is like Istanbul, defined by the presence of various conflicting forces. The first sentence of the book shows the presence of a stranger who doesn't belong to the city; that stranger is the other Orhan. "From a very young age, I suspected there was more to my world than I could see: somewhere in the streets of Istanbul, in a house resembling ours, there lived another Orhan so much like me that he could pass for my twin, even my double" (3). The narrator Orhan is haunted by another Orhan when he saw the picture of another Orhan in the aunt's house in Cihngir. When the narrator Orhan walked in the streets, he feels as if he were the other Orhan. Orhan sees the images of his twin. The picture seems older than Orhan himself. The ghost of Another Orhan never left. Pamuk asserts:

Throughout my childhood and well into adolescence, he haunted my thoughts. On winter evenings, walking through the streets of the city, I would gaze into other people's houses through the pale orange light of home and dream of happy peaceful families living comfortably.

lives. Then I would shudder, thinking that the other Orhan might be living in one of these houses. As I grew older, the ghost became a fantasy and the fantasy a recurrent nightmare (4).

The narrator begins by highlighting the presence of another Orhan in order to illustrate the fact that the journey ahead will be the journey in search of that other Orhan. The presence of another Orhan evoked early on in the narrative draws attention to the fact that, just like the city with its multiple facets, there will be other Orhans with different voices, which will appear throughout the narrative.

Pamuk, like the narrator Orhan never left Istanbul and even never left the houses. The narrator states the other Orhan and connection to the city are the very sources that have made him who he is because it is the foreign gaze of the other Orhan that enables him to appreciate his city without trying to reduce it into a homogenous unity. The narrator states that, like other writers who have used the task of stable roots as the source of writing, he has thrived on the fact that he has always lived in the city where he was born. Pamuk asserts:

Conrad, Nabokov, Naipaul – these are writers known for having managed to migrate between languages, cultures, countries, continents even civilizations. Their imaginations were fed by exile, nourishment drawn not through roots but through rootlessness, mine however requires that I stay in the same city, on the same street, in the same house gazing at the same view. Istanbul's fate is my fate: I am attached to this city because it has made me who I am ... This book is about fate ... (6-7).

It is this rootedness that defines his relationship with the city as, despite staying in the same place all his life he still doesn't feel like he belongs. Pamuk, himself compares

the various writers like Conrad, Nabokov and Naipaul. By presenting various writers, Pamuk's idea is similar to the Edward Said idea. Edward Said writes in *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, "It is supposed that literature and the humanities exist generally within the culture (our culture, as it is sometimes known) that the culture is ennobled and validated by professional humanities and literary critics, the approved practice of high culture is marginal to the serious political concerns of society" (2). Orhan feels proud who live in his city. He gives positive response those worldly known writer who migrate their own country. He also brings the references of Flaubert. Flaubert visited Istanbul two hundred ago before Orhan Pamuk born. Orhan Pamuk born was in 1952. Flaubert predicated that, in a century's time. Turkey would be the capital of the world. But the situation becomes reverse. Pamuk writes, "the reverse came true; after the Ottoman Empire collapsed, the world almost forgot that Istanbul existed. The city into which I was born was poorer, shabbier and more isolated than it had ever been in its two-thousand-year history" (6). Pamuk presents historical situation of Turkey. After the fall of Ottoman Empire rest of the other world forget Turkey. Therefore Pamuk wants to regain popularity of Turkey. So, he brings the reference of Flaubert. As Edward Said explains all texts are "worldly" because text is involved "particular historical situation" (qtd in Hazard Adams 1210). Pamuk becomes sad after the fall of Empire. Istanbul becomes poorer, shabbier and more isolated in the two thousand year history.

The narrator 'Another Orhan' thinks that he might unlucky to have been born in an ageing and improvised city buried under the ashes of ruined Empire. The narrator consoles himself as "I've accepted the city into which I was born in the same way I've accepted my body" (7). So he is arguing that this is a fate. Likewise when the Orhan Pamuk was born, there were rumors of fighting. Pamuk describes, "The

newspapers were full of small news-a few stories about the Turkish troops fighting in Korea, a few rumors spread by the Americans stoking fears that the Northern Koreans might be preparing to use biological weapons” (7). By presenting history, Pamuk tries to show worldly activities. When Pamuk was born, Turkish troops are fighting with Korea. He also includes that North Korea produced biological weapons. Edward Said includes in his book *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, “Book affirms the connection between texts and the existence actualities of human life, politics, societies and events” (5). Pamuk writes events of in 1952.

As Edward Said describes in *The World, the Text, and the critic*, “Text has supported by a discursive situation involving speaker and audience, the designed interplay between speech and reception, between verballity and textuality, is the text’s situation, its placing of itself in the world” (40). Pamuk’s book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* also writes that audience should pay attention to read the book and describes the significance of literature. Pamuk writes:

I find the language of epic unconvincing, for I cannot accept that the myths well about our first live prepare us for the brighter, more authentic, second lives that are mean to begin when we awake.

Because-for people like me at least that second life is none other than the book in your hand. So pay close attention, dear reader. Let me be straight with you and in return let me ask for your compassion. (8)

Pamuk’s memories are the building where his family and most of his relatives lived in different apartments. This micro and familiar space connoted with the republican leading classes are represented. On the one hand, the contradictions experienced by a whole nation divide between the memories of the greatness of the Ottoman Empire and need to shape a secular nation, which justifies the characterization of sitting

rooms as a kind of museum. Pamuk asserts, “They were not meant to be places where you could hope to sit comfortably: they were little museums designed to demonstrate to a hypothetical visitor that the householders were westernized” (10).

On the other hand, Pamuk’s examination of the countless photographs found in his grandmother’s apartment indicates the importance given by the writer to the perspective of memory, which is stressed by his own book that is illustrated with several old photos and pictures that introduce the reader to a city that doesn't exist anymore. It is worth calling attention to Pamuk's subtle criticism of the Turk's need to prove they were westernized when he describes what was supposed to be an intimate and comfortable division of family's house. This criticism introduced in "The photographs in the Dark Museum House" gains particular relevance when it is extended to the macro space of the city that has been progressively altered to assert the aforementioned need of the country to seem westernized.

Most of Pamuk's writings are characterized by the exploration of the East-West paradox. As a result of Turkish modernization process are the constructing inspiration and heart of Pamuk’s writing. In all of his writings, Pamuk portrays different aspects of the state of being in between, exploring the margins rather than standing at the centre. Pamuk includes “Nationalist Istanbul like Yahya Kemal and Tanpinar preferred to look to the poor, defeated and deprived Muslim population to prove that they had not one bit of their identity, and to satisfy their craving for a mournful beauty expressing the feelings of loss and defeat” (227). Therefore Pamuk always stands for margin. In the book illustrates geographical, literary, temporal and autobiographical dimensions of this experience while using the city as a non-linear text. Live in Istanbul, walking the streets of the city, the narrator Orhan learns how to both read and re-write Istanbul through the texts and images that it offers. The saddy,

nervous and gloomy atmosphere of the back streets contradict the newly westernized, modern and rich Nisantasi neighborhood where Orhan was born and spent all his life. Pamuk uses autobiographical, literary and cultural episodes. Orhan explains the condition of not feeling at home in either part of the city. Pamuk's book shows how politics of space can be closely related to politics of memory, for as Deniel Walkowilz and Lisa Knauer describe *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation in public space*, "historical interpretations of public currents all over the world" (vii). By focusing on various representations of Istanbul's monuments and ruins, Pamuk transforms the city sites into an arena that reflects how the imagined community of the nation has been configured in the 20th century with the demise of the empire and the instauration of the republic.

One of interesting aspect in Pamuk's description of Istanbul is the importance the gives to melancholy. He opines that, Istanbul is a city of melancholy, aspect that is not considered negatively, when the book's epigraph quoted from Ahmet Rasim one of his favorite Istanbul's columnists and writers says "the beauty of a landscape resides in its melancholy". This melancholy is manifold and deserves to be examined. It has to be considered as an effect of same politics implemented by the republic and fed by the increasing nationalism, since many signs of Ottoman presence have been deliberately erased from the city as among many other examples. The fourth chapter of the book the destruction of the pashas mansions exposes about melancholy. Pamuk describes:

Still, the melancholy of the dying culture was all around us. Great as the desire to westernize the modernize may have been, the more desperate wish, it seemed, was to be rid of all the bitter memories of the fallen empire [...] But as nothing, western or local, came to fill the

void, the great drive to westernize amounted mostly to the erasure of the past, the effect on culture was reductive and stunting, leading families like mine, otherwise glad of Republican progress, to furnish their houses like museums. (27)

As Chinua Achebe writes *Colonialist Criticism*, “every literature must seek the things that belongs unto its place, must in other words, speak of a particular place, evolve out the necessities of its history past and current and the aspirations and destiny of its people” (qtd in Hazard Adams 1193).

Orhan Pamuk’s, *Istanbul: Memories of a City* in chapter “Black and white” brings the reference of Turkish film industry. He presents impressionist artist of the Istanbul western travelers also visit Istanbul. There are contra dictionary view between western people and Turkish people. He writes, “The streets below, the avenues, beyond the city poor neighborhood seemed as dangerous as those in a black and white gangster film. And with this attraction to the shadow world, I have always preferred the writer to the summer in Istanbul” (31). While watching the films, Pamuk, forgets that this is factious and thinks as if they are real. He describes:

Forty years on the Turkish film industry is no longer [...] they still show, those old black-and-white films on television and when I see the streets, the old gardens, the Bosphorus views, the broken down mansions and apartments in black and white, I sometime forget I am watching feel as if I am watching my own past. (33)

The writer’s sense of melancholy is shaped and consequently, reinforced by the peculiar way he apprehends the city’s soul, that is to say in black and white, fact that stresses the symbolic value he gives to the city. With the help of watching old films,

Pamuk knows the Turkey's old history. Film falls in fiction but Pamuk finds history of Istanbul. Pamuk writes:

To see the city in black and white is to see it through the tarnish of history the patina of what is old and faded and no longer matters to the rest of world. Even the greatest Ottoman architecture has a humble simplicity that suggests and ends of empire melancholy a pained submission to the diminishing European gaze and to an ancient poverty that must be endured like incurable disease; it is resignation that nourishes Istanbul's inward looking soul. (38)

Pamuk describes history of Istanbul. Pamuk asserts that Ottoman architecture has simplicity. After the fall of empire, Turkey faces many problems. The main problem is poverty. Pamuk compares poverty with incurable diseases. By these ideas Pamuk presents the history of Turkey. As Edward Said includes in *Culture and Imperialism*, "Nationalism is a word that still signifies all sorts of undifferentiated things but it serves me quite adequately to identify the mobilizing force that coalesced into resistance against an alien and occupying empire on the part of peoples possessing a common history, religion and language" (269).

The next chapter 'Exploring the Bosphorus', Orhan Pamuk praises the city of Bosphorus. He explores Bosphorus from different point of view. He sees the changes of the city. Pamuk writes the history of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of Ottoman families. He also asserts, the Yalis. Pamuk includes, "If the city speak of defat, destruction, deprivation, melancholy and poverty, the Bosphorus signs of life, pleasure and happiness. Istanbul draws its strength from the Bosphorus" (43). Pamuk presents Bosphorus as a peaceful place. He writes:

Ottoman culture that looked towards Istanbul to exclusion of the rest of the world. The Yalis – the splendid waterside mansions built by the great Ottoman families during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries – came to be seen, in the twentieth, with the advent of the Republic and Turkish nationalism, as models of an obsolete identity and architecture. (43)

Pamuk is very conscious about Turkey's identity. By bringing the reference of Yalis waterside mansion built by Ottoman families during nineteenth and twentieth century, Pamuk tries to show the contribution of Ottoman Empire. Now a day's Turkey as a new republican country Edward Said elaborates in *The World, the Text, and the Critic*:

Worldliness, circumstantially the text's status as an event having sensuous particularity as well as historical contingency are considered as being incorporated in the text, an inalienable part of its capacity for conveying and producing meaning. This means that a text has a specific situation, placing restraints upon the interpreter and his interpretation not because the situation exists at the same level of surface particularly as the textual object itself. (39)

Both Pamuk and Said ideas are similar while writing about a text. In "Exploring Bosphorus", Pamuk takes the idea of Abdülhak Sinasi Hisar, who is a memoirist. Sinasi Hisar recreates the "mysterious allure of his vanishing culture" (48). Pamuk describes:

The brightest of these memoirists is Abdülhak Sinasi Hisar (1887-1963), who *Bosphorus Civilization* is studded with long sentences of a Proustian sensibility. Hisar, who grew up in a Rumeli shisari Yali,

spent part of his youth in Paris and was friends with the poet Yahya Kemal with whom he studied political science. (48)

Despite the focusing on Istanbul's melancholy, Pamuk calls attention to the importance of the Bosphorus associated with life, pleasure and happiness and considered a source of strength as the excerpt below illustrates "one thing remains the same: the place the Bosphorus holds in our collective heart. As in my childhood, we still see it as the font of our good health, the cure of our ills, the infinite source of goodness and good will that sustains the city and all those who dwell in it" (54).

Pamuk, further writes in the chapter "Melling Bosphorus", asserts several writings of different writers such as William Henry Bartlett, Thomas Allom and Eugene Flandin. Pamuk writes:

Melling is an insider's point of view. But because the Istanbulis of his time didn't know how to paint themselves or their city – indeed had interest in doing so – the techniques he brought with him for the west still give these can did paintings a foreign air because he saw city like an Istanbul, but painted it like a clear eyed western Melling's Istanbul is not only a place graced by hills, mosques and land marks we can recognize, but a place of sublime beauty. (67)

Pamuk praises Bosphorus. He writes that Bosphorus holds the collective memoir. When Pamuk lived in Bosphorus, it gives infinite pleasure. He further describes that those people who live in Bosphorus, they are happy.

One of the main issues, Orhan Pamuk describes in the book is the idea of huzun. According to Orhan Pamuk, the melancholy of Istanbul is huzun. The word huzun has an Arabic root. Huzun denotes a feeling of deep spiritual loss but also a hopeful way of looking at life. Pamuk asserts, "A state of mind that is ultimately as life – affirming as

it is negating" (82). For the sufis, huzun is the spiritual anguish one feels at not being close enough to God. Pamuk writes:

To the Sufis, huzun is the spiritual anguish, we feel because we cannot be close enough to Allah, because we cannot do enough for Allah in this world. A true Sufi follower would pay no attention to worldly concerns like death, let alone goods or possessions; he suffers from grief, emptiness and inadequacy because he can never be close enough to Allah, because apprehends of Allah is not deep enough. (81)

According to Orhan Pamuk, huzun is mainly created with the feelings of loss that dominates the city, but has now become an inseparable part of it allowing the inhabitants see themselves reflected in it. The Turkish notion of huzun has an added communal dimension to the concept of melancholy. It is not merely the expression of the individual feeling of loss but echoes a shared emotion that allows people to see themselves reflected in it. Pamuk writes:

Offering no clarity, veiling reality instead, huzun brings us a consort, suffering the view like condensation on a window when a tea kettle has been spouting steam on a writer's lay steamed-up windows make me feel huzun and I still love getting up and walking over to those windows to trace words on them with my finger. As I trace out words and figures on the steamy window, the huzun inside me dissipates and I can relax after I have done all my writing and look outside. But the itself can bring its own huzun. (89)

The huzun that the people feel inside becomes the steam on the window. Once Pamuk erases it, the city's huzun becomes visible in its communal realm. The productivity that huzun enables, inviting Orhan to write on the steamed up window, constitutes the

foundation of the narrative. The narrative itself emerges as the product of huzun, it illustrates how Orhan perceived his city in all its blurriness lingering in between. In many ways the effect of huzun is similar to the effect of black and white photographs in the sense that they are both veiling”, “obliterating” a view. They both function like a protective shield between the city and the individual opening a space where the coexistence of the opposing forces becomes possible. Both the Black and White photographs and huzun are products of the conflict between opposing forces that dominated the city and its people. The two key elements also challenge the opposition between the textual and the visual in the sense that huzun throughout the narrative becomes visible in the photographs, while the images of Istanbul becomes legible with the word huzun. In other words, Pamuk brings out the textual in the visual and vice versa echoing the opposition between the East and the West.

Istanbul: Memories of a City, Pamuk observations, thoughts and feelings about the city concentrate around ‘huzun’ and different forms it takes in the hearts of Istanbulites. He also devotes a whole chapter titled ‘Huzun’ to the explanation, illustration and interpretation of ‘huzun’ as he sees it – a kind of shared feeling which shapes and moulds the soul of the city. To understand ‘huzun’ as a communal feeling experienced by the inhabitants of the city, he discusses how it differs from melancholy and tristesse. In his view, melankoli (melancholy in English) is a dark feeling of a single person, where as huzun is a mood shared by millions of people. As for ‘tristesse’, it is a feeling or experienced by an outsider who feels sorry for the wretched lives of the ‘others’ in poverty stricken lands as portrayed in Claude Levi-Strauss book *Tristestropiques*, what differentiates “huzun” from ‘tristesse’ is the fact that tristesse originates from the look of an outsider to the insider and huzun stems from the feelings and thoughts the insiders develop themselves when they reflect on

their own lives. 'Huzun' is a Turkish word with an Arabic root. 'Melankoli' is a Turkish word borrowed from French and used as the Counterpart of melancholy in English. "Melancolie" in French "Tristesse" is a French word with a Greek root. So Pamuk views on huzun different from the other words like "melancholy" and "tristesse". Pamuk describes, "I am trying to describe now is not the melancholy of Istanbul, but the huzun in which we see ourselves reflected the huzun we absorb with pride and share as a community" (84). Pamuk finds similarities between 'huzun' and Levi-Strauss idea of "tristesse". Pamuk asserts "huzun and tristesse both suggest a communal feeling, an atmosphere and a culture shared by millions" (90). Pamuk associated his idea with fall of Ottoman Empire. He doesn't write huzun as negative aspect but also as a sense of pride. Pamuk takes huzun as a "honoring the virtues of harmony, uniformity, humility" (94). Pamuk writes, "Huzun teaches endurance in times of poverty and deprivation. It also encourages us to read life and the history of the city in reverse. It allows the people of Istanbul to think of defeat and poverty not as a historical end point but as an honorable beginning fixed long before they were born" (94). Pamuk asserts that huzun is also sense of pride. It gives endurance when people are in poverty. Turkish people don't lament about loss. They think that poverty isn't a historical end point. They take as an honorable beginning of their life. Furthermore to clarify his idea of huzun, Pamuk takes idea from Tanpınar's novel *Peace*. Pamuk writes:

Huzun of Istanbul is something the entire city feels together and affirms as one just like the heroes of Tanpınar's *Peace* the greatest novel ever written about Istanbul: because of the huzun they derive from the city's history, they are broken and condemned to defeat. It is huzun that ordains no love will end peacefully. Just as in the old black

and white films, even in the most affecting and authentic love stories, if the setting is Istanbul's its clear from the start the huzun the boy has carried, with him since birth will lead the story into melodrama. (95)

Istanbul: Memories of a City portrays the narrator's experience of the city as fragmented in its structure and content. It is not a linear and homogenous depiction but one that is marked by different conflicts experienced by the narrator. Throughout the narrative Orhan is portrayed in his struggle of reconciling the various, differing aspect of his city as well as the different desires he has regarding his life. While aiming to reach a unified and homogenous understanding of the city and his self, Orhan comes to realize that the feeling of confusion, the blurry view of his life and his city through 'huzun' and not being able to feel at home, are the things that define his relationship with the city. Put simply the narrative illustrates the futility of the attempt to read the city as a meaningful unity, and demonstrates how the city eludes definition, allowing Orhan to get lost. It is only by getting lost that Orhan can become an observer, re-writing the city as he wishes. Commenting on Orhan Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City*, Verna Laschinger and Vivian Blaxell writes,"

Wandering the streets of Istanbul, the first person narrator of *Istanbul: Memories of a City* explores the city's darkest corners to get a sense of himself. During his last career in his life, the young narrator finds his vocation to be that of a writer" (5). Pamuk's narrator watches the burning of magnificent Ottoman mansions along the Bosphorus, the violent acts of destroying houses from the position of a by stander with mixed feelings: shock and grief at these attempt to extinguish a national identity grounded in in past excitement about these tactics as "creative destruction" a term coined by Joseph Schumpeter in *Capitalism, socialism and Democracy* to describe the "essence of capitalism" (qtd in Friedmann 11). Following Schumpeter Journalist James

Surowiecki describes a market ruled by the paradox of 'creative destruction' as follows:

Innovation replaces tradition. The present of perhaps the future replaces the past. Nothing matters so much as what will come next and what will come next can only arrive if what is here now gets overturned. While this makes the system a terrific place for innovation, it makes it a difficult place to live. Since most people prefer some measure of securing about the future to a life lived in almost constant uncertainty (qtd in Friedmann 11).

Act of deliberately damages property such destroy by burning fire and acts of modernization such as considerate urban planning have been equally responsible for Istanbul's changing appearance since the 1920s. Verana Laschinger and Vivian Blaxell write:

Ottoman architecture is still being replaced by indistinct buildings erasing the city's historical and national heritage on a large scale. Consequently, the urban space develops an appearance similar to other urban center in the globalized world. As in Walter Benjamin's parts of one hundred years ago architecture in Pamuk's Istanbul signals economic transition. (6)

Pamuk examines how the inhabitants of Istanbul here received orientalist representations and how they contested them by way of appropriation. By allying himself with Turkish national writes such as Yahya kemal or Tanpinar. Pamuk struggles to create a sense of self that owes as much to the western travel writers as it does to those Turkish authors. Being profoundly attracted to the aesthetics of Hugo, Zola, Mallarme and Proust, they amalgamated them with their concerns about

Istanbul. Theirs is a fusion of innovative aesthetics and local issues like “the decline and fall of the great empire into which they were born” (Pamuk101). The literary works of Kemal and Tanpinar found their origins in Istanbul’s poor Muslim neighborhoods. In portraying, characterizing and depicting the most pathetic sites in town, they not only voiced the terror and grief that generations of Istanbulites felt but made a claim to reappropriate parts of a city and an identity that had been lost and taken away from them. Because they expressed this grief in their books they saved a whole city from despair. Pamuk writes, “The Istanbul in which they lived was a city littered with the ruins of the great fall, but it was their city. If they gave themselves to melancholic poems about loss and destruction, they would, they discovered find a voice all their own” (101).

By integrating the contradictory perspectives of the outsider and insider, huzun the distinct melancholic trait of Istanbul’s inhabitants resulting from the violent process of cultural colonization and the defeat of the Ottoman Empire – was given a literary expression a cultural space. Where it was channeled and made productive. Thanks to Kemal and Tanpinar huzun became the emotional emblem of a cultural identity lost and painfully regained. Tanpinar, Kemal and ultimately Pamuk accept a cultural identity that is uncontested hybrid as Edward Said describes in his book *Culture and Imperialism*, “indeed every cultural form is radically quintessentially hybrid” (68). Pamuk claims of himself and citizen of Istanbul a cultural identity deriving from an inner exile. Even if the essential sadness that accompanies the inner exile can never be overcome.

Edward Said writes about exile in his book *Reflections of Exile*, “Carries with it [...] touch of solitude and spirituality” (181). Comfort can be found in the global connectedness it brings with it. This identity is imbued with the notion of

globalization, because it results from a collaborative process an equal investment of western and Turkish writers. In James Clifford terms this global sense of results in a “strength of consciousness (qtd in Mufti 97). What is more, this consciousness serves as the ideal prerequisite to operate the in the modern globalized economy. Eventually his state of mind will turn pamuk’s narrator into a concerned writer-intellectual, who operates as a voices for the silenced in a globalized world. In order to follow Said’s model as worldly .Who succeeds to make a “scrupulous” political case for the colonized ... the Palestinians ... the minority in his texts, Pamuk’s narrator yet needs to grow up. The teenager is still self-reflexive and self-absorbed.

In the chapter “Four Lonely Melancholic Writers”, Pamuk describes that they play a crucial role in the creation Orhan’s Istanbul. There are four Turkish authors, Yahya Kemal, (poet, 1884-1958), Ahmet HamdiTanpınar (Novelist 1901-1962), AbdülhakSinasiHisar (memoirist, 1887-1963) and Resat Ekrem Kocu (Journalist and historian 1905-1975), who have played a significant role. Although they had different styles and wrote in different genres, these writers had in common a live for the city. All four were influenced by the French tradition and attempted to express their feelings for Istanbul using western forms. The writings of these four writers have provided Orhan with the perspective of an Istanbul that he didn’t experience. Pamuk asserts:

For these four melancholic writes drew their strength from the tension between the past and the present or between what westerners like to call the East and west, they are ones who taught me how to reconcile my love for modern art and western literature with the culture of the city in which I live. (99)

Pamuk ideas are combined with four melancholic writers. Western people divide the world as East and West. These writers taught Pamuk how reconcile the modern and western literature in Turkey society .Pamuk gives more emphasis on western culture. Culture should not be pure. As Edward Said in his book *Representation of Intellectual* argues "... various rhetoric's of blame they give rise to, cultures are too intermingled, their contexts and histories too interdependent and hybrid, for surgical separation into large and mostly ideological oppositions like orient and occident. (xiii)

These four writers, who have witnessed the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the birth of the Turkish Republic, aimed to reinvent the identity of their city. Their aim was to create a national image for their city. These writers riskily go into the poor back streets of Istanbul. The ruins, poverty and neglect dominating these parts of the functioned like witnesses of the hardships that the city and its people had undergone. The ruins of the Ottoman Empire were consoling memories, reminding them and the people of the glorious days of past. It is by using produced a new, relatable image of Istanbul. Orhan Pamuk includes:

In the period just after the First world war, when Yahya Kemal and Tanpinar in search of an image of melancholic 'Ottoman Turkish' Istanbul – lacking Turkish precedents, they followed the footsteps of western travelers, wandering around the ruins of the city's poor neighborhoods the population of Istanbul was hardly half a million. By the end of the fifties, when I was starting school, it had roughly doubled. By 2000, it had grown to ten million. If we put the old city Pera and the Bosphorus to one side, today's Istanbul is ten times bigger than these writers knew (102-103).

Pamuk represents recent development of Turkey. Pamuk's idea can be compare with Daniel Walkowitz and Lise Knauer. They write in their book, *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation in Public Space*, "As the very shape and texture of the nation change, history takes radically different meanings (qtd in Mathesis 169).

Antoine – Ignance Melling, Geranrd de Nerval and Theophile Gautier number among foreign artists who have visited and wrote about Istanbul. Their accounts play a very significant role in the creation of Pamuk's Istanbul. Gerard de Nerval in his *voyage en orient* portrays the city during the month of Random. According to Nerval, who had come to the city if one managed to avoid the poor neighborhoods. Nerval claimed that "Istanbul, which has some of the most beautiful scenery in the world, is like a theatre and best seen from the auditorium avoiding the poverty – stricken and sometimes filthy neighborhood in the wings" (201). Gerard de Nerval seems an orientalist. Nerval presents Turkey people are inferior, they are poverty-stricken. He says that Turkey's citizen as filthy neighborhood. For him, the city's wings were places that needed as the touristic sights. Gautier, who also visited the city during the month of Ramadan, used a visual vocabulary to depict the melancholy of the city, as witnessed in the poor neighbourhoods. Gautier, unlike Nerval, moved away from the cosmopolitan city, capturing something different in those neglected parts of Istanbul. It is through Gautier's writing that one discovers the significance of the old, poor back street of Istanbul. He draws attention to the fact that Gautier's writings not only presented an overview of the 'wings' of the city but also expressed the feeling of huzun. In other words, even his feeling that is presented as the genuine 'feeling' of the city has its origins in the writings of the western travelers. Pamuk asserts:

In the last one hundred and fifty I have no doubt that not only was huzun ruled over Istanbul, but it has spread to its surrounding areas.

What I have been trying to explain is that the roots of our huzun are European the concept was first explored expressed and poeticized in French (by Gautier under the influence of his friend Nerval). (210)

By bringing together his perspective as an inhabitant of the city alongside the foreign gaze of a stranger, Pamuk blurs the boundaries that separate them. Since huzun was invented by means of the exoticized images of Istanbul in the travel writing by French authors like Nerval, Gautier, Flaubert, Baudelaire among others. Pamuk's narrator finds his history, his culture and his feelings through the eyes of these, western outsiders. He accepts these orientalisms, because they help him accept the fact that Turkey has lost a splendid future that could have resulted from the imperial power of Ottoman Empire. Pamuk asserts:

For people like me, Istanbul with one foot in this culture and one in the other the 'western traveller' is often not a real person – he can be my own creation, my fantasy, even my own reflection. But being unable to depend on tradition alone as my text, I am grateful to the outsider who can offer me a complementary version – whether a piece of writing, a painting a film. (260)

In *Istanbul: Memories of a City*, Pamuk reads the history of his hometown in connection with the imprints French culture has made on Istanbul. The western sources that he gets an idea of his home town history. By re appropriating someone else's memory as if it were his own. Pamuk and 'millions of other Istanbulis' generate the "luxury of enjoying our own past as exotic (117). Despite his acknowledgement of Edward Said, who unraveled the exoticized view of western travel writers on the orient as a discursive strategy of imperialism. Pamuk aims to revitalize their orientalism as a strategy of empowerment. By integrating he exoticized

view of Istanbul into his own reservoir of memories, he tries to overcome the very dichotomy between the ‘East’ and the ‘West’, between the orient and the occident, which Edward Said, describes in his famous book *orientalism*:

The orient is watched, since its almost (but never quite) offensive behavior issues of a reservoir of infinite peculiarity: the European, whose sensibility tours the orient, is a watcher, never involved always detached always ready for new example of what the *Description de P. Egypte* called “bizarre Jouissance”. The orient becomes a living tableau of queerness. And this tableau quite logically becomes a special topic for texts. Thus the circle completed; from being exposed as what texts do not prepare one for, the orient can return as something one writer about in a disciplined way. Its foreignness can be translated, it meaning decoded, its hostility tamed. (103)

These tactics threaten to evacuate indigenous identities, but in Pamuk’s view evacuation has been headed off by local appropriations of orientalist images ... “Istanbul’s greatest virtue is its people’s ability to see the city through both western and Eastern eyes” (232). Pamuk thereby lays bare the reality-producing power of discourse by acknowledging that real cannot be separated from the imaginary space. Michel Foucault plays on the differences of the words ‘identity’ and ‘subject’ in his essay *The Subject in Power*, where he hypothesizes a subject formed out of its very subjections, become a subject virtue of being made subject. As he says:

Identity doesn’t have neat inter play of ambiguity as a word, but the same doublings holds good, and identity could be said to be the adopted agency of one who has been identified as the result of some social process. An “identity” is connected to the subject in that identity

is the self-position, making particular subject-position active as a functioning social identity, with the understanding that both of these states take place in the plural not the singular. (17)

Pamuk ideas are also deconstructive. Pamuk does not believe in single identity.

Pamuk and Michel Foucault both ideas seem similar about identity and culture.

Pamuk asserts:

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 own reflection. But being unable to depend on tradition alone as my text, I am grateful to the outsider who can offer me a complementary version- whether a piece of writing, a painting, a film. So whenever I sense the absence of western eyes, I become my own westerner. (260)

These lines clearly describes that identity is constructed. Identity is not singular. Being an Eastern man; Pamuk creates the identity as westerner. In his book *Istanbul; Memories of a City* takes several examples from west. He creates western character with help of imagination and fantasy. Pamuk tries to dismantle the hierarchy between East and West. He mainly focuses on worldly activities .Pamuk's book gives emphasis on culture and history. Said states in his book *Orientalism* that:

Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the orient" and most of the time the occident. Thus a very larger mass of writers, among whom are poets, novelist philosophers, political theorist, economist and imperial administrator, have accepted the basic distinction between the East and the West as the starting point for elaborated theories, epic, novels,

social descriptions and political accounts concerning the orient, its people, custom mind and so on. Said describes that western people think that they are superior and eastern are inferior. Pamuk also feels the inferiority complex. He thinks that European and American people are always happy but the rest of world people are sad and second class people. Pamuk, asserts, Happy people in Europe and America could led lives as beautiful and as meaningful as the ones I'd just seen in a Hollywood film, as for the rest of the world, myself includes, we were condemned to live out time in places that were shabby, broken-down, featureless, badly painted, dilapidated and cheap; we were doomed to unimportant, second class, neglected existences never to do anything that anyone in the outside world might think worthy of notice; this was the fate for which I was slowly and painfully preparing myself. (279)

Orhan Pamuk's book *Istanbul; Memories of a City*, the narrator Orhan observes that it is the failure of the people who constitute his social circle to understand his confusions or desires that has motivated his journeys on the streets of Istanbul, where he hopes to find company for his sorrow and loneliness. The modern, conventional and predetermined lives of Nisantasi people are not appealing for Orhan; being submerged into confusion and sorrow, he feels alone among the group of people that belong to Nistantasi. He wishes to find company for his huzun and beings his search on the streets of the city:

This world of ours in which everyone knew everyone, his good paints and his limits, our elders, our forefathers, our history, our legends – was not a world in which I could be myself. Where ever I was the performer and not the spectator. I could not feel at home. At a birthday

party, for example, I would, after a while- I even went around the room smiling benevolently asking how's it going?and patting people's backs- I would begin to observe myself from the outside, as if in a dream, and I would recoil at the sight of this pretentious idiot. (290)

Orhan Pamuk feels the need to act according to the roles that have been predetermined for him in order to conform to the rules of that community. He doesn't need to go the older parts of the city, as he already feels out of place in the places where he has lived all his life. In the world where he is accorded a predetermined role, Orhan doesn't feel comfortable, and wished to be a spectator. As Homi K. Bhabha in his book *Nation and Narration* writes, "Edward Said aspires to such secular interpretation in his concept of worldliness where sensuous particularly as well as historical contingency ... exist at the same level of surface particularly as the textual object itself" (292). These lines clearly show that Pamuk and Edward Said show their worldliness. The conflict between Orhan, the distant observer and the Orhan who personally experiences the city with his memories is mirrored in the city which is stuck between the East and the west without ever being able to choose one over the other. Just like the city and the people of Istanbul, he, too, cannot decide whether he is part of the westernized circle that his family, school and friends belong to, or the other side of the city, that which will resonates with remnants of the Europe, and which allows him to be a stranger. Pamuk asserts:

Between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, part of me longed like a radical Westernizer, for the city to become entirely western. I held the same hope for myself; but another part of me yearned to belong to the Istanbul I had grown to love by instinct, by habit and by memory. When I was a child, I was able to keep these wishes apart (a child has

no qualms about dreaming in the same moment of becoming a vagabond and a great scientist) but as time wore on, this ability faded and with it the melancholy to which the city boys its head and the same time claims with pride-began to seep into my soul. (291)

The confusion that dominates both the city and the narrator is also the source of the feelings of huzun. Orhan recounts a childhood longing to belong both sides of the city. He realizes that it is this desire that gave birth to the feeling of huzun. His personal experience of the city is conflicted by his roles as performer and observer. As the narrative illustrates there is no need to conform to one over the other, because it is through the confusion that he can create his unique perspective. Free from the responsibility of overcoming the huzun, Pamuk celebrates the inability to decide. The blurry space allows him to be both reader and writer of the city at the same time.

One of Orhan's journeys combines his personal experience with the distant, foreign gaze that he adopts. He recounts this in the penultimate chapter, entitled "The ship on the Golden Horn, watching the city from the windows of the boat. He feels like he belongs there, despite not having anything in common with the people on board. By looking at the shores of the Golden Horn and at the poor and neglected houses on the hills, Orhan realizes that he is not alone in his huzun. The narrator recognizes that his own deceptions and failures are nothing compared to the destruction that the city has undergone. Thus, he finds consolation in watching the ruins structures of Istanbul, 'he sees that the melancholic views mirror his internal feelings keeping him company, making him feel part of the city. Homi K. Bhabha writes about Worldliness in *Nation and Narration* when Edward Said suggests that:

the question of the nation; should be put on the contemporary critical agenda as a harmonic of "Worldliness", he is fully aware that such a

demand can only now be made from the luminal and ambivalent boundaries that articulate the signs of national culture, as zones of control or of abandonment of recollection and of forgetting of force or of exclusiveness or of sharing. (300)

Homi K. Bhabha describes that nation can be made from the luminal and ambivalent boundaries. Nation should have the characteristic signs of national culture and zones of control. Bhabha furthermore writes that nation should be put on the critical agenda “worldliness”. Every text gives certain historicity of Nation. Every writer directly or indirectly writes about their national culture. Pamuk book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* focuses on national culture as well as history. He brings the reference of Second World War. Before the Second World War, Turkey was peaceful country. Pamuk describes:

Here among the old stones and the old wooden houses, history made peace with its; ruins nourished life, and gave new life to history; if fast-extinguishing love of painting could no longer save me, then the city’s poor neighborhoods seemed prepared, in any event, to become my “second world: How I longed to be part of this poetic confusion ! Just as I had lost myself in my imagination to escape my grandmother’s house and boredom of school, now having ground bored with studying architect, I lost myself in Istanbul. So it was that I finally came to relax and accept the huzun that gives Istanbul its grave beauty, the huzun that is its fate. (318)

Instead of trying to fight huzun, Orhan learns to appreciate the two different elements the constitute it. He experiences it on a personal level, with his memories of the city, but also from a distance, as through the eyes of a foreigner. Finding himself lost in the

city, Orhan can also see his own huzun, reflected his memories. The city where he has spent all his life hence becomes a new, unexplored space where he can get lost. Instead of trying to overcome his huzun and bringing order to the conflicting emotions, Orhan decides to explore them as they are, discovering the creative productivity opened up by the grey space that resides in between. It is in those small back streets of the city and on the boat ride on the Golden Horn, that the narrator realizes that he does not need to obliterate the feelings of huzun. Instead of trying to decide between the two opposing forces, Orhan celebrates the confusion.

The city of Istanbul is viewed over two centuries, the memoir of the author spans two decades. The Turkey of the 1950's is desperately wanting to be western, yet as a reaction desperately wanting to be Turkish. Yet the background of international politics and the cold war. During the night soviet ship pass through the Bosphorus, the main Nava after of an essentially landlocked empire and for so part of its imperialistic ambition. Pamuk watches them and keep tabs, just like so many others in Istanbul, the city war throwing its shadow on its water. Pamuk finishes the in the last chapter, entitled: A Conversation with my Mother; Patience, Caution and Art. In this chapter, he expresses the wish of to become a writer. Pamuk writes, ' I do not want to be an artist; I am going to be a writer' (333). He finally regrets the country's situation also. Pamuk's monologue with his mother represents the country's situation. He asserts, ' in a country as poor as ours, around so many weak,defeated, semi-literate people, to have the sort of life you deserve and not get crushed, to be able to hold your head high, you have to be rich"(333).

III. Text and Context

Istanbul: Memories of a City, is divided into thirty-seven chapters. The book introduces the history of the city overlap with personal remembering to Pamuk's own Istanbul and its stories. Throughout his life the author has been bewitched by the colors and sounds of his city and the layers of history which remind him constantly of its glorious past. Pamuk understands his own melancholy as intertwined with that of a city in post imperial decline for over one hundred and fifty years. Although frequently nostalgic about social and physical past of Istanbul, Pamuk never accepts simplification of the changes wrought by westernizing or modernizing influences. Pamuk includes those artists and writers whose renderings of Istanbul have created the city for him, he discusses a broad range of Turkish, Persian and European examples, including Melling, Ahmet Rasim, Nerval, Gautier, Tanpinar and Yahya Kemal and Flaubert. Pamuk manages to juxtapose his personal history with the social, economical and political history of the city via elaborating on how the city together with its way of life was perceived and interpreted in different ways. Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* deals with the globalized history of his hometown as exemplary for others. Pamuk raises his voice as a writer-intellectual. Here as the book splendidly as an intermediary between role models and the public.

The book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* is not only a crucial document of the economic growth and intellectual motion of Turkey, it also historicizes the role of the writer, who in the globalized world of the twenty first century must overcome the solipsism of the nineteenth century's artistic longer and engage in world matters. Trying to offer guidance to his fellow-citizen, Pamuk narrator embraces huzun-the state of exile-as a source of power and agency for the worldly writer-intellectual.

Orhan Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* exemplifies the late Saidean concept of worldliness. In the globalized world of Twenty-first century, where the writer intellectual's political engagement claims as much or sometimes even more public attention as his texts do due to aesthetic reason, the book *Istanbul: Memories of a City* the autobiographical genre becomes the perfect literary format of worldliness. Pamuk's text is a vehicle to introduce the literary and critical performance of the political group, later visiting professor at Columbia University. The first Turkish Nobel Laureate for literature. It promotes the worldliness of the writer-intellectual Orhan Pamuk.

Work Cited

- Achebe, Chinua, "Colonialist Criticism" *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams, New York: Har Court, 1992, 1191-1198.
- Berberoglu, Berch, *The Internationalization of Capital: Imperialism and Capitalist Development on a world Scale*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1987.
- Bhabha, Homi, K. Ed. *Nation and Narration* London: Routledge, 1990.
- Foucault, Micheal, My Body, This paper, Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York, Anehor Book's A Division of Random House 2000.
- Gallagher, Catherine...'Politics, the Profession and the Critic', *Diatrics* 15.2 (Summer 1985); 37-43
- Josue V. Harrari, *Foucault Reader. Paul Rabinow*, New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- Laschinger, Verena and Blaxell, Vivian; *Worldliness in Orhan Pamuk's Istanbul; Memories of a City*. (www.urbanauapp.org)
- Lee, Yen-His, *Language as Obsession; Deciphering Orhan Pamuk's Istanbul; Memories of a City*, *Diacritics* 17.8 (Autumn 2008) 81-95
- Mufti, Aamir R. "Auerbach in Istanbul: Edward Said, *Secular Criticism and the Question of Minority Culture*" *Critical Inquiry*. Autumn 1998.
- Nerval, Gerard de, *Voyage En Orient*, Paris: Granier-Flammarion, 1980.
- Pamuk, Orhan, *Istanbul: Memories of a City*, London: Faber and Faber, 2005.
- Robbins, Bruce. 'Review: Homeless and Worldliness, *Diacritics* 13.3(Autumn); 69-77
- Said, Edward W. –"*Reflections on Exile*" and Other Essays, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard UP 2003.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism* London: Vintage 1994.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism* London: Penguin, 1978.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (1987) Harmond Worth:
Penguin 1995.

Said, Edward W., *Representations of the intellectual*, New York: Vintage Books, 1996.

Said, Edward W., *The World the Text and the critic*, Harvard University Press Cambridge,
Massachuselt, 1982.

Walkowitz, Daniesl, and Lisa Knauer "Introduction". *Memory and the Impact of political
Transformation in Public Space*, Eds. Ianiel Walkowitz and Lisa Knauer. Durhan and
London: Duke UP, 2004.