

**Athens Institute for Education and Research
ATINER**



**ATINER's Conference Paper Series
LNG2015-1615**

**Biographical Self-Reflexivity in the
Postmodernist Novels of One British
and One Turkish Writer-John Fowles
and Orhan Pamuk**

**Semra Saraçođlu
Assistant Professor
ELT Department
Gazi University
Turkey**

An Introduction to
ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ATINER started to publish this conference papers series in 2012. It includes only the papers submitted for publication after they were presented at one of the conferences organized by our Institute every year. This paper has been peer reviewed by at least two academic members of ATINER.

Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos
President
Athens Institute for Education and Research

This paper should be cited as follows:

Saraçoğlu, S. (2015). "Biographical Self-Reflexivity in the Postmodernist Novels of One British and One Turkish Writer-John Fowles and Orhan Pamuk", Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: LNG2015-1615.

Athens Institute for Education and Research
8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece
Tel: + 30 210 3634210 Fax: + 30 210 3634209 Email: info@atiner.gr URL:
www.atiner.gr

URL Conference Papers Series: www.atiner.gr/papers.htm

Printed in Athens, Greece by the Athens Institute for Education and Research. All rights reserved. Reproduction is allowed for non-commercial purposes if the source is fully acknowledged.

ISSN: 2241-2891

29/09/2015

**Biographical Self-Reflexivity in the Postmodernist Novels
of One British and One Turkish Writer -
John Fowles and Orhan Pamuk**

Semra Saraçođlu
Assistant Professor
ELT Department
Gazi University
Turkey

Abstract

The reaction to reality is the main issue in postmodernism. The idea that novel is a copy of the world or that it mirrors the empirical reality has been challenged by the poststructuralist theory of literature which argues that signifiers do not carry with them well-defined signifieds. Instead, there is a chain of signifieds which enables a multiplicity of meanings. The postmodern novel tries to falsify the belief that the novel is a mirror held up to external reality. In postmodern fiction referents belong to a fictive verbal universe not necessarily to a real world; words refer to words and the theoretical importance of self-reflexivity at this fundamental level of epistemology and, crucially, ontology is seen. The opposition between the real world and that of fiction has been among the oldest of the classic ontological themes. It is ‘fictionality’ in the twentieth century. Although the separateness of these two worlds - the fictional and real- is emphasized even in the Renaissance, this does not mean that they are completely different universes which in no way intersect at any point. The aim of this study is to focus on the world of the real or biographical author and biographical self-reflexivity in John Fowles and Orhan Pamuk’s novels: *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* (FLW), *The Magus* (M), *Daniel Martin* (DM), *The Collector* (C), *The Ebony Tower* (ET), and *Mantissa* (MT) by Fowles, and *Kara Kitap (The Black Book)* (BB), *Yeni Hayat (The New Life)* (NL), *Benim Adım Kırmızı (My Name is Red)* (MNR), *Kar (Snow)* (S), and *Masumiyet Müzesi (The Museum of Innocence)* (MI) by Pamuk.

Keywords: Self-Reflexivity, John Fowles, Orhan Pamuk, Postmodernism, Fictional World, Real World.

Introduction

In Linda Hutcheon's classification of overt and covert self-reflexivity, in overt forms of self-reflexivity, the very substance of the novel's content is narration (1980,23). Since the process of narration is foregrounded in the fiction's content, the subject matter becomes the biographical novelist and his writing. The aim is to place the author on a higher realm. By making himself visible in person, or by intruding upon the text to stress the fictionality of the text, the author places himself on an ontological level superior to that of the fictional world that he creates. So the reflected, fictional self of the author is doubly superior to the text that he has created. These embedded representations prepare a move toward infinite regress - a chain of fictional authors writing about authors writing about authors and so on. The only reality is then the act of writing itself. This study aims to focus on the last circle in the embedded worlds within worlds. That is the world of the real or biographical author, and it will concentrate on biographical self-reflexivity.

Both Fowles and Pamuk are world famous writers whose statements in their interviews or in book reviews give "an indirect invitation for [the readers] to observe [them]" (Aubrey 1991: 2). Contrary to the general tendency in modern critical theory not to take into consideration the biographical data of the author, the many references made by Fowles and Pamuk (more so for Pamuk since he constantly advertises himself) themselves to their own biographical data are unavoidable in any understanding of these writers. These include such personal details as appearances, names, places, occasions in life and references to books written by both writers.

Appearances, Names, and Other Personal Dimensions

As Ronald Sukenick puts forth, the writer at his desk or "the truth of the page" is foregrounded in overtly self-reflexive texts:

The truth of the page is that there's a writer sitting there writing the page...If the writer is conceived, both by himself and by the reader, as someone sitting there writing the page, illusionism becomes impossible ... the reader is prevented from being hypnotized by the illusion of that make-believe so effective in the hands of the nineteenth-century novelists but which by now has become a passive, escapist habit of response to a creative work - instead he is forced to recognize the reality of the reading situation as the writer points to the reality of the writing situation, and the work, instead of allowing him to escape the truth of his own life, keeps returning him to it, but one hopes, with his own imagination activated and revitalized (in McHale, 198).

Since both Fowles and Pamuk are concerned with the fact that fiction is Self-reflexive, a reflection on itself, there is always an author evident in their texts and these author/characters, besides their being writers, also share some common physical traits bringing to mind their own authors. In their autobiographical books *Wormholes* (1998), and *Öteki Renkler* (*The Other Colours*) (1999) and in interviews they have made, Fowles and Pamuk respectively provide information about their lives and invite their readers to participate in trying to make sense of the literary/fictional worlds they create. In *FLW* for instance the narrator is “a man of forty” with a beard like a prophet (*FLW*, 388) who intrudes upon his text by appearing first as a character in a train and then as a writer. This bearded narrator whose look is particular “with its bizarre blend of the inquisitive and the magistral; of the ironic and the soliciting” (*FLW*, 389) by making comments on the novel genre and the role of novelist, reminds the reader of the presence of the bearded Fowles behind all these fictional worlds. In *M*, there is “the old man with the clipped white beard” among all the staff introduced to Nicholas in his trial (*M*, 504). This man with the beard who is presented as “the stage manager” (*M*, 505) reminds one of the real-life Fowles who has constructed all the fictional worlds of *M*. In *DM*, on the other hand, the authors and characters coalesce: John Fowles, a writer in his forties, writes a novel about another writer in his forties called Daniel Martin, who also writes an autobiographical novel, using for his hero the pseudonym “Simon Wolfe.” In the world of the book, it is a name picked up from Hollywood directory and at the same time in the real world critics point out that Simon Wolfe is an anagram of Fowles. While in *ET* David Williams writes an introduction to ‘The Art of Henry Breasley’, a book about a painter, in *Mt Miles Green* is a stuck writer who suffers from a mental illness which is identified as an over attachment ‘to the verbalization of feeling’ (*MT*,42).

With the many biographical details he gives in his novels, Pamuk, too, like Fowles, expects and invites his readers to construct biographical links, putting himself as a biographical part of the readers’ worlds into the “fiction” they read. Similar to Fowles’s Simon Wolfe, the main characters’ names, Osman in *NL*, Orhan in *MNR*, Orhan in *S* and Orhan Pamuk in *MI* to different extents, recall their writer’s first name – Orhan. Osman in *NL*, for instance, carries some personal details from Pamuk’s own life. He is the author-character in the novel and finds his vocation in life by means of writing. Like Osman, Pamuk the writer chose to be a writer at the age of twenty-two. Pamuk comes from a family of engineers, officers, professors of law, history and businessmen. He attended an American college in İstanbul and was expected to specialize in one branch of the positive sciences. He thought of becoming a painter and for this reason studied architecture, but only for two years. Just like Osman who goes for the new life the book pronounces, Pamuk dropped out of the architecture course in İstanbul Technical University and attempted to find a “new life” in becoming a full-time writer. In *Öteki Renkler* (*The Other Colours*), Pamuk talks about the beginning of his journey in writing:

I was living with my mother, studying architecture, but I dropped it ... I started to write my first novel at the age of twenty-two and wrote two and a half books in eight years, failing to have them published. Throughout these eight years I had convinced myself that I have to believe in my studies. And I wrote but at the same time read enormously and had an idea about the world literature. Finally, I loved novel writing and decided that this is my only ambition in life and believed in my skills and patience ... At the end of eight years, ultimately my book was published (1999: 49).

Ka in *S* too shares the physical appearances as well as the personal traits of his creator: He is pale faced, has messy hair and is considerably tall as a Turkish man and wears his ash gray coat all the time (*MI*; 10, 380). He is nearly at the same age with its writer (*MI*; 10, 38), a Gemini (*MI*, 118) and is raised by secular parents at Nişantaşı in İstanbul (*MI*; 15, 24) and has a mother like Pamuk's mother (*MI*, 244). Ka prefers loneliness and is introverted most of the time especially with women (*MI*, 175), travels to Kars under snow by Erzurum bus to write an article on politics in religion. Orhan, the old friend of Ka like Kemal in *MI* is also from Nişantaşı, has a daughter named Rüya (*MI*, 428), the title of one of his novels is BB (*MI*, 427) and the next novel he plans to write is *MI* (*MI*, 258).

Osman, just like the author of *NL*, writes all his books “sentence by sentence into [a] notebook” with quadrille pages for graphs and maps (Pamuk 1999: 74, *NL*, 41/37). Like Pamuk (Osman's alter ego), Mehmet's life is “ordered, disciplined and punctual ... By the time the clock strikes nine, [he] [has] [his] coffee prepared and [is] already hard at work writing” (*NL*, 198/212). This is what Pamuk says he does every day. He discusses how to write a good novel in Öteki Renkler (The Other Colours):

Writing requires discipline. You must have hundreds of rules, which will push you to work. You will come (to your office), prepare your coffee and short ceremonies will start: what are they? You have your coffee and (notes) at your worktable. You push the plug of the telephone, (and cut off your connection with the outer world), and walk up and down in the room ... You become happy when you carry out all these things, which force you to work. It is these very ceremonies that make me respect writing and submit myself to the page though they seem to be silly to others ... this is the way of becoming a writer (1999, 70).¹

Just like Mehmet who “writ[es] the book over and over into ordinary school notebooks in longhand” and “work[s] eight to ten hours a day on the average, hitting about three pages per hour” (*NL*, 200/213), or Ka who writes his poems in a green notebook or Orhan Pamuk in *MI* who writes Kemal's

¹The translation belongs to the present writer.

story, Pamuk writes in ordinary school notebooks in longhand (Pamuk 1999: 72). Another biographical detail in *NL* is the “green felt cloth [that] had been spread on the table” (*NL*, 207/220-221) while Osman/Mehmet is writing: Pamuk, too uses green felt cloth on his table. In an interview he explained why:

The first reason why I use green felt cloth on my table is that I grew up in a house where my grandmother used to play cards. Secondly, when I started my first book - Thomas Mann influenced me - I had read that he worked on a green felt cloth. Thirdly, I drink tea, coffee without stopping and spill them. Besides, there is a moral bond I have with it as in the case of a small child who is wrapped up in his old blanket before sleeping (Ekşigil 1999:4).¹

Doctor Fine’s watches, which follow Osman, and New Life caramelas are also from real life, as well as the name Rûya, that of Pamuk’s daughter, for whom the main character starts a journey in İstanbul streets in *BB* (Pamuk 1999: 149). For Pamuk, “his watch is like a part of his body” and, just like his character Osman (*NL*, 207/220-221), he takes it off and leaves it on the table, as if it were a “jest” before a “fight.” His using the brand names of watch for Doctor Fine’s detectives is “something to do with [his] personal interests” (Pamuk 1999: 59).

Differently from Fowles’s novels, the family in *MNR* – Shekure, Orhan and Shevket, and the things that family go through, overlap to some extent with Pamuk’s own family history. His mother (whose name is also Shekure), himself (Orhan) and his elder brother, (who is also called Shevket as in the novel) wait for their father who is away. His mother, like the novel’s Shekure, used to scold them and try to calm the two brothers who could not get on well (Pamuk 1999: 162). As in the novel, there is a continued rivalry in his relationship with his brother. While they were still children, Pamuk was jealous of Shevket since he was more handsome, and a more loved, social, and successful student (Ekşigil 1999: 4). Pamuk seems to be more popular than his brother now but when he is asked about the injustice he did to his brother in his novel, his answer to this is: “It is not injustice, it is revenge.” Especially the ending of the novel has been seen as unjust to his brother:

Don’t be taken in by Orhan if he’s drawn Black more absentminded than he is, made our lives harder than they are, Shevket worse and me prettier and harsher than I am. For the sake of a delightful and convincing story, there isn’t a lie Orhan wouldn’t deign to tell (*MNR*, 470/413).

The rivalry Pamuk feels for his brother can be seen in the Prince’s “effort to get away from his older brother Reşat who was chasing him” (*BB*, 397/365).

¹ Ibid.

“His retarded older brother” (*BB*, 398/366), Honourable Mehmet Reşat, “whose neck he had slapped when he was young and during whose administration the Ottoman Empire, having entered the Great War, collapsed” (*BB*, 413/379).

Both Fowles and Pamuk are well aware of some biographical realities in their fiction. By appearing in person or with the author characters, both writers ask the readers’ participation in constructing biographical elements. They put themselves as a biographical part of the readers’ worlds into the fiction they read. Yet, it must be noted that their fiction is not a reflection of reality but a reflection of the fictionality and compositional procedures of their works. There is similarity but not identity. As stated before:

A mimetic relation is one of similarity, not identity and similarity implies difference—the difference between the original object and its reflection, between the real world and the fictional heterocosm (McHale 1987: 28).

Places

In published interviews and essays both writers accept the fact that there is an autobiographical element in all novels. Yet, they use these elements to stress the illusion of reality. In his “Foreword to the poems,” Fowles discusses the place of autobiographical elements in poetry and novels and states that there is definitely a writer’s private self in all novels. Yet, he says, it is easier to put one’s self into a poem because “A novelist is like an actor or actress onstage, and the private self has to be subjugated to the public master of a novel’s ceremonies. The primary audience is other people. A poet’s is his or her own self” (1998: 28). In *Öteki Renkler (The Other Colours)* which gives many clues about his life and his works and in interviews he makes, Pamuk also admits the unavoidability of biographical details in his works. What is certain is that the world of fiction borrows things from the external world but it is not a one-to-one reflection of it. Therefore, students of Fowles and Pamuk should be careful in differentiating the embedded worlds reflecting each other ultimately. The biographical elements found in the first world do exist in the outer world inhabited by the authors, but the external world is a more inclusive domain including the fictional sphere as well as the realm of the implied author. The job of Fowles and Pamuk readers is not so easy – they will pick upon the elements that the writers have included on purpose in the carefully knitted structure of the novels, and they will see that these details are only a part of the heterocosm Fowles and Pamuk create. In this section some real-life places in the novels of Fowles and Pamuk are traced. Just like names, appearances, and personal traits, which resemble the private selves of the two writers and their lives, the places chosen in the novels reflect their biographical writers.

Fowles is a lover of nature who prefers to live in an isolated town rather than in a city. The reason lying behind this is “his own sense of exile, his sense

of being an outsider of some kind” (Relf 1998: xx). As a result, he says, he finds refuge in the wild places at the heart of nature. The traces of his relationship with nature, wildlife, and the landscape can be found in all his novels. That is why there are isolated, green landscapes in some of his novels. The Dairy in *FLW*, for instance, is taken from Fowles’s isolated farmhouse which is “one-half mile southwest of Lyme Regis, where an extension of Ware Lane turns into a footpath to the west through the Axmouth-Lyme Regis National Nature Reserve - about four miles of totally wild coastline known as the ‘Undercliff’” (Aubrey 1991: 24). The Cobb, where the readers are firstly introduced to Sarah is the wall, which “protects the harbour of Lyme Regis” (Aubrey 1991: 26). Moreover, it is known that Fowles now lives in his farmhouse with its “two acres of garden” because

For [him], the best place to be in exile ... is in a town like this (Lyme Regis) in England ... (novelists) have to keep in touch with their native culture ... linguistically, psychologically and in many other ways ... I’ve opted out of one country I mustn’t leave. I live in England, but partly in a way one might live abroad (“A Sort of Exile in Lyme Regis” in Thorpe 1982: 9).

In *M*, there are the pine forests of the island of Spetsai “to be only a glance away from the hills above Epidaurus, and those near Mycenae and Tiryns; and above all, to be so miraculously remote from the suburban deserts of Essex” (Fowles 1998: 58). Fowles’s old teaching position on the Greek island corresponds to Nicholas’s on the island of Phraxos as well. In *DM*, on the other hand, he refers to Thorncombe, Tarquinia, Tsankawi, and Kitchener’s island. In 1940, Fowles’s parents moved away from the danger of German attack to a farm in Ipplepen, Devon, which Fowles fictionalizes in *DM* as a solitary retreat where he “learnt nature for the first time in a true countryside among the countrymen” (Fowles 1973: 14). Fowles’s description of a wheat harvest in the first chapter of *DM* is also the relation of a biographical experience during his fall term away from school in 1941. Similarly, in an interview Fowles discussed the difference between his own feeling of enjoyment during the killing of the rabbits and the reaction of young Daniel in *DM* (in Aubrey 1991: 9). The secluded house of Frederick Clegg in *C*, and the magic forest in Brittany in *ET* also reflect their biographical writer.

Pamuk, on the other hand, was born, has lived and is still living in İstanbul. Differently from Fowles, who goes after refuge at the heart of nature both in real life and in his novels, Pamuk chooses city life. This does not mean that he is any different than Fowles in the isolated life that he leads. He prefers spending time on his worktable to raki tables and going out to parties. He says: “I don’t want people to think that I dislike going out to parties or that I am not interested in meeting women, but the point is that the after-effect of such parties is so ‘great’ that it takes two weeks to go back my work” (Pamuk 1997: 23).

So, Pamuk too knows the need to be isolated to produce. While nature has an important place in Fowles's life, İstanbul plays a great role in Pamuk's life and consequently this is reflected in his works. Except *S*, which takes place in Kars, all the Pamuk novels under discussion are set in İstanbul. *BB* is the most autobiographical of all. For instance, The Heart-in-the-city Apartment where Galip and Jelal grow up is the same as the Pamuk Apartment in Nişantaşı where Pamuk, his grandmother, uncles, and aunts lived together and where Pamuk wrote some of *BB*. Nişantaşı, Taksim Square, Beyoğlu police station, and Aladdin's Store are all from real life as well (Pamuk 1999: 139). Nüket Esen, in her compilation of essays on *BB* attaches some photographs of The Heart-of-the-city Apartment, the neighbourhood lunatic "who imagined he was a famous soccer player" (*BB*, 387/356), the air shaft in the apartment, "the first floor of an old house next to Beyoğlu police station that had the inscription COMPANIONS over the door" (*BB*, 137/123), Merih Mannequin Atelier, and Aladdin's Store. *NL* too is set in İstanbul and starts with a description of İstanbul after midnight when only the voice of the boza vendor and a distant train clattering along its tracks can be heard in the empty streets. In *MNR*, on the other hand, there is the İstanbul of 1591 with its famous miniaturists while in *MI* the İstanbul of 1970s with Nişantaşı, Cihangir, the back streets of Beyoğlu and Çukurcuma. Life in different periods of İstanbul in *BB*, *NL*, and *MI* also function as a mirror for the real author-Pamuk.

Scenes from Biographical Life

Many aspects of Fowles and Pamuk's novels indicate the existence of their biographical authors. Fowles, for instance, as a younger self, had got much in common with Nicholas, the first person narrator of *M*. Nicholas announces in the very first paragraph, "I went to Oxford; and there I began to discover I was not the person I wanted to be" (*M*, 15). This dissatisfaction of Nicholas actually reflects Fowles's own discontent after he left the marines: "I ... began to hate what I was becoming in life - a British Establishment young hopeful. I decided instead to become a sort of anarchist" (in Aubrey 1991: 14). Fowles never became an anarchist in the literal sense, but he challenged the established norms by writing. For Fowles who says, "I write, therefore I am" (1998: 5), writing becomes the only means of altering society and actualising his goal in life. In an afterword to a collection of essays about *FLW*, he revealed his attitude to fiction-writing: "The true function of a novel, beyond the quite proper one of entertainment, is heuristic, not didactic; not instruction but suggestion; not teaching the reader, but helping the reader teach himself" (in Aubrey 1991: 86).

It is true that there are many biographical references in *M*, *Mt*, *C*, and *ET*. In *M*, Nicholas is an Oxford graduate from the English Department who taught for a year at a public school, like Fowles who worked for a year at the University of Poitiers; and his unhappiness with life that lead to accepting a teaching job on the Greek island of Phraxos: Fowles too received two offers of

teaching positions but chose the one on the Greek island of Spetsai. As he reveals in his Foreword to *M*, “[his] island of Phraxos is ... the real Greek island of Spetsai, where [he] taught in 1951 and 1952” (*M*, 7). As he reflects in *M*, too, Fowles found this private boarding school, its learning environment, and the teaching program expected to be re-created for the Greek boys who are “bad enough” (*M*, 18) strange. And in *M*, the school, the town, the Greek boys are all intolerable but the environment outside the school with its natural and magical beauty attracts Nicholas (in fact Fowles). The “House of the Magus” i.e. the villa Bourani is a real villa called Yiasemi and is owned by a Greek millionaire (Fowles 1998: 65). Fowles visited this isolated villa with its private beach once when a harmonium was being played (not the harpsichord of *M*), and the island and this house, along with the realization that he needed to be exiled from many aspects of English society inspired him to write *M* (*M*, 8). Besides, Fowles is keen on botanising and is a collector. As he himself reveals in “Notes on an Unfinished Novel”, like Conchis, Fowles collects old books (1998: 13). He is also an “amateur ecologist” just as *FLW*’s Charles Smithson is an “amateur palaeontologist” and *C*’s Frederick Clegg, an “amateur entomologist”.

Fowles’s aim is, as his statements about the heuristic function of novels shows, to be a guide to his readers in reaching self-awareness. Conchis in *M*, for instance, prepares a godgame for Nicholas to clear his mind about the distinction between art and life. Breasley in *ET* leads David Williams to his existential authenticity. Miranda and Clegg in *C* embody the two sides clashing inside Fowles: the artistic and the conventional. Fowles plays the role of ultimate stage manager in *M*, *DM*, and *FLW* as well as in *ET* and shares his pleasure in the godgame of writing fiction with his readers. Nicholas’s family name Urfe recalls “earth” (Fowles 1997: 9), and he is “if not the true representative face of a modern Everyman, at least that of a partial Everyman of [Fowles’s] class and background” (*M*, 9). Therefore, if Conchis is seen as “the greatest teacher in the world” (*M*, 479/487), and Nicholas the inexperienced young man who grows up and realizes the fictionality of all the created situations which surrounds him throughout the novel, what Fowles tries to do is the same with his readers—he is “not teaching [them], but helping [them] teach [themselves]” (in Aubrey 1991: 86) about the godgame of fiction reading and that of writing.

Pamuk like Fowles is well aware of the writer at his desk writing his own texts. Osman in *NL*, as in the case of Nicholas and Fowles, is the younger self of Pamuk who looks for higher ambitions rather than becoming an architect “walk[ing] up and down all over Taşkılla Hall” while “most of the other students hurried up stairs to get in the cafeteria line” (*NL*, 22/18). Galip in *BB*, the character Pamuk feels closer to himself both in thought and feeling (Pamuk 1999: 160), like Black in *MNR* receives phone calls from his readers expressing their appreciation as well as criticism of his columns. This happens to Pamuk (Pamuk 1999: 50). Just like Galip, who fantasizes of becoming Jelal the writer and experiments with being somebody else on the telephone, Pamuk, too fantasizes that somebody is calling him on the telephone for something

very vital even though he knows that the telephone is switched off. In *Öteki Renkler (The Other Colours)*, Pamuk states that he himself receives some phone calls from an unknown person who never spoke reminding one of Galip's phone calls from unknown voices (1999: 50, 52, 53).

Fowles received a degree in French at Oxford whereas Pamuk attended architecture courses for two years but then got a degree in journalism at İstanbul University. Fowles, when he was young, was very willing to alter some of the settled institutions in the society. Fowles chose to actualise his dreams of youth with his works he wrote aiming to be "heuristic." Pamuk, at the age of twenty-two decided to be a novelist because it seemed to be the only means for him to deal with books, and texts. In *FLW, DM, M* and also in *ET*, the traces of Fowles the teacher can be felt, just as journalist Pamuk's presence can be traced in *BB*'s Galip, the columnist, and *S*'s Ka, the poet and the journalist, or in the art of miniature in *MNR*, which brings to mind the art of writing and the problem of style in writing. The Prince in *BB* and Osman in *NL* draw the readers' attention to the novelist and the act of writing. In *BB*, for instance, Jelal, the columnist, reflects the problem of modernist and postmodernist fiction writers who are criticized by readers because "[they] hadn't written the sort of column (novel) they'd come to expect from [them]" (*BB*, 172/155). Jelal in many ways functions as the mouthpiece of Pamuk with his words on writing: "storytelling [is] a trick devised to escape from [people's] own tedious bod[ies] and spirits" (*BB*, 249/225). The Storyteller in *MNR* also reflects Pamuk who feels himself under pressure while writing (Pamuk 1999: 154). Olive's words about writing, illustrating and painting overlap with those of his biographical writer also: "We make our books in secret like shameful sinners. I know too well how submission to the endless attacks of hojas, preachers, judges and mystics who accuse us of blasphemy, how the endless guilt both deadens and nourishes the artist's imagination" (*MNR*, 192/166). Pamuk feels trapped in taboos, and political, social, governmental, religious prohibitions when he is writing (Pamuk 1999: 154). For this reason the Storyteller in *MNR* serves as a mask for Pamuk the writer. The life of miniaturists, who spend all their lives on their worktable until they get blind, in Pamuk's view, is the same as that of writers who work for hours and years on their worktables without knowing when they will receive "the respect [they] deserve" (*MNR*, 196/170). It must be noted that drawing has always been a special interest in Pamuk's life. From childhood to the age of nineteen he wanted to be a painter. As Pamuk himself states in *Öteki Renkler (The Other Colours)*, "at the age of thirteen, [he] was good enough to differentiate the drawings of miniature Osman who lived in the 16th century from that of Levni who lived in the 18th century" (1999: 162).

Pamuk has a special interest in ships as well. In an interview, Pamuk states that he has counted the ships sailing through the Bosphorus all through his life (Pamuk 1999: 11). In *BB*, Galip counts cars and gives "the numbers of Dodges, the Packards, the Desotos and the new Chevrolets" (*BB*, 14/6), Uncle Melih "draw[s] pictures of ships and deserted islands on the pages of old Lawsuits rather than practicing law" (*BB*, 16/7) and "leave[s] for Marseilles on a

Romanian ship” (*BB*, 16/8), or Saim while speaking to Galip “listen[s] for a while to the moan of a dark tanker sailing through the Bosphorus” (*BB*, 81/71), or Galip tells the voice on the phone to “consider the mysterious reason why the first steamboat the Turks ever bought from England had been christened Swift” (*BB*, 371/341).

Conclusion

To sum up, Pamuk, unlike Fowles admits that he is a “happy postmodernist” (in Çongar 1998: 14) and, as is mentioned before, postmodernist fiction is concerned with the universe of “text” and how it is constructed. Both writers imagine the author writing their texts but there is always the ontological superiority of the real author to the fictional one who also shares with the reader the problems met in writing which is shown in the second world of embedded worlds within worlds at the centre of which is the fictional world, and outside and including all is the world of the author.

References

- Aubrey, James, R. *John Fowles: A Reference Companion*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Çongar, Yasemin. “Gerçek Tüm Dünyaya Söylenir” (The Reality is Exposed to the World as a Whole). *Milliyet* 27 April 1998: 14.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1976.
- Ekşigil, Hülya. “Ruh Dünyamı Paylaşamam” (I cannot Partake my Spiritual World). *Türkiye* 26 December 1999: 14.
- Esen, Nüket. *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar* (Essays on *The Black Book*). İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.
- Fowles, John, ed. Introduction. *Wormholes: Essays and Occasional Writings*. By Jan Relf. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1998.
- Fowles, John. *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*. London: Vintage, 1969, 1996.
- Fowles, John. *The Magus*. London: Vintage, 1966, 1977.
- Fowles, John. *Daniel Martin*. London: Vintage, 1977.
- Fowles, John. *The Ebony Tower*. Broadway: Signet, 1974.
- Fowles, John. *The Collector*. London: Triad/Panther, 1963, 1976.
- Fowles, John. *Mantissa*. London: Triad/Panther, 1982, 1984.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*. New York and London: Methuen, 1980.
- McHale, Brian. *Constructing Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdağ M. Göknar. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 2001.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Benim Adım Kırmızı*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1998.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *The Black Book*. Trans. Güneli Gün. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.

- Pamuk, Orhan. *Kara Kitap*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1990.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *The New Life*. Trans. Güneli Gün. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1997.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Yeni Hayat*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1994.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Öteki Renkler* (The Other Colours). İstanbul: İletişim, 1999.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Kar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2002.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Masumiyet Müzesi*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2008.
- Scholes, Robert. *Textual Power; Literary Theory and the Teaching of English*. London: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Tarbox, Katherine. *The Art of John Fowles*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1988.
- Thorpe, Michael. *Writers and Their Work: John Fowles*. Windsor, Berkshire: Profile Books Ltd., 1982.
- <http://arşiv.ntv.com.tr/news/131480.asp>
- <http://arşiv.ntv.com.tr/news/457412.asp>