SELF-REFLEXIVITY IN POSTMODERNIST TEXTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE WORKS OF JOHN FOWLES AND ORHAN PAMUK

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
THE MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY
SEMRA SARAÇOĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

SEPTEMBER 2003

Approval of the Graduate school of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz   _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal Norman   _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necla Çıkıgil   _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gönül Pultar   _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez   _____

ABSTRACT

SELF-REFLEXIVITY IN POSTMODERNIST TEXTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE WORKS OF JOHN FOWLES AND ORHAN PAMUK

Saraçoğlu, Semra

Ph.d., English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

September 2003, 122 pages

This dissertation makes a comparative analysis of the self-reflexivity in the novels of one British and one Turkish writer - John Fowles and Orhan Pamuk. The study restricts itself to three novels by each writer. In making this analysis under the light of Robert Scholes's theory of "reality," and making use of Linda Hutcheon's classification of self-reflexivity, and Jacque Lacan's The Mirror Stage, it is argued that both Fowles and Pamuk create worlds within worlds which are similar to but different from each other, namely the fictional world, the world of the implied author, and the outer world, i.e. the world of the writer. Although these worlds reflect each other, it is not a one-to-one reflection of outer reality, since art/fiction is illusion. This dissertation argues that in accordance with their aims in both life and literature, and their views on "reality," Fowles and Pamuk make use

of different self-reflexive devices. While Fowles prefers overt self-reflexive devices, Pamuk chooses to employ both overt and covert ones; this may be because Fowles aims to be didactic whereas Pamuk does not. While Fowles believes in the existence of the external world, Pamuk rejects it. Whatever techniques they use, it is shown that they both write self-reflexive texts focusing on "fictionality" as their theme. The analysis of the six novels by Fowles and Pamuk as the representatives of two different literatures demonstrates that self-reflexivity is an indispensable characteristic of postmodern fiction and that Pamuk is more postmodernist compared to Fowles.

Keywords: Self-reflexivity, Self-reflection, Mirror, Dreams, Fantasies, Fiction - Reality Distinction, Reference and Difference, Self-Other Dichotomy, "I"dentity Crisis, Overt/Covert, Metafiction, Creative Process, Form, Linguistic Medium.

ÖZ

POSTMODERN METİNLERDE KENDİNİ YANSITMA: JOHN FOWLES VE ORHAN PAMUK'UN ESERLERİNİN KARŞILAŞTIRILMALI İNCELENMESİ

Saraçoğlu, Semra

Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

Eylül, 2003, 122 sayfa

Bu tez, bir İngiliz ve bir Türk yazar - John Fowles ve Orhan Pamuk'un romanlarında kendini yansıtma kavramının karşılaştırmalı bir analizini yapmaktadır. Çalışma, her yazardan seçilen üçer romanla sınırlandırılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, Robert Scholes'un "gerçek" teorisi, Linda Hutcheon'ın kendini yansıtma konusundaki sınıflandırması ve Jacque Lacan'ın "ayna" teorisinin ışığı altında Fowles ve Pamuk'un iç içe geçmiş, birbirine benzeyen, ama aynı zamanda birbirinden farklı dünyalar yarattığı öne sürülmektedir. Bu dünyalar kurmaca dünya, yazarın varlığını hissettirdiği, çoğunlukla anlatıcının dünyasıyla karıştırılan dünya ve yazarın dünyası yani gerçek/dış dünyadır. Bu dünyalar birbirlerini yansıtırlar, ancak sanat/kurmaca bir hayal olduğundan, bire bir dış dünyanın yansıması değildirler. Bu tez, Fowles ve Pamuk'un hayattaki ve edebiyattaki doğrultusunda ve "gerçek" hakkındaki görüşlerine bağlı olarak farklı

kendini yansıtma araçları kullandıklarını tartışmaktadır. Fowles öğretici olmayı amaçladığından daha çok açık olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini seçerken, Pamuk öğretmeyi amaçlamadığından hem açık hem de gizli olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini kullanır. Fowles bir dış dünya olduğuna inanır, ama Pamuk daha tutarsız bir yazar olarak dış dünyanın varlığını reddettiği halde yine de dış dünyayı işler, onu kullanır, orada yaşar. Bu çalışma, Fowles ve Pamuk'un her ne teknik kullanırlarsa kullansınlar metinlerinde kurgusallığı/kurmacayı konu edindiklerini savunmaktadır. Farklı iki edebiyatın temsilcisi olan Fowles ve Pamuk'tan seçilen altı roman kendini yansıtmanın postmodern romanın vazgeçilmez bir özelliği olduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kendini yansıtma, Ayna, Rüyalar, Fanteziler, Kurmaca – Gerçek Ayrımı, Referans ve Farklılık, Ben – Öteki ikilemi, "Ben"lik krizi, Açık/Gizli, Üstkurmaca.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

to my family

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aim of study

One of the features recurring in lists of characteristics and definitions of postmodernism is self-reflexivity. Critics employ different terms to express the textual self-awareness of postmodern fiction such as *the introverted novel*, *the anti-novel*, *surfiction*, *the self-begetting novel*, as well as *narcissistic*, *self-reflective*, *self-informing*, *self-reflexive*, *auto-referential novel*.[1] The aim of this dissertation is to argue that "Self-reflexivity"[2] is an indispensable characteristic of postmodern novels. This idea will be reinforced by an analysis of the works of two novelists, John Fowles and Orhan Pamuk, from two different literary backgrounds.

---

[1] John Fletcher and Malcolm Bradbury refer to *the introverted novel* in *Modernism: 1890-1930*. They differentiate the eighteenth century introversion that draws attention to the narrator and twentieth century introversion, which draws "attention to the autonomy of the fictive structure itself" (1976: 394) - as in novels by Muriel Spark. *Anti-novel* is a term used to point out any novel whose structure demonstrates a sort of protest against traditional novels. For *surfiction,* see Raymond Federman's *Surfiction: Fiction Now...and Tomorrow.* For *self-begetting novel*, see Waugh's *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction* (1984). For *narcissistic, self-reflecting, self-informing, self-reflexive, autoreferential novel*, see Linda Hutcheon's *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (1980).

[2] The distinction between self-reflexion and self-reflection must be made clear. Although in *The Oxford English Dictionary* Volume VIII, these two words are given as synonymous, in Hutcheon's work and in this dissertation they are not used synonymously. The distinction between these two adjectives in this dissertation is self-reflexion – "thinking" about the self, self-reflection - "seeing" the self in or on another entity i.e. someone or something else. Self-reflexion with a capital letter, as in the title of the dissertation, is used to refer to both.

The reason for selecting Fowles in this dissertation as a representative of the British postmodern literature is that at the end of the 1960s, with *The French Lieutenant's Woman* Fowles showed his sensitivity to the theoretical issues in the writing of fiction:[1] he demonstrated his postmodern awareness by using parody and pastiche, focusing on the aesthetics of the novel in the nineteenth century and questioning the realist conventions, although he did not abstain from them entirely. Postmodernist tendencies did not seem to be agreeable to the English susceptibility, and as a result only rare examples of this kind could be found in British fiction in the 60s. The most significant work of 1969 is Fowles's *FLW* while Fowles is an important name in the literary history of postmodernist fiction in British literature.

Pamuk, on the other hand, has been chosen because he is the most aggressively postmodern writer in Turkey. In and after the 80s he has produced the fastest selling books in Turkish history. Pamuk takes his place in the Turkish literary scene as the most famous Turkish writer outside Turkey as well. Like Fowles, Pamuk too writes novels in different literary modes and styles, ranging from realism, modernism, and postmodernism. Unlike Fowles, Pamuk openly declares that he is "a happy postmodernist" (in Çongar 1998: 14). Again like Fowles (who is also postmodern), Pamuk undermines and problematizes his narrative by shifting the reader's attention away from narrative content towards the actual narration or circumstance in which the story is produced.

By making a comparative analysis of "Self-reflexivity" and its types in three of both writers' postmodern novels, (*The French Lieutenant's Woman*, *The Magus*, *Daniel Martin* by Fowles and *Kara Kitap* (*The Black Book*), *Yeni Hayat* (*The New Life*), and *Benim Adım Kırmızı* (*My Name is Red*) by Pamuk), this study should reveal the indispensability of Self-reflexivity as a characteristic of the postmodern novel.

---

[1] Fowles in *FLW* acknowledges the importance of Alain Robbe-Grillet, a forerunner of the *nouveau roman* and Barthes, a literary theorist: "But I live in the age of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Roland Barthes; if this is a novel, it cannot be a novel in the modern sense of the word" (1996, 85).

1.2 Background

The main issue in postmodernism is the reaction to reality, and when the postmodern novels in British and Turkish literature are considered, it is duly found that reality is their primary concern. The idea that a novel is a copy of the world or that it mirrors empirical reality has been challenged by the post-structuralist theory of literature, which refuses to accept "the natural link that common sense assumes to exist between word and thing" (Norris 1982: 4). Structuralists and post-structuralists had different ideas on the concept of "reality." Structuralists see the relation between signifier and signified as arbitrary, but, once fixed in language, they are defined and stable. Poststructuralists, on the other hand, argue that signifiers do not carry with them well-defined signifieds. There is a chain of signifieds, which enables a multiplicity of meanings. Meanings are never graspable because we live in a world where there is no fixed intellectual reference. Structuralists argue that they can establish reliable truths through an accurate observation and schematic data collection. The Poststructuralist philosophical outlook, however, leads to the belief that man is not fully in control of language, because the verbal sign is free of the concept it is supposed to designate and a multiplicity of meanings is thus possible. Postmodernist novels are consciously open to these ideas. As a result the concept of reality in the modern novel is found to be very narrow by poststructuralists, and the postmodern novel presents a synthetic whole in which the real and the fictitious, the past and the present are expressed synchronically. The postmodern novel tries to falsify the belief that the novel is a mirror held up to external reality, because postmodern fiction can "never imitate or 'represent' the world but always imitates or 'represents' the discourses which in turn construct that world" (Waugh 1984: 100). It is "fiction about fiction: novels and stories that call attention to their fictional status and their own compositional procedures" (Lodge 1992: 206). Therefore, as post-structuralism argues, "reality is a linguistic construct and if any mirroring takes place, it is of linguistic structure" (Lee 1990: 25). 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. The theme of the fictional world in the classical world, which Sidney described as "heterocosm," continues to exist in the twentieth century as "fictionality."[2] Although the separateness of fictional and real worlds 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 heterocosm theme and the mimetic theme are mutually dependent and mutually implicating. For the real world to be reflected in the mirror of literary mimesis, the imitation must be distinguishable from the imitated: the mirror of art must stand apart from the opposite to the nature to be mirrored. 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).

Therefore, it is true that fictional world and real world overlap to some extent. The fictional world imitates the real world as a background or a model for the possible universes in fiction. However, in postmodern texts this imitation is at the level of form rather than content. That means postmodernist fiction reflects reality, but it reflects only the reflected reality in the fictional heterocosm.

Postmodernism has an ontological approach to reality. "Ontology," according to Thomas Pavel, is "a theoretical description of a universe" (1981: 234). As Pavel and many others stress, postmodernism describes *a* universe, not of *the* universe, but possible universes of fiction. Therefore, with the emergence of postmodernism, "intractable epistemological uncertainty becomes at a certain point ontological

---

[2] Sir Philip Sydney in *Prose Works of Sir Philip Sydney, IV*, 1962, p. 8, re-evaluates the distinctness of the fictional world as "heterocosm" and McHale in *Postmodern Fiction*, (1987), p.28, refers to Sydney's concern with this ontological theme and reveals that the otherness of the fictional world is still debated today, not under the name of "heterocosm" but of "fictionality".

plurality or instability" (McHale 1987: 11). The focus in modernist fiction is the problems of "knowing." As Dick Higgins states in *A Dialectic of Centuries: Notes towards a Theory of the New Arts* (1978), frequently asked questions are: "How can I interpret this world of which I am a part? And what am I in it?" However, in postmodernist fiction, there is a shift from the problems of "knowing" to the problems of "being" and the questions foregrounded have changed into "Which world is this? What is to be done in it? Which of my selves is to do it?" (1978: 101). Self-reflexivity in the postmodern novel is itself a metaphor for the ontological questioning, discussion, and anxiety of the present age. By drawing attention to its being an artefact, postmodern fiction self-consciously opens the relationship between "reality" and fiction to question. This means that it is self-reflexive, a reflection on itself - a commentary on its own narrative and/or linguistic identity. Coiling upon itself, moving forwards and backwards, the postmodern novel questions the novel as a genre in form and content.

Although they come from two different literary backgrounds, both Fowles and Pamuk write postmodern works. Differently from Pamuk, Fowles never admits to writing postmodern novels. Yet, after the Second World War, like many others, he needed to re-evaluate traditional concepts. As he declares in the foreword to *The Timescopes of John Fowles* (1984), in his view all novelists share the same common driving force:

> and that is a sense of loss, or at any rate of insufferable incompleteness, a deprivation we then habitually blame on the real around us. This world is so wrong, so inadequate and unimaginative, that we must speak, and correct and supplement it (in Fawkner 1984:9).

Reminding the reader of Descartes's well-known dictum, "I think; therefore, I am," Fowles writes; therefore, he is (Fowles 1998: 6). His mission in writing, however, is like that of D.H. Lawrence who "is constantly trying, like a good preacher, to save us, and wringing his hands at our apparent collective unwillingness to be saved" (Relf

1998: xx). Although Fowles aims to be didactic in his novels, he prefers to call his novels "heuristic," because he thinks that (in his own words) what they do is, "not teaching the reader, but helping the reader teach himself"(in Aubrey 1991: 86). It seems, as Katherine Tarbox states that both in life and literature Fowles rejects the taking of things for granted, and feels obliged to teach his readers "resistance to fixed ideas," (Aubrey 1991: 32) because

> in ordinary life we interpret our surroundings according to established codes. We tend to put experience in categories, interpret new material by received ideas, to see with others' eyes (Tarbox 1988: 5).

In Fowles's view, this "collector consciousness," as he calls it, is dangerous. So this "epistemological habit" should be avoided not only in life but also in literature (Tarbox 1988: 5).

Although there has always been more resistance to theory in England than in other countries, and although Fowles never admits that he is conversant with post-structuralist criticism, describing himself as a "traditional bourgeois novelist" and also "a social realist," in *FLW* and in some of his other novels Fowles undermines the characteristics of classical realism - "illusionism, narrative which leads to closure, and a hierarchy of discourses which establishes the 'truth' of the story," and makes a criticism of this tradition (Belsey 1980: 70). By subverting and undermining the established rules and systems, he problematizes the novel genre. Fowles is conscious of "the gap between art and life that conventional realism seeks to conceal" and writes fiction aiming to display the "artificiality" of realistic conventions while at the same time employing them in his works. In order to underline the fact that "a work of fiction is a verbal construction rather than a slice of life," although he abhors the categorization "novelist", let alone "postmodernist," preferring to be called a "writer" who aims to teach his readers resistance to fixed ideas, like all postmodern writers, Fowles unsettles trust in the realistic conventions in play, by subverting and challenging them (Lodge 1992: 207).

6

Tarbox's comments on Fowles's concepts of time, history, and author reflect the ruling theses in Fowles novels that "reality" is illusory and can be altered; that conformity and limitations are objectionable. Tarbox's remarks on Fowles's apprehension of time and history give the reader an understanding of Fowles's beliefs on the theory of narration in his fiction, which foreground fictionality as a theme:

> Linear time is an artificial measuring device imposed upon experience, … real time is nebulous, and … all time lies parallel. He believes in what he calls a 'spinning top' model of history and holds as ideal vision the perception of all these tenses at once (Tarbox 1988: 5-6).

In Tarbox's view, Fowles sees the linear arrangement of incidents in a chronological order as artificial. Real time is inclusive and all times, past, present, and future lie parallel. History is not a chain, but a spinning top moving at the same point. Therefore, one expects Fowles to subvert the linear/diachronic arrangement of his discourses, and challenge coherence in time structure. In Mahmoud Salami's view, while in a linear/diachronic narrative, events occur in a coherent time structure, in a horizontal/synchronic narrative, time strata are not organized chronologically because the movement of discourses in a horizontal narrative is "circular, coextensive, and coterminous in a manner where texts march together, collide, then rebound to advance again along the same front" (1992: 22). Fowles achieves this horizontal time by subverting the linear/chronological narrative. This means Fowles abuses the conventional narrative ordering violating the realist notion that fiction creates the illusion of the real world. Postmodern fiction offers not a representation of reality, or an imitation, but a "reality." Besides, horizontal narrative puts an end to the hierarchy of discourses, another characteristic of classical realism. Since the movement of discourses is horizontal, that is, since all times exist simultaneously; no discourse is more privileged than the others. Fowles prefers the state of timelessness to the restriction of chronology.

Fowles's perception of history as including all three tenses – past, present,

and future simultaneously unsettles not only the narrative but also the concept of the author as the creator of the text. He seems to advance the conventional idea that the author is the actual figure that has authority as the creator of the text. However, his idea about conventional authorial responsibility is undermined by the theoretical ideas he comes up with about the use of "person" in narrative. The famous Chapter 13 of The *French Lieutenant's Woman* demonstrates how Fowles himself thinks about the self-conscious violation of the norms of classical realism:

> I do not know. This story I am telling is all imagination. These characters I create never existed outside my own mind…I am writing in…a convention universally accepted at the time of my story (*FLW*, 97).

The "I" narrator in the passage insists on the fact that all that is told in the novel is fiction, not an imitation of reality. That means Fowles pretends to write in a "convention universally accepted at the time of [his] story," but does not write so in fact. Until Chapter 13, the novel presents itself as a historical novel in the realistic style. However, for Fowles, history too is a form of literature. The narrator-author in this chapter breaks the illusion of a Victorian novelist and implies that he himself is a fictional entity and questions the dictates of the classical realist novel. In *FLW*, Fowles treats Victorian literature and 20th century literature as two opposing texts within one narrative and opens both the old and the new conventions to doubt

The use of the "person" in narrative is problematic, too (Salami 1992: 17). In Fowles's novels, there is a difference between the author, the narrator and the reader in relation to the text. Therefore, the reader expects Fowles to controvert the authorial narrative figure. The horizontal narrative he favours makes one expect Fowles to prefer narrative openness, mysterious and circular endings and the projection of texts within texts in a multi-layered narrative. With such counter techniques, he brings the power of the omniscient Victorian author to question. Since Fowles wants to challenge the realistic representation which follows a linearity where events occur in a cause and effect relationship and   plots are resolved with a narrative closure, he

is not concerned with the solution to the mystery, with presenting solutions for the problems described in his novels, but with "how the code of the enigma is constructed and how the mystery is produced" (Waugh 1984: 83). Therefore, for him, there is no end to meaning. The meaning is on the run and it is the reader's task to make up his/her own interpretation as a player participating in the game of fiction - writing.

Orhan Pamuk, differently from Fowles who is a teacher and prefers to be called a "writer" rather than a "novelist", openly calls himself a "novelist," declaring: "I do see myself as a novelist, not a good citizen, a good naturalist, a helpful person or a good father ...My being a novelist comes before all" (in Ecevit 2001: 164). As with Fowles, however, writing is the only way of life for Pamuk. Pamuk spends his life constructing fictional worlds, but not with the Fowlesian aim[3]:

> Literary taste is an outcome of complexity of literature. I never wanted to write a single fold, simple book… I give my whole life to writing and my only aim is not to be read by great numbers. Finally the fact that they have been read by huge numbers of people will be forgotten. At the end, let's say I want to create such a feeling in the reader that he/she will see: 'what a complex thing he has done,' 'how much pleasure he/she gets in reading it,' 'the book is indeed so rich,' and that 'he should have worked a lot on it' (Pamuk in Kırmızı Koltuk (Red Armchair)).

The "novel" for Pamuk, does not present any resolution, nor does it give any lesson. It is more like a site where he can bring at least two opposing texts together to shatter prejudices and existing beliefs (Pamuk 1999: 103). When Fowles is compared with Pamuk, Fowles seems more cautious about concealing his interest in the theory of fiction, which forms the basis for postmodernist fiction. Pamuk not only employs postmodernist narrative techniques in his novels but also admits that he is an addict of theory and has learned a lot from it. All three novels selected in this study

---

[3] The quotations, titles, and character names in Orhan Pamuk novels referred to in English are provided by their translators. All other translations from Turkish are the work of the present writer unless otherwise specified.

exemplify how Pamuk employs all these literary theories and postmodern devices he learned from different literatures. Pamuk constructs his novels as syntheses of both Eastern and Western literatures and the influence of other books on his own work seems inevitable because, as the Murderer in *My Name is Red* says, "all fables are everybody's fables" (*MNR*, 452/397) and the world of fiction is a place where "everything imitate[s] everything else" (*MNR*, 86/70). Pamuk, like Fowles, borrows texts produced earlier by other writers. He admits the intertextual characteristic of his work:

> I make collage. I borrow many things from many books, but this does not make me feel bad… However as James Joyce states, this functions only as a bridge…I create a work of art with my own will…I do not mind what I have borrowed (Pamuk in Kırmızı Koltuk (Red Armchair)).

His definition of "discovery in literature" supports the intertextual quality in his works because what he tries to achieve in a text is the "electrification" that comes into being when two completely different things are brought together (Pamuk 1999: 103). This is the main reason for the multiplicity of texts within his novels and also of forms of narratives in his works. In *The New Life*, the first person narrator presents a discussion of how a book is regarded as a "good" one:

> A good book is something that reminds us of the whole world…The book is part of something the presence and duration of which I sense through what the book says, without it actually existing in the book…Perhaps it is something that has been distilled from the stillness or the noise of the world, but it's not the stillness or the noise itself…A good book is a piece of writing that implies things that do not exist, a kind of absence or death…But it is futile to look outside the book for a realm that is located beyond the words (*NL*, 208/222).

In fact, this is what he does in his fiction. Rather than being a reflection of reality, his fiction is rather "a verbal reality" (Waugh 1984: 100), and is Self-reflexive.

Since "fictionality" is the real subject matter of both writers' fiction, in their

10

novels Fowles and Pamuk create embedded worlds within worlds, and place the world of the characters and the narrator at the centre, taking the only reality as the act of writing itself. This world is surrounded by another world, which includes the first one and is also outside it, where the implied author, who prevents the reader from being hypnotized by the illusion of the make-believe, exists. The world that includes all is the world of the real author and also the reader, who is transformed into a writer at the end of the text. These worlds within worlds inevitably overlap to some extent and reflect each other. However, this does not mean that they are identical. On the contrary, all these three worlds embedded within each other are similar to each other but at the same time different from each other.

1.3 Scope of the Study

While analyzing Self-reflexivity in Fowles's and Pamuk's novels to display that Self-reflexivity is an indispensable characteristic of postmodern fiction, the theories of Jacques Derrida, Robert Scholes, Jacques Lacan and Linda Hutcheon have been helpful as theoretical guidelines.

In most critical writings poststructuralism has been taken synonymously with the name of Jacques Derrida and his deconstructive criticism. Derrida claims that the understanding of a text requires the understanding of the underlying relationship. In his *Of Grammatology* (1976) he criticizes Saussure and says the value of the text comes from 'difference,' which is the transportation of the Sausserean term 'difference'. Derrida sees the different elements, which are suppressed or marginalized to be the most dynamic components of the whole. He claims that everything gains meaning by representation and by reintroduction of differences in signs. 'Play' means getting out of the system, or the structure, to be in touch with 'difference.' This 'play' of 'differance' causes the meaning of a text to be undecidable or unstable. Deconstructive criticism breaks the structure into its components by decentralizing it in order to form a more comprehensive pluralistic

structure with a new centre of logic taking the place of the previous one. Derrida sees the centre as an organizing principle both within and outside the system where both similarities and differences are suppressed for the sake of coherence. The foregrounding of the differences in a structure ignoring the logical centre is to disrupt or deconstruct the system. After each disruption, the unifying principle i.e. the centre changes. Derrida talks about a closed-up system in which God is the centre and stands as an ultimate signifier (in Adams and Searle 1986: 83-93). However, he notes, the modern world rejects a God-centred system and adopts a system, which is open to the 'play' of deconstruction. In this process the signifier is reduced to the signified. So 'play' in a deconstructed text enables one to use as many points of view as possible by escaping the essential centre of logic. The result is the multiplicity of discourses drawn out of the original text.

When analysing the use of types of self-reflexivity in novels of this sort, one must have a clear standpoint on the issue of the "real." In this dissertation the "real" is seen in the light of Robert Scholes's theory. Scholes's theory has proved useful in giving the writer of this dissertation a standpoint and a vocabulary with which to tackle complex issues, and acts as a useful way of placing the two writers in relation to such a standpoint. Scholes takes language as a system of arbitrary signs. He claims that any linguistic system is both referential and differential. Unlike Saussure and his followers who stress the total independence of the verbal signs from the non-verbal signs, Scholes presents a synthesis of Saussurean and Derridaen concepts. Post-structural criticism describes a work of art as a system of differences. However, if language does not refer to the external world, one gets cut off from the world completely. So language, Scholes argues, is not a completely differential system of signs concerning reference, or the external world of the linguistic system, he says:

> I want to challenge the notion that language is a system of "pure differences," for it is this notion upon which the attack on reference is presently based. I will not deny that language is based on difference; rather, I will argue that it is also based on reference,

a dimension of the human use of language that has been systematically repressed or ignored by structuralist and hermetic theoreticians (1985: 87).

Deconstructive criticism emphasizes the view that a literary work of art is completely fictitious, i.e. it does not have any reference to the external world. Scholes, in reaction to this post-structuralist critical trend, claims that a work of art is created as a reaction to the external world in which it is created, it both imitates the external world and imposes on it a new order created by the writer because "language is impure … and certain aspects of linguistic meaning are heavily dependent upon non-linguistic forms of information" (1985: 109). As a result, the linguistic units used to express this experience gain symbolic dimensions. They may be ungrammatical but meaningful within the text. Therefore, in Scholes's explanation of textual power, there are three approaches to reading a text; the first is reading i.e. reading "within" a text. It is a primary activity and requires the ability to understand the linguistic code of the text. The second approach for reading a text is reading "upon" a text, which is interpretation. Reading moves from a summary of events to the discussion of meaning or theme of the text in the light of the metaphorical, symbolic and paradigmatic dimensions. The reader reconstructs the text in the light of both the writer's experience and of his own experience and creates a new organic whole, which is a broader synthesis than the work of art itself.[4] If the first step, "reading within a text" is the grammatization of the text, this second step is the thematization of the text. The reader brings his collective subjectivity to the interpretation of the text. Scholes's last stage of reading is called "criticism" which requires a critique of both themes and the codes. The reader evaluates the text reading it "against" itself by comparison and contrast with other modes of production to which it belongs (1985: 24).

Postmodern fiction insists on its being an artefact. While doing so, it self-consciously opens the relationship between "reality" and fiction to question.

---

[4] This is a very important aspect of Fowles's works.

13

However, it cannot be said that the fictional world is completely cut off from the outer reality. Therefore, as Scholes notes there is both "difference" and "reference." Postmodern fiction reflects reality, but it is the reflected reality in the fictional heterocosm. It describes *a* universe, not *the* universe. For Scholes, then, the fictional world and real world overlap to some extent but they are not identical, only similar. Since postmodern fiction imitates only the form rather than content, the focus of attention is drawn not to what is narrated but rather to how it is narrated. Plot functions only as a means to construct *a* fictional universe. It seems the use of traditional narrative structures cannot serve the demands of the age, and reflecting the changed attitude towards life, the novel, too as a genre in form and content is opened to question.

Linda Hutcheon, who shares the same views with many other critics on the self-obsession of the postmodern fiction, with her classification of self-reflexivity in *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (1980), has provided a guideline to this dissertation. Hutcheon calls postmodernist fiction "narcissistic," "self-reflective," "self-informing," "self-reflexive," "auto-referential," and "auto-representational" (1980: 1). All these terms point to the fact that postmodernist fiction is self-obsessed. There is an inward looking, "an introverted literary level of mimesis" (1980: 12). In postmodern fiction, which is Self-reflexive, the reader's attention is drawn not to what is narrated but to how it is narrated. Plot is only a part of intertextuality, the process of narration matters more than the content. The fictional presence of the writer as author character reinforces this transformation of the traditional narrative from the story told to the storytelling, the functioning of language, and the use of narrative structures. As a result, new demands are made on the reader. Firstly, he should know that what he reads is a text, which self-consciously presents its own creative processes. In this kind of fiction, reading is no longer an easy task. The reader is asked to participate in the creative process. Since the self-reflexive state of the novel denies its existence as "a realistic narrative of something outside itself" (1980: 13), the reader's attention is drawn not to the

projected world but to the text's linguistic medium. Self-mirroring/reflection i.e. making the process of narration the fiction's content demands the reader to be a producer of new set of relations because the reader is left with the worlds of the words on the page.

Hutcheon argues that there are two forms of self-reflexivity - overt and covert. Overt forms are self-conscious. This kind of self-reflexivity is manifested through "thematization" or "allegorization" with the use of "plot allegory," "narrative metaphor," or "narratorial commentary." Covert forms, on the other hand, are not necessarily self-conscious and in such texts the process is "structuralized, internalized and actualised" by means of many models such as the "detective story," "fantasy," "game structure," and the "erotic" (1980: 23).

In the overt forms of self-reflexivity, the very substance of the novel's content is "narration," "the making of fictive worlds and the constructive, creative functioning of the language" (Hutcheon 1980: 30). In this mode the reader, too in reading and trying to make sense of this literary/fictional world, is asked to participate in the novel's self-analysis. The reader, who is forced to acknowledge the text's fictionality, structure, or language, is allowed to learn how he/she makes sense of this literary world by creating perhaps another fictional world but this time of his/her own. He/she is presented with some framing devices such as the presence of an "authorial" narrating figure, parody, "stories within stories" making up Chinese-box structures, because in such fiction frames are set up only to be deconstructed. Therefore, postmodern fiction creates an illusory reality, which seems to be as real as the physical world. Yet, it is not the real world but the world of words.

The use of the presence of the author in postmodernist fiction to destroy the illusion of reality is one form of overt self-reflexivity. It functions as a frame-breaking device. By introducing himself into the text through anagrams or variations on his name, or by appearing as a character entering the text, or by third-person/first-person intrusion narratives stepping into the fictional world to stress the fictionality of the text, the author crosses the ontological divide between the fictional world and

real world, and overturns not only the established relations between story and discourse but also the identity of the author as creator of the text one is reading. Besides, since the writing of the text is foregrounded as the most fundamental problematic aspect of that text, the reader is always reminded that fiction is all about the process of writing of the fictional text one is reading at the moment. The result is infinities of authors preparing a move toward more Chinese-box structures, texts within texts - a chain of the fictional author writing about an author who is writing about an author and so on. The writing/artist characters of these novels also shift the readers' attention away from narrative content towards the actual narration or circumstances in which the story/art is produced.

Borges has shown us that, "fiction is obviously fiction" and "life is fictive, of our making as well" (in Hutcheon 1980: 19). So, there is no place for real "authenticity" any more. That is why parody functions as another frame-break device. In overtly self-reflexive texts, parody problematizes the norms. That means the realistic conventions function as the norm or background against which the experimental strategies can foreground themselves and so construct new fictional forms through self-reflection. As one of the most frequently used literary devices, parody deliberately lays bare the device in order to achieve "defamiliarization." That is, by exposing the old conventions, it attempts to achieve a new and more authentic form. When it subverts the fictional rules and systems that have become conventionalised, parody also problematizes the concept of "reality" and its relation to fiction. This defamiliarization that parody achieves puts a distance between the reader and the text's world. Instead of identifying with any character, the reader, by means of his own experience of building a meaning through language, can share the pleasure of creation in his infinite interpretative possibilities. In overt self-reflexivity "this new role is taught" (1980:34).

In Hutcheon's classification of self-reflexivity as overt and covert, while on the overt level self-reflexivity is clearly and fully expressed, on the covert level, as has been mentioned, it is implicit. The detective plot is one of the paradigms

presently in use in covertly self-reflexive texts. The self-consciousness of the form itself and its structural conventions increase the importance of a hermeneutic act of reading. As a result, the reader in postmodern fiction acts like a detective following every single detail in his/her investigation of the murder mystery. The mystery this time is a metaphorical murder – the murder of the text on the paper, linking and connecting the plot and while doing so building a completely new one. By employing the detective plot as a covertly self-reflexive device, the reader participates in the reconstruction of the text and when he/she completes his/her act of reading and interpretation he/she shares with the writer the pleasure of creative dynamism.

Another device used in cases of covert self-reflexivity is fantasy. While in the overtly self-reflexive texts, the reader is directly told that the referents of the text's language do not correspond to his experience or the empirical world, in the covertly self-reflexive texts, the fictiveness of the referents is absolute. There is confrontation between the "real" and the "fictional", that is, the "possible" and the "impossible;" and the reader creates his/her own literary constructs/novelistic universes. Differently from overtly self-reflexive texts, he/she is not asked, but is forced, to create his/her world of fantasy as real as, but other than, the real world is. As Waugh points out, through the merging of "dreams," "visions," fantasies, "hallucinatory states" and "pictorial representations," the concept of "reality" is problematized (Waugh 1984: 31). The complex interrelation of dream and reality, fact and fiction is a result of fantasy employed as a model in postmodern fiction, both for the structuration of the work and its narration i.e. both as an overt and covert self-reflexive device.

Game structure and the erotic are also covert self-reflexive devices used in postmodern fiction. In using a game model, postmodern novelists invite the reader to a free creative activity as in the detective plot or fantasy. The reader is explicitly reminded that he/she is the player in the game. In such novels, there are some codes and rules that bring the fictive world into play. Unless the reader learns the code, he/she cannot follow the act of writing and reading i.e. he/she cannot decode the meaning. Riddles, jokes or puns and anagrams are some other models, which may

also be used in game structures directing the reader's attention to language itself. By imagining, interpreting, decoding, in short, building the novelistic universe through the fictive referents of the fiction, the reader shares the process of artistic creation with the writer. Therefore this relationship between reader and writer can be considered erotic by nature because the writers attempt to seduce the readers into involvement in the act of reading and at the same time creating. (1980: 32-34).

The ontological concerns that underpin all postmodern works are expressed and demonstrated in the selected novels of two writers in a variety of ways, often structural, but most effectively, perhaps, through self-reflexivity. In the present age, both individuals and fiction are in search for "I"dentity. Since self-reflection itself stands for the identity search in the present age, in this study Lacan's The Mirror Stage, which explains the misconception of the "mirror" image as the "real," is used. At this stage, the character sees an image in the mirror and he/she thinks that image is "him/her." But it is not him/her, it is only an image. This process of misrecognizing one's self in the mirror image creates the ego. To Lacan, ego, or self, or "I"dentity, is always on some level a fantasy, identification with an external image, and not an internal sense of separate whole identity since it is based on visual perception. Lacan says that one's self-concept will never match up to its own being. His/her image in the mirror is always "other" than one is. This is not the same as a binary opposition, where "self" is what is not "other" and "other" is what is not "self." Rather, "self" is "other." "Other" is the not-me but in the mirror image it becomes "me." In the Mirror Stage, the image the child sees not the real "me" but an "other," and it gives the child the idea of "Other" as a structural possibility, one that makes possible the structural possibility of "I" or self. In other words, the child encounters actual others - its own image, other people - and he/she understands the idea of "Otherness," things that are not itself. However, this desire to be the "Other" can never be fulfilled, since the "Other" is, in Derrida's sense, the centre of the system itself and in Derrida's view, nothing in the system can be in the position of the "Other." Because Derrida denies the existence of "present time" (Scholes 1985: 93) and bases his theory on the

idea that "every trace refers to every other trace and to nothing else, producing 'a structure of infinite referral in which there are only traces'" (Scholes 1985: 95). This is the reason for the never–ending "lack" or "loss" which Lacan calls "desire." It is the desire of the baby to unite with its mother's body as before. However, this state of nature, which is perceived as real by the baby, is not possible any more because this irretrievable loss or lack is the real. For Lacan, who reinterprets psychoanalysis in light of structuralist and post-structuralist theories, there are no signifieds; there is nothing that a signifier ultimately refers to. Like Derrida, Lacan says there is no relation of signification between signifier and signified. In his view, one signifier is what it is because it is not something else. Therefore one signifier leads to another signifier, and never to a signified. Lacan says that the process of becoming an adult, a "self," is the process of trying to fix, to stabilize, and to stop the chain of signifiers so that stable meaning, including the meaning of "I," becomes possible. However, in his view this possibility is only an illusion, an image created by a misperception of the relation between body and self as in the mirror stage.

This is valid for the postmodern novel, too. The postmodern novel is a fantasy/ fictional world, not the exact copy of the external world. There is no relation of signification between signifier and signified. One signifier is what it is because it is not something else. The "otherness" of the other gains importance in this sense. That is the distinctness of the real and fictional worlds. What is created in fiction is not the real world but the "other" world. Therefore, postmodern fiction is self-obsessed and is Self-reflexive because, as in the misconception of the relation between body and self in the mirror stage of Lacan, there is a misconception of the relation between "reality" and "fiction" in postmodern fiction and, in order to reinforce the idea that "self" (real) and the "other" (fiction) are similar to but different from each other, postmodern novels, as the novels of Fowles and Pamuk, make use of overt framing devices such as the presence of an "authorial" narrating figure, parody, "stories within stories" making up Chinese-box structures, as well as some covert devices like fantasy, detective plot, game structure and erotic and

19

reinforces its self-reflexive state. As a result, the process of narration, the functioning of language, and the use of narrative structures become the content of the novel.

To sum up, both Fowles and Pamuk use postmodern strategies whether they admit it or not, and focus on the theme of the fictional world as "heterocosm" i.e. "fictionality" is the subject matter of their fiction. Therefore, they create only fiction and undermine the notion that "reality" is truth. Their aim is to challenge the idea that fiction is a mirror of life reflecting its established norms and values, be they social, moral, psychological, political, or historical. Fowles seems to follow Scholes's view in reaction with the deconstructive criticism. Pamuk insists on the differential system of signs as Derridaens do. In Pamuk's case, fiction exists for its own sake, while Fowles aims to be didactic. Although they both write Self-reflexive fiction, Fowles and Pamuk differ in their views on reality. While Fowles seems to be more of a structuralist, believing in the presence of the world of the phenomena i.e. the ontological existence, Pamuk is definitely a post-structuralist insisting on the non-reality of the external world. Scholes reacts against the deconstructive belief that there is no external reality and claims that a work of art both imitates the external world and imposes on it a new order created by the writer, which seems to be closer to Fowles's understanding. It must be noted that neither of the two writers dispense with realistic traditions altogether. What they both do is to rehandle the established narrative conventions of representation and show the changes in aesthetic forms.

Chapter 2 of this study deals with the actual analysis of self-reflexivity in the multi-layered universes of both Fowles and Pamuk novels. Chapter 2 goes into the first world in the structure of embedded circles within each other. It is the more conventional world of the characters, and discusses self-reflexivity as an ontological problem of the present age by tracing the self-reflexive images in the selected novels of both writers. While stressing the difference between the reality/the original object and the world of fiction/its reflection, physical and non-physical reflections are dealt with under the light of Hutcheon's distinction between overt and covert self-reflexivity and Lacan's The Mirror Stage, which explains the misconception of the

"mirror" image as the "real."

Chapter 3 concentrates on the idea that fiction is all about the process of the writing of the fictional world one is reading at the moment. This is the second world in the structure of worlds within worlds where the implied author[5] creates his own fictional world in the fictional world the biographical author created. Since *DM* and *NL* are the only two of the selected novels in this dissertation which can be considered as self-begetting novels in Kellman's terms, Chapter 3 deals only with these two novels because they both are "account[s] usually first person, of the development of character[s] to a point at which [they] [are] able to take up and compose the novel[s] we have just finished reading" (in Waugh 1984: 14).

Chapter 4 is the last world i.e. the world of the "real" or biographical author as well as the "real" reader. This chapter focuses on biographical self-reflexion and demonstrates the higher reality where the author is placed in this hierarchy. Since self-reflexive fiction aims to underline the fictionality of the text and even of the act of writing, the author creates a chain of authors writing about authors and makes his fictional self, superior to the text he has created. Although deconstructive criticism denies the existence of the external/real world, in Fowles's and Pamuk's case the biographical references they make in their works contribute to an understanding of their fiction. For this reason the last circle in the embedded worlds within worlds is the world of the real author, and this chapter focuses on biographical self-reflexivity.

Having concentrated on novels from two different literary backgrounds employing various kinds of self-reflexivity, Chapter 5 comprises the results and conclusion and attempts to evaluate the indispensability of this characteristic in postmodern literature.

---

[5] As Roland Barthes in "The Death of the Author" says, in classic criticism, the "person" of the author plays a great role in the understanding of a work (in Burke 1995: 126). However, in modern criticism, "linguistically, the author is never more than the instance writing, just as *I* is nothing other than the instance of saying *I*: language knows a 'subject,' not a 'person,' and this subject, empty outside of the very enunciation which defines it, suffices to make 'hold together,' suffices, that is to say, to exhaust it" (1995: 127). Therefore, The "I" of the narrator is not necessarily the "I" of the author. "The implied author," as Chatman reveals, "can *tell* us nothing." He/she has "no direct means of communicating" because it seems, "it," in Chatman's words, is "voiceless" (1978: 148).

The Bibliography contains not only references cited in the text but also works which are not referred to but have been helpful as guidelines in the process of writing the dissertation.

CHAPTER 2

SELF-REFLEXIVITY IN THE WORLD OF THE CHARACTERS IN FOWLES'S AND PAMUK'S FICTION

The focus of postmodern writers' exploration is the opposition between the real world and that of fiction. This ontological question brings with itself "the paradox concerning the identity of fictional characters" and "the status of literary fictional discourse (the problem of referentiality)" (Waugh 1984: 90). Since characters belong to the realm of the fictional world i.e. "an imaginative world" constructed as an alternative to the real world or to any other world perceived as "real," they exist there, and their freedom is limited. They are just statements in the novelists' scripts. Therefore, as Waugh states, "a fictional character both exists and does not exist; he or she is a non-entity who is a somebody" (1984: 90). For this reason, this chapter concentrates on the world of the characters/narrators, the fictional world which constitutes the first circle in the embedded worlds within worlds, and aims to display the crucial difference between the reality/the original object and the world of fiction/its reflection, which is, in Scholes's words, both referential and differential (1985: 86-110). Analysis of images in this first world is organized according to Hutcheon's distinction between overt and covert self-reflexivity. Firstly, reported incidents of physical reflection are introduced: mirrors and reflecting surfaces. Characters see/watch themselves and the others in the mirror. Since Self-reflection in the postmodern novel and in Lacan's theory is itself a metaphor for the

question of identity, the mirror functions as a means of identity search. There are also other physical devices of reflection such as paintings, drawings, pictures, books, and performances. Following the analysis of overt self-reflexivity, the reported incidents of non-physical reflection will be discussed: dreams - characters dreaming and seeing themselves in their dreams, the dreamlike quality of experiences, characters' inability to speak as if they were in a dream, and the state between dreaming and wakefulness and fantasies. In this form, dreams and fantasies function as parallels to reality or conventions of reality (Hutcheon 1980: 77). Next, the "eye," "ghost," and "shadow" motives, as well as the images of characters' watching themselves from outside, or experiencing a sense of being watched will be discussed, as they reinforce the narrative and ontological distance between the text and its author/reader.

In both Fowles's and Pamuk's novels, all "those ultimate[ly] lying mirrors" (*DM*, 131) between fact and fiction enable the characters to achieve a realization of self. Since self-reflexivity in the postmodern novel itself reflects the ontological question in the present age, characters in the novels under discussion undergo quests for their identities. Just like Charles Smithson in *FLW*, who travels all around England and America to find Sarah, the personification of his other, on the surface Daniel in *DM*, too starts a journey from America to England and his past. While Galip in *The Black Book* (*BB*) looks for his missing wife Rüya in the streets of İstanbul and the stories of Jelal who also vanishes with Rüya, Osman in *NL* sets out on a quest for the meaning of life at the moments of "accident." The ontological quest will be traced in this chapter by following the use of overt and covert self-reflexive forms Fowles and Pamuk employ in their works while emphasizing the discrepancy between the original object and its reflection.

2.1 Physical Images

2.1.1 Mirrors and Mirror-like Reflectors

> …it wasn't for nothing that the word in our language for the stuff that turns glass into mirror is the same as the word "secret"...Reading is looking in the mirror; those who knew the "secret" behind the glass manage to go through the looking glass; and those who have no knowledge of letters will find nothing more in the world other than their own dull faces (*BB*, 337/309).

These lines in *BB* present the Self-reflexive state of the novel that denies its existence as "a realistic narrative of something outside itself" (Hutcheon 1980: 13). Only the reader who knows that the "secret" at the back of the mirror is not real but fiction can produce new meanings.

Connected with postmodern ontological questioning, all the main characters in Fowles's and Pamuk's novels suffer from identity crisis. They are all in the process of the exploration of self or of potential selves. This search for the self shows itself as the paradox of being one's self and at the same time being the other. Characters experience the difficulty of knowing the other and feel strange when they come face to face with this "otherness." As Lacan in "The Mirror Stage" reveals, characters misrecognize the entity they see in the mirror as the whole being, a "self," designated by the word "I".[44]

The characters in Fowles's and Pamuk's novels, in their quest for their personhood misidentify their "selves" with the reflected images they see - be they on physical or non-physical surfaces, as an "other" and since the "other" is never reachable (as Lacan puts it), they all suffer from the self/other dichotomy because signifiers in their unconscious form a chain of signifiers which constantly shift and circulate and never reach an end, or signified. Through the use of mirror and mirror-

---

[44] As seen before, in Lacan's view, the process of becoming an adult, a "self," is only an illusion, a misperception of the relation between body and self. Therefore, as in the quotation at the beginning of this section, the "secret" behind the glass, any reflecting surface - be it physical or non-physical, is only the "otherness" of the reflected reality, but not the reality.

like images as a step in achieving individual identity, both Fowles and Pamuk explore the theme of self-reflexivity as an ontological question of the present age.

2.1.1.1 Parody as a Reflecting Surface

Before passing on to the reported incidents of physical reflection, mirrors and reflecting surfaces in both writers' novels, it must be noted that Fowles and Pamuk use parody itself as a mirror in foregrounding the form rather than content while trying to stress the Self-reflexive state of their novels. This sort of self-reflexivity is only one sub - part of the whole worlds of both writers' novels, which are made up of embedded worlds reflecting each other endlessly. For instance, John Fowles in *FLW* parodies the Victorian norms and literature and attempts to shatter the reader's conventional moral and aesthetic expectations. He challenges moral assumptions by setting the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries against each other and destroys aesthetic assumptions with the three endings he offers for his novel. By using parody as an overt self-reflexive device, Fowles writes both with a realistic motivation and with an aesthetic motivation. In questioning the realist conventions, he does not dispense with them entirely. In the background there is the Victorian world. By unmasking the dead conventions and laying bare the literary devices in postmodern fiction, Fowles in *FLW* achieves a new and more inclusive whole and through this new synthetic whole, he teaches his readers that "reality" is illusory and can be altered because what he/she reads is fiction. It is true that language is representational, what it represents is a fictional "other" world. So the reader's task is not so easy. First he should realize that the text he reads is Self-reflexive, but at the same time centered on outward reality. However, this does not mean that the world of "reality" reflected in the fiction is the exact copy of the real world. They are similar but not identical. Therefore what is seen in the novel is not the reflection of *the* reality but of *a* "reality." Just like the characters, who misidentify their true selves

with the image they see in the mirror, the conventional reader expects fiction to imitate the real life.

Fowles questions Victorian morality and its literary conventions with the presentation of an alternative world - the world of the 20th century and alternative endings. By doing so, he tries to tell his readers about the need for freedom and emancipation. Charles Smithson, the protagonist of *FLW*, is led to recognition of what freedom demands by Sarah Woodruff, the social outcast of the title. Sarah's role in the novel is important in the sense that she is the character who demonstrates Fowles's ideas on freedom and fiction and, in a way she functions as a model for the readers to follow. With the fictional version of her life that she constructs, Sarah manages to alienate herself from the society she lives in. Being seen as a fallen woman - largely because of her own fiction - enables her to stand outside conventional Victorian society. She is a social outcast. This is parallel to what Fowles himself achieves through his fiction: exploiting the conventions of Victorian realism, Fowles stands outside the conventional Victorian world, which is the fictional world he constructs. Therefore, the reader should notice the ontological divide between the world of fiction and the world Fowles and he/she inhabits. Although these worlds overlap to some extent, they are not identical.

In *Magus* (*M*) Fowles places an art-world at the center of the fictional world he creates. As in the case of the Victorian realism in *FLW*, Bourani in *M* serves as the alternative universe to lay bare the postmodern view that the "reality" of fiction is primarily verbal. What Nicholas has to learn and learns at the end is the fact that there is a thin line between fact and fiction. In the godgame that Conchis plays, Conchis is the manipulator acting like some controlling deity. In *M*, the novel itself does not incorporate the level of a watching author or reader, although one of the messages of the novel - the "godgame" message, makes the reader aware that Nicholas is not only "watched" but also is created by another entity which, at the book level, must be the author "John Fowles." Therefore, Fowles's lesson for the reader is that like Nicholas, he/she, too should perceive "the fictional basis of

everything and … distinguish between different orders of fiction" (Waugh 1984: 112).

Not in *BB* or *NL*, but in *MNR*, Pamuk, like Fowles, uses parody as an overt self-reflexive frame. Pamuk provides a representation of the Eastern culture and archaic Turkish arts and language of the 20th century. He uses the art of miniature as a mirror for the art of writing and uses it also as a backgrounded norm to emphasize the problems of writing, attempting to underline the discrepancy between the reality (or the original object) and the world of fiction (or its reflection). That is why there are mirrors everywhere in the novel. Sometimes they are presented to harem women as gifts by Sultans (*MNR*, 438/384), sometimes the backs of mirrors are decorated just like "a plate," "a chest, or at times, the ceiling of a mansion or of a Bosphorus manor, or even, a wooden spoon" (*MNR*, 10/3). There is also the mirror used "to check the composition as well as mirror-making business" (*MNR*, 56/44). Miniaturists "sit for weeks in the darkness amid mirrors, in the dim light of an oil lamp" in order to "learn how to perceive the world like a blind man despite not truly being blind" (*MNR*, 97/81).

2.1.1.2 Mirrors

Both writers use mirror images in exploring the theme of quest for the self. In both writers' novels there are instances reported when characters see/watch themselves in the mirror. In *FLW*, on the way to face his "other," Charles sees and sometimes watches himself in the mirror. Sarah functions as his "other" and a means of watching himself from outside. Charles is conscious of his physical attraction. He likes to "integrate his good-looking face in the mirror" (*FLW*, 31- 2). He is delighted with what he sees: "He winked at himself in the mirror" being "plunged in affectionate contemplation of his features" seeing a face which, without "its formal outdoor mask" was "too innocent a face" (*FLW*, 45-6). The more he looks into the mirror, the better he sees himself and realizes the split in his mind:

> [he] then went into his bedroom and peered at his face in the
> mirror. But he knew only too well he was awake. He kept saying to
> himself, I must do something, I must act. And a kind of anger at
> his weakness swept over him - a wild determination to make some
> gesture that would show he was more than an ammonite stranded
> in a drought, that he could strike out against the dark clouds that
> enveloped him. He must talk to someone, he must lay bare his soul
> (*FLW*, 202).

Charles's paradox - being his "self" and at the same time being the "other" goes on:

> He still felt, as he had told Sarah, a stranger to himself; but now it
> was with a kind of awed pleasure that he stared at his face in the
> mirror (*FLW*, 357).

However, Charles becomes more aware of his duplicity:

> He caught sight of himself in a mirror; and the man in the mirror.
> Charles in another world, seemed the true self. The one in the
> room was what she said, an impostor; had always been, in his
> relations with Ernestina, an impostor, an observed other (*FLW*,
> 367).

Charles seems to have faced his "other." This awareness of the strife between the "I"
and the "other" is a step for Charles in becoming a more genuine being as a result of
which he will stop playing roles that substitute for true identity. Charles achieves
wholeness when he, too, exists in the "other world" that Sarah lives in. This world is
the fictional world Sarah creates to achieve freedom in order to get out of the
Victorian world. When he acts out his role in Sarah's text, that is helping Sarah get
rid of her virginity, and thus, in his turn, he comes to a self-recognition and be free
when he realizes that what seems to be real may not be real all the time. Actually this
is the lesson Fowles gives to his readers through Charles and Sarah.

Sarah also watches herself in the mirror. She is introduced to the reader as
more like "a figure from myth, than any proper fragment of the petty provincial day"
(*FLW*, 11). The mythical world she is a part of and her insistence on misleading
society about being a fallen woman deserving the label whore enable Sarah to stand
outside conventional Victorian society and gain a measure of freedom. However, her

virginity keeps her within the boundaries of the world of the fictional Victorian society. She is trapped within male ideology. She challenges and tries to change this. Since Sarah does not seem to fit into the pattern of what is expected from a young Victorian lady, she is twice dismissed from her work. The second time this happens, Sarah, too "went to her mirror, but did not look at herself":

> She slowly covered her face with her hands, and then very slowly raised her eyes from the fingers. What she saw she could not bear. Two moments later she was kneeling by her bed and weeping silently into the worn cover (*FLW*, 238).

What Sarah sees is the Sarah who is defeated and becomes the victim of the society, which inscribes her within a hierarchy of classes depriving her of equality and freedom to face the trials of the real world outside. This is not the only time that she avoids looking at mirrors, since mirrors remind her of her loneliness. While "confessing" to Charles her relationship with Varguennes, Sarah tells him that after her father's bankruptcy she had felt this solitude deeply:

> Ever since then I have suffered from the illusion that even things - mere chairs, tables, mirrors - conspire to increase my solitude (*FLW*, 167).

When Sarah goes to Exeter and takes up residence at Endicott's Family Hotel, there is a small mirror in her ill-furnished and ill-equipped room (*FLW*, 269). Although Sarah could not look at the mirror at Mrs Poulteney's, at the Hotel she looks into it:

> More staring this time...then she returned to the bed and arranged the scarf round the shoulders of the laid-out nightgown (*FLW*, 269).

She is more courageous this time because she is determined to lose that virginity which the Victorian society values so much. But having achieved this, since marriage to Charles would be a form of sexual possession, a potential denial of freedom, she turns down his proposal of marriage. By rebelling against all male discourse about

women which ends up with engulfment, Sarah, as the representative of Fowles's view on the need for resistance to fixed ideas, teaches Charles and also the reader what freedom demands.

Nicholas Urfe, the protagonist of *M*, is another character in a quest for his true self. Nicholas, too, starts a journey. On the surface, it is from England to Greece, but deep down it is his inner journey. There are scenes when Nicholas catches sight of his face in the mirror. He "stare[s] at himself in the mirror" (*M*, 241) or at the bar, while "waiting for the drinks," he "watch [es] [himself] in the mirror" and "give[s] [himself] the smallest wink" (*M*, 611) as if he has met somebody else. Just like the other characters, Nicholas, too feels estranged from himself. Sometimes he "cannot stand [his] own face in a mirror" (*M*, 569), since "[his] face was strange to [him]" (*M*, 492).

It is in *DM* that Fowles uses interior circularity of plot. This circularity is constructed on the frame of worlds within worlds at the center of which only the reality of the writing activity exists. The Daniel Martin of the title is a creatively sterile screenwriter who is already in his late forties and realizes the meaninglessness of his life. Although Daniel is older than the protagonists of the other novels under discussion, he, too only wants to know himself, "no one else" (*DM*, 20). On the surface Daniel, too starts a journey from America to his past - England. Yet its importance lies more in its being a mental journey than in its physical aspects. In order to be himself, at the start of his journey, he thinks that he must reject screenwriting and try a new medium, the novel.

Daniel Martin, just like Charles, Sarah, and Nicholas looks at mirrors in order to discover himself. His obsession with his self is rooted in his past to such a degree that Daniel's university nickname had been "Mr Specula Speculans," a man of infinitely mirrored face (*DM*, 72). His Old Oxford room had been famous for its "countless mirrors" (*DM*, 308) and masks (*DM*, 624). Daniel sees his love for mirrors as narcissism. However it seems to be more related with the difficulty he experiences in seeing himself as others see him. In order to watch himself from outside, he looked

at mirrors in his Oxford room. Just like Mr Specula Speculans, "who died of shock on accidentally looking into a mirror without its glass and thereby discovering a true figure of his talents in place of the exquisite lineaments of his face" (*DM*, 61), Daniel, too finds it hard to face his true self. While he lives in America, he decreases the number of mirrors to "a mirror or two" instead of "those ultimate[ly] lying mirrors" (*DM*, 131). It seems that the degree of his self-engrossment also decreases. However "those eternal mirrors" (*DM*, 453) will always be a part of Daniel's life, and "his own face in his mirrors" will always seem strange to him until he achieves "whole sight" (*DM*, 7). It is only when he achieves inner wholeness that he can express himself in writing a novel. For Daniel, collecting mirrors is a way of exploration of self; they are used as "surfaces before which he could make himself naked - or at any rate more naked than he could before other men - and see himself reflected" (*DM*, 269).

In Daniel's life women function as mirrors through which he can see his own split self. Just like the reflected visions of his self in mirrors, there are many women in his life who reflect his potential selves. The underlying reason behind this seems to be "his selfishness, his split subjectivity, and his inability to strike a balance between self and other" (Salami 1992: 182-3). Salami draws a parallel between Daniel's split self and a Lacanian or Freudian castration crisis (1992: 184). Salami sees this "other" as the representative of the father figure who castrates the son. Daniel's father is the typical follower of conventions, social values, rules, and Christianity. He is the embodiment of power and authority. When Dan is a child, he humiliates Dan in front of Margaret; when Dan is a youth, he puts an end to Dan's love affair with Nancy Reeds. This leads, in turn, to a desire in Daniel to kill his father and replace him in order to have the same masculine power and authority that has been "castrated" in him since childhood. As in his life, and as the other part of Oedipal complex, the lost mother forces Dan to go for mother substitutes on whom he can exercise his own power and authority as his father did to his mother. Bruce Woodcock indicates the same thing:

32

His form of vanity is to use women to reflect himself… All his relations with women are manipulative attempts to script them into the role of surrogates for the lost mother, to fulfill the deficiencies which Dan's masculine legacy forces on him for all its power (1984:131).

Daniel can achieve inner wholeness only when he learns to be more human and less selfish. It is only when Jane helps that Dan can examine his true self objectively. Jane's presence enables Dan to get rid of all his masks because Jane is the mirror, the other he has looked for all through his life. She is the real projection of his self.

Although there is no such instance in *MNR*, Galip in *BB*, and Osman in *NL* look at mirrors, like Charles Smithson and Sarah in *FLW*, Daniel Martin in *DM*, and Nicholas in *M*. They watch or observe themselves in mirrors as the first step in discovering their "true" selves. In *BB*, the main character Galip uses Rüya's disappearance as an excuse to search for Jelal. Galip, under the influence of Jelal, looks for the hidden meanings in life by plodding around İstanbul's labyrinthine late 20th century signs and ancient stories and ends up reading the lines on human faces. As Jale Parla states, his search for Rüya seems to be transformed into a search for the "other" or the "twin" (in Esen 1996: 104) and Pamuk traces this theme using a detective plot as a frame to be deconstructed. The first step in knowing one's self is to "look at" one's self. Otherwise one cannot see the discrepancy between what one seems to be and what one really is. Galip wants to look at himself in the mirror, but at the same time avoids it many times:

Although Galip felt like getting up to look at himself in the mirror, he kept on reading carefully (*BB*, 293/267).

He went into the bathroom to splash cold water on his face, hoping it would keep him awake, and somehow managed to keep himself from looking in the mirror (*BB*, 302/276).

33

> He flung the book down, ready to go into the bathroom for a good
> look in the mirror (*BB*, 305/279).

This evasion continues until Galip has sufficient courage to look at his appearance in a glass:

> For a moment, there in the hallway, he had imagined that he could
> go back and plant himself in front of the mirror again, switch the
> light on, and pull away that thin mask, removing it as if scratching
> a scab off a wound (*BB*, 308/282).

Galip, in his obscure literary and historical byways, quests for his self. Yet, in order to succed in his inner journey, he has to explore his self and his other potential selves. Looking in the mirror and facing the other shouldn't cause him "terror" (*BB*, 306/280), instead he should face his self in the mirror and read it because "Reading is looking in the mirror" (*BB*, 336/309). It is only when he reads his face, which is described as a "sallow paper inscribed with an ink that was sea-green" (*BB*, 318/291) that Galip becomes a writer. Reading is the first step for writing.

In the overt forms of self-reflexivity, the reader, too in reading and trying to make sense of the literary/fictional world, is asked to participate through language. In learning how to make sense of this literary world, he/she creates perhaps another fictional world but this time it is his/her own, and he/she becomes a part of a chain of embedded representations of the fictional author who is writing about an author and so on. The only reality is then the act of writing itself. Galip, the reader of faces, becomes Jelal, since "what was reading someone's work after all, but gradually acquiring the writer's memory" (*BB*, 306/280). As Barthes reveals in "The Death of the Author," with the birth of the reader Galip the author Jelal dies (*BB*, 415/381). Hence, Pamuk's message to his readers is that he writes postmodern fiction which reveals its fictionality overtly and that he needs a reader who will share the pleasure

of creation with himself, because he/the author is no longer the authority to decide on the meaning of the text any more.

In *NL* Osman, the youthful narrator, like Galip in *BB* experiences an inner conflict. He looks for a way of fulfilling his life. A book entitled "The New Life" presents him with a new life in its quasi-scriptural pages. Osman stops attending classes and devotes himself more and more to reading the book. As Galip who, like a detective, looks for Rüya and Jelal in the streets of İstanbul and in Jelal's meditative columns, Osman starts on a journey and goes after Rıfkı Hat, Nahit/Mehmet/Osman and Dr Mehmet, since they, too were influenced by the book. Analogous to a "labyrinth of mirrors" made up of "hundreds of pocket mirrors" which creates many visions, Osman is made up of many selves (*NL*, 88/88). Nahit/Mehmet/Osman, whom Osman traces are his potential selves, and his journey is his inner journey as a step towards self-recognition. The mirror image is used in Osman's case, again, as a means of knowing one's self or coming to one's self. In order to put an end to the restlessness in his soul, he has to achieve wholeness/oneness inside. This is possible only if he kills Mehmet, Janan's boyfriend, who is in many ways his other "self." The moment he sees his own reflection in a store window (*NL*, 184/198), Osman decides to kill Mehmet. Before the murder, he catches a glimpse of himself once more in a "rearview mirror on a bright and shiny bicycle parked on the sidewalk" (*NL*, 190/203):

> There I am, with my concealed gun, my new purple jacket, the
> Serkisof watch presented for Doctor Fine in the pocket, blue jeans
> on my legs, my clumsy hands, my fleeting strides…

Although he knows that "the accursed sinister voice inside [him], the black wolf, would snarl and accurse [him] of [his] guilt" (*NL*, 185/198), Osman kills Mehmet.

35

After the murder, he sees himself again, this time in the cracked mirror of a rest-stop washroom:

> [I] caught a glimpse of myself. No one would believe me if I said the person I saw in the mirror resembled the ghost of the assassinated more than he did the assassin (*NL*, 216/231).

This "cracked" mirror is symbolic because, as it happens, Mehmet was not murdered after all, but has disappeared, after having renamed himself Osman. Osman, the narrator, is not sure whether he really killed Mehmet: "But had I really managed to kill him?" (*NL*, 230/245) Perhaps he has, since Mehmet becomes Osman at the end. That is, the narrator/Osman becomes one with his other/Mehmet who is in strife with his self all the time. Killing him, one way or another, he puts an end to the split in his soul.

In the novels of both writers mirrors are also used as a way to express erotic desires or sexual urges besides their use as a means in achieving individual identity. Although in his other works (*The Collector* (1963), *Ebony Tower* (1973), and in *Mantissa* (1982)), Fowles uses them for erotic purposes, of the novels analyzed here, it is only in *FLW* and *DM* that Fowles employs mirrors for erotic purposes. Pamuk, on the other hand makes erotic use of mirrors in all the novels studied here. In *FLW* Ernestina's look in the mirror, like Shekure's in *MNR*, carries sexual overtones. While Ernestina's gaze in the mirror reflects a short-lasted conflict between her strong morality and her sexual intimations, which she sees as a taboo (*FLW*, 34), Shekure's gaze in the mirror functions as a foreshadowing of her sexual attraction to and secret meeting with Black (*MNR*, 169/146). Jenny, one of the women in Daniel's life in *DM*, like Ernestina and Shekure, watches her body, naked in the mirror, and feels strange at a moment of both emotional and sexual excitement (*DM*, 47). Galip in *BB* and Osman in *NL* both look in the mirror under the influence of their sexual desires. Galip fantasizes about being an actor in his dreams and kisses his own reflection in the mirror (*BB*, 132/119), while Osman needs to check his face in the

mirror after Janan's kiss on his lips (*NL*, 27/23). Galip and the B-girl, who imitates an actress in a film, have sex seeing their own selves "as if watching a third person together" (*BB*, 143/129). In a story told by one of the other B-girls in the house, a mirror is used to watch others flirting. The Storyteller in *MNR* too looks in the mirror. Yet his experience is different in the sense that he is torn between his masculine and feminine sides and is helpless in this dilemma. He experiments with becoming a woman, deciding that "if [he] did what they did, ate what they ate, said what they said, imitated their behavior and, … if [he] wore their clothes;" he would start to know women (*MNR*, 402/353). When he does all these, he stares at himself in the mirror. The reflection of such an extraordinarily beautiful woman amazes him and as a result "[his] [own] manliness, which took note of this fact … was erect" (*MNR*, 403/354). There is a similar deviant sexual overtone when Butterfly is on Black's body. Reminding one of the famous preachers of the time who preferred handsome boys to women, even to their wives, Butterfly wants Black to catch that scene in the mirror and imagines "how [his] wife [sees] [them] from the other room in the light cast by the coffeehouse's oil lamp resting on the floor only a short distance away" (*MNR*, 413/362).

There are also times when characters look in mirrors to observe others who are in many ways their doubles. Such instances take place in *M* and *DM* and in *BB* and *NL* only. Nicholas in *M* sees the reflection of the real Lily de Seitas in the mirror (*M*, 605-6). She is not Nicholas's other; she is the last link in the godgame prepared for him in reaching self-awareness. In *DM*, Daniel and Jane, the woman who complements him the most, and whose presence enables him to step outside of himself and examine himself objectively, gaze at each other in the driving mirror (*DM*, 646). While in *BB* it is Galip who watches his wife Rüya at her vanity mirror "becom[ing] three, five, nine, seventeen, and thirty-three Rüyas" (*BB*, 383/353), in *NL* it is Osman who catches a glimpse of "Janan's shimmering reflection in the mirror on the console" (*NL*, 151/160).

All these mirrored characters look at their reflections to see themselves, their "others," and the others as their potential selves. Fowles's interest in the didactic aspects of the novel leads him to avoid plot self-reflexivity, even if there are a few tricks of this nature in *DM*. Pamuk, on the other hand, insists on interior circularity of plot. There are an extraordinarily large number of incidents of self-reflexivity where characters read books and are transformed into each other breaking the hierarchy of discourses, setting out on journeys for the "truth" of the mystery. Pamuk's use of the detective story as a form of covert self-reflexivity enables him to structuralize and/or actualize self-reflexivity. With the writing/artist characters at the center of his fictional world, Pamuk implicitly tells his readers to acknowledge the text's fictionality and his new role in its reconstruction. Although Fowles uses plot self-reflexivity rarely when he is compared with Pamuk, they both use parody as an overt self-reflexive strategy while at the same time projecting the age's concern about the ontological problem – the question of "I"dentity.

2.1.2 Other Physical Devices of Self-reflection

In both Fowles and Pamuk's novels paintings, drawings, pictures-art in general-function as a reflection of reality. In *FLW*, there are paintings, drawings, artists, and poets. Sarah, at the end of the novel, is seen as the assistant to Dante Gabriel Rossetti and lives in his house, which "seems[s] more an art gallery" (*FLW*, 421). The house looks like an artist's studio:

> On a table near the door lay a litter of drawings; on an easel a
> barely begun oil, the mere groundlines, a hint of a young woman
> looking sadly down, foliage sketched faint behind her head; other
> turned canvases by the wall; by another wall, a row of hooks, from
> which hung a multi-coloured array of female dresses, scarves,
> shawls; a large pottery jar; tables of impedimenta - tubes, brushes,
> colour-pots ... small sculptures, an urn with bulrushes (*FLW*, 425).

Rossetti himself is also a poet and lives with his brother (an art critic), and his sister "the poetess Miss Christina Rossetti" (*FLW*, 426, 435). Sarah can also be considered as an actress and an artistically creative character in her fictionalized life story she tells everybody about Varguennes and herself. As Cooper reveals, "Sarah does in some ways function as the magus-figure" (Cooper 1991: 111) manipulating Charles to play the part that she chooses in the text she creates.

In *M*, on the other hand, Nicholas, in Pamela Cooper's words Charles's "double," (1991: 110-111) in the role of interpreter, writes poems (*M*, 57) as well as reads them. Someone leaves "one of the commonest paperback anthologies of modern English verse" (*M*, 68-9) on the beach for him to find. Conchis, on the other hand, is the artist figure in *M*. Nicholas is surprised to see Conchis's collection of art in his house including "books lined three walls,…a life-size reproduction of a Modigliani, a fine portrait of a somber woman in black against a glaucus background (*M*, 92), "the bronze of a young man," "a maquette by Rodin," "the other characteristically skeletal bronze" by Giacometti (*M*, 93), "two paintings: both nudes, girls in sunlit interiors"(*M*, 97). Conchis continually organizes games for Nicholas. He tells Nicholas to read a pamphlet by Robert Foulkes. Having read it, Nicholas finds himself in the world of Foulkes when he sees a man costumed in the 17th century style staring at him from across a ravine (*M*, 140-1). Conchis arranges theatre acts for Nicholas. Lily of the story Conchis tells becomes real followed by the play of harpsichord. A young girl dressed in Edwardian clothes accompanying Conchis as Lily (*M*, 155) starts speaking as "in a drawing room" of 1900s (*M*, 169). Nicholas, while trying to give meaning to this girl pretending to belong to the Edwardian period, with the blow of the horn and the beam of light as in the theatre, finds himself being presented with another play within the play in which Apollo, an absolutely naked man, Lily's brother as she tells, a naked girl and another man, a satyr with a woman in long saffron chiton, and a goddess appear (*M*, 180-4). On the way back to school Nicholas is stopped by a group of soldiers in Nazi uniforms (*M*, 372, 378-

382), which was also one of the games Conchis arranges for Nicholas. June and Julie, as Conchis tells, are twin sisters and are actresses, whom he hired for a theatrical experiment (*M*, 224-229). They all are the part of the godgame Conchis organizes for Nicholas on the way to reach maturity. The typescript of a story left for Nicholas by Conchis about a prince who learns to be a magician by accepting that there are metaphorical meanings in life, and that he should learn to differentiate between the reality and illusion can also be considered as a part of Conchis's godgame reflecting the distinctness between reality and fiction (*M*, 550).

In *DM*, Daniel is a script - writer[45] who has once been a successful playwright but later entered the film world. Daniel's new goal in life is writing a novel. His girl friend Jenny is an actress, but also becomes an author while contributing to Daniel's novel. She makes three contributions towards Daniel's novel – "An Unbiased View" (*DM*, 37-50), "A Second Contribution" (*DM*, 261-267), and "A Third Contribution" (*DM*, 480-495). On the whole, *DM* itself is the novel Daniel plans to write as a means to put an end to his inner strife in achieving a wholeness inside. Fowles's use of "the famous late Rembrandt self-portrait" (*DM*, 702) at the end of the novel to teach Daniel "the ultimate citadel of humanism. No true compassion without will, no true will without compassion" and that he has to continue to choose and learn to feel and consequently write his novel and reach a unified self at the end, is also related with this issue of the distinctness of the reality and the fiction (*DM*, 703).

In Pamuk's novels, especially in *BB*, and also in *MNR*, mirror and painting or original and copy have different effects on the spectators and this discrepancy between original and copy, reminding one of the relationship between the text and the reader, surprises but at the same time disappoints them.

---

[45] In *The Collector*, both Frederick Clegg and Miranda Grey keep diaries. Clegg collects butterflies. He is obsessed with Miranda and wants to possess her as he does the butterflies. The first and third sections are Clegg's diary, while the second section is Miranda's. In *The Ebony Tower*, on the other hand, David Williams is an art critic and a painter like William Breasley. Two young art students, Diana and Anne live in William's house as well. Therefore, Fowles uses art within his novels to stress the blurring between the world of fiction and reality.

In *BB*, the reflection of a reflection is best illustrated in "Mysterious Paintings." The famous Beyoğlu master, owner of a pleasure palace, decides to have "scenes of İstanbul painted on the walls of his establishment's spacious lobby" (*BB*, 375/345). Since academic painters turn his proposal down, the mobster hires two artisans who both claim to be the better craftsman. A contest has been organized for the "Best Painting of İstanbul" "offering the two ambitious contestants opposite walls in the lobby of his pleasure palace" (*BB*, 376/346).

The artist who had installed the mirror wins the prize:

> the guests beheld a splendid view of İstanbul on one wall and on the wall directly opposite it a mirror that made the painting, in the light of the silver candelabras, appear even finer, more brilliant, and more attractive than the original (*BB*, 376/346).

The difference between the painting and its reflection on the mirror gives different delights to the customers. However, this is only a trick of the mirror, since "the fountain was in fact dry" (*BB*, 376/347). The women who work in the palace use the difference between paintings and their reflections as a way of making personality analyses for their clients. The police chief, who pays frequent visits to the brothel, "came face to face in the mirror with a shady looking baldheaded fellow who was depicted toting a gun in a dark alley" (*BB*, 377/347). That is when the police chief realizes that this was the infamous "Şişli Square Murder" and the artist of this painting should know the mystery of the murder. On another occasion, the son of a lord baron [sic] sees in the mirror the image of "a good homemaker who wove rugs in her home in the slums" and realizes that he is mistaken about the love of his life. "Yet when he turned to the painting, he was only "confronted by one of those sad colorless girls who inhabit his father's villages" (*BB*, 377/348). The mirror on the wall that reflects the painting in fact disappoints the police chief when he learns that "the colossal mirror had come down on the rowdies and broken into smithereens,"

41

since now he "could neither apprehend the perpetrator of the murder nor discover the secret of the mirror" (*BB*, 379/349). In *MNR*, the Murderer experiences something similar when he draws his own portrait "in the center of [the painting's] world, where [his] Sultan should've been" (*MNR*, 453/398) and cannot catch a good resemblance at the end because there is a discrepancy between what he sees in the mirror and what he draws (*MNR*, 325/283).

For Pamuk, as in the case of *BB* itself, the boundary between fact/original object and fiction/its reflection is not clear:

> A black book the artist had prankishly stuck into the hand of a blind beggar turned into a two-part book in the mirror, a book with two meanings and two stories; yet, looking at the painting, one realized the book was of uniform consistency and that its mystery was lost in itself (*BB*, 378/348).

It is true that *BB* is a two-part book made up of both Jelal's columns and Galip's texts reflecting each other endlessly. When the contrastive relation between mirror and painting is remembered, the same problematic can be observed in the Galip and Jelal relationship. Jelal is the writer and Galip discovers his true self when he becomes someone else - Jelal. Therefore, Galip is a copy/an imitation of Jelal. However, the reality of Jelal is debatable also. He never appears in the book except at the death scene at the end. He exists only in his columns, which are never explicitly attributed to him. In Galip's case, Jelal is not a stranger. Galip knows him as a person as well as a writer in his texts. If Galip finds his identity when he becomes Jelal, this does not mean that he is an imitation of Jelal, but instead he explores the potential writer in himself and solves his identity problem by becoming a synthesis of Galip and Jelal. Therefore it should be noted that the other, or the reflection, is always preferred. In the case of the mirror contest, it is the copy of the copy. Pamuk blurs the

divide between art and life. Contrary to Pamuk, there is a distinction between art and life. Art imitates life, but the imitated is not identical with the imitation and this leads to infinite possibilities of meanings for each reader.

In summary, both in Fowles's and Pamuk's novels-more frequently in Pamuk's than in Fowles's-characters see/watch themselves in mirrors, and all these glances, all these mirrors and entities, like art which act as mirrors, serve as one thing: the search for individual identity. Deep down all these characters go through an inner turmoil in the process of becoming. However, as Pamuk reveals through Stork in *MNR*:

> An artist's skill depends on carefully attending to the beauty of the present moment, taking everything down to the minutest detail seriously while, at the same time, stepping back from the world, which takes itself too seriously, and as if looking into a mirror, allowing for the distance and eloquence of a jest (*MNR*, 420/368).

So, just as mirrors reflect characters, fiction/art reflects the real world - the world of the writer/reader - but only to an extent.

2.2 Non-Physical Images

"The heterocosm theme and the mimetic theme are mutually dependent and mutually implicating" (McHale 1987: 28). That means postmodern fiction reflects reality, but it is the reflected reality in the fictional heterocosm. While in the first section of this chapter the difference between fiction and reality is traced through the mirror image in the novels under discussion, in this section it is analyzed through the use of dreams, fantasies, the "eye," "shadow," "ghost" motives as well as the image

43

of characters' watching themselves from outside or having the sense of being watched.

2.2.1 Dreams

While in the overt self-reflective texts, the reader is directly told that the referents of the text's language do not correspond to his experience or to the empirical world, in covert self-reflexive fiction, the fictiveness of the referents is absolute. There is a confrontation between the "real" and the "fictional," that is, the "possible" and the "impossible," the world and the other world, and the reader creates his/her own literary construct or novelistic universe. The complex interrelation of dream and reality, fact and fiction is employed as a model in postmodern fiction for the structuration of the ontological level. There are many reported incidents of characters dreaming and seeing themselves in their dreams. In stressing the fictionality of the text, the dreamlike quality of experiences and characters' inability to speak as if in a dream or a state between dreaming and wakefulness are emphasized to serve as some internalized structuring devices to emphasize the ontological levels.

In *FLW*, there is Sam's dream of becoming a rich man. He is Charles's servant, and when his dream comes true, he becomes the representative of the middle classes since - in contrast to Charles who refuses to evolve, thinking that he is already at the top of the social ladder - Sam emerges as a surviving, evolving power, and becomes a tradesman. His dream seems to reflect his future position:

> He loved Mary for herself, as any normal young man in his healthy physical senses would; but he also loved her for the part she played in his dreams - which was not at all the sort of part girls play in young men's dreams in our own uninhibited, and unimaginative, age. Most often he saw her prettily caged behind the counter of a gentleman's shop. From all over London, as if magnetized, distinguished male customers homed on that seductive

> face. The street outside was black with their top hats, deafened by the wheels of their carriages and hansoms. A kind of magical samovar, whose top was administered by Mary, dispensed an endless flow of gloves, scarves, stocks, hats, gaiters, Oxonians (a kind of shoe then in vogue), and collars – Piccadilly's, Shakspere's, Dog-collar's, Dux's - Sam had a fixation on collars, I am not sure it wasn't a fetish, for he certainly saw Mary putting them round her small white neck before each admiring duke and lord. During this charming scene Sam himself was at the till, the recipient of the return golden shower (*FLW*, 204).

Fowles's motto in life and literature seems to question some of the limitations and rules both in the society and the traditional narrative. In his view, there is a common tendency in society to evaluate things according to established systems/codes, and this "collector consciousness" should be left aside (Tarbox 1988, 5). However, Sam still imagines himself serving the upper class. The class opposition and social inequality between servants and masters in the Victorian age seems to continue because Sam's rise in the social ladder can only be considered as a crack in the hierarchy of classes.

Fowles's use of dreams to differentiate between the real and the fictional world is seen mostly in *M*. *M* itself as a whole is based on a dream-like adventure prepared for Nicholas. In *M*, Conchis's story about his first arrival at the house in the island carries some dreamlike overtones, and Nicholas and Conchis's experiences seem to overlap at this point (*M*, 108). The world on the island itself is "like a dream" (*M*, 139). Conchis continuously organizes scenes in which Nicholas unwittingly participates. In time, art and life become indistinguishable for Nicholas (*M*, 157). Not only in the island but also in London there is something dreamlike in the air (*M*, 646). The godgame that Conchis plays shocks Nicholas so much that he sometimes thinks it is all a dream (*M*, 356, 362).

Apart from Sam's dream of getting rich and rising in the social ladder as a member of the newly emerged middle class, and the dreamlike life in Bourani in *M*, and Charles's (*FLW*, 388) and Cochis's (*M*, 116) daydreams, in *DM* Fowles dwells on the ambiguity between these two realms. The relevant parts of the novel here are those relating to Daniel and Jenny's relationship, which Jenny describes as a dream, and Jenny's contributions to Daniel's novel. Whether what Jenny writes is real or fiction cannot be known, because while Jenny is a character in Daniel's fictional world, Daniel and the world he constructs constitute the fictional world of Fowles. Daniel's narcissism as an artist is expressed in terms of dreams, too. At the end of the chapter "Beyond the Door," the third person narrator comments on Daniel as an artist. In the narrator's view, Daniel's life should be: "I create, I am: all the rest is a dream" (DM, 236). Where writers and painters are concerned, Fowles seems to be saying that creating is the only way of being themselves. That is why art is what matters for artists: anything else is just a dream.

Differently from Fowles, Pamuk seems keener on using dreams as a covert self-reflexive device. In *BB*, besides the dreams of Grandpa (*BB*, 15/7), Rüya's ex-husband (*BB*, 126/113), the executioner (*BB*, 279/254, 275/250-1), and the misconstrual of Jelal's dream by one of his ardent readers (*BB*, 174/156-7), there are Galip and Jelal's dreams which revolve around the same motif of to be or not to be one's self. To start with Rüya, for whom Galip searches, the meaning of the name should be noted first. It means both "dream" and something untouchable, unattainable. All through the book she is elusive, and her absence torments Galip with a sense of her unattainability and of his shortcomings. She appears physically only once in the first pages of the novel, but this too turns out to have been an illusion:

> Rüya's chin was buried in the down pillow. In the curve of her brow there was something surreal that brought on anxious curiosity about the wondrous events that took place inside her head (*BB*, 11/3).

The importance of Rüya and what she stands for in Galip's life is reinforced in Galip's dreams. The beautiful girl with blue hair he dreams of when he was a schoolboy (*BB*, 19/11) is nobody but his wife Rüya. With Rüya's disappearance, Galip loses his belief that once "their dreams were indeed tangled together" (*BB*, 157/142). This "deficiency in his dreams" influences his writing in a negative way. Galip finds the solution in "imagining his old self" (*BB*, 158/143):

> the self that did not share his bed with anyone, whose dreams were not entangled in any beautiful woman's dreams (*BB*, 158/143).

The result is success and he finds himself at ease in writing again. He replaces his dream of his "silent and mysterious wife" with that of his stories. Instead of his wife, he sleeps next to "his desk and his papers" and writes stories "that seemed to be the continuation of his dreams" (*BB*, 158-9/143). With her dreamlike nature Rüya is a kind of muse for Galip. For this reason the story of Galip's search for Rüya turns into the story of the productivity of a writer at the end. With the disappearance of his wife, Galip loses his dreams. With this loss he becomes a blocked writer. However if he feels secure, it seems he will receive the "Muse," i.e. Rüya and his lost dreams/memories with a warm welcome and will solve the dilemma that he is torn between the "real" and the "other." Although some descriptions of Rüya are given towards the end of the novel, whether she is real or an illusion remains uncertain. She

is more like a mystical romance character and is always mentioned as "beautiful" Rüya. Galip is attracted to Rüya as the personification of mystery. The nearer Galip gets to his goal, the less real Rüya becomes. In order to reach his dream, Galip needs this image. Rüya is, in fact, only the cause of his quest to become Jelal i.e. to become his true self. In his quest for Rüya, Galip begins to question his idealization of Jelal who has also gone, and ultimately recalls the fact that his own identity was shattered long before his wife Rüya's disappearance. This explains Galip's view that he can be himself if only he becomes Jelal. The sentence Galip wrote for Jelal's column is "I dreamed that I had finally become the person I wanted to be all these years" (*BB*, 310/284). What Galip does not know is that Jelal, too is indeed not himself but the "other." In Jelal's view:

> No one can ever be himself in this land! In the land of the defeated and oppressed, to be is to be someone else. I am someone else; therefore, I am. All right, so what if the person with whom I want to trade places happens to be someone else? (*BB*, 369/339)

> the crucial thing [is] not 'creating' something new but taking something astonishingly wonderful that had been worked on by thousands of intellects over thousands of years, elegantly changing it here and there, and transforming it into something new" (*BB*, 249/226).

In postmodern works it is pointless to look for anything authentic because everything is constructed. That is why Jelal declares that he cannot be himself in the "land" of fiction, but an imitation of some other character in another novel.

This interrelation between dream and reality, fact and fiction can also be observed in the chapter called "Master Bedii's Children" (*BB*, 62/52). There, our attention is drawn to the concept of the "real" and the "false." Mannequins are

regarded as the real, not the copy and the reason lying behind this is that nobody wants to see himself as he is in reality. As Akerson states, "with a strong *volte face*, the text or the artwork becomes the real and the real people in life become the copies of different images." Since the real people cannot be pleased with what they are, they tend to imitate other copies and finally become the copies of the copies (in Esen 1992: 65). In Galip and Jelal's case, it may be thought that the triumph of Galip, whose name stands for victor, as a storyteller is cut short by news of Jelal and Rüya's deaths. However, as in the case of Rüya, Jelal does not exist in the novel, there are only his newspaper columns. He has a name, which indicates glory, greatness. Jelal represents the productivity, the process of writing. When his texts come to an end, he too disappears. The death scene of Jelal is functional in this sense. He is not the representative of the "text," but he himself is a text. In the final section, we see the melting of reality and illusion/dream for the last time. Since the "I," that is Galip, merges with the "I," the narrator, as they speak together, "We remember Rüya" (*BB*, 436/400): Galip becomes one with the narrator and recalls Rüya that is his dead wife. Jelal dies but the "text" does not die. It is the death of the author. Yet, the text goes on to another page through Galip, or the reader, who becomes victorious by becoming Jelal, or the writer.

The same complex interrelation between dream and reality, fact and fiction can be observed in *NL*. There, as Yıldız Ecevit remarks, Pamuk underlines this differentiation between these two worlds by using motifs such as book, journey, new life, angel/Janan, death, love, railway/train, and watch, all of which have multiple meanings (1996: 64-75). They all belong both to this world and the other world. In *NL*, Osman stops attending classes and devotes himself to reading the book. In order to wander "in the light that surged from the book" (*NL*, 9/5), he concludes that everything he has ever known, done, or been must be abandoned. He identifies himself with this book and sets out on a quest for the meaning of life, where life and death intersect at moments of "accident." The book he goes after is the book in which he finds his life story written by Rıfkı Hat. One learns later that the title of this book,

49

The New Life, is also the title of the very book one is reading. Mehmet "carries the book inside him" (*NL*, 69/68). Osman reads the book "turning the pages … [while] [his] whole life was changing as [he] read the new words on each new page" (*NL*, 7/3). In time, life in the book and the book in life become lost in each other. In order to find the meaning of life, Osman sets out on journeys. Osman's journeys are the reader's journeys in reading *NL*. Osman is confused about the ontological level because dreams and the dreamlike quality of the representations in the book he reads are indistinct from the real. Through Osman, and his use of dreams as a covert self-reflexive device, Pamuk implicitly forces his readers not to identify themselves with the world of the novel and to realize that what they read is a "dream"- an illusion/fiction.

Instances of dreams and characters' dreamlike experiences abound in *NL*. First of all, the narrator asserts his own preoccupations on moments of accident where life and death intersect:

> the pasty-faced high school kid dozing in his seat up front is not
> dreaming of kissing his sweetheart but of the forceful impact when
> he kisses the windshield with passion and vehemence (*NL*, 57/54).

Osman's quest for the new life has got a dreamlike quality. His journeys remind one of the Prince's attempts in *BB* to reach a "silence" inside. Osman looks for the meaning of life in fatal bus accidents i.e. in death. To see the souls' agony "talking to beauties in their nightmares" or their happiness in getting ready to arrive at "their dreams of paradise" seem to be what matters for Osman (*NL*, 61/58). Death, in these examples, is not physical death, what is seen in the physical deaths of Rıfkı Hat, Mehmet, Osman's mother, and the people on the buses. It does not mean an end but stands for a new life as in the title.

If one recalls Derrida's theory which is based on the idea that there is a chain of signifiers never reaching any signified, one finds it easier to understand the new

life as in the title of the book, and a new life assumed to be found after death, as nothing but dreams. In order to stress this point, when compared with that of Fowles's, Pamuk's use of dreams is plentiful. Pamuk combines dreams with that of the erotic. That is why there are many instances when Osman in his quest for the new life, with his "traveling companion" Janan, whose name means beloved (*NL*, 67/65), dreams of making love with her, as he had dreamt with the other seatmates he had traveled with in other journeys (*NL*, 58/56). Osman desires to tell Janan about what he dreamt (*NL*, 75/74). Although he strongly desires to touch her beautiful legs, he remembers that he must not because "[he] could hear immediately behind [him] the girl of [his] dreams breathe as she slept dreaming of someone else" (*NL*, 97/99). Although Osman dreams of Janan; Janan dreams of Mehmet - her boyfriend. It is when Janan tells Osman that "[Mehmet] understood that he must abandon his past totally if he was to become a totally new being" that Osman again starts dreaming:

> I would catch myself dreaming of the mother I had left behind, my room, my things, my bed; and feeling insidiously rational and commensurably guilty, I would construct fantasies of joining together what was in my dreams with Janan's dreams of the new life (*NL*, 76/75).

In this circle of embedded worlds within worlds, at the center there is the world/text of Janan with Mehmet, this world is surrounded by the world of Osman who travels with and dreams of Janan, and outside these two worlds the real world where both the writer/Pamuk and the reader exist surrounds all.

In *MNR*, the boundary between fact and fiction is transgressed mostly by the appearance of dead people. They relate their moments of death, as if they were alive. The Corpse speaks in the first chapter. It is the corpse of Master Elegant Effendi. His body is at the bottom of a well and his head, which the murderer smashed with a stone, is crushed. He describes the moment of death as a dream (*MNR*, 11/5). Enishte

Effendi, on the other hand, gives brief information about his state in limbo. He waits there for "the other souls who'd died over the last tens of thousands of years until the Day of Judgment" for the final decision to be given about them *(MNR,* 268/231). Enishte Effendi draws a parallel between his "point of view" above where the birds gather, and perspective in painting or writing. Just like an artist who draws or writes, Enishte Effendi is omniscient. He sees both the past and present simultaneously since he is a soul without a body, and he reaches a self-recognition there above. Where he is, is "the splendid garden in the distance that [he]'d dreamed about once twenty-one years ago, which [he] pray[s] Allah will one day confirm, is Heaven" *(MNR,* 268/231). It seems Enishte Effendi realizes there that one has to be a soul without a body in Heaven, but a body without soul in life. If one takes Enishte Effendi as the representative of artists/writers, he is omniscient and creates/writes not diachronic but synchronic narrative/art and, since he places himself on an ontological level superior to that of the fictional world he creates, he is in "heaven" and is a soul without a body. However, the narrator/implied author/character is a part of the fictional world, for this reason: he/she is a body without soul in the fictional world.

Besides the dreamlike experiences of dead people, which are found only in Pamuk's *MNR,* there are also the main characters' dreams, which reflect their present psychology. For instance, Shekure, whose husband is lost in the war, sees her husband in her dreams: "At times in my dreams, my husband in his agony shows his to me" *(MNR,* 161/139). However, Shekure well knows that Hasan, who is "curious about everything having to do with [her]" since he, too is in love with her, would know that "[she]'d seen [her] husband's corpse in a dream" *(MNR,* 163/140). It is true that she "dreamed of him fleetingly, and there was also a corpse, but was he the corpse? This was a mystery to [her]" *(MNR,* 164/141). Shekure, for years, waits for her husband who hasn't come back from the war. It may be for this reason she has restless dreams in which she sees "strange creatures and women whose arms and legs had been severed and randomly reattached" *(MNR,* 462/405). Her dreams reflect her own position in life - a woman who lost a limb/husband and has another husband

reattached. Apart from the nightmares she sees, Shekure has some happy dreams, too (*MNR*, 462/405). It is obvious that Shekure's nightmare is her husband's death whereas his coming back home is the happy dream she longs for. The husband of her dreams who comes from the fighting in search of the murderer of Enishte Effendi happens to be Black who is Shekure's cousin, and Shekure is Black's chilhood love.

Pamuk elaborates much more on the interconnection between dream and reality than Fowles. Pamuk elaborates on this function of dreams to emphasize the dream-like quality of "reality" in his books. In *BB*, *NL*, and *MNR* characters do not daydream like Charles and Conchis, but they are in a state between dream and wakefulness (*BB*, 415/381, 346/317, *NL*, 49/45, *MNR*, 13/6). Pamuk gives some scenes when the characters experience speechlessness as in a dream (*BB*, 297/271, *NL*, 14/10, *MNR*, 200/173, *MNR*, 336/292, *MNR*, 374/327, *MNR*, 442/387). Besides characters' experience of speechlessness, a merging of the concrete and the abstract levels of meanings can be traced in all the books. In *BB*, there is a dreamlike quality about many scenes. The waiter's experience in the movie played at the "Rüya (which means "dream") Theatre," for instance, is that he sees "dreamlike substitutions" of his face and his hands making him believe that "one was someone else, or that someone else was oneself" (*BB*, 165/149); and there is the reflection of the executioner's guilty conscience which makes him hear the sobbing of the head in the sack in the speechlessness of the trees, the shadows, and the rocks (*BB*, 277/252-3). There is also a dreamlike quality in Galip's helplessness at the Heart-of-the-city Apartments in his first attempt to be his real self, and in the state of peace he achieves having reached the secret of being, in reading the faces of anyone he sees in his journey in İstanbul (*BB*, 322/296).

More outstanding are the experiences of Saim and that of Galip when he sees Jelal among the mannequins of Master Bedii. Saim, Rüya's ex-husband, tells Galip that he is conscious of the complex interrelation between dream and reality in all texts and literature. When he was married to Rüya, he, too became a part of the great conspiracy of the West. He stresses the bad influence of Western movies leading to

the loss of identity. He also knows that the whole society seeks "someone else's dream" (*BB*, 81-2/71). The solution to the problem of identity is not to become other than one's self, but to be one's real self. What Saim fails to understand is that he too lives in a dream world because he is a character in *BB* and "everything that's written, everything in the authoritative texts, alludes not to life but, simply by virtue of having been written, alludes to some dream" (*BB*, 82/71). There is something dreamlike in Galip's mind (*BB*, 206/187) when he sees Jelal among the mannequins of Master Bedii; Galip sees Jelal still wearing the raincoat in which he was "going around Nişantaşı like a ghost" (*BB*, 204/185). This was a feeling that "the solution to the secret he had been blindingly searching for all these years … [was] at hand" (*BB*, 206/187). Galip solves the secret in the faces of people he meets on the roads: the only way to survive seems to be to dream. However, it still is not the solution because it leads to the loss of social identity with the excellence of mystery over authenticity/reality. In the examples of Saim's experience and the mannequins themselves, dream and reality are interconnected but they are not presented as contrastive. As Gregor Vetter reveals, the Turkish culture of Master Bedii a hundred years ago may be seen as unreal today (in Esen 1996: 96). Therefore, the reality, which nearly all the characters go after may not exist any more, but instead it takes its place in their collective unconscious like a dream. In *MNR*, Shekure (*MNR*, 246/212), Black (*MNR*, 259/224), and Enishte Effendi (*MNR*, 265/229) experience this ambiguity between dream and reality.

All these dreams characters see and the dreamlike experiences they go through point out one thing – "reality," as the characters and perhaps readers experience it, is no more than a dream. Fowles does not use dreams as a kind of self-reflexivity to anything like the extent that Pamuk does. This may be because his aim is to be didactic in his novels. Fowles creates a fictional world as Pamuk does in his works. He invites his readers to use what they read in his works as a means of a guide in real life. Fowles admits the existence of the external reality. Pamuk, on the other hand, who openly declares that he writes postmodern fiction, makes good use of this device

54

because for him there is no other reality than the reality of the fictional world. Fowles reasserts a difference between "reality" and fiction whereas Pamuk breaks down the perceived boundaries between the two.

2.2.2 Fantasies

> When we decide that something is unreal, the real it isn't need not itself be very real, indeed, can just as well be a dramatization of events themselves - or a rehearsal of the dramatization, or a painting of the rehearsal or a reproduction of the painting. Any of these latter can serve as the original of which something is a mere mock-up, leading one to think that which is sovereign is relationship - not substance (Goffman 1974: 560-1).

As Erving Goffman argues, there is no simple dichotomy of reality and fiction and postmodern fiction underlines these intermixed "frames." Fantasy serves as model in postmodern fiction to point out the "imaginative leaps in time and space required in the reading of any fictional work" (Hutcheon 1980: 81) and "as a human psychological impulse, [it] is the source of the inventive energy that created man's earliest myths as well as his most self-conscious modern art" (Frye 1963: 31). Fantasy represents a parallel to the reality or the conventions of realism. Therefore, just like dreams, fantasy uses certain realistic conventions in creating its own reality and as a form of covert self-reflexivity; it blurs the ontological level between reality and fiction. Both Fowles and Pamuk with all the fantasies of their characters seem to dwell on the theme of the quest for "self" - the otherness of the other. They practice this idea of otherness through their works – the otherness of their own selves and their own world with that of the fictional world they create as well. Therefore, for Lacan "I"dentity itself is a fantasy since human beings have a tendency to identify themselves with an external image not knowing that it is not an internal sense of a

unified whole. Fowles and, especially, Pamuk, by employing fantasy as a covert self-reflexive strategy aim to reflect the otherness of the other in search for the self.

Charles's dream of Sarah beside him in *FLW* is a parallel to Galip (*BB*, 56/46, 105/93, 384/354), Osman (*NL*, 37-8/33, 42/38, 43/39, 56/53, 181/193), and Black's dreams (*MNR*, 13/6, 170/147, 339/295, 341/297). Sarah complements Charles like the other women in the above-mentioned protagonists' lives. She mirrors the "other" in Charles (*FLW*, 410). In *M*, it is Nicholas who imagines his "other" (*M*, 111). Nicholas's identity quest, his desire to fulfill his life can also be traced in his fantasies: He imagines himself abroad "in Madrid, in Rome, or Marseilles or Barcelona ... even Lisbon" (*M*, 19). He looks for new horizons to write good poetry. At the end of his experience on the island, Nicholas grows up as a human being. Just like the postmodern fiction Fowles writes, the metatheater of Conchis serves to attract and invite Nicholas into an artistic labyrinth. There is a parallelism between the feelings of uncertainty that readers experience while reading the novel and that of Nicholas with the dramatic experience Conchis puts him through. Just like the reader, Nicholas has much to learn. If one takes *M* as a "teaching book," at the end both Nicholas and readers learn that they are free and not entrapped within all those constructs Conchis, in fact the writer, builds because they all belong to the make-believe world, a product of the imagination. In *DM*, Daniel sees an old man in the street while he drives back to London with his daughter Caro. The old man is evidence of how separated people are from one another, i.e. "the loneliness of each, the bedrock of the human condition. I am what I am. What is is" (*DM*, 260). That old tramp seems to be Daniel's "other" among many of his "potential selves" hidden in his psyche. Daniel envies the separateness, isolation of this old man, and his solitude, perhaps even his peace.

When compared with Fowles's novels, in Pamuk's there are many reported incidents of characters' fantasies, which again revolve around the theme of viewing one's self. In *BB* there are mostly Galip's fantasies of becoming Jelal, and Rüya's coming back home. His fantasy of being somebody else comes true with the phone

call he makes to a man called Mehmet, one of Jelal's loyal readers, who also experiments with being somebody else. When Mehmet reads Jelal's essays, he identifies himself with the writer to such an extent that he dreams about Jelal and takes all "the incredible praise spoken about [Jelal]" as it was about him (*BB*, 364/334-5) because: "after a certain point, the distinction between [their] two persons would disappear in the mist and smoke of [his] imagination" (*BB*, 363/334). Galip imagines the man on the phone who keeps calling him. He tries to "materialize [him] out of some dark corner" (*BB*, 256/231). In his imagination, the voice should belong to "someone with a white collar, worn jacket, and a phantom face, forming these sentences impromptu by virtue of an overactive memory" (*BB*, 334/307). He avoids thinking about him. Yet, it seems he cannot "escape his fantasies" (*BB*, 420/385), because in his own words – "we live but for a short time, we see but very little, and we know almost nothing; so, at least, let's do some dreaming" (*BB*, 202/183).

Galip experiences something similar to what that man on the phone lives through. Like the man on the phone, who dreams of being as famous as Jelal is as a writer, Galip, too experiments with becoming Jelal. When his prose is published in Jelal's usual place under Jelal's picture in a newspaper, Galip feels strange. This uncommon situation leads Galip to imagine Jelal reading someone else's work in his own column, "but he guessed that Jelal wouldn't consider this as a personal attack on himself or an imposture" (*BB*, 380-1/351). He even practices his fantasy. Galip reads his own work as if he were reading Jelal, trying to understand how Jelal feels when he reads Galip's piece under his own name and picture (*BB*, 388/357). Galip, reflecting Pamuk's anxieties as a writer, imagines what it is like to be a man who has lost his memory and been abandoned in a ghost town he does not know at all. Moreover he is deprived of his wife Rüya, both his "other" and also the source of his creative power. It is impossible to reach the "other" in post-structuralist theories. Therefore, Galip imagines how Rüya would feel if he had disappeared just like she did. As in his fantasies, Galip looks for the "hiding" Rüya, the hidden and delayed mystery in the novel. He rings home to see if Rüya is back "imagining Rüya, who'd

57

returned home tired, getting out of bed, but he wasn't surprised when no one answered, either" (*BB*, 105/93). He does not stop constructing fantasies (*BB*, 384/354). Sometimes he imagines Rüya's coming back home or that he is the hero in the detective stories that he imagines Rüya reads or imagines Rüya waiting for him to come home. Galip draws a parallelism between the narrator in Proust's novel who waits for his mistress Albertine and himself waiting for Rüya (*BB*, 168/152). Jelal, the "other" - embodiment of everything Galip wishes he were has got his dreams as well. He is one of those "dreamers who die[s] and whose grave sites are obliterated before any of their dreams come true" (*BB*, 181/164). Just like these intellectuals who devote their lives to translating or adapting the works of Western arts and sciences for their own nations, Jelal, too, writes to contribute to the welfare of his own society. He "imagine[s] the bewilderment of the first fellow who stumbled on the secondary meaning of objects." He "dream[s] of a parallel universe within the manifested one, imagin[es] [his] intoxication with new meanings in this new realm as the secondary meanings of things are gradually revealed to [him]" (*BB*, 240-1/217-8). This is what Pamuk himself achieves in his novels.

Similar to Galip who ends up becoming Jelal, Osman, the narrator of *NL*, "fantasize[s] that [he] might start life anew as another Nahit" (*NL*, 117/120), "[he] wanted to become Nahit" (*NL*, 117/121). Nahit is Janan's boyfriend who falls under the book's spell, too and leaves his family and friends behind, and sets out on a quest to discover his new identity in "accidents," and changes to Mehmet (*NL*, 120-1/124-5). Nahit/Mehmet is Osman's alter-ego. He becomes Mehmet and at the end settles at Viranbağ as Osman. Just like the narrator, he "keep[s] rewriting the book without missing a single comma, a single letter, or a period" (*NL*, 198/212). He writes the book to earn his living and is happy with his life (*NL*, 200-1/214). This fantasy of Osman in *NL* and of Galip in *BB* seems to emphasize the ontological problem of the present age as well as of fiction itself. When Nahit becomes Mehmet and then Osman, the reader's attention is drawn to the question - which one is real? Therefore, this transformation of the characters into each other causes to make a distinction

between the real and fiction impossible. Even the town Güdül Osman goes to is a "Fantasytown," a "Souvenir City" where he cannot differentiate between what is real and what is just a product of his imagination (*NL*, 96-97/98).

In *MNR*, Pamuk uses an archaic Turkish art in order to foreground the problems of writing. The miniaturists in his book represent the writers and, like their own writer Pamuk, they are the followers of neither the East nor the West. They are aware of the differences between the methods of the old masters and the Frankish masters. Like their creator, the miniaturists do not dream about "the work of the great masters of Herat and Tabriz, whom they once followed with awe, or the Frankish masters, whose innovative methods they aspired to" (*MNR*, 468/411) but, as in the words of the horse who confesses that he is unique, their works are unique. Miniaturists create their own styles with the help of their imagination. If there is the picture of a horse, then it is "simply the rendering of a horse that exists in a miniaturist's imagination" (*MNR*, 252/217). Pamuk, too, like the miniaturists in *MNR*, is influenced by the methods of both the Eastern and the Western literatures. However, his work is unique, though it may contain traces from both cultures. Moreover, *MNR* like Pamuk's other novels analysed here is a novel on the novel, the reflected reality in the fictional world and is the outcome of his fantasy, a work of imagination.

While in Fowles's novels there are a very few examples of fantasy as a covert self-reflexive device, Pamuk's novels present a number of illustrations of this kind of self-reflexivity. The writers' beliefs about the novel stated earlier seem to be reflected in their use of self-reflexive devices as well. Since Fowles aims to be didactic in his fiction, the scarcity of covertly self-reflexive strategies in his novels is understandable; whereas Pamuk's practice of such patterns seems natural when one considers that he writes only for the sake of writing.

2.2.3   The Image of Being Watched/Watching, the "Eye"/"Gaze," and the
        "Shadow"/ "Ghost" Motives:

The "eye," "shadow," and "ghost" motives as well as the image of characters'
watching themselves from outside or the sense of being watched, are as important as
the "dream," and "fantasy" motives in tracing the embedded worlds of fiction and
reality both in Fowles's and Pamuk's novels analyzed in this study. They serve as
instruments in marking out the existence of the "other"–the writer/reader at the outer
sphere in the circular structure of the novel.

2.2.3.1 Watching Motif as Erotic

In Fowles's novels this image of "watching" or being watched sometimes
functions as something erotic as in Charles's voyeurism of Sarah (*FLW*, 62-3) and
Sarah and Charles's voyeurism of Sam and Mary at love play. Sarah's game play at
first sight seems to be similar to the above-mentioned examples; however, it is not in
fact so. Hers is another dimension of voyeurism. She makes up a "text" about her
relationship with the French lieutenant, Varguennes. By encouraging Charles to
participate in her fiction, she makes Charles a voyeur of her experience with
Varguennes in Weymouth. She is so successful in her game that Charles has erotic
feelings for this abandoned woman (*FLW*, 176). Nicholas in *M* experiences this
feeling of being watched intensely because "all the time [he] felt [he] was being
watched" (*M*, 62, 68, 70, 85, 104). Everything is watched on the island (*M*, 208, 216,
318). Since Conchis's black valet Joe watches Julie and June, they also feel watched
(*M*, 320, 345). Nicholas becomes paranoiac since he feels that "that Joe character"
watches him. He starts perceiving a "hidden pair of eyes in the trees behind" (*M*,
345). Yet he evaluates at the end that these eyes are, indeed, "in the forest of his
unconscious" (*M*, 346). It seems that one part of him gets pleasure out of all these

erotic experiences while the other part feels guilty for what he does. In *DM*, while there is much less use of this motif, there is Jenny, Daniel's girlfriend who is a young actress, being watched by Daniel (*DM*, 24): "Dan was leaning on his elbow, watching Jenny in the darkness" (*DM*, 49) after "they lay down side by side and Dan ran his hand down her body, watching Jenny" (*DM*, 48).

Not in *BB* or *NL* but in *MNR*, Pamuk too uses this watching or being watched motif as an erotic element. Shekure spies on Black, and Black imagines Shekure watch him behind "a crack, knot or what [he] took to be a hole" while he listens to Enishte Effendi's words on "the wonders of light and shadow" (*MNR*, 136/116). There is also the dwarf at the Treasury Room who watches Master Osman and Black secretly when they come close physically in their search for the pictures of horses with peculiar nostrils (*MNR*, 381/333). The Storyteller who experiments with becoming a woman, just like Shekure, spies on the visitors of the house because she is looking for "a husband who'll put her on a pedestal" (*MNR*, 404/354). Olive, the Murderer of Master Elegant Effendi, and Enishte Effendi feel this same sense of being watched as well (*MNR*, 427/374).

2.2.3.2 The "Eye" (I) of the Writer/Reader Watching the Character (he)

This motif of being watched in both writers' novels serves again the self-reflexive state of their novels. As Orhan Koçak points out in "Aynadaki Kitap/Kitaptaki Ayna" (The Book in the Mirror/The Mirror in the Book), "Ayn," which is "eye" in Arabic means "sameness" and "mirror" in Turkish (in Esen 1992: 180). If one understands "eye" in this way, it is seen that the meaning of the "eye" as somebody else watching is turned upside down because there is no "eye" outside, because the "eye" watching is nobody but the "I" who tries to identify itself with an external image. For this reason characters feel the sense of an "other" that is after them all the time. On the other hand, the "I"s in the novels are confused with that of the writers who belong to an ontological level superior to that of the world they

61

create for their characters. The real "I," i.e. the writer, belongs to the real world, yet it may still be the "I" (eye) of the writer and/or the reader who watches his characters from outside.

In *FLW*, for instance, the "watcher" may be the writer who intrudes upon his text and appears as a character in his text. He sometimes breaks the ontological divide between the world of fiction and that of reality but most of the time watches his characters from above. In *M*, Conchis the magician keeps watching Nicholas in his process of reaching self-awareness, and acts like his own creator whereas Nicholas is given the role of the reader who, like him, is taught that he/she is free to give meaning to the text he/she reads. In *DM*, Jenny in "An Unbiased View," which she writes as a contribution toward Dan's novel, finds Dan "patient and neutral. Like an estate agent:"

> And then I began to think he was secretly watching me, trying to make up his mind whether I really was right for the part and I felt annoyed that he wasn't sure (*DM*, 24).

Although Jenny, too is a writer at the center of the fictional world, she is also a character in Daniel's novel who contributes to Daniel in his autobiographical novel whereas both Jenny and Daniel are the scripts in Fowles's novel entitled *Daniel Martin* and all of these characters are watched by Fowles who inhabits the world which includes the world of all these writer/characters. Rembrandt's eyes remind Daniel of Christ's eyes which follow him everywhere (*DM*, 703–4). These eyes continue to follow Daniel because they are the eyes of Daniel's creator, Fowles. Hence, Daniel will not turn back but will continue to choose and learn to feel and write his novel. In *DM*, the Daniel character in the novel is on one level the writer of the novel, and this means that he places himself on an ontological level superior to that of the fictional world he creates. He watches his characters from above and presents the readers with a model for what the real author does in his novel.

In *BB*, the protagonist of the book, Galip experiences the odd feeling that an "other" is watching him. This other is an "eye" that is watching him (*BB*, 69/159).

The "eye" Galip feels is the "I" of Jelal/the writer in the fictional world Galip/Jelal creates and this "eye" in the newspaper never stops watching Galip (*BB*, 72/62). In the first days of Rüya's disappearance, "peeling the orange and eating it, he was gripped by a feeling that somebody was following him". "It felt as if there was the vague presence of an 'eye' just behind his neck". "The same watchful 'eye' on his neck" walks along with him not leaving Galip for a moment because it is nobody else's but his own "eye" whose gaze he meets in the reflection of a bookstore's window (*BB*, 103/91). Although Galip should have been familiar with "the idea of 'being followed' from the detective novels Rüya read" (*BB*, 325/298), this sensation of being watched/followed irritates him. Whether it pleases or annoys him, what is certain is that he is "under surveillance" all the time (*BB*, 386/356, 326/300, 322/296, 323/297). This "shadow" or the "eye" that watches and follows him everywhere does not let him go free until his "eye" and Jelal's "eye" become identical.

In *NL*, the narrator of the book, Osman, experiences a similar sense of being watched sometimes by the book that he reads, or the people who in some way have been influenced by the "book." They are Osman's other "selves." As in the case of Galip, it is again the "eye" (I) watching the "he" (Osman). In his journey that he starts under the book's spell, Osman feels the existence of a "gaze" that follows him. This "gaze" is the "gaze" of the writer with whom the young narrator wants to identify himself (*NL*, 10/5). The more he reads the book, the more he realizes that the "book" is his life story: "So it was that as I read my point of view was transformed by the book and the book was transformed by my point of view" (*NL*, 10/6). The book in life and life in the book and the writer's and reader's (Osman's) "gaze" (point of view) unite. Not only Osman but also the other disciples of the book feel the presence of that "gaze" which follows them. The girl with the blue jeans, who is under the spell of the book like Osman, has a fatal accident in one of the journeys she sets out after having read the book. At the moment of her death, she describes to Janan that "gaze" which she realizes must belong to "Angel" (*NL*, 81/80). The "gaze" that she

sees just before she dies should be Janan's, (which also means creator in sufism,[46]) her creator's, that is God's gaze who expects her to his throne. This indirect reference to God is also an indirect reference to the creator of the book, the writer, who decides to put an end to the role of his character in the book that he writes. That is why the character, the girl in blue jeans, meets his "gaze" for the first time.

Similar to Galip and Jelal in *BB*, Osman feels the same sense of being watched. He too is under observation all the time. In Güdül when they attend an assembly of entrepreneurs as the representatives of "new life," he and Janan are observed (*NL*, 89/90). In addition, Doctor Fine's spies follow Osman while he is following Mehmet, Janan's boyfriend (*NL*, 181/193, 182/194, 195/208-9). Elsewhere, reading the book, Osman gazes at Janan without knowing that Mehmet is watching the two of them while Seiko, the name of one of Doctor Fine's spies, watches all three of them (*NL*, 156/165).

In *MNR*, it is Shekure who imagines that one day her story too will be inscribed in the pages of a book enabling her to have the chance to express herself openly to the ones who "observe her from who knows which distant time and place" (*MNR*, 55/43). That means Shekure/the character imagines her self as a character whose life is revealed in a novel and put under the surveillance of readers she does not know. However, she is a text already trapped within Pamuk's script and has already been observed by the "eyes" of the reader and of her writer. As Shekure in Shekure's fantasy, in fact these inescapable "eyes" making the characters feel so ill at ease are also the eyes of the readers.

---

[46] In Sufism there is an emphasis on man's inner journey to be one with the creator. In this movement it is believed that God is both One and Many. If one studies the created, he/she can know the creator and become one with Him. Ecevit draws a parallel between Sufism and *NL* (1996: 135-185). Although seemingly unrelated to the aspects of Self-reflexivity that this dissertation analyses, it should be noted that many of Fowles's statements about mankind and the place of nature and of art fit in with such an idea as well.

2.2.3.3 Characters ("I"s) Watching Themselves from Outside (as "he"s)

Although in Fowles's novels there are few examples of scenes when the characters watch themselves from outside, in Pamuk's novels these scenes are more in number. In *M*, Conchis (*M*, 118), and Nicholas (*M*, 493) experience this sense of watching themselves from outside. Daniel Martin of *DM*, on the other hand, experiences this sense of "being outside his own body" at Aswan (*DM*, 597).

In *BB*, it is Jelal who observes himself from outside. The "omnipresent" and "ridiculous" "eye" who keeps watching him everywhere seems to serve him in "gaining access to the 'metaphysical experiment'" (*BB*, 110/98). The "eye" stands for whoever it is that Galip/Jelal wishes he were, and Jelal uses it as an ability to watch himself from outside. He is "one" with this eye; he has become that "eye" and now is observing himself (*BB*, 112/99). Jelal feels himself like somebody else, not himself. He is always aware of the "specter of rage and vengeance" and the presence of "the person he was supposed to be on his tail" (*BB*, 133/120). He watches the "I" from the outside. Jelal watches his "other" walk along İstiklal Avenue and Taksim Square, buy some cigarettes, and smoke. With a father-like feeling, he wants to protect him from dangers (*BB*, 115/102). "Leaning up against the wall of the mosque" (*BB*, 112/99), Jelal faces his "other" and goes through a "metaphysical experiment" (*BB*, 111/98, 115/101). In contemplation, Jelal realizes that the "eye" who keeps watching him everywhere was "not a being that resembled him; it was him, himself" in the habit of "keeping an eye on himself" (*BB*, 112/99). Under the gaze of this "eye," he becomes "him." On the night that he comes to this awareness, Jelal becomes "equals" with the "eye" and starts talking to himself as a second or third person (*BB*, 113/100). All through his life, he admits that he tried to reach "him" through impersonation (*BB*, 114/101). "He" is the "eye" and the "eye" is the person he wants to be (*BB*, 113/100). Watching his own body walk along the streets on the way to his flat, Jelal observes "him" close up. When "he" comes home, he sits down at the table and starts writing something. As the "eye" or the "muse," he watches "him" like "a father observing his

65

son pen his first letter" (*BB*, 116/103). The "eye" knows that unless he writes "the stories out of his own world," he cannot be himself (*BB*, 117/104). The "eye" gets pleased only when he manages it. In Galip's case, Jelal is the "eye," the "muse" who keeps watching Galip in his process of becoming which occurs when Galip becomes somebody else i.e. when Galip/"he" becomes the "eye"/Jelal himself. Galip too watches himself from outside before he comes to this realization (*BB*, 108/95). He watches himself in his childhood, too as if observing his "second self who left his own body and soul behind" (*BB*, 217/196/7).

Like Galip in *BB*, Osman in *NL* experiences this sense of watching himself from outside. Osman starts reading and copying the book word by word, when he realizes that "he would go where the text took him, where Janan and the new life must be" (*NL*, 45/41). He sees this journey as a pre-requisite in reaching the "new life" where he will be transformed into a new human being. In this progress on this road, Osman can see himself and his life from outside (*NL*, 45/41). This is not the only time Osman observes himself from outside as if watching somebody else. When they arrive in Güdül for the assembly of the entrepreneurs, he perceives something dreamlike in the town and imagines himself as a "cinematography enthusiast" and begins to see "his own image" watching the environment from the second story window of the Hotel in which he and Janan settle (*NL*, 96/98).

In *MNR*, Stork, Olive, Shekure and Black see themselves as "others" from outside. The Murderer describes Enishte Effendi's murder in terms of a dream and illustration as one sees himself/herself from outside in a dream "lifting that new, huge and heavy bronze inkpot from among the familiar glass, the porcelain and crystal ones that rested on his worktable" (*MNR*, 190/164) and "illustrating what [he] did" (*MNR*, 89/74). Since Shekure receives Black's proposal of marriage on the same day that her father is killed and for this reason they have to fight their enemies who will prevent them from completing his father's book and fight against those who can disapprove of her marriage because she is not a widow, Shekure feels troubled and like a reader who reads about such a woman, "[sees] [her] life from the outside and

66

piti[es] what [she] saw (*MNR*, 223/193). When Enishte Effendi's death is announced in the neighborhood, Black feels the same sensation of watching one's self from outside (*MNR*, 256/221).

2.2.3.4 Shadow Motif

Beside the "eye" image and the motif of watching and being watched, there are the "shadow" and "ghost" motives. "Shadow," as a noun, recalls something unsubstantial/unreal; it is a person's inseparable attendant or companion who keeps a secret watch on that person. Fowles in *FLW* and *DM*, and Pamuk in *NL* and *MNR* use this motif in underlining the "others" who complement the main characters most. In *FLW*, Charles sees the shadow of Sarah, his other, in the faces of American women (*FLW*, 414-5). In *DM*, not Jenny, but Jane is the right woman i.e. Daniel's soul mate to complement the "other" in him. It is with Jane that "Dan finds a last sentence for the novel he was never going to write (*DM*, 704). In *NL*, Osman describes his first impressions about Janan using the image of "shadow." Janan is "the beautiful shadow with the purple clad" (NL, 31/28). Janan is the "shadow," because just like Nahit/Mehmet/Osman, she is a statement in the text of Pamuk. She does exist, but in the fictional world. That is why not only Janan, but also the other disciples of the book are described in terms of "shadows" (*NL*, 14/10). The image of "shadow" can be traced in *MNR* as well. With the influence of his guilty conscience, the Murderer perceives Enishte Effendi differently than he is in reality (*MNR*, 186/161). Shekure, just like the murderer, experiences the same sense of guilty conscience, and also fears of death and the murderer. With Hayriye, she hears the creaking of the gate, and mistakes the shadows of others with their own shadows. On the wedding-night, Black, Shekure, Hayriye and the children feel like strangers when they enter the dark house and see their own shadows reflected on the ceiling (*MNR*, 240/207).

2.2.3.5 Ghost Motif

"Ghost," on the other hand, stands for the spirit of a dead person appearing to somebody who is still living. It is something shadowy or without substance and has got vague shapes. Fowles employs this motif in *M* and *DM*, while Pamuk uses it only in *NL*. In *M*, Nicholas feels himself to be in "an emotional desert" because he has lost both Lily and Alison. Besides, there is his recognition that the "ghost" of Lily will always cause him to fail in any future relationship. However, the "ghost" of Lily serves as a means of bringing Nicholas into the awareness that Alison is the one who will love him in the future (*M*, 553). In *DM*, Dan just before leaving Jenny feels his father's ghost at his shoulder (*DM*, 698). "Dan's ill-concealed ghost" (*DM*, 704), John Fowles gives his omniscient comment on the impossibility of character-author Daniel Martin's novel in the end of *DM* he himself wrote.

Both novelists use the "ghost" image as a means of erasing the boundary between fact and fiction. For instance, Osman walks "like a ghost through the high-ceilinged hallways" (*NL*, 27/23), or while traveling on buses at the moment of accidents he sees "the blissful ghosts of the dead and dying" (*NL*, 61/58), or "a specter appears before his eyes" while he is reading the book (*NL*, 41/37).

Both Fowles and Pamuk use the "eye," "shadow," and "ghost" motives as well as the image of characters' watching themselves from outside or their sense of being watched as a means of covert self-reflexivity. However, while Pamuk insists upon them, Fowles mostly avoids them. Both writers aim to underline the fictionality of their texts. This chapter aimed to go into the more conventional world of the characters and bring the discussion of self-reflexivity as an ontological problem by tracing the self-reflecting images in the selected novels of both writers. Having concentrated on firstly the reported incidents of physical reflection through mirrors, reflecting surfaces, paintings, pictures, performances, books, and then the reported incidents of non-physical self-reflection through dreams, fantasies, and the "eye," "shadow," "ghost," motives as well as the image of watching which serves to

increase the tension on the way to the truth of mystery as in a detective plot, both Fowles and Pamuk draw the reader's attention to the status of the fictional world. Pamuk achieves this by his extreme use of both overt and covert forms of self-reflection, while Fowles prefers the overt ones more.

CHAPTER 3

METAFICTION

Reality in postmodern works is only a linguistic construct, and therefore referentiality is a problem. For this reason the reader's attention is drawn not to the events told but instead to the process of "writing" and "constructing" in the novel. Although the reader of the traditional novels is not used to the laying bare of the fictional illusion, he/she is required to participate in this game of fiction. In metafictional texts, where the writing process of the novel is a part of the novel's own plot, the reader of postmodern texts deconstructs and then reconstructs the text he/she is reading by filling in the gaps between textual segments from his/her experience because "[such] texts show [that] literary fiction can never imitate or 'represent' the world but always imitate or 'represent' the discourses which in turn construct that world" (Waugh 1984: 100). This chapter, different from the previous one, which studied the Self-reflexive elements in the texts, focuses on the idea that fiction is all about the process of the writing of the fictional world one is reading at the moment. This chapter deals with *DM* and *NL* as self-begetting novels because, in Kellman's terms, they both are "account[s] usually first person, of the development of character[s] to a point at which [they] [are] able to take up and compose the novel[s] we have just finished reading" (in Waugh 1984: 14). This is the second world in the frame of worlds within worlds, where the implied author creates his own fictional world within the fictional world the real author created.

Both Fowles and Pamuk deliberately challenge the traditional theory of narrative in their novels. For both the linear/chronological narrative is inappropriate to their works. Fowles is against the modernist view that "consciousness (the certainty that "I" exist for "myself") defines existence." In *DM*, using the shift between the subjective "I" and the objective "he," he "sets out to show that individuals not only construct their own positions in the world and narrate their own histories; they are also situated within others' discourses, are characters in others' fictions" (Waugh 1984: 133). Like *DM, NL* revolves around the same paradox concerning the identity of the fictional world and, as in the other novels under discussion, draws the reader's attention to the frame of embedded worlds within worlds where the fictional world and the real world overlap to some extent, but are not identical. Both *DM* and *NL* underline this difference by tracing the theme of "existential authorship"(Waugh 1984: 135).

DM, like *NL* "as a whole is a commentary on the practice of writing fiction, with a novelist inside it writing a novel which is a commentary on the practice of writing fiction" (Waugh 1984: 95). The hero-narrator is the Daniel Martin of the title who is an artistically sterile screen-writer in his late forties, who realises the meaninglessness of his life and searches for an appropriate medium in which to render the real self. In order to achieve wholeness/oneness by reconciling the conflicting elements within his character, i.e. his self and his other, Daniel decides to write an autobiographical novel – "The real history of what I am," since staging or filming would "just ... betray the real thing again" (*DM*, 20). These words occur in a conversation between Daniel Martin and his mistress Jenny in the very beginning of the novel, which decides that the novel will be the new format for him to reconstruct his fragmented subjectivity. It seems that this very conversation will be the opening chapter of his future novel. "Something will happen. Like a window opening. No, a door. Like a door in a wall" (*DM*, 22) says Jenny. The telephone rings and Daniel faces the past he had believed long buried and forgotten: "Then a voice; and unbelievably, as in a fiction, the door in the wall opens" (*DM*, 24). This coincidence

i.e. Nell's call from England requesting Daniel to go to the bedside of Anthony, leads Daniel to a confrontation with his past. The journey to England is the first step in Daniel's achieving inner "wholeness." For Daniel, it seems that writing an autobiographical novel in which he can reinterpret his past is the cure for his inner split. As Simon Loveday indicates, "he decides that his true vocation is not so much for biography ("Kitchener") as for autobiography, not so much for writing as for writing himself" (1985:109) - and not so much for filming, either. He thinks

> images are inherently fascistic because they overstamp the truth, however dim and blurred of the real past experience ... The word is the most imprecise of signs...What I was trying to tell Jenny in Hollywood was that I would murder my past if I tried to evoke it on camera; and it is precisely because I can't really evoke it in words, can only hope to awaken some analogous experience in other memories and sensitivities, that it must be written (*DM*, 100).

DM is a complex novel and its complexity stems from its oscillation between first and third person narrative points of view, shifts in tense from present to past, and its use of a number of techniques such as flashback, flashforward, and intercutting. The reason lying behind this complexity is related with its being a self-begetting novel and with Fowles's parody of cinema as a norm to foreground the art of writing. There is a chain of narrators, authors and characters. First of all, there is John Fowles, a writer in his forties writing a novel about another writer in his forties called Daniel Martin, and Daniel Martin writes an autobiographical novel naming his hero Simon Wolfe because, as Jenny tells him, "you can't use your own name in a novel" (*DM*, 23). Therefore, John Fowles the author and Daniel Martin the character are both writers of fiction, who consider the subject of their writing as fictional constructs. Since Daniel Martin aims to write an autobiographical novel, he uses Simon Wolfe as his fictional self and tries to look at his life from another point of view. For this reason, instead of using the subjective "I," Daniel employs the objective pronoun "he." The majority of the novel is constructed by a third person narration (Chapters 1-3, 5-6, 17, 32, 36-46). However there is also some first person

72

narration of Daniel (Chapters 8, 10, 12-13, 15-16, 18, 25, 27-29, 31) and Jenny (Chapters 4, 21, parts of 28 and 34) as well as chapters constructed by mixed first ("I") and third ("he") person narration (Chapters 7, 9, 11, 14, 19-20, 22-24, 26, 30, 33, 35).

In "The Harvest" (Chapter 1), the adult Daniel looks back at his childhood and prefers to report the whole chapter in the third person narration. However, when the character's hand slips into the pocket of his trousers to take out a clasp-knife, the distinction between the narrative level and the story level disappears and "he" becomes "I." This is a frame-break device:

> Down, half masked by leaves. Point of view of the hidden bird. I feel in his pocket and bring out a clasp knife; plunge the blade gutted; slit; liver, intestines, stench. He stands and turns and begins to carve his initials on the beech-tree. Deep incisions in the bark, peeling the grey skin away to the sappy green of the living stem. Adieu my boyhood and my dream (*DM*, 16).

The beginning of the first chapter starts with third person narration – with the narrator being the implied author, but then he gives up his role to his character Daniel Martin so that he can report his past experiences. Daniel experiences a conflict between third person objectivity and the first person subjectivity which is later explained by third person narration as a dislike for "I" narration:

> he reserved an especially, and symptomatically, dark corner for first-person narration; the closer the narrative I approximated to what one could deduce of the authorial I, the more murky this corner grew. The truth was that the objectivity of the camera corresponded to some deep psychological need in him (*DM*, 72).

In order to detach himself from himself or in other words to see himself and his past from a different perspective, he plans to use the name Simon Wolfe as well as to use third person narration. However, he cannot keep his promise because he employs both "I" and "he" narrations. While writing his autobiographical novel, Daniel, by using third person narration wants to watch himself from a distance "as if he were

indeed a fiction, a paper person in someone else's script" (DM, 72). This seems to have come true, because while Daniel the narrator treats Daniel the character as a different text in his work, John Fowles the writer does the same thing for the narrator Daniel whom he calls Dan. In the novel that he writes, Daniel perceives himself as a character in a text or filmscript and this reflects exactly what the implied author thinks about Daniel Martin who, in a way, shares the same crisis in the writing of fiction:

> My own personality had undergone a very thorough revolution since adolescence, and even since my arrival at Oxford after war service. I had rejected so much. I was writing myself, making myself the chief character in a play, so that I was not only the written personage, the character and its actor, but also the person who sits in the back of the stalls admiring what he has written (*DM,* 80).

Therefore, Daniel on the way to reach whole self as well as whole sight, i.e. in order to achieve completeness both in art and identity, needs to write a novel and much later realizes that he already started to write it at Thorncombe:

> He had already, without having admitted it to Jenny, borrowed her proposed name for his putative hero: the ghost of Altadena Drive, the pin-found "Simon Wolfe." He didn't like the name and knew he would never use it, but this instinctive rejection gave it a useful kind of otherness, an objectivity when it came to distinguishing between his actual self and a hypothetical projection of himself (*DM*, 449).

As seen, Daniel thinks that it must be writtten in the third person. However, if the very first line of the first chapter is remembered: "whole sight; or all the rest is desolation," the confusion in narrative person can be understood. Daniel Martin's task of writing his novel seems to be impossible because he himself is a fictional character in somebody else's, i.e. John Fowles's, mind. Daniel Martin belongs to the realm of fiction and needs Fowles to reach the ontological universe. Until the very end, Daniel postpones writing his novel:

> That evening, in Oxford, leaning beside Jane in her kitchen while she cooked supper for them, Dan told her with a suitable irony that at least he had found a last sentence for the novel he was never going to write (*DM,* 704).

Ironically, this last sentence is the first sentence of "Dan's ill-concealed ghost" (John Fowles himself), who comments on this intricate author-narrator-character relationship which confuses readers' minds when they finish reading the novel:

> which is perhaps why, in the end, and in the knowledge that Dan's novel can never be read, lies eternally in the future, his ill-concealed ghost has made that impossible last his own impossible first (*DM,* 704).

The last sentence of the novel underlines the fact that this is an open ending and emphasizes the circular structure of the novel, because it makes the reader go back to the first sentence of the novel: "whole sight; or all the rest is desolation" (*DM*, 7). For Daniel, who suffers from a split in his personality, and in order "to escape the first person and become one's own third" (*DM*, 72) keeps looking into mirrors, novel writing, instead of the cinema, will be the right format to use to fit his fragmented self into some practicable system. Since Daniel, in his view, is "a dialogue installer and repairman" (*DM*, 38), "it's [only] the bits between [he] fear[s]" (*DM*, 390). When he rearranges his past which he seems to have forgotten, he will rewrite it and reconcile the strife between the "I" and the "he"/ other in his self, which is also reflected in his fragmented style. Therefore, the first sentence of the novel – "whole sight; or all the rest is desolation" (*DM*, 7) makes the reader think that Daniel will achieve self-recognition only if he strikes a balance inside himself. However, as Salami points out "this sentence belongs more to the end of the novel than the beginning because it seems too authoritative and conclusive." It is only when one finishes reading the novel that one realizes that "the first and last sentences are impossible because they belong to the future novel that Daniel wants to write, which we incidentally read as *DM*" (1992: 165). The last sentence stresses also the circularity of the real and the fictional, the written and the unwritten, the author and

the character. At the start of Chapter 1, one finds "D.H.M" - Daniel's initials followed by the words "and underneath: 21 Aug 42" (*DM*, 16), which may indicate that Dan's projected book is the fictional world within the world of Fowles's fiction where Daniel, too is a character. This indication belongs to John Fowles because the author-character Daniel Martin who intends to write his autobiographical novel is an imaginary character in Fowles's fictional world. His task seems impossible because he and the book he intends to write are all in the realm of fiction, not in the tangible world.

Jenny is the second author-character in *DM*. After Daniel's departure to England, she decides to write some parts of his novel and sends these texts to Daniel. However, reading these texts, the reader senses a similar conflict, as in the case of Daniel who intends to write his autobiographical novel but fails because of his being a character in Fowles's novel *DM*. The same thing is valid for Jenny. Whether her writings are pure fiction or real and whether, within his world, Daniel reports them accurately or not is not made clear. In Jenny's first contribution, Daniel the character and narrator rewrites Jenny's perception of their first meeting, her view of the current film project, and of their first date and lovemaking. In her second contribution, Jenny gives the reader critical information about Dan as she has done in her first text. The reader, of course, does not know whether these sections are really by the character Jenny. She does not like to be dominated by Dan: "I'm more than half writing to myself, you know that. Telling you all this nonsense you first told me" (*DM*, 267). Towards the end of this chapter, in the "Second Contribution," the reader is reminded of the presence of the narrator Daniel: "This was yet to come, of course. But one little Jenny-coined epithet needs a gloss. It derives from a story Dan told her" (*DM*, 267). Since Dan the writer does not allow these chapters to arrive in his book until the middle of the novel, the reader realizes that he has inserted them into the novel as part of his pretence to be an objective narrator. Jenny's third contribution includes her account of a day at Tsankawi but it is immediately followed by Daniel's account of the same day. The two accounts do not match. Jenny's last words in the closing of

the chapter, "You knew. You should have said something" (*DM*, 374) once more remind the reader of the narrator who rearranges, rewrites and paraphrases the raw material of Jenny's letters. In the chapter, "A Third Contribution" where she makes actually her fourth contribution, Jenny writes her own narrative for the first time about an erotic experience she had with Steve. In order to escape from the way Daniel treats her and his female acquaintances, in Jenny's words, as "something in [his] script" (*DM*, 495) or "figment[s] in [his] imagination" (*DM*, 699), Jenny writes her own narrative to free herself from being merely a statement in Daniel's and, in turn, in Fowles's novel: "it was a kind of bottling up, that was why I was writing so many letters. It was just someone to talk to, no more than that" (*DM*, 44). In her last text, by writing she manages to get rid of his domination. However, this must be impossible because she is a character in Daniel's and in turn Fowles's novel.

There seems to exist no clear boundary between the real and the imaginary, i.e. between Jenny's "actual" text which she calls "pure fiction" and Daniel's narrative in relation to her text. Daniel, the narrator, points out his framing of Jenny's story in a dramatic way:

> All of which Jenny was to describe from her point of view, since those snatched days were the basis of her last "contribution," whose real arrival was to come later, whose writing I now recast (but as she granted I might, at the beginning); and whose drift was why, despite her third and still-to-be inserted contribution, she would not "give me up." In Los Angeles, she was to write, we were always "in brackets;" and for a few hours, in New Mexico, our one escape outside them (*DM*, 346).

As Dan and Jenny are "in brackets," Daniel's plot, too is in brackets. As he does in the first chapter, Fowles keeps in Daniel's intended but unwritten novel between the first and last sentences of the novel. This is an impossible task for Daniel because he is just a fictional character in Fowles's text whereas Danny - his younger self, Dan or Simon Wolfe, are fictional in Daniel's text. When he rearranges her contributions, Jenny, too, becomes a character in his script. However Jenny, with the contributions she makes to Daniel's new novel, offers Daniel a new role. Besides being author,

narrator, and character, he becomes a reader. Whenever he reads one of Jenny's texts, he turns into a reader of fictions and he, too becomes a part of the written text *DM*. Therefore, the Self-reflexive narrative points out that character and narrator, ontological and fictional, written and unwritten all merge into each other. In this circular novel, there is no beginning or end. The first and last sentences imply the impossibility of the novel because they are the sentences of the autobiographical novel Daniel Martin desires to write on the way to achieve "whole sight" i.e. to understand both himself and others, in order not to be left in desolation.

Pamuk's *NL*, like *DM*, is a self-begetting novel. From the beginning to the end, it presents a series of journeys that the characters set out on hoping to reach the new life promised by a book that the narrator-character Osman "read ... one day" (*NL*, 7/3). There is always the book as the common point among all these characters, who are also authors. What is to be noted here is that all these author-characters reflect each other endlessly.

Uncle Railman Rıfkı is the author of the book which changed the lives of the main character as well as of Nahit/Mehmet/Osman and Doctor Mehmet the moment they read it. In Nahit/Mehmet/Osman's view, "The old man thought he'd write a book to entertain adults the same way he did children" (*NL*, 28/25) and "optimistic young men such as [themselves] who had read those comics in [their] childhood happened to read the book, and believ[ed] that [their] whole lives were changed from top to bottom" (*NL*, 212/227). According to Doctor Fine, on the other hand, "The writer [of the book] had been a poor retired bureaucrat, a weak personality who didn't even have the courage of his own convictions" (*NL*, 127/132).

Nahit is an author character, too. He is Dr Fine's son who, under the book's spell, devotes his life to the quest for a new identity in "accidents." He becomes Mehmet, Janan's boyfriend, and leads a peaceful life at Viranbağ as Osman, "rewriting the book without missing a single comma, a single letter, or a period" (*NL*, 198/212).

Osman, on the other hand, is the main author-character in *NL*. Just like the character Mehmet who finds that his life and the book fit into each other when he "has met life in the book" (*NL*, 64/62), Osman says that "his soul is like a clean page of an open notebook," he "turns the pages and while his life changes, [he] reads new words and all the things on these pages" (*NL*, 41/37). He "write[s] all the book imparted to [him], sentence by sentence, into the notebook" (*NL*, 41/37). Here it must be noted that what Nahit/Mehmet and Osman do is rewriting, not authorship. It is not creating something new, but copying the already written book word by word. For all these author/characters, writing is the only means of achieving a whole self and the journeys they set out on are to find the writer of the book which influenced them. If the interrelationship between book and new life, which also involves the interaction between writer/author and the act of writing, is reexamined, these characters read the book and interpret it in their own ways and participate in the creative process by creating something new as is expected from the readers of *NL*.

Just like these characters who are in search of the writer, the reader is led to go after the creator of these characters in the book he/she is reading at the moment. By concentrating on a book and a chain of writers in search for the writer of the book entitled *NL*, Pamuk ensures that the reader's attention is drawn not to the story told but to how it is told; and the reader's participation is needed. For instance, the readers of the book, while "[they] set out on the road by bus and traveled from town to town, read the book again and again" (*NL*, 81/80). The main character sees his journeys and his life in the book:

> In the light that surged from the book into my face, I was terrified to see shabby rooms, frenetic buses, bedraggled people, faint letters, lost towns, lost lives, phantoms. A journey was involved; it was always about a journey ... I almost believed in my existence in that world. There was no necessity even to convince myself: I did in fact live there. Given that I lived there, the book must, of course, be about me (*NL*, 9/5).

"Reading words one by one, [he] tries to find [his] path" but at the same time "to [his] own amazement, [he] was constructing wonders of dream which would lead [him] astray" (*NL*, 8/4). Therefore, the fictional and the factual realms are intertwined and reflect each other endlessly.

Like *DM*, *NL* has a circular structure. Apart from the chain of author/narrators, there are many repetitions made by the ontological author for his clever readers, whom he invites to play the game of writing the text. In this game structure that Pamuk plans, Osman, the main character, gives hints at the beginning of the novel pointing out the fact that the book is his life story: "From the beginning I had known the book had been written for me...no, not because they were portentous phrases and brilliant words but since I felt like the book was about me" (*NL*, 10/6). He even sees his own death which occurs in the end of the book "appear in the half-light before dawn" (*NL*, 10/6). Moreover, the first person narrator strengthens his claim by saying that he is the young man who lives with his mother and devotes his life to reading and rewriting the book in order to go on the same journeys the book relates (*NL*, 45/41). The other hint comes towards the end of the book. Osman remembers, with flashbacks, Uncle Railman Rıfkı's intention of writing a book: "I'm going to write a book someday and I will give the hero your name" (*NL*, 249/267). The "book," whose title, *The New Life*, the reader learns later, is the very book he/she is reading. So these books/novels are like the mirrors facing and reflecting each other endlessly. Besides, in the beginning of the novel, the main character "realize[s] [that] [he] [is] standing in front of Uncle Railman Rıfkı's building and staring up into his second-floor flat through the half-open curtains. [He] perhaps realize[s] it without realizing it" (*NL*, 18/14). The same scene occurs again, when Osman, a married man with a daughter now, finds himself walking in the neighborhood as he did when he had first read the book (*NL*, 232/247). Moreover, Osman watches his new neighbours on the same night he read the book and at the end of the novel, as if checking out the reader's attention, he "remember[s] that [he] had first laid eyes on the girl who was later to become [his] wife during the first few hours when [he] read the book" (*NL*,

234/250). Another point is that when he visits Uncle Rıfkı's wife Aunt Ratibe, he sees *NL* written by Uncle Rıfkı and this reminds him of the first time he read it and Uncle Rıfkı's words about *NL*: "I am going to write a book someday, and I will give the hero your name ... I will tell your story" (*NL*,249/267). It seems, a new demand is being made of the reader. He must read the book both from the beginning to the end and vice versa because this is "a circular novel with no beginning or end, of endless potentiality, in which author, narrator, and character are both one and many, both different and the same, simultaneously real and unreal" (Salami 1992: 107).

The last sentence of the novel is "I knew it was the end of my life. And yet I had only wanted to return home; I absolutely had no wish for death, nor for crossing over into the new life" (*NL*, 275/296). This is impossible, for the narrator cannot write about his own death after he has died. Therefore, the reader should understand that Osman is a character in the story, the narrator of the novel told, and that "the narrating 'I' is the subject of discourse, and is a different 'I' from the 'I' who is the subject of the story. As Waugh states "there is yet another level of subjectivity; far behind the whole discourse is the authorial 'I', a subjectivity ... present only in terms of its real absence" (1984: 135). This "I," which appears to be the "I" of the real author, does exist as the "I" of the narrator in the domain which surrounds the fictional world at the centre in the frame of embedded worlds within worlds, but in fact, is absent since it belongs to the outer world where the author exists. This is valid for both Fowles and Pamuk novels. However, in general, and differently from Fowles, Pamuk believes in the post-structuralist idea that "reality is a linguistic construct" (Marshall 1989: 6) and that there is no natural link between a word and a thing. Therefore, he sees it as a mistake to look for the reality in the outer reality because the new life which all the characters go after is hidden in the book entitled *NL* and not outside it. Novels like *NL* and *DM* can be reread because they are both self-begetting novels which focus on the process of becoming, especially the first person narrators' becoming writers, and their novels happen to be the ones one has just finished reading. In order to stress the fact that they both are "account[s] usually

81

first person, of the development of character[s] to a point at which [they] [are] able to take up and compose the novel[s] we have just finished reading" (in Waugh 1984: 14), Fowles puts *DM* in between the last sentence of the fictional author's intended novel, which is the opening sentence of the ontological author, and the last sentences of the "ill-concealed ghost" of Daniel Martin. *NL*, on the other hand, is kept in between the first sentence of the novel which refers to the first time the narrator reads *NL*: "I read a book one day and my whole life was changed" and the second time he reads it: "Before I went to sleep, I took the book out of its hiding place; I placed it on the desk and I began to read, hoping to be affected as I was on the day when I had first read it" stressing the fact that his task is impossible (*NL*, 7/3, 221/237).

By concentrating on the themes of existential authorship and identity search, both Fowles and Pamuk point out the fictionality of their works. The author characters who are writing their own life stories do exist in the fictional discourses of their writers as "an I in the hands of fate ... a paper person in someone else's script" (*DM*, 72). Therefore, in their self-begetting novels both writers create open narratives with circular endings and multi-layered narratives. They both problematize the authorial narrative figure as an overtly self-reflexive framing device by employing the ironic voice which appears as "I." Even though they employ different types of self-reflexive devices, they both question the status of fictional discourse in their works.

CHAPTER 4

BIOGRAPHICAL SELF-REFLEXIVITY

In 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. 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 chapter 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.

4.1 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.

In Pamuk's novels, differently from Fowles, there are no characters who share the physical appearance of their creator. However, 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* and Orhan in *MNR*, 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).

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).

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), Pamuk, too 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).

Doctor Fine's watches, which follow Osman, and New Life caramelas are also from real life, as well as the name Rüya, 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). "His retarded older brother" (*BB*, 398/366), Honorable 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).

4.2 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 heterocosms 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 harbor 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).

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. All of the three 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 neighborhood 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. Life in different periods of İstanbul in *BB* and *NL* also function as a mirror for the real author-Pamuk.

4.3 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). This is what he actually does in *M*. It is true that there are many biographical references in his book such as Nicholas being 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 paleontologist." His aim is to contribute to the improvement of human nature and the natural world in life in general (Aubrey 1991: 47). Through his works, as his statements about the heuristic function of novels shows, he aims to be a guide to his readers in reaching self-awareness. Like Conchis who prepares a godgame for Nicholas to clear his mind about the distinction between art and life, Fowles plays the role of ultimate stage manager in *M* as well as in *DM* and *FLW* 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 Taşkışla 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 Colurs), 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*, and also in *M*, the traces of Fowles the teacher can be felt, just as journalist Pamuk's presence can be traced in *BB*'s Galip, the columnist, 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).

Pamuk, unlike Fowles admits that he is a "happy postmodernist" (in Çongar 1998: 14) and, as is mentioned in the previous chapters, 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.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this study three main types of Self-reflexivity for analysis were selected: Self-reflexivity in the characters' world, metafiction and biographical intrusion. The first world in the frame of worlds within worlds is the fictional world which is mistaken with the real world since it is similar to but different from the real world. The second world is the world of the implied author in which he goes through the process of becoming a writer. It is the world of metafiction whose subject matter is writing/constructing. It is there the real or biographical authors with their fictional selves share the process of writing with the reader. The real world where the real authors stand is outside all these worlds reflected within each other. However, this selection resulted in chapters of very unequal lengths. This is probably due to the fact that, quite simply, there are more characters and opportunities for them to look at themselves than novels (only one metafictional novel for Fowles, for instance) or biographical authors. This, of course, means that Chapter 2 (Self-reflexivity in the World of the Characters in Fowles's and Pamuk's Fiction) has a multitude of examples to be discussed, whereas Chapter 3 (Metafiction) only deals with two metafictions and five narrators (four narrators in *DM* and one in *NL*) and Chapter 4 (Biographical Self-reflexivity) can only discuss two biographical authors.

It became noticeable in the course of this research that very little has been written about the blatant intrusion of author's biographical details in literature. Since this appears to be an important way for writers to blur boundaries between "fact" and

"fiction," it may be something found in many postmodern writers (Salman Rushdie springs immediately to mind). Further research into this practice may be fruitful.

This dissertation has shown that Self-reflexivity is a complex and much used characteristic of the two postmodern writers. Indeed, it is so essential to their works that it is hard to imagine how they could be "postmodern" without Self-reflexivity. Fowles and Pamuk's different view on "reality" has been influential in their writing and this, in turn, has affected the final product. Fowles believes in the presence of the world outside i.e. the ontological existence (as seen in the endings of all his three novels), while Pamuk is firm in the non-reality of the world of the phenomena (as seen in the self-deconstructing attitude in all three novels under discussion). It has been seen that Scholes's views on "reference and difference" (reality and fiction) are close to those promoted by Fowles's novels. Pamuk's novels, on the other hand, go much further down the Derridaen road. Scholes rejected Derrida's idea that signs have no direct reference to the external world and suggested that any linguistic system is both referential and differential. Derrida's deconstructive theory, on the other hand, considered that all human knowledge is differential. One knows something because it differs from something else it is related to. Thus, without a context revealing the differential value of the sign, one cannot establish its meaning. Similarly texts cannot possess meaning in isolation. The aspect of intertextuality makes a text meaningful. The absence of a definite meaning in a text gives possibility to the multiplicity of meanings. Then, deconstruction can be considered as a characteristically post-structuralist approach to texts and it is possible to claim that Pamuk, all of whose novels under discussion refer ultimately to their own fictional selves, presents the readers with self-deconstructing texts, whereas Fowles presents postmodern texts that encourage readers to reconstruct their understandings both in life and literature.

Although the novel as a new form and postmodernism as a new literary movement are found in British literature before they appear in Turkish literature, it has been found out that Fowles is less postmodern than Pamuk, the representative of

Turkish literature. This is related with their views on "reality." Fowles believes in the existence of the real world outside, while Pamuk does not since for Pamuk there is only the world of the text. Consequently, they make use of different self-reflexive devices, which serve their aims and views on "reality." Because Fowles is "heuristic" i.e. he helps his readers teach themselves, he prefers overt self-reflexive frames to the covert ones. Pamuk, on the other hand, employs overt self-reflexive devices as much as the covert ones in his novels. Both Fowles and Pamuk undermine the authorial narrative figure with the ironic voice "I" that they use as an overt self-reflexive strategy in their fiction. While the constant change of narrators blurs the reality of the author, the change in tenses disrupts the concept of time. Both Fowles and Pamuk challenge the linear/diachronic arrangement of discourses. They replace it with synchronic/horizontal narratives, which synthesize the past, future, and present. Moving forwards and backwards, they want to get rid of the restriction of chronology and achieve timelessness so that all times become a *now*. They challenge the closed ending of traditional narratives as well. The open narratives they create with circular endings give the reader freedom to create his/her own fictional universe/s. Both writers' novels are, in fact, their reaction to the external world, which they both imitate and try to change by imposing their own order upon it. Therefore, they create meaning with reference to the external world. However, art is illusion – fiction and there is an ontological divide between art and life. While Pamuk underlines this notion with his plentiful overt and covert reported incidents of self-reflexivity with the physical and non-physical self-reflexive images, Fowles prefers mostly parody and other overt self-reflexive devices such as the problematic use of the "person" in narrative, although he too uses images such as mirrors in common with Pamuk. Yet, Fowles's insistence on such images is less than Pamuk's whose novels display also an interior plot circularity different from Fowles's novels. Pamuk is keen on the non-physical images such as dreams, fantasies, and the use of motives focusing on the "otherness" of the other as it is displayed in Lacan's The Mirror Stage. Both Fowles and Pamuk use a large number of motifs stitched together in the fabric of their books

to stress the thematic importance of their novels. However, Pamuk repeats them more often than Fowles.

As a result of the analysis of three postmodern novel by each writer, it is found out that reading Fowles's novels is not as difficult as reading Pamuk's novels. The reader gets more pleasure out of Fowles's novels because when he/she reads them, his/her mind is not as much confused as in the case of Pamuk's novels. However, reading Pamuk's novels the reader gets fed up with the gimmicks. Yet, he/she can still participate in Pamuk's game. It seems that not only the self-reflexive techniques Pamuk is so much keen on using makes him so popular because not only the literary professional reader but also the common reader can participate in Pamuk's "game" and get pleasure out of the text. Since Pamuk writes multi-layered narratives, he addresses both low culture and high culture. Both intellectuals and non-intellectuals find something to enjoy themselves even though in different extents. For the non-intellectual reader, there is always a plot to follow. Although he/she may not be able to realize postmodern tricks prepared on purpose for the intellectual reader, he/she can still get pleasure out of such novels. The readers who like solving puzzles should appreciate Pamuk's novels more and they are mostly the ones who are familiar with the theories. With all the techniques he employs in his texts, confusing the reader's mind by moving forwards and backwards coiling upon the texts themselves, Pamuk asks his reader's participation to the act of writing/constructing and at the end Pamuk's reader finds himself/herself deeply involved in the text. On the contrary, Fowles does not dispense with the realistic conventions as much as Pamuk does. It must be for this reason that the kind of self-reflexive novels he writes are preferred by readers who do not like the labyrinth-like structure of novels like Pamuk's.

As a last word, what is common in both writers' novels is that Fowles and Pamuk are aware of the age's ontological anxiety. At the bottom they explore the "I"dentity crisis that man goes through. They explore the difficulty in uniting the self and the "other" in disorder or in the fragmented and multi-layered structure of their

novels. No matter what kind of self-reflexive devices they used, they both write self-reflexive texts and comment on their own narratives pointing out the fact that "reality" is illusory and can be altered. This is the message of the "real" authors Fowles and Pamuk. As in Scholes's theory, in Fowles's novels fictional world is not completely cut off from the external reality. However, in Pamuk's works the mimesis is only part of the art of telling story. Then, it is inevitable to say that Self-reflexivity is an indispensable characteristic of postmodernism because in this frame of worlds within worlds writers aimed to display the distinctness of the self (real) and the other (fiction). While at the centre characters set out on journeys to achieve wholeness, putting an end to the strife between the self and the other, the writers too in a way started their journeys by studying this ever-lasting strife between fiction and reality in the novelistic world they created. There is a gap between art and reality but it seems not an unbridgeable one since although the world of fiction is not a slice of life, but a verbal construction, it is not completely cut off from the external phenomenon; even the traces of biographical writers can be felt in these embedded worlds reflecting each other endlessly.

By emphasizing "fictionality" sometimes implicitly or sometimes explicitly telling the reader that he/she must see the distinctness of the real and the fictional worlds as well as their similarities, Fowles and Pamuk who come from two different countries, invite their readers to the game of "writing/creating." They write self-reflexive fiction using different types of self-reflexive devices and the effect upon the readers differ consequently.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams and Searle. Ed. *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1986.

Akerson, Fatma Erkman. "'Kara Kitap'Üstüne Bir Yorum Denemesi" (An Commentary Attempt on *The Black Book*). Esen 61-69.

Alexander, Marguerite. *Flights from Realism: Themes and Strategies in Postmodernist British and American Fiction*. London: Edward Arnold, 1990.

Aubrey, James, R. *John Fowles: A Reference Companion*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Barth, John. *The American Novel Since World War II*. Ed. Marcus Klein. New York: Fawcett Publications, 1969.

Barthes, Roland. *Criticism and Truth*. Trans. K. Pitcher Kenneman. London: Athlone Press, 1987.

Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice,* London and New York: Methuen, 1980.

Bertens, Hans. "Postmodern Culture(s*)." Postmodernism and the Contemporary Fiction*. Ed. Edmund J. Symth. London: Batsford Ltd., 1991.

Bradbury, Malcolm and Palmer, David. Ed. *The Contemporary English Novel*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishing Inc., 1986.

Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern British Novel*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1993.

Brooker, Peter. Ed. *Modernism and Postmodernism*. New York: Longman, 1992.

Burke, Sean. *Authorship From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. London: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Çongar, Yasemin. "Gerçek Tüm Dünyaya Söylenir" (The Reality is Exposed to the World as a Whole). *Milliyet* 27 April 1998: 14.

Conradi, Peter. *John Fowles*. London: Methuen, 1983.

Cooper, Pamela. *The Fictions of John Fowles*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1991.

Cuddon, J.A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. London: Penguin, 1987.

Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and The Study of Literature*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul Ltd., 1975.

Daiches, David. *Critical Approaches to Literature*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1956.

Derrida, Jacques. *Difference: Critical Theory Since 1965*. Tallahasee: Florida University Press, 1986.

- - -. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1976.

Doltaş, Dilek. *Postmodernizm, Tartışmalar ve Uygulamalar* (Postmodernism, Discussions and Some Practices). İstanbul: Telos, 1999.

Ecevit, Yıldız. "Yetmiş Sonrası Romanında Estetik Devrim" (Aesthetic Revolution in Turkish Novel in Post 70s). *Bilkent* 1 January 1999: 18-21.

- - -. "*Benim Adım Kırmızı*'da Çoğulcu Estetik" (Pluralistic Aestheticism in *My Name is Red*). *Varlık* March 1999: 43-56.

- - -. *Türk Romanında Postmodern Açılımlar* (Postmodern Signs in Turkish Novels). İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.

- - -. *Orhan Pamuk'u Okumak* (Understanding Orhan Pamuk). İstanbul: Gerçek, 1996.

Eken, Bülent. "Orhan Pamuk Nasıl 'Yazar'" (How does Orhan Pamuk's Writing Sound?). *Bilkent*, 7, January 1999: 13.

Ekşigil, Hülya. "Ruh Dünyamı Paylaşamam" (I cannot Partake my Spiritual World). *Türkiye* 26 December 1999: 14.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton, 1965.

Esen, Nüket. *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar* (Essays on *The Black Book*). İstanbul: İletişim, 1996.

Fawkner, H.W. *The Timescopes of John Fowles*. London: Associated University Presses, 1984.

Featherstone, Mike. *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage Publications, 1992.

Federman, Raymond. *Surfiction: Fiction Now...and Tomorrow*. Chicago: Swallow Press, 1975.

- - -. *Surfiction: Fiction Now...and Tomorrow*. Chicago, III, 1973.

Finn, Robert. *The Early Turkish Novel: 1872-1900*. İstanbul: İsis Press, 1984.

Fletcher, John and Bradbury Malcolm, *Modernism: 1890-1930*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

Foster, Thomas, C. *Understanding John Fowles*. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.

Fowles, John, ed. Introduction. *Wormholes: Essays and Occasional Writings*. By Jan Relf. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1998.

- - -. *The Aristos*. Boston, Massachusetts: A Plume Book, 1964, 1968, 1970.

- - -. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. London: Vintage, 1969, 1996.

- - -. *The Magus*. London: Vintage, 1966, 1977.

- - -. *Daniel Martin*. London: Vintage, 1977.

- - -. *The Tree*. New York: Ecco Press, 1973.

- - -. *The Ebony Tower*. Broadway: Signet, 1974.

- - -. *The Collector*. London: Triad/Panther, 1963, 1976.

- - -. *Mantissa*. London: Triad/Panther, 1982, 1984.

Frye, Northrop. *Fables of Identity*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Jacque Lacan: A Feminist Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Hassan, Ihab. "Towards a Concept of Postmodernism," *A Postmodern Reader*. Ed. Joseph, Natoli and L. Hutcheon. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

- - -. "The Question of Postmodernism." *Performing Arts Journal*. Volume VI, No: 1: 30-37.

Hawkes, Terence. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *Studying the Novel: An Introduction*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1986.

Higgins, Dick. *A Dialectic of Centuries: Notes towards a Theory of the New Arts,* New York and Barton, Vermont, 1978.

Hutcheon, Linda. "Beginning to Theorize Postmodernism." *A Postmodern Reader*. Ed. Joseph Natoli and Linda Hutcheon. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

- - -. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York and London: Routledge, 1988.

- - -. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of the Twentieth Century Art Forms*. New York and London: Methuen, 1985.

- - -. *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*. New York and London: Methuen, 1980.

- - -. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Kılıç, Engin. *Orhan Pamuk'u Anlamak* (Understanding Orhan Pamuk). İstanbul: İletişim, 1999.

Klein, Marens, ed. *The American Novel Since World War II*. New York: Fawcett Publications, 1969.

Koçak, Orhan. "Aynadaki Kitap/Kitaptaki Ayna" (The Book in the Mirror/The Mirror in the Book). Esen 142-183.

Lee, Alison. *Realism and Power: Postmodern Fiction.* London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Lodge, David, ed. *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism*. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1972.

- - -. *Modernism 1890 –1930*. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury and James Mc Farlane. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.

- - -. *The Art of Fiction*. London: Secker and Workung, 1992.

- - -. *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism*. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1972.

Loveday, Simon. *The Romances of John Fowles*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1985.

Marshall, Brenda, K. *Teaching the Postmodern: Fiction and Theory*. New York and London: Routledge, 1992.

McGowan, John. *Postmodernism and its Critics*. London: Cornell U.P., 1991.

McHale, Brian. *Constructing Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1992.

- - -. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Methuen, 1987.

Mursal, Turan. "Coca Cola, Postmodernizm ve Yeni Hayat" (Coca Cola, Postmodernism and *The New Life*). *Cumhuriyet Kitap* 21 September 1995: 12-13.

Naci, Fethi. *Yüz Yılın Yüz Romanı* (A Hundred Turkish Novels in a Hundred Years). İstanbul: Adam, 1999.

Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction and the Interests of Theory*. London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989.

- - -. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice.* Ed. Terence Hawkes, London and New York: Routledge, 1982.

Onega, Susana. *Form and Meaning in the Novels of John Fowles*. Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research Press, 1989.

Oppermann, Serpil. "A Parodic Rehandling of Conventions: The French Lieutenant's Woman." *Journal of English Language and Literature*. No 3, December 1995: 75-82.

- - -. "History and Subjectivity in Contemporary English Novel." *Journal of English Language and Literature*. No 3, December 1995: 59-74.

The Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Özyer, Nuran. "Bir Edebiyat Araştırmacısı: Yıldız Ecevit" (A Literature Researcher: Yıldız Ecevit). *Cumhuriyet Kitap*. 19 Aralık 1996 : 4.

Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdağ M. Göknar. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 2001.

- - -. *Benim Adım Kırmızı*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1998.

- - -. *The Black Book*. Trans. Güneli Gün. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.

- - -. *Kara Kitap*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1990.

- - -. The *New Life*. Trans. Güneli Gün. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1997.

- - -. *Yeni Hayat*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1994.

- - -. *Öteki Renkler* (The Other Colours). İstanbul: İletişim, 1999.

- - -. "Kırmızı Koltuk" (Red Armchair). *Interstar TV*, 23.10.1994.

- - -. "Boğazdan Geçen Gemiler" (Ships Sailing Through the Bosphorus). *Sabah* 19 *December* 1999: 10-11.

Parla, Jale. "Kara Kitap Neden Kara?" (Why is The Black Book Black?). Esen 102-109.

Pavel, Thomas. "Tragedy and the sacred: notes towards a semantic characterization of a fictional genre," *Poetics* 10: 2-3, 1981.

Perloff, Marjorie, ed. *Postmodern Genres*. Oklahoma: Oklahoma University Press, 1989.

Pifer, Ellen, ed. *Critical Essays on John Fowles.* Massachussetts: G.K. Hall & Co., 1986.

Salami, Mahmoud. *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism.* London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1992.

Sarup, Madan. *Post-Yapısalcılık vePostmodernizm* (Poststructuralism and Postmodernism). Ankara: Ark Yayınları, 1977.

Scholes, Robert, ed. *Approaches to the Novel*. *Sa*n Fransisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1961.

- - -. *Textual Power; Literary Theory and the Teaching of English*. London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Stevick, Philip. "Literature." *The Postmodern Moment*. Ed. Stanley Trachtenberg. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985.

Sydney, Sir Philip. *Prose Works of Sir Philip Sydney, IV*. Ed. Albert Feurillerat. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

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.

Vetter, Gregor. "Kara Kitap'taki Rüya Kavramı" (Dream Concept in *The Black Book*). Esen 91-96.

Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London and New York: Methuen, 1984.

- - -. *Practising Postmodernism: Reading Modernism*. London: Edward Arnold, 1992.

Woodcock, Bruce. *Male Mythologies: John Fowles and Masculinity*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1984.

TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu tez, İngiltere'de 1960'larda ortaya çıkan postmodernizm akımının önemli temsilcilerinden, kendisini sadece "yazar" olarak niteleyen İngiliz John Fowles ve 1980 ve sonrası en hızlı satan ve de romanları çeşitli dillere çevrilen Türk postmodern yazar (kendi deyimiyle "romancı") Orhan Pamuk'un romanlarında kendini yansıtma kavramının karşılaştırmalı bir analizini yapmaktır. Çalışma her yazardan seçilen üçer roman (Fowles'ın *The French Lieutenant's Woman*'ı (Fransız Teğmenin Kadını), *The Magus* (Büyücü) ve *Daniel Martin*, Pamuk'un ise *Kara Kitap*, *Yeni Hayat*, *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'sı) ile sınırlandırılmıştır.

Postmodernizmde ana konu "gerçek" kavramıdır. İngiliz ve Türk postmodern romanlar gözden geçirildiğinde de esas noktanın "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" dünyalar arasındaki ilişki olduğu gözlenmektedir. Yapısalcılar ve öteyapısalcıların "gerçek" kavramına yaklaşımları farklılık gösterir. Yapısalcılar gösteren ve gösterilen arasındaki ilişkinin keyfi olduğunu, bir kere bu ilişki oturduğunda "anlam"ın sabit ve tanımlanabilir olduğu fikrindedirler. Öteyapısalcılar ise, insanın dile hakim olmadığını, sözel göstergenin anlamlandırmayı amaçladığı kavramdan apayrı olduğunu, böyle olunca da bir anlam değil birçok anlam üretilebileceği düşüncesindedirler. Postmodern roman da öteyapısalcıların ışığı altında "gerçek" ve "kurmaca"nın, geçmişle geleceğin aynı anda varolabileceği sentetik bütünler oluşturmayı amaçlar; çoğulcu bir yaklaşımı vardır. Postmodern roman, romanın dış dünyayı birebir yansıtan bir ayna olduğu fikrini yıkar; çünkü postmodern roman Waugh'un da belirttiği gibi gerçek/dış dünyayı değil o dünyayı oluşturan söylemleri taklit eder ya da resmeder (1984: 100). Öteyapısalcıların belirttiği gibi "gerçek"

dilbilimsel bir yapıdır, ve eğer bir yansıma sözkonusuysa, bu dış dünyanın değil dilbilimsel yapının yansımasıdır.

Öteyapısalcılık denince ilk akla gelen isim Jacques Derrida ve onun yapıbozumculuk teorisidir. Derrida farklılıkları vurgular ve yapıyı bozup parçalara ayırır, bir öncekinden daha kapsamlı çoğulcu yeni bir yapı oluşturur. Sonuçta, bir gösterenler zinciri oluşur ve gösterilene bir türlü ulaşılamaz. İşte bu yüzdendir ki postmodern eserlerde anlam, kendisine yaklaşıldıkça aslında uzaklaşmaktadır. Ve bir metinden, okuyucunun kültürel ve edebi bilgisine bağlı olarak birçok anlam çıkarılabileceği gibi aynı okuyucunun ikinci üçüncü okumalarında bir öncekinden farklı anlamlara ulaşması mümkündür. Postmodernizmde aslolan metindir. Metinin dışında bir gerçeklik aramak yersizdir.

Robert Scholes ise Saussure ve Derrida'nın teorilerinin bir sentezini yapar. Scholes'a göre, dil dış dünyadan ayrı düşünülemez; yapıbozumcuların savunduğu gibi edebi bir eser gerçek dünyadan tamamen ayrı değildir. Aksine, dış dünyayı taklit eder. Yazar yeni bir düzen oluşturduğu eserini gerçek dünyaya bir tepki olarak yaratır. Scholes'a göre bir metin üç aşamada okunur: İlkin, metnin dilbilimsel kodları çözümlenir. Sonra, olay örgüsü özetlenir ve metaforik ve simgesel açılardan metnin anlamı ve teması tartışılır. Son olarak ise, eserin ait olduğu edebi tür ve dönemi çerçevesinde hem temalarının hem de kodlarının bir eleştirisi yapılır.

Postmodern kurmaca bilinçli bir şekilde "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" kavramları arsındaki ilişkiyi sorunsallaştırır. Öteyapısalcıların savunduğu gibi kurmaca dünyanın gerçek dünyadan tamamen ayrık olduğunu düşünmek olanaksızdır. Postmodern metin gerçek dünyayı yansıtır, ancak yansıttığı dünya kurgusal dünyadaki yansıtılan gerçekliktir. Scholes'a göre kurmaca ve gerçek dünya bir dereceye kadar kesişirler. Böyle olunca birbirlerine benzerler ama tıpatıp aynı değildirler. Postmodern metinler içerikten çok şekle yöneldiklerinden esas olan artık *ne* anlatıldığı değil, bir şeyin *nasıl* anlatıldığıdır. Olay örgüsü ise bir kurmaca dünya yaratma yolu olmaktan öte değildir.

Linda Hutcheon, birçok eleştirmen gibi postmodern kurmacanın kendine dönüklüğünün farkındadır ve *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (1980) adlı eserinde kendini yansıtma kavramını sınıflandırmıştır. Kendini yansıtma konusundaki bu çalışmada Hutcheon'ın sınıflandırması tezin yazarına ışık tutmuştur. Postmodern romanda olay örgüsü artık bir metinlerarasılıktır ve içerikten çok anlatım sürecidir önemli olan. Roman yazarının romandaki kurgusal yazar kimliği de geleneksel anlatım tekniklerinin yerini hikaye anlatımına bırakmasına, dilin ve anlatım yapılarının kullanımına olanak sağlar. Böyle olunca da okuyucudan edilen talepler değişir. Artık okuma o kadar da kolay bir iş değildir. Okur da bu yaratma sürecine katılmalıdır. Okurun anlaması gereken ilk şey okuduğunun kendi oluşum sürecini bilinçli bir şekilde anlatan bir metin olduğudur. Okur artık metnin dünyasıyla başbaşa bırakılmıştır.

Hutcheon iki türlü kendini yansıtma tekniği olduğunu savunur: açık ve gizli olarak yapılanlar. Açık yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniğinde romanın içeriği "anlatım"dır. Bu türlü kendini yansıtmada okur metnin kurgusallığını anlamaya zorlanır ve bu dünyayı anlamlandırmaya çalışırken kendi yarattığı kurmaca dünyayla yaratma sürecine katılmış olur. Postmodern roman gerçek dünyaya çok benzeyen ama gerçek dünyanın birebir yansıması olmayan hayal bir gerçeklik yaratır. Bu gerçekliğin hayal olduğu ise okuyucuya kullanılan bazı araçlar vasıtasıyla sürekli hatırlatılır. Anlatıcı karakterin gerçek yazarı anımsatan varlığı, içiçe geçmiş Çin kutucuklarını hatırlatan hikaye içinde hikaye yapıları, parodi kullanımı açık yapılan kendini yansıtma teknikleri arasında sayılabilir.

Yazar ismindeki harflerin yerlerini değiştirerek elde ettiği karakter isimleriyle, ya da karakter olarak metnin dünyasında boy göstererek, veya üçüncü ve birinci tekil şahıs anlatımı birarada kullanarak gerçek ve kurmaca dünya arasındaki ontolojik sınırları zorlayarak metnin kurgusallığını vurgular. Sonuçta da gerçek ve kurmaca dünya arasındaki ontolojik sınır ortadan kalkmış olur. Okura sürekli okuduğunun yalnızca yazı olduğu ve okuduğu metnin konusunun da bu metnin

yazma süreci olduğu hatırlatılır. Böylelikle, ortaya içiçe geçmiş kutucuklarda olduğu gibi metin içinde metinler çıkar. Bu, bir yazar hakkında yazan kurmaca yazarlar zinciridir adeta.

Parodi de açık olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniği olarak kullanılır. Parodi geleneksel anlatım tekniklerini sorunsallaştırır. Onları deneysel stratejileri ön plana çıkarıp kendini yansıtma yoluyla yeni kurgusal formlar yaratmada araç olarak kullanır. Eski gelenekleri kullanarak yeni ve daha özgün bir form oluşturur. Gelenekselleşmiş kurmaca kurallarını ve sistemleri bozarak, parodi, okur ve metin dünyası arasındaki mesafeyi vurgular ve okurun herhangi bir karakterle özdeşleşmesine engel olur. Açık olarak yapılan kendini yansıtmada, okura oluşturabileceği sonsuz yorum olasılığıyla yaratma zevkini paylaşma öğretilir.

Gizli kendini yansıtma modelleri deyince ise, Hutcheon'ın sınıflandırmasına göre, akla detektif hikayeleri, fantezi, oyun, ve erotik ögeler gelir. Postmodern roman detektif hikayelerinin yapısal geleneklerini kullanır ve okuyucuya anlam bulma yolunda detektif rolünü uygun görür. Cinayetlerin gizini çözen detektif gibi postmodern roman okuru her detayı ipucu gibi algılayarak olayları birbiriyle ilişkilendirip metindeki gizi çözmeye çalışır ve metni yorumlayarak onu tekrar yapılandırdığında da yazarla birlikte yaratıcılık zevkini paylaşmış olur.

Gizli kendini yansıtma teknikleri kullanılan metinlerde "gerçek," "hayal," mümkün olan, mümkün olmayan biradadır. Açık kendini yansıtma teknikleri kullanılan metinlerden farklı olarak bu tür metinlerde okurdan kendi fantezi dünyasını kurması istenmez; okur buna zorlanır. Rüyaların, görüntülerin, fantezilerin birbirine karışmış hali postmodern romanda "gerçek" kavramının sorunsallaştırılmasında kullanılan araçlardandır. Hem yapılandırmada hem de anlatımda kullanılırlar.

Oyunsu yapı ve erotik ögeler de okuru yaratma faaliyetine davet eder. Okur bu oyunda oyuncudur. Kuralları ve kodları çözdüğü ölçüde oyuna katılır ve o derecede zevk alır. Bilmeceler, kelime oyunları aracılığıyla okurun ilgisi dile çekilir.

Bütün bu kurgulanan oyunlarla okuru, okuma, aynı zamanda da yaratma/yazma sürecine dahil etmek isteyen yazarla okur arasındaki ilişki de zaten erotik bir hal alır. Yazar yazdığı metinle bir nevi okuru baştan çıkarmaya çalışıp, onu metni çözümleyip yorumlamaya zorlarken asıl amacı okurun bu sanatsal yaratıcılık sürecini ve zorluklarını kendisiyle paylaşmasını sağlamaktır.

Postmodernizm "gerçek" konusuna ontolojik açıdan yaklaşır. Ontoloji bir evreni teorik olarak tanımlamak demektir. Modernist eserlerde sorun "bilmek" iken, postmodern eserlerde bu "olmak" sorunu olmuştur. Artık modernizmin en çok sorulan soruları "Parçası olduğum bu dünyayı nasıl yorumlayabilirim? Benim bu dünyadaki yerim ne?" yerini "Bu hangi dünya? Bu dünyada ne yapılmalı? Hangi 'ben'im gerçek 'ben'?"'e bırakmıştır. Postmodern romandaki kendini yansıtma kavramının kendisi zaten çağımızın endişesi olan ve sorgulanıp tartışılan bu ontolojik sorunu yansıtır. Günümüzün kimlik arayış sorununu edebiyatta da kimlik arayışı olarak görmek mümkündür. Jacques Lacan Ayna Dönemi teorisiyle bireyin kimlik arayışını yansıtmaya çalışır. Bu dönemde bebek kendisini aynada görür ve aynadaki görüntüsünün gerçek olduğunu sanır. Halbuki, bu bir yanılsamadır. Birey de aynadaki yansımayı yanlış algılayarak egosunu oluşturur. Bu bir yanlış algılamadır, çünkü Lacan'a göre kimlik/"ben"lik her zaman bir fantezi derecesindedir. Bunun sebebi ise kişinin görsel bir algılamayla bir dışsal görüntüyle özdeşleşmesidir. Özdeşleşilen içsel ayrı bir kimlik bütünü değildir. Aynadaki imaj her zaman gerçek kişiden farklıdır. Yani, hiçbir zaman "ben" "öteki" olmayandır, ya da "öteki" "ben" olmayandır demek doğru değildir. "Öteki" "ben" olmayandır, ama ayna örneğinde "öteki" "ben" olur. Bebeğin aynada gördüğü gerçek "ben" değil "ötekidir" ve bu, onda "öteki" fikrini geliştirir; potansiyel "öteki"ler ve onların farklılığını algılamasına katkıda bulunur. Ancak Lacan'a göre, "Öteki"ne ulaşmak imkansızdır. Bebek için "gerçek" olan annesiyle kurduğu bütünlüktür. Ama artık annesinin de "öteki" olduğu açıktır ve bu gerçekliğe tekrar geri dönmesi imkansızdır. Psikoanalizi Derrida'nın teorisi ışığında tekrar yorumlayan Lacan.gösterenle gösterilen arasında

bir ilişki olmadığını savunur. Gösterenler birbirini izler ama bir gösterilene bir türlü ulaşılamaz. Öteyapısalcılıkta olduğu gibi, Lacan'a göre, yetişkin olma süreci de sabit bir "ben" anlamına ulaşmakla eşdeğerdir; ancak "ben"in sabit bir şekilde anlamlandırılması, ayna örneğinde olduğu gibi beden ve "ben" arasındaki ilişkinin yanlış algılanmasından ortaya çıkan bir imgeden öteye gidemez.

Postmodern romanda da Lacan'ın ayna örneğindeki "ben" "öteki" ikilemi "gerçek" dünya ve "kurmaca" dünya arasında gözlemlenir. Romanda yaratılan gerçek değil hayal dünyasıdır; "öteki" dünyadır. Fowles ve Pamuk da yarattıkları iç içe geçmiş, birbirine benzeyen, ama aynı zamanda birbirinden farklı dünyalarla bu ayrımı vurgularlar. Bu dünyalar kurmaca dünya, yazarın varlığını hissettirdiği, çoğunlukla anlatıcının dünyasıyla karıştırılan dünya, ve yazarın dünyası yani gerçek/dış dünya olmak üzere üç tanedir. Bu dünyalar birbirlerini yansıtırlar, ancak sanat/kurmaca bir hayal olduğundan, bire bir dış dünyanın yansıması değildirler.

Bu çalışmada ikinci bölüm; yani, Fowles ve Pamuk romanlarında birinci dünyayı oluşturan karakterlerin dünyasındaki kendini yansıtma konusu Scholes, Hutcheon ve Lacan'ın bahsedilen teorileri eşliğinde çalışılmıştır. Postmodern ontolojik sorgulamayla ilgili olarak her iki romancının romanlarındaki karakterler kimlik bunalımı yaşarlar. Bu kimlik arayışı kendisini "kendi olmak" ve "başkası olmak" paradoksu olarak gösterir. Karakterler "öteki"ni tanımakta zorlanırlar ve onunla yüz yüze geldiklerinde garip hissedip "ben"i ayna ya da diğer yansıtan nesne ve varlıklarda gördükleri imgeler sanırlar ve bu "ben" "öteki" ikilemi rasında gidip gelirler.

Ayna ve ayna türü yansıtan nesne/varlıkları kullanarak Fowles ve Pamuk gerçek/orjinal nesne ve "kurmaca" gerçeklik arasındaki farklılığı gözler önüne serer. Karakterlerin kendilerini ya da başkalarını gördükleri fiziksel yansımalar Hutcheon'ın açık yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini örneklendirir. Resimler, kitaplar, performanslar da diğer fiziksel kendini yansıtma araçları olarak her iki yazarın seçilen üçer postmodern romanlarında kullanılmıştır. Fiziksel olmayan

yansımalarda ise karakterlerin kendilerini rüyalarında görmeleri, yaşadıkları rüyayı andıran deneyimler, uyku ile uyanıklık arasındaki halleri, rüyadaki gibi konuşamamayı deneyimledikleri anlar, fantezileri, birisi tarafından "izlenme"/"seyredilme" imgesi, "göz," "bakış," "gölge," "hayalet" motifleri gizli kendini yansıtma teknikleri olarak kullanılmıştır.

Hem Fowles, hem Pamuk romanlarının kendini yansıtma özelliklerini vurgulamak için içerikten çok formu ön plana alan açık kendini yansıtma metodlarından parodiyi kullanırlar. Fowles *The French Lieutenant's Woman*'da, Pamuk *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'da okurun geleneksel estetik anlayışını yıkar. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*'da 19. ve 20. yüzyıllar birbirinin karşıtı olarak kullanılır. Arka planda Viktoryen bir dünya vardır. Fowles artık eski ve ölü kabul edilen gelenekleri meydana çıkararak postmodern romandaki edebi araçları daha görünür kılar ve okuruna "gerçek" bir "hayal"dir mesajı verir. Pamuk'un *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'da yaptığı da Doğu Kültür ve Eski Türk sanatlarını, nakkaşlığı kullanarak nakkaşlık ve yazarlık arasında bir paralellik kurmaktır. *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'da nakkaşlığın parodisi yapılmaktadır. Amaç ise mesaj vermek değil, yazma sürecini okurla paylaşmaktır sadece.

Fowles ve Pamuk hayattaki ve edebiyattaki amaçları doğrultusunda ve "gerçek" hakkındaki görüşlerine bağlı olarak farklı kendini yansıtma araçları kullanırlar. Fowles öğretici olmayı amaçladığından daha çok açık olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini seçerken, Pamuk öğretmeyi amaçlamadığından hem açık hem de gizli olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini kullanır. Fowles bir dış dünya olduğuna inanır, ama Pamuk daha tutarsız bir yazar olarak dış dünyanın varlığını reddettiği halde yine de dış dünyayı işler, onu kullanır, orada yaşar. Pamuk'un amacı sürekli "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" arasındaki çizgiyi bulanıklaştırıp okuyucuyu şaşırtmaktır. Çünkü sanat bir yanılsamadır; öyleyse her okuyucu için sonsuz anlam olasılığı bulunur. Sayıca karşılaştırılacak olursa Pamuk'un

romanlarında Fowles'ın romanlarından daha çok sayıda açık kendini yansıtma örneği bulunmaktadır.

Pamuk gizli kendini yansıtma tekniklerini de bolca kullanır. Fowles öğretmeyi amaçladığından bu tür teknikleri Pamuk kadar çok kullanmaz. Örneğin; *The French Lieutenant's Woman*'da sadece bir karakterin zengin olma rüyası vardır. *Daniel Martin*'de ise ana karakter ve sevgilisinin ilişkisi ve sevgilinin yazar-ana kişinin yazmakta olduğu otobiografik romana yazdıkları rüya niteliğinde anlatılır. *The Magus* ise başlı başına ana karakter için hazırlanan rüya gibi bir maceradır. Pamuk ise rüyaları ve fantezileri gizli kendini yansıtma tekniği olarak tüm romanlarında çok sayıda kullanır. Tüm bu "rüya"lar ve "başkası olma" fantezileri bir şeye işaret eder: karakterlerin ve belki okurun da "gerçek" diye algıladığı aslında sadece bir "rüya"dır. Fowles dış dünyanın gerçekliğini savunduğu için eserlerinde "gerçek" ve "kurmaca"nın farklılığını vurgular. Pamuk metinle dış dünya arasında hiçbir ilişki olmadığını iddia ettiğinden "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" kavramları arasında algılanan sınırları zorlar.

Seyretme ya da seyredilme imgesi de her iki romancının eserlerinde de romanların kendini yansıttıkları gerçeğini vurgulamak için kullanılır. Arapça'daki "ayn"ın Türkçe'deki karşılığı "aynılık," "ayna" demektir. Aslında karakterleri izleyen dışarda bir göz yoktur gerçekte. Onları izleyen benliğin tamamlanması için gerekli olan "öteki"den başkası değildir. Bu "öteki" ya da "göz,"/ "bakış" aslında metnin içine girip ontolojik yapıyı bozan yazarın bakışı ya da gözü olabileceği gibi okuma süreci sonunda yazara dönüşen okurun gözü de olabilir. Yazar varlığını bazen "gölge" bazen "hayalet" gibi var ile yok arası hissettirebilir. Tüm bunlar eserin kendine dönüklüğünü vurgulamak için kullanılan stratejilerdir. Pamuk metinlerinin kurgusallığını vurgulamak için bu tür gizli kendini yansıtma tekniklerinde ısrar ederken Fowles öğretme amacına hizmet etmedikleri için bu tekniklerden özellikle kaçınır. Genel olarak bakıldığında, Fowles öğretici olmayı amaçladığından, daha çok açık olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini seçerken, Pamuk öğretmeyi

amaçlamadığından hem açık hem de gizli olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini kullanır.

İçiçe geçmiş dünyaların ikincisi karakterlerin dünyasını da içine alan dünyadır. Burası, gerçek yazarın yarattığı kurmaca dünyada kendi kurmaca dünyasını yaratan yazarın/anlatıcının dünyasıdır. Postmodern eserlerde aslolan kişinin o anda okuduğu kurmaca dünyanın yazma sürecidir. Fowles'ın *Daniel Martin*'i ve Pamuk'un *Yeni Hayat*'ı genellikle birinci tekil şahıs anlatıcının kullanıldığı karakterlerin okunulan romanı yazma noktasına gelene kadar geçirdikleri aşamaların bir dökümü olan geleneksel anlatım kurallarını sorgulayan türde romanlardır. Bunlar kurmacanın kurmacasıdır. Fowles romanında "ben" anlatıcıyı sorunsallaştırır ve okuyucunun ben anlatıcıyı yazarın kendisi olarak algılamasını engellemeye çalışır. *Daniel Martin*, içinde, roman yazma üstüne yorum yapan bir yazar olan, kendisi yazma sanatını yorumlayan bir romandır. Bu içiçe geçmiş çokkatmanlı yapı roman örgüsünde gözlemlenebilir. Yazar/karakter Daniel Martin kırklarının sonlarında "ben" ve "öteki" arasındaki çatışmayı çözme yolu olarak en sonunda otobiografik bir roman yazmaya karar veren bir senaryo yazarıdır. Amerika'da yaşamaktadır. Ama İngiltere'den aldığı bir telefonla ülkesine geri döner ve yüzleşmekten kaçtığı geçmişiyle yüzleşir ve bu sayede romanını yazmaya karar vererek içsel bütünlüğü yakalamaya uğraşır. Romanı bitirdiğimizde anlarız ki okuduğumuz roman özdöngüseldir; çünkü elimizde tuttuğumuz, Daniel Martin'in, yani, ikinci dünyadaki yazarın kurmaca dünyasıdır ki aslında o da gerçek yazarın kurmaca dünyasında bir karakterdir. Romanın son cümlesinde belirtildiği üzere, aslında Daniel Matin'in yazmayı arzuladığı romanın "gerçek" olması imkansızdır. Çünkü, her iki dünya, yani kurmaca dünya ve yazar karakterin olduğu dünya aslında "gerçek" değildir; bunlar asıl yazar Fowles'ın kurmaca dünyasındadır. *Daniel Martin*'de Fowles, birinci ve üçüncü tekil şahısları, geçmiş gelecek ve şimdiki zamanı birada kullanarak alışılagemiş kronolojik anlatım tekniklerini ve zaman kavramını sorunsallaştırır.

Pamuk da *Yeni Hayat*'da Fowles gibi merkezde yazma eyleminin olduğu özdöngüsel bir roman yazar. *Yeni Hayat* adlı bir roman tüm yazar karakterlerin hayatını değiştirmiştir, ve hepsi de hayatlarını değiştiren bu kitabın yazarının peşine düşmüşlerdir. Aslında kitap ve yeni hayat arasındaki ilişki yazar ve yazma eylemi arasındaki interaktif ilişkiyi de içine alır. Romandaki tüm bu karakterler kitabı okurlar ve kendilerince yorumlayıp yeni bir anlam çıkarıp yaratma sürecine ortak olurlar ve aslında *Yeni Hayat* okuyucularına yapmaları gerekenin ne olduğunu öğretirler. Ayrıca, romanda zeki okurlar için serpiştirilmiş birçok tekrar vardır. Osman (ana karakter) daha kitabın başında kitabın kendi hayatı olduğuna işaret eder ve geridönüşlerle Demiryolcu Rıfkı Amca'nın, kahramanı Osman olan bir kitap yazacağını hatırlar. Adı *Yeni Hayat* olan Rıfkı Amca'nın kitabı aslında elimizde tuttuğumuz *Yeni Hayat* romanıdır. Kısaca kitaplar ve yazar karakterler sonsuza dek birbirlerini yansıtan aynalar gibidirler *Yeni Hayat*'da .

Romanın son cümlesi ben-anlatıcının kendi ölüm anının dile getirilişidir ki anlatıcının öldükten sonra kendi ölümünü anlatması, *Daniel Martin*'de olduğu gibi konuyu "ben" anlatıcının sorunsallaştırılmasına getirir. Osman roman anlatıcısının anlattığı hikayede bir karakterdir ve söylemin öznesi olan "ben," hikayenin öznesi olan "ben"den farklıdır. Bu "ben" de gerçek yazarın "ben"iyle karıştırılmamalıdır. Çünkü gerçek yazar hem kurmaca dünyanın hem de anlatıcının dünyasının dışında, her iki dünyayı da içine alan bir bütündedir. Pamuk romandaki "gerçek"i dış dünyada aramanın yersiz olduğunu düşündüğünden öteyapısalcıların etkisiyle, tüm karakterlerin peşinden koştuğu yeni hayatın dış dünyada değil, adı da *Yeni Hayat* olan kitabın içinde saklı olduğunu öne sürer. Fowles ve Pamuk yazdıkları kurmacanın kurmacasıyla varoluşsal yazarlık ve kimlik arayışı konularına odaklanıp eserlerinin kurgusallığına işaret ederler. Her ikisi de çokkatmanlı anlatım kullanıp açık sonlu döngüsel romanlar yazarlar ve "ben" anlatıcıyı açık kendini yansıtma tekniği olarak eserlerinde kullanırlar.

İçiçe geçmiş dünyaların sonuncusu ise yazarın/okurun bulunduğu gerçek/dış dünyadır. Modern eleştiri teorilerinin yazar hakkındaki biyografik bilginin gereksizliği fikrinin aksine, Fowles ve Pamuk eserlerinde hayatlarına dair yaptıkları birçok referansla yazarı anlamada biyografik bilginin gerekliliğinin kaçınılmazlığını ortaya koyarlar. Bazen yazar/karakterler yazar olmalarının yanında bazı fiziksel özellikleriyle de kendi yazarlarını anımsatırlar. Fowles'da durum böyledir. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*'da kırk yaşlarındaki, trendeki sakallı anlatıcı, roman türü hakkında yorumlar yapar ve tüm bu kurmaca dünyanın arkasındaki sakallı Fowles'a işaret eder. Aynı şey *Daniel Martin*'de de görülmektedir. Fowles, kendisi kırk yaşlarında yine kırk yaşlarında Daniel Martin adındaki başka bir yazar hakkında yazan yazardır. Daniel Martin ise telefon rehberinden seçilen bir ismi olan karakterin Simon Wolfe'ın hayatını yazmaktadır. Simon'ın soyadındaki harflerin yeri değiştirildiğinde Fowles ismi ortaya çıkınca bir kez daha okura yazarın varlığı hissettirilir.

Pamuk'un romanlarında ise karakterler fiziksel boyutta yazar Pamuk'a benzemeseler de Fowles'ın *Daniel Martin*'inde olduğu gibi *Yeni Hayat*'taki Osman ve *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'daki Orhan, yazar Pamuk'un ilk ismi Orhan'ı akla getirir. Özellikle Osman karakteri Pamuk'un hayatıyla paralellikler gösterir. Osman da yirmi-iki yaşında yazar olmaya hayatın anlamını yazarlıkta aramaya karar verip mimarlık eğitimini bırakan yazar Pamuk gibi kendini kitabın gösterdiği yeni hayata bırakır. Osman da Pamuk gibi kareli defterlere yazar; Onun gibi disiplidir, ve günde ortalama sekiz on saat arası çalışır. Romanda sürekli Osman'ı izleyen Doktor Narin'in detektiflerine saat isimleri verilmesinin sebebi yine Pamuk'un kişisel ilgisiyle alakalıdır. Yeni Hayat karameları ve *Kara Kitap*'ın gizemli Rüya'sı da gerçek hayattandır. Pamuk'un kendi kızının adı da Rüya'dır. Ayrıca, *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'daki aile ve Pamuk'un ailesi bir dereceye kadar örtüşür. Romandaki Orhan karakterinin yanısıra ağabey Şevket ve anne Şekure de gerçek hayattandır.

Her iki yazarın romanındaki mekanlarda da romancıların gerçek hayatlarından bir şey bulmak mümkündür. Fowles bir doğa aşığıdır. *French Lieutenant's Woman*'daki Dairy ve Cobb Fowles'ın Lyme Regis'teki çiftlik evinin yansımalarıdır. *The Magus*'da ise Nicholas ve Fowles'ın kendisinin görev yerleri Yunan adalarıdır; ya da *Daniel Martin*'deki mekanlar ve özellikle ilk bölümdeki tavşanların öldüğü sahne 1940-1 yıllarında Fowles'ın kendisinin yaşadığı deneyimlerdir. Pamuk İstanbul'un köklü ailelerinden geldiğinden ve İstanbul'da yaşadığından olsa gerek, bu çalışmadaki romanları İstanbul'da geçer (*Yeni Hayat* otobüslerden inilip otobüslere binilen bir romandır). *Kara Kitap* Pamuk'un romanları arasında en otobiyografik olanıdır.

Yazar ve karakter ilişkisi incelendiğinde *The Magus*'daki Nicholas'ın ve aynı zamanda da Conchis'in Fowles'ın yansımaları olduğunu gözlemek mümkündür. Denizciliği bıraktığında hayattan memnuniyetsizliğini dile getiren Fowles gibi Nicholas da Oxford'daki hayattan bıkmıştır. Fowles toplumu yazarak değiştirebileceğine inanır. Spetsai'da öğretmenlik yapmayı seçen Nicholas aslında Phraxos'da öğretmen olarak çalışan yazarına benzer. Conchis ise Nicholas'ın gerçekleri görüp büyümesine katkıda bulunmak için hazırladığı tüm oyun içinde oyunlarla romanlarında kurmaca dünyalar oluşturan Fowles'ı çağrıştırır. Pamuk'un gençlik hali ise *Yeni Hayat*'taki Osman'dır. Kendisinin de yapılan röportajlarda belirttiği üzere *Kara Kitap*'taki Galip ve *Benim Adım Kırmızı*'daki Kara Pamuk'un kendisine en yakın hissettiği karakterlerdir. Sonuçta, Fowles ve Pamuk'un romanlarını yazarken gerçek yazarın, ikinci dünyada okurla yazma sorunlarını paylaşan yazar-karakterden üstün olduğunun, ve merkezde kurmaca dünyanın bulunduğunun ama tüm bu dünyaların dışında ve hepsini içini alan romancının dünyasının varlığının hissedilmesini amaçladıkları söylenebilir.

Karakterlerin dünyasında, yazar karakterin bulunduğu dünyada, ve gerçek yazarın dünyası olan dış dünyada kendini yansıtma olmak üzere bu çalışmada üç çeşit kendini yansıtma analizi yapılmıştır. Ancak sonuçta değişik uzunluklarda bölümler

ortaya çıkmıştır. İkinci bölüm oldukça uzundur. Bunun da sebebi, bu bölümde Fowles ve Pamuk'un romanlarında karakterlerin dünyasındaki kendini yansıtma örneklerinin sayıca çok olması, üçüncü bölümde ise ancak iki roman ve beş anlatıcı işlenmesi, ve dördüncü bölümün de iki yazarı konu almasındandır. Araştırma sırasında yazarın hayatının edebi eserlerde yansımasının "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" kavramlarını sorunsallaştırmada kullanılabileceği ve bu konunun araştırmaya değer olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Bu çalışmada gözlenen şudur: Fowles ve Pamuk hayattaki ve edebiyattaki amaçları doğrultusunda ve "gerçek" hakkındaki görüşlerine bağlı olarak farklı kendini yansıtma araçları kullanırlar. Fowles öğretici olmayı amaçladığından daha çok açık olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini seçerken, Pamuk öğretmeyi amaçlamadığından hem açık hem de gizli olarak yapılan kendini yansıtma tekniklerini kullanır. Fowles bir dış dünya olduğuna inanır, ama Pamuk daha tutarsız bir yazar olarak dış dünyanın varlığını reddettiği halde yine de dış dünyayı işler, onu kullanır, orada yaşar. Postmodernizm akımı İngiliz edebiyatında Türk edebiyatından çok daha önce ortaya çıkmasına rağmen Fowles ve Pamuk karşılaştırıldığında Pamuk'un Fowles'dan daha postmodern olduğu farkedilir. Fowles'ın romanlarını okumak Pamuk'un romanlarını okumaktan daha kolay ve zevklidir. Çünkü okuyucunun kafası Pamuk romanlarını anlamaya çalışırken olduğu gibi karışmamıştır. Pamuk yarattığı çokkatmanlı metinlerle okuru onunla yazma eylemini paylaşıp zevk almaya davet eder. Okur, artık Pamuk'un oyununda bir oyuncudur. Her okur için zevk alacak bir şey bulmak mümkündür Pamuk'un romanlarında. Çünkü Pamuk hem alt kültüre hem de üst kültüre hitap eder. Entellektüel olmayan okurlar için yüzeyde her zaman bir izlek vardır. Edebi donanımı olan ya da (kendi deyimiyle) zeki okur içinse tüm postmodern oyunlar eserlere serpiştirilmiştir. Kullandığı tekniklerle zaman içinde bir ileri bir geri gidip sonunda metinlerin kendisine odaklanan metinler yazarak okurun aklını karıştıran Pamuk, okuru metninin içine alıp onun da anlam üretirken kendisiyle yaratma eylemine katılmasını ister. Bulmaca

çözmeyi ya da detektif romanları okumayı seven okurların Pamuk'un yaptığı oyunları izlerken daha çok zevk alacakları kesin görünmektedir. Fowles, Pamuk kadar geleneksel gerçekçi anlatım tekniklerini terketmediğinden Pamuk'un labirente benzer yapıdaki eserlerinden hoşlanmayan okurlarca daha çok tercih edilir diye düşünülebilir.

Son söz olarak özetlemek gerekirse, incelenen tüm romanlarda görülen, Fowles ve Pamuk'un çağın ontolojik endişesinin farkında oluşları. Aslında her iki yazar da romanlarında bireyin kimlik/"ben"lik bunalımını işlerler. "Ben" ve "öteki" arasındaki süregelen ikilemse kendisini romanların çokkatmanlı ve parçalanmış yapısında gösterir. Her ne teknik kullanırlarsa kullansınlar, Fowles ve Pamuk metinlerinde kurgusallığı/kurmacayı konu edinirler, ve "gerçek"in bir hayal ve değiştirilebilir olduğunun altını çizerler. Kendini yansıtmanın postmodernizmin vazgeçilmez bir özelliği olduğunu söylemek kaçınılmazdır. Çünkü, yarattıkları içiçe geçmiş dünyalarla yazarlar ben (gerçek) ve öteki (kurmaca)nın farklılığını vurgularlar. Özde karakterlerin "ben" ve "öteki" arasındaki savaşı durdurmak için çıktıkları iç yolculuklar anlatılıyor olsa da aslında bu yolculuklar yazarların da "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" arasında süregelen çatışmayı incelemek için başlattıkları yolculuklardır. Kurmaca dünya gerçek yaşam kesitidir denilemez ama gerçek yaşamla da tamamen ayrık olduğu da savunulamaz. Çünkü, sonsuza dek birbirini yansıtan içiçe geçmiş bu dünyalarda yazarların hayatlarından izler bulmak da mümkündür.

Eserlerinde "kurgusallık" konusunu bazen açık bazen de gizli olarak vurgulayan, ve okurlarını "gerçek" ve "kurmaca" dünyalar arasındaki benzerlikleri olduğu kadar farklılıkları da görmeye davet eden Fowles ve Pamuk, her ne kadar biri İngiliz biri Türk olsalar da kendini yansıtan eserler yazarlar ve değişik yansıtma teknikleri kullanırlar. Sonuçta okur üzerindeki etkiler de kullanılan kendini yansıtma tekniğine göre değişiklik gösterir.