

**YASAR UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME**

**MASTER THESIS**

**ARCHIVAL ELEMENTS IN A.S. BYATT'S**  
***POSSESSION* AND ORHAN PAMUK'S**  
***MASUMİYET MÜZESİ***

**İNCİ MISIRLI**

**THESIS ADVISOR: ASST. PROF. TREVOR JOHN HOPE**

**2019 İZMİR.**

## MASTER THESIS JURY APPROVAL FORM

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the Master degree.



28.11.2019

Thesis Supervisor, Asst. Prof.Dr.Trevor HOPE

Yaşar University

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the Master degree.




28.11.2019

Prof. Dr. Dilek DİRENÇ

Ege University

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the Master degree.



28.11.2019

Asst. Prof.Dr.Mehmet KAHYAOĞLU

Yaşar University



Assoc.Prof.Dr. Çağrı BULUT

DIRECTOR OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

## ABSTRACT

### ARCHIVAL ELEMENTS IN A.S. BYATT'S POSSESSION AND ORHAN PAMUK'S MASUMİYET MÜZESİ

İnci Mısırlı

M.A., English Language and Literature

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Trevor John Hope

2019

The purpose of this Master's thesis is to conduct a comparative analysis of concepts of domesticity, gender and nationhood in the novels *Masumiyet Müzesi* by Orhan Pamuk and *Possession* by A.S. Byatt in relation to the archive. The transformation of a house into an individual's museum-like place by which he fulfills his desire to create his own interiority brings about a series of paradoxes concerning the relationship between inside and outside, private and public, hidden and revealed. While the archive's emotional functions of providing a form of compensation for loss, offering nostalgic satisfaction and both preserving and getting rid of the past to overcome the present time's constraints help us to understand the individual and historical need for the domestication of a place, the struggle to be the one who controls the archive that is endowed with all these purposes poses new psychological problems for the individual. This thesis, which treats the two novels as archives, examines the preservation of femininity as a way of repressing it and the question of patriarchal control over the archive in relation to the social and political structures of Turkey and England and the processes of transformation associated with modernity. The concept of "possession" is revealed to have a problematic relationship to ideas of nationhood and national heritage. The question of some kind of national essence is discussed in relation to the Derridean archive with particular reference to the ideas of ideality and disorder.

**Keywords:** archive, museum, interiority, domesticity, gender, nationhood, femininity.

## ÖZ

### ARCHIVAL ELEMENTS IN A.S. BYATT'S POSSESSION AND ORHAN PAMUK'S MASUMİYET MÜZESİ

İnci Mısırlı

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Trevor John Hope

2019

Bu yüksek lisans tezinin amacı, Orhan Pamuk'un *Masumiyet Müzesi* ve A.S. Byatt'ın *Possession* romanlarındaki ev hayatı, toplumsal cinsiyet ve milliyet kavramlarının arşiv teması üzerinden karşılaştırmalı bir analizini yapmaktır. Bireyin kendine ait bir içsellik oluşturma gayesiyle evini müze benzeri bir yere dönüştürmesi iç ve dış, kişisel ve umumi, saklı ve açığa çıkmış gibi zıt ikilemleri beraberinde getirir. Kayıplara karşı bir tazminat formu sağlaması, nostaljik doyum sunması ve şimdiki zamanın yol açtığı zorlukları aşmak için hem geçmişi koruması hem de ondan kurtulması gibi duygusal işlevlerle donatılmış arşivin bireyin kendine ait bir yere ihtiyaç duymasını tarihsel boyutta açıklamasının yanısıra, tüm bu amaçları yerine getiren arşivi kontrol altına alma mücadelesi birey için yeni psikolojik problemler yaratır. Tartışmakta olduğu iki romanı da arşiv olarak ele alan bu tez, kadınlığın bastırılarak ataerkil düzen tarafından koruma altına alınmasını Türkiye ve İngiltere'nin sosyal ve politik yapıları ile modernleşme sürecini ilişkilendirerek incelemektedir. "Sahiplik" kavramının ulusluk ve ulusal miras fikirleriyle problemleri bir ilişkisi olduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Ulusal öz kavramı Derrida'nın arşiv teorisinin sunduğu düşüncelik ve düzensizlik fikirlerine atıfta bulunularak tartışılmıştır.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** arşiv, müze, ev hayatı, içsellik, toplumsal cinsiyet, ulusluluk, kadınlık.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude for my advisor Trevor John Hope, whose vast knowledge, experience, work ethics, patience and endless support have always been by my source of inspiration, and also whom I consider myself lucky to have worked with.

The second very special gratitude shall go to my family, my mother and father. Thank you for your never ending attention, concern and motivation which have helped me not only in this, but always do in all aspects of my life.

I am also grateful for Görkem Karabulut who did not let me lose my faith in this journey, besides literally helping me do all the required technological stuff which I could not have done without him.

My beloved cats and Lokum.

İnci Mısırlı

İzmir, 2019

## TEXT OF OATH

I declare and honestly confirm that my study, titled “ARCHIVAL ELEMENTS IN A.S. BYATT’S *POSSESSION* AND ORHAN PAMUK’S *MASUMİYET MÜZESİ*” and presented as a Master’s Thesis, has been written without applying to any assistance inconsistent with scientific ethics and traditions. I declare, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that all content and ideas drawn directly or indirectly from external sources are indicated in the text and listed in the list of references.

İnci Mısırlı

.....

December 27, 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT.....	3
ÖZ .....	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	5
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	7
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. CHAPTER DOMESTICITY, INTERIORITY AND THE MUSEUM.....	10
2. CHAPTER GENDER AND THE “PATRIARCHIVE” .....	31
3. CHAPTER NATION, MEMORY AND ARCHIVE.....	53
CONCLUSION.....	70
WORKS CITED .....	73

## INTRODUCTION

Ferit Orhan Pamuk, born in Turkey, is a novelist, screenwriter, academic and one of the most prominent figures in Turkish Literature. He grew up in a large family in Nişantaşı, one of the wealthiest and the most westernized neighbourhoods of İstanbul, which plays a key role in his novels. In his memoir *İstanbul* he states that until he was 22, his biggest dream was to be an artist and an architect. Although he started studying architecture at Istanbul Technical University, he dropped out in his last year to pursue another dream: that of becoming a journalist. He, again, started studying journalism at İstanbul University until he realized that it was not the occupation of his dreams. At the age of 23, he has made up his mind and announced his new ambition that would make him who he is today: a novelist.

He published several novels in the following years which have been translated into many other languages, and in 2006 he received the Nobel Prize for Literature. Pamuk's novels scrutinize Turkish identity mostly in relation to history and modernity. His first novel *Cevdet Bey and His Sons* is a story of three generations of a well-off family living in Nişantaşı. *Silent House* narrates a family gathering on the night of the Turkish coup. *The White Castle*'s protagonist is an Italian intellectual who is enslaved by the Turkish and the novel questions the concept of identity. *The Black Book*, a masterpiece by which Pamuk gained international popularity, is more than a detective novel. The setting is İstanbul, where a woman is missing and, while her husband looks for her, the concepts of self-analysis, the problems of both personal and national identity, again, are discussed.

“Ruhumun iki yanı var, resim ve edebiyat arasında bölünmüş... İkisi şimdi burada birleşti,” he says, after pondering his career choices for years, in an interview on *Masumiyet Müzesi*, which is both the novel itself and also a place which he has built in Çukurcuma, İstanbul. It is the first book that he published after gaining world wide recognition with *The Black Book*. He says it took him fifteen years to finish the book and since the very beginning he was planning to open the literal museum, too. He has seen it as an opportunity to concretize his, or as in the novel Kemal's, love story first in the narrative and then in a real place. Not surprisingly the setting is İstanbul, again, said to be the Keskinlers' house as describes in the novel, and is set



from 1975 to the present day. Kemal is one of the two sons of a wealthy family residing in Nişantaşı. When he encounters his distant relative, Füsun, whom he has not seen since she was very small, in the boutique she works in, he is not aware of the imminent obsessive love for her which will have some serious tragic elements. Füsun, being from a lower class, residing with her family in Çukurcuma, one of the less wealthy neighbourhoods of İstanbul compared with Nişantaşı, helps the reader to set the contrast of two different classes and offers a panoramic view on the Turkish identity crisis in both parties as traditional and modern, and how modernity has its effect on them.

The novel kicks off with Kemal's gripe as he says, "Hayatımın en mutlu anıymış. Bilmiyordum. Bilseydim, bu mutluluğu koruyabilir, her şey de bambaşka gelişebilir miydi?" (11). Until the last page of the novel, Kemal attempts to find ease and be as happy as he was when Füsun was his mistress for a short time. As he could not "protect" or "preserve" what he had, throughout the novel he chases Füsun, the missing object that would make his life complete. The museum functions as a compensation for his loss and a sanctuary for him as it is the only place which he creates to feel at ease. As he is unable to change what has happened, he tries to collect all Füsun's belongings to make himself believe what is lost does not necessarily have to be lost unless it is captured in the form of an object: that is to say, archived.

Before moving to the key elements that the archives and archival places are essentially associated with, I would like to introduce another novelist, one of whose works in particular has parallels with Pamuk's. A.S. Byatt, born in the UK, is renowned for her internationally acclaimed short stories and novels. She was once a teacher at London College and quit her job to pursue a full-time career as a writer. Since then she has published many works including the novels *Biographer's Tale and the Quartet*, *The Virgin in the Garden*, *Still Life*, *Babel Tower* and *A Whistling Woman*, *Children's Book*, *Possession* as well as short story collections such as *Sugar and Other Stories*, *The Matisse Stories*, *The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye*, *Elementals* and *Little Black Book of Stories*. She has been listed as one of the 50 greatest British writers since 1945 by the Times newspaper, and she has been awarded the Booker Prize for her best-selling novel *Possession*.

"I thought I have to have two couples, which he says is the beginning of any novel," says Byatt, following D.H. Lawrence's advice for how to start her novel. The two couples of the novel are poets who lived in the Victorian Age and whose relationship is rediscovered, and a couple in the present, who get closer while they aim to prove the two poets' connection. Byatt uses this opportunity of having two different stories from two different times to tell to set some contrasts on the societal structures of different times affecting many things and is being playful as she employs Romantic Victorian poets whose literary works and correspondence function as puzzles in the mystery. The 20th century scholars provide another perspective to the reader while they chase the plot clues of the Victorian romance. In this process many archives are revealed accompanied by many problems that this thesis is going to explore concerning domesticity both in terms of related to household and gender, and nationhood.

At the most basic level defining an archive is undemanding. An archive can be considered as a place which preserves what needs to stay together. It can be the place itself, like a storehouse which keeps and preserves everything in it. In an office, for instance, it can be only a part in the building, a room where some documents are saved and piled up. In a house it might be a little collection on display inside of a cabinet which contains things that one keeps around for a reason. It can be the museum itself exhibiting a peculiar time's art work or a nation's independence war helping the historians and citizens to learn and remember. An archive might be needed because one feels the need for keeping some invaluable objects in one place. They might be delicately collected and organized. Or on the contrary, there might be a need to keep some objects which are useless and yet cannot be discarded. The items in an archive might already have something in common, be located, brought together on purpose and categorized just like folders arranged in alphabetic order. Or at first glance they may not seem to reflect a unity or a perfect kind of categorization. In all cases, the role assigned to the archive, the function of it is simple: to keep together and to preserve.

Archive can be one's memory that is full of occasions, pieces of memories that are either cherished or have to be thrown out completely if they evoke the past's undesirable experiences. One's memory gathers everything, good or bad, and it is the

place one wanders about if he wishes to feel the excitement of a certain event again by remembering it, but at the same it, nonetheless, it reminds what is not wanted in one's most personal metaphorical archive. It might lay bare what needs to be avoided or forgotten on purpose. It is not an easy task to be fully in control of what our memory preserves and what it might offer us from our own past experiences and it is a place that can be shaped by the external and yet shall be protected from outside.

In this digital age, an archive might be in the form of a digital storage like a USB or some intangible cloud that saves our media, documents, all kinds of personal or non-personal information on the internet making it easy to be accessed. Collecting, bringing together and keeping them in one's home or anywhere else are almost like everyday acts. However, on the theoretical level defining and understanding the concept of archive is intricate as Jacques Derrida claims "nothing is less clear today than the word "archive"" (90). In his book *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, Derrida actually starts his discussion with a rethinking of the archive in relation to digital communication. It was a lecture delivered by him in 1994 and later translated into English where he in fact broadly explains the nature of the archive in Freudian terms rather than merely focusing on digital media. He starts by saying, "Let us not begin at the beginning, nor even at the archive" (1) and rejects to follow an order or a kind of principle that involves an origin. Instead, he starts with a very literal definition and introduces the archive's etymology, which is a Greek word "arkhé" meaning origin and beginning. He offers the term "arkheion" which is "initially a house, a domicile, an address" (2). Derrida suggests that an ideal order must be without anything interrupting. In such a system all the elements should form a kind of homogeneous unity. However, what Derrida implies is that perfect order is impossible because it necessarily requires the external, which contravenes to the ideality. He suggests some paradoxes that challenge the most common functions of the archive. He rejects any kind of origin, unity, instead he reveals several oppositions that an archive is built upon: inside but at the same time outside, private but in some ways still public, preserved and yet revealed. It is the nature of the archive that it embraces opposites denying any kind of homogeneous perfection. That is to say, despite one's aim of making a collection with some similar objects and claiming that it, for instance, is an archive of one particular thing, according to

Derrida, these kinds of associations and categorizations are impossible as above-mentioned oppositions are inevitable.

The archives found in Orhan Pamuk's *Masumiyet Müzesi* and A.S. Byatt's *Possession* which this thesis will focus on contain the paradoxes that are suggested by Derrida. In addition to the problems raised by Derrida, this thesis will also link archives to broader problems of Turkish and British societies and also of individuals. In each of the novels, there is a prominent archive that is the Masumiyet Müzesi itself where Kemal gathers Füsün's objects and the house of Christabel LaMotte, the dead Victorian female poet. The first chapter of this thesis is going to look at the domestic places and museum-like houses in two novels as archives. Didier Maleuvre provides a historical approach to houses and their function as a museum in his book *Museum Memories*, and in my first chapter I use his theories to understand the concept of museum-like places which happen to be houses, too. He consigns the role of "domestic keeper" to homes and, concerning the act of collecting objects says, "collecting is a way of taking possession of the world" (135). Taking something home is a way of domesticating it and it is important as, starting from the 19th century, people have felt the need of museums in order to define their pasts. As the museums increased in number, home-making and interiority have become a kind of project for the modern man to help him make his presence in the world concrete. The interior has become a tool to express individuals' life, as it is trusted to show how a person dwells not in house but also in the world as an individual. Maleuvre says, the interiority "represents a basic anthropological document" (120) for human beings by which they make a sense of their existence. Homes have become the subjective places where people started embodying their own history, memory and nostalgia.

According to UNESCO, which uses International Council of Museums' definition, museum is a

non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.

Broadly it is known to be a public place to educate public on certain things, eras, art or anything. However, Pamuk has his own way of interpreting the need for a museum and its purpose as in his manifesto on museums he says, “Müzeler, özellikle hızla zenginleşen Batı dışı ülkelerde ortaya çıkmakta olan yeni ve modern insanın dünyasını, insanlığını araştırmalı ve ifade etmeli”. He suggests instead of national museums, humans need to build their own museums that show their own subjectivity, although, as we shall see, this will paradoxically turn out to be inseparable from ideas of national identity.

In her article “Innocent Memories: Reading the Museum in Orhan Pamuk’s *The Museum of Innocence*” Sarah Rengel argues, “Motivated by love for Füsün, Kemal creates a literary museum which de-emphasises narratives of nation and modernisation, instead celebrating the importance of subjective experience” (16) as she deals with the relationship between a private, subjective museum and public museum carrying traces of nationalism. I would argue, though, that while subjectivity might seem to come to the foreground, what happens in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, is quite the opposite. Despite Kemal’s insistence on sharing his story with others and despite Orhan Pamuk’s views on museums as expression of subjectivity telling only one person’s experience is tangled with a much larger issue: nationalism and gender.

The Masumiyet Müzesi is under construction throughout the novel and the urge that causes Kemal to build a collection of Füsün’s objects seems very simple: to prove that what he considers to be the happiest moment on his life really happened. He wants the visitors to experience his memories through certain objects that he proudly puts on display in his museum. In the novel he is the storyteller, but he assigns this role to the museum and wants the interiority to preserve his life and memories even after he is dead. Christabel’s house seems to be similar to the museum in Pamuk’s novel in the sense that its visitors, although they are not as welcome as in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, try to get a glimpse of her life by intruding in her archive. Again, another domestic place becomes open to the public. Thus, the houses, the domestic keepers become the domestic story tellers that are supposed to narrate their owners’ stories themselves. However, it lays bare the fact, also stated by Irmak Ertuna that “the story of an individual becomes linked to a collective

experience” (109). The house, the most domestic place, becomes the property of others as well.

While Kemal tries to preserve his memories with Füsün in the Masumiyet Müzesi, he is determined not to miss a single detail in their love story, so he makes sure he provides long lists and descriptions of every item he collects. The novel is “accompanied by prosaic descriptions of varying detail, dually contextualized by their relation to Füsün as well as their cultural and historical embedding” (133) as Dorothee Birke and Stella Butter argue. The objects range from Füsün’s earrings to salt shakers taken from Füsün’s parents’ house. All must provide a link to Füsün, making her an essential element in Kemal’s archive. He is obsessed with attaching a meaning to every single object in his collection to keep them still familiar to him. He wants to be surrounded by the familiarity of those objects, that link him to Füsün.

Although the house was once a private, later it becomes a rather public place, out of Kemal’s control and this raises the problems of what Freud calls uncanny, or “unheimlich”. He says this is “the name for everything that ought to have remained ... secret and hidden, but has come to light” (345). An individual’s private home turns into a public place of which he has lost his control and can no longer claim ownership, be the authority in decision making. The place becomes both familiar and unfamiliar at the same time. The archive, according to Derrida, is always in need of an external object. He rejects any kind of homogeneity in an archive, and he says the system necessarily requires an “external substrate” in order to be complete. The house which is associated with the image of a safe place that protects whatever is in it, is compromised by the fact that it also requires the outside. It is this challenge and uncanny that makes Kemal weaker in his obsession with Füsün and with preserving her in his house.

In my second chapter, starting from a discussion of the problems of femininity from societal, cultural and political perspectives, I shall be arguing how femininity is treated as a source of disruption and how the archives in the novels are gendered. Fethi Demir says, Pamuk narrates events “Aşk, bekâret, masumiyet, cinsellik gibi konuların 1970’li yıllarda İstanbul’un üst sınıfları arasında nasıl algılandığına dair takıntılı bir aşğın sevdiği kadın için tüm hayatını vermesi ve aşkını yaşatmak için bir

müze kurmaya çalışması bağlamında” (936). Different social classes in Pamuk’s novel, provide a clear insight into femininity which is implied to be a possession of men. While Turkish society seems to be ambivalent as they are exchanging their conventional national identity for a more modern one, still the issues of sexuality and sexual impurity seem to remain as unsolved. The female body, which is another form of archive, is proposed as something that should remain private and unstained. In fact, there are many references showing that in order to keep it pure male power has to interfere. It is men who call all the shots when it comes to the female body as they claim their authority.

Bianca Tredennick has looked at issues of sexuality in *Possession*, and she says the novel “re-establishes heterosexuality as the norm in the relationships” (191). She points out the criticism the novel has received since all the “unideal” acts concerning sexuality somehow seem to be solved. Femininity is treated like an archive that is expected to embrace nothing but ideality, to be pure and untouched. This sense of ideality appears to be under threat throughout the novel but through the ending of novel in order to offer a happy ending to the narrative, all negative suspicions and thoughts disappear. The implications of LaMotte’s homosexual relationship with her companion Blance Glover or the problems that occurred when she got pregnant from the poet, Ash, and gave birth in France, not in England, do not seem to be the main issues anymore. As Tredennick discusses, the ending of the novel is rather happy with all the odds of the past seem to be overlooked when the present couple Maud and Mitchel’s romance starts. In order to maintain a kind of peace, problems concerning female sexuality are ignored.

In my final chapter, I am using ideas from Meltem Ahıska to account for my discussion of nation as an archive. In her essay titled “Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern,” Ahıska claims that Turkey is “labeled by both outsiders and insiders as a bridge between the East and the West” and “has been trying to cross the bridge between the East and the West for more than a hundred years now with a self-conscious anxiety that is arrested in time and space by the bridge itself” (353). In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, the Turkish identity is acclaimed by one part of the society as something, like femininity, that should be preserved as it is. “Özcülük,” essentialism, seems to gather some ideal attributes of a certain nationhood and believed to be the

core element in national identity. And yet, when it comes to describe and define what makes up the essentials of a nationhood it becomes a rather difficult project. The “öz,” essence, that is the archive of true Turkishness, it is argued, must remain untouched from the West. However, the other part of society is already in favour of trading their “öz” with something more modern so that they can look alike Westerners. I will be discussing how this bridge, existence of which is already accepted, affect the identity of Turkishness as an archive.

In *Possession*, one of the scholars, in pursuit of the Victorian poets, is English while the other is American and the both claim ownership over the works of two poets that are English. In the heat of this argument over the “ownership” of an archive involving nationhood, I refer to Ernest Renan to explain what a nation is. He opposes his definition to the most common belief that it is race, land or blood that brings people together and creates a sense of Turkishness or Britishness. He, in fact, argues that it is memory that a nation is built upon. Collective memory and collective forgetting are the most essential core elements in the concept of nationhood. “Öz”, which is vaguely defined and only associated with concrete attributes that can be easily recognized, and yet highly praised and served as something crucial, is what he objects to.

While other people have looked at the other aspects of the *Possession*, very little criticism has focused on the questions of nationhood. What I am aiming to show in my third chapter is, it is not only an important component of the novel, but it is also very closely related to the questions of domesticity and ownership in relation to the archive.



## 1. CHAPTER

### DOMESTICITY, INTERIORITY AND THE MUSEUM

*Of all the modern notions generated by mere wealth the worst is this: the notion that domesticity is dull and tame. Inside the home (they say) is dead decorum and routine; outside is adventure and variety... But the truth is that the home is the place of liberty, the only spot on earth where a man can alter arrangements suddenly, make an experiment or indulge in a whim. The home is not the one tame place in a world of adventure; it is the one wild place in a world of rules and set tasks.*

G.K. Chesterton<sup>1</sup>

Domesticity is more than a material, physical space, referring to the life inside the home in the most literal sense. It is a private, personal place and is usually associated with the most privatized comfort zone in people's mind where one is expected to feel the most secure, the most "at home". Didier Maleuvre, who provides the historical account for this chapter on domesticity, says that "home is not simply a house; [it is] an image of how we dwell and how we inhabit the world" (120). Maleuvre is particularly interested in the domestic interior in the 19th century which is seen as the age of revolutions which shaped personal spaces. According to Diana Fuss, after the American and French revolutions in the 18th century, there was a transformation from "communal house into a personal sanctuary, a place ideologically re-moved from the turmoil of civic life" (3). With the rise of privacy and interiority in the 19th century, houses became the image of people's subjectivity, a place for creation and preservation of a sense of self. This is the period when home collections in interiors came to be increasingly conceived as private museums, according to Maleuvre. He defines interiority as "a magnified dollhouse, a cutely domesticated universe," and the owner as its "benevolent master" (135). With every piece that one delicately collects and puts into one's house to preserve, one creates

---

<sup>1</sup> Chesterton, G.K. *What's Wrong with the World*.

one's own interiority, with the purpose of creating an image for oneself to represent to others, although this is also a place of solitude.

Chesterton agrees that a house is not only house, but is also much more than that. He challenges the common image of a confining place where one cannot distract oneself from boring household tasks. He says, in fact, it sets one free. The contrast he is making will be analyzed further, but echoing Maleuvre's thoughts on the relationship between an individual and his domestic interior and Chesterton's praise of the domestic place, Pamuk says, in his manifesto on his literal museum the Masumiyet Müzesi that he built in İstanbul with the same name, "Müzelerin geleceği evlerimizde içindedir". In his work, he represents the case of an individual struggling to create an interiority combining the concern for personal comfort with that of display. His work, *Masumiyet Müzesi*, is almost like a guidebook to the literal museum. Throughout the novel the protagonist Kemal, interrupts the narrative in order to refer to the museum he creates and explains the reasons why he is turning his house into an archive, he is collecting different kinds of objects, and describes how each object attains a new meaning in the collection and what triggers him to do this. In the novel, Kemal and Füsün, his distant cousin whom he loves deeply, become lovers at the very beginning, but shortly after they separate against Kemal's wishes to continue the relationship. Just like a person who distracts himself from the world by writing or by doing any other kind of activity, Kemal starts collecting objects related to Füsün and later realizes that this domestic place helps him to find comfort in the real world. At the same time he puts all these down on paper and metaphorically builds the second museum, which is the book itself, *Masumiyet Müzesi*. Kemal is both the builder of the museum and the fictional author of the novel as it is written in first person narrative. Although the novel and the museum seem to perform to one particular love story and be owned by one particular man, that is Kemal, there are some hints that Pamuk actually tries to represent "any" person's struggle to create a place where he feels at home, where he runs away to commune with his possessions.

Kemal's frustration at the loss of Füsün and at the end of their relationship and the loss of his connection with Füsün make him feel a need to create a place that is full of their memories and thus to recreate what he cannot experience or have in real

life. The fashioning of a private, almost sacred place is an attempt to create an individual interiority in which he builds up his own fantasy world of which he wants to take control, where he can commune with all the objects he collected from different places. And in addition to the existing objects of the house that he finds when he starts to meet Füsün there, he brings all these objects to his house as he believes that the house is the right place to keep them and provide a secure place for them. The house gradually becomes a museum housing Kemal's archive and then paradoxically becomes home again for Kemal as he starts living there after Füsün's death. However, since the very beginning it has been neither just a home, nor a museum. It is an emotional place that offers him peace rather than just a museum to wander around or a home to just dwell inside. With every piece he collects and takes to the house he builds up his own archive where the most important thing is to possess these objects and hold on to them. By collecting and arranging all the pieces himself, and by explaining all their meanings also by himself, he wants to have the power to own, to be able to substitute for his loss, and that is the power he is lacking in reality. The act of domesticating different objects collected from different places and creating a place full of them is a way of "being" to Kemal. He wants to domesticate what he cannot have in real life and by taking home a piece of his dream, he finds himself living it. The place itself gives full play to Kemal's imagination, and he creates a new life, a new identity for himself while building his museum-like house.

In Kemal's case his domestic place is the ideal image of himself and how he actually wants to inhabit the world. Apart from his house, which is the Merhamet Apartmanı, there are some other domestic places in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, that serve as an archive. Also, *Possession*, the other novel I shall be examining in this thesis, in comparison with Pamuk's work, is rich in terms of archive, archives as domestic spaces and the paradoxical relationship between museums and houses. The psychological benefit of those places in both novels is that they offer some kind of shelter to those who dwell there. I avoid analyzing this in terms of ownership in this chapter as this is a matter of debate for another chapter and in *Possession*, as the title of the novel itself suggests, it is not crystal clear who owns those places or if anybody owns them. The characters in the novels depend on their houses to be the

safe place where they can store their personal belongings. They store what they do not want others to see or, on the contrary, they think that it is the right place to keep and show others what they value as an individual. By taking and keeping some items in their home, for instance, people are making them their own. Thus, all the domestic places in the novels, tell a story about the people who dwell there regardless of whether these characters would want their story to be told or not. It is the image that the interiority presents with all its subjectivity. In the attempt to create a domestic place, the characters have formed a personal museum while it is at one level supposed to be a space of their most private area that they have. This chapter will be dealing with problems of domesticity and the act of domesticating as a way of archiving, expression of individuality and display by interiority and the psychological, ideological and formal problems that arise with it.

In both novels, there are plenty of houses that function as domestic archival spaces. In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, we primarily see this in the case of the Merhamet Apartmanı, which serves Kemal both as a museum and a house. It seems to be the main place that the novel is built around, and it is the Masumiyet Müzesi that gives the novel its name. However, in relation to archiving and collecting, it is important to look into the relationship between the Merhamet Apartmanı and other domestic places in the novel. In this context we can take a look at the Keskinlers' house, where Füsün lives with her parents and which Kemal visits a lot in the years following their separation and Füsün's marriage to another man. It is the primary source of Kemal's museum as he finds and takes most of the objects from there into his museum. Secondly Kemal has another home where he lives with his parents for quite a short period in the novel before he moves into the Merhamet Apartmanı. He does not take any objects from his parents' house while furnishing the Merhamet Apartmanı which was once used by Kemal's parents as a place to throw things away. It has never been used as a "home" by Kemal's family before, and Kemal says there are two types of objects found in the house: "çay fincanı, unutulmuş bir toka, cetvel, tarak, silgi, tükenmez kalem gibi bana onunla yan yana oturma zevklerini hatırlatan eşyalar" and "annemin eski ve işe yaramaz diye buraya attığı eşyalar" (188). Kemal's family used the house as a storehouse into which they would put whatever is not necessary in their house or things that they want out of sight. He makes a clear distinction

between the objects that were already there and the ones that he brings in. Kemal is very attentive about the distinction between these two places, his parents' house and the Merhamet Apartmanı, and he does not want the objects belonging to one place to be muddled up with those from another place. This idea is explored in another of Pamuk's novels also, *Kara Kitap*, as the "apartman boşluğu". It is the place used by all the residents of the apartment as a space into which all the unwanted objects would be thrown. The aim of having the "apartman boşluğu" is to keep things out of sight but still preserve them in another place. It is the fantasy of an outside. It provides another archive that preserves residual objects that are no longer needed or wanted in one archive. The Merhamet Apartmanı served as an "apartman boşluğu" for Kemal's parents, and it is quite ironic that later it becomes almost a sanctuary for Kemal with all the objects in it. The relation between these places is important as all of them are involved and connected to each other in the process of turning the Merhamet Apartmanı into a museum. It is the process that the Merhamet Apartmanı has undergone before actually turning into Kemal's museum and his home.

The other function of the Merhamet Apartmanı is that it literally provides a kind of shelter for Kemal's second life in which he is not the same person he is when he is in his parents' house. In the novel we initially see Kemal living in his parents' house with them and occasionally going to the Merhamet Apartmanı. However, especially after Füsun leaves him, he starts living in the apartment and rarely goes to his parents' house. I think moving into another place, which is to be his private museum, is significant for an understanding of the motives which lead him to turn that place into a museum. At the beginning of the novel Kemal is in a relationship with Sibel, with whom he is about to get married. His parents want him to marry Sibel as she is classy and a socialite, which seems to be very important for Kemal's parents. However, after he meets Füsun, he loses his interest in Sibel but does not give up on the idea of marrying her as if it is a kind of duty that he has to accomplish. This is when he starts cheating on her and spending more time at the apartment even when Füsun is not there. He does not take Füsun's belongings out of the Merhamet Apartmanı; instead, he brings anything related to their relationship from his home to the apartment. For instance, when Füsun turns down his gift, that is a pair of earrings that Kemal's father gave him, he says, "Babamın sevgilisine aldığı

küpeleri orada bıraktım” (103), as if he does not want to mix the objects between the two houses. It is ironical that those earrings were a gift for another woman that his father was cheating on his wife with. While his father sees no wrong in telling the story, Kemal treats those earrings as a family tradition to hand them down to another mistress. Furthermore, he does not want to keep anything related to Füsün in his other house where he lives with his parents who believe that he is happy in a relationship with Sibel.

In *Possession*, there are some domestic places that include the house of LaMotte, the dead female author whose house is being intruded in order to bring her personal archive to light after years. It seems to be the most evident domestic place in the narrative, but if we compare LaMotte and Kemal, their relationship to their archives differs in one significant way. When alive, LaMotte put all her possessions in her bedroom without consciously knowing the fact that she was actually creating her personal archive. She just wanted to put all her belongings into a place of privacy and keep them secure. She lived in a house which is now partially without care and being used by others, a fact which I will explore more further in this chapter, but her bedroom, which is untouched, can be considered as the private domestic archival place. She surrounded herself with her property that she wanted to keep in her place. Her process of building an archive is a common act. We also surround our place with objects that we value or just to mark our place as ours just like in the nature of most animals. Sometimes, in order not to feel like a stranger in a place, which can be an office room or a hotel room abroad, we take our own possessions and decorate the place with them. The purpose is to make that place our own. She created a space and trusted that it is her own so that she can freely keep her items. Kemal’s case is more paradoxical. In contrast to LaMotte, Kemal does not live in the domestic place he creates at the beginning of the novel. The place has never been used as a home by Kemal’s parents although the place is built to be used as a house. After his meetings with Füsün, Kemal decides to turn the place into a museum and later he actually starts living in it. In a way by building a museum, he builds a home for himself. Although he has a home where he lives with his mother, he moves into the museum which is full objects that remind him of Füsün. So sooner or later in both novels the houses also serve as a museum or vice versa.

In *Possession*, the domestic places that similarly serve both as a house and museum, are connected with each other, as we have already seen in *Masumiyet Müzesi*. There are several archival places that almost function as the pieces of a puzzle that characters have to find and reveal one in order to grasp the whole story. So, just as in Pamuk's work, it is important to reveal the connection between those archival spaces. After having found LaMotte's house and her letters and poems with lots of clues pointing out a secret love affair with a married man in the Victorian age when it would be seen as a scandal, the present scholars suspect that the secret lover which LaMotte's poems hint and her letters addresses at might be another well-known Victorian poet: Randolph Henry Ash. He was believed to good, loyal husband and to be a noble gentleman. His house is unknown and thus out of reach, but his tomb is later found and dug up to find his personal possessions that were buried with him. While not itself a domestic place, this literal tomb, containing personal artifacts presents, an uncanny reflection of the tomb-like qualities of the houses in the novel.

The last archive that will be analyzed here in relation to these two is the house of Roland Mitchell, the male scholar who is working on Ash and wants to uncover the relationship between these two dead authors. He is an important figure in the narrative as he is the one who started the project of exploring the poets' personal spaces to reveal the love affair that has been kept a secret for many years in accordance with their wishes. And also, he brings some objects from places such as the London Library and LaMotte's house to his place in order to examine them. He trusts his house to be the guardian of some secret objects taken from other places. This causes a paradox as he builds another kind of domestic archive at his home by "borrowing" from other archives as in Kemal's case. He is not conscious that he is actually building another archive by domesticating some objects and hiding them in his place. In any case, it is suggest that almost all the domestic places in the novels borrow from each other or lend to one another in order to be fully grasped or to be complete. All the archival places somehow are in need of one another.

In *Possession*, the main aim of the scholars is to reveal the relationship between LaMotte and Ash. Their connection has never been revealed before for almost a century, and this motivates Roland and Maud, another female scholar working on LaMotte, to bring it into the light. First Roland finds Ash's informal

letters to another woman, who does not seem to be his wife, in the London Library, and this eventually leads him to another author's house where he finds LaMotte's poems that contain hints about their relationship. In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, Kemal and Füsün's relationship takes place in the present time. As readers we witness everything since the beginning as Kemal makes us a part in the narrative by directly addressing at us. In *Possession*, there are flashbacks that occur with the help of the poets' works enabling us to understand their relationship. In both novels there is an intimate relationship between the love affairs and the domestic places. They provide a kind of basis for the lovers to store the remains of their love affairs and they also provide a guide for the reader by helping them understand the function of a domestic place and how it is shaped by one's experiences in life.

The title of Pamuk's book, *Masumiyet Müzesi*, refers to the Merhamet Apartmanı. Kemal wants to attribute some "innocence" into his place in order to justify all the motives that has caused him to build that place. Kemal says, "Keskinler'in bir eşyasını cebime indirdiğimde, içimdeki çocuksu saflık duygusu bir süreliğine kaybolur," and it suggests that he actually feels guilty of collecting. That is why he innocence becomes more of an issue, a kind of goal to achieve. In *Possession*, the title itself also gives away so much about the novel as we see characters get greedy in possessing things or become extremely curious about others' possessions. It is the dead authors' possessions that tell the secrets that their owners tried hard not to let them be known or seen by others. Towards the end of the novel, Kemal feels oppressed, still not powerful or happy enough to feel "at home" at the Merhamet Apartmanı. It comes to a point that he wants his love story to be seen as innocent. He trust the objects at the Merhamet Apartmanı to take over that role of keeping his story harmless and innocent. In the title of both novels the power of possessions come to the foreground as they speak on their own, which again takes us back to Maleuvre's thoughts on homes being an image of how we inhabit the world with all our domesticated objects in domestic places. The objects that one leaves behind in his domestic place are the most evident witnesses, history records of that person.

We have seen domestic archives play a paradoxical role of both concealing and revealing, and there appears to be a contrast along these lines between LaMotte's and



Kemal's. Kemal's museum, the Merhamet Apartmanı, and Christabel's house both consist of several floors, and also the current resident of the houses resides on the top floor. Kemal says, "Mehtaplı bir gece yarısı Çukurcuma'daki evde, çatı arasındaki küçük perdesiz odama hoş bir ışığın içinde uyandım ve altımdaki büyük delikten müze boşluğuna, aşağıya baktım" (529). It is understood that it is important for him to be close to his objects as he says, "her şeyi görebiliyor ve eşyaların ruhlarını fark eden bir Şaman üstadı gibi, onların hikayelerinin içimde kıpırdandıklarını hissedebiliyordum" (529). He has a full view of his collections from his bed as the objects are on display in the most apparent way possible, and he looks at all the objects in the museum with a great interest. It is almost as if the museum with all its objects gives Kemal life. Kemal brings them in life by giving them a meaning and in return they keep Kemal alive when he is desperate. Kemal's museum is completely on display and the structure of the house lets him take a full view of his collection from the top. However, in order to reach LaMotte's room, the visitors should pass corridors and go up a stone staircase as her room is located on an upper floor of the east wing (81). It is sensed that it is a little tedious, tiresome way into her room as it takes some effort. Also, while Kemal has set all the items in a proper location so that he can see them from where he sleeps, LaMotte put her belongings into boxes with no intention of displaying them to others or even to herself as Kemal does, so it requires a little more effort to reach them. It is almost like LaMotte's room and her property are hidden away. Still both LaMotte's and Kemal's bedrooms are located on the top floor as these rooms are the most private places that are found in their house. In LaMotte's house it is the bedroom that contains the archive, and in Kemal's museum it is the whole house, but the bedroom has the best view of it.

LaMotte's house is not welcoming or well looked after like Kemal's. The fact that it has a "winter garden" as describes by its current residents shows that it embraces some paradoxes in itself. In winter a garden is not a vivid, favourable place to be as it is probably full of leafless, dead plants. It is the exact image that welcomes Roland and Maud when they first see the house. At first glance LaMotte's house offers an eerie experience. When they first encounter with the house, it is said that, "The short day was darkening; the back door swung in heavily under a Gothic porch over which a rose, now leafless, was trained" (76). Their first impression of the

house is quite depressing as the house is very gloomy. Leaving aside the literal mention of the gothic, the leafless but trained rose is quite striking. It is a metaphor for the house itself as it is decaying with only some parts of it being taken care of. This may be a metaphor for LaMotte and the archival remains. Although she is dead, Roland and Maud are trying to get into her bedroom, where she kept all her personal things, and learn about her life. They want to know about the secret love affair between LaMotte and Ash whom are already dead. They are trying to bring something to light that is already in the past. When Roland and Maud ask to see LaMotte's room, Sir George, the present resident of the house, says, "You'd need a torch. No electricity in that part of the house. Only on the ground floor corridors" (80). From this we understand that the family only uses the ground floor, and the mood in the house becomes even gloomier as they step into those unused areas. The place is described as thus: "tiled and bleakly lit corridors under electric lighting, and the along dusty carpets in dark shuttered places, and up a stone staircase and then further up a winding wooden stair, cloudy with dark dust" (81). There are lots of gothic elements in the house that make the visitors feel like the part of the house where LaMotte's room is located is dark and startling as the place is left to die after LaMotte.

LaMotte's house itself gives Roland and Maud the sensation of thrill and causes them anxiety at the same time. They feel like they are actually intruding somewhere that they have not been invited but the gothic atmosphere does not prevent them from entering the house and then her bedroom. While they are looking for some clue that might prove that LaMotte and Ash had a relationship, Roland says that they are "imagining perhaps a hidden drawer, and at the same time uncomfortably aware of the laundry lists in *Northanger Abbey*" (82). This is an important reference in terms of gothic elements in the novel as in Austen's *Northanger Abbey* where a teenage girl imagines that the castle she is dwelling in is a place full of secrets and horror after reading too many Gothic novels. When she finds mysterious letters thinking that they will help her to solve the mystery of the castle, they turn out to be nothing but laundry lists. In *Possession*, the dim and dusty room of LaMotte triggers them to look around attentively because they might find something of value. But here, Roland is like a self-conscious figure in a gothic

house, half-aware that it is the atmosphere, the physical condition of the room excites him. Roland and Maud are conscious in this experience. The physical condition of the house and all these elements of gothic imagery take control over Roland and Maud by making them believe that there is something to be found.

In literature, the style of gothic applies to the uncanny quite commonly. Roland and Maud's excitement in a horrifying place and Kemal's gradually growing discomfort around the objects that have been very delicately collected and brought together in order to evoke nothing but positive feelings result in uncanny. Roland and Maud feel so curious that the atmosphere of the house does not stop them from entering LaMotte's archive. Kemal wants to be surrounded by the objects that offer him comfort and yet he cannot oppress their power in his own place. The familiarity of the objects that once Kemal felt and the scholars' curiosity are combined with the feelings of mystery, horror and strangeness. Kemal's own memories that he has enshrined start haunting him as he lives at the apartment. He has to move on the top floor not only to get a full view of the house, but also to metaphorically claim his superiority over the collection. All the paradoxes such as interior and exterior, public and private, inside and outside that have been looked at so far suggest a dialectical relationship, that is in the nature of archive. Uncanny, as well, embraces oppositions like familiar and unfamiliar, excitement and yet horror in itself. It is formed by those oppositions that need each other.

Following this description of the museum-like houses and the different feelings they evoke in their visitors, now I will be focusing on the emotional function of the archive. For Kemal it becomes more like an attempt to create a kind of temple where he finds emotional peace. It actually derives from the urge to possess what is Füsün's so that he can imagine a connection to her whenever he holds or looks at a certain object. In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, the act of collecting and gathering objects in an archive starts with Kemal secretly taking and keeping Füsün's earrings, which becomes the first object he puts into his museum. She unintentionally leaves her earrings at the Merhamet Apartmanı, and Kemal decides to keep them to himself instead of returning them to her. He says, "o gittikten sonra ucunda adının baş harfi olan küpeyi mavi çarşafın arasında görmüş, kenara kaldıracağıma, tuhaf bir içgüdüyle, kaybolmasın diye ceketimin cebine koymuştum" (12). That instinct to possess what

is Füsun's is the main reason why he turns their meeting place into a museum. It is actually long before he separates from Füsun that he decides to keep her items to himself. It almost evokes the idea that once an object is contained within the Merhamet Apartmanı, it cannot leave because it already has a meaning there. It already plays its part in the love story. They have to be in the collection all together to fulfill the feeling Kemal experiences that there is something missing in his life. He is in need of the company of those objects which he is domesticating by keeping them in the Merhamet Apartmanı, and he takes pleasure of possessing them. Keeping the earrings is the very first act of preserving something as a cue and securing it so that it will be a reminder of the day that the owner does not want to forget. Kemal says, "ama ilk sevişmenin izlerine ve eşyalarına gösterilecek aşırı bir dikkat, Füsun ile benim aramda gelişen yoğun şefkat ve şükran duygularını anlamaya engel olabilir" (38). He actually directly talks to the reader or the visitor of his museum, urging them not to get lost in detail but to focus on the object's total meaning, the feeling they evoke because it is what the most important thing should be for the visitors.

For Kemal, the most important thing about his museum and the objects in it is that they convey emotion. Kemal calls his house, which is the museum, a "hatıralar evi", "duygusal müze" or "kişisel müze". In order not to forget what he feels at a specific time or event, he captures his emotion in an object and wants to preserve it. He creates an ideal place to secure his objects, but furthermore he wants the place to be like a supplier of his desires and to compensate for his loss by offering him the justification so as to make him believe that their relationship was real and there is a hope that he can still be with Füsun. Kemal desires that the company of the objects will become a kind of remedy to him. He describes his ultimate situation as "koleksiyoncu gibi değil, ilaçlarına bakan hasta gibi," and he becomes addicted to the "medicine" that he has dispensed himself (187). He falls into a desperate need for those objects that he has collected himself in order to escape from reality and alleviate his pain.

Kemal describes his meetings with Füsun in that house in great detail. Starting very literally at the beginning, he describes the house in term of its physical condition and then he talks about every single object he has there. He talks about the

objects in the house, but gradually as he builds his relationship with Füsün, the house serves as a temple he goes to whenever he is deprived of Füsün. When he cannot bear with her absence, he turns to the Merhamet Apartmanı to calm him down. But the paradox is that, while it is his secret place to get away to find ease, he wants to open the doors of his museum to others to come in as well. He has already “domesticated” objects from outside, but then he wants to open up again in order to take the edge off the power of the objects. And now the whole idea is to open up the interiority of the museum to the exterior eye which is paradoxically expected to be a part of the museum. By building a domestic, physical place, Kemal wants the reader or visitor to take part in his ideal world. He offers an emotional experience from his world by turning pages in the novel or wandering in the museum. However, in *Possession*, in domestic museum-like places, whether they are a house or a tomb, the objects are gathered in order to keep their privacy, to exist without the touch of the exterior. Also; comparatively in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, the pieces which are supposed to indicate the domesticity of the houses are taken in from the outside and turned into a modern representation of the owner’s interiority.

Compared with Kemal’s Merhamet Apartmanı, in *Possession*, LaMotte’s house has some similarities and differences in the sense of offering an emotional experience to its visitors. She tried to keep all her private belongings hidden and had no intention of uncovering her private life. LaMotte did not want to convey any emotion through her belongings, and she did not even want her house to be intruded upon; thus, the emotion the visitors get from her house is more self-directed. They have to find their own way in the house as there is no guide. Furthermore, her objects were not put in an order as there was no intention of sharing a part from her private life. The visitors get the thrill of being in a place full of treasure that was not meant to be found or brought into the light especially by an outsider. The objects found in that room are “the desk, the trunks, the hat boxes,” and that makes the visitors of the place feel like they are in a “treasure hunt” (81). She gathered all her private letters and put them in a secret place in her bedroom so that no one can learn what she did not want to reveal when she was alive. LaMotte’s bedroom is not initially meant to be a museum and thus the objects are only her private belongings. They seem to be common pieces that can be found in any bedroom, but in the novel they become

special cues that the outsiders need in order to understand LaMotte's world. But Kemal's intention is very different as he wants the museum to speak on its own even after he is dead. She did not want anyone to find her private letters or to experience her emotions through those letters. In contrast to Kemal's attempts to provide a psychological experience to the outsiders, LaMotte had no intention of opening up her private archive. However, in the sense that it is outsiders that turn both Kemal's and LaMotte's houses into museums, with or without the owners' consent, those places become domestic archives that provide an insight into their owners' private lives.

In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, there is a constant insistence that Kemal creates the museum in order to tell his story to others, to make them feel the same way as he does or did at a specific time or event. I have already mentioned that he wants to emotionally benefit from a physical place that he is the founder of. He elucidates his act of collecting objects and putting them into his house by explaining that they function as "işaret, anlatıcı, kanıt". He makes an analogy between the torch that is used in cinemas to show the audience its seats and the objects in his house which help him remember and testify to the past. The earrings and all the other objects have one thing in common: to make the readers or the visitors of his museum feel the way Kemal feels about the objects and more importantly about Füsun. Those objects are both the torch that light up the story of each object and Kemal's remedies. He wants to offer a psychological experience by building a literal, physical environment first to himself and then to the readers of the novel and the visitors of the museum. He wants them to fully comprehend how all objects in the museum make him feel when he needs them and also wants the readers to feel the same way. The objects are all forming compensation for his loss, and he wants to preserve his memories in them.

In terms of loss, Füsun also loses her virginity at the Merhamet Apartmanı, which eventually creates a contrast with the title of the book, that is the museum of "innocence". This conveys the sense that even if something is gone, it still can be preserved in other forms. Substituting for his loss is what Kemal wants to do at the Merhamet Apartmanı. It is Kemal's primal aim to capture specific memories in specific items, giving them life in objects and waiting them to accompany him. Even if Kemal is no longer in a relationship with Füsun, he can still hold on to their

memories in that house with the help of the objects and resist the idea that something is gone forever. Although literally the past is within the past, he metaphorically finds a way to preserve it in the present permanently. With this particular behavior I turn to Didier Maleuvre, who argues that to secure the distant past is to enshrine personal memory (115). He believes that individuality or personalization can be achieved by archiving ones's past. Kemal values personal memory and wants to glorify his private life by keeping all the traces that make it his own and eventually put it in display.

In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, Kemal builds a museum by collecting most of the pieces from the Keskinlers' house, which is a traditional place full of old, nostalgic objects, which are, therefore, already domestic. The objects greatly vary from matches to cologne bottles and a salt cellar. The only common ground between them is that they are collected from that house. Describing the objects and the emotions they evoke in him, Kemal says, "Ama bu duyguların yalnız bana ait olmadığını, bu eşyalarla yıllar sonra karşılaşan müze ziyaretçilerinin de, aynı şeyleri hissedeceğine de içtenlikle ve saflıkla inanırım" (337). It is a paradox that the house is built in the present with objects mostly from the past, and the visitor will experience this whenever they visit. Maleuvre says, "the interior is an image of historical nostalgia, a place of historical memory" (116). While Kemal cannot maintain a relationship with Füsün in the present, he tries to keep the past alive by building a museum of old memories. Maleuvre proposes that the "dweller fails to dwell in his own century," due to the clash between the contemporary world and temporary objects. He calls this "historical escapism," and also for Kemal archiving and trying to find his own place where he "feels at home" becomes his way of dealing with present pain. The interior helps him to overcome the lack of happiness in the present by wrapping up his own memories and objects that he possesses instead of Füsün.

Interiority plays the most significant role in his story by showing how all the domesticated objects make up for the desired past for its dweller. In the modern imagination the domestic interior refers to the privatization of social life and desocialization of the individual (Maleuvre 121). In Kemal's case privatization and later publicizing his domestic interior, results in finding himself distanced from the outside and reality. As he starts spending more time at the Merhamet Apartmanı, he

withdraws from the social life and becomes just like a homeless man without a domicile. He becomes addicted to his collection and he loses control in a place which is supposed to offer him comfort. It comes to a point that the past is hurtful and in present he does not have a place to call home and to run away to. He “desocializes” as he publicizes his interior.

Pamuk says in his manifesto, “Eşyalar çevrelerinden, sokaklarından kopartılmadan kendi doğal evlerine hüner ve dikkatle yerleştirilirse, zaten kendi hikayelerini anlatırlar”. First the objects are must be gathered by their owner and then it is proposed as something positive that they have to get rid of their owner and become the subjects themselves. But how are all the objects “carefully and ably” brought together in a domestic place supposed to get rid of their owner and take control in story telling? How do they turn into subjects from objects in a story and thus become the possessor of their collector? Throughout the novel Kemal talks repeatedly about “eşyaların gücü” and how important it is to just possess them. He says the whole purpose of telling his story is to make people understand what seems to have controlled his whole life, what, at some point, seemed to be the only objective of his life, when they visit the museum. But maybe his invitation to the visitors is a way of overcoming the repression, the control of the objects upon him. By including elements from the outside world into his house, which is supposedly a domesticated, completely personal space, he wants to break the firm bond between the objects that he handed over the power and himself. Maybe this invitation is a way out from what he has created so proudly and claim, ironically, as “his” only.

While trying to persuade the reader that his love story is real and frequently mentioning the literal museum and how the novel functions as a guide of it, Pamuk playfully introduces himself as a character in the novel. We first see Pamuk at Kemal and Sibel’s engagement party as Kemal says, “Fusun’u dansa kaldıran ikinci kişi ise, gururla söylediğine göre, Pamuklar’ın masasından az önce göz göze geldiğim Orhan Bey’in kendisiymiş” (132). Tahsin Yaprak says, “Kar romanında yaptığı gibi romanda kurmaca Orhan Pamuk’u ısrarla okura gerçek olarak tanıtmaya çalışır” (471). Later in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, Kemal says he has asked Pamuk to write the novel as he trusts Pamuk can manage this better than him. Despite the insistence on the subjectivity, despite Kemal’ constant assurance that it is “his” story, the



narrator's identity becomes blurred. It is intentional, and again, it is a way out from the oppressive love affair and losing the power struggle between his collection and himself. Kemal, again, needs an external force to manage his private archive that should have been only his own.

Also, in *Possession*, the idea of possessing the objects and being possessed by them becomes a dialectical problem as in *Masumiyet Müzesi*. LaMotte's room, which excites its visitors as they intrude into something private and secret, is protected from the outside. Most of the private correspondence between LaMotte and Ash is found in a house owned by LaMotte's relatives, one of whom is mainly concerned with their material value. LaMotte's relative is one of the characters in the narrative who is only interested in the economic worth of her objects while feeling no emotional investment in them. Although he lives in that house, he and his wife have never tried to delve into her room. However, it is completely the opposite is true for Maud and Roland, who display a different kind of greed about the idea of entering into her personal space. When Maud says that she feels "possessive" about what they find in LaMotte's room, Roland answers, "It's because we found them. And because - because they're private" (91). It is a kind of a guilty pleasure that they obtain while they are in LaMotte's house or more specifically in her bedroom. Both the Victorian poets LaMotte and Ash are rediscovered through their private spaces which represent other archival places. LaMotte's room is seen as a "treasure" which must be dug up. The visitors expect the containers in her room to reveal her private life and tell the story themselves without the need of an owner. For Maleuvre, home is a domestic keeper of all the items that are kept away from outside but also has the power to be a spectacle itself. Here, it is the objects that take LaMotte's role and even betray her by revealing what she kept secret while she was alive. All the greedy attempts to know about the Victorian poets through their domestic archives, raise the question: who is the true resident of the house? Is it the objects in it or the owner who took them in piece by piece?

At the very beginning of *Possession*, Roland is in the London Library where he is studying the works of Ash, found in a book that is "thick and black and covered with dust" (1). While exploring the library and the books related to the poet, he finds Ash's correspondence with an unknown woman: "Roland recognized the

handwriting with a shock of excitement... it didn't look as though they had been touched before" (2). He gets excited over the fact that he found something that is actually the poet's own and it is not anyone's property. It is the first act in the novel associated with digging into someone else's private life and feeling pleasure in possessing something that is not one's own. The situation is described thus: "the dead leaves continued a kind of rustling and shifting, enlivened by their release. Ash had put them there" (3). It seems similar to Kemal's intention of making the objects alive to convey an emotion or narrate a story to others. Probably, Ash did not deliberately put those papers there in order to be found, but still Roland gets excessively excited over what he has found and does not want to leave them behind in the London Library. He feels very possessive of that correspondence and he thinks it is "quite impossible to put these living words back" (8). And while no one is looking, he slips the papers into his books to take them home. Although the metaphor of "living words" is quite interesting and reminds us of the notion of building a personal museum, things get more challenging when Roland takes the papers from the London Library to his home. In a way he builds a domestic archive at his home with someone else's property which actually, and equivocally, belongs somewhere else. The London Library is a public archive but Roland takes a piece from the collection there and greedily builds his own archive in a most domestic place. He thinks he must have that correspondence and his home is the right place to keep it secure.

Roland's house, which becomes another domestic space that functions as an archive in the narrative is a flat in a building of four floors. Besides the similarity with the other domestic archives in both novels that have multiple floors, Roland and his girlfriend live on the ground floor with old, dusty and secondhand furniture (15). Just like LaMotte's house, which is full of gothic elements, Roland's house also differs from Kemal's house, which is well cared for. The building has a garden which can only be visited by Mrs. Irving, who is the owner of the other three floors. Curiously, the garden is described as a "prohibited but tempting garden". Except for Mrs. Irving no one else has right of entry and she describes the young people as destructive and careless. Although it is Roland and his girlfriend's house and they are so eager to explore the garden at large, they do not have access to do so. They are forbidden to enter a part of their house, which partially functions as Roland's trusted

space where he can hide his objects and build his archive. He thinks his house is the most secure place to take Ash's correspondence to, but even in his own place, there is secrecy and even a prohibition that he has to obey.

While Roland's archival activities begin in the public space of the museum, his attempts to build a domestic archive starts almost as a spontaneous act. He is not looking for objects to gather and make his own collection. By contrast Kemal is in control of the process of archiving more than any other character in both novels. However, his museum-like place, the Merhamet Apartmanı was primarily used as a place where Kemal's mother would throw away the things she did not want to see or use. It was almost like a waste bin for those objects that are neither a trash nor valuable for use. It is Kemal who changes the objects in the house with the ones that offer him peace, against all the paradoxes that have been suggested earlier. Having drawn attention to the change in the use of the house, I would like to focus on the new meaning objects adopt in an archive. Just as Roland steals from the London Library and brings the correspondence to his house, Kemal also steals from another place to put into his museum. The period when Kemal and Füsün are separated, he spends the nights joining Füsün's family, the Keskinler, for dinner. On those nights he steals objects from the Keskinler's house as a reminder of a particular event.

Füsün'un 1982 Nisanı'nda takmaya başladığı bu Buren marka incecik kol saatini görür görmez, bunu yirmi beşinci doğum gününde Füsün'a benim hediye edişim, bugün kayıp olan kutusundan saati çıkardıktan sonra Füsün'un annesi ve babasının görmeyeceği bi ara, açık mutfak kapısının arkasında beni yanaklarımdan öpüşü... annesiyle babasının bana tek tek teşekkür edişleri canlanır gözlerimin önünde. (298, 299)

Kemal assigns a new meaning to the watch that he displays in his museum, and the watch reminds him of the exact moment that he longs to remember. While the Merhamet Apartmanı was once full of the objects that Kemal's mother threw away because they would disrupt the integrity, the supposedly perfect order of their home, as Kemal takes up residence, the place turns into a new archive with objects so desired, and Kemal creates a new unity. Maleuvre suggests, "every element has an assigned place within the totality," (135) and the domestication of each piece create a

larger meaning for the place. In order to story be graspable by external eyes, each material must be consigned with its own meaning and thus the idea of totality must be achieved. Whereas Roland does not care for the totality of the objects or their meaning in his home. His only concern is to possess them in this domestic place and keep them away from external eyes.

In order to “materialize memory,” as Pierre Nora terms it, the power of the objects in archival places is relied on. Kemal puts the list of objects on paper with descriptions and explanations, whereas the evidence of Victorias poets’ were expected to be burned, according to their wishes, and yet their archives are discovered through their works found in domestic places such their own houses or tombs. Maleuvre reads the relation between the interior and the written form as follows: “interior has to be written out in order to be fully possessed and internalized” (125). It is writing that opens up an archive, in both novels, whether it invites or excludes. Kemal referring to “bu romanın ve müzenin amacı,” in order to give the sense that the book itself is a guide for the museum that he builds and to remind the purpose of the novel again and again. When Roland and Maud visit Christabel’s room they get excited over all the objects they find but mostly about dolls, and letters, as she wrote poems about the dolls, and the letters provide an insight into her life in the most evident way. The two novels provide a kind of inventory for the archives that are in the process set up or have already been existing. The novels provide a glimpse of the main interiority which is revealed to the outside. As Maleuvre quotes from Bachelard who says, “to describe the real houses would be like showing them to visitors,” (137) the novels become archives in their own ways that show readers to get a greater perspective on those existing archives in the novels.

Domestic places function as an archive which is associated with the problems of interiority and exteriority, being allowed into or having to intrude, possessing the objects in the archive and being possessed by them. They provide an insight into the owner’s way of preserving the past within the present, suffusing places with possessions to which he consigned their own private meanings. Domestication of material objects provides a real museum-like place which tells the story of the place on its own. The collection overpowers its dweller and becomes the subject itself for

the story being told. Representation of each piece contributes to the narrative and the homemaker fails to control his power upon the objects. Interiority becomes the historical memory for his so-called owner, whose privacy, his own archival being comes to light. As Pamuk suggests in his manifesto, “tek tek bireylerin hikayesi, insanlığımızı bütün derinliği ile ortaya koymak için daha uygun”. Modernity is a period in which a man seeks his individuality withdrawn from its political being. The prioritization of individualism along with modernity in the 19th century has been provoked and become a project for the people. Houses have been the threshold matter in this project to build their own interiority. However, both novels hint that the attempt to turn one’s domestic place into a museum to make it the new story teller of its dweller is not a triumph as desired. The materiality and intrusion of exteriority are so powerful and the subjective ideality is so impossible to achieve in the novels that the places’ true dweller is overcome by the objects that he has taken in himself.

## 2. CHAPTER GENDER AND THE “PATRIARCHIVE”

We cannot deal with the problems associated with domesticity and domestic archives without looking at the one thing it is strongly associated with: femininity. Maleuvre looks at the notion of domesticity from a historical perspective but he fails to provide an analysis of gender, although they are inseparable. Combining the two notions in his poem titled “Angel in the House” Coventry Patmore draws an image of an ideal Victorian woman who is devoted to her husband, gentle, and forgiving, a who possesses so many other positive attributes that she is “too good to be true”. This image of women later faced heavy criticism by many writers, but it was the ideal portrait of a woman of that time. True womanhood would simply refer to a woman who was expected to stay home, looking after children, staying out of “men’s world”. Amid these ongoing debates on the representation of femininity and given the general view of society regarding how a woman should be, the Victorian age was a difficult period to be other than the stereotypic ideal woman. Domesticated femininity, however, is not confined to the Victorian age as it is still one of the core problems of many societies today.

The traces of the problems women had to endure in that period can be tracked through the archives in *Possession*, where the two characters of the old love story related in the novel are Victorian. The first description of LaMotte’s appearance is quite thought-provoking as she is described as a “generic Victorian lady, specific shy poetess” whose photograph is “veiled under a crackling, protective translucent page” (38). This photograph is found in the British Museum, which can be considered as a public archive that has been keeping the image of a British Victorian poet for years. LaMotte was not acclaimed as a poet in her time, but after her death all her works, the places she lived in and she went to are analyzed by the two scholars in the hope of finding some hints about her personal life and getting to know her better not just as a writer but also as a woman. The way her appearance is first introduced in the novel evokes the feeling that she is of no importance and her figure is not striking, as she is just a generic Victorian woman. It suggests some stereotypical thoughts concerning how a typical woman, not just a poet, but

particularly a “Victorian woman” of the novel is observed and interpreted by the society in general. She is critically described as a “shy poetess,” and no further description is provided because that is the way a woman was seen or expected to be in those times. Not prominent, always having to remain in the background.

Another paradox related to the conservation of LaMotte’s photograph is that it is found under a protective translucent page, which brings about the discrepancy whereby women are both in an exposed and also in a concealed place at the same time. The translucency resembles some kind of a glass house which in theory is a domestic place that keeps everything in it safe but still paradoxically reveals it at the same time. I will be touching upon the concerns about privacy in more detail in the following chapter and in relation to *Masumiyet Müzesi* as well, but now it is important to look at the paradox that is suggested by the translucent page: hiding and revealing at the same time. The translucent pages challenge this opposition as they keep and give away the photograph of a woman. It is important to note that it is a photograph of a woman in particular about whom there are numerous clues that she was in a relationship with a married poet, gave birth to their adulterine and may have been in a homosexual relationship with someone who was once known to be her friend. She was not a stereotypic Victorian domestic woman, and she would not conform to the gender values of her time. With every new piece of information the two scholars find out about her, they are inspired to seek further. They attempt to remove her from her hidden or so-called protective domestic archive and rediscover her as a woman.

In *Kara Kitap*, another novel by Pamuk, the same kind of gender issues in relation to the archive are one of the most central problems that the novel keeps touching upon. The male protagonist Galip, comes home one day to realize that his wife, Rüya, has left him without taking most of her belongings but just leaving him a short note. The name of his wife, “Rüya,” which means dream in English, suggests that maybe she does not even exist because throughout the novel she is nowhere to be found. While Galip investigates this case and tries to find his wife, he actually starts questioning his own identity as he moves into Rüya’s brother’s apartment, where he starts living her brother’s life by wearing his clothes and even taking over his job as a columnist in a newspaper writing under his name. In *Kara Kitap*, not

only is Galip's identity questioned, but as he wanders in İstanbul searching for clues to her whereabouts, he also introduces the neighborhoods and the streets of the city in a way that evokes a kind of map in the reader's mind. İstanbul's identity is discussed as a city or even as if it was a Turkish person. Interestingly in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, as well, İstanbul as a city occupies an important place in the novel and evolves just like a character. Kemal even says that İstanbul has started to change after Füsün is dead and hints that also in this novel a woman and a city are quite intertwined. İstanbul becomes more of an issue in Pamuk's novels and it is introduced as a city about to make a leap into a modern, westernized world but too conventional and entrenched in history to embrace a new identity just like that. But still, in the end, it could be concluded that the two works of Pamuk show many similarities as they both centre on a man's attempt to find a woman he loves, and gender roles become even more complicated as men struggle in the search of these missing objects that are gendered as feminine. Both novels provide an archive to the reader, and in the narrative they help the male characters metaphorically to find themselves and even physically find their lovers. However, in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, besides the aim of reaching Füsün, there is a prevailing general criticism concerning the status of women in Turkey, the question of whether women are domestic angels in the house as in Patmore's term or trying to change to adapt themselves to modernity. Or, indeed, are women the agents of change and modernity through which the society can get rid of all their problems which arouse in the past, concerning gender?

Similar to the ideal woman portrayed by Patmore, in *Masumiyet Müzesi* there is an insistent representation of Turkish womanhood, or in other ways the way it is preserved, that shows some similarities to that of Byatt. It is said that reading a newspaper in Turkey in the 1980's "gözlerinin üstü bantlarla kapatılmış kadın fotoğraflarından yapılmış maskeli baloda gezinmeye benzerdi" (70). Again, through the photograph of women found in a very public place such as a newspaper it is hinted that there is an attempt to hide the face of women and make it impossible to identify them. The paradox of showing the face of a woman but also covering some parts of it at the same time so that there is no clear aspect of who she really is and deliberately publishing in a newspaper is just like keeping a photograph of a woman



who is veiled and yet preserved by a translucent page. While *Possession* centers on a Victorian poetess in its account of the criticism concerning the preservation and rediscovery of femininity, *Masumiyet Müzesi* focuses on the effect of the modernization process on femininity. Modernization itself produces tensions around femininity and gender, and it is evident in the novel when Füsun cannot maintain her own consistent figure in society as a liberated woman. She feels the need to cover her body even when she is on the beach and she cannot get used to wearing a swimsuit. Kemal comments on this situation, saying it is a result of “Türk insanının mahcubiyeti ve Füsun’un kırılmanlığı” (176) and relates these gender issues to nationalism, which will be discussed in my following chapter, by referring to her as a fragile Turkish woman who is known to easily get hurt.

Now I would like to look at the issues of women’s self-censorship in more detail. Censorship is mentioned many times in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, mostly in relation to the films that Kemal, Füsun and Feridun intend to shoot. However, the matter of self-censorship manifests itself not only for women but also for men. Referring to the Keskinlers’ dinner table, Kemal says: “duyduğum aşk ve oturduğumuz aile sofrası o kadar çok incelik ve yasakla çevrilmişti ki...” (323). Kemal implies that everyone sitting at the table knows that there are some intangible and delicate rules according to which they are expected to behave. Moreover, there are some “incelik” that also control their way of life just like Füsun not feeling comfortable with a swimsuit and feeling that she is compelled to cover her body, in order to avoid being looked at or criticized. Füsun’s father, who knows that Kemal is not only a relative visiting them but is in love with his daughter although she is married to someone else, chooses to ignore this fact and he gives “göstermesi gereken tepki” (411). All these precautions are taken so that Füsun does not seem like an immoral, shameless woman who freely shows off her body and to prove that her father is not a man who welcomes into his house a man who is in love with her married daughter. All these acts of self-censorship are another form of veil or tape to make the female characters seem “proper” to others.

The fact that women intentionally cover their face with a veil or have their eyes covered with a tape and still have their photograph revealed in public spheres creates a paradox. Whether or not they are content with this act of self-censorship is unclear,

and yet there is another paradox, as this represents a collision between private and public spheres. The archives in both cases reveal what is supposed to be kept private. In her essay titled "Women and the Making of the Modern House," Alice T. Friedman, tells a story about an architect, one of whose clients asked for a private house in the country away from others but got a house built with glass walls and no changing room at all. Her desire to live in a private place was violated when visitors started coming in order to see the house that the architect built. Also in this story it is a woman whose body is on display in a place which is supposedly domestic and private. Christabel's and Turkish women's photographs are archived and are considered to be private and yet easily reached by anyone. I would also like to note on the subject of things which are private and yet having been turned into public, Kemal tries so hard to keep the Merhamet Apartmanı to himself by removing all the old unnecessary objects of others. For years the house remains only his, but later he claims that all he wants is to welcome visitors to his place and let them feel his own memories and feelings. The house would also be seen as feminine and yet, again, we see Kemal's desire to make it public.

In both Byatt's *Possession* and Pamuk's *Masumiyet Müzesi*, the missing object is gendered as feminine and especially in the latter the narrative is dominantly masculine, because it is told from Kemal's perspective. With the help of this contrast the problems women have to endure in both Turkish and British societies can be analyzed. Although the cultural context is different in the two novels, the representation of femininity shows explicit similarities. *Masumiyet Müzesi* provides a masculine perspective on womanhood in Turkey after the proclamation of the Republic, and it deals with the ongoing debate concerning femininity in Turkey. Gender issues are criticized not only by Kemal but also by many other characters in the novel, regardless of their sex or status in society. Men are expected to be dominant and powerful figures while women should be silent and obedient. This is very similar to Patmore's representation of an ideal woman. It is challenging for both parties as women were expected to be passive and obedient, whereas men had to be in control as a requirement of their sex.

While Pamuk claims that he is in favour of subjective museums, based on one individual's experience in life and claiming that people themselves should be the

main attraction instead of anything else that makes up an archive as discussed in chapter 1, he is being ironical in issues of gender. Given the cultural context in which he is writing, it is not shocking to see a woman being oppressed by others. While the male character of the novel *Masumiyet Müzesi* tries to build his own place with all the problems raised with domesticity, he excludes femininity. He sets Füsün aside and becomes the subject himself who seems to ironically suffer from her absence first in his life and then in the archival place of his, which happens to be a house. Femininity is deliberately removed from where it is normally associated with. That is why all the female characters in the novel, whether they are modern or traditional, fail to show “self-ownership” as they are oppressed by the patriarchal order. Not only their clothes but also their behavior is controlled by men making them a kind of commodity, a possession of masculinity in a story where a man claims his power as an individual by means of the archive and thus, feminine subjectivity is ignored.

In his book *The Representation of the Past*, Kevin Walsh claims that there was a “marked boom in the museum and heritage industry” towards the end of the 20th century (1), that people felt the need to go back in history and rediscover their past. While looking back at history there is no better place to go to than museums. As modernization takes place, humans have had the desire to know about their own history, their past and origins because in order to make sense of their presence in the world they needed to make a connection with the past. That is the reason why people started building museums, statues, and libraries to glorify and justify their history. Jürgen Habermas says, “the present perpetuates the break with the past in the form of a continual renewal” (Habermas 48). This archival urge becomes even more interesting when gender issues are also taken into account. The need to rediscover the past showed its influence when, in the 1960’s, feminist literary scholars started going back to history in order to recover earlier female writers and their works that academically were not taken seriously in their own times. For example, Virago Press, a British “international publisher of books by women” was founded in 1973 with the explicit aim of rediscovering fiction and classics written by women. Through literature, which is a way of archiving, Virago Press brings those female writers and their works back to life. Having been influenced by Women’s Liberation Movement that occurred from the late 1960’s to the 1980’s, it has been committed to publish

only women's works against the publishing industry which has been run by men. I believe the act of digging up in *Possession* is a way of liberating LaMotte out of her archive and making her voice heard and introducing her with a new identity by revealing her personal correspondence, belongings and literary works.

In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, the museum is full of Füsün's objects such as her earrings, clothes and cigarette stubs, each of which has its own meaning and memory for Kemal. Although the house is a domestic archive created by a man, on one level it is supposed to be a female archive as all the objects are somehow linked to Füsün. Nevertheless, she is unaware that there is a collection being made since some of her objects are almost stolen from her and her family. Füsün takes a passive part in the narrative just as in *Kara Kitap* where the reader only sees the man looking for his wife without the wife being tangibly present. Comparing *Masumiyet Müzesi* with *Kara Kitap* we can say that the latter is almost like a detective novel in which the protagonist investigates every possible clue in order to find his wife. *Masumiyet Müzesi* is more like a process novel, where we witness the protagonist building an archive of a woman trying to capture the highlights of their story in a place where it all started in 1975. Kemal tries hard to find and fit pieces together in his museum in order to reach Füsün again. He believes that having Füsün's objects brings him closer to her. Interestingly in the chapter "Bazı Nahoş Antropolojik Gerçekler" in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, there is an argument about Turkish societal structure that says women are seen like objects to be possessed by their fathers initially following their birth, and then passed on to their husbands. The protagonist, Kemal's, desire for Füsün, who is 18 and has her first sexual experience with him, is driven by the urge to "possess her." And according to the anthropological facts introduced in the novel, women who enter into a sexual liaison shall be punished by the society and excluded from it. The chapter offers several possible consequences of pre-marital sex such as a woman and man deciding to get married, a father marrying off his daughter with the man she had intercourse with, or the homicide of the woman. On every occasion the woman's fate is determined by men and she is not a voice that can choose what she wants. I think just as society punishes women and casts them away, Kemal also does the same thing when he is building up the collection of Füsün's objects. When he cannot possess her in real life, he punishes her and finds vent by excluding her from

the collection built from her various objects. The reason for all the consequences about women's liaison underlies the same urge as Kemal's: to control and then to possess woman. In all three novels the archive can be seen as a means to capture and possess women by at the same time excluding women to reclaim their power on them.

Patriarchal domination in Turkish society is metaphorically carried out in Kemal's archive. He excludes Füsün from his archive, but at the same time he objectifies her in it. The distinction between "I" and "we" in his narrative, where he dominantly uses the former, shows how he wants to get rid of Füsün and make her passive both in the cultural context described in the novel where she suffers, and in his archive, too. Derrida argues, "there is no political power without control of the archive, if not the memory" (11) and this justifies Kemal's deliberate insistence that both the novel and the literal place function as his archive and thus, memory. As Füsün has left him, Kemal takes revenge by keeping her passive in everything, even in his memory by proclaiming that every single object is supposed to tell how he has felt in a particular moment in his life even if it is linked to her.

Besides the archives found in it, the novels themselves also provide another way of archiving. In his article "The Dossier Novel: (Post)Modern Fiction and the Discourse of the Archive" Codebò says, "The archive and the novel share significant traits: both apply writing to the preservation of knowledge, store the memories of past events, and base their claims to truth on written proofs" (1). The texts are archives in which readers wander around in the pursuit of discovery along with the characters. Considering the books as archives on the most basic level, the women, in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, especially, are passive like the reader and the ones who are in charge, who control everything are men. Having said before that *Masumiyet Müzesi* is narrated by a man, the novel itself works in the interest of Kemal to help find Füsün and keep her. In *Possession*, the status of women is still rather not determined by the society neither in the Victorian Age nor in the 20th century that it actually takes place. In both novels women are the lost objects in the archives and neither of the missing female characters in the novels conforms to the stereotypic image of their gender. *Masumiyet Müzesi* is itself an archive of which a man is the archivist

besides the collection in it, but in *Possession* it is more unambiguous which gender has more power over an archive.

Now, I would like to look into the novels historically. *Possession* deals with two different times in the narrative: the Victorian age and the 20th century, when it is set. Although it is not as evident as in *Possession*, *Masumiyet Müzesi* also deals with two different times: before and after the proclamation of the Republic. The novel is set around the mid-1970's to 1980's. Turkey witnessed many radical reforms in the republican period. Time-wise the novel does not take place right at this time, but the effects of the changes are still fresh and vivid. In the novel it is still clear Turkey is undergoing the changes in all aspects of life that the proclamation of the Republic has brought along, and the novel offers a setting in which society seems hesitant and doubtful. But in this chapter I would like to discuss the ways femininity is affected directly or indirectly by the changes in different areas of life. The problems of modernity that are in progress for Turkey will be analyzed further in my following chapter along with the subject of nationalism. However, now I shall emphasize that it is impossible to separate the problems of the time of modernization and the way female body is being affected by it. State feminism, following the proclamation of the Republic, tried to ensure that women would equally take part in politics, education, and work, but as far as we can observe in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, even 50 years later women are still forced to adapt themselves to the change. Even though society is not really sure whether it is ready to welcome all of these changes, still, women are rushed in this process and expected to be the walking symbols of that modernity of which the society is afraid. This pertains to fear of adapting too much and thus losing their previous, authentic selves because of it. Femininity and gender issues have never been solved easily in Turkish society, but now the female body is even more challenged with the necessities of modernity. In the process of modernization mandatory de-hijabification was an enormous change for women, but even years following this, Füsün still feels unease while she is at the beach wearing her swimsuit, which shows that some pieces of clothes are removed from a woman by law and yet due to inner or outer reasons she still feels that she needs to cover up somehow. It also suggests that women are both encouraged to become modern and still criticized when they do not represent the fragile and shy image of a traditional

Turkish woman. The reason for this paradox is that women are seen as an experimental object that is trivial and elastic which effortlessly can take shape according to the current needs and desires of the time and people.

*Possession* is similar in that it, too, seems to deal with two different times, and we get a glimpse of how femininity is conceived in them. The two poets' literary works offer a kind of flashback for the reader to the Victorian age. While searching through the Women's Resource Centre, which contains the works of female writers and is the place that Roland and Maud often visit in order to find out more about LaMotte, they come across some correspondence between her and Ash besides some of her works. On one occasion they find a poem of hers written about the City of Ys, which turns out to be a Breton legend about a city later swallowed by the ocean. The most interesting thing about the legend is, as LaMotte notes in one of her poems, that the women of the city were transparent. The transparent body suggests metaphorically that the body itself gives away all it has to anyone that sees it. There are female bodies which hold no secret, and this suggests an openness to every eye (133). But at the same time, we can read this story suggesting that the female body is completely invisible as it is transparent and that it catches no one's eyes. This story was written by LaMotte in the Victorian age, and I believe that she is being critical of the fact that women were expected to be open to criticism as they were treated as the objects. The way Turkish women are subject to the judgement of everyone and expected to procure their own femininity by the decisions that came out of others' debate resembles the legend of Ys, where there is a suggestion of female body facing criticism voluntarily or withstanding.

The Women's Resource Centre is run by Maud, the female protagonist who studies LaMotte. The Centre holds the collection of unpublished works of female writers, including the works of LaMotte and the journals of Blanche Glover, LaMotte's housemate and suspected lover who commits suicide following the years LaMotte and Ash come closer. The centre preserves only women's studies in the hope that they are secured in the present so that they can be always studied and thus, remembered as in the case of Virago Press. Maud mentions of the place as not being very secure and "*disgracefully* underfunded since its inception" (437). It can be seen as a feminist attempt to establish an archive which is a counter archive that is

opposed to the dominant archive, or what Derrida might call patriarchive. It is the metaphorical “*apartman boşluğu*” that we have looked at in chapter 1. It does not stand as an outside although it is a fantasized external. Instead, it is inside just as the literal “*apartman boşluğu*”. It stands as a resisting feminist archive functioning as an outside to the main archive where femininity is consigned. In order to maintain an ideal order in one archive, an outside space is needed to consign all the objects that violate the ideality in the dominant archive, and in this case it is the femininity. And yet, the order, the archive, is never complete and the resistance starts from within.

Women’s Resource Centre also stands as an opposition to the Stant Collection, which contains the works of Ash. I believe it is worth noting that in the novel gender-wise there is a sharp distinction as the female poet is studied by women and the male poet is studied by men. The Women’s Resource Centre deals with the works of female writers and is run by a female scholar, whereas the Stant Collection has the male writers’ works studied by male scholars such as Mitchel and Blackadder. These two archives can be seen as gendered feminine and masculine. Respectively, the Stant Collection contains “Randolph’s and Ellen’s woven hair, Ellen’s cushion embroidered with lemon-trees, the jet brooch of York roses on its cushion of green velvet” (385), but the objects of Ellen only find a place in this collection as those of the poet’s wife. Both of these collections have restricted access for visitors, and throughout the novel the accessibility of the works is a matter of debate.

When Roland visits the Women’s Resource Centre to find a link between Ash and LaMotte, he sees that Maud immediately starts patronizing him by giving instructions on how they should proceed. Roland seems reluctant to work in the way Maud insists that they should, which involves “conventions of recording their observations on index cards according to a system she was already using in the Women’s Resource Centre” (129). Although he objects to this at first, he later gives in as he is just a visitor there, and he accepts Maud’s own regulations. Maud, being an heir of LaMotte, always seems very protective and possessive over her works and when other writings are discovered she wants them in the collection as well. She says, “I should naturally like LaMotte’s letters to be in the Women’s Resource Centre—which isn’t very secure, but the rest of her things—that came from my family—are already there” (480). She believes everything that once belonged to LaMotte, now is



hers and that these items deserve to be united: “On the other hand I don't want—I feel, having read them—the letters should stay together. They belong together. It's not only that they need to be read consecutively to make any sense—they—they are part of each other” (480). All the pauses in her speech makes it clear that she is trying to convince the others that they belong each other and then to the Women's Resource Centre, of which she is in charge. She seems to be the guardian to an archive which is structurally feminine, restricting masculinity by all means.

Although the Women's Resource Centre is the only exception in the concept of archive being controlled by a female, the domestic archives that have been discussed in the previous chapter seem to be stereotypically feminine. However, those archives seem to be domesticated and framed by the patriarchy, which makes it difficult to name the archive as just “feminine” or “patriarchive” as they are both. The two women in the texts, Füsün and LaMotte, are neither in control nor even present while their archives come out into the open. Just as the female body is dominated by men, all those places seem to be under the control of men, too. Kemal builds up the collection, the Masumiyet Müzesi, with Füsün's objects unknown to her and positions himself as the storyteller. The objects are supposed to tell Kemal's story, rather than Kemal and Füsün's story, as she is just a passive detail in the house which holds the archive. He says, “hikayemi eşyaların hikayesi gibi anlatabilme coşkusuyla gözden geçiriyorum” (353). He emphasizes that it is “his” story that is going to be told by the objects. They will convey the way Kemal felt at that specific time rather than the mutual emotion that was shared between them. He also says, “kendi dünyama, kendi eşyalarım dönmek istiyordum” and makes it clear that the place is his and it is the world in which he wants to live with the memory of Füsün (282).

In addition to his desire to tell his story in the novel, the reader cannot fully find out what Füsün thinks or how she feels as she is left out. Just like Kemal, we also are unable to reach Füsün, and she is absent to the reader as well, although the whole story seems to be about her. The intention of keeping her passive in the story to be told to the visitors by being the narrator himself is added up with the problem of excluding her from the archive, too, that in way is actually hers as she is the content. Although Kemal dreams about his old days with Füsün in the apartment and imagining that they are the lovers, he never really invites Füsün there again. Instead,

the place they meet is her parent's house where she lives with her parents and husband. For years following their break-up Kemal has to sit at the Keskinlers' table almost every day dining with Füsün's family including even her husband, in order to stay close to her. Kemal had to find a way into the Keskinlers' house even if it meant that he had to see Füsün with her husband there. And yet, despite this acceptance, the feeling of being left outside of Füsün's life, the way he wants to: still as lovers, I think, forces him to exclude her from the archive to gain some control or reclaim his masculinity. It is important to note that he spends most of his time in the archive, but later it literally becomes a house where Kemal lives after Füsün's death. As I have discussed in my previous chapter, the domestic place, which would be gendered as feminine, becomes much more important to Kemal. After Füsün's death he says he decided to build the museum: "kaybetme acısı ile kaybetmenin anlamı arasındaki bu noktalarda vardım" (507). Losing her makes him even more passionate about holding onto her, and the only way is finding ease in the museum that he actually builds for himself. He says the main aim of creating the archive is to retell his story to everyone else and make them experience everything he did, that domestic archive functions much more than that eventually. It is the place where he feels at ease even without Füsün in it.

At this point I would like to explore the paradox that is caused by this pursuit of women by men and the exclusion of women from archives. The women are represented as fragile, weak-willed, but still they hold so much power that men are unable to give up on them. Women seem passive, but men try hard to obtain them which creates a bit of a contrast as women are usually seen as obedient figures who have no autonomy. Just like an unappreciated female writer, in the book the women are neglected but still they are the goal, the aim to be reached in both novels. The digging up of LaMotte's tomb, the taking of Füsün's objects, the finding and reading of Ellen Ash's diary to get insight into her relationship with her husband all suggest that men actually need those women. They become obsessed with the idea of taking control of women by possessing their archive. Irwin Altman and Setha M. Low have introduced the term called "place attachment," which refers to a bond between a person and a place. In the novels it is the people who give a "meaning" to the place that they feel attached to. Kemal, for instance, creates his own place to which he is

acutely addicted. He desperately needs the house to find ease. This attachment becomes more interesting considering that it is a woman whose objects are gathered to create the archive.

The reason why Kemal feels like he desperately belongs to that place and the two scholars are greatly inspired to know everything about LaMotte by getting into her archive can also be because of the fact that the two female characters do not really conform to the societal rules of their times. The more they look intriguing and non-conformist, the more the others feel like they have to capture them. However, by building the museum in a time where a woman is not able to maintain a persistent female identity and by rediscovering the poet after years men, and also women in *Possession*, help them gain a whole new identity in this process, which they lacked in their own time.

We see a transformation in LaMotte's identity in the sense that at first she was just described as a shy Victorian poetess but later turns out to represent a rather marginal image through the archives in the novel. Suzanne Keen argues that there are "discomforts and inconveniences suffered in the service of knowledge" in *Possession* (35). The knowledge taken from the archives poses some problems such as LaMotte having had a love affair with a married man, and having given birth to a child in France in secret, into light. Jane Campbell describes her "as a victim of Victorian repression and stereotyping" (59), because it turns out that she did not represent a woman that could be subdued by the norms of the age she was living in. She wanted to hide her own identity, her own non-conformity in an archive. However, revealing it not only exposes her, but it also directly addresses at the present issues. Finding out that she was not a stereotypic Victorian woman also accordingly affects the present time reality in which the novel primarily takes place. Through LaMotte's archive Maud explores her own ancestry which links both women to each other. LaMotte's archive both arises some disturbing truths but it also provides some answers and explanations to the present questions.

Kemal excludes Füsün from the archive but at the same time he wants to keep her memory in it, as I have stated earlier. He secretly builds the archive with various objects of Füsün to feel that the place still has her vivid memory in it, but it is almost

as if he wants to keep Füsün's intangible presence and his story inside protected from the outside. That is why even she is unaware that there is an archive being formed about her. So this act of excluding her from her own domestic archive and Kemal's possessiveness towards it somehow makes it fundamentally patriarchal. In the novel, Kemal wants to preserve Füsün metaphorically in the objects first and make her a part of the house from which he emotionally benefits to overcome his loss. By saying "eşyalara sarılmak" what he really implies is that he wants to hold on to Füsün as if she never left him. This parallelism between what the objects mean to him and how he feels closer to Füsün with every object he takes into his museum keeps coming back in the novel. I think this act of preserving a woman in objects and then later in a house that is reserved for Kemal himself at first has come from some gender problems ongoing in Turkey at that time. Womanhood is perceived as something delicate of which men want to take control in the novel.

There are two women in *Masumiyet Müzesi* who have developed different styles of womanhood. Sibel represents love and trust whereas Füsün stands for courage and modernity to Kemal. At first Kemal cannot decide with whom he should be and maintains the two relationships simultaneously. It is interesting that he does not feel uncomfortable about being engaged to Sibel while having another relationship with Füsün at the same time. Maybe the difference between these two women and the reason for Kemal's choice to be with both of them at the same time implies that men in Turkey cannot fully adapt themselves to the changes brought about by modernism that affect women. Kemal finds both of the women interesting, maybe because they together constitute Kemal's ideal of womanhood. Despite not feeling uncomfortable about being with both of them and not letting either of them go, it is still very clear in the novel that Kemal prefers Füsün over Sibel, although Sibel is represented as Kemal's equal in the sense that she comes from a high-class family and has received good education abroad. She is said to be "Fransa'da okuyan aydın ve mutlu Türk kızı" (208). She is not a completely opposite character to Füsün in the sense of being "free". Neither of the women can be regarded as a completely stereotypic Turkish woman. Füsün is Kemal's distant relative, a teenage girl trying to make her living by working in a shop as her family is relatively poor. It is only after Füsün stops seeing him and marries someone else that Kemal makes up his mind and

burns his boats with Sibel. Füsün, who has never been abroad, is quite passionate about being known and seen as she wants to be an actress, which is looked down on and regarded as something “hafif,” which could be translated as “light” or “loose”. Füsün first appears as a shop assistant and then the jobs she wants to do are all about being seen and exhibiting herself. She wants to be a famous actress appearing in modern films where she is appreciated as a woman, instead of in typical, old fashioned, censored Turkish film. These jobs that she has worked in or desired to work suggest that she, as a woman, can only maintain some trivial jobs which do not require much thinking or effort. Kemal does not want Füsün to be seen by others but he encourages her to hold an exhibition of her bird drawings. They are metaphorical in that they are actually birds drawn by someone on a paper and put on display for others. It is as if the birds are trapped on paper while Füsün sees them flying. This contrast resembles Füsün’s condition as she is not allowed to be an actress and put herself on display but she is encouraged to hold an exhibition. Again, she is asked to be passive rather than active in her own life.

Having discussed the ways of controlling women in order to claim patriarchal power and the difference between Sibel and Füsün for Kemal, I would like to deliberate over the sexual purity which holds a crucial role in traditional views of womanhood in Turkey. Kemal seems to be a modern man who is not on the side of those who are against premarital sex, but still he thinks virginity is an important matter. On one occasion he regards the life story of one of Sibel’s friend thus: “çok üzücü bir hikayedir o. Pek çok erkekle yattığı için o zavallı kadın çok aşağılanmıştır” (82). He does not explicitly criticize the woman, and yet he pities her and implies that she is not married because she has slept with numerous men and there is nothing to be surprised about. Concerning his relationship with Sibel he says, “Ben de sorumlu, doğru dürüst biri olduğum için, Sibel’le elbette evlenecektim, bunu zaten çok istiyordum; ama istemesem de “bekâretini bana verdiği” için artık onu bırakmama imkân yoktu” (16). He admits that deflowering a woman would mean that he makes a promise to protect her social image by marrying her. Her status changes after Kemal’s affair with Füsün as she is said to be “Fransa’da okuyan aydın ve mutlu Türk kızı,” but later she turns into “sorunlu bir zenginle nişanlanıp içkiye alışan dertli ve alaycı bir Türk kadını” (208). There is even a chapter named “İnsanın

nişanlısını ortada bırakması normal midir?" where he thoroughly analyzes the situation and feels bad for Sibel while he still is sure that he wants Füsun instead of her. Despite the fact that they were engaged and Sibel would have sex with him, he still leaves her and makes her story just as sad as her friend whom they pitied. A man's desire becomes more important than a promise that he made by having sex with Sibel. The term "bekâretini birine vermek" in Turkish would actually put the blame on the women as it suggests it is a woman's decision to "give". However, in all cases men tear loose from this situation as it is the woman who is pitied or she is the one who committed the crime, almost on her own. Men have the full power on their relationship and they escape unscathed from the problems caused by liaison.

The relationships that Kemal has are different from what is suggested and considered to be fair by everyone. Looking into Kemal's relationship with Füsun it is seen that it bears some resemblances to the one with Sibel. Füsun has lost her virginity with Kemal at the very beginning of the novel, and I think the rest of the problems related to their relationship stem from this fact. While talking about the friend of Sibel, Füsun makes him a promise by saying, "merak etme... Hayatımın sonuna kadar senden başka kimseyle yatmayacağım" (82). After this promise he feels relieved, and it is clear that he enjoys the fact that he is the man whom Füsun has chosen as her first lover. I think the reason why Kemal cannot give up on her even after she gets married to someone else is because of this promise and the fact that he is the one whom Füsun has chosen to lose her virginity with. I think it even triggers the thought of building the archive, or the museum. The role of this promise in the society is described thus: "Aklı başında ve bakire genç bir kızın böyle durumlara düşmesi, kendisiyle evlenme niyetinde olmayan bir erkeğe kendini "teslim etmesi" düşünülmediği için, böyle bir şeyi yapan, yani evlenme sözü ve umudu olmadan bir erkekle yatan kızın aklının başında olmadığı inancı da çok yaygındı" (70). This quote is taken from a list called "Bazı Nahoş Antropolojik Gerçekler", which I have mentioned earlier as some well known "facts" that everybody would agree with. The notion of delivering oneself, "teslim etme," like "bekâretini verme," is interesting in the sense that it is not only having sex but also women are making a commitment to the men. And if there is no agreement such as both sides agree to marry, the woman is considered mad in the society for losing her virginity to someone who will not take

care of her by marrying her. Premarital sex built around a promise shows that Turkish society require a male power laying claim to a woman and, as suggested in the novel, women also require a kind of protection of men.

Analyzing both of Kemal's relationships in terms of Turkish customs of the time, Kemal causes harm to both of the women. He left Sibel after falling in love with Füsün although he was engaged to her. It is a promise of marriage which Turkish society is in favour of and yet Kemal breaks it. I think the name of the museum being "innocence" might be because he regards this love as innocent with no bad intention. He wants to believe that he has been an innocent man who just followed his own desires and needs. It is ironic as he might be using this adjective to make this whole thing innocent to justify his acts. That notion of innocence is shaken even more with Kemal's intention of preserving the memory of Füsün in that house and calling that place as innocent. Opposing the conventions, according to Kemal, Füsün turns into an object herself that should be kept and protected from outside even when she is not physically in there. Just like he is protecting her the way he would if he married her right away after their intercourse, he now protects the memory of Füsün there.

In addition to sexual purity, of women in particular, concerning marriage it is said that there are those "toplumumuzu ayakta tutan" (201) facts and conventions. There is a huge emphasis and role assigned to marriage, and it is offered as something that needs to be done in the novel. It is also criticized that "Toplumumuzu ayakta tutan pek çok sağlam evlilik bir tür fırtınalı ve mutsuz aşkları unutmak için yapılmıştır" (201). It is cynically suggested that marriage is like a kind of disguise for passionate love affairs that might harm the Turkish society. When Füsün is married to Feridun, Kemal sees no harm in visiting them constantly and not hiding his feelings. This shows that although marriage is seen as a serious, required commitment in society, Kemal does not consider that as an obstacle between himself and Füsün just like ignoring the fact that Sibel lost her virginity to him, which makes him responsible for her according to Turkish customs. For years he visits Füsün even if it means he will see Feridun, too. He is quite patient and he takes the reality lying down. In *Possession*, Ash is married and yet he has an affair with LaMotte, which they keep as a secret. Interestingly, while traveling together he gives LaMotte a ring

saying that it would be easier to travel and stay together if they are seen as a married couple. It also implies that the society would take the concept of marriage seriously and would not criticize them. There are some hints in the novel that Ash's wife blames herself for not bearing a child and on many occasions she hints that they have never had a sexual intercourse in their marriage. This might seem different from Kemal's case, however, I think their way of thinking about marriage have some similarities. They both agree that it is a serious and necessary act that "protects" women, again, but they still see no harm in getting into an affair with another woman. The two men of the two novels seem to comply with the fact that marriage is an important institution, and yet they self-interestedly interpret it and make use of it.

The femininity, which has been kept under control by some rules, conventions, institutions and facts explained so far, and which there has been an attempt to preserve in archives, comes back. In psychoanalytic terms the repressed always returns. Although it has been treated as something which disrupts ideality and thus needs to be kept hidden, femininity returns through a self-violation of the very thing that preserved it in the first place. The archive exposes the sexual secrets of LaMotte and Glover. They both symbolize the feminine corruption in Victorian mores for many reasons and their archives, which consist of their private letters and journals, explosively reveal their most hidden truths, once again showing the fact that an "outside" which gathers what has to stay outside, does nothing but reveal. Femininity, which carries the elements of uncanny, cannot be preserved without the violation of the archive, which was formerly supposed to keep it hidden.

The oppositions revealed in chapter 1 such as the fact that a house is both private and public, revealing and preserving, including and excluding also come to the foreground when gender is related to the archive. The public and private spheres in the 19th century were gendered, the former being masculine and the latter being female and therefore being related to the home and family (Digby 195). If we ignore the fact that the domestic places discussed previously are not completely private spaces, they should be associated with femininity. Womanhood in both novels, in both societies is treated as something that should be protected from outside which reinforces the correlation between femininity and domesticity. But what about the archive? While domesticity functions as a separator between public and private



spheres, and thus, houses and other kinds of private areas have already been associated with femininity, does it mean that they should necessarily be called the feminine archives?

Derrida offers the term “patriarchive” by highlighting that an archive is entitled with masculinity. He does not talk about femininity at all, and only mentions the term “patriarchive” in a footnote, not unpacking it thoroughly. According to him, the archive is always about control and all systems of power are at the same time systems of representation. Thus, the system of ordering, gathering is masculine as it both serves masculinity and also is under the control of it while the content is feminine. In both novels there are lots of examples of patriarchal control over feminine content. Femininity is treated as the imprisonment of patriarchal power. Men function as the “arkhons,” the guardians of the house and keep the feminine at home, and consign femininity to home. They metaphorically preserve femininity within the home.

However, in both novels the women are the subject themselves rather than the objects. With all their non-conformity they metaphorically want to get out of their protected places, or their archives and claim their own subjectivity, power and control over the archive. LaMotte both carries the elements of traditional femininity and she also metaphorically represents resistance. She is a writer, which makes her a subject rather than an object. Füsün refuses to conform to the list of “Bazı Nahoş Antropolojik Gerçekler” one by one and at the end of the story decides to go on a road trip to Europe with Kemal, leaving her husband. There is a constant struggle for power over the archive between masculinity and femininity. Thus, there are constant tensions and contradictions which leave us wondering what really determines the gender of an archive that is itself full of oppositions? What makes a place a patriarchive or feminine? Is it the place itself where an archive is formed: Is it the objects in it that somehow are gendered as well? Is it the gender of the owner, the guardian, the dweller who seems to control the archive? What I suggest is that there cannot be a gender based archive name applying to all the archives found in both novels. Archive, consisting most of the oppositions in nature, cannot take one side in terms of gender.

While women are represented as in need for male protection, how is the relationship between virginity and the archive affected from this? What I shall argue is that all the acts of digging up metaphorically represent the violation of female virginity. *Possession* is full of the mentions of archivists being the first person to touch an object and the excitement it evokes. Roland, for instance, is thrilled that he is the first person that uncovers a poet's letters, the first to get a hold of them. This act can be analyzed as a metaphor of uncovering female sexuality and virginity, which in a patriarchal sense must remain pure and untouched. All these acts and implications seem to function as a metaphor for deflowering. Archive both exists to preserve but it also violates female sexuality. LaMotte's archive exposes her sexual secrets. The same archive which metaphorically preserves virginity also becomes a threat, a danger to it. Or it reveals that ideal of purity and perfection was nothing but illusion in the first place. The archive that should have kept LaMotte's sexual secrets, reveals them. Patriarchal ideality requires to preserve feminine virginity which is a danger to it.

From the similarities between the representation of women in photographs, both novels provide an insight of two different societies' way of preserving femininity. The women's photographs in both novels suggest that there are public and private spheres that are intertwined. It is treated as something that has to remain in "private" places and yet paradoxically it is revealed to public. The way women themselves conform this concept of keeping their bodies as private archives is also achieved through self-censorship. In *Masumiyet Müzesi*, the archives, which were mentioned also as domestic in my first chapter, now appear as stereotypically feminine in which women are captured so that men can claim their power upon them. Füsün is the last object of the collection which is domesticated and framed with patriarchy. LaMotte is the eternal missing object in the archive that also preserves her somehow. However, in terms of gender it is seen that in both cases there is a constant struggle for power over the archives which makes it difficult to fundamentally name the archive patriarchal or feminine archive. These problems concerning archiving femininity and female body arise further as modernization takes places producing tensions around gender. While women are expected to keep their domestic and passive selves in this process, they are somehow treated as an experimental object in

the phase of modernization to exercise the effects of it. Although they are domestic, privatized objects in society, they are challenged with having to participate in the public sphere, too. Sexual impurity keeps coming forward as one of the most central problems in both novels in terms of gender and on which men claim themselves authority. In my next chapter, I shall look into these issues, this time in relation to nationhood and archives heretofore described as domestic and masculine or feminine.

### 3. CHAPTER

#### NATION, MEMORY AND ARCHIVE

In *Masumiyet Müzesi* sex-based stereotypes are accompanied by some national attributes as expressed in the phrases such as: “Batılılaşmış, İstanbullu zengin ev kadınları,” “bir Türk erkeğinin evlilik öncesi yaptığı gibi,” “bir Türk kızının hareketleri,” “kendi ekmeğini kendi kazanan dişli bir Avrupalı kadın”. I see it as impossible to separate the nation from gender while analyzing the characters of the novel. As the political, cultural, and even religious reforms take place to shape the modern life of Turkish society, there is an insistent pressure on both sexes imposed by the nation which affects them on an individual level as Turkish men and women. Like womanhood, as I have discussed in my previous chapter, the nation also undergoes a troublesome process after the proclamation of the Republic, and while modernity is seen as a threat to the so-called original Turkish culture, the question of the true, original attributes of Turkishness arises. Just like some stereotypic gender roles assigned to the characters of the novel, there seem to be some national attributes that they naturally hold. Sometimes it is like an excuse or shelter to feel safe inside, as expressed in the phrase “bir Türk erkeğinin evlilik öncesi yaptığı gibi”, which normalizes Turkish men’s recklessness or self-interest that might not be acknowledged as normal behavior by others. It ironically suggests that whatever he does should be tolerated indulgently with the help of the attribution of “Turkishness”. Mostly men profit from these national attributes as they provide an alibi for their acts and justify them, whereas Turkish women are still perceived as fragile and domestic and judged if they try to be any different or are seen as too conventional if they resist the change. As the time the novel is set in witnesses some fundamental changes in Turkish lifestyle, which can be perceived as an archive as well, it is not so easy to claim it is their nation which is behind the wheel, and the biggest factor in whom they are in their life when it comes to be a woman or a man in the society. The fact that Kemal comes from the modern, bourgeois class and Füsun with her typical, poor working-class family also makes this nation and gender affinity even more complicated as it uncovers the different social levels and how they are being affected by this renewal process. In this chapter the focus is going to be the nations as

archives, the paradoxes created by the attributes that are said to constitute a certain kind of nationhood, the essence of nationhood in terms of authenticity and imitation.

*Masumiyet Müzesi* benefits from the typical Yeşilçam Cinema love affair between a rich man and a poor girl, as the male protagonist of the novel is a rich businessman from Nişantaşı who represents the Turkish bourgeoisie of the 70's, while Füsun represents the victimized woman from the poor working-class who desires and seeks a change in her life. Her biggest dream is to be noticed and admired by others, but she is usually described as demanding and yet dissatisfied. At the very beginning of the novel she loses a pair of her earrings and, just as she keeps impatiently asking whether Kemal has found the missing pair or not, throughout the novel she is a woman who seeks some new attributes to employ for herself as a Turkish woman in the changing society of Turkey regardless of her very traditional family. With her ambivalent character, she can be considered as a metaphor of the state the nation is in. When Kemal asserts that it is Füsun's bravery and modernity that made her have sex with Kemal before marriage, Füsun does not think that it is something positive. The interesting part is that Kemal says he regrets having called her brave and modern as we understand from this "compliment" "benimle yattığı için Füsun'a özel bir sorumluluk ve bağlılık duyamayacağım sonucu çıkıyordu." (58) In fact, "“modern” olduğuna göre, evlenmeden önce bir erkekle yatmak ya da evlendiği gece bakire olmamak onun için bir yük olamazdı” (58). Kemal thinks this compliment would make Füsun happy but instead she instinctively denies that she is either brave or modern “tıpkı hayallerdeki Avrupalı kadınlar ya da İstanbul sokaklarında dolaştığı söylenen kimi efsanevi kadınlar gibi” (58). She wants to prove how modern she is to Kemal but still she cannot accept the attribute of “modern” as it would mean complete denial of her social traditions and rules, which I have mentioned under the title of “Bazı Antropolojik Gerçekler” in my previous chapter, and this is something she is not ready for.

This chapter is going to deal with the ways her nationhood affects her life, the decisions she makes and the love Kemal has for her and which causes him to build a collection with her objects. She is a clear representation of a woman who seems to be ambivalent because of the patriarchal oppression of the class she belongs to. She cannot break free of the ties to the past expectations and traditions of Turkey. She

wants to fit into the social class that Kemal has been living in, but her traditional family has an impact on her, too. Kemal is an important factor in this attempt at modernization as he is from a higher class with a seemingly more open-minded view of the world. Kemal invites her over to the Merhamet Apartmanı, and he has a dream of visiting Europe with Füsün. These places all represent a way out of the Turkish traditions or of Turkey itself, which is described as a “kadınla erkeğin yan yana gelemediği, birbiriyle görüşüp konuşamadığı” place by Kemal’s mother (467). When she finally sets herself free and decides that she will be with Kemal, she dies in an accident, during their European road trip, which is almost a suicide. The paradox of a female character never being able to let go and become free suggests an insight into the dilemma that this national identity renewal has brought into the Turkish society which still lives according to its traditions.

Meltem Ahıska says, “Europe has been an object of desire as well as a source of frustration for Turkish national identity in a long and strained history” (351). In her article “Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern,” she analyzes Turkey’s attempts to become a member of the European Union and how Western countries have changed Turkey’s new identity to accommodate it among them. But the efforts to become as modern or developed as Western countries did not start after the negotiations with the EU. Right after the proclamation of the Republic, Turkishness became a kind of project of change. The clothing and the alphabet reforms were carried out in order to create a new identity for Turkey which Ahıska refers to as “Turkey’s self-consciously crafted Western identity” (351). The important thing in this process of renewal is that Turkey has been aware of and willing about this change. “Occidentalism” is the term she uses to “conceptualize how the West figures in the temporal/spatial imagining of modern Turkish national identity” (353). In her argument and also for the majority of the Turkish people, modernization and westernization seem to operate as synonyms. In order to get rid of the old, typical and folkloric look, Turkey has consciously and willingly adopted the West’s life style. In order to be accepted by the others and to see themselves as modern as the West, they have embarked upon a constant change. Turkishness has never become something complete so that it can be preserved. Instead it seems to be quite shapable

but what Ahıska suggests is that Europe may either be a model for a new identity or a threat to the pure, original identity.

In Orhan Pamuk's novel *Kara Kitap*, all the newspaper articles of Celal are said to have been written earlier, because he is also another missing character in the novel, like Rya, and they all deal with the problems of the past where Turkishness has been disappearing. He mostly deals with the history and traditions of the nation and his articles point to the idea that the "purity" of the Turkish identity is stained by foreignness. At the same time, Celal's columns question why people are in the search of a missing object and believe that by finding it they can fulfill all their desires. But at the same time the articles question how the modernity causes alienation from the core values of a culture. We can connect this to Ahıska's analysis of how the object of desire can be at the same a source of frustration. While Celal's columns draw our attention to the nostalgic time in which Turkishness is represented as changing and degenerating, what was once seen as a source of modernization turns out to be the source of that "rot" in the national identity. In *Masumiyet Mzesi*, this Turkishness is also represented as an archive that should be preserved but compared with *Kara Kitap*, there is much more insistence on presenting modernity as a way to happiness or freedom. About sexuality it is said that, "bu acıların ötesine geçmiş, modern, mutlu, yeni insanlarsınız" (129) and it shows the view of people concerning the oppression of the past form of Turkish aspect which causes unhappiness as it limits their life. It is implied that if one can overcome the stress of modernity, what is promised is happiness.

Now I would like to pause here to look into the representation of Turkishness as an archive in *Kara Kitap* before moving on to *Masumiyet Mzesi*<sup>2</sup>. The former has a chapter called "Bedii Usta'nın Evlatları," which is one of Celal's columns that takes us back to the past times and sets a comparison with the present. The column is about an interview Celal has carried out with Bedii Usta, who is known to be the first Turkish mannequin maker. The chapter initially claims to explain the history of the art of mannequin, but later it turns out to be much more than a piece of history. We see the contrast between two reactions towards the West. One reaction is the belief

---

<sup>2</sup> I would like to acknowledge the connections between *Kara Kitap* and the Derridean conception of archive drawn by Trevor John Hope in our graduate course of Literary Criticism and Theory in 2015.

that modernization could be possible only if Turkish people adapt themselves to the Western culture, while the other one is a resistance towards the West as the reason why Turkishness has lost its supposed purity. Bedii Usta opposes to Westernization and refuses to make his mannequins as a Westerner. The first mannequins that he makes are the strong and heroic figures of Turkish history and most importantly they are victorious fighters against Western countries.

Üç yüz yıl önce Akdeniz'de İtalyan ve İspanyol gemilerine kök söktüren levendlerimizin ve civan yiğitlerimizin palabıyıkları ve bütün haşmetleriyle, bu ilk müzeye yerleştirdiği ve saltanat kayıkları ve kadırgalar arasında dikildiğini gören müzenin ilk ziyaretçileri, tanıkların anlattığına göre, hayretler içinde kalmışlar. (65-66)

Bedii Usta, “who supposedly, at the turn of the twentieth century, makes mannequins to represent true Turkish identity and tradition in the face of the sweeping modernity and westernisation” (Khatami 10) wants to preserve the existing, original identity and makes his mannequins according to the stereotypes of Turkishness. He wants to preserve that Turkish identity as it is, as an archive, without the touch of the West. He forms an archive of “true” Turkishness by making those mannequins. And the fact that the mannequins are fighters is symbolic of the way in which he wages war against westernization himself.

While Bedii Usta searches for a shop which would buy his mannequins, one of the shopkeepers who turns him down tells him that the Turkish people want to be someone else, rather than Turkish. He regards Bedii Usta's mannequins as “gerçek Türkler, gerçek vatandaşlar” and claims that they are fake representations of what the Turkish people are trying to get away from. It is interesting that something that is once regarded as “gerçek,” true, turns into fake and thus disliked. “Türkler artık “Türk” değil, başka bir şey olmak istiyorlarmış çünkü. Bu yüzden kılık kıyafet devrimini icat etmişler, sakallarını tıraş etmişler, dillerini ve harflerini değiştirmişler” (67). The escape from Turkishness is achieved through the help of the West. Turkey has adopted Western clothes and the Latin alphabet and tried to leave Turkishness behind. However, Ahıska says, “The West” has either been celebrated as a “model” to be followed or exorcised as a threat to “indigenous” national values” (353). While



the shopkeepers describe how the Turkish people imitate the Westerners by trying to be like them, there is a threat that they overlook. The West may be the “source of frustration and threat” to their national, core values which have to be preserved in order to claim an original, authentic identity of Turkey and yet they are ready to sacrifice it in order to become more like them. Bedii Usta has valued the “indigenous national values” and tried to preserve them in his mannequins. The shopkeeper says the reason why customers prefer to see the “Westerner mannequins” is that, “O elbiseyi giyen “ötekiler” gibi olabilme hayalimiş asıl satın almak istedikleri” (67). The customers are said to be chasing a dream, which is to look like a European, and this is offered as something that can be sold and bought. Füsün also has this dream of becoming one of those legendary and modern women who are said to wander around the streets of İstanbul. Füsün, and the customers that the shopkeepers talk about ironically symbolize one part of society who want to sacrifice their indigenous national values and marginalize themselves without giving it a much thought.

Despite having been turned down many times, Bedii Usta does not even try to make mannequins that could be easily sold to the shops and put on display. Bedii Usta’s son says, “bizleri “bizler” yapan “özümüzün” bu tuhaf ve tozlu eserlerin içine gömüldüğünü söylüyordu” (67). Bedii Usta has tried to preserve that “öz” in his mannequins because he believes that it is the component of the Turkish identity. Although they are confined to the basement, the mannequins and the basement are represented as in this way: “Dört bir yanımız kıpır kıpır kıpırdanmaya çalışan, sanki bir şeyler yaparak yaşamak isteyen mankenlerin o dondurulmuş yaşamıyla dopdoluydu” (68). Bedii Usta’s son explains that his father would sit in a cafe in Beyoğlu to watch the gestures and mimics of Turkish people in order to make his mannequins accordingly. Despite the irony in aiming to preserve the “öz” in a lifeless body, Bedii Usta and his son romanticize this story of mannequins and claim that they want to live and pass on. Here, through Bedii Usta’s mannequins and the shopkeeper’s claim about the Turkish people we see two opposing attitudes towards the West which is either desired or feared.

I find some similarities between the descriptions of Bedii Usta’s place and another archive in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, which is the shop, or boutique as it is referred to in the novel, where Füsün works. It is located in Nişantaşı, which is a

neighborhood populated by upper class people, and it sells expensive famous foreign clothing and shoe brands. It is also the place where Kemal and Füsün meet for the first time and Kemal notices how attractive Füsün, his distant relative, has become. Kemal actually goes into this boutique to buy a gift for Sibel, who loves wearing foreign brands, and he buys a bag for her. The boutique is ironically named “Şanzelize,” directly translated from the French Champs-Élysées and made into Turkish. It is a well known street in Paris where all the expensive and luxurious shops are located, but I find it cynical that the boutique in Nişantaşı uses this name whereas it actually sells fake goods under the name of foreign brands. As the name suggests and the shop owner proudly speaks of the goods they sell, it reveals the fact that people are first attracted to the shop because of its name and it is their desire to possess those items there in order to get closer to the Western image. They want to be different, which justifies the shop owners’ claim as they refuse to display Bedii Usta’s mannequins, saying that those mannequins are quite the opposite of the current desire of Turkish society. Sibel notices her bag bought from Şanzelize Boutique is fake at first glance and tells Kemal to return it. As a Turkish woman she wants to intentionally lose her “öz” in order to look and feel more like a Westerner. When Kemal goes back to the shop in order to return the bag, Füsün reacts like she is embarrassed as if it is her fault and denies that the bag is fake in a very protective way. It is ironic that this shop, which appeals to rich Istanbul women, actually sells fake products and helps people to reach the ideal western image of their dreams with these unauthentic accessories and Füsün, herself, becomes an agent in this process along with the shop. The paradox in Bedii Usta’s attempt to produce true Turkishness, and the shop owners’ intention to display more modern mannequins which have nothing to do with the Turkishness that Bedii Usta wants to show, also manifests itself in Şanzelize Boutique. It sells goods that will help Turkish people to achieve the goal of looking alike Westerner but paradoxically they are the fake representations of their imagined ideal Western image.

Kemal says he exhibits in his museum the first Turkish soda pop which reminds him of those happy and peaceful days when it first came onto the market. The owner of soda pop company is Kemal’s friend Zaim, whom Sibel dislikes; saying she finds him too vulgar as he hires an oriental dancer to his events and uses a

lighter with the logo of Playboy to light the cigarettes of women. I would like to shortly note that Sibel later marries Zaim, whom she once described as a bad example for Kemal. However, the great irony that I want to present is that Zaim hires a German model to act in the commercial film of the first Turkish soda pop. A foreign, female model is said to be admired by everyone she encounters with in the streets of İstanbul. The fact that even the most local, indigenous product is commercialized by the help of the West justifies the shopkeepers' claims concerning Turkish people trying to escape from their displeasingly old fashioned self. This urge becomes so impulsive that although they feel proud that now they have their first ever soda pop, still in order to make it appealing it needs to be Westernized to some extent.

The slogan used to market the soda pop is "Siz her şeye layıksınız" which would translate to English as "you deserve everything," but it loses its pun in the translation. Although it is surely offered as something positive as it is the first soda pop and Turkey literally "deserves" to have its own authentic soda pop, the negative associations the verb implies suggest that there is an accusation. It is a bitter phrase which implies that Westernization is a kind of crime that Turkish society willingly commit, and thus they should suffer the consequences. Sibel describes the slogan as selfish and insensible and says it is not an appropriate slogan "Pek çok gencin solculuk, sağcılık diye birbirini öldürdüğü Türkiye gibi fakir ve dertli bir ülkede" (40). Bedii Usta tried hard to preserve the essence of Turkishness and he failed as it was other Turkish people who did not acknowledge it as essential as he thought. The need of a German woman to commercialize a Turkish product would actually make Bedii Usta say that it was the Turkish society itself which willingly claimed that they needed modernity, thus the West, and now it is what they have deserved.

One last archive is the Alaaddin's Store which appears both in *Kara Kitap* and *Masumiyet Müzesi*. As a matter of fact, it really exists in İstanbul with the same name selling a wide variety of products as a great representation of Turkish commodity culture. It is first introduced in another interview that Celal has done with Bedii Usta and the place with all its products is said to live in the memory of everyone. It functions as a national archive that symbolizes the corruption in Turkish identity. It is

described in *Kara Kitap* as: “Bir Amerikan filmi gelir, bütün gençler kara gözlük alırdı, bir gazete haberi çıkar bütün kadınlar dudak kremi, bütün erkekler imamlara yakışır takkelerden isterdi, ama çoğu zaman istekler hiç anlaşılmayan bir şekilde veba gibi yayılırdı” (52). The place, I would argue, can be considered as a modern archive that keeps pace with the ongoing process of modernity. Just like the Şanzelize Boutique, it starts functioning as an agent to fulfill the dreams of Turkish society by offering whatever is trending in the West and helping them adopt those current trends. “Bu millet, bu insanlar bir... bir... “tuhaf” diye Alaaddin’in bulamadığı kelimeyi ben yetiştirdim, “anlaşılmaz” diye, “hatta korkutucu” diye” (52) says Celal while the fact that the Turkish have turned this local shop into something that provides their Westernized selves’ needs. This urge to become more and more like a Westerner takes control of Turkish society in a way that Galip and the owner of the store call odd, incomprehensible and even scary. Something that is foreign and strange becomes the new “öz,” which is constantly being re-made. Although Bedii Usta makes his mannequins like a simple, monotype as if it is enough to represent Turkishness in an object the way he does, the society consents to become a monotype of something else as they start wearing black sunglasses, put on lip cream or hats that would, interestingly, suit Turkish imams.

I would like to stop here to briefly analyze the manner in which Turkish essence becomes something disturbing and scary. Freud defines the uncanny as, “that class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar” (340). In order to be uncanny, a subject must arouse horror but still it has to be familiar to that person. The new Turkishness that is formed with some foreign attributes arouses distress and can be seen as the heterogeneity brought from outside to the desired, perfect structure. I think we can easily adapt the definition of the unheimlich (unfamiliar) to this new Turkish identity: “Unheimlich is the name for everything that ought to have remained ... secret and hidden, but has come to light” (Freud 345). Although Turkishness was introduced as something so special that it should be appreciated and preserved, with the touch of the West it turns into something disturbing as in the “return of the repressed” as it is familiar and unfamiliar at the same time. This heterogeneity causes stress as the external substrate is needed in the first place in order to form a new self for Turkishness. However, by

imitating Westerners and adopting their lifestyle by buying some objects from Alaaddin's Store or Şanzelize Boutique, they start taking something modern as new Turkishness. The main cause of this scariness of the new identity is that an external substrate is added into something so pure and far from imitation. But from the Derridean perspective an archive, which, in this case, is Turkishness, already needs an outside to become complete.

In his book *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, French Philosopher Jacques Derrida tries to explain the system of the archive by analyzing the connotations of the word "consignation". Consignation refers to gathering together in the archive. It gathers all sorts of power by unifying, identifying and classifying the objects: "Consignation aims to coordinate a single corpus, in a system or a synchrony in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration" (Derrida 3)<sup>3</sup>. To consign means to create an ideal structure which is supposed to bring all the objects together regardless of their differences. Despite the ideality of the system by which all the associated and similar objects are brought together, Derrida implies that such a system is not possible as there cannot be a perfect order without anything interrupting it: "In an archive, there should not be any absolute dissociation, any heterogeneity or secret which could separate (*secernere*), or partition, in an absolute manner" (3). However Derrida claims that such perfect order is impossible because archive "is entrusted to the outside, to an external substrate" (8). It means that there cannot be an ideal, homogeneous order because the order depends on a kind of external object. Having been inspired by Freud who, and especially in his discussion of the uncanny, has dealt with the relationship between inside and outside, Derrida explains this theory based on archive with the help of this paradoxical relationship as well.

While discussing a nation's archive, especially the Turkish archive in this case, Derrida's suggestion that the archive requires an external object is of great significance. A nation's archive is believed to be the home to its "öz" that is shaped with the nation's centuries old traditions, common law that everybody grows into,

---

<sup>3</sup> Again, I would like to acknowledge the connections between *Kara Kitap* and the Derridean conception of archive drawn by Trevor John Hope in our graduate course of Literary Criticism and Theory in 2015.

stereotypic behavior, and even appearance, characteristics. In the view of Bedii Usta, Turkishness is proposed as something vital and very pure that must be preserved, but in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, there are many implications that it is not something stable and unchanging which can be preserved in the way Bedii Usta wants. At this point, in need of a definition for nation and nationhood that are interpreted in different ways by the characters, I turn to Ernest Renan who says, referring to the nation, “it is not more soil than it is race which makes a nation. The soil furnishes the substratum, the field of struggle and of labour; man furnishes the soul. Man is everything in the formation of this sacred thing which is called a people” (52). His definition raises the question whether we can talk about a true, authentic Turkishness that Bedii Usta wants to represent and also Sibel wants to escape from. What do they call the “öz”, essence, of Turkishness that they should preserve? Derrida points out the archive is derived from the term, *arkhé*, which is at one level an institution that is produced. It is not pure or natural. He says that it has two different meanings: commencement and commandment. Commencement means "originary, the first, the principle, the primitive" (Derrida 1), whereas commandment is a place where the order is exercised or given. He argues about whether there is such thing as a single first thing, origin, which seems to be the core element in his analysis of archive. But, in the first place, is there even an “öz” that is believed to be so pure that it should be preserved as it is? Derrida offers the term “*arkhé*” to define what is produced. If Turkishness is produced, if it is an *arkhé*, can it still have an essence that all the following items have been built upon in order to make it complete? Nuri Eren, as quoted by Ahıska, proposes another question in relation to this uniqueness that, “*özcülük*” wants to claim: “Of all the nations in the World, Turkey is unique in having failed to forge a consistent image of herself. Is she of Europe or of the East?” (249). My suggestion is that maybe it is both: including all the imports from West into its “originary”, first self and thus making a whole new identity containing elements from both inside and outside.

“*Mış gibi yapmak*” is the core problem in Pamuk’s novel while criticizing Turkish nationhood and some requirements of being Turkish. In order to become ideal, they need to perform some necessary acts. Although Kemal seems to be relatively more modern than most of the other characters in the novel, he still does

not overlook the rules that govern their everyday life. The conflict between a traditional and modernizing society in the novel also takes place in the domestic archives such as the Merhamet Apartmanı, which is the place where Füsün lost her virginity, and the Keskinlers' house, where Füsün lives with her parents and her husband, later. In this part of the novel she seems to alter her once modern-want-to-be image into a domestic woman who has not left her father's house, still sits at the table with her family, watches TV and plays lotto afterwards. For Kemal, the entrance into this house is only possible in his capacity as a relative. Everybody in that house acts as if Kemal is a distant relative who has paid a visit to chat. The paradox is that even the most domestic, traditional environment that would well arranged with the Turkish values is still built around the concept of "miş gibi yapmak". Nobody, even Füsün's husband, finds the fact that Kemal visits them almost every night abnormal. In normal circumstances even chatting with a married woman would seem inappropriate and be judged negatively by most but as he is from a higher class this situation is normalized. By sitting at the dinner table altogether and surrounding themselves with Turkish traditions with this appreciated domestic lifestyle, they practice the traditional Turkish values by "miş gibi yapmak". Just like selling fake goods to make people believe that they are modern or at least they seem modern, everybody in Keskinlers' house ignore all the odds and display a traditional Turkish relative gathering and believing that they are innocent.

The problems about nationhood mostly center on the conflict between the West and the original self that is seemingly a part of the East in *Masumiyet Müzesi*. In *Possession*, however, "nationality" is offered as something that is very strict and rightful as there are many references claiming that an object, a place is British or American making it definitely belong to that nation. The scholars of the novel who are in pursuit of rediscovering the two poets are distinguished as British and American. "Blackadder, a Scot, believed British writings should stay in Britain and be studied by the British" (10), and this perspective is at the root of great paradoxes throughout the novel such as what makes a writing British and why could a certain nationhood claim ownership on it? The title of the book, *Possession*, also makes itself apparent in this context as Blackadder, ironically working at the British Museum, is a man on the side of fanatic nationalism who greedily thinks that those

writings must be preserved and re-gathered and studied by only the British. The novel starts with a short poem by Ash about a secret garden waiting to be found, but later on in the novel nationhood seems to be an obstacle that prevents them from claiming possession or a tool which opens the archive of the poets.

The tomb of LaMotte, who was not an appreciated writer in her time as I have suggested before, is said to be a “national monument”. Instead of her own profession, her father’s is written on it suggesting some gender based traditions of her time, as already mentioned in my second chapter. Apart from gender, problems of ownership in terms of nation come to the forefront as well. Before Roland and Maud find it, Lord Bailey tells them another American female scholar, Dr. Leonora Stern, came and she “said its condition was shocking. A national monument,” but Lord Bailey, although he was not very fond of LaMotte, becomes possessive and replies, “Not *her* national monument I told her, and she shouldn’t come poking her nose in where, it wasn’t wanted. She asked to borrow some shears. That was when I got the gun out” (80). The reason why he becomes so aggressive and protective of this tomb is because the scholar who claimed it was not taken care of in the way it should is American. Lord Bailey takes sides with Blackadder in excluding other nations from “their” national archive and being the one, true owner of it. Even if it is not in a good condition, the tomb is still British heritage and it should not be touched by the American.

Considering the novels that I deal with and, even on the most basic level, the fictional British poets introduced in *Possession*, we should take literature itself as an archive. The literature becomes a part of the national archive which can be acknowledged as an organization formed around the culture and ideas of nation. It contains the canon of important writers within itself. Thus reading the works of one particular nation’s literature might be a means of understanding them socially and historically. According to Renan, the nation is not blood, race or anything else but it is the memory. That is the only substance essential as the nation has always been about memory. Literature can provide a basis for the institution of memory that the nation needs to claim itself. Museums, statues, libraries are connected with the rise of the nation state as they present archives that the collective memory benefits from. However, literature itself is equally significant in the concept of memory, archiving a



certain culture and thus leading us into some complex problems of ownership of this national heritage: that is literature.

The two poets at the center of the novel are British, which means that all the works that have been found are within English Literature. All the poems, letters, proses, epigraphs found in the novel are the two poets' and this makes them British as well. They are a part of the British memory serving as a written document for the nation's history. However, from American perspective the archive of British culture is also part of the archive of American culture. The American scholar dislikes the condition of the national heritage of England believing that it has not been treated as it should. Metaphorically America claims the role of inheritor of the British archive. Although England has been the historic enemy and oppressor which America had to get rid of in the past, for America, English literature is something that they need to make sure of its ideality.

Throughout the novel, with the help of American scholars Cropper and Stern, America is portrayed as a wealthy man driving around in expensive cars and capable of buying anything he wishes. Leonora is said to be "a frightful nosy American" (79), and due to her dominance there are some implications that Maud feels like she is responsible of telling her about the findings related to LaMotte. The other American scholar, which I would define as an antagonist to Blackadder, is Mortimer Cropper who sneakily follows Mitchel and Maud. He is an indifferent and arrogant man who thinks Blackadder "had not stepped outside the British Isles for many years, except to attend international conferences on Victorian poetry, all of which took place in identical seminar rooms reached by car from identical hotels" (107). He looks down on Blackadder not only as a person but also as a scholar and almost despises him. Blackadder, driving a black long Mercedes that is "of the kind more normally seen driving dignitaries in countries behind the Iron Curtain, a swift funereal car," is easily recognized by Mitchel and Maud while being traced by Cropper. His choice of an expensive, eye-catching car as he follows them well summarizes him as he does not feel any shame for whatever he does. He is not afraid of being seen.

Right at the climax of the plot, when Cropper digs up the grave of Ash, the English team hides in the dark waiting to catch him redhanded. It is quite interesting that this illegal action to obtain Ash's highly private letters is performed by the American scholar and we, as the reader, take side with the English team and when the town where the graveyard is located is hit by the storm and everyone there becomes trapped, we feel relief. The fact that the American scholar could not get a hold of the British archive, so-called, it is proposed as a victory. The British archive, literature and more importantly its history, thus "memory" is saved by the British from America's violation. The national archive is protected from the other nationhood which unrightfully claims ownership and in the novel it seems like a triumph that requires celebration.

Derrida, rejecting the ideality and unity of the archive, says, "There is always more than one- and more or less than two" (1,2). The counter-archive, that would paradoxically work against itself, is also inside the archive itself. In *Possession*, another nation functions as a counter-archive which represents the outside for Englishness. Derrida claims, "There is no archive without a place of consignment, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside" (11). France is the place where LaMotte goes to in order to hide her pregnancy and give birth to her and Ash's child there. It is an attempt to consign her sexual impurity, the image of an unideal Victorian woman with immorality to France. Her evidence of impurity has to be gotten rid of by exporting it to France and considering it as buried there in order to keep her ideal British woman figure safe. Thus, France becomes the new archive in which those things that have been denied by a certain view of Englishness are consigned. The Merhamet Apartmanı was once used as a place to throw out the unnecessary items and it would make sure Kemal's parents house would hold a kind of integrity on its own without those objects. In *Kara Kitap*, it is the "apartman boşluğu" and in *Possession*, it manifests itself as a trade between two nations archive that accept the concept of consignment and agree to import and export.

The ideality of the archive of Englishness is complete and made possible by consigning what is unideal to Frenchness. On the other hand, this produces the deconstruction of this ideal archive that depends on the thing that both is contained

and has to be thrown out. The archive is, at the same time, made incomplete and impossible. In order to preserve the “öz” of Englishness that does not accept certain things such as sexual impurity and illegitimate child, LaMotte goes to Nantes, France to hide her non-conformity from her nation. Interestingly, while the scholars trace her correspondence and travels from one place to another in order to gather information, they follow the footsteps of LaMotte and find themselves in France. She was once claimed for the nation but how does this fact that she had to be consigned to another nation affect her “öz”? Does this mean that LaMotte, who is acknowledged as a part of the national heritage of England, is at the same time a property of the French archive which agreed to accept her into its own? In fact, the question whether a certain nation can really claim ownership over a person with regard to evaluating her “öz” yet remains unanswered.

Despite Renan’s proposal that a nation cannot be simply defined by concrete elements such as land or the metaphorical and still highly credited concept of “shared blood,” in both novels there is a huge emphasis on nationhood and its archive that needs to be preserved. Through the literal act of digging up domestic, masculine or feminine archives, the problems of nationhood arise. The praised and glorified “essence” is proposed as something opposite to the imitation of the West in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, but from a deconstructive point of view, the West, symbolizing the outside, is essential in the process of Turkey’s formation of a new identity for itself in modernization. Both novels offer some insight into the problems of nationhood from other perspectives such as traditional and modern in *Masumiyet Müzesi*, and British, American, French in *Possession*. While the archive emphasizes the impossibility of any kind of “özcülük” that can be preserved, both novels deal with the paradoxes of keeping their essence authentic and pure by getting a little help from the “outside”. Turkey is indeed a special case that suffers from modernity while one part of its people who are too conventional and in favor of keeping their “öz,” knock against the other part that is only too pleased and readily welcomes even the smallest change that will make them look like “ötekiler”, the Westerners that are admired. This notion of “özcülük,” essentialism, manifests itself in *Possession* to some extent as the core problem related to nation seems to be claiming ownership. Being a member of a nation is offered as something that naturally makes that person

the owner of the archive but still the novel paradoxically suggests a primitive urge to literally “possess” a national heritage regardless of the nationhood of the person who claims ownership over it.

## CONCLUSION

From the literal collection being built in the foreground of the novel to the other places that somehow function as archives, Pamuk's novel *Masumiyet Müzesi* provides an allegorical perspective on a modern man's desire to leave a trace in the world. National museums, monuments or statues have existed for centuries for many purposes which can be understood in historical and sociological terms, but Pamuk examines this concept at an individual level as he discusses the ways a man attempts to gather all his valuable belongings and create a place his own, which is supposed to function as his own subjective museum. The novel splendidly reveals the need for a modern man to work diligently to create a place which serves as an institution of his personal memory, and a museum in which he will find comfort when he cannot do so in real life and which will somehow makes his existence in the world permanent even after he is gone. Kemal, a wealthy man from the upper classes of Nişantaşı, İstanbul, finds himself in the middle of an obsessive love crisis which takes control of his life making him unable to continue living as he did before. Remembering and memory become the two essential things that he depends on while turning his house into a museum which later becomes his house again where dies. The last chapter of the novel, titled "Mutluluk," the happiness, wants the reader to make sure although he could not reach Füsün in real life, ends with Kemal saying, "Herkes bilsin, çok mutlu bir hayat yaşadım" (548). The last words, still insist that despite the great absence of Füsün, that he lived his life properly and happily.

The two periods meticulously and elegantly illustrated in Byatt's novel deliver rich archives to help us understand the very basic emotional relationship between an individual and its home both in a domestic and a national sense. The modern need to rediscover the past and make connections with it in the present manifests itself as the Victorian Age is vividly represented by Byatt's rich use of letters, poems that go on and on for pages, and journals that are said to be written by the two Victorian poets. While she offers the Victorian Age and two poets along with it as archives to be explored, the postmodern anxiety of "possessing" bursts, which, in the novel, is closely associated with the problems of gender and nation. Similar to Pamuk's novel, there is an insistent desire to complete and archive, despite all the tensions that rise,

and literally possess it. Starting from the individual level of a need to own something, the novel goes on to explore femininity and female body as something to be obtained: through an archive. When it comes to claim ownership over the so-called “national heritage,” that is the female poet’s collections of private correspondence, the nation appears to be the judge which decides who shall own it.

Analytically as we break things down, we see that the concept of the archive in both of these works turns out to be inseparable from the questions of domesticity, gender and national identity. This suggests, in turn, that we should consider all of these things are interconnected. The archives in the novels teach us something about all of the above-mentioned elements. Museums and houses, or monuments and boutiques all extend to the paradoxes of personal and public, as well as the private and collective. The relationship between the private and public comes all the way from domestic places to social areas of life where gender is involved in political areas with regards to nationhood.

In my reading of these two novels, I have tried to analyze literature branching into psychology, sociology, history and individualism in modern culture. Maleuvre helps us to understand the modern desire between an individual and his intention to create his own interiority. While he analyzes the ways people try to create an ideality at home, to claim their individuality as well, Ahıska discusses how Turkish identity faces the challenge of modernization and how Turkey cannot make sure of the effects of Westernization on its identity, reputed by the Turkish to be pure. One can choose to study Derrida narrowly as to making point of his philosophical theories on deconstruction without relating them to the fields of life. However, his book *Archive Fever* provides a wonderful foundation for understanding the formation of interiority, femininity and national identity. Deemed to be significant concept of “özcülük” is deconstructed in accordance with Derrida’s questioning of the very thing that the nation is built upon: originality. In the social and political sense he denies that an archive, whether it is a house or something gendered as feminine or attributed to a nation, can be ideal. He challenges the concept of archive by saying it is both private and public. It both preserves and reveals. It can be modern but traditional, at the same time. However, the goal is to demand ideality for itself, which he says is not possible.

Literature, I would argue, has to go back and forth between psychology, the individual sociology and history. It is not about a certain kind of literary work that has to deal with these issues, but from a more general perspective, literature itself has already those elements in it waiting to be discovered and demanding that we make connections with our social and political lives as individuals.

Overall, in the light of this thesis there are plenty of questions that remain and can provide basis for future studies to elaborate on. In the question of authorship and possession of the archives does it matter who the author is? It is a rather cliché thought to look at the novels by of making a distinction between a female writer and a male writer, but what does it mean to compare a novel written by a woman and another novel written by a man? Does A.S. Byatt, herself, function as the female archivist while Pamuk is a male archivist? This thesis carries out a comparative project between a British novel and a Turkish novel. Gender and nationhood, the cultural difference are inseparable, and in some ways they are quite similar novels. However, at the same each has to be understood in terms of questions of nationality. So the final question is, what does it mean that we have in national terms a British archive and a Turkish archive?

## WORKS CITED

- Ahiska, Meltem. "Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102.2 (2003): 351-79. Print.
- Birke, Dorothee, and Stella Butter. *Realisms in Contemporary Culture: Theories, Politics, and Medial Configurations*. Vol. 21: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. Print.
- Byatt, Antonia Susan. *Possession: A Romance*. Vintage, 2009. Print.
- Campbell, Jane. *AS Byatt and the heliotropic imagination*. Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 2004.
- Chesterton, Gilbert Keith. *What's Wrong with the World*. Cassell, 1912.
- Codebò, Marco. "The Dossier Novel:(Post) Modern Fiction and the Discourse of the Archive." *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies* 3.1 (2007). Print.
- Demir, Fethi. "Orhan Pamuk'un Romancılık Serüveninde Yeni Bir Durak: Tematik Romanlar." *Turkish Studies* 6 (2011): 1.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. University of Chicago Press, 1996. Print.
- Digby, Anne. *Victorian Values and Women in Public and Private*. Proceedings of the British Academy. 1992. Print.
- Ertuna, Irmak. "The Mystery of the Object and Anthropological Materialism: Orhan Pamuk's Museum of Innocence and André Breton's Nadja." *Journal of Modern Literature* 33.3 (2010): 99-111. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund, and James Ed Strachey. "The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud." (1964). Print.
- Friedman, Alice T. *Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History*. Yale University Press, 2006. Print.
- Fuss, Diana. *The Sense of an Interior: Four Rooms and the Writers That Shaped Them*. Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historian's Debate*. John Wiley & Sons, 2018. Print.
- Keen, Suzanne. *Romances of the archive in contemporary British fiction*. University of Toronto Press, 2003.



- Khatami, Richie Nojang. "Ali Shariati and the False Promise of Ideology." Univesity of Toronto (ubc.academia.edu).
- Maleuvre, Didier. *Museum Memories: History, Technology, Art*. Stanford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire." *representations* (1989): 7-24. Print.
- Pamuk, Orhan. "MANİFESTO." *Masumiyet Müzesi*, [tr.masumiyetmuzesi.org/page/manifesto](http://tr.masumiyetmuzesi.org/page/manifesto). Accessed 14 July 2019.
- Pamuk, Orhan. "Ruhum İkiye Bölünmüştü, Şimdi Birleşti." *Egoist Okur*, <https://egoistokur.com/orhan-pamuk-ruhum-ikiye-bolunmustu-simdi-birlesti/>. Accessed 1 November 2019.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Kara Kitap*. 3 ed: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2015. Print.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *Masumiyet Müzesi*. 7 ed: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2015. Print.
- Renan, Ernest. *What Is a Nation?* : Tamilnation. org, 1998. Print.
- Rengel, Sarah. "Innocent Memories: Reading the Museum in Orhan Pamuk's the Museum of Innocence." *Limina* 23.2 (2018). Print.
- Tredennick, Bianca. *Victorian Transformations: Genre, Nationalism and Desire in Nineteenth-Century Literature*. Routledge, 2016. Print.
- UNESCO UIS. "UNESCO UIS." <http://uis.unesco.org/>. Accessed 22 October 2019.
- Walsh, Kevin. *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World*. Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Yaprak, Tahsin. "Postmodernizmin Orhan Pamuk'un Romanlarındaki Yansımaları." Adıyaman Üniversitesi, 2012. Print.