

Introduction

Had Pyrrhus not fallen by a beldam's hand in Argos or Julius Caesar not been knifed to death? They are not to be thought away. Time has branded them and fettered they are lodged in the room of the infinite possibilities they have ousted. But can those have been possible seeing that they never were? Or was that only possible which came to pass? Weave, weaver of the wind.

Ulysses

James Joyce

In Lieu of an Opening

There is an interesting dialogue in the key-passages of James Joyce's acclaimed novel *Ulysses*. Stephen Dedalus, the artist-philosopher who is employed as a schoolmaster in Dublin is summoned by his in charge Mr. Deasy. Deasy is the personification of all that Dedalus is not. In sharp contrast to Dedalus's apprehension stands Deasy's conviction. Dedalus thinks of thought, Deasy is convinced that the validation of thought without expression is impossible. Dedalus is ever susceptible to drift into oblivion and re-invent history. For Deasy, nothing that is unhistoric can lay its claim to authenticity. History for Dedalus is a nightmare, for Deasy "All history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God" (Joyce, *Ulysses* 42). Deasy is unconditionally faithful to the piety of tradition and to him the habitation of history is a nominalised condition. For Dedalus, on the contrary, history is characteristic of a nuance, a perilous excess that is always on the verge of a recline, yet never quite so.

Dedalus's problematic nuance with history is an impersonation of the problematic relationship that the historic shares with modernity. Andrew Gibson, pondering upon this nuance, observes that "it is a lesson in resisting, accepting, and transcending history at one and the same time" (*Joyce's Revenge* 20). This simultaneous status of being and belonging in the inside-outside of

history is, in all possibilities, suggestive of the problematic relationship that modernity shares with history. It is thus that the thesis begins with a reference to Stephen Dedalus and his engagement with history for much of the thesis contemplates the nuances involved in conceptualising a relationship between the uneasy imperatives of history, modernity and subjectivity. The thesis introspects into the nuances that involve these three distinct, yet interrelated parameters by focusing on the archetype of the flâneur, who, in all possibilities, is the representative archetype of the modern subject (the thesis will justify such a claim). It is not without deliberation and discretion that flânerie has been chosen as the nuanced event which, the thesis presumes, is characteristic of the febrility that is involved in the co-habitation of modernity and history. As the thesis proceeds, it will be suggested that the engaging enterprise of flânerie has the potential to evolve as the possible practice of an alternative historiography, where ‘other histories’ and other possibilities in history are unearthed and validated. To substantiate such a claim, the thesis engages in a strategic theoretical reading of selected novels by the Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk. The texts have been chosen keeping in mind the contesting issues of flâneur, history and modernity and the subsequent chapters explore the many ways in which flânerie evolve as a possible praxis of alternative historiography. The historic in this research, in the lights of continental philosophers who have significantly contributed to the philosophy of history, ceases to be a confined as occurrences that have a materialised validity. Instead, the concept of history acquires an openness, suggesting both the materialised and the epistemic, the incidental and the conceptual, the concrete and the abstract. Modernity is *make it new*, it is apparently an unconditional rejection of the past for a valorisation of the present. Past, history, memory, tradition and such connotations are its ‘other’; they ought to be the foil in contrast to which modernity derives its essence. Paul de Man observes “the various antonyms that come to mind as possible opposite for ‘modernity’-a variety of which is

itself symptomatic of the complexity of the term—none is more fruitful than ‘history’” (*Blindness* 144). The very fundamental essence of the condition of modernity involves a consideration of past and history as a foil and a host of critical thinkers interested in the philosophical constitution of modernity (including the likes of Habermas, Adorno, Foucault, Benjamin, Paul de Man et al.) have all pondered upon the basic premise of modernity as characteristic of a departure. The modern claims its recognition in departure from history (tradition). To be contained within the premises of history is suggestive of a possible defiance that is posed at the clairvoyant call and claim of modernity to novelty. The modern and its preoccupation with the proclaimed gospel of ‘make it new’ is likely to render history as irrelevant. In its overemphasis on novelty, modernity renders history as an other—an outcast that epitomises all that the modern is not. To be modern is to identify tradition as a malicious and an outdated influence and hence history is definitely not a favourable climate where modernity can arrive. In his “Manifesto on Futurism”, Tommaso Marinetti poses a question that is not merely rhetorical but is impregnated with the vibrancy that makes modernity:

Why should we look back over our shoulders, when we intend to breach the mysterious doors of the Impossible? Time and Space died yesterday. (Marinetti 51)

A little while hence, Marinetti’s manifesto doesn’t just proclaim the death of time (history) but also inhibits a possible mourning of the past with an ‘ethical’ question: “Do you wish to waste your best strength in this eternal and useless admiration of the past, an activity that will only leave you fatally spent, diminished and crushed?” (52)

History and the tyranny of the past is a confinement and one is almost on the verge of inferring that modernity, at least in an *apparent (emphasis mine)* sense, involves a rejection of history.

Yet, such an inference never materialises, which is why the word ‘apparent’ has been mentioned and emphasised in italics in the preceding line. History and the historical is an inseparable component of consciousness. To be is to belong within a continual lineage of time and space and even the faintest and the most insignificant trace of being involves a *growth (emphasis mine)*. To grow is to invite a former, a slice of ‘happened’ within the retrospection of happening and thus the historic is not characteristic of an archaic essence. Instead, history is the contingent, the perpetual that slips with every passing moment contributing to the repertoire of history. The historic is the essential yet insignificant *everyday (emphasis mine)*. It is, as the thesis contends, a basic premise of subjectivity, agency and consciousness. The advancement of modernity, almost inescapably, invites the historic to a tryst. The proposed validation of modernity as the new is haunted by the spectral presence of the past. That way, much like Dedalus, the modern is never in liberation from past. The more prolific the claim to deny, the more intense is the awareness of the persistence of history. It is what one might call a recognition in denial. Hence, History is where history is denied.

This ambiguity, which is an inseparable aspect of any possible understanding of history in the modern age, is pertinently experienced in context of the urban climate of the metropolis. The arrival of modernity has significantly influenced the city and its manifest urban habitation, not just contributing to its already growing design but also constituting and formulating its essence. In all possibilities, it is the modern condition which sanctions the city its autonomy and it is under the influence of modernity that the city devises its points of departure from the other habitations of community life, the most obvious one being the countryside. This is not to suggest that the village and such other habitations have been insulated from the influence of modernity but only to emphasise that the centre of modernity has been, by some in-explainable correlation, the city. Marshall Berman observes that any attempt to “identify the distinctive

rhythms and timbres of modernity” is an encounter with a “dynamic new landscape in which modern experience takes place” (*All* 18). Berman describes this landscape as a “landscape of steam engines, automatic factories, railroads, vast new industrial zones; of *teeming cities* (*emphasis mine*) that have grown overnight, often with dreadful human consequences...”(19). Berman’s vivid description of the landscape of modernity further enlists the advancements in locomotives, technology and the hotcake of economics called the market, which are all valid but which one can refrain from re-harping for the time being. Instead, the contention is the italics in the quote, which suggestively identifies the landscape of modernity with the landscape of city. Modernity has been problematically identified and co-terminated by sociologists, cultural philosophers and even poets and artists to an extent, with the metropolis and the urban spatial paradigm.

However, one ought not to constrain modernity and the modern condition within the limits of what have been largely identified as European modernism. Michael Levenson, an eminent scholar and intellectual of Modernism, makes this significant observation:

Was there a first modernist? Even to pose the question is to hear the sound of folly. We look back to Edgar Allan Poe and further back to Lord Byron and then back again to Laurence Sterne. Francois Villon can be a precursor, as can Catullus or Petronius...To try to identify an elusive beginning or to propose clinching definitions is to play a game with changing rules.” (*Modernism* 8)

To propose the historical genealogy of Modernity as the mid-nineteenth early twentieth temporal epoch and to equate modernity with the historically identified phenomenon of Modernism is probably suggestive of an epistemic myopia. Modernity, in all possibilities, is not equable with Modernism. Undoubtedly, Modernism had its own call to modernity and modernity in its own way contributed to the determinant essence of Modernism, but that is not

all. There have been ‘other modernities’ which have either preceded or followed the European Age of Modernism. The thesis, in due course, will return to these other modernisms, for they will play a significant role in our understanding of the arrival of modernity in a non-European politico-cultural milieu like Turkey.

Modernity is suggestive of a condition, a characteristic urge to claim exclusivity, based on some principle of departure from tradition and its epistemes and practices. Berman sums up modernity as the “state of perpetual becoming” (*All* 16), much in resonance with Habermas’s oft quoted phrase of “an incomplete project”. (“Modernity” 01) To be modern is to experience a continuous shift and movement which is a growth that is non-schematic and non-systemic. Instead, it is conducive of a discontinuity; a sort of non-schematism which do not adhere to the rudimentary advocacies which holistically equate modernity with progress. To be modern is to experience and be aware of an ambiguity, an awareness that is intrinsic to the conceptual scepticism of Dedalus (Berman observes “self-doubt” as a constituent characteristic of the modern man, refer to *All* 23) that has been referred to at the very opening of the chapter, the oft quoted dialectic of *to be or not to be* where being and non-being are equally probable and relevant possibilities. Berman’s insightful introduction to *All That is Solid Melts into Air* wraps up modernity as this strange and liminal condition which is inhabited by ambiguity, paradox and contradiction. To be modern is to belong, habitate and interiorise the poise of paradox.

Framing the Flâneur

The flâneur is an archetype that dominates the cultural landscape of the late nineteenth-early twentieth century European modernity. Yet, culture does not exist in split from the greater worlds of political, economic and other discursive paradigms that formulate and constitute the social structure. Those old obsolete considerations of economy and politics as base and culture as superstructure are no longer credible; culture is as much as a component of base as are other

considerations. Hence, any consideration of the flâneur is likely to provoke reflections and interventions pertaining to social, political and economic considerations. Hence, while one considers and sustains the interrogations pertaining to the literary-cultural personage of the flâneur, one cannot disregard the implications that flânerie holds within a greater consideration of the epistemic foundations of politics, economics and such other social discourses.

To ensure that one does not lose his/her path in drifting across an archetype that has been interrogated and interpreted, churned and reproduced, re-read and misread, revised, reconceptualised and re-presented in representation, it is probably inevitable to begin from where it all began, i.e. Charles Baudelaire and his celebrated essay “The Painter of Modern Life”. Although engaging theoretical essays and enchanting literary works (Bruce Mazlish’s essay “The flâneur: from spectator to representation”, non-fictions like *Walking in Berlin* by Franz Hessel or even works of fiction like *Open City* by Teju Cole. These works have probably provided some epistemic base to the wistful urge of the thesis to deconstruct the flâneur) have taken the flâneur to streets that are outside Baudelaire’s Paris and habitations of modernity that are outside its typical alignment with nineteenth century, yet one must begin with Baudelaire, if only to acclaim him the credit of coining the archetype.

Charles Pierre Baudelaire identifies the flâneur as *the painter of modern life (emphasis mine)* and even when he does not affirm M.G. (the painter, who in all possibilities is Constantin Guys) as the flâneur, subsequent scholarships have inarguably deciphered a missing link between the flâneur and the much appraised exemplary ‘artist of the floating world’. (one can probably call him so, for the contingent nature of modernity has similar manifestations in dissimilar habitations and make nineteenth century Paris resemble post-war Japan) Keith Tester observes:

The flâneur of nineteenth century Paris receives his most famous eulogy in the prose and poetry of Charles Baudelaire. Certainly, flânerie is one of the main narrative devices of the Paris

Spleen collection of 1869 and thus Baudelaire provides an insight into exactly what it is that the flâneur does. Baudelaire achieves it by calling forth a poetic-and a poet's-vision of the public places and spaces of Paris. For Baudelaire, there is no doubt that the poet is the man...who can reap aesthetic meaning and an individual kind of existential security from the spectacle of the teeming crowds-the visible public-of the metropolitan environment of the city." (*Flâneur* 1-2)

Flâneur is not a coinage, it is a practice that is only validated by Baudelaire in eulogy and the poetics and praxis of representation. The 'missing link' is hence premised upon the identical patterns of thought and being that are characteristic to the flâneur and the exemplary artist of modernity and although Michel Foucault has located an opposition between the flâneur and Baudelaire's painter of modern Life before arriving at the conclusion that "Constantin Guys is not a flâneur" ("Enlightenment" 41), nevertheless, for many scholars, they are both invoked with an equability and are often identical. It is on such grounds that the present thesis can afford to walk further into 'habitus'es and habitations which are otherwise unidentifiable with nineteenth century Paris. While one cannot deny the contribution of Baudelaire in according the flâneur and the practice of flânerie the status of an archetype, yet the very proliferation of the archetype hints at the possibility of deconstruction. Tester observes:

Flânerie, the activity of strolling and looking which is carried out by the flâneur, is a recurring motif in the literature, sociology and art of urban, and most especially of the metropolitan existence. Originally, the figure of the flâneur was tied to a specific time and place: Paris, the capital of the nineteenth century...But the flâneur has been allowed, or made, to take a number of walks away from the streets and arcades of nineteenth century Paris...The flâneur has walked into the pages of the commonplace." (*Flâneur* 1)

It is hence, not astounding, that Baudelaire identifies his painter of modern Life as a “man of the world”, uncontained by any determinable consideration of habit, habitus and habitation. Baudelaire’s M.G. is “a man of the world” (Baudelaire 13), “very cosmopolitan” (12) whom Baudelaire does not prefer calling the artist. The following quote will probably render an insightful illustration of Baudelaire’s much appraised ‘other’ artist (or the non-artist artist) of his time:

He takes an interest in everything the world over, he wants to know, understand, assess everything that happens on the surface of our spheroid. The artist moves little, or even not at all, in intellectual and political circles...With two or three exceptions, which it is unnecessary to name, the majority of artists are, let us face it, very skilled brutes, mere manual labourers, village pub-talkers...Their talk, inevitably enclosed within very narrow limits, quickly becomes a bore to the man of the world, to the spiritual citizen of the universe. Thus, to begin to understand M.G., the first thing to note is this: that curiosity may be considered the starting point of his genius.” (13)

Baudelaire’s artist is not adherent to the pragmatics of the bourgeois order where unidirectional and methodical persistence of *techne* can confer excellence to the individual (*emphasis mine*). Instead, the artist is a polyphonic intellectual—a man who is curious of the heterogeneous in a non-utilitarian manner. Very soon, Baudelaire compares his artist to the short story protagonist of Allen Poe’s *Man in the Crowd* and observes that “the crowd is his domain”. (Baudelaire 15) In this curious state of being at home in the world, in his profound ability to be “away from home and yet to feel at home anywhere” (15) Baudelaire’s artist posits himself (arguably masculine, see Lauren Elkin’s *Flaneuse or The Invisible Flaneuse?: Gender, Public Space, and Visual Culture in Nineteenth Century Paris* for feminist responses on the flâneur and the myth

of masculinity) in an ambiguity, the ambiguity which is synonymous with the atmosphere and is the probable aorta of modernity.

Modernity preoccupies Baudelaire's aesthetic meditations and although it is evidently impossible to explore the nuances that pervade his understanding of modernity within the limited scope of an Introduction, yet, an attempt can be undertaken to understand his conception of modernity in the specific context of the referred essay. Baudelaire defines modernity in *The Painter of Modern Life* as follows:

Modernity is the transient, the fleeting and the contingent; it is one half of art, the other being the eternal and the immovable. There was a form of modernity for every painter of the past; the majority of the fine portraits that remain to us from former times are clothed in the dress of their day... You have no right to despise this transitory fleeting element, the metamorphoses of which are so frequent, nor to dispense with it." (18)

Yet again, modernity is validated not as a condition that can be identified and situated within a particular temporal or historic order. Instead, it is the *un-situatedness* (*emphasis mine*) of modernity which is its essence, for it concerns all that is transitory and fleeting. To situate modernity, the artist must capture its contingency and it is only by an indulgence of the transient and the contingent that modernity can lay its claim to history. In other words, to historicise modernity it is pre-notional to historicise the contingent. Baudelaire observes that modernity is suggestive of the eternal in the transitory and the artist must co-habit this ambiguity; he must be saliently responsible to both the temporary and the underlying permanence, both the fleeting and the constant within.

This dialectic disposition of the flâneur is further harped upon by Walter Benjamin who sporadically revisits Baudelaire and his take on the flâneur and modernity in his literary and

epistemic oeuvre. Benjamin's preoccupation with modernity is considerably influenced by his radical interest and subsequent revision of Baudelaire, which by now, is an already established fact in academic circles. Michael Jennings, in his insightful introduction to the collection of Benjamin's essays on Baudelaire published under the title *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire* observes that Benjamin was susceptible to an "intense identification with Baudelaire" (Jennings 16). Hence, one can evade a detailed analysis of the creative intricacies involved in Benjamin's restitution to Baudelaire the title of the *lyric poet in the era of high capitalism (emphasis mine)*. Instead, what is far more intriguing is Benjamin's innovation in conceptualisation of the flâneur and attributing it to Baudelaire, almost with an interpretive imposition.

Jennings' Introduction to Benjamin's essays on Baudelaire affirms that Benjamin's engagement with Baudelaire "was less the invention of a new Baudelaire than the assertion of the centrality of a number of aspects that had been neglected or misunderstood." (Jennings 23-24) Jennings claims that Benjamin's sporadic and rhizomatic engagement with Baudelaire and his subsequent reading of Baudelaire is deeply resonant of the epistemic overtures that pervade Baudelaire's literary-aesthetic oeuvre and its engagement with modernity. It is hence, no surprise, that in one of his seminal ruminations on Baudelaire, Benjamin highlights the poet's preoccupation with the metropolis. Citing Baudelaire's dedication addressed to Arsene Houssaye as the preamble of *Paris Spleen*, where Baudelaire identifies the aesthetics of poetics prose as the apt medium for capturing the "experience of giant cities", Benjamin observes that the crowd is "imprinted in his (Baudelaire's) creativity" ("On Some" 180) Referring implicitly to the aesthetics of shock, Benjamin foresees the crowd as a sensory truth, a source of affectation as well as apprehension.

Benjamin identifies the crowd as a possible motif that served as the premise on the basis of which Poe's *Man of the Crowd* was "equated" ("On Some" 188) with the flâneur. Although Benjamin identifies an essential difference between their nature of response to the pervading presence of the crowd, nevertheless, the crowd occupies a predominance within the sensibility of the flâneur. Benjamin's conceptualisation of the crowd occupies a prominence within the sensibility of easeful unease that he identifies as characteristic to the flâneur. For him, the crowd and its presence is fundamental to the perpetual "out of place" sensibility that is residual and pre-ontological to the ontic essence of the flâneur (188).

This out of place-ness that Benjamin identifies as fundamental to the flâneur is a significant premise upon which the conceptual framework of the present research has been designed. To be in place is to inhabit history. It is also a poignant suggestion of being in-habit, i.e., in a familiarity that is very much intimate and habitual, with no possible ecstasy of the estranging. Above all, it is to belong within a nominalised world where forms and their apparent significance is the only validated truth, as such there can be no *other* signification involved (*emphasis mine*). The flâneur refutes and resists such a homogenous and singular stranded purview and instead inhabits an experiential reality that is profoundly pluri-significant, pregnant and manifold with other determinants of meaning. This is where the flâneur holds the possibility of inhabiting an altered possibility of reality or to be more precise, unfolds reality within the gaze of an altered possibility. This altered is as much non/ trans-empirical as it is an aporia to history.

Benjamin's radical and creative thought undoes the archetype of the nineteenth century loiterer, i.e. the flâneur, and takes him beyond the confined aesthetic connotations and its relationship with an aesthetic modernity that has been characteristic to the reflective renderings of Baudelaire. Benjamin's play with Baudelaire is non-hermeneutic and rhizome like, inviting his

readers to analyse the polyphonic epistemic considerations and implications that are contained within the poet's aesthetic preoccupation. Thus, Baudelaire's temporal consciousness and his discontinuous engagement with time equally intrigue Benjamin. As Baudelaire poses the flâneur-artist in the habitations of modernity as an individual enchanted by beauty, Benjamin identifies this sense of beauty to be intimately collected with recollection. Referring to Proust's conjecture that "Time is peculiarly dissociated in Baudelaire" ("On Some" 197), Benjamin observes that Baudelaire's engagement with time involves recollection and is marked not by "any immediate experience" but rather by "a concept that is concomitant...with the notion of modern beauty." (197)

If one returns to Baudelaire and his conjectures around the painter of modern life and modernity, one deciphers with ease that his artist turned flâneur is preoccupied with beauty. It is the liability of the artist to extract "the mysterious beauty that may be hidden...however small or light it may be" (*Painter* 18) within the premises of modernity. Although modernity is the transient and the fleeting, the essence of modernity is an underlying beauty which is irreducible. Benjamin, in reflecting upon the temporal consciousness of Baudelaire, takes his readers towards the notion of time and beauty. For Benjamin, to extract beauty (the task of the flâneur), it is essential to recollect, that is, locate the slice of life in a disjoint that can "stand out from time." ("On Some" 197) Recollection, which Benjamin observes has a share of correspondence with beauty, promises the pertinence of experience and its curious infusion with ritual elements. Hence, the appreciation of beauty and the quest of modernity becomes an intimate and personalised experience, profoundly subjective and never free from the intimations of the lived. The rituals which are "appropriated" (197) by the flâneur-artist in his everyday encounter personalises the historic, which Benjamin describes as "prehistory" (198). Benjamin argues that such correspondences are fundamental to Baudelaire's engagement with modernity where the past

is evoked in infusion with the present within a practice of reminiscence (199). The present thesis, in due course, and in subsequent chapters, identify such correspondences- those attempted personalisation and epistemic appropriation of the habitual and its subsequent validation as an infused and intermediated reality, as an attempted claim to an alternative order of history. While Benjamin identifies the infusion as a possible genesis of the historyless, the thesis prefers to locate in it an alternative claim to history. For Benjamin at this juncture, history is suggestive of a chronologically designed and ascribed temporality (I particularly mention 'juncture' for elsewhere, especially in *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, Benjamin is ready to revise history, without discarding it as historyless) which ceases to be so with the gradual formulation of a philosophy of history. History for him becomes a Messianic entropy that can essentially disrupt any possible design of a chronological schema. In his later philosophical retrospections, the historyless acquires the status of primal history. Jennings observes that primal history, in the Benjaminian notion, is that which transgresses the ideological formulation of history and as such characterises history as the discontinuous. Benjamin's preoccupation with the discontinuous strains of history that survives in the fissures of the homogeneous ideological model of history and historiography is recurrent in his voluminous and incomplete *Arcades Project*. In the *Arcades Project*, Benjamin contemplates the historic within an imagist poetics where the traces of the discontinuous and the non-systematic past erupt as transgressions within the schematised and organised historicity of reality. This notion of history has a significant contribution in constituting the epistemic consideration of alternative history that the present thesis ponders upon.

But to linger a little more with the flâneur, if only to contemplate the heterogeneous potentialities which Benjamin attributes to the flâneur. In his yet another seminal essay, "The Paris of the Second Empire of Baudelaire", Benjamin returns to the flânerie and this time he is

more conscious of exploring the relationship that the flâneur shares with the spatial. For Benjamin, flânerie involves an intimacy with the spatial disposition of modernity and more topically, the metropolis. This intimacy is not contained and captured by the mere suggestion of inhabiting the arena and atmosphere of metropolitan modernity. It is also suggestive of an appropriation of the spatial by the self, i.e. the flâneur. For Benjamin, the flâneur in the city is analogical to Baudelaire's fish in water, yet not just so. He is not a passive and benign inhabitant of the city but also postulates the city within his pragmatics of habit. Inhabiting the metropolis involves an appropriation of the constituent fundamentals. Benjamin observes:

The street became a dwelling place for the flâneur; he is as much at home among house facades as a citizen is within his four walls. To him a shiny enamelled shop sign is at least as good a wall ornament as an oil painting is to the bourgeois in his living room. Buildings' walls are the desk against which he presses his notebooks; newsstands are his libraries; and cafe terraces are the balconies from which he looks down on his household after his work is done. ("Paris" 68-69)

As the essay follows, Benjamin locates the flâneur and his "dwelling" ("Paris" 68) in the outside in tension with the various measures of control that was devised by the various institutions of governance and administration in France. There is a latent suggestion to conceptualise in the poesis and praxis of flânerie a possible "resistance to control" (78), something that has had a simultaneous and synonymous onset with the birth of the bourgeois mode of governance in France. The flâneur, for Benjamin, embodies the last and the liminal possibilities of resisting the policies and politics of identification.

With the intervention of Benjamin, the flâneur stands on the verge of becoming the *other* of a nominalised bourgeois modernity (*emphasis mine*). The utilitarian model of a bourgeois mode of being is increasingly nuanced by the flâneur for he is concerned with the useless. He departs

sharply from the industrialist episteme of high capitalism by endorsing leisure over work and rest over labour. The perpetrating practice of cognition and consolidation of identities by State and its governing apparatuses and institutions are systematically overturned by his precarious statelessness and his wistful urge to exist incognito. The segmented world of the private and the public which is otherwise fundamental to the bourgeoisie social structure is jeopardised by his (the flâneur's) urge to dwell in the outside, thereby disrupting the binary construed model of being. More importantly, the flâneur attempts an interiorisation of the exterior and it is here that he is likely to become the *other* gaze through which modernity, metropolis and its constituent essences reconceptualise themselves. With such considerations in mind, the chapter will now turn towards the concept of history, for the thesis in question attempts to understand the possibility of the flâneur to emerge as the alternative historiographer.

History and Its Discontents

To be is to be within history and any possible praxis and poesis of being that concerns the human (in anthropocentric milieu, even the natural cannot escape the human) are enfolded within a temporality that is profoundly, almost inescapably, historic. Human condition is a Historic condition, to be human is to exist within the pre-determined legitimacies that constitute the climate of history. R.G. Collingwood, an influential historian-philosopher, rather didactically, observes that “history is ‘for’ human self-knowledge” and that the study of history and the practice of historiography implies “knowing” oneself (*Idea* 10). To engage with history is synonymous with an engagement with the human and any possible human existence is a profoundly historical-historicised existence.

Collingwood's notion of history and historiography is fundamental to what he calls “evidence” (*Idea* 10) and we can identify his philosophy of history to be promised upon a rationale that is reason. Collingwood's preoccupation with the idea of history as science presupposes that

history is scientific and founded on the principles of objectivity. The premise of historical knowledge and consciousness is determined by “the interpretation of evidence: where evidence is a collective name for things which singly are called documents, and a document is a thing existing here and now, of such a kind that the historian, by thinking about it, can get answer to the questions he asks about past events” (10). E.H. Carr in his seminal work *What is History* would essentially question the validity of the “objectivity” of history by pointing out how any kind of “interpretation of evidence” is liable to a bias and how history is profoundly subjective for it is never in split from the larking shadow of the interpreter-historian (*History* 29). Carr observes that the “...emphasis on the role of the historian in the making of history tends, if pressed to its logical conclusion, to rule out any objective history at all: history is what the historian makes” (29). As such, Carr would advise to “study the historian before you begin to study the facts” (26). However, keeping the historians’ debate aside for the time being, the chapter aims to take into consideration the *other* manifestations of historical consciousness that is synonymous with the epistemic disposition of modernity and which essentially refute the high-sounding claims that regard history as objective and comprehensible by a rational and scientific mode of enquiry.

T.S. Eliot, the representative poet of the Modern age and modernity, writes in “Gerontion”

History has many cunning passages, contrived corridors
 And issues, deceives with whispering ambitions,
 Guides us by vanities. Think now
 She gives when our attention is distracted
 And what she gives, gives with such supple confusions
 That the giving famishes the craving. Gives too late
 What's not believed in, or if still believed,

In memory only, reconsidered passion. (*Collected Poems* 30)

To invoke the poet in foil to the historian is not due of its own relevance; it intends to capture the heterogeneity that accompanies the epistemic considerations of history in the milieu of modernity. In the febrile epistemic-cultural condition of modernity, history develops a plural hermeneutic and occupies a fertility that is characteristic of poetry. While the conventional and orthodox model of historiography (partially embodied in thinkers like Collingwood) stands convinced that history is adherent to a factual objectivity, there are other understandings of history which increasingly highlight and foreground the ‘deception’ of history. James Longenbach observes “What is truly different about many twentieth-century (the canonised age of modernity) historians’ idea about history is their rejection of the presuppositions about the nature of historical knowledge that make the construction of any sort of teleological or even linear history possible” (*Modernist Poetics* 6). History acquires the status of an untameable excess, evading the possibilities of comprehension and lingering as an aporia to the being and becoming of the human.

Hence, there are contrary, mutually exclusive and yet overlapping conjectures of history that predominate the milieu of modernity. For philosophers like Friedrich Nietzsche, whom Paul de Man regards as an anti-historicist opting for “a radical rejection of history” (*Blindness* 147), history is a burden- an immanence that conditions and limits the human subject to a paradigm of finitude. As such, it is the predicament, yet ethical imperative, of the historicised subject, i.e. Man, to become the subject of History and subject history rather than exist in subjection to history. Nietzsche believed:

To think of history as objective...is the secret work of the dramatist, that is, to think of everything one after the other, to weave the isolated details into a totality, always on the

condition that a unity of the plan in the material has to be established, if it is not inherent in it”
(*Use* 23)

While one cannot ignore the dark sarcasm with which Nietzsche rejects the positivist school of historiography which attempts an interpretation of meaning and in absence of any, invents one; what is also significant is Nietzsche’s implicit suggestion that history after all is a synthetic and not organic truth. It is the agency of man which accomplishes the synthesis. The existential status of history is constructed in subjection by man, it is never otherwise. Hayden White, reflecting upon this interchange in subjection, notes:

Nietzsche’s purpose as a philosopher of history was to destroy the notion that the historical process has to be explained or emplotted in any particular way. The very notions of explanation and emplotment are dissolved; they give place to the notion of historical representation as pure story, fabulation, myth conceived as the verbal equivalent of music. Yet this conception of historical representation has its own conceptual underpinnings; it presupposes a lexicon, a grammar, a syntax, and a semantic system by which the historical field can be provided with a number of possible meanings. (*MetaHistory* 371)

For Nietzsche, as White argues, history is not homo significant but is rather suggestive of a plurality. This essence of the plural can be unveiled and experienced by dissolution of “the authority of all the inherited ways of conceiving history” and by returning “historical thinking to a poetic, and specifically Metaphorical, mode of comprehending the world.” (*MetaHistory* 372)

To live in the metaphorical is to exist in the proximity of a liminal, where the suggested is more fundamental than the apparent, the interpreted and experienced is more authentic than the manifested. It is the perilous inside-outside which Dedalus lives in, it is the ambiguous and the

dichotomous suggesting an ever-escaping excess that haunts the flâneur. The consciousness of history as metaphor bears a resemblance with the essence of flânerie (or the consciousness of the flâneur) and hence one cannot necessarily overlook a correspondence between flânerie and alternative historical consciousness. However, it is probably necessary to ponder upon the other notions of the historic that modernity contains for modernity is not all about Nietzsche. The epistemic purview of modernity is characterised by ambiguities and paradoxes and the discourse of history in the poetico-pragmatics of modernity is no exception. The historic emerges as a nuanced consideration in the epistemic milieu of modernity and such nuances pervade the introspections of even professional historians like Collingwood, who is one of the principal propounders of objective history.

Collingwood's notion of objective history does not necessarily exclude the possibility of a personalisation of history. As is suggested by his observation, to "discover the thought of a friend who writes us a letter, or a stranger who crosses the street" (*Idea* 219) is also very much situated within the considerations of history. History occupies an everyday topicality in the milieu of the modern and reflecting upon the relevance of history in the milieu of modernity. James Longenbach observes "...writing a poem is as historical an act as playing Chopin or falling in love" (*Modernist Poetics* 10). To be is to be within history, a history that is determined and constituted by the intimate order of everyday.

To be historical is also suggestive of a recognition of the Other and is hence intimately associated with an ethics of the Other. Collingwood observes "...historical method is the only one by which I can know the mind of another" (*Idea* 219). The conceptualisation of method inevitably suggests hermeneutics which, in the Gadamerian sense, is premised upon an intersubjectivity. David E. Lyne in his Introduction to Gadamer's *Philosophical Hermeneutics* observes that for Gadamer the hermeneutical "has to do with bridging the gap between the

familiar world in which we stand and the strange meaning that resists assimilation into the horizons of our world.” (Lynge xii) To be acquainted with the historical as a methodology that contributes to consciousness is to be impregnated with the possibility of being in an intimacy of the unfamiliar that is not otherwise an empirically and materially validated constituent of the habitations of the self.

Ethics of Alternative Historiography

The methodological that premises historical consciousness is performed into existence by the practice of historiography. To indulge in historiography is to engage with the past and an interpretation of the past, which is not an unproblematic enterprise. Reading the past and the practice of historiography bears a resemblance with, what Michel de Certeau calls, the act of “decoding” (*Writing* 3). More importantly, like any other form of methodological practice, it enhances a split between the surveyor and the surveyed, the student and the studied. Michel de Certeau observes:

MODERN Western history essentially begins with differentiation between the present and the past...This rupture also organizes the content of history within the relations between labor and nature; and finally, as its third form, it ubiquitously takes for granted a rift between discourse and the body (social body). It forces the silent body to speak. It assumes a gap to exist between the silent opacity of the “reality” that it seeks to express and the place where it produces its own speech, protected by the distance established between itself and the object (*Gegenstand*). The violence of the body reaches the written page only through absence, through the intermediary of documents that the historian has been able to see on the sands from which a

presence has since been washed away, and through a murmur that lets us hear-but from afar-the unknown immensity that seduces and menaces our knowledge.” (2-3)

de Certeau’s observation is a genuine epistemic portrait of the traditional notion of historiography where the body of the past is a “legible picture that can in turn be translated into that which can be written within a space of language” (*Writing* 3). Ezra Pound is critical of such a practice of ‘dissecting’ history which assumes that the past is an organised body of knowledge.

In his *Guide to Kulchur*, Pound observes:

We do NOT know the past in chronological consequence. It may be convenient to lay it out anaesthetized on the table with dates past here and there, but what we know by ripples and spirals eddying out from us and our time.” (Pound 60)

In contrast to this conventional model of traditional historiography, which takes for granted the notion of an undisputed and linear model of the past, stands the alternative model of historiography. The praxis of alternative historiography involves recognising the conventional model of historiography as essentially incomplete and liable to a (mis)appropriation and misrepresentation of the past by an objective schema of progress. In correspondence with an alternative historical consciousness, the principles of alternative historiography involve an indulgence of that which is “forgotten in order to obtain the representation of a present intelligibility” (*Writing* 19). de Certeau sums it up thus:

But whatever this new understanding of the past (historiography) holds to be irrelevant-shards created by the selection of materials, remainders left aside by an explication-comes back, despite everything, on the edges of discourse or in its rifts and crannies: “resistances,” “survivals,” or delays discreetly perturb the pretty order of a line of “progress” or a system of interpretation. These are lapses in the syntax constructed by the law of a place. Therein they

symbolize a return of the repressed, that is, a return of what, at a given moment, has become unthinkable in order for a new identity to become thinkable.” (19)

de Certeau’s suggestion of alternative historiography involves a lawlessness and precarity that is identical and characteristic of the flâneur—who is the bare subject occupying the liminal place of placeness. It is also suggestive of the correlation that historiography shares with place in authenticating the place its status. Historiography becomes an essential constituent practice and pragmatics which contribute in claiming/ making place out of space. While history is vital to the ontological essence of the place, it is also suggestive of a possible homogenisation. The historicised place simultaneously excludes, appropriates and annihilates other possibilities of becoming that pervaded the space before its historicization into place. These exigencies and anomalies, which are suggestive of an alternative possibility of becoming, are unveiled within the praxis of alternative historiography.

The binary contrast between space and place is pondered upon by de Certeau in his seminal work *The Practice of Everyday Life*. For de Certeau, place “implies an indication of stability”, while space “has none of the univocity or stability of a “proper” (*Practice* 117). de Certeau claims that “space is a practiced place”, where practice is suggestive of a vitality and is suggestive of “intersections of mobile elements” (117). Practice, as de Certeau seemingly suggests in his work, involves a performative intervention into the structured, patterned and the nominalised (de Certeau defines it as “ways of operating” (xi)) and is fundamental in opening up/ dissecting the finite and the fixed. For de Certeau, the space is the “ambiguity of an actualization, trans-formed into a term dependent upon many different conventions...modified by the transformations caused by successive contexts.” (117)

Flânerie, or the act of loitering, is a practice that increasingly posits the nominal within the ambiguous and in doing so, constantly melts the possible place of the city into the firmament

of the spatial. For de Certeau, the “ordinary practitioners of the city” are walkers and it is through the practice of walking that “the imaginary totalizations produced by the eye” can be escaped, thus revealing the possibilities of the birth of “another spatiality...A migrational, or metaphorical, city.” (*Practice* 93) de Certeau locates in the practice of loitering within the urban space a form “of resistance...without being out-side the field in which it is exercised”. (96) This is suggestive of a “process of appropriation of the topographical system on the part of the pedestrian” where “walking is suggestive of enunciation” (97).

This enunciation involves a possible reclamation of the spatial; it is a consideration of the urban habitation of the city in sovereignty from its situatedness as a place. The status of the city as a place is historic; it is by a subsequent de-historicization that the place becomes space. This de-historicization is not an absolute rejection of history. Rather it involves an awareness of the shortcoming of history. Pondering upon the historicity of the city de Certeau observes that the city exists in a ‘casual time’ and that “Casual time is what is narrated in the actual discourse of the city” which for him “is better articulated on the metaphorical practices and stratified places than on the empire of the evident in the functionalist technocracy” (*Practice* 203). de Certeau describes casual time as “a lapse in the system, and its diabolic adversary, it is what historiography is supposed to exorcize by substituting for these incongruities of the other the trans-parent organicity of a scientific intelligibility” (202). While the fiction of reason and its discursive methodology and poetics try to produce the city within a synchronous model of history, de Certeau points out that the seemingly consistent model of time constructed by historiography and accorded to the city is “broken and jerky” (202). It is marked by the “gap or failure of reason” (202) and exposes the shortcomings of theoretical time, i.e. the time constructed within the modalities of historiography. To trace the historical genuineness of the city it is necessary to acknowledge the casual time as historic. The city is, to go by de Certeau’s

proposition, located within an alternative model of history and it is in flânerie that this alternative model of history can be accessed.

Walter Benjamin explores the possibilities and potentials that the flâneur holds in evolving as the alternative historiographer. To him, flânerie is not a praxis that is essentially determined by the spatio-temporal immanence of the city. Instead, the flâneur inhabits not just the city as a topographical category but as an event. The flâneur's consciousness of the city is a possible field where the city can emerge in its openness, amidst overlapping temporal manifestations and bearing traces of all that which constitute its essential identity. This status of identity is accorded not just by the immanent but also the latent, not just the recognised but also the repressed-denied. For Benjamin, this other side of the realised is the primordial, that which has been previously discussed as "primal" (Jennings 12). What the flâneur embodies is the essential gaze through which the city can be accorded its primordial and non-immanent stature:

Couldn't an exciting film be made from the map of Paris? From the unfolding of its various aspects in temporal succession? From the compression of a centuries-long movement of streets, boulevards, arcades and squares into the space of half an hour? And does the flâneur do anything different? (Benjamin, *Arcades* 83)

The flâneur for Benjamin is that comprehensive gaze that posits the city in a tradition—a tradition which, however, is not suggestive of a mere consistency. Locating the city within this renewed hermeneutics of tradition involves a consideration of not just the recognised surface of history but also its underside. Benjamin's revision of the archetype of flâneur and the performative praxis of flânerie does not locate it within the unproblematic milieu of the modern metropolis. Instead, the very notion of modernity is problematised by the constant indulgences of all that is in departure from the institutionalised and canonised essence of modernity that is characteristic of a valorised obsession with the new. Modernity lingers as the discontinuous and the archetypal

subjectivity of the modern milieu (i.e. the flâneur) is endowed with a consciousness of the discontinuous.

Orhan Pamuk: A Flâneur within the Derivations of Modernity

Modernity in the non-West is derived, it arrives late and arrives with the notion of an already historicised vision of modernity, construed upon a design of progress. Unlike the West, where it is a febrile and fertile event co-habited by heterogeneities and even mutually contrary possibilities, the derived ordeal of modernity in the milieu of non-West are premised upon a vision of homogeneity. Touraj Atabaki observes that the arrival of modernity in a non-Western milieu like Turkey was an “exclusively from above” (*State* xiv) phenomenon where the plurivocalities were substituted by the organisation and implementation of a governed structural and political order. The dissemination of the principles of modernity involved the evolution of a centralised subject of authority called State and the consolidation of a National structure of economy. What is perhaps more important is the notion of rationalism and progress that was advocated by the Centralist State as the only possible mode of being. As such, any consideration of modernity in context of a non-Western cultural milieu is likely to invite a consideration of the tension between the native and the alien, the containments of tradition and the surplus of progress.

Orhan Pamuk, the celebrated novelist of Turkey, who was awarded the Nobel Prize in 2006, systematically revisits these tensions between tradition and modernity, the local and the global, the native and the alien. Horace Engdahl, the Permanent Secretary of the Swedish Academy, describes him thus:

Pamuk is a writer who opens the doors between hostile cultures and he makes it appear absurd that two cultures like the European and the Turkish, who have so much in common and who have been so intertwined over the centuries...are not able to understand each other (Engdahl).

Pamuk attempts to unearth the hybridity which is essentially historic to Turkey and which has for long been unexplored by the vehement historicization of Turkey within either of the binary patterned lineages of nativism and modernity. His engagement with this hybridity is explicit in his ficto-critical memoir *Istanbul* where the cultural paradoxes and the liminal counters of exchange where modernity and heritage co-habit are explored in the authorial reminiscences of his growth with-in the city. Elsewhere, Pamuk has called Istanbul “the capital of the world” (*Strangeness* 3) which is located in the curious poise between the East and the West. Although this thesis does not attempt a material reading of Pamuk’s novels and instead takes its own liberty in conceptualising an interpretive assessment of his oeuvre, nevertheless it is presumably methodical to begin with an assessment of Pamuk’s engagement with his city and its historic-material base. That way, the thesis will probably be able to contest the peril of strategic appropriation which is the perennial companion of a conceptual theoretical research.

Pamuk’s interest in his native city Istanbul is well known. The Press Release of the Swedish Academy which declared him as the winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, 2006 described him as the writer “who in the quest for the melancholic soul of his native city has discovered new symbols for the clash and interlacing of cultures” (Swedish Academy). In his various interviews and non-fiction pieces, he has been unambiguous in his obsession with Istanbul. What is significant, however, is his urge to see his city not within the immediacy of its being but in its rupture and discontinuity, in its own history and within the intimacies of memory. Istanbul is the veritable space that is both a place and is simultaneously beyond its placeness. Here for instance, are a few lines from his much-appraised memoir *Istanbul*:

It is impossible for me to remember my childhood without this blanket of snow...I couldn't wait for it to snow-not because I would be going outside to play in it, but because it made the city look new, not only by covering up the mud, the filth, the ruins and the neglect, but by producing in every street and every view an element of surprise, a delicious air of impending disaster (*Istanbul* 37).

The non-validation of the empirical is the hay-stone that premises the possibility of reclaiming the spatial, which is haunted by the phantasm of disaster and disarray. The ecstasy of surprise is synonymous, almost identifiable with disaster. The premonition of the disaster anticipates an unbecoming of the place and its return to the elementary status of space. Hence, 'snow' (a significant motif in his novel with the same name and which has been analysed in the following chapter) delights him, for it significantly contributes to the transgression from the monotony of place and transforms the familiar and empirically nominalised habitation into an estranging unfamiliar.

The historic, however, is not a dismissible and ignorable consideration and it is functional as an essential constituent in Pamuk's consciousness of Istanbul. For Pamuk, the historic acquires a living presence, re-membering itself as a vitality which thrives in simultaneity with the present. The considerations of the past and the history of the city refuse to be contained as an anecdotal base to the contemporaneous milieu of modernity. Rather, it is transposed with the present, consistently merging with the 'now' time of modernity. To be conscious of this vital persistence of the historic is to see the city in "black and white" (*Istanbul* 34). Pamuk writes:

To see the city in black and white is to see it through the tarnish of history: the patina of what is old and faded and no longer matters to the rest of the world. (38)

Pamuk's preoccupation with the historic occurs in the backdrop of a secular modernity and its ideological climate of progress that engulfs Turkey in general and Istanbul in particular. To be conscious of the historic as a vital presence and not as a relic problematizes the unambiguous claims and self-advocacies pertaining to the arrival of modernity. What is more, it is not just the limits of modernity that is contested by an unambiguous awareness of the historic. It is also simultaneously an opening up of the very consideration of history. History becomes an everyday affair, not removed from time but very much posited within the considerations of the contemporaneous. The living presence of history accords the everyday its own metaphor—an excess of significance that is the elementary enticement for the flâneur and the fundamental motif of flânerie:

There are places—in Tepebasi, Galata, Fatih and Zeyrek, a few of the villages along the Bosphorus, the back streets of Uskudar—where the black-and-white haze I've been trying to describe is still in evidence. On misty, smoky mornings, on rainy, windy nights, you can see it on the domes of mosques on which flocks of gulls make their homes; you can see it, too, in the clouds of exhaust, in the wreathes of soot rising from stovepipes, in the rusting rubbish bins, the parks and gardens left empty and unintended on winter days, and the crowds scurrying home through the mud and the snow on winter evenings; these are the sad joys of black-and-white Istanbul.” (*Istanbul* 35-36)

The excess is the historic, a historic excess that constantly intervenes Turkey's grand march to the history of modernity and poses the historicization of modernity within a framework of discontinuity. This discontinuity is increasingly framed within an alternative engagement with modernity. Pamuk locates a validated performative and “a moral point” (*Istanbul* 39) in the everyday practices of Istanbulers who “have shunned the vibrant reds, greens” and wears “the same pale, drab, shadowy clothes” (38). To him, this is a ritual enactment undertaken in

remembrance of things past, an everyday validation of the past which is present in absentia and it is the absence that holds an unforeseen validity over the present. Pamuk locates this lingering persistence of the historic, which is present in a consciousness of absence, as the possible root of *huzun*, a Turkish word with a theological root and later on adapted within the epistemic mysticism of the Sufi tradition. Pamuk observes that the essence of loss that is suggested in the Arabic meaning of the word, acquires the connotations of a cherishable and desirable ecstasy within the Sufi tradition. For the Sufis, the sense of loss is suggestive of the craving that the soul has for the divine and the more one is haunted by the intimations of *huzun*, the more he is endowed with a possibility of approaching the transcendental. The ecstasy is materialised in the lack and Pamuk realises that “it is the absence, not the presence, of *huzun*” which torments the believer (81). The tradition of *huzun*, as Pamuk argues, has been a time-honoured tradition in Turkey and is intimately functional as an identifiable premise that constitute the ambiguities of Turkish everyday and its consciousness of history. To wilfully embrace *huzun* and its constituent/ accompanying essence of loss is to linger within the paradox of a performative that is “as life affirming as it is negating” (82).

For Pamuk this tradition of loss is a historic sensibility, it is a historic way of responding to history. Hence, the city and its community existence is poised within the ethics of loss, something that persists even in a *modernity arrived and manifested* milieu (*emphasis mine*). This consciousness of the historic becomes an everyday companion of life in Istanbul, to be in the city is to be in loss, a loss that invites the residual remnants of history which linger even after the relics of heritage are substituted by the exhibits of modernity. The historic is traced in the constituent milieu of the urban-modern and Pamuk preponderantly observes:

To feel this *huzun* is to see the scenes, evoke the memories, in which the city itself becomes the very illustration, the very essence, of *huzun*. I am speaking of the evenings when the sun

sets early, of the fathers under the street lamps in the back streets returning home carrying plastic bags. Of the old Bosphorus ferries moored to deserted stations in the middle of winter...of the old booksellers who lurch from one financial crisis to the next and then wait shivering all day for a customer to appear...of the tea houses packed to the rafters with unemployed men; of the patient pimps striding up and down the city's greatest square on summer evenings in search of one last drunken tourist..." (*Istanbul* 84-85)

Pamuk's elaborate quote, which runs for almost three pages, accounts an exhaustive picture of the Istanbul everyday and ends with an affirmative containment "I speak of them all". (*Istanbul* 85) What is suggested is the inescapable persistence of the historic and its almost natural presence in every perceivable model of the ritual, mundane and insignificant order of urban existence of Istanbul. Being in Istanbul is synonymous with belonging in *huzun* and to be in *huzun* is to be in consciousness of loss, a loss that acknowledges the absence of the departed only to validate its presence in absentia. The becoming of history is induced by recognition; the being however persists even when it is not palpable and consciously experienced. To engage in flânerie is to be able to recognise history not in becoming but also in being.

The present thesis, with the relevance of such theoretical and conceptual framework, attempts to engage in substantiating the flâneur as the alternative historiographer in the selected novels of Orhan Pamuk. The thesis unveils other consciousness of history and its intimate association with the archetype of the flâneur. In doing so, the thesis also engages in a more nuanced understanding of the flâneur that is not strictly in adherence with the historical base of its origin and is yet very much in lineage with the ontic and epistemic ethos of flânerie. For validating the arguments and the interpretations, the thesis takes into consideration the philosophers that have been introduced in the scope of this Introduction and also other contemporary thinkers who belong to the same epistemic lineage but have their own departures while engaging with

the stratified and nuanced categories of history, modernity, flânerie, urban philosophy et. al. Hence, in the following chapters, the thesis has taken recourse to other eminences in Continental philosophy which include the likes of Jacques Derrida, Jean Luc Nancy, Immanuel Levinas, Edmund Husserl, among others. Since the research is conceptual, a considerable liberty has been taken to argue within a cross-cultural and non-chronological purview. The intention has been to substantiate the thematic nuances which the novels contain and the way they can be critically examined to uncover the fundamental logic that the thesis aims to substantiate: the possible semblance between the act of flânerie and alternative historiography and the possibility of considering the flâneur as an alternate historiographer.

The novels have not been selected in empirical whimsies but keeping in mind the contentions that the thesis engages with. The ensuing literature review has consisted in a careful reading of novels which deal with similar themes (*Invisible Cities*, *Year of the Death of Ricardo Reiss*, *The History of the Siege of Lisbon*, *Istanbul Istanbul*, *Open City*, *A Mind at Peace* to list a few) but the final design has been conceptualised with a characteristic emphasis on the fictional oeuvre of Orhan Pamuk. Such a preference does not claim that the texts that the thesis has excluded do not necessarily explore the nuances which constitute the research question. The novels listed above profoundly engage with the aspects of flânerie and in some cases with history as well. However, those novels have tried to foresee the flâneur as a precursor, and in some cases (for instance, in a novel like *The Siege of Lisbon* or *Invisible Cities*) as an inventor of history. The flâneur in such literary texts engages in the practice of fictionalising history. Even though such a practice can very well be a possible mode of alternative historicization (fiction, in the postmodern milieu has claimed its right to history and has started usurping from history its singularity) as well, it does not fall within the consideration of the historic that has been conceptualised in the thesis. The thesis, on the contrary, has tried to unearth an alternative

consciousness of history that is very much premised within the functionalities of history. History and its extensive repertoire of the past has been conceptualised as a preliminary premise and a foundational hermeneuticised field that can be subjected to interpretation, without being necessarily discarded. The historic and the hauntings of history do not constitute an impossible determinacy which can be evaded only in rejection and subsequent denial (interested reader can look into the novel *The History of the Siege of Lisbon*) or in a strategic transcendence (as in Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities*). Neither is it a profoundly intimate indulgence of the lived that the self engages in, if only to negate the infernal material reality of the present. (*Istanbul Istanbul* by Bernard Sonmez) The historic in the thesis has been regarded as a curiously open premise that does not have a consistent predicament.

Chapter Abstracts:

The first chapter of the thesis engages in a close reading of Orhan Pamuk's novel *Snow* and attempts to interpret Ka, the exiled poet protagonist in the novel as a flâneur turned historiographer/ alternative historiographer. The chapter explores how the trope of flânerie is pertinent in the novel as an act of engaging with the heterogeneous epistemic conjectures of history. Hence, the chapter has been titled **Poet as the Historian: Flânerie and the Becoming of History in *Snow***. The chapter takes into consideration the idea of history in the novel and reads it as an epistemic essence rather than a concurrence of events.

The Turkish border town of Kars functions as an essential motif in the novel; it is a discontinuity within the Kemalist model of homo-hegemonic secularism and a valorised order of reason which dominate Turkey and Turkish history. For the modern Nation State of Turkey, Kars is historically underscored as a border town that is constantly falling out of secularised, modern history due to its growing obsessions with fanaticism. On the contrary, to the provincial subjects of Kars, performatives of non-modernity are the only possible recourse that can ensure Kars to

find its place in history through absolute singularity whereby it can disengage itself from the accumulative canon of world history. Hence, the provincial town of Kars stands as a point of departure and occupies a liminal status of hybridity where faith and reason, tradition and modernity, world history and lived history are posited/ juxtaposed in an economy of striation.

As Ka, the protagonist in the novel, arrives at Kars to report on the mystery of suicide girls, he is drawn into this unprecedented tension between two opposing binaries of historicism; the fabric of progress and modernity which is modelled on the Hegelian notion of world history and the performative cultures of non-modernity which are ruptures in Turkey's endeavour to culminate into a modern Nation State. Ka, the exiled subject, sees both this process of history making and unmaking in play and confronts the homo-hegemonic tendencies that both these performatives of hegemony and counter-hegemony involves. As the chapter shall substantiate, this double vision of Ka makes him a flâneur in essence and not just in performance and flânerie becomes an essential trope in the novel, not just in terms of aimless wandering (that Ka engages in for a considerable duration in the novel) but also in terms of an accumulative consciousness. This economy of accumulation, is not appropriative and the heterogeneity of impressions, narratives, catastrophes, historical monuments and emblems are all perceived like images which are operative in their transiency within the economy of consciousness of the solitary self. They do not become teleological advocations that will attempt to incorporate Kars in an either/or status of an inside/outside two contrary models of history and historical thought, i.e. the progressive and the exclusive. Instead, the images and events are inspirations to Ka's poetic enterprises, a work that is irretrievably lost in due course of the novel. Ka's historicization of Kars and the documentation of the suicide girls, in other words, thus becomes a historicization that is based on the metaphysics of absence rather than presence and is characterised by an openness rather than a teleological conclusion. His non-teleological consciousness lays the

possibility of an alternative historiography where the singular and the discontinuous that evade the tension between the material and the ideological can claim the possibility of recognition and hence, historicization.

The second chapter titled **Turning Memory into History: The Material and the Spatial-Personal in *The Museum of Innocence*** attempts to substantiate the intimate relation between material cultures and the material history of the self. Through an engagement with Orhan Pamuk's novel *The Museum of Innocence*, the chapter substantiates how the material and cultures of materiality evolve as a paradigm where the personal and the socio-historical spatial, memory and history co-habit. In doing so, the chapter problematises the easy consideration of the self-referential status of memory and depicts it as relational, dependent upon the corporeality of material culture. The chapter argues that the relational nature of memory is also fundamental in according the material its trans-material status of being and attempts to engage in an understanding of how objects often evolve as images; as sites which are material in form but trans-material in essence. This trans-material understanding of the object is intimately associated with the poetics of *flânerie* and the chapter argues that Kemal, the principle character in the novel who re-members his beloved Fusun by collecting and preserving objects that bear her traces, is a curious combination of the *flâneur* and the alternative historiographer.

The novel describes the endeavours of Kemal, an upper class Istanbulite, who to (re)member his love affair with his cousin Fusun, strolls around Istanbul and collects tokens and memorabilia which are impregnated with the impressions of his lost love. Kemal consequently constructs a museum that archives his loss; a discursive paradigm where the objects acquire a double life, the material and the affective. The archive of remembrance that Kemal conceives, by preserving and accumulating diverse objects, materials, possessions, becomes a personal labyrinth for him, where he can enact the performative of loss. Simultaneously however, these

memorabilia preserve their materiality and for the neutral observer; they are not affective relics and emblems but material renderings and validations of a past that embraces the collective and becomes history.

It is in this doubleness that the objects in the novel evolve as images, they are simultaneously relevant within the economy of the affective and the material, the temporal and the eternal. Like an image, the objects described in the novel surpass their form and provoke an essence that is personal and simultaneously historical and it is in his engagement with the trans-discursive material that Kemal provokes a possibility of evolving as a flâneur in the novel. For him, the objects are events which mean more than what they mean and as such this experience of the surplus that survives beyond the empirically perceivable validates his sojourns through the city as flânerie. Simultaneously however, the objects are spatially and temporally relevant to the subject; they are induced with remembrances of an occurrence that is spatio-temporally removed from the *now* (*emphasis mine*). The objects evoke a memory of a lost time and place and in this unveiled yesterday, the objects become potent signifiers of not just memory but also the greater milieu of history, that which contributes to the materiality of the object. In other words, the memory of objects often overlaps with their historicity. What the material signifies is the relational nature of memory and its dependence upon the material history of the object. Hence, the trans-material essence of the object that is revealed in its intimacy with memory is co-habitant with the historicity that the object derives from its historicity. The trans-material and the material thus complement each other in a paradox where the historic and the mnemonic intermingle and the act of archiving memory and making it persist in the essence of remembrance also becomes an act of archiving history, thereby contemplating the possibility of an alternative historiography.

In the third chapter of the thesis, memory and remembrance and its potentiality to evolve as a fertile interpretive domain that has the possibility of according the present an alternative foundation of the past is pondered upon. The chapter titled **In Search of Lost Wife: Flânerie, Remembrance and the Re-conceptualisation of History in *The Black Book*** engages in an understanding of the ambiguous disposition of memory as a curious poise of lived and interpreted, occurred and imagined, and ponders upon the possible implications that it carries in its persistent presence as a conceptual and constituent component of consciousness. The chapter, following the plight of Galip, the lawyer whose wife Ruya goes missing, takes into consideration the possibility of an alternative historiography which explores the unfelt significances of the lived, in order to accord a historicity to the present that has evolved as estranging and in unprecedent with the comprehended order of the lived. The chapter also substantiates Galip as the flâneur turned alternative historiographer who engages in material and metaphorical journeys through the streets of Istanbul, searching in them a trace and a sign which do not just convey significance within the consideration of the present but also posits the present within an alternative order of the past.

The novel registers the (mis)adventures of Galip, a lawyer who is immersed in a quest of his missing wife Ruya and in his endeavours to do so, Galip frequents the clubs and coffeehouses, the cinema halls and restaurants he had once visited with his wife. These revisits are simultaneous with his revision of memory. However, the ploy of memory is not an escape into the bliss of nostalgia; it is governed by the principle of quest. The quest however, in due course turns into a quest of essence rather than existence and it is in this engagement with the ideal rather than the real that Galip becomes a flâneur. Galip's flânerie is also suggested in his urge to go beyond the nominal, material and empirical to engage in a significance that is suggested,

yet not materialised. When it comes to the context of the past, this preoccupation with suggestive makes Galip the alternative historiographer.

Galip's explorations of the spatialities of remembered and the remembrances of the spatial accomplish the enactment of an intimate historiography. This intimate consciousness of history is also complemented with an informal mode of historiography that is suggested in the novel in form of the newspaper columns of Celal. In the novel, Celal is a journalist and a half-brother of Ruya and the daily columns that he writes for the newspaper *Milliyet* are also ficto-critical renderings on the history of Istanbul, where the happened is constantly tempered by possibilities and speculations, so as to defy the logocentrism of history and historical consciousness. History in the novel is constantly intervened by speculative conjectures and the chronological telocentric discursive formulation of history is intervened by a defiance of finality; by an experiential account of spaces where the present *now* is not dissociated from the past *then* and the crystallised vortex of past is not necessarily a consolidated occurred (*emphasis mine*). Rather, they are refractive tropes where the present survives as a possibility and not an unchallenged finality. The historical consciousness evolves as a kairotic discourse where the past and present constantly shape and influence the other and the chapter addresses this tendency of existential historiography that the novel embodies, chiefly by taking into consideration the character of Galip and his gradual development. The chapter argues that Galip develops as a flâneur turned historiographer whose tryst with history is existential in a sense that the past constantly intervenes into his perception of the present and as such his account of the contemporary is intrinsically characterised by a metaphysics of absence, where the perceived is always an absence of the remembered.

The fourth chapter of the thesis is titled **The decadent flâneur and the Progress of History: Alienation, Flux and the Poetics of Reconciliation in *A Strangeness in My Mind***. The chapter

assesses Mevlut, the boza seller protagonist of *A Strangeness in My Mind* as a flâneur endowed with an alternative historical consciousness who negotiates with the ordeal of change and the milieu of modernity that encompasses the social, political, economic and the spatial milieu of Istanbul. The chapter takes into consideration Mevlut's nuanced engagement with modernity and identifies his ambiguous state of being within and without the valorised temporality of the present which modernity endorses, as a possible premise of alternative historiography.

Mevlut's occupation as the boza (an authentic and traditional Turkish drink) seller, his appreciations of Armenian architectures and cemeteries, his desire to frequent the older quarters of Nisantasi during his night-time strolls conjecture him as a traditional subject who is interested in archaic occurrences rather than the kaleidoscope of everyday. Simultaneously, his urge to become modern by refuting the orthodoxies of family and his persistent urge to claim a sovereignty of being, his unmatched awareness of the perceptible variances of the present, make him the discursive subject of the temporal. This essential ambiguity that Mevlut embodies is suggestive of flânerie- a hyphenation in being and an intrinsic ability to behave and belong in discontinuity. Flânerie thus becomes a possible ploy through which Mevlut evolves a double consciousness; that is conscious of the *now* but is never oblivious of the 'then'. This double consciousness of the temporal conceptualises the past as not teleological history which ensures an arrival at modernity; rather as instantaneous and discontinuous. The past is not opaque or inert but vital and organic, possessing the ability to intervene the happening with the reminiscences of the happened. This is suggestive of an alternative historical consciousness and Mevlut's preoccupation with such a vital essence of history nourishes the possibility of an alternative historiography. Critical engagements with the novel have often attempted to understand the novel as a bildungsroman where the self is reconciled and accommodated with the flux of change that dominates the spatial-locational. The present chapter departs from such

pertinent readings to understand how this assimilation is accomplished in departure; wherein the self becomes a part of change with this salient realisation that the present is not necessarily an annihilation of past.

The final chapter analyses the findings derived from the research and retaliates the possibility of locating an overlap between the flâneur and the alternative historiographer. The thesis in no way suggests that the novels discussed are attempts to re-read the materiality of Turkish history within the fabric of fiction. Neither does it argue that the idea of history in the novels involve any specific episode from the history of Turkey. As such, the thesis has consciously excluded the novel *My Name is Red* from its purview and scope because the concerned novel has often been read as a period/ historical fiction. The thesis has evaded such easy connotations of history as periodic or episodic. On the contrary, the thesis has tried to engage with the philosophy of history and the generous fertile milieu in which history is often poised when considered philosophically. The thesis has also tried to take the flâneur as an archetype and flânerie as a practice outside its standard considerations. Influenced by more recent studies, Flânerie in the thesis has refused to be contained within the considerations of a performance and has trespassed into the considerations of being. In doing so, the thesis has probably been considerate of the elaborate sections of the present chapter which have considerably pondered upon the many interpretive implications involved in the archetype of the flâneur and the practice of flânerie.

Works Cited

- Atabaki, Touraj. "Introduction". *The State and the Subaltern: Modernization, Society and the State in Turkey and Iran*. Ed. TourajAtabaki. London: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2007.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life*. trans. P.E. Charvet. London: Penguin Books, 2010.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin Mclaughlin. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.
- ... "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire". trans Harry Zohn. *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire*. Ed. Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006. 170-212.
- ... "The Paris of the Second Empire of Baudelaire". trans. Harry Zohn. *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire*. Ed. Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006. 46-133.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Carr, E.H. *What is History?*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
- Collingwood, R.G. *The Idea of History* (Revised Edition). Ed. Jan Van Der Dussen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- ... *The Writing of History*. trans. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- de Man, Paul. *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971
- Eliot, T.S. "Gerontion". *Collected Poems 1909-1962*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc, 1963. 29-31.
- Engdahl, Horace. Interviewed by Ola Larsmo. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/2006/prize-announcement/> Accessed on 30th August, 2020.
- Foucault, Michel. "What is Enlightenment?". trans. Catherine Porter in *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rainbow. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984. 32-50
- Gibson, Andrew. *Joyce's Revenge: History, Politics, and Aesthetics in Ulysses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Habermas, Jurgen. "Modernity- An Incomplete Project." trans. Seyla Ben-Habib. *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, edited by Hal Foster. Washington: Bay Press, 1983. 3-15

Jennings, Michael W. "Introduction". *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire*. Ed. Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006. 1-25

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. London: Penguin Books, 1968.

Levenson, Michael. *Modernism*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2011.

Longenbach, James. *Modernist Poetics of History: Pound, Eliot and the Sense of the Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Lynge, David. E. "Introduction". *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Hans-Georg Gadamer. trans. and ed. David E. Lynge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Marinetti, F.T. "The Founding and Manifesto in Futurism" (1909) in *Futurism: An Anthology*. Ed. Lawrence Rainey, Christine Poggi & Laura Wittman. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2009. 49-53

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Use and Abuse of History for Life*. trans. Ian C. Johnston. 1873. Retrieved from www.Abika.com. Accessed on 23rd February, 2020.

The Swedish Academy. *The Nobel Prize in Literature 2006*. NobelPrize.org. Nobel Media AB 2020. Sat. 16 May 2020. <<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/2006/summary/>>

Pamuk, Orhan. *Istanbul: Memories and the City*. trans. Maureen Freely. London: Faber and Faber, 2006.

...*A Strangeness In My Mind*. trans. EkinOklap. Haryana: Hamish Hamilton, 2015.

Pound, Ezra. *Guide to Kulchur*. Connecticut: A New Directions Book. Retrieved from archive.org. Web Link <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.148695/page/n9/mode/2up> Accessed on 19th November, 2019

Tester, Keith. "Introduction". *The Flâneur*. Ed. Keith Tester. London: Routledge, 2015. 1-21

White, Hayden. *MetaHistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.