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Introduction

The concept of the “subject” has remained one of the most controversial and debated concepts in Western metaphysics, philosophy and critical theory. Since the concept is a fundamental building block for any critical theory involving selfhood, identity, epistemology, existentialism, authorship, or for constructing any edifice of thought, perspective and hypothesis, it has always occupied the center stage in almost any debate or discussion related to philosophical or critical enquiry. The greatest of philosophers like Descartes, Sartre and Heidegger have evolved their own theories relating to the subject. They have theorized, examined and developed many ramifications to it as far as its existence is concerned. It has been problematized and theorized by many in different ways. Michel Foucault problematized the concept of “subject formation” in a twin-pronged semantic sense, i.e. firstly, the various ways by which “a human being turns him or herself into a subject” and secondly, how he/she is turned into a subject by external agencies of power and knowledge.

Foucault’s entire oeuvre is constructed around the lynchpin of subject formation. His claim stands as a testimony to this: “The goal of my work during the last twenty years has . . . been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, The Subject and Power 208). Clare O’Farrell substantiates this statement very succinctly and aptly in Michel Foucault: “. . . Foucault suggested that all his earlier work had in fact been about how people exist as subjects in the world, even if he hadn’t articulated this sufficiently” (110). Judith Butler in The Psychic Life of Power has also explicated Foucault’s concept of subject-formation:
... power imposes itself on us, and, weakened by its force, we come to internalize or accept its terms. What such an account fails to note, however, is that the "we" who accept such terms are fundamentally dependent on those terms for "our" existence. ... Subjection consists precisely in this fundamental dependency on a discourse we never chose but that, paradoxically, initiates and sustains our agency. (2)

Thus, the subject is one who is brought into existence in the first place by the discursive apparatuses and also made to submit willingly to the same apparatuses. The terms of a subject’s birth and identity thus also become the cause for his subordination. Foucault does not attribute agency to the consciousness of a subject but to “... the constant interplay between strategies of power and resistance” (Mayo, “Foucauldian Cautions on the Subject”). Thus, the problem of how an individual becomes a subject owing to the operation of power dynamics constitutes the core thematic of Foucault’s entire oeuvre. (Rabinow, FR 11) Foucault’s interest centers on the processes and modes of “turning human beings into objectified subjects ...” (Rabinow, FR 8). At this point, Louis Althusser’s definition and formation of a subject can be evoked: “In the ordinary use of the term, subject in fact means: (1) a free subjectivity, a centre of initiatives, author of and responsible for its actions; (2) a subjected being, who submits to a higher authority, and is therefore stripped of all freedom except that of freely accepting his submission.” The Foucauldian mode of subject formation is comparable to Althusser’s “ideological interpellation” of individuals into subjects. (“Ideological State Apparatuses”) Butler states:

In Althusser's essay “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” the subordination of the subject takes place through language, as the effect of the authoritative voice that hails the individual. In the infamous example that Althusser offers, a policeman hails a passerby on the street, and the passerby turns and recognizes himself as the one who is
hailed. In the exchange by which that recognition is preferred and accepted, interpellation—the discursive production of the social subject—takes place. (*PLP* 5)

In effect, Foucault’s entire opus revolves around the subjectification of the self through strategically operating power relations, discursive formations, and the episteme of the day. Power relations in Foucault’s view operate by manipulating, disciplining and normalizing the individual’s body and soul. It is power relations that enable the formation of discursive fields which give birth to the subject. On the one hand, power relations constitute the individual’s body as their nodal or relay point while on the other hand the subjectified self of the individual itself becomes the origin of resistance. Rabinow and Rose explain this process of subjectification as: “The human being, from this perspective is not so much an entity -- not even an entity with a history -- than the site of a multiplicity of practices or labors” (*EF* 15).

Since according to Foucault, power cannot exist without resistance, resistance is both a condition and a threat to power and the subject is both, a medium for the operation of power and resistance. Though Foucault is deeply suspicious about the concept of total or absolute liberty, he nevertheless is hopeful about the potential of any regime of power to carry within itself possibilities of liberation:

I do not think that it is possible to say that one thing is of the order of “liberation” and another is of the order of “oppression.” There are a certain number of things that one can say with some certainty about a concentration camp to the effect that it is not an instrument of liberation, but one should still take into account . . . that, aside from torture and execution, which preclude any resistance, no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remain the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings. (Rabinow, *FR* 245)
Foucault’s starting point of subjectification is this complex and strategic configuration of power, discourse and resistance. The concept of subject formation as dealt with by him has been explored by applying it onto a writer whose works besides being an excellent reflection of the postmodern era, are ones in which the characters are not merely delineated as generic types but as social and discursive products whose actions are not their own but are in a sense controlled by the discursive apparatuses around them. “Foucault uses the word apparatus to mean a device oriented to produce something – a machinic contraption whose purpose in this case is control and management of certain characteristics of a population. . . . [It is] composed of a grouping of heterogeneous elements . . . deployed for specific purposes at a particular historical conjuncture” (Rabinow and Rose, EF 10).

Turkish writer, Orhan Pamuk is one such author whose fiction contains the depiction of such discursive constructs and products whose self ceases to be their own. Pamuk’s characters function as transit points for the passage of relations of power and resistance. There is an underlying sub-textual angst that runs through his fiction and is felt by his characters which makes his discursive constructs behave like tormented humans who are constantly escaping from something and searching for something. This sub-textual angst experienced by the characters can be grasped by the discerning reader with the aid of various tactics opted for by them like: an obsessive urge to shed one’s self and become someone else, a sense of despondency which prevails amongst almost all his characters, constant efforts made by them to induce meaning into their lives by narrating stories, and by their life-long searches, journeys and forays made for that ultimate meaning.

It is this ambivalent status occupied by Pamuk’s characters which becomes the focus of this research by analyzing their curious identities, consciousness, intentions
and actions. It is not only his characters who occupy an ambivalent status, as Pamuk’s writing itself cannot be strictly categorized as political, philosophical, metaphysical or sociological. A sense of crisis at the realization of a fluidity of the realms of the fictional and historical, and the personal and political invades Pamuk’s writings as well as his characters: “Pamuk’s political sensibilities are couched in philosophical terms and estranged from “real” life settings” (Seyhan, “Seeing Through the Snow”).

Pamuk’s characters disturb the reader, leaving him unsettled because the characters’ own bodies have been turned into “stages” or “agencies” for facilitating the transmission of various discursive relations. The thesis traces this peculiar phenomenon when the “body” in the modern-day era, that too in a highly contentious geographical political, social and religious space like Turkey cannot and does not remain a mere body, but transmutates into a highly complex political and social site from where various power relations travel, connect and communicate. The body also offers itself as a public space, owned, controlled and manipulated by the disciplinary society in order to guarantee and perpetuate its own smooth and un-objected operations.

In this entire process of their bodies turning into a political and social space, there is initially not much resentment felt by the characters who have turned into subjects. The initial absence of resentment and suspicion in the subjects is owing to their own willful participation in the discursive regimes of the day. This is a Foucauldian line of thought wherein “a human being turns him - or herself into a subject” (The Subject and Power 208). Paul Rabinow has explained this method of subjectification given by Foucault as one which involves “...those processes of self-formation in which the person is active” (11). This process of self-formation is a complex one which is actuated through a multitude of “...operations on [people’s]
own bodies, on their own souls, on their own thoughts, on their own conduct” (Rabinow, FR 11). Foucault explains this process of self-understanding of people brought about by external mediators as a dangerous form of subjectification in which individuals, instead of being acted upon and controlled by others, act upon and control themselves. They might be however assisted in their own subject formation by any external agency but the role of the external factors is limited in this case, with their own role being the most active. Considered as the least identifiable source of subjectification, this particular process conditions the individuals by using their heightened dependence upon the need to articulate themselves or to indulge in misleadingly therapeutic procedures like confession. The process functions in stark contrast to the conventionally understood processes of subjectifying individuals who reside in passivity.

However, since the Foucauldian notion of power cannot exist in the absence of resistance, the characters eventually experience and recognize their own subjecthood and appropriation of identity by disciplinary apparatures. It is also owing to the highly evolved mental perspicacity of these subjects that they become aware of the loss of their identity and opinion under highly disciplinarian forms of control. This awareness of the loss of identity experienced by the characters manifests itself through the psychological mediums of story-telling, writing, and other similar forms of artistic expression. It is at this crucial point that the characters’ selves begin to resist their subjectification through various strategies. This expression of their strategies and acts of resistance is very subtly woven into Pamuk’s narratives and has been traced in the thesis.

The thesis thus strives to prove that though the characters of Orhan Pamuk’s fiction are subjectified individuals, yet they simultaneously carry within them the
potential and the will to liberate their subjectified selves from the disciplinary apparatuses of their times. Their bodies and souls are traversed by power relations, history and politics, invested, marked, tortured, trained, forced to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies and to emit signs (Foucault, DP 25). We can observe various discursive formations struggling to lay exclusive claim to the characters’ selves, thoughts, actions and behavior. In short, power operating through various discursive formations produces the examined, trained, invested, marked, disciplined and normalized subject in Pamuk’s fiction, who constantly seeks to break through his/her subjectivity by inventing new and alternate discourses, thereby giving birth to an entirely new self. This new and re-constituted self escapes the normalized discourse and extends beyond the epistemic limits of the day.

The thesis takes up the English translations of six prominent novels by Orhan Pamuk namely, *Snow, My Name Is Red, The White Castle, The Black Book, The New Life* and *Silent House* and examines and analyses the incidences, causes and repercussions of the characters turning into subjects. The objective of the thesis is twofold. Firstly, to trace the history of the subjectification of the characters of Pamuk’s fiction and secondly, to locate the particular sites of resistance from where the subjectified characters strive to de-construct and de-normalize their subjectified selves. The subject formation of the characters as well as their resistance are both traced using Foucauldian tools and concepts, like disciplinary apparatuses, power, knowledge, discursive formations and strategies of resistance. The methodologies which the thesis makes use of in attaining its objectives are analytical and conceptual.

The first chapter titled “Subjectification through the Discourse of Identity” explores the subject formation of Pamuk’s characters through the discourse of identity, which draws upon some of the most important tactics adopted by disciplinary
apparatuses in producing “individualized or deviant identities”. These identities are constructed by producing feelings of fear and guilt within the subjects. In *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault has addressed the idea of the creation of guilt within deviants or madmen by tracing its genealogical development through the 17th and 18th centuries. Thus, Foucault describes the operational dynamics of Tuke’s asylum as those in which fear became “... an essential presence in the asylum” and there was substitution “... for the free terror of madness the stifling anguish of responsibility; fear no longer reigned on the other side of the prison gates, it now raged under the seals of conscience” (Rabinow, *FR* 144, 145). This nexus of fear and guilt was an insidious force which worked at making the individual vulnerable to his own self and recognition of this guilt within him was also directed at freeing himself of it and eventually finding a return route “... to his awareness of himself as a free and responsible subject, and consequently to reason” (*FR* 146). The thesis thus looks at how characters in Pamuk’s fiction are made to live with these externally induced feelings of guilt and fear and are also made to realize the importance of living a guilt-free life by removing all traces of potential culpability within them. However, if we extend the Foucauldian line of thought, we can very well understand that whether individuals are stamped as latent sinners or made to return to their awareness of free subjects, it is merely a disciplinary strategy to convert them into easily governable docile bodies.

Another cause of Pamuk’s characters turning into subjects is the Foucauldian notion of surveillance and observation by which an individual is turned into a docile body. Foucault’s disciplinary society is underpinned by the technology of a continuous yet invisible observation in which the observer is himself a significant part of the entire process of observation, and the observer and the observed enter into a silent, unnamed pact according to which it is not the observation which binds both of
them but the potentially deferred concept of observation. The observed feels and knows that he could be watched anytime and so he disciplines his/her own self under the potential threat of ceaseless observation. On the other hand, the observer’s job is restricted to keeping this potential, ceaseless threat intact by re-enforcing the apparatuses of observation. This potential concept of observation and surveillance looms overhead each moment of the day and is far more powerful in creating and restoring discipline and order than the traditional mode of concrete and visible punishment. The latter bore the potential of being transgressed at any time, whereas the Foucauldian notion of the abstract threat of observation is far more dangerous and effectual in achieving its objectives as the invisibility of it invalidates the occurrence of any possible transgressive act on the part of the observer. This mode of surveillance and observation creates the disciplined and obedient subject who forever keeps a check on his own behavior and actions and does not even require an outside agency to control his actions. This abstract notion of observation and surveillance can be seen as operating at a sub-textual level in Pamuk’s works.

The study also looks into the chief causes underlying the disturbing discontentment of Pamuk’s characters which makes them ever so uncomfortable in their own skins and makes them burn with a desire to escape their burdensome selves. Each of the factors leading to the subject formation of Pamuk’s characters has been analyzed and classified under its parent category. For instance, devices of subject formation like “confession” and “journalistic discourse” have been tagged under their broader label of “subject formation through the agencies of power and knowledge”. On the other hand, disciplinary apparatuses like “the elusive desire” and techniques of “examination” and “surveillance” have been grouped under the larger category of “subject formation through the discourse of identity”.
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The next concern dealt with by the chapter is the failure of representation of truth in the modern era. The characters of Pamuk’s fiction undergo anxiety in the absence of a reliable medium by which to render their truths, and also the panic of the realization that there can be no absolute truth. Since the very notion of representation has suffered a collapse, there can only be one palpable and concrete reality, which is story-telling. Pamuk, the story-teller narrates intricately woven webs of stories which contain characters who can only communicate something by means of telling stories. The chapter sets out to prove that story-telling becomes the new mode of expression as the story-teller supersedes the intellectual. Characters like Faruk of *SH* and Ka of *Snow* are uneasy with the provisionality of truth and meaning, and the insufficiency within themselves of being able to represent facts, data and history without narrativizing it. Their angst leads them to weaving stories for everything which turns out to be a bottomless pit for them. The boundaries can not be determined within the medium of story-telling owing to its highly unreliable and slippery nature. In the lack of any markers or milestones to help them find their way back to the real world, the characters end up narrativizing their own lives. The chapter thus investigates how story-telling can become a dangerous medium leading to the subject formation of the characters.

The next chapter which is titled “Subjectification through Agencies of Power and Knowledge” studies all those mediums, agencies and relations of power and knowledge which are insidiously and pervasively functioning within the most innocuous spaces of everyday human lives and relations, and are instrumental in turning individuals into subjects who are in complete concordance with their ideology.
The birth of the subject as an epistemological category according to Foucault occurred at the end of the 18th century, marked by a rupture between the classical era and the modern thought. Thus, Foucault states in *NGH*: “The body is the inscribed surface of events (traced by language and dissolved by ideas), the locus of a dissociated Self (adopting the illusion of a substantial unity), and a volume in perpetual disintegration” and the prime task of Genealogy “... is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history’s destruction of the body” (148). Since the end of the 18th century, the problem of analyzing this epistemological category called man, has acquired serious dimensions. Instead of being the transcendental originator of knowledge, the subject now becomes the product of the rules of discursive formation. It is now the discourse which speaks through the subject and the subject can only exist in the field established by discourse. The event of human bodies being traversed, marked and inscribed by historical events can be seen in the form of the lifelike mannequins created by Bedi Ustaa in Pamuk’s *TBB*, who carry every single gesture and trace of history on them. The techniques by which Pamuk’s characters are turned into subjects are analogous to Foucault’s rules of discursive formations like, control over the utterances and non-utterances of statements, constant and pervasive surveillance, and the apparent neutrality and political invisibility of the techniques of power. The chapter traces all these techniques of power, knowledge and discursive relations by which Pamuk’s characters not only become subjects of external agencies, but willing ones.

In order to enrich our understanding of subject formation, it is essential to evoke Judith Butler’s understanding of a subject. According to Butler, a subject is one who is born into linguistic codes and conventions which is precisely what my chapter takes up: “The genealogy of the subject as a critical category, however, suggests that the subject, rather than be identified strictly with the individual, ought to be
designated as a linguistic category, a placeholder, a structure in formation” (PLP 10). The chapter studies the formation of Pamuk’s characters like Galip of TBB who turns himself into a subject the functioning of whose entire psyche is controlled and ruled by the trivialness of everyday events. For instance, when Ruya leaves and he combs the apartments for signs (of the possible reasons for Ruya’s sudden disappearance) – and later the entire city for signs of her appearance, disappearance or absence/hiding – he allows those signs to turn into powerful symbols which take complete control of him and his movements, physical and psychological. Galip allows the signs to become so potent and all-pervading that his eyes are forced - or rather maneuvered - to look at every object anew. “Every object in the house, every shadow, took on a new personality; it was like waking up in a new home” (TBB 51). In fact, Pamuk’s characters function like pawns controlled entirely by the dictates of signs. They are searching for something or the other, their wife, their identity, their soul-mate, or a new life, in a universe which is ruled by signs. It is a post-structuralist universe in which Pamuk’s characters float across becoming subjects of the aporetic nature of signs. There are secrets and mysteries lurking within the dark alleyways of history and signs strewn across the city are teeming and bursting with an assurance of concealing within their obvious nature and meaning, the other, lost nature and an ultimate meaning which the protagonists are searching for all their lives. Even the most mundane of objects takes on an eerie and other-worldly meaning and nature and provides a false and transient sense of security and solace to the characters of having solved the mystery or having cracked the code. One trail leads to the other and so on, with no end. Even the words which Ruya has managed to solve in the crossword before leaving, are all suggestive to Galip of a mystery - “secret”, “listen”, “moon”, “darkness and death”, “tomb”, “difficult” - and they also suggest a cessation, gap or a discontinuity - “interval”, “division”. The words which Ruya manages to solve and Galip sees as compelling signals of some coded message, conveying the reasons for
Ruya’s sudden departure, can almost be interpreted as an abrupt abeyance in the schemata of normal events, lurking like a secret in the darkness of the night, waiting to be deciphered and made sense of. It is ironical however, that the mysteries elicited by these words are apocryphal. Butler’s idea of an individual’s subjecthood can be evoked at this point: “. . . one is dependent on power for one’s very formation, that that formation is impossible without dependency, and that the posture of the adult subject consists precisely in the denial and reenactment of this dependency” (PLP 9). Thus, the danger persists for as long as the subjects deny their dependence on the ideological and disciplinary apparatuses.

Speaking of the subject as a carrier of discursive and power operations, it is not merely the transformation of the characters into subjects and their consequent probabilities for resistant action with which the thesis is concerned, but also the makeup of their disposition and temperament. It has been observed that in all works of Pamuk, the subjectified characters are delineated as passive and sentient spectators instead of action-oriented individuals. They are observant and dwelling in thought to the extent of absorbing and soaking in everything around them through their senses, but without the action. Goknar analyses the character of Ka in Snow as: “Ka is at the mercy of a number of “outside forces” that not only write his poems, but write his destiny. . . .Once in Kars, his appropriation by these outside forces becomes something of a mystical experience, that ultimately leads to his exile from the national space of Kars (and Turkey)” (191).

Thus, Pamuk’s main characters display a preponderance of thought which controls them and makes them feeble and paralyzed. It is the other characters around them who are riveting with their differing ideologies and opinions. The subjects hardly utter any statements, let alone strongly opinionated ones, and remain immersed in an uncertain flux. They are constantly pulled apart in various directions by the
other characters and in the process, find themselves to be involuntarily submitting to
the pull of the strongest ideology, without believing in it strongly. Delayed action and
a weak will constitute the personality of these subjects. They are also ridden with a
wracking and deep-seated doubt regarding the larger and complex questions
concerning epistemology, metaphysics and the meaning of existence in general. It is
in fact this lurking doubt or agnostic instinct regarding everything around them that
ultimately acts as one of the tools of de-subjectification of the characters, because it
helps them to ferret out the answers for themselves instead of adopting the answers
which have already been laid out. This is where the need for exploring the characters’
own consciousness becomes absolutely necessary in order to understand better their
functioning, behavior and actions.

The impressionable ninety year old widow Fatma, the indecisive historian
Faruk - a la Hamlet, the idealistic and imaginative Hasan of SH, the hopelessly lost
Galip of TBB, and the romantic murderer Osman of TNL, are all such characters who
are turned into subjects and display the same behavioral characteristics mentioned
above. However, it is this very trait of being forever suspended in a limbo which
supplies them with the angst required to pull themselves out of the discursive mess in
which they are trapped. And even if they are unable to extricate themselves from the
predicament in which they are ensnared, they do manage to at least recognize their
own subjecthood which is the first and the most important move to be taken in the
Foucauldian schemata of resistance. The recognition of one’s subjecthood is
extremely important for one to adopt a resistant strategy towards the medium of
subjectification.

One very significant cause of the characters turning into subjects in Pamuk’s
fiction is the terribly crisis-ridden era of representations in which almost every system
of representation witnesses its own collapse. This crisis in representational systems in
general and in language in particular, is depicted in Pamuk’s fiction by means of a
catastrophic ambiguity and inscrutability which penetrates almost every by-lane of his works. People losing their selves, the never-ending abysses of stories which run in circularity forever, the “riddles” which Galip looks for in his own and others’ faces, and the constant and untiring efforts made by the characters to “decode faces” are redolent of an elusive mystery which seems to lie at the heart of the world according to the characters. There arrives however, never a moment of finding, discovery or epiphany in Pamuk’s novels, rather, the potentiality of the pregnant moment is delayed eternally. Mystery and riddles become the staple and perpetual source of anxiety and the journey undertaken by the characters – for decoding the secrets and for reaching at the ultimate, meaningful destination – becomes the meaning itself. It is this very irony which mocks at the continual efforts of the characters of Pamuk’s fiction made for finding that fleeting meaning. However, it is only when the subjects realize their being caught up in this ordeal of forever-delayed meaning that they begin to understand the workings of discursive operations and the disciplinary fields around them, and it is this moment at which their defy and resist their subjectification.

The next chapter titled “Sites of Potential Resistance” takes up all those sites of resistance from where the characters of Pamuk’s fiction strive to de-subjectify their selves. The chapter traces all those tactics and tools employed by the characters in their resistance against discursive structures, power regimes and modes of established knowledge. Foucault’s strategies of resistance are an indispensable cause as well as effect of relations of power, which are assymetrical, diffused and present everywhere. According to him, the struggles which ensue from these dispersed power relations “. . . can influence the behavior or nonbehavior of the other. . . .It means that we always have possibilities, there are always possibilities of changing the situation. We cannot jump outside the situation, and there is no point where you are free from all power
relations. But you can always change it" (EST 167). Thus, the Foucauldian proposal of resistance is one which accords an imperative status to the strategies of resistance:

... if there was no resistance, there would be no power relations.
Because it would simply be a matter of obedience. You have to use power relations to refer to the situation where you're not doing what you want. So resistance comes first, and resistance remains superior to the forces of the process; power relations are obliged to change with the resistance. So I think that resistance is the main word, the key word, in this dynamic. (EST 292)

A very important element of power relations is that, “These power relations are . . . mobile, reversible, and unstable.” He also adds that a certain degree of freedom on both the sides is a prerequisite for the relations of power to function, because without freedom, power would cease to be and would transform into coercion or violence. (EST 292) What we can thus acquire from this inter-relationship and inter-dependency of power relations and resistance is a very mobile, fluid and complex version of resistance which is in fact quite analogous to the Athusserian plan of resistance. Since the Foucauldian tools of resistance are generated from the functioning of power relations they have to be understood and employed very carefully. Foucault does not overrule the possibility of change in an exploitative and authoritative relationship but this depends upon two dominant factors: Firstly, the recognition and awareness of one’s subjecthood and the exploitative relationship in which one exists. The willing acceptance of and compliance with the ideology of the disciplinary apparatuses is the foremost condition of subjecthood and must be shaken off. Secondly, the realization that there always exists a degree of freedom for everyone everywhere, which however also ought to carry with it the knowledge that any strategy of resistance comes with an equal potential of allying itself with the relations of power and the discursive apparatuses.
The chapter takes off from this provisional point and all resistant strategies opted by the characters of Pamuk’s fiction which are allied with this understanding of resistance. Foucault’s understanding of resistance is also allied with Althusser’s and Butler’s ideas of conditions and possibilities of resistance, on which the chapter is based. Some of the strategies of resistance taken up by Pamuk’s characters are – art, wherein they endeavor to turn their own lives into works of art, for instance, the miniaturists in MNR and Sunay Zaim in Snow who make an earnest effort at transforming the nature of representation or staging of socio-political reality through art. Creation of alternative discourses of knowledge is another very interesting strategy of challenging directly the influence of discursive structures of knowledge. Characters like Hoja of TWC are engaged in lifelong struggles to liberate their selves from the strictures and hold of discursive knowledge. Apart from this, an alternative understanding of existing literatures is also an important strategy opted for by characters like Mehmet of TNL. These and many more Foucauldian strategies of resistance have been brought out in this chapter.

The Foucauldian line of resistance on which the thesis is constructed, is thus a very delicate and malleable tool which contains the pliability to be bent and used in any way required. If the subjectified characters were not aware of their willing participation in their own subjectification, they would never have been able to possess the energy to understand their own subject formation. It is thus this very awareness and insight into the existence of matter – animate and inanimate – which equips the characters with the much required perception to acknowledge their subjechood.

Foucault’s objective of liberating the individual not only from the state and from the state’s institutions, but also from the multiple Governmental practices that are exercised through its institutions, is kept intact by Pamuk. The subject in Foucault’s opinion is capable of rejecting the individuality that has been imposed on
him/her for several centuries by promoting new forms of subjectivity. The thesis traces this resistant behavior of the subject in Pamuk’s fiction.

In addition to this, the creation of hitherto unexplored constellations of desire and pleasure in order to withstand the onslaught of the disciplinary State’s mechanisms of creating monogamous, heterosexual identities is another method by which subject formation is resisted in Pamuk’s works. This idea is explored by Foucault in *HS-I*. The whole new idea of being open towards the re-configuration of the subject’s sexual identity is again taken up as a significant tool to resist subject formation in Pamuk’s *TBB*. During Galip’s and the famous Turkish actress’s look-alike encounter, both of them desire to shed their identities and become someone else - “It was not the woman in his arms, but he who became someone else” (148).

Similarly in *MNR*, the storyteller desires to be a woman by doing “what they did, [eating] what they ate, [saying] what they said . . . [and wearing] their clothes” (429), and feels that he would know women better if he got into their skin. In fact, the storyteller in *MNR* not only flirts with the desire to experience the woman in him, but also “… performs nine impertinent, irreverent monologues based on rough drawings supplied by the miniaturists. [He takes] on the personae of a dog, a tree, a coin, Death, the color crimson, a horse, Satan, and two dervishes. . .” (Updike, “Murder in Miniature”). Tactics of resistance like these and many more opted by the characters of Pamuk’s fiction have been traced in the thesis. The thesis tries to locate that line or that dynamic interstice wherein the Foucauldian docile subject is transformed into the resisting subject or the counter-discursive practitioner who challenges or actively criticizes the very system of discipline that nurtured and ordered him.

Things losing their sense of “familiarity” as presented in *TBB* are also symptomatic of a re-ordering of perspective or the re-structuring of the rules of discursive formations into which characters like Galip are born. There are flashes
which come to Galip since the time Ruya leaves him – flashes of things around him losing their familiarity and everything familiar taking on an unfamiliar appearance, but unfortunately Galip fails to comprehend the deeper significance of these flashes. Things losing their “familiarity” can be seen through the Foucauldian perspective of objects shedding their phenomenological and subjective being, in other words, their being viewed by the subject in an anti-phenomenological light which strips them of all their layers of objectively conferred meaning or significance that has come to be their core since the time they were born. These flashes of the constructed or invented nature of worldly objects in particular and of the invented nature of truth in general does strike Galip at recurrent intervals during his search, but the other forces have a stronger bearing and influence on his psyche.

The subject in Pamuk’s works is thus emptied of its motives, thoughts, feelings, emotions and desires and is instead substituted by potentially infinite subject-positions which can be read as being structurally analogous to hollow moulds which carry the potential to be filled in with absolutely any subject – whether Rumi, Celal, Galip, the color red or a murderer. This hollow mould of a subject-position is parallel to Foucault’s de-subjectified self and offers the readers a promise and hope of a self which is not the subject of any discourse any longer.

The discourse about “wanting to be someone else”, which abounds in Pamuk’s fiction can be re-read through the Foucauldian lens as a subject giving way to an infinite number of subject-positions. Similarly, the style of *MNR* is a deliberate effort made by the author to throw the reader into a tizzy as the story is not narrated by any one narrator. The authority of a single narrator takes a back-seat as the story is spoken through multiple voices and narrators, some of them even being inanimate objects like a coin and the color red. This technique of a splitting of the authorial or narratorial voice into an infinite number of subject-positions pushes the envelope for the
traditional reader as it provides an equal authorial intention to each voice and character in the narrative. So the coin or the dog would take the story forward with their own intentions and views as would the Jewish clothier or any of the miniaturists. So, none of the characters can be assigned more or less importance. With so many mouths speaking the narrative becomes a field of various discourses struggling and jostling against each other to assign and fix the meanings of the content in their own way. Therefore, not only the content but also the structure of the novels of Pamuk is such that open-endedness, a slippage of meaning and a continual conflict of the various discourses is not only tolerated as an inevitability of the postmodern era but rather celebrated. The characters’ destinies are no longer controlled by the author. They are let loose by the author in the field which is ruled by nothing except various discourses and the agencies of power and knowledge. There are no hidden puppet strings by which the author controls his characters. He simply lets them exist on their own and speak for their own selves, surrendering them to the discursive struggles of the day which the characters are subjected to and controlled by. It is the characters’ response to the various discursive events, their surrender and their resistance to them, which becomes the core thematic of this thesis.

Though Foucault remains the strongest ground on which my thesis takes shape, but there are also a number of other allied thinkers and theorists who can be considered to be either taking ahead his thought in succession or the minds from whom Foucault inherited and shaped some of his most revolutionary ideas. These allied minds who belong to the Foucauldian fraternity as far as the premises of my thesis are concerned are Slavoj Zizek, Deleuze and Guattari, Lacan, Paul Ricoeur, Michel de Certeau, Maurice Blanchot, Judith Butler and a few others. I have also used some of their theories and concepts related to the formation of a subject and the various methods and techniques of resisting this subjectification.