

Derleme Makale/Review Article

**A HETEROTOPIC AND GLOCAL PLACE:
THE MUSEUM OF INNOCENCE**

BİR HETEROTOPIK VE GLOKAL MEKÂN: MASUMİYET MÜZESİ

Lebriz SÖNMEZ*

Geliş Tarihi: 19.11.2018
(Received)

Kabul Tarihi: 26.11.2019
(Accepted)

ÖZ: Orhan Pamuk'un sekizinci romanı *Masumiyet Müzesi*, uzun soluklu ve saplantılı bir aşk hikâyesidir. 2008'de basıldıktan itibaren hem çok olumlu geri bildirimler almış hem de eleştirilmiştir. Sadece bir aşk hikâyesini değil, aynı zamanda modern ile geleneksel yaşam tarzının arasına sıkışmış bir coğrafyada fiziksel ve duygusal bir aşkı deneyimlemenin imkânsızlığını anlatır. Romandaki başkarakter, aşkının soyut halini sevdiğinin eşyalarının somutluğuna dönüştürmektedir. Bu eşyalardan oluşturduğu gerçek müze kurma hayali, 2012 yılında İstanbul'da Çukurcuma'da gerçek olur. Bu bağlamda, gerçek hayatta bir müze kuran ilk roman kurgusal başkarakteridir. *Masumiyet Müzesi* gerçekte bir müzenin romanıdır. Müzedeki her bir eşyanın hikâyesinden oluşan ve de müzeye nasıl getirildiklerini anlatan bir katalog gibidir. Müze, hem başkarakterin aşkına hem de o yıllardaki İstanbul'un politik, kültürel ve sosyal olaylarına şahitlik eder. *Masumiyet Müzesi* yerel bir edebi ürün olarak karşımıza çıkmakta, ancak gerçek bir mekân olan bir müze formuyla da evrensel olarak düşünülmektedir. Kurgu ve gerçekliğin iç içe geçmesinden dolayı, İstanbul'daki müze, Foucault'nun 1967'de derslerinin birinde anlattığı bir heterotopya olarak kabul edilebilir. Foucault'ya göre, her kültür tarihi boyunca kendi heterotopyalarını üretmiştir. Ütopya temelde gerçek dışı, fakat heterotopya gerçek bir mekândır. Romandaki başkarakterin, sevdiğinin eşyalarını biriktirerek aşkına ulaşma ütopyası, gerçek bir müze şekliyle bir heterotopyaya dönüşmektedir. Heterotopya, birbiriyle karşılaştırılmaz mekân ve alanların bir araya gelmesiyle oluşan gerçek bir mekândır. Bu bağlamda, İstanbul'daki Masumiyet Müzesi, gerçek ve hayalin, yerel ve evrenselin, sanal ve fiziksel olanın bir araya geldiği heterotopik bir mekândır. Bu çalışma, Foucault tarafından kazandırılan *heterotopya* kavramı aracılığıyla, roman ve müzenin nasıl bir arada yorumlanabileceğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Orhan Pamuk, Masumiyet Müzesi, Glokal Mekân, Heterotopya, Gerçek ve Kurgu.

ABSTRACT: Orhan Pamuk's eighth novel, *Masumiyet Müzesi* (The Museum of Innocence) is a long-term and obsessive love story. Published in 2008, it has attracted a lot of attention positively as well as criticism. It depicts not only a love story but also the impossibility of experiencing a physical and emotional love together in a geography trapped between modern and traditional life-style. In the novel, the protagonist converts the abstractness of his love into the concreteness of his lover's belongings. His dream of

* Öğretim Görevlisi Dr., Balıkesir Üniversitesi, lebriz@balikesir.edu.tr, ORCID:0000-0001-7964-2839

generating a real museum from these belongings came true in Çukurcuma-Istanbul in 2012. In this context, he is the first novel fictional protagonist to build a museum in reality. *Masumiyet Müzesi* is actually the novel of a museum. It can be likened to a catalogue of a museum informing the stories of every object in it and also how they are brought together. The museum can be assessed that it is the witness of both protagonist's love story and political, cultural, and social events in Istanbul in those years. It can be said that *Masumiyet Müzesi* is produced locally as a literary production, but distributed globally in the form of a museum as a real place. Based on the interconnection of fiction and reality, the museum in Istanbul can be accepted as a heterotopia which is a term Foucault coined in one of his lectures in 1967. For him, every culture has created his own heterotopia throughout its history. Utopia is basically an unreal space, but heterotopia is a real one. In the novel, the protagonist's utopia for collecting his lover's belongings to reach his lover emotionally turns into a heterotopia by the way of a real museum. Heterotopia is one real place which juxtaposes various incompatible spaces or sites. In this sense, *Masumiyet Müzesi* (The Museum of Innocence) in Istanbul is a heterotopic place juxtaposing real and imagined, local and global, virtual and physical. This study explores how the novel and museum are interpreted together by the concept of *heterotopia* coined by Foucault.

Keywords: Orhan Pamuk, Museum of Innocence, Glocal Place, Heterotopia, Reality and Fiction.

1. INTRODUCTION

Orhan Pamuk, born in 1952, is a prolific Turkish novelist who combines historical, religious, social, and political issues in his works. He began his education at a technical university and continued in the department of journalism. Graduating from the University of Istanbul in 1977, he has written a series of acclaimed novels awarded in Turkey and abroad. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2006. His novels, such as *Sessiz Ev* (*Silent House*, 1983), *Beyaz Kale* (*The White Castle*, 1985), *Kara Kitap* (*The Black Book*, 1990), *Yeni Hayat* (*The New Life*, 1996), and *Benim Adım Kırmızı* (*My Name Is Red*, 1998) have been widely translated.

Pamuk began to write his remarkable postmodern novel – *Masumiyet Müzesi* (*The Museum of Innocence*) – ten years before its publication. He did the necessary research on museology and the history of museology during the process of writing the novel. Finally, the novel was printed as his eighth novel in 2008 and has achieved great acclaim all over the world since then. It can be considered that it is the novel of a museum because it is produced from the plot of the novel. It is both a modern and postmodern novel. As a modern novel, it draws a lonely protagonist/narrator who lives his story through a blend of real, imaginary, conscious and subconscious elements. His life is presented with accuracy detached from moral considerations on society. In the novel, the love story between a mature man and a young woman starts with sexual experiences that old values have been

discarded. A pessimistic ambience in tone is dominated throughout the novel. As a postmodern novel, the narrator-protagonist call the story as ‘novel’ in a clear way by addressing himself ‘I’. “*As I write these words I feel I should take care not to cause undue upset to those concerned souls who have taken an interest in my story for a novel need not be full of sorrow just because its heroes are suffering*” (Pamuk, 2009: 67). Also, the narrator talks to the reader during the reflection of his inner world: “*The reader will already have guessed that I then sank into deep indignation. But it didn’t last long*” (216). In addition, the reality and fiction are intertwined; the readers find a real ticket on the page 485 for the fictitious museum where the protagonist desires to establish in the novel.

The author also draws partly an autobiographical work of Istanbul and builds a relationship between museology and literature (Zariç, 2014: 46). In the epilogue of the novel, Pamuk expresses his thoughts on love and the museum. He signifies that he collects the objects enthusiastically to build the plot of his novel and in his museum from the very beginning of his writing. He sometimes exploits some of his family’s belongings:

I gave my father’s old ties to Kemal’s father and my mother’s knitting needles to Füsün’s mother, thus some parts of my story are produced. I had a great pleasure from my characters’ use of my family’s belongings (Pamuk, 2018: 503)¹.

It starts with a sentence by the protagonist – Kemal Basmacı: “*It was the happiest moment of my life, though I didn’t know it*” (Pamuk, 2009: 6). Due to this sentence, from the very beginning, the reader interprets that Kemal will not live a happy life. The title of the book stems from the love story of a man who loves a woman passionately and who creates a museum coming into existence by everything she has touched. Pamuk draws a love story lasting nearly thirty years between a rich, upper class and engaged man (Kemal) and his poor, young, and beautiful distant relative (Füsün) in Istanbul between 1975 and 2004. Füsün’s belongings collected by Kemal ease the pain of his desperate love. “*We can bear the pain only by possessing something that belongs to that instant. These mementos preserve the colors, textures, images, and delights as they were more faithfully, in fact, than can those who accompanied us through those moments*” (2009: 50). Kemal decides to establish the museum with the objects of his desperate story and his lover’s after her death. Kemal:

Sometimes, thus, consoled, I would imagine it possible for me to frame my collection with a story, and I would dream happily of a

¹ The quotation has been translated by the author of this article, since the English version of the novel does not include the epilogue on ‘love and museum’ by the author.

museum where I could display my life – the life that first my mother, and then Osman, and finally everyone else thought I had wasted – where I could tell my story through the things that Füsün had left behind, as a lesson to us all (307).

The key events of the plot are chronologically as follows: Kemal's recognition of his love to Füsün, his breaking up with his *fiancée*, Füsün's marriage to another man, Kemal's perpetual dinner visits to Füsün's house and collecting some of her belongings on each of his visits for eight years, Füsün's divorce and decision on marriage to Kemal, Füsün's death in a traffic accident, and Kemal's museum in the address of Füsün's house. This endless love is sealed within thousands of Füsün's belongings such as her comb, earrings, fork, glass, keys, matches box, or her 4213 cigarette butts, all of which are collected by her lover. Pamuk not only draws a love story but also gives a detailed description of the sociological, cultural, urban and daily life in Istanbul between 1950 and 2000. Virtue, the difference between the rich and the poor, family values, honour, bravery, and fidelity are the main themes in the novel. In the final part of the novel titled "Happiness", he also successfully puts himself into the novel as a character. In this part, the narrator considers that his museum needs a catalogue in the form of a novel. He chooses Orhan Pamuk, whose father and uncle had commercial dealings with the narrator's father in the past, to write his entire story. Pamuk also mentions about himself for praise. The narrator: "*I had also heard that he was a man lovingly devoted to his work and who took storytelling seriously*" (317). According to Bayrak and Yaprak, by this way, the author endeavours to create the illusion of the plot, which the narrator tells, up to that part and he designs a paradox that the narrator is not him (2012: 59).

From the beginning, the reader believes that the protagonist will not live a happy life, however, the novel ends with his sentence: "*Let everyone know, I lived a very happy life*" (328). His happiness is related directly to his decision and his endeavours on the constitution of the museum. His dream for taking his woman endlessly does not come true but his museum does just before his death.

2. THE MUSEUM OF INNOCENCE (MASUMİYET MÜZESİ)

The author bought the building of the museum in 1990 and since then he has begun to design the novel by synchronizing with the museum. In other words, the novel proceeds along with the museum. Füsün's home address is the same as the museum address. In addition, the logo of the museum represents the butterfly figure on Füsün's earrings, which is one of the key points in the novel. The Museum of Innocence was opened in 2012, four years later than the publication of the novel. It was awarded "Museum of the Year in Europe" in 2014. The objects that the characters of the novel use, wear, hear, see, save and dream are exhibited

in the boxes and windows artistically designed for each section of the novel inside the museum. There is also a bedroom on the third floor belongs to the protagonist and founder of the museum (Kemal) and the label on the wall says that he lived in this room between 2000 and 2007. In this sense, he is the first novel fictional protagonist to build a museum in reality. On the official website of the museum², Pamuk expresses his thoughts that a society needs such kind of museums telling the individual stories rather than national, history or art museums. By this way, the people are able to familiarize their own ordinary stories, which are more intense, more humanistic, and more alive than a particular history, a company, or a nation. These museums mirror people's humanities individually. The protagonist indicates that his aim of founding the museum is to present how to tell his love story to a person who does not know anything about Istanbul, Nişantaşı, and Çukurcuma and to be able to give a meaning to his life then. He expresses his feelings as follows:

Visitors to my Museum of Innocence must compel themselves, therefore, to view all objects displayed therein – the buttons, the glasses, the old photographs, and Füsün's combs – not as real things in the present moment, but as my memories (Pamuk, 2009: 259).

The sound recording by the author gives the visitors guidance that describes and tell the story of each object, which enables to create a lively atmosphere for the novel. Not only the belongings of the characters are exhibited in the museum, but also the photographs, pictures, postcards, pieces of manuscripts, newspaper clippings, films, passbooks, lottery tickets, etc. dated from 1950 to 2000. The museum connects the life of Istanbul in 1975s and the pathetic love story of Kemal and Füsün. Many memories from old times are presented in each of 83 boxes designed for each of 83 sections of the novel.

The museum is the result of intertwining real life and fiction even if it represents real life. A fictitious novel turns into a real place; that is a novelized realism has an architectural dimension (Şimşon, 2016: 232)³. The protagonist's purpose of developing the museum is to construe the years he lives by the way of collecting the objects, dresses, photos, accessories, utensils, and so on; that is, to convert Time into Place. Each object symbolizes the atmosphere of Turkey in the 1970s even if they belong to the protagonist. In fact, the memories in his mind do not reflect a merely individual history, but rather constitute the imagery of a nation by means of the streets, neighbourhood, houses, districts, and objects of Istanbul in his mind. He has gained, recalled, and located his memories in society. The existence of the museum preoccupies the reader/visitor whether the story is

² <http://tr.masumiyetmuzesi.org/>

³ The quotation has been translated by the author of this article.

fictitious or real. Pamuk answers the question of whether he is being the protagonist in real life or not:

1- “No, I am not Kemal who is my protagonist.”

2- “However, I can never make my readers believe this”⁴

(Pamuk, 2011: 25).

In an unpublished oral presentation delivered at the conference “Glocal Places of Literature: Production, Distribution, Reception” which was held by Georg-August-Universität Göttingen in Germany on 28-30 June 2018, Spring and Schimanski emphasize that the consumer objects and commodities as a recurrent motif are described as being imports or imitations from “Western Countries”, such as the Jenny Colon handbag. They assert that the bag, though the novel does not specify where it is made, signifies asymmetrical transnationality in the novel. They also express this transnationality in the application not only of the objects but also of cultural forms and sexual mores in Pamuk’s fiction. The objects in the museum in Istanbul are in the same form in the recreation of the museum made for a temporary exhibition at the Museum of Cultural History in Oslo in 2017. Thus, on the one hand, the transnationality is central for Pamuk’s museum, on the other hand, it emerges from a specific national culture focusing on the life of national elites in the iconic Turkish city of Istanbul. From their point, it can be concluded that the Museum of Innocence in Istanbul is the juxtaposition of transnationality and nationality in the same place.

3. HETEROTOPIA

Michel Foucault’s acclaimed lecture ‘Of Other Spaces’ (*Heterotopias*) in 1967 has been a landmark in spatial studies⁵. In his essay, Foucault developed the concept of heterotopic spaces and defined the term *heterotopia* (Foucault, 1986: 24). Etymologically, heterotopia is a combined term with the Greek prefix ‘hetero’ which means “other” or “different” and ‘topos’ that means “place” or “site”. Thus, as a term, it means a place that juxtaposes different and dissimilar spaces. However, *heterotopia* is a complicated and multifaceted term. In Hook’s words, it is “an unfinished concept” or “a strictly provisional set of ideas” (Hook, 2007: 185). As a concept, *heterotopia* is used in various disciplines such as architecture, urban studies, art, geography, and literature. This proves that *heterotopia* has an interdisciplinary characteristic that is adaptable in many areas. For example, in medical sciences, heterotopia or heterotopic is used as a term which means

⁴ The quotation has been translated by the author of this article. Originated in numbered.

⁵ This study has been inspired by the author’s PhD thesis (Sönmez 2017), Istanbul Aydın University.

“*displacement of an organ or other body part to an abnormal location*” (Weiss, 2015: 187).

Foucault specifies the differences between the two spatial theories – utopia and *heterotopia* - by claiming that a utopia is a basically unreal space, but a *heterotopia* is a real space. Utopias are ideal places with their perfect and desired qualities. Utopia has a character of idealized spatiality, but *heterotopia* is a spatial concept which includes distinct and contrasting realities, alienated (or forced to be alienated) subjects, and the places and people that show resistance to the established power. It is formed by the juxtaposition of disparate systems. In *heterotopia*, the subject (person) cannot judge the objects or the events around him/her in a familiar way and feels as the alienated ‘other’.

Foucault asserts that every culture created its own *heterotopias* throughout its history (Foucault, 1986: 24). Considering the variety of differences in human groups, life-styles, traditions and cultures in the whole world, one can imagine different kinds of *heterotopia*. He also defines ‘six principles’ to explain the practicality of the *heterotopias* in real life. The third principle is applicable for this study as it describes the *heterotopias* as one real place that juxtaposes various incompatible spaces or sites. Foucault exemplifies theatre for the third principle because theatre stage presents several independent places combined in an enclosed location (25). Not only space but also time is juxtaposed in a *heterotopia* as it has been defined in Foucault’s fourth principle. For this principle, Foucault describes *heterotopias* as a place that both slices and links time. He regards time along with place and coins the term ‘heterochronies’ (26). Museums and libraries are exemplified for the fourth principle because they present and represent the past time with concrete objects. As a meaningful principle for this study, the fifth principle is also helpful in understanding what a *heterotopia* is. Foucault underlines that *heterotopias* conserve and isolate the people and it is compulsory to obey certain rules, permissions, and rituals managed by their own mechanism. Prisons or military camps are exemplified for this principle (26).

Inspired by Foucault, Joanne Tompkins emphasises the *heterotopias* especially focused on the heterotopic quality of theatre. She specifies that Foucault’s definition is one of the most appropriate ways to analyse theatre (Tompkins, 2014: 4-5). She also highlights *heterotopia*’s capacity to create an “*intensification of knowledge*” in parallel with Robert Topinka’s argument. Topinka articulates that *heterotopias* are sites that “*make order legible*” and *heterotopology* can be investigated in texts as a collision of forces producing knowledge. He acknowledges *heterotopias* as the sites of knowledge intensification

rather than the sites of resistance in order to expound how *heterotopias* make order legible. He states that:

By juxtaposing and combining many spaces in one site, heterotopias problematize received knowledge by revealing and destabilizing the ground, or operating table, on which knowledge is built. To be sure, this destabilization can offer an avenue for resistance. (Topinka, 2010: 56).

Tompkins states that *heterotopia* has an important role in analysing real and metaphoric spaces conceptually because the fictitious spaces, “*world-making spaces*” in her term, in a performance help us to rethink and rearrange “*space, power, and knowledge*” so that the actual world can be perceived and understood. The audience/reader might recognise other worlds through *heterotopias* (2014, 6-7). This study examines a novel as another genre of literature rather than a play mentioned by Tompkins or Topinka. However, the author also utilizes real and metaphoric spaces for fictitious spaces in his writing even if it is not a performance on the stage. In this sense, Pamuk’s museum can be regarded as a ‘world-making space’ in Tompkins’ term and as a *heterotopia* in Foucault’s term. The reader/visitor might recognize other worlds such as different social patterns and certain rituals in the 1970s by means of this *heterotopia*.

4. DISCUSSION

Sometimes I would forget Time altogether, and nestle into “now” as if it were a soft bed. Kemal (Pamuk, 2009: 246)

‘Oh, please, Kemal Bey, life must go on – you can’t die with the dead.’ Had he done so, I would have explained that the Museum of Innocence was to be a place where one could live with the dead. Kemal (311)

In the novel, Kemal attends Füsün’s family dinners every night nine years after he has broken up with his *fiancée*. During his visits, he collects Füsün’s belongings loaded with his memories from the house that is converted into a museum today. He forgets the ‘time’ conceptually. Moreover, he spends his days quite happily due to his collecting objects because he imagines Füsün part by part through her belongings. In this sense, he does not assess his life in the way of the timeline by Aristotle connecting the ‘now’s, instead, in the way of each intense moments. He advises the readers that life should be perceived through one of intense moments separately. He clarifies it by exemplifying from his life and expresses that having dinner with his lover and her family for nine years can be interpreted as an absolutely nonsense attitude or an obsession if we assume life through Aristotle’s timeline. Contrarily, perceiving life through each moment enables us to assess it as 1,593 happy nights spent on the lover’s dinner table.

One of the characteristics of this museum is to exhibit the real objects of a fictitious occasion. The feeling of reality emerged from the objects is juxtaposed with the fictitious love of Kemal and Füsun. In this sense, the juxtaposition of reality and fiction creates a *heterotopia* according to the third principle by Foucault because it contains two incompatible concepts in one real place. Additionally, in one of his interviews about the museum, Pamuk indicates that the juxtaposition of disparate, contradictory cases and objects is the ground of literature (Pamuk, Masumiyet Müzesi, 2012). He asserts that the objects in the museum produce a world by combining each other just like sentences, details, and pieces of lives produce a novel.

The geographer Yi-Fu Tuan made a distinction in his book titled in *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, underpinning the differences between the notions of “space” and “place” in 1977. For him, space is a broader term encompassing unseen or unknown locations and more incentive than place referring to more familiar, known, lived, and private place. Tuan examines the ways in which people interconnect with space that is related with home, nation, surroundings, architecture, and experiences. “‘Space’ is more abstract than ‘place’. What begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (Tuan, 1977: 6). From this perspective, it can be asserted that the novel/text is a ‘space’, but the museum is a ‘place’. Tuan also specifies ‘place’ as a form of object and adds that “*Places and objects define space, giving it a geometric personality*” (17). Therefore, the Museum of Innocence is the ‘place’ of the novel containing the objects related to the love story and particular period of Istanbul; that is linked to an event or a history (Johnson, 2016: 6). It is a known, private, concrete place and has a geometric personality with its objects. These objects have been embodied by the museum. Johnson also indicates that in French the term of ‘emplacement’ is utilized by Foucault to define heterotopia and this term “*has a sense of both space and place*” (6).

The author produces a museum also combining the perception of traditional and contemporary museology. The Museum of Innocence reflects traditional museology due to searching, collecting, dividing, comparing, classifying, protecting, arranging, and displaying the objects, but also the contemporary museology due to communicating and instructing. It builds communication between the love story in the novel and the objects from a particular period in the past and displays this relationship to the museumgoers. It has a sort of return effect on the visitors that is made an impact by the characters just like a mirror functioning as a heterotopia (Foucault, 1998: 179). The visitors are both passive and active participants observing, feeling, and experiencing the hard times of that

period and Kemal's hopeless love. The focal point in the museum is on the plot of the novel and also the objects of the period intermittently. Moreover, the author's own guiding voice on the headphones creates an impressive atmosphere to perceive the story as a reality.

Additionally, the reader of the novel witnesses a spiritual mirror experience by the protagonist Kemal. In his first visit to Füsün's house after a long time, he learns shockingly Füsün is married. Kemal goes to the bathroom on the top floor. While he is searching Füsün's belongings depressively to collect, he sees himself in the mirror and, from his expression, he recognizes an unsettling disconnection between his body and his soul. He expresses that there has been another universe inside his head looking at the reflection of his face. He realizes the unity of all objects and all the people in the universe. The meaning of life is to feel that unity emerged from the power of love:

I now understood as an elemental fact of life that while I was here, inside my body was a soul, a meaning that all things were made of desire, touch, and love, that what I was suffering was composed of the same elements (154).

For Foucault's fourth principle, a *heterotopia* also juxtaposes the time in one real place like a museum or library. Termed as 'heterochronies' by Foucault, such heterotopias are associated with the parts of time. "*The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time*" (Foucault, 1986: 26). He exemplifies museums and libraries as the *heterotopias* that are compiling time endlessly. He articulates that the idea of accumulating every kind of things from any epochs, any forms, any tastes enclosing in one place belongs to the modern times; however, the idea of establishing a museum or library in the seventeenth century was related to an individual choice (26). The museums as an outcome of the western culture of the nineteenth century represent 'a place of all times' to accumulate time indefinitely. From that point, the Museum of Innocence enables its visitors to experience the 'rediscovery of time' in disparate periods between 1950 and 2000 in Istanbul. This experience supported by the fictitious characters' belongings, in a quite detailed way, constitutes a timeless place; that is a *heterotopia*. Moreover, the protagonist Kemal defines real museums as "*places where Time is transformed into Space*" (Pamuk, 2009: 315).

In the fifth principle, Foucault describes heterotopias as places which cannot be entered freely like a public place. "*Heterotopias always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable*" (Foucault, 1986: 26). Certain permission, gestures, and rituals are the deterministic features of *heterotopia*. Considering a visit to the Museum of Innocence is only

available with a ticket and its visitors are responsible for certain rituals, hence the qualities of *heterotopia*.

The author draws his readers the social, cultural, and political life in Istanbul in the period of 1975-2004 witnessing by Kemal and Füsün's love story. He depicts the local streets, small shops, restaurants, daily life, accommodation and fashion styles - 'on the edge of Europe' - in Istanbul in the past with detailed delineations:

As we listened to light music from that era, we remembered how the Istanbul bourgeoisie had trampled over one another to be the first to own an electric shaver, a can opener, a carving knife, and any number of strange and frightening inventions, lacerating their hands and faces as they struggled to learn how to use them (Pamuk, 2009: 84).

The locality of the novel turns into the "globality" by the means of a museum exhibiting the objects belonging to the local culture in that period. The museumgoers will recognize that the story does not only belong to the lovers – Kemal and Füsün – but also to Istanbul, which is the meeting point of Asia and Europe, the East and the West. In addition, Kemal, at the last section of the novel, thanks to Orhan Pamuk to draw Füsün not damagingly to her pride despite her attitudes and life-style incompatible to the local culture. He articulates that his museum is not only for the Turkish people but all the people of the world:

Yes, that is the crux of it, Orhan Bey – pride. With my museum I want to teach not just the Turkish people but all the people of the world to take pride in the lives they live. [...] if the objects that bring us shame are displayed in a museum, they are immediately transformed into possessions in which to take pride (320).

Visiting many museums, shops, and markets in the world before his museum, Kemal emphasizes the "globality" of the objects around us. In one of his visits to a flea market, he considers:

All these objects – the saltshakers, china dogs, thimbles, pencils, barrettes, ashtrays – had a way of migrating, like the flocks of storks that flew silently over Istanbul twice a year to every part of the world (315).

5. CONCLUSION

The Museum of Innocence, built in 2012, might be considered as the mirror of Pamuk's same-titled novel written in 2008 because the museum-goers have a feeling of being positioned on the inside of the novel. It is also the transformation of space into place. The mimetic spaces and objects experienced by the fictitious characters of the novel are presented in the museum designed in a modernistic appearance. Pamuk tells the love story of Kemal and Füsün by means of the objects both in the novel and in the museum. In one sense, he produces a concrete form of love. The author succeeds in making the fictitious museum at the last part of his novel into reality. Thus, the museum in Istanbul juxtaposes the real life and fiction;

that is, a combination of two contrasting concepts which is once more a quality of *heterotopia*.

Foucault exemplifies museums as heterotopias due to their heterochronic feature, which presents ‘a sort of absolute break’ with people’s ‘traditional time’. He indicates that the heterotopias are organized in a way “*a sort of perpetual and indefinite accumulation of time in an immobile place*” (Foucault, 1986: 26). Consisting of the objects and the traces of social and political life from the period of 1950-2000, the Museum of Innocence provides its visitors an experience and a feeling of an ‘absolute break’ with their present and daily time and also a temporal accumulation. Foucault suggests that “*we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another*” (23). Pamuk’s museum meets such relations that enclose the concepts of real and imaginary, local and global, abstract and concrete, different and same, which cannot cluster in normal circumstances. It is an enclosure of unusual juxtapositions in this way.

As Pamuk expresses in his interview, the Museum of Innocence is the result of his endeavour to indicate the artificiality of the art of novel. It is an experimental work. He articulates that the basis of novel writing is to juxtapose the adverse things (Pamuk, ORHAN PAMUK, 2015). In this context, it can be considered that a novelist utilizes *heterotopia* in his/her art of writing. The transformation of a fictitious house into a real building (museum) is the juxtaposition of reality and fiction. The author’s museum proves that museums exist not only for nations and their history, but also for a person and his story.

REFERENCES

- Bayrak, Özcan, and Tahsin Yaprak, “Üstkurmaca ve Gerçeklik Bakımından Orhan Pamuk’un Masumiyet Müzesi Romanında Postmodern Unsurlar”, *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt: 22, Sayı: 1, Sayfa: 53-64, Elazığ 2012.
- Foucault, Michel, “Of Other Spaces”, *Diacritics*, Trans. Jay Miskowiec, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring, pp. 22-27, The Johns Hopkins University Press, JSTOR, USA 1986.
- , “Different Spaces”, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault*, trans. Robert Hurley, in James D. Faubion (ed.), Vol. 2, pp. 175-185, Penguin, London 1998.
- Hook, Derek, *Foucault, Psychology and The Analytics of Power*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2007.
- Johnson, Peter, “Brief History of the Concept of Heterotopia”, (revised), *Heterotopian Studies*, 2016.

- Pamuk, Orhan, *The Museum of Innocence*, Trans. Maureen Freely, Random House, New York 2009.
- , *Masumiyet Müzesi*, 15. Baskı, Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat, İlk baskı 2008, İstanbul 2018.
- , *Saf ve Düşünceli Romancı*, Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanatı, İstanbul 2011.
- Pamuk, Orhan, "Masumiyet Müzesi", Röportaj, Renkli Haberler, YouTube, 26 Nisan 2012, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hCgvb_extkE&t=59s, (17 May 2018).
- , "ORHAN PAMUK – Bir Kentin İzindeki Romancı", Online video clip, Eccemuzik, 18 Mart 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AHNm0ptOMnA>, (21 May 2018).
- Sönmez, Lebriz, "Politics of Locations: Spatial Images and Imaginings in David Greig's Plays", PhD Diss., İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul 2017.
- Spring, Ulrike, and Johan Schimanski, "The Glocal in Literary Exhibitions: Towards a Transnational Museum of Literature", Presentation at the conference of *Glocal Places of Literature: Production – Distribution – Reception*. June 28-30, The University of Goettingen, Germany 2018.
- Şimşon, Elis, "Masumiyet Müzesi", *Edebiyatta Mimarlık*, Ed. Hikmet Temel Akarsu ve Nevnihal Erdoğan, 229-234, YEM, İstanbul 2016.
- Tompkins, Joanne, *Theatre's Heterotopia – Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space*, Palgrave Macmillan, London 2014.
- Topinka, Robert J, "Foucault, Borges, Heterotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces", *Foucault Studies*, No: 9, September, 54-70, University of Kansas, USA 2010.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, The University of Minnesota, London 1977.
- Weiss, Elizabeth, *Paleopathology in Perspective*, Rowman & Littlefield, London 2015.
- Zariç, Mahfuz, "Postmodernist Yapısal Eleştiri Bağlamında Orhan Pamuk'un Masumiyet Müzesi Adlı Romanı", *Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt: 4, Sayı: 2, 46-75, Batman Üniversitesi, Batman 2014.

