

From City to Text

Seher Özsert

Zirve University, seher.istanbul@hotmail.com

Abstract

Michael De Certeau (1984) introduces the rhetoric of walking by observing Manhattan from the 110th floor of the World Trade Centre by approaching the city as a human text. He claims that totalizing this text in the eye without analyzing closely and without experiencing it is isolation and distancing from life. Certeau (1984) rejects this Panopticon look by urging the necessity of walking on the narrow streets of the city to have unique analyses like free voyage of the reader on the lines of the text. The voyeurs must come down and just jump onto the streets freely to become walkers and readers must be born on the text after the death of author as Roland Barthes (1967) suggests. Only then, the variety of voices created by innumerable walkers in the city and multiple footsteps on the text can compose a chorus by creating a harmony of differences. The chorus of free pedestrians' footsteps involves unique voices depending on their perspectives. Inspired by Certeau (1984) and Barthes (1967), this paper analyzes four different voices of walkers in one of the most magnificent cities in the world, Istanbul or Constantinople in the past. The descriptions of the city are different due to the writers' different point of views, their ideologies and their aims. Their angles, the time they live and their sex have also big effects on their writings. Four texts by four different writers describing Constantinople/Istanbul are discussed in this research: *The Turkish Embassy Letters (1970)* by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *The Lands of the Saracen (1863)* by Bayard Taylor, *The Innocents Abroad (1869)* by Mark Twain and *Istanbul, Memories and the City (2006)* by Orhan Pamuk.

Keywords: City, Text, Walking, Istanbul, Constantinople

Şehirde Metne

Özet

Michael De Certeau (1984), Manhattan'ı Dünya Ticaret Merkezi'nin 110. katından gözlemleyip, şehre bir insan metni gibi yaklaşarak, yürüyüş retorliğini gözler önüne sermiştir. Yakından incelemeyen ve hiçbir deneyim yaşamadan bu metni göz önünde bir bütün olarak ele almak ona göre hayattan soyutlamak ve uzaklaştırmaktır. Certeau (1984), eşsiz bir analize sahip olmak için, metnin dizelerinde okuyucunun özgürce dolaşması gibi şehrin dar sokaklarında yürüyüşün gerekliliğini ısrarla belirterek, bu Panoptik bakışa karşı çıkmaktadır. Gözlemciler aşağıya inmeli ve yürüyüşçü olmak için özgürce sokaklara atlamalıdır ve okuyucular da Roland Barthes'in (1967) ortaya koyduğu gibi yazarın ölümünden sonra metinde doğmalıdırlar. Ancak o zaman, şehirde sayısız yürüşçüler tarafından oluşturulan farklı sesler ve metin üzerindeki birden fazla ayak sesleri farklılıkların ahengini yaratarak bir koro oluşturur. Bu özgür yayaların ayak seslerinin korusu her birinin kendi perspektifine bağlı olarak eşsiz sesler barındırır. Certeau (1984) ve Barthes' dan (1967) esinlenerek, bu çalışma dünyanın en görkemli şehirlerinden biri olan İstanbul'da ya da eski haliyle Konstantinopolis'deki yürüyüşçülerin dört farklı sesini incelemektedir. Şehrin tasvirleri, yazarların farklı bakış açılarından, ideolojilerinden ve maksatlarından dolayı farklılık göstermektedir. Şehri görüş açıları, yaşadıkları zaman ve hatta cinsiyetleri bile yazıları üzerinde büyük etkiye sahiptir. Konstantinopolis/ İstanbul'u tasvir eden dört farklı yazarın dört metni bu araştırmada tartışılmaktadır: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu'nun *The Turkish Embassy Letters* (1970), Bayard Taylor'un *The Lands of the Saracen* (1863), Mark Twain'in *The Innocents Abroad* (1869) and Orhan Pamuk'un *Istanbul, Memories and the City* (2006).
Anahtar Kelimeler: Şehir, Metin, Yürüyüş, İstanbul, Konstantinopolis

Introduction

Michael De Certeau (1984) introduces the rhetoric of walking by observing Manhattan from the 110th floor of the World Trade Center. Certeau (1984) states that this image from the highest point of the city is “a wave of verticals. Its agitation is momentarily arrested by vision. The gigantic mass is immobilized before the eyes” (92). It certainly evokes a pleasure inside the people for feeling themselves in the position of possessing the whole, but he questions this: “To what erotics of knowledge does the ecstasy of reading such a cosmos belong? Having taken a voluptuous pleasure in it, I wonder what is the source of this pleasure of "seeing the whole," of looking down on, totalizing the most immoderate of human texts” (92). From the very beginning, he refers to the city as a human text and totalizing this text in the eye without analyzing closely is a kind of isolation for him. By standing at the top point, one distances himself from the living parts like crowd, voices, ongoing rush of the day etc.; “To be lifted to the summit of the World Trade Center is to be lifted out of the city's grasp... When one goes up there, he leaves behind the mass that carries off and mixes up in itself any identity of authors or spectator” (92). He further analyzes this being lifted over the city through the representations of Renaissance paintings in which no human eye could observe the scenery from that perspective but only a solar eye could witness. He depicts this vision as a voyeur observing the masses from a celestial eye:

His elevation transfigures him into a voyeur. It puts him at a distance. It transforms the bewitching world by which one was “possessed” into a text that lies before one's eyes. It allows one to read it, to be a solar Eye, looking down like a god. The exaltation of a scopic and gnostic drive: the fiction of knowledge is related to this lust to be a viewpoint and nothing more. (Certeau, 1984, p. 92)

This power structure of controlling the people from a watching tower is a reminder of Michel Foucault's idea of Panopticon. Foucault presents this control tower in the middle of a circle-structured building divided into tiny cells and then there is a person in each who is not aware of being watched. There are the residents of the city in Certeau's (1984) analysis who are not aware of the voyeur over them. However,

Certeau (1984) rejects this power structure of Panopticon and he claims that there must be a fall from top to bottom no matter how difficult it is:

Must one finally fall back into the dark space where crowds move back and forth, crowds that, though visible from on high, are themselves unable to see down below? An Icarian fall. On the 110th floor, a poster, sphinx-like, addresses an enigmatic message to the pedestrian who is for an instant transformed into a visionary: It's hard to be down when you're up. (Certeau, 1984, p. 92)

Certeau (1984) uses the allusion to the story of Daedalus and his son Icarus who does not listen his father's warning while escaping from the labyrinths of Crete. Daedalus constructs wings from feathers and wax, and he warns his son not to stay close to the sun. But the agitation of flying drives Icarus to ignore his words. While flying down, he realizes that he has no feathers left; he falls on the river and drowns. The difficulty and at the same time excitement of falling down might bring such disasters, but it is necessary to break down the idols of hierarchal power structure and declare freedom against the rules. Icarus enjoys his choice of falling and creates his own destiny, like the same, Certeau (1984) encourages the reader to come down and just jump into the streets freely. Coming down turns the voyeurs' into walker who can live the real experiences of the city: "The ordinary practitioners of the city live 'down below,' below the thresholds at which visibility begins. They walk an elementary form of this experience of the city; they are walkers, Wandersmiinner, whose bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban 'text' they write without being able to read it" (93).

Certeau (1984) resembles these walkers to lovers in each other's arms in terms of the blindness of knowledge they have while experiencing the space. He focuses on the variety of voices created by innumerable walkers in the city and he uses a really nice metaphor by claiming that the multiple footsteps compose a chorus creating a harmony of differences:

Their story begins on ground level, with footsteps. They are myriad, but do not compose a series. They cannot be counted because each unit has a qualitative character: a style of tactile apprehension and kinesthetic appropriation. Their swarming mass is an innumerable collection of singularities. Their intertwined paths give their shape to spaces. They weave

places together. In that respect, pedestrian movements form one of these “real systems whose existence in fact makes up the city”. (Certeau, 1984, p. 97) As Certeau (1984) declares, these varied pedestrian footsteps form the city life by creating experiences in each corner. Freedom of choices in the city while walking is his main concern and he states that these walkers try random choices of roads rather than being stuck to city maps or governmental restrictions. Like Icarus, pedestrians also enjoys their exploration of the city through short-cuts and accessing the areas of their own selection:

The walker transforms each spatial signifier into something else. And if on the one hand he actualizes only a few of the possibilities fixed by the constructed order (he goes only here and not there), on the other he increases the number of possibilities (for example, by creating shortcuts and detours) and prohibitions (for ex ample, he forbids himself to take paths generally considered accessible or even obligatory). He thus makes a selection. The user of a city picks out certain fragments of the statement in order to actualize them in secret. (Certeau, 1984, p. 98)

Certeau (1984) states that the walker creates a kind of discreteness with his choices. The chorus of walkers’ footsteps involves unique voices depending on their perspectives. In this respect, four different voices of walkers can be analyzed to prove Certeau’s (1984) argument. Certeau (1984) observes Manhattan as an example, but his spatial theory can be applied to any city. This paper analyzes one of the most magnificent cities in the world, Istanbul or Constantinople in the past. People have written many different things about the city of Constantinople/Istanbul for many centuries. The reason of course is its being the motherland or intersection of many nations and cultures. Istanbul’s geographical position which seems to connect Asia and Europe is not the reason for its being one of the most famous cities in the world, but there are also political reasons. Their descriptions of the city are different due to the writers’ different point of views, their ideologies and their aims. Their angles, the time they live and their sex have also big effects on their writings. Four texts by four different writers describing Constantinople/Istanbul are discussed: *The Turkish Embassy Letters (1970)* by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *The Lands of the Saracen (1863)* by Bayard Taylor, *The Innocents Abroad (1869)* by Mark Twain and *Istanbul, Memories and the City (2006)* by Orhan Pamuk.

The Four Walkers of Constantinople/Istanbul

Montagu (1970) is the wife of an ambassador in Ottoman Empire in the middle of 18th century and she writes her experiences of the city in her letters. In her text, she describes what she sees as she walks through Constantinople. She uses her physical presence, her experiences together with the history and landmarks of the city. Actually, she has the privilege to see many places thanks to her husband's position and she states this in one of her letters, "...for there is no possibility for a Christian to live easily under this government but by the protection of an ambassador..." (Montagu, 1970, 80). She has the opportunity to have distinct experiences by the help of her husband's political power. As she has no readerly purpose, she writes about her own realities and her text is a writerly text.

The representation of Constantinople in Montagu's (1970) letters composes a really nice picture. She likes the city and the people, because she has good experiences in this country. She mentions in her letters that she tries to break down the bad images about the city and the people. She talks about a plague and indicates that: "Those dreadful stories you have heard of the plague have very little foundation in truth" (80). Then by giving herself as a witness, she explains it is not so terrible as it is commonly told. The city is represented as very developed in medical field. She trusts an experiment done by the doctors in Constantinople and makes us believe by giving the information about her son that she tries this on him. She also compares Constantinople to England by stating its being a more developed city in science and she claims to introduce a new invention to her people: "I am patriot enough to take pains to bring this useful invention into fashion in England and I should not fail to write some of our doctors very particularly about it if I knew anyone of them that I thought had virtue enough to destroy such a considerable branch of their revenue for the good of mankind (81/82). She attains herself helpful by being capable of contributing England's development in medical area with this new invention.

Montagu (1970) later continues to show the outside and inside structure of the buildings in Constantinople. She uses the metaphor of its being like a woman that is closed or covered to the outside world but holding much more beauty inside. The proof is that people try to decorate the inside parts of their homes than the outside. She talks about the two parts inside the houses: harem and men's apartment. She was privileged to enter the harem, which makes her different from the authors who had

written about the city before, “You will be surprised at an account so different from what you have been entertained by the common voyage writers, who are very fond of speaking of what they don’t know” (Montagu, 1970, 85). According to her, as she always talks about in her letters, she is the only and the first one to observe the city from the inside of the houses. The writers before her had talked about outside features of the city or inside without knowing it exactly. When Montague (1970) was invited to the Grand Vizier’s harem, she became so proud of herself once more. She indicates this in her letters: “I was invited to dine with the Grand Vizier’s Lady, and it was with a great deal of pleasure I prepared myself for an entertainment which was never given before to any Christian” (86). She was so pleased to be the first one to have such a big honor. She describes the Grand Vizier’s Lady by showing how kind Turkish people are as opposed to the prejudices:

And to that behavior so full of grace and sweetness, such easy motions, with an air so majestic, yet free from stiffness of affectation that I am persuaded, could she be suddenly transported upon the most polite throne of Europe nobody would think her other than born and bred to be a queen, though educated in a country we call barbarous. To say all in a word, our most celebrated English beauties would vanish near her. (Montagu, 1970,p. 89)

It seems like a description about the lady but it tells many things about the city, too. As a part of the country they call ‘barbarous’, Constantinople is full of kind people and she proves that these ideas are not true. She again breaks the stereotypes about the country that has been known as barbarous among other western people. She makes everything she could do in order to show how beautiful the city is in reality. She wants to be the person who tells the real beauties of Constantinople. She talks about the landmarks of Constantinople like Pera, Tophane, Galata, Seven Hills, and St Sophia etc. to give the authority in her writing:

Our palace is in Pera, which is no more a suburb of Constantinople than Westminster is a suburb to London...One part of our house shows us the port, the city and the seraglio and the distant hills of Asia, perhaps altogether the most beautiful prospect in the world. A certain French author says that Constantinople is twice as large as Paris. (Montagu, 1970, p. 99)

She compares Constantinople to other European cities like Paris and England by stating that it is better than them in a way. Montagu (1970) admires the city and this makes her description of Constantinople more superior to other cities in the world.

Taylor (1863) also writes about Constantinople as a traveler. He is a journalist, so he writes for a living by thinking what the reader wants from him while writing. Different from Montagu's (1970), his text is reader oriented. He does not give so much attention to the realities but he tries to make a good writing that will catch the western readers' attention easily. He puts a distance between himself and the city from the very beginning. He comes from the sea and sees the panoramic image of the city as a whole. It seems like a dream city between clouds: "It was too faint and distant and dazzling to be substantial. It was like one of those imaginary cities which we build in a cloud fused in the light of the setting sun" (Taylor, 1863, 6). When the readers read such a sentence, they instantly draw this dreamlike city's picture in their minds, which fulfills the expectations of the readers. He also uses insubstantialisation in his text; that is, it is a city that you cannot touch. His approach is very different from Montagu (1970), as she comes from Adrianople to Constantinople by land. She could not see the city as a whole, so she could not describe it like a dream city, she tells her experiences as she progresses.

Taylor (1863) talks about almost the same places as the other writers did such as Pera, Galata, St Sophia, Sultan Achmed, and Golden Horn. As he approaches the city, his view narrows and these places are seen more clearly. He writes about those most typical places and famous buildings to make his text attractive to western audience. As journalism also includes some exaggerated information, he reports the things that he is not sure but whispered from somewhere else. Especially, he uses oriental features to catch people's attention. He uses religion as a means of comparison and gives much information about the times that Islam has most powerful signs on the city. He chooses Ramadan and Bairam to show some Islamic and cultural attractions during these periods. He talks about The Sheikh el-Islam about whom western readers do not know anything, which would be an interesting knowledge.

Taylor (1863) mentions Montagu's (1970) writing in his text by comparing a specific place from her description and what he finds out actually. He was disappointed because he could not find what he had expected:

The historic interest of these spots is familiar to all, nor; with one exception, have their natural beauties been exaggerated by travelers. This exception is the village of Belgrade, over which Mary Montagu went into raptures, and set the fashion for tourists ever since. I must confess to having been woefully disappointed. (p. 20)

He thinks that some travelers exaggerate what they see including Montagu (1970). She describes everyplace with vast admiration, so it might be too much for some places. Although he comes from the orient, dresses and lives like a Turk while he is working in the orient, Taylor (1863) has no admiration or love for the city and the people, and thus he can make negative judgments about the city. He reflects the feeling that he does not like living in that city, it is only a duty for him.

At that time, America was preparing to take the power and they were looking outside for new territories. Therefore, Taylor (1863) hopes Constantinople will not continue as an Islamic City but soon they take the power. Ottoman Empire's approaching its end makes this hope more powerful. He states that: "I, for one, rejoice that, so long as the religion of Islam exists (and yet, may its time be short!), no Christian model can shape its houses of worship" (Taylor, 1863, 21). He is talking about the Oriental architecture of the Mosques, but the reader can understand his desire for the end of Islam.

When Montagu (1970) and Taylor's (1863) writings are compared, it is obvious that the description of the city is different from the perspectives of a woman and a man. Montagu (1970) talked to the most powerful women in the Empire, she entered harem and she observed the lives of women; however Taylor (1863) talked to the most powerful men, he was with Pashas or some other men and he showed the city from men's angle. Taylor (1863) approaches his observations as a man not an objective writer. He mentions The Sultan's having five hundred ladies in his harem and his having every right on them, but he does not pay any attention to women's lives.

Twain (1869) has a different representation of Constantinople when compared to the first two authors and he draws a negative image. He had had a purpose before writing about this city, so he saw what he had wanted and showed them as the reality. He tells his purpose at the beginning of the book: "notwithstanding it is only a record of a picnic, it has a purpose, which is, to suggest to the reader how he would be likely

to see Europe and the East if he looked at them with his own eyes instead of the eyes of those who travelled in those countries before him” (Twain, 1869, 1). As he states in the preface of the book, he went to search by himself to find out whether Europe was wonderful, as it had been told. He wanted to see the realities with his own eyes, not from the nostalgic descriptions of previous writers. According to the common discourse, Europe was perfect in every way, had power, education etc. and he stayed against it by wishing to witness with his own eyes. He is a realistic writer who does not talk about exaggerations or nostalgias. The reality is bad, ugly for him; that’s why he is so rude in his writing style.

Twain (1869) is challenging the discourse; he is deliberately rude by trying to insult the people and making fun of them together with the land. The Americans were trying to create a national soul at that time and he was uncomfortable due to the situation they were in. That was the reason why he went to so many places such as Holy Land, Egypt, Scotland, Italy, Constantinople etc. He searched his origins, his history, culture and identity like other American people. They were trying to find and answer to the question ‘Who are we?’, so they began to look around.

Twain (1869) also talks about what other writers talked before. He compares New York to Constantinople: “This great city contains a million inhabitants, but so narrow are its streets, and so crowded together are its houses, that it does not cover much more than half as much ground as New York” (Twain, 1869, 358). He could not change the geographical form of the city, so he could not challenge with typical descriptions. However, when he starts to describe the city and the people deeply, he begins to be offensive. He mentions about the people in Constantinople: “if you would see the very heart and home of cripples and human monsters, both, go straight to Constantinople” (361). He gives such a bad representation of the city portraying it to be full of monster-like people.

Actually, it is true that he came to the city by keeping prejudices in his mind. He aimed at writing as many bad things as possible, because he looked from a negative point of view. He saw different things that a foreigner could not see at first sight. For instance, when he took a boat, he was not interested in the beauty of the sea or he did not enjoy the scene; but instead he calculated unnecessary things about the boat and saw negative things about the boatmen: “This kind of boating is calculated to drive an impatient man mad in a week. The boatmen are the awkwardest, the

stupidest, and the most unscientific on earth, without question” (358). Any tourist in his shoes would most probably take pictures or would enjoy the time on the boat. This is an example showing his hatred and bad feelings about the city:

Every where was dirt, and dust, and dinginess, and gloom; every where were signs of a hoary antiquity, but with nothing touching or beautiful about it; every where those groups of fantastic pagans; overhead the gaudy mosaics and the web of lamb-ropes- nowhere was there any thing to win one’s love or challenge his admiration. (Twain, 1869, p. 364)

The last representation of Constantinople, today’s Istanbul, is by a Turkish author Pamuk (2006). Istanbul is his own city in which he has grown up and he has many experiences from his childhood. He describes the city in a deeper way by touching its spirituality. As a Muslim author, he introduces the spirituality of the city. He tries to show that there are some things deeper rather than the outside shape, which makes his representation of Istanbul different from the others. While other foreign authors talk about the landmarks, buildings or similar outside features of Istanbul, Pamuk (2006) focuses on the soul of the city. He connects himself to the city and he is emotionally bound up with it through his memories. He describes the city with the word ‘hüzün’, which means a deep melancholy and he observes that this feeling is shared by the community, not only by himself:

What I am trying to describe now is not the melancholy of Istanbul, but the hüzün in which we see ourselves reflected, the hüzün we absorb with pride and share as a community. To feel this hüzün is to see the scenes, evoke the memories, in which the city itself becomes the very illustration, the very essence, of hüzün. (Pamuk, 2006, p. 84)

His analysis of the city stands to make the reader to feel this emotion. He draws the pictures of common things in Istanbul, but these observations are not only his personal experiences. His memories are related to everyone who lives there, in that culture, “...the hüzün is so dense that you can almost touch it, almost see it spread like a film over its people and its landscapes” (89). He feels this hüzün in everywhere and he believes to share this feeling with all the citizens. Pamuk (2006) is different from other authors, because he grows in that culture and he knows many specific things that a foreigner may not notice. He allows Turkish readers who share the same culture to feel very close to his descriptions. For instance, he notices a very interesting

point: “the holy messages spelt out in lights between the minarets of mosques on holidays that are missing letters where the bulbs have burned out” (86). This situation is a small detail while describing a city, but he catches it. Such specific examples make the residents smile by letting them to think ‘that is right, I know, this always happens’.

Cultural elements make his book more successful for the domestic reader than the other authors’ writings who are foreign to that culture. In one part, he talks about the heroes in the old Turkish films, which are so connected to the issue of the *hüzün*. These characters reflect the soul of the city with their melancholic feelings and experiences: “Just as in the old black-and-white films, even in the most affecting and authentic love stories, if the setting is Istanbul it’s clear from the start that the *hüzün* the boy has carried with him since birth will lead the story into melodrama” (Pamuk, 2006, 95). This is so true that, Turkish audience guesses the ends of the many films by looking only a few scenes or only by looking the artist acting in them. These films basically tell similar stories and they reflect the *hüzün* of Istanbul. There are some characters such as *Küçük Emrah*, *Ferdi Tayfur* or *Orhan Gencebay*, who always suffer in the streets of Istanbul. They become the stereotypes of *hüzün* connected to Istanbul. As Pamuk (2006) argues clearly, Istanbul gives an arabesque and sad image to the people living there.

The perception of Istanbul is mostly because of the way the people want to see it. Turkish people get used to living with this melancholy from their birth. Pamuk (2006) compares Genevans to Turkish people, which show Turks’ detachment to the ruins or the misery. When someone asks an address, Genevans describes the simplest object, a street pole, like “that elegant, magnificent bronze fountain” (91), while an Istanbul resident calls a hamam as “the ruin you’ve just passed” (91). The people in Istanbul carry this melancholy by choice, not like a burden but like an honor. There is a common type of character called ‘poor but proud man’ in many Turkish films referring to this melancholic lifestyle.

Conclusion

The representation of Constantinople/Istanbul is very different from the perspectives of four different authors. Montagu (1970) draws a beautiful picture about the city, she tries to show the good sides of the city in every way. She shows the hospitality of the most powerful ladies in the city and shows their good attitudes

towards her. She sees herself as the first Christian to witness inside lives of Muslims. She tries to change the prejudices of Western people about Turks by showing that they are actually good people. On the other hand, Taylor (1863) has not such a love for the city or for the people instead he does not like them even though he lives very similar to them. He writes this just for his job as a journalist traveler. He writes according to the expectations of western people. He draws a picture of Constantinople as a dream city and gives some landmarks about it in order to take the reader's attention. He even challenges the information Montagu (1970) gave before. Contrary to those two writers, Twain (1869) writes neither for showing the beauties of the city nor for the expectation of the readers; he writes to challenge all discourse about Constantinople. He writes from a bad point of view and he tries to show as many negative sides as he can. Pamuk's (2006) description of Istanbul is very different from those three, because he touches the spirituality of the city. He describes his motherland, so he is detached to the city he is writing about. Besides these four authors' depictions of Constantinople/Istanbul, there are numerous different representations about it. This is both because of Istanbul's being a famous city and also because of every person's having different point of views while looking at the city. Even if hundreds of pages were written about Istanbul, it would not be enough to show the real aspects of such a city. These different representations of Istanbul prove that Certeau's (1984) argument is right in terms of the various perspectives of walkers changing according to the time, the circumstances and intentions:

Walking affirms, suspects, tries out, transgresses, respects, etc., the trajectories it "speaks." All the modalities sing a part in this chorus, changing from step to step, stepping in through proportions, sequences, and intensities which vary according to the time, the path taken and the walker. These enunciatory operations are of an unlimited diversity. They therefore cannot be reduced to their graphic trail. (p. 99)

The chorus of walkers presents colorful footsteps to the reader and creates multiple options by jumping into the city to have unique experiences. The city can be accepted as a text and the walkers are the readers as Certeau (1984) states, "A migrational, or metaphorical, city thus slips into the clear text of the planned and readable city" (93). There are varieties of interpretations by different readers depending on the angle they look at the text. Roland Barthes (1967) puts the emphasis on the reader not the writer

of the text in the aim of sustaining the freedom of walking for the readers on the text. He kills the author and celebrates the birth of the reader. He states that the text does not consist of the message of the God, the author, but includes a space of many dimensions, including various kind of writing, reflecting thousands sources of culture. Furthermore, nothing is the same for all readers and everything is flowing in a constant change like the city, the walker, the conditions etc. As Barthes (1967) states, the only stability is the multiplicity of experiences without any restrictions on the text:

A text consists of multiple writings, issuing from several cultures and entering into dialogue with each other, into parody, into contestation; but there is one place where this multiplicity is collected, united, and this place is not the author, as we have hitherto said it was, but the reader: the reader is the very space in which are inscribed, without any being lost, all the citations a writing consists of; the unity of a text is not its origin, it is in its destination; but this destination can no longer be personal; the reader is a man without history, without biography, without psychology; he is only that someone who holds gathered into a single field all the paths of which the text is constituted.

(Barthes, 1967, p. 6)

City and text are similar in that they both allow walkers or readers to have limitless experiences. Comparing the four writers Montagu (1970), Taylor (1863), Twain (1869) and Pamuk (2006) in their descriptions of Constantinople/Istanbul, one can clearly identify the variety of experiences of these walkers. They all touch some landmarks such as Pera, Galata or St Sophia like any observer of the city. These stereotypical places are always mentioned in many texts although they were written in different centuries. In spite of some similarities related to the landmarks of Constantinople, these four authors approach the city from different perspectives and there are huge differences depending on their experiences. For instance, Twain (1869) is different from the other authors while describing the city in that he represents the city in a very negative way. He assumes that he knows everything and the others do not know the realities, and he states to prove the accuracy of his argument. There are also crucial differences between Pamuk's (2006) book and the other texts. He writes in a very different century compared to the others and he connects himself to the soul of the city in which he lives. He lives and tries to feel the city from childhood, which creates a big difference among the other foreign authors. In Montagu (1970), Taylor

(1863) and Twain's (1869) representation of the city, Turkish readers feel a distance between the author and Constantinople; however in Pamuk's (2006) writing they can see both the physical and the emotional unity of the writer and the city. As a Turkish citizen, I also feel so close to the descriptions that Pamuk (2006) makes, even I share similar memories. One cannot ignore that gender, time, ideology, age and purpose of an author have crucial importance in representing a city, because they all create multiple perspectives of analyses

Bibliography

Barthes, R. (1967). "The Death of the Author" Trans. Richard Howard. Aspen 5. 6. Web. 3
January 2014.

Certeau, M. D. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. California:
University of California Press.

Montagu, L. M. (1970). *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*. New York:
AMS Press.

Pamuk, O. (2006). *Istanbul. Memories and the City*. London: Vintage.

Taylor, B. (1863) *The Lands of the Saracen*. GP. Putnam: New York.

Twain, M. (1869). *The Innocents Abroad*. American Publishing Company: Hartford.