be considered the progenitor of this new literary strategy.

Lucas H. Harriman
University of Miami

Reply:

After reading my interview with Orhan Pamuk, Lucas Harriman has concluded that the word "disform" is "an apparent mistake in transcription" resulting from "the author's Turkish accent." Harriman writes that Pamuk should be "offered the choice" to respond to the interview. It is important, first of all, to speak about the process by which this interview reached its final, published form. Not only did Pamuk sign an Institutional Review Board consent form at the time of the interview, he also had to review the final version of the interview and sign an additional release form, prepared by *PMLA*. In my e-mail correspondence with him, he expressed his pleasure with the final version of the interview. It would be naive to assume that Pamuk, who has had his fair share of trouble with interviews in the past, did not bother to examine this one, let alone glance at its title, which, as Harriman points out, contains the word in question.

Harriman attributes this error to the author's accent—an assumption I find condescending and somewhat offensive. As a Turk myself, I can attest to the fact that both Pamuk and I are able to differentiate between "dis" and "this." And why question only this one word if mispronunciation or "mangled" transcription is an issue? The implied reason for Harriman's suspicion here, it seems, is the notion that "disform" (which Harriman incorrectly labels a "neologism") is too difficult a word for Pamuk to use. But Pamuk—a Nobel laureate in literature—is perfectly capable of employing surprising and ambitious vocabulary.

More intriguing here is Harriman's inadvertent engagement with a much larger, theoretical issue: dialogic interactions. For Bakhtin, for example, verbal "utterances" gain their meaning not merely from authorial intent but from the way they respond to previous utterances, from the speech genre, and from the author's position. Harriman insists that Pamuk's meaning "seems obvious," but it is not: perhaps Pamuk was picking up on my use of the word "dismantling" in the question (177); perhaps he wished to respond to an academic question with academic vocabulary. We cannot know, which is why critics from Aristotle to Žižek have focused on the differences in construction between oral and written meaning. All we know is that by giving consent to the text as it was printed, Pamuk opened up questions about formal textual meaning. Harriman laments that "disform" could have been a "provocative" term, but he is also concerned about all the silly things his colleagues will do with it. So perhaps the word can be seen as legitimately provocative after all.

Finally, Harriman is troubled by my "leading questions," which he suspects might be an attempt "to characterize the Nobel Prize–winner as a formal subversive." As to asking leading questions, some might say this is the point of conducting an interview. As to the idea that Pamuk is a formal subversive, I confess that I would find it difficult to argue that he is not one. Anyone familiar with the tradition of the Turkish novel before Pamuk could hardly consider *My Name Is Red* or *White Castle* anything other than revolutionary. Disforming is what he does.

Z. Esra Mirze
University of Tampa

Wordsworth the Environmentalist?

To the Editor:

Given the nature of the times, it is not surprising to find critics who depict Wordsworth as a "green" poet. Adam Potkay characterizes him this way in "Wordsworth and the Ethics of Things" (123.2 [2008]: 390–404). Potkay asserts that Wordsworth's poetry is EPA approved because it gives human beings and things equal status. But arguing equality makes no sense, for it implies that people and other things have an obligation to be ethical toward each other. If that were true, hurricanes, earthquakes, epidemics, and bear attacks on humans would have

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900168889 Published online by Cambridge University Press