

Review of: "Mathematical and Linguistic Characterization of Orhan Pamuk's Nobel Works"

Dominique Raymond

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article offers an original angle of analysis for literary critics, who rarely venture to use mathematical tools and concepts to produce fruitful analyses. However, especially if we want to broaden our readership, we should first justify the corpus: why were these 4 novels by Pamuk chosen? What's more, it's astonishing to compare the musical note to the letter as much as to the word, as if these were two equivalent linguistic elements, which is obviously false. It would be far more accurate to announce in the introduction the succession of analyses: letters first, then words, and to say why this is so. Similarly, while it's not wrong to assert "the similarity of music and literature, both artistic and structural", this argument alone, without proof, example, or justification of any kind, is open to criticism. The article would benefit from solidifying its grounding in previous work, drawing, for example, on this research by Stanislav Drozd et al. "Quantifying Origin and Character of Long-Range Correlations in Narrative Texts," *Information Sciences*, vol. 331 (2016), pp. 32-44, the work of Anne-Sophie Bories, or this issue of the journal *Études littéraires*, *Littérature et mathématiques : dérivées variables*, vol. 50 no 2, 2021. Finally, it is difficult to subscribe to this conclusion: the "quantitative analysis of Pamuk's novels provides different information from the qualitative analysis of his corpus", since it remains arduous to find traces of the qualitative analysis in the article.