

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Knowledge as Perspective: A Genealogical Study of Pamuk's *My Name is Red*

**A Thesis Submitted to Central Department of
English in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

By

Hari Prasad Bhattarai

Central Department of English

Tribhuvan University

Kirtipur

February 2010

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Hari Prasad Bhattarai has completed his thesis on **Knowledge as Perspective: A Genealogical Study of Pamuk's *My Name is Red*** under my supervision. He carried out this research paper from June 2009 to February 2010. I hereby recommend his thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

Mr. Harihar Gyawali

Supervisor

Date: -----

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Approval

This thesis, entitled **Knowledge as Perspective: A Genealogical Study of Pamuk's *My Name is Red***, submitted to Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Hari Prasad Bhattarai, has been approved by the undersigned members of research committee.

Members of the research committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head of
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am particularly grateful to my thesis supervisor Mr. Harihar Gyawali, a lecturer of Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur for his priceless supervision on my research.

I am equally gratified to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the head of Central Department of English, TU, Kirtipur, for his patronage to complete this study. Likewise, my respectable teachers Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Dr. Sanjeev Upreti, Saroj Ghimire, Pushpa Acharya and Ghanashyam Bhandari are praiseworthy for their kind suggestions and help to conduct this research.

How can I be silent without honoring my parents who are encouraging me at every step of life? Therefore, I express the inexpressible respect to my father Narahari Bhattarai and mother Padma Kumari Bhattarai. My elder brothers Shanti and Ramesh; and younger brothers Krishna and Ishwor are eligible to share the credit of my study.

Finally, all my friends including Mitra Dev (Santosh), Ishwor, Om, Ananta, Surya, Prithvi, Sudan, Arjun, deserve thanks for their company whether to collect materials or to discuss ideas.

Hari Prasad Bhattarai

February 2010

Abstract

This research is concerned with Orhan Pamuk's use of multiple character-narrators in his fictional work *My Name is Red*. The character-narrators express various perspectives regarding different issues to aid the new historical notion of "knowledge as perspective". Characters like Black, Beloved Uncle, Shekure, Husret Hoja, Butterfly, Olive, Dog, Tree, Gold Coin and so on opine ideas countering the canonical notions regarding truth, knowledge, history and so on. Husret Hoja's conception regarding coffee that it is devil's ruse and Gold Coin's unveiling the secret that it is not pure as supposed by others but counterfeit force us to find out causes behind their expressions. Similarly, the recurrent account of historical characters and their exposition of the negative aspects of the past in a fictional work entice the readers to question history. Sultan Murat III's passion for power and miniaturist painters' treacheries to be in a better position unveil the dark side of history to support Nietzschean notion that history is also the record of crimes, passions and follies. Therefore, this research contends to prove that truth, knowledge, history and power are nothing but the definition of power holders, which are one-sided, subjective and changeable. Genealogical study of these factors, after all, certifies that history is subjective, power is universal and all pervasive; and knowledge and truth are mere constructs.

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Chapter I. <i>My Name is Red: An Amalgam of Perspectives</i>	1-8
Chapter II. The Other Side of History, Truth and Knowledge	9-25
Chapter III. Knowledge as Perspective: A Genealogical Study of	
<i>Pamuk's My Name is Red</i>	26-45
Chapter IV. Multiplicity of Truth and Knowledge	46-48
Works Cited	49-50

Chapter I: Introduction

My Name is Red: An Amalgam of Perspectives

My Name is Red (2001) is a magnum opus of Orhan Pamuk (born on June 7, 1952), a novelist from Turkey, which claimed a well famous International IMPAC Dublin Award in 2003. In this text, Pamuk gives voice to each and every character to intensify the objective of his writing. He has used multiple plots and character-narrators.

The multiplicity of plots and narrators, in *My Name is Red*, creates problems. Pamuk has used various characters including images, animals and humans. His style of giving voice to each character reminds us of heteroglossia that gets textualized in the novel. A Corpse speaks in the first chapter and this unusual narration continues in further chapters. Like Corpse, Dog, Tree, Horse, Gold Coin, Death, Red and Satan get chance to develop the plot further. However, Black, Beloved Uncle, Shekure, Butterfly, Esther, Master Osman etc. are the usual character-narrators. There is politics behind using multiple character-narrators and non-human characters. Gold Coin, a non-human character-narrator, narrates that it is not pure but counterfeit. However, other persons like Stork and Butterfly treat it as pure gold coin. Even the readers consider it as pure but the mystery unveils when the coin speaks itself.

Shekure, in anger, discloses the truth that his father Enishte Effendi shares bed with his slave girl Hayriye. Until she disclosed this fact, it was another truth that Enishte is a renowned moral artist. So, problem arises regarding the truth. Which condition, before disclosing the fact or after disclosing the fact, is true? Should we believe Shekure who tells something in anger and recants later? Likewise, need we to believe on Husret Hoja, who believes coffee as devil's ruse? Is coffee really a devil's ruse or is it just an expression guided by religious preoccupation? What about the dog,

which considers humans less rational than beasts? Therefore, we can deduce that expressions are the result of socio-politico-historical situatedness. Behind declaring something, there is the role of culture, society, politics, history etc. These factors convert truth and knowledge to mere perspectives.

Butterfly, a miniaturist painter, claims to be the best artist. Likewise, both Olive and Stork also claim to be the best. So, it becomes very difficult to know the best. Whom should we believe- Butterfly, Stork or Olive? Or, can there be many 'best' artists? Similarly, the Murderer acts as if he is grieved most by the death of Elegant Effendi and even the other people believe him. But, the murderer himself says that he is pretending of grieving so that others won't suspect him as the murderer. So, what about those characters who are unaware of this fact. Are not they believing on something as true which is not exactly?

When all the miniaturists run behind money and power, we are obliged to consider that money and power are determining factors of everything. Probably, Sultan Murat III, the imperialist king of Ottoman Empire of late sixteenth century, commissions Enishte Effendi to illustrate a book in Venetian style so that he could impress the Westerners to elongate the age of his rule. The depiction of Sultan Murat III and his ruling period as setting of the novel, presenting of Master Osman, a historical man, as a character; and mentioning and describing many historical events, persons and places to forward the plot confuse the readers. Whether we are reading a fictional work or historical document, we get turmoil sometimes. Even the autobiographical, social and religious aspects of the author add this confusion. However, Feride Cicekoglu reads this novel as the confrontation of 'Word' and 'Image'. In his essay "A Pedagogy of Two Ways of Seeing: Confrontation of "Word and Image" in *My Name is Red*", he writes:

What is unique is the role that the confrontation of different traditions of painting, Western and Islamic, and that between "word and image" play in the resolution of the love story and the solving of the mystery. The tradition of miniature painting, the illumination and illustration of narrative texts, which legitimized itself as the art of the book, may be interpreted as a way of dealing with the iconoclastic tradition of Islam. In this context, images are not seen as things-in-themselves but they are treated as "footnotes" even when the image seems to dominate the written word on the page. Image making becomes an extension of the text, rather than an independent art. (2)

Cicekoglu's attention gets attracted by the images depicted in the book. He considers those images as the footnotes for understanding miniaturist paintings and Islamic tradition. However, he is much interested to strike words with images and find their position. He finds images much dominant than words. So, he describes this novel as the expression of images. Unlike Cicekoglu, Can V. Yeginsu reads this novel as the national allegory that binds two continents (Europe and Asia) in which Turkey, the motherland of Pamuk, is divided. Yeginsu writes, "After making some introductory remarks about Orhan Pamuk's work, I'd like to focus, in particular, on his mesmerizing narrative of a country that not only unites two continents but functions as a *tertium quid* veering between the world's two dominant belief systems" (1).

Marc. Kloszewski in the Library Journal critiques this novel by relating it to its religious background. He remarks:

In addition, this is both an examination of the way figurative art is viewed within Islam and a love story that demonstrates the tricky mechanics of marriage laws. Award-winning Turkish author Pamuk

[. . .] creatively casts the novel with colorful characters (including such entities as a tree and a gold coin) and provides a palpable sense of atmosphere of the Ottoman Empire that history and literary fans will appreciate. (234)

Kloszewski, moreover, is interested in viewing the novel by relating its form to its content. He mentions Pamuk's figurative tallancy and aligns it with Islam and Ottoman Empire of sixteenth century. Being different to Kloszewski, J. Stefan Cole focuses on the cultural aspects of the text. He mentions that Pamuk's *My Name is Red* is the amalgam of eastern and western cultures. He opines, "'To God belongs the East and the West," the book quotes the Koran, and this suggests its polemic: With the Renaissance the historical tide turns finally and forever away from the arts of the East. A cultural clash that apparently echoes today" (13).

However, Freely Maureen is much interested in the comparative study of Pamuk's *My Name is Red* with Umberto Eco's *The Name of the Rose*. He writes "The interweaving of human and philosophical intrigue [of *My Name is Red*] is very much as I remember it in *The Name of the Rose*, as is the slow, dense beginning pace. The two titles are close enough to suggest that Pamuk is admitting his own debt to Frankish innovator" (41).

Pamuk's basketball coach and professor Walter G. Andrews comments on the over all writing style of Pamuk. He finds Pamuk's work being enmeshed with memory and nostalgia. He says:

In Orhan's novels, I am brought face to face with the fact that memory is important. It becomes far more than harmless nostalgia. It is not just the museum we once visited on a class trip or during a sojourn abroad. It is not just the Topkapı Palace or the Ottoman treasury. It is not the

buried or sunken detritus of lost civilizations or junk at the bottom of an apartment airshaft. It is the *stories* we are going to tell ourselves about all this stuff. (27-29)

Unlike other critics, Philip McDermott reads this text through postmodern eyes. As he gives postmodern look, he finds it as raucous as Pandora's box with opinion, ideas and comments. In his own words:

This being a postmodernist work, the morals confuse and conflict. In fact, this novel is as raucous as Pandora's box with opinion and comment, but Pamuk's postmodernism is marked by religious meditation that undercuts fundamentalism. The whole point of postmodernism is that nothing is certain; adding Allah to the mix actually heightens the uncertainty by claiming that there is a fixed and certain center everywhere—and nowhere. (77)

Not only that, McDermott also finds this text deconstructing the traditional concepts of certainty, fixity and Singularity by valorizing uncertainty, changeability and plurality. Despite the wide range of perspectives, none of the critics, however, analyses the reasons behind Pamuk's use of multiple perspectives. Thus, the present research contends that Pamuk advocates relative, contaminated and subjective truth, by bringing different perspectives into use, in *My Name is Red*. In this regard, he stands as the critique of absolute, pure and objective truth.

New historical reading of the novel *My Name is Red* tries to prove the notion that knowledge and truth are only perspectives. They get changed with time, place and persons. Money, power, socio-politico-cultural background, religion, gender etc. are the factors that help to convert truth and knowledge to perspectives. Like truth and knowledge, history also gets questioned in new historicism. Pamuk has tried to

capture the new sense of history in his fictional work. In new historicism, history is understood as the relative factor that is affected by power and politics. The very sense of history gets textualized when Pamuk presents Sultan Murat III and Master Osman as historical characters with their 'other side'. Obviously, Sultan Murat III was the imperialist king of the then Ottoman Empire. His 'grand' deeds were recorded in history. However, his negative sides were concealed. Pamuk unveils those aspects. Sultan had greed for power, therefore, he secretly commissioned Enishete Effendi, a miniaturist painter, for illustrating a book in Venetian Style so that he could impress the westerners and save his throne.

In the same way, Pamuk excavates the bitter reality of miniaturist painters. No doubt, miniaturist painters are still famous in the world. But it will be strange to the modern readers to reveal that those miniaturists would be engaged in murdering and killing to be the 'best' illuminator. Their claim to be the best turns out to be their one-sided evaluation that leads their understanding to be only perspective. Not only miniaturist painters but also other characters like Husret Hoja, Dog, Corpse, Esther etc. get affected by the same disease.

This research has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter introduces the text, tool and objective of this research, whereas, the second chapter deals with the analysis of theoretical modality, with the due reference to the critics like Greenblatt, Montrose, Nietzsche, Foucault, Jenkins, Chris Barker, Stuart Hall and so on. Similarly, the third chapter applies the tool in the text and the final chapter concludes the major ideas of this paper.

This research has used some terms like new historicism, discourse, power, history etc. The term 'New Historicism' may sound unfamiliar to beginners. It is used in this dissertation to mean 'new notion of history' that has been proved in this text.

Terms like knowledge, truth, power, discourse, perspective etc. are used in a little different sense.

'Knowledge' refers to 'the information provided by sense organs that is judged by mind'. Or, knowledge, in this thesis, echoes Kantian sense of understanding. Likewise, 'truth' refers to the knowledge that may or may not be factual, absolute and universal. Truth is guided by spatio-temporal relationship. According to time and space, it may be changed and understood differently. Unlike general sense, this researcher has attempted to define 'power' in a new way. Normally, power is understood as the brutal force that is used to threaten and control someone. However, in this paper, power has been used in a positive sense. Power does not always mean brutal force. Sometimes, even the resistance and disobedience give power. It is not always vertical but all pervasive too. Power is creative aspect; it creates effects of truth through discourse.

Whereas, 'discourse' itself refers to the written or spoken language. If power holders use language to control things they create discourse. In fact, rulers create discourse through different means like medias so that they can rule people easily. Discourse, as that are constructed by power holders, may or may not be truthful. Last but not the least, 'history' is another term that gets recurrently used in this dissertation. History, here, includes every details of the past. Like Keith Jenkins, history is not the past for this researcher too. Past is what is really passed, whereas, history is what historians recorded. Therefore, history also is not absolute and objective but relative and subjective. Autobiographical backgrounds of historians, power, society, culture etc influence history. In this thesis, history is also understood as the inclusion of past crimes, passions and follies. It is the voice of 'left overs' too. Hence, all these terms in

this thesis are used in a different sense. To be clear, terms are used in Foucauldian sense of the 'other'.

Chapter II: Methodology

The Other Side of History, Truth and Knowledge

The "Other Side" refers to the shaded part of something. Everything has its bright and dark side. Regarding History, Truth and Knowledge too, the same principle holds true. Traditionally, only one aspect (mainly bright) of these factors had been valorized. Their other side had (has) been kept overshadowed. According to the traditional definition, history, truth and knowledge are considered as pure, objective, universal and scientific. However, this notion has been challenged in recent years. The other side of these factors has been excavated by a new theoretical concept known as New Historicism.

New Historicism, as a theoretical practice, was developed in the 1980s at the hands of American critics like Louise Montrose, Stephan Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. The purpose behind its inception was to undermine the long-practiced way of viewing a text as an 'objective totality'. Unlike New Critical perspective of viewing a text as an 'objective totality', New Historicism views a particular text in relation to author's autobiographical backgrounds, culture and his/her socio-politico-historical situatedness. In fact, New Historicism blurs the boundary between 'literary text' and 'history'. For it, history is textual and a text is historical. New Historicism fosters the concept that history is not 'teleological', 'objective' and 'universal' but it is discontinuous, subjective and parodic which is written from the power-holder's perspective. History does not have definite beginning, proper middle and the logical end; so, it is not teleological. Neither the history of different places can be the similar nor unified, so, it is not universal too. Therefore, New Historicism redefines history by undermining the traditional concept and including the 'left overs'.

Louis Montrose excavates three factors for the emergence of New Historicism. First, it is the people's growing consciousness on gender, ethnicity, religion, or class origins, political allegiances etc. This consciousness forced each and every individual to think about one's historicity, culture and situatedness, which, later on, led to the coming out of this theory. Regarding this factor, Montrose writes that "experiences of exclusion or otherness may, of course, provoke a compensatory embrace of the dominant culture, a desire for acceptance and assimilation . . . [which] provoke attitudes of resistance or contestation" (393). Second, the burgeoning of the women's movement and of feminism during the 1970s and; the third is challenging the existing assumptions and procedures in several academic disciplines by 'intellectual ferment' that is summed up in a word 'theory'. These factors share some principles commonly. Among them "a problematization of those processes by which meaning and values are produced and grounded; a shift from an essential or immanent to a historical, contextual and conjunctural model of signification; and a general suspicion of closed systems, totalities and universals" (393) are prevalent. This shift in theory has challenged liberal humanist claims that the literary and critical canons embody an essential and inclusive range of human experience and expression.

Montrose further clarifies the new historicism as an approach that brought a change in studying a literary text. Unlike new critical approach, it digs out the historical and cultural aspects of a text. In his own words:

This emergent socio-political-historical orientation in literary studies is characterized by an antireflectionist perspective on cultural work by a shift in emphasis from the aesthetic analysis of verbal artifact to the ideological analysis of discursive practices, and by an understanding of meaning as situationally and provisionally constructed. (395)

Not only that, Montrose also points out the shift towards ideological analysis of discursive practices from closed aesthetic analysis of verbal artifact. Discursive practice refers to the social rules and regulations, which are constructed by the ruling classes but are treated as universal truths. New historicism considers such ideologies and discursive practices as situational and provisional that are created.

J. Hillis Miller, however, shows his dismay towards this reorientation in literary and cultural studies. His dismay becomes explicit in his 1986 Presidential Address to the Modern Language Association. In his speech, he notes:

Literary study in the past few years has undergone a sudden, almost universal turn away from theory in the sense of an orientation towards language as such and has made a corresponding turn toward history, culture, society, politics, institutions, class and gender conditions, the social context, the material base. (283)

Though, Miller is hyperbolic, his speech proves the shift in criticism from textual to contextual.

In his introduction to a 1982 essay collection, Stephan J. Greenblatt distinguished what he dubbed the "new historicism" both from an older, reflectionist, and positivist literary historical scholarship and from New Critical formalism. He commented that "Renaissance literary works are no longer regarded either as fixed set of texts that are set apart from all other forms of expression and that contain their own determinate meanings or as a stable set of reflections of historical facts that lie beyond them" (6). Furthermore, he remarked that the outlines of art and literature are socially and historically configured: distinctions "between artistic production and other kinds of social production . . . are not intrinsic to the texts; rather they are made up and constantly redrawn by artists, audiences and readers" (7).

Clifford Geertz, an anthropologist, in his book "The Interpretation of Cultures", influenced 'cultural poetics' or new historicism produced during the later 1970s and early 1980s. However, Geertz seems to align new historicism with culture.

For him:

The term "culture" [. . .] denotes a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes towards life. (89)

Unsurprisingly, Geertz too opines that meaning of a text can be revealed by linking to the historical aspects. However, he views that those historical aspects are not expressed directly but in symbolic form.

The definition of new historicism becomes shallow and superficial if Michel Foucault is not cited. Foucault, a French philosopher and 'a historian of otherwise', contributed a lot to give life to new historicism. Foucauldian new historicism discusses about history, power, discourse, truth, knowledge, representation etc. and how these factors support each other to be strengthened. Foucault studies these factors very minutely and finds out many susceptible but interesting ideas, which challenge the long-governed truths and ideas in western metaphysics. In fact, his thorough study reveals the other side of history, truth and knowledge. This minute 'study of factors' refers to what Foucault calls "genealogy".

Genealogy was first used by Charles Darwin to mean 'the passing of genes from one generation to another.' It suggests 'descent' that Darwin took vertically. Foucault rejects the Darwinian sense of the term. For him genealogy does not refer to descent and verticality but it refers to dispersion and horizontality. In Foucault's

definition, genealogy refers to a form of history that studies the process of the formation of discourse, history, knowledge, truth etc. In his own words:

[. . .] Genealogy, that is, a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, etc., without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history. (*Truth and Power* 59)

From these lines, one can understand that genealogy is not history itself but it is a tool to study history, constituents of knowledge and discourses, power and representation etc. Genealogy analyses everything 'of the subject within a historical framework.' Therefore, genealogy does not take anything in its absolute form, but analyses according to its socio-political-historical situatedness.

As genealogical study challenges the absoluteness of everything, it is vain to search for 'Truth' and 'Knowledge'. However, because of the cultural and historical backgrounds, there is the possibility of multiple truths and perspectives on knowledge. Traditional notion of objective truth and pure knowledge is shattered in genealogical study. Instead, the process and politics of discourse formation is revealed.

Discourse refers to a linguistic composition longer than a sentence. However, in Foucault, this definition does not work. For Foucault, discourse is:

a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment. . . . Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language. But . . . since all social practices entail

meaning, and meanings shape and influence what we do – our conduct
 – all practices have a discursive aspect. (qtd. in Hall, 291)

Discourse, Foucault argues, constructs the topic. It defines and produces the objects of our knowledge. It governs the way that a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others. Similarly, discourse never consists of one statement, one text, one action or one source. Discourse constructs, defines and produces the objects of knowledge in an intelligible way while excluding other forms of reasoning. It is a discursive practice of ruling class people to rule over. Ruling class people form various ideas on various subjects like madness, psychiatry, sexuality etc. so that they can easily rule the people. The people who are in power define subjects the way they find comfortable. Or, their interpretation assists them to tempt the common people.

Discourses provide ways of talking about a particular topic with repeated motifs or clusters of ideas, practices and forms of knowledge across a range of sites of activity. In tune with Foucault, Chris Barker in his book *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice* summarizes that:

The concept of discourse in the hands of Foucault involves the production of knowledge through language. That is, discourse gives meaning to material objects and social practices. Needless to say, material objects and social practices 'exist' outside of language.

However, they are given meaning or 'brought into view' by language and are thus discursively formed. (90)

Since discourses are created and constructed, their definition changes according to person, place and time. What used to be believed as truth in fourteenth century might have turned false in eighteenth century. Similarly, what is right in one corner of the

world may not be right in another corner. Or, more specifically, what is true for one person may not be true for another because truth is the matter of interpretation!

Regarding the changeability of discourse, Foucault writes:

In a science like medicine, for example, up to the end of the eighteenth century one has a certain type of discourse whose gradual transformation, within a period of twenty-five or thirty years, broke not only with the "true" propositions which it had hitherto been possible to formulate, but also more profoundly, with the ways of speaking and seeing, the whole ensemble of practices which served as supports for medical knowledge. These are not simply new discoveries; there is a whole new "regime" in discourse and forms of knowledge. (*Truth and Power* 54)

This single extract establishes the Foucauldian notion of discourse. In it, his showing of the transformation on scientific discourse forms the general idea on discourse. This also implies that discourses are always in the process of formulation, correlation and transformation, which take place after a certain period of time.

While talking about the Foucauldian discourse, one should not forget to compare and contrast it with Saidian notion of discourse and Gramsci's idea of hegemony. Said takes discourse as a 'continued' phenomenon with which, Foucault, the philosopher of discontinuity, obviously disagrees. Similarly, Said takes the European knowledge about the orient as tainted that comes after being filtered through a 'grid'. This is similar to Foucault's notion, for he also does not believe in real representation. But, for Said, there exists the 'real orient', which should be sought outside the discourses of Orientalism neglecting its 'tainted' representation. In this sense, Said (mis) interprets Foucault. Similarly, Said examines the west-east

relationship as that of power and domination for which Orientalism functions as knowledge and imperialism as power. But, for Foucault, the power relationship results from differences in discourses that are involved in discursive practices.

Foucault, however, seems to have some similarities with Antonio Gramsci, who defines hegemony as the 'willful consent to be ruled' and does not examine power-relationship in terms of domination. People belonging to certain discourses, according to Gramsci, may have that consent to be ruled whereas the superior discourse may try to rule with the help of the truth it establishes. Foucault also agrees that discursive practices result from the differences in discourses, which are intricately woven with power.

Power, like in Gramsci, has about the same sense in Foucault. However, Foucault is not the first person to talk about power. Before him, there were Hegel, Marx and others to deal with it. Hegel and Marx considered power as vertical entity, which comes from the 'top' and reaches down to the 'bottom'. For them, power is repressive and dominating. The class of "Haves", who has the means of production, always exploits the class of "Haves not". Therefore, for Hegel and Marx, there is the relationship of 'exploitation' between dialectical classes.

Unlike this, Foucauldian notion of power is quite different. For Foucault, power is not vertical but horizontal. It is not only repressive and dominating but also creative and productive. Foucault completely rejects the repressive notion of power. He opines:

[. . .] it seems to me now that the notion of repression is quite inadequate for capturing what precisely the productive aspect of power. In defining the effects of power as repression, one adopts a purely juridical conception of such power, one identifies power with a

law which says no; power is taken above all as carrying the force of a prohibition. Now I believe that this is a wholly negative, narrow, skeletal conception of power [. . .]. What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it does not only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge [and] produces discourses. (*Truth and Power* 61)

From these lines, one can easily understand the Foucauldian notion of power.

Foucault is unhappy with the way of identifying power with the juridical conception and law. He does not like to call power as the 'force of prohibition', 'negative' or 'narrow'. But, he regards it as good and productive, which 'produces things', 'induces pleasure', 'forms knowledge' and 'produces discourses'.

Similarly, Foucault challenges the notion of verticality of the power. Power does not only come from 'above' but also comes from 'below', left and right. So, he categorizes power as 'all pervasive' meaning it 'comes from everywhere'. Even resistance can be a form of power. One can defeat other by not obeying him/her. Regarding this all pervasiveness of power, Foucault writes:

Power is everywhere: not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere. [. . .] power comes from below; that is there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix-no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. (*History of Sexuality* 93-4)

Therefore, it can be concluded that Foucault redefined the traditional notion of power by adding on it. For Foucault, power does not 'function in the form of a chain' – it circulates. It "is never monopolized by one center. It is deployed and exercised through a net-like organization" (98). This suggests that we are all, to some degree, caught up in its circulation – oppressors and oppressed. It does not radiate downwards, either from one source or from one place. Power relations permeate all levels of social existence and are therefore to be found operating at every site of social life – in the private spheres of family and sexuality as much as in the public spheres of politics, the economy and law.

Since nothing can be free from the chain of power- knowledge and truth also get enmeshed with it. Therefore, genealogical study of knowledge and truth along with history should be made to reveal the politics on these factors. But, before doing the genealogical study, it will be better to deal with the traditional conception of truth and knowledge. Traditionally, truth is known as "something pure, objective, universal and that can not be proved as false." Something 'True' is boundless and beyond the categories in older sense. Truth is always capital and absolute. It is always vertical. Similarly, Knowledge is regarded as absolute. What one understands becomes idea for others. So, knowledge is worldly and grand.

However, genealogical study shatters this traditional notion of truth and knowledge. For Foucault, truth is nothing but a 'discourse'. It is created and constructed. It changes according to the time and space. More than that, truth is politically colored. It is enmeshed with power politics. Most surprisingly, Foucault calls the traditional 'Truth' as 'myth'. In his words:

[. . .] truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power: contrary to a myth whose history and functions would repay further study, truth isn't the

reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the type of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. ("*Truth and Power*" 72-3)

In his later work Foucault becomes more concerned with how knowledge is put to work through discursive practices in specific institutional settings to regulate the conduct of others. He focuses on the relationship between knowledge and power and how power operates within what he called an institutional *apparatus* and its *technologies* (techniques). Foucault sees knowledge as always inextricably enmeshed in relations of power because it is always being applied to the regulation of social conduct in practice.

Foucault's concern with discourse, knowledge and power brings him closer to those classical sociological theories of ideology, especially Marxism with its concern to identify the class positions and class interests concealed within particular forms of knowledge. But Foucault has quite specific and cogent reasons why he rejects the classical Marxist problematic 'ideology'. Marx had argued that, in every epoch, ideas reflect the economic basis of society, and thus the 'ruling ideas' are those of the ruling class, which governs a capitalist economy, and correspond to its dominant interests.

Foucault's main argument against the classical Marxist theory of ideology is that it tended to reduce all the relation between knowledge and power to a question of class power and class interests. Foucault does not deny the existence of classes, but he is strongly opposed to this powerful element of economic or class reductionism in the Marxist theory of ideology. Secondly, he argues that Marxism tended to contrast the 'distortions' of bourgeois knowledge, against its own claims to 'truth' – Marxist science. But Foucault does not believe that any form of thought could claim an absolute 'truth' of this kind, outside the play of discourse. All political and social forms of thought, he believes, are inevitably caught up in the interplay of knowledge and power. So, his work rejects the traditional Marxist question 'in whose class interest does language, representation and power operate?'

Foucault argues that not only is knowledge always a form of power, but power is implicated in the questions of whether and in what circumstances knowledge is to be applied or not. This question of the application and effectiveness of power/knowledge was more important, he thought, than the question of its truth.

Knowledge linked to power, not only assumes the authority of the 'truth' but has the power to make itself true. All knowledge, once applied in the real world, has real effects, and in that sense at least 'becomes true'. Knowledge, once used to regulate the conduct of others, entails constraint, regulation and the disciplining of practices. Thus, "There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time, power relations" (*Discipline and Punish* 27).

According to Foucault, knowledge does not operate in void. It is put to work through certain technologies and strategies of application, in specific situations, historical contexts and institutional regimes. This led Foucault to speak, not of the

'Truth' of knowledge in the absolute sense – a truth which remained so, whatever the period, setting, context – but of a discursive formation sustaining a 'regime of truth'.

To clarify it, Foucault argues:

Truth isn't outside power. . . . Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth; that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true, the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned . . . the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (qtd. in Stuart Hall, 49)

Just as truth and knowledge are politically colored, so the history is. Traditionally, history is the record of past actions and incidents. It is the chronology of facts. It is true, pure and absolute which is formed through evolution. However, Foucault redefines history and excavates the politics behind its creation. Foucault, by borrowing from Nietzsche, claims that history is not only the record of 'big things' about 'big people' but it is also the record of crimes, passions and follies. But traditional notion of history does not include the negative side. It hides the negative aspects and foregrounds the positive aspects only. Foucauldian history, however, blends both negative and positive aspects. To exaggerate a little, it claims that history consists more negative than positive aspects.

While talking about Foucauldian notion of history, it becomes more relevant to discuss whether a literary text expresses historical facts or not. Traditional historians viewed that a literary text is purely 'literary'. No traces of history can be found in a literary text- they believed. But new historicists historicized the literary

texts. For them 'a text is historical and history is textual.' In fact, new historians blurred the age-old demarcation between history and fiction. For them, history is constructed like a fictional work in which writer's politics of foregrounding and hiding the facts works highly.

This new notion of history is well dealt by Michel Foucault. Foucault in his essay "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", calls this history an "effective history." For him, effective history "deprives the self of the reassuring stability of life and nature, and it will not permit itself to be transported by a voiceless obstinacy toward a millennial ending. It will uproot its traditional foundations and relentlessly disrupt its pretended continuity" (Pandey 93). Foucault opines that effective history rejects stability, continuity and linearity; and advocates for discontinuity, dispersion and changeability. Effective history can also invert the relationship that traditional history, in its dependence on metaphysics, establishes between proximity and distance. The latter is given to a contemplation of distances and heights: the noblest periods, the highest forms, the most abstract ideas, the purest individualities. It accomplishes this by getting as near as possible, placing itself at the foot of its mountain peaks, at the risk of adopting the famous perspectives of frogs. Foucault writes:

Effective history, on the other hand, shortens its vision to those things nearest to it – the body, the nervous system, nutrition, digestion, and energies; it unearths the periods of decadence, and if it chances upon lofty epochs, it is with the suspicion – not vindictive but joyous – of finding a barbarous and shameful confusion. (94)

Keith Jenkins interestingly analyses history. She answers the question "what is history" both theoretically and practically. On theoretical side, "history is one of a series of discourses about the world" for her. The discourses do not create the world

(the physical stuff on which we apparently live) but they do appropriate it and give it all the meanings it has, she believes. For our bewilderment, she differentiates between 'history' and 'past'. For her history is what historians recorded and past is what really passed. Since history is the "writings of historians", it is a discourse. The process of constructing history is like that of composing a story. She writes:

Different sociologists and historians interpret the same phenomenon differently through discourses that are always on the move, that are always being de-composed and re-composed; are always positioned and positioning, and which thus need constant self-examination as discourses by those who use them. (Jenkins 12)

Jenkins believes in plurality of history, as there is one past and multi-interpretations. The same past is interpreted from various sides and found out various interpretations. Regarding the genuineness of histories, she writes that "most information about the past has never been recorded and most of the rest was evanescent"(14). Therefore, for Jenkins, history is mere 'an inter-textual linguistic construct'. History is only a linguistic construct because it is composed of epistemology, methodology and ideology too. Epistemology shows we can never really know the past and methodology and ideology are always plural. Jenkins views "history is theory and theory is ideological and ideology just is material interests" (24). On the practical side of the construction of the history, Jenkins writes about the process of forming history. She writes that although professional historians overwhelmingly present themselves as academic and disinterested, and although they are certainly in some ways 'distanced', nevertheless, it is more illuminating to see such practitioners as being not so much outside the ideological fray but as occupying very dominant positions within it, to see professional histories as expressions of how dominant ideologies currently

articulate history 'academically'. She also opines that history gets produced by a group of laborers called historians who take themselves personally their values, positions and their ideological perspectives along with their epistemological presuppositions while constructing.

Not only that, she also mentions the pressures historians get while recording history. Pressures like family pressures, pressures from friends, pressures from work place, pressure from publishers regarding format, wordage, market, deadlines, literary style, referees etc. play the dominant role to make history a story. Therefore, Jenkins claims:

History is a shifting, problematic discourse, ostensibly about an aspect of the world, the past, that is produced by a group of present-minded workers (overwhelmingly in our culture salaried historians) who go about their work in mutually recognizable ways that are epistemologically, methodologically, ideologically and practically positioned and whose products, once in circulation, are subject to a series of uses and abuses that are logically infinite but which in actuality generally correspond to a range of power bases that exist at any given moment and which structure and distribute the meanings of histories along a dominant-marginal spectrum. (Jenkins 32)

To wrap up, whether it is history, truth, knowledge, power or discourse- nothing can escape from politics. Politics governs the history, as history is not the past. Past is what is actually passed and history is what salaried persons (historians) documented. Since history cannot be free from personal biases and prejudices it cannot be objective and universal. Therefore, history is a construction just like that of truth and knowledge. Truth and knowledge, in fact, are not absolute and pure but they are

relative and contaminated. They get changed with time and space. Knowledge depends on perspectives and truth is the creation of power holders. Power, in deed, is the determinant of knowledge, truth and history. Foucauldian notion of power, however, seems to be different from traditional Marxist and Hegelian conception. Marx and Hegel considered power as vertical, violent and repressive, whereas, Foucault believes power to be creative, horizontal and all pervasive. Power, according to Foucault, comes from below too.

People, who are in margin, are hegemonized by power. The oppressed class unknowingly becomes ready to be ruled. This notion of Gramscian hegemony is well comparable with Foucauldian idea of discourse. Foucault believes that oppressors rule the common people through certain discourses. Such discourses are created entities regarding different aspects like sexuality, psychiatry, civilization etc. Power holders create such discourses so that they can easily tempt the people to rule over. Since Foucault redefined the notion of discourse, power, truth, history etc. he is taken as a pillar of new historicism. Like Foucault; Giles Gunn, Stephan Greenblatt and Louise Montrose are considered as other pillars of new historicism, who in 1980s and 90s, studied history, truth and knowledge from the other side.

Chapter III: Textual Analysis

Knowledge as Perspective: A Genealogical Study of Pamuk's

My Name is Red

Orhan Pamuk's award winning fictional work *My Name is Red* challenges traditional style of fiction writing. Since Pamuk himself believes that "imperfection gives rise to what we call 'style'" (79), it will be futile to talk about style and writing techniques. Basically, this fictional work deals with the issues of art and illustration. In addition, it takes us back to the later part of sixteenth century Turkish location and involves us in the interaction of various issues with the then Sultan, miniaturists and artists. So, history is the main issue of this work. But, we don't feel that we are reading history while reading this novel as the whole novel is set in that particular time. If to borrow from S.B. Kelly, a critic, this novel is a scintillating fusion of murder mystery, postmodernist fable and historical romance. However, this research's objective is not to vanish in the grandness of this novel but to peep through the window of criticism to solve some problems.

Problem arises when the writer gives voice to multiple characters. Including non-living, non-human and human characters, there are twenty-one mouths to take forward the actions of the text. In a Bakhtinian sense, this novel is a beautiful example of heteroglossic construct. Different characters narrate the story from their side. They do not know many things about other characters. Even the readers should depend on all the characters to know the whole plot. What one character narrates is just a part of the plot. Therefore, every character's narration supplements the plot of the novel. The interesting aspect is that readers get confused by listening to the different characters. For example, there are four miniaturist painters, and each of them claims to be the best. So, who is right and who is wrong- readers can not decide. Are all right and

truthful? Before that, what is truth? Is it something that is constructed by the weakest one or the strongest one? These and these-like questions turmoil the readers.

Similarly, some characters share their ideas on general things. But their ideas are strange to us. Islamic prophet Husret Hoja considers coffee as the devil's ruse. While preaching his followers, he says "Ah, my devoted believers! The drinking of coffee is an absolute sin! Our Glorious Prophet did not partake of coffee because he knew it dulled the intellect, caused ulcers, hernia and sterility; he understood that coffee was nothing but the devil's ruse" (14). This notion of Hoja really confuses the readers. Is coffee really the devil's ruse? Or, it is just his perception- the problem comes.

The series of problems don't end only on these. Shekure, the female protagonist, reveals in anger that her father Enishte Effendi sleeps with his slave girl. Whereas, Enishte Effendi doesn't seem such a moral less man because he is a renowned artist. Is this true? Or, is it only the expression of anger? We have not authentic answer. The Gold coin, a non-living character-narrator, reveals the secret that it is not pure gold but counterfeit. However, people carry it very secretly considering it as the pure gold. What would be our conception if the coin hadn't been given the voice? Wouldn't we believe the gold coin as pure? In the same way, Butterfly, a human character-narrator, opines, "If a man's reed [penis] satisfies the wife, his reed of artistry will pale in comparison" (80). This simple sentence blames all the artists to be sexually impotent and also conveys that the people who can satisfy their wives cannot be the great artists. However, there are not factual evidences regarding all these problems. These are mere perspectives.

Interestingly, Pamuk also includes dog's perspective. The dog, another character-narrator, barks, "to be human is to err" (13). It says, "I am a dog, and because you humans are less rational beasts than I, you are telling yourselves, "Dogs'

don't talk." Nevertheless, you seem to believe a story in which corpses speak and characters use words they couldn't possibly know. Dog's do speak, but only to those who know how to listen" (12). This speech of a dog is really amazing. It is wonderful to give voice to a dog. More than that, a dog blames human beings for being less rational beast than dog itself. Why Pamuk is giving voice to dogs? Cannot others represent dog's voice? Is it really factual what the dog believes? These questions remain unanswered until this researcher does surgery of each and every aspects of this text through the perspective of new historicism.

Historically, the novel is set in the later part of the sixteenth century. Exactly, it takes the time of Sultan Murat III who ruled the Ottoman Empire (the part of which is modern Turkey) from 1574 to 1595. Though this novel is a fictional work, many historical events and characters have influenced the plot of it. To exaggerate a little, this novel seems to be a historical documentation of the then time. Different characters discuss about the style of miniaturist painters. Some of the characters are directly brought from history. For example Master Osman is a historical figure of sixteenth century Ottoman Empire, but he also gets his position in this novel. In the chapters 38, 41 and 51, Osman speaks to the readers. He was among the most prominent Ottoman miniaturists. However, Pamuk not only brings history into his fiction but he also points out the other side of history. Sultan Murat III was the ruler of later part of the sixteenth century Ottoman Empire. His brave deeds are included in the history. Whereas, Pamuk reveals the fact that Sultan was influenced by western art of that time and he secretly commissioned some miniaturist painters to illustrate art in western style. Being an Islamic ruler, he loved Christian style of illustration, which was considered as sin at that time. Still, the king dared to cross the line. His that deed was not included in the history but Pamuk brought it under his control. Moreover,

Pamuk also captures the greed of miniaturist painters for money and power. All miniaturist painters, in this novel, including Black, Butterfly, Olive, Stork, Enishte and Elegant; work for money and power. Their involvement for money and power forces this researcher to raise questions and solve them new historically.

New historicism considers knowledge and truth as perspective. Unlike the traditional notion of knowledge that it is pure, objective and universal, new historicism takes it as a constructive and subjective element. Knowledge and truth vary according to time, place and persons. Pamuk seems fully aware of this fact. That's why he makes the use of Bakhtinian heteroglossia. He brings twenty-one different characters and gives voice to each of them. These twenty-one mouths produce such a noise that this text turns out to be a collage of sound. Each character has his/her limited point of view. No characters can cross their limited circumstance and intervene others. Their limited perspective guides them to narrate whatever they think and see but not what other characters think and see. So, it seems natural to give voice to a corpse, a dog, a tree or a gold coin. No one can represent every other. That is why, the corpse's lament in first chapter about his death and Master Osman's not knowing of this fact in chapter 11 sounds realistic. The corpse [of Elegant Effendi] in first chapter narrates from the depth of a well: "for nearly four days I have been missing: My wife and children must be searching for me; my daughter, spent from crying, must be staring fretfully at the courtyard gate. Yes, I know they're all at the window hoping for my return. But are they truly waiting? I can't even be sure of that" (3). And, Master Osman shows his ignorance regarding whereabouts of this man. He says, "It has been six days, and he [Elegant Effendi]'s not to be found anywhere. He's plain disappeared" (67). This confusion, in fact, has been aroused because of the limited point of view. If there were a single omniscient narrator, s/he would know

each and everything that would be objective and universal. But there is nothing all pervasive and objective. Therefore twenty-one different character-narrators foster the concept of knowledge as mere perspective.

To limit knowledge only to a perspective, there are different factors. Some of the factors are power, position of the speaker, social status, economic status, religion, gender etc. All these factors play role to narrow knowledge and truth to mere understanding directly or indirectly. In chapter three, a dog narrates the plot. It blames human for being less rational beast than the dog itself. It also concludes that to be human is to err. However, dog's this conception regarding human beings is just a perspective. Dog's this perspective arises because of its being a dog. If it was not a dog and was a human, it would think in different way. Similarly, Husret Hoja, an Islamic prophet, declares coffee as a 'devil's ruse'. Actually, his notion is also a perception. In fact, Husret Hoja is an Islamic man. Since coffee is considered as the product of westerners (Christians), he disliked it. It is his religion that enforced him to consider coffee as devil's ruse. This becomes clear when he remarks "But those who curse me and our religion, it is they who are the true mongrels" (14).

Someone's perception on something is also applied to others. When a perspective is applied to others, it becomes knowledge for them and the same knowledge changes into Truth. In Foucauldian notion, the perception of someone regarding something is called discourse. Discourse helps to create knowledge and truth. Discourse gets universalized when it is believed as Truth. This politics of truth and knowledge gets excavated through genealogy. Genealogy is the form of history, which studies the constituents of something. So, if someone studies truth and knowledge genealogically, s/he finds the real politics. For example, the notion "imperfection gives rise to what we call style" (79) seems to be truthful. Even, we

may blindly believe on it. But, if we question on its constituents- how and why this notion is coined, we can know that this is not a proven statement, but only the Butterfly's perspective on style. Similarly, Butterfly again tries to create another truth by saying "If a man's reed satisfies the wife, his reed of artistry will pale in comparison" (80). If this statement is fact-based, it declares all the artists sexually impotent and also establishes the point that the people, who can satisfy their wives, can never be artists. Actually, this idea was intentionally made by Butterfly to make Black, the protagonist, jealous. This fact gets revealed through Butterfly's monologue. He mutters, "Like everyone who envies the talent of the miniaturist, Black, too, believed these lies and was heartened" (80). In reality, this is the lie of Butterfly, which turned out to be truth for Black. This is just an example. All truths are product of somebody else's lie, pretension and perception.

When Butterfly claims, "I am the one who earns the most money, and therefore, I am the best of all miniaturists" (83), we are obliged to believe him. But when Stork narrates, "Our sovereign, despite the endless gossip of all of those jealous artists, knows full well that I am the most talented of his miniaturists. He admires my illustrations" (337); we get confused. Both the miniaturists claim to be best. Who is actually best? Is it Butterfly or Stork? The best is always one. Both painters cannot be best. Therefore, it is mere their perspective which comes out of their self-glorifying nature.

Perspective on something is created through discourse. Discourse is a group of statements, which provide a language for talking about a particular topic at particular historical moment. It is about the production of knowledge through language. In the novel, the murderer, a speaker, tries to produce a truth when he says "a city's intellect ought to be measured not by its scholars, libraries, miniaturists, calligraphers and

schools, but by the number of crimes insidiously committed on its dark streets over thousands of years" (123). The murderer produced this discourse because he is given a chance to speak. Because of his socio-cultural background, he demanded to determine the intellectuality of the city by the sides of crimes committed here, which is natural. This demand also fulfils the notion that discourse is the product of someone's socio-cultural situated ness. This conception is reinstated by a satan, a character-narrator. Satan views "if all men went to Heaven, no one would ever be frightened, and the world and its governments could never function on virtue alone; for in our world evil is as necessary as virtue and sin as necessary as rectitude" (350). Satan's this discourse is nothing but the product of its being Satan. These two examples are enough to believe that discourse creates the effects of truth.

In another scene, the murderer helps us to declare that the outer reality (truth) may not be always genuine but also fakes. Or, his pretension becomes truth for others. In the funeral ceremony of the miniaturist painter Elegant Effendi, the murderer was also present. He narrates:

They threw cold, muddy earth onto the battered and disfigured corpse of ill-fated Elegant Effendi and I wept more than any of them. I shouted, "I want to die with him!" and "Let me share his grave!" and they held me by the waist so that I wouldn't fall in. I gasped for air and they pressed their palms to my forehead, drawing my head back so I might breath. By the glances of the deceased's relatives, I sensed I might have exaggerated my sobs and wailing; I pulled myself together. Based upon my excessive sorrow the workshop gossips might suppose that Elegant Effendi and I had been in love. (117)

What can be the limitation of incongruity more than this? A murderer who has murdered someone grieves much more than any others in his death! For others, it is truth that the murderer (who is not identified as murderer by others except readers) grieved much more than other people. In fact, it was his pretension so that others could not identify him as murderer. We know this fact when he says, "I sensed I might have exaggerated my sobs and wailing." Do not other people consider his acting as reality? But, it is not reality; it is just an act. This act compels us to believe reality (truth) as fake action, which differs from person to person. If his wailing is truth for others, it is pretense for him and the readers.

Truth varies according to persons. People have the tendency of twisting the truth. This feature of truth gets textualized when Shekure, the female protagonist of the novel, narrates her perspective. In the anger, she discloses, "[. . .] recognizing the extent of my anger, but not being able to respond in some manner made me even furious. At that juncture, I imagined my father and Hayriye in bed in that ridiculous and disgusting position" (109). This revelation in anger asserts that Enishte Effendi, the father of Shekure, sleeps with his slave girl Hayriye. We wouldn't know this fact if Shekure had not been angry with her father. Once she disclosed, she had not any options except lament. So, she regrets, "I regret having just now told you, out of spite, about the matter between my father and Hayriye. No, I wasn't lying, but I'm still so embarrassed that it would be best if you forgot about it. Pretend I never mentioned anything, as if my father and Hayriye weren't thus involved, please" (110)? However, Shekure's regret enforces us to believe that reality gets changed. Until Shekure was not in anger, we believed that Enishte was an honest miniaturist painter. That was truth for us. There are not other clues except this to prove him a moral less man. When she reveals it, we are surprised to know the other side of him. Now, Enishte is a

moral less man who shares his bed with a slave girl! Hence, knowledge keeps on changing.

The knowledge as perspective comes to the surface if the narration of Beloved Uncle (Enishte) and Butterfly is compared. Butterfly suspects Olive and Stork for murdering Elegant Effendi, whereas Beloved Uncle suspects on Butterfly himself. Butterfly blames, "Olive and Stork are the ones behind this vulgarity" (114). On the other hand, Beloved Uncle doubts on Butterfly for murdering Elegant and also fears whether he (Butterfly) also kills him (Uncle). Uncle questions: "Could this one actually kill a man, I wondered, for example out of envy? Might he kill me" (115)? This two-way suspicion entices us to conclude that truth varies according to persons.

Like truth, power also gets questioned in new historical reading. New historicism, however, defines power not only as a negative attribute but also as a positive aspect. Power is the determining factor of everything. It creates discourses and paves ways for constructing truths. Regarding the greatness of power, Beloved Uncle (Enishte) recites, "despite whatever great artistic sense and talent a man might possess, he ought to seek money and power everywhere to avoid forsaking his art when he fails to receive proper compensation for his gifts and efforts"(27). Beloved Uncle views that it is money and power, not artistic talent, that makes people strong. It is power of the artist, which makes him famous not his artistic skills. So, power is the decisive factor for everything. In fact, this whole novel deals with the issues of power and dominance directly or indirectly. The miniaturist painters compete each other to win Sultan's favor, so that, they can be powerful. Whereas, the Sultan wants to win the favor of western empires to make his Ottoman Empire powerful. Sultan Murat III secretly commissions Enishte Effendi to illustrate a book in Venetian Style, which, he would present it to them and win their heart. Unveiling this secret program,

Beloved Uncle says, "Because this book is a secret, Our Sultan has disbursed payment to me under cover of Head Treasurer" (29). Uncle continues to Black, " I wanted the things I depicted to represent Our Sultan's entire world, just as in the paintings of the Venetian Masters" (29). This temptation of Sultan to Venetian style is not his desire but his trick of trade to prevent Ottoman from Westerners' attack. Sixteenth Century, the time in which this novel takes place, was the time of colonization. Therefore, Sultan's trick to handle power by depicting Venetian Style sounds reasonable.

Even the miniaturist painters, given voice in the novel, try their best to hold power. Elegant Effendi was killed so that the murderer could win the favor of Master Osman. Butterfly, Olive, Stork and Enishte all try their best to show their ability of drawing. However, their purpose is not other than to be best miniaturist, and hence, to be most powerful. Being confused by the murdering of miniaturists, Hasan, the brother of Shekure's past husband, questions, "Miniaturists are murdering each other over the pictures in that book. [. . .] Is it for money or—God forbid—because the book desecrates our religion" (158)? People do everything for money and power. They work, they illustrate, they rule or they kill; whatever they do – do for power. Power is the only goal and end of everyone. In the novel, Black notices, "In all of Venice, rich and influential men wanted their portraits painted as a symbol, a memento of their lives and a sign of their riches, power and influence – so they might always be there, standing before us, announcing their existence, nay, their individuality and distinction"(130). Black's this mentioning frees power from Hegelian and Marxist definition. Power, for them, is repressive element, which casts from 'above' to 'below'. However, this extract presents power as a symbol for social prestige. In the novel, we get enough evidences that show people's consciousness regarding the importance of power, no matter it is economical, social or political.

Master Osman says, "The pictures as well as the books commissioned by sultans, shahs and pashas proclaim their power" (323).

Orhan Pamuk, the novelist, himself seems very much cognizant concerning the new historical notion of power. New historicism considers power as all pervasive element that circulates even from the 'below'. Unlike the Hegelian notion, which limits power in the hands of some upper class people, Pamuk gives equal chance to every character to speak their voice. If Pamuk had used single omniscient narrator, his depiction would be like that of a tyrant ruler. But, he has given voice to everyone, from the richest (like Sultan, Master Osman) to the weakest (like Esther, Orhan, corpse). In this sense, Pamuk seems democratic and associative. He gives chance to speak even to the very minor characters like Esther and Orhan. Esther, a poor clothier, sometimes challenges Black and Enishte as well. Orhan, a six-year-old boy, forces his mother, Shekure, to do whatever he likes through his obstinate manner and crying. This suggests that power comes not only from 'above' but comes from 'below' too. To take an evidence, Black narrates how he get forced by Shevket, Shekure's younger son, to visit Hanged Jew's house:

"Have you ever seen a dead cat?" he [Shevket] asked. [. . .]

"Nay." [says Black]

Shall I show you the dead cat in the house of Hanged Jew?"

He went out to the street without waiting for my response. I followed him. (142-43)

This dialogue between Black and Shevket clarifies that how one gets forced to follow the other through his obstinate manner. In a Foucauldian sense, it is also the use of power. Power, according to Foucault, is not only physical but also economical, social or political which is all pervasive; and also vertical than hierarchical.

New historicism considers a text as the collective influence of author's biography, his/her social, cultural or religious background, history and many more. So, a fictional work turns out to be a historical document if it is read new historically. In this light, Pamuk's *My Name is Red* comes out to be a historical record more than a fictional creation.

First and foremost, the novel itself is clearly located in the historical era of late sixteenth century. Exactly, this novel has been set during the reign of Sultan Murat III, an Ottoman imperialist king. Sultan Murat III ruled the Ottoman Empire from 1574 to 1595 and this novel revolves around his ruling period. To assure this, the novelist has provided chronology of history at the end of this novel. To cite him:

1574-95: The reign of Ottoman Sultan Murat III (during whose rule the events of our novel take place). His rule witnessed a series of struggles between 1578-90 known as the Ottoman-Safavid wars. He was the Ottoman Sultan most interested in miniatures and books, and he had the *Book of Skills*, the *Book of Festivities* and the *Book of Victories* produced in Istanbul. The Most prominent Ottoman miniaturists, including Osman the miniaturist (Master Osman) and his disciples, contributed to them. (508)

As mentioned in this extract, this novel documents the speeches regarding Ottoman-Safavid wars, brings the illustrations from *Book of Skills*, *Book of Festivities* and the *Book of Victories* recurrently, and also captures the illustrations and styles of Master Osman. Master Osman himself is presented as a character-narrator who narrates chapters 38, 41 and 51. This real cum fictional character-narrator narrates about the tradition and history of miniaturist paintings. He says:

You know about those ornery old men [miniaturist painters] who've charitably devoted their lives to art. They'll attack anyone who gets in their way. They're usually gaunt, bony and tall. They'll want the dwindling number of days before them to be just like the long period they've left behind. They're short tempered, and they complain about everything. They'll try to grab the reins in all situations, causing everyone around them to throw up their hands in frustration; they don't like anyone or anything. I know, because I'm one of them. (282)

While reading these fictional lines we feel as if we are going through the pages of history. Actually, these lines narrate the real history. Not only that, Osman also talks about the historical persons. For example:

The master of masters Nurullah Selim Chelebi, with whom I had the honor of making illustrations knee to knee in the same workshop, was this way in his eighties, when I was but a sixteen years-old apprentice (though he wasn't as peevish as I am now). Blond Ali, the last of the great masters, laid to rest thirty years ago, was also this way (though he wasn't as thin and tall as I am). Since the arrows of criticism aimed at these legendary masters, who directed the workshops of their day now frequently strike me in back, I want you to know that the hackneyed accusations leveled at us are entirely unfounded. (282)

Feride Ciekoglu, an associate professor and director of the Master Program in Visual Communication Design, Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, also mentions Sultan Murat III and Master Osman as historical figures. He writes:

Of all the Ottoman Sultans it was Murat III, who was the most interested in miniatures and books. During his reign (1594-1595) he

had the *Book of Victories* (1579), the *Book of Festivities* (1585), and the *Book of Skills* (1588) produced in Istanbul all under the supervision of Nakkas Osman [Master Osman]. "His prestigious position as the chief illustrator on the palace chronicler Seyyid Lokman's production team meant that Nakkas Osman's style came to dominate all miniature painting during this period." (6)

Therefore, the real depiction of Sultan Murat III, Master Osman and their interested books obliges this researcher to say that this novel is more historical than fictional. Black, the protagonist of the novel, expresses the real cause for illustrating a book of paintings in the novel, which also takes back to the history. According to him, "[. . .] the Sultan wanted to have the book completed in time for the thousandth-year anniversary of the Hegira. Our Sultan [. . .] wanted to demonstrate that in the thousandth year of the Muslim calendar He and His state could make use of the styles of the Franks as well as the Franks themselves" (38).

The series of the influence of history to this text does not end in these examples only. Most of the events in the text are historically occurred events, which are only kept in order by Pamuk. Referring to the Ottoman-Safavid war of the past, Pamuk speaks through Black, "it seems I reminded the landlady of her son who'd been killed by Safavid Persian soldiers at the front and so she agreed to clean the house and cook for me" (8). More than this, the recurring reiteration of historical books and people confuses us whether is it imaginary text or factual record. Time and again, Pamuk talks (through the mouth of different characters) about Bihzad, Nizami or Firdusi, the artists, and their works like *Husrev and Shirin*, *Leyla and Majnun* or *The Book of Festivities*. As an example, the murderer narrates:

Let's consider a piece by Bihzad, the master of masters, patron saint of all miniaturists. I happened across this masterpiece, which also nicely pertains to my situation because it's a depiction of murder, among the pages of a flawless ninety-year-old book of the Heart School. It emerged from the library of a Persian prince killed in a merciless battle of succession and recounts the story of Husrev and Shirin. (20-21)

Similarly, *Beloved Uncle* (Enishte Effendi) reminds of an historical event to show the influence of Western tradition in Ottoman's art. Clarifying it, Uncle gives account:

Not only in Tabriz, but in Mashhad and Aleppo, many miniaturists had abandoned working on books and begun making odd single-leaf pictures – curiosities that would please European travelers – even obscene drawings. Rumor has it that the illuminated manuscript *Shah Abbas* presented to Our Sultan during the Tabriz peace treaty has already been taken apart so its pages could be used for another book. Supposedly, the Emperor of Hindustan, Akbar was throwing so much money around for a large new book that the most gifted illustrators of Tabriz and Kazvin quit what they were doing and flocked his palace. (28)

In this extract, *Beloved Uncle* remembers that historical time in which the miniaturists of Ottoman Empire were faded up with their own style and attracted to the style of Westerners. It also gives information about how the Emperor of Hindustan threw money around for new books and how illustrators of Tabriz and Kazvin were tempted to it. Likewise, *Butterfly*, a miniaturist painter, meditates on the painting and visualizes his past experience. He says, "the two-page scene I was painting depicted the deliverance of condemned and imprisoned debtors and their families by the grace

of Our Sultan. I'd situated the Sultan on the corner of a carpet covered in bags full of silver coins, as I'd personally witnessed during such ceremonies" (81). This past experience reflected in the text suggests that history cannot be avoided from the fiction writing too. Another instance, that reconfirms history as the backbone for fiction writing, comes in the surface while hearing the Olive's narration. Olive, a miniaturist painter, while giving his ideas on Blindness and Memory, tells, "in Lami'i Chelebi's Turkish translation of the Persian poet Jami's *Gift's of Intimacy* which addresses the stories of the saints, it is written that in the bookmaker's workshop of Jihan Shah, the ruler of the Blacksheep nation, the renowned master Sheikh Ali Tabrizi had illustrated a magnificent version of *Husrev and Shirin*" (92). Olive continues, "This magnificent book, along with the one Sheikh Ali Tabrizi made for the late Jihan Shah, entered Our Sultan's treasury in Istanbul when the ever-victorious Tall Hasan was defeated at the battle of Otlukbeli by Sultan Mehmet Khan, the Conqueror, may he rest in peace. Those who can truly see, know" (94). Needless to say, these fictional extracts are full of historical evidences. Whatever Olive narrates in these lines come to be the factual lines. To authenticate Tall Hasan as a historical ruler, it is relevant to cite the chronology of history that is provided by the author himself at the last of the novel, "1375-1467: The Blacksheep, a Turkmen tribal federation, ruled over parts of Iraq, eastern Anatolia and Iran. Jihan Shah (reigned 1438-67), the last Blacksheep ruler, was defeated by the Whitesheep Tall Hasan in 1467" (506).

However, Pamuk does not present history in a traditional sense. Traditionally, history is conceived as the pure, objective and teleological entity, which records only the 'grand' events and incidents of past. Conventional way of documenting history does not include the crimes, follies and passions of past. Neither, it embraces the 'left

overs'. Unlike it, new historical documentation collects all the positive and negative aspects of the past. In the case of this novel, Pamuk gives account of the misdeeds of miniaturist painters, misuse of power by Sultans and their temptation towards money and power. Traditional history does not tell that Sultan Murat III was fearful with Western Empires. Whereas, Pamuk illustrates the fearful moments of Sultan in his paintings, he says, "[. . .] unlike the Venetians, my work would not merely depict material objects, but naturally the inner riches, the joys and fears of the realm over which Our Sultan rules" (29). Similarly, Pamuk captures the desires of sultans to be inscribed in the books not through good deeds but through the bags of money. This fact is revealed when Shekure questions, "Isn't it just for the sake of this delight [to be listened from distant lands and people] that sultans and viziers proffer bags of gold to have their histories written" (51)?

In fact, the whole novel is about the killings of miniaturist painters and finding out the culprits. 'Grand' history does not include this 'other side' of past. In reality, there was the ill competition among the miniaturist painters to illustrate better arts and to earn a lot. They used to take power by hooks or crooks. So, the murdering of Elegant Effendi and Enishte Effendi resembles the same historical imperfection. Black narrates, "I informed him [the Head Treasurer] that the monetary rewards and honor involved in being invited to illustrate and illuminate Enishte Effendi's book had likely led to unavoidable competition and jealousy among the masters" (274). Black's this realization is nothing but the reality of the then time. The murderer, a character-narrator, tells that he murdered Elegant Effendi so that his (murderer's) misdeed of religious sacrilege would not come out. He confesses, "panicking, I grabbed a stone that lay beside the well. While he [Elegant Effendi] was still on the seventh or eighth step, I caught up to him and struck him on the back of his head with all my strength. I

struck him so swiftly and brutally that I was momentarily startled, as if the blow had landed on my own head. Aye, I felt his Pain. (25) Assisting this real confusion and killings of miniaturist painters, Feride Ciekoglu writes:

We encounter the miniaturists in their dilemma between two approaches to depiction, triggered by the murder of one who is known to have grown skeptical about their secret commission to paint in Western style. The artistic dilemma at the abstract level finds its reflection in contemporary life, in the uprisings of the fundamentalists who created terror in Istanbul, by bursting into a coffee house where pictures, depicted in a naturalistic way, became objects for secular narration. (7)

Traditional history recorded the fact that Sultan Murat III was a very powerful king of Ottoman Empire. He was equally interested in miniaturist art and illustration. So, he used to commission painters to make beautiful illustrations. However, it does not mention why king was so much passionate towards the paintings. But Pamuk unearths this secret. He speaks through Black:

Precisely what Our Sultan stated He wanted: A book that depicted the thousandth year of the Muslim calendar, which would strike terror into the heart of the Venetian Doge by showing the military strength and pride of Islam, together with the power and wealth of the Exalted House of Osman. (275)

This extract excavates that Sultan wanted to make a book of illustration not because he loves art very much but because he wants to show his pride and prestige through art. Actually, his intention is to threaten Venetian Doge by showing his military power and wealth. This fact cannot be found in traditional history but it is noticed in

this novel while reading new historically. Therefore, this novel can be taken as the masterpiece for representing history from the other side.

New historicism stresses the fact that a literary text conceives history not in its purest form but in a contaminated appearance. It also believes that writers cannot be free from their values, positions and ideological perspectives along with their epistemological presuppositions while constructing a text. Religious beliefs, social status and gender also influence the writings of a writer. Since Orhan Pamuk is a Muslim novelist, the Muslim religiosity shapes this text's structure. In the novel, he time and again says 'Allah' to 'God' as Muslims call Allah for God. For example, Olive says, "through our color, paints, art and love, we remember that Allah had commanded us to 'See'" (92). Similarly, Muslim terms like Sultan, kaffir and names like Orhan, Esther, Hasan, Shevket, Nizami etc. echo the whole text. There are many citations from Koran too. Black and Shekure follow the tradition of marriage according to Koran. Likewise, Hasan reminds Shekure about the law of Koran to get divorce and remarriage. Regarding the process of remarry in Muslim culture Black takes the reference of a preacher. Black narrates, "the preacher objected that by the dictates of Islamic law a divorced woman must wait a month before remarrying, but I countered by explaining that Shekure's former husband had been absent for four years; and so there was no chance she was pregnant by him" (241). Not only the case of divorce and remarry but also about marriage procession, funeral procession or circumcision procession, Pamuk cites from the Koran. The beautiful example of influence of religion on text comes while reading the Murderer's narration to Enishte. The Murderer says:

On Judgment Day, the idol makers will be asked to bring the images they have created to life. [. . .] Since they will be unable to do so their

lot will be to suffer the torments of Hell. Let it not be forgotten that in the Glorious Koran, 'creator' is one of the attributes of Allah. It is Allah who is creative, who brings that which is not into existence, who gives life to the lifeless. No one ought to compete with Him. The greatest of sins is committed by painters who pressure to do what He does, who claim to be as creative as He. (193)

History in a new sense challenges the conventional one. Traditionally, a married woman goes to her husband's house to serve her husband and his family. Pamuk, however, goes against this convention. He forces Black, the protagonist, to live with Shekure in her father's house even after he marries her. This revolutionary fact is captured when Black says, "Since Shekure wouldn't be leaving her father's house for mine, and I would be moving into the paternal home as bridegroom, the bridal procession was only fitting" (243). Along with history, religion, culture and tradition, social status also plays important role to determine somebody else's thinking. New historicism accepts social status as an important tenet for shaping a text. If a writer belongs to poor social status, his writings depict the struggle of a poor man for food and cloths, and if s/he belongs to higher class, his/her writings represent the higher class too. In our text, other people come to pay tribute to late Enishte Effendi and console his family members at the mourning days. But, Esther, a poor clothier, comes there not to pay tribute or console but to satisfy her hunger. She admits, "I like social gatherings because I can eat to my heart's content, and, at the same time, forget that I'm the black sheep of the crowd"(291).

Chapter IV: Conclusion

Multiplicity of Truth and Knowledge

New historical reading of the fictional work *My Name is Red*, by Pamuk, proves the statement that truth and knowledge, after all, are constructed elements, which, instead of being factual, are mere perspectives. To convert truth and knowledge into perspective, there is the role of culture, society, social status, religion, political background, gender etc. These very elements influence history too. History also gets questioned in new historicism that ends including the crimes, passions and follies of the past. In other words, history, truth, knowledge, discourse and power get new sense in the novel *My Name is Red*.

Esther's desire to take part in the social gatherings proves the Marxist notion that understanding [knowledge] is determined by social status. Esther likes to take part in social gatherings (no problem it can also be the funeral procession) so that she can satisfy her hunger fully. Since, there is not equality in people's social status, understanding [knowledge] varies according to their position. Beside social status, religion and culture also influence a person's knowledge. Husret Hoja, being an Islamic prophet, preaches that coffee (a product of westerners) is devil's ruse. It is the trick of devil, so people should not drink coffee. In his preaching, one can easily sense the influence of religion. New historicism takes a fictional work as the collective influence of history, culture, society and autobiography of the writer. In this light, this novel turns out to be a masterpiece of new historical document. Pamuk cites various historical persons, places and books. Sultan Murat III is the historical imperialist king of the then Ottoman Empire. His strong presence in the text brings many other historical aspects to the surface. Master Osman is another historical miniaturist

painter. He gets voice in the novel. His narration of the miniaturist painting tradition takes us back to the pages of history.

However, this text strongly opposes the traditional notion of history. Conventional notion of history includes only 'grand' incidents and events. Basically, it records the perspective of ruling class people. Whereas, this text includes crimes, passions and follies of the then sultans; and also depicts the other side of miniaturist painters. Hence, this text advocates for new notion of history. The depiction of Sultan Murat III's passion for power and miniaturist painters' murdering and killing each other to get more money and power asserts the same fact.

Power, in new historicism, gets new meaning. In traditional sense, power means the brutal force that is applied to control others. But, assertion of the power in a new way defines it in a little different way. Power is the determinant of social prestige. But sometimes, even the comparatively weak person asserts power over the stronger one. In the novel, Shevket's childhood obstinacy forces Black to follow him wherever he goes. Similarly, Esther's arrogance, sometimes, challenges Black and Butterfly. These evidences encourage anyone to believe the changed meaning of power. Power is not always repressive but it is creative too. It helps to create discourses and effects of truths. It is all pervasive, which comes from 'below' too.

The valorization of margin over center is another aspect of new historicism. It is through narration that Pamuk equates everyone and everything. Pamuk has given voice to every character who (which) narrates his/her perception over events and incidents. All together, there are twenty-one mouths to forward the plot. Beloved Uncle, Black, Shekure, Esther, Butterfly, Olive, Stork etc. are common character-narrators, whereas, Corpse, Horse, Death, Tree, Gold Coin etc. are non-human exceptional character-narrators. Pamuk's democratic depiction can be found in his

characterization. Their twenty-one perspectives toward events support the claim that truth and knowledge are perspectives.

Works Cited

- Andrews, Walter G. "Memory and Nostalgia : An Introduction to *My name is Red*." *World Literature Today* 80.6 (2006): 27-29.
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Çiçekoglu, Feride. "A Pedagogy of Two Ways of Seeing: A Confrontation of "Word and Image" in My Name Is Red." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 37. 3 (Autumn2003): 1-20.
- Cole J. Stefan. "MNR : East meets West." *Publishers Weekly* 6 Aug. 2001: 13-15.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." *Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984. 51-75.
- . . . *Power/ Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.
- . . . *Discipline and Punish*. London: Tavistock, 1977.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic, 1973.
- Greenblatt, Stephan J. "Introduction: The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance." *Library Journal* 15.1(1982): 3-6.
- Hall, S. *Formation of Modernity*. Eds. S. Hall and B. Giobes. New York: Cambridge, 1992.
- . . . *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Jenkins, Keith. *Rethinking History*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Kloszewski, Marc. "My Name is Red : Introduction." *Library Journal* 126.14 (2001): 234-35.

- Maureen, Freely. "The Interweaving of Human and Philosophical Intrigue" *New Statesman* 27 Aug. (2001): 41-45.
- McDermott, Philip. Rev. of *My Name is Red*, trans. Erdag M. Goknar. *Magill's Literary annual*, (Fall 2001): 77.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "Presidential Address 1986. The Triumph of Theory, the Resistance to Reading, and the Question of the Material Base." *PMLA* 102(1987): 281-91.
- Montrose, Louis. "New Historicisms." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephan Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992: 392-418.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdag M. Goknar. London: Faber and Faber, 2001.
- Pandey, Beerendra. *Intellectual History Reader: A Critical Introduction*. Kathmandu: MK, 2008.
- Yeginsu, Can V. "Exiles, the Turkish Republic, and Orhan Pamuk. " *World Literature Today*. (2006): 112-19.