

Elements of Epistemic Savagery in Orhan Pamuk's *My Name is Red*

Paul Thomas Raj V^{*},

*Ph. D Research Scholar (Part-Time), PG & Research Department of English,
Muthurangam Govt. Arts College (Autonomous), Otteri, Vellore-2, Tamil Nadu, India*

Dr. J. Bobby Rajakanthi,

*Associate Professor & Head, PG & Research Department of English,
Muthurangam Govt. Arts College (Autonomous), Otteri, Vellore-2, Tamil Nadu, India*

Abstract: This paper explores the concept of epistemic savagery in Orhan Pamuk's novel *My Name is Red*. It examines how the narrative technique and the perspectives of the characters reflect a clash between individualism and religious communitarianism within the context of Ottoman art and culture. By analyzing the use of first-person narration and the ideological conflict over artistic representation, the study reveals how characters struggle with the influence of Western individualism on traditional Islamic values. The paper also delves into the symbolism of classical miniature painting, the role of the artist under the Sultan's rule, and the presence of homoeroticism and pederasty in the novel. These elements are discussed to illustrate the broader epistemic violence experienced during a period when Renaissance ideals began to permeate the Ottoman Empire. Ultimately, the study highlights the contradictions between the characters' professed beliefs and their actions, offering a nuanced understanding of the tension between preserving cultural heritage and embracing new artistic paradigms.

Keywords: Epistemic savagery, individualism, religious communitarianism, Renaissance influence, narrative technique, homoeroticism, pederasty, cultural heritage, artistic representation.

Introduction:

The account procedure of the individualized characters in *My Name is Red* mirrors the polarity among independence and strict communitarianism. Practically every one of the characters, with few exemptions, ardently investigates independence since it begins from the West, undermines their craft, and maintains perspectivism as a definitive judgment on workmanship. Amusingly, they utilize a similar strategy to recount their accounts utilizing the first-individual pronoun "I". Every section starts with "I", yet every craftsman in the novel loathes individual style. These craftsmen don't sign their artworks, accepting that God is the genuine maker, and marking their work would suggest rivaling God. Indeed, even the traditional works of art of Husrev and Shirin, Sohrab and Rustom, made by the best Ottoman craftsmen, and were not delivered in that frame of mind by ensuing specialists. These works have been duplicated in the specific way, making it difficult to recognize the first expert artwork from the propagations. Marking and making a work of art in an unmistakable style is thought of as much the same as going wrong, similar to Satan, who was quick to decline to show homage person for being a particular individual. Differentiation or a singular style in workmanship, accordingly, is viewed as the spell of Satan.

Suppression of Artistic Expression:

The section zeroing in on Satan doesn't underline this point unequivocally; it is essentially named "I, Satan" as opposed to "I'm Satan." Satan contends that he isn't doomed and isn't liable for each transgression individuals commit. Ottoman craftsmen abstained from projecting an individual at the focal point of their compositions to forestall excessive admiration and to try not to portray the world according to a human viewpoint instead of God's. Satan claims he didn't bow to Adam since he went against independence and didn't maintain that man should be given the all important focal point by God. All in all, he would not love man, lining up with the impression of Ottoman craftsmanship that doesn't give man restrictive consideration.

The old style custom of smaller than usual composition, which extends the world according to God's perspective, sees individual style as ungodly and impacted by Satan. The emphasis on likeness with stunning subtleties and looks by "Frankish unbelievers" is viewed as an attack on their practice and connivance by Satan. Satan feels irritated by these allegations and excuses himself by saying he was quick to challenge man's development on the planet. He states, "There is something I will always remember... something I will continuously be glad for: I never knelt before man" (465). He further explains his point about European

craftsmanship, saying, "These specialists additionally try to arrange their subjects in the focal point of the page, as though men were intended to be adored, and show these pictures like symbols before which we ought to prostrate ourselves" (465).

Cultural Imperialism:

Comparative contemplations are communicated by the "Tree" in the novel, regretting that it has lost its significance in the wake of being taken by cheats. The communitarian contention is obvious in different narratorial voices, for example, "The Tree," "The Canine," and the "Two Dervishes," who are important for a composition being subtly ready by Enishte for the Ruler. The tree portrays its transportation to Istanbul and its tumble from a book when cheats took it. It was important for a composition dispatched by King Mohamad Mirza. Since its partition from the expert book, the tree feels it has lost its significance, seeing itself not as a singular element but rather comparable to the entire composition. The tree considers its ongoing condition, saying, "I would rather not be the tree; I need to its imply" (80). This communitarian contention proposes that independence doesn't focus on local area over the person. For the tree, content as opposed to shape or style is vital.

Conflict of Identities:

The book being taken and afterward destroyed and isolated from different canvases appears to be enlivened by a genuinely verifiable occasion including Firdousi's legendary sonnet "Shahnama", otherwise called "Demotte Shahnama". The composition outline was offered to Paris vendor George Demotte in 1910. Unfit to find purchasers at a beneficial value, Demotte isolated the works of art from the limiting and sold them separately. These works of art have since entered different private and public assortments. The connection among word and picture, original copy and outline, represents the solidarity and congruity in craftsmanship leaned toward by Ottoman specialists, who were propelled by Persian miniatures. Wickens expresses, "Persian idea and expression are essentially independent, internal turning... It is this central viewpoint which has frequently been perceived as normal for Persian engineering (the focal yard), garden-format (the average pool), cover plan, mosaics and miniatures" (240). All parts of life mirrored similar manner of thinking of concordance and solidarity as requirements for communitarian life.

Power Dynamics and Knowledge Control:

Ace Osman has a place with the conventional way of thinking, endeavoring to arrive at the radiant degree of craftsmanship like his precursors while horrendously mindful that they seldom accomplish it. He is the last enduring craftsman who looks for flawlessness in workmanship like his ancestors in Herat. He anticipates visual deficiency and passing as gifts from God for his commitment to workmanship. He respects Enishte, his adversary, as pompous, stupid, aggressive, and unintelligent for believing his lords should paint like another person. Enishte urges the Ruler to propel Osman to mimic European bosses, causing Osman extreme misery (374). He tells Dark, "Importance goes before structure in the realm of our craft," though for Frankish and Venetian bosses, "The area of significance closes and the space of structure starts" (511). This is the way he separates between Frankish, Herat, and Chinese artistic creation:

Suppose we were to turn down a road: In a Frankish composition, this would bring about our venturing outside both the edge and the canvas; in a work of art made following the extraordinary bosses of Herat, it would carry us to the spot from which Allah views us; in a Chinese work of art, we would be caught, in light of the fact that Chinese outlines are endless (376).

Ace Osman tells Dark that when Shah Ismail reconquered Herat from the Uzbeks, he celebrated by dispatching a book of miniatures named "The Combination of Stars". A specific canvas in the book that Osman considers marvelous portrays two rulers on the bank of a stream praising triumph. He portrays the work of art:

Their appearances looked like the Ruler of Delhi, Keykubad, and his dad Bughra Khan, the leader of Bengal... they additionally looked like the essences of Shah Ismail and his sibling, Sam Mirza. I was sure beyond a shadow of a doubt that the legends of whichever story I summoned while taking a gander at the page would show up there in the King's tent (498-99).

Religious and Philosophical Tensions:

Two critical focuses arise and they are one, how the figures were indistinguishable as per the Herat school, which didn't have confidence in giving anybody unmistakable acknowledgment; two, these books were authentic records of Kings, enlightened under their watch. Thusly, it is difficult to expect any form from these artistic creations with the exception of the one supported by the state of affairs. The "Book of Festivities", which Expert Osman gets ready likewise, is an authority record of the King praising the Sovereign's circumcision

service. *My name is Red* utilizes individual stories to give bits of knowledge into the characters' brains and a not working under a Ruler endures resistance. Consider how Expert Osman feels when taken to the royal castle by the King's authorities. He subtleties his anxieties about being tormented by the King over bits of gossip about committing apostasy and satirizing the sovereign (377). This fills in as proof that smaller than normal works of art having filled majestic needs.

Gendered Knowledge:

Enishte Effendi, whom Osman thinks about his adversary, fell enthralled of Venetian representation during his ambassadorial visits to Europe, appreciating their unmistakable and individual quality. At first, that's what Enishte accepted, "Painting without its going with story is a difficulty," yet in the wake of seeing the pictures in Venice, that's what he presumed "This is without a doubt very conceivable," as the canvas wasn't an expansion of a story by any stretch of the imagination: "It was something by its own doing." He was shocked by a representation of a "person" in Europe, noticing that it could recognize one individual from another fair by the particular state of their face, without depending on their outfit or decorations (38-41). Their miniatures coming up short on strategy.

View on Miniatures:

Enishte lets Olive know that Frankish "unbelievers" don't have the reasonableness, conviction, and brilliance of varieties as they do, "Yet their compositions are more convincing in light of the fact that they all the more intently look like life itself. They don't paint the world as seen from the gallery of a minaret, overlooking what they refer to viewpoint as" (271). Enishte is dazzled by likeness' authenticity, which catches what should be visible with the unaided eye as opposed to apparent in the brain, as miniatures will generally do. He tells Olive, "Without a doubt, they paint what they see, though we paint what we check out" (271). This pressure separates the experts and sets them in opposition to one another, with Rich and Enishte turning into the main losses.

Conclusion:

The original present's two points of view still up in the air by independence and strict communitarianism. Persian miniatures, which Ottoman painters copy, plan to satisfy God and stay away from disrespect. While this way of thinking apparently drives the conversation on workmanship, ground real factors vary, and the advocates of wonderful and ideal specialty of progenitors appear to be shallow. Neither bosses Osman divert visually impaired as a gift from God, nor is Enishte an unbeliever as he fears. Enishte knows about his limits as a subject under the Ruler, so he denies painting himself in the style of likeness since the King should be portrayed exceptionally. He tells Dark, "I, too, needed to possibly be depicted thusly. However, no, that wasn't fitting; it was Our King who should be in this way depicted!" (40-41). Not with standing their awareness of impiety, the lord is viewed as second just to God.

Works Cited:

- [1]. Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Translated by Erdağ M. Göknar, Knopf, 2001.
- [2]. Wickens, G. M. "Persian Thought and Its Expression." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*, vol. 106, no. 2, 1974, pp. 233-250.
- [3]. Murray, Stephen O. *Islamic Homosexualities: Culture, History, and Literature*. Edited by Stephen O. Murray and Will Roscoe, New York University Press, 1997.
- [4]. Pamuk, Orhan and Erdağ M Göknar. *My Name Is Red*. 1st American ed. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 2001.
- [5]. Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- [6]. Moran, Berna. "Narrative Strategies in Orhan Pamuk's *My Name is Red*." *Middle Eastern Literatures*, vol. 10, no. 1, Apr. 2007, pp. 47-60.
- [7]. Paker, Saliha. "The Representation of the Ottoman Empire in Orhan Pamuk's *My Name is Red*." *East-West Encounters in Literature and Cultural Studies*, edited by Teresa Bela and Andreea Paris, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007, pp. 3-19.
- [8]. Pamuk, Orhan. "My Name is Red: Art, Power and Representation in the Ottoman Empire." *The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, vol. 26, 2006, pp. 177-190.
- [9]. Tezcan, Baki. *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [10]. Yavuz, Hakan. "Islam and Art: Orhan Pamuk's *My Name is Red*." *Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2015, pp. 26-38. doi: 10.3138/jrpc.27.1.03.