

站在世界的中心： 從奧罕·帕慕克之《我的名字叫紅》 看世界文學中的普世價值

黃雅芬/Ya-fen Huang

淡江大學英文系講師

Department of English, Tamkang University

【摘要】

十六世紀的伊斯坦堡在奧罕·帕慕克(Orhan Pamuk)之《我的名字叫紅》(*My Name Is Red*)中位處西化衝擊的時代，其傳統美學是否得以被彰顯，並呈現自古以降固有文化所賦予的獨特性？對當時代土耳其微圖畫家而言，真實的藝術作品表述只在傳達阿拉精神的存在，而非具體描繪畫者心中神的形體。然而，文學藝術的生產建構方式不斷隨文化社會價值改變，真正的土耳其美學何以彰顯？在不同的文化情境影響下，何謂普世價值？其放之世界皆準的論點是否可消除長久以來以歐美觀點運作的「西方正典」霸權，以檢視賞析非當今主流意識生產的文學藝術作品？全球化時代知識模式思考下，世界文學因此提供新的文學研究閱讀方法，期能更精準指出非西方／已西化國家文學藝術中的在地性／獨特性。本文藉由《我的名字叫紅》為例，探討傳統伊斯蘭美學觀面對漸漸浮現的威尼斯式藝術風格、西方文化的入侵，其民族美學的獨特性在普世價值關照下所遭遇的衝突與困境。

【關鍵詞】

世界文學，普世價值(the universal)，米歇·傅柯，本體模式(mode of being)，重現的限制(limits of representation)，康德，美學，獨特性(particularity)，《我的名字叫紅》(*My Name Is Red*)

【Abstract】

Orhan Pamuk's *My Name Is Red* presents the epitome of Turkish culture in the

16th century dominated by an inherent ideology. In an age of gradual Westernization, how can the particular Turkish aesthetics be recognized in terms of its own specific cultural ideology? This is a genuine question. For the miniaturists in the 16th-century Turkey, transmitting the sole existence of God seems difficult to achieve in a work of art because the reality of artistic creation (whether painting or literary work) is greatly attached to cultural/social values of the time. The concept of “the universal” in World Literature, providing a path through the cognition of the general truth, tends to deal with the representation of the general public’s most basic concerns even if specific literary productions are nowadays still made under a particular national banner such as Anglo-American. World Literature in the age of globalization would suggest a prospective literary-study approach that could balance with the existing “Western Canon” by further specifying the local/particular characteristics in other non-Westernized national literature. In *My Name Is Red*, the cultural conflict between the traditional Islamic aesthetic concept and a new Venetian style of art offers an instance presenting an issue about whether individual/national aesthetics could be unfolded/identified under the concept of “the universal.”

【Keywords】

World Literature, “the universal,” Michel Foucault, mode of being, the limits of representation, Kant, aesthetics, individuality, particularity, *My Name Is Red*

Standing in the Center of the World:

“The Universal” of World Literature in Orhan Pamuk’ s *My Name Is Red*

The city of Istanbul in the 1590s, located metaphorically as “a center of the world” in the Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk’ s *My Name Is Red*, offers a picture of hidden yet significant undercurrent of conflict between the non-Western, threatened Persian pictorial art and the gradually appearing Westernization of Frankish style of art during the 16th century. Within the influence of the Western, individuality-prevailing aura, the demand for portraits in the world of Italian Renaissance paralleled the rise of modern consumer capitalism where artists produced what the market wanted—figures in portraits were required to highlight the individual characteristics. However, the figures delineated by the art of classical Persian miniatures, in contrast, were to be together with sublimely religious and impersonal beauty and not allowed to reveal individual characters or expressions; that is, the paintings cannot signify painters themselves but are strictly the illustrations of the text while “the identity of the miniaturist is not important” (Pamuk 58). If each of the two different yet somehow similar aesthetics is analogized as the Leibnizian monad with the notion that the world is “pure emission of singularities” (Deleuze 60) converging/diverging itself or the others infinitely, is it accessible to identify a table of resemblances between two aesthetic modes of being constructed by the Eastern and Western knowledges, respectively? The case is, in the standard of traditional Islamic artistic creation, how could a particular character, national or individual, be revealed under “the universal” without being disturbed by Western values? Besides, is the image of the present-day Western Asia still somehow conceived by Edward Said’ s Orientalism, which observes a dualistic perspective? By sorting out the prospects of World Literature first and later by exploring points of view from Michel Foucault, this paper aims to contextualize, taking Orhan Pamuk’ s *My Name Is Red* for example, the problematic subjectivity of artistic Islam in Western Asia, hopefully further to indicate the feasibility of how a particular aesthetic concept is unfolded cross-culturally under the notion of “the universal,” intending to explain why the encounter of released contrary components generates conflicts.

Distant Reading

The current acknowledged way of literary study has led to a “distant reading” (57) named by Franco Moretti in his “Conjectures on World Literature” because the current close reading is administered in the condition where the smaller details— “devices, themes, tropes” (Moretti 57)—are much more elaborated than the text; the literary text itself therefore has disappeared. This kind of deduction seems to point out a controversial situation in the literary studies—implied meanings from the text are catching readers’ attentions more than closely reading the text itself. The pre-conditioned knowledge of a language also neglects the particularity of each literary work. It is believed that a literary work is created and read by a particular national system of linguistic signs (English is used as a common language in most Anglo-European literature, for instance), but then there could be a problem about how a literary work written in a “non-international language” (non-English) can be sympathized/understood completely by readers outside the Anglophone circle. What if a translated language is not adequate for transmitting the implied meanings and other information that are not said in literary works themselves directly, an understanding of a local language allowing people to communicate straight with each other, without relying on someone else to interpret or explain what is happening? What else should be concerned if the language is not essential in a literary production, given the fact that it is impossible for a person to know all languages in the world? Moretti points out that a literary text needs “*a single direct textual reading,*” while a translation could only generate a “second hand” (Moretti 57) understanding. It might be desirable if the concept of “the universal” applying to human phenomena in general does exist in the spirit of literature, the World Literature may then suggest a way out for the current difficulties in literary study. Or, less fortunately, this new way of thinking will ultimately just end up setting up another new set of literary canon “as if it were a *law of literary evolution*” (Moretti 58). Such a problem of whether this concept merely seeks another canonical genre certainly needs a consideration as well. If the “national literature” fails to contribute an all-around method for nowadays literary study (Moretti 54), could the notion of the so-called world literature help literary studies “beyond the canon” (Moretti 57) and at the

same time teach people to stay with “one, and unequal” (Moretti 56) world literary system? Moretti attempts to urge the trend of “World Literature” by proposing an emerging conjecture for current literary study, claiming that “world literature is not an object” ; “it’ s a *problem*, and a problem that asks for a new critical method” (55). Each local culture belongs to the periphery of the literary system implying that the traditional European ideology still dominates the way of literary thinking; the development of modern literature therefore will lead to “a compromise between a western formal influence and local materials” (Moretti 58). One-sided national literary study is gradually replaced by the rising of the world literature, and the emerging of the new literary study approach in the changing/changed age could perhaps lessen the language gap among historical cultural differences.

If contemporary Anglo-American literature is being studied from a multi-cultural perspective, in the sense that the boundary between two national literatures should be crossed, is there any idea interpreted as a modernized trend, namely, a common language to be decoded/read by the hypothesized “World Literature” which tries to discontinue the cultural imperialism of the United States and Europe? We need only to look at the standard of the particular (local/national) pointed out under a modeled conception of the universal such as the aesthetics, assumed as a canonical measurement composed of certain resemblances of an age. A statement should be questioned—a conventional conception likely to explain all human phenomena so that the notion of representation of people’ s essential (common) concern in the literary/cultural productions nowadays treats the ideology, shared by all people like the faculty of “thinking particular as contained under the universal” (Kant 18), entirely providing a cognition of the universal truth. Acknowledging the social, cultural, and historical forces at work in a world linked by electronic media, economic globalization, and the concept of living in a global village which will not halt by national borders, especially for those who have ever experienced exiles and foreign cultures (which they also consume a lot today), the studies of works of fiction from a cross-cultural as well as multi-cultural vantages are recognizably conspicuous in many modern and contemporary novels, whereas, will a literary work still be fully appreciated and read by means of a translated language as people are no longer

getting a special linguistic experience in the name of Goethe's "Weltliteratur"¹? The thrust of progressive modernity as an arising cosmopolitan dogma challenges the formation/transformation of subjective identity in customary cultural flows. If the idea of world literature is to encompass all literary works read beyond their cultures or regions, either in original or translation, in its most expansive sense, literature should include any work that has ever reached beyond its home base. The norm to distinguish one specific national (domestic) literature from another is thus gradually being blurred.

The world literature literally equals any national literary work which is able to be appreciated by people without complicated language difficulties; that is to say, by a translated language, readers can still fully receive the messages transmitted by the author and they also can completely "sense" the meaning of any word probably created implicitly by the writer as a metaphor or so. David Damrosch has tried to define the term "World Literature" since Goethe coined the phrase. In his "What is World Literature?" the central argument is that world literature is not at all fated to disintegrate into the conflicting multiplicity of separate national traditions, nor, on the other hand, needs it be swallowed up in a so-called "global babble" (4). Damrosch claims that world literature is "not an infinite, ungraspable canon of works, but rather a mode of circulation and of reading, a mode that is as applicable to individual works as to bodies of material, available for reading established classics and new discoveries alike" (5). Nevertheless, Damrosch seems to attempt to define the term as a standard as well. Similarly, in his *Conversations with Goethe*, Johann Peter Eckermann thinks that Goethe is the living embodiment of world literature, "even of world culture as a whole" (qtd. in Damrosch 2). Looking at Goethe's *Weltliteratur* within the multiple frames Eckermann provides, people still encounter today all the major complexities, tensions, and opportunities as they try to grasp their rapidly expanding world and its exfoliating literature (Damrosch 2). "I am more

¹ Goethe's *Weltliteratur* has received a great quantity of discussion in recent years; in the first section of "What is World Literature?" David Damrosch portrays how and when Johann Wolfgang von Goethe coined the term "Weltliteratur": "Speaking to his young disciple Johann Peter Eckermann in January 1827, the seventy-seven-year-old Goethe used his newly minted term *Weltliteratur*, which passed into common currency after Eckermann published his *Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens* in 1835, three years after the poet's death. The term crystallized both a literary perspective and a new cultural awareness, a sense of an arising global modernity, whose epoch, as Goethe predicted, we now inhabit." See David Damrosch.

and more convinced,” said Goethe, “that poetry is the universal possession of mankind, revealing itself everywhere and at all times in hundreds and hundreds of men. . . .I therefore like to look about me in foreign nations, and advise everyone to the same” (Damrosch 1). Damrosch claims that “national literature is now a rather unmeaning term; the epoch of world literature is at hand, and everyone must strive to hasten its approach” (1). Literary works have been argued to cross cultures which do exhibit “what Northrop Frye thought of as archetypes or what more recently the French comparatist Étiennele argued that common literary patterns must provide the necessary basis for any truly global understanding of literature” (Damrosch 5). A viable concept when delimited this way, world literature still consists of a huge corpus of works. These works, moreover, stem from widely disparate societies, with very different histories, frames of cultural reference, and poetics, thus lacking specialized knowledge: “the foreign reader is likely to impose domestic literary values on the foreign work, and even careful scholarly attempts to read a foreign work in light of a Western critical theory are deeply problematic” (Damrosch 4). Thus, if all literature is still criticized theoretically on the basis of dominated Western literary conventions, how to find out and read the particular character in a national literary work under the all-pervading standards needs to be cogitated.

With new technology of communication and transportation in a global sense, the way to distinguish one culture from another seems impossible. Again, how could “the particular” be recognized by a current globalized discourse if there is indeed an essential criterion of the universality of literature? The idea of “the universal” in world literature related to globalization, many years ago, had been defined as phenomena of America, since the whole world seemed to function or be seen by means of a particular perspective created by European or American ideology. J. Hillis Miller observes, “We live now, as most people know, in the time of the end of the Cold War and the globalization of economies. All the economies of the world are intertwined in new ways that have partly to do with the way markets are global, not national, just as corporations are now often transnational, not national, partly with the way financial transactions and investments are globally intertwined” (4). The purpose of studying different cultures through literary works should be just one way

for a nation to be competitive in the global sense. In the sense, the difference between the West and the East is just a comparison between some European/American countries and Eastern ones like China or India. Miller, however, has this to say, “British literature, it appears to me, will and should become gradually more marginal in the United States universities” (6) because Anglo-American literature could not serve as a resource for education in national values only. What if “the changes will give the study of English literature a radically different function from the older one, which saw Shakespeare as part of our cultural heritage and as necessary knowledge for all good citizens of the United States so we could stand up against communism?” (Miller 6) As the so-called international language, English has been used and its ideology also been disseminated for several centuries; say, English is still the center of literary reading demonstrating a universal ideology. People of this generation have to admit and realize that “in the global economy, [we] will need to have a knowledge of our own culture in all its diversity, including at least some of the many languages besides English our citizens speak” (Miller 7).

Thinking Particular as Contained Under the Universal

What can world literature do so far as its language is not a national one showing a specific regional character? Some possible definitions of world literature should be examined primarily to call for a change in our ways of thinking of a “particular” under the canon of “the universal.” For a world citizen trying to cross the border among various cultures, the term appears to declare a new coming of age of literary reading measurements so that the essence of literature could be a microcosm of social structure to present a common human phenomenon from past to present. Nowadays, as the point has broached, the whole world seems to be involved in the operation of a globalized, multi-cultural, everything-goes aura and influenced by powerful capitalistic manipulations, in which the struggle between traditional and modern forms of art is encapsulated by many societies’ values and ideologies in the name of globalization. Therefore, if a literary work is a significant linguistic structure (sign system) controlled by infinite existential ideological codes continuing to present a common human phenomenon, the specific usage of a national language seems no

longer essential for the understanding of any kinds of literary production. There might be some collective historical/cultural modes of being or literary conventions interpreted by people who do not have to know all languages around the world; nevertheless, does it make sense to represent an essential/universal cultural awareness in such a world of globalization, an alleged decentered epoch?

The problematic essential/universal standard partaken by all people needs to be reconsidered if the principles of appreciating arts or the aesthetics, for example, are defined variously, i.e., a representation is not fully represented consequently. If there are some common cultural aura/epistemological arrangements shared by all people from the ancient to the present time, how can such perception explain those resembling aesthetic concepts (epistemological arrangements) inhabited in an old space being actually no longer presented exactly in the same way in another historical period; on the contrary, if there is a common phenomenon/language being posited by people in the world for generations, how can those measurements inhabited in a position incompletely represented before be applied now to appreciate/examine a work of art in different ages? Suppose the spirit of aesthetic is a unique expression of an artist, and it also aims to have a perfect representation of the divine, how has an individual artist succeeded in overcoming his or her personal vanity (or which is partly dominated by certain ideology politically, culturally, or aesthetically, etc.) to present the quintessence of cosmopolitanism? To figure out how a work of art transmits the existence of God is not easy to be achieved because an artistic work does not simply represent a reality or visual image without thinking of its attached ideology. The demand for portraits in the Western world parallels the rise of modern consumer capitalism, where an artist produces what the market wants, not what some central authority (like the Sultan in Islamic society) says what they can produce.² However, the authorities also try hard to maintain traditional values against the assault of Western ones. Is true art an expression of the individual artist, or is it the perfect representation of the divine in which the individual artist has accomplished to overcome his or her personal characteristic? The social-cultural conflict, in *My Name Is Red*, between Islamic aesthetic concept and Frankish style of art shows a

² This point excerpts from an article by Peter Gordon, an editor of The Asian Review of Books. For the book review, see online. <<http://www.asianreviewofbooks.com/arb/article.php?article=34>>

problem about whether the particular (national character) could be revealed under the universal and whether the uniqueness of the traditional aesthetics can be interpreted without the disturbance of Western values.

The Text: My Name Is Red

My Name Is Red by the Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk, set in Istanbul during the reign of Ottoman Sultan Murat III (1574-95) and somehow beyond into the reign of Sultan Ahmet I, presented in many voices and from many perspectives (the first voice being that of a corpse), concerns the fate of miniaturists and illuminators whose art form began during the Timurid Dynasty (1370-1526). Early fifteenth-century Herat (of present-day Afghanistan) had been the center of Islamic painting, and Bihzad was considered its greatest master. The novel takes place at the apex of miniature painting's demise because the influence of infidel art, the Renaissance, is already being felt, especially the portraiture of Frankish artist—portraiture³ is prohibited for fear that the likeness of a human would replace Allah as an object of worship—an affront to Islam because of the belief: "To God belongs the East and the West. May He protect us from the will of the pure and unadulterated" (Pamuk 161). Master gilder Elegant Effendi having been killed by a fellow artist, three other miniaturists had been secretly at work (commissioned by the Sultan) using the new Frankish methods. The cause to Elegant's death is concealing "an appalling conspiracy against our religion, our traditions, and the way we see the world" (5) and the provocation resulting in being murdered derives from "the enemies of the life in which you believe, of the life you're living, and of Islam" (5). How did the cultural clash happen between the Renaissance and Islamic arts, and what standards did they follow to decide the moment separating the incompatibilities? Under the examination of the universal principle, the irreconcilable of varied knowledge

³ In "A Conversation with Orhan Pamuk," when asked to define the significance of the conflict between the Islamic painting aesthetic and the Western one, Pamuk answers, "To be influenced by the western ways of portraiture is a dilemma for the traditional Islamic painter who is devoted to repetition and purification of traditional forms. . . . One is that of seeing the world through the eyes of any individual person. . . . The other is seeing the world through God's eyes, from high above as the Islamic painters did, and perceiving the totality of, say a battle from above." How belief in God is affected by the West could be examined to indicate the shift from an old world to a new one. For the interview, see online. <<http://www.randomhouse.com/knopf/authors/pamuk/qna.html>>

arrangements, in *My Name Is Red*, is certainly proved to come into being a bloody war.

The Undelineated Aesthetic Experience

The aesthetics is a mode of epistemological arrangements as well as a universal experience of experiencing beauties shared by people in different ages; however, is the perception of the aesthetics constructed politically or just sensed naturally based on no particular measurements? Can experiences be fully described by words? Master Osman, in *My Name Is Red*, so recalls his apprentice life:

I felt the pain of the beatings we all received during our long apprenticeships, the blows inflicted with rulers, until our cheeks turned bright red, or with marble polishing stones upon our shaven heads, as I flipped—with humiliation—through the pages of a primitive book that displayed methods and implements of torture. (314)

By means of seeing some material objects, memories could be represented concretely as visible images. However, how is the aesthetic experience depicted exactly through materials or languages? A painting could be conceived as a representation of what people want to say or how people think—their desire. Once Master Osman remembers his passion for painting and feels the depth of thought he experienced before, saying that

I had the strong feeling that painting was not about melancholy and regret but about this desire I felt and that it was the talent of the master artist that first transformed this desire into a love of God and then into a love of the world as God saw it. (316)

If painting how God sees the world is an important drawing skill for Turkish painters at that time, does it follow that painting is a medium used to connect among people, God, and the truth? Why is the experience of experiencing God not possible

to be put into words? For instance, while searching for the murdering evidences in Master Osman' s Treasury, Black, a miniaturist and binder who has recently returned from twelve years away in Persia, murmurs to himself:

regardless of whether the illustration was made today or a hundred years ago, whether it's a depiction of war or love, what the artist of absolute faith actually paints and conveys is a battle with his will and his love for painting. (Pamuk 301)

A work of art, created by an individual artist, does present a world which blurs the border between a specific personality of the cultural representation and a produced dominating social ideology. Accordingly, a particular concept of the aesthetics is hardly manifested under the flows of the Westernization.

If the rupture of two contiguous epistemological arrangements goes along with forces, could the aesthetics become a cosmopolitan table of identities used to prevent the possible collision between incompatible cultural/artistic standards? What are “art” and “aesthetics” ? Aesthetics, or aesthetic, is often used as a synonym for art in general, but the original definition of the word could be helpful to catch some gist of the idea. In ancient Greek, *aithesis* (the root of “aesthetic”) means “feeling” and corresponds to the German, *Gefühl*, a term Immanuel Kant uses to evoke the idea of inner feeling. Art would then be the sphere where inner feeling is evoked, rather than being the sensations evoked by an external source. In the very beginning of *The Critique of Judgment*, Kant distinguishes “the subject” of the experiencing from “the object” of being experienced, saying that “what is merely subjective in the presentation of an object, i.e., what constitutes its reference to the subject and not to the object, is its aesthetic character; but whatever it serves, or can be used, to determine the object (for cognition) is its logical validity. In the cognition of an object of sense, these two referents (to the subject and to the object) occur together” (29). Kant explains, “[T]hat subjective side of a presentation which is incapable of becoming an element of cognition is the pleasure or displeasure connected with that presentation” (29). An attempt here is made to deny the individualist and relativist approach of empiricism, which can never produce a

consensus about beauty, thus the “beauty,” rather than being a sensation directly perceived by the senses, is essentially a subjective, interior feeling. Against the rationalist view, Kant says that the aesthetic faculty is not cognitive—beauty, then, has no concept, or prior model that is entailed in its being a feeling. In a sense, this feeling, evoked by beauty, in principle, will be shared by every one of us because “beauty is the ‘object’ of universal delight.”

In the “Introduction” to *The Critique of Judgment*, Kant tells us that “Judgment in general is the faculty of thinking the particular as contained under the universal.” If the universal (rule, principle, law) is given, then judgment, which subsumes the particular under its *determinative*, even though (in its role) as transcendental judgment, states *a priori* the conditions that must be met for subsumption under that universal to be possible. But if only the particular is given, the judgment has to find the universal for it, and then this power is merely *reflective* (Kant 18). The Kantian terms, *determinant* and *reflective*, suggest a concept that in general is the determination of whether a particular instance qualifies as one thing or another, that is, to subsume a particular thing under the general concept of one object. Thus, for example, *beautiful* is not a determinative concept because judgments about beauty are “reflective” instead, occurring in the absence of a firm rule or standard and are more likely to generate disagreement. But how can the experience of aesthetics be understood by all people from their different and already existing or unambiguously given principles? Stork, one of the three suspect miniaturists in *My Name Is Red* who paints “The Tree and the Dog,” thinks that an artist’s skill should depend on “carefully attending to the beauty of the present moment” (Pamuk 368) and “taking everything down to the minutest detail seriously while, at the same time, stepping back from the world” (Pamuk 368); say, the experience of aesthetics will be sensed like “looking into a mirror, allowing for the distance and eloquence of a jest” (Pamuk 368). To appreciate beauty of any artistic kind in life, one should keep a distance, so that the aesthetics could practically be as a universal connection between tradition and modernity—Eastern Asia and the West.

“The Limits of Representation”

In the name of traditional Islamic artistic creation, pictures should not be drawn to depict the real world, desecrating their Allah; people can see, through their naked eyes, the exact representation of a world because it does not follow the social rules at that time. Butterfly, a miniaturist in *My Name Is Red*, states about “the flaw” of a painting that “since one would never expect any such things from the old masters, the Sultan was seized by a kind of panic, suspecting that this volume he was reading recounted not a story or a legend, but what was most unbefitting a book: reality itself” (Pamuk 64). Black, the main character in *My Name Is Red*, once visits the workshop of a painter named Nuri Effendi, where he reminds a boy beaten by his master miniaturist that the beatings he himself and the other master miniaturists received serve as apprentices. “This was a postbeating silence, the likes of which I’d experienced many times” (59). Black and those boys share the collective experience, “a silence which would be broken at times by a nerve-wracking chuckle or a witticism” (59). The mode of being adopted in the sixteenth-century Islamic artistic training determines the so-called “right” paintings or “the paganish” ones, and the knowledge of how to be a great painter or miniaturist is structured by such a feeling of “silence” in which “painting is the silence of thought and the music of sight” (59). Who will be the one to determine the concept of being “correct” or “pretty” to punish the people who do not obey “the rules”? Will the aesthetic measurements be the same in different ages of history? If the years of the sixteenth century in Islamic aesthetic are supposed to be broken by a discontinuity that separates the traditional Islam and modern European style, what is the measurement derived so immediately to establish a particular space of being in the field of knowledge? An idea of deconstructing each mode of being of arranged knowledge from Michel Foucault’s “The Limits of Representation” might explain how the conflict is created between the traditional Islamic arts and the so-called modern Frankish paintings around the sixteenth-century Islam.

If there is a general linguistic rule supposed to be followed by all people around the world for generations, how do the criteria analyze a new epistemological organization existing before but no long properly used to examine a work of art in different ages? If the principles of appreciating arts or the aesthetic measurement, for example, are defined variously, and the table of identities for a certain historical

period is arranged variedly and discontinuously, what standards could be recalled or remembered by future generations to name the beauty of a work of art for a certain age of history? The representation of the artistic positivities is supposed to be limited/framed by some criteria so that the character of each representation could itself be recognized from how it existed before. In *My Name Is Red*, Enishte Effendi, behind the secret book in the Infidel style that costs Elegant his life and has commissioned Black to write the text, metaphorically divides sultans' love for paintings into three seasons: at first, those artists are bold, eager, and curious; that is, the rules of paintings are for the sake of respect and to influence how people see them. During the second phase, they commission books or illustrations to satisfy their own tastes because they have sincerely learned how to enjoy paintings while, at the same time, ensuring the continuation of their renown in this world. In the autumn of sultan life, they no longer concern themselves with the persistence of their worldly immortality (159). What is "worldly immortality"? "I mean the desire to be remembered by future generations, by our grandchildren. Rulers who admire miniatures and books have already acquired an immortality through the manuscripts they've commissioned from us—upon whose pages they've had their names inserted, and at times, their histories written," explained Enishte Effendi to the murderer (159). In Islam of the sixteenth century in *My Name Is Red*, the master Effendi presents a new European concept of arts, against traditional one, in which an artist's style (signature) could be identified and recognized. However, immortality after death for arts has been more emphasized by Islamic artists because they believe that there are no, whatsoever, earthly forms of arts (or materials) that could fully reproduce (represent) the real world of God.

The debate of questioning the artistic style, whether a miniaturist ought to have "his own personal style" or "a use of color, a voice all his own" (Pamuk 17), brings an obvious cultural/artistic difference between Islam and the West, tradition and the modern—the miniaturists sacrifice individuality to tally with a point of view most people identify; however, European (the Western) art emphasizes the individual style (individuality) both in the artists and the subjectivity of art works. Could it be that the clash between two different aesthetic concepts in an era of mixing traditional and modern spirit are caused from those changing limits of the representations? Is it

possible to designate what happened to the problematic discontinuity (enigmatic in its principle, in its original rupture) between two successive tables of historical identities which broke respectively the thought in the last years of the eighteenth century and the Renaissance thought at the beginning of the seventeenth century, for example?

“The great circular forms in which similitude was enclosed were dislocated and opened” so that “the table of identities could be unfolded” and “that table is now about to be destroyed in turn, while knowledge takes up residence in a new space” (Foucault 217). The example from the first section of Foucault’s “The Limits of Representation” introduces a concept of how the knowledge arrangements (modes of being) are organized or represented differently in each given time (history), and it mainly questions how new knowledge taking up its residence in a new space connects each other; that is, in what way is the measure of an organized structure determined to distinguish one from the others— “Where did this unexpected mobility of epistemological arrangement suddenly come from, or the drift of positivities in relation to one another, or deeper still, the alteration in their mode of being?” (Foucault 217)

Foucault first briefly covers the Renaissance episteme and then the Classical episteme and three empirical sciences. The emergence of history as both knowledge and the mode of being of empiricity is still constituted by many signs of a deeper rupture, in which signs are chronologically scattered in the formation of philology, of economics, or of biology. Thus, first of all, the fundamental mode of being of the positivities does not change so that men’s riches, the species of nature, and the peopled languages are still retained by “double representation” (Foucault 221) in the Classical Age; in the second phase of historical developments, however, “words, classes, and wealth will acquire a mode of being no longer compatible with that of representation” (Foucault 221). Representation is no longer the being of thought, the unquestioned principle of all cognitive ability; rather, it must be grounded on something else. In other words, could the notion of the universal be detected from different epistemic modes of being between two conjoint but separate historical cultural arrangements? Here Foucault poses an insightful question as to how and why a once dominating branch of knowledge suddenly becomes marginalized. “How is it that thought detaches itself from the squares it inhabited before—general

grammar, natural history, wealth—and allows what less than twenty years before [sic] had been posited and affirmed in the luminous space of understanding to topple down into error, into the realm of fantasy, into non-knowledge?” (Foucault 217) What event, what law do people obey to make sense that these historical (chronological) changes suddenly decided so that “things are no longer perceived, described, expressed, characterized, classified, and known in the same way, and that it is no longer wealth, living beings, and discourse that are presented to knowledge in the interstices of words or through their transparency, but beings radically different from them?” (Foucault 217) What is the measurement to limit the way it goes in each epistemological arrangement and the unexpected mutation? The questions of where this unexpected mobility of epistemological arrangement suddenly comes from, how the drift of positivities relates to one another, or what the alteration in their mode of being is might not easily be figured out; nevertheless, the rupture between two different “tables of identities” is not clearly defined/identified yet. “How were these ways of ordering empiricity—*discourse*, the *table*, *exchange*—eclipsed?” (Foucault 220) It is not so accessible to specify a table of identities about what makes the discontinuity happen in the compilation of factual successions or sequences occurring in each mode of being. The original rupture is still a mystery, but a point might be certified that the rupture usually brings a clash between two different epistemological arrangements.

What is the definition of “the universal” after all? Will the perspective of “the universal” be able to eliminate the already existing “Western Canon,” in a sense, to be closer to the realm between the Westernization and local characteristic in the East? The struggle of either continuing tradition for identifying specific cultural character or accepting the fact of modernization in the aura of social/cultural/economic globalization is similar to the conflict of aesthetic representations between the East and the West in *My Name Is Red*. It is the religion—“I fear no one but Allah. It was He who provided us with reason that we might distinguish Good and Evil” (Pamuk 20)—which determines the knowledge arrangements of Islamic artistic mode of being, while the belief the Westerners follow delineates a solid concept of universal truth for generations; in the sense, either being changed compulsorily by the others or trying to coercing people into doing something

they do have in their traditions might bring serious clashes which have happened a lot in human history. The Ottomans are the inheritors of a centuries-old tradition of oriental miniatures, where figures, animals, and trees and clouds are not meant to resemble any physical object, but are rather meant to show the essence of the object, in the way God sees it. If we used to distinguish the difference between the so-called “Islamic art” and “the Renaissance artistic style,” and if the aesthetic norms of Islamic painting should not be judged by the influence of Western imperialism (or by Western literary conventions of university), how does such point give the definition of “the universal” applied to the reading of World Literature? Yet in the name of traditional Islamic artistic creation, how could a particular national character be revealed under “the universal” without being disturbed by Western values, and what standards are to be followed to decide the moment that separates the incompatibilities which show the cultural clashes between the essentially aesthetic concept and the newly coming artistic measurements? We have long since believed that any universal phenomenon could be represented in a literary work, but is any idea supposed to be the essence of the universality of literature, and how could “the particular” be recognized by a so-called globalization ideology? What is the measurement to limit the way that goes in each epistemological arrangement and the unexpected mutation? Here, an effort has been made, by using a certain point, with or without translation, to represent an essence of the world and to explain the indefinable human phenomena shown in literary works. Unfortunately, it does not seem to be very successful when applied to exactly interpret the Islamic view of seeing the world because the literary study is still examined under Western (Anglo-American) ideology.

本論文於 2008 年 3 月 13 日通過審查。

引用書目

Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.

- Deleuze, Gilles. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Limits of Representation." *The Order of Things*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Judgement*. Trans. James Creed Meredith. London: Oxford UP, 1952.
- Gordon, Peter. "My Name Is Red by Orhan Pamuk." *The Asian Review of Books*. 27 Feb. 2006 <<http://www.asianreviewofbooks.com/arb/article.php?article=34>>
- Miller, J. Hillis. "Will Comparative Literature Survive the Globalization of the University and the New Regime of Telecommunications?" *Tamkang Review* 31.1 (2000): 1-21.
- Moretti, Franco. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 55-68.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdağ M. Göknar. New York: Random House, 2001.
- . "A Conversation with Orhan Pamuk." *Borzoi Reader*. 27 Feb. 2006 <<http://www.randomhouse.com/knopf/authors/pamuk/qna.html>>