

# CULTURE CONTACTS AND THE MAKING OF CULTURES

Papers in Homage to  
Itamar Even-Zohar



Edited by

Rakefet Sela-Sheffy and Gideon Toury



# CULTURE CONTACTS AND THE MAKING OF CULTURES

**Papers in homage to Itamar Even-Zohar**

Edited by

Rakefet Sela-Sheffy

Gideon Toury

Tel Aviv

Tel Aviv University: Unit of Culture Research

2011

Copyright © 2011 Unit of Culture Research, Tel Aviv University  
& Authors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by photostat, microform, retrieval system, or any other means, without prior written permission of the publisher or author.

Unit of Culture Research  
Faculty of Humanities  
Tel Aviv University  
Tel Aviv, 69978 Israel  
[www.tau.ac.il/tarbut](http://www.tau.ac.il/tarbut)  
[tarbut@post.tau.ac.il](mailto:tarbut@post.tau.ac.il)

*Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Homage to Itamar Even-Zohar* / Rakefet Sela-Sheffy & Gideon Toury, editors.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-965-555-496-0 (electronic)

The publication of this book was supported by the Bernstein Chair of Translation Theory, Tel Aviv University (Gideon Toury, Incumbent)

Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Homage to Itamar Even-Zohar

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet 1954- ; Toury, Gideon 1942-

© 2011 – Unit of Culture Research & Authors

Printed in Israel

# Table of Contents

To The Memory of Robert Paine	V
Acknowledgements	VII

## **Introduction**

Rakefet Sela-Sheffy	1
---------------------	---

## **Part One**

### **Identities in Contacts:**

### **Conflicts and Negotiations of Collective Entities**

Manfred Bietak	
The Aftermath of the Hyksos in Avaris	19

Robert Paine†	
Identity Puzzlement: Saami in Norway, Past and Present	67

Rakefet Sela-Sheffy	
High-Status Immigration Group and Culture Retention: German Jewish Immigrants in British-Ruled Palestine	79

Wadda Rios-Font	
Ramón Power y Giralt, First Delegate to the Cádiz Courts, and the Origins of Puerto Rican National Dis- course	101

Israel Gershoni	
Culture Planning and Counter-Planning: The Young Ha- san al-Banna and the Formation of Egyptian-Islamic Cul- ture in Egypt	131

Gisèle Sapiro	
Recadrer la mémoire collective: l'exemple de la France à la Libération	147
Nitsa Ben-Ari	
Popular Literature in Hebrew as Marker of Anti-Sabra Culture	219
Jón Karl Helgason	
The Role of Cultural Saints in European Nation States	245
<b>Part Two</b>	
<b>Repertoire Formation: Invention and Change</b>	
Orly Goldwasser	
The Advantage of Cultural Periphery: The Invention of the Alphabet In Sinai (Circa 1840 B.C.E)	255
Gabriel M. Rosenbaum	
The Rise and Expansion of Colloquial Egyptian Arabic as a Literary Language	323
Gideon Toury	
The Invention of a Four-Season Model for Modern Hebrew Culture	345
Panchanan Mohanty	
Why so Many Maternal Uncles in South Asian Languages?	365
Thomas Harrington	
Urbanity in Transit: Catalan Contributions to the Architectural Repertoire of Modern Uruguay	391

Nam-Fung Chang The Development of Translation Studies into a Discipline in China	411
Yaacov Shavit The Reception of Greek Mythology in Modern Hebrew Culture	437
Saliha Paker Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics: A Systemic Approach	459
Notes on Authors	475

# TRANSLATION, THE PURSUIT OF INVENTIVENESS AND OTTOMAN POETICS: A SYSTEMIC APPROACH<sup>1</sup>

**Saliha Paker**

Why talk about sixteenth century Ottoman poetry and translation in the twenty-first century? The reason may well lie in the fascination that world translation history holds for those of us who care to reach out beyond the customary borders of cultural interest to provoke comparative thinking, an inclination that seems to be gaining ground, especially among young scholars.

Twenty-five years ago, Ottoman translation history was considered a novelty, perhaps somewhat exotic too, when introduced in the predominantly European context of the International Comparative Literature Association Congress held in Paris (1985). I discussed the first translations of European literature into Ottoman Turkish in the second half of the nineteenth century (Paker 1986), which I analysed in a “polysystemic” framework (Even-Zohar 1978; 1979). Read in the light of the polysystem theory, the interrelationship between indigenous developments in Ottoman literature and translations from overtly “foreign” works of more or less the same century (which began to shape a modern poetics that served as the foundation of the later west-oriented Turkish literature) became clearer than ever when approached from a systemic perspective. In the process, Turkish secondary sources such as literary histories written in the early republican times, grew in importance, for me, as critical loci which needed to be explored and challenged. Since then, I have continued, albeit sporadically, to study Ottoman translation history from the same perspective but moving back to the fourteenth century: a different and more revealing point of departure. There was an important reason for this. When asked, in the early 1990s, to write an article on the “Turkish tradition” for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Published (with minor revisions) with the kind permission of Antoine Chavvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli eds. 2011. *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang GmbH.



*Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998), I discovered an enigmatic approach in the secondary sources concerning translation practice: an evasion of the issue of literary transfer from Perso-Arabic in terms of “translation,” a veiling, almost a concealment, of the practice that had governed literary production for more than four hundred years. The present paper is an attempt to draw attention to sixteenth century Ottoman poetic practice by addressing issues raised in important secondary sources that support the arguments I have been pursuing thus far.

### Introduction

In this paper, I shall (a) describe Ottoman *Divan* poetics as one of “resemblance” (Foucault 1977: 17); (b) explain how translation as *terceme* (repetition), the fundamental means of literary production in the order of resemblance, is disrupted by creative interventions, thus ensuring the survival of the Ottoman poetics of resemblance for at least four hundred years, from the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries; and (c) suggest that *telif*, an equivocal term used in modern Turkish scholarship to describe the literary status of a work elevated above that of *terceme*, does *not* signify “originality” but creative mediation, an inventive form of translation. I had initially intended to propose also a polysystemic approach for a comprehensive historiographical study of connections and interactions between what may be hypothesised as a central system (the “intercultural” system of the *Divan* tradition) and co-systems in various historical periods; this would be aiming for a fuller picture of the dynamics of Ottoman literature, instead of static, compartmentalised and disconnected accounts of different historical genres and literary practices. For Ottoman literature did not only consist of *Divan* poetry at a presumed centre: its peripheries extended into the popular-mystical, the popular-heroic, popular romances, the oral tradition, etc., all of which need to be investigated in a general theoretical framework. However, given the limits of time and space, that discussion will have to be taken up later.

The Ottoman poetics that I will discuss here pertains to the *Divan* (Court) tradition that developed from Persian, following varieties of the metric verse, *aruz*, based on the Arabic tradition. It reflects the literary practices of Ottoman “poet-translators” in a hypothesised “central

intercultural system" (taking shape from the middle of the fifteenth century), in which both so-called source and target coexisted (Paker 2002 a), as I shall explain below. Boundaries were not clear; source and target overlapped in both language and literary tradition.

### 1. What Fuzûlî Said, What Foucault Echoed

In a recent book on *Divan* poetry as "a lost paradigm in a world transformed", Kemal Kahramanoğlu (2006: 1) draws attention to some statements by Fuzûlî (1480?–1556), considered to be "the greatest of classical Ottoman poets" (Köprülü [1947]1989: 554–580). Born in Karbala, near Baghdad, Fuzûlî spent his whole life in the same region, without a single visit to the Ottoman capital and at a remove from the patronage of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent. His work survived in three separate collections (called *divan*) which he himself put together in (Azerî) Turkish, Persian and Arabic, each of which were considered in his time to be the "distinguished languages" of the Ottoman intercultural domain. In the preface to his Persian *Divan*, Fuzûlî states that he seems to fail no matter how hard he tries as a poet to compose a *mazmun* (conceit) that is considered satisfactory. "This is a strange situation," he says. "It is not acceptable to write something that has been said before, because it has *already* found expression; nor is it acceptable to write something that has *not* been said before, because it *hasn't* already found voice in the poetry of others" (Fuzûlî in Tarlan, quoted by Kahramanoğlu 2006: 1).

In Kahramanoğlu's view, Fuzûlî was the only Ottoman poet who articulated clearly the poetics of his time: the tradition's critical straight-jacket which forced poets into an almost impossible position, representing the dilemma that appeared to block the way for poetic inventiveness (2006: 2). This issue seems remarkably relevant to the conclusions I have been able to draw from my own research in the Ottoman translation tradition. Would such statements as those by Fuzûlî provide some justification for E.J.W. Gibb (1857–1901), the renowned Orientalist, to argue that the Ottomans were "a singularly uninventive people" and that their literary works imitated, first, Persian poetry and, later, French literature? (1901; 1901/2002: 12-14.)

Despite his pejorative opinion of Ottoman poetry, Gibb nevertheless found it worthwhile to translate it into English in no fewer than six

volumes (1900–1909). His views exerted great influence both on European and Turkish scholars. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü ([1913]1989: 22), the founder of modern literary-historical scholarship in Ottoman, was both challenged by and critical of Gibb's work and set out to uncover and even "create" (as Walter Andrews argued in 2002) an authentic canon of Turkish poetry that was uncontaminated by Persian and Arabic and that reflected the true Turkish literary spirit. As I attempted to show in a previous essay (Paker 2007), Köprülü's students and followers of his research paradigm were driven by an ideal to remove the stigma of absolute imitateness which attached itself to Ottoman poetry. In this paper, I would like to focus on some fresh approaches, like Kahramanoğlu's, to Ottoman poetry and poetics and see how they tie in with my own research in literary translation history. Therefore, I would like to examine a few more observations made by Kahramanoğlu, whose book illuminates the epistemic roots of the Ottoman *Divan* poetic system. This book complements the arguments proposed by Walter Andrews, in which the existence of a "Perso-Ottoman epistemic domain" is hypothesised and elaborated: "an epistemic domain, the domain of a certain regime of knowledge (or, in Foucault's sense, of certain conditions of knowledge), which creates itself in a poetic idiom that does not imply a territorial boundary between Turkic and Persian" (2002: 18)

Returning to Kahramanoğlu, we find that there are striking similarities that he has noted between the epistemic particularities of the Renaissance as articulated by Foucault in his *Order of Things* (1977) and those pertaining to the order of Ottoman *Divan* poetry. This indicates a parallelism that is much too important to overlook; for the Ottoman sixteenth century, like the European Renaissance, seems to have been governed by an episteme of resemblance (Kahramanoğlu 2006: 27). Kahramanoğlu also notes that the Ottoman resemblance episteme lasted longer than the European one by two hundred years; it started to dissolve in the second half of the nineteenth century with the *Tanzimat* which marks the beginnings of Ottoman "enlightenment", reflecting the emergence of what Foucault described as the "Classical" episteme (Kahramanoğlu 2006: 33 ff.; Foucault 1977: 44 ff.). Kahramanoğlu points out that it was the intellectuals of the *Tanzimat* who first expressed their

criticism of *Divan* poetry as they attacked obscure figures of thought that derived from resemblance as irrational.

Foucault's categories: *convenientia*, *aemulatio*, *analogy* and *sympathies* – the four central similitudes governing the episteme of resemblance in the European Renaissance (Foucault 1977:17–25) – have led Kahramanoğlu to find meaningful correspondences in *Divan* poetry, which is the most explicit manifestation of the Ottoman renaissance.

Before continuing with Kahramanoğlu's arguments, I would like to point out that the notion of an Ottoman renaissance is granted much wider scope in *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (2005) by Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı. This is a groundbreaking study in which the scholars focus on the sixteenth-century love poetry of the Ottomans and the Europeans in an unparalleled comparative analysis that transcends the conventional boundaries set between pre-modern Eastern and Western aesthetics.

At the beginning of their chapter on "Renaissance, Renaissances, and the Age of Beloveds," Andrews and Kalpaklı write:

Historically, the discussion of Ottoman literary culture has focused on obvious continuities with Arab and Persian literature, on the esteem with which Persian predecessors were regarded, and on the apparent reluctance of the Ottomans to depart from traditional literary norms. What has been missing is even the slightest suggestion that the Ottoman experience may have been a renaissance – comparable to the European Renaissance – of Middle Eastern, Islamic culture, **a revitalization of traditional forms and themes** and not just the last gasp of a moribund tradition. After all, the dominant literary culture of the late Renaissance in Europe could, on the basis of ample evidence, be described as a sterile imitation of classical Greek and Roman models as mediated through the unique genius of Petrarch, an unimaginative succession of idealized beloveds, of ancient gods and goddesses, of amorous shepherds and shepherdesses, all given the barest semblance of life by the literary genius of Italian poets, authors, and playwrights severely limited by Bemboist vernacular neoclassicism. This is, in fact, how Ottoman literary culture has been described – just replace the Greek and Roman models with Arabic and Persian models, Petrarch with Hafez, the classical gods, goddesses, and shepherds with the Leylas and Mejnuns, the Husrevs and Shirins, of the Islamic tradition (2005: 329, my emphasis in bold-face).

These words cannot but remind us of E.J.W. Gibbs' verdict on Ottoman poetry. They constitute one more reason to look at Ottoman poetics in the light of Foucault's theory of resemblance, based on the European Renaissance.

And now, to quote Foucault:

**Up to the end of the sixteenth century**, resemblance played a constructive role in the knowledge of Western culture. It was resemblance that largely guided exegesis and the interpretation of texts; it was resemblance that organized the play of symbols, made possible knowledge of things visible and invisible, and controlled the art of representing them. The universe was folded in upon itself: the earth echoing the sky, faces seeing themselves reflected in the stars, and plants holding within their stems the secrets that were of use to man. Painting imitated space. And **representation – whether in the service of pleasure or of knowledge – was posited as a form of repetition**: the theatre of life or the mirror of nature, that was the claim made by all language, its manner of declaring its existence and of formulating its right of speech (Foucault 1977: 17, my emphasis).

“Repetition” is a key term here that is to be associated with translation as *terceme*, “saying again.” The *Qur'an*, for instance, although deemed ‘untranslatable’ because of its absolute, divine wording, was transmitted in countless exegeses and commentaries. So were verse and prose rewritings and reinterpretations of mystical or profane love stories as well as books of advice for rulers, i.e. “mirrors for princes.” In the sixteenth century alone, no fewer than sixteen retellings of the pre-islamic love story of Leyla and Mecnun were composed (Toska 2007a: 33), the most famous of which is by Fuzûlî. There was also an abundance of versions in Persian and Arabic (*Kalilah wa Dimnah*) of fables involving two jackals and other beasts, which can be traced back to Sanskrit and which were made popular in the form of mirrors for princes also in Turkish (Paker and Toska 1997). To insert a telling remark about the transmission of the latter: a sixteenth century Ottoman version of the book of fables, *Hümayunname*, dedicated to Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent himself and composed in the exalted tradition of *Divan* poetry in which meanings lay hidden in conceits, brought honour and wealth to Ali Çelebi, the poet-translator. However, its nineteenth century version, *Hülâsa-i Hümayunname*, which was commissioned by Sultan Abdülhamid II to Ahmed Midhat Efendi, the most prolific writer of the

period, in order that the renowned book of fables and advice for rulers would be read and understood more clearly in prose, turned out to reveal criticism of despotic sovereigns when rewritten in plain discourse (with personal interventions by Ahmed Midhat Efendi); this displeased the Sultan who had it burnt and banned from publication (Toska 2007b). This serves as an excellent example of the implications of the shift from the discourse of resemblance to that of criticism, the dominant feature of “classical” episteme (Foucault 1977: 79-80).

To return to Foucault’s propositions as quoted above, Kahramanoğlu provides us with plenty of illustrations of correspondence with elements of Ottoman *Divan* poetry: the constant “play of symbols” exhibited in the *gazel* (love lyric), such as rosebud for lips, sun or moon for the face, rose or tulip for the cheek, stars for the eyes, pearls for teeth and tears (Kahramanoğlu 2006: 27). Such symbols also appear in emulative and analogical relationships: the tulip or the rose appears less radiant compared with the beloved’s cheek, the darkness of night appears pale beside the beloved’s hair, the stars fail to match the brightness of his/her eyes, the pearl is worthless compared to the beloved’s teeth (Kahramanoğlu 2006: 29). From the perspective of the present paper, the most significant correspondence involves *mazmun* (conceit) (Kahramanoğlu 2006: 101-109): resemblance that “made possible knowledge of things visible and invisible and controlled the art of representing them”. As noted above, the elaborate, polysemic, multi-layered rhetorical art of composing *mazmun* was the poet Fuzûlî’s chief concern. *Mazmun* was the art of concealing meaning and concept in couplets of implicit significations, that is, of translating the implied invisible into the explicitly visible. According to İskender Pala (2007: 403–408), a leading authority on the subject, *mazmun* signified the highest form of poetry, an art in itself, beyond that of the rhetorical use of simile and metaphor. It was meant to create an extensive web of associations in the mind of perceptive readers, to puzzle, excite and delight those who could decipher the symbols or clues offered by the poet, to lead them to explore and discover hidden meanings. Pala observes that the classical Ottoman tradition was far more involved in the use of *mazmun* than Persian poetry and that by the sixteenth century it had become the highest ideal of poets (like Fuzûlî) to construct the *bikr-i mazmun* (virgin conceit), which Pala translates (into modern Turkish) as

*özgünlük* (originality) (Pala 2007: 407). I elaborate below on the terms signifying originality and invention.

## 2. Disrupting Terceme/Repetition: Means of Literary Survival in the Order of Resemblance

At the beginning of his article on translation and transmission in Ottoman poetry (2002), Andrews states that composing *nazire*, a genre of parallel or emulative poems, is the only form of translating in the “Perso-Ottoman-Urdu” context that is of interest to him because it rests on a “creative” (not “substitutive”) act and that such poems “are translated and translate in an attitude of universalizing similarity” (Andrews 2002: 36). It seems important also to note that in the very attempt to be creative, in the composition of his *mazmuns*, for instance, the *nazire* poet was trying to break the cycle of clichéd repetition.

The sixteenth century saw the appearance of *tezkire* writers, literary biographers of past and contemporary poets like themselves; they evaluated some of their works and commented on them, often critically. Harun Tolasa, a specialist in the field, has remarked that in their assessment of a poet’s work the biographers took the practice of *terceme* (translation) as their principal point of reference, particularly in narrative poetry (Tolasa 1983: 322). In other words, they acted on the assumption of resemblance, repetition (cf. “assumed translation” Toury 1995) in order to locate, identify and judge what was *not* or “should *not* be regarded as *terceme*” (Paker 2009). Such evaluative notes by the biographers may be considered a form of “authenticating” (Hermans 2007: 22, 23-25) the claim made by poets in their prefatory statements (in the case of romance narratives called *mesnevi*) regarding the extent to which they followed their sources and what differences they introduced. If, as a result of biographers’ investigation, the work turned out to have been composed contrary to what was expected or what the poets had stated in their prefaces, they were accused of theft, exposed and condemned (Tolasa, *ibid.*).

Tolasa states that the first three principal biographers (of the sixteenth century) who were the object of his study “did not object to *terceme*” (*ibid.*). However, as poets themselves, they were obviously keen to determine whether a certain poet’s claims to (let me provisionally say) “originality” were justified and to evaluate his work accord-

ingly. For poets *did* claim to make inventions of their own. And, upon recognition of their inventiveness, creative ability (*icad, ibda, ihtira* in Tolasa 1983: 216) and sometimes even of their genius, they were applauded. To secure recognition, patronage or financial reward and to ensure the survival of his work and signature in the vast literary “repertoire” (cf. Even-Zohar 2002) of repetition, a poet of the sixteenth century, for example, might opt to rewrite or reinterpret a classical Persian romance of the tenth century. In his preface, the poet would generally name the Persian source, sometimes referring to more than one, bearing in mind the multiple renditions, reinterpretations of the source by his predecessors and even by his contemporaries. He might substitute mystical love for physical love and introduce aspects of his own time and social mores, and his own aesthetic preferences in terms of structure and poetic composition. The plot and the sequence of episodes might be reorganised or remain the same or similar, but the poetry would bear the mark of his individual inventions. Such a poet would ideally be expected to excel in composing *mazmuns* but *not* to create a work of art that was entirely new or that did not resemble any previous work.

Yet, we understand from Fuzûlî’s dilemma that to achieve poetic inventiveness or innovation was extremely difficult or nigh impossible. As I have argued above, the reasons are to be found in the epistemic foundations of the system of resemblance, within which repeating or reinterpreting appear to have been generically representative of literary production, and only a limited degree of variation and innovation seems to have been possible.

From the angle of the arguments presented in this paper, what seems telling about the biographers’ critical concern is that “equivalence” to the source text(s) (indicated by the poet in his preface) was not a necessity. In fact, good poets were not expected to maintain strict equivalence to their sources.

Given the order of resemblance and repetition, the biographers would assume poet X’s source text to have existed not as ST1 but as STn, since such a text (STn) could only be expected to be a previous interpretation or *re*interpretation (TTn) of an earlier (or even of a contemporaneous) text. The expected relationship of STn with poet X’s text in question seems to have been the biographers’ starting point in as-



suming that there had to be *some* similarity or resemblance relationship between the two texts and in comparing them, as guided by their own concept(s) of similarity and difference.

The historical evaluation process hypothesized here points to the significance of Gideon Toury's three relationship postulates for equivalence, which lie at the root of his concept of "assumed translation" (Toury 1995: 32-33) and which are not only valid but also extremely useful in rethinking the critical activity of the Ottoman literary biographers, who not only assumed (naturally, within the given order of resemblance) that there had to be a source for the derived text, but also sought to examine the scope and extent of the transfer and textual similarity-difference relationships, comparing at least the two texts, if not more. This represents a significant historical example of the time- and culture-bound nature of what appear to be norms that led critics to determine the extent and nature of "equivalence". But it must also be said that herein lies a paradox from Toury's perspective: the context for all this activity was not established by two distinct source and target systems but by a central "intercultural system" (Paker 2002) ("a universe folded in upon itself", see above), where source and target *coexisted*. Even in the late nineteenth century, the transitional period between the pre-modern and the modern, as the Perso-Ottoman intercultural system began to dissolve and separate source systems gradually emerged as a result of translating explicitly foreign sources, the order of resemblance, and *terceme* (repetition) as its main feature, continued to a certain extent to dominate. This is best observed in the translation of prose works, in the multiple designations writer-translators chose to identify the products of their transfer practices (e.g. *iktibas* = borrowing, *hülâsa* = summary), which implied an Ottomanising intervention with their source texts (Demircioğlu 2009). Closer diachronic comparative studies of how European works were translated in the second half of the nineteenth century and later would, no doubt, help clarify how translating the "foreign," with its representation of difference, served not to perpetuate the episteme of resemblance but to disrupt it and usher in the discourse of criticism.

### 3. *Terceme* and *Telif*: Friends or Foes?

In a recent paper, I claimed that the term and concept of *telif*, signifying a practice (to be explained below) which is closely connected to the practice of *nakl* (transfer) in the Ottoman literary context, should be considered among the variety of transfer activities correlated to the broader concept of *terceme* (Paker 2009). *Telif* is an Ottoman term that still exists (not as a verb but a noun and an adjective) in modern Turkish and means “original” in opposition to “translation”. In two previous studies (Paker forthcoming and 2009), I attempted to draw attention to the strong probability that *telif* was *not* taken to signify “original” (in binary opposition to “translation”) in the earlier Ottoman context. My argument was that in Ottoman usage this term was closer to its etymological root in Arabic (Turkicised as *ülfet*) meaning a harmonising or reconciling of differences, and that it did not signify the practice of creating an “original” in the sense in which we use it nowadays. My supporting argument was that the meaning of *telif* must have shifted towards “original” when Ottomans, as of the nineteenth century, became familiar with this concept of European Romanticism. This is what can be traced in the transitional discourse (from the traditional to the modern) of Köprülü, arguably the leading authority in Ottoman literary scholarship in the twentieth century, who used the term to describe and judge a creatively mediated version of a Persian source text (Paker 2007). It was Köprülü’s (and his followers’) use of *telif* to elevate a text above what he regarded as a mere repetition or imitation that did not bear the mark of the poet’s creativity that must have been instrumental (at least in Ottoman literary scholarship) in establishing the apparent opposition between *telif* as original and *terceme* as translation. In fact, Köprülü followed the earlier literary biographers in seeking and praising inventiveness or originality, but he introduced an artificial divide or opposition between practices that were not oppositionally different to each other.

In view of additional and supporting hypothetical evidence derived from Foucault’s theory regarding pre-modern resemblance episteme, my previous arguments seem to have gained a surer footing. For in the order of resemblance, the existence of only one hypothetical “primary Text” may be assumed (Foucault 1977: 79): a Source Text which may have been repeatedly reinterpreted for hundreds of years as an act of

*terceme*. Even the *Qur'an*, the only Islamic text considered original, and unrepeatable except in its Arabic words and syntax that represent the words of Allah as revealed to his prophet Muhammed, was the object of continuous exegetical interpretation (cf. Fatani 2006).

#### 4. Conclusions

In this paper I have attempted to reach some conclusions with regard to a synthesis of certain arguments that I have been pursuing in my research in Ottoman translation history for the last ten years. The impetus or inspiration for my present endeavour came from Kahramanoğlu's research and the connections he established between Foucault's theory of resemblance and Ottoman poetics. What was missing in his analysis was any reference to the practice of *terceme*, the fundamental means of perpetuating resemblance – what Foucault seems to have meant by: “representation ... was posited as a form of repetition”. This gap could be filled with arguments from my research on *terceme* as an Ottoman intercultural-bound practice and concept (2002), based on my reading of Toury's concept of “intercultural” (1995: 28) and of Anthony Pym's (1998: 177; 2000: 5): the latter having developed from a challenging criticism of the former (Pym 1998: 180). Pym's notion of “intercultural” appeared to be highly applicable to Andrews' mapping of a “Perso-Ottoman epistemic domain” in his seminal analysis of the practice of *nazire* as creative translation (Andrews 2002: 19; Paker 2002: 136). From a systemic analytical perspective (suggested as an improbability by Toury), it was possible for me to argue that the notion of “Ottoman intercultural” could be theorised as a “central intercultural system” of a hybrid Perso-Arabic and Turkish composition (Paker 2002: 139). Parallel to such arguments ran my research on perceptions of such terms as *terceme*, *taklid* and *telif* in the Turkish secondary sources of modern literary historical discourse. At the end of the nineteenth century, there was a shift of focus particularly in perceptions of *terceme* as writers and critics struggled with how to think about translations of distinctly foreign (European) provenance, which were not from the familiar epistemic domain which they had stopped thinking of as “foreign” (Paker 2006). *Taklid* (imitation) was *terceme*'s natural companion, and together they became a central concern in “influence” studies which were taken up pervasively by Köprülü and the followers of his research paradigm

(Paker 2007). Surprisingly, the notion of *telif* never, to my knowledge, became an issue; it was taken for granted as an attribution of originality and superiority, as opposed to *terceme*, again following Köprülü. What is even more significant, is that in scholarship it helped to conceal or veil the fact of *terceme* inherent in compositions that also bore the mark of the superior artist (Paker 2007: 272). What may be regarded as a conclusive argument is that if, in literary historical scholarship, we assume that the order of resemblance prevailed for over four hundred years, then we must also assume that the practice that kept literary production alive was the constant struggle or conflict between repetition and creative intervention. It is this kind of conflict that is voiced by the poet Fuzûlî on the difficulty of composing laudable *mazmuns*. In fact, Fuzûlî's statements encapsulate the fundamental dynamics underlying what I would now call the Ottoman *poetics of resemblance*. *Terceme* (repetition) was the fundamental practice that ensured its survival for so many hundreds of years; call them *taklid*, *nazire* or *telif*, related channels of poetic transmission intervened in the flow, releasing creative energy that challenged or broke (as institutionally approved, cf. Hermans 2007: 24) "equivalence" relationships to (not "into") what was regarded as clichéd sources. It was the dynamics of intervention as inventive, innovative "options" (Even-Zohar 2002: 169; 2000: 47) that fed and expanded the literary "repertoire" of the hypothesised central Ottoman intercultural system and gave birth to "its best works [as] part of a canon of 'great literature' in a polyglot empire of poetry" (Andrews 2002: 37).

## References

- Andrews, Walter G. 2002. "Starting Over Again: Some Suggestions for Rethinking Ottoman Divan Poetry in the Context of Translation and Transmission." in S. Paker ed. *Translation(s): Reshaping of Literature and Culture* (15–37). Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Andrews, Walter G. & Kalpaklı, Mehmet 2005. *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Demircioğlu, Cemal 2009. "Translating Europe: The Case of Ahmed Midhat as an Ottoman Agent of Translation." in J.Milton and P. Bandia eds. *Agents of Translation*, 131-159. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar 2002. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer." in S. Paker ed. *Translations: (re)shaping of literature and culture*, 166-174. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- 2000. "The Making of Repertoire, Survival and Success under Heterogeneity." in G. Zurstiege ed. *Festschrift für die Wirklichkeit*,(41-51. Darmstadt: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- 1979. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today*, 1: 1–2, 287–310.
- 1978. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." In" J. S Holmes, J. Lambert, R. van den Broeck eds. *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, 117-127. Leuven: Acco.
- Fatani, Afnan H. 2006. "Translation and the Qur'an." in O. Leaman ed. *The Qur'an: An Encyclopedia*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel 1977. *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of Human Sciences*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Gibb, E.J.W. 1911. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
- 1900–1909. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. E.G. Browne ed. 6 Volumes, London: Luzac.
- 2002 [1901]. *Ottoman Literature. The Poets and Poetry of Turkey*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University Press of the Pacific.
- Hermans, Theo 2007. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.
- Kahramanoğlu, Kemal 2006. *Divan Şiiri. Değişen Dünyada Kaybolmuş Paradigma*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi Yayınları.

- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad 1989 [1913]. *Edebiyat Araştırmaları*. Vol. 1. İstanbul: Ötüken.
- Pala, İskender 2007. "Mazmun". *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. in T. S. Halman et al eds., Vol. 1, İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Paker, Saliha forthcoming. "On the Literary Practices of 'a Singularly Uninventive People' and the Concept of Telif as Creative Mediation." in Ş.Tahir- Gürçağlar, J. Milton, S.Paker eds. *Translation in Turkey*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 2009. "The Curious Methodological Validity of "Assumed Translation"/Terceme as the Conceptual Basis of Analysis in Ottoman Literary Translation History." Presented at the International Workshop on Rethinking Methods in Translation History, 25-27 September, Okan University, İstanbul.
- 2007. "Influence-Imitation-Translation or Translation-Imitation-Influence? A Problematic Interrelationship in Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's Literary-Historical Discourse." in A. F. Christidis ed. *Language, Society, History: The Balkans*, 265-277. Thessaloniki.
- 2006. "Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and its Practice. The 1897 'Classics Debate' as a Focus for Examining Change." in T. Hermans ed. *Translating Others 2*, 325-348. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA:St. Jerome MA.
- 2002a. "Translation as Terceme and Nazire. Culture-bound Concepts and their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation History." in T. Hermans ed. *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II*. Historical and Ideological Issues, 120-143. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.
- 2002b ed. *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- 1986. "Translated European Literature in the Late Ottoman Literary Polysystem." *New Comparison*. 1: 67-82.
- Paker, Saliha & Toska, Zehra 1997. "A Call for Descriptive Translation Studies on the Turkish Tradition of Rewrites." in M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarova, K. Kaindl eds. *Translation as Crosscultural Communication*, 79-88. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pym, Anthony 2000. *Negotiating the Frontier, Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

- 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* 1998. M. Baker & K. Malmkjaer eds.
- Tarlan, Ali Nihad 1996 ed. *Fuzûlî Divanı Şerhi*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Tolasa, Harun 1983. *Sehî, Latîfî, Âşık Çelebi Tezkirelerine Göre 16. Yy.'da Edebiyat Araştırma ve Eleştirisi I*. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları No. 4.
- Toska, Zehra 2007a. *Salih Çelebi ve Mecnun-u Leyla Mesnevisi (Kıssa-i Pür Gussa)*. *Critical Edition and Textual Analysis*. The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.
- 2007b. "Ahmet Mithat Efendi'nin "Bir Diğer Eseri": Hülâsa-i Hümâyunnâme." *Journal of Turkish Studies*. In Memory of Şinasi Tekin. 2. – Y.Dağlı, Y. Dedes, S.S. Kuru eds. The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.
- Toury, Gideon 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Paker, Saliha 2011. "Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics: A Systemic Approach." In *Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Homage to Itamar Even-Zohar*. Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet & Gideon Toury eds. Tel-Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Unit of Culture Research, pp. 459-474.  
[ISBN 978-965-555-496-0] [e-book available from: [http://www.tau.ac.il/tarbut/Publications/Even-Zohar\\_Homage\\_Book.pdf](http://www.tau.ac.il/tarbut/Publications/Even-Zohar_Homage_Book.pdf)]

Saliha Paker is Professor of Translation Studies and part-time translator of Turkish poetry and fiction. Since her retirement from Boğaziçi University in 2008, she has served as Head of the Department of Translation Studies at Okan University, Istanbul, where she continues to teach part-time, as well as at Boğaziçi University. Her special field of study is literary translation history in Ottoman and modern Turkish society, on which she has written numerous essays in international publications. Her forthcoming book in Turkish is an annotated collection of her papers, offering a critical look at her research experience as translation historian over the last twenty-five years.