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TRANSLATION, THE PURSUIT OF INVENTIVENESS AND OTTOMAN POETICS: A SYSTEMIC APPROACH¹

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

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 imitativeness 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 boldface).
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, *Hülasa-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, multilayered 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
özgünlik (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 reinterpretation (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-
assuming 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, hülasa = 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 interculture-bound practice and concept (2002), based on my reading of Toury’s concept of “interculture” (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 “interculture” 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 perpective (suggested as an improbability by Toury), it was possible for me to argue that the notion of “Ottoman interculture” 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 inter-cultural 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).
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