Canons as Reservoirs: The Ottoman Ocean in Ziya Pasha's *Harabat* and Reframing the History of Comparative Literature

C. Ceyhun Arslan

Comparative Literature Studies, Volume 54, Number 4, 2017, pp. 731-748 (Article)

Published by Penn State University Press

CANONS AS RESERVOIRS: THE OTTOMAN OCEAN IN ZIYA PASHA'S *HARABAT* AND REFRAMING THE HISTORY OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

C. Ceyhun Arslan

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the introduction of Ziya Pasha's Ottoman anthology *Harabat* (AH 1291–1292 [1874/1875–1875/1876]), which provides a comparative history of Arabic, Turkish, and Persian literatures. I argue that *Harabat* compiles texts from diverse geographical and temporal origins and, instead of defining them as members of distinct national traditions, projects this compilation as what I call a literary "reservoir" that constitutes the multilingual Ottoman canon. My argument draws upon Ziya Pasha's characterization of the Ottoman culture as an "ocean" that encompasses Arabic, Persian, and Turkish "streams." This description undermines the typical scholarly view that the Ottoman culture emerged and developed under Arabic and Persian influences. I then reframe our understanding of canonization through using the conceptual repertoire that the world literature scholarship has brought into literary studies—circulations, target culture, and source culture. Building upon John Guillory's work on the process of canon formation, I propose that each source text can be "deracinated" when its context is ignored in the target culture to facilitate this text's incorporation into a new canon, or "reservoir." This article finally calls for rewriting the history of comparative and world literature by demonstrating that *Harabat* is constitutive of the nineteenth-century comparative literature paradigm.

KEYWORDS: Canon, Ottoman literature, reservoir, Goethe, Ziya Pasha

"Circulation" has become one of the central tenets of the world literature scholarship. David Damrosch defined world literature as "all literary works that

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE STUDIES, VOL. 54, NO. 4, 2017.

circulate beyond their culture of origin, either in translation or in their original language"[1] and Alexander Beecroft recently described six ecologies of world literature based on the "constraints operating on the circulation of literary texts in a variety of different historical contexts."[2] These works rest on the premise that studying textual circulations undermines the strict boundaries of national canons as well as the nationalistic frameworks that have characterized literary studies. While agreeing with this premise, I propose that literary critics view circulation as a force that also generates new canons.

For understanding the relation between circulations and literary canons, I draw upon John Guillory's work on the process of canon formation. Guillory pinpoints "the deracination of the text tradition" as an important component of this process, describing it in the following words:

> It is just by suppressing culture in the ethnographic sense—or reserving that sense of culture for non-"Western" artifacts—that the traditional curriculum can appropriate the "great works" of Western civilization for the purpose of constituting an imaginary cultural unity . . . . The deracination of the text tradition thus forces us to define the intertextual relation, say, between Aquinas and Aristotle as evidence of the continuity of Western culture, but it allows us to set aside the fact that Aristotle and Aquinas have almost nothing in common culturally.[3]

This article calls for a reframing of our understanding of canonization by building upon the conceptual repertoire that the world literature scholarship has brought into literary studies—circulations, target culture, and source culture. To rephrase Guillory's insight in the framework of world literature, each source text can be "deracinated" (i.e., its context slightly or even fully overlooked in the target culture) to facilitate this text's incorporation into a new canon.

To demonstrate how circulations play also a key role in the process of canonization, I designate canons as "reservoirs," which amalgamate texts circulating from various source cultures and project them as the property of a particular culture. By doing so, I open up new ways in which scholars of world literature can theorize the process of canonization. As a case study, I give a close reading of the famous Ottoman anthology, *Harabat* (AH 1291–1292 [1874/1875–1875/1876]) (*Tavern*) by Ziya Pasha (1825–1880). Jeffrey Di Leo observes that "anthologies are discussed by progressive thinkers in terms of the canonical formations that they propose and the possible political and cultural directions in which they implicate their subject matter."[4]

Following Di Leo, I propose that *Harabat* compiles texts from diverse geographical and temporal origins and, rather than defining them as members of distinct national traditions, projects this compilation as the Ottoman "reservoir" or canon that constitutes the basis for the cultural direction that Ziya Pasha advocated. My argument draws upon Ziya Pasha's characterization of the Ottoman language as an "ocean" that encompasses Arabic, Persian, and Turkish "streams" in *Harabat*'s introduction, which was so influential that the prominent Ottoman intellectual Ebüzziya Tevfik (1849–1913) published this introduction as a separate book, *Mukaddime-i Harabat* (AH 1311 [1893/1894]).

Texts that belong to a canon that is affiliated with a particular linguistic or national tradition can join reservoirs through circulations, becoming part of another canon that encompasses works of diverse languages and source cultures. The cultural reservoir has a strictly circumscribed boundary that allows intertextualization only among a select number of texts for generating a canon that can incorporate works from diverse languages and cultures, akin to Ziya Pasha's vision of "Ottoman literature." Texts written in languages other than Arabic, Persian, and Turkish also circulated in the Ottoman Empire; however, these literatures, such as Armenian or Kurdish, did not shape the cultural reservoir that the elite Ottoman men of letters identified with.

I emphasize the role of intertextuality in generating the Ottoman reservoir also to undermine "the influence paradigm" that has shaped the study of Ottoman literatures to this day. Intertextuality theory does not merely pinpoint shared elements among different texts; in fact, Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes developed the intertextuality theory to criticize the influence paradigm that has emphasized that any derivation of a source text means an unquestioned acknowledgment of that source text's superiority.[5] According to the intertextuality theory, each adaptation represents a creative rewriting of the source text, as adaptations can surpass and even subvert the source text's supremacy. Drawing upon the influence paradigm, the current scholarship often considers Turkish literature the last chain of Islamic literature that started with Arabic, developed into Persian, and finally culminated in its "most derivative" form—the Ottoman literature. For example, in his famous *A History of Ottoman Poetry* (1900–1909), Elias John Wilkinson Gibb (1857–1901) argues that Turkish poetry lived under the fetters of Persian influence for centuries until French culture became the dominating influence during the late nineteenth century.[6]

Analyzing *Harabat*'s introduction reveals the need for a new conceptual framework for analyzing multilingual canons. The scholarship of world literature, despite its aim to undermine the Eurocentrism of the comparative literature discipline, can be often prone to what Rey Chow has called

"Eurocentric models of language and literature." As she puts it, "[The critique of Eurocentrism] must question the very assumption that nation-states with national languages are the only possible cultural formations that produce 'literature' that is worth examining. Otherwise, we will simply see, as we have been seeing, the old Eurocentric models of language and literature study being reproduced ad infinitum in non-European language and literature pedagogy."[7] Chow warns against the practice of a comparative and world literature that often projects literary works as spokespeople of national communities, ignoring that texts can have multiple, even contradicting, cultural identities other than the national. Such a practice perpetuates institutional biases in literary studies today that, for example, would not consider classical Arabic poetry Ottoman because it assumes that texts have a single cultural identity circumscribed by the time and place of their production, two factors that are then used to assign to them a national identity. It ignores other ways in which texts from disparate geographical and temporal origins amalgamate and contribute to creating heterogeneous cultural communities like the intelligentsia of the late Ottoman period.

This article first describes the concepts "reservoir" and "intertextuality" that crystallize Ziya Pasha's vision for the Ottoman culture in *Harabat*. After examining the ocean imagery in Goethe's and Ziya Pasha's writings, I discuss the context in which *Harabat* was written and show that *Harabat* was constitutive of the comparative literature paradigm that developed in the nineteenth century. This article thus proposes that reflecting on reservoirs opens up new ways of thinking about the future of the comparative literature discipline.

Ziya Pasha's Ottoman Ocean and Intertextual Reservoirs

Despite its comprehensive scope of 1227-pages, *Harabat* does not provide an encyclopedic coverage of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish poetic traditions. It instead selects works from each to affirm a multilingual Ottoman heritage, viewing Persian and Arabic traditions as an integral component of a grand imperial cultural identity. Through not simply amalgamating but also making categorical claims on Persian, Arabic, and Turkish poetic heritages in its introduction, *Harabat* marks an Ottoman intellectual's authoritative stance in defining, categorizing, and analyzing these literary corpora.

In the beginning of *Harabat*'s introduction, Ziya Pasha praises God[8] and the Prophet Mohammad.[9] Then he provides his reasons behind composing

this anthology. This section includes mostly biographical information about Ziya Pasha, who, through composing *Harabat*, writes down the works of Arab, Turkish, and Iranian poets who have shaped his cultural and intellectual formation.[10] He discusses Chagatai and Ottoman Turkish poets who composed their works before the empire attained vast territories and adopted an imperial, cosmopolitan identity.[11] Afterward, he describes the requirements of being a poet, as he argues that poets need to have both natural talent and a comprehensive training of linguistic sciences.[12] Ziya Pasha then provides the biographies of *Rum* (Roman; an epithet used for Anatolia as well as Ottoman Turkish) poets who have attained prominence after the empire expanded its territories in the fifteenth century.[13] At the end of this lengthy introduction, he expresses his opinion on Iranian[14] and then on Arabic poetry.[15] In the final section, Ziya Pasha laments his declining health, apologizing for any mistake he might have made when he compiled the anthology.[16]

Literary histories written after *Harabat* claimed that the Ottoman culture had always lived under the influence of another culture and had to find a new source of influence that would revive an ailing empire in crisis in the nineteenth century. For example, Şehabeddin Süleyman in *Tarih-i edebiyat-ı Osmaniye* (AH 1328 [1910/1911]) (*History of Ottoman Literature*) claims that the Eastern "water spring" (*menba*) had nurtured Ottoman literature until the nineteenth century when the "Western water spring" became its main source.[17] İbrahim Necmi in *Tarih-i edebiyat dersleri* (AH 1338 [1919/1920]) (*Lessons on Literary History*) similarly argues that while Ottoman literature had hitherto lived under Persian and Arabic influences, it had to seek the Western spring to rejuvenate and create a new literature: Şinasi discovered the water spring of the West to revive the Ottoman culture.[18] İsmail Hikmet in *Türk edebiyatı tarihi: Ondokuzuncu asır* (1925) (*History of Turkish Literature: Nineteenth Century*) writes that three springs, Arab, Persian, and Byzantine influences, shaped the Ottoman literature.[19] The imagery of water springs was also used in Turkish literary histories that were written after the demise of the Ottoman Empire. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar in *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (1949) (*History of the 19th Century Turkish Literature*) notes about the condition of Ottoman poetry, "Sanki bütün pınarlar kurumuş ve insan çırılçıplaktır" (It was as if all springs dried up and humankind was completely naked),[20] and later on the art of the same period, "[H]ayatın yaratıcı pınarı kurumuştu" ([T]he creative spring of life dried up).[21] ismail Parlatır uses the same metaphor to describe the emergence of modern Turkish literature in *Tanzimat edebiyatı* (2006) (*Tanzimat Literature*): The East used to be the "water spring" (*kaynak*) for the Ottoman literature until the late nineteenth century, but the West then became

the new "water spring."[22] What unites all these histories is the assumption that a modern, more rejuvenated Ottoman literature has emerged after it distanced itself from a culture that was assumed to be drying up.

Two metaphors—ocean and water spring—stand for different kinds of canon formation circumscribing the texts that a community like the Ottoman literati chooses to preserve and remember. *Harabat* challenges the commonly held notion that a literary canon is a list of texts that belong to only a single linguistic tradition, as it asserts that Arabic, Persian, and Turkish poetic traditions mix so perfectly in the Ottoman "ocean" that they form the canon that an Ottoman poet should master. In many histories written after *Harabat*, however, Ottoman literature could never surpass, but merely imitate, Arabic and Persian literatures that set the standards for eloquence and poetics.

The lines below, which capture most lucidly Ziya Pasha's vision for the Ottoman culture, do not project Arabic and Persian literatures as a separate "spring" that has nurtured the Ottoman civilization, but instead an integral constituent of its ocean:

ترکی دیلی اوّل ایدی یکتا
ایتدی آنی فارسی دوبالا

هم اویله یاقشدی ایکی گوهر
گویاکه قارشدی شیر وشکر

یاخود ایکی بحر علم وعرفان
برلشدی برابر اولدی عمان

یوق اوج دکّز اولدیلر فراهم
آندن چیقدی بو بحر اعظم

زیرا عربی لسانله اوّل
اولمش ایدی فارسی مکمل

عثمانلی لسانی بو لساندر
فکر ایله نه بحر بیکراندر

عثمانلی لساننی بیلن ذات
بر بنّادرکه حاضر آلات

بر قاچ درلو اداته نائل
بر قاچ نوع انقلابه قابل [23]

(Once, the Turkish language was on its own
then Persian elevated and doubled it

These two jewels (*gevher*) befitted each other so well
as milk and sugar mixed together

Or two seas of knowledge and wisdom
came together and became an ocean

No, three seas came together
and from their union emerged this majestic ocean

Since the Persian first
attained perfection by uniting with the Arabic language

This language is the Ottoman language
so contemplate that this is a peerless ocean

Someone who knows the Ottoman language
is an architect with devices

Who has mastered several tools
able to create various transformations)

Unlike many other literary historians who claimed that the Turkish culture lived under the influence of Persian civilization, Ziya Pasha argues that the Persian language elevated the Turkish language to generate the hybrid Ottoman ocean. In his introduction to the poetry anthology, Ziya Pasha provides a lengthy description of the Ottoman language because he defines poetry as *ayine* (the mirror) of language.[24] Ziya Pasha calls the languages that mix in the Ottoman ocean *gevher*, which means not only "jewel" but also "essence"; therefore, the Ottoman "ocean"—or what I call reservoir—incorporates languages and their literary traditions in such a way that several cultural essences intertwine with each other to the point of becoming indistinguishable, mixing like sugar and milk.

Harabat is exclusive, because Ziya Pasha makes no mention of Greek, Armenian, Kurdish, or Albanian texts that also circulated widely in the empire. Nor does his anthology strive to include all the works of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish poetry. These exclusions serve to reinforce the boundaries of Ottoman reservoir. *Harabat* functions almost like a handbook and addresses an aspiring Ottoman litterateur who needs to be well versed in a literary reservoir to join the intellectual elite.

Ziya Pasha draws upon the rooted tradition of a community well versed in what Cornell Fleischer called "the Ottoman way," a set of manners and educational background that made a person member of the Ottoman elite.[25] There is a remarkable similarity between Ziya Pasha's description of the Ottoman ocean and the following words from Mustafa Âli (1541–1600), who was deeply familiar with this "Ottoman way":

في الواقع في زماننا ولايت رومده جارى اولان لسان بو العجب السنه ٔ چاردن
مركب بر نطق پاك مذهب‌دركه اهل دللر تكلمنده گوياكه سائرندن أعذبدر فرضا
لسان عربى تكلمى فرض ويا واجب اولسه وزبان فارسى استعمالى سنت سنيه
مقامنده قيام بولسه بيان اولنان حلاوتدن مركب لسان تركى تلفظى مستحب وبسيطنك
تركى فصحا قولنجه نهيى واجبدر

> (The astonishing language current in the state of Rum, composed of four languages [West Turkish, Chagatai, Arabic, and Persian], is a pure gilded tongue which, in the speech of the literati, seems more difficult than any of these. If one were to equate speaking Arabic with a religious obligation, and the use of Persian with a sanctioned tradition, then the speaking of a Turkish made of these sweetnesses becomes a meritorious act, and, in the view of those eloquent in Turkish, the use of simple Turkish should be forbidden.)[26]

Mustafa Âli makes a clear distinction between the simple Turkish and the eloquent Turkish, "the Ottoman ocean" that unites different languages and is also celebrated in *Harabat* centuries later.

To capture the hybridity of the Ottoman language and its literary tradition, Saliha Paker builds upon Anthony Pym's concept of "interculture"—"beliefs and practices found in intersections or overlaps of cultures, where people combine something of two or more cultures at once"—and argues that "[Ottoman interculture] would have to be conceptualized in the intersection of three cultures (Persian, Arabic, and Turkish), as the trilingual, tricultural site of operation of Ottoman poet-translators."[27] Paker also notes that those who operate within the

Ottoman interculture like Ziya Pasha still perceive Arabic, Persian, and Turkish as three distinct cultures even though the boundaries among them remain highly porous as they become integrated into the Ottoman interculture. A heterogeneous combination of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish linguistic elements, the Ottoman interculture signified that the empire saw itself at the latest frontier of the complex heritage of the Islamic Middle East, both preserving it and taking it to new heights.

Goethe's Ocean of World Literature

Ocean is a key metaphor also in the conceptualization of world literature by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832). Azadeh Yamini-Hamedani demonstrates that the Persian poet Hafez (1315–1390) played a fundamental role in this conceptualization.[28] Hafez's work, which celebrates the intoxicating divine love that undermines the rigid boundaries between the lover and the beloved as well as the Self and the Other, becomes crucial for Goethe who shares similar visions of transcendence in *West-östlischer Divan* (1819) (*West-Eastern Diwan*). This work projects the division between East and West, like the division between the lover and the beloved in Hafez's poetry, as something that should be overcome. Reading Hafez's work, Goethe writes that he enters the Orient and notes, "[G]eht man aber einmal ernstlich hinein, so ist es vollkommen als wenn man in's Meer geriehte" ("[I]f one enters it [the Orient] seriously, it is as though one goes into the ocean").[29] According to Yamini-Hamedani, if national literature is a land, then world literature for Goethe is the ocean in which one becomes immersed, only to emerge again out of it as more rejuvenated, enlightened, and open-minded.

Ottoman poets have used the imagery of tavern, *harabat*, which also featured prominently in Hafez's poetry, to refer to a space of intense passion and spiritual intoxication.[30] Understanding the imagery of "ocean" in Persian and Ottoman Turkish poetry, especially its resonances with Islamic mysticism, provides crucial insights into the cosmopolitanism that Ziya Pasha's "tavern" stood for. Mystics have seen themselves as drops that yearn for union with the divine Ocean, God. When Ziya Pasha writes in the beginning of *Harabat*'s introduction that all created beings constantly repeat the word "God,"[31] he suggests that linguistic discrepancies prevent us from seeing, both on the metaphysical and cultural level, an overarching unity. Ziya Pasha's mystical view of creation resonates with *Harabat*'s vision of culture and identity. Diverse manifestations of creation seek unity with God as a metaphysical Ocean; diverse poetic heritages unite in the Ottoman reservoir as a cultural ocean that

provides vigor, stability, and permanence. *Harabat* affirms a nonvolatile vision of the Ottoman culture that does not suffer from a cultural crisis or anxiety, as Ziya Pasha describes *Harabat* as an assembly (*bezm*) in which Arab, Persian, and Turkish poets find repose (*aram*) in the final section.[32]

On the one hand, the literary ocean in both Goethe's and Ziya Pasha's works seems to defy boundaries and even to promise a sense of metaphysical transcendence; and on the other hand, these oceans have geopolitical boundaries, since Ziya Pasha describes this ocean as "the Ottoman language" and Goethe as "the Orient." I thus choose to use the term "reservoir" to emphasize that these oceans are, after all, human-made. They do not act independently from the aesthetic judgments of their communities or the power hierarchies that shape global literary circulations. Goethe's vision of world literature is more like a reservoir that incorporates works from a few select authors such as Hafez rather than an ocean that encompasses all masterpieces of the world. Similarly, Ziya Pasha does not plunge into a multilingual ocean that existed since time immemorial to compose *Harabat*, which instead selectively incorporates Arabic, Persian, and Turkish works into an Ottoman reservoir.

The difference between Goethe's attitude toward Hafez and Ziya Pasha's attitude toward French writers provides key insights into unequal power dynamics that shape the global literary field. For *Harabat*, reading European masterpieces is more a matter of urgency than of pleasure, since knowing these works would halt "zealotry and irrationality," traits that were contributing to the empire's political and cultural decline according to many Ottoman intellectuals:

ایستر ایسك آڭلامق جهانی
اوگرنملی اورپا لسانی

ایتمش اوراده فنون ترقی
تحصیلدن ایلمه توقی

بیلمك كرك آنده‌كی فنونی
ترك ایله تعصب وجنونی[33]

(If you wish to comprehend the world
it is important to learn the European language (*Avrupa lisanı*)

Arts and sciences have advanced there
do not refrain from acquiring education

It is crucial to learn arts and sciences there
leave aside zealotry and irrationality)

When describing the advanced status of arts and sciences in Europe, Ziya Pasha uses the Turkish suffix "*miş*," which refers to events that one learns or hears from someone else—a detail that demonstrates that Europe is still a nebulous space in *Harabat*. Ziya Pasha encourages the reader to pursue education because he *heard* that sciences and arts are highly developed in Europe. The word "there" (*orada*) substantiates the narrator's distance from Europe. Ziya Pasha indicates that one cannot become a "complete poet" without learning what he simply calls "the European language" (*Avrupa lisanı*); nevertheless, he never gives a clear idea about what this "European language" corresponds to. While *Harabat* clearly lays out the conditions for becoming a poet and passes authoritative judgments on Persian, Arabic, and Turkish poetic traditions, it does not provide clear guidance on how to engage with the European tradition, while acknowledging its necessity.

Goethe would go so far to consider Hafez his "twin" (*Zwilling*); however, Ziya Pasha does not describe Western poets in such affectionate terms and implies a strong sense of unfamiliarity with and even distance from them.[34] Ziya Pasha notes that the Persian poet Sanai (d. 1131?), the Ottoman poet Nefi (1572–1635), and the Arab poet al-Farazdaq (ca. 641–728) are irreconcilably different from French writers, Molière (1622–1673) or Racine (1639–1699):

قابلمی ایده [راسین] [لامارتین]
[نفعی] گبی بر قصیده تزیین!

ممکنمی [سنائی] و [فرزدق]
[مولیر] گبی بر تیاترو یازمق![35]

(Can Racine and Lamartine
craft a *kaside* poem like Nefi!

Is it possible for Sanai and Farazdaq
to write a theater play like Molière!)

While emphasizing this cultural discrepancy, *Harabat* also wants its audience to reach out to the West and learn its arts and sciences. This captures an

important ambivalence that characterized Ziya Pasha's period, emphasizing the need to situate *Harabat* within the sociopolitical transformations of its time.

Contestations of the Ottoman Heritage and the Formation of Comparative Literature

The Ottoman Empire (1299–1922) went through vast cultural, economic, and demographic transformations in the nineteenth century. The declaration of the Gülhane Decree in 1839 and the Islahat Decree in 1856 culminated in statewide reforms on issues ranging from tax collection to military drafting. The territorial expansion of Russia created an unprecedented influx of Muslim refugees who migrated from Central Asia to Anatolia, significantly changing the empire's demographic landscape. Furthermore, "[t]he Balkan territorial losses raised Muslims' share of the empire's population from 60 percent before 1878 to 72 percent in the 1880s census and 74 percent in 1906–1907."[36] The empire also experienced the largest debasement of its monetary currency in this period.[37]

Ziya Pasha was a member of the "Young Ottomans," an influential community of thinkers who believed that the empire was experiencing a political and cultural decline in the face of these territorial losses, economic adversities, and demographic changes.[38] These thinkers thus advocated constitutional government and sought a synthesis between Islamic values and ideals of the European enlightenment to halt this decline. Ziya Pasha had a cultural formation that would generate such a synthesis. He was well versed in Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, signifying his mastery of "the Ottoman way." He was a self-made man who taught himself Arabic and learned Persian through reading its masterpieces such as *Shahname* (977–1010) by Ferdowsi (940–1020). He also showed the same voracious interest for learning French, which was increasingly becoming an essential component of an Ottoman intellectual's formation during Ziya Pasha's time. After having studied the language only for six months, he could translate *Histoire arabes et des mores d'Espagne* (1851) (*History of Arabs and Mores in Spain*) by Louis Viardot (1800–1883) into Turkish.[39]

Although Young Ottomans often had deep disagreements with each other, all of them shared a disdain for state bureaucrats and advocated the constitutional government that would curb the power of these bureaucrats. They drew upon Western thinkers such as Rousseau (1712–1778), Volney (1757–1820), and Montesquieu (1689–1755) as they formed their political and cultural vision for the empire. At the same time, they also criticized what they considered an unbridled Westernization that was spearheaded by

state bureaucrats. Young Ottomans believed that these bureaucrats adopted "superficial aspects" of the European culture such as Western fashion but dismissed its key values such as freedom that actually contributed to its progress. Therefore, *Harabat* wants its audience to read and learn from French writers such as Molière but never to imitate them. Unlike Goethe, Ziya Pasha would not consider French writers his "twins" since this attitude could exacerbate the excessive Westernization that would not lead to cultural progress and liberation that the empire should have aspired for.

Ziya Pasha's *Harabat*, which cherishes "the Ottoman way," can be also seen as a possible cultural foundation of the political ideal that is now described as "Ottomanism," which was advocated by many Young Ottomans. Ottomanism aimed to recast the empire's "subjects" who came from different ethnic, religious, and linguistic backgrounds as "citizens" that shared a civic allegiance to the Ottoman state and dynasty.[40] At the same time, Ziya Pasha believed that the state gave privileges to non-Muslim communities at the expense of Muslims during the imperial reforms of the nineteenth century.[41] The exclusion of various literatures such as Ladino (Judeo-Spanish) from *Harabat* suggests that even if some Young Ottomans advocated Ottomanism as a political ideology, they did not consider various literatures that were produced in the empire an integral element of the Ottoman interculture.

Many literary histories after *Harabat* had a different vision of the Ottoman reservoir. These histories projected Persian and Arabic texts as "classics" that once influenced the Ottoman Turkish literature and also claimed that the Ottoman literature started by imitating classical Arabic and Persian works, just as the Western literature began by imitating classical Greek and Roman works.[42] Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901–1962) writes on the influence of Arabic on Cevdet Pasha's style: "Bir bakıma göre Cevdet Paşa'nın nesrinde Arapçanın tesiri, garp muharrirlerine kadim Latin edebiyatının yaptığı hayırlı tesire benzer" (In a sense, the influence of Arabic on Cevdet Pasha's prose writings is akin to the beneficial influence of ancient Latin literature on Western authors).[43] In her famous history of Ottoman poetry, Dora d'Istria (1828–1888) also compares the influence of Arabic and Persian poetry on the Ottomans with the influence of Greek and Latin works on the French.[44] In all these works, the Ottoman literature is the final destination in a teleological Islamic history, which becomes the mirror image of a European history that has a similarly teleological trajectory whose origins lie in ancient Greece and Rome.

Yet, many sultans and intellectuals of the empire, especially during its heyday, did not see such a stark separation between the ancient Greek/Roman and the Islamic civilization. After the conquest of Istanbul in 1453,

Ottoman rulers saw the empire as the "New Rome" and wished to renew the ancient Roman Empire through reuniting Rome with Constantinople. According to Paolo Giovio who wrote his observations on the Ottoman Empire in *Commentario de la cose de' Turchi* (1532) (*Commentary on Turks*), Sultan Süleyman I (r. 1520–1566) often claimed that the empire of Rome and indeed the entire West belonged to him since he was the legitimate successor of Constantine the Great.[45] Ziya Pasha uses in *Harabat* the designation *Rum*, which means "Roman" and refers to Anatolia that had remained under the Byzantine rule, as an epithet for Ottoman poets. Many literary histories after *Harabat*, however, do not use this designation, as Selim Kuru notes, "[a]lthough Rum poets who composed their poetry in Turkish are today generally called 'Osmanlı' ['Ottoman'] or '*divan*' poets, this had not been the case until the nineteenth century. Before that time, they were distinguished among other local and foreign cultures by the title '*şuara-yı Rum*' (poets of Rum)."[46] Rome eventually ceased to be a source of identification for Ottomans.

This burgeoning distance and eventual disaffiliation from Rome signified a transition in which many members of the Ottoman intelligentsia viewed the empire less as a multilingual cosmopolitan state that carried the legacies of the Arab, Greek, Iranian, and Roman imperial heritages and more as a Muslim-Turkish state that no longer viewed Arabic and Persian literary traditions as members of the Ottoman reservoir. These heritages were not necessarily discarded but instead resignified as "classics." Perhaps ironically, the late Ottoman Empire witnessed an unprecedented circulation of these "classics" as well as an extensive number of translations from Arabic and Persian works of Islamic literature into Turkish.[47]

This revived interest in "classics" is deeply intertwined with the emergence of the Orientalism discipline in the nineteenth century. As Aamir Mufti argues, Orientalism perpetuated a nationalist-philologist understanding of culture and thus projected the world as an amalgamation of disparate civilizations, each possessing an authentic, classical tradition.[48] For Mufti, this changing understanding of the world led to the use of the concept "literature" as an umbrella category that encompasses many non-Western works that were not necessarily considered literary by their own communities. These texts, which circulated more extensively during this period throughout the globe, were starting to be categorized as the classics and as cultural pedestals in which non-Western civilizations were rooted. Only then, Mufti notes, could the discipline of world literature be imagined as an object of study.

Many Ottoman literary histories drew upon these Orientalist notions of culture and literature to forge the empire's future political and cultural aspirations. Ebüzziya Tevfik also notes that during their exile in London, Young Ottomans extensively read the Arabic collection of the British Museum's library and formed strong friendships with Orientalists who came to the library.[49] Prominent Young Ottomans engaged in extensive debates with Orientalists such as Ernest Rénan (1823–1892) and Léon Cahun (1841–1900), sometimes strongly negating their views and sometimes building upon their ideas in their writings. Even *Harabat*, which undermines a nationalist-philologist understanding of culture as well as the categorization of Arabic and Persian works as Ottoman "classics," resonates with the Orientalist scholarship of its period that is known for producing encyclopedic literary histories of different civilizations. In many instances, *Harabat* divides the world into different communities that are irreconcilably different from each other—a key feature of the Orientalist scholarship according to Mufti. For example, Ziya Pasha argues that someone in Europe can never be like someone in Africa, since each community, due to its geographical region (*iklim*), has a distinct character.[50]

Like the Ottoman ocean that intertextualized various poetic traditions, *Harabat* as a work of literary history was a reservoir that drew upon multiple discourses in circulation, including the Ottoman interculture that Ottoman poets have been familiar with for centuries, the Orientalist discipline of the nineteenth century, and the vision of Islamic mysticism that was exemplified in Hafez's poetry, which also shaped Goethe's vision of world literature. *Harabat* was not necessarily a product of a "periphery" culture that created a comparative work under the influence of French and German scholars of comparative literature. Despite their crucial differences, such as their attitudes toward foreign literatures, both Goethe and Ziya Pasha used the metaphor ocean to refer to their ideal cultural vision and extensively engaged with a metaphysical understanding of the world that shaped Hafez's poetry. The history of comparative and world literature, therefore, can also be conceptualized as reservoirs, which were emerging simultenously in different parts of the world that became more connected through textual circulations, rather than as a "water spring" that first emerged in Western Europe and then influenced the rest of the world.

"Comparative literature, as we all know, is a product of the nineteenth century. But in another sense, all literature has always been comparative, *watered by many streams*."[51] These remarks by Haun Saussy still provide an exciting direction for the future of the discipline. My article suggests a reframing of the discipline's history through showing that

non-Western works, like *Harabat*, can be analyzed within the context of the nineteenth-century comparative literature paradigm. "But in another sense," *Harabat* also suggests that canons are not necessarily "fixed nodes" that are connected through circulations. Even national canons are more like reservoirs that are watered by many streams of world literature than fixed lands that remain outside these streams. While world literature has demonstrated how national canons are always connected through global circulations, it can also show that these canons are enmeshed in and even constituted by circulations through the conceptual shift that this article is calling for. Reservoirs provide an alternative object of study for literary critics who have often focused either on strictly defined canons of texts written in one language to imagine a nation-state or on interactions among texts of many languages that drift in transnational circulations to imagine a globe. The "Ottoman way" that Ziya Pasha has adamantly defended may have faded away; however, *Harabat*'s reservoir can inspire today's scholars to envision new ways of mapping the ecology of world literature.

C. CEYHUN ARSLAN is a postdoctoral fellow at the Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations and will become an Assistant Professor of English Language and Comparative Literature at Koç University, Istanbul, in February 2018. He received his PhD in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University in May 2017. His research interests include Arabic and Turkish literature, literary and cultural theory, and diaspora and migration studies.

Notes

1. David Damrosch, *What Is World Literature?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 4.

2. Alexander Beecroft, *An Ecology of World Literature: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (Brooklyn: Verso, 2015), 25.

3. John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 42.

4. Jeffrey R. Di Leo, "Analyzing Anthologies," in *On Anthologies: On Politics and Pedagogy*, ed. Jeffrey R. Di Leo (London: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 2.

5. For a more detailed history on the distinction between intertextuality and influence, see Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, eds., *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

6. Elias John Wilkinson Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry* vol. 5 (London: Luzac, 1900–1909), 3.

7. Rey Chow, "In the Name of Comparative Literature," in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, ed. Charles Bernheimer (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 109.

8. Ziya Pasha, *Mukaddime-i Harabat* (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, AH 1311 [1893/1894]), 5–10.
9. Ibid., 11–17.
10. Ibid., 18–31.
11. Ibid., 32–41.
12. Ibid., 41–55.
13. Ibid., 55–80.
14. Ibid., 80–97.
15. Ibid.,98–103.
16. Ibid., 103–106.
17. Şehabeddin Süleyman, *Tarih-i edebiyat-ı Osmaniye* (Istanbul: Sancakcıyan Matbaası, AH 1328 [1910/1911]), 278.
18. İbrahim Necmi [Dilmen], *Tarih-i edebiyat dersleri* (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, AH 1338 [1919/1920]), 114.
19. İsmail Hikmet [Ertaylan], *Türk edebiyatı tarihi: Ondokuzuncu asır* (Baku: Azerneşr, 1925), viii.
20. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi, 1985), 77.
21. Ibid., 134.
22. Ismail Parlatır, *Tanzimat Edebiyatı* (Ankara: Akçağ, 2006), 10.
23. Ziya Pasha, *Mukaddime-i Harabat*, 37–38.
24. Ibid., 51.
25. Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541–1600)* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 20.
26. Mustafa bin Ahmet Âli, *Künh ül-Ahbar* (Istanbul: Takvimhane-i Amire, AH 1277 [1870/1871]), 1:11. Translation in Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 22.
27. Saliha Paker, "Translation as *Terceme* and *Nazire*: Culture-Bound Concepts and Their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translational History," in *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, ed. Theo Hermans (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002), 137.
28. Azadeh Yamini-Hamedani, "Foundational Metaphors: Goethe's World Literature; Posnett's Comparative Literature," in *Foundational Texts of World Literature*, ed. Dominique Jullien (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 155–60.
29. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Briefe*: *Mit Einleitungen und Erläuterungen*, ed. Philipp Stein, vol. 7 (Berlin: Otto Eisner, 1905), 4. Translation in Yamini-Hamedani, "Foundational Metaphors," 156.
30. For a detailed description of the tavern trope, see İskender Pala, *Ansiklopedik divan şiiri sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Akçağ Basım, 1990), 410.
31. Ziya Pasha, *Mukaddime-i Harabat*, 5.
32. Ibid., 103.
33. Ibid., 47.
34. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *West-östlicher Divan* (Leipzig: Insel, 1912), 22. Also quoted in Yamini-Hamedani, "Foundational Metaphors," 157.
35. Ziya Pasha, *Mukaddime-i Harabat*, 49.
36. Carter Vaughn Findley, *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity: A History, 1789–2007* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 175.
37. Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), xx.
38. For a history of Young Ottomans, see Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000).
39. M. Kaya Bilgegil, *Ziya Paşa üzerine bir araştırma* (Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası, 1979), 27.
40. For Ottomanism, see Stefano Taglia, "Ottomanism Then and Now," *Die Welt des Islams* 56, no. 3–4 (2016): 279–89.
41. Hamit Bozarslan, "The Ottomanism of the Non-Turkish Groups: The Arabs and the Kurds after 1908," *Die Welt des Islams* 56, no. 3–4 (2016): 318.

42. For such descriptions of Otoman literature, see İsmail Hakkı [Alişan], *Osmanlı meşahir-i üdebası* (İstanbul: Nişan Berberyan Matbaası, AH 1311 [1893/1894]), 88; Faik Reşat, *Tarih-i edebiyat-ı Osmaniye* (Istanbul: Dersaadet Kütüphanesi, n.d.), 17; Mehmet Fuat [Köprülü], *Malumat-ı edebiyye* (Istanbul: Kanaat Matbaası, AH 1330 [1911/1912]), 18.

43. Tanpınar, *19uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, 177.

44. Dora d'Istria, *La poésie des Ottomans* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1877), 42–43.

45. Quoted in Gülru Necipoğlu, "Visual Cosmopolitanism and Creative Translation: Artistic Conversations with Renaissance Italy in Mehmed II's Constantinople," *Muqarnas* 29, no. 1 (2012): 50.

46. Selim Kuru, "The Literature of Rum: The Making of a Literary Tradition (1450–1600)," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, eds. Kate Fleet, Suraiya Faroqhi, and Reşat Kasaba (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 549.

47. Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, 203.

48. Aamir R. Mufti, *Forget English!: Orientalisms and World Literatures* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

49. Ebüzziya Tevfik, *Yeni Osmanlılar tarihi*, vol. 1 (Istanbul: Kervan Yayınları, 1973–1974), 147.

50. Ziya Pasha, *Mukaddime-i Harabat*, 49.

51. Haun Saussy, "Exquisite Cadavers Stitched from Fresh Nightmares: Of Memes, Hives, and Selfish Genes," in *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*, ed. Haun Saussy (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 5, italics mine.