Introduction

Translational Orientations

Having squandered his inheritance on expensive European items, Bihruz Bey, the protagonist of Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem's *The Carriage Affair* (*Araba Sevdası*, 1896), regularly puts himself on display in the promenade of a local park. It is here that he falls head over heels for Periveş Hanım, due not to her character but rather to the luxurious landau carriage in which he first spots her. Determined to present Periveş with a declaration of his love, Bihruz sets out to compose a letter worthy of the status he imagines she represents. Yet the series of misinterpretations and botched translations that he strings together from French source texts is matched only by the falsity of his assumptions: the woman is a prostitute and the carriage is rented.

In a crowning touch, Bihruz decides to append to his letter a verse of poetry. While certain that the Ottoman Turkish language is not suitable for this genre, Bihruz knows that Turkish women admire the work of a certain Vâsıf.[1] Yet after selecting what he deems an appropriate verse, Bihruz realizes he cannot decipher it on his own. Unwilling to admit defeat, he turns to an Ottoman Turkish dictionary once gifted to him by his father. Covered in dust and tearing at the seams, the "Redhouse" that Bihruz unearths from the messy depths of a drawer is in a state of clear neglect. Yet Bihruz immediately vows to rebind and prominently display the dictionary upon recognizing its author—Sir James Redhouse—as a well-known British Orientalist. Transformed in Bihruz's eyes into an omniscient source of knowledge on the Ottoman Turkish language, this dictionary suddenly

takes on a more prominent role in the story line. Placing all of his trust in this book, Bihruz believes it to be more credible than his well-educated Turkish colleagues, only to discover in the end that the joke was on him. Due to his lack of education, Bihruz misreads the Perso-Arabic script of the Ottoman Turkish poem. Refabricating the verse in question, he refers to the blonde object of his affection as a "swarthy youth."

Written on the heels of political, economic, and educational reforms aimed at modernizing the Ottoman Empire, *Carriage* tells the tragicomic story of a *züppe*, or insufficiently Westernized Ottoman dandy: in his attempt to emulate European culture, Bihruz proves only his mediocre training in French, his equally poor knowledge of Ottoman Turkish, and his general disdain for Ottoman culture.[2] While this novel now forms a cornerstone of modern Turkish literature, *Carriage* faced heavy criticism in the twentieth century. In his landmark study, *A History of Nineteenth-Century Turkish Literature* (*XIX. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 1949), for example, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901–1962) describes *Carriage* as devoid of interiority. Interpreting Bihruz's mortgaged carriage—rather than Bihruz himself—as its protagonist, Tanpınar deemed the novel to be a "book of rootless shadows" populated by characters without a sustained presence.[3] Marked by transcience and artificialty, Tanpınar likened the novel to a joke.[4]

While Tanpınar viewed *Carriage* as the story of a specific generation—and thus understood its efficacy as limited to the critique of a passing era—he did not simply brush this work aside.[5] On the contrary, he identified *Carriage* as the first work of Turkish literature worthy of being considered in the category of the novel.[6] Thus even in his critique, Tanpınar recognized something foundational in *Carriage*, a recognition paradoxically corroborating his earlier declaration that Turks still did not have a novel of their own.[7] In essays such as "Our Novel" ("Bizde Roman I," 1936) and "Toward a National Literature" ("Millî Bir Edebiyata Doğru," 1940), Tanpınar expressed the "lack" of an authentically Turkish literature that could serve as the expression of a national self.[8] As a novel without an explicit center, *Carriage* only exacerbated this sense of lack.

Pointing to the novel as a genre borrowed from the West, Tanpınar underscored the need for a novel that could encapsulate the "totality" of Turkish experience.[9] Following an extensive period of Europeanization, he argued for the need to "return to ourselves, our own lives, our own past, and our own riches."[10] This, he believed, required not a rejection of Western art forms such as the novel but rather a synthesis of Turkish values and European ideals.[11] *Carriage* was, on the contrary, a novel that refused this

kind of synthesis. If, for Tanpınar, Turkish literary history was marked by a lack, *Carriage* is a novel that flaunts this lack. Whereas Tanpınar longed for an authentically Turkish self, *Carriage* refused to render its characters with the interiority necessary to achieve this goal. And unlike Tanpınar, who viewed the creation of fully fleshed-out characters with complex inner thoughts and feelings as a prerequisite for cultural authenticity, *Carriage* upended the premise of authenticity itself.

The tension between these two positions has often been described in terms of belatedness.[12] Inspired by European models that preceded it, the Turkish novel in particular has been treated as a belated art form. This accusation is often tied to the fact that the genre of the novel in the Ottoman Turkish literary realm was in large part inspired by translations from French. The modern Turkish novel is thus linked to an understanding of translation as an art form that follows an "original" in both space and time. Like the character of Bihruz, the Turkish novel was doomed to merely mimic its European counterpart.[13]

This book seeks to reframe such conversations on Turkish literature and culture around the concept of orientation, as opposed to notions of interiority, authenticity, or belatedness. While Tanpınar did not use this term explicitly, the stakes of orientation were clearly an urgent theoretical concern for him. Registering both a deep sense of loss and an anxiety about the future, his novels reflect the "psychological dilemma" of a people whose identity had undergone profound transformations in the face of rapid societal changes across the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[14] While Tanpınar was by no means a backward-looking fundamentalist, he responded by asserting the need to "return" to a collective "Turkish" self after decades of Westernizing reforms. He thus perceived a dissolution of Turkishness in the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey's historic reorientation toward Europe. Despite his recurrent emphasis on interiority, Tanpınar presents us with a mode of orientation that is dependent on a fixed external referent (the "West"), which perpetuates the very dependency of Turkish culture it seeks to overcome.

By maintaining the "West" as a stable external referent, Tanpınar's need to "return" to a preconceived and collective Turkish self inverts phenomenological definitions of orientation, which describe this concept as starting with and affirming the individual self. In his focus on lived experience, for example, Edmund Husserl describes the body as "the zero point of orientation, the bearer of the here and now."[15] It is only from "here"—our bodily position in space and time—that, for Husserl, an external "there" may later

emerge. This external point of reference toward which we orient ourselves serves in turn to solidify the interiority of the self.

Taking up the example of *Carriage*—together with its rendition into German in 2014—I argue here for an alternative model of *translational* orientation. Whereas Husserl assumes the self-as-body as the starting point and anchor for all subsequent acts of orientation, Tanpınar seeks to find orientation in a *return* to the self. Despite their differences, both of these models thus rest on the assumption of, or desire for, an intact self. In contrast, the concept of translational orientation refutes the idea of a clear starting point, or of a (national) consciousness that could exist outside of, or prior to, the play of language. Language—and in particular language in translation—is always relational, linking meaning to movement and displacement. Whereas Tanpınar longed for the return to an authentic Turkish identity, the concept of translational orientation underscores the multiple processes of translation at work in a novel like *Carriage*, and thus also in the production of "Turkishness" in the first place.[16]

Reading *Carriage* with Tanpınar under the sign of belatedness would uphold an understanding of orientation as a unidirectional affair: such a reading would suggest that modern Turkish literature was fundamentally altered in its reorientation toward Western European models in the late nineteenth century, whereas European literature remained intact in the exchange. Taking up the German–(Ottoman) Turkish relationship in particular, this book instead insists on an understanding of orientation as an omnidirectional encounter. In the words of Sara Ahmed, "orientations involve at least a two-way approach."[17] When we orient ourselves toward someone or something, we are also approached by that person or object. When we touch something, we are also touched. As a site of contact, orientation thus does not always affirm one's perceived bodily position but rather harbors a disorienting potential that may destabilize the boundaries of self and other, interiority and exteriority.[18]

This disorienting potential is inscribed in the very term "orientation," which is semantically linked to the word "Orient." Grimm's dictionary, for example, presents the concept of self-orientation as a *problem* rooted in the relationship of "West" to "East": "(in the absence of the compass needle) to try to find the excess—namely, the East—of one's familiar worldly location."[19] Orientation emerges, in this definition, as a process of turning toward an implied "East" that is nevertheless impossible to locate with accuracy. As the unknown excess of an implied West, the imprecise location of the Orient also implies the instability of the Western self who requires it as

an external referent for self-definition. A critical approach to orientation, I argue, involves a similar rethinking of the relationship between Turkish and German, East and West.

Considering literary translations between German and (Ottoman) Turkish as one mode of textual, linguistic, and cultural encounter, this book builds on the work of Ahmed and others to argue that there is no zero-point of orientation, no clearly defined "here" and "there," and, by analogy, no original and translation that stand in opposition. While translation scholars have long recognized the paucity of theoretical frameworks based on binarisms, pointing to the need for "middle grounds, alternative possibilities, [and] positions of both/and,"[20] readers and scholars alike still often utilize the terms "source" and "target" as relatively stable categories through which we can refer to texts and languages.[21] Within this logic, translations are also generally assumed to travel in one direction: from source to target, and from past to present. This assumption prevails despite a sustained scholarly emphasis on translation as a dynamic and contested site of power relations, and as a creative rather than a merely mimetic act.[22]

We can see these assumptions of stasis—as Karen Emmerich has shown—in how scholars continue to treat "originals" as "categorically richer texts than translations."[23] But "originals" are also fluid texts formed through multiple mediating processes of editing, manuscript preparation, serial publication, and so on. By grappling with and extending the extant levels of variance within a given text, translation constitutes a creative act with the power to forge new textual reconfigurations.[24] The original thus serves neither as a static point of orientation nor as confirmation of originality.

In 2014, the first translation of *Carriage* into any language worldwide demonstrated precisely this, by projecting the questions of orientation so central to this novel into new linguistic, temporal, cultural, and geographic realms. *Leidenschaft in Çamlıca* (*A Passion in Çamlıca*), which formed part of the "Classics" series by the German publisher Literaturca, appeared in a very different historical moment from that of the novel's inception. While only a limited number of Ottoman Turkish texts had been translated into German by 1896, *Leidenschaft* participates in a contemporary uptick in translation activity from both Ottoman and modern Turkish literature into German. For comparison, a meager 260 translations were undertaken prior to 1989, whereas 750 books were translated between 1990 and 2010 alone. Together with newer and older publishing houses seeking to challenge cliché-laden representations of the Turkish cultural landscape—including Binooki, Manzara, Dağyeli, Babel, Ararat, Express-Edition, Rotbuch, and

Verlag am Galgenberg—Literaturca aims to bring a more diverse array of (Ottoman) Turkish texts in translation to the German literary scene.

These cumulative efforts have been bolstered by several key events: In 2005, the Turkish government established an extensive subvention program (TEDA) to support the translation of Turkish literature abroad, including 280 translations into German.[25] From 2005 to 2010, the Robert Bosch Foundation funded the Turkish Library, a high-quality twenty-volume translation series published with Unionsverlag.[26] Within this period, Orhan Pamuk received the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2006, bringing new attention to Turkish literature worldwide. Turkey's 2008 appearance as guest of honor at the Frankfurt Book Fair then led to both a record number of translations from Turkish into German and a yearlong series of cultural events across Germany.[27]

From within this contemporary context, what can a publication like *Leidenschaft* tell us about German–(Ottoman) Turkish cultural relations of the *past*? Bihruz's conception of Europe is shaped by France, and his main source of knowledge about the Ottoman Turkish language is a dictionary first produced by the British Orientalist Sir James Redhouse in 1861. In short, German language and culture are seemingly absent from the scene. But does *Carriage* simply corroborate an apparent lack of German–(Ottoman) Turkish cultural relations in the nineteenth century? Reading this novel in translation fundamentally alters the way we approach this question. It leads us, on the contrary, to read about such a presumed lack through the lens of the German language, 118 years after the fact. By enacting an unexpected site of encounter in the present through its very form (the German language), *Leidenschaft* also sensitizes us to other possible sites of connection in the past. This is to say it leads us to reconsider the importance of a German–(Ottoman) Turkish relationship where we might otherwise presume it to be absent.

Against this background, the relationship of *Carriage* to *Leidenschaft* serves as a springboard from which to take a long view of the German–(Ottoman) Turkish relationship in order to address the main premise of this book: the manner in which diverse translations between German and (Ottoman) Turkish have operated across time frames, political contexts, and literary traditions to serve as geopolitical and chronopolitical forces of orientation in their own right. As with the other diverse case studies addressed in this book, the example of *Leidenschaft* underscores multiple modes of directionality at work in the process of translation. While

Leidenschaft follows *Carriage* temporally in standardized calendrical time, for example, this translation does not reassert an "originary" quality of the Turkish novel. On the contrary, the German language highlights in new ways the manner in which a novel like *Carriage* negotiates the very terms of originality. In doing so, it also redirects the questions of orientation inherent both to Ekrem's novel and to this book.

Carriage contrasts *alaturca* and *alafranga* lifestyles, which represent an orientation toward traditional "Eastern" (Turkish) and "Western" (European) tastes and mannerisms, respectively. Yet while clearly exposing the farcical character of Bihruz's *alafranga* tendencies, the novel does not uphold some authentically Turkish alternative or provide an example of a successfully modernized character. *Carriage* instead exposes as the backdrop for Bihruz's follies a fundamentally shifting cultural terrain marked through and through by processes of translation.

Given the historical significance of translation as an Orientalist mode of knowledge production, *Leidenschaft* transfers the questions of origins and originality so central to *Carriage* into a new register. Even before the unification of Germany in 1871, German was an important language of scholarly Orientalism. Reading *Carriage* in German thus prompts us to examine the general role Orientalism played in asserting the difference between Orient and Occident, as well as the concept of an authentically Turkish character in the first place. This highlights in turn the links between a more general Western process of self-orientation vis-à-vis the East and the institutionalized practice of scholarly Orientalism. It furthermore invites us to analyze the specific role that German Orientalism played vis-à-vis its French and British counterparts in the late Ottoman Empire, as well as changes in the German–(Ottoman) Turkish relationship over time. Reading *Leidenschaft* with attention to these issues creates a productive tension between the diverse modes of mediation inherent to the Ottoman Turkish novel and the Orientalist fixation of an "Eastern" other in both space and time.

Opening up these diverse implications requires attention not only to the work of translation in the moment of its undertaking but also to the effects of translation across longer spans of time. In other words, reading *Leidenschaft* in 2014 may bring us back to issues inherent to *Carriage*'s inception, while also projecting us forward into potential reconfigurations of the German-Turkish relationship in the future. This approach attends to the transtemporal movements of translation, which "cross and connect times on different, yet 'jumping scales,'"[28] thereby allowing us to trace intersections

across nonsynchronous histories. It is furthermore tied to the concept of orientation as a mode of situating oneself not only in space but also in time.

As Ahmed cogently argues, orienting oneself in time involves engagement with multiple temporalities. While orientation in the present often entails a process of looking backward, it can also propel us forward into the future: "The hope of changing directions is always that we do not know where some paths may take us: risking departure from the straight and narrow, makes new futures possible, which might involve going astray, [or] getting lost."[29] Similarly, this book examines the myriad ways in which a German–(Ottoman) Turkish translational relationship has "run astray" from the dominant historical and discursive narratives of Orientalism and modernization from which they emerged. In its sweeping view of the German–(Ottoman) Turkish literary-cultural relationship from 1811 to 1946, this book also looks forward to the as-yet-uncharted futures of fields like Turkish German, translation, and world literary studies. It does so by examining the omnidirectional and transtemporal movements of translations, which harbor the productively disorienting potential to reconfigure the relationships of "original" to "translation," "past" to "present," "West" to "East," and "German" to "Turkish."

TRANSLATIONAL REORIENTATIONS

At the time of *Carriage*'s composition, translation activity played a central role in the reorientation of Ottoman Turkish literature away from the long-standing influence of Persian and Arabic and toward new European cultural influences. Linked to questions of modernization and Westernization, and thus also imitation, authenticity, and originality, debates on the relative purpose and value of translations from European source texts were hotly debated in the public sphere.

The significance of translation for the project of Ottoman modernization dates to the early nineteenth century. Some of the first translations from European (predominantly French) source texts were undertaken for political purposes within the context of the Translation Chamber (*Tercüme Odası*), which was created in 1821 and fully established as a department of the Sublime Porte in 1833. In addition to teaching French, Arabic, Persian, general history, and math, the Translation Chamber trained its Muslim students as translators of official documents.[30] As an important center for the education of young bureaucrats who often went on to serve as diplomats

in European capitals,[31] the Translation Chamber is but one example of how the institutions of civil bureaucracy helped produce members of a new intelligentsia that were active in both political and literary spheres.

The Translation Chamber took on increased importance in the 1840s, following the 1839 Edict of Gülhane, which ushered in the Tanzimat, or the "reorganization" era of the Ottoman Empire (1839–76).[32] During this period, a series of state-sponsored modernizing reforms modeled largely on European practices were initiated in the military, administrative, legal, and educational realms.[33] Translations of Western European source texts played a formative role in this wide-ranging attempt to revitalize Ottoman society, forming a basis for the sociopolitical importance of translation activity in the late Ottoman Empire and the modern Republic of Turkey.

In the literary realm, İbrahim Şinasi (1826–1871) undertook the first ever translations from a European language into Ottoman Turkish in 1859; his renditions of classical French poetry by Racine, Lamartine, La Fontaine, Gilbert, and Fénelon set the stage for the dominant role French literature would play in the field of late nineteenth-century Ottoman Turkish literature.[34] In this same year, Yusuf Kâmil Paşa (1808–1876) translated François Fénelon's *The Adventures of Telemachus* (*Les Aventures de Télémaque*, 1699) and Münif Efendi (1830–1910) translated a collection of philosophical texts by Fénelon, Fontenelle, and Voltaire.

Following a long and rich history of translations from Arabic and Persian, these first translations from French initiated an important paradigm shift in the Ottoman Turkish literary realm. Victoria Holbrook describes this period as nothing short of a "radical shift of semiotic orientation," during which characteristically Ottoman forms of literary criticism slowly gave way to the European-inspired genres of the novel, the journalistic essay, philological literary history, modern drama, literary criticism, and the anthology.[35] On the one hand, this introduction of new genres via processes of translation was incredibly generative: it contributed to the dissemination of new political and cultural ideals, affected new forms of literary experimentation, and contributed to the assertion of a modern Turkish literary voice.[36] On the other hand, the reorientation of Ottoman Turkish literature toward Western European models also produced crippling anxieties. The translation of European literature into Ottoman Turkish was linked to the presumed one-way movement of modernity from West to East. And like the growing body of European literature in translation, the Turkish experience of modernity was plagued by questions of secondariness and belatedness. Compounding these issues, cultural elites feared

the erosion of a specifically Turkish cultural and religious identity in the face of modernization.

In the literary realm, these anxieties often coalesced around the figure of the dandy. Early examples of dandy figures—such as Felâtun Bey in Ahmet Mithat's *Felâtun Bey and Râkım Efendi* (*Felâtun Bey ile Râkım Efendi*, 1875)—appeared alongside counterexamples of "properly" modernized characters capable of forging a successful synthesis of Eastern and Western influences.[37] Such counterexamples served as a clear and confident voice from within the novel that could mock the dandy as a "false other."[38] In her brilliant analysis, Nurdan Gürbilek notes that any such confident voice is missing in *Carriage*, whether in the form of a character or an omniscient narrator. Shifting between third-person singular and first-person plural, the narration of *Carriage* wavers. At times, the narrator's authorial voice becomes indistinguishable from Bihruz's. "It is this faltering voice," Gürbilek argues, "that makes *The Carriage Affair* a novel going out of order, a novel in which the writer loses its voice among voices and texts other than his own."[39]

Of the many voices and texts that appear in *Carriage*, several serve as source texts for an act of translation that forms the core of the novel. In an attempt to compose a love letter, Bihruz turns to French Romanticism for inspiration. Yet because he is unable to comprehend his literary sources, he produces nothing more than a string of mistranslations. At its core, then, we might say that *Carriage* is about the failure of translation on both linguistic and cultural levels.[40] This is poignantly reflected in Bihruz's speech, which is shot through with superfluous French expressions, to the extent that he is at times unintelligible to family and friends. Placed in parentheses in the Perso-Arabic script of the Ottoman Turkish text,[41] these French terms are generally italicized in the myriad intralingual translations of the novel into modern Turkish. In each instance, French serves as a force of linguistic and cultural intrusion, as a sign of Bihruz's excessiveness, and as an indicator of his failure to communicate effectively.

In an iconic scene, Bihruz turns to the lyric poet Vâsıf to augment his already ludicrous love letter. Yet while relatively accessible in terms of form and content, Vâsıf's poetry remains indecipherable for Bihruz. Exasperated, he retorts aloud, "Çince mi bunlar? *Kel drol dö langaj*" ("Is this Chinese? *Quel drôle de langage*").[42] In this brief aside, Bihruz expresses his alienation from the Perso-Arabic script, which—through the comparison to Chinese—is coded as illegible and incomprehensible. He then openly

belittles the "bizarre" Ottoman Turkish language, expressing an internalized sense of inferiority toward French *in French*.

The Ottoman Empire was never colonized; Bihruz's remarks are rather generated from within a process of modernization and societal reorientation actively undertaken by the empire. Yet his comments clearly exhibit an internalization of philological Orientalist rhetoric. While lauding the development of Turkish nationalism at the turn to the twentieth century, various Orientalist scholars dismissed the elevated rhetorical style of Ottoman divan poetry—which had served as the main literary genre since the fourteenth century—as outdated or difficult.[43] Bihruz's comments reveal how this Orientalist worldview permeated the thought of Ottoman Turkish cultural elites until it ultimately came to bear on their perception of the Perso-Arabic script itself.

As with myriad other French phrases in the novel, translator Beatrix Caner renders this entire scene into German: "Ist das auf Chinesisch geschrieben? Was für eine lächerliche Sprache."[44] (Is this written in Chinese? What a ridiculous language.) The implications of this shift loom large: Overwriting the French, the German language serves as a powerful medium of temporal reorientation, in that it asserts the strength and persistence of a German-Turkish literary-cultural relationship in the present. At the same time, the translation belies German anxieties of the late nineteenth century, when Germany vied with France and Britain for economic influence in the late Ottoman Empire through projects such as the Berlin-Baghdad Railway. Bihruz criticizes the Ottoman Turkish language *in German*, even as the content of the novel continues to detail his obsession with French. As such, the phrase "was für eine lächerliche Sprache" imagines the *potential* power of German as a dominant cultural influence in the late Ottoman Empire that could rival French. This tension itself then inadvertently recalls German authors' own sense of inferiority toward French classicism well into the nineteenth century, bringing yet another perspective to the concept of belatedness.

French classicism served as both a literary model and a hegemonic force for German authors throughout the eighteenth century. The resulting desire to establish a strong German literary and cultural identity that could counter French classicism was compounded by the Napoleonic Wars and the German battle against French "imperialism."[45] In the absence of a politically unified nation-state, German intellectuals imagined themselves as part of a *Kulturnation*, or a cultural union, sustained through recourse

to a common language and literature. Projects such as Joachim Heinrich Campe's *Dictionary of the German Language* (*Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 1807) and Jacob Grimm's German lexicon (*Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 1854), which sought to record and preserve linguistic tradition, were central to a projection of the German language as a unifying force. An imagined national literature further served as critical preparation for the eventual political unification and economic integration of the individual principalities under a common German state in 1871.[46]

Translation played a central role in the early nineteenth-century assertion of a German *Kulturnation*. During this time period, authors undertook an unprecedented amount of translations from European and "Oriental" literatures, as well as biblical and classical texts. Their paradoxical investment in the transformative power of translation to exert a specifically *German* identity took recourse to an earlier precedent: Luther's Bible (1522). Establishing a common literary language through the act of translation, Luther's translational style was deemed an important expansion of the German language. Consequentially, many late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century scholars saw him as both a reformer and a creator of language. Antoine Berman discusses, in particular, the importance of Luther's translations for the German concept of *Bildung*. German national self-awareness, he argues, developed not only through contact with the foreign but also by *passing through* the foreign in translation. Translation thus engendered a process of alienation that ultimately led to self-understanding.[47]

Around 1800, translation took on an increasingly important role, paving the way for the fields of philology, comparative grammar, textual criticism, and hermeneutics. The emergence of diverse theories of translation—as a journey abroad (Herder), as a form of enhancement (Schlegel), and as mode of rewriting (Hölderlin)—marked a paradigm shift from an early eighteenth-century emphasis on questions of fidelity to early Romantic conceptions of the translator as a creative genius.

As early as 1768, Johann Gottfried Herder quoted Thomas Abbt's idea that the job of a genuine translator is more than the simple transmission of foreign content. Rather, Herder elevates the translator to the rank of a classic author, who must be "a creative genius, in order to satisfy both the original and his own language."[48] Johann Heinrich Voss's translations of the *Odyssey* (1781) and the *Iliad* (1793) paved the way for the kind of translation Herder envisioned, establishing a new stage in German translation theory and practice. In addition to paying close attention to the syntax and word order of Greek, he also reproduced a very close approximation of Greek

hexameter in German. While Friedrich Gottfried Klopstock had previously introduced Greek forms into German, even he was highly critical of Voss's style, arguing that Voss's translation of the *Iliad* "had done violence to the idiom of the Germans, and had sacrificed it to the Greeks."[49] Despite this initial criticism, Voss's close attention to form revealed a new flexibility in the German language that had previously been thought impossible, and by 1798 his translations had indeed come to be regarded as classics. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in particular praised Voss's translations for their versatility and rhythmic quality, revealing important shifts in style and taste that were already occurring in the 1780s.

The translation of *Carriage* into German raises a number of issues central to this historical background. Reading this novel from the present affords a long view of German and (Ottoman) Turkish translational (re)orientations that predate *Carriage*'s first publication. Can a German historical understanding of translation as a creative act of cultural rejuvenation provide a counterforce to the anxiety of belatedness that pervades a novel like *Carriage*? The act of reading *Carriage* through the lens of the German language enacts a translational encounter that brings two nonsynchronous histories together and foregrounds the inherently comparative nature of both (Ottoman) Turkish and German literary histories.[50]

The contemporary context of *Leidenschaft*'s publication in 2014 also serves as a counterpoint to the novel's historical backdrop. *Carriage* was written at a time when Ottoman Turkish authors viewed their own work as "belated" and during which European source texts were translated into Ottoman Turkish in increasing numbers. Over a century later, we might understand "belatedness" as a quality of the German translation rather than the novel itself. Furthermore, *Leidenschaft* is one of an increasing number of Turkish literary texts being translated into German and other languages worldwide. While Turkish still remains a relatively "minor" literature on the global scene,[51] the twenty-first century has seen a reversal of directionality in German-Turkish translational flows. This is significant, in that German—alongside French and Latin—has historically formed the Eurocentric core of fields like comparative literature.[52]

All of these factors suggest the need to do away with linear models of comparison, which perpetuate scales of development. By figuring one group's present as another group's future, linearity fuels the same anxieties found at the core of the figure of the dandy. Reading *Carriage* in German prompts us instead to think omnidirectionally: Whereas *Carriage* portrays a one-way European (and in particular French) influence on the figure of Bihruz,

Leidenschaft brings a triad of relations (Turkish-French, German-Turkish, German-French) into contact, thus troubling the very dichotomy of orientations depicted through the terms *alafranga* and *alaturca*. Finally, the introduction of German—as a language of nineteenth-century scholarly Orientalism—into the narrative of *Carriage* highlights the geopolitical implications of translation as a historically powerful mode of orientation, *dis*orientation, and *re*orientation.

ORIENT-ORIENTATION-ORIENTALISM

The verb "to orient" is etymologically linked to the imagined space of "the Orient" as that which lies to the East. Derived from the meaning of Orient, as the (Eastern) horizon over which the sun rises, the verb "to orient" evokes both a general directionality and the more specific idea of "turn[ing] toward the east."[53] The "East" could of course denote any number of horizons. It is through Euclidean geometry, and its assertion of Greenwich as the prime meridian, that the practice of orienting oneself connotes "participat[ion] in a longer history in which certain 'directions' are 'given to' certain places: . . . *the* East, *the* West, and so on."[54]

This specific manner in which "East" and "West" have acquired status as global directions is also central to Edward Said's theory of Orientalism. Without denying its status as an actual place, Said emphasizes the "man-made" quality of an "Orient" imagined to be geographically, culturally, and historically distinct from the "Occident."[55] As a complex system of knowledge produced by Western scholars and statesmen, Orientalism represents, and thereby also contains, the Orient. Maintained through the self-projected positional superiority of the Westerner,[56] Orientalism enforces the Orientalist as the zero-point of orientation. The power of Orientalists to fixate the "East" in their orientation toward it is then reinforced by the expansive reach of European colonialism. It is no coincidence that the most rapid advancements in Orientalist institutions and scholarship corresponded with the period of unparalleled European expansion from 1815 to 1914; during this time period, European colonial domination grew from covering 35 percent of the inhabited Earth to nearly 85 percent.[57]

The effects of Orientalism on the Ottoman subject are explicitly broached in *Carriage* through the introduction of an Ottoman Turkish dictionary (*Lügat-ı Osmâniyye*) in which Bihruz searches for a key word from Vâsıf's verse. Hidden away in the depths of a drawer in the women's

section of the house, this dictionary has clearly not been used in years. Yet Bihruz places newfound trust in this book upon recognizing its author as the British Orientalist Sir James Redhouse. Upholding the dictionary as an omniscient source of knowledge, Bihruz asserts that there is nothing the "Redhouse" does not know, to which his well-educated colleague Naîm Efendi[58] offers the tongue-in-cheek retort that "his excellency Redhouse" must be mistaken.[59]

In the end, the joke is on Bihruz. Mixing up the diacritical markings of the Perso-Arabic script, he misreads *çerde* (چردہ, dark complexion) as *cerde* (جردہ), which he discovers in the dictionary to mean "yellow horse." Assuming this word refers to a "blonde," he thus accidentally describes the object of his affection as "swarthy."[60] Comically poignant, Bihruz's interactions with Naîm Efendi and other colleagues involve an extensive back and forth in which they debate which letter is represented on the page. Does the word in question (*çerde*) begin with a *jīm* with one dot or three? Is it of Arabic or Persian origin?[61]

This portrayal of reading as a demanding process of decipherment points to important debates in the realm of language reform at the time of *Carriage*'s publication. One aspect of these multifaceted debates focused on the supposed inadequacy of the Perso-Arabic script to represent the sounds of Ottoman Turkish. Among other factors, reformers emphasized that the Perso-Arabic script contains more vowels and fewer consonants than Ottoman Turkish and that the Persian and Arabic writing systems do not write short vowels on the page. As a result, one combination of consonants in Ottoman Turkish could have multiple meanings depending on its (unwritten) vowels; alternatively, one word could be spelled with different combinations of consonants. In response, figures such as Mehmed Münif Paşa (1828–1910) and Mirzâ Feth'ali Ahûndzâde (1812–1878) put forth different proposals to modify the Perso-Arabic script. Through the introduction of vowel signs and new diacritical markers, these reformers aimed to produce a more phonetic writing system that could eradicate the orthographic ambiguities of Ottoman Turkish.

In her pioneering work on Turkish literary modernity, Nergis Ertürk shows how such proposals dovetailed with the Turkish "discovery of [a] native vernacular" during the world historical communications revolution of the nineteenth century.[62] During this period of intensified translation and textual dissemination, the Ottoman Turkish language was "freed" from the recitative power of authorial presence through its mass distribution in new print media. In this context, Ertürk reads the history of late

nineteenth- and early twentieth-century linguistic modernization—which focused on phoneticizing and simplifying the Ottoman Turkish language by rendering it more essentially "Turkish"—as a process of first setting, and then violently defending, limits to the inherent omnidirectionality of Turkish writing. While on the surface, language reforms supported simplification and legibility, they also sought to contain the ambiguities of the (Ottoman) Turkish language. This process entailed producing a national language that heralded its essential selfsameness through the denial of its translative origins. Within this context, *Carriage* registers the tensions and effects of the communications revolution, which incidentally also served as one condition of possibility for it as a novel.[63]

Bihruz and his colleagues' inability to read the script of Ottoman Turkish furthermore pokes fun at the positivist master narrative of Orientalism, which described the hybridities of Ottoman Turkish and its main literary genre of divan poetry as excessively difficult and therefore inaccessible. This narrative emphasized not only that Ottoman Turkish was written in the Perso-Arabic script but also the manner in which it had incorporated vocabulary and grammatical structures from each of these languages. It further highlighted Ottoman Turkish literature's absorption of diverse poetic conventions from Persian, which had in turn absorbed and appropriated Arabic over the centuries.

Emphasizing the fluid nature in which these different traditions come together in Ottoman Turkish literature, contemporary scholars underscore the existence of an Ottoman interculture.[64] This concept seeks to overturn the lingering authority of an Orientalist approach steeped in nineteenth-century philological tradition. Driven by the search for historical origins, philologically minded Orientalists attempted to sort out the "Arabic," "Persian," and "Turkish" components of Ottoman Turkish literature and to foreground only that which was seen as exclusively "Turkish" as authentic or original. In the process, numerous aspects of Ottoman Turkish literary style were deemed to have been appropriated or borrowed from "foreign" (i.e., Arabic and Persian) traditions that were actually integral to it. In short, "Orientalist technique partitioned the body of Ottoman literature into components whose origins lay outside of it, whether geographically or in time."[65] As a result, Ottoman Turkish literature was generally deemed unoriginal in its own right.

These are the grounds on which the English Orientalist Elias John Wilkinson Gibb—who had dedicated the better portion of his life to

researching a six-volume anthology on Ottoman Turkish literature—could declare the Ottoman Turks to be a "singularly uninventive people" in all matters pertaining to literature. Dividing the history of Ottoman Turkish literature into "old" and "new" schools, he declared the first to be modeled on the classics of Persia and the second on those of modern Europe—particularly France.[66] It is perhaps no surprise that he denied both schools any trace of "true genius." Compounding its implied difficulty, this supposed lack of originality led to a general consensus that Ottoman Turkish literature was inherently untranslatable, even as certain works *were* translated into Orientalist languages such as English, French, and German.

Inspired by Western European literary and political forms, pioneering Ottoman Turkish authors of the late nineteenth century also portrayed Ottoman divan poetry as lacking in innovation. While these authors broke new ground in terms of literary experimentation, their criticisms of the Ottoman divan tradition exhibited an internalization of Orientalist rhetoric fixated on the concepts of origins and originality. Bihruz's disparaging view of Ottoman Turkish as unfit for the genre of poetry is an excellent example of this, as are his colleagues' attempts to parse out the potentially non-Turkic (i.e., Arabic and Persian) origins of the word *çerde*. Yet the scene adds an additional layer of complexity when these colleagues suggest *çerde* might actually be a French cognate. Across the span of multiple pages, they then offer an increasingly absurd string of potential interpretations, including "to rock a cradle" (*berse/bercer*), "lullaby" (*bersöz/berceau*), "a woman's cape" (*bert/berthe*), "parsley" and/or "Roquefort cheese" (*persiye/parsillé*).

This scene stretches the translatability of *çerde* to a breaking point; meaning is lost in an endless chain of speculations. But why, I ask, must this process of deciphering the Perso-Arabic script of Ottoman Turkish morph into a world of French cognates? If, however comically, *Carriage* does partake in the trope of untranslatability, this scene underscores the central role European Orientalist scholarship played in the production of such rhetoric in the first place.

At the time of *Carriage*'s publication, the implied untranslatability of Ottoman divan poetry was tied to a new Eurocentric understanding of originality that was retrospectively applied to an Ottoman literary realm with more flexible understandings of both originality and translation. The Ottoman Turkish term *terceme* loosely corresponds to the English term "translation," but it also encapsulates a diverse array of practices, such as *tedkik* (investigation), *taklid* (imitation), *tanzir* (emulation), and *nazire*

(parallel or competitive writing). *Terceme* thus does not uphold the same concept of unmediated originality that its more modern equivalents *tercüme* and *çeviri* suggest.[67]

To demonstrate this, Saliha Paker shows, in particular, how the connotations of the term *telif* have changed over time. In its contemporary usage *telif* is associated with original authorship and thus stands in opposition to an understanding of interlingual translation as a secondary or uninventive practice. Yet the processes of *te'lîf* and *terceme* were closely interconnected until at least the second half of the nineteenth century.[68] Changes in the meaning of each word can be traced to a new conception of originality (*özgünlük*), which first entered Ottoman Turkish discourse as a literary term around precisely this time.[69] Paker highlights here the important role played by intellectual Namık Kemal (1840–1888), who was strongly influenced by European Romanticism and its conception of the author as genius. While Kemal did not explicitly use the word *özgünlük*, he employed a host of other words pointing toward this concept in his writing, such as *has* (peculiar to), *mahsus* (on purpose, intentionally), and *benzemezlik* (dissimilarity). According to Paker, Kemal thus translated into Turkish the terms of originality, which he attributed in turn to European literature as a model for a new and progressive Ottoman literature.[70]

Due to the intertwined nature of the literary realm with the cultural and institutional reforms of the Tanzimat era, and more generally with agitations for political reform thereafter, this new emphasis on originality also had important repercussions for the development of Turkish nationalism. Diverse intellectuals began to assert an essentially Turkic identity separate from the other ethnicities of the empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yet this Turkish nationalism was largely spurred on by forces from outside the empire. Two of the most important influences on the movement were translations of foundational works from the Orientalist discipline of Turkology and newly disseminated writings by Turkic intellectuals from Russia. These translative origins of Turkish nationalism necessarily undermined the new emphasis on unmediated originality, which led Turkish intellectuals to seek out and foreground essential forms of Turkishness in the realms of literature, language, and culture.[71]

This tension comes to the fore in a novel like *Carriage*: often described as the founding text of modern Turkish literature, *Carriage* in no way emphasizes an essentially "Turkish" voice. Rather, the competing, wavering, and faltering voices of the novel highlight what Mahmut Mutman terms the "deterritorialization of language"[72] in the late nineteenth century.

Amid the multiplicity of languages in the empire (including Turkish, Greek, Armenian, Kurdish, and Arabic), the gradually eroding dichotomy of high (courtly) and low (common) registers of the Ottoman Turkish language, the communications revolution and its ushering in of a new public sphere via print media such as newspapers and books, and the proliferation of translations from European languages and literary schools, *Carriage* renders onto the page the impossibility of "establish[ing] a homogenous and stable referential world" outside of itself.[73] Yet as Ertürk shows, *Carriage* does not merely perform the failure of representation.[74] The novel also registers the very processes of "vernacularization and translational exchangeability as conditions of its own possibility."[75] As such, it also signals the multiple "origins" of the Ottoman Turkish novel in a language marked through and through by processes of translation.

Within this historical context, it is important to note that *Carriage* does not portray untranslatability as a *quality* inherent to divan poetry itself but rather as a *mode* that emerges from Bihruz's lack of education. Bihruz's inability to translate does not demonstrate the authenticity of Vâsıf's verse as an "original" source text.[76] By thematizing translation, the novel highlights the manner in which Bihruz has himself been fundamentally altered through his encounter with European—and in particular French—culture. Through this presentation of its main character as fundamentally mediated, the novel also reflects on its own generic form, which entered into Ottoman Turkish literature via literary translations. On multiple levels, then, *Carriage* suggests that in the throes of literary-cultural modernization processes conditioned by the empire's self-orientation toward Western European influences, there is no original "self" to return to in the aftermath of translation.

ORIENTALISM AND WORLD LITERATURE

Despite its significance for a modern Turkish literary canon, its engagement with European literature, and its thematization of translational processes, *Carriage* remained untranslated until 2014. As a result, it had virtually no European reception across the twentieth century. This simple fact would again seem to support a by now commonplace narrative regarding the manner in which literatures of the so-called periphery have been "interfered with" by source literatures from a geopolitical "center" that essentially ignores them.[77] Yet if we care to look closer, we might uncover a different

story: namely, the manner in which the enterprise of world literature was built around the philological practice of European Orientalism and its search for national origins. Like the hybrid character of Ottoman divan poetry—an entire tradition that Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem (1817–1914) himself helped to overwrite—a novel like *Carriage* also fell by the world-literary wayside owing to its refusal to conform to the basic premises of philology.

As the discipline of Orientalism shows, Western culture did not simply ignore writings from the so-called periphery. Rather, at the time of *Carriage*'s publication, German scholarly Orientalists did take an interest in other pioneering authors—such as Namık Kemal and Halide Edip Adıvar (1884–1964)—who were more clearly recognizable as forerunners to a national Turkish literature. German Orientalists by and large embraced texts that conformed to their own historical presumptions about nation building. In other words, Orientalists' search for an authentic "Turkish" literature was shaped by their own cultural fantasy regarding Germany's emergence as a *Kulturnation* a century prior.

Many translations undertaken into German in the early twentieth century also served as an important mode of political orientation, which upheld Germany's self-presentation as a "neutral" partner for the Ottoman Empire. While lauding new developments in contemporary Turkish literature, for example, Orientalist Otto Hachtmann rejected the possibility that German literature might serve as a model for Turkish authors. This, he argued, could only lead to a third "literary imprisonment," following Ottoman Turkish literature's enslavement to Persian and then French models.[78] Self-righteous statements such as Hachtmann's—which played up Germany's presumed lack of colonial interest in Ottoman territories—conveniently ignore the kind of economic influence Germany exerted over the Ottoman Empire and its significance for Germany's self-positioning vis-à-vis France and Britain during the era of German colonialism (1884–1919). The Berlin-Baghdad Railway in particular, which Germany began constructing in 1903, served as a mode of access to regions that had not yet been colonized by other European powers.

While Hachtmann wrote from the specific perspective of the German-Ottoman military alliance during World War I, his comments are steeped in a much longer trajectory of German Orientalist scholarship that asserted its supposed innocence vis-à-vis its British and French counterparts. This narrative would much later be picked up and perpetuated in Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978). Understood as "a Western style for dominating,

restructuring, and having authority over the Orient," which was exercised through academia, literature, and the corporate institutions of colonialism,[79] Said famously did not address German Orientalist scholars in his path-breaking study. The "German Orient," he writes, "was almost exclusively a scholarly, or at least a classical, Orient: it was made the subject of lyrics, fantasies, and even novels, but it was never actual, the way Egypt and Syria were actual for Chateaubriand, Lane, Lamartine, Burton, Disraeli, or Nerval."[80]

In contrast to France and Britain—which form the core of Said's study—Germany had neither colonies nor a nation-state in the early nineteenth century. Via this exclusion, one implication of *Orientalism* is that in the absence of "actual" contact with the Orient, German Orientalist literature and scholarship was less insidious than that of its French or British counterparts. Barring the fact that German-speaking lands—most notably Prussia and the Hapsburg Empire—*did* have diverse forms of direct contact with the Ottoman Empire,[81] many German Orientalists of the early nineteenth century adopted a similar position to Said. By upholding the belief that they were engaged in the study and translation of Oriental languages and literatures, and not the colonization and subjugation of Oriental peoples, Germans maintained a moralizing self-image.

Such assumptions were bolstered by the burgeoning realm of translations and translation theory in the German context, which incidentally also picked up on tropes of orientation. Friedrich Schleiermacher's 1813 essay "On the Different Methods of Translating" ("Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersezens"), for example, clearly depicts translation as a directionally motivated undertaking. In Schleiermacher's account, the translator positions a text within a new cultural context by figuratively *moving* the reader or author. For the translator who truly wishes to bring together these two persons, he argues, there are only two possibilities: "Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him."[82] These methods are now commonly referred to as foreignization and domestication, respectively.[83] In the first instance, the translator seeks to adhere as closely as possible to the language of the original, at the risk of making the target language seem unnatural and ungainly. In the second, the translator strives to create a translation that reads as if it were written in the target language. This kind of fluency essentially masks the fact that the text has been translated from another language.

While Schleiermacher first presents these as equally viable options, he clearly favors foreignizing translations. For Schleiermacher, the process of rendering a foreignizing translation is at once an extraordinary act of humiliation and the starting point for a transformative encounter with the foreign. This suggests that translation should orient the reader toward a foreign other rather than reinforce an already solidified image of the self. This form of translational orientation has clear moral underpinnings for Schleiermacher. In the course of the essay, he elevates a foreignizing—and implicitly German—approach toward translation above the domesticating style of translations in French classicism:

> [The foreignizing] method of translating cannot flourish equally well in all tongues, but rather only in those that are not confined within the narrow bounds of a classical style beyond which all else is deemed reprehensible. Let these bounded languages seek to expand their territories by inducing foreigners who require more than their native tongues to speak them . . . and let them appropriate foreign works by means of imitations . . . but this sort of translation they must leave to the freer languages in which deviations and innovations are more readily tolerated, such that these deviations may, in the end, combine to produce a new characteristic mode of expression.[84]

Several key assertions come to the fore in this passage. Schleiermacher's depiction of languages "bound by a classical style" as expansionist asserts that French classicism bears imperialist tendencies. Schleiermacher suggests in turn that Germans do *not* need more than their native tongue. In other words, Germans need not learn French as a means of gaining cultural capital. The French language is rather portrayed as inherently insular and the French method of translation as a violent means of appropriation. German, in contrast, is depicted as a "free" language, or a language that can not only tolerate foreignness but that also emerges renewed and rejuvenated from productive encounters with the foreign in translation.

Wilhelm von Humboldt advanced similar views in the 1816 preface to his translation of *Agamemnon*. Here, he depicts translations from Greek—and in particular those of Voss—as a unique success for the German language. Identifying hexameter as a defining feature of the Greek national character, Humboldt argues that only the Germans had been able to successfully render its rhythms into their language thus far.[85] In short, he describes

German as possessing a certain flexibility or openness to the foreign that other languages do not. This understanding of the German language as uniquely open to and receptive of the foreign was central to the surge in translation activity at the turn of the century, which brought about a subsequent regeneration of German language and culture.

Schleiermacher's and Humboldt's assertions hinge on the absence of both a German nation-state and German colonies in the early nineteenth century. Yet scholars such as Susanne Zantop have shown how Germany's lack of colonial possessions created an even stronger sense of entitlement for many Germans. In her examination of "colonial fantasies" during the late 1700s and early 1800s, she shows how authors forged an imaginary German colonial history. In the absence of actual colonies as a testing ground, these colonial fantasies provided more of a "mythological" than a clear-cut "intellectual authority" over the East. Yet, over time, German colonial fantasies established themselves so strongly that they eclipsed reality.[86] Through literature, Germans created a "colonial universe" that they inserted themselves into, with fictive colonial scenarios providing Germans the opportunity to imagine themselves in the role of colonizer.[87]

Scholarly Orientalism played a similarly important role in Germany's self-definition as European. In the absence of colonies, Orientalism provided a key opportunity for Germans to counter their sense of cultural and political subordination to other European powers, and to assert their position in a European civilization otherwise deeply marked by the colonial enterprise.[88] Building on Mary Louise Pratt's distinction between violent conquest and anticonquest, Todd Kontje shows how German scholarship dealing with the Orient was intimately linked to the triumphs of European civilization. German narratives of universal history in particular, which categorized peoples of the world along racial and temporal hierarchies, played an important role in establishing European hegemony,[89] all while asserting the "pure inwardness of the German nation" as the "proper ground for the liberation of the spirit."[90]

While Zantop and Kontje focus on the discursive power of German literature and philosophy, B. Venkat Mani uncovers the myriad material connections between German Orientalism and British colonialism in particular. Focusing on the institution of world literature and its origins in early nineteenth-century Germany, Mani highlights the influence of British translations from Sanskrit on early German Romantic authors, the manner in which German libraries acquired Oriental manuscripts through colonial trade routes, and the interconnections between Johann Wolfgang von

Goethe's statements on *Weltliteratur* (first published in 1836) and Thomas Babington Macaulay's "Minute on Indian Education" (1835).[91]

In his examination of the historical trajectory of global English, Aamir R. Mufti further elaborates on the relationship between British colonialism and German Orientalism. Tracing the origins of Orientalism to the British colonization of India, Mufti describes how an early generation of British Orientalists discovered "not one single culture of writing but rather a loose articulation of different, often overlapping but also mutually exclusive, systems based variously in Persian, Sanskrit, and a large number of the vernacular registers, often more than one in a single language, properly speaking."[92] Orientalists made sense of this diversity by restructuring it according to the historicist model of an evolutionary national history and retroactively applying European categories of literature. As such, the British colonial project of philologically based Indology was an important predecessor for German and, eventually, also a larger European discourse of world literature,[93] which set out to classify and evaluate diverse forms of textuality under the uniform title of "literature."[94] To put this more succinctly, Mufti traces the genealogy of world literature to the philologically based practice of modern Orientalism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[95] By producing a conception of the world as an assemblage of civilizational entities with specific textual traditions, he describes Orientalism "as an articulated and effective imperial *system of cultural mapping*"[96] and an organized classification strikingly similar to the contemporary discourse of (Anglophone) world literature.

UNHINGING WORLD LITERATURE

What does the historical nontranslation of *Carriage* tell us about the history of German–(Ottoman) Turkish translational contact? And how can the 2014 translation help us to read this history from a different angle? On one hand, *Carriage* confounds an Orientalist fixation with origins. As a novel that did not clearly conform to a nationalist paradigm, it was also not taken up into the philologically determined circuit of world literature. On the other hand, the 2014 translation appeared amid a surge in world literature scholarship in the twenty-first century. A transtemporal reading of *Leidenschaft* thus brings us from the rhetoric of untranslatability perpetuated by nineteenth-century Orientalism to postcolonial reconceptualizations of world literature in the present.

This time span is punctuated by no fewer than seventy-six "translations" of *Carriage* into modern Turkish. The need to constantly update the language of this novel is testament not only to the immense changes the Turkish language has undergone since the late nineteenth century but also to the enduring quality of *Carriage*'s narrative and style and the continued significance of its theme. Indeed, nearly thirty new versions of the novel have appeared in Turkey since 2015 alone.[97] On one hand, the multiple versions of *Carriage* attest to the novel's fundamental *translatability*, if we understand the shift from Ottoman Turkish to modern Turkish as a mode of intralingual translation.[98] On the other hand, the persistent move to render this novel into ever-more modern versions of Turkish also underscores the fundamental unreadability of the "original" for the general public. This gesture toward unreadability circles back to Orientalist worldviews that plagued Bihruz and his fellow Ottoman dandies.

I argue that it is through the shift to a linguistic register other than Turkish—and more specifically to a European language that is *not* thematized in the novel—that a translation such as *Leidenschaft* can open up new lines of interpretation for *Carriage* in the future. While a term for world literature had not yet entered into the Ottoman Turkish language in 1896, a novel such as *Carriage*—together with its contemporary translation—leads me to revisit the stakes of world literature across this time frame.

In one of the most influential definitions of the term, David Damrosch describes world literature as "all literary works that circulate beyond their culture of origin, either in translation or in their original language."[99] While this may encompass any work that somehow transcends its home culture, Damrosch qualifies that "a work only has an *effective* afterlife as world literature whenever, and wherever, it is actively present within a literary system beyond that of its original culture."[100] While we might read a novel such as *Carriage*—which actively negotiates the tropes of authenticity and originality—as understanding itself and its subject matter *in translation*, under a definition such as Damrosch's, it would only join the sphere of world literature with its translation in 2014.

In her focus on the widespread teaching of select—mainly Anglophone and Francophone—texts in English translation, Emily Apter has drawn attention to "singular modes of existing in the world's languages,"[101] which are elided in the idiom of global English. Revisiting the terms of comparative and world literature, Apter thus argues for a right to untranslatability that safeguards cultural and linguistic specificity.[102] A novel such as *Carriage* provokes us to fundamentally rethink this argument; it demonstrates how

the rhetoric of untranslatability was part and parcel of an Orientalist grand narrative about the Ottoman literary past that plagued Turkish authors well into the founding of the modern Republic of Turkey.

In this context, writes Walter Andrews, "no one (including the Turkish Republic, its actual descendant) had an interest in claiming or seeking origins in Ottoman culture." It is thus no surprise, he concludes, "that Ottoman literature remains on the distant margins of 'world literature.'"[103] Central to the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century devaluation of the Ottoman literary tradition, Orientalist grand narratives profoundly influenced Turkish authors' perceptions of their own literary production well into the republican era. Even in the 1940s, when Turkish reformers and intellectuals fully asserted themselves as European, Turkish literature was rarely understood as world literature (*dünya* or *cihan edebiyatı*). Coded as decidedly European, world literature was set in contrast to the *national* literature of the new republic.

By contrast, this book uncovers profound interconnections between German and (Ottoman) Turkish literary spheres that have otherwise been imagined as separate. In doing so, it asks what implications the German–(Ottoman) Turkish relationship might have for our understanding of world literature—for which German culture is often imagined as a crucial site of inception but from which Turkish literature has been historically excluded. At the same time, this book does not call for a reading of Turkish literature as world literature by means of simply widening the canon. Taking inspiration from Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's call to "rethink comparativism [by approaching] translation as an active rather than a prosthetic practice,"[104] it argues rather that translations between German and Turkish—*in both directions*—negotiate the meaning of world literature as an event or a relationship to come.[105] Even as the German–(Ottoman) Turkish translational relationship emerged from within the discourse of Orientalism—which at its core seeks to relegate the Orient and Occident to separate positionalities—the translations analyzed in this book generate instability. This instability holds, in turn, a disorienting potential, which does not simply manifest itself as a category of cultural crisis but rather serves as a site of opening for new configurations of the German-Turkish relationship in the future.

What new role might late Ottoman translations—such as those that ultimately led to the adaptation of the genre of the novel and the kind of radically modern narrative employed in *Carriage*—play when we approach them as active rather than reactive forces? Responding to the work of Damrosch and others, Spivak has also called for a "loosening" of

the terms that make up world literature. Rather than seek a clear-cut definition, she argues that world literature has not necessarily already happened in a manner that can be easily defined; world literature points rather to the power of texts—and texts in translation—to project a future that is still open to imagination and interpretation.

Spivak underscores here Goethe's own comments on world literature as an epoch, the approach of which, he states, "we must *strive* to hasten."[106] The open-endedness of this statement imagines the aporetic nature of world literature as an event that is yet to be fully realized. This conception of world literature allows us to revisit late Ottoman translation movements—and novels that register the profound effects of these translations—not simply as a sign of belatedness within a societal reorientation toward Europe but rather as productively inconclusive. As such, the German translation of *Carriage* does not catapult the Ottoman Turkish novel into the realm of world literature; it rather extends and reconfigures the modes of (dis)orientation in the novel, which defy the Orientalist philology at the heart of world literature as we know it, even as it portrays a late Ottoman internalization of philological conventions.

This understanding of world literature as productively inconclusive also sheds light on the first translations from Ottoman Turkish into German in the early nineteenth century. Undertaken exclusively by diplomats, these texts raise questions about the role of translation in Orientalist practice. While diplomats such as Heinrich Friedrich von Diez (1751–1817) and Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774–1856) were in contact with and even strongly influenced the trajectory of German scholarly Orientalism, their positionality as nonprofessionals provides an opportunity to explore previously understudied aspects of the German–(Ottoman) Turkish cultural relationship in the nineteenth century. Marked by the dynamics of cultural exchange and diplomacy, their translations did not always line up with the basic tenets of Orientalism.

Notably, translation figures into Said's broader theory of Orientalism as a metaphor of cultural encounter based on a specific form of positionality. According to Said, the manner in which a Western author writes about the Orient serves as a form of strategic location: "Everyone who writes about the Orient must locate himself vis-à-vis the Orient; *translated* into his text, this location includes the kind of narrative voice he adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kind of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text—all of which add up to deliberate ways of addressing the reader, containing the Orient, and finally, representing it or speaking on

its behalf."[107] Such strategic self-positioning occurs via a process of translation-as-interpretation. As an exercise of control, to "translate" the Orient is to fixate it in both space and time through the process of textual representation. In the terms of orientation, translation involves a process of directing oneself toward a specific image of "*the* Orient," which in turn constitutes the position of its assumed counterpart, "*the* Occident." Translation-as-interpretation thus enables the production of geographic and temporal distance, thereby reaffirming the stability of the Orientalist/self.[108]

Translation nevertheless takes on new contours across the long arc of Said's argument. In his discussion of latent and manifest forms of Orientalism, translation becomes a means of rendering the Orient intelligible in a much more ambiguous manner: "The relation between Orient and Orientalist was essentially hermeneutical. Standing before a distant, barely intelligible civilization or cultural monument, the Orientalist scholar reduced the obscurity by translating, sympathetically portraying, inwardly grasping the hard-to-reach object."[109] Transformed here into a *sympathetic* gesture, the process of translation-as-interpretation entails a negotiation of the very terms of representation. As a trained expert, the Orientalist's main job was to interpret the Orient for his compatriots. Yet Said gestures here toward a paradoxical acknowledgment on the part of the Orientalist—which occurs through a hermeneutically inflected process of translation—that the Orient is on some level difficult to read and thus also difficult to describe and fully comprehend. Within Said's theory of Orientalism, translation thus emerges as a key form of containment—but also as the very process that renders such containment impossible. If, in other words, to translate the Orient is to produce an essentialized and localized image of it, the very *need* to translate also attests to the Orient's unknowability and thus its resistance to being fixed in space and time. Contrary to a form of orientation that begins with and reaffirms the self, such resistance can produce disorienting forms of contact by rendering the instability and interdependence of both self and other, Orient and Occident, visible in new ways.

The translations of diplomat Heinrich Friedrich von Diez are an excellent example of this. While his translations were received within an Orientalist framework, Diez dedicated the better portion of his life to collecting and translating Ottoman Turkish source texts, which he hoped would overturn stereotypes about the "despotic" Turk as an Oriental other. Diez's work was then taken up by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who adapted numerous translations from Ottoman Turkish in his monumental *West-East Divan* (*West-östlicher Divan*, 1819). Notably, neither Diez's

translations nor Goethe's poetic adaptations result in a fixation of the Ottoman other. Unlike the systematizing force of Orientalism as a discursive form of knowledge production about the East, they destabilize Diez and Goethe's positions as Western authors.

It is no coincidence that such poetic destabilization occurs within a text that was central to Goethe's conceptualization of world literature. A reading of the *Divan* in this light—with close attention to the Ottoman Turkish–inspired elements throughout—uncovers an alternative paradigm of *Weltliteratur* that is open to diverse forms of translational disorientation. Rather than serve as a strict form of cultural mapping, this early German–(Ottoman) Turkish encounter engenders a malleable and messy form of *Weltliteratur* marked by the transtemporal movements of translation.

Moving forward from this historical starting point, this book attends to the idiosyncrasies of German–(Ottoman) Turkish literary-cultural contact from approximately 1811–1946 through the lens of three key figures: Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), Friedrich Schrader (1865–1922), and Sabahattin Ali (1907–1948). Divided into six chapters, it moves between German and (Ottoman) Turkish contexts, examining each figure within a broad network of translation activity. Rendering visible an aspect of the German–(Ottoman) Turkish relationship that has remained largely neglected in scholarship to date, this book sheds light on translations that are not bound by the terms of economic imperialism, Orientalism, or modernization history. While the diverse case studies I take up are all in some way connected to Orientalism—and thus marked by modern Orientalism's investment in historicism—they also work against the basic premises of containment and originality that undergird its system of discursive knowledge production. By engaging multiple time frames, overlapping with authorial practice, and linking disparate literary traditions across retroactively applied periodizations, the translations I examine do not merely orient themselves toward an original they are assumed to follow. As points of connection they instead produce new directionalities and thus also serve as sites of opening for new configurations of the German-Turkish relationship in the future.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

If, as scholars Mani and Mufti argue, the paradigm of *Weltliteratur* emerged through Orientalist and colonial practices that asserted a binary coding

of the world into developed and underdeveloped, center and periphery, major and minor, chapter 1 asks what role the Ottoman Empire and translations from Ottoman Turkish played within this framework. Due to both a strong French influence in the late Ottoman literary sphere and the incompatibility of Ottoman Turkish with the dominant paradigms of German and Austrian scholarly Orientalism, literary translations between Ottoman Turkish and German in the nineteenth century have been treated as either insignificant or exceptional. In response, I interrogate the category of exceptionality by asking what *was* translated, why, and how.

Chapter 1 addresses this question through a reading of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *West-East Divan*, which incorporates and adapts translations from Ottoman Turkish into its poetry. Contrary to Goethe's scattered comments on *Weltliteratur*, which articulate a form of literary-cultural exchange in the service of a self-affirming universal progress, I argue that the poetry of the *Divan* embraces a more productive form of disorienting cultural contact. Thematizing excess, spatial instability, and disorientation, the Ottoman Turkish–inspired elements of the *Divan*, in particular, envision a messier form of *Weltliteratur* as a radical questioning of the self.

Chapter 2 takes up the first translations from German into Ottoman Turkish, which were coincidentally of Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther* (*Die Leiden des jungen Werther*, 1774). In my analysis of these translations within shifting conceptions of originality in the late nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, I argue that they do not simply consecrate Goethe's role in a canon of world literature; they rather actively negotiate the terms of originality and cultural transformation. As such, they engender an open-ended conception of world literature as process: rather than a sign of belatedness within the historical reorientation of the late Ottoman literary realm toward Europe, they reveal *Werther*'s account of modern subjectivity to entail processes of mediation that undermine the authority of an assumedly original German or Western narrative voice. Thus, the *Werther* translations also speak back to Goethe's own use of poetic experimentation in the *Divan* some sixty years prior and the specific vision of *Weltliteratur* it engendered.

Chapter 3 examines the short story "My Nephew" ("Yeğenim," 1899) by Ahmet Hikmet Müftüoğlu (1870–1927). Published on the eve of the twentieth century—following decades of political agitation for modernizing reforms—"My Nephew" weighs the consequences of losing one's cultural bearings amid far-reaching processes of societal reorientation. A satire of the superficially Westernized Ottoman dandy, the Paris-educated "nephew"

of this story returns to Istanbul, only to undertake the "spread of civilization" (*neşr-i medeniyyet*) among household members. As a figure fraught with the anxieties of Westernization and the fear of cultural disorientation, the Ottoman dandy was an archetype of late Ottoman literature, which generally took France as its site of reference in the "West." This chapter asks what new implications "My Nephew" gains in German translation.

Orientalist and journalist Friedrich Schrader's 1908 translation of "My Nephew" appeared in the *Ottoman Lloyd*, an official newspaper that upheld Germany as a neutral role model for the Ottoman Empire in the era leading up to the German-Ottoman military alliance in World War I. Yet Schrader's German title—"Der Kulturträger (Mein Neffe)" ("The Bearer of Culture [My Nephew]")—brings the rhetoric of the white man's burden to the fore. In the specific context of the *Ottoman Lloyd*, I argue that Schrader's translation practice calls attention to aspects of the civilizing mission operating in Germany's economic and military interactions with the Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As such, Schrader's translation shows both that Germany was far from a neutral model for the Ottoman Empire and that translation in this time period was anything but a neutral enterprise. Taking Schrader's training as an Orientalist—but also his diverse roles as journalist and cultural curator—into consideration, this chapter asks how the German translation of "My Nephew" prompts us to consider what kind of cultural labor might reach beyond the civilizing missions of colonialism and Orientalism toward a more meaningful process of German-Turkish cultural exchange in the future.

Picking up where chapter 3 leaves off, chapter 4 considers Friedrich Schrader's late-career embrace of Ottoman divan poetry (1920–22) in relation to his 1916 translation of Halide Edip Adıvar's *The New Turan* (*Yeni Turan*, 1911). Schrader enthusiastically endorsed Turanism (pan-Turkism)—and its valuation of a specifically Turkish race—in his translator's preface to *Das neue Turan*, which was published at the height of the German-Ottoman military alliance. While his 1916 translation reflects a clear investment in the forces of ethnic nationalism that led to World War I, I show how his journal articles from the 1920s are more closely aligned with Edip's very specific vision of a politically liberal and democratic form of Turanism. More specifically, I argue that Schrader's late-career investment in the Persian-inflected genre of Ottoman divan poetry entails a rethinking of the rhetoric of authenticity and originality, which forms a basis for ethnic nationalism, philology, and humanism alike. In conclusion, I show how Schrader's late-career writing opens up a vision of humanism that is

dislodged from Europe as an imagined birthplace and that points toward new forms of cultural orientation for the Ottoman Empire in the future.

Chapter 5 turns to early republican Turkey and a reading of modernist author Sabahattin Ali's "The Comprehensive Germanistan Travelogue" ("Mufassal Cermenistân Seyâhatnâmesi," 1929) as a prescient alternative to conceptualizations of world literature that would emerge in Turkey in the following decade. Unlike the dominant depiction of world literature *in translation*—which underscored the act of transferring an intact European literature into the Turkish literary-cultural realm—Ali points to the elements of translation already at work in German culture as one so-called origin of world literary classics. Ali achieves this through a form of self-translative Ottoman Turkish, which I argue presents an early theorization of Turkish literature *as* world literature.

Whereas the 1920s and 1930s saw a series of modernizing reforms that took the "West" as a stable entity toward which Turkey could orient itself, Ali depicts the local city of Potsdam as an unstable and thus disorienting force. He does so by translating the sounds of this place name into those of Ottoman Turkish. The resulting word, *Put-sedd-ümm*, takes recourse to the outdated grammar, vocabulary, and script of Ottoman Turkish, which had been labeled as illegible and untranslatable in the 1928 script reform. On the eve of more radical language reforms, which sought to uncover a "pure" and more legible form of modern Turkish, Ali takes recourse to the complexities of an outdated Ottoman Turkish to showcase the depths of its expressive capacity. The result is a form of translation that does not orient itself toward an original that it comes after. The translation rather moves forward and backward across multiple times, places, and languages to imagine an inherently open future in which new and unexpected meanings may emerge.

In conclusion, chapter 6 takes up Erich Auerbach's concept of the *Ansatzpunkt*—or point of departure—in its reading of Sabahattin's Ali's final novel *The Madonna in the Fur Coat* (*Kürk Mantolu Madonna*, 1943) and his 1943 translation of Heinrich von Kleist's *The Engagement in Santo Domingo* (*Die Verlobung in St. Domingo*). As an organic part of the literary object, Auerbach describes the *Ansatzpunkt* as so eminently clear that it can "speak for itself." Only by this definition can it form a "handle" from which to approach the material and engender a "radiating power" that in turn provides a form for viewing, dealing with, and ordering world history. In my examination of narrative gaps as an *Ansatzpunkt* in *Madonna* and *Engagement*, I ask how a textual silence might "speak for itself" or radiate

outward: What implications might this have for both Auerbach's understanding of world literature in the postwar era and for diverse Turkish intellectuals' usage of the term nearly a decade prior?

The 1940s Translations from World Literature series—for which Ali produced his Kleist translation—upheld a Eurocentric understanding of world literature, which was based on a more general conceptualization of Western civilization as a synthesizable whole. In line with larger Turkish humanist reforms of the time, the World Literature in Translation series thus sought to transfer assumedly universal Western values into the Turkish language and culture, through an orderly and systematic translation movement on a grand scale. In sharp contrast, my focus on Sabahattin Ali allows for a vision of world literature to emerge that is premised on the messy interrelationship of his writing and his translation practice. Whereas world literature in translation was meant to serve as a coordinate of cultural orientation in 1940s Turkey, Ali's work suggests rather that world literature is about a form of (inter)relationality that places the stability of each side of the literary exchange into question. As such, it also upends Auerbach's understanding of world literature in the postwar era. While the world historical synthesis Auerbach still longed for in 1952 necessarily depended on the existence of stable component parts, the interrelationship of *Engagement* and *Madonna* betrays the fundamentally hybrid character of Germanness and Turkishness alike. Converging on—and radiating outward from—narrative silences in each text, this interrelationship conveys the unstable positions of translator/translated and source/target, thereby upending the premise of cultural originality itself.