



Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi Sayı: 10/1 2021 s. 124-138, TÜRKİYE

Araştırma Makalesi

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE AT UNIVERSITIES IN TURKEY: THEORY, APPLICATION, DEVELOPMENT AND TRENDS

Elmas ŞAHİN*

Geliş Tarihi: Temmuz, 2020

Kabul Tarihi: Şubat, 2021

Abstract

In Turkey both the theoretical and practical several studies have been done in the context of the definition, nature and methods of comparative literature; however, most of the studies are far from understanding the comparative literature. It is a fact that the discipline comparative literature compares "what, how, why" has not been fully understand, and that the definitions, scopes and methods of comparative literature lead to confusions, misunderstandings, misperceptions or wrong approaches when literary studies in Turkish are reviewed.

In this respect, this study deals with the present state of comparative literature studies at Turkish universities related to the theory, perception and application of comparative literature scholarship in Turkey and focuses on significant mistakes made in the theory and practice related to the comparative literature whose main function is to examine at least two different nations' literatures, interactions between literatures.

Keywords: Comparative literature, Turkish literature, theory, application, perception, approaches.

TÜRKİYE'DE ÜNİVERSİTELERDE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI EDEBİYAT: KURAM, UYGULAMA, GELİŞİM VE YÖNELİMLER

Öz

Türkiye'de karşılaştırmalı edebiyatın tanımı, doğası ve yöntemleri bağlamında teorik ve pratik olarak çeşitli çalışmalar yapılmıştır; ancak, çalışmaların çoğu karşılaştırmalı edebiyat bilimini anlamaktan uzaktır. Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat disiplini, "neyi, nasıl, niçin" karşılaştırdığı tam olarak anlaşılmadığı ve karşılaştırmalı edebiyatın tanımları, kapsamları ve yöntemlerinin Türkçede yapılan edebiyat çalışmaları incelendiğinde karışıklığa, yanlış anlamalara ve algılamalara veya yanlış yaklaşımlara yol açtığı bir gerçektir.

Bu bağlamda bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde karşılaştırmalı edebiyat biliminin; kuram, algı ve uygulamasına yönelik karşılaştırmalı edebiyat çalışmalarının mevcut durumunu ele almakta ve temel işlevi en az iki farklı ulusun edebiyatını, edebiyatlar arasındaki etkileşimleri incelemek olan karşılaştırmalı edebiyatla ilgili kuramsal ve uygulamada yapılan belirgin hatalara odaklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat, Türk edebiyatı, kuram, uygulama, algılayış, yaklaşımlar.

* Doç. Dr.: Çağ Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, elmassahin@cag.edu.tr

Introduction

Comparative study of literature has recently become one of the popular researches for scholars in the departments of Western languages and literatures; and Turkish language and literature of Turkish universities. Comparative literature which is a preferable discipline us to recognize, understand, evaluate, compare and contrast our own literature and the other's one is misunderstood, misinterpreted and misapplied from time to time for the reason that it adopts the method of 'comparison' as the main instrument commonly used in the study areas such as history of literature, literary theory and criticism.

Since 1990s in Turkey, most Turkish scholars like Gürsel Aytaç, İnci Enginün, Emel Kefeli, Adnan Karaismailoğlu, Kamil Aydın, Jale Parla, Medine Sivri, Kadriye Öztürk, Birsen Karaca, Bedrettin Aytaç, Ali Gültekin, Ali Osman Öztürk, Yılmaz Koç, Cemal Sakallı, Binnaz Baytekin, Elmas Şahin, Ahmet Cuma studying western languages and literatures and any foreign language and literature or Turkish literature have been strongly interested in comparative studies. It is possible to meet many research articles related to introduction, history, theory and practice of comparative literature including the relations between two or more nations' literary products. However, we also meet the academics like Gürsel Aytaç, Ali Donbay, Yavuz Bayram who accept as comparative literature the comparisons of a single nation's literary products to each other as well as relationships of different literatures. In this context, there are numerous articles or essays by Turkish research assistants, instructors or lecturers studying their interactions, similarities and differences between Turkish literary works and writers in the light of comparative literature scholarship.

Therefore, I will initially focus on how the concept of Comparative Literature as a literary discipline is perceived at the Turkish literary chairs. Although it is obvious that the phrase of 'comparative Literature' indicates a study of two or more literatures, even with definitions of many scholars as Paul Van Tieghem, Wellek, Pichois, Spivak, Remak or Bernheimer, defined "Comparative literature studies the effects of different literatures according to their relations to each other." We meet misunderstanding approaches on this concept supposed that 'it is a study of comparisons between the works and writers of a single nation or country.' Whereas comparative literature is not a study of products of a single national literature, but it is focused on international literary relations, that is, it takes attentions to impacts and influences, analogies or similarities and differences among literatures of at least two nations, shortly it is interested in the relations among literatures, therefore it is an international field.

We have to keep in our minds the fact that the study of its own products of a nation is research of literature, not comparative literature. To give an example, to study Shakespeare and Ben Jonson as English playwrights is research of English literature, it gives us some information about progress of English literature, but to study Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, or one of them with one or more of the world literature, for instance with Molière of French literature, or Goethe of German literature or Abdülhak Hamit Tarhan of Turkish literature, to discuss issues as "what Shakespeare is to the French, Molière is to the Russian, Goethe is to Turkish or Tarhan is to English, what kinds of parallels, effects, inspirations or differences and similarities between them" will be a study of comparative literature. For instance, the study named *The Influence of Ben Jonson on Restoration Drama* by Emerson Grant Sutcliffe for comparative literature is a meaningful work investigating international influences on French and Spanish drama of Ben Jonson as well as the native one- the neo-classical tragedies Corneille and Racine

and the romances of the Scudery and La Calprenede that are responsible of the Dryden and his followers, the comedies of Molière as furnish models. And Karl G. Rendtorff's *Shakespeare in Germany* (1916) and Nedret Kuran's *1900-1983 Yılları Arasında Türkçede Goethe ve 'Faust' Çevirileri Üzerine Bir İnceleme* (1984, A Study on Goethe and the Translations of 'Faust' in Turkish between 1900- 1983) or Cengiz Alyılmaz's *Köktürkçe ve Eski Uygurca Dersleri Adlı Kitaptaki Orhun Yazıtları'na Ait Metinlerin Kaynağı Hakkında* (2018, On The Source of The Texts of Orhun Inscriptions in The Book "Köktürkçe Ve Eski Uygurca Dersler" are remarkable studies of comparative literature.

A single literature cannot gain success by itself. It develops in relation to another literature or literatures and reaches its real success. In this context, comparative literature is on the scene in order to fill in the gaps. For this reason, comparative literature is not a comparison to each other of its own literary products of a nation; but a study of literatures of other nations beyond the borders. It should be interpreted as a study of international literatures, cultures, languages, and the studies created for the sake of comparative literature must also be maintained in this respect.

For the answer of a question like "what makes Virginia Woolf so special to English, or Marcel Proust to French, Jorge Luis Borges to Argentinean, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar to Turkish readers?" we need to know the other's literature as well as our own literature to decide what the importance, value or place of a writer in a national literature is. It is necessary to deal with the literary personages and works of that writer in a broad framework in the light of comparative literature. For instance Turkish symbolist Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar can be studied in a comparison in terms of their influences and reactions, or originalities and to French symbolists such as Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Verlaine, Valéry, Rimbaud; of course, this kind of study will be a study of comparative literature because it could also draw the attention of French readers like Turkish readers, even if not the entire world, it will be easier to attract the interest of world literature lovers.

When we look at the Turkish scholars' theoretical and practical approaches to comparative literature as a discipline, Although the notion of 'comparative' started with Plato and Aristotle's literary and philosophical discussions in ancient Greek times before the ages, the studies of comparative literature in the university chairs or academic platforms appeared at best in the second half of-19th century in the West, comparative literature's account with Turkish universities was possible in the middle part of 20th century, one century later from the West. For historical evolution of comparative literature in Turkish and Western literatures more detailed information are available in the article named Elmas Şahin (2017) 's *A Historical and Critical Survey of Comparative Literature in Turkey*.

The inexplicable contributions of the Romance philologists like Leo Spitzer (1933-1936) for three years and Erich Auerbach (1936-1947) who taught for eleven years at Istanbul University in Turkey in the 1930s and early 1940s before moving to the United States will be great "as the foundational figures of comparative literature who came as exiles and émigrés from war-torn Europe with a shared suspicion of nationalism." (Apter, 2004, p. 77) Tulay Atak who introduces him in her essay prefaced "Introduction: Wortkunst in Turkish: Leo Spitzer and the Development of the Humanities in Turkey" in her English translation (2011) with titled *Learning Turkish* of the article named Spitzer's *Türkçeyi Öğrenirken* (1934) published in a Turkish journal (*Varlık*) also emphasizes that he plays a foundational role in comparative

literature, as Erich Auerbach, Edward Said, Aamir Mufti, and Emily Apter have argued. (Spitzer, 1934, p. 763).

Auerbach's *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der Abendländischen Literatur, 1946), which is a product of his Istanbul years, is important for comparative literature and world literature. This book that Auerbach compares some masterpieces like *Odysseus' Scar*, *Fortunata*, *Sicharius and Chramnesindus*, *Adam and Eve*, *Madame Du Chastel*, *In the Hotel de la Mole* and *The Brown Stocking* around the world from Homer to Woolf is a multi-layered route map drawn from the course of comparative literature towards national literatures.

Mediha Göbenli (2005, p. 79) remarks "the institutionalization of the comparative literature scholarship became more and more important after 1945. Especially the contributions of the Jewish German Romanists who from the Hitler regime first escaped to Turkey then were exiled to the United States are indeed important" On the other hand Kader Konuk also states "Spitzer was the scholar who indeed introduced comparative methods to the study of language and literature." (2010, p. 65) and in the similar way she argues the role "Auerbach played as a Romanist, a Germanist and Comparatist in Istanbul posed new challenges to him." (p. 44).

Of course Spitzer or Auerbach's roles in the Turkish universities are undoubtedly debatable; but much earlier in 1874s, it is necessary to remember that Rezaizade Mahmud Ekrem (1847-1914) taught literature in *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* (Political Sciences), in *Galatasaray* high school of Istanbul in 1878-1981 years (Tanpınar, 2001, p. 477) and he followed a western method of teaching by changing the understanding of a one sided teaching, which was continued until his time. Rezaizade introduced not only his students with comparative examples of French literature and Turkish literature, but also he translated several books like Chateaubriand's *Atala*, Silvio Pellico's *Mes Prisons* for his contemporaries and readers from western literatures and wrote several poems, essays and theoretical books. Not only Rezaizade Mahmud Ekrem, but also Ahmet Mithat Efendi taught world history, world philosophy and history of religions in *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* and *Darülfünun* in Istanbul. He wrote the world history books like *Kainat* (The Universe, 1870-81) in 15 volumes, *Tarih-i Umumi* (The World History, 1878) and *Mufassal Tarih-i Kurûn-ı Cedide* (Detailed History of the Recent Centuries, 1886) in three volumes. And together with 20th century both writers and academics like Mehmet Fuat Köprülü (1913-1941), Ziya Gökalp (1914-1919), Yahya Kemal (1916-1922), Ali Nihat Tarlan (1933-1972), Ahmet Caferoğlu (1924-1973) were giving lectures on literature, sociology, philosophy, western and eastern languages and literatures with comparative methods in several departments of *Istanbul Darülfünun/University*.

Turkish scholars and students closely knew Western literatures, and they had been familiar with especially French, German and English literatures in earlier times than forty-two refugee scholars like Spitzer and Auerbach were appointed to Istanbul University. There are the leading names of Turkey like "classical philologists Azra Erhat, Suat Sinanoğlu, literary critics and writers Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Adnan Benk, Güzin Dino, English professors Mina Urgan, Berna Moran, Romance scholar Sühyla Bayrav, Germanist Şara Sayın" (Konuk, 2010, p. 167) as well as students and colleagues of Auerbach and Spitzer, among them from international (non-Turkish) students "Rosemarie Burkart, Herbert and Liselotte Dieckmann and Hans Marchant" (Burke, 2017, p. 124). in 1938s when the refugee scholars were in Turkey, the writers and academics like Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1939-1962), Mehmet Kaplan (1939-1984),

Halide Edip Adıvar (1940-1950), İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan (1939-1958), Ali Canip Yöntem (1943-1950), Muharrem Ergin (1950-1990) and Ömer Faruk Akün (1951-1993) taught the courses such as Turkish and western literatures, aesthetics, philosophy, literary criticism with comparative approaches in the Istanbul University.

Despite the fact that the Turkish academicians have been very interested in the western and eastern literatures from past today, even though Turkish language and literature, western languages and literatures, Turkology and philology departments have been established in many Turkish universities since the second half of the 20th century, the courses of comparative literature could be put in the curriculums of some philology departments in last quarter of 20th century. What a pity, comparative literary chairs in the Turkish universities could be established in the first quarter of the 21st century.

When we look at position of comparative literature in the Turkish universities, comparative literature in philology departments as well as chairs of Comparative Literature has been given to the students as a literary course in MA and PhD programs for last twenty years in the BA since 1990s. Particularly the scholars who teach comparative literature in the departments of Comparative Literature, Turkish Literature, English Literature, French Literature, German Literature, Russian Literature etc., introduce national and international literatures to Turkish students and readers, and enlighten literature lovers about the state of Turkish literature in the other literatures or in the world literary by their academic studies in the context of comparative literature and cultural studies.

The departments of Comparative Literature in the Turkish universities was first established in *İstanbul Bilgi University* in 1996, then *Osmangazi University* in 2000, *Koç University* in 2008, and the other universities like *Selçuk* (2009) and *Dokuz Eylül* (2011) have followed these. However; when we look at the pioneers of Europe, Friedrich Schlegel at Bonn established the first chair in comparative literature in 1818. And the other chairs as in Naples in 1861 for Francesco de Sanctis and at the University of Lyon in 1890, where Joseph Texte was appointed, followed by Fernand Baldensperger cofounder of the *Revue de littérature compare*, and at Geneva in 1865 came to the light. On the other hand the first chairs of comparative literature in the USA were established at Harvard University in 1890, then at Columbia University in 1899. In the USA courses in comparative literature were taught at Cornell and Michigan in 1870s. Comparative literature spread in a fast way to many universities. One of the most significant courses in comparative literature was created at the Sorbonne in 1910 for Baldensperger, while another chair was created in Strasbourg in 1919 and then at the Sorbonne in 1925. At the Collège de France, Paul Hazard held, as of 1925, the first "chair in the history of comparative literatures of Southern Europe and Latin America" (Tomiche, 2013, p. 254) and in 1925 another important chair of Comparative Literature and Literary Theory was established at University of Ljubljana in Slovenia that a seminar of comparative literature was first held in 1926.

So what, courses in comparative literature at Turkish universities also appear in the ends of twentieth century. From 1990s today in some philology departments as Turkish, English, French and German literature of some universities such as *Atatürk, Çağ, Ege, Hacettepe, Haliç, İstanbul, Marmara, Mersin, Yeditepe* comparative literature courses have been given to the students as undergraduate or postgraduate or doctorate courses. Although Turkish universities met comparative literature very late, this discipline has become a fascinating field study for

Turkish comparative researches and philologists for last twenty years, and the various books and articles related to theory and application of comparative literature have increased steadily.

The first book written in the name of 'comparative literature' and on its theory and practice in Turkish is İnci Enginun's *Mukayeseli Edebiyat* (Comparative Literature, 1992). Following this, we meet the other remarkable theory books such as Gürsel Aytaç's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bilimi* (The Science of Comparative Literature, 1997) and *Deneme Üzerine Bir Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Çalışması* (A Study of Comparative Literature on Essay, 2007), Ali Osman Öztürk's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Araştırmaları* (Comparative Literature Research, 1999) Emel Kefeli's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat İncelemeleri* (Comparative Literature Studies, 2000), Şeyda Ülsever's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat ve Edebi Çeviri* (Comparative Literature and Literary Translation, 2005), Binnaz Baytekin's *Kuramsal ve Uygulamalı Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bilim* (Theoretical and Applied Comparative Literature, 2006), Kamil Aydın's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat: Günümüz Postmodern Bağlamda Algılanışı* (Comparative Literature and Its Perception in Today's Postmodern Context, 2008), Mesut Tekşan's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bilimi* (The Science of Comparative Literature, 2012) and Hüseyin Arık's *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bilimi* (The Science of Comparative Literature, 2012). They are almost focused on definition, theory and situation of comparative literature in Western countries, but not in Turkey.

Surely, since beginning of the 21st century the numbers of books and papers or articles that put theory and methods of comparative literature into practice have considerably increased in terms of a new comparative cultural literature. The books related to comparative and cultural studies like Yıldız Ecevit's *Intellektuellenproblematik bei Max Frisch und Oğuz Atay* (Intellectual Problems with Max Frisch and Oğuz Atay, 1990), Medine Sivri's *Paul Eluard ve Nâzım Hikmet'te Renklerin Dili: Şiirde Renkler Açısından Karşılaştırmalı Bir Yaklaşım* (Language of Colours in Paul Eluard and Nâzım Hikmet: A Comparative Approach in terms of Colours in Poetry, 2008), Elmas Şahin's *Batı'da ve Türkiye'de Kadın Hareketleri ve Feminizm* (Women's Movements and Feminism in the West and Turkey, 2012), *Zamana Vuran Dalgalar: Virginia Woolf & Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar* (The Waves Hitting the Time - Virginia Woolf & Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, 2015), Jale Parla's *Efendilik, Şarkiyatçılık, Kölelik* (Mastery, Orientalism, Slavery, 2015), Vedi Aşkaroğlu's *Trajik ve Modern Triolojik Bir Çözümleme - Oğuz Atay-Joseph Conrad-Yusuf Atılğan* (A Tragic and Modern Triological Analysis - Oğuz Atay-Joseph Conrad-Yusuf Atılğan, 2016) have considerably increased in terms of a new comparative cultural literature.

After last decade of 20th century, innumerable international literary symposiums held by several universities, literary organizations or associations open a huge window to comparative literature. The department of the Turkish language and literature of *University of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart* in 1995, 1996 and 1997 years hold the first national comparative literature symposiums, and it organized an international comparative literature in 1998. Since 2001, both national and international symposiums in comparative literature held by philology departments of Pamukkale, Eskişehir Osmangazi, Çukurova, Anadolu, Çanakkale, Marmara, Süleyman Demirel, Mersin, Kırıkkale and Konya Selçuk Universities are important gains for comparative literature. (Gültekin ve Üyümez, 2008, p. 39).

Theory, Application and Development and Trends

Comparative Literature studies that are points of meeting and intersection among the literatures in the languages and relations of different nations are perceived differently in many countries of the world such as France, England, Germany, Russia, Japan, China, India or Turkey. Just as there are some essential differences or some similarities between French theory, US-American school, German approach or Russian thinking in Comparative Literature, there are fundamental differences and parallels between Turkish thinking and Western or the United States schools. Even the comparative literature scholarship in Turkish sometimes has turned its face to American theory, sometimes to French or German theories, and sometimes it has built its own theory by adding some things on the theories of the others or by taking or removing something from the other schools. In this respect for Turkish comparatists' perceptions and applications of comparative literature it can be said that the four schools (French, American, German and Turkish) are valid and in use from past to present.

While most scholars accept that one of the most basic ways of destroying barriers between literatures of nations is comparative literature, the some scholars or defenders of Turkish school of comparative literature take advantages of the "comparison" method of comparative literary theory, she/he compares and contrasts a single national literary works to each other's and they regard these kinds of studies as comparative literature. For instance, the Turkish advocates of the comparative literary school such as Gursel Aytaç, Ali Donbay, Yavuz Bayram accept comparisons of Turkish literary products to one another as studies of comparative literature. Aytaç, who is the first defender of this idea in her book *Comparative Literature Scholarship*, focuses on past and present of comparative literature in the west and America (there is some very limited information about its survey in Turkish literature) also puts her theoretical information and approaches into some practice with a few articles. As she makes comparative studies between Turkish and German literature, does some writers of Turkish literature to each other's, even compares a single writer's two works to each other's. When her studies between Turkish and German can be suited to the fact essence of comparative literature, but according to the basis of comparative literature scholarship, her article titled "Peride Celal'in Kadın Yazarları" that Peride Celal's Feminine Writers was compared (Aytaç, 2001, p. 148) in her book is a comparison of some works of a specific national author in Turkish literature that comparative literature is used as a method, as it is known comparative literature is a study of literatures, not a single literature.

In the beginning of her book, Aytaç (2001, p. 7) who greatly contributes for Turkish comparatists, defends that the role and function of researcher is to study in sort of subject, thought or form the least two works written in different languages. but a few pages later she has some thoughts that as some comparisons can be made on its own works of a national literature, also made between literatures of different nations (p. 11) in the following part of her book the same writer's two works belonged to different periods can be compared as well. (p. 93).

Because of Wellek's some arguments such as everybody has the right to study any question even if it is confined to a *single* work in a *single* language and everybody has the right to study history or philosophy or any other topic. We comparatists surely would not want to prevent English professors from studying the French sources of Chaucer, or French professors from studying the Spanish sources of Corneille, etc., (Wellek, 1963, p. 291) in his article "The Crisis of Comparative Literature" published in *Concepts of Criticism* in 1963, some scholars

have directed towards a thought like "comparative literature is made better in the boundaries of a single national literature" probably some writers have been in a thought like that the comparisons of a single national literature's products without literatures beyond borders will be accounted of comparative literature. Additionally Rousseau and Pichois's some references intended to Wellek as anyone's task is to take some places out (from description of comparative literature) that seem to him superficial or inappropriate to reach their own specific purpose. For example, the removing of the 'as long as may they belong to different cultures' will describe the current state of the American comparison. According to this understanding (R.Wellek), comparative literature can be made better within the borders of a national literature. On the other hand, Europeans regard crossing from the linguistic or cultural border as an 'indispensable' condition (Rousseau and Pichois, 1994, p. 182-183) give some courage to those supporting these ideas.

Whereas, if that so, Wellek's this idea is valid for comparison method, not for comparative literature. Of course, a researcher knows better his or her own nation's writers, but Wellek also knew that this is a comparison method, a literary study, a research study, not comparative literature. His real concern was to break down prohibitions and borders that is, restriction or inhibitions on freedom of interdisciplinary study. No one will ever object to such a thought. Of course, they can study comparative literature as long as they have mastered their subject matters. No one sees any problem in it. If those who dare to enter the undiscovered garden are unsuccessful, they will be exposed to strict arrows of critics.

From past today, there have been the critics depreciated as many as those who have appreciated Wellek because of his thoughts about the concepts of comparative literature, general literature and national literature. While trying to expand the boundaries of comparative literature, he saw national and general literatures as a whole and he did not see the comparative literature different from them, put literary history, criticism and literary theories on the same dimensions, and his thoughts like these were not be adopted much. In any case, while comparative literature studies different literatures, languages, cultures, traditions and customs, as a matter of course, it turns its face towards history of literature, literary criticism and theories of criticism or towards the other interdisciplinary fields like sociology, history, philosophy, psychology etc. Anyway, Wellek and Warren already emphasize in their theory book that comparative literature is a study of relationships between two or more literatures. (Wellek and Warren, 1949, p. 40). Wellek's criticisms and objections are on the French school of comparative literature, on its system and method. That is, against some French comparatists who used single-minded methods and attempted to narrow "comparative literature" to a study of the "foreign trade" of the literatures, in that times, especially focused on Paul van Tieghem's comparative literature vision trapped in only "sources, influences, causes and effects." (Wellek, 1963, p. 283).

It is of course possible to expand literary borders without departing from the essence of comparative literature. Since Goethe's *Weltliteratur* (1827) and Marx and Engels's discourses on "world literature" comparative literature has been criticized so much, it was sometimes discussed by some scholars like Tieghem, Wellek, Guérard, Remak about 'what it is or not' and 'its field and function,' it was sometimes declared as 'a dead discipline' by Spivak, Bassnet and her followers dealt with the idea of a new comparative literature, in one sense we welcome today's 'comparative (cultural) literature' that Tötösy de Zepetnek states in his *Comparative*

Literature: Theory, Method and Application (1998) as a 'new comparative literature' expanded as a "dialogue between cultures" (Tötösy de Zepetnek, 1998, p. 15). That is to say, comparative literature is the knowledge of more than one national language and literature, and/or "the knowledge and application of other disciplines," in other words "the knowledge of other" as well as the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary study of literature. (Tötösy de Zepetnek, 1998, p. 13). Furthermore as Haun Saussy says that comparative literature has already won its battles (2006, p. 3), it is 'a discipline alive' and it will continue by increasing or decreasing as long as literatures go on. It is a fact that "national literature means little now" (Pizer, 2013, p. 80). Therefore, comparative literature will show us the color, smell, form, content of the literatures of other nations, and the self meets the other, and they know each other's literary values. Thus, they redefine themselves in the international dimensions. As İnci Enginün defends that "no civilization can develop within itself without touching other civilizations. Sumerian, Egyptian, Greek, Latin and Islamic civilizations have always continued by taking something from the previous ones and transferring them to later generations. There are the rings of these great civilizations in the background of these Renaissance and contemporary European civilizations." (Enginün, 1992, p. 15).

In this respect relations between literatures are so important. The global reader is interested in world literature, comparative literature or interactions among national literatures much more than in a national literature. Goethe already recognized importance of world literature and therefore proclaimed the concept of *Weltliteratur* nearly from two hundred years ago. About Chinese, German and English novelists in his talks to Eckermann, Goethe's comparative approaches like "the Chinamen think, act, and feel almost exactly like us; and we soon find that we are perfectly like them, excepting that all they do is more clear, more pure, and decorous than with us. With them all is orderly, citizen-like, without great passion or poetic flight; there is a strong resemblance to my 'Hermann and Dorothea,' as well as to the English novels of Richardson" (Goethe, 1850, p. 349) are important reflections embracing all literatures for comparative literary approaches between literatures.

In the other side, in *Communist Manifesto* in 1847 Marx and Engels's states that "national one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature" (1978, p. 476) are still valid today. The most researchers in departments or programs of Turkish language and literature to departments of Western and Eastern languages and literatures in Turkish universities follow either one-sided teaching and research methodology or they focus on products of a single national language or a single national literature and some of them produce their studies under the name of comparative literature. This is one of the most important problems of comparativism in Turkey. In a context, a tendency to compare literary products belonged to one country like Francesco Sanctis (1817-1883), who is the father of comparative literature in Italia, is very common in philology and Turkology departments. As Shunqing Cao also expresses, unfortunately Sanctis's understanding of comparative literature was extremely narrow, because he limited to "comparison" of literature within one country. To him, comparison made sense only when it was applied within the tradition of one country, for example, the comparison between Dante and Boccaccio (Cao, 2014, p. 5). Among the Turkish scholars Aytaç and her followers thinking like Sanctis deal with the comparison studies within a single literature in one county instead of international literatures behind boundaries. Whereas comparative literature that "is a unique tool for readers or academics or researchers who feel

curious, enjoy reading and analyzing literary works about other languages and cultures of the other nations, or interested in global studies and international relations (Şahin, 2016, p. 11) will give the scholars a chance of correctly evaluation with minus and plus both self and other.

When we look at interests or tendencies of the Turkish scholars in comparative literature we can say that the Turkish school of comparative literature follows a four-dimensional path. The first one is the US-American school in the light of Rene Wellek's thoughts, the second one is the American and German schools based on Henry Remak's discourses, the third one is the French school shaped by Baldensperger, Brunetière, Hazard, Tiegghem, Carré, Guyard etc., but mostly Paul Van Tieghem's ideas are influential on Turkish scholars. And the last one is the Turkish school blended Remak, Tieghem and Tötösy de Zepetnek's perceptions. When we look at Turkish perceptions of comparative literature, we recognize that Rene Wellek's and Tiegham's perceptions are common in Turkish School of Comparative literature formed in the lane of the national literature studies particularly for last two decades.

Some scholars studied the classical and modern Turkish literature go to the footsteps of Rene Wellek. Aytaç's opinion "literary works of a single nation can be compared" has also influenced comparative literary enthusiasts. Most of the disciples and scholars who rarely have ideas of what comparative literature is, what it should be, or how it should be done, have begun to analyze the literary products of her or his national literature with great enthusiasm without regarding with another country's literature, they suppose what they do is a study of comparative literature. Aytaç's idea about "study of a single national literature" to relation of comparative literature is preferable for the other group. I am sure, Gürsel Aytaç who has a significant place and value as a Germanist and comparatist, cannot wish her followers to confine the comparative literature within the borders of national literature by escaping the essence of literature, closing your eyes to the other literatures, to the world.

After Rene Wellek and Gursel Aytaç, the impact of followers or authorities like Ali Donbay with his article titled "Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Araştırmalarının Yeni Türk Edebiyatındaki Gelişme Çizgisi" (Development Course of Comparative Literature Studies In Modern Turkish Literature, 2013) http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/204963160_031DonbayAli including a large bibliography on 'so-called' comparative literature studies in Turkey (but most of them are national literature studies) and Bayram Yavuz with his article named "Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat ve Bir Uygulama" (Science of Comparative Literature and A Practice, 2004) http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/YENI%20TURK%20EDEBIYATI/yavuz_bayram that he compares "Bâkî and Taslicalı Yahyâ's Gazelles" of two Divan poets of Turkish literature as a study of comparative literature will undoubtedly be greater for the groups that are only focused on their own literature and they are eager to compare the products in the national borders. These approaches and applications overlapped with Croce's thoughts defining comparative literature with the words "it is neither a subject nor a separate discipline" (Bayram, 2004, p. 215-23) show 'comparative literature' as a subdivision or a sub-discipline of Turkish literature or a national literature.

In this context, Turkish comparativism, which develops around 'Wellek school' and 'Aytaç's manner', moves away from the real meaning and function of the concept of comparative literature and goes towards the study of 'national literature' comparing literary products of

Turkish national literature by itself. Not only with this, and it is in some tendencies to classify these sorts of studies and some bibliographical lists of national literary studies as comparative literary scholarship or studies of Turkish comparative literature as well, so-called a study of expanding the field of comparative literature. Firstly, we need to ask the following questions: If these studies are comparative literature, what is national literature?, what is literary theory?, what is literary criticism?, or what is research of literature? Who is interested in the development or decline of a nation's literature or the adventure / history of a national literature, which methods or techniques are used?, what are the differences between national literature and comparative literature? Shortly if we do not know how to call the studies of literature/s yet, we need to seriously consider learning what the history of literature, literary criticism, national literature or comparative literature is.

Secondly, can the field of comparative literature be expanded in such a direction that the limitations only for the sake of national literature are broken down? What kinds of contributions do such studies provide to the comparative literary? If they have some contributions, are these contributions to comparative literary, or are they to Turkish national literature? If these for national literature, because they are only focused on our own literature, at that rate do they not point out the studies clarifying the matters such as where our literature comes from, goes to, what its sufficiency and insufficiency, its extremes and limits, its corrections and mistakes, its beauty and ugliness. Additionally do they not identify their own writers' interests, relationships, interactions or inspirations with one another; their similarities, differences, parallels, writing styles, expression forms, developments, their positions in the national literary tradition? These are always the usual things that are done by the scholars of national literature. How can we better recognize ourselves without the other's literature/s, is it possible to fully understand our own literary values by closing our eyes to the other? It will not be possible to fully realize and evaluate what is belonged to us without the other's literature. If we like to introduce 'self' to someone else, knowledge of the other is necessary for us as well.

Turkish school of comparative literature should not be a sub-field or a tool of the school of national literary, the national literary works can surely be studied with comparative methods of comparative literature, but it is necessary to accept the comparative literature as a separate discipline, a journey to relations among literatures. And in this context to create Turkish comparatists' own theories, build their practices and approaches should be the basic task and function of the Turkish school of comparative literature. Even though some part of Turkish school goes away from comparative literature diverges towards different ways; today, the real segment of the Turkish school of comparative literature is in safe hands by struggles of some comparatists and philologists like Ali Gültekin, Ali Osman Öztürk, Cemal Sakallı, Kadriye Öztürk, Yılmaz Koç, Ahmet Cuma, Medine Sivri, Emel Kefeli, Jale Parla, Birsen Karaca studying foreign languages, literatures and cultures, trying to build and develop it in a way that is comparable to the essence of comparative literature.

Image studies focused on products of different nations' literatures have plentiful contributes to comparative literature as comparative cultural studies, but not cultural studies such as a country's image, local colors in a foreign writer's literary works, travel or diary books or the image of a country in a foreign literature (e.g., images of Turkish Harem in Montegue's *Turkish Embassy letters* (1763), Nerval's portrayal of Turkey in *Voyage en Orient* (Travel to Orient, 1851), representation of Germany in Ahmet Haşim's Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi (Travel to Frankfurt,

1933). However many travel writings listed in her article "Introduction to and Selected Bibliography of English-language Books about Turks and Turkey" that Elmas Şahin presents a selected bibliography of work (<http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2130>) on texts published from the sixteenth to the late nineteenth century by Western travel writers are very significant for comparative scholars and comparative imagology studies as comparative cultural studies.

On the other hand, the scholars like İnci Enginün, Emel Kefeli, Ali İhsan Kolcu and Mesut Tekşan deal with imitation, attribution, appropriation, borrowing, plagiarism and "foreign trade of influence" in the center of the Tieghem's approaches in their comparative studies; the specialists like Jale Parla and Nazan Aksoy, I also agree, tend to the studies of comparative cultural literature in similar approaches to Remak and Tötösy de Zepetnek's methodologies far from Wellek's line of U.S. school; and the others, especially most of the Germanists support German school. But I must state the comparatists who have achieved the essence of comparative literature try to build "post comparative literature" due to pop culture, postmodernism, post colonialism or cultural colonialism, orientalism and intertextuality studies, that is "a new Turkish school of comparative literature" nested by their own theories try to create a Turkish school of comparative literature as well as having some benefits of all the schools partially or wholly.

Therefore, the substances of U.S., French, British, German, Russian schools and so on have been merged and united as a whole under the Turkish school's roof rather than French school in narrow patterns which has continued for a long time by limited approaches like "borrowing, influence and imitation" or Wellek's American school frankly struggled among general, national and literary theory. Now Turkish comparatists studying at least a foreign literature, language and culture can look at literary products from a multi-dimensional window. Literatures, languages, histories, cultures, traditions, customs, roots, styles, spirits, beliefs, themes, tones, images, and mythological socio-political, economic and psychological elements etc., can be examined and evaluated in terms of form and content. Today when we look at the U.S. school, thanks to critics, the wrong line has been abandoned, if the Turkish researchers intend to see themselves as comparatists they have to avoid from the same illusion, they should regard this point. Otherwise, they throw a rope in a blind hole and nobody can remove it out.

The main faces of the Turkish school of comparative literature are partly similar to Remak, Tieghem and Tötösy de Zepetnek or partly Aytaç's approaches. Leading scholars of philology and Turkology departments agree with the professor of German, Remak's suggestions that are acceptable to most comparatists of all over the world, also including America. Comparative literature is the study of literature beyond the confines (boundaries) of one particular country, and the study of the relationships between literature on the one hand and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as the arts (e.g., painting, sculpture, architecture, music), philosophy, history, the social sciences (e.g., politics, economics, sociology), the sciences, religion, etc., on the other. In brief, it is the comparison of one literature with another or others, and the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expression. (Remak, 1971, p. 1). Turkish scholar Emel Kefeli, who also has similar approaches to Remak, describes comparative literature as "a huge discipline studying relationships between literature on the fields such as philosophy, sociology, psychology, film as well as interactions between the literary texts of different nations, different languages and cultures" (Kefeli, 2000, p. 9).

Not internal relations closed to the borders, but external relations concern to Turkish comparatists sharing the same ideas with the most specialists like Tötösy de Zepetnek

underlining that "comparative literature has intrinsically a content and form that facilitate the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary study of literature" (Tötösy de Zepetnek, 2003, p. 235) in his article the titled *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies* comparative literature is declared as study of literatures beyond national boundaries and study of the relationships between literatures or the study of interdisciplinary relations.

Turkish comparatists generally accept French comparatist's three systems known as 'influence,' 'imitation' and 'reception' (Tieghem, 1931, p. 13-142) suggested in *La Littérature Comparée* (1931) by Tieghem. Today the concept of 'influence,' 'borrowing or 'interaction' as the first step of comparative literature or an expression like that there should be a 'donor' and 'recipient' is about to lose its validity in The US, England, Germany or Russia.

Conclusion

To sum up, Turkish school of comparative literature is basically built on three focuses of the American school. The first one is thematology which is a comparative study of themes in literatures, thematic studies in different texts with the same subject/s (subject matter, motif, image, symbol, myth, situation, character, object, sound, action so on) in writers' works of different countries from perspective of comparative. The Turkish school in thematology studies turns its face to American school in 'analogy' studies regarding texts as an aesthetic object and to "The 'French' school *that* has attached to literary history for a long time, in the search for the fact, the study of '*influences*' (Brunel, Pichois and Rousseau, 1983, p. 28), focusing on external dealings in the literary texts. In fact The Turkish school does not separate American and French schools from each other, but it combines two poles to one. The second is typology studying different types, concerning figures, persons, events, and symbols, structure and so on in different international texts. The comparatists take advantage of typology studies to better understand and interpret or evaluate certain circumstances affairs, issues or factor. The last one for the Turkish comparatists is stylistics that is interpretation of literary texts, a study of literatures from a methodical or linguistic direction, aesthetically, emotionally or intellectually focusing on literary styles, rhetorical figures, choices of sounds and words, syntactical patterns.

Today despite of some crisis in definition of comparative literature and misunderstandings its theory and practice, the most Turkish comparatists feel importance of comparative literature as a perfect mirror reflecting literary values of the texts of each nation, and recognize that what kinds of contributions studies of comparative literature or comparative cultural literature have for national literatures or world literature.

References

- Alyılmaz, C. (2018). Köktürkçe ve eski Uygurca dersleri adlı kitaptaki Orhun Yazıtları'na ait metinlerin kaynağı hakkında. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(1), 1-52.
- Apter, E. (2004). *Global translator. The invention to comparative literature*. İstanbul, 1933. [book auth.] Christopher Prendergast. *Debating World Literature*. London: Verso, p. 76-110.
- Aytaç, G. (2001). *Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat bilimi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Bayram, Y. (2004). Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat bilimi ve bir uygulama. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 16, 69-93.

- Brunel, P., Pichois, C. and Rousseau, A. M. (1983). *Qu'est-ce que La Littérature comparée?*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Burçoğlu, N. K. (1984). *1900-1983 yılları arasında Türkçede Goethe ve 'Faust' çevirileri üzerine bir inceleme*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Burke, P. (2017). *Exiles and expatriates in the history of knowledge, 1500-2000*. Lebanon: Brandeis University Press.
- Cao, S. (2014). *The variation theory of comparative literature*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Croce, B. (1973). *Comparative Literature*, Hans-Joachim Schultz and Phillip H. Rhein, *Comparative literature: the early years, an anthology of essays*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Donbay, A. (2013). Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat araştırmalarının yeni Türk edebiyatındaki gelişme çizgisi. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 8, 491-560.
- Enginün, İ. (1992). *Mukayeseli edebiyat*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Goethe, J. (1850). *Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann and Soret. Trans from German by John Oxenford in two. Volumes, Vol 1*. London: Smith, Elder and Co.,
- Göbenli, M. (2005). *Direnmenin estetiği'ne güven*. İstanbul: Donkişot Yayınları.
- Gültekin, A. and Üyümez, F. B. (2008). Türkiye'de karşılaştırmalı edebiyat çalışmaları. *Alman Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, 20, 35-44.
- Kefeli, E. (2000). *Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat incelemeleri*. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Konuk, K. (2010). *East west mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Pizer, J. (2013). Teaching world literatures. (ed.) Stephen Tötösy de Zepetnek and Tutun Mukherjee. *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literatures, and Comparative Cultural Studies*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India Pvt. Ltd., 78- 87.
- Rendtorff, K. G. (1916). Shakespeare in Germany. *Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik*, 17(6), p. 189-195, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/30167745.pdf>
- Remak, H. (1971). Comparative literature, Its definition and function. [book auth.] Newton Phelps Stallknecht and Horst Frenz. *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rousseau, A. M and Pichois, C. (1994). *Karsılastırmalı edebiyat*. Trans. Mehmet Yazgan. İstanbul: MEB Yayınları.
- Saussy, H. (2006). Exquisite cadavers stitched from fresh nightmares: of Memes, Hives, and Selfish Genes. Haun Saussy. *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 3-43.
- Spitzer, L. (1934). *Learning Turkish*. Trans. Tülay Atak, PMLA 126 (2011). 763–79.
- Sutcliffe, E.G. (1914). *The Influence of Ben Jonson on Restoration Drama*, University of Illinois:
- Şahin, E. (2016). On comparative literature. *International Journal of Literature and Arts*, 4 (1-1), 5-12.
- Şahin, E. (2013). *Introduction to and selected bibliography of English-language books about Turks and Turkey*. CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, 15, 1.

- Şahin, E. (2017). A historical and critical survey of comparative literature in Turkey. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(4), 2448-2472.
- Tanpınar, A.H. (2001). *19'uncu asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*. İstanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi.
- Tieghem, P. (1931). *La littérature comparée*. Paris: A. Colin.
- Tomiche, A. (2013). Comparative literature in French. (ed.) Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek and Tutun Mukherjee. *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literatures and Comparative Cultural Studies*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India Pvt. Ltd., 254-269.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (1998). *Comparative literature: theory, method, application*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (2003). "From comparative literature today toward comparative cultural studies". Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek. *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. USA: Purdue University Press. 235-267.
- Wellek, R. and Warren, A. (1949). *Theory of literature*. New York: Harcourt.
- Wellek, R. (1963). The crisis of comparative literature. [ed.] René Wellek and Stephen G. Nicholas. *Concepts of criticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 282-295.