



“Commendable in an Ottoman of his background”: Christopher Ferrard and a reassessment of his contributions on Islamic literary sciences

Rahmi Oruç ^a and İ. Didem Arvas ^b

^aDepartment of Comparative Literature, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey; ^bDepartment of Turkish Preparation, Gebze Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

ABSTRACT

This paper critically assesses Christopher Ferrard’s (d. 2024) contributions to the study of nineteenth-century Ottoman rhetorical scholarship. In particular, it examines Ferrard’s definition of rhetoric as necessarily grounded in national literary traditions and his assessment of the scholarly output based on its alignment with a nation-centric approach. We demonstrate how this conceptual framework results in favorable evaluations of scholars who advocated for a nation-centric approach while leading to negative assessments of those who upheld the universality of *balāgha* and sought to vernacularize it in the Ottoman context. We conclude by advocating for further research that offers more comprehensive accounts of Ottoman rhetorical thought, balancing universalist and particularist perspectives.

KEYWORDS

Balāgha; *‘ilm al-ādāb*;
Ottoman rhetoric; *Edebiyat-ı cedide*; *‘ulūm al-ādābiyya*

With earlier trends privileging Western-centric paradigms gradually giving way to more inclusive approaches, scholars have started to pay, as far as possible, closer attention to non-Western traditions with a fresh eye. Islamic literary sciences—and *balāgha* (often translated as rhetoric) in particular—constitute one such tradition that has yet to receive the scholarly attention it merits within the Anglophone academic discourse. While there is a growing body of scholarship on this tradition and the non-Western literary theory more broadly, this goal remains to be fully achieved.¹ Many of these traditions—and Islamic literary theories in particular—have yet to be thoroughly studied and reintegrated into broader scholarly discussions.²

This article examines Christopher Ferrard’s (d. 2024) work, which to date is the only major contribution in English directly addressing nineteenth-century Ottoman Turkish developments in *balāgha*.³ Our analysis focuses on several distinct aspects of Ferrard’s study: his conceptual definition of rhetoric, his historical overview of the *balāgha* tradition, his perspective on the universality of *balāgha*, his approach to the efforts aiming for vernacularization, his representation of intellectual developments in the *balāgha* tradition following ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. al-Jurjānī (d. 1078 or 1081), his portrayal of the contributions by figures such as Namık Kemal (d. 1888), Rezaizade Mahmud Ekrem (d. 1914), and finally, his depiction of *inshā’* (often translated as

composition and prose) and *balāgha*. This focused investigation reveals that Ferrard defines rhetoric primarily in terms of its emergence solely within the context of national languages and literatures, which does not fully engage with alternative views within the tradition that emphasize *balāgha*'s broader applicability across linguistic and cultural contexts.

Our analysis indicates that Ferrard's influential, yet problematic scholarly framework aligns closely with earlier Orientalist perspectives, notably those articulated by Elias John Wilkinson Gibb (d. 1901). This alignment reveals a significant literary unity of horizon between Orientalist scholarship and proponents of the "new literature" movement in Ottoman intellectual circles. As noted by Victoria Holbrook and Nagihan Gür in the case of Gibb, Ferrard serves as an external observer whose scholarship has contributed to solidifying nation-centric literary frameworks within Turkey, that is, frameworks claiming that a literary theory or history can be defined and analyzed solely within the context of the national tradition to which it is assumed to belong.⁴ This influence is notably reflected in the official literary periodization that categorizes literature produced between 1911 and 1923 as *millî* (national) literature, framing earlier periods as insufficiently national. This idea was later state sanctioned through curricula, regulations, and the commission of books.⁵ Such a stance has been further reinforced in the works of scholars, including Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (d. 1962) and Kazım Yetiş as we will elaborate on later in the article.

Balāgha, as literary theory and rhetoric, was a staple of the medrese curriculum for a thousand years. Yet the term *balāgha* itself—and related Arabo-Islamic concepts like *ādāb* or *ijāz*—resists neat translation into English.⁶ This extensive tradition, spanning centuries, gradually diminished in prominence. By the second half of the twentieth century, many scholars predominantly neglected that Islamic civilization had hosted diverse traditions encompassing poetics, literary theory, criticism, and composition.⁷ Wen-chin Ouyang recounts a personal anecdote from an interview at the University of Virginia, where her interlocutor "cocked one eyebrow"⁸ skeptically, questioning whether medieval Arabic literary criticism existed. Indeed, literary criticism existed in the so-called "medieval" Islamic inquiry into poetry, both in the sense of literary criticism and composition; a philosophical inquiry into the nature of the Qur'ān; a linguistically oriented approach that took poetry as its main witness (*shāhid*); and a proper tradition of rhetoric in the Aristotelian sense. While it is not easy to translate *balāgha* as either "literary theory" or "rhetoric" proper, it is clear that the Muslim world has been preoccupied with a unique line of research (first as *ilm al-ādāb* in the classical sense and then as *ādāb/edebiyat* in the modern sense) on the theoretical and practical aspects of speech, poetry, communication and literature writ large.⁹

Rifā'a Rāfi' al-Ṭahtāwī's (d. 1873) *Takhlīṣ al-Ibriz fī Talkhīṣ Bārīz* translated as *An Imam in Paris*, takes great pains to document and introduce tens of "modern" sciences necessary for the progress of the Muslim world, and Egypt in particular. Rifā'a Rāfi' al-Ṭahtāwī equates *balāgha* and the Frank rhetoric, stating that, "This is the science of elegant expressions, or the science of making the expression appropriate to what is required by the circumstances. [...] Viewed from this angle, this science is not peculiar to the Arabic tongue but can be found in any other language."¹⁰ Nevertheless, in his tremendous undertaking of the *nahḍa*, al-Tahtāwī only tangentially mentions this discipline in a few pages, claiming that:

But as this science is more complete and more perfected in Arabic than in other languages, especially the art of style ornaments and tropes [*badī*], and as it is poorly developed in European languages, it may seem that it is one of the specialties of Arabic. The eloquence of the style of the Qur'an, which was sent down to man as an inimitable creation, is exclusive to Arabic.¹¹

As we will see, this trust in tradition slowly vanished over time. In fact, in the emergent Arabic national literature movement, al-Tahtāwī's reference to his readers to medrese books on *balāgha* came to represent only a minor approach, later lost to oblivion. Haifa Al-Faisal rightly claims that a colonial epistemic shift occurred, and *balāgha* began to be viewed as part of the great *inhiṭāt* (decline) of the Muslim world's progress, with the only solution being to abandon *balāgha* in favor of a Western literary theory.¹² As we will see in the works written in Ottoman Turkish, the decline paradigm and a subsequent revolution was wholeheartedly embraced by some scholars themselves.¹³

The structure of this article comprises two main sections, aiming to offer an in-depth assessment of Ferrard's contributions on Ottoman rhetorical scholarship. Section 1 contextualizes Ferrard's scholarship and outlines his central arguments, focusing on his nation-centric conceptual framework. Section 2 examines Ferrard's enduring influence on Ottoman Studies by illuminating his scholarly connections to Orientalist figures such as Gibb, tracing how his interpretations have impacted modern Turkish academic discourse and highlighting overlooked universalist perspectives. By situating Ferrard's arguments within the broader context of Orientalist and late Ottoman discourses, we show how his framework reinforces narratives of decline and revival, thus obscuring the nuanced diversity inherent in late-Ottoman intellectual life.

Section 1: a nation-centric approach to rhetoric/literary theory

Dr. Christopher Ferrard occupies a complex and somewhat enigmatic position of note within the field of Ottoman Studies through his dissertation "Ottoman Contributions to Islamic Rhetoric." His doctoral thesis, supervised by John R. Walsh until his death (d. 1975) at the University of Edinburgh, laid the foundation for his lifelong engagement with Ottoman literary studies. After defending his dissertation at the University of Edinburgh in 1979, Ferrard's career took an unexpected turn, steering him toward business rather than academia. Yet his intellectual contributions continue to resonate, situating him within a lineage of prominent Orientalist scholars such as Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (d. 1856), Gibb, James William Redhouse (d. 1892), and Laurence Paul Elwell-Sutton (d. 1984), whose work significantly shaped Western perceptions of Islamic literature.¹⁴ Much like Gibb, Ferrard's work reveals a staunch advocacy for the "new literature"¹⁵ emerging in Ottoman Turkish—a perspective he so fervently championed that his views often blurred the lines between an Orientalist scholar and a Turkish intellectual deeply invested in this literary transformation.

Ferrard's intellectual framework appears heavily indebted to Gibb best known for his *History of Ottoman Poetry*¹⁶ (1900–1909; *Tarih-i Eş'âr-ı Osmaniyye*). This six-volume work surveys five centuries of Ottoman poetry, from Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī to Ziya Paşa, and includes many poems that Gibb selected and translated into English, some of which notably originated from *Ta'lim-i Edebiyât*, authored by Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem.¹⁷ Ferrard's entries on Gibb and Elwell-Sutton in the TDV İslâm

Ansiklopedisi (TDV Islam Encyclopaedia) further demonstrate his dedication to documenting and analyzing the contributions of key Orientalist scholars. They also reflect the continuation of this Orientalist lineage.¹⁸ Ferrard's reliance on Gibb's ideas amplifies a narrative that prioritizes monolingual nation-centric perspectives.

Although Ferrard did not pursue a standard academic career, his influence persisted. In addition to his contributions in the related fields, Ferrard co-edited a special issue of *The Journal of Ottoman Studies* (1988) focusing on critical advancements in Ottoman studies. This issue remains a significant resource for scholars in the field.¹⁹ He also encouraged a number of scholars underscoring his enduring presence in academic circles.²⁰ His connection to Turkish academia is further evidenced by his articles published in journals such as *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı* and *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* which maintain their relevance today.

Ferrard's scholarship appears to be cited across various fields, underscoring its broad impact. It informs, for instance, studies on classical Turkish literature pedagogy (Tanzimat and Republican periods²¹), medrese curricula,²² Ottoman court history,²³ Ottoman libraries²⁴ and divan poetry editing.²⁵ As Ferrard's ideas serve as a point of reference for late Ottoman intellectual historians, Yetiş rarely cites Ferrard directly but often paraphrases his ideas nearly verbatim, perpetuating the same nation-centric framework.²⁶

In his dissertation, Ferrard provides a broad overview of the development of Ottoman contributions to Islamic rhetoric, focusing particularly on the attempts to develop an Ottoman rhetoric distinct from traditional Arabic models. He starts acknowledging the inherent complexities of defining rhetoric. Recognizing that no single definition can encompass the full scope of rhetoric, he proposes a more expansive understanding: rhetoric, he argues cannot be confined to a single function, nor does it stem from a universal need across literate societies. The development of rhetoric in antiquity, he contrasts, took shape as forensic rhetoric—a science fostering persuasive, effective speech—whereas in the Islamic world, it sprang from literary criticism.²⁷ He further distinguishes rhetoric from formal literary criticism;

Having analyzed the works that make up a tradition and having formed a literary theory thereupon, the critic can apply this to a particular work, to evaluate it within that tradition. The words 'literary tradition' has been emphasized to avoid the erroneous supposition that a literary theory evolved from works in one language may, with some validity, be applied to a particular work in another language.²⁸

Ferrard's emphasis on a national "literary tradition" function as a leitmotif throughout his analysis, yet he provides little explicit justification for his insistence that a successful theory must originate from a monolingual national context. It seems he views this position as an incontrovertible premise that does not require further justification.

Having defined literary theory and rhetoric in terms that incorporate a national dimension, Ferrard shifts his focus to the historical development of Islamic rhetoric, identifying a pivotal moment in its evolution: Jalāl al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ*.²⁹ He notes that Sakkākī³⁰ (d. 1229) and al-Qazwīnī (d. 1338) abridged the profound analyses of al-Jurjānī³¹ thus stripping much of the unique depth that characterized al-Jurjānī's contribution: "The final stage in the development of rhetoric came with the establishment of a textbook which would dominate the field to the exclusion of all other original works."³² This abridgment and subsequent incorporation into the

medrese curriculum led to what Ferrard describes as the fossilization of Islamic rhetoric: “There then followed a proliferation of super-commentaries and glosses,” their number bearing witness to the alleged inadequacy of the standard textbook.³³ Hence, the proliferation of commentaries, in his view, indicates *Talkhīṣ*’s shortcomings and a broader stagnation within the discipline. Ferrard also argues that, though the *Talkhīṣ* may represent an Islamic theory of literature, it was used chiefly as a style manual in the medrese. Thus, he contends these two functions—style and literary theory—were never clearly distinguished. This overlap allegedly contributed to the challenges faced by Ottoman scholars in developing a rhetoric suited to their language.

Continuing Ferrard highlights that scholars still lack direct knowledge of the medrese curriculum, noting, “today’s scholar is still relatively ignorant of the titles of the books, the manner of their presentation, and the level at which they were taught.”³⁴ Based on this, he speculates that the medrese syllabus changed little from the fourteenth century until the mid-nineteenth century; attributing the medreses a uniform character and giving this a scholastic flavor. These books, Ferrard notes, were memorized by generations of medrese students, though likely fully understood by few.³⁵

Ferrard delves into the dual cultural orientation of the Ottoman literati, who navigated between Iranian and Arabic influences, acknowledging that the medrese did not hold a monopoly on higher education, and rhetoric could be studied through works outside the syllabus:

The Ottoman literati were men of divided cultural orientation, within each two personae ever vying for dominance. Just as the Renaissance Italians accepted and cultivated the two distinct traditions of pagan Hellenism and Judeo-Christianity, the Ottomans looked towards Persia and the Arabic-speaking world. The former represented his aesthetic values, embodied in poetry as diverse as that of Jalaladdīn Rūmī and Hafīz, while the latter held his scholastic tradition, kept alive in the medrese curriculum.³⁶

Ferrard notes that Iranian poets “delighting in ambiguity and allusion, they affect a mode which blurs the edges of reality and pursues the spiritual with metaphors drawn from the profane.”³⁷ In contrast, the Arabic model is described as “literal and precise, attempting to establish truth by defining the spiritual in the language of logic.”³⁸ He claims that Ottoman scholars’ efforts to reconcile these two traditions were repeatedly challenged by the persistent threat of Puritanism.

Examining specific works, Ferrard discusses *Manāẓir al-inshāʾ* by Maḥmūd b. Shaybān b. Muḥammad Gīlānī, known as Ḥāce-i Cihān³⁹ (fl. 18th century), highlighting how the author relegated the *Talkhīṣ* to an ancillary status:

When dealing with the faults incidental to *fesāhat*, he quotes the examples in the *Talkhīṣ*, explains them, and then proceeds to illustrate the point with several Persian couplets of his own choice. By presenting the rhetorical theory by way of a preamble to the main section of his work, Ḥāce-i Cihān has reduced it to the status of ancillary science, while at the same time restoring to it utility and purpose, which had been denied it by the Arabic theoreticians.⁴⁰

This approach signified a departure from treating rhetoric as an alien science to be mastered for its own sake. Allegedly, after paying his due to the tradition, “almost with an air of relief”⁴¹—Ḥāce-i Cihān begins to entertain and delight his reader, saving rhetoric from becoming a “handmaiden.”⁴² He also discusses the *Miftāḥ al-balāgha wa miṣbāḥ al-*

faşāḥa by Ruşūhî Anqarawî⁴³ (d. 1631), reprinted in the nineteenth century, the publishers used the unusual term “edebiyat” to denote “literature,” as a sign suggesting possible influence by Kemal’s call for Turkish rhetoric.⁴⁴

Despite its importance, the *Miftāḥ* never reached a second edition. Ferrard explains this by pointing to the shortcomings of the educational system at the time, noting that the medreses had become strongholds for conservative pietists who upheld traditional methods with near-religious zeal. Meanwhile, the more “secular-minded elements of society,”⁴⁵ says Ferrard, who was the intended audience for the *Miftāḥ*, preferred a completely different approach to literary theory, one rooted in Western paradigms. Ferrard criticizes the various translations and adaptations of Arabic rhetorical texts into Turkish, suggesting that these efforts indicate a recognition of the inadequacy of the traditional system: “[T]hese translations gradually seek the expansion and clarification of the material that tradition compelled them to rely on, it is not too much to assert that they were in this way protesting at the constricting conditions of the educational system.”⁴⁶ While he acknowledges these may not have been conscious efforts at liberation, he deems them “a tacit expression of the sense of inadequacy.”⁴⁷

Turning to Ahmed Cevdet Paşa’s *Belāgat-ı ‘Osmāniyye*,⁴⁸ Ferrard bluntly states that “It must, however, be recognized as utterly failing in its avowed purpose of providing a rhetorical system for Ottoman Turkish, and its inadequacy can be attributed to the confused conceptions held by its author concerning the nature and scope of the subject itself.”⁴⁹ Cevdet Paşa (d. 1895) regarded rhetoric as a universal science, assuming that Arabic texts could serve Turkish needs with minor modifications. Ferrard contends that Cevdet Paşa should have done something else: “Whereas the proper approach would have been to deduce law and principle from his literature, he was content to seek in it only those examples which illustrated the foreign system.”⁵⁰ This reliance on Arabic models without sufficient adaptation, Ferrard argues, produced obscurities unsuited to Ottoman Turkish. For him, the biggest failure lies in the examples given in Ottoman Turkish for concepts defined in *Talkhīṣ*.⁵¹ Despite these shortcomings, Ferrard acknowledges that the work had the merit of rendering Arabic examples into Ottoman Turkish, allowing even those with limited Arabic proficiency access to Islamic rhetoric.

Ferrard also discusses Abdurrahman Süreyya (d. 1904), who wrote the *Mizānū’l-Balāgha*⁵² and its commentary *Sefīne-i Balāgha*. Despite his Kurdish background and multilingual abilities, Abdurrahman faced criticism regarding his command of Ottoman Turkish. Ferrard remarks on the triviality of some of his old school medrese education:

The impression left by the *Ta’līkāt* is that its author was a scholar of the old school, educated in a medrese, and completely immersed in the trivial arguments fostered by a system of education that could only accommodate itself to changing social values by the introduction of yet a further gloss to the ... body of commentary on a text written several centuries before.⁵³

In contrast, Ferrard highlights that the “modernist” approach, as he puts it, of Ekrem and his *Ta’līm-i Edebiyāt*⁵⁴ is a significant departure from classical rhetoric. Influenced by French literary theory, particularly Émile Lefranc’s (d. 1854) *Traité Théoretique et Pratique de Litterature*⁵⁵, Ekrem sought to provide Ottoman literature with a rhetorical system not based on Arabic. Ferrard rightly argues that Ekrem responded to Kemal’s call for a new grammar, rhetoric, and composition style by emulating the French

tradition. According to Ferrard, Ekrem's attempt was pioneering and ground-breaking, but never enough:

The *Ta'lim-i Edebiyât* succeeded in its immediate objective: to provide Ottomans with a rhetorical system that was not based completely on Arabic. In the long term, the goal was to develop Ottoman Turkish rhetoric, and here it failed, for Ekrem could not discover a set of principles that was exclusive to the Ottoman, the *Traité* and the *Talkhîs* both dealing, in the main, with concepts which have universal applicability.⁵⁶

This raises the question of whether any literary work could ever fully satisfy the parameters Ferrard sets. He reflects on the broader implications of rhetoric and its relationship with literature. He argues that while many languages exist without a formal rhetorical tradition, an awareness of rhetorical theory can influence literary production inspiring writers to explore the mechanisms of language and emulate exemplary forms.⁵⁷ Concluding his analysis, Ferrard presents a narrative of Ottoman rhetoric as a struggle between adherence to traditional Arabic models and the desire to develop a rhetoric suited to the Ottoman Turkish language. He underscores the challenges posed by the medrese system, the limitations of assuming the universality of Arabic rhetorical principles, and the efforts of scholars to adapt or transcend these constraints.

Section 2: Ferrard's enduring impact on *Balāgha* studies

To evaluate Ferrard's lasting impact on *balāgha* studies, it is crucial to interrogate the foundational assumptions that shape his reading of Ottoman rhetorical scholarship and the limitations they impose. In delving into Ferrard's exploration of Ottoman contributions to Islamic rhetoric, several critical issues arise that raise questions about the breadth and validity of his analysis. Among the critical issues identified, Ferrard's exclusive emphasis on Ottoman Turkish texts significantly overlooks the multilingual and multicultural realities of the Ottoman intellectual landscape. This narrow scope underestimates the richly multilingual and multicultural dimensions of the Ottoman Empire's intellectual landscape, in which scholars operated within a milieu notably diverse in both language and thought. As scholars like C. Ceyhun Arslan have aptly demonstrated, the emergence of national literature(s) and the confinement of literary study to a single language or group is a relatively recent and, arguably, limiting phenomenon.⁵⁸ By restricting his discussion to Ottoman Turkish, Ferrard reflects a broader tendency of applying contemporary notions of nationalism to historical contexts that were far more fluid and interconnected. *Balāgha* argues that neither words nor meanings alone constitute its subject matter; instead, it studies the universal principles, how words and meanings are tied together to produce rhetorical effects—namely, *nazm*. However, applying these principles in each language requires local adaptations. For instance, nineteenth-century Ottoman scholars like Süreyya and Cevdet Paşa often recognized that while the fundamentals of *balāgha* might be universal, Turkish rhetorical models demanded examples and terminology suited to Ottoman readers. In this sense 'one's own rhetoric' emerges as a local expression of a broader, shared tradition. That is, *balāgha* does not focus on individual words of a given language, neither does it focus on meaning solely.⁵⁹ Instead of working to situate these authors' writings within an intricate political, religious, and literary milieu of the period, Ferrard frequently assigns motives and

intentions to them without clear evidence. For instance, he suggests that unease with the medrese system incited Ottoman scholars to craft new rhetorical frameworks.⁶⁰ However, many scholars were content with the established *balāgha*, viewing it as a sufficiently robust conceptual foundation for literary analysis. As a result, a considerable number of scholars categorized as traditionalists, as well as those attempting to strike a balance between modernist and traditional approaches, did not feel compelled to formulate entirely new rhetoric. While justifying his intention to write a book of *inshāʿ*, Süleyman Paşa (d. 1892) states:

Indeed, to serve this cause, numerous books of various kinds have been authored and compiled, discussing and illustrating extensively in the languages of Arabs, Persians, and Europeans, following their natural disposition and dialects. (...) such an endeavor has not been favored or undertaken by the scholars of our Ottoman language to date, and this segment of our literature, which would have been a source of dissemination has somehow been left in silence.⁶¹

Their efforts at translating or adapting existing works often stemmed from practical issues, such as students' familiarity with Arabic and the limited instructional time for study, rather than any overarching dissatisfaction.

Ferrard's binary classification of contributions as either within or outside the *medrese* proves similarly reductive often casting the medrese as an Islamic, conservative, Arabic-oriented fortress incapable of accepting new ideas. He writes, "The medreses had become the sanctuaries of the conservative pietists whose high regard for traditional methods had all the fervor of religious conviction."⁶² This depiction underplays the vibrant intellectual activity within the medrese system, where scholars engaged in substantial debate, critique, and innovation across diverse disciplines. The medrese was not a monolith, but rather a constellation of learning centers capable of fostering continuity and advancement. What is more, scholars who advocated new literature, such as Kemal and Recai-zade Mahmud Ekrem, were also deeply engaged with the medrese and its intellectual products. In one letter, Kemal wrote from Paris to Ekrem, asking him to send *al-Muṭawwal* translation, "Where is my *Muṭawwal*? Are you sitting on it? I need it! I'll write a book on literature," a demand that vividly illustrates the text's genuine impact among those reformist Ottoman literati who still actively cultivated and valued extensive classical scholarship.⁶³

This overly reductive interpretation extends to Ferrard's reading of *inshāʿ* as a progressive alternative to *balāgha*, embraced, according to him, by scholars seeking to avoid the perceived conservatism of the medrese and Arabic rhetorical tradition. Yet, many of those contributing to *inshāʿ* were themselves products of the medrese or firmly connected to its scholarly milieu. The nineteenth-century witnessed the creation of new schools and curriculum reforms introduced by individuals from different backgrounds, complicating neat "conservative vs. progressive" divides. Thus, Ferrard's reductive binary obscures the real complexity and interplay of intellectual currents. Such a binary, however, fails to capture the overlapping allegiances of scholars who, while medrese-trained, engaged deeply with new pedagogical paradigms—and vice versa. One such example is Hacı İbrahim Efendi (d. 1888), who is placed in the conservative camp by Ferrard. In his commentary on Cevdet Paşa's work on *balāgha*, Hacı İbrahim Efendi explicitly states his very progressive goals:

[...] the high schools opened far and wide with the purpose of progress [*terakki*] in sciences. For example, the School of Law, established to be a source of legal scholars, is an institute of education for various sciences, and it is unquestionable that from this school of beneficial trade, many competent authorities of governance will emerge soon. Because, in this school, not only are the necessary sciences taught to those who are ambitious for positions of governance, but also the noble science of eloquence is being taught. Thus, the students, by acquiring the principles of eloquence and by making the capital of literature [*sermaye-i ede-biyye*] their own, will render their speeches acceptable and respected.⁶⁴

In constructing a decline paradigm, Ferrard portrays the medrese as restricting progress, arguing that canonical texts like al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīṣ* led to the fossilization of Islamic rhetoric, and viewing the "proliferation of super-commentaries and glosses" as evidence of the text's inadequacy. This perspective aligns with an older orientalist premise positing a Golden Age succeeded by decline and stagnation in Islamic scholarship—an interpretation that contemporary researchers have questioned. For instance, Khaled El-Rouayheb underscores how *munāzara* (argumentation) continued to flourish, showing no signs of decline.⁶⁵ Similarly, Asad Q. Ahmed demonstrates that *manṭiq* (logic) remained dynamic and innovative well into subsequent periods.⁶⁶ Even in *balāgha*, the nineteenth-century developments Ferrard discusses were characterized by active debates and multiple viewpoints, rather than one-dimensional stagnation. Portraying the medrese as an institution focused on rote memorization neglects the tradition of critical examination and inquiry prevalent at the time, characterized by regular scholarly debates and rigorous engagement with diverse perspectives.⁶⁷

Taftazānī's *Muṭawwal* (d. 1390) was by no means static; it built on critique of earlier ideas—particularly Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī's (d. 1083)—and in turn spurred new commentary. In his critical edition of Iffet Efendi's *Muṭawwal* translation, Mustafa Irmak notes that the translator drew upon a wide range of medrese-based sources: "Engaging with and translating classical works like *al-Muṭawwal*, which have inspired numerous *hāshiya* and *ta'liq*-style commentaries, inevitably requires drawing upon this vast corpus of scholarship."⁶⁸ Drawing from his analysis, it becomes clear that the work relies on dozens of sources composed at different times, with three functioning as its core.⁶⁹ This indicates that any scholar engaging with *balāgha* is, in fact, entering dialogue with a centuries-old intellectual tradition that has been continuously developed and enriched over time.

Ferrard interprets these established engagement patterns as signs of inadequacy and failure—an assessment that does not adequately reflect the creative and dynamic intellectual environment within medrese. Yet he also recognizes—albeit briefly—that the new schools, unlike the medrese institutions where Taftazānī's *Muṭawwal* formed a core part of the curriculum, often could not train students in Arabic to the same degree of depth. As he notes, "it was Arabic alone that figured in the syllabus," whereas the new schools were compelled to shift their focus toward teaching in Turkish, including formal literature, due to the insufficient Arabic proficiency among new generations.⁷⁰ The need to make texts accessible for a broader audience can thus reflect evolving pedagogical conditions rather than a fundamental critique of the medrese system based on Arabic teaching.⁷¹ The debate over vernacularization within Ottoman literary circles centered primarily around making *balāgha* accessible and relevant to contemporary Ottoman society. Scholars approached vernacularization with distinct, often conflicting

perspectives. For instance, Kemal's advocacy for an overtly Turkish style and grammar represented a significant departure from classical Arabic rhetorical norms, even framed at times as a nationalist break with the past.⁷² By contrast, many other scholars such as Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, Hacı İbrahim and Muallim Naci (d. 1893) who translated or adapted Arabic rhetorical texts aimed primarily to facilitate teaching, especially for students lacking advanced Arabic.⁷³

Ferrard's perspective is especially pronounced in his treatment of scholars such as Ahmed Cevdet Paşa and Süleyman Paşa, whom he deems unsuccessful while praising Ekrem's *Ta'lim-i Edebiyât* as revolutionary. He regards Cevdet Paşa's as failing in its purpose to establish a rhetorical structure for Ottoman Turkish, attributing this outcome to "confused conceptions held by its author concerning the nature and scope of the subject itself."⁷⁴ Even though Ekrem's own text showed shortcomings—lack of illustrations or explanations that made some sections unclear—Ferrard labels it pioneering, excusing such flaws as typical of a seminal work.

As Emine Evered makes clear, after *Ma'ârif Nizâm-nâmesi* (Educational Edict) reforms the educational area radically transformed: "One set of directives from 1877 mandated courses like *Medhal-i Kavâ'id* in the first grade, a generic Arabic course in the second grade, and an *İlm-i Balâgha* class in the fourth," while at higher levels "teachers across the empire recognized that a thorough reading of *Muṭawwal* conferred essential skills not just for rhetorical flourish, but also for parsing the intersections between grammar, theology, and philosophy."⁷⁵ Although the weekly hours devoted to these classical subjects sometimes fluctuated in response to shifting policies and curricular reforms, they were by no means phased out. In many i'dâdî schools, Arabic instruction was reduced to just two or three hours per week—especially for students preparing for advanced military training—while in other institutions such as the Literature Department of Dârümuallimîn or Galatasaray Sultânîsi, Arabic grammar and rhetoric remained obligatory in the upper grades.⁷⁶

Rather than reflecting this complexity, Ferrard imposes a binary between medrese and non-medrese, conservative and progressive, Arabic and Turkish. This dichotomy simplifies intricate dynamics and imposes a Western-centered interpretive structure on a setting shaped by overlapping cultural, religious, and intellectual influences. His usage of an epigraph from Kemal further underscores this perspective: "The Arabs who opposed the sword of the *Sharia* in the wake of Islam could not resist the authority of eloquence."⁷⁷ Accordingly, Arabic, which once served to support religion, ultimately became an obstacle for inventive young Turkish scholars—a valid observation for some, but it cannot be universally applied.

This personal evaluation mechanism is also observed in his comparisons between Süleyman Paşa and Ekrem. Ferrard suggests Süleyman Paşa's approach fell short because French theory was outdated and incompatible with the "medrese system," yet he commends Ekrem for employing similar French sources in a tone that may appear to be condescending:

[F]or the very fact that he was able to appreciate the quality of such a work is in itself commendable in an Ottoman of his background, and there were sections of the society in which he lived who would have rejected out of hand what he had to present if it were given a specific European identification.⁷⁸

The inconsistency seems to lie in applauding Ekrem for adapting Western concepts while criticizing others for equivalent pursuits, indicating a subjective preference for Westernization over local scholarly contributions, regardless of their content or caliber.

Ferrard criticizes individuals who maintained the belief in the universality of rhetoric and sought to vernacularize literary traditions. He views these endeavours as misguided, yet he approves of Ekrem retaining components such as *al-bayān*. Ferrard writes, “Ekrem, obviously influenced by Lefranc, breaks down this traditional distinction ... It is no longer the precious Islamic science ... it is now relegated to the level of *badī*.”⁷⁹ With his sentences he does not explain why the relegation of *al-bayān* to *al-badī* is regarded as a success, whereas Süleyman Paşa’s incorporation of *bayān* into his new *inshā*’ project is portrayed as a sign of confusion. Although he acknowledges that Ekrem’s minimal commentary leaves certain sections unclear, he ascribes it to the challenges intrinsic to groundbreaking work—a more lenient verdict than he extends elsewhere. The question arises, what precisely renders Ekrem’s work pioneering beyond its evident embrace of Western theories? He suggests that Ekrem’s students may not have understood his novel ideas, implying that contemporary society was so unfamiliar with them that the response remained “one of cautious silence.”⁸⁰ This claim, however, does not align with the numerous reactions—both favorable and critical—prompted by Ekrem’s work, documented in ‘Alī Amīrī’s (d. 1923) *Müntehabāt-ı Edebiyye*, which showcases a variety of stances within the print culture of the period regarding Ekrem.

Ferrard follows in the footsteps of Gibb, reintroducing and recycling modernist narratives—brought forward in the late nineteenth century. Gibb framed Ottoman literary history through a familiar “golden age → decline → revolution” arc. These arguments later found a home in Turkish academia, demonstrating the symbiotic relationship between Orientalist scholars and their modernist “oriental” colleagues. Indeed, this dual influence has been studied in other contexts: Arslan illustrates how Ahmet Rasim’s (d. 1932) translation of Le Bon’s work helped shape perceptions of Arabic within the “Ottoman canon”,⁸¹ while Alexander Jabbari performs a comparable analysis in his work on the Persianate.⁸² In both cases, it becomes clear that Orientalist discourse often emerges in tandem or in close communication with local reformist arguments, rather than simply imposing an external, colonial viewpoint. Ferrard’s stance exemplifies this pattern because he speaks as a kind of mouthpiece for the modernist scholars (whom he explicitly refers to as literally “modernist”) who criticized the universality of *balāgha*. Although Ferrard’s tone is not as overtly polemical, he still echoes modernists like Tanpınar (d. 1962), who praised Ekrem by proclaiming, “Our first reckoning with the *badī* and *bayān* to rhetoric of the Arab starts with him.”⁸³ When Tanpınar wrote these sentences in 1939, Ferrard was nowhere on the scene, revealing that the perspective Ferrard reimports is already deeply rooted in earlier local critiques.

Yet there remains an alternative history that could have been and should have been written. While it is true that some late Ottoman scholars rejected the universal scope of *balāgha*, embracing a more particularist and often nation-centric line aligned with Western theories, many others remained committed to its broader applicability and sought to adapt, rather than replace, its conceptual structure. In the context of Ottoman literary studies, Ferrard effectively continues Gibb’s approach, and Gibb, as Gür has shown, was heavily influenced by leading Young Ottoman intellectuals such as Kemal.⁸⁴ Holbrook even notes that Gibb’s *History* ended up re-importing Young

Ottoman polemics into Turkey “as a new and foreign cultural product.”⁸⁵ From Ferrard’s epigraph to his ready endorsement of modernist critiques of *balāgha*, we see Gibb’s “new literature” stance continued. As Gibb was “an adamant supporter of ‘new literature,’” Ferrard similarly champions Ottoman rhetoric over what he and the modernists call “Arab rhetoric,” and thus the modernist critique was ushered once again into Turkish academia. Gibb’s position is explicit in his criticism of classical Ottoman poetry: “At no time had Ottoman poetry appeared in so hopeless a plight as during the last years of the Old School ... poetry seemed to have fallen into a Chinese stagnation of lifeless conventionalism with neither wish nor power save to mumble the dry bones of a long-dead culture.”⁸⁶ Contrastingly, he celebrates the emergence of the new literature influenced by the West: “Where there seemed to lie the apathy of death there is now busy hopeful life; torpor and stagnation have given place to progress ... Turkish poetry has become for the first time natural and personal.”⁸⁷ This stark contrast mirrors Ferrard’s evaluative framework. Furthermore, Gibb’s broader argument defines Ottoman literary culture primarily through “a susceptibility to foreign culture,” first manifesting itself as excessive imitation of Persian literary forms and subsequently shifting toward European, particularly French, models.⁸⁸ Ferrard largely reproduces this perspective, adopting a similar interpretive lens by identifying traditional Ottoman rhetoric as excessively imitative and static, while lauding Ottoman scholars who embraced European literary frameworks as genuinely progressive. This view would later echo in the work of Yetiş, further discouraging attempts to draft a genuinely universal literary theory.⁸⁹

This entanglement of Orientalist and modernist views would later be formalized and amplified through state institutions, most notably in the codification of the *Millî Edebiyat* (National Literature) during the early Republican period. The institutionalization of this literary discourse was systematically reinforced by Turkey’s Ministry of Education through canon formation and *dirigisme*—the deliberate shaping and censorship of literature to serve ideological ends. This process gained formal clarity with the publication of the 1931 High School Curriculum and the 1932 Primary School Program by the Ministry of Education, which explicitly identified *Millî Edebiyat* as a literary period to be taught in schools. These curricular reforms emphasized the use of a purified Turkish language, the valorization of folk culture, and Anatolian themes, and the rejection of ornate Ottoman literary forms. As a result, the newly defined literary history began with the *Yeni Lisan* (New Language) movement and culminated in early Republican writing, while earlier periods were reframed as ideologically inadequate or not truly national. As Zehra Dönüş Eroğlu emphasizes, one of the principal authorities behind canon formation is “a political party, ideology, state, or a regime’s desire to impose its ideological arguments on society.”⁹⁰ Hence, the Ministry not only set curricula but also published standard textbooks (e.g. Tanpınar’s *19th-Century Turkish Literary History*, 1939), reinforcing an ideological framework. Through these interventions, *Millî Edebiyat* was not merely treated as a historical category but was actively constructed as a national truth, suppressing alternative literary heritages and codifying Republican ideals into the literary canon.

Given this historical context of rigid canon formation and ideological compartmentalization, it remains uncertain whether today’s academia—divided into departments such as Middle Eastern, Near Eastern, Arabic, or Persian studies—can comfortably accommodate an Islamic literary theory conceived as universal in scope. It seems the unwillingness to view Islamic literary studies as universal has been internalized to the extent that guest

editors of the *PMLA* on Arabic theoretical lexicons find it necessary to offer the following remarks to their contributors:

In our initial prompt to the scholars who contributed to this special feature, Harb, Miller, and I challenged our contributors to consider how Arabic theoretical concepts might resonate theoretically in non-Arabic contexts. To take up this challenge, we proposed, would be to participate in a species of counterhegemonic activity, to take part in “occupying the canon” of theory, as El-Ariss has described it, by asserting the right and might of Arabic concepts to “inform and shape our understanding of objects and phenomena more generally”. (“Theory” 8). For we stand firmly convinced that, just as with any other body of theory, Arabic theoretical concepts can produce “effects beyond their original field” (Culler 3)—or in other words, that Arabic theory is theoretical.⁹¹

We might further question labeling “Islamic literary theory” as purely “Arabic.” While terms such as “Islamicate” or “Arabic” may be justified descriptors for “Islamic philosophy,” particularly given significant non-Muslim contributions, there is no compelling reason to classify *balāgha* specifically as an “Arabic literary theory.”

Ferrard’s views, thus, are an exemplar of not only Orientalism but also “area studies” that resist acknowledging the universalist aspect of Islamic literary tradition. While underlining this, our aim is not to propagate an Islamic view, but rather—at least in the eyes of many of its proponents—a fact. We do not aim to create an unfolded, single-layered conception of Islam. In this respect, as Jabbari shows, even “Persianate” scholars like Abu Bakr al-Shiblī (d. 946) classed their language’s literary history as Islamic literature, hinting that a non-Western universal approach can arise from centuries of diverse languages and geographies. After its development, the different geographical, doctrinal, and linguistic approaches can be considered, not as Ferrard’s already established national literary theory, but as different modalities within the same universal tradition.

Conclusion

This paper has undertaken a detailed reassessment of Christopher Ferrard’s contributions to the study of the Ottoman rhetorical scholarship with particular attention to his conceptual premises, interpretive strategies, methodological choices and evaluative priorities. The first section reviewed Ferrard’s intellectual formation and his position within a lineage of Orientalist scholarship, notably his engagement with Gibb’s legacy and his influence on subsequent Turkish academic discourse. It also examined Ferrard’s overall portrayal of Ottoman rhetorical developments, emphasizing his framing of literary change in terms of binary distinctions—between progressive and conservative, secular and religious, Arabic and Turkish, national and universal—which, while analytically productive, reduces a complex intellectual terrain to an overly linear narrative of modernization. The second section focused on the conceptual assumptions that underpin Ferrard’s analysis. Central among these is his premise that rhetoric must emerge from a national literary tradition, an idea he treats as self-evident. We have argued that this position stands in tension with the approaches of many authors he studies. This guiding premise informs his evaluation of Ottoman scholars, favoring those who pursued a distinctly Turkish rhetorical system while characterizing as inadequate or confused those who sought to maintain or adapt the universalist framework of the classical

balāgha. Lastly, the paper situated Ferrard's work within a broader intellectual context, showing how his narrative aligns with—and helps to reinforce—a convergence between Orientalist perspectives and emergent nationalist discourses in the late Ottoman and early Republican periods. In highlighting these issues, our study contributes to a reconsideration of the historiography of Islamic literary theory and the development of a non-Western as well as universal literary theory that can enrich global literary theory, moving beyond narrowly nation-centric frameworks. Thus, we can better appreciate how Ottoman intellectuals actively negotiated between universalist Islamic traditions and emerging nationalist frameworks, offering fresh perspectives on literary theory beyond the usual Euro-American paradigms.

In closing, the analysis presented here highlights several avenues for further research. A conceptual history of *'ulūm al-ādābiyya* is needed to clarify how literary disciplines such as *balāgha* and *inshā'* were historically categorized and theorized across different periods. Moreover, the systematic translation and contextual study of major rhetorical texts—especially those composed or circulated in the nineteenth-century—remains an urgent priority for broadening the scope of inquiry. There is also a need for comparative research that examines how debates on literary theory unfolded across various linguistic and regional contexts within the Islamic world, including their reflections in educational curricula, journals, and public discourse. A revised historiography of Ottoman rhetorical scholarship would benefit from a balanced representation of both particularist and universalist perspectives, rather than privileging a single interpretive framework. In this respect, a closer analysis of how key Ottoman scholars such as Hacı İbrahim Efendi, Süreyya, and Cevdet Paşa understood and utilized core concepts such as *lafz*, *ma'nā*, and *nazm* in their vernacular engagements with *balāgha* will be crucial for mapping a fuller picture of the intellectual landscape. Such studies would not only deepen our understanding of Ottoman rhetorical thought but also contribute to the broader project of global literary theory.

Notes

1. Rashwan, "The History of Literary Theory," 2024.
2. Dolcerocca and Bozyer, "The Stakes of 'Imitation," 2024; Gould, "Premodern Multilingual Arabo-Islamic Poetics." For NonWestLit project see: <https://site.unibo.it/nonwestlit/en>; For GlobalLIT see: <https://globallit.hcommons.org/>
3. Ferrard's dissertation, "Ottoman Contributions to Islamic Rhetoric" and his serial articles frequently utilize either identical sentences or paraphrased versions of those sentences. Therefore, while we refer to his thesis, we also cite his paper where relevant.
4. Holbrook, "Philology Went Down," 19–41; Gür, "The Reading Processes of a Scottish Ottomanist," 171–205.
5. For a detailed example of dirigisme as state-directed interventions in literary canon formation, see Eroğlu, "The Formation of Literary Canons."
6. From the medieval period through the nineteenth century *balāgha* was recognised as a well-established and eclectic literary tradition which was widespread on a broad geography. For more information about history of *balāgha*, see Harb's *Arabic Poetics*.
7. Recognizing the untranslatability of *balāgha*—which encompasses both rhetorical eloquence and literary theory within Islamic intellectual traditions—we use in this article the term interchangeably with "Islamic rhetoric and literary theory," unless otherwise specified. Occasional English glosses are provided solely to aid initial comprehension. This approach foregrounds the historical specificity of these concepts and avoids assimilating them into

- Western-centric theoretical frameworks. For foundational studies on the conceptual scope of *balāgha*, see Lara Harb's *Arabic Poetics*.
8. Ouyang, *Literary Criticism in Medieval Arabic Islamic Culture*, 1.
 9. On modern scholarly uses of 'ādāb (*adab/edebiyat*), see Hany Rashwan, "Hadith as Oral Literature through Early Islamic Literary Criticism," and Nuha Alshaar, "Reconstructing Adab in Islamic Studies."
 10. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *An Imam in Paris*, 339.
 11. *Ibid.*
 12. Al-Faisal, "From Balāgha to Intiqād," 299.
 13. Süreyya, "Abdurrahman Efendi ve Muarızları."
 14. Ferrard, "Gibb and Elwell-Sutton," 250.
 15. E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, 21.
 16. *Ibid.*, 45.
 17. Gibb's work introduced Ottoman poetic traditions to English-speaking audiences and shaped the foundational perspectives of later scholars, including Ferrard. In 1919, Şahabetin translated parts of Gibb's history into Turkish and taught it in his Ottoman Literature classes at the Darülfünun, indicating its significant academic reception. For more information see Donbay, "Gibb."
 18. *Ibid.*
 19. Ferrard, Erünsal, and Woodhead, *The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 7–8. Ferrard's series of articles, also the subject of this paper, have been published in the same journal.
 20. Erünsal, "Medieval Ottoman Libraries."
 21. These works are Arğıt's "Eski Türk Edebiyatı Öğretimi" and Aynur's "Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları."
 22. Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Medrese Müfredatına Dair."
 23. Menchinger, "Gems for Royal Profit."
 24. Sabev, "Balkanlar'da Osmanlı Medrese Kütüphaneleri."
 25. Erünsal, "The Editing of Dīvān Poetry," 93, 13–33.
 26. Yetiş, *Belagatten Retoriğe*.
 27. *Ibid.*, xii.
 28. *Ibid.*
 29. Al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīş al-miftāḥ*—first printed in 1859, according to our research—discusses and simplifies the third chapter (eloquence) of al-Sakkāki's *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm*. For al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīş al-miftāḥ* and later commentaries, see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (GAL). For a critical edition of the *Talkhīş*, see *Talkhīş al-miftāḥ* (1859).
 30. Sakkāki's *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm* was first printed in 1900. For critical editions, see Zarzūr's *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm* and Çelik's *Belāğat: Miftāḥu'l-'ulūm* (2017).
 31. Al-Jurjānī's *Dalā'il al-ījāz* (*Proofs of Ijāz*) and *Asrār al-balāgha* (1900) are both foundational works on Arabic rhetoric and linguistic inimitability. For critical editions of *Asrār*, see 'Abduh and Riḍā.
 32. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," xvii; "The Medrese Tradition," 168.
 33. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," xviii; "The Medrese Tradition," 165.
 34. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 23.
 35. *Ibid.*, xvii.
 36. *Ibid.*, 24.
 37. *Ibid.*
 38. *Ibid.*, 25.
 39. Maḥmūd b. Shaybān b. Muḥammad Gilānī, known as Ḥāce-i Cihān's *Manāẓir al-inshā'* is a significant work on Persian prose and rhetoric (1845). For critical edition of *Manāẓir* see Kashmiri and Qureshi's *Sharh al-manāẓir al-inshā'*.
 40. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 27–28.
 41. *Ibid.*, 28.
 42. *Ibid.*

43. Ruşūhī Anqarawī's (d. 1631) *Miftāh al-balāgha wa mişbāh al-faşāha*, first printed in 1852, is based on al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīş al-miftāh* and Hāce-i Cihān 's *Manāzir al-inshā'*.
44. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 141.
45. Ibid., 32.
46. Ibid., 50.
47. Ibid.
48. Ahmet Cevdet Paşa's (1890) *Belāgat-ı 'Osmāniyye* sparked numerous critical responses upon publication, including Abdurrahman Süreyya's *Talikat-ı Belāgat-ı 'Osmāniyye* (1882), Hacı İbrahim Efendi's *Temyiz-i Talikat* (1882), and the anonymous *Hall-i Talikat* (1882). For critical editions of *Belāgat*, see Selim Altıntop's study.
49. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 50.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., 68.
52. Abdurrahman Süreyya's *Mizānū'l-Balāgha* (1885) is a critical response to Ahmed Cevdet Paşa's *Belāgat-ı 'Osmāniyye*. For modern scholarship on the *Mizān*, see Baranoğlu's dissertation, "Abdurrahman Süreyyā Mizānū'l-Belāga." For critical edition of *Ta'liqāt*, see Güneş's *Ta'liqāt-ı Balāgat-ı 'Osmāniyye*. Also Ferrard here refers to the work entitled *Hall-i Ta'liqāt*, attributed to an anonymous author as Mekteb-i Hukük Talebesinden Biri (A Student of the School of Law), published by Matbaa-i Osmaniyye in 1880.
53. Ferrard fails here to distinguish between *Mizān*, a proper book of *balāgha*, and Süreyya's polemics with the entourage of Cevdet Paşa. Moreover, he incorrectly categorizes *Mizān* as a grammar book within the old system, undervaluing its significance as arguably the most advanced Ottoman rhetoric book of its time. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 94.
54. For modern scholarship of Ekrem's *Ta'lim-i Edebiyyāt*, see Enginün's (1994), Ayan's (1997) and Öztürk's critical editions of *Talim-i Edebiyat* (2016).
55. Émile Lefranc's *Traité Théoretique* was originally published in 1847.
56. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 202.
57. Ibid.
58. Arslan, *The Ottoman Canon*.
59. Taftazānī's *Mu'awwal fī tarjumatī't-talkhīş wa'l-muṭawwal* (1854), 93–95, is a commentary on al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīş al-miftāh*. For modern scholarship, see Çelik's *el-Mutavvel*. For more on *nazm*, see Abu Deep, *Al-Jurjānī's Theory of Poetic Imagery*, Larkin, "The Theology of Meaning," and Harb, "Form, Content, and the Inimitability," 18:3.
60. Ferrard, "The Contribution of Recâizâde Maḥmud Ekrem," 165.
61. Süleyman Hüsnü Paşa, *Mebâni'l-İnşâ Cild-i Evvel*, 2. edited by Fatma Yıldız.
62. Ibid., 32.
63. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 121.
64. Hacı İbrâhim Efendi, *Sharḥ-i Balāgha*, 5–6. For modern scholarship, see Dağlar's "Hacı İbrahim Efendi *Şerh-i Belağat*," 321–70.
65. On this subject see El-Rouayheb's studies "Opening the Gate of Verification," and *Islamic Intellectual History*.
66. For more information, see Ahmed's article "Post-Classical Philosophical commentaries,"
67. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 18.
68. Irmak, "Klasiklerin Osmanlı Tercümelerine Bir Bakış," 407.
69. Ibid.
70. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 57
71. Ibid., 51.
72. Kaplan, *Namık Kemal*.
73. Aksoy, *Moderniteye Karşı Geleneğin Savaşçısı*.
74. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," 63.
75. Evered, *Empire and Education under the Ottomans*, 285.
76. Altınova, "Osmanlı Modernleşmesinde Rüşdiye Mektepleri," 142–55.
77. Ferrard, "Ottoman Contributions," ii.
78. Ibid., 141.

79. Ferrard, “The Contributions of Rezaizade Mahmud Ekrem,” 155.
80. Ibid., 112.
81. Arslan, *The Ottoman Canon*, 70–71.
82. Jabbari, *The Making of Persianate Modernity*.
83. Tanpınar, *19. Asr Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 1: 373. Translation is ours.
84. Gür, “The Reading Processes of a Scottish Ottomanist,” 171–75.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid., 66.
87. Ibid.
88. Holbrook, “Philology Went Down,” 26–27.
89. Yetiş, *Belağatten Retoriğe*.
90. Eroğlu, “The Formation of Literary Canons,” 83.
91. “An Arabic Theoretical Lexicon,” *PMLA* vol. 1 [139] 14–15. On this special issue see also, Stanton, El-Ariss, Harb, and Miller’s contributions, 9–15.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This study was carried out within the scope of the research project “Emergence of Modern Literary Theory in the Ottoman Empire,” funded by Ibn Haldun University Scientific Research Projects (BAP) under project number 2228.

ORCID

Rahmi Oruç  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2350-5063>

İ. Didem Arvas  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8995-0066>

Bibliography

- Abdelmageed, Muhamad K. K. “(De-) Linking Arabic-Islamic Poetics in Contemporary Literary Theory: Reclaiming Enunciation.” *Cairo Studies in English* 1 (2022): 99–128.
- Abdünnâfi İffet Efendi. *al-Nafal-Mu’awwal fî Tarjumati’t-Talkhiş wa’l-Muṭawwal*. 2 vols. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1872–1890.
- Abdünnâfi İffet Efendi. *En-Nef’u’l-Mu’avvel (Beyân-Bedi’) Telhîs ve Mutavvel Tercemesi*. Edited by Mustafa İrmak. Istanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2019.
- Abdurrahman Süreyya. “Abdurrahman Efendi ve Muarızları,” *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* 1099, April 20, 1882.
- Abdurrahman Süreyya. *Mizânü’l-Balâgha*. Istanbul: Ceride-i Askeriyye Matbaası, 1885.
- Abdurrahman Süreyya. *Sefîne-i Balâgha*. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Ebüzziya, 1888.
- Abdurrahman Süreyya. *Ta’lîqât-ı Balâğat-ı ‘Osmâniyye*. Edited by Bahadır Güneş. Istanbul: Serander Yayınları, 2023.
- Abu Deep, Kamal. *Al-Jurjani’s Theory of Poetic Imagery*. UK: Aris & Phillips, 1979.
- Açık, Kerim. “Tanzimat Döneminde Açılan Yeni Okullarda Arapça Öğretiminde Kullanılan Ders Kitaplarının Yöntem Açısından İncelenmesi.” *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* 37 (2020): 1–49.
- Ahmed, Asad Q. “Post-Classical Philosophical Commentaries/Glosses: Innovation in the Margins.” *Oriens* 41, no. 3–4 (2013): 317–348. doi:10.1163/18778372-13413405
- Aksoy, Musa. *Moderniteye Karşı Geleneğin Savaşçısı Hacı İbrahim Efendi*. Istanbul: Akçağ Yayınları, 2013.
- Al-Tahtâwî, Rifâ’a Râfi’. *An Imam in Paris: Al-Tahtawi’s Visit to France 1826–1831*. Translated by Daniel L. Newman. London: Saqi Books, 2011.

- Al-Baydawī, Nāṣir al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar. *Hāshiya ‘alā dalā’il al-Ijāz*. Istanbul: al-Matba‘a al-Amiriyya, 1895.
- Alfaisal, Haifa. “Liberty and the Literary: Coloniality and Nahdawist Comparative Criticism of Rūhī Al-Khālidi’s History of the Science of Literature with the Franks, the Arabs, and Victor Hugo (1904).” *Modern Language Quarterly* 77, no. 4 (2016): 523–546.
- Alfaisal, Haifa. “From Balāgha to Intiqād: Politicising the Science of Literature in Modern Arabic Literary Thought.” In *Arabic, Persian, and Turkic Poetics: Towards a Post-Eurocentric Literary Theory*, edited by Hany Rashwan, Rebecca Ruth Gould, and Nasrin Askari, 274–304. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024.
- Al-Jurjānī. *Asrār al-Balāgha*. Edited by Muḥammad ‘Abduh. Cairo: al-Matba‘a al-Ḥusayniyya, 1954.
- Al-Jurjānī. *Asrār al-balāgha*. Edited by Muhammad ‘Abd al-Hādī Abū Rayda. 6 vols. Mīdān al-Azhar: Muḥammad ‘Alī Şubayḥ, 1959.
- Al-Jurjānī, ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *Dalā’il al-ijāz*. Cairo: al-Matba‘a al-Amiriyya, 1900.
- Al-Khālidi, Rūhī. *Tārīkh al-‘ilm ‘inda al-‘arab wa-l-muslimin*. Cairo: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1978.
- Al-Qazwīnī, Ḥatīb. *Talkhīş al-miftāh*. Edited by İsmailağa Telif Heyeti. Istanbul: Sıraç Yayınevi, 2023.
- Al-Qazwīnī, Jalāl al-Dīn. *Talkhīş al-miftāh*. Cairo: Bulak Press, 1859.
- Al-Rāfi‘i, Muḥammad Şādiq. *Tārīkh adāb al-‘arab*. Cairo: Mu’assasat Hindāwī li-l-Ta’līm wa-l-Thaqāfah, 2013.
- Alshaar, Nuha. “Reconstructing Adab in Islamic Studies.” In *Deconstructing Islamic Studies*, edited by Majid Daneshgar and A. Hughes, 167–203. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2020.
- Al-Taftāzānī, Sa’d al-Dīn Mas’ūd ibn ‘Umar. *Al-Muṭawwal*. Cairo: al-Matba‘a al-Amiriyya, 1854.
- Al-Taftāzānī, Sa’d al-Dīn Mas’ūd ibn ‘Umar. *Hāshiya ‘alā asrār al-balāgha*. Istanbul: Dār al-Tibā’a, 1910.
- Al-Taftāzānī, Sa’d al-Dīn Mas’ūd ibn ‘Umar. *Al-Muṭawwal ‘ala al-talkhīş*. Istanbul: Dār al-Tibā’a, 1911.
- Al-Taftāzānī, Sa’d al-Dīn Mas’ūd ibn ‘Umar. *El-Mutavvel*. Edited by Zekeriyya Çelik. Istanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2019.
- Altınova, Ayşegül. “Osmanlı Modernleşmesinde Rüşdiye Mektepleri.” Master’s thesis, Gazi Üniversitesi, 2010.
- Altıntop, Selim. “Belâgat-ı Osmâniyye’deki Edebî Terimlerin Tanımları ve Tasnifi Üzerine Bir İnceleme.” PhD diss., Ege Üniversitesi, 1999.
- Argıt, Celile Eren. “Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Eski Türk Edebiyatı Öğretimi.” *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 5, no. 10 (2007): 513–542.
- Arslan, C. Ceyhun. “Translating Ottoman into Classical Arabic: Nahḍa and the Balkan Wars in Aḥmad Shawqī’s ‘The New al-Andalus’.” *Middle Eastern Literatures* 19, no. 4 (2016): 278–297. doi:10.1080/1475262X.2016.1248037.
- Arslan, C. Ceyhun. “Canons as Reservoirs: The Ottoman Ocean in Ziya Pasha’s *Harabat* and Reframing the History of Comparative Literature.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 54, no. 4 (2017): 731–748.
- Arslan, C. Ceyhun. *The Ottoman Canon and the Construction of Arabic and Turkish Literatures*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2024.
- Aynur, Hatice. “Sözden Yazıya Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları Üstüne Bazı Gözlemler: 1990–2005.” *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 28 (2006): 17–40.
- Baranoğlu, Şahin. *Mizânü’l-Belâga*, authored by Abdurrahman Süreyyâ, PhD diss., Ege University, 1999.
- Black, Deborah. *Logic and Aristotle’s “Rhetoric” and “Poetics” in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*. New York: Springer, 1990.
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Supplement to the Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 3 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1937–1942.
- Dolcerocca, Özden Nergis, and Hazal Bozyer. “The Stakes of “Imitation”: Debating Modern Poetics and National Identity in Late Ottoman Literature.” *Middle Eastern Literatures* (2024): 1–19. doi:10.1080/1475262X.2024.2425645.

- Donbay, İbrahim Halil. "Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* 14 (2009): 688–690.
- El-Rouayheb, Khaled. "Opening the Gate of Verification: The Forgotten Arab-Islamic Florescence of the 17th Century." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38, no. 2 (2006): 263–281.
- El-Rouayheb, Khaled. *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Eroğlu, Zehra D. "The Formation of Literary Canons in History of Turkish Literature." *Journal in Humanities* 12, no. 2 (2023): 1–13. doi:10.31578/hum.v12i2.526. (Original work published January 22, 2024).
- Erünsal, İsmail E. "Medieval Ottoman Libraries." *Erdem* 1, no. 3 (1985): 745–754.
- Erünsal, İsmail E. "The Editing of Divân Poetry: How Successful Has it Been?" *Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 93 (2003): 13–33.
- Evered, Emine Ö. *Empire and Education under the Ottomans: Politics, Reform, and Resistance from the Tanzimat to the Young Turks*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012.
- Fazlıoğlu, Şükran. "Osmanlı Medrese Müfredatına Dair Çalışmalar: Nereden Nereye?" *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 12 (2008): 593–610.
- Ferrard, Christopher. "Gibb and Elwell-Sutton." 10 vols. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1994.
- Ferrard, Christopher. "Ottoman Contributions to Islamic Rhetoric." PhD diss., Edinburgh University, 1979.
- Ferrard, Christopher. "The Development of an Ottoman Rhetoric up to 1882. Part I: The Medrese Tradition." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 3 (1982): 163–188.
- Ferrard, Christopher. "The Development of an Ottoman Rhetoric up to 1882. Part II: Contributions Outside from the Medrese." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 04 (1984): 19–34.
- Ferrard, Christopher. "The Contribution of Recâizade Mahmud Ekrem's Ta'lim-i Edebiyyât to the Development of Ottoman Rhetoric, Part II." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 6 (1986): 139–161.
- Ferrard, Christopher. "The Contribution of Recâizade Mahmud Ekrem's Ta'lim-i Edebiyyât to the Development of Ottoman Rhetoric. Part III." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 05 (1986): 215–233.
- Ferrard, Christopher, İsmail E. Erünsal and ve Christine Woodhead, eds. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies*. Special Issue, 7–8 (1988) İstanbul: İsam İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi. <https://osmanliarastirmalari.isam.org.tr/dergi/issue/view/sayi7-8>.
- Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. 6 vols. London: Luzac & Co., 1900–1909.
- Gilânî, Maḥmûd b. Shaybân b. Muḥammad (Hâce-i Cihân). *Manâzîr al-Inshâ'*. İstanbul: Matba'a al-Amîriyya, 1845.
- Gould, Rebecca Ruth. "Premodern Multilingual Arabo-Islamic Poetics." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature*. Accessed March 22, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190201098.013.1205>
- Gould, Rebecca Ruth. "The Challenges of Comparison." In *Arabic, Persian, and Turkic Poetics: Towards a Post-Eurocentric Literary Theory*, edited by Hany Rashwan, Rebecca Ruth Gould, and Nasrin Askari, 1–21. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024.
- Gür, Nagihan. "The Reading Processes of a Scottish Ottomanist: E. J. W. Gibb and His Young Ottoman Sources." *Middle Eastern Literatures* 21, no. 2–3 (2018): 171–205. doi:10.1080/1475262X.2019.1576478.
- Hacı İbrahim Efendi. *Sharḥ-i Balâgha*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1298/1881.
- Hacı İbrahim Efendi. *Temyiz-i Talikât*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1882.
- Harb, Lara. "Form, Content, and the Inimitability of the Qur'an in 'Abd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî's Works." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 18, no. 3 (2016): 72–94.
- Harb, Lara. *Arabic Poetics: Aesthetic Experience in Classical Arabic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Holbrook, Victoria R. "Philology Went Down to the Crossroads of Modernity to Meet Orientalism, Nationalism, and ... Ottoman Poetry." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 11 (1994): 19–41.

- Ibn Khaldun, ‘Abd al-Rahman. *Muqaddimah Ibn Khaldun*. Beirut: Dar Maktabah al-Ma‘arif, 2013.
- Irmak, Mustafa. “Klasiklerin Osmanlı Tercümelerine Bir Bakış ve Abdünnâfi İffet Efendi’nin Mutavvel Tercümesi.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of *Osmanlıda Ulûm-i ‘Arabiyye Sempozyumu*, Istanbul, Turkey, December 18–19, 2020, 379–409.
- Jabbari, Alexander. *The Making of Persianate Modernity: Language and Literary History between Iran and India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- Kaplan, Mehmet. *Namık Kemal: Hayatı ve Eserleri*. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1968.
- Larkin, Margaret. *The Theology of Meaning: ‘Abd al-Qâhir al-Jurjânî’s Theory of Discourse*. Michigan University: American Oriental Society, 1995.
- Lefranc, Émile. *Traité Théoretique et Pratique de Littérature: Rhétorique et Éloquence*. Paris: Jacques Lecoffre, 1874.
- Leitch, Vincent B., William E. Cain, and Laurie A. Finke. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001.
- Mekteb-i Hukuk Talebesinden Biri. *Hall-i Talikât*. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Osmaniye, 1882.
- Ouyang, Wen-chin. *Literary Criticism in Medieval Arabic-Islamic Culture: The Making of a Tradition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.
- Rashwan, Hany. “Arabic Jinās is Not Pun, Wortspiel, Calembour, or Paronomasia: A Post-Eurocentric Approach to the Conceptual Untranslatability of Literary Terms in Arabic and Ancient Egyptian Cultures.” *Rhetorica* 38, no. 4 (2020): 335–370. doi:10.1525/rh.2020.38.4.335.
- Rashwan, Hany. “The History of Literary Theory in Medieval Arabo-Islamic Cultures.” In *Arabic, Persian, and Turkic Poetics: Towards a Post-Eurocentric Literary Theory*, edited by H. Rashwan, R. R. Gould, and N. Askari, 266 vols, 20–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024.
- Rashwan, Hany. “Hadith as Oral Literature through Early Islamic Literary Criticism.” *Studia Islamica* 119, no. 1 (2024): 34–69. doi:10.1163/19585705-12341481.
- Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem. *Talim-i Edebiyat*. Edited by Hüseyin Ayan. Istanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1996.
- Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem. *Talim-i Edebiyat*. Edited by İnci Enginün. Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1997.
- Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem. *Talim-i Edebiyat*. Edited by Furkan Öztürk. Istanbul: DBY, 2016.
- Ruşûhî Anqarawî. *Miftâh al-balâgha wa mişbâh al-faşâha*. Istanbul: Matba‘a al-Amîriyya, 1852.
- Sabev, Orlin. “Bulgaristan Örneği Işığında Balkanlar’da Osmanlı Medrese Kütüphaneleri.” A paper presented at the annual meeting of *Osmanlı İlim, Düşünce ve Sanat Dünyasında Balkanlar Milletlerarası Tartışmalı İlmî Toplantı*, 7–9 May 2014, 143–174.
- Sakkâkî, Yûsuf b. Abî Bakr. *Miftâhu’l-‘Ulûm: Belâgat*, edited by Zekeriyya Çelik. Istanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2021.
- Süleyman Hüsnü Paşa. *Mebânî’l-inshâ*. vol I. Istanbul: Mekteb-i Fünûn-ı Harbiye-yi Şâhâne Matbaası, 1291 (1874).
- Süleyman Hüsnü Paşa. “*Mebani’l-İnşa (Cild-i Evvel)*,” edited by Fatma Yıldız.” Master thesis, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, 2016.
- Süleyman Hüsnü Paşa. “*Mebani’l-İnşa (Cild-i Sani)*,” edited by Nazife Benzer.” Master thesis, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, 2016.
- Stanton, A. Z. “Introduction to “An Arabic Theoretical Lexicon.”” *PMLA/Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 139, no. 1 (2024): 9–15.
- Studies, History. “Ethan L. Menchinger- Gems for Royal Profit”: Prefaces and the Practice of Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Court History,” n.d.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Istanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi, 1949.
- Yetiş, Kazım. *Namık Kemal’in Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Üzerine Görüşleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1996.
- Yetiş, Kazım. *Belagâttan Retoriğe*. Istanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2006.