



What Julia Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France* can Tell us About World Literature

Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France, by Julia Caterina Hartley, London, I.B. Tauris, 2023, 296 pp., £81 (Hardback), 26.09 (e-book), ISBN: 9780755645619.

Richard Hibbitt

To cite this article: Richard Hibbitt (24 Mar 2026): What Julia Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France* can Tell us About World Literature, Global Intellectual History, DOI: [10.1080/23801883.2026.2638225](https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2026.2638225)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2026.2638225>



© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 24 Mar 2026.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 127



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Special Issue on Julia Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism*

Guest Editor: Edward Hughes

 OPEN ACCESS



What Julia Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France* can Tell us About World Literature

Richard Hibbitt

University of Leeds

Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France, by Julia Caterina Hartley, London, I.B. Tauris, 2023, 296 pp., £81 (Hardback), 26.09 (e-book), ISBN: 9780755645619.

In the essay *Conjectures on World Literature*, published at the start of this century, Franco Moretti begins by quoting some well-known statements about world literature by Goethe and by Marx and Engels. The Goethe quotation comes from a conversation with Eckermann in 1827: 'Nowadays, national literature doesn't mean much: the age of world literature is beginning and everybody should contribute to hasten its advent.'¹ After a brief reference to Goethe's reading of non-European literatures – in this case an unnamed Chinese novel – Moretti appraises the extent to which Goethe's pronouncement has been borne out:

Well, let me put it very simply: comparative literature has not lived up to these beginnings. It's been a much more modest intellectual enterprise, fundamentally limited to Western Europe, and mostly revolving around the river Rhine (German philologists working on French literature). Not much more.²

Leaving aside objections to Moretti's argument here – there are of course many comparative literature specialists around the world with expertise in non-Western European languages and literatures, – it is instructive to return to Goethe's collected remarks and writings on world literature and to consider which works of comparative literature *have* realised his recommendations for the future. Julia Caterina Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France* is a perfect example of how comparative literature can develop the East–West/West–East exchanges that Goethe exemplified himself in his *West-östlicher Divan* (*West-Eastern Divan*), published in 1819. Goethe's inspiration was the Persian poetry of Hāfez (1320–1389), which he had read in an 1812 German translation by Joseph von

CONTACT Richard Hibbitt  R.Hibbitt@leeds.ac.uk

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

Hammer-Purgstall, an Austrian diplomat and scholar. Hartley refers to it in her analysis of Théophile Gautier's preface to his 1852 collection *Émaux et Camées* (*Enamels and Cameos*):

Pendant les guerres de l'Empire
 Goëthe, au bruit du canon brutal,
 Fit *Le Divan occidental*,
 Fraîche oasis où l'art respire.
 [During the wars of the Empire
 Goethe, at the sound of the brutal cannon,
 Made the Western Divan,
 A fresh oasis where art alone breathes.]³

Hartley reads Gautier's reference to Goethe here as evidence that 'the Persian canon was no longer the preserve of the Romantics'. This insight achieves three things. First, it tells us something new about the relationship between Iran and French literature. Second, it tells us something new about world literature: we learn how Gautier used Goethe as an intertextual reference for his own engagement with Persian poetry. Third, it also shows us *in nuce* how comparative literature can work in practice. My appraisal of *Iran and French Orientalism* will explore some of the ways in which it contributes to our understanding of world literature.

1. Translation and Mediation

The subject of translation runs through studies of world literature like a river glimpsed from a train passing through the same valley. Sometimes the railway track runs alongside the river, which dominates the view; at other times the river is out of sight, but the traveller always knows that it is there. In other words, translation is a major issue for some theorists, whereas for others it is not an explicit concern. Goethe's references to translation – including his own attempts – emphasise the importance of 'good translation' in enabling the international communication of ideas and the broadening of individual and national horizons.⁴ Other theorists of world literature have taken a more polemical position, notably Georg Brandes in the 1899 article 'World Literature':

It is impossible to write anything artistic in another language than one's own. On that we are all in agreement. But these translations! To these we all object.⁵

Leaving aside Brandes' cursory dismissal of exophonic writing, it is interesting to see where his argument takes him. He rejects the value of any type of translation, not just of lyric poetry, but also of prose, where the 'loss remains immeasurable, albeit less striking than in poems'.⁶ But his dislike for translation is not simply based on an aesthetic judgement: he also points out that translation is unequal because it favours writers who are already at an advantage because they come from countries with widely-spoken languages, or what he calls 'world languages'; he cites French, English and German, followed by Italian and Spanish. Here his argument seems to arrive at an

aporia: he has to acknowledge the importance of translation for a writer like Ibsen, writing in what he calls a ‘small language’, while at the same time rejecting the value of translation tout court. In response, it is of course true that we can make an effort to learn a foreign language that is not offered to us at school or even undergraduate level. This is what Hartley has done by learning the Persian language, taking an MA in Iranian Studies, and becoming a mediator between French and Iranian culture through the medium of English.

This achievement is not only an important contribution to research into world literature: it is also a response to Moretti’s observation that the majority of comparatists only know one or two Western European languages. But it also responds to an earlier appeal in an essay by Eric Auerbach entitled ‘Philology and *Weltliteratur*’, published in 1952, in which Auerbach discusses the post-WW2 division of the world order into European-American or Russian-Bolshevist spheres of influence. As Auerbach notes, this ‘was not what Goethe had in mind’ when he envisaged a future world literature.⁷ He writes as follows:

All human activity is being concentrated either into European-American or Russian-Bolshevist patterns; no matter how great they seem to us, the differences between the two patterns are comparatively minimal when they are both contrasted with the basic patterns underlying the Islamic, Indian or Chinese traditions.⁸

Auerbach’s essay was translated into English by Maire Said and Edward W. Said for publication in the *The Centennial Review* in 1969. The latter refers to it in *Orientalism*, distinguishing between the scholars he associates with ‘Islamic Orientalism’ and the work of philologists such as Auerbach and Ernst Robert Curtius, while noting their ‘strong cultural resemblance’.⁹ We can construct a lineage here from Goethe’s humanistic view of world literature through Auerbach and Said to Hartley’s *Iran and French Orientalism*. But Hartley’s achievement is not simply to pick up the baton of contributions to the study of world literature: it is also to critique not only assumptions about ‘Islamic traditions’, but also the assumptions about Orientalism itself.

2. Similarity and Difference

One of the sub-headings in the introduction to *Iran and French Orientalism* is entitled ‘Beyond the paradigm of difference’. This refers to another central aim of the book: to investigate the various ways in which French writers responded to the similarities and differences they found in Iranian culture. Hartley sets out to go beyond what she refers to as the ‘paradigm of difference’ in Said’s *Orientalism*:

French writers’ encounter with Iran was much more multifaceted than this, since it typically involved a negotiation between what made Iran familiar and what made it foreign. Far from being monolithic, French accounts of Iran feature ambivalences, nuances and even contradictions. In order to do justice to this complex landscape, one must be prepared to transcend the dualism of the Orient/Occident binary. (p. 7)

Hartley accomplishes this task throughout the book through careful attention to the convergences, divergences, nuances, reciprocities and anomalies she teases out through her textual analyses. The main theoretical support here comes from two studies: Anil Bhatti and Dorothee Kimmich’s *Similarity: A Paradigm for Culture Theory* (2017) and Tzvetan

Todorov's *Nous et les autres: la diversité humaine dans la pensée française* (1989), translated into English by Catherine Porter as *On Human Diversity – Nationalism, Racism & Exoticism in French Thought* (1994). We can also see an affinity between Hartley's approach here and recent work in the field of world literature, particularly with regard to going beyond the dualism of the binary without ignoring the importance of the concepts within such dualisms. This is one of the reasons why the term 'transnational' has had some critical success: it allows us to think about transcending the national while still acknowledging its importance, not least to anyone trying to flee from war, persecution, famine or the climate crisis. Another way of thinking about dualism while avoiding the binary is through the practice of what Stuart Hall calls 'relational thinking'. The following insight is taken from a 2001 essay by the theorist Vilashini Cooppan, who uses Hall's term as a way of thinking about globalisation:

Globalization, by no means reducible to the universal reign of commodification, is for many of its scholars an inherently mixed phenomenon, a process encompassing both sameness and difference, compression and expansion, convergence and divergence, nationalism and internationalism, universalism and particularism. Consistently contradictory, deeply double, the 'global' has less to do with the concept of a hegemonic, homogenous universal than with what Stuart Hall terms the practice of relational thinking.¹⁰

To my mind Hartley's approach here can also be seen as a form of relational thinking, with regard first to her emphasis on similarity and diversity rather than the Orient/Occident binary, and second to her acknowledgement that universalism and relativism can co-exist (p. 8). Of course, relational thinking is not simply a panacea: critics can easily end up offering new essentialist views of sameness and difference while claiming to undo them. It is a testament to Hartley's critical acumen that she avoids this trap: we finish *Iran and French Orientalism* with a greater awareness not only of the relationship between France and Iran in the nineteenth century, but also with a case study of how to go beyond the paradigm of difference without leaving difference behind. This becomes particularly clear in Chapter 2, which is entitled 'History and historical fiction'. For example, Hartley shows here how Judith Gautier was able to transcend dualisms in her 'fluid understanding of cultural identity', which she links to Jules Michelet's argument that 'Islam incorporated and upheld certain Zoroastrian values' (p. 103). It is also evident in Chapter 3, entitled 'Travel-Writing', where Hartley shows how one form of difference could be replaced by another: when discussing how Arabians and Ottomans served as a foil to Persians instead of the West, she refers to 'a repurposed binary opposition' (p. 112). In both cases we can see here the value of relational thinking in action.

3. Geocriticism and Literary Tourism

Hartley shows how travel-writing can, in the case of Marthe Bibesco's *Les Huit paradis* (1908), 'intertwine descriptions of the "real" geographic location with an idealised version based on Persian literature' (p. 3). This insight is germane to two fields of literary studies: geocriticism and literary tourism. The theory of geocriticism has been developed notably by two scholars, Bertrand Westphal and Robert T. Tally Jr, who has also translated Westphal's work from French into English. The title of Westphal's 2007 study *La Géocritique: réel, fiction, espace*, translated by Tally as *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional*

Spaces (2011), indicates its focus: geocriticism analyses how space is constructed from both real and fictional sources, encompassing architecture, geography, sociology, politics and a wide range of cultural representations. One of Westphal's disarmingly simple observations is that when we refer to a particular place, we are referring to a composite of the real and the fictional. A heightened example of this would be the expression 'Brontë country', but we can see this process everywhere. Westphal refers to this correlation between the referent and its fictional representation as the 'homotopic consensus':

When Balzac represents Paris, or Dickens London, or Döblin Berlin, or Dos Passos New York – or when Umberto Eco represents Paris, Jacques Roubaud London, Jean-Philippe Toussaint Berlin, or Kafka New York – in all these cases, and many others, a relationship is marked by a homotopic consensus. In other words, the virtual properties expressed through the narrative will be added to the progressively actualized properties of the referent.¹¹

We see a wide spectrum of examples of this homotopic consensus in *Iran and French Orientalism*. We have the travel-writing exemplified by Marthe Bibesco, who combined her reflections on visiting Iran with what Hartley describes as her 'preference for an idealized Iran based on literature over the realities of the place she is visiting' (p. 164). This is contrasted with the travel-writing of Jane Dieulafoy, who 'changes their outlook on Persian poetry over the course of their stay' (p. 166); for Dieulafoy, place and representation are in a constantly evolving and nuanced intertextual relationship. At the other end of the spectrum, we have some of the earlier productions discussed in Hartley's fourth chapter, 'Performing arts', where 'Iran' or 'Persia' are based largely on imagined versions. Hartley argues that the reliance on these stereotypes can also be attributed to collaborative and commercial factors: 'I venture that Orientalist binaries and essentialisations are encouraged, first, by the physical experience of attending performances and, secondly, by the financial cost associated with large-scale productions, which places them under greater pressure to conform to the expectations of the public' (p. 173). This insight adds in turn to our understanding of geocriticism: fictional representations of space thus vary not only according to their authors but also to genre and modes of production. The different performances discussed in the chapter on performing arts tell us as much about culture in nineteenth-century Paris as they do about how Iran was represented on stage.

A geocritical reading of *Iran and French Orientalism* enables us to think about Hartley's critique of Orientalism from a different perspective. Westphal considers the question of Orientalism in a section of *Geocriticism* entitled 'The Fate of the Stereotype', where he discusses the process of 'othering':

Can one speak of the Other? The temptation is strong, even irresistible. It animates all voyagers who admire these 'others' (or not), all of those who are curious, and also all of those who want to assert their superiority over the Other, if necessary. This temptation is often culpable. In his preface to the French translation of Edward Said's *Orientalism*, Tzvetan Todorov notes, with a not unfounded sense of bitterness, that the 'history of discourse on the *other* is overwhelming. From time immemorial men have thought they were better than their neighbours; the only things that change are the flaws imputed to them'. These alleged flaws are scattered about the long history of stereotyping and ethnotyping. Can we then go beyond the stereotype?¹²

We can see Hartley's study as a resounding answer to this rhetorical question: it aims not only to go beyond stereotyping and ethnotyping, but also to interrogate the categories used to replace them. This is one reason why the term 'other' is largely absent from her investigation of similarity and diversity, or is used advisedly, as in this assertion in the Conclusion: 'Iran also cannot be reduced to a mere exotic Other or political foil to French culture, since to do so would ignore the numerous examples of admiration, identification and imitation studied over the course of this book' (p. 225).

Another critical lineage can therefore be proposed here: from Said via Todorov to Westphal and Hartley. One of the aims of geocriticism is to examine cultural representations from a neutral perspective, notwithstanding the awareness that the observer is always located somewhere and is always influenced to some extent by their position. Hartley's analyses of the representations of Persia in the literary culture of nineteenth-century France are similarly attuned to this awareness of the writers' different approaches to cultural representation. With regard to the wide spectrum of examples of the homotopic consensus, we can also note how her study identifies writers who attempted to go beyond the stereotype without the first-hand knowledge of travel-writing, such as Marcelline Desbordes-Valmore and Judith Gautier (pp. 172-173). Geocriticism enables us to place all these examples as part of the same process; Hartley's study enables us to see what geocriticism might mean in practice.

There is an interesting overlap between geocriticism and the activity known as literary tourism, which also requires a homotopic consensus between the reader and the writer: the places that we visit, or aspire to visit, are based on real-life locations in a text that we have read. In *The Literary Tourist: Readers and Places in Romantic and Victorian Britain*, Nicola J. Watson argues that the verifiability of place is one of the legacies of nineteenth-century realism, which was coeval with the rise in literary tourism; literary tourism is implied by realism, and vice versa. Watson suggests that writing, reading and tourism combine to create literary place:

It is a central premise of this book that literary place is produced by writing mediated by acts of readerly tourism, and in that sense literary place is itself a 'text'. It is the internal workings of an author's works, buttressed by a particularised series of inter-texts, which produce place, not the other way around.¹³

Westphal and Watson are approaching the same confluence of real and fictional space from different points of departure, one theoretical and the other practical: the hybrid places that we read about and visit are co-created by writers, readers and tourists, who add a further layer of creation – and even more layers, if they then go on to write about their visits. Literary tourism began as a British phenomenon, galvanised by the cult caused by the publication of Rousseau's *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* in 1761, which led to targeted tourism around Lake Geneva. Can we see some of the travel writers discussed by Hartley as literary tourists, given that many of them travelled on state-funded missions? I would suggest so in some cases, such as that of Marthe Bibesco, whose writing about Iran was indeed mediated by her own readerly tourism. In this case, however, it is not a book linked to a specific place, as in the case of the Rousseau tourists (who included Byron and Shelley), but, as Hartley shows, the *Mille et Une Nuits* [*Thousand and One Nights/Arabian Nights*]. Her chapter on travel-writing ends by discussing 'three travelogues that recount touristic journeys to Iran' (p. 109), by Bibesco,

Claude Anet, and Pierre Loti. Although none of these writers were inspired to visit by a particular book, we can see elements of literary tourism in all of their travelogues. This places *Iran and French Orientalism* in a different context, which invites further research, for example into other examples of literary tourism in the early twentieth century, or the influence of Bibesco's idiosyncratic travel writing on other writers.

4. The Global Literary Field/ the World Republic of Letters

Much of the recent work on world literature has considered the ways in which we think about space. Some theorists (e.g. Franco Moretti, the group of scholars working as the Warwick Research Collective) have drawn on Immanuel Wallerstein's world-systems theory, others (e.g. Pascale Casanova) on Fernand Braudel's conviction that history should be studied on a global scale.¹⁴ Very few of these studies have discussed examples of literature from Iran, for the reasons that Moretti suggests. There is however a growing body of recent research into this subject. The most comprehensive study is *Persian Literature as World Literature* (Bloomsbury, 2023), edited by Mostafa Abedinifard, Omid Azadibougar and Amirhossein Vafa. Last year also saw the publication of Samuel Hodgkin's *Persianate Verse and the Poetics of Eastern Internationalism* (CUP, 2024), which explores how writers from 'Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, India, and the Soviet East bonded over their shared love of the classical Persian verses of Hafiz and Khayyam'. Hartley's study can be seen as a counterpart to Hodgkin's. There are also several essays in the growing corpus of work on world literature that consider literature from Iran, such as Nicholas Dew's essay 'The Order of Oriental Knowledge: The Making of D'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque orientale*' (2004), or Fatima Burney's recently published chapter 'The Locations and Dislocations of Persian Genius: Emerson's Bardification of Hafiz' (2025).¹⁵ Alexander Beecroft's *An Ecology of World Literature: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (Verso, 2015) refers at various points to the importance of Persian-language literature. We can also see some of the work by Rebecca Ruth Gould as an example of studying Persian literature in a global context, exemplified by the article 'Hard Translation: Persian Poetry and Post-National Literary Form' (2018).¹⁶ Another scholar working on both literature and literary theory from Iran is Kayvan Tahmasebian, whose articles include 'Translation as Metonymy: Bijan Elahi's Persian Variation on *Cyrano de Bergerac*' (2024).¹⁷ Gould and Tahmasebian have also co-translated two volumes of poetry from Persian into English, by Bijan Elahi and Hasan Alizadeh respectively.¹⁸ Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism* constitutes another example of how this recent research is bringing a knowledge of literature in Persian to an Anglophone readership, thereby increasing our knowledge and understanding of world literature.

Of all the studies on world literature published over the last three decades, Pascale Casanova's *La République mondiale des lettres* (1999; trans. as *The World Republic of Letters*, 2004), is perhaps the most fruitful in terms of a potential dialogue with *Iran and French Orientalism*. Casanova posits Paris as the capital of the world republic of letters during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, arguing that consecration through publication in Paris was the predominant means for a writer to enter the global literary field. She examines a wide-ranging corpus of examples, but most of these are taken from European, North American, or South American sources. Hartley's study adds to Casanova's work on world literature in the long nineteenth century in this

specifically French context. It would be interesting to trace further the reception (including via translation) of the works on Iran that she discusses subsequent to their publication in Paris. *Iran and French Orientalism* also enables us to think more about the connection between gender and genre in the French literary field and beyond. Hartley organises her primary corpus according to genre: poetry; history and historical fiction; travel-writing; performing arts. One form of taxonomy reveals another distinction, as Hartley notes in the Introduction:

Gender is thus doubly political, both in terms of the conventions that will affect how an author presents Iran and in terms of the hierarchy of genres which informs the wider reading public of what types of writing and what authors are most authoritative. It is therefore no accident that among the works analysed in this book it is those written by women authors, who are by definition at the margins of the literary establishment, that are the most nuanced in terms of their treatment of Iran and the most experimental in their use of genre. (pp. 11-12)

Hartley's argument here reveals how *Iran and French Orientalism* can also add to our wider knowledge of literary history, especially to the role of women writers in the progressive use of genre and in the complexity of representing different cultures. This contributes not only to our knowledge of French literature, but also to wider ongoing work to demonstrate the understudied role that women writers have played in cultural exchange.¹⁹

5. Rose/ Robe

One of the advantages of Goethe's collected writings on the concept of world literature is that he does not give us a fixed definition. It is certainly not a canon of masterpieces; he sees it more as an attitude, an aspiration, an exhortation, and an ongoing process of dialogue through circulation, translation and communication. We saw above how his interest in Persian poetry was used as an intertext for the preface to Théophile Gautier's *Émaux et Camées* (*Enamels and Cameos*). A final example of Hartley's contribution to studies of world literature is her discussion of some of the different ways in which reception and intertextuality can operate. To my mind, the most striking example of this comes in the analysis of Marceline Desbordes-Valmore's poem 'Les Roses de Saadi' [Sa'di's Roses]. As Hartley points out, without the poem's title, 'readers would be hard-pushed to notice that this poem has anything to do with Iran' (p. 51):

J'ai voulu, ce matin, te rapporter des roses;
Mais j'en avais tant pris dans mes ceintures closes
Que les nœuds trop serrés n'ont pu les contenir.
Les nœuds ont éclaté. Les roses envolées
Dans le vent, à la mer s'en sont toutes allées.
Elles ont suivi l'eau pour ne plus revenir;
La vague en a paru rouge et comme enflammée.
Ce soir ma robe encore en est tout embaumée ...

Respires-en sur moi l'odorant souvenir.
 [This morning I wanted to bring you back some roses;
 But I had gathered so many inside my closed belts
 That the tightly fastened knots were not able to contain them.
 The knots burst. The roses carried off
 By the wind went away to sea.
 They followed the water to no longer come back;
 The wave seemed to turn red from them, almost ablaze.
 This evening, my dress is still full of their perfume ...
 Breathe in from me their fragrant memory.] (p. 51)²⁰

Looking at this poem without its title, we can see why Paul Verlaine appreciated the work of Desbordes-Valmore, including her in his collection of essays entitled *Les Poètes Maudits* (1884/88). 'Les Roses de Saadi' anticipates Verlaine's own work in *Romances sans paroles* (1874): the line 'Par le boudoir longtemps parfumé d'Elle' from 'Le piano que baise une main frêle', the fifth poem in the *Ariettes oubliées* section, can be read as an homage to Desbordes-Valmore's poem. Hartley shows how the double meaning of 'robe' in line 8, which can refer either to medieval male robes or to nineteenth-century female dresses, allows Desbordes-Valmore to create an intertextual poem drawing on Sa'di's *Golestān* which also works as a universalising lyric poem. In this respect the importance of the title becomes apparent: 'Les Roses de Saadi' acknowledges the source of this creative response. We are left with a poem that plays with the dual imagery of the rose and the robe. It is, as Hartley argues, a poem that 'has stood the test of time in a way that overt forms of cross-cultural poetic imitation have not' (p. 54). Her analysis of 'Les Roses de Saadi' functions as a synecdoche for *Iran and French Orientalism* as a whole. It also constitutes a fine example of how comparative literature can work in miniature.

6. Epilogue: World Literature in the Classroom

I have outlined above some of the things that Julia Hartley's *Iran and French Orientalism* can tell us about world literature as both a concept and a practice. But who does this 'us' refer to? It isn't simply the readers of the book, or anyone else who engages with it. It's also the undergraduate comparative literature students who take the course 'COMPLIT4040 Writing Persia' at the University of Glasgow which was devised by Julia a few years ago. Put 'Writing Persia' and 'Glasgow' into a search engine of your choice and you will find it:

This honours course explores the long tradition of Western writing on Iran (historically referred to as 'Persia'). Its coverage spans from classical accounts of the Achaemenid empire, to early-modern and modern travel-writing, Enlightenment literature, and nineteenth-century poetry, and ends with a novel by a contemporary French-Iranian writer. Through the study of these texts, students will be introduced to various facets of Iran's

history and culture, as well as gaining a critical perspective on how these have been transformed and instrumentalized in a Western context.²¹

Students enrolled in this course don't simply find out about France and Iran in the nineteenth century; they study Aeschylus, Plutarch, Marlowe, Jean Chardin, Goethe, Montesquieu, Omar Khayyam, Mary Renault and Négar Djavadi. Vilashini Cooppan wrote in 2001 about 'World literature in the classroom: making of a method', referring to her own attempts with colleagues to put her theory into practice.²² There are of course many different ways to teach world literature. 'Writing Persia' is another example of how this can be done.

Notes

1. Franco Moretti, 'Conjectures on World Literature', *New Left Review*, 1 (January-February 2000), 54–68 (p. 54).
2. Ibid.
3. Julia Caterina Hartley, *Iran and French Orientalism*, 6. The translation is by Hartley herself. Subsequent references will be given in parentheses in the body of the article.
4. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, 'On World Literature', in *World Literature: A Reader*, ed. by Theo D'haen, César Domínguez and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004), 9–15 (p. 15).
5. Georg Brandes, 'World Literature', in *World Literature: A Reader*, ed. by Theo D'haen, César Domínguez and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004), 23–27 (p. 25).
6. Ibid.
7. Erich Auerbach, 'Philology and World Literature', trans. by Maire Said and Edward W. Said, in *World Literature: A Reader*, ed. by Theo D'haen, César Domínguez and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004), 65–73 (p. 66).
8. Ibid.
9. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 262.
10. Vilashini Cooppan, 'World Literature and Global Theory: Comparative Literature for the New Millennium', *symplekē*, 9.1–2 (2001), 176–197 (p. 177).
11. Bertrand Westphal, *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*, trans. by Robert T. Tally Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 102.
12. Westphal, *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*, 146.
13. Nicola J. Watson, *The Literary Tourist: Readers and Places in Romantic and Victorian Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 12.
14. See Franco Moretti, *Distant Reading* (London: Verso, 2013); WRec (Warwick Research Collective), *Combined and Uneven Development: Towards a New Theory of World-Literature* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015); Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by Malcolm DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).
15. Nicholas Dew, 'The Order of Oriental Knowledge: The Making of D'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque orientale*', in *Debating World Literature*, ed. by Christopher Prendergast (London: Verso, 2004), 233–252; Fatima Burney, 'The Locations and Dislocations of Persian Genius: Emerson's Bardification of Hafiz', in *The Locations of (World) Literature*, ed. by Francesca Orsini and Laetitia Zecchini (Leiden: Brill, 2025), 56–75.
16. Rebecca Ruth Gould, 'Hard Translation: Persian Poetry and Post-National Literary Form', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 54.2 (2018), 191–206.
17. Kayvan Tahmasebian, 'Translation as Metonymy: Bijan Elahi's Persian Variation on Cyrano de Bergerac', *Comparative Critical Studies*, 21.1 (2024), 51–75.
18. Rebecca Ruth Gould and Kayvan Tahmasebian, *High Tide of the Eyes: Poems by Bijan Elahi* (Brooklyn, NY: The Operating System, 2019); Kayvan Tahmasebian and Rebecca Ruth Gould, *House Arrest: Poems of Hasan Alizadeh* (Todmorden: Arc Publications, 2022).

19. While researching Franco-British literary exchanges around the year 1908, I discovered that male translators tended to translate dead male French writers with established reputations, whereas female translators tended to translate more contemporary French literature, including works by women writers. I concluded that male translators were more concerned with perpetuating the canon, whereas female translators were more likely to take risks on an unknown new writer. Commercial factors surely reinforced these gendered practices as well. See Richard Hibbitt, 'Entente asymétrique?: Franco-British Literary Exchanges in 1908', in *Channel Packets: Franco-British Cultural Exchanges, 1880–1940*, ed. by Andrew Radford and Victoria Reid (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 34–51 (pp. 42–44).
20. The poem was originally published in 1860 in *Poésies inédites*. The English translation is Hartley's own.
21. <https://www.gla.ac.uk/coursecatalogue/course/?code=COMPLIT4040> [accessed 10 April 2025].
22. Cooppan, 'World Literature and Global Theory: Comparative Literature for the New Millennium', 183–91.

Disclosure Statement

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

References

- Auerbach, Erich. "Philology and World Literature trans. by Maire Said and Edward W. Said," In *World Literature: A Reader*, edited by Theo D'haen, César Domínguez, and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen, 65–73. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.
- Brandes, Georg. "World Literature." In *World Literature: A Reader*, edited by Theo D'haen, César Domínguez, and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen, 23–27. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.
- Burney, Fatima. "The Locations and Dislocations of Persian Genius: Emerson's Bardification of Hafiz." In *The Locations of (World) Literature*, edited by Francesca Orsini, and Laetitia Zecchini, 56–75. Leiden: Brill, 2025).
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by Malcolm DeBevoise. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Cooppan, Vilashini. "World Literature and Global Theory: Comparative Literature for the New Millennium." *Symplokē* 9, no. 1-2 (2001): 176–197.
- Dew, Nicholas. "The Order of Oriental Knowledge: The Making of D'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale*." In *Debating World Literature*, edited by Christopher Prendergast, 233–252. London: Verso, 2004.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. "On World Literature." In *World Literature: A Reader*, edited by Theo D'haen, César Domínguez, and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen, 9–15. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004).
- Gould, Rebecca Ruth. "Hard Translation: Persian Poetry and Post-National Literary Form." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 54, no. 2 (2018): 191–206.
- Gould, Rebecca Ruth, and Kayvan Tahmasebian. *High Tide of the Eyes: Poems by Bijan Elahi*. Brooklyn: The Operating System, 2019).
- Hartley, Julia Caterina. *Iran and French Orientalism: Persia in the Literary Culture of Nineteenth-Century France*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2024.
- Hibbitt, Richard. "Entente Asymétrique? Franco-British Literary Exchanges in 1908." In *Channel Packets: Franco-British Cultural Exchanges, 1880–1940*, edited by Andrew Radford, and Victoria Reid, 34–51. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Moretti, Franco. 'Conjectures on World Literature', *New Left Review*, 1 (January-February 2000), pp. 54–68.
- Moretti, Franco. *Distant Reading*. London: Verso, 2013.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 2003.

- Tahmasebian, Kayvan. "Translation as Metonymy: Bijan Elahi's Persian Variation on Cyrano de Bergerac." *Comparative Critical Studies* 21, no. 1 (2024): 51–75.
- Tahmasebian, Kayvan, and Rebecca Ruth Gould. *House Arrest: Poems of Hasan Alizadeh*. Todmorden: Arc Publications, 2022.
- Watson, Nicola J. *The Literary Tourist: Readers and Places in Romantic and Victorian Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Westphal, Bertrand. *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*, trans. by Robert T. Tally Jr. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- WRec (Warwick Research Collective)., *Combined and Uneven Development: Towards a New Theory of World-Literature*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015.