

Yavuz Sultan Selim (1512–1520) and his imitation strategies

A case study of four Ḥāfiẓ ghazals*

BENEDEK PÉRI

Department of Turkic Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest
peri.benedek@btk.elte.hu

Received: July 01, 2018 • Accepted: November 01, 2019.

© 2020 The Author(s)



ABSTRACT

Unlike his Ottoman contemporaries, Yavuz Sultan Selim composed his poems almost exclusively in Persian. A great part of his poetic output consists of poetic replies inspired by the classics of the Persian poetic canon as it was perceived by Ottomans. Through an in depth analysis of four imitation poems inspired by four ghazals by Ḥāfiẓ the present paper aims at highlighting the poetic strategies Selim used when he composed poetic imitations.

KEYWORDS

Persian poetry, Persian literature, Ottoman poetry, Yavuz Sultan Selim

* The present paper is a largely revised and enlarged version of my earlier article published only in Hungarian: 'I. Szelim szultán (1512–1520) imitációs technikája. Két Háfiz parafrázis példája', *Keletkutatás* 2016, tavasz: 63–76. It was conceived as part of a larger project aiming at the publication of a new critical edition of Sultan Selim's collection of poems (divan), which is hoped to appear in 2020.

Yavuz Sultan Selim composed poetry almost exclusively in Persian in a period when the imperial Persianate Ottoman literary paradigm and canon became firmly established and this new development led to a boom in the production of quality content in Turkish.¹ It is no wonder that from the late 15th–early 16th century onwards most Ottoman poets used Turkish as a literary medium and there were only a few who tried their hands at composing poetical pieces in Persian. Against this background Selim's Persian poetry clearly deviates from contemporary Ottoman trends and it is not without reason to believe that Selim's decision to write only in Persian was very consciously made. His poetic oeuvre seems to have been part of the Ottoman-Safavid propaganda war and it was supposedly meant to place Selim into a Timurid cultural context, a common cultural heritage well-known to and even shared by the Ottomans and the Safavids and show his target audience, educated Persians in a flamboyant manner that Selim embodied the Timurid ideal of a sovereign who was a valiant warrior and at the same time a learned and highly cultured intellectual.² A piece of visual evidence illustrating Selim's ambitious goal appears at the most appropriate place, in a lavishly illustrated copy of his *divān* that is thought to have been prepared for the ruler himself (Ateş 1968: 466) in Khurasani style around 1515–1520 (Bağcı and Çağman and Renda and Tanındı 2010: 61). The painting occupies a double page with one half portraying the Sultan as he sets off on a hunting expedition while the other half shows him sitting in the company of two young men listening to one of them reciting poetry from a book. There's another double folio in the volume that depicts hunting scenes with the Sultan hunting deer and fighting off the fierce attack of a lion at a hunting expedition (*Divān-i Sulṭān Selīm*. FY 1330: ff. 27b–28a, 57b–58a.).

In classical poetry a seemingly easy way to demonstrate a poet's talent and skill in the art of poetry was to imitate popular or famous models. Imitation in Persianate ghazal poetry, especially in the form of a poetic reply (*javāb*) repeating the metre, rhyme and *radif* combination of a model poem is an acknowledged process of poetic creation that played an important role in the history of the Persian classical poetic tradition. Scholarly writings on the subject tend to treat this type of poetic imitation as a one-on-one poetic encounter in which an imitation poem keeps reflecting on and reacting to a previously composed poetic text. The imitation poem is viewed as a text which is in discourse with a single model and according to the technique chosen by the author it repeats or reuses poetic elements, key words, phrases, poetic images, and rhetoric figures of the model text in a slightly changed or a totally different poetic context.

An analysis of a great number of imitation ghazals, however, suggests that the process of composing an imitation of or a reply to a model ghazal tends to be of a more complex nature. When a number of poetic replies are inspired by a model, a set of paraphrases is established. Poems within a given set, besides being related to the model poem, are often inter-textually related to each other as well. The more poems there are in the set or the farther we get in time from the composition date of the original model, the possibility of such textual relations binding a freshly created text to its predecessor poems grows. If many of the paraphrases have connections to other poems within the set a paraphrase network is formed.³

Some paraphrase networks are short lived others, mainly those that are inspired by famous or popular poems, can have a long life spanning centuries and finally they can even turn into a ghazal sub-genre.

¹ For a detailed description of the process see Kuru 2008.

² For a detailed argumentation see Péri 2017.

³ For the concept of 'paraphrase network' in an Ottoman context see Péri 2018.



A special feature of a paraphrase network is that the poems of the network share a *mundus significance*, a signifying universe that consists of characteristic, poetic contexts, ideas, images, key phrases and a set of rhyming words. The signifying universe of a paraphrase network can be compared to a heap of lego parts offering many possibilities for those who wish to build something from them. The parts and bits can be freely used according to the poet's aim and taste. He can freely choose from them and it is not compulsory to use them all. As time passes by the signifying universe of a paraphrase network necessarily grows and as authors of imitation poems composed at a later phase in the life of a paraphrase network have more choices, they begin using elements borrowed from other *javābs* within the set. These imitation poems, though they seem to be inspired by a single model, technically speaking, are replies inspired by the paraphrase network as a whole.

Composing poetic replies to earlier models became a very popular technique of artistic creation during the Timurid period the accomplishments of which served as a cultural model for creating the imperial Ottoman literary paradigm. This method was very consciously chosen among others by the founder of the Persianate Chaghatay literary tradition Mīr 'Alī-šīr Navāyī (d. 1501) who compiled a full collection (*divān*) of Persian poems containing mainly imitation poems or poetic replies (*javābs*) inspired by select texts of acknowledged authors (Navāyī 1342/1963; Zipoli 1993, Péri 2018). Yavuz Sultan Selīm seems to have followed in Navāyī's footsteps as according to Laṭīfī (d. 1582), a 16th century Ottoman literary critic, Sultan Selīm 'was most of the time imitating the *divān* of Navāyī' (Laṭīfī 2000: 150). Since the greater part of Navāyī's poetic oeuvre was in Chaghatay Turkish and Selīm used almost exclusively Persian as a poetic medium, it is not without reason to believe that Laṭīfī's remark referred to Navāyī's collection of Persian poems.

It goes without saying that an imitation poem can have the desired effect only if it equals or surpasses its model in terms of artistic value. Quintilian, a Roman author of a much used manual on the art of rhetoric, advised his reader 'to consult his own powers when he shoulders his burden. For there are some things which though capable of imitation may be beyond the capacity of any given individual, either because his natural gifts are insufficient or of a different character' (Butler 1920: 85). Quintilian's remark appears to have been valid in a Persian and Ottoman literary context as well where the success of an imitation also greatly depended on picking an appropriate model.

Selīm appears to have chosen his models very consciously, mainly from among celebrated authors of 13th–15th century Persian poetry and composed imitations modelled, among others, on ghazals by Sa'dī (d. 1291), Amīr Ḥusrau (d. 1325), Salmān Sāvājī (d. 1396), Kamāl-i Ḥujandī (d. 1400), Kātībī Turšizī (d. 1434), Jāmī (d. 1492), Navāyī and last but not least Ḥāfīz (d. 1392).⁴

Ghazals composed by Ḥāfīz were often selected as models in the 15th–16th century (Yāršāṭīr 1334/1955: 79–81) and a few Ottoman authors also tried their hands at composing *javābs* to them. Some of these were considered extremely bad by contemporary critics. 'Ahdī (d. 1593) mentions in his poetic anthology that a poet bearing the nom de plume Niṣārī who was able to versify in three languages, 'composed paraphrases to the complete *Divān* of Ḥāfīz' but he adds that 'I wish he had not written poetry in any language at all' (Solmaz 2005: 556). The imitation of Ḥāfīz's ghazals was considered very close to a mission impossible and all efforts spent on such an endeavour futile because as Kınalızāde Ḥasan Çelebi (d. 1604), another Ottoman biographer from the 16th century, put it 'Since Master Ḥāfīz-i Šīrāzī's eloquent verses were inspired by the sa-

⁴ For poets imitated by Selīm see Péri 2010, 2015a, 2015b.



cred spirit they are without any unnecessary circumstantialities and blemish. They might as well be directly translated from the words of the Invisible. Any effort at composing *javābs* to this kind of pure poetry thus falls very far from the right path' (Kınalızade 1989: 753).

The present paper is going to provide the reader with an analysis of four imitation ghazals composed by Selīm, two of which have been recently found during the ongoing process of preparing a new critical edition of Selīm's *divān*. Through analysing Selīm's *javābs* inspired by Ḥāfiẓ's famous first ghazal, his poem starting with the words '*Agar ān turk-i širāzi*' ('If that Turk from Shiraz'), and two lesser known ghazals, it aims at examining how Selīm fared on the field of imitating famous and less popular pieces by an acknowledged poet and at the same time it tries to showcase the basic strategies Selīm used to build up his Ḥāfiẓ imitations.

The first ghazal of the *divān* of Ḥāfiẓ became a very popular model for imitation during the Timurid period and by the end of the 15th century a well-defined 'Ḥāfiẓ's first ghazal' paraphrase network and a shared *mundus significans* (signifying universe) evolved. The *javābs* of Kātībī, Fattāḥī (d. 1448), Amīr Šāhī (d. 1453), Jāmī, Navāyī, Qabūlī (fl. 15th century), La'ālī (fl. late 15th century), Mas'ūd Qummī (fl. late 15th century), Hilālī (d. 1529), Ahlī Širāzī (d. 1535) and Ḥaydar Haravī (d. 1552), were linked to their model as well as to each other through an intricate network of inter-textual links.⁵ Since many outstanding and significant authors of the age composed poetic responses to the first ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ, an acknowledged and thus successful *javāb* might have paved the way for a daring, ambitious and talented poet into an exclusive circle of the literary elite. Poetic responses to Ḥāfiẓ's first ghazal are often met with in *divāns* from the first half of the 15th century onwards, which also indicates that poetic replies to the first ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ evolved into a popular subgenre within classical ghazal poetry.

Selīm, who besides having success on the battlefields quite evidently aspired to win poetic laurels, could not resist the challenge represented by such an emblematic model and composed a poetic response to it.⁶ We do not have an autograph but in the illustrated manuscript previously

⁵ See Kātībī 1382/2003: 23; Fattāḥī 1385/2006: 1; Šāhī 1348/1969: 1; Jāmī 1378/1999, 1: 194–195, 2: 79–82, 468–469; Navāyī 1342/1963: 68–69; Ertaylan: 1948, ۳۳۳; La'ālī, f. 236a; Sup: 1995, ۷; Hilālī: 1338/1959, 15; Ahlī: 1344/1965: 4; Ḥaydar Haravī: f. 6b.

⁶ Selīm's imitation is contained in almost all the manuscripts used for the critical edition: Millet Genel Kütüphanesi AE Farsça 324, ff. 18a–b (AE); Amasya Bayezit II Halk Kütüphanesi 486, f. 3a (Amasya); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Atif Efendi Koleksiyonu 2077, f. 3b (Atif2077); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Atif Efendi Koleksiyonu 2078, ff. 15a–b (Atif2078); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Esad Efendi 3422, f. 2b (Esad); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Fatih 3830, ff. 3b–4a (Fatih); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Hacı Mahmut Efendi 3630, ff. 14b–15a (HM); İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi FY 929, f. 17b (IU929); İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi FY, 1016 f. 6b (IU1016); İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi FY1067 f. 11a (IU1067); İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi FY 1330, ff. 5b–6a (IU1330); İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi FY 1331, ff. 23a–b (IU1331); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Lala İsmail 449, ff. 4a–b (LI); Kitābhāna, Mūza va Markaz-i Asnād-i Majlis-i Šūrā-yi İslāmī 13392, f. 1b (Majlis13392); Kitābhāna, Mūza va Markaz-i Asnād-i Majlis-i Šūrā-yi İslāmī 21013 pp. 101–102 (Majlis21013); Sāzmān-i Asnād va Kitābhāna-yi Millī no. 814721, pp. 5–6 (Millī); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Nuruosmaniye 3827, ff. 5a–b (NO); Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi Reşid Efendi 762, f. 4b (RE); Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi Revan 507, f. 5a (Revan507); Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi Revan 737, f. 6b (Revan737); Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi Revan 738, f. 4a (Revan738). The poem is missing from two of the manuscripts: National Library of Israel Yahuda Collection Ar. 1128 (Jerusalem), Kitābhāna va Mūza-yi Millī-yi Malik 4620 (Malek). They might have been written on folios missing from these manuscripts. The poem also appears in Paul Horn's edition Selim 1904, 22.



mentioned it is the first poem in the *ġazalīyāt* section.⁷ This significant place allotted to the poem in this manuscript seems to suggest that Selim was satisfied with the result of his poetic efforts.

<p>غم عشقت در اقلیم محبت حل مشکله نهاده رو بسوی قلزم عشقت ز ساحله که در بیحاصلی دارند عشاق تو حاصله بوادی سعادت بی قدم طی کرده منزلها گمانها شد یقین و گشت ثابت جمله باطلها</p>	<p>زهی درد فراق و سوز هجرت راحت دلها نهنگ آسا در آب دیده مردان بلا پرور ثواب حج کند حاصل فقیه اما نمیداند سبک روحی که طوف کوی جانان کرد مردانه سلیمی یار لب در نطق و از کاکل گره بگشود</p>
---	--

Even a superficial reading of Selim's ghazal is enough to notice that except for a few compulsory formal elements such as the metre, rhyme and *radif* combination and a few shared rhyming words (*dil* 'heart', *muškil* 'difficult', *sāhil* 'shore' and *manzil* 'station') the model and its imitation have very little in common. Not even the number of couplets is the same (Ḥāfiẓ: 1382/2003, 75). While Ḥāfiẓ's poem and most elements of the 'Ḥāfiẓ first ghazal' paraphrase network consist of seven couplets, Selim's *javāb* consists of only five which is quite uncharacteristic of the sultan's ghazal poetry as a great number of his ghazals consist of seven or nine *bayts*.

A further essential formal difference between the model and its imitation lies in the fact that though the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ starts and finishes with Arabic lines, Selim, like Šāhī, Kātībī and Ahlī before him ignored this emblematic feature of the model poem repeated in most of the poetic replies. It is difficult to tell exactly why Selim decided not to add Arabic verses to his poem but if the most famous Ottoman commentator of Ḥāfiẓ, Südi Bosnavī (d. 1599?) was right in asserting that poets with Shiite inclination resented the lines in the model poem that contemporary literary criticism attributes to Yazid ibn Mu'aviya (d. 683), the Umayyad caliph whose army was responsible for massacring the Shiite martyrs of Kerbala in 680, Selim's decision might have something to do with the religious sentiments of Iranian intellectuals, his targeted audience (Brockhaus 1854: 2).

As far as its content is concerned, out of the two key topics of Ḥāfiẓ's ghazal, wine and love, Selim retained only the latter one. Wine, wine consumption and intoxication be it in its real or a metaphorical sense are not often recurring motifs in Selim's ghazals, so the omission of the topic of wine from his imitation poem fits into the general pattern of his ghazals very well.

The poem in Selim's version is about a painful relationship. Love is the topic that connects the first three couplets. The semantic field of a religious Muslim's visit to the Ka'ba connects the fourth couplet to the previous one where the term for pilgrimage, *hajj*, occurs. These two couplets elevate the poet's emotions into celestial heights and suggest that his love is not ephemeral human love ('*ašq-i majāzī*) but an eternal love directed towards the Supreme Being ('*ašq-i ḥaqīqī*). The last bayt, the *maqta'* which makes it clear that the sultan's beloved is a human being, is logically not connected to the preceding couplets in any way and makes the reader feel as if the only reason for its being there is the rhyming word *bāṭil* 'rumour' Selim was determined to use.

In the case of an imitation or emulation poem one would expect to find at least a few inter-textual allusions to its supposed model but in Selim's ghazal there are none. However, when Selim's ghazal is compared to the whole set of poems of the 'Ḥāfiẓ's first ghazal' paraphrase network it

⁷ The ghazal is placed first in the following manuscripts: İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi IU1016, IU1330, Milli, Fatih, Revan737, Revan738. It is placed second in the following manuscripts: Majlis13392, Atif2077, Esad, LI, NO, RE, Revan507.



is not difficult to realize that its five couplets are full of allusions linking Selīm's piece to earlier poetic texts.

The second hemistich of the first couplet closes with the noun phrase *ḥall-i muškil-hā* 'a solution for all troubles' which is one of the emblematic expressions of the 'Ḥāfiz's first ghazal' network used by Šāhī, Kātibī, Ahlī, and last but not least by Jāmī who applied it in three out of his seven *javābs*.

Selīm's exquisitely elegant and graceful second *bayt* which is a telling example of the poet's creative talent and imagination also shows how closely connected Selīm's piece is to other poems of the 'Ḥāfiz's first ghazal' tradition, as the source of inspiration for the second couplet seems to have been the fourth couplet of Kātibī's ghazal.

Selīm II.

Nahang-āsā dar-āb-i dīda mardān-i balā-parvar

Nihāda rū ba-sūy-i QULZUM-i 'ašq-at zi sāhil-hā

In their tears miserable men, like crocodiles

Turned their faces towards the ocean of your love from the shores.

Kātibī IV.

Dar in DARYĀ ki kam-tar qatra-aš tiġ ast ġavṣī kun

Ki sar-hā-yi nahang-ān-i bī-badan bīnī bi-sāhil-hā

Dive into this ocean where even the smallest drop is a sword,

When you see the headless bodies of crocodiles on the shores.

Though the poetic context and the metaphors dominating the two couplets are different, the joint occurrence of two key elements, the image of crocodiles (*nahang*) which is present only in Kātibī's *javāb* and the rhyme word *sāhil* ('shore') cannot be coincidental. If we add that some of Kātibī's ghazals served as models for Selīm, the connection between the two *javābs* seems to be firmly established.⁹ The similarities between Selīm's third and Navāyī's fifth couplet does not appear to be coincidental either.

Selīm III.

Šavāb-i haj KUNAD ḤĀṢIL faqīh ammā na-mī-dānad

Ki dar bī-ḥāsilī dārānd 'uššāq-i tu ḥāsil-hā

A jurist harvests the fruit of reward for completing a pilgrimage but he doesn't know

That these fruits are useless in the eyes of your lovers.

Navāyī V.

Man u bī-ḥāsilī ki-z 'ilm u zuhd-am ān čī ḤĀṢIL ŠUD

Yakāyak dar sar-i ma'šūq u may šud jumla ḥāsil-hā

Me and the uselessness of all that I've harvested from learning and austerity,

All the things I had harvested were spent on my beloved and wine.

⁸ Typographic devices are meant to highlight the parallelisms of the couplets compared.

⁹ For Selīm's ghazals modeled on Kātibī's poems see Péri 2010: 28, 33.



The dichotomy of useless orthodox religious practices taking the devotee nowhere closer to his goal and the mystic's successful spiritual quest facilitated by love or wine, a recurring topos in classical ghazal poetry is the basic idea behind both couplets which is expressed by both Navāyī and Selīm in a very similar way, using the same or very similar tropes, words and phrases. The parallelisms between the two *bayts*, the pair of opposing notions of fruitful (*hāšil*) and fruitless (*bī-hāšil*), the compound verb in the first hemistich with the same none verbal element (*hāšil kunad*; *hāšil šud*) that serves to secure a poetic focus on the concept of 'fruitfulness', the antithesis of orthodox religion represented by the character of a jurist (*faqīh*) in Selīm's ghazal and by the term 'asceticism' (*zuhd*) in Navāyī's poem and the mystical path symbolized by lovers and beloved respectively, the appearance of two verbal nouns ('*uššāq* 'lovers'/*ma'sūq* 'beloved') formed from the same Arabic radicals and last but not least the use of the same rhyming word seems to confirm the reader's suspicion that the basic idea for Selīm's couplet came from Navāyī's *bayt*.

The inspiration for Selīm's next couplet seems to have come from a third *javāb* of the 'Ḥāfiz's first ghazal' paraphrase network.

Selim III.

Sabuk-rūhī ki ṭauf-i kūy-i jānān kard mardāna

*Bi-vādī-yi sa'adat bī-qadam ṭay karda **manzil-hā***

A light-hearted one who bravely circumambulated the street of his beloved,

Travelled through all the stations in the valley of bliss without taking a single step.

The poetic mixture of the idea that pilgrimage, let it be a religious one or a visit to the street where the poet's beloved dwells, is a spiritual rather than a physical journey, the presence of the semantic field of *hajj* represented here by the term (*ṭauf* 'circumambulate'), the occurrence of the word *rūh* ('soul') and the presence of the noun *manzil* ('station') as the rhyming word within one couplet might all be interpreted as hints pointing to the direction of a possible model, the third couplet from the first of Jāmī's seven *javābs*.

Jāmī 1/III.

Bi-jān šau sākin-i Ka'ba biyābān čand paymāyī

*Ču nabvad qurb-i rūhānī čī sūd az qat'-i **manzil-hā***

You should dwell in the Ka'ba in your heart. Why are you treading through the desert?

If spirituality is not close to you, travelling through the stations does not make any sense.

The inter-textual links connecting Selīm's poem to the *javābs* of Kātibī, Navāyī and Jāmī highlight Selīm's cunning strategy of imitating the first ghazal of Ḥāfiz. Instead of risking a failure and a bad poem by trying to compose a direct response to his supposed model, in other words by trying to imitate the inimitable, he found a way round his problem. He turned to the poems of the 'Ḥāfiz's first ghazal' network instead that by his time had developed into a 'Ḥāfiz's first ghazal' tradition, picked and reworked several elements of its signifying universe and from these poetic building stones he built up his own *javāb*.

When Selīm set to compose one of his other *javābs* that at first sight seems to be a poetic response to another ghazal by Ḥāfiz, he chose a slightly different strategy. Before we go into details we should have a short look at the supposed model, Ḥāfiz's ghazal starting with the words *Agar ān turk-i širāzī...* 'If that Turk from Shiraz...'



Though it is one of, if not the most analyzed of his poetic pieces subjected to many scholarly attempts of interpretation by literary critics in the 20th century (Hilman 1975: 164), it has hardly ever been stressed that Ḥāfīz's poem itself is part of an intricate network of *javābs* that possibly started with two long ghazals by Rūmī (d. 1273) (Rūmī 1388/2009: 99–100, 109). The network consists of three intertwined sets of poems relying on the same rhyme (-ā) and *radīf* (-rā) but different metres. One group of poems is in *mujtass-i muṣamman-i maḥbūn-i maḥzūf* (- . - | . . - | . . - | . . - | . . - or . . -), a second group uses the metre *hazaj-i muṣamman-i sālim* (. . . - | . . . - | . . . - | . . . -) and the third group is in *ramal-i muṣamman-i maḥbūn* (- . . - or . . - | . . - | . . - | . . -).¹⁰ The two latter branches were started by Sa'dī (d. 1292) whose four poems, two in *mujtass*, one in *ramal* and one in *hazaj* became quite fashionable models for oncoming generations of poets (Sa'dī 1385/2006: 523, 524, 1050). The *hazaj* branch of the network is represented among others by the poems of Amīr Ḥusrau, Salmān Sāvajī, Ḥāfīz, Šāhī, Mağribī (d. ca. 1408), Kātibī, Fattāhī, Qārī-yi Yazdī (fl. 15th c.), Abū Ishāq (fl. 15th c.), Jāmī, Navāyī, Āhī (fl. 15th century) and Hilālī.¹¹ The *mujtass* branch consists of *javābs* by Amīr Ḥusrau, Nizārī Quhistānī (d. 1320), Ḥāfīz, Mağribī, Kamāl-i Ḥujandī, Jāmī, Navāyī and Ahlī Širāzī.¹² The *ramal* group includes *javābs* by Ḥasan-i Dihlavī (d. 1337), Salmān Sāvajī, Kamāl-i Ḥujandī, Ašraf, Humāyūn Isfaraynī (d. 1496) and Jāmī.¹³ The most striking feature of the three sets of *javābs* is that though they rely on different metres they seem to share the same *mundus significans*, the same signifying universe. Metaphors and other rhetoric devices, motifs, rhyming words, key concepts seem to have been interchangeable between the sets. Ideas used by one poet in a ghazal written in *mujtass* might appear in a later *javāb* by another author composed in *hazaj* or in *ramal*. The names of the two Central Asian cities, Samarkand and Bukhara at the end of the famous first couplet of Ḥāfīz, for example, first occur together in a ghazal composed in *mujtass* by Amīr Ḥusrau¹⁴ and the rhyming phrase of the third *bayt* in the ghazal of Ḥāfīz (*ḥān-i yağmā*) is first used by Sa'dī in a context very similar to the one we see in the couplet of Ḥāfīz, in one of his ghazals also composed in *mujtass*.

Ḥusrau III.

Našīb-i ḥusn girift ān but-i Samarqandī

Ču kišvar-i dīl-i mā ḥiṭṭa-yi Buḥārā-rā

The fame of that idol from Samarkand,

Conquered the country of our heart like the land of Bukhārā.

¹⁰ Sa'dī's poem is in *ramal-i maḥbūn-i sālim* (- . . - or . . . - | . . - | . . - | . . -) but later poets replaced it with a more frequently used *ramal* metre, *ramal-i muṣamman-i maḥbūn-i maḥzūf* (- . . - or . . - | . . - | . . - | . . - or -).

¹¹ For the texts see Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī 1361/1982: 4; Salmān Sāvajī 1371/1992: 366–367; Ḥāfīz 1382/2003: 75–76; Šāhī 1348/1969: 2; Mağribī 1372/1993: 9, 11; Kātibī 1382/2003: 21–22; Fattāhī 1385/2006: 4–5; Qārī-yi Yazdī 1303/1886, 37; Abū Ishāq 1302/1885: 31; Jāmī 1378/1999: 1:470–371; Navāyī 1342/1963: 72–73; Āhī: f. 139a; Hilālī 1338/1959: 2;

¹² Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī 1361/1982: 18–19; Nizārī Quhistānī 1371/1992: 496–497; Ḥāfīz 1382/2003: 76; Mağribī 1372/1993: 21; Kamāl-i Ḥujandī 1372/1993: 26; Jāmī 1378/1999: 1:198, 200, 2:83, 484–485; Navāyī 1342/1963: 78 Ahlī: 1344/1965: 10–13.

¹³ Ḥasan Dihlavī 1383/2004: 4; *Divān-i Kamāl-i Ḥujandī*, 26; *Divān-i Ašraf*. Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Fatih 3777, f. 4b; Jāmī 1378/1999: 1:198–199.

¹⁴ Buḥārā as a rhyming word occurs first in a ghazal composed in *mujtass* by Nizārī Quhistānī. Nizārī Quhistānī 1371/1992: 496–497.



Sa'dī X.

Tu ham-čunān dil-i šahrī bi-ğamza-ī bi-barī

Ki bandagān-i banī Sa'd hān-i yağmā-rā

You rob the hearts [of the inhabitants] of a whole city with a wink, the same way,

Like adherents of the Banu Sa'd when they take spoils.

The ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ composed in *hazaj*, he also wrote a poem in *mujtass*, is an important milestone in the history of the 'ā-rā' *javāb* network as it exerted a great influence on ghazals belonging to the 'ā-rā' tradition from the 15th century onwards and it inspired many poets to compose poetic replies to it. Let it suffice to mention the imitation poems of Qārī-i Yazdī, Abū Ishāq and Asrārī (another *tahalluṣ* used by Yahyā Sibak 'Fattāḥī') that were all composed as lampoons and the poetic replies of Navāyī and Jāmī. It should be added here that eight further 'ā-rā' ghazals composed in *hazaj* are known from the post-Ḥāfiẓ period but they were not necessarily meant as direct poetic responses to the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ.

The analysis of Selīm's ghazal should be done against this literary background with a view to the above described poetic context and the comparative research should include all the poems of the 'ā-rā' network of *javābs*.

دلیل عشق در کوی ملامت میکشد ما را
در آن منزل که باشد حال قدری نیست دنیا را
که فرقی نیست پیش باده نوش امروز و فردا را
بمجلس یک اشارت بس بود رندان دانا را
روانی کرد می پالا سر و دستار مولا را

براه غم گذر نبود بخود هر بیسر و پارا
بسرستان چه میگویی حدیث دینی ای زاهد
میفکن کار با فردا بدور آور قدح ساقی
اجازت شد حریفان چشم ساقی گشت خواب آلود
سلیمی در مدرسخانه می نوشید از مشرب

Selīm's ghazal is in *hazaj* and it consists of five couplets.¹⁵ Two main topics dominate the poem: love and more importantly wine and wine drinking, which is very atypical of Selīm's ghazals. Though key subjects and the main heroes, the *sāqī* 'cupbearer' and the drunkards lend a very Hafizian atmosphere to the poem, inter-textual allusions scattered throughout the text of the poem, however, suggest that some of the couplets were inspired by other poets' 'ā-rā' ghazals.

The *maṭla'* seems to resemble the first *bayt* of Šāhī's response to Sa'dī's ghazal.

Selīm I.

Bi-rāh-i ġam guzar nabvad bi-ħud har bī-sar u pā-rā

Dalīl-i 'ašq dar kūy-i malāmat MĪ-KAŠAD MĀ-RĀ

Not every miserable person walk go on the road of affliction on his own,

A sign of love draws us to the street of scorn.

Šāhī I.

Bi-ħud rah nīst dar kūy-i tu muštāqān-i šaydā-rā

Ĥum-i zulfat bi-qullāb-i muħabbat MĪ-KAŠAD MĀ-RĀ

¹⁵ The poem is included in the following manuscripts: AE f. 24b; Amasya f. 2a; Atif2078 f. 20b; Fatih f. 9a; HM f. 19a; IU929 f. 16a; IU1330 f. 11a; IU1331 f. 28b; Majlis13392 f. 6a; Millī p. 16; NO f. 13a–b; RE f. 10b; Revan738 f. 9b.



Lovers mad with desire cannot enter your street on their own,
Your curly locks, the hooks of love, draw us there.

The method Selīm used to imitate Šāhī's first *mišrā'* is one of the basic techniques of creating a close replica of a chosen model. The key elements of the model line are either retained as it happens in the case of the phrase *bi-ḥud* 'on his own' or they are replaced with synonymous or near synonymous expressions. Selīm replaced the phrase *rah nīst* ('there is no way') with *guzar na-buvad* ('there is no passage'), the noun phrase *muštāqān-i šaydā* ('people who are mad with desire') with *har bī-sar u pā* ('every powerless one') and the phrase *dar kūy-i tu* ('in your street') with *bi-rah-i ġam* ('to the road of sorrow') which all might be interpreted as synonyms of each other in the context of lyric ('*āšiqāna*) ghazal poetry.

Selīm's strategy for composing his second *bayt* was somewhat different and thus the result is not a close replica but more of an emulation evoking the sixth couplet of Sa'dī's ghazal:

Selīm II.

Bi-sarmastān čī mī-ġuyī ḥadiš-i dīnī ay zāhid
Dar ān manzil ki bāšad ḥāl QADRĪ NĪST duniyā-rā

Ascetic, why are you trying to talk about religious tradition to the intoxicated ones,
In a house where ecstasy rules, people do not care for this-worldly matters.

Sa'dī VI.

Murād-i mā višāl-i tu-st az duniyā u az 'uqbā
Va gar na bī-šumā QADRĪ NA-DĀRAD dīn u duniyā-rā

Our only desire in this world and the next one is to be with you,
If it does not come true, religion and worldly matters do not have any value for us.

Selīm seems to have been inspired by the core idea expressed in Sa'dī's couplet: those who are truly intoxicated by love, are overwhelmed by their emotions so much that they do not care for this-worldly matters like material goods or orthodox religious practices. While Selīm slightly reworked the topic through shifting the focus of the couplet more towards stressing the dichotomy of the mystical spiritual experience and orthodox religious practices he labelled this-worldly, he retained the rhyming word and several of the key words and phrases present in the model couplet, like *dīn* ('religion') and *qadrī nīst* ('it does not have any value'). Through the new poetic context he created by introducing the opposing pair of the 'intoxicated ones' (*sarmastān*) and the 'ascetic' (*zāhid*), an antithesis often met with in the ghazals of Hāfiz, he manages to give a very Hāfizian touch to his emulation of Sa'dī's bayt.

Though the basic idea of Selīm's third couplet that we should live in the present and cherish every moment of it because the future is insecure and shaky also comes from Sa'dī's ghazal, the wording of the couplet, the inclusion of the phrase *bā fardā* ('with tomorrow') and the rhyming word *fardā* ('tomorrow') within the same *bayt* suggests that besides being inspired by Sa'dī, Selīm was also influenced by Šāhī's fourth *bayt*. The Sa'dī-Šāhī poetic mixture received a very Hafizian flavouring through adding the character of the cup-bearer (*sāqī*) and the wine drinking poet who calls out to the *sāqī* to bring more wine because this intoxicating substance helps him to reach an ecstatic state of mind where this-worldly matters such as time do not count any more.



Selim III.

Ma-yafgan kār BĀ FARDĀ bi-daur āvar qadaḥ sāqī

Ki farqī nīst pīš-i bāda-nūš imrūz u fardā-rā

Do not worry about tomorrow! Sāqī, give the cup around!

Because for someone who drinks wine the difference between today and tomorrow doesn't exist.

Šāhī IV.

Gam-i nā-āmada ḥurdan bi-naqd-am ranja mī-dārad

Hamān bihtar ki BĀ FARDĀ guzāram kār-i fardā-rā

Worrying about problems that have not arrived yet would unnecessarily burden my soul,

It is much better if I left tomorrow's problems to tomorrow.

Sa'dī VIII.

Bi-yā tā yak zamān imrūz ḥuṣ bāšim dar ḥalvat

Ki dar 'ālam na-mī-dānad kasī aḥvāl-i fardā-rā

Come and let's have a good time today, only you and me alone,

Because nobody in this world knows what tomorrow will bring.

The analysis of Selim's '-ā-rā' ghazal suggests that Selim very consciously tried to avoid the inclusion of direct textual allusions to the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ and except for a very vague hint at the end of the fourth couplet where the phrase containing the rhyming word and the *radīf rindān-i dānā-rā* ('for the wise drunkards') evokes the image of the wise old man, another character from the tavern whose advice the blessed young people cherish in the seventh couplet of the '-ā-rā' ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ, he succeeded in his efforts. Though at a first glance Selim's poem seems to be a poetic reply to the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ, in reality it is an imitation poem inspired by the whole of the '-ā-rā' paraphrase network. Selim used the poetically rich *mundus significans* of classical poetry focusing his attention on elements available in the signifying universe of the evolving '-ā-rā' sub-genre and like a kid playing with legos, he used choice elements of the set available to him to build an original poem which is in constant discourse with previous poems of the '-ā-rā' network. He mixed textual elements used earlier by Sa'dī and Šāhī, included his own choices and flavoured the mixture with the topic of wine-drinking, a topic introduced by Ḥāfiẓ to the '-ā-rā' *javāb* network. In this way he could join the distinguished company of acknowledged poets like Navāyī and Jāmī who composed successful poetic replies to the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ and at the same time he could successfully avoid having to cope with the difficulties the imitation of a famous and practically inimitable poem presented.

The third and fourth poems were selected to show how Selim imitated a model when it was a relatively lesser known ghazal. There are common features both imitation poems share: neither of them has been published yet, both of them are contained in the same group of manuscripts, both of them belong to relatively small paraphrase networks, the initial poems of the two networks were written well-before Ḥāfiẓ, both models were originally panegyrics and neither of them were written in ghazal form.

The imitation poem composed in *hazaj-i muṣamman-i aḥrab-i makfūf-i maḥzūf* (- - . | . - - . | . - - . | . - -) using the rhyme *-ištī* has an additional feature. It contains a hint that makes at least an approximate dating possible which is quite rare in the case of lyric ghazals. The appearance of the



place name Trabzon in the first couplet suggests that the ghazal was composed during Selīm's stay in the city. He was seventeen when he was appointed governor in 1487 and he remained posted to the city until 1510 so this ghazal might have been composed during this period.¹⁶

از ماه و شانست طربزون چو بهشتی	هر گوشه بتی هر طرفی حور سرشتی
روبیده گل و نسترن از هر لب کشتی	بازار ز نسرین پر و دشتش ز بنفشه
با دلیر ترسابقه در کنج کنشتی	کافر شدن و باده کشیدن چه خوش آید
در دیر مرا نیز چه بودیکه بهشتی	صد سجده کنم پیش بت ار مغبچه گوید
شایسته بپیوند غمش رشته که رشتی	زنار بلا گر نفتادی بکف دل
انکار مکن نیز بهر صورت زشتی	از چهره خوب ار طلبی معنی نقاش
کسی نامه عصیان سلیم ار نوشتی	یک حرف نمی گشت کم از لوح ارادت

The initial poem of the paraphrase network is a qasida by the well-known Ismaili poet Nāṣir-i Ḥusrau (d. ca. 1077) possibly addressed to a local dignitary in Khurasan (Nāṣir-i Ḥusrau 1357/1978: 365–366). Though qasidas in most cases aim at praising the addressee and extol his virtues, Nāṣir-i Ḥusrau's poem keeps blaming the person he addresses and the poem is full of reproach. As far as its tone and wording is concerned it resembles a love poem, an *‘āṣiqāna* ghazal rather than a qasida. Perhaps it was this feature that caught the attention of Sa‘dī who saw the poetic potential in the text and composed a poetic reply to it. Though Sa‘dī wrote his poem in the form of a lyric ghazal he retained both the formal framework represented by the metre, rhyme and *radīf* combination and the reproaching, moralising tone (Sa‘dī 1385/2006: 859). The next poem in the paraphrase network composed in the same mood is a ghazal by Auhadī (d. 1338) (Auhadī 1376/1997: 365) that was followed by a ghazal composed by Ḥāfiẓ (Ḥāfiẓ 1382/2003: 278). Ḥāfiẓ's poem represents a milestone in the history of the paraphrase network from two essential points of view. First because Ḥāfiẓ introduced a new motif, wine, and secondly because he slightly changed the rhyme. While earlier the rhyme was *-štī* as Nāṣir-i Ḥusrau, Sa‘dī and Auhadī also used words like *guzaštī* 'you've left' *bi-kuštī* 'you've killed', *duruštī* 'coarseness' as rhyming words, Ḥāfiẓ narrowed the range of rhyming words and applied only those of the original set that have a penultimate front vowel (*na-nivištī* 'you haven't written', *na-kištī* 'you haven't sown', etc.). The poem of Ḥāfiẓ became a model for an Ottoman poet of Mehmed II's reign (1444–1446, 1451–1481), Ḥāmidī (d. after 1488) who saw so much poetic potential in Ḥāfiẓ's ghazal that he composed three poetic replies to it (Ertaylan 1949: 507–508).

Selīm followed in the footsteps of his Ottoman predecessor in the sense that his poem was clearly also meant as a reply to the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ. It should be stressed however, that the version of the poem of Ḥāfiẓ Selīm imitated was slightly different from the poem found in modern editions because the ghazal in the Ottoman Ḥāfiẓ tradition included a few additional couplets.¹⁷ Selīm's *javāb* does not contain any direct inter-textual references to Ḥāfiẓ's ghazal; still the choice of rhyming words and motifs characteristic of the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ create an atmosphere that evokes the mood and tone of the model poem very well. However, when it comes to details, it

¹⁶ The poem is contained in the following manuscripts: AE f. 75b; Amasya f. 43b; Atif2078 f. 64b; HM f. 64a; IU929 f. 52b; IU1067 f. 47b; Jerusalem ff. 65a–b; Majlis13392 f. 52a; Majlis21013 pp. 199–200.

¹⁷ Sūdī's commentary contains thirteen couplets, five more than the version in the critical edition (Sūdī 1366/1987: 4: 2346–2352).



seems that Selīm relied on other poems of the paraphrase networks as well and borrowed elements of their *mundus significans*. Selīm's first couplet with the rhyming phrases, *ḥūr-sirištī* 'hourly natured' and *ču bihištī* 'like a heaven' appear in the same order in the first couplet of Ḥāmidī's second poem. The syntactic arrangement of the first hemistich with two phrases covering almost the same metrical space connected by an *u* 'and' in one case and a 'comma' in the other and the appearance of the word *butī* 'a beauty' and the noun phrase *ḥūr-sirištī* within the same *mišrā'* suggest that Selīm was aware of Sa'dī's poem.

Selīm Ia

Har gūša butī, har ṭarafī ḥūr-sirištī

'An idol in every corner, a houri-natured one in every direction...'

Sa'dī VIIIb

Sarvī saman-andām u butī ḥūr-sirištī

'A jasmin bodied cypress and a houri-natured one...'

The closing couplet of the two poems also contain parallelisms as three key concepts, all present in Sa'dī's first hemistich, re-appear in Selīm's first *mišrā'*.

Selīm VII.

Yak ḥarf NA-MĪ-GAŠT kam az lauh-i irādat

Kasī nāma-yi 'iṣyān-i Salīm ar na-nivištī

Not a single letter would have disappeared from the paper of God's will,

If someone hadn't written a report on Selīm's disobedience.

Sa'dī X.

Saylāb-i qazā NA-STARAD az daftar-i ayyām

Īn-hā ki tu bar ḥāṭir-i Sa'dī bi-nivištī

The flood of God's will hasn't deleted from the copy book of fate,

Those [things] that you wrote there for Sa'dī.

The notion of *qazā* meaning God's will that decides all created beings' fate in Sa'dī's poem appears through the word *irādat* 'will' in Selīm's. The concept of a surface containing the will of God in a written form is represented by the noun *daftar* 'copy book' in Sa'dī's couplet and by the word *lauh* 'a sheet of paper' in Selīm's bayt. The verb *na-starad* 'doesn't delete' conveys the idea of a process that leads to the deletion of some parts of a written text in Sa'dī's poem and so does the verb phrase *yak ḥarf kam na-gašt* 'not a single letter has disappeared' in Selīm's first line. The fact that the parallelisms occur in a couplet that has the verb *nivišt* 'wrote' as the rhyming word seems to further confirm the theory that in the case of the last couplet Selīm was heavily influenced by Sa'dī's bayt. However, some key motifs of Selīm's *maqta'*, including the past conditional expressing an unreal condition, the motif of the surface containing a written text, the presence of the noun *nāma* 'letter', the concept of heavenly will are elements also found in Ḥāfiẓ's poem.



Ḥāfiẓ I.

Ān ġāliya-ḥaṭ gar sūy-i mā nāma nivištī

Gardūn varaq-i hastī-yi mā dar na-nivištī

If that person with fragrant peach fuzz hadn't written a letter to us,

The Sky wouldn't have crossed out [the writing on] the page of our existence.

Except for these intertextual hints hidden in the first hemistich and the last couplet and the set of rhyming words used, Selīm did not include further textual allusions to any of the poems constituting the paraphrase network. The lack of a *radīf* that could confine a poet into a narrow poetical space, the diversity of semantic fields defined by the set of rhyming words and the flexibility of the poetic moods present in the poems of the paraphrase network created a vast poetical playground for Selīm and made it possible for him to freely choose from the wide range of poetic elements available in the *mundus significans* of the literary tradition. The result is an emulation poem composed in awareness of the existence of other poems within the '–štī paraphrase network'. Through a special focus given to poetic features characteristic of the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ this poetic reply inspired by the whole of the network receives a very Ḥāfiẓian tint.

The fourth poem chosen for analysis is also part of a relatively small paraphrase network and it has not been published yet either. The poem is composed in the metre *muẓārī*'-i *muṣamman-i aḥrab-i makfūf-i maḥzūf* (- - . | - . - . | . - - . | - . -) and relies on the rhyme *-ā* and the *radīf kunad* 'he/she does, makes, etc.'. It is preserved only in a small number of manuscripts.¹⁸

آن مه زیاده با من مسکین جفا کند
که خویش را ملامت مردم چرا کند
باید که مردی خوی به درد و بلا کند
تا حاجتی که هست ترا حقّ روا کند
ناکس بود کسی که بغیر التجا کند
ترسم ولی که درد دلم را دوا کند
آن بخت کو که در قدمت جان فدا کند

هر چند جور بیش کشم تا وفا کند
دیگر نخواهم آه و فغان کرد از غمش
منّت برای عیش و تنعم نمی‌کشم
جانا برآر حاجت عشاق بینوا
انجا که هست شاه حقیقت مراد بخش
تیر ترا بجان طلبم هر دم از خدا
مسکین سلیم بی تو بجان آمده ز غم

As in the previous case the initial poem in the paraphrase network was a panegyric, a short *qit'a* written by Ḥāqānī (d. ca.1199) (Ḥāqānī 1346/1967: 849). Ḥāqānī's poem composed in the second person singular is dedicated to the Eldigūzid Muẓaffār al-Dīn Qizil Arslān (1186–1191) and its main message wrapped up in elaborately worded praise, was to call the ruler's attention to the poet's *divan*.

Anvarī (d. ca. 1169) retained the formal framework and composed a lyric ghazal relying on the metre, rhyme and *radīf* combination seen in Ḥāqānī's *qit'a* (Anvarī 1364/1985: 503). Except for the shared framework and a rhyming word (*vafā* 'faithfulness') there is no connection between Anvarī's love poem and the '–ā *kunad*' poem of Ḥāfiẓ composed in a moralising *rindāna* tone (Ḥāfiẓ 1382/2003: 154–155).¹⁹ A heading preceding Navāyī's poem in his *divan* clearly shows that

¹⁸ AE ff. 38a–b; Amasya ff. 19a–b; IU929 f. 26a; IU1331 f. 41a; Jerusalem f. 28b; Majlis13392 ff. 49a–b; Majlis21013 pp. 134–135.

¹⁹ *Divān-i kāmīl-i Ḥāfiẓ*, 154–155. *Kulliyāt-i Ahlī-yi Širāzī*, 10–13.



his *javāb* was meant as a poetic reply to the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ (Navāyī 1342/1963: 145–146). It seems that the ghazal of Ḥāfiẓ initiated another paraphrase network that consists of poems relying on the same metre and rhyme but using a slightly different *radīf*. Instead of *kunad* ‘he/she does’, the third person singular of the present form of the verb *kardan* ‘to do’, its plural, *kunand* ‘they do’ is applied. As a line in Navāyī’s poem indicates, the signifying universe of the two paraphrase networks had melted by the second half of the 15th century and elements present in the *mundus significans* of one of them could be used in poems belonging to the other. The first *miṣrā’* in Navāyī’s ghazal focusing on the poetical potential inherent in the combination of two concepts, *va’da* ‘promise’ and *vafā* ‘faithfulness’, was clearly conceived under the influence of Kātibī’s opening couplet (Kātibī 1382/2003: 85).

Navāyī Ia.

Va’da kunad vafā va bi-va’da vafā kunad

He/She promises faithfulness and he/she keeps his/her promises

Kātibī I.

Zulf va ruḥ-at ču va’da-yi javr u jafā kunand

Ān va’da ham ḥuṣ ast čī bāṣad vafā kunand

Your plaits and face promise torment and pain

The promise [itself] is lovely how nice it could be when it’s kept

Ḥāmidī also joined the line of poets who composed an ‘-ā *kunad*’ poem in *muẓāri’* (Ertaylan 1949: 384). Though wine, a key element of Ḥāfiẓ’s piece, makes its appearance in the last couplet Ḥāmidī’s poem is closer to the ‘*āšiqāna* mood of Anvarī’s ghazal that is totally devoid of *rindāna* elements praising wine as an entheogen. Wine does not appear in Selīm’s ghazal either. But this is not the only common feature Selīm’s and Anvarī’s ghazal share. Selīm’s *matla’* contains several hints like the phrase at the beginning of the first *miṣrā’* and the pair of rhyming words that suggests the influence of Anvarī’s couplet.

Selīm I.

Har čand jaur-i biš kašam tā VAFĀ KUNAD

Ān mah ziyāda bā man-i miskīn jafā kunad

[It doesn’t matter] however much torture I tolerate [hoping] that he/she will be faithful

That moon [faced one] torments me the wretched one all the more

Anvarī I.

Harč ar jafā bi-jāy-i man ān bī-VAFĀ KUNAD

Ān-rā vafā šumāram agar čī jafā kunad

If that faithless one torments someone else instead of me

I count this as an act of faithfulness though it torments me.

Beside the apparent inter-textual allusions to Anvarī’s poem Selīm’s ghazal contains another couplet that contains more subtle allusions to the *matla’* of Ḥāfiẓ’s ‘-ā *kunad*’ ghazal.



Selīm IV.

Jānā bar ār ḥājat-i ‘uššāq-i bī-navā

Tā ḥājati ki hast tu-rā ḤAQ ravā kunad

Darling fulfil the needs of [your] helpless lovers

[If you wish] God to satisfy the needs you have.

Ḥāfiẓ I.

Gar may furūš ḥājat-i rindān ravā kunad

ĪZAD gunah bi-baḥšad u daf-i balā kunad

If the wine-seller satisfies the needs of the vagabonds,

God forgives [all] sins and averts trouble.

The basic idea underlying both couplets is that if someone satisfies the needs of the destitute, God will grant his wishes. Though the two couplets are seemingly very different, there are many similarities between the two *bayts* and there is a level of interpretation where Selīm's couplet can be seen as a paraphrased version of Ḥāfiẓ's lines.

In the context of *rindāna* ghazals *rinds* are people on a spiritual quest trying to attain a personal experience of God (*Īzad*). Lovers (*‘uššāq*) in Selīm's ghazal can be of a very similar flock, people who are not in love with another human being (*‘ašq-i majāzī*). Their love is real love (*‘ašq-i ḥaqīqī*) directed towards the Ultimate Truth (*Ḥaq*). The difference between the two couplets lies in the poets' different perspectives. While Ḥāfiẓ's statement is a general one claiming that an action helping friends of God to get closer to their goals earns God's approval and results in a blissful state, Selīm's *bayt* put into the context of a love poem is more specific and promises heavenly reward to the beloved if he/she takes notice of his/her lovers.

Except for these inter-textual allusions Selīm's *‘-ā kunad* poem does not contain further textual references to any of the poems of the paraphrase network. The case of this ghazal is very similar to the previous one. The not too difficult metre, the set of rhyming words that have many possibilities for semantic bonding and the easy to use *radīf* guarantee that the poet's imagination can freely and creatively work within these very wide boundaries.

As a conclusion of the analyses hitherto done it is possible to conclude that Selīm's poetic replies connected to ghazals of Ḥāfiẓ are emulations and not simple slavish imitations. Though the four cases are different because in the first two cases Selīm targeted two well-known poems written by an acknowledged poet and in the third and fourth case his models were lesser known ghazals, Selīm applied a very similar strategy in all the cases. Using the space allowed by the poetical framework, he tried to go round the problem. He kept a distance from his models and instead of trying to compose a direct reply to them, he turned to the signifying universe of the paraphrase networks containing his models and used whatever was available there. He picked several of the poetic building stones of some choice elements of these networks, reworked, reshaped them according to his own taste, added his own ideas and out of this mixture created his own poems. The results of his efforts are *javābs* that are typical emulation poems. They are in constant discourse with the tradition that inspired them and at the same time are refreshingly unique and original. As far as the artistic value of Selīm's ghazals are concerned it would be most befitting to conclude the present paper with T. S. Eliot's thoughts on tradition and individual talent.

'One of the facts that might come to light ... is our tendency to insist, when we praise a poet upon those aspects of his work in which he least resembles anyone else. In these aspects or parts



of his work we pretend to find what is individual, what is the peculiar essence of the man. We dwell with satisfaction upon the poet's difference from his predecessors, especially his immediate predecessors; endeavour to find something that can be isolated in order to be enjoyed. Whereas if we approach a poet without this prejudice we shall often find that not only the best but the most individual parts of his work may be those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most vigorously' (Eliot 1982: 36).

Open Access. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, a link to the CC License is provided, and changes – if any – are indicated. (SID_1)

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- ABŪ IŠHĀQ HALLĀJ-i ŠĪRĀZĪ 1302/1885. *Dīvān-i aṭ'ima*. Qustantiniya: Čāḫānayı Abū Żiyā. ĀHĪ. *Dīvān-i Āhī*. Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi 3422, ff. 136b–155a.
- AHLĪ 1344/1965. *Kulliyāt-i aš'ār-i Maulānā Ahlī-yi ŠĪRĀZĪ*. Bi-kūšīš-i Ḥamid RABBĀNĪ. Tihṛān: Kitābhāna-yi Sanā'ī.
- AMĪR ḤUSRAU 1361/1982. *Dīvān-i kāmīl-i Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī*. Bi-tašḫīḥ-i Sa'īd NAFĪSĪ. Bi-kūšīš-i M. DARVĪŠ. Tihṛān: Intišārāt-i Jāvidān.
- ANVARĪ 1364/1985. *Dīvān-i Anvarī*. Bā muqaddima va tašḫīḥ va maqābila-yi hašt nušḫa. Bi-kūšīš-i Sa'īd Nafīsī. Tihṛān: Intišārāt-i Pirūz-Sikka.
- AŠRAF. *Dīvān-i Ašraf*. Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Fatih 3777.
- AUHADĪ Marāġa'ī 1376/1997. *Dīvān-i Kāmīl-i Auhadī Marāġa'ī*. Tihṛān: Intišārāt-i Pišrau.
- BROCKHAUS, Hermann 1954. *Die Lieder des Hafis. Persisch mit dem Commentare des Sudi*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- BUTLER, Haidd Edgworth (ed./trans.) 1996. *The Institution Oratoria of Quintilian with an English Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dīvān-i Sulṭān Selīm*. İstanbul Ünivesitesi Nadir Eserler Kütüphanesi, FY 1330.
- ERTAYLAN, İsmail Hikmet 1948. *Külliyāt-i Dīvān-i Kabulī*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- ERTAYLAN, İsmail Hikmet 1949. *Külliyāt-i Dīvān-i Hāmidī*. İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.
- FATTĀHĪ Nišāpūrī (Sibak) 1385/2006. *Dīvān-i ġazaliyāt va rubā'iyāt*. Bi-ihitimām-i Mahdī MUḤAQQAQ va Kabrī BUSTĀN-ŠİRİN. Tihṛān: Anjuman-i Asar va Mafakhir-i Farhangī.
- ḤĀFĪZ 1382/2003. *Dīvān-i kāmīl-i Ḥāfız*. Bi-ihitimām-i Muhammad QAZVĪNĪ va Qāsim-i ĠANĪ. Tihṛān: Intišārāt-i Ṭahūrī.
- ḤĀQĀNĪ 1346/1967. *Dīvān-i Ḥāqānī Širvānī*. Bi-muqābila-yi qadimtarīn nusuh va tašḫīḥ va muqaddima va ta'liqāt. Bi-kūšīš-i Żiyā al-Dīn SAJJĀDĪ. Tihṛān: Kitābfurūšī-yi Zavvār.
- ḤASAN-I DIHLAVĪ 1383/2004. *Dīvān-i Ḥasan Dihlavī*. Bi-ihitimām-i Sayyid BIḤİŠTĪ ŠĪRĀZĪ va Ḥamid Riżā QILİÇĀNĪ. Tihṛān: Anjuman-i Āsar va Mafāḫar-i Farhangī.
- ḤAYDAR HARAVĪ, *Dīvān*. Upsala Univ. Bibliothek, Nova 389.



- HİLALİ 1338/1959. *Divân-i Hilâlî Çâgatâyî*. Bi-taşhîh va muqâbila va muqaddima va fihrist az Sa'îd NAFÎSÎ. Tihhrân: Kitâbhâna-yi Sanâ'î.
- JAMÎ, Nûr al-Dîn 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Aḥmed 1378/1999. *Divân-i Jâmî*. 2 vols. Muqaddima va taşhîh 'Alâhân AFŞAḤZÂD. Tihhrân: Mîrâş-i maktûb.
- KAMÂL-I HÛJANDÎ 1372/1993. *Divân-i Kamâl-i Hujandî*. Taşhîh-i Aḥmad Karamî. Tihhrân: Naşriyât-i Mâ.
- KÂTIBÎ Nişâpûrî Turşîzî 1382/2003. *Divân. Ğazaliyât*. Taşhîh-i Taqî VAḤİDİYÂN KÂMYÂR–Sa'îd HÛ–MUḤAM–MADÎ ḤAYRÂBÂDÎ and Muḥtabâ JAVÂDÎ-NIYÂ. Maşhad: Bunyâd-i Pażûhaşhâ-yi Islâmî.
- KINALIZADE Hasan Çelebi 1989. *Tezkiretüş-şuara*. II. Haz. İbrahim Kutluk. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- LA'ÂLÎ. *Divân-i La'âlî*. Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi 3422, ff. 234b–246a.
- LATÎFÎ 2000. *Tezkiretüş-Şua'arâ ve Tabsiratü'n-Nuzamâ. İnceleme-Metin*. Haz. Rıdvan Canım. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı.
- MAĞRİBÎ 1372/1993. *Divân-i Muḥammad Şîrîn Mağribî*. Bi-taşhîh va ihtimâm-i Liünard Lüizon (Leonard Lewisohn). London–Tihhrân: Dânişgâh-i Makgill–Dânişgâh-i Tihhrân.
- NÂŞİR-I HÛSRAU 1357/1978. *Divân-i aş'âr-i ḥakîm Nâşir-i HÛsrau*. Bi-ihtimâm-i Muḥtabâ MÎNOVÎ va Mahdî MUḤAQIQ. Tihhrân: Mu'assasa-yi Muḥâla'ât-i Islâmî-yi Dânişgâh-i MakGîl.
- NAVÂYÎ, Amîr 'Alî-şîr 'Fânî 1342/1963. *Divân*. Bi-sa'î ve ihtimâm-i Rukn al-Dîn HUMÂYÛN-FARRUḤ. Tehran: Kitâbhâna-yi Ibn Sinâ.
- NIZÂRÎ QUHISTÂNÎ 1371/1992. *Divân-i Ḥakîm Nizârî Quhistânî bar asâs-i dah nuş'a*. Bi-jam' va tadvîn va muqâbila va taşhîh va taşhîya va ta'liq va dibâça-yi Muḥâhir MUŞAFFÂ. Tihhrân: Intişârât-i 'İlmî.
- QÂRÎ-I YAZDÎ 1303/1886. *Divân-i albîsa*. Qustantiniya: Maḥba'a-yi Abû Ziyâ.
- RÛMÎ, Maulânâ Jalâl al-Dîn 1388/2009. *Kulliyât-i Şams-i Tabrîz*. Muḥâbiq bâ nuş'a-yi taşhîh suda-yi Badî' al-Zamân FIRÛZANFAR. Tihhrân: Intişârât-i Payâm-i 'Adâlat.
- SA'DÎ 1385/2006. *Kulliyât-i Sa'dî*. Bi-taşhîh-i Muḥammad 'Alî Furûĝî. Tihhrân: Intişârât-i Hurmus.
- ŞÂHÎ, Amîr Sabzavârî 1348/1969. *Divân*. Bi-Taşhîh va ḥavâşî va muqaddima-yi Sa'îd ḤAMİDİYÂN. Tihhrân: Intişârât-i Ibn Sinâ.
- SALMÂN SÂVAJÎ 1371/1992. *Divân-i Salmân Sāvajî*. Bâ muqaddima va taşhîh-i Abû al-Qasim ḤÂLAT. Tihhrân: Naşriyât-i Mâ.
- SELÎM 1904. *Divân-i balâĝat 'unvân-i sulṭân Salîm Ḥân-i avval*. Bi-ihtimâm-i Pâul HÛrn (Hrsg. von Paul HORN). Berlin: Maḥba'a-yi davlatî.
- SOLMAZ Süleyman 2005. *Ahdî ve Gülşen-i Şu'arâsî*. (İnceleme - Metin). Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı.
- SÛDÎ 1366/1987. *Şarḥ-i Sûdî bar Ḥâfiz*. 4 vols. Tarjuma-yi 'İsmat SATTÂRZÂDA. Tihhrân: Intişârât-i Zarrîn–Intişârât-i Nigâh.
- SUP, Shin Yang 1995. *Divân-i Mas'ûd-i Ḥummî*. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.

Secondary sources

- ATEŞ, Ahmet 1968. *İstanbul Kütüphanelerinde Farsça Manzum Eserler. Üniversite ve Nuruosmaniye Kütüphaneleri* [Poetical Works in Persian Preserved in Libraries in Istanbul. The University Library and the Nuruosmaniye Collection]. İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları.
- BAĞCI, Serpil, Filiz ÇAĞMAN, Günsel RENDA, and Zeren TANINDI 2010. *Ottoman Painting*. Ankara: Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Publications–Banks Association of Turkey.
- ELIOT, Thomas Stearns 1982. 'Tradition and the Individual Talent.' *Perspecta* 19: 36–42.
- HILLMANN, Michael C. 1975. 'Hafiz's "Turk of Shiraz" Again.' *Iranian Studies* 8/3: 164–182.



- KURU, Selim S. 2012. 'The Literature of Rum: The Making of a Literary Tradition: (1450–1600)' In: Suraiya N. FAROQHI and Kate FLEET (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Turkey. Vol. 2. The Ottoman Empire as a World Power 1453–1603*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 548–592.
- MEISAMI, Julie Scott 2010. 'A Life in Poetry: Hāfiz's First Ghazal.' In: Franklin LEWIS and Sunil SHARMA (eds.) *Necklace of the Pleiades. 24 Essays on Persian Literature, Culture and Religion*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 163–181.
- PÉRI Benedek 2010. 'Szelim szultán perzsa gázaljai I. Az első megközelítés. (The Persian ghazals of Sultan Selim I. A First Approach).' In: DÉVÉNYI Kinga (szerk.) *Varietas Delectat. Tanulmányok Kégl Sándor emlékére*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, 21–45.
- PÉRI Benedek 2015a. 'I. Szelim szultán kiadatlan perzsa versei I (Unpublished ghazals by Yavuz sultan Selim. Part I.)' *Keletkutatás* 2015 tavasz: 115–138.
- PÉRI Benedek 2015b. 'I. Szelim szultán kiadatlan perzsa versei II. (Unpublished Persian poems of Sultan Selim I. Part 2.)' *Keletkutatás* 2015 ősz: 113–130.
- PÉRI Benedek 2017. 'From Istāmbōl's throne a mighty host to Irān guided I;/Sunken deep in blood of shame I made the Golden Heads to lie': Yavuz Sultan Selim's Persian poetry in the light of the Ottoman-Safavid propaganda war.' *Archivum Ottomanicum* 34: 183–192.
- PÉRI Benedek 2018. '«...beklerüz». An Ottoman Paraphrase (*naẓīre*) Network from the 16th Century.' In: Christiane CZYGAN and Stephan CONERMANN (eds.) *An Iridescent Device: Premodern Ottoman Poetry*. Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 147–180.
- PÉRI Benedek 2018. 'Mīr 'Alī-Šīr Navāyi and the first ghazal of Hāfiz.' In: Shuhrat SIROJIDDINOV (ed.) *'Alī-sher Navoiy va XXI asr' mavzuidagi Respublika ilmiy-nazariy anjumani materiallari*. Toshkent: Tama-ddun, 176–183.
- YĀRŠĀTĪR, Iḥsān 1334/1955. *Šī'r-i Fārsi dar 'ahd-i Šāhruḥ* [Persian Poetry in the Age of Shahruh]. Tihṙān: Dānišgāh-i Tihṙān.
- ZIPOLI, Riccardo 1993. *The Technique of the Ġawāb. Replies by Nawā'ī to Ḥāfīz and Ġāmī*. Venecia: Cafos-carina.

