

Some formal and stylistic characteristics of a ghazal written by Ahmed Rushdie Mostarac in Persian language

Namir Karahalilović, PhD

University of Sarajevo - Faculty of Philosophy

Summary

Ahmed Rushdie Mostarac* is one of the Bosniak authors that had written in oriental languages. His *divan* of poetry which is dominated by poems in Turkish language is preserved. As a part of *divan* there are also preserved three Rushdie's ghazals in Persian. In this paper we present one, hitherto unknown to the general public, Rushdie's ghazal in Persian, with an analysis of its formal and stylistic peculiarities.

Key words: ghazal, versatility, *radīf*, metaphor, simile, accumulation, rhetoric, inversion, antithesis.

* Translator's note: Mostarac / the one who comes from Mostar.

I

AHMED RUSHDIE MOSTARAC (1637-1699) is one of many Bosniak poets who wrote their poetry in oriental languages. His *divan* (collection) of Poetry – for which Rushdie’s biographers didn’t spare words of praise, highlighting the poet’s talent, training and perfectionism – is dominated by poems in Turkish language in a variety of poetic forms.¹ In addition to Turkish, Rushdie wrote poetry in Persian language, as well, and for that matter – at least according to the currently known sources – exclusively ghazals. Number of Rushdie’s ghazals written in Persian language, in older sources, is usually expressed with the adverbs of quantity “more” and “few”. In one of the recent works on Ahmed Rushdie it is said that in his *divan* there are represented three ghazals in Persian.² One of them, a shorter ghazal of less than five couplets, has been already known to general public.³ But since Fevzi Mostarac states that Rushdie showed “more skill in structuring poems in Persian”⁴ there shouldn’t be excluded a possibility that such a significant and explicit value judgment is based on an examination of the much more extensive poetic corpus. Here I present a slightly longer Rushdie ghazal in Persian.

¹ On the life of Ahmed Rushdie more in: Safvet-beg Bašagić, *Bošnjaci i Hercegovci u islamskoj književnosti*, Matični odbor Bošnjačke zajednice kulture “Preporod”, Sarajevo, 2007, pg. 277-283; Hazim Šabanović, *Književnost Muslimana BiH na orijentalnim jezicima*, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1973, pg. 385-389; Fehim Nametak, *Pregled književnog stvaranja bosanskohercegovačkih Muslimana na turskom jeziku*, El-Kalem, Sarajevo, 1989, pg. 127-129.

² See: Adnan Kadrić, “Uvod u poetiku Divana Ahmeda Rušdija Mostarca”, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 58/2008, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2009, pg. 104.

³ Bašagić mentions that ghazal in the original collection, as well as in its translation to Bosnian (see: S. Bašagić, *Bošnjaci I Hercegovci...*, pg. 283) Though there are five couplets in the original language, in its translation to Bosnian there are four couplets; therefore, it lack the translation of one couplet, that being the third one. The same translation is done by Šabanović and Nametak. In his translation of the ghazal in question, Džemal Ćehajić offers translation of the third couplet, as well (see: Fevzi Mostarac, *Bulbulistan*, Prijevod s perzijskog: Džemal Ćehajić, Stilizacija: Džemaludin Latić, Kulturni centar I.R. Iran u BiH, Sarajevo, 2003, pg. 137).

⁴ F. Mostarac, *Bulbulistan...*, pg. 137.

Original:⁵

ز سوز عشق تو شد سینه ام کباب دریغ
 نصیبم از لب لعلت نشد شراب دریغ
 همیشه جام بدستم هوای عشق بسر
 بر آب و باد زدم خیمه چون حباب دریغ
 گل⁶ مراد کندم خزان⁷ رسید و گذشت
 بهار عمر من و گلشن⁸ شباب دریغ
 نظر بطالع ما کن بحسن عالمسوز
 گذشت یار ندیدم چو آفتاب دریغ
 نمیرسد ز پیش کس فکر که آه رسد
 چو عمر من رود آن ماه با شتاب
 هزار نقطهء داغ و هزار حرف ستم
 مرا ز خط تو اینست انتخاب
 علاج درد دلم را ازو طلب کردم
 نیاید⁹ از لب لعلش مرا جواب دریغ
 ز ترک غمزه مستت چرا وفا جویم
 دریغ کرده ام این فکر ناصواب دریغ
 گهی¹⁰ بفکر میانش گهی¹¹ بفکر وصال

⁵ Original in Persian taken from: *Sahhâf Rüşdî Divanı*, Süleymaniye (Lala Ismail Efendi) Kütüphanesi, Nu: 445/1, f. 63a.

⁶ In the original: کل.

⁷ In the original: خزان; corrected.

⁸ In the original: کلشن.

⁹ In the original: نیابد; corrected.

¹⁰ In the original: کهی.

¹¹ Ibid.

همیشه کار مرا شد خیال و خواب

خمار هجر ترا تا بکی کشد رشدی

نشد ز بادۀ وصل تو نشویاب ۱۲ دریغ

Transliteration:¹³

Ze sūz-e ‘ešq-e to šod sīne am kabāb darīg
 Nasībam az lab-e la‘lat našod šarāb darīg
 Hamīše ġām be dastam hawā-ye ‘ešq be sar
 Bar āb o bād zadam xeime ċon¹⁴ habāb darīg
 Gol-e morād kadam xazān resīd o gozašt
 Bahār-e ‘omr-e man o golšan-e šabāb darīg
 Nazar be tāle‘-e mā kon be hosn-e ‘ālamsūz
 Gozašt-e yār nadīdam ċo¹⁵ āftāb darīg
 Namīresad ze pīš-e kas fekr ke āh resad
 Ćo¹⁶ ‘omr-e man rawad ān māh bāšetāb
 Hezār noqte-ye dāġ o hezār harf-e setam
 Marā ze xatt-e to īn ast entexāb
 ‘Elāġ-e dard-e delam rā azū talab kardam
 Nayāyad az lab-e la‘laš marā ġawāb darīg
 Ze tark-e ġamze-ye mastat ċerā wafā ġūyam
 Darīg karde am īn fekr-e nāsawāb darīg
 Gahī be fekr-e miyānaš gahī be fekr-e wesāl
 Hamīše kār marā šod xiyāl o xāb

¹² Illegible in the original; the word is reconstructed based on the context, versification structure and rhyme of the poem. Any other manuscript of Rushdie’s ghazal is not available to me so I could make a comparison. See footnote No. 43.

¹³ On the sistem of transcription used in the Latin transliteration of the text see in: Namir Karahalilović, “Prilog rješenju problema transkripcije za perzijski jezik”, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 54/2004, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2005, str. 199-213.

¹⁴ Second vowel “u” in the comparative particle چون [čün] is shortened in pronunciation into short vowel “o” for the sake of poetic metre.

¹⁵ Second vowel “u” in the comparative particle چو [čū] is in pronunciation shortened into a short vowel “o” for the sake of poetic metre.

¹⁶ Ibid.

Xomār-e heġr-e torā tā be kei kešad Rošdī
Našod ze bāde-ye wasl-e to našwyāb darīġ

Bosnian translation:

Od žara ljubavi za tobom grudi mi spržene – avaj,
S tvojih mi rumenih usana¹⁷ pića ne zapade – avaj;
U ruci stalno mi čaša, u glavi želje ljubavne,
Na vodi i zraku se utaborih poput pjene – avaj;
Otrgnuh cvijet želje, jesen stiže a nesta
Proljeća mog života, mladosti cvijetnjaka – avaj;
Ljepotom što svijet prži pogledaj mi lice,
Ne vidjeh: draga prođe kao sunce¹⁸ – avaj;
Zbog toga da uzdahne niko ni ne pomišlja,
Žurno kao život moj ide ta ljepotica;¹⁹
Hiljadu usijanih tačaka, hiljadu slova patnje,
Iz tvoga rukopisa moj izbor takav je;
Lijek zatražih od nje svoga srca bolovima,
S rumenih joj usana odgovora nema²⁰ – avaj;

¹⁷ In the original: لب لعل [lab-e la'ī]. Genitive construction in the literal meaning “usne rubina” / “the ruby lips” that is “usne poput rubina” / “lips like ruby”; the matter in question here is the *comparative genitive link* (ezāfe-ye tašbīhī) in which the first member of the genitive construction is the *content of comparison* (mošabbah) and the second member of the genitive construction is the *subject of comparison* (mošabbah behe) while the izafet kesra takes over the role of *comparative particle* (adāt-e tašbīh). The mutual feature *o* (waġh-e šabah) of the two comparative correlations is of course the intensive red colour. The comparative genitive link لب لعل [lab-e la'ī] is so frequent in classical Persian literature that it has the status of common place. (We have to emphasise that comparison within the genitive construction can go in the the opposite direction” as well, so that the second member of the construction becomes content, and the first one the subject of comparison.)

¹⁸ Literal translation is: “Ne vidjeh prolazak drage poput sunca” / “I didn’t see my beloved’s passing by like that of the sun”; I gave up on it for the sake of rhyme.

¹⁹ In the original: ماه [māh]. Noun in the meaning “moon”; is in classical Persian literature a frequent metaphor for a beautiful woman, so frequent that it has a status of a common metaphor.

²⁰ Literal translation is: “S rumenih joj usana ne dolazi mi odgovor” / “From her red lips the answer doesn’t come”; I gave up on it for the sake of rhyme.

Otkud nada da proći ću se tvog miga zamamnoga,
 Avaj, zbog tog čina nedostojnoga – avaj;
 U mislima čas njen mi stas, čas sastanak,
 Sav mi život postade maštanje i sanak;
 Mahmurluk razdvojenosti Rušdi dokad da trpi,
 Vinom susreta s tobom on se ne opi²¹ – avaj.

English translation:

The love zest for you has burned out my chest – alas,
 From your red lips I got no drinks – alas;
 My hand always holds the glass, and my head holds love desires,
 In the water and air I settled like foam – alas;
 I plucked the flower of desire; the autumn is here and gone is
 The spring of my life, the youth of flower-bed – alas;
 With beauty that scorches the world look at my face,
 I saw not: and my beloved passed by like sun – alas;
 Therefore to breathe no one thinks of,
 Hurriedly like my life that beauty walks;
 Thousands of ardent dots, thousands of letters of suffering,
 From your writings is all I choose to see;
 The cure I sought from her with my heartache,
 But her red lips gave no answer – alas;
 Whence the hope that I shall rid of your attracting eye,
 Alas for that unworthy act – alas;
 One instant her stature, one instant rendezvous is in my thoughts,
 My life's become but reverie and dream;
 How long will Rushdie suffer from drowsiness of separation,
 The wine of rendezvous with you he has not drank – alas.

In the aforementioned ghazal dominates sadness, pain and suffering, caused by an unrequited love. The poet expresses unhappiness

²¹ Literal translation is quite uncomely and it goes like this: “On ne postade onaj koji nalazi pijanstvo zbog susreta s tobom” / “He has not become the one who finds drunkenness because of the meeting with you”; I gave up on it because of its syntactic structure which is unsuitable for our language and because of rhyme.

caused by his beloved woman's indifference, and hopelessness and sorrow due to the passage of his life in this state. Adversity that the poet is exposed to belongs to those circumstances in which the traveler feels a spiritual distance and separation from God, so that he does not seem to enjoy his favor. On the possibility of such - esoteric, gnostic - interpretation of this poem suggest the words *love* ('ešq), *lips* (lab), *drink* (šarāb), *glass* (ġām), *wink* (ġamze), *separation* (heġr), *wine* (bāde) and *meet* (wasl / wesāl), which in Sufi poetry assume characteristic significance that goes far beyond its denotative meaning. Although, in this paper, there will be no detailed discussion on the possibilities of interpretation of the presented ghazal,²² even these sketchy notes indicate one of its key features and values – a meaningful and purposeful versatility and thus the openness to different interpretations and receptions.

II

Emotions which “color” overall atmosphere of the ghazal are in more places further enhanced with an exclamation of grief *alas* (darīġ). But this does not exhaust its role in the ghazal. In a formal sense, it has a prominent place and importance.

In fact, from the Latin transliteration of the ghazal and for those who are unable to read the text in Persian language it is noticeable that the interjection “alas” in the poem is repeated often, and at a precisely determined place in the first distich at the end of both semi couplet, and in the coming distiches only at the end of the second semi couplet.²³ In this way, the cry of “alas” has the function of a versification element inherent for the classical Persian literature: one word - or more words, even a whole sentence – that is, immediately after the rhyme²⁴ placed at the end of both semi couplets of the first distich, and then at the end of the second semi couplet of the other distichs, in Persian science of

²² Given the narrowly defined topic of work, this and indications of possible influences of other authors in this ghazal will be discussed on another occasion.

²³ In that sense, the exception is the second semi couplet of the eighth distich in which the exclamation دریغ [darīġ] is written at the beginning, as well.

²⁴ The rhyme of this ghazal is “āb”, which is noted in the Latin transliteration.

prosody and rhyme ('elm-e' aruz wa qāfiye) is called *radīf*,²⁵ and a poem that contains this element, a *moraddaf*.

However, at the same time there is an inconsistency in the use of *radīf* that can be noticed: according to the classical poetic formal standards, if *radīf* stands in the first distich, it must be used in all other distiches of the poem. In this ghazal, by Ahmed Rushdie the Mostarian, this rule is not met: out of the total of ten couplets, *radīf* is used in the top four, then in the seventh and eighth, and in the final, tenth couplet. In the fifth, sixth and ninth couplets *radīf* is not used.

The reasons for this formal inconsistency have so far been unclear. It would be very hastily and carelessly to conclude that the poet was not able to follow the criteria on the use *radīf* consistently, since in his other two ghazals available in Persian, he authoritatively proves just the opposite.²⁶ However, more important thing than the very reasons for this phenomenon's existence is, perhaps, the fact that this Rushdie's ghazal unambiguously confirms that one other similar case of formal unconventionality,²⁷ also caused by the inconsistent use of *radīf*, in the Bosniak literary heritage written in Persian language, does not represent an isolated case, in other words, an exception.

²⁵ More on this in: *Farhangnāme-ye adab-e fārsī (Gozīde-ye estelāhāt, mazāmīn wa mouzūāt-e adab-e fārsī)*, Be sarparastī-ye Hasan Anūše, Sāzmān-e čāp wa entešārāt, Tehrān, 1376. (1997), pg. 627. *Radīf*, as a versification element, is present in Persian literature in New Persian language *darī* as early as from the works of poets of the so called horasan style (*sabk-e xorāsānī*). (On this see: Mohammad Ġāfar Mahgūb, *Sabk-e xorāsānī dar še'r-e fārsī*, Entešārāt-e dānešsarā-ye 'ālī, Tehrān, 1350. (1971), pg. 106-108.) The development and use of *radīf* will reach a peak in the works of poets of the so called Iraqi literary style (*sabk-e 'erāqī*), within which great attention is paid to "after rhyme identical refrain (underlined by N. K.) at the end of the couplet (*radīf*)." Ahmed Tamimdari, *Istorija persijske književnosti*, S persijskog preveo: Seid Halilović, Kulturni centar Irana : Društvo srpskokocnogorsko-iranskog prijateljstva, Beograd, 2004, pg. 119. Since the original manuscript of this work is not available to me, it is unclear whether it is a formulation made by author or translator; however, it is difficult that *radīf*, given its above characteristics could be identified with the refrain, since it is always - as the author states - placed at the end of the couplet, therefore, within and not after it, as is usual for the refrain.)

²⁶ See: Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Lala Ismail 445, f. 62b-63a.

²⁷ On this see in: Namir Karahalilović, "O strukturnoj nekonvencionalnosti jednog gazela Nabija Tuzlaka na perzijskom jeziku", *Pismo*, V/1, Bosansko filološko društvo, Sarajevo, 2007, pg. 199-206.

Thus, on the one hand, it can be concluded that the consistent use of *radīf* and fulfillment of all other formal criteria in the poems written in Persian, by some Bosniak authors, testify of their knowledge on the formal standards of the classical Persian literature and its poetic forms, and of their ability to apply them in their own creative work. On the other hand, the ghazal presented in this paper, by Ahmed Rushdie Mostarac - as well as the above mentioned similar case by another author - perhaps suggests that the occasional use of inconsistent *radīf* in the works of Bosniak poets who wrote in Persian actually represented an expression of the desire to engage into a dialogue with the traditional, formal and other poetic canons, in order to examine and evaluate them critically. Of course, for a reliable judgment on the matter in question, it is necessary to make an insight into a much more extensive poetic corpus by many authors.

III

In addition to its roles in a formal sense, previously considered exclamation *alas* (*darīġ*) is very stylogenic, and as such, stylistically functional. Accumulation of consonants “d”, “r” and “g”, and a long vowel “i” between the second and third consonant, underline the dominant emotions (sadness, sorrow, grief, despair...); they emotionally “soak” the whole text. Frequent distribution of this exclamation occurs as a striking phonostylistic unit, while at the same time it vigorously participates in the euphony of the poem. In addition, the given exclamation also has a function of a connector.

Ahmed Rushdie Mostarac shows a very good skill in creating stylistic figures. Here, I will point out some of them.

1. Along with metaphor, which has already been mentioned,²⁸ the poet frequently uses *similie* (*tašbīh*), and he does so by creating it very aesthetically nuanced. There are following examples of *similie* in the text:

²⁸ See footnote 19.

1.1 In a classical comparative structure, which has both correlates, namely the *content of comparison* (mošabbah) and a means of comparison (mošabbah behe), and *comparative particles* (adāt-e tašbīh). Given the nature of correlates and of the common features of comparison, there can be found several subtypes of this kind of comparison:

1.1.1 The comparison in which both, the content and the means of comparison indicate something *sensuous* (hessī), whereby the common feature of comparison (wağh-e šabah) is the word *unique* (mofrad); such is comparison of the poet's encampment²⁹ with foam in the second couplet, and a common feature is impermanence, temporality.

1.1.2 The simile in which the content and the means of comparison both indicate something *sensuous*, whereat the common feature of comparison is *complex* (morakkab); such a simile is one that compares sweetheart (that is, her passing through) with the sun (that is, the movement of the sun) in the fourth couplet. The common feature of comparison is beauty and magnificence of the beloved woman and the sun, or scenes of their passing through / movement.

1.1.3 Simile of which the content of the comparison signifies something *sensuous*, whereas the means of comparing signifies something *abstract* ('aqlī). Such a simile is the one that compares a beautiful woman (that is, her departure) with the poet's life (that is, with its passing) in the fifth couplet, whereat, the common feature of the two correlates (i.e. speed) is in the couplets explicitly indicated. However, the speed as an explicitly noted mutual feature between the two correlates can be added with irreversibility—as the poet's life goes fast and for good, so does the loving woman - hurriedly, leaving no possibility of return. Therefore, here, as well, we have the case of a complex common feature.

This interpretation suggests that the simile in the examples under 1.1.2 and 1.1.3, due to the fact that the common feature in both cases is

²⁹ The original copy contains infinitive form خیمه زدن [xeime zadan] in its literal meaning “udariti/zabiti šator”, that is “podíci šator” /to make a tent/.

complex, should be defined as a *simile by analogy* (tashbih tamsīl-e),³⁰ and not as *simile built on similarities*.

1.2 In a *comparative genitive correlation* (ezāfe-ye tašbīhī), considering the nature of correlates, there are also several subtypes of simile:

1.2.1 Simile in which both the content and the means of comparison signify something sensuous.³¹

1.2.2 Simile in which the content signifies something abstract, whereas the means of comparing signifies something sensuous. That type of comparison we have in the structure *drowsiness of separation* (xomār-e heḡr) in the final couplet. The context makes it clear that the comparison goes from the second to the first member of the genitive structure, namely the separation from the loved person is compared to drowsiness.

In this case, not only because the content of comparison is abstract and the subject of comparison sensuous, a contextual interpretation of the common comparison feature is needed.

The separation and drowsiness do not share a common trait based on which a comparison could be established, the key thing here is connotation or the effect that both have on the one who experiences them. As the drowsiness gives headache to the person who suffers from it, causing a feeling of heaviness, apathy and inertia, so does the separation from the beloved to the person in love. It causes similar states and provokes the same feelings, but perhaps with even greater intensity.³² The sole demand for the interpretation of common features leads to the conclusion that the simile structure “drowsiness of separation” is a comparison by analogy.

³⁰ More on simile by analogy in: Munir Mujić, *Arapska stilistika u djelu Hasana Kafije Pruščaka*, Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2007, pg. 93. Compare to: Doktor Sīrūs Šamīsā, *Bayān*, Enteshārāt-e Ferdūs, Tehrān, 1381. (2002), pg. 109-110.

³¹ See footnote No 17. Compare with: Esad Duraković, *Arapska stilistika u Bosni: Ahmed Sin Hasanov Bošnjak o metafori*, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2000, pg. 43-44.

³² Compare with: E. Duraković, *Arapska stilistika...*, pg. 71.

There is the identical example in the last comparative genitive link in the poem, that is the simile structure *the wine of rendezvous* (bāde-ye wasl). Here, as well, the content of comparison means something abstract and the subject of comparison something sensuous. The comparison is carried out from the second point of the simile structure to the first, that is, the encounter with the beloved is compared to wine, and in this case, as well, it is necessary to interpret the context – a rendezvous and wine do not share any common trait, but they have the same effect on those who taste them, equally or similarly (in terms of quality and intensity). As the wine physiologically gets drunk the person who tastes it, so does the rendezvous with the beloved woman—it leads him into a state of emotional intoxication. And this is the example of a comparison by analogy.

2. Accumulation (morā‘āt-e nazīr)³³ is a rhetoric figure that Ahmed Rushdie uses in this poem many times. I will point out here all found examples:

2.1 In the second semi couplet of the second distich there are words *water* (āb), *air* and (bād),³⁴ *foam* (habāb); given exactly in this order, as if some kind of gradations process is taking place—when mixed, water and air give foam. A key role in this stylistic figure is exactly that of foam, because of its characteristics of short duration, vicissitudes, and transience—that through the earlier elaborated comparison tries to show the hopeless position of the poet in love, the futility of his efforts to get closer to his beloved woman and gain her attention.

2.2 In the third distich there are words that, as far as accumulation goes, can be divided into two groups: one consisting of a *flower* (gol),

³³ In contemporary Persian stylistics, some authors the term همبستگی [hambastegī] for this rhetoric figure in the literal translation to Bosnian means “povezanost” (connectedness), which clearly point to the semantical relation of the ideas mentioned within the rhetoric figure itself. (See: Mīr Ġalāloddin Kazzāzī, *Zībāšenāsī-ye soxan-e pārsī*, Našr-e markaz, Ketāb-e Mād, Tehrān, 1381. /2002/, p. 103)

³⁴ In the first semi couplet there is a noun هوا [hawā] meaning “želja” (wish); but it also has the meaning of “zrak” in Bosnian (Eng. air).

flower garden (golzār), *spring* (bahār) and *autumn* (xazān), and the other one of *life* (‘omr) and *youth* (šabāb). All of them together successfully create an impression of the poet’s resignation and the inevitable passage of life. By renunciation of desire (that is “tearing off its flower”) ends the era of his youth, the time of greenery, fertility, freshness and enthusiasm, and show bare, unfruitful autumn of life.

2.3 In the fourth distich there are words: *beauty* (hosn), *the one who / that which burns the world* (‘ālamsūz), *dear* (yār) and *the sun* (āftāb). In this case, by the use of rhetoric figure of accumulation it is intended – as is the case with the previously explained simile – to show the beauty of the beloved woman. As the sun shines and heats the whole world, so does the beauty of the poet’s unattainable beloved, which is radiant and unbearably strong.

2.4. In the sixth distich there are words: *dot* (noqte), *letter* (harp) and *handwriting* (xatt). Here, we see again some kind of gradation: according to the rules of the dimensions of the letters of the Arabic alphabet, length / height and width / thickness of each letter (or any part thereof) amount to a certain number of dots,³⁵ on the other hand, a certain number of letters makes a script, whether it’s about alphabet or—which in this case is more likely—someone’s handwriting. By the use of the rhetoric figure of accumulation the poet in love is, apparently, expressing his own ill fortune—out of everything that he could have gotten from his beloved, and the symbol of which is her handwriting, he did not get anything good: a thousand of (which is a huge number) red hot dots, imprints on his soul, and as much as that of suffering (embodied in letters).³⁶

2.5 In the ninth distich the word *thought* (fekr) is used twice, and then there are the words *imagination* (xiyāl) and *sleep* (xāb). It is apparent the poet’s intention to depict his state of complete mental and emotional

³⁵ On this see in: Dr Teufik Muftić, *Arapsko pismo*, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 1982, pg. 44-45.

³⁶ Thereto, the noun انتخاب [entexāb], meaning “izbor” (choice) is here to be interpreted as a sign of the poet’s resignation and inability and not as an expression of conviction that he alone, by his choice, determined his own destiny.

preoccupation with his beloved woman³⁷ by the use of accumulation of the above mentioned nouns.

3. It is obvious that the poet, in different distiches, mentions his beloved woman in different ways: in the first, sixth, eighth, and tenth distich he uses the personal pronoun of the second person singular *you* (to), in its full or enclitic form, or as the second member of the genitive structure, in the meaning of the possessive pronoun “your”, in the fifth, seventh and ninth distiches the beloved is referred to in the third person singular, and with the use of the personal pronoun of the third person singular she (ū) (also in both forms - full and enclitic), or as the second member of the genitive structure, in the meaning of possessive pronoun “her”, or by using the nouns *dear* (yār) and *beauty* (māh). Such a technique—especially because the two ways of mentioning of the beloved are used interchangeably, from distich to distich—seems to achieve the effect of surprise thus maintaining the dynamic tone of the poem. A powerful emotional charge is present from its beginning to its end. However, there is an exception to this technique in the fourth distich where in its first semi couplet his beloved woman is mentioned in the second person singular, which is referred by the use of imperative form *see* (nazar kon). However, in the second semi couplet, without any contextual introduction or indication, the verb in the first person singular *I didn't see* (nadīdam), is used, which refers to the poet, whereas the beloved is marked by the noun “dear”, which is a subject of the predicate passed (gozašt)³⁸ in the third person singular. According to my judgment, this exception is made on purpose. By mentioning his beloved within one distich in different persons (contrary from the rest of the distiches), by changing the grammatical person of the predicate, the poet creates preconditions for his final goal and that is the making of the *rhetoric inver-*

³⁷ In this sense, the noun خواب [xāb], in its basic meaning “san” (a dream) is to be interpreted here as a revery/fantasing and not as a state opposite to being awake.

³⁸ I'm pointing out that there is a noun “prolazak” (passage) in the original version of the poem, but considering the context it is clear that it replaces the finite verb form in the third person singular of the preterite, whereat the noun in question, which is at the same time a preterite base for the infinitive گذشتن [gozaštan] meaning “proći” / “to pass” and the verb which it replaces have the same form.

sion, known as *eltefāt*³⁹ in the literary stylistics of the Oriental – Islamic circles. The sudden inversion achieved with this stylistic figure has a task of emphasizing the poet's being taken aback, and his consequent grief because of the disparity between what he expected (that is to be seen by his beloved) and what really happened (that is the passing by of his beloved whom he didn't even see, nor enjoyed her beauty).

4. Ahmed Rushdie's Mostarac stylistic crafts culminate at the very end of the poem, after the metaphore, simile, accumulation and rhetoric inversion in the last distich of the poem there is a minor antithesis (*tazādd*)⁴⁰. In the first semi couplet there are words *drowsiness* (*xomār*) and *separation* (*heḡr*) and in the second *drunkenness* (*našw*)⁴¹ and *randezvous* (*wasl*). Thereto, "drowsiness" and "separation" are antithetical ideas in relation to "drunkenness" and "randezvous". While the antithesis between the terms "separation" and "randezvous" is not questionable, the dilemma might occur if we bring into same relation terms "drowsiness" and "drunkenness". But, Ahmed Rushdie, in this sense, follows the settled motif in Persian literature in which drowsiness is not only the consequence of drunkenness, but it is also in addition to that, and before anything else, a condition that can only be overcome by drunkenness. In this respect, for instance, Hāfez Širāzī writes:

“Mnoge noći besane mi, što mi žudnja budi maštu,
od sto noći sam mahmuran; daj pokaži mi mejhanu!”⁴²

³⁹ On this rhetoric figure see in: E. Duraković, “Retorički obrat u Kur’anu”, *Ostrvo*, Tuzla, Decembar 2004, pg. 12-19; Compare to: Dr. S. Šamīsā, *Negāhī tāze be badī*, Entešārāt-e Ferdūs, Tehrān, 1381. (2002), pp. 171-172; *Farhangnāme-ye...*, p. 121.

⁴⁰ Though there are terms derived from Arabic roots “t”bq that are used for this rhetoric figure, in Persian stylistics, the most frequent one is تضاد [*tazādd*]. (Examples see in: Dr. S. Šamīsā, *Negāhī tāze...*, p. 117)

⁴¹ This noun in the original language exists within the complex active participle نشوياب (*našwyāb*), in the literal translation “onaj koji nalazi pijanstvo” (the one who finds drunkenness), that is “onaj koji se opija” (the one who is getting drunk).

⁴² Hafiz Širazi, *Divan*, S perzijskog preveo: Bećir Džaka, Naučnoistraživački institut “IBN SINA”, Sarajevo, 2009, pg. 27.

“My many nights are sleepless, for yearning awakes my fancy,
 Hundreds of nights have made me drowsy; oh, show me the way
 to meihana!”

Therefore, in this kind of opposing relation “drowsiness” and “separation” almost mean the same—“deprivation“, while “drunkenness” and “rendezvous” mean “the accomplishment of the wish“. With this rhetoric figure, the poet finally and irrevocably expresses the grief for the failure and impossibility of his unfortunate love. The first semi couplet reflects the condition he is in and the second semi couplet states what will always be out of the poet’s reach. Rushdie’s mastery in this example is reflected in the following: since the word “drunkenness” and “wine” are in close semantic relationship, it can be concluded that the poet used two comparative genitive links which was previously discussed (i.e. “drowsiness of separation” and “wine of rendezvous”) as two points of the antithesis.

In the presented gazelle Ahmed Rushdie Mostarac had shown his great craftsmanship in the writing of poetry in Persian. With the use of appropriate lexical material author achieves meaningful and purposeful versatility poems, leaving place for different receptions and interpretations. In this ghazal the poet shows the sovereign mastery of all the postulates of formal poetics in the literature written in Oriental-Islamic cultural circle. At the same time, a formal plan of the ghazal is characterized by the inconsistent use radif, versification element inherent to Persian poetry from its earliest times.

Without the possibility of definitely confirming this argument—which would ask for a research on a more extensive poetic corpus—it can be assumed that such a practice on the author’s part reflects his tendency towards critical examination of the formal poetic canon. The special value of the poem is author’s great skill in using euphonic potentials of certain lexemes, as well as the construction of a wide range of rhetoric figures (metaphors, simile, accumulation, rhetorical inversion and antithesis), which he subtly nuances and uses with competence. With the exception of a slight deviation in the second semi couplet of the ninth couplet, this ghazal is adorned by the almost impeccable inner rhythm. Considering all the above said, I think that we can conclude

the following: if the identity of the author of the ghazal here presented and analyzed we could hardly find any argument in support of the claim that it was written by a nonnative speaker of Persian language.

Translated into English by Aida Džiho-Šator

Bibliography:

- Bašagić, Safvet-beg, *Bošnjaci i Hercegovci u islamskoj književnosti*, Matični odbor Bošnjačke zajednice kulture “Preporod”, Sarajevo, 2007.
- Duraković, Esad, *Arapska stilistika u Bosni: Ahmed Sin Hasanov Bošnjak o metafori*, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2000.
- Duraković, Esad, “Retorički obrat u Kur’anu”, *Ostrvo*, Tuzla, Decembar 2004, str. 12-19.
- *Farhangnāme-ye adab-e fārsī (Gozīde-ye estelāhāt, mazāmin wa mouzūāt-e adab-e fārsī)*, Be sarparastī-ye Hasan Anūše, Sāzmān-e čāp wa entešārāt, Tehrān, 1376. (1997)
- Kadrić, Adnan, “Uvod u poetiku Divana Ahmeda Rušdija Mostarca”, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 58/2008, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2009.
- Karahalilović, Namir, “O strukturnoj nekonvencionalnosti jednog gazela Nabija Tuzlaka na perzijskom jeziku”, *Pismo*, VI/1, Sarajevo, Bosansko filološko društvo, 2007, str. 199-206.
- Karahalilović, Namir, “Prilog rješenju problema transkripcije za perzijski jezik”, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 54/2004, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2005, str. 199-213.
- Kazzāzī, Mīr Ġalāloddin, *Zibāšenāsi-ye soxan-e pārsī*, Našr-e markaz, Ketāb-e Mād, Tehrān, 1381. (2002)
- Mahğūb, Mohammad Ġa’far, *Sabk-e xorāsānī dar šer-e fārsī*, Entešārāt-e dānešsarā-ye ‘ālī, Tehrān, 1350. (1971)
- Mostarac, Fevzi, *Bulbulistan*, Prijevod s perzijskog: Džemal Ćehajić, Stilizacija: Džemaludin Latić, Kulturni centar I. R. Iran u BiH, Sarajevo, 2003.
- Muftić, Teufik, *Arapsko pismo*, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 1982.
- Mujić, Munir, *Arapska stilistika u djelu Hasana Kafije Prušćaka*, Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2007.
- Nametak, Fehim, *Pregled književnog stvaranja bosanskohercegovačkih Muslimana na turskom jeziku*, El-Kalem, Sarajevo, 1989.
- *Sahhāf Rüşdī Divani*, Süleymaniye (Lala Ismail Efendi) Kütüphanesi, Nu: 445/1.
- Šabanović, Hazim, *Književnost Muslimana BiH na orijentalnim jezicima*, Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1973.
- Šamīsā, Sīrūs, *Bayān*, Entešārāt-e Ferdūs, Tehrān, 1381. (2002)
- Šamīsā, Sīrūs, *Negāhī tāze be badī*, Entešārāt-e Ferdūs, Tehrān, 1381. (2002)
- Širazi, Hafiz, *Divan*, S perzijskog preveo: Bećir Džaka, Naučnoistraživački institut “IBN SINA”, Sarajevo, 2009.
- Tamimdari, Ahmed, *Istorija persijske književnosti*, S persijskog preveo: Seid Halilović, Kulturni centar Irana : Društvo srpskocrnogorsko-iranskog prijateljstva, Beograd, 2004.