

Sabina Bakšić and Alena Čatović

LITERARY HERITAGE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA IN THE
OTTOMAN TURKISH LANGUAGE: A PRAGMATIC DIMENSION

Literary Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish
Language: A Pragmatic Dimension

Sabina Bakšić and Alena Čatović

Publisher

Orijentalni institut Univerziteta u Sarajevu
Zmaja od Bosne 8b, Kampus Univerziteta u Sarajevu
Sarajevo, BiH, e-mail: ois@unsa.ba

For the Publisher

Aladin Husić

Editor

Adnan Kadrić

Reviewers

Fehim Nametak
Adnan Kadrić

Translated by

Selma Đuliman

DTP

Narcis Pozderac, TDP Sarajevo

Elektronsko izdanje

www.

ISBN ???

© Orijentalni institut Univerziteta u Sarajevu

Sva prava zadržana. Nijedan dio ove knjige ne može biti objavljen ili preštampan
bez prethodne saglasnosti izdavača i vlasnika autorskih prava.

UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU – ORIJENTALNI INSTITUT

Sabina Bakšić and Alena Čatović

LITERARY HERITAGE OF BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA IN THE
OTTOMAN TURKISH LANGUAGE:
A PRAGMATIC DIMENSION

Sarajevo, 2023.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 7 |
| PRAGMATICS AND HISTORICAL PRAGMATICS | 11 |
| DIWAN LITERATURE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA .. | 23 |
| Hasan Ziyai Mostari | 25 |
| Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic | 27 |
| Suleiman Mezaki. | 28 |
| Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi. | 30 |
| Osman Shehdi | 31 |
| Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak | 36 |
| POETIC FORMS OF DIWAN LITERATURE | 40 |
| Qasida | 40 |
| Ghazal | 42 |
| Mathnawi. | 43 |
| Kit'a (Epigram) | 44 |
| Tarih or Chronogram. | 45 |
| SPEECH ACTS IN DIWAN POETRY | 45 |
| 1. Expressives | 49 |
| 1. 1. Good Wishes (Duas, Prayers) | 49 |
| 1. 2. Complaints | 64 |
| 1. 3. Self-praise | 93 |
| 1. 4. Compliments and Praise | 109 |
| 1. 5. Praise and Gratitude | 123 |
| 2. DIRECTIVES | 128 |
| 2. 1. Requests and Pleas | 129 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3. REPRESENTATIVES | 142 |
| 3. 1. Representatives in Chronograms..... | 143 |
| CONCLUSION | 151 |
| APPENDIX: Examples of Speech Acts in the Literary Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish Language..... | 153 |
| 1. EXPRESSIVES | 153 |
| 1. 1. Good Wishes and Duas | 153 |
| 1. 2. Complaints | 155 |
| 1. 3. Compliments and Praise | 158 |
| 1. 4. Gratitude | 159 |
| 2. DIRECTIVES..... | 160 |
| 2. 1. Requests and Pleas | 160 |
| 3. REPRESENTATIVES | 162 |
| ABSTRACT | 165 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 167 |

Introduction

Classical Ottoman literature is a term for an elite, mainly poetical tradition that was cultivated in the Ottoman Empire in the period between 14th and 19th century, in the Ottoman Turkish language. Turkish literary historians of the 20th century also called it the *diwan* literature (*Divan Edebiyatı*), for poets collected and recorded their poetry in meticulously edited collections of poetry – *diwans*. The name *diwan literature* is thus a relatively new term, and is derived from the word *diwan*, which, in a literary context, means *an anthology, a collection of poems* (Macit 2002:47). Classical *diwans* were characterised by a very strict form, so as to contain poetical forms classified in accordance with the traditionally-determined order. Turkic peoples had developed a literary expression influenced by the Arabic and Persian literatures, which is seen in the content, rhyme, metre and form (ghazal, qasida, rubaiyat, mathnawi, kit'a (epigram), etc.). A diwan poet had to be highly educated and, aside from the Ottoman Turkish, Arabic and Persian languages, he had to be familiar with the Islamic civilisation, especially with the Islamic mysticism, as well as with the traditions of the great Asian civilisations: Chinese, Indian, and, especially, Iranian. Poets of the diwan dedicated their poems to dignitaries (sultans, viziers, beys) and would thus find patrons to ensure their existence. The most important poets of the diwan in the Ottoman period were Baki, Hayali, Taslicali Yahya, Sheikh Galip, Ahmed Pasha, as well as the Ottoman sultans themselves. It is important to emphasise that the most voluminous diwan in the Ottoman Turkish language is that of Suleiman the Magnificent.

A number of people who originated from Bosnia and Herzegovina served in the institutions of the Ottoman Empire. Being fluent in the Ottoman Turkish language was not the only precondition for employment in the civil service; requirements also included the knowledge of Islamic

and natural sciences, and, frequently, of Arabic and Persian. Numerous texts of different registers and genres bear witness to that. In almost five centuries of the Ottoman rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a considerable number of the educated local population attempted to write the diwan literature. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the diwan literature was mainly written in the Ottoman Turkish language, and then in Persian and Arabic, since those were the languages of a high culture, that is, of the educated. Some poets wrote in the Bosnian language, meaning that they were poets of the Aljamiado literature. Still, some poets from Bosnia and Herzegovina gained popularity in centres of the Ottoman Empire. The first complete diwan in our area was written by Hasan Ziyai Mostari, in the 16th century. Other poets from Bosnia and Herzegovina are Sabit Bosnevi, Mezaki from Čajniče, Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic, Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak, Osman Shehdi, Fadil Pasha Serifovic, Fevzi Mostari, etc.

Today, due to the change in the sociocultural environment, one can speak of the issue of the perception of the diwan literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which can be observed in two aspects. Namely, not only does one face the difficulty in understanding the foreign and archaic language, but also a special system of symbols, motifs, allusions and reminiscences. Of course, that issue is not only something inherent to the perception of texts of the authors from Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish language, but it can also be observed in a wider context, as an issue of today's perception and understanding of the diwan literature in general. The perception of the classical Ottoman literature is fairly limited in the modern Turkish society as well, since the old poetry had its own distinctive characteristics, familiar only to the reader of the time, and, as the context got lost in time, the game of words and meaning has become incomprehensible to the modern reader.

However, in the Ottoman Empire, the perception of the classical Ottoman literature was conditioned by the approval of a certain literary work at the court of the Ottoman sultan, or, at the princes' courts, mansions of the grand viziers, shaykhs al-Islam, defterdars, pashas and beys (Durmuş 2009: 16). Namely, the relationship between the Ottoman Empire towards art was patrimonial, and many literary works bear witness

to that, for they frequently refer to the poet's desire and striving to present his poetry to a dignitary, who would become his protector, patron. Since the establishment in 1299, the Ottoman Court in all dynasties, such as Seljuk, Karahan, Mamluk, etc., nurtured the tradition of assembling and supporting famous artists and learned men, thus encouraging new creative endeavours. Especially after 1453, when Sultan Mehmed II conquered Constantinople and decided to make the city a cultural capital of the world, many gifted artists had become protégés of the Ottoman Court. It is owing to that patrimonial system of the Ottoman Empire that numerous works in the field of construction, calligraphy, literature, music and science in the broadest sense were created, all of which contributed to the reinforcement of the reputation and the political power of sultans as their patrons.

Halil İnalcık, one of the leading researchers of the Ottoman history, defined in his work *Şair ve Patron* [The Poet and the Patron] the Ottoman Empire as a patrimonial state in which all material goods belonged to the sultan as an absolute ruler, while a layer of rich dignitaries consisted of the people who earned his sympathy. For that reason, the order in the Ottoman Empire was based on the ruler-subject relationship (2003: 10). Yet, on the other hand, the sultan, who was also called "The Shadow of God on Earth", was obliged to be just and to protect his subjects. The western perception of an oriental despot treating his subjects as slaves is wrong, for, the sultan, as a god-fearing believer, was / should have been, in fact, a protector of the people, like a father and a head of the family, just and ethical (Kurz 2012).

Analogous to the absolutist power of the sultan as a statesman, in art, he imposed himself as the ultimate patron, which not only meant financial patronage, but also authority in aesthetically evaluating a work of art. In that sense, the Ottoman sultans dictated the criteria and the taste in poetry and music, which were forms of art they were well acquainted with owing to the classical education they had obtained at the court as princes (İnalcık, 2003: 15). Such an artistic environment and education influenced the Ottoman princes, and, later, sultans, to start writing poetry themselves. The skill of writing poetry was a matter of prestige for the Ottoman rulers, so the majority of them, more or less successfully, left behind vast collections of poetry – *diwans*.

Researching the perception of the classical Ottoman poetry is not possible without an insight into the relationship between a certain poet and the Ottoman court, or other, lower ranking dignitaries and institutions of the Ottoman Empire. The effects of the classical Ottoman literature are mostly seen in the status and awards the poets would acquire both at the centre of the empire and in the Ottoman provinces, for example, Bosnia at the time.

Since certain diwan verses were directly dedicated to potential patrons, in order to analyse them, as well as to shed light on the poet-patron relationship, we will use pragmatics as a theoretical framework, since it is a linguistic discipline analysing the use of language, that is, the relationship between signs and their users. Namely, pragmatics observes language as means of action towards the collocutor, changing thus the extralinguistic reality. In the verses of classical Ottoman literature, one can observe performatives, i.e. speech acts by which the poet is trying to influence the addressee, in this case, most frequently, a dignitary as a potential patron. Their relationship can be observed through the way in which the poet addresses a dignitary, as well as the very position and status of the author. Such speech acts are present in poetic forms, such as qasidas, müzeyyel ghazals, chronograms, kit'as, as well as in introductory and closing sections of the mathnawis, where pleas, complaints, praise, compliments and good wishes are observed. Although the aforementioned poetry is preserved today in the written form of the , it should be emphasised that they used to be recited in the elite circles of the Ottoman society, hence they can be observed as manifestations of a certain communication and analysed from the pragmatic aspect as well.

Pragmatics and Historical Pragmatics

Pragmatics is most frequently defined as a science analysing the language in use, and the first ideas and themes of pragmatics were developed by philosophers and sociologists. The very term *pragmatics* comes from the philosopher Charles Morris (1938), a semiotician who claimed that signs had three types of relations: syntactics, analysing the formal relations among signs; semantics, analysing the relations of signs to designatum; and pragmatics, analysing the relations between signs and their interpreters. Philosophers were the first to observe that language does not only express the truth, that is, information on the extralinguistic reality; rather, the same extralinguistic reality can be changed by language. Hence, John L. Austin, who pioneered the speech act theory, introduced the difference between constatives and performatives. The former concerned the claims on the extralinguistic reality and were subject to truth or falsity, while the latter were utterances by which the status of collocutors and extralinguistic situation is changed, (to utter one of these sentences is not just to say something but rather to perform a certain kind of action) hence they were subject to felicity (happiness) or infelicity (unhappiness). For example, the utterance “I now pronounce you husband and wife” is an obvious example of the performative speech act, for it changes the status of collocutors (who become married). One cannot consider performatives from the true/ false standpoint, for it only establishes a new situation in the extralinguistic reality, but it can be unsuccessful if pronounced by an unauthorised person (in this case, the person needs to be authorised to officiate at a wedding ceremony). According to Austin, every performative, (i.e., a speech act) consists of three aspects (acts) realised simultaneously:

1. locution, the very uttering of a sentence, i.e. utterance,

2. illocution, which is the force of an utterance, i.e. the speaker meaning, and
3. perlocution, which is the effect of the utterance on the collocutor – it is determined by specific circumstances and is not achieved by mere pronouncing of an utterance.

That is why the illocution and the perlocution of the speech act do not necessarily have to overlap; for example, “It is hot in here” can possess the illocutionary force of a request to open the window, while the collocutor will understand it as a claim about the extralinguistic reality and may respond by saying – “Yes, indeed”.

One of the initial difficulties that appeared in the Speech Act Theory concerned establishing a distinction between constatives and performatives. Determination criteria were proved to be unreliable unless utterances contained a performative verb, or unless such a verb could be added to an utterance, for example: “I will come” and “I promise that I will come”. In this case, the verb *promise* is a performative verb, present tense, first person singular. Finally, Austin himself eliminated the differentiation between constatives and performatives by “classifying the constative only as a peculiar case of the performative” (Paternai 2005: 19).

The very classification of performatives (that is, speech acts), that started with Austin, and that was based on the communicational goal, lived to see many changes, depending on the criteria that different authors considered appropriate; still most frequently used is the classification developed by John Searle, the main representative of the academically institutionalised line of interpretation of Austin’s performative theory that has become known as “The Speech Act Theory”. John Searle differentiates five types of speech acts.

1. Representatives, commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, characterised by the following verbs: claim, conclude, deny, confirm, etc. They are similar to Austin’s expositives.

2. Directives, which are an attempt of the speaker to initiate the hearer to perform an action, characterised by verbs such as: ask, beg, command, request, etc. Directives encompass different speech acts, including orders, as well as pleas. They are similar to Austin’s exercitives.

3. Commissives are speech acts whose point is to commit the speaker to perform a certain future action, characterised by verbs such as: promise, swear, oblige, etc. They are similar to Austin's commissives.

4. Expressives are speech acts that express the attitude and emotions of the speaker, characterised by verbs such as: thank, congratulate, apologise, praise, etc. They include a spectre of speech acts, including praise and compliments, as well as criticism. They are similar to Austin's behabitives.

5. Declaratives are speech acts that change the extralinguistic reality, that is, the status of the hearer, characterised by verbs such as: declare (e.g. mobilisation), submit (e.g. a letter of resignation), lay off, christen, etc. They are similar to Austin's verdictives.

As we have already stated, there are several different classifications of speech acts, but one of the most famous to this day has been Searle's improved classification of Austin's speech acts.

Speech acts can also be classified as direct and indirect. Indirect speech acts are characterised by an indirect relationship between the form and the function of the utterance, that is, "between the intended function of the utterance and its literal meaning indicated by the formal linguistic means" (Ivanetić 1995:23). Indirect speech act is one that is performed by means of another, in Searle's words, a speech act X is performed by a speech act Y. In such cases, illocution is expressed indirectly. Three main types of sentences (declarative, interrogative, imperative) are connected to the three main illocutionary forces: declaring, asking and ordering. If there is a direct overlap between the type of the sentence and the illocutionary force, direct speech acts are in question. However, if, for example, the declarative sentence "It is cold in here" is used to ask the collocutor to close the window, then we are talking about an indirect speech act, used instead of the direct speech act "Close the window!". In this case, the form correspondences with the function. Searle claimed that indirect speech acts possess two illocutionary forces: a literal, direct force, and a non-literal, indirect force. He considered them to be a combination of two speech acts, primary and secondary, where the primary acts through the force of the secondary. When indirect speech acts are in question, "the speaker thinks what they say, but even more than that" (Nikolić-Hoyt 1993:193).

Speech acts are also classified as cooperative and non-cooperative, that is, speech acts that help establish closeness and solidarity with the collocutor (for example, compliments and good wishes), as well as face-threatening acts (for example, requests and criticisms).

Cooperative speech acts do not only entail an absolute agreement with the partner, but also all other forms of non-aggressive behaviour aimed at stabilising or maintaining the relationship and achieving a non-conflict state (...) Non-cooperative speech acts, on the other hand, are characterised by both collocutors' insistence on their requests, which are in discordance with the general cooperative communicational goals. That arises due to differences in the attitude towards the object in question, that is, due to the kind of the connection determined by the history of their relationship, roles, permanent of current domination, etc. (Ivanetić 1995: 74)

It has been noted that the latter, the non-cooperative speech acts, are frequently realised as indirect speech acts, for in that way the mitigating effect takes place, preventing a potential conflict with the collocutor, which is one of the ways to introduce the notion of *politeness*, more precisely, a polite usage of language. Here too the context plays the crucial role, since it determines whether or not indirectness will also entail politeness (depending on the relationship between collocutors, and the type of speech act). The notion of *politeness* was initially considered from the point of view of Grice's cooperative principle. As a reminder, Herbert Paul Grice considered that the conversation is to an extent a joint effort, a collection of purposes, or even a commonly acceptable direction. Collocutors follow the principle "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (as cited in Miščević-Potrč 1987: 58). Grice called this the cooperation principle, entailing four maxims:

1. the Quality Maxim ("Make your contribution truthful")
2. the Quantity Maxim ("Make your contribution as informative as is required" and "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required")
3. the Relevance Maxim ("Be relevant")
4. the Manner Maxim ("Be perspicuous").

Robin T. Lakoff and Geoffrey Leech were the first to observe that the aforementioned maxims are frequently violated in communication because of politeness. Robin T. Lakoff added the “politeness rules” to Grice’s cooperative principle, reformulating it to “rules of conversation”. Thus, in her opinion, there are two kinds of pragmatic competence:

1. “Be clear” and
2. “Be polite”.

Geoffrey Leech’s model, together with the model proposed by Stephen Levinson and Penelope Brown, enabled the analysis of politeness (polite usage of language), as well as testing the real language samples. Geoffrey Leech approached pragmatics as rhetoric, going as far as to call it interpersonal rhetoric, and he also distinguished it from textual rhetoric and defined it as an active, effective usage of language in everyday communication. Interpersonal rhetoric consists of (Grice’s) cooperative principle, politeness principle, as well as irony (Leech 1983: 15-16). The aforementioned principles set boundaries to behaviour in communication. Cooperation and politeness as regulatory factors ensure that the conversation stays within the desired boundaries (meaning that the conversation will not become useless and disturbing). The politeness principle regulates “the social balance and friendly relations” (Leech 1982: 82). It is important to mention at this point that Leech differentiates illocutionary and social goals. The essence is that the speaker, notwithstanding his/her desire to gain his/her own conversational goals (illocutionary), needs to consider the social goals that concern politeness. That means that in the implementation of a certain request the speaker needs to attempt to preserve the social balance between him/herself and the collocutor, that is, to prevent offending his/her collocutor. Leech noticed that breaching maxims is a rule rather than an exception and asked for the reason why people are so frequently indirect in conversation and concluded that the cooperative principle cannot explain the issue. That is where the importance of the cooperation principle is fully shown, and Leech explained it through a “banal” example: unless you are polite to your neighbour, you will no longer be able to lend a lawnmower from him (Leech 1983: 82). For Leech, politeness is truly asymmetrical, for that which is polite for the collocutor is impolite for the speaker. That

is why his maxims also express asymmetry. For Leech, the most important is the tact maxim, especially in the anglophone linguistic area. It states:

- a) Minimise cost to other; and
- b) Maximise benefit to other.

Apart from the tact maxim, according to Leech, there are other maxims that concern the politeness principle, and they come in pairs (which indicates that politeness is asymmetrical):

1. the tact maxim: a) minimise cost to other and b) maximise benefit to other;
2. the generosity maxim: a) minimise benefit to self and b) maximise cost to self;
3. the approbation maxim: a) minimise dispraise of other and b) maximise praise of other;
4. the modesty maxim: a) minimise praise of self and b) maximise dispraise of self;
5. the agreement maxim: a) minimise disagreement between self and other and b) maximise agreement between self and other;
6. the sympathy maxim: a) minimise antipathy between self and other and b) maximise sympathy between self and other. (Leech 1983: 132)

The modesty maxim helped Leech to introduce the so-called pragmatic paradox of politeness, where, in an example of a reaction to a compliment, there exists a conflict between the agreement and modesty maxims – during a conversation, a Japanese woman compliments her collocutor's beautiful garden. The other woman refuses the compliment stating that the garden is nothing special. The first collocutor keeps complimenting, while the second keeps rejecting the compliments. Leech concluded that the modesty maxim is stronger and more prominent in the Japanese society (that is why they refuse compliments), than the agreement maxim, which is more present in the western societies (which is why compliments are accepted as a sign of agreement with the collocutor). As has already been stated, the theory proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson is a model that can be tested on real language samples. Their book *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use* is both most cited and most criticised book that deals with linguistic politeness. The authors approach

the linguistic politeness through the notion of *face* introduced by Erving Goffman, an anthropologist and sociologist. Brown and Levinson define *face* as a public self-image that every member of the society wants to claim for himself/herself and it consists of two aspects:

1. positive face, the positive consistent self-image or “personality”, crucially including the desire that the self-image be approved and appreciated, and
2. negative face, the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction (Brown and Levinson 1987: 61).

In principle, people cooperate in interaction in order to save face, and that cooperation is, according to the authors, based on mutual vulnerability of the face. Those two aspects, in the theory proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, are considered the basic needs and desires, and every member of the society knows that other members possess them. That is why they are defined also as a desire of every other member of the society that his/her desires are also those of other members of the society (positive face), that is, as a desire to be undisturbed in one’s activities (negative face).

Certain acts that are realised through verbal or non-verbal communication can by nature be face threatening acts (FTA). That is where one can establish the first distinction between the acts threatening the positive, and acts threatening the negative face. The former entail expressive criticism, disagreement, complaints, accusations, insults, while the latter entail orders, requests, advice. Another distinction would also entail the acts threatening the face of the speaker and the acts threatening the face of the listener. Acts threatening the positive face of the speaker include apologies, admitting mistakes and taking the blame, while acts threatening the negative face of the speaker include expressions of gratitude (the speaker is accepting the debt and humiliates his/her own face), accepting the collocutor’s expressions of gratitude and apology, accepting the collocutor’s offers. The assessment of the seriousness of an FTA involves the following factors in many cultures:

1. the social distance between the collocutors (in symmetrical relations),

2. the balance of power between the collocutors (in asymmetrical relations), and
3. the “weight” of imposition that can vary across cultures (Brown and Levinson 1987: 74).

The aforementioned parameters determine the selection of the appropriate politeness strategy. The choice of the strategy thus depends on whether the collocutors are in a close relationship, or if they are acquaintances or strangers (a horizontal distance), as well on whether they are in a subordinate-superordinate relationship (a vertical distance), and, ultimately, on norms of a certain culture.

As has been previously stated, each rational member of the society will attempt to use certain politeness strategies in order to mitigate threats to the collocutor’s face. As Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson claim, they will act rationally in that case, that is, on the basis of the practical judgment aimed at achieving certain goals in the best possible way. Hence, they will opt for the most appropriate politeness strategies aimed at mitigating the acts that could threaten the collocutor’s face. However, those acts do not necessarily have to be verbal, they can also be implemented through gift giving, or by mere bowing (Brown and Levinson 1987: 91). Depending on the context or the aspect of the threatened face, the collocutor has four different strategies at the disposal:

1. bald on record;
2. positive politeness strategies;
3. negative politeness strategies;
4. off record.

It is important to emphasise that the terms *positive* and *negative* were introduced by the philosopher Émile Durkheim, and that they do not carry the meaning of positive or negative evaluation. Namely, those are the rituals that Durkheim introduced as “positive”, i.e., those that establish the relationship and closeness with the Absolute, and “negative” that represent taboos, forbidden things and indicate respect for and separation from the Absolute (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987: 43). The aforementioned politeness strategies consist of sub-strategies that are implemented by certain linguistic means.

1. Bald on record

This is the strategy that can be marked as the only strategy realised in accordance with Grice's cooperation principle (Brown and Levinson 1987: 94). That is why the speaker will use it every time when efficiency is more important than preserving the face of the listener. Motives of the speaker to use this strategy will depend on the circumstances, that is, on the context.

In the first case, when the face threatening act is not mitigated, for the face will be ignored or considered irrelevant, we are talking about the situations when maximum efficiency is needed, and that is something both the speaker and the listener are aware of. The bald on record strategy is present in cases when there is a considerable focus on a certain task.

The use of this strategy can also indicate the power the speaker has over the listener, so he/she fears no sanctions or non-cooperation of the collocutor. The speaker also may deliberately choose to be impolite, showing that he/she does not care about the collocutor's face. One can reverse the situation: the discourse of power can be recognised through ignoring politeness strategies, that is, through non-mitigating speech acts that threaten the collocutor's face.

The third group consists of cases where bald on record can be marked as polite, for, here, the threat to face is in the collocutor's interest. Those are advice and warnings that express the care for the collocutor, as well as expressions of welcome, farewell, and offering.

2. Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness is repair, corrections, compensation, directed towards the collocutor's positive face, the collocutor's desire to have their attempts, actions, achievements, values, etc., desirable to other members of the society as well. However, positive politeness, unlike negative politeness, does not have to contain a compensation; it is almost identical with the everyday intimate language behaviour. The only difference is that positive politeness contains an element of exaggeration, which is a marker of the face-redress aspect of positive-politeness expression. These strategies can be considered an "accelerator" that eases communication,

making it more pleasant by reducing the distance between collocutors (Brown and Levinson 1987: 101-103), and include the following strategies:

1. *noticing/attending to the addressee's interests, wants, needs, goods, containing compliments;*
2. *intensifying the collocutor's interest*, where stories are told in the present tense, placing the collocutor in the midst of the narration as if he/she is personally present;
3. *using in-group identity markers;*
4. *seeking agreement with the collocutor*, which is realised by choosing "safe topics" or by repeating of what the collocutor utters;
5. *avoiding disagreement;*
6. *presupposing/raising/asserting common ground;*
7. *jokes;*
8. *asserting / presupposing the collocutor's knowledge and concerns for his/her wants;*
9. *offers and promises;*
10. *optimism;*
11. *including the collocutor in the same activity;*
12. *giving or asking for reasons;*
13. *assuming/asserting reciprocity.*

3. Negative Politeness Strategies

Negative politeness is directed towards the collocutor's negative face. Negative face consists of the need of an individual for freedom and undisturbed activity. Negative politeness strategies are used when one wants to achieve social distance, which is opposite of positive politeness strategies, which enable closeness and solidarity between collocutors. Negative politeness is at the core of what is called respect, "good manners", just as positive politeness is at the core of the "familiar" behaviour. When politeness is mentioned in the context of the Western culture, it is negative politeness behaviour that springs to mind; its strategies are conventionalised and described in the etiquette books. They serve to minimize the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects, and include the following strategies:

1. *conventional indirectness* is the outcome of two opposite intentions: the desire to provide space (possibility to refuse) to the collocutor and the desire to go on record;
2. *hedges*, which reduce the strength of an expression (Holmes 1995: 74). That is why Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson also call them “weakeners”;
3. *pessimism*, where one expresses doubt that the conditions for the speaker’s request have been fulfilled;
4. *minimising imposition*;
5. *giving deference*, which consists of two aspects: the speaker praises the collocutor and humbles and abases him/herself;
6. *apologizing*;
7. *impersonalisation*;
8. *stating the FTA as a general rule*;
9. *nominalisation* and
10. *admitting the debt*.

4. Off record (Unconventional Indirectness)

All strategies in this group are implemented indirectly to an extent that it is difficult to describe a clear communicative intention. The speaker is exempted from the responsibility of threatening the collocutor’s face, making the intention non-transparent. It is up to the collocutor to interpret, in his/her own way and by following certain hints, what the speaker is saying, and, since the hints are determined by the form, not the content, they can be addressed to both positive and negative face of the collocutor. Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson categorised the strategies belonging to the aforementioned group in accordance with the violation of a Gricean Maxims.

The first group concerns the strategies that violate the Maxim of Relevance: *giving hints*, *associations* and *presuppositions*.

Litotes (understate), *hyperbolae (overstate)* and *tautology* are strategies used to violate the Quantity Maxim, whereby *litotes* are used to say less, *hyperbolae (overstate)* to say more than is required, and *tautology* is used in situations when the speaker encourages hearer to look for an informative

interpretation of the the non-informative utterance (Brown and Levinson 1987:220).

The use of contradictions is characteristic of violating the Quality Maxim, as well as *irony*, *metaphors* and *rhetorical questions*.

Ambiguity, *vagueness* and *overgeneralisation* (including proverbs) are also strategies used to violate the Manner Maxim.

Nonconventional indirectness also entails *addressing a third person* rather than the very collocutor, as well as *the use of ellipsis*, when the speaker does not finish the utterance, and by leaving an FTA half undone, speaker can leave the implicature “hanging in the air” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 227).

Brown and Levinson’s theory also faced heavy criticism, but, had it not enabled such an explicit and elaborate model of polite language use, it would not have easily become a subject of denial.

Since this book analyses certain speech acts and politeness strategies that mitigate the speech acts in the classical Ottoman poetry, this research is necessarily placed in the framework of historical pragmatics, a relatively new pragmatic discipline that combines the methodology of pragmatics and historical linguistics. The historical dimension is not that much different from other dimensions, such as geographical, social and the like. Historical pragmatics can be divided to *pragmaphilology* and *diachronic pragmatics*. Pragmaphilology focuses on “historical” texts from the pragmatic point of view, paying close attention to the communicational context of texts, describing their contextual aspects which include the sender and the recipient of the message, social and individual relationships, as well as goals of the text, while diachronic pragmatics takes a certain linguistic form as the starting point and analyses its pragmatic function in different time periods, or may also start from a speech function and analyse its different realisations through time, comparing the illocutionary force of certain speech acts (declaring love in the 16th century was completely different as opposed to declaring love in hip hop). In any case, it is logical to presuppose that communication in the earlier time periods can also be described through pragmatic terms, such as speech acts and politeness. Those are always written texts, but they can be observed as manifestations

of a certain communication and analysed as such from the pragmatic aspect. *The speech act theory* has frequently been considered as a starting point of a pragmatic description and as the main methodological means of historical pragmatics. In that sense, the focus here will be the analysis of certain speech acts observed in the Ottoman literature, means of mitigation through language use, as well as the context in which those speech acts appear. That context, *inter alia*, includes the status of the speaker (the poet) and of the collocutor (the interpretative community, the Ottoman elite, potential patrons), their social relations, as well as the concrete situation in which a speech act is implemented. That is why the following chapter will deal with the diwan literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina that was created in a wider context of the Ottoman Empire.

Diwan Literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina

As has already been stated in the Introduction, during almost five hundred years of the Ottoman rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a number of people from this area worked in the institutions of the Ottoman Empire and, at the same time, tried to write the diwan literature. Most writers were kadi and muderris, dervish sheikhs, as well as military personnel, in other words people that rose to high positions after having been educated in madrassahs in the empire's centres, or in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is how Fehim Nametak described the process in his book *Divanska poezija XVI i XVII stoljeća* [Diwan Poetry of the 16th and 17th Century] :

Poets of the diwan poetry that had originated from Bosnia and Herzegovina were in most cases members of the ulama. The majority of them went to Istanbul or other centres of the empire to obtain education, and would study there Persian classical poetry, which had encouraged them to start writing literary works in Turkish, and, sometimes, in Persian or Arabic. (1991: 32)

Employed by the Ottoman Empire, many authors originating from Bosnia and Herzegovina would become protégés of the local patrons, Bosnian beys and pashas, some even of the Ottoman sultans. It is known that a certain number of diwan poets from this area performed highly

important functions in the Ottoman administration and at the court. Their progress was certainly enhanced by the literary endeavour, that is, by verses they would dedicate to their protectors, their patrons. It should be emphasised that the very verses of poets from Bosnia and Herzegovina conditioned their close relationship with the Ottoman officials, as well as certain positions in the institutions of the Ottoman Empire. Numerous examples of poetry bear witness to that, for in those verses, our poets address the dignitaries for help and support, praising their abilities and generosity, referring to their own position, past achievements as well as reiterating the loyalty to both their patrons and the Ottoman state.

Works of the Bosnian authors in the Ottoman Turkish language have been preserved in the manuscripts around the world. Sometimes, those are only fragments of verses, at other times entire collections of poetry – diwans, or even poems in the form of mathnawi that was either love and mystical poetry, or didactic and historical. Also, a considerable body of prose has been preserved. The aforementioned works have been subject of analysis of both Bosnian, Turkish and European researchers. The diwan poets from Bosnia and Herzegovina have been treated in two ways: either collectively, in a chronological order, with a very brief overview of their biographies and works (the approach seen with Bašagić, Handžić, Šabanović, Nametak, etc.), or individually, through comprehensive studies, frequently doctoral dissertations that focus on the literary-historical or linguistic analysis of works of our authors.

In the pragmatic analysis of the literary heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish language, works of authors from 16th, 17th and 18th century have been selected, for they frequently refer to the extralinguistic reality and the relationship with patrons. Also, poets who left behind entire collections of poetry – diwans, or even mathnawis, such is the case with Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic, the author of the *Muradnama*, have also been selected. Thus, this study encompasses the works by Hasan Ziyai Mostari, Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic, Suleiman Mezaki, Sabit Bosnevi, Osman Shehdi and Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak. Some of these poets were born in Mostar and Čajniče, towns that still exist in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while others originated from Užice and Bijelo Polje,

then the territory of the Bosnia Eyalet, an Ottoman province from 1580 to 1908. As the westernmost Ottoman province, it encompassed large parts of today's Croatia and Montenegro, as well as Serbia. Undisputedly, the work of the aforementioned poets, regardless of their origin, is cultural heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and they all left an indelible trace in the country's history. Suffice to mention Sabit Bosnevi who worked in Sarajevo as a kadi, assembling a circle of dignitaries, and Osman Shehdi, originally from Bijelo Polje, who formed his own library in Sarajevo.

These poets have already been subject to several analyses. Some of their diwans have been published in the Latin alphabet in the Republic of Turkey, and some have been analysed as part of doctoral dissertations and master's thesis. In the pragmatic analysis of the literary heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish language, we find it necessary to reflect upon their lives and social status, as well as their relationship with both the institutions of the Ottoman Empire and the potential protectors or patrons.

Hasan Ziyai Mostari

Hasan Ziyai Mostari is considered to be the earliest diwan poet in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the author of the entire collection of poetry (diwan) in the Ottoman Turkish language. He is known under the pseudonym (Turkish: *makhlās*) Ziyā'ī, although he himself stated at the end of his *Diwan* that his real name was Ziyai the son of Ali the son of Husein the son of Mahmud the son of Jusuf from Herzegovina, while the transcriber of his second work entitled *Kıssa-ı Şeyh Abdürrezzāk* [The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak] writes that his real name was Hasan Çelebi the son of Ali from Mostar. The available sources do not offer evidence in support of the exact date of his birth, but, on the basis of the biography collections and the transcribers' notes, we know that he died of plague in Mostar, in the Hijri year 922 (1584 CE). The information of the Hasan Ziyai Mostari's life proceed mostly from his own texts, the originals of which are kept in libraries in Edirne, Istanbul, London, Mostar, Sarajevo, Travnik, Zagreb and Belgrade. The manuscripts reveal that Ziyai authored four works: *The Diwan* (the only

copy is preserved at the Selimiye Library); narrative poems *Kıssa-i Şeyh Abdürrezzāk* [The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak], written in the mathnawi form and preserved in four manuscript copies (two in Istanbul, one in London and one in Zagreb); didactic poetry *Kenzü'l Esrār* [The Treasure Chest of Secrets], and *The Commentary to the Qasida of the Persian Poet Sa'dī* in the Ottoman Turkish language. Ziyai's manuscripts include transcriptions of three classical works: *Sunbulistan* [The Hyacinth Garden] by the Persian classical poet Shuja'uddin Gurani; a commentary to the work *Mashariq al-anwar an-nabavijjah min sahāhal-ahbār al-mustafavijjah* [A Collection of the Trustworthy Hadiths] by Abdullatif bin Abdulaziz, also known as Ibn al-Malak, as well as the commentary to *Gulistan* by Sürūrī.

Poetical forms such as the qasida, ghazal, kit'a, that dominate in Hasan Ziyai's *Diwan*, do not directly treat the life's reality, but neither are they completely free from referring to the poet's life. The qasida in particular, as the poetic form used to adulate to a prominent person, contains the names of dignitaries the poet addresses. These concrete names reveal not only with whom of the dignitaries the poet was in contact, but also in which 16th century social circles he was moving. Out of 11 qasidas written by Hasan Ziyai, four were dedicated to Hasan Bey, that is, Hasan Pasha, two to Mehmed Bey, and one each to Mustafa Bey, Osman Bey and Sinan Bey. Since those were, in the majority of cases, Bosnian regents, that is, persons from Bosnia, one can speak of the local influence and the affirmation of Hasan Ziyai as a poet.

Mehmed Bey, whose pseudonym was Vusūlī, and to whom Hasan Ziyai dedicated *Kıssa-i Şeyh Abdürrezzāk* [The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak], was Mehmed, the son of Abdi Agha from Skopje, who died in 1596CE/998AH. It is known that Mehmed Bey Vusūlī was a kadi in Konya, Kütahya and Istanbul, and that he later became a kazasker. However, alongside all those duties, he was also a poet. He wrote *Selim-name*, a work dedicated to Selim II. Such a profile of Mehmed Bey Vusūlī from Skopje is in complete congruence to the praise Ziyai addresses to his patron, dignitary and poet to whom he also dedicated *The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak*.

The education and mystical orientation of Hasan Ziyai can be determined from the very character of his works, as it is obvious that he

was possessed of literary education and a mature poetical expression in the Ottoman Turkish language. The fact that he transcribed the *Subulistan* and the commentary to *Gulistan*, and that he personally wrote a qasida in his *Diwan*, together with 14 ghazals and one kit'a, as well as certain bayts in *The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak* in Persian, indicate that he was fluent in the language to the extent that enables him to found his individual poetic expression. Although he did not write poetry in Arabic, transcribing the works belonging to the Islamic tradition, as well as frequent citing of the Qur'an and hadiths in verses, strongly indicate the poet's classical Islamic education, as could be found in the Ottoman madrassahs. Still, apart from Hifzija Hasandedić's opinion that Ziyai was a muderris in Karagoz Bey's madrassah in Mostar, there are no available data on if and where he had graduated from a madrassah.

Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic

Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic's origins are tied to Mostar, more precisely, to the Podhum mahala. According to the available data, in his early youth, during the reign of Sultan Selim II (1566-1574), he went to Istanbul to pursue education at the court in Ibrahim Pasha's saray. When Sultan Murat III (1574-1595) came to the throne, he was transferred to Enderun, to the inner chambers of the court, with imperial falconers (Kadrić 2008: 41).

Even in his early youth, Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic showed interest for belles-lettres, obviously influenced by his teacher, Ahmed Sudi from Čajniče, a well-known commentator of Sufi works. Around 1582, Bajezidagic wrote a poetic work entitled *Zübdetü-l Eş'ār*, where he demonstrated his skill of writing in Persian. This work attracted the attention of Sultan Murat III, an admirer of the classical Persian poetry, and he entrusted the translation of *Sehānāme* from Persian to Bajezidagic. Upon the completion of writing, Sultan Murat III became a patron and a protector of Bajezidagic, whose reputation grew in the imperial entourage. Prior to 1591, the Sultan promoted Bajezidagic to the position of the main imperial falconer (doğancıbaşı) and his personal advisor (muşāhib-i ḥāss), which are positions he would perform until the death of the sultan. Bajezidagic remained close to the

imperial court during the reign of Sultan Mehmed III, and he participated in the conquest of Egerin 1596, while, in February 1599, he was appointed the beylerbey of Bosnia. He performed the duty until 1600, during the conquest of Kaniže (Kanizsai). After that, he remained for a while in his native Mostar, only to again assume the position of the beylerbey of Bosnia in 1602. He participated in many battles while a beylerbey, including the Battle of Csepel (Kovin Adası) at the Margaret Island (today's Hungary), where he died on 14 July 1603 (Kadrić 2008: 42-47).

Although Bajezidagic's ghazals, chronograms, rubaiyats and mufrads are contained in many manuscripts, to this day a collection of his poems – the diwan – has not been found. Still, three of his works have been preserved to this day: *Murādnāma*, *Dervīš Paša İnşası* and *Zübdetü-l Eş'ār*. Particularly significant is work *Murādnāma*, a mathnawi he wrote at the demand of Sultan Murat III by assuming the classical story from *Sehānāma* by the Persian author Bina'i. In that work, Bajezidagic reflects upon his own life and support provided by Sultan Murat III. The relationship between the protégé and the patron can be clearly seen in the introduction, as well as from the author's biography, which reads that Bajezidagic was given senior positions at the court as a reward for his work. Owing to his reputation and position at the court, Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic became a waqif, and left important endowments in his birthplace, Mostar. One of them was a mosque he had primarily had built as a masjid in 1591/92, in the Podhum mahala, as well as a library in Mostar which contains items that show Bajezidagic's sophisticated understanding of the Sufi literature at the time. This is also supported by the fact that he had paid the muderris of his waqif the amount of ten dirhams to interpret Rumi's *Mathnawi*.

Suleiman Mezaki

The real name of poet Mezaki was Suleiman, mentioned also as Dervish Suleiman and Suleiman Dede. He was born in Čajniče in the early 17th century. How exactly he came to Istanbul and entered service at the court is unknown, but sources confirm that he was a sipahi and secretary to several pashas. He frequently accompanied the Mevlevi sheikhs, Arzi

Dede and Ahmed Dede, as well as prominent 17th century poets such as Vecdî, Fehîm-i Kadîm and Neşâtî. Mezaki himself belonged to a Mevlevî tariqa, and was buried in the harem of the Mevlevî tekke at Galata, Istanbul (Mermer 1991: 19-24).

Mezaki left a complete diwan of poetry, edited and transcribed to the Latin alphabet by Ahmet Mermer in Ankara, in 1991. The *Diwan* contains 29 qasidas, na't being the first, dedicated to the Prophet Muhammad PBUH, while six qasidas he dedicated to Sultan Murat IV, and seven to Sultan Mehmet IV. He dedicated other qasidas to high state dignitaries, such as: Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha, Kaymakam Mustafa Pasha, Köprülü Mehmed Pasha, Deli Hüseyin Pasha, Yusuf Pasha and Mahmud Pasha. Ghazals follow the qasidas, and they are the most frequent genre in Mezaki's *Diwan* – 441 can be found. He also wrote nine chronograms, one in the ghazal form. Other forms of the diwan literature are not really present in Mezaki's *Diwan*, so we can find only 12 mufrads (individual bayts – verses), one kit'a, one rubaiyat and one museddes.

Regarding the perception of Mezaki's work, the extent to which he was appreciated among his contemporaries and poets of the later period can be observed clearly in the naziras on his poetry. The authors who wrote naziras after his poems were many, including: Vecdî, Neşâtî, Rüşdî, as well as Arif Hikmet, a Bosnian writer, and a 19th century poet Namık Kemal. Sabit and Sâni'î wrote three takhmis poems in accordance with Mezaki's ghazals. All this confirms that poetry was held in high regard and that other poets were inspired to emulate Mezaki's literary expression.

As far as poets who influenced Mezaki are concerned, Persian classical poets to whom he frequently referred in his verses are: Câmî, Enverî, Hâfız-ı Şîrâzî, Hâkânî, Muhteşem, Urfî, Selmân-ı Sâvecî, Tâlib and Vassâf. Frequent mentioning of these poets shows that Mezaki was familiar with the Persian literature and its classics. On the other hand, Ahmed Mermer, who wrote his doctoral dissertation about Mezaki's work, says that the poet would find role models in the 16th and 17th century Ottoman poets Baki and Nefî.

Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi

Also known as Bosnalı Alaeddin Sabit, Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi, a diwan poet, was born in 1650 in Užice, then the territory of Bosnia Eyalet. His literary opus has attracted the attention of many researchers, in Europe and Turkey alike. In the European research of Sabit Bosnevi's work, we should mention Jan Rypka, E.J.W. Gibb, as well as Bosnian oriental philologists Safet Bey Bašagić, Alija Bejtić, Mehmed Handžić, Ešref Kovačević, Hazim Šabanović and Fehim Nametak. Interest in the analysis of Sabit's literary opus continues to this day, which can be exemplified by Adnan Kadrić's doctoral dissertation entitled "Linguo-Stylistic Analysis of Sabit Alaudin Bošnjak's Poetry", which he defended in 2006.

Concerning the Turkish research of Bosnevi's work, we should in the first place mention Turgut Karacan's dissertation, published in Sivas in 1991, entitled *Bosnalı Alaeddin Sabit – Divan*. Reviews about this Bosnian poet and his work can be found in all valid histories of Turkish literature, as well as in the diwan poetry anthologies. Many scientific papers and analyses of Turkish researchers define the use of the expressions and proverbs from the colloquial and everyday language, together with the local themes, as the fundamental features of Sabit Bosnevi's poetry. That is why he is considered one of the most prominent representatives of the "mahallîleşme" process, that is, the trend of introducing the local elements into the 17th and 18th century diwan poetry.

Sabit Bosnevi left a rather comprehensive opus, that consists of the *Diwan* and several narrative poems in the mathnawi form. His narrative poems include:

- 1) *Zafername (Ode to Victory)*, Sabit wrote for the Crimean han Selim Giray, who was invited by Sultan Suleiman II to an expedition against Austria;
- 2) *Edhem ü Hüma*, an unfinished love mathnawi;
- 3) *Derename*, a grotesque mathnawi;
- 4) *Berbername*, a satirical short mathnawi containing 93 couplets, and
- 5) *Amrîi'-Leys*, a poem containing 43 couplets about the eponymous sultan assembling an army for an expedition.

Sabit Bosnevi is also the author of the commentary and the translation of the hadith entitled *Terceme-i Erbe'in Hadīs*.

His *Diwan* was written in accordance with the classical ottoman collections of poetry. It starts with the mi'rajiyya, followed by two naat poems, 36 qasidas dedicated to dignitaries of the time, that is, to the statesmen and dignitaries such as viziers Halil Pasha, Ibrahim Pasha, Hasan Pasha, etc. There are also three more poems in the form of the qasida, entitled *Abdū'l-kādir el Geylānī*, *Hazret-i Mevlevī* and *Şikārī-ikadī*, making the total of 39 qasidas. Poems that follow are six müzeyyel ghazals (for an occasion), three takhmis, 44 chronograms, 355 ghazals, 2 terci'-i bends, 45 kit'as, 24 rubayiats, 182 mufrads and five lugaz poems (Karacan 1991: 45-47).

It is known that Sabit Bosnevi had obtained primary education in his hometown under the esteemed professor Halil Effendi, before setting off to Istanbul to pursue further education. There he gained sympathy of the navy commander – Mehmed Pasha – who intervened on behalf of Bosnevi with shaykh al-Islam thus securing him internship. He later advanced, becoming a muderris, earning 40 akçes a day. We learn from the poem dedicated to Selim Giray that he worked for a while as an intern in Edirne and that the aforementioned ruler promoted him to kadi in Caffa (Feodosia) in Crimea. Sabit would perform this duty later as well, in different intervals and regions, such as Ioannina (Greece), Thrace and Sarajevo. His last service was a Mevlevi Sheikh in Diyarbakır only to be dismissed from the position in 1709. He then returned to Istanbul. The following three years, until his death in 1712, he was unemployed and without a position (Nametak 1991: 77-81).

Osman Shehdi

Osman Shehdi is known as the father of poet Ahmed Hatem and the owner of the library in Sarajevo. It is assumed that he was born in 1680s in Jenişeher Fener or, according to some sources, in Bijelo Polje (Bayındır 2008: 4-5). He was an official at the Ottoman Court, occupying different positions, including the secretary and the steward (*kethüda*) to Umni Mehmed Bey, who was sent to the diplomatic mission in Russia during

the reign of Mahmud I. Somewhat later, in 1757, during the reign of Abdul Hamid I, Shehdi was appointed Ambassador to Russia. Also, he was an official in charge of finance (defterdar) and a scribe in the janissaries. He died in 1769.

Osman Shehdi authored two works: the *Diwan* in the Ottoman Turkish language and the *Sefâretnâme* that was written during his stay in Sankt Petersburg as an envoy of Mustafa III with Empress Elizabeth Petrovna. Although this work is a unique example of the 18th century Ottoman travel literature, here we will focus on the poet's poetical opus contained in the *Diwan*, the only copy of which can be found in the Suleymaniye Mosque Library in Istanbul. His *Diwan* was the topic of Şeyda Bayındır's master's thesis, who provided the transcription of the entire work in the Latin alphabet. The way in which the *Diwan* was written, i.e. the order and the presence of certain genres is also interesting. It starts with two *terkib-i bends* (compounded stanzas), and continues with *qasidas* that are interrupted by poems in the form of the *mathnawi* and *kit'a*, only to again include *qasidas* and, at the end, *ghazals*. Such an order of genres also indicates that the author did not write his *Diwan* in the traditional manner – at least, that was not the case with the sample which was transcribed. On the other hand, the number of poetical forms also attracts the attention: 39 *qasidas*, 68 *kit'as*, 29 *ghazals*, 20 *mathnawis*, 2 *terkib-i bend* forms and 1 *terci-i bend* (repeated verse), for this indicates that lyricism did not dominate in Shehdi's poetical orientation. That is also confirmed by the dominant genres, i.e. *qasidas*, including *chronograms* (*tarihs*) celebrating the birth of the Ottoman princes, accessions to the throne, deaths of dignitaries, military campaigns, construction and reconstruction of important objects, etc. As such, the poems could not have contained lyricism but were rather chronicles. In that sense, titles of certain *qasidas* are indicative, for they frequently resemble paragraphs of prose that describe the content of the *qasida* that follows. The long titles are also present in his *chronograms*, sometimes exceeding five or six lines. The 67 *chronograms* were mostly written in the form of the *kit'a* and the *qasida*, and they show the author's need to record the events in the society of the time, as well as in his own immediate environment.

Such poems, written for an occasion and as chronicles, indicate that Osman Shehdi also adopted the trend of the 18th century Ottoman poetry, known as *mahallîleşme*, when the poets paid attention to the local themes. In his poems, especially in chronograms, the poet recorded the construction of many mosques, fountains (çeşme), madrassahs and libraries in Istanbul, as well as in other parts of the Ottoman Empire. He also described victories, military expeditions and conquests of fortresses in a very wide geographical area, from Timisoara and Belgrade in the west, to Tabriz in the east. When Shehdi speaks of that area, he mentions many locations in the Ottoman Empire, as well as the current European and other states with which the Ottoman Empire had a very dynamic relationship. Also, his chronograms concern different events during the rule of the Ottoman sultans Ahmed II (1691-1695), Mustafa II (1695-1703), Ahmed III (1703-1730), Mahmud I (1730-1754), Osman III (1754-1757). There is also a chronogram on the occasion of birth of Sultan Abdul Hamid I (1774-1789), the son of Ahmed III, whose ascension to the throne Osman Shehdi did not live to see. Still, the majority of his poetry concerns the *tulip age*, i.e. the rule of Sultan Ahmed III and his Grand Vizier Damat Ibrahim Pasha.

If one wishes to make a more precise description of Shehdi's chronograms, the following eight categories apply:

- 1) *Chronograms of death*, which include: two chronograms on the occasion of the passing of Darvish Abdulgani, as well as the famous sultana Haseki and Veli Effendi; chronogram on the occasion of death of Tavkli Effendi, Salih Effendi, who was the chief trustee for kharaj, a chronogram of death for Shehdi's son, Nigahizade Ahmed Çelebi (Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak), a chronogram of death for Serkilari Ali Agha, as well as for Ahmed Dede who was a mesnevihan (reader, instructor) of the Yeni Kapı tekke in Istanbul, and a chronogram of death for El-Hac Ibrahim Effendi.
- 2) *Chronograms of birth*, which include: the chronogram of birth of Mehmed Esed, the son of Ibrahim Effendi, the son of shaykh al-Islam Fejzullah Effendi; chronogram of birth of Sultan Abdul Hamid, as well as of Sultan Numan; a chronogram of birth of prince Sultan Muhammad, prince Sultan Isa; a chronogram of birth of Sultan Murad and a chronogram of birth of prince Abdulmalik.

- 3) *Chronograms of reconstruction*, which include: a chronogram on the reparation of Sultan Eyyub's turbe (tomb), as ordered by Sultan Ahmed III; a chronogram of the restoration of the Sultan Suleiman's Mosque in Belgrade, as ordered by Sultan Ahmed III; a chronogram of the reconstruction of the residence at the Eyyub dock, which was financed by Çorlulu Ali Pasha during the reign of Sultan Ahmed III; a chronogram on the reconstruction of roads during the reign of Ahmed III; a chronogram of the reconstruction of a mosque in Damascus, affected by the earthquake, which was financed by Baltacı Mehmed Pasha; a chronogram to the reconstruction of the Huneyn Mosque during the reign of Sultan Ahmed III.
- 4) *Chronograms of construction*, which include: a chronogram of the construction of the minaret on the Sultan Eyyub Mosque, ordered by Sultan Ahmed III; a chronogram of the construction of a fountain by Sultan Mustafa II; a chronogram on the construction of the Hagia Sophia atrium during the reign of Ahmed III; a chronogram of the construction of the Cirit square, ordered by Sultan Ahmed III; a chronogram of the construction of a castle by Ahmed III; a chronogram of the construction of a small castle by the sea during the reign of Ahmed III; a chronogram of the construction a mosque, financed by Çorlulu Ali Pasha during the reign of Ahmed III; a chronogram on the construction of a fountain by Çorlulu Ali Pasha; a chronogram on the construction of the fountain at the Galata neighbourhood by sultana Gülnuş, mother of Ahmed III; a chronogram of the construction of the castle by Ismail Effendi, next to the Ebu Eyyub el Ensari's tomb; a chronogram of the construction of a tomb, a sebil (fountain) and a library erected by Ibrahim Pasha; a chronogram of the construction of a fountain by haji Mustafa; a chronogram of the construction of a fountain by Ali Pasha; a chronogram of a mosque erected by Ibrahim Pasha.
- 5) *Chronograms of ascensions to the throne and assuming the duty*, which include: a chronogram of naming Selim Giray the han of Crimea; a chronogram on ascension to the throne of Mustafa II; a chronogram on the occasion of the promotion of Seyyid Fetullag, the elder son of shahid shaykh al-Islam Fejzullah Effendi, while serving as a *nakîbü'l-eşrâf* during the reign of Mustafa II; a chronogram on

the occasion of naming the second son of shaykh al-Islam Fejzullah Effendi to the position of the kazasker of Anatolia; a chronogram of naming Khalil Pasha a Vali of Egypt; a chronogram on the occasion of naming Ali Pasha a vizier; a chronogram on naming Abdi Effendi a foreign affairs minister (re'isülküttāb); a chronogram on naming haji Imad Pasha a *kethüda*; a chronogram on the occasion of naming Mahmud Effendi a kazasker of Rumelia; a chronogram on naming Ali Effendi a shaykh al-Islam; a chronogram on naming Ibrahim Pasha a vizier.

- 6) *Chronograms on weddings* – only one chronogram falls into this category, dedicated to the wedding of Çorlulu Ali Pasha.
- 7) *Chronograms on conquests*, which include three chronograms: a chronogram on the conquest of the Revan fortress during the reign of Ahmed II; a chronogram on the conquest of the Tebir fortress during the reign of Ahmed II; and a chronogram on the conquest of the town of Konitsa (Κόνιτσα).
- 8) *Chronograms on the weapons of war*, which include two chronograms: a chronogram on the imperial cannon, commanded by Çorlulu Ali Pasha during the reign of Ahmed III; and a chronogram on the imperial cannon during the reign of Ahmed III.

Osman Shehdi's chronograms written in the form of the qasida include, as has already been stated, a chronogram on a fountain erected by sultana Gülnuş. The full title reads: "To the sweet water fountain erected in front of the honourable mosque at the Galata by sultana Gülnuş, mother of the late Sultan Mustafa and Sultan Ahmed III" (Merhūm Sultān Mustafā ve Sultān Aḥmed-i Sālisiñ Vālideleri 'Gülenveç' Sultān Merhūmun Ġalatada Biña Eyledigi Cāmi'-i Şerīf Hāricinde İcrā Eyledigi Āb-ı Hoş-güvār-ı Çeşme-şāra Me'mūren Didüğimiz Tāriḥdir). Shehdi's chronograms are expressly local in nature and refer not only to the locations in Istanbul, but also to other parts of the empire. Such is the chronogram on the restoration of a mosque in Belgrade: "This chronogram to a mosque was written when this poor soul, the defterder of Timisoara, received the request to write a chronogram to the esteemed mosque of mimar Halil, once that vizier, who is second to none, became the protector of Belgrade, and once the damaged honourable mosque, the endowment of the late Suleiman the ghazi at a

high fortress, was reconstructed and expanded in accordance to the decree issued to the aforementioned vizier by Ahmed Han III, the famous ruler of the global empire” (‘Bu Āṣaf-ı Bī-naẓīr Belğrād’a Muḥafız Olduğda Qal’a-i Bālāda Vaqı’ Olan Cami’-i Şerīf-i Engürūs Merhūm Sultān Süleymān Ġāziniñ Eser-i Ḥayrātı Olup Murūr-ı Eyyāmıyla Ḥarābe Olmağla Ḥālā Erīke-i Saltanat-ı Cihān- bānı Padişāh-ı Rūy-ı Zemīn Sultān Aḥmed Ḥān-ı Sālīs-i Vāla Şānı Olup Ol Cāmi’i Tesvī’ Vü Müceddiden Nigāşte Vezīr-i Müşārun İleyhi Me’mūr Müceddiden Ma’mūr Eylediklerinde Bu Faḳīr Temeşvār Defterdārı Bulunmağla Me’ktüb-ı Emr-i Üslūbları Vürüduyla Binā-kerde-i Ḥalīl Olan Cami’-i Celīl İçün Tārīḥ Talep İtmeleriyle Cümlei Cāmi’ Olmak Üzre Bu Tārīḥ İnşād u İrsāl Olunmuşdu).

Such long titles of chronograms are a distinctive characteristic of Osman Shehdi’s chronicles, the length of which often reaches the length of the qasida – up to 30 couplets.

Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak

Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak (Akovalızāde) is an 18th century poet who left behind a complete *Diwan* in the Ottoman Turkish language, including about 30 poems in Arabic and Persian. Ahmed Hatem also wrote several commentaries, and one moral-didactic poem in Arabic together with a commentary, as well as a commentary to the *Tuhfe-i Şāhidī* dictionary, a commentary to the *Elfāz-ı Küfr* risala (epistle) by Bedrī Rāşīd, a commentary to the *Mültekā*, as well as a work in the field of mathematics, entitled *Şerhü’l-lem’a*. A truly comprehensible and versatile in terms of the genre, the *Diwan* was written in a semantically and syntactically complex manner, while, stylistically, it is rather difficult to understand for it contains characteristics of Indian literary style.

As inferred from the poet’s name, he was born in Akova (Bijelo Polje), the son of Osman Shehdi, also a poet and official at the Ottoman court. He was highly educated and familiar with the Oriental languages, as can be seen in his *Diwan*. Beside languages and literature, this poet, through the education obtained in Istanbul and other centres of the Ottoman Empire, gained enviable knowledge of theology and Sufism as well. A prolific

scholar, he performed important duties, primarily that of a kadi in several cities of the Ottoman Empire. He died in 1754 in Larissa, present-day Greece, during his last diplomatic mission. His father, Osman Shehdi, wrote a tarih (chronogram) about the event, from which we can conclude that Ahmed Hatem was a distinguished and established poet, which is a claim also supported by other literary-historical sources of the time.

Hatem's poetic opus has been a subject of recent research in the Republic of Turkey as his *Diwan* was analysed and transcribed in Mehmed Celal Varışoğlu's master's thesis. In our region, there have been several research endeavours that concern Hatem's poetry, more notably, Sabaheta Gaćanin's doctoral dissertation which concerns poetry in the Persian language, and Mirza Sarajkić's master's thesis on Hatem's ghazals in the Arabic language. Although a dominant poet by scope and complexity, Hatem's literary opus in the Ottoman Turkish language is yet to be thoroughly researched in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak's poetical opus in the Ottoman Turkish language is mostly witnessed by his *Diwan*, a collection of poems written in accordance with the traditional practice in the classical Ottoman literature. Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak's *Diwan* is preserved in the Ottoman Turkish language in nine manuscripts, as well as in a print copy dating back to 1867. The *Diwan* itself is arranged so as to contain certain poetic forms categorised in accordance with clearly defined criteria. Thus, at the very beginning we find 16 qasidas, 44 chronograms, 127 ghazals, one mustazat (a poetic form containing four to five stanzas), three poems in form of *şarki*, two muhammes poems (a five-line poem in which a second poet closed the poem by writing three lines that imitated the style of the opening couplet, written by the first poet) and 22 independent bayts (mufreds).

Among the qasidas that were mainly written in the classical manner (the first one in the naat form, the following six dedicated to Sultan Mahmud I, five to Silahdar Ali Agha and one each to Said Bey, Muhammed Ishak and Baltacı Mehmet Pasha), the last one stands out, dedicated to the modus, that is, to the makam in the classical Ottoman music. That qasida contains numerous music terms and bears witness to the author's knowledge of the classical music, which was a frequent topic of his poetry, written in

other forms as well. As far as length is concerned, that is, the number of couplets, Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak's qasidas differ significantly, varying from a very long na't that contains 139 bayts, to the qasida entitled *The Legend of Silahdar Agha* (Der-Menkıbet-i Silāhdār 'Ali Ağa) containing only 13 couplets.

In the *Diwan*, 44 chronograms follow the qasidas. A number of chronograms in Ahmed Hatem's opus can be described as being the result of a general trend in the 18th century diwan literature, which concerned local values and events that were referred to through poetry. *A Chronogram to a Beautiful Tekke in Yeni Şehir* (Tārīḥ-i Tekye-i Dil-keş Der-Yeñişehir), *A Chronogram to the Construction of Ahmed Pasha's Court* (Tārīḥ-i Oṭa Der-Sarāy-ı Hazret-i Aḥmed Paşa), *A Chronogram to the Birth of Ahmed Said* (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet-i Aḥmed Sa'id), *A Chronogram to the Birth of Hayreddin-bey* (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet-i Ḥayreddīn Beg), *A Chronogram of Birth* (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet), dedicated to the birth of his daughter Fatima, *A Chronogram of Birth*, dedicated to the birth of Hatice (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet). Those are followed by chronograms on the construction of fountains; number 7 is dedicated to the fountain built by Mustafa Agha (Tārīḥ-i Çeşme), while number 8 is dedicated to the construction of Ahmed Aghazade Ibrahim's fountain (Tārīḥ-i Çeşme), while chronogram number 9, entitled *A Chronogram to the Construction of Abdullah Pasha's Fountain in Turhal* (Tārīḥ-i Çeşme Berā-yı Muḥsin-zāde 'Abdullah Paşa Der-Ṭurḥal), indicates both the person who left the legacy and the location of the fountain. Chronogram number 10 is dedicated to the fountain erected by a certain Muhammed (Tārīḥ-i Çeşme), while number 11 is about the fountain of Ali Pasha (Tārīḥ-i Çeşme-i 'Ali Paşa). Chronogram number 12 is about the death of Kuyucu-zāde Muḥammed Çelebi (Tārīḥ-i Berā-yı Kuyucu-zāde Muḥammed Çelebi), as well as the following seven chronograms, all dedicated to the deceased persons: Zuleykha, (Tārīḥ-i Vefāt-ı Züleyḥa Kadın), Şeyḥ-zāde Ḥüseyin Efendi (Tārīḥ-i Berā-yı Şeyḥ-zāde Ḥüseyin Efendi), Aisha (Tārīḥ-i Berā-yı Kerīme-i Müftü Efendi), Muhammed Effendi (Tārīḥ-i Vefāt-ı Dāmāt Efendi), haji Molla, the son of Muhjudin Effendi (Tārīḥ-i Vefāt-ı Ḥācī Mollā bin Muḥyiddin Efendi), Emina, the daughter of Ahmed Pasha (Tārīḥ-i Vefāt), as well as Emin Agha (Tārīḥ-i Berā-yı Emīn Ağa). The

following two chronograms are dedicated to the construction of objects – number 21 to the construction of haji Muhammed's fountain (Tārīḥ-i Çeşme), and number 22 to the construction of a castle of an unnamed owner (Tārīḥ-i Kaşr). What follows is a chronogram of the birth of Seyid Ismail (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet) and a chronogram of opening a shop (Tārīḥ-i Dükkān), and again a chronogram of birth of Ali Begzad Muhammed Bey (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet). After the chronogram of death of Seyid Omer Agha (Tārīḥ-i Vefāt) comes a chronogram of the birth of Hatice (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet), as well as a chronogram of birth of Sharif Osman (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet). Chronograms of birth and death follow in succession, so the chronogram number 29 is dedicated to the death of haji Bekir Agha (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet), number 30 to the birth of Said Muhammed (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet Sa'īd Muḥammed), while number 31 is a chronogram of death of Sheik Muḥjiddin Effendi (Vefāt-i Tārīḥ-i Muḥyiddin Efendi). The following chronogram is dedicated to Ḥācī-zāde Ḥācī Maḥmūd Efendi (Tārīḥ-i Oṭa-i Ḥācī-zāde Ḥācī Maḥmūd Efendi), while the chronogram number 33 is dedicated to the birth of Said Effendi (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet-i Sa'īd Efendi). Chronogram number 34 concerns the construction of a library (Tārīḥ-i Binā-yı Kütüb- hāne-i Dāmād Efendi). Chronogram number 35 was written on the occasion of the construction of a minbar, a minaret and a masḥid in a street (Tārīḥ-i Mināre vü Minber ü Mescid-i Maḥalle), while the following chronograms were dedicated to births: number 36 to the birth of Hatice (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet), number 37 to the birth of Mustafa, the son of haji Husain (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet), and number 39 to the birth of his own son, Yahya (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet). Chronogram number 39 is a marsiya (an elegy, commemorative poem) on the occasion of death of Nimetullah, the daughter of mullah Yenişehir (Mersiye-i Kerīme-i Mollā-yı Yenişehir). The following, chronogram number 40, is dedicated to a mosque built by haji Bekir Agha and haji Selim Agha in Bulgaria (Tārīḥ-i Cāmi'), and chronogram 41 concerns the completion of the construction of a ship (Tārīḥ-i Kalyon). These are followed by chronograms of birth: Seyid Halil (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet), Baltaacı Aḥmed Agha (Tārīḥ-i Berā-yı Oṭa Baltaacı Aḥmed Ağa Der-Yenişehir) and a chronogram of birth of an unnamed person (Tārīḥ-i Vilādet).

These chronograms are followed by 107 ghazals. The majority of Hatem's ghazals, in accordance with the usual content of this form, talk about love, a loved one, and of a love potion. However, certain ghazals that contain reflections on certain social topics and the situation in poetry are especially interesting. The makhlas bayt forms are especially indicative as far as Hatem's poetics is concerned, as well as the situation in the 18th century Ottoman poetry.

Poetic Forms of Diwan Literature

In the pragmatic analysis of the literary heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish language, we focused on poetic forms (genres) that entirely or in certain sections reflect the relationship between the poet and his patron. Namely, the introductory and final parts of the mathnawis, the *fahriye* (praise poetry) and the *methiye* in qasidas, the *makhlas* (the pen name of the poet) bayts in ghazals, certain kit'as and chronograms, which contain verses through which poets reflect to their own poetic expression and the position in the Ottoman society, an interactive relationship with a real or a potential patron, and also refer to the extralinguistic reality. Prior to the analysis of such verses, it is necessary to explain some characteristics of the content of the aforementioned poetic forms within the Ottoman literary tradition.

Qasida

The qasida can be traced back to the pre-Islamic Arabic poetry. It reached the Ottoman literature through Persia. The very name of this poetic form in Arabic means "that which is the goal, which leads to a goal". In other words, a certain goal defines the content of the qasida, or, as Fehim Nametak says in his work *Divanska poezija XVI i XVII stoljeća* [Diwan Poetry of the 16th and 17th Century]: "The qasida is a poem that was sung for a certain purpose, as its very name states; its author frequently asked for a position or some other favour from the person he would dedicate

the poem to” (1991: 19). Of course, the content of the *qasida* is not only limited to the “achievement of a goal”, to the praise of a dignitary the poet was asking for help; the *qasida* also contained other thematic units that traditionally determined the structure of this form of the *diwan* literature. Most theoreticians of the classical Ottoman literature speak of six main parts of the *qasida*: 1) *nesīb* or *teşbīb*, 2) *girīz-gāh* or *girīz*, 3) *methiye*, 4) *tegazzül*, 5) *fahriye* and 6) *dua*.

a) *Nesīb* or *teşbīb* is the introductory part of the *qasida*, containing 15 to 20 initial bayts. This is an aesthetically valuable part of the *qasida* containing the descriptions of, most frequently, nature, the arrival of spring, winter, Eid al-Fitr or Eid al-Adha, Ramadan, war campaign, etc. These chapters would determine titles of *qasidas*: *bahariyye* (*qasidas* dedicated to the description of spring), *şitāiyye* (*qasidas* dedicated to the description of winter), *temmūziyye* (*qasidas* dedicated to the description of summer), *ramazaniyye* (*qasidas* dedicated to the description of the holy month of Ramadan), *‘idiyye* (*qasidas* dedicated to the description of the Eid al-Fitr or Eid al-Adha), *hammāmiye* (*qasidas* dedicated to the description of the hammam and to the beautiful women of the hammam), etc.

In his work “Nature and the Diwan Literature” Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı (1999:92), a prominent researcher of the *diwan* literature, considers the descriptions of nature by the Ottoman poets as a pre-defined and a general décor, emphasizing that “The nature in the *diwan* literature is the nature organized in the middle of a room, or painted in thousands of colours on a small page. Of course, the nature thus described ceases being nature.” He further adds: “With these poets, spring is identical to the spring of all poets; what’s more, it is identical to every spring.”

b) *Girīzgāh* or *girīz*, is one or more bayts that mark the transition between the introductory chapter and the *methiye* chapter, which praises the person the *qasida* is dedicated to. In this part of the *qasida*, poets attempted to find appropriate, clever words to initiate the praise of their potential patron.

c) *Methiye* is a chapter of the *qasida* that praises the person the *qasida* is dedicated to. Praise expressed in this chapter is frequently overemphasised, with abundance of tropes, so they do not reflect the actual person which

is the object of praise. Theorists of the diwan poetry do not hold this chapter in a high aesthetic regard, since poets, for the purpose of flattering, exaggerate in the praise of a dignitary, comparing them frequently to historical and mythological characters.

d) *Tegazzül* is the chapter most frequently following the methiye with verses in the ghazal manner. This ghazal, in full congruence with the qasida regarding the metre and the rhyme, would be announced by poets; a one-bayt-long introductory would usually precede the ghazal.

e) *Fahriye* contains the poet's self-praise. Here, the poet, just as is the case with the methiye, exaggerates, for, when they speak of themselves, they frequently use the hyperbolae (overstate) to express their own poetic abilities. The fahriye is a very important part of the qasida, especially in the sense of understanding the poet's perception of his own and poetry in general.

f) *Dua* is the last part of the qasida, where the poet speaks to God, expressing pleas and wishes for the benefit of the potential protector.

Ghazal

Ghazal is a "poem of at least five couplets, thematising love, beauty, wine. It is the most frequent form of the diwan poetry, in which poets write about their feelings: joy, pain, thrills of love, etc." (Nametak 1991: 179). Most historians define the ghazal as lyrical poetry. The very term *lyrical* came from the western poetics and its use in the context of the ghazal is of a recent period – the 20th century. Classical Ottoman stylistics, the postulates of which were borrowed from the Arabic stylistics, did not recognise the term, but, its definition of ghazal is very close to today's meaning of the term *lyricism*. Just as is the case with the majority of poetic forms in the diwan poetry, the ghazal was primarily a form in the Arabic literature, which spread to Persia and then to the Ottoman literature. It was formed in the Arabic literature by separating a part of the qasida that was dedicated to the description of the poet's love for his beloved, which coincides with the meaning of the word *ghazal* (courting). Thematically, it is defined as poetry of love and wine, while Cem Dilçin, in line with the majority of

other Turkish theorists, stated the following: “The ghazal primarily shows the expressive and the subjective aspect of the diwan poetry” (1995: 109).

The term *lyricism* which is frequently associated with the ghazal, marked, in antiquity, the poems sung with lyre, while, later, in the renaissance period, the poem was defined as a text written to be *read*, which separated it from music; thus, its musicality was expressed through the very structure of the text. The development of romantic sensibility in the late 18th century saw the increase in the importance of lyrical poetry, as a “spontaneous outburst of feelings”; subjectivity, emotionality and spontaneity became distinctive features of lyricism. The modern concept of poetry defines lyricism on the basis of its origin – through the connection with music and the romantic sensibility (Lešić 2005: 368-370).

The two distinctive features of lyricism – sensibility and musicality – can be recognised in the ghazal. It can be observed, even through the classical definition, that *ghazal* was a poetic genre in which feelings dominated. On the other hand, its musicality was conditioned by highly strict forms. The form of the ghazal contained the following rhyme: the first two half-lines rhyme, and the rhyme is further contained in every second of the couplets that follow, i.e. at the end of the bayt. Schematically, this can be presented the following way: *aa ba ca da*, etc. Ghazal was always composed in the ‘*arūž*’, which especially contributed the ghazal’s musicality. It should be mentioned also that, in the Ottoman society, the ghazal accompanied by different musical instruments, most frequently saz (the baglama), so it was sung rather than recited.

When defining the ghazal, the *müzeyyel* ghazal should especially be emphasised; it is a occasional ghazal containing additional two to three couplets, for the purpose of presenting it to a dignitary, or a potential patron. Just like the *qasida*, the *müzeyyel* ghazal ends in a couplet containing a *dua*, a prayer for the praised dignitary.

Mathnawi

The very definition of the *mathnawi* as a literary form in the classical Ottoman literature relies on the dictionary term that means “two by two”,

which determines the rhyme of the form, more precisely its inner rhyme that exists between two half-lines (the *misra*‘) within the bayt (Dilçin 1995: 167). Such a form of the rhyme has enabled this form, which originates from the Persian literature, to be used for writing vast pieces of literature.

Cem Diliçin, in his book *Örneklerle Türk Şiir Bilgisi* [The Theory of Turkish Poetry with Examples] mentions that the mathnawi is organised in the following manner: introduction – *dibāce*, a non-compulsory part, in verse or in prose, followed by a compulsory chapter that praises God’s unity – *tevhīd*, which is also followed by a compulsory linking hymnody *münacāt*, in which the poet writes a dua to God, and then a chapter praising Muhammed (PBUH.) – *na’l*. The majority of mathnawis, usually but not always, contain a *mirāciye*, a poem about the ascension of Muhammed (PBUH.) to heaven and meeting with God. The following chapter or chapters are also non-compulsory and they contain a praise to the four khalifs (*medh-i çihār-yār-ı güzīn*) or some other prominent people in the Islamic tradition. The mathnawi ends in a praise (*methiye*) to the person the poem is dedicated to. Prior to continuing with the main theme of the mathnawi, the poet discusses in a separate chapter the reasons for writing the work (*sebeb-i telīf* or *sebeb-i nazm-ı kitāb*). This is a compulsory chapter in all mathnawis and it is important in light of determining the poet’s poetics and the approach to poetry. Finally, after all those chapters that refer to both the Islamic literary tradition and the socio-cultural context in which the poet operates, comes the main text of the mathnawi (*āğāz-ı dāstan*), or the part where the main theme is discussed. The text itself is divided into several chapters that are indicated through subtitles and they concern a certain episode of the entire theme. The last chapter of the classical mathnawi is its ending (*hātime*), in which the poet mentions his name, the date of the completion of writing in a chronogram, and a conclusion.

Kit’a (Epigram)

The poetic form *kit’a* (*epigram*) usually consists of two couplets, with the rhyme established between the second and the fourth. Schematically, we could exemplify it as follows: *ba – ca – da – ea*. In the Ottoman literary

tradition, the kit'a usually does not contain the poet's pseudonym – the makhlas, although we can find poets who used it, including some of the classics like Bākī and Fuzūlī (Dilçin 1995: 203). The diwan tradition defines the kit'aas as a form that can contain than two bayts (the long kit'a - *kit'a-i kebīre*), resembling the ghazal without the initial *matla bayt*. However, such forms of kit'a significantly differ in content from the ghazal and are most frequently used for writing chronograms (Dilçin 1995: 203). The Ottoman literary tradition is very diverse in view of themes of the kit'a, i.e., it defines the kit'a as a genre that expresses the poet's ideas, wisdom, attitudes, judgements and criticism (Dilçin 1995: 202), or a thought, witticism, satire or a description of an event (Nametak 1991: 28).

Tarih (Chronogram)

The tarih or chronogram is a specific genre of the diwan poetry the content of which speaks of an event, while the year in which the event happened is expressed through the numeric value of letters in the Arabic alphabet in which it is written. From a semiotic standpoint, chronograms are a phenomenon because of the explicitly motivated relationship between the signifier and the signified, since the signifier, as part of the sign, is not only contained in the text of the verses, but also in each individual letter, so we can talk about chronograms as a collection of both linguistic and graphical signs. Keeping in mind the demanding nature of the genre, we can only speculate the extent of the artistic challenge the diwan poets must have faced. The genre's complexity most certainly conditioned its length, so the tarih was frequently a short form in the diwan tradition, frequently expressed through a single bayt, or as kit'a.

Speech Acts in Diwan Poetry

One of the definitions of the speech act is that it is an action (for example, a request, a compliment) implemented by uttering a certain segment of speech, while linguistic units by which this can be done range from exclamations

to combinations of several sentences, so each “illocutionary homogenous utterance containing several sentences works as a single unit – a speech act” (Ivanetić 1995: 16). Since it is possible for one speech act to contain other speech acts, it is also called the speech event. Context is highly important in the process, and it, among other things, includes the relationship between the speaker/the sender of the message and the collocutor/the recipient of the message who are determined through the dominant factors (the vertical social scale), as well as the social distance factors.

As previously mentioned, historical pragmatics approaches historical texts from the aspect of the speech act theory, which is an approach also considered relevant in the discourse analysis.

Although different definitions of discourse exist, we will mention the one that holds discourse as any unit of a connected speech or writing. In that sense, literary texts are also observed as discourses. Deborah Schiffrin (1994: 7-12) distinguishes six different approaches to discourse analysis:

a) Speech act theory approach. We have mentioned previously that this theory stemmed from an understanding that language is not only used to describe the world/to transmit information on extralinguistic reality, but also to realise certain activities that change such a reality. For example, “Can you pass the salt?” can, according to Schiffrin, be understood, depending on the context, as a question related to the ability of the collocutor, but also as a request to pass the salt. Hence, this is an indirect speech act. Such an approach to discourse analysis focuses upon the knowledge of underlaying conditions for the production and the interpretation of activities/acts that are implemented through words/language. It is obvious that words can perform more than one “action” and that context assists in distinguishing utterances according to their functions. Thus, discourse analysis, through the speech act theory, entails certain topics, such as indirect speech acts, multifunctionality of expressions and their dependence on the context. The very (speech act) theory ensures the ways of text segmentation and determination of its units which can, again, be combined to form units of a higher order;

b) Interactional sociolinguistics approach. The field itself stems from anthropology, sociology and linguistics, and shares with them the interest

in culture, society and language. The approach is characteristic of John Gumperz who studied the way people from different cultures may share the grammatical knowledge of a language, but differently contextualise what is said. The approach deals with the way in which language is situated in particular circumstances of social life and the way in which it reflects different kinds of meaning (Erving Goffman);

c) Anthropology-based ethnography of communication approach. Instead of focusing on the notion of linguistic competence, Dell Hymes proposed focusing to the notion of communicative competence which entails the knowledge of society, culture, psychology and language (including grammar), necessary for a correct language use and behaviour in a speech event;

d) Pragmatic approach. This approach is mostly based on the ideas of Paul Grice who introduced different types of meaning (the focus is on the speaker's meaning, i.e. intentions); he considered that every conversation is conducted in accordance with the cooperative principle entailing four conversational maxims that have been mentioned previously in the text;

e) Conversational analysis approach. This approach is called "ethnomethodology" and aims at discovering the method by which members of a society produce a sense of a social order. Conversation that has a specific order and structure is key in the process;

f) Variational linguistics. This is an approach initiated by William Labov, stating that linguistic variation is both socially and linguistically conditioned. An important segment of the approach is based on the detection of formal patterns in the text (frequently in narratives), as well as on the analysis of the way in which those patterns are limited by that very text.

The speech act theory approach, as one of the approaches used in both historical pragmatics and discourse analysis, will serve as the key methodological means in the analysis of poetry written by our authors in the Ottoman Turkish language. The first step is the identification utterances as speech acts, which may be difficult sometimes unless it is an explicit performative that contains a performative verb; if there is a verbless primary performative, for example, the utterance "This is yours", then ambiguity may arise – either the speaker gives something to the collocutor, or s(he)

is only claiming that something belongs to the collocutor. The primary performative should be deducible to the performative formula: “By this I [verb] to you this”, but that, however, does not eliminate the difficulty in finding the grammatical criteria and textual conditions that apply to performatives (Schiffrin 1994: 57). Indirect speech acts, i.e., speech acts that do not consist of the already-established “formulae” can appear in an infinite number of different realisations, while the identification of means that signal the illocutionary force of an utterance is frequently very arduous, hence the means can be considered suggestive rather than indicative. That is why here we will talk about the speech acts that contain a performative verb or some other linguistic means showing its illocution, as well as the context they appear in (which here encompasses knowledge of the recipient and the sender of the message, their social relationships, conditions and rules). Speech acts are determined by culture and time. Every linguistic community creates its own inventory of speech acts, as well as a collective of performative verbs used to talk about those speech acts. That is why they too can be observed in accordance with the way in which they are implemented through time, or they can be analysed in accordance with their description in a single period, which will be the case here. It should be mentioned that some sections of poetic genres in the Ottoman literature have titles that clearly indicate a speech act, for example, the *methiye*, or the very name of a genre, such as the *qasida*, which is a poem with a purpose – i.e. the performative. Most frequent speech acts in the Ottoman literature (more precisely, poetry) are expressives and directives. Commissives, committing the speaker to a future action, they are most frequently embedded in expressive speech acts. Declaratives, speech acts that change the extralinguistic reality, always entail an institution authorised to make such changes, hence, no wonder that no examples of such speech acts have been found, since poetry itself is not an adequate place for their realisation. Here, we will talk about verses that can be categorised as performatives, showing the relationship between the poet and the current or potential protector or patron. Chronograms (*tarihs*) are an exception in a way, since they are representative speech acts, i.e. speech acts that express facts about extralinguistic reality. Still, chronograms, as

a specific genre of the diwan poetry, the content of which describes an event, and in which the year the event occurred is expressed through the sum of the numerical value of the Arabic alphabet, indirectly also describe the relationship between the patron and his protégé. In this study, we will analyse the chronograms that record the construction of important objects, military campaigns and victories, deaths of state dignitaries, and which, indirectly, express the relationship between the poet and the state, i.e. the poet and individual authorities.

1. Expressives

As has already been stated, expressives are speech acts that express the attitude and emotions of the speaker, characterised by verbs such as: thank, congratulate, apologise, praise, etc. These verbs belong to a very heterogeneous group, since they contain a wide spectrum of speech acts, from praise and compliments, to criticism and scorn. They can be divided to expressives with a positive and expressives with a negative attitude towards the collocutor or his/her act. Searle's rules for differentiation of speech acts are sufficient only for the classification of general types of speech acts (expressives, directives, declaratives, commissives and representatives), but are "not precise enough for a valid internal specification of illocutions within those general types" (Ivanetić 1995: 45).

1. 1. Good Wishes (Duas, Prayers)

Expressive speech acts also entail good wishes addressed to the collocutor, that is, the recipient of the message. Just as compliments and praise, they are constituents of positive politeness strategies, for they show care for the collocutor, i.e. the recipient of the message, in an attempt to establish closeness and solidarity. The contemporary Turkish language is abundant with expressions of good wishes, almost for every situation imaginable, in order to avoid the unpreferred silence (the Bosnian language does not have as many such expressions, thus we are frequently forced to say "I don't know what to say.") and establish solidarity with other members of the

community, which is highly important for the collectivist societies such as Turkish. Good wishes entail prayers, i.e. *duas* that are, in fact, addressed to God, but they concern the collocutor (one asks God to bestow some good on the collocutor). The word *dua* is Arabic and it means “calling”, “invitation”, “calling upon”, “prayer”, “plea”. *Duas*, i.e. prayers are means of communication with God. Since the prayer is, in fact, a conversation with God, it follows that it is oriented towards the interpersonal function of language. Hence, if God is the collocutor, it then also entails “addressing Him” and “listening to Him”. The prayer is a complex phenomenon, containing two dimensions: private and social. Since it is realised through words, it is also a linguistic activity that transposes language from the daily life to another (transcendent) sphere. A prayer, as means of communication with God, entails several speech acts: plea/confession, gratitude, request. One can say that the examples that will be analysed are also speech acts that, together with the good wishes for the recipient of the message, also bring good to the author himself (the longer the benefactor lives, the longer the author benefits), and they can also be observed as a flattery to the higher ranking collocutor, the addressee (again, all for the purpose of achieving benefit to self, but one must keep in mind that the needs of face are limited with religious people). It is necessary to emphasise that an entirely different concept of power, as well as the ruler-subject relationship, existed in the Ottoman Empire. Namely, the ruler was seen as a father figure and a moral role model, so both the subordinates and the superiors were morally obliged towards one another (Kurz 2012: 106). Through this prism we should observe the poetry which praises the power of the ruler and which contains *duas* for the ruler’s wellbeing – as an expression of the consistent paradigm of both the literary tradition and the ruler-subject relationship, not only the poet’s intentions to claim benefit for himself through such form of address. Namely, the predominant view was that whoever opposed the sultan also opposed God and that the servants had to be loyal to the ruler, obliged to pray to God for the sultan’s health and longevity, besides the obedience and expressions of love (Kurz 2012: 112). Thus, *duas* found in the Ottoman poetry can be observed as fulfilment of those duties.

Good wishes, i.e. prayers to God for the benefit of another person, and prayers in general, are positive politeness strategies. As has already been stated, P. Brown and S. Levinson assumed the term positive politeness strategy from Émile Durkheim, who distinguished positive and negative rituals, whereby the former are used to get close to the Absolute, and the latter, frequently taboos, express awe and God-fearing nature. In this case, the poet used good wishes and duas to become close to the addressee and to establish a close relationship with him, making the addressee feel recognised and loved.

1.1.1. Good Wishes (Duas) in Qasidas

As we have previously mentioned, duas are the last part of the qasida, in which the poet addresses God through prayers and wishes for the well-being of his potential benefactor. As the essential part of the qasida, duas are also speech acts, prayers (pleas) addressed to God. They are considered speech acts because they gain a magical power from the Transcendent, and since they are used for the benefit of the addressee, they can also be, as we have already emphasised, a positive politeness strategy.

Qasidas written by Hasan Ziyai, a poet from Mostar, the author of the oldest collection of poetry (diwan) in the Ottoman Turkish language in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in accordance with the established literary tradition, end in duas, prayers to God for the benefit of the dignitary they are dedicated to. In that sense, Ziyai's *Qasida to the Autumn in Praise of Mehmed Bey* is significant, since the poet prays for the recipient of the message to remain long in power, for it could benefit the author (the sender of the message) as well, provided he remained in his mercy.

*Truly from the heart a special dua he makes
That commander he remains everlasting in the day and nightfall*

*My dua is incessant to the Almighty God
When He bestows His blessings inexhaustible*

*May your endless dirhams spill throughout the world
May the Almighty increase your generosity every more*

‘Ale’l-ḥuṣūṣ du’ā kıla ‘an ṣamīmü’l-ḳalb
Devām-ıdevletüñe bi’lgudüvvi ve’l-âşâl

Cenāb-ı ḥazretüñe her zamān du’ām oldur
Cihāna bereketi mādām ki şaçarsa nihāl

Şaçıla’āleme lütfüñ diremleri bī-hadd
Şaḥāñı artıra her bār Ḳādir-i müte’āl (Q5/28–30)

In the first couplet, the author speaks of himself in the third person singular, which is a relatively common procedure after the *makhlās* bayt. We can also state that such use of the third person singular contributes to the objectivization of what was said, implemented as a claim that a *dua* is made. On the other hand, the emotional involvement and honesty of the good wish, i.e. the *dua*, is emphasised by the Arabic phrase *‘an ṣamīmü’l-ḳalb* (truly from the heart). The *dua* also contains an exaggeration *bi’lgudüvvi ve’l-âşâl* (in the day and nightfall), which concerns the duration of the rule of the potential patron Mehmed Bey, which also entails the benefit of the author himself. In that way, not only does the poet wish well to the other person, but indirectly to himself too. That is even more striking in the last couplet, where money is explicitly mentioned (dirhams) together with a prayer that the Almighty increased the generosity of the patron, which is realized by the optative (*şaçıla*, *artıra*). Although the optative in the contemporary Turkish language is a verb mood expressing wishes, one must keep in mind that:

[O]ne of the most important syntactic and semantic features of the optative in the old Ottoman Turkish language is its functional movability and polysemic nature. We need to emphasise that it was used to express all means and all three temporal spheres, partly even the past. (Čaušević 1987: 74)

Here too we can recognise the request as a speech act, since the poet, in fact, urges God to bestow wealth and generosity to Mehmed Bey, so

that he could continue sharing wealth to others, including himself. That is why Michael Hancher (1979: 2) classifies prayers as directive speech acts, since they urge to God to perform a certain activity.

A similar example is found in the *Qasida to the Spring in Praise of Mehmed Bey* by the same author:

*O, the Master of Being, my wish is but one
Until the sun and the moon succeed each other*

*Make his happiness and life last day and night
It's how his enemies in damnation and misfortune will be gone*

Ey Vācibü'l-vücūd murādum budur hemān
Devr eyledükçe dünyede ħurşī dile kamer

Rūz u şebeyle devlet ü 'ömrini müstedām
Eyle vücūd-ı düşmenine kahr ile zarar (Q3/25–26)

Here too, as in the previous example, the permanent nature of the wish (the life and power of the patron) is emphasised, and this time, it is expressed through an expression in Persian *rūz u şeb* (day and night), and through the quasiconverb *-dikçe*, which, among other, translates into Bosnian as *dokle god*, expressing the duration of an activity as long as the activity expressed in the main clause lasts, and, in this case it is – “until the sun and the moon succeed each other” (Devr eyledükçe dünyede ħurşīd ile kamer). The quasigerund, i.e. “the quasiconverb *-Dikça* compares the two activities in accordance with the frequency of occurrence and the temporal criterium” (Čaušević 2018: 318).

Besides the dua for the benefit of Mustafa Bey, there is also a curse in the last couplet, which is, in fact, a bad wish intended for the bey's enemies. There, the poet addresses God (the addressee) asking for misfortune to the enemies (*kahr ile zarar*), by which he transforms the curse into a kind of a good wish for the patron. Imperative is used here (*eyle devlet ü 'ömrini müstedām, Eyle vücūd-ı düşmenin ekahr ile zarar*).

Hasan Ziyai, a poet from Bosnia and Herzegovina, writes similarly in his *Qasida to the Wind in Praise of Hasan Bey*:

*May Allah save you from thorns of misfortune
So that you smile like a rose in the rose garden of this world*

*May the Almighty God make your life and power last
May he bestow you with abundant beauty in both worlds*

Hār-ı āzārdan Allāh ide zātuñ maḥfūz
Olasın gül gibi gül-zār-ı cihānda ḥandān

‘Ömrüñi devletüñi dā’im ide Ḥazret-i Ḥaḳḳ
İki ‘ālemde saña vireme zāduñ Yezdān (Q 7/31–32)

It is interesting that, in this example, in contrast to the previous, the permanence of what is wished for is extended from the temporal to the spatial sphere, i.e. the expression *iki ‘ālemde* (in both worlds) can be viewed in both these senses, while the very wish is realised through the optative (*ide, olasın, ide, vire*). Also, the dua for the benefit of Hasan Bey is characterised by the language use typical for lyrical poetry. Namely, metaphors such as *thorns of misfortune* (*Hār-i āzār*), *rose* (*gül*) and *rose garden of this world* (*gül-zār-ı cihān*) make the good wish abstract and polysemous, giving it a lyrical dimension. Still, the lyrical context of duas in qasidas is found with other poets too, so similar metaphors can be found in qasidas of the poet Osman Shehdi.

In his *Spring Qasida for Sultan Ahmed III the Ghazi*, Osman Shehdi, two centuries after Ziyai, also wishes for his ruler to be “smiling like a rose” (Bayındır 2008: 139).

*God, make his day at the throne merry
And the glorious sultan like a rose smile*

*May joy and might adorn his glorious and just throne
In jubilation of the noble heart, o, Lord, rescue from suffering provide*

*May he conduct well the affairs of this world
May his helpers be angels from the world sublime*

*May you bestow all of the sultan's kin with bright light
May it be seen that it is the sun on the sky of the state that shines*

*May that bud that has just formed in the rose garden of the world
O, God, be an ornament on the sultan's noble turban*

*Make him, the representative of the state, steady
And his extraordinary affairs always thrive*

İlāhā bu şehinşāh-ı 'āzīmü'ş-şānı tahtında
İdüp gül gibi handān eyle rüz-ı baht-ı bīdārı

Serīr 'adle revnāk-baḥş olup 'izz ü sa'ādetle
Şafā-yı ḥātır-ı iḥsān ile yā Rab virme ekdār

Vire ḥüsn-i nizām-ı temşiyet aḥvāl-i dünyāya
Olap Kerrūbiyān-ı 'ālem-i bālā meded-kārı

Her şeh-zādegān-ı nev-tulū'un ber-füruḡ ile
Ki anlardır sipihr-i devletiñ ḥurşīd-i envārı

Ḥudāvendā nevres-i ḡonca güller bāḡ-ı 'ālemde
Ola bu şehriyār-ı şāḥdārıñ zīb-i destārı

Vekīl-i devletin hem mesnedinde eyle pā-ber-cā
Umūr-ı ḥaşş u 'āma kıl muvaffak anı her-bārī (Q 29/59–64)

Although this example contains, in the description of the ruler, metaphors characteristic of lyrical poetry, the second couplet especially emphasises moral traits of the ruler that equally stand for both the description and anticipation. With “May joy and might adorn his glorious and just throne”

(*Serîr 'adle revnâk-bahş olup 'izz ü sa'âdetle*), the poet describes, or, more precisely, compliments the sultan, but also mentions the values he expects the sultan to possess. Such an attitude is congruent with the social order of the Ottoman Empire, where justice was the most important characteristic of the ruler, who was expected to protect the subjects from violence and the abuse of power of other ruling representatives. Also, in the Ottoman society, the sultan was “The Shadow of God on Earth”, i.e. the person protecting the social order in the name of God (Kurz 2012: 108). That is confirmed by the following couplet: “May he conduct well the affairs of this world / May his helpers be angels from the world sublime” (*Vire hüsni-inizâm-ı temşiyet ahvâl-i dünyâya / Olup Kerrûbiyân-ı âlem-ibâlâ meded-kârı*), where the ruler is entrusted the management of the affairs of this world, with the support of beings from the transcendent world; this utterance is realised by the use of the optative (*vire*).

The sultan's position in this world is represented in the dua in the last couplet: “Make him, the representative of the state, steady / And his extraordinary affairs always thrive” (*Vekîl-i devletin hem mesnedinde eyle pâ-ber-câ / Umûr-ı haşş u 'âma kıl muvaffağ anı her-bârı*). The sultan is described by the syntagma *vekîl-idevlet* (representative of the state), where the word *devlet* may have several meanings. The attribute *devletli* / *devletlü*, which means “the one who is prosper, happy and supplied”, was used for Ottoman sultans and other dignitaries (Devellioğlu 1998: 181).

Also, there is the syntagma *devlet kuşu* which means, in the contemporary Turkish, “a sudden stroke of luck, profit”, while, in the past, it was used as one of the synonyms for the bird phoenix. This syntagma is connected to the narrative that the sultan will become the one over whom the bird phoenix flies (*anka*).

The same couplet contains a plea (prayer) to God expressed through imperative (*eyle*, *kıl*). If we were to observe it as a speech act, we would conclude that this is a directive. Although this directive contains no mitigating devices, the context itself, i.e. the fact that the addressee is God Almighty, categorises this speech act as a prayer. As has already been stated, M. Hancher (1979: 2) classified prayers as directives because they ask for a certain action to be taken. We conclude that the pleas are addressed

to God because of the expressions such as *İlāhā* (o, God), *Hudāvendā* (o, God; o, Lord) that have been used at the beginning of the verses, and which contain the Persian vocative morpheme *-ā*.

1.1.2. Good Wishes (Duas) in Ghazals

Although duas are not a characteristic part of the ghazal, the so-called *müzeyyel* ghazal should be mentioned, i.e. an occasional ghazal that contains additional two to three couplets for the purpose of being presented to a dignitary, i.e. a potential patron (that means that the poet directly addresses the addressee – the patron). Just like the *qasida*, the *müzeyyel* ghazal ends in a couplet containing a dua, a prayer for the benefit of the praised dignitary.

Thus, good wishes and duas are also found in the ghazal dedicated to Sultan Murad IV by Mezaki, a poet from Čajniče. The ghazal was written in the *redif* form *-āndur Üsküdār*, referring to the well-known part of Istanbul. We will present the entire ghazal in order to show the two couplets added to the initially lyrical poem that are dedicated to the ruler and that have an entirely different pragmatic function and the overall purpose.

*It's a God's blessing, Üsküdār, the eternal Jannah
Which brings joy to the hearts of the young and the old – Üsküdār*

*The smell of flowers constantly spreads in the morning horizon
The glorious smell in the noses of people and souls – Üsküdār*

*Beauties with lips like buds and the lovebirds like nightingales
Be and it shalt be a rose garden - Üsküdār*

*It is always talked of as a rose garden that brings joy to the heart
Without a doubt, its glory spreads everywhere Üsküdār*

*Everybody praises its air that feeds the soul
He is the most glorious son of time – Üsküdār*

*O, Mezaki, if only every place were this beautiful
It is the place of gathering with the drink of the emperor of emperors
– Üsküdar*

***Of the glorious kin, Sultan Murat, the most noble
Who in his reign made a garden of Jannah –Üsküdar***

***May he never taste the pain for as long as he lives in this world
It is like a rose garden of Jannah bringing joy – Üsküdar***

Bäreke'llāh şan behişt-i cāvidāndur Üsküdār
Kim şafā-bahş-ı dil-i pîr ü civāndur Üsküdār

Büy-ı ezhārın şabā āfāka neşr eyler müdām
Nühket-efrüz-ı meşām-ı ins ü cāndur Üsküdār

Gonca-fem cānān ile bülbül-neğam ridān ile
Gül-sitān-pîrā-yı bāğ-ı kün-fe-kāndur Üsküdār

Söylenür her dem şafā-yı dil-küşā-yı gül-şen,
Lā-cerem dillerde böyle dāsītandur Üsküdār

Medh ider feyz-ı hevā-yı cān-fezāsın her kişi
Hāşılı memdūh-ı ebnā-yı zamāndur Üsküdār

Ey Mezākī n'ola ma'mūr olsa böyle her yeri
'İşret-ābād-ı şehen-şāh-ı cihāndur Üsküdār

**Cem-nejād-ı muhterem Sultān Murād-ı pür-kerem
Kim zamanında hemān bāğ-ı cināndur Üsküdār**

**Çekmesün bir dem elem tā kim cihānda dem-be-dem
Gül-şen-i cennet gibi rāhat-resāndur Üsküdār (G 60)**

The last two couplets are important for the pragmatic analysis of Mezaki's ghazal, especially the last couplet where we see a good wish expressed for the ruler. Namely, the positive politeness strategy is recognised in the poet's wish that the praised person never goes through suffering, which is a sign of care for that person. That is how closeness and solidarity are established between the speaker and the addressee. On the other hand, in the couplet that comes second to the last, we can see the expression of respect in the very description of the sultan: "Cem-nejād-ı muhterem Sultān Murād-ı pür-kerem". The phrase *Cem-nejād* stems from the word *cem*, which means *ruler*, *sultan*, but was also a nickname of the Prophet Suleiman and Alexander the Great, and the word *nejād/nijād* which means *kin*, *kind*, *offspring*. That is why the aforementioned construction is semantically dense and could simultaneously be translated also as "of the imperial kin, the noble kind". In the same couplet, together with praise, the poet compliments the sultan for his achievement: "Who in his reign made a garden of Jannah – Üsküdar" (*Kim zamanında hemān bāğ-ı cināndur Üsküdār*). On the one hand, from the pragmatic aspect, it can be argued that this is an exaggeration, while, from the position of the Muslim, the description of the beauty of a place culminates in the metaphor of the gardens of Jannah, which here denotes Üsküdar, a neighbourhood in Istanbul, the capital of the Ottoman Empire.

In the third couplet of this ghazal the power of the word is seen: "Be and it shalt be a rose garden - Üsküdar" (*Gül-sitān-pīrā-yı bāğ-ı kün-fe-kāndur Üsküdār*), where we see a citation from the Holy Quran in Arabic (*kün-fe-kān*), integrated in the Ottoman Turkish text. Such a procedure was common for the classical Ottoman literature and is considered a stylistic device *iktibas*, while the use of the Arabic language can be perceived as a citation signal.

Good wishes, i.e. duas written for the benefit of the ruler can also be seen in the müzeyyel ghazals by poet Sabit Bosnevi. Namely, the ghazal he dedicated to Sultan Mustafa II, together with compliments and praise, also contains a prayer for the victory of the sultan.

Sabit, this fiery and eloquent quill

Is no wonder if the mountains crumble before the soul of prince Dehlev

One slave of the emperor of emperors, a young servant

Koفا from the barn cannot measure with the crown of Keyhüsrev

The centre of the world, Sultan Mustafa Han, whose

Mercy has covered all, the water, the fire, the earth and the air

May the Almighty God make him a victor against the infidels

May he conquer all with his sabre on the way to Uyvar

Sābitā buḥāme-i āteş-nisār-ı āb-dār

Dāğlar yaḳsa n'ola cān-ı Emīr-i Dehleve

Bir şehihinşāhuñ ḡulāmıdur ki endnā çākeri

Saṭl-ı ıstāblın deḡişmez efser-i Keyḡüsreve

Kuṭb-ı 'ālem ya'ni Sultān Muṣṭafā Ḥan kim anuñ

Luṭfı heb şāmildür āb ü āteş ü ḡāk ü ceve

Ḥaḳ Ta'ālā düşmen-i dīn üzre manşūr eyleye

Feṭḥ ola tıḡ ile Uyvar yolları heb o leve (G 48/6-9)

These verses primarily test the knowledge of the reader/the recipient of the message, since they mention princes Dehlev and Keyhüsrev; the addressee is expected to possess and share the same knowledge with the author. The poet mentions the geographical location Uyvar, i.e. a fortress in today's Slovakia, besieged by the Ottomans several times before finally conquering it in 1663, during the reign of Sultan Mehmed IV. The fortress would remain in the hands of the Ottomans the following 22 years, and they had to give it up in 1699 by the Treaty of Karlowitz, during the reign of Sultan Mustafa II, to whom the verses are dedicated. The mentioning of the conquest of Uyvar reflects the real historical events, but they also

stand for the Turkish heroism and strength, as we can see in the phrase *Fort comme un Turc* (as strong as a Turk/before the Uyvar).

Changing of the grammatical person is also evident, so the poet addresses himself in the second person singular, achieving thus the emphasis and estrangement effect which was a common procedure in the Ottoman literature, since the awareness on the consistency of the use of the grammatical person signifying the lyrical *I* did not exist. Sultan Mustafa II was described as the centre of the world, whose mercy shines over the four elements: “Kuṭb-ı ‘ālemya’ni Sultān Muṣṭafā Hān kim anuñ / Luṭfi heb şāmildür āb ü āteş ü hāk ü ceve”, which emphasises the extent and the overwhelming nature of his power. The science of the four elements the world is made of is also present in the worldview of the Ottoman society. The context suggesting the sultan’s power over the elements implies his power over the entire earthly world as a microcosm.

As in the majority of cases, here too we see the good wish realised by the third person singular optative (*manşūr eyleye, feṭh ola*).

1.1.3. Good Wishes (Duas) in Mathnawis

In the introductory sections of mathnawis, i.e. in the chapter entitled *sebeb-i te’lif* (the reason for writing), poets frequently refer to their own life and poetics, but also to their protectors, patrons, to whom they dedicate the mathnawī. The custom of the author addressing the patron in the introduction existed in England as well, especially in the 16th century. The reasons are the same: the author’s existence depended on the patron and his good will, and it was entirely understandable that he was complimented and praised (Taavitsainen – Jucker 2008: 204).

In introductions of their narrative poems, the diwan authors would describe their patron and express good wishes and duas for his benefit in the end. Such an example can be found in *The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak* by Hasan Ziyai Mostari. Ziyai, speaking of Vusuli Bey, to whom he dedicated his work, ends the praise by the following words:

*For the ones in need his door is always open
Merciful he is, may he be blessed with a long life*

*To his pure soul ourdua is eternal
May his life be long and mercy endless*

Ḳapusı merdüm-i muḥtāca penāh
Ġurebā müşfikidür “ṭāle beḳāh”

Zāt-ı pākine du’āmuz dā’im
Luṭfı dā’im ola zātı ḳā’im (244–45)

The mentioned verses describe the patron as merciful and generous, which is also the description of the wishes (in each instance expressed through the optative) of the author that Vusulī Bey continues to behave that way and that God bestows him, so generous, with an endless life and mercy (*Luṭfı dā’im ola zātı ḳā’im*). By complimenting Vusulī Bey that he is merciful and of “pure soul”, the author emphasises his dua by the syntagma in Arabic: *ṭāle beḳāh* which underlines the religious dimension of the utterance. Namely, in the Oriental-Islamic tradition, Arabic, as the language of the Quran, was preferred in duas and prayers. In the end, the poet writes a claim: “To his pure soul our dua is eternal” (*Zāt-ı pākine du’āmuz dā’im*), by which the poet states to be constantly praying for the benefit of his protector (even beyond the poetic expression). The presence of good wishes for the patron in mathnawis of the authors from Bosnia and Herzegovina can also be seen in *The Muradnama* by Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic. He dedicated his work to Sultan Murat III, especially the methiye, i.e. the praise to the sultan, where he mentions many good wishes to the ruler.

*I shall say but one: expressing weakness
I want to present a **hayr-dua***

*O, God, by the light of the immense Sky
By the perfection of the Speech so pure, eternal*

*Make this sultan, rightly raised
Eternal in the state and rule*

*Support those who support him
Beat the enemies of his state*

*Submit the world to his command
Make his army ever victorious*

*Improve his faith and affairs in this world
Make him joyful in both the worlds!*

Ol hemān yek ki ‘acַz idüp iẓhār
Eyleyem bir du’ā-yı ḥayr īsār

Ya ilāhī be-nūr-ı ‘Arş-ı ‘azīm
Be-kemāl-i Kelām-ı pāk u ḳadīm

Sen bu sultān-ı ḥūb-aḥlākī
Devlet ü salṭanatda ḳıl bākī

Ḳılub a’vān-ı nuṣretün manşūr
Eyle ‘adā-yı devletün maḳhūr

Emrine ‘ālemi musaḥḥar ḳıl
‘Askerīn dāyima muẓaffer ḳıl

Dīn ü dünyāsın eyleyüb ma’mūr
İki ‘ālemde ḳıl anı mesrūr (327–332)

As can be seen in the above example, the dua is perceived as a verbal gift: “Eyleyem bir du’ā-yı ḥayr īsār” (I want to present a *ḥayr-dua*), where the verb *īsār eyleyem* is used. Also, by the use of the syntagma *du’ā-yı ḥayr* (a *ḥayr-dua*), the poet emphasises that it is a good wish, unlike the

Turkish expression *beddu'ā*, consisting of the word *bed*, meaning *bad*, and the Arabic word *du'ā*, meaning *prayer*. In the continuation of the poem, the imperative is the dominant verb form, consisting of the auxiliary verbs *eyle* and *kıl* in combination with the Arabic participles. One such example is the verse '*Askerīn dāyima muẓaffer kıl* (Make his army ever victorious), where the Arabic participle *muẓaffer* (victor) was used also as an adjective for the sultan. "The adjective *muẓaffer dāyima* – always victorious was introduced to the tughra of Murat II, and has remained in all other seals that followed" (Čolić 2005: 50).

The characteristic of the sultan, also emphasised in the above verses, is good upbringing, which assumes high moral values: *sen bu sultān-ı hūb-ahlākī*, and that is in line with the perception of the sultan in the Ottoman Empire as a moral role model, a just protector of his subjects. The poet addresses God asking Him to bestow good on the sultan: to rule eternally, to defeat his enemies, and to be joyful in both the worlds. In those good wishes, the expectations from the ruler can be read as well, i.e. the desire for him to be a successful ruler and commander. At the same time, the author indirectly includes himself in the dua, saying: "Support those who support him" (*Kıluba 'vān-ı nuṣretün manṣūr*). Namely, the author does not mention the names of those he dedicates the good wish (dua) to; rather, he describes them as those who support the ruler, and it is very difficult not to conclude that the poet did not include himself in this methiye.

1. 2. Complaints

Complaints are also expressive speech acts, although Michael Hancher (1979: 2) considers them to be representatives after all, for they state the facts relates to the extralinguistic reality. Unlike good wishes/duas, they are face threatening acts, since the speaker/sender of the message expresses his disapproval and negative feelings towards the state of affairs described in the proposition, and for which he holds the hearer responsible. Some of their functions also entail expressing discontent, disapproval, but also facing the problem in order to remedy the situation. They are sometimes also used as means to give vent to one's feelings, as well as a way of

self-expressing. According to Leech (1983: 105), they are conflictive illocutionary functions, since their illocutionary goal (the speaker's intention) conflicts with the social goal (of maintaining cooperation and politeness). Complaints can also be both expressive and directive speech acts (the directive may be added or implied), since the sender of the message can simultaneously ask for the correction of the situation s(he) is complaining about, threatening also the collocutor's negative face.

Complaints can be divided to direct and indirect (Boxer 1996: 236). In direct complaints, the collocutor is mentioned as the cause of the unsatisfactory situation of the speaker, so s(he) is asked to correct it. Such complaints are also directive speech acts, so they threaten the collocutor's negative face. Anna Wierzbicka describes such speech acts (in this case, focusing on the English language) the following way: the speaker expresses the idea that something bad is happening and wants the recipient of the message to intervene and to do something in order to improve the situation. (Wierzbicka 1987: 242).

In order for complaints to be realised, author Iryna Prykarpatska (2008: 93) proposes the following strategies based on the research and modes of different authors (Brown and Levinson, Olshtain and Weinbach, Anna Trosborg): 1. below the level of reproach, i.e. objection is not expressed, for example, "Never mind, let's meet some other time." 2. disapproval is expressed, for example, "It's a shame that we now need to speed up the work because you postponed it." 3. a complaint is expressed, for example, "You are always late and that is why we now have less time to complete the job." 4. an accusation and a warning are expressed, for example, "Don't expect me to sit around next time waiting for you." and 5. a threat is expressed, for example, "If you are late one more time and jeopardise the project, I'll report you to the manager." (Olshtain – Weinbach 1987). In the examples from the Ottoman literature, we also find threats, only they are addressed to the speaker/sender of the message, since they convey the message that something bad will happen unless the situation changes.

Complaints contain three components:

1. Main component

a) initiation/opening of communication (greetings, terms of address)

- b) complaints (expressing negative evaluation, including justification)
- c) requests (direct or indirect attempts to get the recipient of the message to redress the situation)
- 2. Level of directness
 - a) indirect (no explicit mention of the offense)
 - b) somewhat direct (mentioning of the offense, but not the responsibility of the collocutor/the recipient of the message)
 - c) very direct
- 3. Amount of mitigation (Rinnet, Nogami 2006: 33).

On the other hand, indirect complaints can be categorised as 1. self-complaints – speaker expresses negative evaluation about himself/herself, and 2. situation-induced complaints. Such complaints do not have to include the request for correction, since the collocutor is not considered responsible for it; this is a positive politeness strategy the purpose of which is to get closer with the collocutor. That is why Janet Holmes (1995: 188) considers such instances a form of phatic communication, stating that indirect complaints, i.e. general complaints about life, time, situation in economy, etc. call for agreement and compassion, rather than a conflict and a threat to somebody's face. The fact is also that in the contemporary Turkish society, as part of safe topics, the conversation about problematic aspects of life dominates because of a prevailing belief in the evil eye (Zeyrek 2001: 64). It is difficult to establish the difference between, for example, complaints serving as criticisms and those that are only part of the phatic communication. In the following examples, it seems that it is the combination of direct and indirect complaints, since they are addressed to the people of a higher social status, especially considering that it is impossible to determine sometimes who the true recipient of the complaint is. As has already been said, complaints can be both expressive and directive speech acts, since they can also contain a request towards the addressee. Namely, the sender of the message, in our case – the poet, describes himself as a hopeless, unprotected and poor, but, in fact, he is asking the recipient of the message (a person of a higher social status) to act. However, sometimes, the poet expresses resignation: through verses,

he states that he accepts the situation which is against his will and which they cannot alter. Sometimes it is impossible to determine the difference between indirect complaints and resignation.

1.2.1. Complaints in Ghazals

Reference to the extralinguistic reality is rarely present in ghazals, an exception being the final couplet in ghazals – *the makhlas bayt* (the Ottoman *makhlas beyti*). That is a couplet in which the poet weaved his name, i.e. used a poetic pseudonym – *makhlas*. Diwan poets frequently used pseudonyms and were, in fact, famous for the practice in which they would add their name to, most frequently, last or the last but one couplet. The name would often be written in capital letters, or in some coloured ink for the purpose of achieving easier detection. Hence, the presence of the poet's name in the poetry, the main function of which was to show who wrote the verses, also made the author fictitious, and, like other characters, an equal element of the artistic structure. The *makhlas bayt* can be viewed as a self-referential section of the text, implemented either as a reflexion of the author to himself, or to his own text.

Mezaki, a 17th century poet from Bosnia and Herzegovina, referred to his own poetry through verses, without being humble about it: he frequently used hyperbolae (overstate), praising his own poetry, expressing complaints regarding the reception of his poetry, i.e. stating that the uneducated and the ignorant cannot understand it.

*Mezaki, how will the ignorant recognise the value of your verses
One doesn't throw pearls and gems before a bagmaker*

Ey Mezākī ne bilür kıymet-i nazmun nā-dān
Öyle bir pīle-veredür ü güher virmezler (G 138)

As the example shows, the verses contain both self-praise and a complaint. A complaint also frequently contains implicit or explicit self-praise (for example, today's speaker would say: "I've been working so

hard but no one appreciates it”), which may sometimes signal a target group the speaker belongs to (in our case, the poet). The use of the present -r (*bilür, virmezler*), in Turkish signifies an action covering all the three-time spheres (past, present and future) and is frequently used to express the contemporary facts and habitual or repeated actions or to make statements that are considered to be always true. That is why its use in Mezaki’s verses suggests that the poet’s plight is permanent, it is a social constant. One may claim that the poet thus expresses resignation, i.e. that he accepts the situation against his will, since he is unable to alter it. “Resignation is the result of unsuccessful, frequently long-lasting attempts to alter the existing situation...” (Mrazović – Vukadinović 1990: 643). However, it seems that the very expression of resignation may also be an attempt to persuade the recipient/ the author to change the unsatisfactory situation.

The poet emphasises the value of his own position by comparing it to pearls (*dür*) and jewels (*güher*), thus violating the modesty maxim, while, on the other hand, he devalues those who do not belong to the aimed group of recipients by calling them ignorant (*nā-dān*) and bagmakers (*pīle-ver*). In this way, the poet emphasises that poetry demands special education and aptitude, and that it can be understood only by the educated elite. If we refer to the poet’s biography, we would see that his audience was mostly members of the highest classes of the society. That is why it can be argued that this is a form of bonding, because the collocutors (the poet and the aimed recipients of the message/the patron) share a similar experience and educational background.

Mezaki also frequently reflects to the current situation in the perception of the Persian and Ottoman poetry, and, in his allusions, he mentions Baki, the most famous poet of the 16th c. Ottoman poetry:

*Ghazals are no longer read at gatherings
There, neither the poetry of Urfī, nor of Taleb, nor of Baki dwells*

Okunmaz oldı gazeller miyān-ı meclisde
Ne nazm-ı ‘Urfī vü Tālib ne şī’r-i Bākī var (G 89/5)

Mezaki's complaint is expressed through a periphrastic conjugation *okunmaz oldu* (are no longer read), i.e. through a periphrastic form *-maz olmak*, which is a terminative (concluding) aspect, in which *okunmaz* is a qualification. Namely, that is a way of expressing something forever over, not only in the moment of speaking. That is how the complaint is further emphasised. Mentioning the poets Urfi and Taleb, as well as the Ottoman poet Baki, expresses the poet's negative attitude on the current situation in poetry, i.e. on the absence of the classical values.

Complaints regarding the perception of one's own work can also be seen in the *makhlās bayts* of Hasan Ziyai, a Mostar poet. Like Mezaki, Ziyai thematises poetry in his ghazals, expressing complaints regarding the situation in poetry and new trends that suppress the former poetic authorities.

*Ziyai, this new style that has arrived
Cast all the old poets into oblivion*

Eski eş'arı hep unutdurdı
Ey Ziyā'î bize bu tarz-ı cedîd (G 57/5)

Unlike Mezaki's verses, Hasan Ziyai does not use the present *-r* but the perfect form *-di* (*unutdurdı*), by which he materialises his current situation that is the cause, i.e. the object of the complaint.

Poet Sabit Bosnevi as well, through his *makhlās bayts* refers to his own poetry and verses. Complaints regarding the fate of the poetry can be found in his poems as well.

*Sabit, paper is the one that arranges my verses into lavish pages
It is an antiquarian who sells art to the articulate*

Benüm her şî'rümi bir nüṣṣa-ı garrā idüp Sābit
Suhen erbābına şan'at şatar şaḥḥfdur kâğız (G 67/5)

In the above verses, the poet complains that the paper has become more valuable than poetry, i.e. that the form (the cover) is what "sells" the content.

Those verses seem quite contemporary, since one finds similar speech acts even today. Namely, complaints by certain professions regarding a lack of understanding of the environment are a common (almost ritualised) part of today's spoken discourse, so one can speak of continuity of "complaining" through centuries.

Similar can be said for the following verses, in which Sabit Bosnevi this time mentions the quill, not the paper. Namely, in the 17th c., poets wrote poetry using a quill that was both the means and a symbol of poetry.

*Sabit, the quill can barely make ends meet
The value of knowledge cannot be sold easily*

Getürmez iki ucın bir yire kalem Sābit
Metā'-ı ma'rifeti böyle şatmak el virmez (G 136/6)

In these verses, the complaint that generally refers to the position of the poet gains the gnomic dimension again through the use of the present *-r* (*getürmez*, *el virmez*), but also through a metaphor (metonymy) of the quill that cannot make ends meet, i.e. that cannot ensure the existence to the poet.

We can also see interesting examples of complaints regarding the current situation in poetry and the position of the poet in Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak's makhlas bayts, from the first half of the 18th century.

*How lovely the ghazal is in the language of our time
O, Hatem, lurid words are often empty*

Hâtem zebân-ı 'aşr ile pek şüh olur gazel
Cāfcāflıdır sühan ki fülân festekizlidir (G 35/12)

Here, the author uses the word *cāfcāf*, of Persian origin, meaning *showing*, *lavishness*, *competition*, but which means, in common speech, "the one who achieves something through eloquence" ('Ağız kalabalığıyla bir şeyi elde eden') (*Türkçe Sözlük* 1988: 241). As was the case in the

previous examples, the verses are a complaint against the situation in poetry, i.e. the dominance of form over content.

Not only does Ahmed Hatem refer through his verses to the language of his time, but also to poets, his contemporaries, like Nedim, for example:

*To the poetry of famous Nedim there could be no comparison
The gun of his art echoes across the world*

Nazm-ı Nedīm-i dehr ile olmaz muḳābele
Anuñ tūfeng-i ṭab'ı sekiz kertelizlidir (35/13)

Hatem's complaint refers to the reception of the 18th century poets that remained in the shadow of Nedim's poetry. At the first level of meaning, we see praise to Nedim's poetry, but the illocution of the utterance is, after all, a complaint related to the unsatisfactory position of other poets and the reception of their work.

The use of the word *gun* (*tūfeng*) relates to war and serves to show the supremacy of the poet Nedim. The structure *tūfeng-iṭab'ı* meaning *the gun of his nature* has been translated as *the gun of his art*, since the word *tab'* meant, in the classical Ottoman poetry, the "artistic nature of the poet" and was frequently a synonym for the poet and poetry.

1.2.2. Complaints in Mathnawis

Introductory and final parts of mathnawis are of a special importance for the pragmatic analysis, since, in those sections, poets would frequently reflect upon the extralinguistic reality, the perception of their own poetry, matters of the relationship with the dignitary (the patron) to whom the work is dedicated, and their own poetic identity. Namely, prior to dealing with the main theme of the mathnawi, the poet dedicates one chapter to the reasons why he decided to write the poem (*sebeb-itelīf* or *sebeb-i nazm-ı kitāb*), thus referring to the extralinguistic reality. Also, in the last chapter of the classical mathnawis, i.e. their ending (*hātime*), the poet frequently speaks about poetry and his own work, mentions his own name, the date of the completion of writing in a chronogram, and a conclusion.

A 16th c. poet from Mostar, Hasan Ziyai, in the introductory chapter of his *Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak* states that his poetry was not acclaimed in his living environment, so he was forced to leave his home country:

*In the end, the heavens that had protected the ignorant
Indeed saw and cognised my skill*

*Having put me through ordeal
Having condemned me to a life of misery*

*Every ghazal was like a persecution to me
My fervour had turned into a pain with no end*

*In my verses nobody found interest
Away or at home the same I felt*

*Now the skill has equaled the shame
The verses now who will read, who will listen*

‘Ākıbet bu felek-i dūn-perver
Bende fehm eyle difi’l-cümle hüner

‘Ādetince baña cevır itdi ‘azīm
Eyledi faqr maḳāmunda muḳīm

‘Ayn-ı ‘azl oldı baña her ḡazelüm
Elem oldı gıce gündüz emelüm

Şi’rüme itmedi kimse raḡbet
Baña yeg oldı vaṭandan ḡurbet

‘Ayn-ı ‘ayb oldı meḡer şimdi hüner
Naẓm-ı pāki kim oḡur kim diñler (150–54)

In the first four verses, the poet complains about his predicament, since his art was not recognised and he was living in misery, forced to leave his home country. One can thus argue that this is an indirect complaint that calls for the recipient's (the patron's) solidarity. In that sense, the use of the perfect -di can be explained, since it marks a concrete activity in the past (*fehm eyledi, cevr itdi, 'azl oldı, raġbet itmedi, yeg oldı*). In the last couplet from the sphere of the past, the poet uses the adverb *şimdi* (now) and moves us to the current moment, complaining of defective system of values, where the skill, meaning the skill of the poet, had been exposed to shame. In the end, with the present -r and an interrogative sentence in order to make an emphasis, the poet paints a general image of the reception of poetry: "The verses now, who will read, who will listen" (*Naẓm-ı pāki kim okur kim diñler*).

The poet's mentioning of the heavens as the cause of his plight is noteworthy. Namely, according to the worldview present in the classical Ottoman poetry, the heavens (*felek*) had an influence over all life on Earth. The Ottoman poets, unable to complain to God regarding their own destiny, since it was inappropriate for a believer to do so, would describe their predicament casting blame on the heavens and the stars (Onay 1996: 230).

In the following part of the introduction, Hasan Ziyai further complains against the social situation, reflecting upon his position as a poet:

*It is a shame that wind in my back did not blow
What could I say, when I only knew was sorrow*

*Poor are we and the time in which we dwell
No sanctuary for poets their sorrow to quell*

Rūzgār olmadı ħayfā hem-vār
Nola dirsem ġamı vardur ħemm var

Bir zamān oldı dirīgā bu zamān
Bulımaz ehl-i hüner ġamdan emān (246–47)

In the second verse, the poet used the exclamation that denotes wailing (*dirīgā*), which translates as *alas*; *o, my*; *oh*, which is a frequent characteristic of complaints in the diwan poetry. This issue will be discussed later.

In the same chapter, Hasan Ziyai extends his complaints to the general condition; he underscores the plight of the learned people, his contemporaries:

*The age of ignorance has come, cognition has left
Truly, that bird has flown away from its nest*

*Many a wretch fortune has seen
Thinking their words pearls and gems to be*

*Indeed, people of all kinds might be
But the barefaced are the majority*

*The malevolent happiness and honour have gained
The honourable is staggered by the secret of the fate*

*The ignorant in silk now are wrapped
The learned overwhelmed with refuse and reject*

*The ignorant lie in a bed with the nicest atlas silk
The learned in the sheets of the sharpest stones shall sink*

*Thorns and waste are a bed for the noble
Never shall the ignorant experience that*

*What a misfortune must it be when every minute
The ignorant scorns the wise aloud*

*The brightness of the eye is the nobleman's adornment
The ignorant as a blind man dims that light*

*The heavens so many arrows of fate have fired
They should have by now killed all the learned*

Dem-i cehl irdi vü ‘irfân göçdi
Fi’l-ḥaḳīḳa yuvadan kuş uçdı

Māl ile nice ğabī oldu ğanī
Zann ider dürr ü güherdür süḥani

Gerçi kim nās olupdur ecnās
Toğrusı ekseri ammā encās

Devlet ü ‘izzete düşmiş eşrār
Hep bu esrār ile ḥayrān ebrār

Cāhilüñ setri zibā-yı dībā
Kāmilüñ ḥār u ḥas olur ammā

Cāhilüñ atlas ü ḥārā döşegi
Kāmilüñ ḥār ile ḥārā döşegi

Ḥār u ḥāşāk döşek kāmilde
Böyle ḥāşā ki ola cāhilde

Ne belādur bu ki cāhil her bār
‘Āḳıle dīl uzadur süsen-vār

Kāmil olanda olur nūr-ı başār
Cāhil ammā gelür ol nūrı başār

Ol kadar tīğ-ı ḳazā urdı felek
Bu dem erbāb-ı hüner mürde gerek (275–84)

As in the previous verses, the poet again blames the heavens for the misfortune of the learned: “The heavens so many arrows of fate have fired/ They should have by now killed all the learned” (*Ol kadar tîğ-ı kazâ urdı felek/Bu dem erbâb-ı hüner mürde gerek*), but also the ruthless weather and the unfavourable wind, as is expressed in the title of the chapter. That is metonymy. The poet uses the terms referring to time and wind to imply fate. That is why Ziyai’s verses are an indirect complaint, which is a part of the positive politeness strategy, since such complaints express solidarity with the recipients of the message who are in the same situation. Namely, the recipients of Hasan Ziyai’s work must have been members of the same interpretative group, at the same educational level, otherwise they would not have been able to read and understand his poetry. That is especially significant when one considers that the poet from Mostar dedicated his *Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak* to his patron Vusuli Mehmed Bey, also a poet. This is confirmed in Ziyai’s verses, where he stated the following of his patron: “He is unmatched in administrative affairs/He is the bey of all beys even among poets”.

Expressiveness of the complaint is emphasised by antithesis, which is used to achieve a contrast through introducing together the opposite notions, for example, *cāhil*– *kāmil* (the ignorant – the learned), *eşrār*– *ebrār* (the malevolent – the honourable). The contrast is also seen in the use of identical Arabic paradigms. The contrast is found in the description of the general situation and the situation of the poets, i.e. the learned on the one hand, and the ignorant on the other. They are contrasted through terms such as “silk, atlas, pearls, gems” used for the ignorant, and “thorns, refuse, waste and stones” for the learned. All that implies that poets are not adequately rewarded for their poetry. Namely, the effect of literature, i.e. its pragmatic dimension (perlocution) manifested through material goods was frequently lacking.

In the final chapter of the *Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak*, i.e. in a certain afterword to the mathnawi, entitled *The End of the Book*, the poet, dealing with the issue of the perception of his work, expresses complaints related to the ignorant members of the society who cannot understand his verses:

*Know that a superficial man who wrote nothing
Will say that my job resembles neither the field nor the sickle*

Bil ki hatt itmedüğinden zāhir
Bu ne çiftüm ne orağumdur dir (1687)

In the following verses, the poet complains about the ignorance of members of different professions, who not only do not understand his vocabulary, but could neither understand the value of the book. In doing so, the poet uses the present -r which describes gnomic facts.

*If a blacksmith were to set his eyes on this
If all these dots made sparks, he'd think*

*If a saddler were to come upon these lines
He would recognise the wooden pikes in all 'alifs*

*What can that poor man do, for such is his craft
His eyes are only searching for sharpness of spike*

*If, however, a shepherd saw them along the road
He'd think the 'alifs were rods*

Bir demirci buna kılsaydı nazar
Şanur ol noktaları cümle şerer

Bir semerciye görünürse busuñur
Elifin cümle çuvāldüz şanur

Neylesün şan'atıdur ol ebter
Gözini sivri çuvāldūza diker

Baksa çübān eger nāgeh añ
Şanur anuñ elifin cümle 'aşā (1680–83)

Ziyai's thematization of the perception of his own poetry indicates his concern about the reader response. The poet, in fact, wants to direct the perception of his own text by defining a "model reader", who is by no means an uneducated or an illiterate craftsman, but the educated elite. Such complaints contain also a certain amount of self-praise, since it is emphasised that the illiterate and the uneducated cannot understand poetry, meaning poetry is defined as prestigious and elitist. Here, one can notice the poet's self-identification with the ideal target group (the educated elite, other poets), hence, the self-praise can (just like the complaint) serve as a strategy of establishing solidarity between members of the same group.

1.2.3. Complaints in Kit'as (Epigrams)

We need to remember that the diwan tradition defines the kit'a (epigram) as a poem with two couplets, a genre expressing ideas of the poet, his wisdom, attitudes, judgments and criticism (Dilçin 1995: 202).

In Hasan Ziyai's *Diwan*, the kit'a, apart from the love-mystical content, draws attention because of examples where the poet expresses complaints against his own position in the society and the issue of the perception of his poetry.

*Ziyai, dwellers of this town
When they look at me it is not kind and benevolent*

*Either I am not possessed of any craft
Or they cannot recognise it*

Ey Žiyā'ī bu şehir halkında
Baña hiç şefkat u 'ināyet yok

Belki bunlar ya ma'rifetsizdür
Bende yā zerre kıbiliyyet yok (Q 32)

In contrast to his complaints, Hasan Ziyai here does not express the ignorance and the lack of education of the people in his surrounding;

rather, he uses a euphemism: “dwellers of this town/when they look at me it is not kind and benevolent” (*bu şehir halkında baña hîç şefkat u ‘ināyet yok*), which is, in fact, a litotes in the form of a negation employed to mitigate the utterance, before proceeding to problematise his art: “Either I do not possess a craft of any kind/ Or, maybe, they cannot recognise it (*Belki bunlar ya ma’rifetsizdür/Bende yā zerre kâbiliyyet yok*).

*I have dedicated many a year to science and study
So that I, as a learned man, would gain the people’s recognition*

*Unfortunately, whoever has seen my learnedness, he immediately
became envious
Everyone has betrayed me, I have lost my respect and reputation*

Niçe yıldur ki taḥṣîl-i kemāl ü ma’rifet kıldum
Umardum merdüm-i kâmil diyü halk eyleye rağbet

Belā bu kim kemālüm gördi her biri ḥasūd oldı
İhānet kıldılar gitdi olanca hürmet ü ‘izzet (Q 16)

It is interesting that the poet, in this instance, and, again, in contrast to the complaints that he expresses in the *Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak*, mentions how he had educated himself to gain respect of the community whose ignorance later led him to complaint: “I have dedicated many a year to science and study / So that I, as a learned man, would gain the people’s recognition” (*Niçe yıldur ki taḥṣîl-i kemāl ü ma’rifet kıldum / Umardum merdüm-i kâmil diyü halk eyleye rağbet*). In the end, his education, which is also a kind of self-praise, was no more than the object of envy and reason to lose respect, which is the poet’s complaint. “Self-praise” also entails exaggeration (*niçeyıldur*/ for many years), which is followed by a complaint (*belā bu*/ unfortunately), since it contains the word *misfortune* (*belā*) and *betrayal* (*ihānet*), which could also be characterised as an accusation. Namely, that is also an expressive speech act, and it is a specific form of the claim about guilt “for which there are no limitations

as per the relationship between the collocutors” (Ivanetić 1995: 70), so it can be realised even when the one being accused is absent, without a direct interaction with him/her. In that speech act, the speaker / the sender of the message refers, through his/her utterance, to a certain activity that either happened in the past, or is currently unfolding, and which has disturbed and violated a moral or legal norm, i.e. which has caused material or non-material damage, for which the speaker holds the collocutor, or some third party, responsible (Ivanetić 1995: 70).

Also, in Suleiman Mezaki’s *Diwan*, interesting examples of complaints in kit’as can be found, which relate to the envy of the enemy, i.e., the accusation of the envy, but this time, the addressee is the highest instance – the sultan:

*To the honourable ground beneath your feet
Oh, Sultan, I have given my face like a harvest*

*My plea, in your presence, is uttered
With a hundred words gratitude and complaints*

*Praised be the Almighty Lord
Your slave known as honest*

*My complaint is that the envious ignorant
With the calumnious fire has burned my heart*

*I hope that your astute character
The truth from lie will set apart*

Hāk-ı pāy-ı şerīfe sulṭānum
Çehre-fersāyī-i zirā’at ile

‘Arż-ı hālüm budur huzuruñda
Başt-ı şad-şükr ü şad-şikāyet ile

Şükr oldur Cenāb-ı Mevlā'ya
Kuluñum şöhet-i şadākat ile

Şekvem oldur ki hāsīd-i nā-dān
Cigerüm yaqdı nār-ı tōhmet ile

Umarın mū-şikāfī-i ṭab'ūñ
Farķ ider şıdķ u kızbi diķķat ile (KT 1)

This example contains several pragmatic paradoxes. On the one hand, the modesty maxim can be observed, as well as self-dispraise of the sender of the message: “To the honourable ground beneath your feet/Oh, Sultan, I have given my face like a harvest” (*Hāk-ı pāy-ı şerīfe sulṭānum/Çehrefersāyī-i zirā'at ile*), or “Your slave known as honest” (*Kuluñum şöhet-i şadākat ile*). On the other hand, self-praise can also be observed, when the poet states for himself to be known for honesty (he is, at the same time, a slave famous for honesty), as well as when he states: “I hope that your astute character/ The truth from lie will set apart” (*Umarın mū-şikāfī-i ṭab'ūñ/Farķ ider şıdķ u kızbi diķķat ile*), for here, indirectly, he is violating the modesty maxim by expressing hope that the sultan (whom he also compliments in that way) will recognise the true values. In the couplet “My plea, in your presence, is uttered/With a hundred words gratitude and complaints” (*‘Arz-ı hālüm budur huzuruñda /Başt-ı şad-şükr ü şad-şikāyet ile*) the poet simultaneously utters three speech acts at the same time: plea, gratitude and complaint, with exaggeration: “a hundred words gratitude and complaints”.

1.2.4. Complaints in Qasidas

Interesting examples of complaints can be observed in two qasidas by Hasan Ziyai, entitled: *Kasīde-i Seng-istān* (*A Qasida to a Rocky Landscape*) and *Kasīde-i Hāne-i Vīrāne* (*A Qasida to a Razed House*). Not only do the two qasidas thematically step away from the literary tradition, but they also do that by the very fact that they are not dedicated to a prominent person. In

both these poems, the poet complains about the devastation, poverty and his living conditions.

When we observe Hasan Ziyai's *Qasida to a Rocky Landscape* in light of the structure of the classical Ottoman qasida, we can conclude that it contains only the introductory chapter, the *nesīb*, and the final chapter, the *dua*. More precisely, the first nineteen couplets could conditionally be accepted as an introduction, since they do not represent a description of nature, an arrival of a season or a festivity, or some object, as was common in the Ottoman literary tradition; rather, that was an expression of the spiritual state of the poet, frequently shown through the metaphor of the stone.

Apart from the introduction that concerns the description of the poet's spirit, the *Qasida to a Rocky Landscape* contains also the final chapter with two couplets (20 and 21), where the pessimistic lines of the previous verses change to an extent. From the aspect of the genre, it is significant that this qasida does not contain the central chapter, the *methiye*, where the person to whom the qasida is dedicated is praised. Considering the fact that this chapter is not present in Ziyai's qasida, we can question whether or not this poem is a qasida at all. Namely, according to the theoreticians of the diwan literature, the *methiye* is an obligatory and the essential part of the qasida, while other chapters are only introduced. The contemporary Turkish author Filiz Kılıç, in her text *The Poetic Forms*, defines the qasida through the existence of the *methiye*: "Otherwise, a qasida without the *methiye* chapter is unimaginable" (210). Still, the non-existence of the *methiye* chapter is not the only thing that moves away the *Qasida to a Rocky Landscape* from the poetic norms of the time: it also does not contain the *fahriye* chapter, which is traditionally dedicated to the praise of the very poet, i.e. to own artistic achievements. Instead of praising the nobleness of a potential patron or his own poetry, in this qasida we find only complaints and displeasure with the poet's own situation, described in the introductory chapter. On the other hand, unlike the classical qasidas, whose *nesīb* chapter is abundant with the clichéd descriptions of nature and the known décor, Hasan Ziyai's descriptions are innovative and original. Namely, although here too one can observe the stylistic devices of exaggeration,

i.e. hyperbolae (*mübalağa*), the descriptions are much more concrete than the ones found in the classical Ottoman qasidas. Such content would traditionally coincide more with the forms *terqib-i bend* or the *terji bend*, since they thematically stem from religious, sufi and philosophical ideal, and they also contain criticism of the society, complaints about one's life and fate. As an expression of displeasure and grieving over the unkind fate, such forms were especially suitable for writing elegies, i.e. the marsiya (Dilçin 1995: 250). If we observe in that light Ziyai's verses from the *Qasida to a Rocky Landscape*, we will notice that the content is the same as the traditionally determined content of the *terqib-i bend* or the *terji bend* forms. As a form, the Ottoman qasida, as we have already emphasised, was not meant for writing elegies and philosophical or sufi verses, hence in that sense as well can we see Ziyai's distancing from the tradition.

In the *Qasida to a Rocky Landscape*, the poet expresses complaints regarding his own position:

*We complain about the life on the rock
What can we do, troubles plummet on us*

*O, friends, set a tall stone grave marker
If I, the poor, here abroad, lose my life*

*These are the rocks of God, oh, if only God would protect my falcon
So that he no to nest in such a place would strive*

Taşda meskenden inen katı şikâyet kıluruz
N'idelüm başumuza pârelenür anca mihen

Bir ulu taşı mezârumda nişân eyleyesiz
Döştlar bunda ölürsem elem-i gurbetden

Bir Hudâyî kayalardur ki Hudâ ide halâş
Şâhin-i tab'umı bu yirde yuva tutmağdan (Q 9/14–16)

Seemingly, the poet is resigned so much so that he does not address his complaints to any individual in particular. What is more, he is addressing the rocky landscape, which may be characterised as an irony of a sort, spurred by a feeling of utter resignation. On the other hand, we see in those very verses addressees from the same social background, whom the poet labels as “friends”: “O, friends, set a tall stone grave marker/If I, the poor, here abroad lose my life” (*Bir ulu taşı mezārumda nişān eylesiz/Dōstlar bunda ölürsem elem-i gurbetden*). This is, in fact, a request expressed through the optative (*eylesiz*): the poet asks the addressee to set a tombstone upon his death. That request does not concern changing of his current situation. On the contrary, he shows that he has accepted it, resigned, and that the action is postponed for the time following his death. The word *abroad* (*gurbet*) may refer to the actual absence of the poet from home, but also to his subjective feeling of alienation, since it is impossible to determine Hasan Ziyai’s whereabouts in the time he wrote the *Qasida to a Rocky Landscape*.

In the last couplet, the poet indirectly expresses a plea (prayer), more precisely, a wish expressed through the optative “*ide ḥalāṣ*” (would protect), which can be fulfilled only by God.

A Qasida to a Razed House is a similar example, since the poet, by describing his run-down home, creates an atmosphere that is rather far from the one seen in the introductory chapters of classical *qasidas*.

*Alas, a strange, unfortunate place my house has become
The skies have cast me, a slave, in the middle of a razed hearth*

*Is this ruin my heart or my home
A fate coming from the sky has appeared*

*May no poet ever write such unfitting verses
Otherwise not a single corner will remain to mention the House of God*

Meskenüm oldu dirîgâ bir ‘aceb miḥnet yiri
Ḥāne-i vîrāneye koydı felek ben çākeri

Hâne-i vîrâne-i kâlbüm midür ya meskenüm
Zâhirâ yoḥsa kaçâ-yı âsumân-ı mazharî

Beyt-i şî'ri böyle nâ-sâz olmasun bir şâ'irüñ
Yoḥsa Beytu'llâh ḥaḳḳı dünyede ḳalmaz yiri (Q11/1–3)

In the first couplet, the poet uses the exclamation of complaint *dirîğâ*, meaning “alas”, “ouch”, “oh”. Exclamations, as a lexical category, are highly complex, for they utilise different linguistic aspects (Wilkins 1992: 155). Namely, Wilkins claims that the words are also both lexemes and expressions, i.e. speech acts. In the aforementioned example, the exclamation *dirîğâ* is an expressive speech act the poet uses to express lament over his own self; he expresses his sorrow, suffering and helplessness, which is part of the entire poem functioning as an expressive (complaint). Here too the poet deems fate responsible for his plight, i.e. the heavens (*felek*, *kaçâ-yı âsumân*), while the following verse expresses a good wish for other poets. Namely, when the poet states: May no poet ever write such unfitting verses / Otherwise not a single corner will remain to mention the House of God (*Beyt-i şî'ri böyle nâ-sâz olmasun bir şâ'irüñ / Yoḥsa Beytu'llâh ḥaḳḳı dünyede ḳalmaz yiri*), he indirectly complains about his own situation, that is, he quite effectively describes the circumstances he is in. A similar occurrence is seen today, when a speaker complains about his/her position and, in doing so, uses a good wish so that nobody else ever experiences it (“I wouldn’t wish this on my worst enemy”). Through the classical Ottoman stylistic device *cinas* (paranomasia) *beyt-i şî'ri* (verses in poetry, *bayt* – a couplet), a warning is expressed that if other poets found themselves in such a situation, i.e. misery, not a single corner will exist fitting to mention God’s house (*bayt*) through verses (*bayt*). Warning as a speech act, unlike the threat, can be uttered by a speaker who cannot implement a sanction.

At the same time, the *Qasida to a Razed House* is dominated by irony, where the poet’s sense of humour can be noticed:

*If one could only see the suffering that has begotten me
Every nail’s head would protrude from the planks*

*When I look around, I fear I see the abyss of Gehenna
An army of snakes, myriapods and scorpions has assembled in the
house*

*To this house, the art of its builder suits so well
Had it been built in the antique style, it would not have dilapidated thus*

*The spider is my curtain maker, regent of the land of the poor
Time and again his gridded curtain down comes*

*From one minute to the next, he changes faces of pain and sorrow
From Skender's mirror, the water there he spills*

Var ise eyler temāṣā çekdügüm zaḥmetleri
Taḥtadan başın çıkarmış yekserinün ekseri

Korḡarın çāh-ı cehennemdür temāṣā eylesek
Evdeki mār u çiyān u 'akreb olmuş bir çeri

Ol kadar evde yaşısun bu evüñ mi'mārı çün
İhtiyār itmiş degül yapmakda tarz-ı āḡeri

Cā-be-cā çekmiş müşebbek zarların bir 'ankebūd
Perde-dārumdur benem iḡlīm-i kaḡruñ serveri

Dem-be-dem derd ü belādan dürlü şūret gösterür
Cā-be-cā dökmiş şuyı āyīne-i'İ skenderī (Q11/10–14)

The poet expresses utter resignation by means of parody. It is interesting that he uses lexemes that are associated with castles and states when describing his house, such as *army* (çeri), *curtain maker* (perde-dār), *curtain* (zar), *regent* (server), etc. Thus, he employs self-irony when speaking of himself as of a ruler to whom the spider is a “curtain maker, regent of the land of the poor” (*Perde-dārumdur benem iḡlīm-i kaḡruñ serveri*).

A special meaning of irony is that it makes the role of the recipient in decoding the sense of a text or its segment particularly visible, in addition to indicating the instability of sense of each text; the fact that irony is possible entails that in the world of meaning "no content is safe", while readiness to recognise the irony is also readiness to accept such a "evasive meaning". (Katnić-Bakaršić 2001: 330)

Observing the *Qasida to a Razed House* in light of the Ottoman literary tradition, one can notice that it refers to the genre by its very title, i.e. that the author tried to define the genre through the title, but also to create thus a certain parody. Namely, right from the title, the recipient anticipates to see the name of a dignitary mentioned, and, in the Ottoman tradition, usually a sultan, a vizier, or a pasha, more rarely a bey; frequently, the title would provide description of dignitary's virtues and military victories together his name.

From today's perspective, it is very difficult to reconstruct the motives behind Hasan Ziyai's decision to write the *Qasida to a Razed House*. Primarily, qasidas were poems dedicated to potential patrons, i.e. persons with whom the poet had some contact, or whom he even knew. Since this qasida is not dedicated to a dignitary, and we know from the foreword to the *Diwan* that the poet complained about not being understood in his environment, unable to find a patron, we are led to think that the *Qasida to a Razed House* is the actual voice of the poet by which he rebels against the lack of appreciation by the authority of poets, as well as against the canons of poetry.

Still, despite being off the radar of the ruling poetical canon, the *Qasida to a Razed House* had an interesting fate. Namely, it has been established that this is the only qasida by Hasan Ziyai recorded elsewhere, besides the *Diwan*, i.e. it was recorded in a collection, preserved in the Archives of Herzegovina in Mostar, as well as in the manuscript No. 4287, preserved at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo. The fact that this qasida found its place alongside some other ghazals and mufrads by Ziyai, together with verses of other selected poets, certainly speaks of its positive reception after the poet's death, i.e. in the 17th century, since the Mostar collection mentions the year 1601 (1652). Namely, at the time, the best indicator of a positive

reception and interest for a certain work was seen in multiple rewriting of the poem, so sometimes a poem would appear in collections written by later authors.

Another interesting example is a qasida by Sabit Bosnevi, where he addressed the grand vizier Kalajli Ahmed Pasha, referring to his precarious situation following the appointment to a position in Bosnia.

*At Asaf's threshold that rises sky high
The time has come for my plight to be declared*

*I have bene confided a duty in Bosnia, a dire place
Reminding me of a valley in Gehenna*

*I had set out with debt, and have lost a lot
Neither a gift, nor a dime, nor a dirham have I received*

*From the snow, rain and wind here
Only a handful of dew instead of silver have I received*

Āṣafā sūdde-i ulyā-yı sipihr-āsāña
Ben de aḥvālūmi i'lām idecek dem geldi

Virdiler Bosnada maṣṣīb diyü bir cāy-ı 'azāb
Göricek ḥaṭırā vādī-i cehennem geldi

Deyn-i vāfirle gidüp ḥā'ib ü ḥāsır geldüm
Ne hedāya vü ne dīnār ü ne dirhem geldi

Berf ü bārānı düşüp bād-ı hevādan ancak
Sīm-i maḥṣūle bedel nuḳre-i ṣebnem geldi (Q 30/25–28)

In the first verse, Sabit Bosnevi uses the performative verb *to declare* (*i'lām itmek*). In fact, he is claiming that the time has come “to announce”, which is why some linguists classify complaints as representative speech

acts. The declaration contains a direct complaint addressed to Kalajli Ahmed Pasha, whom he addresses (compliments) as “Asaf”. In the Oriental-Islamic literary tradition, Asaf is the vizier of Prophet Suleiman and a symbol of a proficient decision-maker and commander (Nametak 2007: 39). In the following verse, the poet states to have been confided a duty in Bosnia, which was in a difficult situation at the time. Historical sources confirm that Sabit was appointed the kadi of Sarajevo after it had been looted and burnt to the ground prior to his arrival, in 1697, by prince Eugene of Savoy’s army (Šabanović 1973: 383).

In the second couplet, the poet describes the plight that had befallen him by comparing Bosnia to Gehenna, which is the worst and the least desirable place for a believer. However, besides the spiritual dimension, Sabit openly complains about his own material position and says: “I had set out with debt, and have lost a lot / Neither a gift, nor a dime, nor a dirham have I received” (*Deyn-i vāfirle gidüp hā’ib ü hāsır geldüm / Ne hedāya vü ne dīnār ü ne dirhem geldi*). He continues to describe the financial loss through a remarkable metaphor: “Only a handful of dew instead of silver have I received” (*Sīm-i maḥşüle bedel nuḳre-i şebnem geldi*). The use of the perfect -di is noticeable in all the verses. Its aim is to describe a concrete activity and action. Sabit ends the poem by describing the weather in Bosnia, symbolising the difficult living conditions he encountered: “From the snow, rain and wind here / Only a handful of dew instead of silver have I received” (*Sīm-i maḥşüle bedel nuḳre-i şebnem geldi / Berf ü bārānı düşüp bād-ı hevādan ancaḳ*).

1.2.4.1. Complaints and Self-Praise in Fahriyes

As has already been stated, self-praise is common both in the Ottoman texts and in the contemporary Turkish language, just as are complaints. The speaker/the sender of the message, emphasises his value by complaining about his precarious situation, since others do not recognise his qualities. One may say that we frequently praise ourselves today by complaining about bad conditions; thus, the complaint means that we deserve better, i.e. that our values are not recognised and appreciated.

Self-praise can also be face-threatening acts, because the speaker uses them to express a positive attitude about oneself. By praising him/herself, the speaker also threatens the addressee's face and/or shows that she/he does not care about the collocutor's feelings (Brown and Levinson 1987: 67). In that way, one violates the modesty maxim, which states: a) minimise praise of self and b) maximise dispraise of self (Leech 1983: 132). However, this, as well as other maxims, are not absolute rules, especially the second sub-maxim, since the person would constantly underestimate him/herself, which would annoy the collocutors, and, more importantly, they would deem such a person as dishonest (Leech 1983: 133). That is why some authors state that the maxim does not mean that the Chinese, for example, do not think positively of themselves, rather, they only need to appear humble and unassuming. Today, the breach of the modesty maxim is present, even desirable, in many situations, for example, during a job interview (and answers to the question: "Why should we hire you?") and when writing a CV (Michale Hancher classifies self-praise as representative speech acts, 1979:2). Self-praise as a positive statement about oneself is, in fact, a converse of a compliment, hence the same definition can be used to define it, albeit this time, the focus is not on the hearer but on the speaker: it is a speech act used to explicitly or implicitly express approval/positive evaluation related to the speaker or something that concerns him/her (or, for example, self-advertisement), which is, still, normally expressed in a milder form. Some authors distinguish bragging, which is more aggressive and competitive ("I am brilliant"; "I am better than others"; "I didn't even have to try hard") from a positive self-disclosure ("I really worked hard"; "Others have given me an opportunity"), which is primarily an ordinary piece of information, but it also reveals facts about the speaker as a positively-evaluated individual in his/her community. However, the line between bragging and a positive self-disclosure is frequently fluid and difficult to detect. Also, self-identification with an ideal reference group (applicable to the cases of poets' self-praise) is frequent. Hence, self-praise (just like complaints) can serve as a strategy of establishing solidarity with members of the same group.

From the aspect of expressing self-praise, these parts of the *qasida*, known as *fahriye*, deserve particular interest, since they are, content-wise, based on the self-praise of the poet. The *fahriye* is an important section of the *qasida*, most notably in light of understanding the poet's perception of his own poetics and poetry in general. Frequently in the *fahriye*, poets complain about the reception of their own poetry, their difficult position and dependence on a patron. Here too we find both self-praise and complaints; one might claim that the latter is an addition to the former.

Such is the *fahriye* in the *Qasida to the Wind in Praise of Hasan Bey* by Ziyai:

*The ignorant and the powerful assemble and frolic
But what is to be done when the wishes of the good have not become
yet*

*There is no one interested in the virtuous poet
It is strange how every ignoramus has become a poet*

*Isn't there a soft-hearted to have pity on the poor me
So that I confide him through tears that my sorrow is great*

*We still stand though many a country has conquered us
Upon our head came the greatest of pains and misery*

*From the judgement of the penitent and envy of the knowing, there isn't
anyone
To provide help and security in the wheel of time*

Cāh ile cāhil olanlar buluşur zevk eyler
Kām ile līk buluşmaz n'ideyin kāmīl olan

Şā'ir-i fāzıla bir raġbet ider almadı hī
Ne 'acebdür bu ki şā'ir geinür her nādān

Yok mı ben bî-dili bir acıyacak şîrîn-tâb
Ağlayup derd-i derûnum ideyin aña beyân

Kalduķ ayakda bizi eyledi iller pā-māl
Başumuzda niçe endüh u ğam u derd-i girân

Ṭa'n-ı nādān ile dānā ḥasedinden hergiz
Bulmaduķ devr-i zamān içre meded emn ü emān (Q 7/16–20)

As with the previous examples of complaints, the poet here reflects upon the general situation in the social milieu and the lack of appreciation for the poetry. Here too the “guilty party” is depersonalised, i.e., it is mentioned as “the wheel of time” (*devr-i zamān*). Thus, although the qasida is dedicated to Hasan Bey, the mention of him is depersonalized and he is not called out as responsible for such a predicament; rather, he is expected to display understanding and solidarity. He should be “soft-hearted to have pity on the poor me / so that I confide him through tears that my sorrow is great” (*Yok mı ben bî-dili bir acıyacak şîrîn-tâb / Ağlayup derd-i derûnum ideyin aña beyân*). In other words, it is an indirect complaint by which the poet is trying to become close to the addressee (Hasan Bey), but also an indirect request by which the poet is asking the collocutor to perform a certain action (to have pity, i.e. to help him). At the same time, Hasan Ziyai discloses resignation, as, in a way, he is coming to terms with the plight described using the present -r: The ignorant and the powerful assemble and frolic / But what can one do when the good have not become yet” (*Cāh ile cāhil olanlar buluşur zevķ eyler / Kām ile lîk buluşmaz n'ideyin kāmîl olan*). The complaint in matter also encompasses self-praise, because the poet, as was customary in the classical Ottoman literature, is, de-facto, complaining about the lack of understanding and belittlement of his art: “There is no one interested in the virtuous poet / It is strange how every ignoramus has become a poet” (*Şā'ir-i fāzıla bir rağb etider kalmadı hiç / Ne 'acebdür bu ki şā'ir geçinür her nādān*). The syntagma *Şā'ir-i fāzıl* (honourable, chaste, a poet adorned by virtues) is used to describe the poet, and contrasted to the word *nādān* (the ignorant).

1. 3. Self-praise

As already stated, self-praise may be face-threatening acts, since the speaker is uttering a positive statement about him/herself, thus breaching the Leech's modesty maxim. The positive image of self by the speaker/the sender of the message can also be accomplished recalling past events, as well as through quoting others (who think positively of the speaker).

However, self-praise can also serve to establish solidarity between members of the same group. In that sense, Daria Dayter (2014: 97) lists the following self-praise strategies:

1. Explicit self-praise without modification / mitigation, which is nearest to the aforementioned bragging, and is a threat to the hearer's face, since it suggests that the speaker is better than the hearer;
2. Explicit self-praise with modification / mitigation, which includes:
 - a) disclaim the face threat ("I don't want to be immodest", "I apologise if I sound immodest", etc.);
 - b) shift focus away from self ("She has helped me a lot", etc.);
 - c) self-denigrate ("I did it well, but could have done better", etc.) and
 - d) refer to hard work ("I tried very hard", etc.) and
3. Reinterpretation:
 - a) self-praise followed by complaint and
 - b) self-praise framed as a third part complaint.

Previously, it has been stated (and shown), that complaints and self-praise frequently go hand-in-hand in the Ottoman poetry. Complaints of being misconstrued can be considered speech acts threatening the hearer's/ message recipient's face (in this case, the members of other professions who do not understand poetry), as well as speech acts that establish and strengthen solidarity with other members of the target group (poets).

1. 3. 1. Self-praise in Makhlas Bayts

At this point it is worthwhile mentioning that the ghazal/lyrical poetry, rarely includes examples of self-praise, but the makhlas bayt, the last verse containing the poet's name (makhlas), is an exception. Presence of the

poet's name in poetry, apart from claiming the authorship, referring to the author himself, could be also considered the self-referential part of the text.

*O, Ziyai, for the five bayts you uttered in a single breath
Nobody wrote a muhammesin five years*

Beş beyti bir nefesde ki didi Ziyā'iyā
Beş yılda dimeye aña kimse muhammesi (G 468/5)

Here, the poet does not shy away from praising his art; he speaks of his own ability to utter a verse in a single breath, considering it to be a quality that every diwan poet should possess. At the same time, he constantly emphasises his own supremacy and thus invites other poets to write the muhammes about his verses and enter a literary dialogue with him. This is a speech act of challenge, which, although some authors consider it an expressive speech act, also requires from the addressee to act. In this case, that is to excel the author in poetry writing. Thus, *challenging* is, according to Michael Hancher (1979: 6) an “amalgamate” of two speech acts – commissive and directive, where both illocutions are equal; the speaker is simultaneously obliged for an action to which he also calls his collocutor. The said author, because of such speech acts, extends Searle's classification so as to include the so-called commissive directives. That is a sort of a verbal duel that belongs to the argumentative language, including the exchange between two or more speakers / senders of the message, where others are challenged to show their verbal abilities in front of an audience, and where the poetic function of language is at the forefront (Pagliai 2009: 63). “Poetic” duels, unlike verbal duels, do not insult, for they rely on eloquence and creativity.

In the mentioned texts, poet Hasan Ziyai refers to the *muhammes*, a widespread form in the classical Ottoman literature. By definition, the *muhammes* contains four to eight verses consisting of five couplets, that is, the *misra*, which is the meaning of the very word muhammes in Arabic (times five). As far as formal characteristics and the definition are concerned, the *takhmis* is very similar to the *muhammes*. The main

difference is that the *muhammes* is a form primarily written in stanzas containing five *misras*, while the *takhmis* entails adding three couplets to the already-existing bayts of a ghazal, a qasida, etc. Thus, unlike the *muhammes* that is written by a single author, the *takhmis* is formed in two stages: first, there is a prototext, i.e. a ghazal or a qasida of a poet, which serves as a template to the *takhmis* author who adds to it, in the same metre and rhyme, three additional couplets. Thus, the *takhmis* is a form demanding an artistic dialogue, i.e. a certain competition in the literary creation of two poets.

In his *Diwan*, Hasan Ziyai Mostari considers his own *takhmis* poems to be *mukhammas*, although their content does not indicate so. The fact that the *takhmis* forms have been replaced by the *mukhammas* in nomenclature should not come as a surprise, because it was common in the classic diwans and collections. In his book *The Muhammes in Turkish Literature*, Mustafa Erdoğan mentions many classical authors who wrongly named the *takhmis* as *muhammes*. Given such a practice in diwans of the classical period, the case of Hasan Ziyai should not be considered unusual, and one should not wonder why the poet, whilst praising his own poetry in the ghazal verses, confused the two forms.

In the following couplet, Ziyai more openly expresses the speech act of challenging:

*At the battlefield of poetry, Ziyai's horse is rearing
May all who possess the skill come to the arena*

‘Arşa- ināẓm Ziyā’ī nūñ atı oynagıdur
Her kimüñ kim hüneri var ise meydān alsun (G 359/5)

Interestingly, the poet here “challenges” other poets and by using the metaphor “the battlefield of poetry” (‘*Arşa-i naẓm*’), he projects the domain of writing poetry to the domain of waging war. Writing poems turns into a battle. Namely, the word *arşa* in the Ottoman Turkish language means *a place, a battle*, but translates in different contexts so as to denote a battlefield, for example, ‘*arşa-i kār-zār (savaş meydanı)*’ (Develioğlu 1998: 39). In

the contemporary Turkish language, the phrase *meydan okumak* means to *challenge, dare* (to a quarrel, fight) (Đinđić – Teodosijević – Tanasković 1997: 693). In that context, by using the metaphor of a horse (Ziyai's horse is rearing / *Žiyā'īnūn atı oynagıdur*) the poet compares his poetic wit to the agility of a horse in a battlefield. Finally, Hasan Ziyai openly challenges other poets to compete against him, using the aforementioned term for battlefield – *meydan*: “May all who possess the skill come to the arena” (*Her kimūn kim hūneri var ise meydān alsun*).

However, in the following verse, he reflects upon the past claiming superiority over his predecessors:

*Among the lovers of this touching melody
Ziyai, no poet had ever composed before*

Aşhāb-ı şevk içinde bu muḥriḳ edālārı
Evvel Žiyā'iyā hele bir şā'ir itmedi (G 485/5)

The poet describes his verses as a *touching melody* (*muḥriḳ edālārı*), which, in today's perspective, may lead us to conclude that the Ottoman poets expected their poetry to cause a certain effect on the recipients. In the second verse, he openly praises himself as the one cannot be matched. That could be viewed as an attempt to install himself as a poet of high relevance to the literary tradition he belonged to.

Self-praise of own poetic skill can also be seen in the following couplet:

*Ziyai, let's assume you have become the ruler of the land of verses
But what will your fate be, you'll collect the verses and what will you
do with the diwan*

Žiyā'ī tūtalım kim pādişāh-ı mülk-i naẓm olduñ
Hūner kadrin bilür yok cem' idüp dīvānı n'eylersin (G 374/5)

By addressing himself, the poet uses the hedge “let's assume” (*tūtalım kim*) and says to have become the “ruler of the land of verses” (*pādişāh-ı mülk-i naẓm olduñ*). Namely, the hedge is contained in the fact that the

poet does not use the verb *proclaim* (to proclaim someone a ruler), which would be expected; rather, he uses the verb *assume* in the optative form *tutalım*, which is also used in the contemporary Turkish language. Here too a metaphor is used to express the poetic skill *ruler of the land of verses* (*pādişāh-ı mülk-i nazm*), which is the highest “title” in a hierarchical society such as the Ottoman Empire. In the second verse, the poet reveals fear of the wrong reception of his verses, which could be interpreted as an indirect complaint for the lack of appreciation of his value. According to Dayter (2014), this can be categorised as a reinterpretation, or self-praise followed by a complaint.

A similar approach can be observed with diwan poets from Bosnia and Herzegovina, who wrote the makhlās bayts in ghazals. Thus, Mezaki, who lived a century after Hasan Ziyai, frequently used the last couplet in reference to and praise of his own verses.

*Mezaki, it is not too much to claim I have mastered the art of poetry
I spent plenty of time as currency in service of the masters*

Mezākī çok degül şāhib-i kemāl-i fenn-i nazm olsam
Bu deñlü nağd-i vaqtüm hıdmet-i üstāda virdüm hep (G 28)

By praising his own poetic accomplishment, the poet also underscores the role of the literary tradition of his predecessors. Such a procedure could be qualified as self-praise with modification/mitigation, since it shifts the focus from oneself to another. However, the poet does not forget the importance of “hard work” when he says that he “have been so long in service of the masters” (*Bu deñlü nağd-i vaqtüm hıdmet-i üstāda virdüm hep*). Mezaki emphasises in these verses that he spent much time following the path of his role models in poetry. Interesting is the monetary metaphor of time: “deñlü nağd-i vaqtüm” (literally: *plenty money time*). It serves to expresses deliberate exaggeration in self-praise and to violate the modesty maxim. The metaphor *money of time* can also be spotted in the poetry of other diwan poets, again with aim to indicate that writing poetry is the source of income for the poets and to convey an indirect message that the poet is asking for (or expects to see) a reimbursement for his endeavour.

In the following couplet, Suleiman Mezaki exaggerates in his poetic self-praise:

*Who can compete with Mezaki, the champion of expression
When every bayt to a ghazal and a ghazal to a qasida resembles*

Kim söyleşür Mezākī-i mu’ciz-i kelām ile
Her beyti bir ğazel ğazeli bir qaşidedür (G 116)

The couplet begins with the poet putting forward a rhetorical question which, as a trope, has “an opening function; it initiates the addressees to pay further attention to the text” (Katnić-Bakaršić 2001: 276). From a pragmatic aspect, such a procedure emphasises a dialogue with potential recipients who are called upon to confirm his poetic skill. Exaggeration is used to express self-praise through the syntagma “Mezākī-i mu’ciz-i kelām” (*Mezaki, the champion of expression*). In the second verse, however, the poet praises his poetry through gradation, comparing his verses firstly to the ghazal, and then his own ghazals, which are shorter forms, to a considerably more complex form – the qasida. Thus, gradation in exaggeration becomes a form of intensification, where “every next element bears an additional scheme of quantity (intensity) compared to the previous” (Katnić-Bakaršić 2001: 302). In this case, it is the number of couplets (bayts), first in the ghazal, then in the qasida, where the number of couplets ranges from 30 to 150.

Exaggeration is also a characteristic of other makhlas bayts in Suleiman Mezaki’s ghazals:

*Mezaki, look, seven planets of my poetry
Know it by seven stars in the heaven*

Gör Mezākī seb’a-i seyyāre-i nazmum benüm
Åsumān-ı ma’rifet heft-aħterinden bellüdür (G 113)

In the Ottoman Turkish language, the syntagma *seb'a-i seyyāre* is related to the seven planets of the solar system: Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Pluto. Thus, the poet's comparison of his own poetry to the seven planets emphasises its value, it gives it a cosmic dimension. The exaggeration is especially prominent in the second verse, where the poet speaks of the "heavens of (poetic) skill" (*āsumān-ı ma'rifet*) and the "seven stars" (*heft-aḥter*). In the Islamic tradition, number seven holds a special significance. It is considered that there are seven heavens, seven climatic belts, seven messengers of God, and the number is frequently mentioned in the Holy Qur'an. Also, the number is particularly significant in view of Rumi's *Mathnawi*, since therein he speaks at several places about seven stars, seven valleys, seven *makamas*. In the case of Mezaki this has a specific importance, because he belonged to the Mevlevi order of dervishes, and was buried in the courtyard of the Mevleki tekke at Galata, Istanbul.

1. 3. 2. *Self-praise in Mathnawis*

We will again emphasise that the introductory (*sebeb-itelīf* or *sebeb-inazm-ı kitāb*) and the final (*hātime*) chapters of the mathnawis were frequently used for self-referential reflections of the diwan poets. Thus, they are particularly important to understand the poet's perception of his own self and his poetry.

The epilogue to the *Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak* by Hasan Ziyai Mostari, i.e., its final chapter entitled *The End of the Book*, shows an apparent similarity in the self-referencing procedures to the introductory chapter of that same mathnawi: the poet reflects upon his own poetry, its reception and artistic value:

*If the witty in love took it in his hands
Compare it to a beauty he might*

*My beloved is this lovely book
Which has become the fruit of my life*

*The one who has revealed the hidden wisdom
Witnessed a meeting with an honourable face*

*‘Alif is indeed of such stature
While the lām hair resembles*

*Those thin ‘alifs remind of the stature of the sweetheart
The dots mimic beauty marks of the sweetheart*

*Every cīm resembles the locks of hair of the beloved
Every mīm befits the beauty of the sweetheart*

‘Āşık-ı nükte-şinās alsa ele
Anı teşbīh kılar bir güzele

Dilberümdür bu kitāb-ı dil-cū
Hāşılı hāşıl-ı ‘ömrümdür bu

Eyleyen gizlū niķātın iz’ān
İtdi dīdār-ı şerīfin seyrān

Ṭoĝrusı dir elifdür kāmēt
Lāmlar anda ser-i zūlf-şıfat

Elif ikāmēt-i dilār-misāl
Noķtası ‘arız-ı dilberdeki hāl

Kākül-i dilbere beñzer her cīm
Dehen-i dilbere gūyā her mīm (1698–1703)

Hasan Ziyai compares his work to a beauty, postulating thus the relationship between the recipient and the work as the one that grows between lovers, which reminds of the love relationship in lyricism of the classical Ottoman poetry. Namely, the book is described by adjectives

normally ascribed to a beloved person in the Ottoman literary tradition: stature of the *'alif*, lips like the *mīm*, beauty spots like dots, hair like the *cīm*. At the same time, the poet, by referring to the graphemes of the Arabic alphabet (a procedure that introduces a new semiotic dimension), emphasises his affiliation to a culture in the period when oral tradition still dominated. That is one of the ways in which Hasan Ziyai emphasised his prestigious role as a poet, as a literate, educated person in the Ottoman province such was the 16th century Bosnia. His self-praise gains greater significance through describing (complimenting) a potential recipient as a witty person, a person in love: "If the witty in love took it in his hands/ Compare it to beauty he might" (*Āşık-ı nükte-şinās alsa ele / Anı teşbīh kılar bir güzele*). Still, the poet mitigates his utterance by using the conditional *alsa*. This is the second type of conditional sentences used to express conditions that can be realised:

By a dependent clause, a condition necessary for the realisation of the content of the main clause is conceived. In the h. language, they are introduced by the conjunction "when", while the predicate in the main and the dependent clause is in the form of the potential (for example: "If he asked me to marry him, I would"). In the Turkish language, a conditional is used in the protasis for the present (-se/sa), while the present -r or the future tense – i.e. the tenses that are semantically close to the Croatian potential – are used in the apodosis. (Čaušević 1996: 514)

However, when he speaks of his own relationship towards his book, Hasan Ziyai is far more categorical: "My beloved is this lovely book" (*Dilberümdür bu kitāb-ı dil-cū*). The verse "Which has become the fruit of my life" (*Hāşılı hāşıl-ı 'ömrümdür bu*) is a culmination of a sort regarding the poet's relationship towards his own work.

1. 3. 3. Self-praise in *Qasidas*

As has already been mentioned, *qasidas* as panegyrics are performatives (poems with a purpose) used to gain sympathy and support of the patron who provides for the poet's existence. Hence, when the poet openly praises himself, he, in the contemporary language, puts himself on the market by advertising his own poetic qualities.

Attitudes about poets and poetry are frequently present in qasidas, primarily in the fahriye chapter. Such poetic reflections are especially interesting because they shed light upon the author's poetics and his poetic self-reflection. "The Ottoman poets saw an opportunity for self-praise also in the verses primarily dedicated to glorify and memorialise patrons" (Durmuş 2009: 83).

We come across such an example in Hasan Ziyai's qasida to Hasan Bey, where the fahriye chapter is longer than any other fahriye in any other of his qasidas; it is thus the poet's reflection upon the current poetic framework and his place in it:

*So what if he even liked my verses
And they fall into the favour of the happiest, perfect man*

*Indeed, my verses flow
They remind of a pure water when away it runs*

*O, the commander of words, through your noble eyes
Look, these verses are peerless*

*Many praise the black hair
Compare me not with it, do not touch those mahogany locks*

*Sorrow has many a time broken my heart
Then my verses find a friend in the most beautiful of pearls*

*Sometimes thus Ziyai's heart glows so
That glow-worms in pitch-dark it resembles*

N'ola nazmum begense meyl eyler
Kāmil olan kemāl-i kām-yāba

Fi'l-ḥaḳīka selāset-i nazmum
Beñzer ol pāk aḳup giden āba

‘Avn-i ‘aynunla ey emîr-i kelâm
Naẓar eyle bu nazm-ı nâ-yāba

Kākül-i zülfi medh ider çokdur
Beni beñzetme değme mû-tāba

Niçe kez deldi bağrumı ğam-ı derd
Nazmum uyınca dürr-i hoş-āba

Şevke gāhî gelür Ziyā’î gönül
Beñzedi zulmet içre şeb-tāba (Q 10/21–26)

Hasan Ziyai begins with a rhetorical question in praise his verses: “So what if he even liked my verses” (*N’ola nazmum begense meyl eyler*), for such a reception is only natural for the poetry created by the poet possessed of qualities described in the continuation of the qasida. The author praises his own verses by comparing them to water, pearls, and glow-worms in the dark. Verses are appreciated as articulate, they flow. In the original, the expression used is *selāset-inazm*, where *selāset* is a term in literary stylistics, meaning an intelligible text, of a “plain” style.

The comparison of verses with water is not a coincidence: “They remind of a pure water when away it runs” (*Beñzer ol pāk akup giden āba*), both in the literal and in the metaphorical sense, since water in the Islamic tradition holds a special place as one of the greatest blessings. Also, it is a part of many Turkish phrases; for example, *su gibi konuşmak* (to speak fluently). In the ensuing couplet, the poet addresses the bey: “O, the commander of words, through your noble eyes / Look, these verses are peerless” (*‘Avn-i ‘aynunla ey emîr-i kelâm / Naẓar eyle buna zm-ı nâ-yāba*). Both self-praise and the praise to Hasan Bey as the “commander of words”, should be observed in the context of the Oriental-Islamic tradition, where the word, i.e. eloquence, is a prestigious value expected from the poet as much as from his patron. Thus, the poet uses a directive look (*naẓar eyle*) to call out Hasan Bey, the addressee, to look at the verses he describes, violating the modesty maxim, as peerless. The directive,

compare me not (beni beñzetme) directly requests from the potential patron to favorise and evaluate the poet's work; it addresses the reception of the poetry by separating it from that of other poets. The poet finishes the description of his poetry by comparing it to a pearl: "naẓmum uynca dürr-i hoş-āba", while his heart, where the poetry is conceived, is compared to a glow-worm in the dark: "beñzedi ẓulmet içre şeb-tāba". The verses are described through the aforementioned metaphors as "a light in the dark", or as something outstanding.

Self-praise is also found in the fahriye of the qasida by Hasan Ziyai Mostari, entitled *Qasida to the Spring for Mustafa Bey (Kaşide-i Bahār Der Medḥ-i Muştafā Beg)*:

*There are many a jewel in my lovely verses
To cover your dargah by them while walking*

*Not many reasons are needed for him to do a good deed
God's unity can only be understood by the Sufi*

Bu denlü var naẓm-ı belīgüm güherlerin
Der-gāhına nisār iderin eyleyüp güzer

Cüz'ī sebeb gerek ide küllī 'aṭālar ol
Ḳadr-i kemālī yine kemāl ehli fehmi ider (Q3/23–24)

In the aforementioned sections of the fahriye, Ziyai praises himself and thus breeches Leech's modesty maxim. However, the self-praise reveals a directive as well, for it is an attempt to achieve favour, as well as help of the dignitary. The poet finds his verses to be lovely and filled with jewels (*naẓm-ı belīgüm güherlerin*). Also, this chapter of the fahriye is the platform for the poet to reflect upon his own poetry, as well as to praise himself. Hence, it is a space where the poet engages in self-referencing.

In the couplet "Not many reasons are needed for him to do a good deed / God's unity can only be understood by the Sufi" (*Cüz'ī sebeb gerek ide küllī 'aṭālar ol / Ḳadr-i kemālī yine kemāl ehli fehmi ider*), the poet

compliments the recipient of the message as a person prone to doing good, postulating him thus as a benefactor for the purpose of receiving profit. He then refers to the joint background and context, which is a positive politeness strategy by which he realises closeness and solidarity with the collocutor (the recipient of the message), an interpretative community is again called upon and established.

It should be emphasised that in the Ottoman poetry, in most cases, the recipient of the verses was at the same time the author, and that the majority of the Ottoman dignitaries also wrote and supported writing of poetry. "Outside Istanbul, princes' courts, beys' and pashas' konaks came to prominence as centres of art of a sort, but also milieus where poets are protected" (Durmuş 2009: 16-17).

Self-praise is found in Mezaki's *Qasida to Ahmed Pasha* commemorating the capture of the Uyvar fortress.

*If you would let me show you my knowledge, see
How my verses are a guide for poets*

*Those words of mine in a lovely new style have
Just been formed, fresh and in rhymes*

*My nose is filled with the scent of praise to you
Its scent feeds my soul day and night*

*My lovely words of poignant mind
That scatter adornments are the gold of the wise*

*At every assembly of wisdom, the rosewater of my words
Is an honour for the gathering of pure friends*

*The noble horse of imagination again rises
The maidan of poetic decor is too narrow for him*

*Look at my newly formed verses and polished jewels
If there were an elixir of the word, this land and water it would be*

*Each of my lovely bayts proves a fervent endeavor
The house of wisdom is a noble nature of the knowing*

*No wonder thus that the lovers praise my verses
The rosebud of the turban on the head of the sun and loyalty*

*The rose garden of my poetic nature has again cultivated roses
This Rumelian land, abundant with water and air*

*The heart rejoiced in the exuberance of praising you
All flourished like the gardens of Jennah*

*Like my quill that adorns the bride of my verses
Memory of your sweet scent and hundreds of fragrances*

*If only my words were mentioned with your name until the Judgement
Day
The words that spread deserve to be forever preserved*

İznüñ var ise ‘arz-ı kemāl itmege seyr it
Şi’rüm ne kadar şîve-nümâ-yı şu’arâdur

Ol muhteri’-i tarz-ı cedîdüm ki kelâmum
Hep tâze-revîş tâze-zebân tâze-edâdur

Pür oldı yine nûkhet-i medhûñle meşâmum
Kim râyîhası şâm ü seher rûha gıdâdur

Ol nâdire-senc-i hîredüñ zîb-i nikâtum
Pîrâye-dih-i râ-yı zerîn-i ‘uçalâdur

Her meclis-i ‘irfânda gül-âb-ı kelimâtum
Âb-ı ruḥ-ı cem’iyyet-i yârân-ı şafâdur

Yerkân-ı hayâlün yine bir cünbişi var kim
Meydân-ı taḥayyül aña bir teng-fezâdur

Gör nazm-ı ter ü bîḥte-i cevher-i ṭab'um
İksîr-i sūḥan var ise bu arz ile mādur

Bu verziş-i bürhân ile her beyt-i laṭîfüm
Dârü'l-ḥikemi ṭab'-ı selîm-i ḥükemādur

'Uşşāk n'ola nazmumı baş üzre tutarsa
Gül-ğonca-i destâr-ı ser-i mihr ü vefâdur

Gül-hîz-i ḥayâl itdi yine gül-şen-i ṭab'um
Bu Rûm ili kim ḥıṭṭa-i ḥoş-âb ü hevâdur

Endîşe-i medḥüñle gönül oldı küşâde
Kim ravza-i cennet gibi pür-neşv ü nemâdur

Ḥāmem gibi meşşâta-i ebkâr-ı ma'ânî
Yâd-ı dem-i ḥoş-büyüñ ile ğâliye-sâdur

Nāmuñla sözüm ḥaşre dek olsa n'ola mezkûr
Menşûr-ı sūḥan lâyıḳ-ı tevḳî'-i beḳâdur (Q 14/42–47)

The poet primarily uses the conditional *iznün var ise* (If you would let me) as a hedge, mitigating therefore his utterance by which he calls Ahmed Pasha to pay attention to his verses. It is necessary to emphasise that in this case the poet used an inverted sentence: “İznün var ise ‘arz-ı kemāl itmege’”. However, he then uses the imperative, *seyr it*, which is linguistically speaking a bald on-record strategy, thus openly and immediately addresses his potential protector, involving him emotionally. B. Vuletić is of the opinion that the sensitivity of an expression rests upon the usage of the second person: “speaking in the second person is a mark of an emotionally engaged speaking: both the speaker and the hearer are active participants in

speaking” (qtd. in Katnić-Bakaršić 2001: 319). Walter G. Andrews, in his work *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry*, dedicated to the Ottoman lyrical poetry, also supports the attitude about the relationship between the recipient and the author, stating that directness, honesty and sensitivity are achieved by a manner of expression that is very similar to everyday speech. He is of the opinion that the inverted sentence achieves closeness, since the inverted sentence postpones the information transfer, creating a significant indefiniteness potential presupposing that both the speaker and the hearer, to a significant extent, familiar with the main content of the message and share the same cognition (2000: 139).

Still, the poet speaks of a wider reception of his poetry, i.e., he expresses an expectation that his verses will be read by others he describes (compliments) as wise and knowledgeable. Also, the poet wishes his poetry to be perceived among the educated people of his time: “At every assembly of wisdom, the rosewater of my words / Is an honour for the gathering of pure friends” (*Her meclis-i 'irfānda gül-āb-ı kelimātum / Āb-ı ruḥ-ı cem 'iyyet-i yārān-ı şafādur*).

Observed historically, the qasida has been read/recited in social circles that included highly educated people, mostly poets. In that sense, W. Andrews is of the opinion that reading or listening to poetry automatically places the person in a close and emotionally charged dialogue, which, if it is defined by the basic elements of a limited scope and frequent repetition throughout the tradition, is a procedure resembling a ritual (2000: 153). The perception of the Ottoman poetry as a ritual in a sociological sense is very plausible, considering that poetry was frequently a part of dervish ceremonial acts, or was reproduced at various gatherings of poets, learned people, or other elite groups. The poetry itself contained frequent references related to poets' assembling in gardens, receiving food and drink from a cupbearer (*sākī*) and reciting verses. In that context, poetry becomes a means of dialogue between members of a certain group, and a way to build an emotional bond between them.

This comes to prominence especially in the case of poet Mezaki, a member of the Mevlevi order, known to have participated in gatherings of dignitaries at the time. “According to some sources, Mezaki attended

the gatherings of poets and participated in discussions together with high-ranking persons, including the well-known Mevlevi sheikhs such as Arzī Dede and Ahmed Dede, the chief astronomer” (Mermer 1991: 23). The intensive poetic dialogue between Mezaki and his contemporaries reflected the qualification of his own poetry, which he characterised as modern and “fresh”: “Those words of mine that in a lovely new style / Just formed, fresh and in rhymes” (*Ol muhteri’-i tarz-ı cedīdüm ki kelāmum / Hep taze-revīş taze-zebān taze-edādur*). Although the classical Ottoman literature was conventional in the synchronic relationship between texts; verses that contained traditional content expressed in an innovative manner were highly praised, and that is the quality Mezaki emphasises in his own poetry. Also, by breaching the modesty maxim, he hides no praise for his poetic work, likening it to lovely words, ornaments, the gold of the wise, polished jewels, gardens of Jennah, roses, and bride. At the same time, the poet expresses explicit self-praise with modification / mitigation and includes referring to hard work: “Each of my lovely bayts proves a fervent endeavor / The house of wisdom is a noble nature of the knowing” (*Bu verziş-i bürhān ile her beyt-i laṭīfüm / Dārü’l-ḥikemi ṭab’-ı selīm-i ḥükemādur*). In the end, he reveals a wish that concerns the reception of his work. Namely, in the couplet “If only my words were mentioned with your name until the Judgement Day / The words that spread deserve to be forever preserved” (*Nāmuñla sözüm ḥaşre dek olsa n’ola mezkūr / Menşūr-ı sühan lāyık-ı tevķī’-i beḳādur*), Mezaki covets eternity to his verses, which is something Ahmed Pasha could secure with his name and authority.

1. 4. Compliments and Praise

Compliments (and praise) are speech acts, classified within the positive politeness strategy, since the sender of the message uses them to express a positive evaluation of the message recipient (their importance is seen through Facebook and other social networks’ “likes” in today’s world). One can compliment the collocutor’s appearance, possession, personality and achievements. Compliments usually contain exaggeration, hyperbolae (overstate): “That was excellent, fantastic”. According to Leech, there

exists a natural inclination towards mitigation in relation to impoliteness. However, there are also exaggerations, most frequently realised through hyperbolae. Leech interprets them through the Interest principle (“say what is unpredictable, and hence interesting!”) (Leech 1983: 146).

According to Janet Holmes (1995: 116-117), compliments are the most remarkable examples of the positive politeness strategy. Those are speech acts by which the collocutor is explicitly or implicitly granted recognition for some “good” in their possession (ownership, characteristics, abilities, etc.). Those traits are positively evaluated by both the speaker and the hearer. Their function is, as Holmes states, primarily affective and social, rather than referential and informative, since their purpose is to improve the mood of the collocutor. Also, they serve to establish closeness and solidarity. In some contexts, compliments can function as both praise and encouragement, and as such they primarily serve as expressions of praise and admiration, rather than solidarity (Holmes 1995: 119).

According to the relationship between collocutors on the vertical social scale, one may differentiate between patronizing compliments that the superior addresses to the inferior (since he/she has a certain power / superiority allowing to pass an evaluative judgement of the collocutor), as well as flattering and adulation that concern the compliments addressed to the superior, for the purpose of gaining a certain benefit. Pleasing the addressee is a way for the sender of the message to achieve their goal. By complimenting the addressee (provided that they feel good about the compliment is approving), positive evaluation of the collocutor is also achieved.

Although many authors consider praise as compliments addressed to the subordinated persons, they are still considered unwelcome for they put the recipient of the message in a subordinated, and the one addressing the compliment into a superior position (Holmes 1995: 119). However, praises can also be found in cases that concern persons of higher ranks. Such forms of praise are present in speeches and written documents from different historical periods, and their origin can be traced back to the Roman Empire, when praise to the ruler prevented his advantage in court or at a political speech. In Europe, especially in the Renaissance humanism period, there was a significant dependence on the powerful, hence the

favours of patrons and employers were paid in praise. In panegyrics, kings were presented as heroes who protected the entrusted kingdoms and the Christian faith, while the ideal ruler was a good warlord, but also a learned man, poet and philosopher. Praise and self-praise in this period became the two faces of praise speeches. Humanists considered themselves as extraordinary individuals, committed to their literary work, so, for them, it was inappropriate to be burdened with the duties of this world. Therefrom stems a deep disappointment and displeasure with their own position.

It is necessary to emphasise that compliments can also be part of some other speech act, for example, requests or pleas, where they can serve as a mitigating device: “You are such a good person, I know you will help me”, and this is, in fact, their true position and function.

1. 4. 1. Compliments and Praise in Qasidas

Methiyethe chapter with praises to the person for whom the qasida is meant, frequently includes overemphasised compliments and praise, which are not a truthful reflection of that person. Comparing dignitaries with historical or mythological characters is an explicit characteristic of the methiye.

Ziyai’s *Qasida of the Spring in Praise of Sinan Bey* contains numerous compliments and praise dedicated to the Ottoman dignitary.

*Merciful and generous means Sinan Bey
For his shrine is a safe fortress, the source of God’s soldiers*

*I hope he won’t believe the skilled are suited
To be destroyed during his time as the cursed*

*May he accept, have mercy on and help you
To find a protector in him for the love of God*

*Do not make Ziyai sad in the darkness of pain
But satisfy the thirst of that poor man by the noble water of life*

Müşfik ü ehl-isaḥā ya'ni Sinān Beg kim anuñ
Menba'-i ceyş-i İlāh dergehidür hışn-ı ḥaşīn

Umarın bunu revā görmeye kim ehl-i hüner
Pāy-māl ola zamānında olup ḳahra ḳarīn

Dest-gīr ola ayakda ḳomaya şefkat ide
Saña Allāh rızasıyçün ola şimdi mu'īn

Zulmet-i gamda Ziyā'īyi melūl eylemeye
Bezl ide āb-ı ḥayāt-ı keremin aña hemīn (Q 8/22–25)

The first cited couplet of Hasan Ziyai's qasida contains a praise (an expressive speech act), i.e. a compliment to Sinan Bey, who, although the poet addresses him, is mentioned in the third person singular, for the purpose of gaining respect, objectivity and a certain distance:. Praise is observed in the following: "Merciful and generous means Sinan Bey / His shrine is a safe fortress, the source of God's soldiers" (*Müşfik ü ehl-isaḥā ya'ni Sinān Beg kim anuñ*

Menba'-i ceyş-i İlāh dergehidür hışn-ı ḥaşīn). Here, the reference is made to then most admired characteristics of a soldier: a military commander, a God-fearing person, just and merciful.

However, in the ensuing couplet, we observe a directive speech act through the use of optative mood that indicates a wish or hope; the illocution here initiates the collocutor (the reader, who, again, is mentioned in the third person singular) to take a certain action to the benefit of the sender of the message (i.e., the author); the poet expresses hope that the "skilled" will be helped (the poets, including the author of the qasida): "I hope he won't think the skilled are suited / To be destroyed during his time as the cursed" (*Umarın bunu revā görmeye kim ehl-i hüner / Pāy-māl ola zamānında olup ḳahra ḳarīn*).

This couplet could serve as an illustration of the linguistic teetering between postulation and correspondence, because expressing hope in this case is not a mere presentation, but also an attempt at creating, organising

a world (in this case, that Sinan Bey truly becomes the protector of the poet). It shows the power of language – the force “to rather create than to mirror the world; to create a situation rather than to report on the events” (Paternai 2005: 65).

The code-switching of grammatical persons is also seen in the couplet: “May he accept, have mercy on and help you / To find a protector in him for the love of God” (*Dest-gîr ola ayakda kıomaya şefkat ide / Saña Allāh rızasıyçün ola şimdi mu ’în*), where the poet addresses himself in the second person singular, while the third person singular is employed for the recipient of the message. This could be interpreted as a desire expressed through the optative for the purpose of decreasing the pressure against the collocutor (the recipient of the message).

Optative is also present in the following couplet: “Do not make Ziyai sad in the darkness of pain / But satisfy the thirst of that poor man by the noble water of life” (*Zulmet-i gamda Ziyā’îyi melûl eylemeye / Bezl ide âb-ı hayât-ı keremin aña hemîn*), where the poet refers to himself in the third person singular, again to ensure objectivity and distance, while the recipient of the message is referred to in the second person singular. In this plea (directive), the poet resorts to self-humiliation, or, rather, portrays himself as powerless (poor), which is another negative politeness strategy, i.e. giving overwhelming reasons: one of the reasons for threatening the collocutor’s face can be one’s own helplessness.

A similar procedure is seen in qasidas of other poets from Bosnia and Herzegovina, including Sabit Bosnevi. In his qasida *Ramazaniye*, dedicated to Baltacı Mehmet Pasha, Sabit, alongside numerous compliments to the dignitary, also mentions his generosity and readiness to reward poets for their poetic achievements.

*His benevolence for the poet invites generosity
And the smile for the beautiful verses signalises bestowal*

*Let us make the beautiful canvas of words an adornment of the market
No such opportunity shall arise to sell eloquence*

*Virtues, spirituality and poetic wit adorn the sultan
Viziers take pride in maturity, knowledge and aptness*

*The one who lies to be at loss at this market
Shall have no other chance to sell his verses*

*The poet who hasn't traded at this market
Could he open his store elsewhere*

Şā'ire hüsn-i teveccühleri in'āma delīl
Luṭf-i mazmūna tebessümleri ihsāna nişān

Hôş kumāş-i suheni zīver-i bāzār idelüm
Hîç söz şatmağa girmez ele bir böyle zemān

Pādişeh fāzıl ü ehl-i dil ü mazmūn-şinās
Vüzerā kāmīl ü şāhib-hüner ü nādiredān

Ne zemān görse gerek ḥayr-ı metā'-i suheni
Bu revāyicde iden kızb ile da'vā-yı ziyān

Böyle bāzārda da eylemeyen istiftāḥ
Ne zemān açsa gerek sūḫ-i me'ānide dükān (Q 45/35–39)

Compliments and praise are part of the following couplet: “Virtues, spirituality and poetic wit adorn the sultan / Viziers take pride in maturity, knowledge and aptness” (*Pādişeh fāzıl ü ehl-i dil ü mazmūn-şinās / Vüzerā kāmīl ü şāhib-hüner ü nādiredān*), that lists the characteristics of an ideal ruler (vizier). However, those characteristics are not only a description, but rather expectations of the poet. Nota bene that the “poetic wit” is among the listed virtues, which brings us back to the conclusion established earlier that the recipient of poetry in the Ottoman Empire was, in most cases, the poet himself, and that the majority of the Ottoman dignitaries used to write poetry or participate in its creation. In a certain sense, it could be said that

the Ottoman poetry was a product of the relationship between the poet and his patron. “In that context, popularity of the poet, of the protégé, was also a success of the patron himself, celebrating him as the person who encouraged the prestigious cultural tradition” (Durmuş 2009: 17). In other words, the protégé was responsible for the glory of the patron, while the patron was responsible for the poet’s social position and a positive reception of his poetry.

By using the economic terms such as money, market, store, canvas, sale (*metā’*, *bāzār*, *sūk*, *dükān*, *kumāş*, *satmak*) Sabit Bosnevi emphasises the existential dimension of the poet – patron relationship. In that way, poetry is presented as goods to be sold, which brings the poet into the position of the marchant who offers (and praises) the goods. By presenting his poetic artistry as the tool to ensure his own existence, Sabit clearly indicates the pragmatic dimension of poetry, which is characteristic of the qasida as a form. That is best observed in the last two couplets: “The one who lies to be at loss at this market / Could he open his store elsewhere” (*Ne zemān görse gerek hayr-ı metā’-i suheni / Bu revāyicde iden kızb ile da’vāyı ziyān*); “The poet who hasn’t traded at this market / Where else could he open his store” (*Böyle bāzārda da eylemeyen istiftāh / Ne zemān açsa gerek sūk-i me’ānide dükān*). Although all those verses have been characterised here as praise, one cannot ignore the fact that they are, especially when the “sale and market” are mentioned, also speech acts that Michael Hancher (1979: 8) categorises as “mutual commissive directives”, i.e., a special group of speech acts simultaneously containing the illocution of commissives and directives. The poet here commit to write and present (offer) poetry, and the patron is required to take a certain action (recognition and reward).

Praises to dignitaries are also frequently found in Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak’s qasidas, predominantly praise to Sultan Mahmud I. He was the 24th Ottoman sultan who ruled from 1730 to 1754. An interesting example is observed in the third qasida of Bjelopoljak’s *Diwan*, entitled *A Qasida to Spring in Praise of Sultan Mahmud* (*Bahāriyye Der-Medḥ-i Hudāvendigār Ḥazret-i Sultān Maḥmūd Ḥān*):

*He is such a remarkable rider of that vast space
That he is riding his Buraq under the sun resembling the heavenly pan*

Bir şeh-süvār-ı ‘arşa-i şevket ki oynadur
Tepsî-yi âfitâb-ı felekde buragını (Q 3/79)

The praise to Sultan Mahmud I also includes exaggeration (hyperbolae), a common procedure in praise and compliments. Thus, the ruler is a “remarkable rider”, which was an essential characteristic of a commander. Praise is contained in the description of the space he is riding through – “vast space” (‘arşa-i şevket). In the second couplet, a religious dimension is ascribed to the sultan, when depicted on the back of the Buraq, the animal that elevated Muhammad PBUH during Mi`raj. “It is described as an animal, smaller than a mule, larger than a donkey, permanently shining, glowing like a lightning, which is the reason why it is used as a symbol in poetry” (Nametak 2007: 61).

The following qasida in Hatem’s *Diwan* entitled *A Ramazaniye in Honour of His Highness Sultan Mahmud* (Ramazāniyye Der-Manşibet-i Hāzret-i Sulṭān Maḥmūd Hān) also contains numerous instances of praise to Sultan Mahmud:

*The scent of your nobleness has enfolded the world
Heavens filled with the smoke of your agarwood that fills the heart
with delight*

*Your benevolence has brought youth to my old age
You have made me the one that is pointed at as if I were a crescent*

Mu’atṭar oldı cihān şāh-bū-yı luṭfindan
Boyandı ‘ūd-ı şafā dūda āsmān heme ān

Keremlerünle beni pīrlıkde tāzeledün
Hilāl-i ‘īd gibi eyledün müşār-benān (Q 4/22–24)

In the first couplet, the poet praises the sultan's nobility by the use of synaesthesia, a perceptual trope representing "an expression or an utterance in which notions are linked so as to create an impression perceived by some other sensory pathway" (Bagić 2012: 295). Namely, nobleness of the sultan smells like agarwood, spreading around the world. The poet compares the abstract notion of nobleness to the sense of smell, highly important in the perception of the world in the eastern culture, placing it thus through the comparison with agarwood, as a specific scent of the east, to a certain part of the world. On the other hand, by comparing the sultan's influence with the scent that, according to the poet, fills one with joy, he emphasises the ruler's power not only in the world, but also in heavens.

In the second couplet, we see both praise and an expression of gratitude, which is also a frequent practice in the contemporary Turkish language. Namely, it is obvious that the poet has already obtained favour with the sultan through his verses, so he now exaggerates to a certain degree to disclose gratitude together with praise: "Your benevolence has brought youth to my old age / You have made me the one that is pointed at as if I were a crescent" (*Keremlerünle beni pîrlikde tazelediün / Hilâl-i 'îd gibi eylediün müşâr-benân*). It can also be observed from the verses that, owing to the sultan's support, the poet reached fame, which indicates that even artists at that time perceived "popularity" as important; i.e. a positive reception of their work as very important.

The seventh qasida of Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak's *Diwan* is dedicated to the same ruler. *The Qasida in Praise of Sultan Mahmud (Der-Sitâyiş-i Sulţân Maĥmūd Ĥân)* ends in words positioning the poet as an honest lauder and the sultan as his protector:

*To say the light of my eye or the joy of my heart
My words come from a pure heart like a mirror that does not erode*

*Oh, my ruler, my sultan, who deserve God's pleasure
No other lauder is second to your praise than the helpless Hatem*

Nûr-ı dîdem dir isem yâ ki sūrūr-ı sînem
Sûĥanım âyîne-i şıdķıma jengâr olmaz

Behre-merzāt-ı Hūdā pādīşehim sultānım
Size Hātem gibi nāçār senā-kār olmaz (Q 7/24–25)

The first couplet emphasises the poet's honesty through the metaphor of a non-eroding mirror: "My words come from a pure heart like a mirror that does not erode" (*Sühānım āyīne-i şıdkıma jengār olmaz*), a frequent procedure in today's complimentary expressions (the speaker adds the expression "I really mean that" to a compliment), since the honesty principle is often questionable because it is sometimes difficult to recognise the speaker's intention, which is why the dream of the absolute decipherability of the society is ever present: "Many essentially important facts are found beyond the time and place of an interaction, or remain concealed within them. The 'true' or 'real' attitudes, beliefs, and emotions of the individual can be ascertained only indirectly, through his avowals or through what appears to be involuntary expressive behavior. (Goffman 2000: 16). By underlying honesty, the poet addresses the sultan very closely, calling him "the light of my eye" (*nūr-ı dīdem*) and "the joy of my heart" (*sürür-ı sīnem*).

In the second couplet, the poet lives no question mark that his praise is for the sultan, through self-humiliation by calling himself the lauder (*senā-kār*). However, here we come across a pragmatic paradox: the poet states to be praising the sultan through self-humiliation, referring to himself as "helpless", but at the same time promotes himself as the best lauder: "No other lauder is second to your praise than the helpless Hatem" (*Size Hātem gibi nāçār senā-kār olmaz*). Hence, through self-humiliation and praise of the other we find self-praise and exaggeration.

Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak also praised other dignitaries, his contemporaries. One such example is silahdar Ali Agha, to whom Bjelopoljak dedicated *The Qasida in Praise of Silahdar Ali Agha* (*Der-Sitāyiş-i Silahdār 'Ali Ağa*). Still, in the fahriye chapter, he places Ali Agha's position in the context of the absolute rule of Sultan Mahmud I:

*O, the emperor of empires, your excellency Sultan Mahmud
The emperor of Rumelia and Iran*

*I am conversing with two different hearts
For both a master and an agha of mine*

*If I were to present them both to the rose and the nightingale
I am not sure how they would divide*

*To compare them with the Sun and the Moon
One next to the other, nothing between them to divide*

*To hide them from my own eyes
Nothing is more important than my left and my right*

*In the service of the sultan of the world
May they be merry, joyful and proud*

Şāh-ı şāhān cenāb-ı Maḥmūd Ḥān
Pādişāh-ı mülūk-ı Rūm u ‘Acem

İki gūne gönülle bahs iderim
Hem efendili hem ağalı benim

İkisin gülle bülbüle virsem
Nice pāy ideler ‘aceb bilsem

Mihr ü mehtaba eylesem teşbih
Olmasa arada ne pīş ü ne em

İki gözümde eylemek iḥfā
Şağ u şol cümleden görüldi ehemm

Ḥıdmetinde o şāh-ı devrānuñ
Olalar şād u hurrem ü mükerrem (Q 8/11–16)

Although the qasida is dedicated to silahdar Ali Agha, Ahmed Hatem uses adjectives at the beginning in praise of Sultan Mahmud I, which indicates a hierarchical organisation of the Ottoman state and an unquestionable devotion to the sultan. In addressing the sultan with the “emperor of empires” (*Şāh-ı şāhān*), we see the repetition of the same word or words derived from one root (paregmenon and polyptoton) – the noun is used within the same syntagma, intensifying the expression almost to the level of the superlative. In praising both the sultan and silahdar Ali Agha, the poet is aware of the delicate nature of his task: he simultaneously praises the former, an absolute ruler, and the latter, a high ranking official. That dilemma is seen in the use of the conditional clause: “If I were to present them both to the rose and the nightingale / I am not sure how they would divide” (*İkisin gülle bülbüle virsem / Nice pāy ideler ‘aceb bilsem*), which is used as an independent form, for the purpose of expressing “a dilemma, wavering, indecisiveness (limited to interrogative forms)” (Čaušević 1996: 298). In this case, the dilemma is seen in positioning of the sultan and the silahdar. Namely, the poet subtly brings them to the same level, which is the greatest compliment and praise to Ali Agha.

Silahdar Ali Agha is an object of praise in other qasidas by Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak. Thus, he named his tenth qasida *The Tale of Silahdar Ali Agha* (*Der-Menkabet-i Silāhdār ‘Ali Āğa*), and therein he reflects upon the praise of Ali Agha in his previous writings:

*The lovely quill in love started speaking
Hatem, are you praising Ali Agha the fortunate?*

*O, the light of the eye of cognition, you who care for the ones who love
you deeply
Are you increasing your mercy to the pauper devoted to you*

*By your virtues, you have again put on the festive garment to my verses
Are you dressing a seashell, decorating the pearl precious and rare?*

Şīvelendi hāme-i şūrīde Hātem yoksa sen
Midḥat-āmīz sa'ādetli 'Ali Ağamısın

Ey ziyā-yı çeşm-i 'irfān-dīde āşüfte-nevāz
Sen budūr üftādeye her laḥza luṭf-efzā mısın

Tab'ıma vaşfuñla bir 'ıydiyye giydirdün yine
Cāme-pūşān-ı şādef dürr-i yetīm-ārā mısın (Q 10/10–12)

This qasida is characterised by the rhyme ending in “ā mısın”, meaning that it entirely consists of interrogative sentences. The second person singular the poet uses to address himself is a rhetorical question, while, when he addresses Ali Agha, it is not only that, but also a form of an initiation, a directive speech act. The couplet “The lovely quill in love started speaking / Hatem, are you praising Ali Agha the fortunate?” (*Şīvelendi hāme-i şūrīde Hātem yoksa sen / Midḥat-āmīz sa'ādetli 'Ali Ağamısın*) is the beginning of the fahriye chapter, which coincides with the introductory function of the rhetorical question. It

conceals the claim that emphasises the speaker's attitudes and impressions; it expresses shocking and touching content, strong emotions, such as love, thrill, surprise, hate, bitterness, pity. Rhetorical questions substitute the objective manner of speaking by the subjective; it makes the effect superordinate to the content, connotation to denotation. (Bagić 2012: 271)

Praise is emphasised in the second couplet: “O, the light of the eye of cognition, you who care for the ones who love you deeply / Are you increasing your mercy to the pauper devoted to you” (*Ey ziyā-yı çeşm-i 'irfān-dīde āşüfte-nevāz / Sen bu dūr üftādeye her laḥza luṭf-efzā mısın*), where Ali Agha is addressed as “the light of the eye of cognition” and described as a person who takes care of his subjects. That means that the qualities of a dignitary are again emphasised: learnedness, wisdom, care for his subjects. On the other hand, this question can also entail a rhetorical question, as well as a form of a directive speech act, since the addressee is incited to take certain action or to behave in a certain way.

In the last couplet: “By your virtues, you have again put on the festive garment to my verses / Are you dressing a seashell, decorating the pearl precious and rare?” (*Tab’ima vaşfuñla bir ‘ıydiyye giydirdüñ yine / Cāme-pūşān-ı şadef dürr-i yetīm-ārā mısın*), the poet employs the word *again* (*yine*), leading the addressee to understand that he is looking for the connection with a previous event. This is a *presupposition* strategy, and it is a part of the unconventional indirectness (off record) (Brown and Levinson 1987: 217). Furthermore, the poet underlines the role of his patron in the creation of poetry, claiming that his virtues have contributed to the beauty of verses and their positive reception. Here we also come across both self-praise, when the poet calls his verses rare and precious pearls, and praise, since it is the patron who contributed to such verses. From here we can conclude the role of the patron in the classical Ottoman poetry, where not only were they “active participants in the creation of poetry, but also in determining the poetic environment and style” (Durmuş 2009: 17).

1. 4. 2. Compliments and Praise in Ghazals

As previously noted, reference to the extralinguistic reality is found primarily in the so-called *müzeyyel ghazals*, or the ghazals written for a specific occasion, with the purpose of being presented to a dignitary, a potential patron.

In that sense, ghazal No. 38 in Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak’s *Diwan* is interesting, since it contains, apart from the basic love theme, also the poet’s reflection to the current social and political reality. We can see that it is an example of the *müzeyyel ghazal* both from the form and the content. The poet’s pseudonym – *makhlas* – appears in the ninth, not in the last, 11th, couplet, which leads to believe that the last two couplets were most probably added later. The lyrical tone of the ghazal is interrupted by introducing the verses with the historical person, the mufti of the city of Yanya (Ioannina – today’s Greece), as well as the Iranian poets, representatives of the so-called Indian style:

*Mufti of the city of Yanya is such a poet
Next to his purity all reveals mistakes*

*He is like Urfî, the Selim of our time by nature
His poetry is as glistening as Sevkî's, his sensitivity the Saib's
resembles*

Müftî-yi şehr-i Yanya ki erbâb-ı ma'rifet
Nisbetle tab'-ı pâkine hep pür-kuşûrdur

'Urfî-arâ vü tab'-ı Selîm-i zamânedir
Şevket-şî'âr-ı neyyir-i Şâ'ib-şu'urdur (G 38/10–11)

We cannot determine who the mufti of Yanya was, but we do know that müzeyyel ghazals are added subsequently, when the poet adds new verses to the existing ones, to present them to a dignitary. It is interesting to note that the mufti of Yanya is here described as an exceptional poet.

On the other hand, in view of observing Hatem's poetics, mentioning of Iranian poets Urfî, Sevkî and Saib is very indicative, for they were representatives of the *Indian style* that had emerged in the Ottoman literary tradition in the 17th century, lasting in Hatem's time as well, all the way to the late 18th century. The Selim mentioned in the verses is most probably Sultan Selim the Grim who wrote a diwan in Persian.

1. 5. Praise and Gratitude

In the following examples of praise to protectors and patrons, gratitude is intertwined with praise. Gratitude is a reactive speech act, realised after the hearer does something that benefits the speaker. Although most of such expressions are explicit performatives, since they contain the lexeme *hvala* (in Bosnian, for example), "indirect expressions of gratitude are also possible. For example, in the situation when a younger person is bringing a chair to an older person, or is giving up their seat, expressions of gratitude could include: You are such a lovely person! That's very nice of you! etc."

(Mrazović – Vukadinović 1990: 608). Thus, this can also be a compliment, a praise. Also, perlocution of the previously written poetry in which the poet asks something from the patron can also be seen in praise.

In that sense, it would be interesting to mention an example of a qasida by Sabit Bosnevi, where he expresses gratitude to Halil Pasha, a Bosnian regent, for providing a clock. Sabit's relationship towards Halil Pasha is described in other sources as well: "During his regency in Sarajevo, he left several documents on his stay, as well as a poem on the arrival of Halil Pasha, a regent of Bosnia. At the time, Sarajevo and Bosnia were in a period of confusion, the kadi's incomes were scarce, so the only satisfaction for him was to have been at the centre of attention as a poet and as an intellectual" (Nametak 1991: 79).

Praise for the Clock (With Praise for the Clock)

*To the anguished abstinent from the sultan
A sign of the emperor's benevolence has arrived*

*The time of iftar henceforth
Shall never be doubted, the clock has arrived*

*Let us present a dua to pasha's character
Sabit, the time for that has arrived*

Sā'atüñ Teşekkürine)

Rûze-dâr-ı ğama sultānumdan
Hişşe-i hân-ı 'ināyet geldi

Vaqt-i iftārda şimdiden soñra
Şekkimiz kalmadı sā'at geldi

Zāt-ı Paşaya du'ā eyliyelüm
Sābitā vaqt-i icābet geldi (Q 25)

These verses are part of the Sabit Bosnevi's *Diwan*, in the chapter with *qasidas*, although their length and structure do not adhere to the traditional characteristics of the *qasida*. Yet, they can be observed as such from the standpoint of understanding the *qasida* as "a poem with a goal", or the texts that tell a lot about the relationship between the poet and his patron. Right from the title we see the construction "Sā'atüñ Teşekkürine" (With Praise for the Clock), in the dative case. That can be understood as the expression of the intention, the goal of the poem. However, in these very verses we do not see a direct request, which is mostly expressed through representative speech acts the author expresses, describing the situation upon receiving the gift, and which is by all means more favourable for him. The gratitude is also expressed in the *dua* for the benefactor Halil Pasha, which could be observed as a return gift of a sort. However, despite expressing gratitude and a *dua* to Halil Pasha, the poem begins with the appreciation of the benevolence of the sultan, since all material goods in the Ottoman Empire belong to him. Consequently, the sultan oughts to be credited with all the good deeds of the Ottoman dignitaries.

As far as linguistic means are concerned, the praise in matter is accomplished with the verb *gelmek* in the perfect -di, which expresses an action that ended prior to the moment of speaking. Since the perfect -di marks dynamicity and processuality, i.e., an action in which the speaker participated, it can also "have a secondary, most frequently context-dependent, *modal meaning of categoricity*" (Čaušević 1996: 262-3).

This is not the only other good deeds of Halil Pasha witnessed and noted in his *qasidas* by Sabit Bosnevi, while serving as a *kadi* in Bosnia. Among them is a gratitude for the rice which Halil Pasha donated to Bosnia.

When Halil Pasha Gave Rice while [Sabit] Was a Kadi in Bosnia

*Owing to Halil Pasha, the benevolent commander
The kitchen with rice to the top was filled*

*Poverty had starved the soul until then
We have been relieved from that suffering and again we lived*

*Cornucopia from Halil the noble
The Nile of mercy of rice has arrived*

Bosna Kādısı İken Hālīl Paşa Pirinç Virdükde

Hān-ı cūd-ı Hālīl Paşadan
Toldı maṭbaḥ erizle ḥınca-ḥınç

Kılleti virmiş idi cāna ta'ab
Kurtulup ol kederden olduḡ diñç

Berekāt-ı Hālīl-i raḥmāndur
Ki yetiştürdi Nīl-i luṭfı pirinç (Q 29)

Here again a direct request is not to be seen; rather the poet mentions the Halil Pasha's benevolence as the reason for the improvement of the situation in Bosnia, and he describes him as "Hān-ı cūd" (literally: commander, ruler of nobleness) and "raḥmān" (noble, merciful). At the same time, the poet describes the difficult conditions that preceded the good deed: "Poverty had starved the soul until then / We have been relieved from that suffering and again we lived" (*Kıllet ivirmiş idi cāna ta'ab / Kurtulup ol kederden olduḡ diñç*). Historical facts confirm this event. Sabit arrived to Sarajevo when the city was in a dire situation, having previously been looted by Eugene of Savoy. "Sabit's incomes as a kadi were so small that he was unable to support his family, hence, upon his own urgency, he did not see the end of his two-year term, having again been dismissed from the duty" (Nametak 1991: 80). In his expressions of gratitude, Sabit uses a hyperbolae to describe the benevolence of Halil Pasha and compares the rice he gave to the river Nile, which "symbolises fertility and bounty, bringing prosperity to Egypt" (Nametak, 2007: 195).

Sabit expressed gratitude to the Ottoman dignitaries on other occasions as well. One such occasion is a qasida where he showed appreciation to the grand vizier for the gift of a sable coat:

A Qasida on the Occasion when the Grand Vizier Gave Him a Sable Coat

*An assembly as honourable as yours never have I seen
A person with pure generosity as yours never have I seen*

*At the noble assembly I wore the black sable coat
At my own figure the benevolence of Asaf of this world today I have seen*

Vezer-i 'Aẓam Semmūr KūrkVirdükde Dimiřdūr

Leṭāfetde ne bezmün gibi bezm-'ünvānını gördüm
Semaḥatda ne zāt-ı pākūññ akrānını gördüm

Siyeh semmūr bir boy kürki giydüm bezm-i luṭfuñda
Boyumca Āṣaf-ı dehrün bugün iḥsānını gördüm (Q 28)

Since this qasida is not dated, nor does it contain the name of the grand vizier, it is difficult to determine who he really was. Here too the poet praises his benefactor as a noble person, comparing him to Asaf, the vizier of the Prophet Suleiman. "He was skilled in metaphysical sciences. In the diwan poetry, he symbolises competent viziers and commanders" (Nametak 2007: 39). Also, the poet here refers to the "assembly" (*bezm*), meaning assemblies of poets and dignitaries under the auspices of the grand vizier, which had a significant influence to the development of poetry in the Ottoman Empire. As a reminder: "alongside the court, the konaks of royal dignitaries, such as the grand vizier, shaykhs al-Islam, kazaskers, viziers, defterdars, as well as princes' courts and the konaks of pashas and beys outside Istanbul, all came to prominence as centres of art and protection of poets" (Durmuş 2009: 16-17). The Ottoman dignitaries were middlemen between poets and the sultan. "Viziers and other royal dignitaries from the sultan's circle not only evaluated poetry, forwarding it to the sultan, but they also passed final decisions on whether or not poets

were to attend their poetic assemblies” (Durmuş 2009: 44-45). Hence, no wonder that Sabit praises the assembly of the grand vizier: “An assembly as honourable as yours never have I seen” (*Leṭāfetde ne bezmüñ gibi bezm-’ünvānını gördüm*), after which he also praises the vizier personally. The verses are dominated by the perfect -di, which, aside from the primary meaning (*to see*) here also bears the meaning of *to live, experience, gain* (for example, “senden çok iyilik gördüm” – “I have seen/ experienced/ a lot of good from you”).

Just as is the case in the previous gratitude for the clock, here we can overtly see how the poets used their poetry, parts of which were performatives, or speech acts of request (which will be discussed in the following chapter and in the qasida in which the poet is asking for a clock), to ensure prizes, provisions, even employment. These verses bring information on the perlocution of Sabit’s poetry, which is seen in a concrete reward – a sable coat. Although not many examples are found where poets ask for concrete gifts, only to show gratitude upon receiving them, as is the case, for example, with Sabit’s plea for a clock, some sections of poetry did primarily serve to ask for provision, i.e. for ensuring existence.

2. Directives

Directives are speech acts in which the speaker asks/requests the hearer to (not) take a certain action. Depending on the context, mostly depending on the relationship between the collocutors, they span from orders and requests to begging. Since these are speech acts that pose the greatest threat to the hearer’s negative face, or his/her desire and need to be undisturbed and free in their activities, they are most frequently mitigated by linguistic means that are part of negative politeness strategies and are implemented as indirect speech acts, especially if the collocutors are in the superior – inferior relationship, and if there is a significant social distance between them.

2. 1. Requests and Pleas

The rules of felicity conditions for the realisation of a request are as follows:

1. propositional content conditions or rules concern specific restrictions of the content of the dependent clause, i.e. the “text” itself; this is the future act A of the hearer;
2. preparatory conditions concern the “prerequisite” of the real world for every illocutionary act and involve background circumstances and knowledge about speaker and hearer:
 - a) the hearer is able to realise the act A; the speaker believes that the hearer is able to realise the act A;
 - b) it is not obvious neither to the speaker nor to the hearer that the hearer will do the act A in a normal course of events;
3. the sincerity condition that entails feelings, beliefs and intentions of the speaker appropriate for every speech act; the speaker wants the hearer to do the act A;
4. essential condition is the point of the speech act: it is seen as an attempt to get the hearer to do the act A (qtd. in Schiffin 1994: 71).

Shoshana Blum-Kulka and Elite Olshtain (1984) categorise requests as speech acts to the following units:

A) address terms B) the head act C) adjuncts to head acts; for example:
A) Selma, / B) Could you lend me a pen / C) I can’t see my pen anywhere.

Requests differ in the realisation also in accordance to directness, i.e. indirectness: a) the most direct b) the conventionally indirect level and c) nonconventional indirect level), while the adjuncts to the head acts may include:

1. checking on availability, for example, “Are you going to the centre?”;
2. getting a precommitment, for example: “Would you do me a favour?”;
3. grounder, for example, “I didn’t attend the lecture yesterday” (“Lend me your book”),
4. sweetener, for example, “You have such a wonderful handwriting” (“Could you write it down for me?”);
5. disarmer, for example, “I hope I’m not interrupting”;

6. cost minimizer, for example, “If you’re going in that direction” (“Could you take me”).

Requests concern the speaker demanding the hearer for a future action that is in the former’s interest. It is noteworthy that the speaker, the sender of the message, through the speech acts of requests and pleas counts on the recipient’s approval of the message. “Requests differ from pleas in the intensity of the expression of the speaker wants and in the reduced politeness” (Mrazović, Vukadinović 1990: 614), or, in other words, “the speaker uses pleas to politely ask the hearer to do what is in the speaker’s interest” (Mrazović, Vukadinović 1990: 612). One can say that pleas are normally addressed to the hearers with a higher rank than the speaker / sender of the message.

2. 1. 1. Requests and Pleas in Ghazals

Poetry is frequently a platform for poets to put forward their requests and pleas. Sometimes such content is expressed in qasidas, ghazals, or in the introductory parts of mathnawis. Although classical ghazals are primarily lyrical, they rarely express the demands of poets that concern the extralinguistic reality, with an exception of the so-called müzeyyel ghazals. In that sense, Sabit Bosnevi’s müzeyyel ghazal, dedicated to the then-shaykh al-Islam, in which the poet expresses request for a new placement, deserves a particular interest.

*We ask the dear shaykh al-Islam to look
To make him a means for the position and honour*

*Visiting and welcoming the world, we grew tired
For how long shall we endure this*

*People in positions light scented wood chips
Why then would we suffer and sigh*

*We have performed our duty fairly and carefully
We rely on you, God’s guardian*

*We have crossed the path of pure service
To prepare for a new path*

Şeyhü'l-islām ciger-güşesinüñ bir nazārın
İsterüz vāsıt-ı manşıb ü cāh eyleyelüm

Gezerek tehniye-i 'ālemi bī-tāb olduk
Tā-be-key cānımuızı böyle tebāh eyleyelüm

Ehl-i manşıb kıoyalar micmere tırnaķ 'ūdın
Biz niçün tırmalanup reş ile āh eyleyelüm

Muħlişān bir yire geldük bunı tedbīr itdük
Sizi idā'-ı yed-i ħafızu'llāh eyleyelüm

Yolımız geldi hemān pākça manşıblardan
Birine kendimüz āmāde-i rāh eyleyelüm (G 46/10–15)

In the second couplet – “We ask the dear shaykh al-Islam to look / To make him a means for the position and honour” (*Şeyhü'l-i slām ciger-güşesinüñ bir nazārın / İsterüz vāsıt-ı manşıb ü cāh eyleyelüm*) – the poet uses the performative verb *to ask / istemek* (*İsterüz*, meaning *we ask*, and we assume that the personal pronoun *we* is used to express humbleness). However, it is interesting and indicative that he is asking “only” for the shaykh al-Islam’s look, which is sufficient to change his destiny. That means that paying attention to the poet could influence his position in the society. Also, in the following verses we see a complaint against the poet’s current situation: “Visiting and welcoming the world, we grew tired / For how long shall we endure this” (*Gezerek tehniye-i 'ālemi bī-tāb olduk / Tā-be-key cānımuızı böyle tebāh eyleyelüm*), where the poet asks about its duration. The complaint is especially emphasised in the following couplet, when the poet’s situation is contrasted to the life of fortunate people occupying certain positions: “People in positions light scented wood chips / Why then would we suffer and sigh” (*Ehl-i manşıb kıoyalar*

micmere tırnak 'ūdın / Biz niçün tırmalanup reş ile āh eyleyelüm). Such a complaint can be characterised as direct, since it ends in a directive speech act by which the poet asks to be assigned a new post indirectly, by praising himself, i.e. his work and effort: “We have performed our duty fairly and carefully / We rely on you, God’s guardian” (*Muḥliṣān bir yire geldük buni tedbīr itdük / Sizi īdā’-ı yed-i ḥafīzu’llāh eyleyelüm*), “We have crossed the path of pure service / To prepare for a new path” (*Yolumuz geldi hemān pākça manşıblardan / Birine kendimüz āmāde-i rāh eyleyelüm*). It is not by chance that the ghazal contains a redif with an *-āh eyleyelüm* ending, where the use of the optative *eylemek* (to do, to work) is used in the first person plural, since the optative in Turkish “serves to express a real wish that can be fulfilled” (Čaušević 1996: 293).

2. 1. 2. *Requests and Pleas in Mathnawis*

Requests and pleas in the diwan poetry are frequently recipient-oriented, i.e. they concern the target audience that consists of educated people and dignitaries of the time. Such pleas most frequently concern the perception of the poetry, more precisely, they express the author’s expectations that their work would be evaluated and rewarded. In most cases, the poets start the mathnawi by addressing the recipients and hoping that their verses would have a positive effect. Such an example can be found in the introductory part of Hasan Ziyai Mostari’s *The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak*:

*I do hope that this wonderful pearl
Will still be found by a valiant buyer*

*That it will reach the honourable and the learned
That it will enter their ears with ease*

*Oh, heart, your words have become the deserted pearls
Human souls had no mercy upon those orphans*

*Oh, if only there were a dignitary
To have mercy on this poor child*

Umarın lîk bu dürr-i şehvâr
Müşterîye irişe âhîr-kâr

Bir kemâl ü hüner ehline ire
Rûzgâr ile kulağına gire

Sözlerüñ dürr-i yetîm oldu dilâ
Raḥm ider yok o yetîme aşlâ

Bulınur ola bir ehl-i devlet
Ol yetîme ider âhîr şefkat (315–18)

In the following verses, we see the request, i.e. a plea that is realised indirectly, through the use of the optative (*irişe, ire, gire, bulınur ola*). In the first couplet, the poet expresses hope that his poetry would find a buyer: “I do hope that this wonderful pearl / Will still be found by a valiant buyer” (*Umarın lîk bu dürr-i şehvâr / Müşterîye irişe âhîr-kâr*). This example clearly shows that writing of poetry for the poet was also the source of income, so he, in the manner of any good tradesman, praises (advertises) his merchandise by comparing it to a pearl. The recipient, i.e. the potential patron who would reward the verses is described as “a valiant buyer”, where the adjective *valiant* suggests a kind of a challenge and initiative. The poet then expresses wishes that concern the reception of his work, and which are understood as indirect requests: “That it will reach the honourable and the learned / That it will enter their ears with ease” (*Bir kemâl ü hüner ehline ire / Rûzgâr ile kulağına gire*). They also contain the poet’s complaint regarding the lack of understanding and neglect of his work: “Oh, heart, your words have become the deserted pearls / Human souls had no mercy upon those orphans” (*Sözlerüñ dürr-i yetîm oldu dilâ / Raḥm ider yok o yetîme aşlâ*). Finally, the verses “Oh, if only there were a dignitary / To have mercy on this poor child” (*Bulınur ola bir ehl-i devlet / Ol yetîme ider âhîr şefkat*) do not have a particular addressee; rather, the poet invokes compassion and is looking for someone to have mercy on him, i.e. his poetry. Hasan Ziyai defines the potential addressee as (ehl-i devlet)

(dignitary, statesman, official, etc.). Here again we see the confirmation of the thesis that the relationship between the ruler and the subject in the Ottoman Empire was similar to that between the parent and the child, for the poet describes himself, i.e. his work as an “orphan” (*yetīm*). We also see that certain officials were in a way obliged to protect art and artists.

In the Ottoman society, a dignitary considered protecting art his obligation even if he was not particularly interested in it. That fact leads us to a conclusion that the support and protection of art has become a tradition. Cevdet Dadaş says it was usual for poetry to reach certain instances and to be accepted and awarded. (Durmuş 2009: 79)

We see a similar approach with Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic. Namely, in the introduction to his *Muradnama*, a work dedicated to Sultan Murat II, he expresses his expectations concerning the reception his work:

*As soon as the quill sketched this work
It wrote its name – **Muradnama***

*I hope that adroit observers
Will read it with eyes full of attention*

*That they will not discover my flaws, that they will be silent
And that they will conceal the flaw with exceptional kindness*

*Do not think that a perfect expression is my goal
Neither am I a perfect man, nor of the skilled orators*

Şüretün naķş idince hāme bunuñ
Yazdı nāmun Murādnāme bunuñ

Umarun nāzır olan ehl-i hüner
İde ‘ayn-i ‘ināyet ile nāzar

‘Aybumu açmayub hāmūş olalar
Zeyl-i luţf ile ‘ayb-ı pūş olalar

Ġarażum řanmañ ola arz-ı kemāl
Ne kemāl ehliyüm ne ehl-i maķāl (261–64)

Poet Dervish Pasha also indirectly expresses his demand, i.e. a plea, by using the mitigating devices. Namely, he is asking the potential patrons to “skim through” his work, but with full attention. He is indirectly asking them (by complimenting them to be adroit and benevolent observers) not to reveal the possible flaws and not to speak of them: “That they will not discover my flaws, that they will be silent / And that they will conceal the flaw with exceptional kindness” (‘*Aybumu açmayub ħamūř olalar / Zeyl-ilutf ile ‘ayb-ı pūř olalar*). The compliment is an addition to the speech act and is a sweetener – a praise of the collocutor’s abilities. He implements his expression through the use of the optative, (*ide nařar, olalar*). In the end, the poet adheres to the modesty maxim: “Do not think that a perfect expression is my goal / Neither am I a perfect man, nor of the skilled orators” (Ġarażum řanmañ ola arz-ı kemāl / Ne kemāl ehliyüm ne ehl-i maķāl).

2. 1. 3. Requests and Pleas in Qasidas

Requests and pleas are also seen in qasidas, primarily in chapters fahriye and methiye. An interesting example is seen in Sabit Bosnevi’s qasida in which he is asking Halil Pasha to allocate him a clock which he would use in the courtroom during his time as a kadi in Bosnia.

A Plea to Halil Pasha for a Clock while [Sabit] was a Kadi in Bosnia

*We ask God for something as beautiful and wise
To provide a long and easy life to the pasha*

*Everyone is now preoccupied with some lament
But we are asking for health for that honourable being*

*Since we have remembered our friend and his virtues
We are no longer addressing others and aren't asking to speak to them*

*Just as should the earth under heavens supreme
For permission to express our need we ask*

*We have been left in the dark and trouble in the courtroom
For one means to differ night from day we ask*

*We don't even know when the fasting hour starts, but for the sake of
iftar
To know the time of the sunset we ask*

*If we didn't know about your sensitivity to the noble antivenom
Why would we then ask for your friendship with a scorpion in our chest*

*May the Lord make just is what we ask for
And we ask for help for the dignitaries' patronage*

Bosna Kādısı İken Halil Paşadan Sâ'at Recāsına

Hakdan ne hoş ireb ne güzel hâcet isterüz
Paşaya 'ömr-i bî-had ü bî-gâyet isterüz

Herkes birer niyâz ile meşgûldür velî
Biz ol vücûd-ı muhtereme şîhhat isterüz

Fıkr ü hayâl-i vaşfi olalıdan enîsimüz
Ğayr ile ne mükâleme ne şöhet isterüz

Bi'l-iktizâ türâb-ı der-i çarh-ı rif'ate
Bir 'arz-ı hâcet eylemege ruḥşat isterüz

Ƙalduƙ der n-ı maħkeme-i teng   t rede
Leyl   neh r  se mege bir  let ister z

 ms k-i derdim z de var amm  fu  r i  n
Va t-ı g r b  bilmege bir s 'at ister z

Tiry k-ı lu f  h ssiyetin h b bilmesek
'A reble  oyunumuzda ni  n  lfet ister z

Mevl  ha as z eyleye ma l bumuz budur
Evt ddan hu  l  i  n himmet ister z (Q 24)

All these verses are directives, according to their illocution. However, in them we also see other speech acts that serve to mitigate the directives, since they pose a threat to the collocutor's (the addressee's) negative face, and are, as such, face-threatening acts. Thus, at the beginning, we find duas that concern the wellbeing of Halil Pasha: "We ask God for something as beautiful and wise / To provide a long and easy life to pasha" (*Ha dan ne ho  ireb ne g zel h cet ister z / Pa aya ' mr-i b -had   b -g yet ister z*). After that, the poet compliments his potential benefactor, although he speaks of him in third person. He thus emphasises the virtues that separate him from other dignitaries: "Since we have remembered our friend and his virtues / We are no longer addressing others and aren't asking to speak to them" (*Fikr   hay l-i va f  olalıdan en sim z / G yrile ne m k leme ne  o bet ister z*). In the following verses, the poet uses hedges to avoid coercion of the addressee. He is, in fact, checking on availability, since the poet primarily asks for the permission to even address him: "Just as should the earth under heavens supreme / We ask for permission to express our need" (*Bi'l- kt z  t r b-ı der-i  ar -ı rif'ate / Bir 'arz-ı h cet eylemege ru  at ister z*). According to the conversation analysis, that was a pre-request aimed at avoiding a dispreferred response, i.e. rejection. Furthermore, the poet states reasons for his request (the grounder), which can be observed here as a direct complaint, since the addressee is expected to fix, to improve the unsatisfactory situation: "We have been left in the dark and trouble in

the courtroom / We ask for one means to differ night from day” (*Ḳalduḳ derūn-ı maḥkeme-i teng ü tîrede / Leyl ü nehârı seçmege bir âlet isterüz*); “We don’t even know when the fasting hour starts, but for the sake of iftar/ We ask to know the time of the sunset” (*İmsāk-i derdimüz de var ammā fuṭūr için / Vaḳt-ı ğurûbı bilmege bir sâ’at isterüz*).

In praising the collocutor’s abilities (sweetener), in this case, Halil Pasha, the poet uses the trope paronomasia (word play), which is “a combination of the tropes of repetition at lexical and phonetic levels” (Katnić-Bakaršić 2001: 311). Namely, although the poet speaks of a scorpion and of an antivenom, he also implies the second meaning of the word *aḳreb*: a short, thick “hour” hand on the clock: “If we didn’t know about your sensitivity to the noble antivenom / Why would we then ask for your friendship with a scorpion in our chest” (*Tiryāk-ı luṭfı ḥāssiyetin ḥûb bilmesek / ‘Aḳreble koyunumuzda niçün ülfet isterüz*). “Such a play become spurposely relevant, and bringing together the frequently disparate terms, the poet seeks to establish new semantic relationships, unexpected ties that form an intersection that contains the key motif of the poem” (Katnić-Bakaršić 2001: 311). Sabit ends his qasida by a dua to God, asking Him to help him realise his request, which again speaks of the hierarchy in the Oriental-Islamic civilisation where God is always the highest instance.

Requests and pleas are also present in other qasidas by Sabit Bosnevi. We find an interesting example in the qasida he dedicated to the Crimean han Selim Giray. Bosnevi also dedicated his *Zafername* to Han Selim Giray.

Sabit’s Qasida to the Crimean Han Selim Giray

*Heaven help me to present before your feet
The trouble that this cruel age has brought me in*

*What mercy would it be if this miserable ant
Would be remembered by Sultan Suleiman, brighter than the stars*

*So that he brought this dead man back to life by his mercy like Mesih
The wrath of envy broke him, the jealous have destroyed him*

*Thousands of sufferings he survived and is again plagued
By the separation from the family and wife, the misfortune of children*

*The burden of suffering has turned me to ashes
It set a flame in my soul*

*My heart is breaking because of these sufferings
May the sharp sabre set me free from my wounds*

*For thirty months already have I in the city of Edirne
Performed the duty by constantly counting days*

*So what even if he cried at your doorstep
Asking Kefa for help and goodness*

*The air of Kefa opens up like a lilac
This misfortunate heart burnt by the fire of misfortune*

*Before I ask for a post in the shadow of your mercy
It is my greatest wish to put my face to the ground beneath your feet*

*Nowhere will you find such a slave in shackles of misfortune
Freed from the wind of the wooden shackles' reprimand*

*Indeed, the heart's desire is to be near your power
Although my cruel star is not smiling to me*

*Felek müsâ'id olup hâk-i pâye 'arz itsem
Baña ne 'işveler eyler zamâne-i bî-dād*

*Ne luṭfî olur bu ki bir böyle mûr-ı nâçîzi
O pâdişâd-ı Süleymân sitâre-âyîne yâd*

Mesîh-i luţfı bu ğam mürdesin idüp ihyā
Kırıldı renc-i ħassedden helāk olup ħussād

Hezār-bār dirilüp yine helāk eyler
Fırāk-ı chl ü ‘ıyāl ü muşîbet-i evlād

Yerile ħırmen-i ārāmuñ itdi hākister
Yaķup elemeleri cānumda āteş-i veķķād

Bu dāğlarla ķonmaz ħāţırum ħırāş eyler
Olup ceriĥe-i şamşam-ı ‘azl-zaĥm ziyād

Otuz ay oldı ki zaĥmetle şehr-i Edirnede
Mülāzemet çekерüm gün-be-gün idüp ta’dād

Niyāz ederse n’ola ħāk-i āsitānuñdan
Kefe ķazāsını iĥsāna himmet ü imdād

Kefe hevāsı ile lāleler gibi açılır
Bu nār-ı ķahr ile pür-dāğ olan dil-i nā-şād

Civār-ı sāye-i luţfuñda manşıb istemedен
Ġubār-ı pāyüñe yüz sürmedür ehemmi murād

Olursa böyle olur bu esîr-i bend-i belā
Dü-şāĥa-i sitem-i rûzgārdan āzād

Egerçi ħāĥiş-i dil ķuvvet-i ķarîbededür
Velî sitāre-i ğaddārum eyler istib’ād (Q 7/47–58)

The poet begins his address with a hedge that mitigates the demand and is, in fact, a prayer for the poet to implement his demand: “Heavens help me to present before your feet / The trouble that this cruel age has

brought me in” (*Felek müsâ'id olup hâk-i pâye 'arz itsem/ Baña ne 'işveler eyler zamâne-i bî-dād*). At the same time, we see also self-humiliation in several verses. Namely, the poet self-humiliates even literally, stating that he is going “beneath the feet” (*hâk-i pâye, hâk-i âsitānuñdan*) of the authority. He speaks of himself as of a “miserable ant, dead man, ashes, misfortunate heart burnt by the fire of misfortune, slave” (*mûr-ı nâçîzi, mürdesi, hâkister, nâr-ı kahr ile pür-dâğ olan dil-i nâ-şād, esîr-i bend-i belâ*), contrasting that with the position of the sultan and the Han of Crimea who he describes as “brighter than the stars, merciful like Mesih” (*sitâre-âyîne, Mesîh-i lutf*).

Although the qasida is dedicated to the Crimean Han Selim Giray, Sabit mentions the sultan Suleiman II: “What mercy would it be if this miserable ant / Would be remembered by Sultan Suleiman, brighter than the stars” (*Ne lutfi olur bu ki bir böyle mûr-ı nâçîzi / O pâdişād-ı Süleymân sitâre-âyîne yād*), again confirming the Ottoman Empire’s strict hierarchy. Namely, Sultan Suleiman II, who ruled from 1687 to 1691, called Selim Giray to engage in the campaign on Austria. He was victorious in a battle near Prekop, and Sabit commemorated the event in his famous work *Zafername*. In this qasida, the author uses the metonymy *Kefa*, which means the city, an eyalet in Crimea where Selim Giray ruled. “So what even if he cried at your doorstep / Asking Kefa for help and goodness” (*Niyâz ederse n'ola hâk-i âsitānuñdan / Kefe kazâsını ihsâna himmet ü imdād*). Also, when he praises the air of Kefa, he is, in fact, describing the nobleness of Selim Giray: “The air of Kaffa opens up like a lilac / This misfortunate heart burnt by the fire of misfortune” (*Kefe hevâsı ile lâleler gibi açılır / Bu nâr-ı kahr ile pür-dâğ olan dil-i nâ-şād*).

This section of the qasida can be characterised as a direct complaint, since the poet explains his demand by his difficult situation. Also, in the verses: “Before I ask for a post in the shadow of your mercy / It is my greatest wish to put my face to the ground beneath your feet” (*Civâr-ı sâye-i lutfuñda manşib istemeden / Ğubâr-ı pâyüñne yüz sürmedür ehemmi murād*), the author realises his request indirectly. Namely, although he openly announced his request, nowhere in the text does he so explicitly addresses it to the addressee. He again emphasises his subordinate

position, stating his greatest wish were “to put my face to the ground beneath your feet”. Notwithstanding the verse that represents the poet’s resignation, a poet’s acceptance of the fate: “Although my cruel star is not smiling to me” (*Velī sitāre-i ġaddārum eyler istib’ād*), the previous verse again contains an indirect request, i.e. a plea which is intensified by the description of the poet’s dire situation: “Indeed, the heart’s desire is to be near your power” (*Egerçi hāhiş-i dil kuvvet-i karībededür*). The strategy *giving overwhelming reasons*, as part of the negative politeness, is frequently used for the purpose of mitigating the imposition, where one of the reasons may be one’s own inability and helplessness forcing the speaker to threaten the collocutor’s negative face.

Sabit Bosnevi also wrote his famous work *Zafername* which he dedicated to the Han of Crimea, Selim Giray. He was then finally granted his position as a kadi in Kaffa.

In the aforementioned qasida, dedicated to Selim Giray, entitled Zafername (The Book of Victory), he is asking Giray to grant him the position of a kadi in Kaffa (Theodosia), in Crimea. Giray complied with the request and granted him the position, but this service did not last long either. (Nametak 1991: 77)

3. Representatives

As has already been stated, representatives are speech acts by which the speaker / the sender of the message expresses the facts or that which he considers facts on the extralinguistic reality. Those are announcements, initial speech acts by which the speaker / the sender of the message informs his collocutor / the recipient of the message about something (Mrazović – Vukadinović 1990: 602). For chronograms, i.e. tarihs, one can say that they are representatives of a sort, i.e. announcements, since they announce the information on the date of the construction of an object, as well as on other important dates (births, deaths, important events, etc.).

3. 1. Representatives in Chronograms

Let us again emphasise that the tarih or the chronogram is a specific genre of the diwan poetry the content of which focuses on a certain event, while the year in which the event took place is expressed by the sum of the numerical value of the Alphabet letters in which the tarih is written. According to Bagić, chronograms are lexical wordplays (Bagić 2012: 152), while many authors consider them to be riddles. They exist in both the West and the East. In the West, they were written by Romans, but they later spread throughout Europe (on certain buildings, books, medallions, money). Keeping in mind the demanding nature of the genre, in the sense of establishing harmony between graphemes and the language itself within a poem, we can only guess how demanding a challenge that was for the diwan poets. The genre's complexity certainly conditioned its length, hence, in the diwani tradition, chronograms are mostly short forms, frequently expressed in a single bayt, or in the kit'a form. Writing tarihs demanded both the skill and knowledge of the author, but also of the recipient, since those were preconditions for the message to be understood with a certain effort. Chronograms send the information at two levels – through graphemes and numbers, and that is the only way to solve the “riddle”. The recipient could thus experience additional pleasure and connect with the poet through the shared background knowledge.

Pragmaticians Kent Bach and Robert M. Harnish call Searle's representative speech acts constatives, stating that they express the collocutor's belief and his intention and desire for the addressee to possess or form the same beliefs. The same authors categorise the constatives into 15 classes, including the assertives, predictives, retrodictives, descriptives, informatives, etc. (1984: 41-42). As far as chronograms are concerned, the following classes of constatives apply: retrodictives, stating the facts related to extralinguistic reality; descriptives that categorise, describe, note and present the facts from extralinguistic reality; and informatives that bear witness, inform, proclaim, announce and notify. However, as it was the case with other examples of speech acts in Ottoman poetry, here in the case of the representative and constative we come across other forms of speech

act mostly expressives (praises and good wishes). They are subordinated to primary illocution with aim to inform addressee of certain event.

However, the recipient is anonymous, since chronograms were not only contained in collections of poetry, but also in other manuscripts and even on buildings which the authors wanted to commemorate in such a way. Addressees of the expressives were dignitaries (frequently the builders themselves, i.e. the devisor). Also, chronograms written in calligraphy on the walls of buildings had an aesthetical and artistic purpose, and did not always emphasise and praise the benefactor and his work; rather, they referred to the author and events that were important for him.

A number of chronograms in Osman Shehdi's *Diwan* presented in the qasida form are specific for this author. The main characteristic of the poetical expression in chronograms of this author are very long and complex strings of possessive construction specific for the Indian literary style, which spread through the 17th and 18th c. diwan literature. One such chronogram is dedicated to the reconstruction of Sultan Suleiman's mosque in Belgrade:

*Shah of all shahs, sultan Ahmed Han Gazi
The third among the rulers of the pure Ottoman kin*

*During his noble rule the hearts throughout the world rejoiced
He now is the successor of Suleiman's kingdom*

*At the tall Belgrade fortress he performed a great deed
To this supreme endowment he indeed was a famous benefactor*

*For, sultan Suleiman Han, who resides in Jannah
Left great works that should never be destroyed*

*The constructor of the house of God, Halil Pasha
Again brought to life Sultan Suleiman's Mosque*

*So what even if he earned a great reward and a good deed
When he erected such a glorious mosque*

Şehenşāh-ı cihān Sultān Aḥmed Ḥān-ı Ġāzi kim
Budur ol sālīs-i hānān-ı nesl-i pāk-i ‘Osmānī

Olupdur devr-i ‘adlinde cihān-ābād diller şād
Budur ‘ālemde şimdi vāris-i mülk-i Süleymānī

İdüp şāhāne himmet hısn-ı bālā-yı Beligrāda
Bu ḥayrāt-ı celīle oldu el-ḥāk vākıf-ı şānı

Ki sultān-ı behişt-ārā Süleymān Ḥān-ı Ġāzi’niñ
Ḥarāb olmazdı bu āsārınıñ temkīn-i erkānı

Semti bāni-i beyt-i Ḥudā ya’ni Ḥalīl Paşa
Cedīden kıldı iḥyā cāmi’-i Sultān Süleyman’ı

N’ola ki ḥıssa-yāb u nā’il-i ecr-i cezīl olsa
Ki böyle cāmi’-i vālā-yı pür-feyze odur bāni (T 27/1–6)

This chronogram contains compliments and praise addressed to sultan Ahmed, similar to those we see in qasidas and muyyezel ghazals. We first see the repetition of the word or its root (paregmenon and polyptoton): “Shah of all shahs, sultan Ahmed Han Gazi / The third among the rulers of the pure Ottoman kin” (*Şehenşāh-ı cihān Sultān Aḥmed Ḥān-ı Ġāzi kim / Budur ol sālīs-i hānān-ı nesl-i pāk-i ‘Osmānī*). Compliments are also seen in the second verse, where the sultan’s righteousness, power and care for his subjects is praised: “During his noble rule the hearts throughout the world rejoiced / He now is the successor of Suleiman’s kingdom” (*Olupdur devr-i ‘adlinde cihān-ābād diller şād / Budur ‘ālemde şimdi vāris-i mülk-i Süleymānī*). In this couplet, the sultan is compared to Suleiman, which is, in this case, polysemous, since the word can relate to Suleiman the Magnificent who built the mosque, as well as one of God’s messengers, who, according to the Islamic tradition, ruled “Over all creatures and things, animate and inanimate, owing to the power that was bestowed to him” (Nametak 2007: 227).

The chronogram's primary illocution is in the following couplet: "At the tall Belgrade fortress he performed a great deed / To this supreme endowment he indeed was a famous benefactor" (*İdüp şāhāne himmet hışn-ı bālā-yı Beligrāda / Bu hayrāt-ı celīle oldu el-hāk vākıf-ı şānı*). Here, he refers to the facts existing in the extralinguistic reality, i.e., he announces that the sultan Ahmed reconstructed the Mosque of Suleiman the Magnificent in Belgrade. The terms *hayrāt* and *vākıf* are significant, since they imply the role of the Ottoman dignitaries as devisors. According to Marlene Kurz (2012: 104), the Ottoman foundations are a nonverbal way of spreading the ruling ideology. The description of waqifs in chronograms, as well as in other Ottoman texts is traditionally characterised by superlative adjectives, but always in the context of a devout person, hence, the first devisor in this case, Suleiman the Magnificent, is described as a "resident of Jannah", which is the ultimate praise: "For, sultan Suleiman Han, who resides in Jannah / Left great works that should never be destroyed" (*Ki sulṭān-ı behişt-ārā Süleymān Hān-ı Ğāzi'niñ / Harāb olmazdı bu āsārınıñ temkīn-i erkānı*). The warning to preserve foundations is expressed through the imperfect -irdi, which, in this case, is a voluntative and desiderative mood. At the same time, the couplet contains a claim which is simultaneously a good wish, since such a content (that someone is a resident of Jannah) cannot be the subject of knowledge, but only hope and a good wish that is also seen in the last couplet that contains a conditional sentence expressing a strong wish, which can concern both Suleiman the Magnificent, the first builder of the mosque, as well as Sultan Ahmed and Halil Pasha, who reconstructed it: "So what even if he earned a great reward and a good deed / When he erected such a glorious mosque" (*N'ola ki hıssa-yāb u nā'il-i ecr-i cezīl olsa / Ki böyle cāmi'-i vālā-yı pūr-feyze odur bānı*).

The chronogram's representative function is also seen in the *Diwan* by Hasan Ziyai Mostari, where the poet refers to the local events. One such chronogram concerns the water that arrived in Mostar in 983 (1575/76 AD), as the very title suggests: *To the Waqif Water that Arrived in Mostar*. We cannot precisely determine what kind of water is in question, but the content of the tarih clearly indicates it was an important event for the city of Mostar:

*The surface of the city is water, the same as Selsebil
They wrote a tarih to it saying it was the other water of life*

Şehrün yüzi suydur hem ‘aynı Selsebîlün
Yazdılar ana târih âb-ı hayât-ı sâni (T 8/2)

Although there are no records about the construction of a water supply system construction in Mostar that year, the sources indicate that a water supply line existed in Mostar before 1610, so it is very likely that the tarih concerns the construction of a water supply system to the city. Evliya Çelebi wrote in his work *Seyâhatnâme* [The Travelogue] that water was transferred from the Radoboljša river across the Old Bridge to the city center, reaching 45 locations such as public fountains, public kitchens (imarets), mosques, etc. (see Tezcan 2011: 215). It is obvious that this is a local tarih, which indicates that the poet was in Mostar at the time. This is also confirmed by another source that Ziyai transcribed the *Collection of Authentic Hadith* in Mostar, in that same year – 983 (1576 AD), which is clearly stated in the manuscript.

The poet compares the water to Selsebil, which is “the name of one of the rivers in Jannah, whose taste is sweet” (Nametak 2007: 219). Probably because of the abundance of water that arrived to the city, the poet says: “The surface of the city is water” (*Şehrün yüzi suydur*). In the second verse, a representative speech act is used in the representative, i.e. we observe a self-referencing procedure in which the poet simultaneously writes the chronogram and provides information about it. It is interesting that he uses the perfect -di of the verb *yazmak* (*yazdılar*, in Bosnian: *napisali*; in English: *they wrote*), third person plural. This can be explained, on the one hand, as objectivization, and, on the other, as adhering to the modesty maxim, since in this way the poet places himself in the background.

Ziyai’s chronogram to the construction of the Old Bridge in Mostar is also reflects a local event. The bridge was constructed in 974 AH (1566/67 AD).

A Chronogram to the Old Bridge in Mostar

*He built a bridge like a rainbow
O, my God, is there any other like it*

*Looking at it, impressed, a wise man uttered a tarih to it
Oh, sultan, we too shall cross the bridge that the entire region is crossing*

Tārīḥ-i Cīsr-i Mostār

Ḳavs-i ḳuzaḥuñ ‘aynı bir köpri binā itdi
Var mı bu cihān içre mānendi hey Allāhum

‘İbretle baḳup didi tārīḥini bir ‘ārīf
İl geḳdüḡi köpriden biz de geḳerüz şāhum (T1)

Exaggeration is evident at the beginning of the chronogram. In the first couplet, the arch of the bridge is compared to a rainbow, while, in the second couplet, there is a rhetorical question: “O, my God, is there any other like it” (*Var mı bu cihān içre mānendi hey Allāhum*), which can be interpreted as an address to God, but also the exclamation “Oh, God” (*hey Allāhum*) intensifies the meaning of the question and can indicate the speaker’s overwhelming emotional state. This is a secondary expressive exclamation (since it was formed by the process of grammaticalization and lexicalisation, in this case, from the ritual “vocative” that was used during prayers) that shows the speaker’s emotional state (Ameka 1992: 111).

In the second couplet, we see self-referencing – the poet is writing about how he wrote the chronogram: “Looking at it, impressed, a wise man uttered a tarih to it” (*‘İbretle baḳup didi tārīḥini bir ‘ārīf*). The author here uses the polysemous term *ārīf* to refer to himself as a wise man. Namely, the word means: “The one who has achieved cognition, the one who has met God; that is the sense of the hadith ‘Whoever knows himself, he knows Allah’. Sufis claim that *irfan* (cognition) is a gift from God, meaning that it holds a higher position than science. Science is the fruit

of reason, while irfan is the fruit of feelings” (Nametak 2007: 36). In the second couplet of the last verse, the poet addresses the sultan / shah, and it is possible that he is addressing Suleiman the Magnificent, who had given the order to mimar Hayrettin, the pupil of Mimar Sinan, to construct the Old Bridge. Using exaggeration to emphasise that the bridge is crossed by the entire region, Hasan Ziyai provides a picturesque description of the use of the bridge, since Mostar had seen no other similar bridge on the Neretva river: “Oh, sultan, we too shall cross the bridge that the entire region is crossing” (*İl geçdügi köprüden biz de geçerüz şāhum*).

Still, Hasan Ziyai’s *Diwan* also contains descriptions of events that were important for the entire Ottoman Empire. One such example is the coming to throne of Sultan Murat III.

A Chronogram on the Accession to the Throne of the Sultan, Protector of the World

*Murat, the son of Sultan Selim, as he desired
In the worldly empire he has gained the rule and the power*

*In a happy empire if only his rule
Were made eternal by You, oh, God*

*To the arrival to the throne of the sultan of the entire world
A dignitary from the assembly uttered a chronogram*

Tārīḥ-i Cülūs-ı Pādişāh-ı Ālem-penāh

Murād üzre Murād ibn-i Selīm Hān
Cihān mülkinde buldı ‘izz ü cāhı

Devām-ı devletini ber-mezīd it
Serīr-i saltanatda yā İlāhī

Cülūs-i tahtına bir mīr-i meclis
Didi tārīḥ heft iklīm şāhı (T 4)

Unlike the previous chronograms that comment the construction of useful objects for the society, here the poet records a date that was very important for the entire Ottoman Empire: the arrival of Sultan Murat III to the throne. We notice a praise, the glorification of Murat III, who: “In the worldly empire he has gained the rule and the power” (*Cihān mülkinde buldı ‘izz ü cāhı*). Here we again see the positioning of the sultan as a ruler in this world, i.e. the God’s representative on earth. The poet calls the sultan Murat, the son of Selim, which indicates that the sultan was indeed Murat III (who ruled from 1574 to 1595). In the second verse, there is a prayer that concerns the longevity of his rule: “In a happy empire if only his rule / Were made eternal by You, oh, God” (*Devām-ı devletini ber-mezīd it / Serīr-i salṭanatda yā İlāhī*). The chronogram ends in the couplet: “To the arrival to the throne of the sultan of the entire world / A dignitary from the assembly uttered a tarih” (*Cülūs-i taḥtına bir mīr-i meclis / Didi tāriḥ heft iḳlīm ṣāhı*), where the poet refers to his own writing of chronograms, hence we can assume that he is addressing himself in third person singular: “a dignitary from the assembly” (*bir mīr-i meclis*), which is a breach of the modesty maxim.

As we could see in the aforementioned examples, chronograms, as representative speech acts, provide certain information on the extralinguistic reality, but they also contain other speech acts, like expressives, which are most frequently used to express compliments and praise to the rulers who (most frequently) built a certain object described in the chronogram. In that way and in that form, together with the historically-relevant data, the relationship between poets and representatives of the authority can be interpreted.

Conclusion

In this book, we attempted to analyse through a different approach the literary heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish language. Namely, this poetry has not been analysed through the lens of pragmatics, which, in consequence, meant that some of its characteristics and values remained hidden and unnoticed.

Poetry is a charm, charming. 'Carmen' is Latin for a lyrical poem. Originally, it was the name of the magical abracadabra made real through the language; in short, it was the name of a speech act. All speech acts function by being successful charming. They enchant, just like magic. (Peternai 2005: 76)

However, if we consider the aforementioned citation, we will see that the verses of our poets who wrote in the Ottoman Turkish language can also be observed in the same manner. Some forms, like the qasida ("the poem with a goal") were performative by the very definition; it can be said that they were an unhindered, open "enchantment" of the potential patron and sponsor, like a verbal gift at the "linguistic market". For that gift, a return, concrete present was expected. Also, some parts of the qasida, like the methiye or the fahriye, clearly indicate that a dignitary is praised, or that the poet is self-praising; they also contained the chapter *dua*, in which the poet would address God to make pleas or wish something for the benefit of his potential patron. Ghazals, the direct translation of which means *courting*, two to three couplets would be added in order to present the poem to a potential patron – that is called the *muyyezel ghazal*, i.e. the occasional ghazal. Mathnawis also contained sections like the methiye, or praise to the person the entire work was dedicated to, as well as a chapter containing the reasons why the author decided to write his work (*sebeb-i telîf* or *sebeb-i nazm-ı kitâb*). That was an obligatory chapter in all mathnawis and it indicated the poet's approach to poetry. As far as the kit'a form is concerned, the Ottoman literary tradition defines them as a genre that expresses the poet's ideas, wisdom, attitudes, judgment and criticism (Dilçin 1995: 202), i.e., a single thought, witticism, satire, or a description of an event (Nametak 1991: 28). Finally, there are chronograms (*tarihs*),

describing certain events, but also containing praise to the commendable dignitaries.

We methodologically opted for historical pragmatics, a relatively young new discipline that still has produced many books and papers that have attempted to offer a different insight into the texts from the past. Our analysis relied on speech acts encoded in poetry, which show the position and the status of the Bosnian poets who wrote in the Ottoman Turkish language, as well as their relationship towards the authority, i.e. potential patrons who were frequently themselves poets, and from whom the very existence of these poets depended. That is why one could conclude that all those performatives were primarily directives, since they were an attempt to directly or indirectly initiate the dignitaries to provide material assistance to poets. The presence of other speech acts, such as expressives (good wishes, compliments, self-praise, complaints) and representatives, paints a detailed picture of the poet himself, as well as about the relationship towards the potential recipients and patrons, as well as of a wider context in which the verses were written.

Classical Ottoman literature was not familiar with, nor did it recognise originality in today's terms, hence, poets were obliged to strictly follow the form in which they would express themselves poetically. Although their verses abound with clichés, it still appears that the poet's traits sometimes show, i.e. the signs of their own situation and position. Notwithstanding a wider context, as well as the relationship between poets and dignitaries and patrons, this book was an attempt to reveal those signs as well. Thus, for example, the previously-mentioned verses by Sabit Bosnevi seem quite contemporary, although they come from the past. Even today, many writers would certainly place their signature on them:

Sabit, the quill can barely make ends meet
The value of knowledge cannot be sold easily

Appendix: Examples of Speech Acts in the Literary Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish Language

1. Expressives

1. 1. Good Wishes and Duas

Hasan Ziyai Mostari

May your endless dirhams **spill** throughout the world

May the Almighty **increase** your generosity every time

(**Şaçıla** ‘āleme lütfüñ diremleri bī-hadd

Sahāñı **artıra** her bār Qādir-i müte’āl) (Q 5/30)

The good wish is here realised by the optative *şaçıla* and *artıra*. In the first verse, it is found in the initial position, while, in the second verse, it follows the direct object, which indicates an inverted sentence. However, here we are discussing poetry in the Ottoman Turkish language, where the meter and rhyme may influence the word order. Since the first addressee, the Almighty, is expressed by the Persian possessive construction “*Qādir-i müte’āl*” which consists of the Arabic word *Qādir*, one of 99 names of Allah, and *müte’āl*, meaning “supreme” (one of God’s attributes), we can conclude that this is a dua (prayer) by which God is asked to increase the generosity of a person. However, in that way, the very sender of the message (the author) indirectly, through the dua, prays for his own benefit. This prayer is intensified by the use of the Persian adverb *her bār* (every time), which ensures continuity of the good wish.

May the Almighty God **make** your life and power last
May he **bestow** you with abundant beauty in both worlds

(‘Ömrüñi devletüñi **dā’im ide** Ḥazret-i Ḥakk
İki ‘ālemde saña **vire** mezāduñ Yezdān) (Q 7/32)

In a good wish, i.e. the dua, the Almighty God is asked to make Hasan Bey’s life and power “last”. The optative is again used in this speech act (*ide, vire*), which here, due to the meter and the rhyme, and also probably due to the emphasis is not placed in the final position. The first verse contains the syntagma (a possessive construction in the Persian language) *Ḥazret-i Ḥakk* (the subject), which consists of the word *Ḥazret*, an expression of respect used with the name of an important person in the Islamic tradition (to an extent, it could be compared to the word *saint* in Christianity). However, that term is also seen in the contemporary Turkish language, as an honorific title used to show respect to both religious and worldly authorities. In the analysed verse, it is used as an attribute for the word *Ḥakk*, which in Islam means *Absolute Truth, Almighty God*. In the second verse, the subject is expressed by the word *Yezdān*, a term used primarily in Zoroastrianism to express the divinity of good. Afterwards, it was used in Islam to denote *Allah* (Develioğlu 1998: 1162). Here too the permanent nature of that which is desired is emphasised (*dā’im*), which is extended from the temporal to the spatial sphere by the syntagma *iki ‘ālemde*.

Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic

Submit the world to his command
Make his army ever victorious

Improve his faith and affairs in this world
Make him **joyful** in both the worlds!

(Emrine ‘ālemi **musahhar kıl**
‘Askerīn dāyima **muzaffer kıl**

Dīn ü dünyāsin **eyleyüb ma'mūr**
İki 'ālemde **kıl anı mesrūr** (327–332)

In the first couplet, the good wish (dua) is realised by the imperative form of the auxiliary verb *kılmak* (*musahharkıl, muzafferkıl*). That is where we see that the dua to the Almighty God for the benefit of Murat III resembles, i.e. bears the characteristics of the directive speech act, since the imperative form asks a certain action to be completed by the addressee. That is why Michael Hancher (1979: 2) classified prayers as directive speech acts. Unlike the first couplet, where the imperative is in the final position, the second couplet contains inversion (*eyleyüb ma'mūr, kıl anı mesrūr*). Still, one should keep in mind that this is poetry, where, alongside the meter and rhyme conditioning, syntax is always tampered with. Good wishes are dual in nature, since they relate both to the worldly and the spiritual (religious) sphere (*dīn ü dünyāsin, iki 'ālemde*).

1. 2. Complaints

Hasan Ziyai Mostari

We **complain** about the life on the rock
What can we do, troubles **plummet** on us

(Taşda meskenden iñen çatı **şikāyet kılmuruz**
N'idelüm başumuza **pārelenür** anca miñen) (Q 9/14)

In this couplet we see the expression of a negative evaluation of the situation the poet is in, and, as far as directness is concerned, we can say that this is partial directness, since *violation* is mentioned, but not the responsibility of the collocutor / the recipient of the message. The complaint is realised through the performative verb *şikāyet kılmuruz* (we complain) in the present -r first person plural, which was most probably used because of humility – the poet did not want to stand out. In the second couplet, we see the verb *itmek* (*etmek*) in the optative for the first-person

plural in the phrase *N'idelüm*, which has been replaced with the phrase *ne yapalım* (what can we do) in the contemporary Turkish language. This form is used to express resignation and helplessness, which adds a sense of the poet's acceptance of the situation. This is also emphasised by the use of the present -r *pārelenür*, which literally means "falling apart, breaking".

Suleiman Mezaki

My complaint is that the envious ignorant
With the calumnious fire has **burned** my heart

I hope that your astute character
The truth from lie will set apart

(**Şekvem oldur** ki hāsīd-i nā-dān
Cigerüm **yağdı** nār-ı tōhmet ile

Umarım mū-şikāfī-iṭab'ūñ
Farğ ider şıdğ u kızbi diğğat ile) (KT 1)

In these verses, the complaint is expressed by an indirect demand to the recipient of the message to correct the situation the poet is complaining about. Although the poet does not use the performative verb, he mentions the speech act at the very beginning: "Şekvem oldur ki" (my complaint). The content of the complaint is expressed by the perfect -di (*yağdı*) that expresses an action that ended prior to the moment of speaking – "the perfect -di **always** means *dynamicity* and *processualism*, i.e. an action that the speaker was engaged in" (Čaušević 1996: 262). It should be noted that this perfect also has a secondary, modal meaning that denotes something categorical. In the second couplet, optimism is expressed through the use of the verb *ummak* (to hope) in the first person singular of the present -r. The poet expresses hope that the addressee will tell the difference between truth and lies, complimenting thus the recipient of the message as a clever

and just person, praising himself at the same time as a person who sides with the truth.

Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi

I had set out with debt, and have **lost** a lot
Neither a gift, **nor** a dime, **nor** a dirham **have I received**

From the snow, rain and wind here
 Only a handful of dew instead of silver **have I received**

(Deyn-i vāfirle gidüp hā'ib ü hāsır **geldüm**
 Ne hedāya vü ne dīnār ü ne dirhem **geldi**

Berf ü bārānı düşüp bād-ı hevādan ancak
 Sīm-i maḥşüle bedel nuḳre-i şebnem **geldi**) (Q 30/25–28)

These verses show a complaint expressing a negative evaluation, including the reasons. Partial directness is present here since the responsibility of the collocutor / the message recipient is for the situation the poet is in is not mentioned. The complaint contains the perfect -di, but one should keep in mind that the entire qasida was written in the redif form -*emgeldi*. In the verse “Ne hedāya vü ne dīnār ü ne dirhem geldi” (“Neither a gift, nor a dime, nor a dirham have I received”, literally “Neither a gift, not a dime, nor a dirhem arrived”), is a complaint intensified by cumulation, i.e. by mentioning elements that are characterised by the same syntactic position. Intensification is also achieved in the following couplet through expressing a contrast of what the poet desired (silver) and what he truly got (dew): “Sīm-i maḥşüle bedel nuḳre-i şebnem geldi” (Only a handful of dew instead of silver have I received).

1. 3. Compliments and Praise

Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak

The lovely **quill in love** started speaking
Hatem, **are you praising** Ali Agha the fortunate?

(Şīvelendi **hāme-i şūrīde** Hātem yoksa sen
Midhat-āmīz sa'ādetli 'Ali Ağa **mısın**) (Q 10/10)

In this couplet, the compound noun *midhat-āmīz* was used; it consists of *midhat*, meaning “praise”, while the word *-āmīz* means “the one that contains, that is mixed with something” (Develioğlu 1998: 32), which in this context means “the one who has begun praising”. In that way, the speech act of praise is openly implied, although it is realised indirectly, by an interrogative sentence. However, the question that could here be characterised as rhetorical is, in fact, conditioned by the very form, since the qasida contains the - *ā-mısın* redif (chorus, rhyme). Hatem defines himself as the person who praises Ali Agha, and he also uses exaggeration when describing himself as “the quill in love” (*hāme-işūrīde*). The word *şūrīde* has several meanings: “scattered, shaken, in love, devoted, enthralled” (Develioğlu 1998: 1004). The attribute *sa'ādetli* is used to describe the praised Ali Agha, which means “happy”, but also denoted a certain military rank in the Ottoman period, as Develioğlu (1998: 903) emphasises. Thus, this attribute can be observed as a good wish (to make the addressee happy).

Hasan Ziyai Mostari

Merciful and generous means Sinan Bey

For **his shrine** is a safe fortress, the source of God's soldiers

(**Müşfik ü ehl-isahā ya'ni Sinān Beg** kim anuñ
Menba'-i ceyş-i İlāh **dergehidür** hışn-ı haşīn) (Q 8/22)

In the first couplet, the attributes “merciful and generous” (*müşfik ü ehl-isahā*) are emphasised because they do not modify Sinan Bey the usual way; rather, the Arabic expression *ya ’ni* (*that is, namely, meaning*) is used to make them equal to *Sinan Bey*, as if the equality sign has been placed between *Sinan Bey* and “merciful and generous”. In continuation, Sinan Bey is praised the way that certain characteristics are ascribed to him, all of which were expected from a ruler to possess: godliness and protection of his subjects. It is interesting that the poet used the word *dergah*, which means “tekke, lobby”, which here can be understood as the scope of his activity and rule, modified by a religious undertone.

1. 4. Gratitude

Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi

Praise for the Clock (**With Praise for the Clock**)

To the anguished abstinent from the sultan
A sign of the emperor’s benevolence has arrived

The time of iftar henceforth
Shall never be doubted, the clock has arrived

Let us present a dua to pasha’s character
Sabit, the time has come for that

(Sā’atüñ Teşekkürine

Rûze-dâr-ı ğama sulţānumdan
Hışşe-i hân-ı ‘ināyet geldi

Vaqt-i iftārda şimdiden sonra
Şekkimiz kalmadı sâ’at geldi

Zāt-ı Paşaya du'ā eyliyelüm
Sābitā vaḳt-i icābet geldi) (Q 25)

This is a praise representing a reactive speech act that is realised after the hearer did something for the speaker. In the verses that follow, we see indirect praise, although the speech act is contained in the very title (gratitude - *teşekkür*). Namely, the poet describes his situation prior to and after receiving a present and speaks of himself as of an “anguished abstinent” (*rūze-dār-ı ğam*), who, having received the clock, can precisely determine the end of fasting. The dua (*Let us present a dua to pasha's character – Zāt-ı Paşaya du'ā eyliyelüm*) is a verbal return gift to Halil Pasha. However, the poet never forgets the ironclad hierarchy of the Ottoman Empire, since he primarily emphasised the sultan's benevolence, since he, after all, was the owner of all material goods: “To the anguished abstinent from the sultan / A sign of the emperor's benevolence has arrived” (*Rūze-dār-ı ğama sulṭānumdan / Hişşe-i hān-ı 'ināyet geldi*).

2. Directives

2. 1. Requests and Pleas

Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi

We **ask** the dear shaykh al-Islam to look
To make him a means for the position and honour

(Şeyhü'l-islām ciger-güşesinüñ bir nazarın
İsterüz vāsıf-ı manşıb ü cāh eyleyelüm) (G 46/10)

In this *muyyezel* ghazal, the poet uses a performative verb *istemek* in the first person plural of present -r (*isterüz – we ask*), realising the speech act of request. The use of the first person plural can be marked as modesty (*we* to express modesty). It is indicative that the author here asks the

shaykh al-Islam, whom he describes as “dear” so as to realise closeness with the addressee, “only” to look. Thus, we can conclude that the shaykh al-Islam’s power is so immense that a mere look (*to be used as a means of the position and honour –vāsiṭ-ı manşib ü cāh*), i.e. paying attention to the poet, would suffice to change his social situation for the better.

Alauddin Sabit Bosnevi

A **Plea** to Halil Pasha **for a Clock** while [Sabit] was a Kadi of Bosnia

Just as should the earth under heavens supreme
For permission to express our need we **ask**

We have been left in the dark and trouble in the courtroom
For one means to differ night from day we **ask**

We don’t even know when the fasting hour starts, but for the sake of
iftar
To know the time of the sunset we **ask**

(Bosna Kâdısı İken Halil Paşadan **Sā’at Recāsına**

Bi’l-iḳtizā türāb-ı der-iḳarḥ-ı rif’ate
Bir ‘arz-ı ḥācet eylemege **ruḥṣat isterüz**

Ḳalduḳ derūn-ı maḥkeme-i teng ü tīrede
Leyl ü nehārı seçmege bir ālet **isterüz**

İmsāk-i derdimüz de var ammā fuṭūr iḳün
Vaḳt-ı ḡurūbı bilmege bir sā’at **isterüz**) (Q 24/4-6)

We can see from the very title of the poem that this is a speech act of request, i.e. a plea: *Sā’at Recāsına* (*A Plea to Halil Pasha for a Clock*). The

original text contains a dative case (*recāsına*), which expresses the poet's intention. The very verses, however, are dominated by a performative verb, since the redif of the poem ends in *-a/et isterüz* (we ask), in the present -r, which mitigates the demand as potentially non-cooperative. However, at the very beginning, the author questions the availability, since he is asking for a permission to express his demand: "For permission to express our need we ask" (*Bir 'arz-ı hācet eylemege ruḥṣat isterüz*). The poet then states reasons for his demand / plea, which can here be observed as a direct complaint, since the addressee is expected to perform an activity that would improve the current unsatisfactory situation, which is described by exaggeration: "Kalduḡ derūn-ı maḥkeme-i teng ü tūrede" (We have been left in the dark and trouble in the courtroom). Still, the main reason for asking for a clock is religious: to determine the time of iftar, the end of fasting.

3. Representatives

Osman Shehdi

The constructor of the house of God, Halil Pasha
Again **brought to life** Sultan Suleiman's Mosque

(Semtī bāni-i beyt-i Ḥudā ya'ni Ḥalīl Paṣa
Cedīden **kıldı iḥyā** cāmi'-i Sultān Süleyman'ı) (T 27/5)

This couplet contains a representative speech act by which the author states facts about extralinguistic reality: that Halil Pasha reconstructed the Sultan Suleiman's Mosque. The chronogram also contains a compliment to Halil Pasha which is introduced as a rheme (a new information) in the form of an expression in Arabic *ya'ni* (that is, namely, meaning), making the pasha equal to the "constructor of the house of God". The compliment is seen in the allusion to the Prophet Ibrahim (PBUH.), the constructor of the Kaaba, who was mentioned as *Halīlullāh*, i.e. "Allah's friend", Ibrahim

(PBUH.). He is mentioned in the Holy Quran in the same way (An-Nisā) (Nametak 2007: 110). The speech act is realised by the use of the perfect -di – *kıldı ihyā* (brought to life), by which the poet expresses an activity that ended prior to the moment of speaking – “the perfect -di **always** means *dynamicity* and *processualism*, i.e. an action that the speaker was engaged in” (Čaušević 1996: 262). It should be noted that this perfect also has a secondary, modal meaning that denotes something categorical. Inversion is seen in the second couplet. This could signify the poetical tempering with syntax. This verb phrase emphasises the importance of Halil Pasha’s act: he did not reconstruct, but brought the mosque to life.

Hasan Ziyai Mostari

A Chronogram to the Old Bridge in Mostar

He built a bridge like a rainbow
O, my God, is there any other like it

(Tārīḥ-i Cısr-i Mostār

Ḳavs-i ḳuzaḥuñ ‘aynı bir köpri **binā itdi**
Var mı bu cihān içre mānendi **hey Allāhum**) (T1/1)

This couplet contains a representative speech act by which the poet presents information about the construction of the Old Bridge in Mostar. In doing so, he uses the perfect -di (*binā itdi*), expressing an action that ended prior to the moment of speaking. However, in it we find a compliment expressed through exaggeration, since he compares the bridge to the rainbow (*ḳavs-iḳuzaḥ*). The second verse is, in fact, an inverted rhetorical question, probably for the purpose of achieving rhyme and emphasis. “Var mı bu cihān içre mānendi hey Allāhum” (*O, my God, is there any other like it*). The addressee mentioned here is God, which additionally intensifies the importance of the question, while, on the other hand, the use of vocative “hey Allāhum” implies that it is an expressive exclamation showing

the emotional state of the speaker, who is overwhelmed with emotions. Again, a compliment can be seen here, a praise (with exaggeration) that is indirectly addressed to the constructor of the bridge which is described as an unparalleled object.

A Chronogram on the Accession of the Throne of the Sultan, Protector of the World

To the arrival to the throne of the sultan of the entire world
A dignitary from the assembly **uttered a chronogram**

(Tārīḥ-i Cülūs-ı Pādişāh-ı Ālem-penāh

Cülūs-i taḥtına bir mīr-i meclis
Didi tārīḥ heft iḳlīm şāhı) (T 4)

This verse as a representative speech act refers to the extralinguistic reality, presenting information on Sultan Murat III's accession to the throne. However, at the same time, the verse contains another representative by which the poet presents information on his writing of the chronogram: "bir mīr-i meclis didi tārīḥ" (*A dignitary from the assembly uttered a tarih*), where he used the perfect -di. The poet speaks of himself in the third person singular, violating thus the modesty maxim because he described himself as a "mīr-i meclis" (*dignitary from the assembly, commander, master of the assembly*). He compliments the sultan by a praise: "heft iḳlīm şāhı" (*sultan of the entire world*), i.e. his rule stretches to the seven climatic areas to which, according to the Islamic geographers, the world was divided. The Islamic scholars believed that the world was divided to seven climatic areas (initially established by Ptolemy).

Abstract

During almost five centuries of the Ottoman Empire's rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a significant number of educated people from this region worked in the Ottoman administration, and, at the same time, used their skills to write diwan poetry. Their work within the administration created possibilities to become protégés of local regents, Bosnian beys and pashas, and even the Ottoman sultans. It is well known that some of the diwan poets from this region held very high positions in the Ottoman administrative hierarchy and even court. Their poetical skills certainly facilitated the advancement of their careers within the system, particularly the couplets they devoted to their patrons, and which would often help them form a close relationship with the Ottoman dignitaries and access better employment opportunities. That can be seen in many of the couplets in which the Bosnian poets asked for the support of distinguished persons and officials and in which they first praised the knowledge and generosity of their patrons and then spoke of their own position, achievements and loyalty to the rulers and the Ottoman Empire.

For the purpose of a pragmatic analysis of the literary heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Turkish language, the works of authors from the sixteenth, seventeenth and the eighteenth century have been selected, i.e. the poems in which one can find references to the extralinguistic reality and relations with their patrons. Some of the selected poets left behind complete collections of poetry –*diwans* or even *mathnawis*, like Dervish Pasha, the author of *Muradnama*. Hence, for this study, we selected poems by Hasan Ziyai Mostari, Dervish Pasha (Baježidagić), Suleiman Mezaki, Sabit Bosnevi, Osman Shehdi and Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak.

Since diwan poets directly refer to the potential patrons in their bayts, this study, besides shedding light on the relationship between the poet and the patron, analyses poetry through the theoretical framework of pragmatics, a linguistic discipline that analyses the use of language, that is, the relationship between signs and their users. In other words, pragmatics studies language as a tool to influence the addressee, as well as to change the extralinguistic reality. Historical pragmatics, on the other hand, deals with the texts from the past, approaching them through the speech act theory. In the couplets of the classic Ottoman literature, one can find certain performatives, that is, speech acts with which the poet attempts to influence the addressee, in this case, often some prominent individuals as potential patrons.

The manner in which a poet addresses his patron often reflects the nature of their relationship, as well as the position and status of the author. Such speech acts have been present in poetic forms such as the qasida, ghazal, chronogram, kit'a (epigram), as well as the introductory and closing sections of mathnawis, where one can find appeals, complaints, approvals and compliments, as well as good wishes. Even though the examples of the aforementioned poetry have been preserved as written texts, one needs to emphasise that they were often read and recited in the elite circles of the Ottoman society. Therefore, they can be observed as manifestations of specific forms of communication and, as such, analysed from the pragmatic aspect.

Bibliography

- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things With Words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Aksoy, Ömer Asım. 1995. *Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Altıntaş, Hayrani. 1999. *Tasavvuf tarihi*. Ankara: Akçağ.
- Ameka, Felix. 1992. "Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech". *Journal of Pragmatics* 18. 101-118.
- Andrews, Walter G. 1999. "Batı'da Osmanlı Şiirini Okumak" *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. Haz. Mehmed Kalpaklı. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları. 369-380.
- Andrews, Walter G. 2000. *Şiirin Sesi, Toplumun Şarkısı*. Transl. Tansel Güney. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Avşar, Ziya. 2009. "Gölge Avıyla Boşalan bir Sadak: Mahallileşme". *Turkish Studies*. A Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic. Volume 4/5. 19-33.
- Aynur, Hatice. 2009. "Türkî-i Basîr Hareketini Yeniden Düşünmek" *Turkish Studies*. A Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic. Volume 4/5. 34-59.
- Bagić, Krešimir. 2012. *Rječnik stilskih figura* [A Dictionary of Stylistic Devices]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bakšić, Sabina. 2012. *Strategije učtivosti u turskom jeziku* [Politeness Strategies in the Turkish Language]. Sarajevo: Elektronsko izdanje Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu.
- Bašagić, Safet-beg. 2007. *Bošnjaci i Hercegovci u islamskoj književnosti* [Bosniaks and Herzegovinians in the Islamic Literature]. Sarajevo: Preporod.
- Bayındır, Şeyda. 2008. *Şehdî Divanı*. Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara. (unpublished master's thesis)
- Berruto, Gaetano. 1994. *Semantika* [Semantics]. Zagreb: Antibarbarus.

- Bilkan, Ali Fuat. 2007. "Klasik Estetikte Yeni Yönelişler: Orta Klasik Dönem (1600-1700)". *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Ed.T.S. Halman. İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. 282-284.
- Bilkan, Ali Fuat. 2007. "Mahallî Üslup". In: T.S. Halman (Ed.). *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. 241-435.
- Biti, Vladimir. 1994. *Upletanje nerečenog* [Interweaving the Unsaid]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, E. Olshtain. 1984. "Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech acts realization patterns (CCSARP)". *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 5. No. 3. 196-212.
- Boxer, Diana. 1996. "Ethnographic interviewing as a tool in speech act analysis: The case of complaints". In: Gass, Susan and Joyce Neu (Eds.). *Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in Second Language*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 217-241.
- Brown, Penelope, Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. (second edition) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*. 2007. Parlatır, İsmail, György Hazai, Barbara Kellner-Heinkele (Eds.) Budapest: Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Chittick, William C. 2005. *Sufijski put ljubavi* [The Sufi Path of Love]. Sarajevo: Naučnoistraživački institut "Ibn Sina".
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 25. 349-367.
- Čaušević, Ekrem. 1988. "Da li su u starosmanskome jeziku postojale dvije paradigme "optativne" forme na -y(a)/-y(e)?" ["Were there two paradigms of the optative form -y(a)/-y(e) in the Ottoman Turkish language?"]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 37. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 73-87.
- Čaušević, Ekrem. 1990. "U prilog naučnoj transkripciji vlastitih imena bosanskohercegovačkih stvaralaca na orijentalnim jezicima" ["A contribution to the scientific transcription of names of the authors from Bosnia and Herzegovina in Oriental Languages"]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 39. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 163-69.
- Čaušević, Ekrem. 1996. *Gramatika suvremenoga turskog jezika* [The Grammar of the Contemporary Turkish Language]. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Čaušević, Ekrem. 2018. *Ustroj, sintaksa i semantika infinitivnih glagolskih oblika u turskom jeziku* [The Structure, Syntax and Semantics of Infinitive Verbs in Turkish]. Zagreb: Ibis grafika.

- Čolić, Ljiljana. 2005. *Osmanska diplomatika s paleografijom*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Ćatović, Alena. 2010. "Žanrovske karakteristike mesnevice na primjeru *Priče o Šejhu Abdurrezaku* Hasana Ziyaije Mostarca" [Characteristics of the genre in *The Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak* by Hasan Ziyai Mostari]. *Radovi XIV-XV*. Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu. 69-79.
- Ćatović, Alena. 2011. "Otklon od književne tradicije u Kasidi kamenjaru Hasana Ziyaije Mostarca" [Moving away from the literary tradition in the Qasida to a Rocky Landscape by Hasan Ziyai Mostari]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 60. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 171-182.
- Ćatović, A. and Fehim Nametak. 2011. "Termini iz klasične turske muzike u Divanu Ahmeda Hatema Bjelopoljaka" [Terms from the classical Turkish music in Ahmed Hatem Bjelopoljak's Diwan]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 61. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 237-255.
- Ćatović, Alena. 2013. *Orijentalno-islamska književna tradicija u stvaralaštvu Hasana Ziyaije Mostarca (transtekstualnost u klasičnoj osmanskoj poeziji)* [Islamic Literary Tradition in the Work of Hasan Ziyai Mostari]. Sarajevo: Elektronsko izdanje Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu.
- Ćatović, Alena. 2017. *Tragom priče o Šejhu San'anu: Hasan Ziyaija Mostarac i njegova Pripovijest o Šejhu Abdurrezaku* [Tracing the Story of Sheikh San'an: Hasan Ziyai Mostari and His Tale of Sheikh Abdurrezak]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu.
- Čehajić, Džemal. 1976. "Diyā'ī Hasan Čalabī al-Mostārī". *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 22-23. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 329-344.
- Dayter, Daria. 2014. "Self-praise in microblogging". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 61. 91-102.
- Demirel, Şener. 2009. "XVII. Yüzyıl Klasik Türk Şiirinin Anlam Boyutunda Meydana Gelen Üslup Hareketleri: Klasik Üslup- Sebk-i Hindī- Hikemī Tarz- Mahallīleşme". *Turkish Studies*. Volume 4/2. 279-306.
- Devellioğlu, Ferit. 1998. *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat*. Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Dilçin, Cem. 1995. *Örneklerle Türk Şiir Bilgisi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Dizdar, Elma. 2011. *Stilski potencijal atributa u arapskom jeziku* [Stylistic Potential of Noun Phrase Modification in Arabic]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu.
- Duraković, Esad. 2005. *Prolegomena za historiju književnosti orijentalno-islamskoga kruga* [A Prolegomena to the Literary History of Oriental-Islamic Literature]. Sarajevo: Connectum.

- Duraković, Esad. 2007. *Orijentologija– univerzum sakralnoga teksta* [Orientalology: The Universe of the Sacred Text]. Sarajevo: Tugra.
- Durkheim, Emile 1982. *Elementarni oblici religijskog života* [The Elementary forms of the Religious Life]. Belgrade: Prosveta.
- Durmuş, Tübâ Işınsu. 2009. *Tutsan Elini Ben Fakîrin: Osmanlı Edebiyatı Hamilik Geleneği*. Istanbul: Doğan Kitap.
- Elezović, Gliša. 1940. *Turski spomenici I, 1348–1520* [Turkish Monuments I, 1348 – 1520]. Belgrade: Srpska kraljevska akademija.
- Erdoğan, Mustafa. 2002. *Türk Edebiyatında Muhammes*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Gibb, E. J. Wilkinson. 1999. *Osmanlı Şiir Tarihi*. (I–IV) Transl. Ali Çavuşoğlu. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Goffman, Erving. 2000. *Kako se predstavljamo u svakodnevnom životu* [The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life]. Belgrade: Geopoetika.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. 1999. “Tabiat ve Divan Edebiyatı”. U: Mehmet Kalpaklı (Ed.). *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları. 92–94.
- Gürgendereli, Müberra. 2000. “Hasan Ziyā’î’nin *Kıssa-ı Şeyh Abdürrezzāk Mesnevisi*”. *Bilge* 24. İstanbul. 125–27.
- Gürgendereli, Müberra. 2002. *Hasan Ziyā’î. Hayatı- Eserleri-Sanatı ve Divanı*. Ankara: T. C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Gürgendereli, Müberra. 2007. *Hasan Ziyā’î: Şeyh-i San’ân Mesnevisi*. İstanbul: Kitabevi.
- Hancher, Michael. 1979. “The classification of cooperative illocutionary acts”. *Language in Society*. Vol. 8, Number 1, Cambridge University Press. 1-14.
- Hasandedić, Hifzija. 1955. “Zadužbine Ćejvana Kethode u Hercegovini” [Ćejvan Kethoda’s Foundations in Herzegovina]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 5. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 274–286.
- Hasandedić, Hifzija. 1958. “Dva hronograma o smrti mostarskog legatora Ćejvan-kethode” [Two Chronograms on the Death of Ćejvan Kethoda, the Legislator of Mostar]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 6-7. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 275–282.
- Hasandedić, Hifzija. 1970. “Nekoliko zapisa iz orijentalnih rukopisa Arhiva Hercegovine u Mostaru” [A Few Lines from the Oriental Manuscripts of the Archives of Herzegovina in Mostar]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 16-17. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 117–124.

- Hadžiosmanović, Lamija and Emina Memija. 1995. *Poezija Bošnjaka na orijentalnim jezicima* [Bosniak Poetry in Oriental Languages]. Sarajevo: Preporod.
- Holmes, Janet. 1995. *Women, Men and Politeness*. London and New York: Longman.
- Horata, Osman. 2007. "Klasik estetikte hazan rüzgârları: Son Klasik Dönem (1700-1800)". In: T.S. Halman (Ed.). *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. 282-284.
- İnalcık, Halil. 2003. *Şair ve Patron*. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- İsen, Mustafa. 1999. "Tezkirelerin Işığında Divan Edebiyatına Bakışlar: Divan Şairlerinin Tasavvuf ve Tarikat İlişkileri" In: Mehmet Kalpaklı (Ed.). *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları. 306–310.
- Ivanetić, Nada. 1995. *Govorni činovi* [Speech Acts]. Zagreb: Zavod za lingvistiku Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Ivanetić, Nada. 2005. "Frazemska intertekstualnost i njena recepcija" ["Intertextuality of Phrases and Its Perception]. *Zbornik: Semantika prirodnog jezika i metajezik semantike*. Zagreb – Split. Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku. 345–355.
- Janeković Römer, Zdenka (ed.). 2000. Filip de Diversis, *Dubrovački govori u slavu ugarskih kraljeva Sigismunda i Alberta* [Speeches from Dubrovnik Glorifying Hungarian Kings Sigismund and Albert]. Dubrovnik – Zagreb: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU.
- Jucker, H. Andreas (Ed). 1995. *Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jucker, H. Andreas and Irma Taavitsainen (Eds). 2008. *Speech Acts in the History of English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Kadrić, Adnan. 2008. *Muradnama Derviş-paşe Bajezidagića: Objekt Ljubavi u tesavufskoj književnosti* [Dervish Pasha Bajezidagic's Muradnama: The Object of Love in the Sufi Literature]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu.
- Kadrić, Adnan. 2015. *Lingvostilistička analiza poezije Sabita Alaudina Bošnjaka* [A Linguistic and Stylistic Analysis of Sabit Alaudin Bosniak's Poetry]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu.
- Kalpaklı, Mehmed. 1999. "Divan Şiirinde Aşk". In: Mehmet Kalpaklı (Ed.). *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları. 454–456.
- Kalpaklı, Mehmed. 2006. "Osmanlı şiir akademisi: Nazire" U: T.S. Halman (Ed.). *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: TC Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları. 133–38.

- Kanar, Mehmet. 2003. *Örnekli Etimolojik Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.
- Karacan, Turgut. 1991. *Bosnalı Alaeddin Sâbit- Divan*. Sivas: Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Karahalilović, N. and Alena Čatović. 2011. "Indijski književni stil: dominantne odlike u poeziji na perzijskom i osmanskom turskom jeziku" [Indian Literary Style: Dominant Characteristics of Poetry in Persian and Ottoman Turkish Languages]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*. 61. Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu. 255-281.
- Katnić-Bakaršić, Marina. 2001. *Stilistika* [Stylistics]. Sarajevo: Ljiljan.
- Kılıç, Filiz. 2002. "Nazım Şekilleri" In: İsen, Mustafa et al. (Eds.) *Eski Türk Edebiyatı El Kitabı*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.
- Köprülü, Fuat. 1928. *Millî Edebiyatın İlk Mübeşşirleri ve Divân-ı Türkî Basit*. İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası.
- Kur'an s prijevodom na bosanski jezik* [Holy Qoran with the Translation into Bosnian]. 2004. Transl. Esad Duraković. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Kurz, Marlene. 2012. "Gracious Sultan, Grateful Subjects: Spreading Ottoman Imperial 'Ideology' throughout the Empire" *Studia Islamica*, Vol. 107, No. 1. Maisonneuve & Larose. 96-121.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *The Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Lešić, Zdenko. 2003. *Nova čitanja – poststrukturalistička čitanka* [New Readings – A Post-Structuralist Reader]. Sarajevo: Buybook.
- Lešić, Zdenko. 2005. *Teorija književnosti* [Theory of Literature]. Sarajevo: Sarajevo Publishing.
- Mehmed Halifa Bošnjak. 2002. *Ljetopis 1650-1665* [A Chronicle, 1650 – 1665]. Transl.
- Fehim Nametak. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut.
- Mengi, Mine. 2002. *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Mermer, Ahmet. 1991. *Mezākī: Hayatı, Edebî Kişiliği ve Divanı'nın Tenkidli Metni*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayını.
- Mermer, Ahmet. 2009. "Türkî-i Basit'e Yeni Bir Bakış". *Turkish Studies*. A Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic. Volume 4/5. 262-278.
- Mišćević, Nenad, M. Potrč (Eds.). 1987. *Kontekst i značenje* [Context and meaning]. Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka.
- Miyasoğlu, Mustafa. 1999. *Kültür Hayatımız*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.

- Mrazović, Pavica, Zora Vukadinović. 1990. *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika za strance* [Grammar of Serbo-Croatian for Foreigners]. Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad: Dobra vest, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- Muftić, Teufik. 1984. *Arapsko-srpskohrvatski rječnik* [An Arabic – Serbo-Croatian Dictionary]. Sarajevo: Starješinstvo Islamske zajednice u SR Bosni i Hercegovini, Hrvatskoj i Sloveniji.
- Mujezinović, Mehmed. 1998. *Islamska epigrafika Bosne i Hercegovine*. Knjiga III [Islamic Epigraphy of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Book III]. Sarajevo: Sarajevo Publishing.
- Mujić, Munir. 2007. *Arapska stilistika u djelu Hasana Kafije Pruščaka* [Arabic Stylistics on Hasan Kafi Pruščak's Work]. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu.
- Muvekkit, Salih Sidki Hadžihuseinović. 1999. *Povijest Bosne* [The History of Bosnia]. Sarajevo: El-Kalem.
- Nametak, Alija. 1933. "Karadžebeg i njegovo doba". *Novi Behar* 3–4. Year VII. Sarajevo. 36–41.
- Nametak, Fehim. 1982. "Kadićev zbornik kao izvor za proučavanje književne građe" [Kadić's Collection of Writings as a Source for Analysis of the Literary Material]. *Radio Sarajevo – treći program* 38. Sarajevo. 438–477.
- Nametak, Fehim. 1991. *Divanska poezija XVI i XVII stoljeća* [The Diwan Poetry of 16th and 17th Centuries]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Nametak, Fehim. 2001. "Hasan Ziyai– pjesnikovi zapisi o sebi i svome gradu" [Hasan Ziyai – the Poet's Notes of Self and His City]. *Beharistan*. 2. Sarajevo. 12–24.
- Nametak, Fehim. 2007. *Pojmovnik divanske i tesavvufske književnosti* [Thesaurus of the Diwan and Sufi Literature]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut.
- Nikolić-Hoyt, Anja. 1993. "Indirektni govorni činovi" [Indirect Speech Acts]. *Suvremena lingvistika*. 35-36. Zagreb. 191-197.
- Onay, Ahmet Talât. 1996. *Eski Türk Edebiyatında Mazmunlar*. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Olshtain, E., L. Weinbach. 1987. "Complaints: A study of speech act behavior among native and non-native speakers of Hebrew". In J. Verschueren, M. Bertucelli-Papi (Eds.). *The pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Benjamins. 195-208.
- Öztuna, Yılmaz. 1992. *Büyük Türk Müsikisi Ansiklopedisi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, Kültür Eserleri Dizisi.

- Pagliai, Valentin. 2009. "The Art of Dueling with words: Toward a New Understanding of Verbal Duels across the World". *Oral Tradition*. 21/1. 61-88.
- Pala, İskender. 1998. *Divan Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: ÖtükenYayınları.
- Peternai, Kristina. 2005. *Učinci književnosti* [The Effects of Literature]. Zagreb: Disput.
- Prykarpatska, Iryna. 2008. "Why are you late? Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Study of Complaints in American English and Ukrainian". *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*. 21. 87-102.
- Rinnert, C., & Nogami, Y. 2006. "Preferred complaint strategies in Japanese and English. Authentic Communication". *Proceedings of the 5th Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference*. 32-47.
- Sarajkić, Mirza. 2011. *Gazeli Ahmeda Hatema Bjelopolja na arapskom jeziku* [Ahmed Hatem Bjelopolja's Ghazals in Arabic]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu.
- Searle, John. 1975. "Indirect speech acts". *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3: Speech Acts. 59-82.
- Searl, John. 1991. *Govorni činovi* [Speech Acts]. Belgrade: Nolit.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford UK /CambridgeUSA: Blackwell.
- Süreyya, Mehmed. 1311. (1888). *Sicil-i Osmānī*. (III) İstanbul: Maārif-i Nazāret.
- Šabanović, Hazim. 1973. *Književnost muslimana BiH na orijentalnim jezicima* [Literature of Muslims in Oriental Languages]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Şemseddin Sami. 1996. *Kāmūs-ı Türkī*. İstanbul: ÇağrıYayınları.
- Şentürk, Ahmet Atilla. 1999. *Osmanlı Şiiri Antolojisi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Tamimdari, Ahmed. 2004. *Istorija perzijske književnosti* [History of Persian Literature]. Transl. Seid Halilović. Belgrade: Cultural Centre of the IR Iran in Belgrade.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. 1998. *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. İstanbul: DergahYayınları.
- Tarlan, Ali Nihad. 1999. "Divan Edebiyatında Sanat Telâkkisi". U: Mehmet Kalpaklı (Ed.). *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları. 104-110.
- Tezcan, Nuran ve Semih Tezcan. 2011. *Evliyâ Çelebi*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Tökel, Dursun Ali. 2000. *Divan Şiirinde Mitolojik Unsurlar*. Ankara: Akçağ.

- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Berlin, New York. Walter de Gruyter.
- Tunç, Semra. 2016. "Divanından hareketle Koca Râgıb Paşa'nın Şiir Anlayışı". *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Cilt 25, Sayı 4, 195-206.
- Verschueren, J. 1987. *Pragmatics as a Theory of Linguistic Adaptation*. International Pragmatics Association.
- Verschueren, J. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Varişoğlu, Mehmet Celal. 1997. *Hâtem: Hayatı, Edebî Şahsiyeti, Divanı'nın Tenkitli Metni ve İncelemesi*. Atatürk Üniveristesi, Erzurum. (unpublished master's thesis).
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1987. *English Speech Act Verbs: A semantic dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Wilkins, P. D. 1992. "Interjections as deictics". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 18, Issues 2-3: 119-158.
- Zeren, Ayhan. 1992. "Makam Kavramında Seyrin Önemi Hakkında". *IV Miletlerarası Türk Halk Kültürü Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı HAGEM Yayınları.
- Zeyrek, Deniz, 2001. "Politeness in Turkish and its linguistic manifestations: A sociocultural perspective". In: Bayraktaroğlu, A., Sifianou, M. (Eds.) *Linguistic Politeness Across Boundaries: The Case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 43-73.