

BENEDEK PÉRI

“When they praise your lips Bayrām’s verses are the water of life” Bayrām Khān’s Persian and Turkish ghazals

Introduction

Bayrām Khān (d. 1561) was one of the most influential nobles at the Mughal court during the reign of Humāyūn (1530–1540, 1555–1556) and his successor, Akbar (1556–1606).¹ As a member of an eminent Baharlu Türkmen family, he simultaneously represented three major components of Mughal culture: Persian, Central Asian Turkish and Indian. He was of Turkish origin. He had family ties in Iran, his contacts at the Safavid court proved essential for Humāyūn in regaining his kingdom, he was brought up in a mixed Perso-Turkish literary culture that developed during the reign of Timur’s successors, he married into a Turkish royal family, and he spent most of his adult life in an Indian environment. All in all, he was a typical Timurid nobleman, a sedentarised, Persianised Turk who, besides being a member of the military class, the people of the sword, *abl-i sayf*, was also an acknowledged poet, and thus also belonged to the ‘people of the pen,’ the *abl-i qalam*. Like many other Turkish poets of his age, he produced poetry both in Persian and in Turkish, and if we can believe his contemporary, the historian Badā’unī, his collection of poems (*divan*) ‘was in every hand and his verses were on every tongue.’²

¹ N. H. ANSARI: “Bayram Khān”. In: *Encyclopedia Iranica*. iranicaonline.org/articles/bayram-or-bayram-khan-mohammad-kan-e-kanan-an-illustrious-and-powerful-iranian-noble-at-the-court-of-the-mugh (II. 01. 2018). For a more detailed description of his life see Sukumar RAY: *Bairam Khan*, Karachi: Institute of Central and West Asian Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Karachi, 1992; Kausar CHANDPURI: *Mubammad Bairam Khan Turkman*, Agra: Akhbar Press, 1931.

² Thomas Wolseley HAIG (trans.): *The Muntakhabu-t’-Tawārikh by ‘Abdu-l’-Qādir Ibn-i-Mulūk Shāh known as al-Badāoni*, Vol. 3, Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1925, 265. Bayram Khān’s full *divan* consisting of Persian and Turkish verses was published three times. Edward DENISON ROSS, *Persian and Turki Diwans of Bairam Khan*, Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1910; Husamuddin RASHDĪ – Muhammad SABIR (eds.): *Divan of Bayram Khan*, Karachi: The Institute of Central & West Asian Studies, 1971; ‘Abd al-Majīd TURAN: *Muhammed Bayram Khānkhānān: Türkmen Khalqının Böyük Şaxsiyat ve Şā’iri*, n.p., 1378. The Turkish poems were published separately by Münevver TEKCAN: *Bayram Han’ın Türkçe Divanı*, İstanbul: Beşir Kitabevi, 2007.



Persian miniature. Youth reading, by Reza Abbasi, 1625–1626.

Bayrām the poet

His motives to compose poetry might have been the same as with other Turkish nobles of Timurid and post-Timurid Persianate societies, that is, to demonstrate that they were cultured and not one of the uneducated and boorish Turkish semi-nomads, the *atrāk-i bī-idrāk* ('stupid Turks'), who were sneered at even in 16th–17th century Ottoman sources.³

Writing poetry and composing original pieces appears to have been very important for Bayrām, who formulated his poetic credo in one of his poems in the following way:

Out of sheer ignorance, poets nowadays,
Are not ashamed of borrowing lines.
Verses of this servant are not borrowed like the verses of others,
Because I would be ashamed if I borrowed verses.⁴

A story related by Badā'unī, however, suggests that Bayrām Khān's poetic principles could turn very flexible when it came to 'borrowing' another poet's works.

One of the remarkable incidents of this year was that the Khān-i Khānān published as his own a *ghazal* of Hāšim Qandahārī, putting the lines into a different arrangement; he ordered 60,000 tankahs of money to be paid to him by way of compensation, and asked if the sum were sufficient; Hāšim by way of an extempore joke said 'Sixty is too little,' upon which he increased the sum by 40,000 and gave him altogether a complete *lac*.⁵

The present paper has a twofold aim. First, it endeavours to give an overall description of Bayrām's *ghazal* poetry, observe the basic differences between his Persian and Turkish (Chaghatay) poems and decide where between the two extremes of plagiarism and originality his poems should be placed; secondly,

³ Güvāhī, for example, relates three stories to illustrate the boorishness of Turks in his *Pend-nāme* written in 1526. GÜVĀHĪ: *Pend-nāme*. Haz. Mehmet Hengirmen, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1983, 166–168. A 17th-century Ottoman historian, Naima (d. 1716), uses the denigrating term *etrāk-i bī idrāk* ('stupid Turks') as an adjective for rural Turks from Anatolia. *Naima Taribi*. Vol. 3. Çev. Zuhuri Danişman, İstanbul: Zuhuri Danişman Yayınevi, 1968, 1381, 1382.

⁴ *Imrūz šā'irān-i digar az kamāl-i jabl*
Az šīr-i mustā'ar na-dārand nang u 'ār
Aš'ār-i banda čun digarān mustā'ar nīst
Dāram hazār 'ār xī aš'ār-i mustā'ar
RASHDI – SABIR: *op. cit.*, 12.

⁵ George RANKING: *The Muntakhabu-t' -Tawārikh by 'Abdu-l'-Qādir Ibn-i-Mulūk Shāh known as al-Badāoni*, Vol. 2, New Delhi: Atlantic Pub. & Distributors, 1990, 36.

through analysing some of his imitations, it attempts to present a somewhat more detailed picture of Bayrām Khān’s poetic talent and poetical strategies.

Imitation poems and the interpretation of traditional ghazals

I have decided to focus on Bayrām’s Persian and Turkish imitations for the following reasons: Since Bayrām’s ghazals were preserved in his *divan* in a traditional form, that is, arranged in alphabetical order by the last letter of the *radīf* or the rhyming word, they came down to us ‘as isolated pieces of poetry detached from the context they originally belonged to.’⁶ Due to the conventionality of the ghazal as a genre, an interpretation of such poetic texts is almost impossible without additional information from outside sources. Sometimes we might be able to discover the historical context which inspired the poet, as is the case with Bayrām’s Chaghatay ghazal composed for his protégé, Šāh-quli Maḥram Baharlu, but most often we cannot tell exactly why a poem came into being.⁷ In case of poetic imitations, however, the model poem (or in certain cases poems) might be used as a reference point, creating a sort of poetic context that makes at least a partial interpretation possible because the choice of model (or models) might provide us with clues as far as a poet’s character, talent and poetic skills are concerned.

Quintilian, the Roman author of a much-used manual on rhetoric, advised his readers to consult their own powers before ‘shouldering their burdens,’ and warned them to avoid models ‘which, though capable of imitation, may be beyond the capacity of any given individual, either because his natural gifts are insufficient or of a different character.’⁸ Ašraf al-Dīn Ḥasan, a Ghaznavid poet, gave a very similar piece of advice to a young poet when he advised him whose poetry to study and whose poetry to avoid.⁹ The range of models a poet of the classical Persian tradition chose to imitate thus might be very telling of his character and professional skills.

Furthermore, the character or the dynamics of the relationship between an imitation and its model or models might not only supply us with further information on a poet’s natural disposition and on his way of thinking, but it also might give us clues why the imitation poem was composed. Depending on a poet’s

⁶ J. T. P. DE BRUIJN: *Persian Sufi Poetry. An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Poems*, Richmond: Curzon Press, 1997, 56.

⁷ Benedek PÉRI: “Ki és milyen nemű Bayram Hân egyik csagatáj gazeljében a rejtélyes lírai kedves?” *Keletkutató*, 2014 ősz, 5–20. For an English version see Benedek Péri, “The gender of the beloved in one of Bayram Khan’s gazels” (Forthcoming).

⁸ *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian with an English Translation* by H. E. Butler. Vol. 4, London: W. Heinemann, 1968, 81.

⁹ RĀWANDĪ: *Rāḥat al-šudūr va āyat al-surūr dar tāriḫ-i āl-i Saljūq*. Bi-sa’ī va tašḫīḫ-i Muḥammad Iqbāl. Bi-muqaddima-yi Ustād Badī’ al-Zamān Firūzānfar va Ustād Muḥtabā Mīnuvī, Tihrān: Intišārāt-i asāṭir, 1385/2006, 57–58.

capabilities, motives and aims, strategies of poetic imitation might range from the most basic modes of ‘repetition of the same’ to higher levels of emulation.¹⁰ Though the process of poetic imitation in Persianate traditions usually involves the notion of competition, besides competing with past or contemporary poetic texts, imitations and emulations might also be composed to honour a fellow poet, to show off professional prowess, or to simply disguise the lack of original thoughts.

Bayrām’s Persian ghazals

Bayrām Khān’s Persian *divan* as we have it today does not include too many imitation poems, but we should keep in mind that his poetic oeuvre does not seem to have survived in its entirety. ‘Abd al-Bāqī Nihāwandī saw in the library of Bayrām’s son and heir ‘Abd al-Rahīm a copy of the *divan* that consisted of more than 2000 couplets, but this manuscript has not surfaced yet.¹¹ Our modern editions contain much less of Bayrām’s verses. We cannot tell how many Persian ghazals Bayrām composed in his life, but all three modern editions – the 1910 edition prepared by Edward Denison Ross, the more comprehensive Karachi edition published more than sixty years later, in 1971 by Husamuddin Rashdi and Muhammad Sabir and the latest edition of ‘Abd al-Majid Turan that appeared in 1999 – contain only thirty-nine such poems.

Only very few modern critics seem to have bothered to deal with Bayrām’s Persian poetry but those who did have two totally opposing opinions. Hadi Nabi in his *Dictionary of Indo-Persian Poetry* claims that each verse in Bayrām’s ‘concise *Diwan* is a specimen of excellence.’¹² Annemarie Schimmel, on the other hand, does not seem to have had a very high opinion of Bayrām’s Persian poetry because she labelled his verses ‘rather conventional.’¹³

Schimmel was right in her judgement if she meant by the term ‘conventional’ that Bayrām’s ghazals are very simple and mediocre pieces which rely heavily on the traditional arsenal of commonplace poetical devices. Bayrām is clearly an amateur poet who is capable of composing poetry but whose poems usually lack complex metaphors, elegant rhetorical figures and original thoughts. In this respect he is one of those self-designated poets whom Ḥusayn Muḥammad Šihāb Anṣārī, a 14th century Indian literary critic, termed versifiers (*mawṣūn tab’*) ‘whose mind has not realised the minutest niceties of poetry and has not recognised its principles’

¹⁰ For a useful taxonomy of imitation strategies see John MUCKELBAUER: *The Future of Invention. Rhetoric, Postmodernism and the Problem of Change*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008, 57–77.

¹¹ ‘Abd al-Bāqī NIHĀWANDĪ, *Ma’āthir-i Rahīmī*. Vol. 2. Ed. Muhammad Hidayet Husain, Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1925, 61.

¹² Nabi HADI: *Dictionary of Indo-Persian Poetry*, New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts–Abhinav Publications, 1995, 306.

¹³ Annemarie SCHIMMEL: *Islamic Literatures of India*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973, 25.

and who ‘do not know that a poem consists of pleasant words and elegant and unique content.’¹⁴

Bayrām’s favourite trope appears to have been a very simple and easy-to-handle rhetoric figure, *tazādd* (‘antithesis’) which he endeavoured to insert into his lines as often as possible and which he sometimes used quite skilfully.

Dar sāya-yi šab jamʿ šawad partaw-i kburšid
Har gab šawad az kākul-i ū tār parišān
 The light of the sun gathers into the shadow of the night
 Each time a string of hair separates from her/his forelock.

Though all the opposing conceptual pairs, ‘shadow’ (*sāya*) and ‘light’ (*partaw*), ‘night’ (*šab*) and ‘sun’ (*kburšid*), ‘come together’ (*jamʿ šudan*) and ‘fall apart’ (*parišān šudan*) are topoi of classical Persian poetry, the way Bayrām handles them indicates that he had not only learnt the basic skills of composition, he also had a natural flair for poetry.

A possible reason for the lack of elegant rhetorical figures and the resulting simplicity of several of Bayrām Khān’s Persian poems might be that they were hastily composed or improvised and meant for specific occasions. Bayrām’s ghazal with the *radīf* ‘*ma-ranj*’ ‘don’t be enraged,’ possibly meant as an apology and a pledge of loyalty to Akbar, clearly belongs to this category.¹⁵

A characteristic feature of Bayrām’s more elaborate ghazals is that they are burdened with many repetitions as if the poet was unable to break free from the hold of the few key concepts and keywords he worked with. The ghazal Bayrām composed using the metre *ramal-i muṣamman-i makbbūn* (- . - - or . . - - | . . - - | . . - - | . . - - or - -), the rhyme *-ā*, and the *radīf*¹⁶ ‘*mī-gardad*’ is for example a typical Bayrāmian product.

Gird-i ān kākul agar bād-i Šabā mī-gardad
Sabab-i tafarruqa-yi khāṭir-i mā mī-gardad
Har nafas gird-i sar-i kākul-i ū gašta Šabā
Hama asbāb-i parišānī-yi mā mī-gardad
 Whenever the gentle breeze is circling that forelock,
 It becomes a reason for our mind to be distracted.
 In every breath of time when the gentle breeze circles the end of that forelock,
 It becomes the sole reason for us to be distraught.

¹⁴ Ḥusayn Muḥammad Šihāb ANSĀRĪ: *Kanḡ al-Favāʿid*. Ed. A. S. U’sha, Madras: University of Madras, 1956, 14.

¹⁵ Ross: *op. cit.*, 28.

¹⁶ *radīf* is a refrain like element following the rhyme (*qāfiya*). It can be a suffix, a word, a phrase or a whole utterance.

Out of the keywords of this couplet *kākul* ‘a lock of hair’ and *gird* ‘around’ reappears once more and *sar* ‘head’ two more times, which makes the poem quite colourless and monotonous. In spite of the poem’s flatness, the third couplet is an exception from the ghazal’s overall insipidness and it illustrates that occasionally Bayrām was able to produce quite skilfully constructed lines:

Khāk bar sar kunam aẓgham šuda dar ātaš u āb
*Ki ba-gird-i sar-i ū bād čirā mī-gardad*¹⁷

I throw dust upon my head and it’s surrounded by fire and water because of my grief.

Why is the wind circling around the head of my beloved?

The inclusion of the four elements (*čahār ‘unsūr*), *khāk* ‘dust, soil’, *ātaš* ‘fire’, *āb* ‘water’ and *bād* ‘wind’ in a single couplet is not an uncommon phenomenon in classical poetry.¹⁸ Though it is a traditional poetic device that could be taken to the extremes of mentioning earth, fire, water and wind in almost every single couplet of the poem, as Anwarī did in one of his *qasīdas*,¹⁹ in Bayrām Khān’s poetry such rhetorically well-structured couplets count as exceptional accomplishments.

We cannot tell exactly which classical poets Bayrām Khān read and from whose poems he learnt the *tanāsub* (‘congruency’) of *čahār ‘unsūr*, but it might well have been from the *divan* of the abovementioned poet, Anwarī (fl. 12th c.), who was a favoured author at the Mughal court.²⁰

Bayrām Khān, as we have seen in his poetic credo, made a loudly advertised programme not to ‘borrow’ from earlier or contemporary poets, perhaps because his poetry also served as a means to stress his personal integrity and independence. A handful of his Persian poems still contain very explicit intertextual allusions, suggesting that they were inspired by earlier poetic texts. One such poem is a paraphrase, a *jawāb* of a ghazal written by Anwarī. The two poems share the same metre (*baḡaj-i musaddas-i mahzūf*; . - - - | . - - - | . - -), rhyme (-*ār*), and *radif* (-*ī na-dāram*) combination and their first couplet²¹ (*maṭlaʿ*) is very similar.

¹⁷ ROSS: *op. cit.*, 29; RASHDI – SABIR: *op. cit.*, 20.

¹⁸ Franklin D. LEWIS: “The Rise and Fall of a Persian Refrain. The Radif ‘Ātash u Āb’”. In: Suzanne PINCKNEY STETKEVYCH: *Reorientations/Arabic and Persian Poetry*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994, 202.

¹⁹ For Anwarī’s *qasīda* see *Divān-i Anwarī*, Lucknow: Nawal Kishore, 1897, 220–221.

²⁰ Annemarie SCHIMMEL: “Anvari and his Poetry”. In: Annemarie SCHIMMEL – Stuart Cary WELCH: *Anvari’s Divan: A Pocket Book for Akbar*, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1983, 66.

²¹ A couplet (*bayt*) consists of two hemistichs (*mišrāʿ*). The first and the last couplets of a ghazal are termed *maṭla* and *maqṭāʿ* respectively.

Anwarī

Nigārā JUZ TU *dildārī na-dāram*

Bi-juz tu dar *jabān yārī na-dāram*²²

My beautiful one, I do not have a beloved except for you.

Except for you I do not have a companion in this world.

Bayrām Khān

Nigārā BI-GHAYR-I TU *yārī na-dāram*

Bi-juz *fīk-r-i waṣl-i tu kārī na-dāram*

My beautiful one, I do not have a companion, but you.

I do not have anything to do except for thinking of being with you.

This first *bayt* is an example of one the most basic methods of reproductive imitation, when an author creates a close replica of the model text. John Muckelbauer, describing the various paths of imitation antique authors followed, terms this type of imitation the ‘repetition of the same.’²³ Bayrām’s way of reproducing his model is simple. He retains the first word of the model hemistich and replaces its keywords with synonyms. Instead of *juz*, he inserts *bi-ghayr-i* and in the place of *dildār* he uses *yār*, the rhyming word of the second hemistich in Anwarī’s first *bayt*. We might surmise that evoking Anwarī’s first couplet was a very purposeful and conscious act on Bayrām’s side. It is very typical of the genre of the *jawāb*, an imitation poem retaining the metre, rhyme and *radīf* combination of the model text that the first couplet might serve as a kind of introduction to the paraphrase, providing the reader with a literary context in which its poet wishes his imitation or emulation to be interpreted.

Bayrām’s aim might have been something very similar here. Since every single couplet of the poem might be interpreted as a declaration of loyalty, we might suppose that through dressing up his message into a poetic garb evoking Anwarī’s ghazal, Bayrām intended to please the Emperor Akbar, who was a great admirer of Anwarī’s poetry and whose favour he started losing in the late 1550s.²⁴

The highly successful conspiracy of his enemies finally alienated Akbar from his prime minister, who rebelled and was routed by the imperial forces at the battle of Gunachur in 1560. Bayrām fled but soon realised that he did not have a hope to escape. Before turning himself in, Bayrām Khān sent a letter to the Emperor

²² *Dīvān-i Anwarī*, 494. Typographical devices in the quotations are meant to highlight parallelisms of the couplets compared.

²³ MUCKELBAUER: *op. cit.*, 57.

²⁴ According to Abū al-Faẓl °Allāmī, the *divan* of Anwarī was one of the favourite books of Akbar. (Henry BLOCHMANN: *The Ā’in-i Akbarī*, Vol. I, New Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1994, 110). His admiration for the poetry of Anwarī is well attested by the exquisite copy of the *divan* prepared for him in 1588. For the initial incidents that led to the estrangement of Akbar and Bayrām Khān see RAY: *op. cit.*, 188–190.

in which he repented his sins and stressing his loyalty, begging for forgiveness.²⁵ Sin, forgiveness and the poet's loyalty to an unnamed shah are the key motifs of a ghazal that might have been composed during this period. In this poem Bayrām wrapped his message into a poetic garb of a paraphrase of a poem originally written by Kamāl Khujandī (d. 1401).

Besides using the same unique metre (*bazaj-i musamman-i sālim*), rhyme (*-āb*) and *radif* (*-i kbud na-mīdānam*) combination, textual evidence also testifies to the connection of the two poems as Bayrām Khān's second couplet seems to have been inspired by the second *bayt* in Khujandī's ghazal.

Kamāl Khujandī

Agar qasd-i gurīz uftad ma-rā az javr-i čāsm-i ū

*Bi-juz dar sāya-yi zulf-aš panāb-i kbud na-mī-dānam*²⁶

Should I wish to escape from being tortured by his/her eyes,

Except for the shadow of his/her locks I do not know of any place of refuge.

Bayrām Khān

Či mī-sūzī bi-tāb-i qabr-am ay kbursīd-i mah-rūyān

*Ki ghayr az sāya-yi lutf-at panāb-i kbud na-mī-dānam*²⁷

You, who are the sun among the moon faced ones, why are you burning me with the heat of your anger,

Except for the shadow of your favours I do not know of any place of refuge.

The similarity of the two couplets is less striking here than it was in the case of Bayrām's paraphrase of Anwarī's *bayt*, because, though Bayrām repeated the keywords and retained the syntactic and metrical structure of Khujandī's second *mišrā'*, he completely rewrote the first one. He did it in an interpretative way that suited his own momentary purposes. Bayrām's intention was not to produce a perfect replica of his model, perhaps because the message the poem conveys was more important for him than rhetorical niceties. This is why he was willing to sacrifice the rhetorically valuable poetic bond that connects the concept of shadow to the motif of the traditionally also black locks of the beloved in Khujandī's line and replaced the noun *zulf* 'a curling lock of hair' with the similarly sounding one-syllable word *lutf* 'grace,' which fits into the context of the message of his poem. He aimed at reproducing Khujandī's couplet in a different way and he reshaped it in such a manner that suited his purpose.

Bayrām used a very similar method in the case of a couplet he included in one of his paraphrases that was inspired by a Persian ghazal of Mir 'Alī-šīr Nawāyī

²⁵ RAY: *op. cit.*, 213.

²⁶ *Dīwān-i Kamāl-i Khujandī*. Bā tashīh u ihtimām-i 'Azīz Dawlatābādī, Tabriz: Kitābfurūšī-yi Tīhrān, 1337/1958, 255.

²⁷ ROSS: *op. cit.*, 33.

‘Fānī’ (1441–1501), whose Turkish poems, as we will see, had a great influence on Bayrām’s Turkish poetry.²⁸ Both of the two ghazals in question are composed using the metre *mujtas-i muṣamman-i makbbūn* (. - - | . . - - | . - - | . . -), the rhyme *-āna* and the radīf *-yi ū*.

Bayrām’s poem looks as if its author had tried to conceal the fact that his poem was an imitation and though he struggled hard not to create an exact replica of Nawāyī’s couplets he could not distance himself from his model. He closely followed Nawāyī’s method of structuring the couplets: the keyword of the *bayts*, after appearing either in the first hemistich or at the beginning of the second *miṣrāʿ*, resurfaces as the rhyming word of the couplet. Bayrām’s ghazal, compared to Nawāyī’s fluent and rhetorically embellished poem, is halting, ungraceful and boring due to the many repetitions. Nevertheless, his fifth *bayt*, which is an exceptionally elegant emulation of Nawāyī’s sixth couplet, approaches the key topic, the motif of the bird and the seed from a different angle and suggests that Bayrām was occasionally also capable of composing outstanding pieces of poetry.

Nawāyī VI.

Ma-šaw farīfta-yi zulf u kbāl-i šābid-i dabr

Ki jast tāyir-i xīrak xi dām ū dāna-yi ū

Do not get misled by the plait and mole of the beloved of our age,

The cunning bird leaps away from snarl and seeds.

Bayrām V.

Kabūtar-i haram-aš gar šawad hawāla-yi man

Bi-čašm kb^wīš kunam fikr-i āb u dāna-yi ū

If the pigeon of his closed quarters is transferred to my care,

My eyes would supply it with water and seed.

Bayrām took the method of imitation by variation further and used it in a more explicit way in a ghazal that was most probably inspired by a poem of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmi (d. 1492). The subject and the tone of the poem suggest that Bayrām’s ghazal was composed as a lyric letter mildly reproaching the addressee for neglecting the poet. According to a heading in Turan’s editions of the *divan*, the poem was meant for Humāyūn, who failed to send a letter to Bayrām for quite a long time.²⁹

Strictly speaking, this poem does not fall into the category of *jawāb* because the metre and the *radīf* of the model poem and its imitation are different. A closer look at both poems, however, reveals that the apparent differences involve a great deal of similarities. Both poets used metres that share common metrical patterns (. - -)³⁰

²⁸ Alisher NAVOIY: *Mukammal asarlar toʻplami. Yigirma tomlik. Oʻn toʻqquzinchi tom. Devoni Foniyy (davomi)*, Toshkent: Fan, 2002, 233.

²⁹ TURAN: *op. cit.*, 109.

³⁰ Jāmi’s poem is in *ramal-i muṣamman-i makbbūn* (- . - - or . . - - | . . - - | . . - - | . . - - or - -) and Bayrām’s is in

and Bayrām got his *radīf* (*na-kardī* ‘you didn’t do’) by omitting the second half of the *radīf* Jāmī applies (*na-kardī bargiz* ‘you’ve never done’).

Besides the formal similarities, intertextual allusions consciously or unconsciously scattered mainly in the first three couplets of the imitation ghazal also show that Bayrām’s poem was really modelled upon Jāmī’s ghazal. The method of imitation or, to be more precise, emulation by variation can be best observed in the first three couplets. Bayrām picked one or two keywords of Jāmī’s *bayts* and put them in a new poetic context. In the first couplet the selected words are the rhyming words of Jāmī’s *matlaʿ* – *šād* ‘happy’, *yād* ‘memory’ – in the second bayt it is *ābād* ‘populated’ and in the third one it is *faryād* ‘cry.’

Jāmī I.

Yād bād-at ki zi man yād na-kardī bargiz

*Dil-i nā-šād-i ma-rā šād na-kardī bargiz*³¹

You should remember that you have never remembered me,

You have never made my unhappy heart happy.

Bayrām Khān I.

Harfī na-niwīštī dil-i mā šād na-kardī

Mā-rā bi-ḡabān-i qalamī yād na-kardī

You have not written a word to us, you have not made our heart happy,

You have not remembered us with the tongue of your pen.

Jāmī II.

Kardam ābād bi-šad khūn-i jigar khāna-yi čašm

Jā dar-īn manzil ābād na-kardī bargiz

I populated the house of my eye with blood drops from my heart,

But you have never come to settle down in this place

Bayrām Khān II.

Ābād šud aḡ lutf-i tu šad khātar-i wīrān

Wīrāna-yi mā būd ki ābād na-kardī

Your grace turned hundreds of ruined minds into cultivated places,

The only place that remained uncultivated is our ruins.

Jāmī III.

Gūš-at ay sīm-bar aḡ halqa-yi zar gašt girān

Yā tu khud gūš bi-faryād na-kardī bargiz

Oh, silver bodied one! Has the golden ring made your ears too heavy?

Or you just simply have never listened to my cries.

baḡaj-i mušamman-i akbrab-i makfūf-i mahzūf(- . . | . . . | . . . | . . .).

³¹ *Kulliyāt-i Dīwān-i Jāmī*. Bā muqaddima-yi Faršid Iqbāl, Tihirān: Iqbāl, 1388/2009, 271.

Bayrām Khān III.

Bar yād-i tu šad bār kunam nāla u faryād

Faryād ki yak bār ma-rā yād na-kardī

I weep and cry hundred times when I remember you,

Alas, you have never remembered me.

We can only guess as to why Bayrām deviated from the metre, rhyme, *radīf* combination of his model. It was perhaps because, like in the cases we have seen earlier, he wished to adapt an earlier poetic text to his poetic needs. He eliminated the second word of Jāmī’s *radīf* (*bargīz* ‘never’) because he might have felt that the meaning it lent to the lines would not have been true as far as his correspondence with Humāyūn was concerned. Nevertheless, by modifying the *radīf*, the metrical pattern also changed, which he tried to counterbalance with the unusual number of intertextual allusions to Jāmī’s poem.

Another ghazal composed using the metre *baḥāj-i muṣamman-i akbrab-i makfūf-i mahzūf* (- . . | . . . | . . . | . - -), the rhyme *-ār* and the *radīf* “*digar nīst šumā-rā*” ‘you do not have it any more’ falls even farther from the traditional definition of *jawāb*, as it belongs to a rare, nevertheless very interesting sub-genre of imitation poems. The model is unrecognisable at first sight, but a closer reading reveals that the poem belongs to a network of *jawābs* composed in Central Asian Turkī (Chaghatay) during the 15th-mid 16th centuries by prominent poets of the Central Asian Turkish tradition, Ḥāfiz-i Khwārizmī (fl. early 15th c.), Luṭfī (d. 1465?), Gadāyī (fl. 15th c.), Bābur (d. 1530), ‘Ubaydī (d. 1530) and last but not least Bayrām himself. All poems belonging to the paraphrase network use the same metre and rhyme we see in Bayrām’s ghazal, but the *radīf* is Turkish, *tapılmas* ‘cannot be found.’ Bayrām translated *tapılmas* into Persian but he did it very clumsily, which clearly indicates the limits of his knowledge of classical Persian authors because he did not realise that the model poems that served as a starting point for the Turkish network of paraphrases were Persian ghazals originally composed by Sayf-i Farghānī (d. 1305) and Awhadī using the rhyme *-ār*, the *radīf* ‘*na-tvān yāftan*,’ ‘cannot be found,’ and the metre *rajaḥ-i muṣamman-i sālim* (- . . | . . . | . . . | . . .).³²

Bayrām’s Persian poem heavily relies on the *mundus significans* (signifying universe) of this Turkish ‘*tapılmas* paraphrase network’ and uses many of its traditional elements. The notion of ‘buying and selling,’ for example, is the central motif of Bayrām’s second couplet, and it is also the key topic in Luṭfī’s second Turkish *bayt*. In addition to the shared key motif, the rhyming word (*kbarīdār* ‘buyer’) is the same in both couplets and this confirms that Bayrām took the basic idea for his couplet from Luṭfī’s ‘*tapılmas* ghazal.’

³² *Guz̄ida-yi ašār-i Sayf-i Farghānī*. Bi-kūšīš-i Abū al-Qāsim Rādfar, Tihṙān: Amīr Kabīr, 1365/1986, 92–93; *Dīwān-i Kāmīl-i Awhadī Marāghayī*. Tashīh-i Amīr Ahmad Ašrafī, Tihṙān: Intiṣārāt-i Pišraw, 1376/1997, 315.

Bayrām II.

*Bāzār-i šumā bā digarān garm wa līkan
Ān banda kharīdār digar nīst šumā-rā*

Your marketplace is crowded with strangers, but
You will never have a buyer like this servant of yours.

Lutfi II.

*Gül keldi yūzūng dewride kim hūsn satay dep
İdlandı wü hīç yerde kharīdār tapılmas³³*

The rose came close to your face and said 'I am going to sell beauty',
And though it had a nice smell, it did not have any buyers at all.

Lutfi's poem was not the only Turkish source from which Bayrām borrowed ideas for his poem. The *jinās* Bayrām uses in his fourth couplet might be a Persian version of a Turkish wordplay we see in the 'tapılmas poem' composed by Bābur (*gham-khār* 'companion' and *gham khārī* 'the thorn of sorrow'), who used every opportunity to insert a homophone pun in his poems as *jinās* was his favourite trope.

Bayrām IV.

*Mā-rā bi-rab-i 'aşq zi gham khār ma-dārīd
Ān 'āşiq-i gham-khār digar nīst šumā-rā*

On the road of love do not look down upon us because of our sorrow,
Because you do not have another sorrowful lover.

Bābur III.

*Aghyār köz allıda wü ol yār 'iyān yoq
Gham khārı köngül ichre wü gham-khār tapılmas*

My rivals are in front of me and my companion is nowhere to be seen,
A thorn of sorrow is in my heart and there is no one to soothe me.

Bayrām Khān was not ashamed of recycling elements of his earlier products and seems to have turned to his own 'tapılmas poem' for raw material as well. This is at least what the rhyming words of his Persian *maṭla'* and *maqta'* (*zār* 'mournful', *yār* 'companion' and *vafā-dār* 'faithful'), the occurrence of the noun *jafā* 'cruelty' and the phrase *mibr u vafā* 'love and fidelity' later in the text allude to.

The intertextual links present in the poem suggest that Bayrām's Persian ghazal is a 'tapılmas poem' in essence and as such it is an integral part of the Turkish 'tapılmas paraphrase network.' It is not the only non-Chaghatay element of the *jawāb* set, as three 18th–19th century Ottoman poets, Sāmī paşa (d. 1813), Meşhūrī Efendi (d. 1857) and Yenişehirli Awnī (d. 1883), composed ghazals in Ottoman Turkish

³³ Günay KARAAĞAÇ: *Lutfi Divanı. Giriş-Metin-Dişin.TipkiBasım*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1997, 88.

that rely on the signifying universe of the ‘*tapılmas jawāb* network’ and the *radīf bulunmaz* ‘it is not possible to find,’ the Ottoman version of Chaghatay *tapılmas*.³⁴

As far as Bayrām’s Chaghatay ‘*tapılmas ghazal*’ is concerned, the choice of rhyming words, the vocabulary and the numerous scattered intertextual clues indicate that it was inspired by the ‘*tapılmas* poems’ of his near-contemporaries, Bābur and the Özbek ruler, ‘Ubaydullāh Khān ‘Ubaydī.’ Bayrām’s *maṭla*’ makes it evident that he wished his poem to be interpreted as a poetic response to Bābur’s ghazal, because the title-like first couplet is a rearranged and modified version of Bābur’s first *bayt*, very consciously and efficiently evoking its model.

Bābur I.

*Sen-dek manga bir yār-ı jefā-kār tapılmas*³⁵

Men-dek sanga bir yār-ı wefā-dār tapılmas

I would never find a companion as tormenting as you,
You would never find a companion as loyal as me.

Bayrām Khān I.

*Men zārga sen-dek yana bir yār tapılmas*³⁶

Sen yārga men-dek yana bir zār tapılmas

It is not possible for me, the tormented one, to find a companion,
It is not possible for you, who is my companion, to find anyone as tormented as me.

This method of repetition by variation can also be observed in the second *bayt* of Bayrām’s poem, which seems to be consisting of two slightly reworked hemistichs borrowed from two different couplets of ‘Ubaydī’s poem.

Bayrām II.

Köp zār sanga boldı giriftār welikin

Men-dek yana bir zār-ı giriftār tapılmas

Many tormented ones have been captivated by you, nevertheless
You will not find a tormented captive like me.

‘Ubaydī IV.

*Köp yār egerçi tapılır sanga welikin*³⁷

Jān bergüçi men kibi wefā-dār tapılmas

³⁴ *Dīvān-i Ebu Bekir Sāmī Paşa*. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Aşir Efendi 332, f. 48a; *Selānikli Merhūm Meşbūrī Efendinin Dīvānıdır*, Selānik: Selānik İslāhhanesi, 1292, 76; Lokman TURAN: *Yenişehirli Avnī Bey Dīvānı’nın Tablilī*. Doktora Tezi, Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 1998, 780.

³⁵ Bilal YÜCEL: *Bābūr Dīvānı*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1995, 133–134.

³⁶ TEKCAN: *op. cit.*, 90.

³⁷ QUL UBAYDIY: *Vafo qilsang*. Nashrga tayyorlovchi A. Hayitmetov, Toshkent: Yozuvchi, 1994, 10.

Though you will find many companions, nevertheless
You will not find anyone as self-sacrificing and loyal as me.

°Ubaydī II.

Akhtarsang eger bir yaratıp ikeki jibānmi

Men-dek sanga bir zār u giriftār tapılmas

Should you search both worlds, hunting high and low,

You will not find anyone as tormented and captivated as me.

The result of Bayrām's poetic efforts is a typically structured 'Bayrāmian' couplet, examples of which we have already seen in his Persian ghazals. The keyword of a *bayt* is introduced either in the first *mişrāc* or at the beginning of second and it reappears in a rhyming position within the same couplet.

Bayrām's Chaghatay ghazals

The cross-linguistic '*tapılmas jawāb* network' takes us to Bayrām Khān's poetry composed in Chaghatay Turkish. The available manuscripts of his divan contain 46 ghazals, most of which are heavily influenced by poets of the 15th and early 16th centuries, Luḫfī, Gadāyī, Bābur, °Ubaydī, but most of all by the undoubtedly most outstanding author of the Chaghatay poetic canon, Mīr °Alī-šīr Nawāyī. In this respect Bayrām Khān followed in the footsteps of many other Chaghatay poets who consciously or unconsciously chose the oeuvre of Nawāyī as a poetic reference point.

By the middle of the 16th century Nawāyī's poetry was not only known in a vast geographical area extending from Anatolia to India, but it also became a benchmark of high-standard poetry in Turkish. A long line of first-rate poets tried their hands at composing poetry in Nawāyī's style, among them such outstanding Ottoman authors as Aḫmed Paşa (d. 1497), Nejātī (d. 1509), Khayālī (d. 1557), Sultan Süleymān, the Lawgiver (d. 1566) or the Azerbaijani Muḫammad Fuẓūlī (d. 1556).³⁸

Nawāyī's popularity in the 16th century Turkic world might be assessed by the fact that amateur poets also did their best to imitate Nawāyī's style. Seydī °Alī Re'īs (d. 1563), an Ottoman navy captain who got shipwrecked at the coasts of India and reached Humāyūn's court sometime in 1555, became very much affected when his literary accomplishments in Chaghatay were compared to the ghazals of Nawāyī. Humāyūn called him a second Mīr °Alī-shīr and praised him with the following clearly over-exaggerating words: "...bir yıl bu ravişe warzış oluna çaghatay tayfesine

³⁸ For a detailed list of poetic paraphrases of Nawāyī's ghazals composed by Ottoman poets see Yusuf Çetindağ: *Ali Şir Nevâî'nin Osmanlı Şiirine Etkisi*, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2006.

*Mīr ‘Alī-Šīrī unutturursun.*³⁹ “If for one more year thou perfectest thyself in this kind of poetry thou wilt altogether supplant Mir Ali Shir in the affections of the people of the Djagatai’s.”⁴⁰ Nawāyī’s influence can be detected at various levels in Bayrām Khān’s poems. The most direct level is represented by ghazals written as *jawābs* to Nawāyī’s poetic pieces.

Bayrām’s strategy of imitating the works of earlier poets can take, as we have already seen, the crudest form of imitation, when full lines of the original poem are repeated, though in a slightly modified version, as it is the case with Bayrām Khān’s first poem of his *divan* imitating the *tawhīd* from Nawāyī’s *Gharā’ib al-Šigbar*.⁴¹

The third couplet of Bayrām’s ghazal is clearly a copy of the fourth *bayt* of Nawāyī’s poem.

Nawāyī, *Gharā’ib* no.3/IV.

Kün ſekli yūzüng sejdesidin **BOLDI MÜŞEKKEL**

Tün turrası qabrmg yelidin boldı mutarrā

The Sun prostrated before you and this shaped its face,

The curls of the night became perfumed by the wind of your anger.

Bayrām Khān no.1/III.

Kün çebresi mibring nūridın **BOLDI MÜNEVVER**

*Tün turrası qabrmg yelidin keldi mutarrā*⁴²

The face of the Sun became radiant from the light of your sun like face,

The curls of the night became perfumed by the wind of your anger.

The second *mişrā‘* of Bayrām Khān’s couplet quite evidently falls into the category he terms ‘borrowed lines’ (*aş‘ār-i musta‘ār*) in his poetic credo. Nevertheless, it should be considered a rare example of lines borrowed from Nawāyī, whose influence heavily permeated Bayrām Khān’s *ghazals*. Though Nawāyī’s *ghazals* clearly serve as models for Bayrām, in most cases the influence of the great poet is present in more subtle ways, only as inspiration.

To quote a typical example for this subtle type of relationship between Nawāyī’s and Bayrām Khān’s *ghazals*, let us have a look at the fifth couplet, the *maqta‘* of Bayrām’s ghazal no. 21 in Münevver Tekcan’s edition.

³⁹ SEYDİ ‘ALİ RE’İS: *Mirāt al-Memālik*. Ed. Ahmed Jevdet, Istanbul: Iqdam 1313/1895, 49. For a modern edition of his poems written in Türkî see Kemal ERASLAN: “Seydi Ali Reîs’in Çağatayca Gazelleri”. *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 16, 1968, 41–54.

⁴⁰ ARMINIUS VÁMBÉRY: *The Travels and Adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reis in India, Afghanistan, Central Asia, and Persia during the Years 1553–1556*, London: Luzac & Co., 1899, 50.

⁴¹ For Nawāyī’s poem see Günay KUT: *‘Alī Šīr Nevāyī: Garā’ibü’s-Sigar*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2003, 28–29.

⁴² TEKCAN: *op. cit.*, 63.

Bayrām Khān V.

Bilip sipibr ghamım qan yašin töker Bayrām

*Şafaq emes ki erür ber namāz-i şām qızıl*⁴³

The sky has realised my sorrow and sheds bloody tears, Bayrām,
It's red at the time of the evening prayer not because it signals: dawn is near.

Nawāyī, *Gharā'ib* no. 404/III.

Çarkh agar hāluma qan yıghlamadı hijr tüni

*Nega bas boldı şafaqın yüzi ol şām qızıl*⁴⁴

If the sky, seeing my state on a lonely night, had not shed bloody tears,
Why has the face of that night become deeper red than the colour of dawn?

The rhyme (-ām) and the *radif* (qızıl 'red') of the two poems are the same but their metres are different. Since Bayrām's poem is in *mujtas-i muşamman-i makbbün-i mahzūf* (. . . | . . . | . . . or -) and Nawāyī composed his piece using *ramal-i muşamman-i mahzūf* (- . . | - . . | - . . | - . .), Bayrām's *ghazal* is not a *jawāb* in the strict sense of the term. Nevertheless, the close relationship of the two couplets as far as form and content is concerned cannot be denied. Both couplets are built upon a rhetorical figure called *husn-i ta'lil* 'poetical aetiology.' Nawāyī provides us with a very imaginative and poetic explanation why the sky looks red before the night falls. Bayrām, as we can see, adopts not only the meaning (*mā'nā*) of Nawāyī's lines, but he also uses Nawāyī's key concepts and places them into a slightly modified poetic context.

In some of Bayrām Khān's *ghazals* Nawāyī's influence is present in a very subtle way. Bayrām composed a *ghazal* using the metre *bazaj-i muşamman-i sālim* (. . . | . . . | . . . | . . .), a very common rhyme, -ān and a much used Chaghatay *radif* -ImGA, the first person possessive combined with the dative ending.⁴⁵ Nawāyī does not have a poem that would exactly match these formal characteristics. He wrote two *ghazals* using the abovementioned rhyme and *radif* combination, but both of them are in another metre, *mujtas-i muşamman-i makbbün* (. . . | . . . | . . . | - . .).

The wide range of poetic choices provided by a great number of rhyming words ending in -ān and the flexibility of the *radif* coupled with the fact that the poems of the two poets use different metres would suggest that they are not connected in any way. A deeper analysis, however, shows that Bayrām's *ghazal* is related to both Nawāyī poems. Bayrām, it seems, was inspired by one of the motifs that appears twice in Nawāyī's lines. He might have seen some poetic potential in the motif of the beloved's ear and built his own piece around it. The subtle but perhaps unconscious allusions present in two of his couplets illustrate this connection very well.

⁴³ TEKCAN: *op. cit.*, 101.

⁴⁴ KUT: *op. cit.*, 308.

⁴⁵ TEKCAN: *op. cit.*, 136–137.

If we compare his *maṭlaʿ* to the seventh couplet of Nawāyī’s *ghazal* no. 542 from *Nawādir al-Šabāb*, the relationship becomes evident.⁴⁶

Bayrām Khān I.

Figbānimdin qulaq aghrip mudur ārām-i jānimgha

Yoq erse ne üçün yā Rab qulaq salmas figbānimga

Is it possible that hearing my cries the ears of him/her who guarantees my soul’s peace hurt?

I cannot imagine another explanation for him/her not listening to my cries.

Nawāyī, *Nawādir* no. 542/VII.

Ne sūd elni gar etse Nawāyī afighāni

Çu yār salmadı bargiz qulaq figbānimga

Is it useful for the people to listen to Nawāyī’s hues and cries?

My beloved has never listened to my cries.

It is evident from the beginning that Bayrām followed the basic lines of Nawāyī’s couplet. Besides building his *bayt* upon a basis provided by Nawāyī’s key words and expressions (*fighān* ‘hue and cry’ and *qulaq salmaq* ‘to listen to’), Bayrām made use of the same rhetorical figure, a *husn-i ta’lil* (‘fabulous aetiology’), and explained why his beloved did not listen to his sorrowful cries. Though Bayrām used some of the main building stones of Nawāyī’s lines, the result is something undoubtedly new and original. Bayrām did not attempt to imitate or recreate his model in a slightly changed poetic garb. Nawāyī’s lines provided him with inspiration and he used the model *bayt* as a starting point for his own couplet.

A very similar phenomenon can be observed in the case of the third couplet of the same poem. This *bayt* is connected to another Nawāyī *ghazal*, *ghazal* no. 567 from *Fawā’id al-Kibar*.⁴⁷

Bayrām III.

Birew kim āşkār nālaī qilsam ol qulaq salmas

Ne türlüğ yā Rab olghay muṭṭalī DARD-I NIHĀNIMGHA

If a person does not even listen, when I am wailing in public,

My Lord! How is that person going to notice my hidden sorrow?

Nawāyī, *Fawā’id* no. 567/IV.

Qalp gham içre yana körmedi nişāt yüzün

Birew ki saldı qulaq NĀLA-I NIHĀNIMGHA

He/She has never escaped from sorrow and has never seen the face of joy again,

[As] he/she listened to my hidden wailing.

⁴⁶ For Nawāyī’s poem see Metin KARAÖRS: *’Alī Şir Nevāyī: Nevādirü’ş-Şebāb*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2006, 539.

⁴⁷ For the poem see Önal KAYA: *’Alī Şir Nevāyī: Fevāyidü’l-Kiber*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1996, 522.

It is easy to see how skilfully Bayrām used the same method of recreating something new from classical, recycled elements. He retained the rhyming word and also kept some choice vocabulary elements of his model, *birew ki* ‘a person who’, *qulaq salmaq* ‘to listen’ and *nāla* ‘wailing.’ The result of this process of poetic recreation is a couplet that is more of an interpretive emulation than a simple imitation of Nawāyī’s *bayt*.

Summary

As a conclusion, we can say that Bayrām’s attitude towards poetry seems to have been very similar to Petrarch’s approach, who opined that an ideal imitator ‘will produce one thing, his very own, out of many things, and he will, I will not say flee, but conceal [*celabit*] the imitation so that he will appear similar to no one and will seem to have brought, from the old, something new to Latium.’⁴⁸ Nevertheless, in spite of his loudly advertised poetic credo, Bayrām Khān’s poetry is full of appropriated ideas and poetic devices borrowed from earlier or contemporary poetic texts.

Bayrām seems to have had a natural flair for poetry but he was more of a versifier than a proper poet. Still, as far as borrowed poetic elements and devices are concerned, a perceptible difference may be observed between Bayrām’s Persian and Chaghatay ghazals.

Most of his Persian ghazals, though occasionally modelled upon other poets’ works, are ‘original’ Bayrāmian pieces built up from the building stones of a well-established and faceless poetic tradition. In early Mughal India the treasure-house of canonised Persian traditional poetic texts provided even amateur poets like Bayrām with abundant ready-made and flexible raw material, poetic devices, topics, motifs, vocabulary items that could be easily adapted to a poet’s instant needs. The Persianate Chaghatay classical literature, on the other hand, was a relatively new tradition, established in the second half of the 15th century by Nawāyī, whose works played a key role in shaping other Turkish literary traditions as well. Compared to the large number of Persian classical poetic texts at hand, there was only a very small number of works written in Chaghatay a mid-16th century hobby poet could turn to for inspiration or use as a model. It should be stressed here that most poets, both professionals and amateurs, needed models because due to the short history of the tradition and the characteristics of the Turkish language it was more difficult to write classical poetry using the qualitative system of prosody in Chaghatay than in Persian. In this situation the small number of poetic texts produced by the classics, Luṭfī, Gadāyī, Bābur and, above all, Nawāyī, offered a firm and reliable base part-time poets like Bayrām could use as a starting point. Perhaps this is the reason why Bayrām’s Chaghatay ghazal poetry includes a greater number of author-based imitations and conscious or unconscious intertextual links.

⁴⁸ George W. PIGMAN III: “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance”. *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, 1980, 10.

As far as Bayrām’s methods of imitation are concerned, they range from the basic ‘repetition of the same’ to the highest levels of emulation. In this respect there is no difference between his Persian and Turkish works. Bayrām chose his models wisely and never seems to have overburdened himself. Most of his poems, his imitations and emulations included, are acceptable pieces of poetry that, except for a few rare instances of originality and creativity, do not cross the boundaries of conventional mediocrity.

Abstract

The present paper aims at a comparative analysis of the Persian and Turkish (Chaghatay) ghazals of Bayrām Khān, a Mughal official, who was one of the most influential characters during the initial phase of Akbar’s reign (1556–1605). Like many noblemen who tried to follow the legacy of their Timurid predecessors, Bayrām Khān composed poetry in order to demonstrate that he was educated, erudite and cultured. His Persian and Chaghatay poems and the poetic strategies he applied provide the modern reader with an opportunity to get a glimpse of the cultural background of a Turko-Mughal official, his personality and worldview.

Keywords

Bayrām Khān, Mughal, India, Persian poetry, Chaghatay poetry, ghazal

Rezümé

A tanulmány célja egy indiai mughal tisztségviselő, Bayrām Khān (megh. 1561) perzsa és török gazel-kötészetének összehasonlító vizsgálata. Az Akbar (1556–1605) uralkodásának korai szakaszában meghatározó szerepet betöltő Bayrām Khān számos más, magát a timurida hagyományokhoz tartó előkelő kortársához hasonlóan a versírással a klasszikus műveltségben való jártasságát, műveltségét kívánta demonstrálni. Perzsa és keleti török (csagatáj) nyelven írt versei lehetőséget teremtenek arra, hogy rajtuk keresztül bepillantást nyerjen az utókor egy török származású mughal előkelő irodalmi műveltségébe, s költői stratégiáin keresztül kicsit jobban megismerje a szerző személyiségét, világlátását.

Kulcsszavak

Bayrām Khān, mughal, India, perzsa költészet, csagatáj költészet, gazel