TOURKHAN GANDJEI

Navā'ī on Rhyme in Turkish

The recent discovery of the Kanz al-qāfiya (Thesaurus of Rhyme)¹ composed by Bahrāmī, a contemporary of Mahmūd of Ghazna (d. 421/1030), shows that it is not a treatise on rhyme, as might be suggested by the fact that Nizāmī-yi 'Arūżī recommends its perusal to all aspiring poets², but a simple rhyming dictionary. Although this work could be, and was, a source of reference for poets of the early period, it could not, because of its limitations, be of great use to poets in need of theoretical guidance. Indeed, when seen in retrospect, not a few poets of the pre-Mongol period were guilty of defective rhymes.

It was the great work of Shams al-dīn Muḥammad b. Qais which first laid down the strict and detailed rules for rhyme³, and these gained general acceptance among succeeding generations. The problem of Persian rhyme thus solved by the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century, but the question of rhyme in Turkish poems composed on the model of Persian poetry, and in quantitative metre (' $ar\bar{u}\dot{z}$), remained for a long time unsettled. Although Navā'ī and Babur composed treatises on ' $ar\bar{u}\dot{z}$, they did not attempt to discuss the problem of rhyme.

N a v \bar{a} ' \bar{i} in the *Majālis al-nafā'is*⁴ quotes the following opening verse (*maṭla*') of A t a y \bar{i} :

ol şanam kim su qiragida parī dik olturur gāyat-i nazuklügidin su bilä yutsa bolur

and states that the rhyme ($oltur-ur \sim bol-ur$) is defective, and adds, not without an air of contempt, that A t a y $\bar{\imath}$ composed his poems in the Turkish style ($turk\bar{a}na$), with scant concern for rhyme. He is probably alluding to the rhyme scheme found in Turkish popular poetry which by comparison with the rigidity of Persian rhyme is relatively loose. But curiously enough, N a v \bar{a} ' $\bar{\imath}$, who always speaks with the utmost respect of L u t f $\bar{\imath}$, considering him to be a "Lord of Speech"⁵, and the

² Čahār maqāla, ed. Muh. Mo'īn, Tehrān 1334, p. 57.

⁴ Majālis an -nafā'is, Tashkent 1961, p. 74.

⁵ Majālis, p. 72.

¹ R. Levy, Kanz al-qāfiyah [or al-qawāfī] by 'Alī'Izz al-Dīn Bahrāmī-yi Sarakhsī, in A Locust's Leg. Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh, London 1962, p. 135.

³ Kitāb al-Mu'jam fī ma'āyīr aš'ār al-'ajam, ed. Qazvīnī-Mudarris Rażavī, Tehrān 1335, p. 188 seq.

only Turkish poet until his time comparable with the Persian masters⁶, chooses to be silent about his use of rhyme. In fact Luțfī, in more than one of his poems, uses similar turkāna rhymes. In the poem with the opening verse:

haq ol kün kim ajunni yaratip-tur jahān husnin barin sizgā birip-tür

he uses the following rhyme words: yarat-"ip-tur, bir-ip-tür, in-ip-tür, čiq-"ip-tur, kit-ip-tür, qil-"ip-tur, al-"ip-tur and aš-"ib-tur.

The reason for Navā'ī's silence in this matter was, probably, the fact that Luṭfī was also a recognised poet in Persian and hence well acquainted with the established rules of rhyme. Navā'ī in spite of his silence in this instance, could not possibly approve such defective rhymes, for in fact he himself makes no use of them. Unlike his predecessors he was well acquainted with the Turkish language and capable of the morphological analysis necessary to avoid such irregularities.

In the Muḥākamat al-luġatain, while discussing the possibilities of Turkish rhyming words in comparison with those of Persian, Navā'ī, taking into consideration the Turkish vowel-system, dwells on the facilities open to the Turkish poets, and enumerates the following additional possibilities9:

(a) The "known" $w\bar{a}w$ (\bar{u} , in Turkish u, \bar{u}) rhymes with the "unknown" $w\bar{a}w$ (o, in Turkish o, \bar{o}), e.g. $ot \sim \bar{o}t \sim ut \sim \bar{u}t$; $tor \sim t\bar{o}r \sim tur \sim t\bar{u}r$.

(b) The "known" $y\bar{a}$ (\bar{i} , in Turkish i, \bar{i}) rhymes with the "unknown" $y\bar{a}$ (\bar{e} , in Turkish e), e.g. $biz \sim b\bar{i}z \sim bez$; $tir \sim t\bar{i}r \sim t\bar{e}r$.

(c) alif rhymes with the "silent" $h\bar{a}$, e.g. $ara \sim sar\bar{a} \sim dar\bar{a} \sim sara(h) \sim dara(h)$; $yada \sim sad\bar{a} \sim b\bar{a}da(h)$.

(d) wāw rhymes with żamma, e.g. irür~hur~dur~gurūr~żarūr.

(e) yā rhymes with kasra, e.g. aģīr~bagīr~ṣādir~qādir~ta'xīr~taģyīr.

The above formulation of Navā'ī is an attempt to systematise and generalise an already existing tacit rhyming licence of which the Turkish poets, including Navāī himself, made but sporadic use. However the tone of the whole discussion is perfectly consonant with the general thesis of the Muḥākamat al-luġatain. It was Navā'ī's enthusiasm for his subject that induced him to elaborate a conception of rhyme which was, and proved to be, of limited popularity, for it was, strictly speaking, neither "optic" nor "acoustic".

⁶ Muhākamat al-lugatain, ed. Quatremère, Paris 1841, p. 33.

⁷ British Museum, Add. 7914, f. 172r; cf. also 176v seq., 178v seq.

⁸ Nevertheless, N a v ā'ī in one of his poems uses the following rhyme words: köydürgäli, olturgalī, sürgäli, sevdürgäli, belgürgäli, yetgürgäli, tilmürmäli. Dīvān, facsimile edition, Moscow 1964, p. 388. Here the repetition of -tur-~-dür- and -gür- as causative suffixes makes the rhyme scheme defective, and not very different from those used by A t a yī and L u t fī. It seems that N a v ā'ī does not feel them to be causative suffixes. In fact the causative verbs, for him, as he explains with examples in the Muḥākamat al-luġatain, are those formed by -t-, such as: yügürt-, qīldurt-, yašurt- and čīqart-. (The last three verbs are obviously doubly causative).

⁹ ed. Quatremère, p. 13.