



Ottoman Tradition in The Post-Ottoman Times: A Century of Translating The *Mathnawi* into Bosnian¹

Munir Drkić*

Ahmed Zildžić**

* Assoc. Prof.

University of Sarajevo
Faculty of Philosophy
Department of Oriental
Philology

munir.drkic@ff.unsa.ba

Sarajbosna / BOSNA
HERSEK

** Assoc. Prof.

University of Sarajevo
Faculty of Philosophy
Department of Oriental
Philology

ahmed.zildzic@ff.unsa.ba

Sarajbosna / BOSNA
HERSEK**Received:**

16.09.2021

Accepted:

07.03.2022

Field Editor:

Gülsüm Kırbuş

Abstract

This article examines the reception of Jalaluddin Rumi's *Mathnawi* in post-Ottoman Bosnia and Herzegovina through the hitherto published translations of that work in the Bosnian language. The authors inspect the Bosnian translations of the *Mathnawi* according to contemporary translation studies, the retranslation and relay translation studies in particular. Following the survey and analysis, the authors conclude that the translation of the *Mathnawi* into the Bosnian language cannot be regarded as a linear historical progression because the process itself reveals a complex and multilayered relationship of the local culture towards the *Mathnawi*. The principal incentive for the translation of Rumi's masterpiece has been an age-old Ottoman tradition of interpreting the *Mathnawi*, dating back to the 16th century. This is observable in the translators' approach to the text, their insistence upon the contents at the expense of its poetic features, as well as their repeated invocation of the tradition of oral interpretation of verses, and frequent reliance upon the earlier Turkish translations of the *Mathnawi* and its commentaries composed in the Ottoman times.

Keywords: *Mathnawi*, Bosnian language, retranslation, relay translation, Ottoman tradition.

Post-Osmanlı Döneminde bir Osmanlı Geleneği: Bir Asırlık *Mesnevî*'nin Boşnakçaya Çevirilmesi

Öz

Müellifler bu yazıda Celâleddîn Rûmî'nin *Mesnevî* adlı eserinin Boşnakçaya yapılan tercümelerine dayanarak, eserin Post-Osmanlı Bosna'sında karşılanmasını incelemektedir. Yazıda, çağdaş çeviri kuramlarına ve özellikle yeniden çeviri ve röle çeviri kuramlarına nazaran *Mesnevî*'nin Boşnakça tercümelerini tahlil edilmektedir. Müellifler tetkik ve tahlil yaptıktan sonra, *Mesnevî*'nin Boşnakçaya tercüme sürecinin doğrusal bir târihî gelişim olmadığını neticesine varıyorlar. Zira bu süreç mahalli kültürün *Mesnevî*'yle mudil ve çok boyutlu bir ilişkisini teşhir etmektedir. Mevlânâ Celâleddîn Rûmî'nin şaheserini çevirmenin esas nedeni, XVI. asıra uzanan eski Osmanlı *Mesnevî* şerh etme geleneğiydi. Tercümanların metne karşı tavırları, eserin şiirsel özellikleri karşılığında eserin içeriği üzerinde ısrar etmeleri, sözlü şerh geleneğine sık sık atıfta bulunmaları, *Mesnevî*'nin daha evvelki Türkçe çevirilerinin ve Osmanlı döneminde yazılan şerhlerin kullanılmaları bu durumu berrak olarak göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Mesnevî*, Boşnakça, yeniden çeviri, röle çeviri, Osmanlı geleneği.

¹ This research was conducted in coordination with the Research Chair for Rumi Studies (www.molaviresearch.ir).

INTRODUCTION

Ever since the integration of the Balkans and Bosnia into the expanding Ottoman Empire in the 16th century, Jalaluddin Rumi's *Mathnawi*, alongside several other classical literary works in Persian, established a pervasive presence in that region. The presence and influence of these literary works in local cultural tradition could be examined in two separate periods: Ottoman and post-Ottoman eras. From the middle 15th century until the second half of the 19th century, the reception of these texts in the Balkans and Bosnia was more or less similar to that of other parts of the Empire. Some of those texts were part of school curricula (such as *Pendname*, misattributed to Feriduddin Attar, and *Gulistan* by Sa'di Shirazi), whereas others were used as models for imitating local authors (such as *Mathnawi*, *Gulistan*, and *Diwan* by Hafiz Shirazi). Among them, several literary works were publicly recited and interpreted (foremost the *Mathnawi*, but also Hafiz's *Diwan* and *Pendname*). While the aforementioned literary works were repeatedly translated in the Ottoman Empire, which prompted some authors to characterize Ottoman culture as a retranslation culture (cf. Albachten, Gürçağlar, 2019), the target language of those translations was predominantly Ottoman Turkish, and rarely any other language within the Empire.

None of those texts was translated into Bosnian in the Ottoman period. Instead, local educated elites read them either in the original, in Ottoman translation, or through many commentaries. At the same time, the most widespread of literary texts - particularly the *Mathnawi* - were orally transmitted and interpreted for the wider interested audience. After the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1878, the region of the western Balkans and Bosnia moved from an Oriental into the Western cultural sphere, and traces of the resulting cultural shifts continue to reverberate until today. One of the main changes that resulted from the Austro-Hungarian occupation was that the so-called *elsine-i selase* (i.e., Arabic, Persian and Turkish) lost the status they had held in the Ottoman times: literacy and production in these languages were gradually replaced by translation activities and later academic research into them (cf. Algar 2016, par. 8).

In other words, the erstwhile linguistic mediums of literary production were transformed into objects of scientific inquiry and research. Subsequently, from the end of the 19th century, the opening Bosnian translations of Persian literary works began to appear in periodicals and later in separate volumes. Through those translations, classical Persian literary works started a new life in a new time and milieu. While in the Ottoman period, those works were part of a homogenous entity that was underpinned by and interpreted foremost according to the dominant Sufi doctrine, the life of each one of them took a separate direction in the post-Ottoman times. This article traces the *afterlife* of Rumi's *Mathnawi* in Bosnia-Herzegovina by examining and presenting the hitherto published and known translations of that book in the Bosnian language. Post-Ottoman Bosnia has witnessed distinct political and social orders with divergent social and political circumstances, from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, first and second Yugoslavia, until the country's independence in 1992. Rumi's *Mathnawi* has been translated into Bosnian several times, in each of these disparate periods of the post-Ottoman history of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The State of Research

Among many studies and articles concerning the *Mathnawi* in Bosnia, only a handful discuss its Bosnian translations. Although the first Bosnian translation appeared more than a century ago, within the last two decades, critical reviews and studies of the existing renditions of the *Mathnawi* began to emerge. In a critique of the increasing number of relay translations of Persian classical masterpieces at the beginning of the 21st century, Zildžić (2006) treats the Bosnian translation of the third and fourth volume of the *Mathnawi* translated from English by Velid Imamović; the remaining volumes would be published subsequently. Through his analysis of several examples in those translations, Zildžić

concluded that Imamović's relay translations of the *Mathnawi* and relay translations of Hafiz's *Diwan* and Sa'di's *Gulistan* demonstrate negligence and misapprehension of the status of those literary works in local tradition. Expounding on the poetics of the *Mathnawi*, Duraković (2014) devoted a separate chapter of his study to the translation of the first and second volume of the *Mathnawi* by Fejzullah Hadžibajrić, as well as the remaining four volumes translated by Velid Imamović, concluding that both translations were aesthetically inadequate, hence wrong. He added that the *Mathnawi* in Hadžibajrić's translation lacks all the formal and essential features of a poem, being reduced to a set of short prose texts without aesthetic value. In his view, this underlying characteristic of those translations mounts to be a forgery of sorts of the Persian original. (Duraković, 2014, p.188). His treatment of Imamović's translation is even harsher; indicating that this translation as well lacks all the essential characteristics of poetry, Duraković further emphasized its being a relay translation: in a milieu wherein the *Mathnawi* held high status for centuries, an indirect translation of this remarkable work of world literature is deemed particularly unacceptable. Moreover, relying on Nicholson's English translation of the *Mathnawi* is equally controversial from two aspects: firstly, Nicholson's translation of the *Mathnawi* exhibits a similar measure of aesthetic inadequacy and lack of consideration for poetic features of the original, and secondly because Nicholson is an Orientalist and it is the "acclaimed Orientalist scholars - precisely them! - who often mischaracterized classical literature in Oriental-Islamic languages through their translations thereof." (Duraković, 2014, p. 189).

In contrast to these reviews with a normative and critical approach to *Mathnawi* translation, in an article pertinent to Hadžibajrić's translation of the *Mathnawi*, Drkić (2014) defines his translation not as wrong or inaccurate, but rather specific given the particular social circumstances of its emergence. The reduction and simplification observable in Hadžibajrić's translation are thus explained as a direct consequence of its close attachment to the micro-context within which it emerged.

While earlier reviews had the semantics of the text in their focus, this study is aimed at the pragmatics of its interpretation in which the original text is no longer the most significant element - that position is reserved for the interpreter's exposition of the text, which is significantly conditioned by the level of knowledge and understanding of the recipients. The above-mentioned critical reviews of Bosnian translations of the *Mathnawi* do not postulate the tradition of *Mathnawi* translations as a whole, focusing instead on individual cases and examples. Contrary to that, this article will treat all the existing translations of the *Mathnawi* into the Bosnian language and will offer conclusions based on principles of translation studies.

Theoretical Background

In translation studies, multiple translations of an original text are examined within the concept of retranslation. Simply put, retranslation as an outcome signifies a second or a different interpretation of the same text into the same target language. Consequently, multiple or repeated translations of the same text as a process are a phenomenon that is realized in a specific time frame. In practice, however, we sometimes encounter simultaneous translations of the same text, making it somewhat challenging to determine which one is antecedent and which one is precedent (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010, p. 294). Retranslation studies focus on literary translation, where a retranslation is a welcome addition that leads to a fuller and varied understanding of the original text (Gürçağlar, 2020, p. 485).

In his ground-breaking and often-quoted article, Antoine Berman (1990) established the Retranslation Hypothesis, according to which translation as a process is inherently unfinished and can only be completed by retranslations (1990, p. 1). Initial translations tend to approximate the original text to the target language and culture, indeed to naturalize works in foreign languages and present them to a new culture. At the same time, retranslations accord more attention to the phrasing and style of the

original, maintaining cultural distance between translation and its source. This view presupposes that initial translations are inevitably insufficient, and subsequent interpreters use the well-trodden path of the initial translation: the initial rendition presented the original text so that retranslations could be more faithful to the spirit of the original. In short, initial translations are domesticating, and retranslations are foreignizing the original text in the target culture. Accordingly, retranslations are, as a rule, better and "greater" than the initial ones (cf. Gürçağlar, 2020, p. 485).

Berman's model was later criticized as overly simple and particularly for embracing the scheme of history as a linear progression (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p. 2). Nonetheless, the idea that subsequent translations are closer to the original became a doctrine (Michalycsa and Wawrzycka, 2020, p. 4). While it is possible to find many instances that confirm Berman's model, it is manifest that other elements can shed more light on the nature of retranslations (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010, p. 296). The nature of initial renditions and retranslations can best be explained in distinct and varying contextual conditions (Brownlie, 2006, p. 167), and a more significant number of case studies is thus strongly recommended.

Reasons for retranslating are numerous and depend on cultural context, but the most frequently invoked are shifts of social context, obsolete initial translations, a fuller comprehension of the original text, its author, and culture, while economic reasons cannot be ruled out as well (Brownlie, 2006, p. 155; Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010, p. 296-297; other reasons are listed in: Gürçağlar, 2020, p. 487). From this list of incentives for retranslations, we can observe the concept of linear progression widely accepted, albeit often criticized. It is also assumed that retranslations are a response to earlier renditions, unless attested otherwise. Although it occurs seldom, some retranslations could also be passive, i.e., conducted without direct contact or even awareness of earlier versions (Pym, 1998, p. 82).

One significant conclusion of earlier studies is that the emergence of retranslations and the formation of literary canon are interconnected and interrelated: many retranslations help a text acquire the status of a classic in the target culture, which in turn, prompts further retranslations of the text (Venuti, 2004; Koskinen, Paloposki, 2010, p. 295; Massardier-Kenney, 2015, p. 78-79). Accordingly, texts with a higher status in the target culture are retranslated more frequently.

Some retranslation studies include within its fold relay translations as well, i.e., renditions of a text that had already been translated into a *third* language. It is, however, more appropriate to differentiate between these two terms because retranslation is a repeated translation of a text already rendered into the *same* language. Apart from *relay translation*, we encounter terms such as *indirect translation*, *second-hand translation*, *second-generation translation*, *intermediate translation*, and *intermediary translation*. (Washbourne, 2013, p. 608). The terminology is not standardized and different authors argue in favor of one term or the other. The most frequently used terms are *indirect translation* and *relay*. Without pretensions towards adjudicating the matter, as it clearly stands out of the scope of this article, we decided for *relay*, as suggested by St. André (2020), although *indirect translation* would be equally adequate.

In the past, not much attention was accorded to relay translations because they were considered a copy of a copy (the initial rendition being a copy), a necessary evil, always assuming that it is better to translate directly from the original. This approach is mainly encountered in literary translations. Because they are considered a copy of a copy, it is often assumed that relay translations emerge in the initial contact between different cultures only to be replaced later with direct translations (St. André, 2020, p. 470-471). That would, in turn, mean that relay translations age with the passage of time. Alvstad (2017) criticized this view and showed that the number of relay translations increases in certain language combinations, citing predominantly economic reasons for that.

Relay translations are specific for distant cultures, and their existence is often justified by a dearth of well-trained interpreters who can conduct direct translations. There are both positive and negative aspects of relay translations that can be considered. On the one hand, in the past, relay translations significantly facilitated the transfer of knowledge between cultures. For instance, works of classical Greek philosophy were rendered into European languages from Arabic, accelerating Renaissance in Europe, while many other relay translations played an essential role in shaping European consciousness of distant cultures. Thus, any translation from Chinese into a European language would soon give rise to renditions into a number of other languages in Europe. Of course, relay translations were always espoused with concern and anxiety regarding their accuracy and adequacy. This anxiety, however, is present only with one's own or a culturally close target language (St. André, 2020, p. 470-471).

In general, the intermediary language is culturally or geographically close to the target culture, or the *lingua franca* of a specific region at a certain time. In the view of relay translations of literary works with a history of presence and influence in a local cultural context, these relations are much more complex. Such is the case with Persian classical works in Bosnia. These works were long read and publicly commented upon before the emergence of initial translations, so the subsequent relay translations that appeared mostly due to economic reasons, were met with harsh criticism.

Historical and Cultural Context: *Mathnawi* in Ottoman and post-Ottoman Bosnia

In order to attain the canonized status in a culture, a literary work must first pass through a complex process of reception that includes many literary, cultural, and even religious and political aspects. One of the underlying features of a literary work considered a masterpiece in certain cultures is that several generations of recipients engage in its reading and interpretation, which facilitates its further transmission. In other words, literary work appeals to its readers who re-actualize it intra-linguistically (commentaries, analysis, and studying), inter-linguistically (through translations and retranslations), or even inter-semiotically (script adaptations for theater or cinema and others). It is the repetition that is essential for the high status of a work of literature. One mode of intra-linguistic and inter-linguistic repetitions that should not be neglected is a model composition or simple imitation of a work (Massardiér-Kenney, 2015, p. 78-79). The *Mathnawi* in Ottoman and post-Ottoman Bosnia has passed through this complex procedure and has attained and maintained the status of a canonized work of literature. Several arguments can be put forth to support this claim. Firstly, several Bosniac poets in the Ottoman period wrote poetry inspired and modeled on the *Mathnawi*. Derviš-Paša Bajezidagić is the most famous amongst them, and he had composed two volumes of his own mathnawi before seeing Rumi in a vision. According to the tradition recorded by an 18th-century Bosnian author Fevzi Mostari in his Persian work *Bulbulistan*, Rumi advised Derviš-Paša to abandon his project because his mathnawi could not be successfully imitated. (Karahalilović, 2014, p. 113)

Bosniac authors also composed commentaries of the *Mathnawi*, and Ahmed Sudi Bosnawi and Abdullah Bosnawi stand out amongst the commentators. Apart from them, there are other commentaries preserved in the manuscript form in Bosnian and international collections of Islamic manuscripts. Finally, with the emergence of a distinct Ottoman social order in Bosnia, a tradition of public reading and interpretation of the *Mathnawi* (Pers. *mathnawi-khani*) had been established in several Bosnian towns. The tradition of *mathnawi-khani* was particularly prominent in Mostar and Sarajevo, where the *Mathnawi* was read and interpreted for larger audiences following similar practices in Istanbul and other cultural centers of the Empire (cf. Inan, 2020, p. 161).

Relevance of the *mathnawi-khani* tradition was twofold: Rumi's masterpiece was in this way presented to larger audiences, and transfer of knowledge and teachings was both written and oral. Verses and stories from the *Mathnawi* were not only read and translated but also interpreted and

commented upon, and this practice was considered religious observance and moral guidance. The preserved endowment decree (*waqfnama*) dated in 1010/1602, by which the practice of *mathnawi-khani* was established in Mostar, manifestly points to the religious nature of this activity. According to this act, preserved in the MS collection of the Gazi Husrev-bey Library (V, 182), the *Mathnawi* was to be read and interpreted four days a week in four different mosques in Mostar; before reading verses, the lecturer was obliged to quote one Qur'anic verse and one Prophetic tradition relevant to the topic of his lecture, while in the end he was obliged to offer supplication and recite the opening Qur'anic chapter. *Mathnawi-khani* sessions in Sarajevo had a similar structure. (Drkić, 2018) The differences between the two traditions of *mathnawi-khani* in Mostar and Sarajevo are twofold: first, while the Mostar tradition came to a close at the end of the Ottoman period, the Sarajevo tradition continued until today. During the 20th century, some influential figures among Bosniacs served as *mathnawi-khans*, such as Džemaluddin Čaušević (grand mufti or *re'isu-l-ulema*), Mujaga Merhemić, Fejzullah Hadžibajrić, and Halid Hadžimulić. Although *mathnawi-khani* sessions in Sarajevo in the 20th century were organized in a private setting with a limited audience, during the last two decades, these lectures have become considerably more popular, attracting, in some cases, an audience of more than two hundred and fifty listeners.

Second, while the textual basis from the *mathnawi-khani* tradition in Mostar was a commentary by Mustafa Sururi, Sarajevo *mathnawi-khans* in the post-Ottoman period relied more frequently on commentary by Ismail Rusuhi Ankaravi (Hadžibajrić, 1985, p. 2). Given that both commentaries were among the most widely used in the Ottoman Empire and that one of them continued to be used in Bosnia-Herzegovina, one can argue that the *mathnawi-khani* in Bosnia follows the well-established Ottoman tradition until today.

In short, the *Mathnawi* in the Bosnian cultural context has an active presence extending over many centuries and postulates itself as an exceedingly important text far surpassing its literary value.

Aims and Methodology

The principal aim of this article is to offer an analysis of the existing translations of Jalaluddin Rumi's *Mathnawi* into the Bosnian language and thereby present the process of translation and retranslation of this canonical literary work in local culture. The main questions in this regard are: how complex was the process of translating the *Mathnawi* into the Bosnian language and did the existing translations follow in the linear progression? Did subsequent translations come in response to earlier, or have some of them been passive? To what extent did the Ottoman tradition of commentary upon this text influence interpreters' approach in post-Ottoman times? Have the translation activities concerning the *Mathnawi* shed new light on certain aspects or offered new insights into the presence and influence of this work in the local culture?

Methodologically, this is a case study: following the analysis of smaller units (i.e., individual translations), conclusions would be drawn on the status of the main unit (i.e., the *Mathnawi* itself) in the target culture. The primary focus will be on how the source text was perceived in the existing translations, while the issue of how the existing translations correspond to the Persian original remains secondary. It is vital to determine the purpose of each translation and what makes it relevant to its recipients.

Bosnian Translations of the *Mathnawi*

The first thing to bear in mind when describing and analyzing the existing renditions of the *Mathnawi* is the length of the original text: it is a monumental literary work comprising six volumes with more than twenty-five thousand verses composed over some twelve years. Translating the *Mathnawi* in its entirety is an arduous task; hence most of the translations analyzed here are fragmentary.

As far as it is known today, the first traces of translating the *Mathnawi* into the Bosnian language could be related to a certain Velagić who had translated only one verse (no. 2225) from the first volume and wrote it down in the Arabic script on the margins of the printed edition of the *Mathnawi* from 1288/1872. Nothing more is known about the interpreter or when his translations were done; the sole merit of this translation is its being the first.

First Bosnian Rendition of the *Mathnawi*

The first endeavor and written translation of the *Mathnawi* is attributed to religious scholar, *muderris*, and poet Alija Sadiković (1872-1936) from the town of Janja in northeastern Bosnia, who is counted amongst the most productive Bosniac authors in Alhamiado literature (Mulahalilović, 1982, p. 191).

He began translating the *Mathnawi* in 1906 and until the beginning of 1917 he had done between 16.000 and 17.000 verses, more than a half of the original text. However, on the night of January 30, 1917 his residence caught fire, and a larger part of his private library, including his translations from the *Mathnawi*, perished in the course. His renditions of only fourteen opening verses were recovered to bear witness to the lost work. This fateful turn of events had profoundly affected Sadiković, who lamented his lost translations until his death, never going back to the unfinished work (Mulahalilović, 1982, p. 194).

Although being a slim percentage of the translated verses, the recovered renditions are nonetheless significant as they indicate the translator's method: Sadiković would first write down the original verse in Persian and then render it into the Bosnian beneath. Some verses were rendered twice, in two variants. From these verses, we can observe that Sadiković tended towards a freer and versified translation preserving essential poetic features, which testifies his abundant poetic talent and versatility. Moreover, this is the only Bosnian translation of the *Mathnawi* recorded in the Arabic script. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Arabic script was still used among religious scholars but was abandoned before long and replaced with the Latin and Cyrillic scripts. In light of its literary and aesthetic features and being temporally and culturally close to the Ottoman times, one can safely conclude that had Sadiković's work been saved, it would be regarded as a great translation, albeit being the first one.

Second Translator and His Translations

A second Bosnian translation of the *Mathnawi* was penned by Adem Karadžović (1891–1981). Born in the town of Bar in present-day Montenegro, after completing his studies in Istanbul and Cairo, Adem later settled in Sarajevo permanently. He was a close associate and intimate friend of Džemaluddin Čaušević, the first *mathnawi-khan* in post-Ottoman Bosnia. He attended lectures on the *Mathnawi* by both Čaušević, and Mujaga Merhemić, who succeeded him as *mathnawi-khan*, allegedly at the request of Karadžović himself (cf. Traljić, 1998, p. 143). Adem translated only two stories from the *Mathnawi* in prose and several verses on two separate occasions. In the journal *Islamski svijet* [The Islamic World] (1934, no. 124, p. 17-18), he first translated a story from the *Mathnawi* entitled *Dun'ja kao stara baba* [This world as an old lady], and then another story *Uobraženi Turkuša i dovitljivi terzija Čeker oğlu* [Pretentious Turk and Ingenious Tailor Ceker-oğlu] in the same journal (1935, no. 140, p. 7; no. 141, p. 7). Few paragraphs on the *Mathnawi* and its author were added to the second translation.

Both renditions are, in fact, relay translations from the Ottoman contained in the book *Mesnevi Hikayeleri* by Fazlullah Rahimi. Later he translated several verses and published them in the same journal as a dedication on Džemaluddin Čaušević's sixty-fifth birthday (1936, no. 16, p. 4).

His translations are overly simplified and without formal poetic features; verses are rendered separated as prose phrases. Such approach is an outcome of interpretation and commentary of *Mathnawi* verses and stories as practiced in Sarajevo in the first half of the 20th century. Finally, several decades later, in an introduction to his Bosnian rendition of *Pend-name* by Zarifi-baba, Karadžović also printed his translation of the eighteen opening verses of the *Mathnawi* entitled *Nay-nama* stating that “the essence of Sufism is contained therein.” (Zarifi-baba, 1970, p. 21–22). Contrary to his earlier translations, this rendition maintained some standard features of the original, such as meter and rhyme.

Karadžović's work, being the first retained Bosnian renditions of the text, initiated the process of *Mathnawi* translation. Apart from that, his translations are at the same time first relay translations from the *Mathnawi*. Choosing a book in Ottoman as the basis for his work shows that the Ottoman tradition of understanding and interpreting the *Mathnawi* bore heavily on Karadžović. Judging from his choice of material and interpreting approach, which resembles commentary more than a typical translation, one can ascertain that Rumi's masterpiece is much more than a literary text: it is indeed a guidebook on the path of spiritual maturing. With this translation, the canonical status of the *Mathnawi* in the Bosnian cultural context is strongly reinforced and affirmed. Karadžović does not refer to Sadiković's translations, so one cannot know if he was aware of them, which marks his work as passive in relation to the first translation. However, their approach is complementary: while the first recognizes formal features of the poetic manner of the original, the second emphasizes the contents and the morals conveyed by *Mathnawi*'s stories.

A third, most celebrated Bosnian translation of the *Mathnawi*

A *Mathnawi* translation with the most favorable reception so far in Bosnia-Herzegovina was penned by Fejzullah Hadžibajrić (1913-1990). For twenty-three years (from 1965 until 1988), he served as *mathnawi-khan* in Sarajevo. He had met with Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı in Konya on two occasions (in 1965 and 1966) and briefed him on the *mathnawi-khani* activities in Bosnia. On his part, Gölpınarlı welcomed the continuing tradition of the *Mathnawi* interpretation sessions in Sarajevo and invested him with “permission and blessings to interpret and translate the *Mathnawi*” in accordance with the well-established Mevlevi heritage (Hadžibajrić, 1985, p. 1). Hadžibajrić completed and published the first volume of his Bosnian rendition in 1985 and the second volume in 1987; his translation project, however, remained incomplete.

Although the translator remarked in a note on his work on the first volume that oral interpretation could not be equated with written translation (Hadžibajrić, 1985, p. 2), it is clear that his approach was strongly influenced by the tradition of public reading of the *Mathnawi* in Sarajevo.

To begin with, his notes prepared for interpretation lectures on the *Mathnawi* were the basis for his written translation, and the only difference was that a new method and arrangement needed to be applied before the text could be printed. Secondly, his translation was produced from the Persian original, although at Gölpınarlı's urging, the translator also made use of Veled Izbudak's Turkish rendition of the *Mathnawi* as a support translation.

Moreover, Ankaravi's Ottoman commentary of the *Mathnawi* bore significantly upon Hadžibajrić's translation, which does not come as a surprise given the status and frequent use of that commentary in the tradition of oral interpretation of the *Mathnawi*. Public readings of the *Mathnawi* as a point of departure in the understanding of the original text is further emphasized by the fact that Hadžibajrić's translation is void of most formal features of poetry, except for the opening eighteen verses. This characteristic of the translation had already been discussed intensively in the scholarly literature (cf. Duraković, 2014; Drkić, 2014). Distichs are separated, but the text of the translation is given in prose with the only sporadic occurrence of rhyme. Bećir Džaka, at that time professor of Persian at

the University of Sarajevo, was tasked with checking the accuracy of the translation. Finally, Hadžibajrić supplemented his translation with numerous notes and marginalia that not only discuss multiple meanings of certain words and terms but also include anecdotes from the history of Islam, particularly the history of Sufism, and commentary on some Qur'anic verses and Prophetic traditions. In light of all of that, Hadžibajrić's translation should be situated between standard literary translations and classical commentaries common in the Ottoman Empire as the main incentive for its appearance was, in fact, the oral tradition of the public readings in Sarajevo.

Hadžibajrić does not mention the first Bosnian translation of the *Mathnawi* because he had no hold on it, and its author was no longer alive at the time; therefore, Hadžibajrić's translation is passive in relation to Sadiković's earlier work. It is, however, difficult to maintain that Hadžibajrić was entirely unaware of Sadiković's rendition for the simple fact that Sadiković's work had been announced multiple times before two volumes of Hadžibajrić's translation were printed (Mulahalilović, 1982; Huković, 1987).

What is more probable is that Hadžibajrić avoided Sadiković's approach on purpose, insisting more on the transfer of meaning and the contents at the certain expense of poetic features of the Persian original. Reasons for that are not difficult to imagine: the *Mathnawi* is principally a quasi-scriptural text in Ottoman culture. It was regarded not simply as a moral guidebook, but a sacred text as essential for spiritual life as the Qur'an and Hadith, the two primary sources of Islam. According to this view, the *Mathnawi* was considered a sacred text, overflowing with divine wisdom, signs, and knowledge, a book containing arcane knowledge of creation. (Inan, 2020, p. 163-164). This view remained dominant in the Sarajevan circle of *Mathnawi* interpreters throughout the 20th century, and its direct outcome is Hadžibajrić's rendition of the first two volumes into the Bosnian language.

Hadžibajrić accorded to the Persian original the status of a sanctified text, or at the very least, a text of higher-order and for his translation adopted the target-oriented, rather than source-oriented strategy. According to a target-oriented strategy, translation inevitably presupposes a process of adaptation of the original text in order to suit and achieve a certain purpose.

In this approach, the interpreter does not follow the structure and the formal features of the original but seeks to adapt the text to cultural norms, and particularly to the level of knowledge and understanding of the recipients in a bid to put forward, by way of translation, a pathway for their spiritual growth and ennoblement (see Naudé, 2010).

Our translator says as much, stating that the *Mathnawi* as one of the greatest works of Sufi thought "abounds with allegories, which makes its literal rendition into another language difficult." Hence, he chooses to forgo formal features of the original and to explain (not only to translate!) allegories as the underlying quality of a Sufi text (Hadžibajrić, 1985, p. 2). The outcome is a simplified translation adapted for a larger audience whereby all the essential aspects of Sufi teachings, the allegoric quality of the text, and the religious aspect of the original are preserved and further elucidated in the interpreter's commentaries and accompanying notes.

Thus, a conclusion inevitably imposes itself that the aura of sacrosanctity that envelopes the *Mathnawi* represented the main obstacle for its faster translation so that in the end, Hadžibajrić was able to prepare and publish only the first two volumes in Bosnian. Shortly after the publication of those two volumes, a significant shift in the social and cultural context comes at the beginning of the 1990s. This social and cultural transition resulted in the national awakening of the Bosniacs, which also included a revival of their religious and spiritual traditions. In new circumstances, oral interpretation of the *Mathnawi* became very popular and with it also Hadžibajrić's translation. His work was reprinted multiple times and included in the teaching curricula of some high schools in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The first complete translation and first relay translation of the *Mathnawi*

Persian classical texts became very sought after in the new social and cultural circumstances at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, and this new development is best reflected in the appearance of an increased number of translations from Persian, a significant portion of which were relay translations (cf. Drkić, Zildžić, 2020). Naturally, the *Mathnawi* was not an exception to this rule. However paradoxical it may appear, the only complete translation of this exceptionally important text in the local cultural tradition is, in fact, a relay translation from English.

Its translator, Mr. Velid Imamović, took from where Hadžibajrić left off; in 2004 he published his translation of a third volume, then in 2005 fourth and fifth volumes and finally in 2006 he published his rendition of a sixth volume of the *Mathnawi*.

After he had completed the translation, he returned to work on the first and second volumes that were printed in 2009. In his introduction, Imamović stated that the basis for his work was an English translation of the *Mathnawi* by Reynold Nicholson. The sequence of the published volumes reveals the interpreter's active viewpoint towards Hadžibajrić's work. Apart from that, it appears that Imamović adopted the same approach and followed the same goal, keeping his work on the *Mathnawi* translation closely related to the tradition of public readings. However, certain circumstances about this translation demonstrate that such was not the case. Namely, because of his heavy reliance on an understanding of a western Orientalist, Imamović's translation of the *Mathnawi* inevitably gives a distorted meaning of the original text. Nicholson had to adapt the text for the recipients of his English translation; that process included domestication of the original, as well as the inclusion of explanatory notes on certain terms and concepts that might be alien to English readers, but not necessarily to Bosnian ones. This is a particularly sensitive issue with Sufi texts such as the *Mathnawi*, making a significant difference even with relay translations: it is not the same to translate the *Mathnawi* from Nicholson's English and Izbudak's Turkish translation. The first translator approaches the original as a culturally foreign and distant text, while the latter deals with the original based on a centuries-old tradition. One is safe to conclude that the primary reason for such a choice was economic consideration. There could be little doubt that Imamović's translation differs significantly from Hadžibajrić's work.

Imamović's statement that "an essential, perhaps the most vital aspect of translating the *Mathnawi* is that the translator must be thoroughly familiar with Sufism, not only in a philosophical sense, but as a way of life" is bewildering (Imamović, 2004, p. 15).

What can be derived from such a statement is that the most significant criterium for a translator is Sufi practice, while no other preconditions such as knowing the language of the original or familiarity with the culture within which the text arose are deemed relevant. This unfamiliarity with the cultural context permeates Imamović's translation, particularly in explanatory notes and glossary at the end of each volume. Suffice it to mention two examples. At the end of the third volume of his translation, the translator confuses *Mongols* and *Mughals*; he mentions Mughal as "a member of invading people that conquered India" (Rumi, 2004, p. 480), even though the Mughal Empire was established only in the 16th century, i.e., more than two centuries after the completion of the *Mathnawi*, so it cannot be relevant to its context.

In the fourth volume, the term *Simurgh* is explained as "a symbolic name for Allah; *si* means thirty and *murgh* means a bird... in [Attar's Sufi poem] *The Conference of Birds* thirty birds reached the ultimate goal and recognized Almighty within themselves" (Rumi, 2005, p. 424). Apart from being inaccurate and grossly oversimplified, the translator is apparently not familiar with the fact that *simurgh* is a mythical bird present in old Persian epics and legendary accounts; a bird with feathers in every color that raised Zal, father of the legendary Persian hero Rustam, etc. As a result, such explanations, in fact,

make the text more difficult to penetrate and the meaning of critical terms even more elusive. Finally, the claim that Sufi practice is the essential aspect in translating the *Mathnawi* makes little sense if the basis for one's translation of the *Mathnawi* is the English rendition by Nicholson, who certainly was not a Sufi practitioner.

In brief, Imamović's most valuable contribution is that his Bosnian translation is the only complete translation of the *Mathnawi* so far. His work departs from the tradition of interpreting the *Mathnawi* in local cultural contexts even though the translator invokes Sufi practice, making his work different from that of his predecessors. Nonetheless, Imamović's translation is a direct outcome of Rumi's most celebrated masterpiece's growing popularity. His work, in turn, helped make the *Mathnawi* even more popular among Bosnian readers.

Another traditional translation and commentary

Another noteworthy translation of the *Mathnawi* is that done by Ahmed Mešić (1916-1994). He had translated and composed commentary on the first volume and some 2625 verses from the second volume of the *Mathnawi*. Although his work chronologically precedes that of Imamović, being done between 1978 and 1994, it was only published in a three-volume series in Bosnian in 2016. Mešić himself was a *mathnawi-khan* established in two Bosnian towns, namely Visoko and Tuzla, and in his lectures, he followed the traditional approach stemming from the Ottoman period. His books are not mere translations: the text comprises of a phonetically adapted transcription of Persian verses, then a simplified translation is given in bold letters, and finally a Bosnian commentary underneath every verse. Accordingly, the translation is only one aspect of his work that is moreover "almost an easier part of the task" compared to more extraordinary efforts exerted at the correct pronunciation of the Persian original, as stated by the translator himself (Mešić, 2016, p. 5). By placing such heavy emphasis on the correct pronunciation of the Persian original of the *Mathnawi*, the translator gives almost a scriptural significance to that text, adding that apart from solid command of Persian, which is but an auxiliary tool, the translator must possess solid knowledge of the Qur'an and various Islamic disciplines such as Prophetic tradition, Islamic doctrine, jurisprudence and inevitably Sufism as well (Mešić, 2016, p. 6). In other words, Mešić was fully aware of the importance of the culture from which the *Mathnawi* emerged, as well as the gravity of the tradition of its oral transmission in the local cultural context in Bosnia, in which the text enjoyed a privileged status.

The basis for his work was the Persian original of the *Mathnawi*; the accuracy of the translation was checked through Abidin-Pasha's Turkish rendition (1305/1888) and Muhammad Kaffafi's Arabic rendition of the *Mathnawi* (1966-67). Mešić used both those supporting sources for his translations and his commentary. In cases where Abidin-Pasha and Kaffafi would give significantly diverging meanings of the original, Mešić cited both versions at times, arguing in favor of one of them. Based on that, we can conclude that his work is a direct translation from Persian, heavily based on two support translations.

Such a methodological approach is significant for three reasons. First, it emphasizes the translator's great esteem for the original text. Second, it shows that great effort was exerted and full attention accorded to each verse. Third, this approach indicates the cultural intermingling and symbiosis among the *elsine-i selase*, i.e., the three main languages of the Ottoman period – Arabic, Ottoman Turkish, and Persian that were held in high regard in Ottoman Bosnia as languages of Islamic literacy. Many Bosnian authors knew all three languages equally well and wrote in them. Accordingly, Ahmed Mešić, the translator of the *Mathnawi*, represents the prototype of a Muslim scholar educated on the basis and principles of the Ottoman scholarly tradition in Bosnia, even though he was born in post-Ottoman times. Amongst the translations of the *Mathnawi*, Mešić's work stands out as a prose

rendition of the text by which the translator puts forward the spiritual and moral message of the original text at the expense of its formal features. Prose translations by Mešić are further anchored by his prose commentaries upon each verse. In that regard, he notes:

My principal aim with this translation is to address the needs of Muslim believers and other well-disposed readers who are interested in the Sufi teachings within the Mathnawi. I intend to bring precisely that side of the Mathnawi closer to them. Consequently, I will not get involved in the study of the Mathnawi as a literary, philosophical, or historical text; neither would be given herein any linguistic analysis of the original text. I do not suppose that my work would be accepted as 'scholarly.' I will also render individual verses of the Mathnawi into Bosnian in prose in the manner of earlier Turkish and Arabic translators. I will not try to give them in rhymed verses (Mešić, 2016, p. 4).

Although aware of different possibilities in approaching, understanding, and interpreting the original text of the *Mathnawi*, Mešić limited himself to a particular kind of readers and recipients, giving his translations a clear purpose and direction. His overall goal was to teach the recipients about Islam and Sufism through his translation. That had been precisely the purpose of public readings and interpretation of the *Mathnawi* in Ottoman Bosnia.

Contrary to other translators of the *Mathnawi*, in his introduction, Mešić refers to earlier translations. He mentions the hitherto oldest rendition of a single verse into the Bosnian language written in the Arabic script on the margins of a published text of the *Mathnawi* from 1288/1872. Mešić also expresses astonishment that no other earlier *mathnawi-khan*, except Hadžibajrić, tried his hand at translating the text into the Bosnian language. Finally, he noted the first Bosnian translation of the *Mathnawi* by Alija Sadiković with admiration, pointing out that he was not a *mathnawi-khan*, indicating that the *Mathnawi* has enjoyed favorable reception and admiration outside of this narrow and specialist circle of oral interpretation and commentary (cf. Mešić, 2016, p. 14-16).

These statements and the corresponding approach to his work confirm the active relation of Mešić's translation to the earlier attempts by other authors.

Based on all its characteristics, Mešić's work can be categorized as a target-oriented translation, or more specifically, directed towards a particular group of recipients within the target culture. The translator exhibited great appreciation for the original text, focusing exclusively on its contents and ignoring all other formal features. It is, hence, a little surprise that in sixteen years of working on the translation and commentary of the *Mathnawi*, he had managed to complete less than two volumes.

Nonetheless, Mešić's work testifies to the deep bond between local Bosnian culture and Rumi's masterpiece, and this bond cannot be reduced to the question of the Persian language of the original text, nor to its Islamic and Persian cultural context. The existing loyalty in the local cultural context of Bosnia towards the *Mathnawi* inevitably includes a rich tradition of the oral translation and commentary of the text, which has been established in Ottoman times and continues until today.

Translation of selections from the *Mathnawi*

Even though the above-described translations of the *Mathnawi* are incomplete, with one notable exception, it is clear that the initial intention of the translator was to produce a complete Bosnian rendition of the text, which did not materialize for various reasons. Another category is partial translations from the *Mathnawi*, begun by Adem Karadžović and his account of several stories and verses from the *Mathnawi*. His pioneering work remained isolated until the last two decades when several partial translations from the *Mathnawi* appeared in Bosnian. These translations were selections from the *Mathnawi* adapted for particular purposes. Their appearance is connected with the social context of the revival of the Muslim heritage in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the last three decades.

One of those selections is in verse, while the remaining selections of *Mathnawi*'s stories are printed in prose. The versified selection is, in fact, a translation of *The Isle of the Mathnawi* [Jazīre-i Masnavi], a topic-based selection of 360 distiches by a 16th century Mevlevi shaykh and Ottoman poet Yusuf Sineçak. Apart from its widespread popularity in the Ottoman Empire, in the Bosnian cultural context, *The Isle of the Mathnawi* was furthermore significant because one of its prominent commentators was a local author named Abdullah Bosnawi (17th century). An autograph of Bosnawi's commentary of this work is registered in the collections of Gazi Husrev-bay Library in Sarajevo under the call number R-6854. Moreover, this library hosts other commentaries upon *The Isle of the Mathnawi*, composed by other authors as well (cf. Drkić, 2016, p. 13-14). Publication of this translation is thus connected with the significance of this work in the local cultural tradition with roots in the Ottoman period.

We will also mention herein two prose translations from the *Mathnawi* adapted for children. The first translation is done from Persian and published as *Mathnawi for children vol. 1* (2005) and *Mathnawi for children vol. 2* (2007), embellished with appropriate illustrations. Both volumes contain fifteen stories from the *Mathnawi*. Several years later, another translation was printed under the title *Mathnawi for children*. This is a Bosnian rendition of a Turkish work entitled *Mevlanadan hikayeler* by Mürşide Uysal. The book is illustrated with scenes from certain stories, and a chronology of the most important events from Mawlana's life is appended at the end (Uysal, 2012, p. 165-175).

Another translation entitled *Tree of Eternity* is also noteworthy. This book is a selection of ninety-nine stories from the *Mathnawi* rendered in prose (Rumi, 2020). The basis for this translation were summaries of *Mathnawi* stories from *A Commentary of Mathnawi* [Şarh-e jāme'-e Masnavi-ye Ma'navi] by contemporary Iranian scholar Karim Zamani (Zamānī, 1379 [2000]). The translated volume entitled *Tree of Eternity* contains stories from all six volumes given in chronological order according to the original.

Translations of selected parts from the *Mathnawi* undoubtedly confirmed the canonical status of this work in local culture. Their importance, however, is best observable in the fact that these translations popularized the Mathawi among the readers and recipients that are consistently left aside by most traditional translations of that work. By facilitating the reception of the *Mathnawi* among other classes of readers, these translations shed new light and opened new niches of comprehension of the original text, plainly demonstrating the ability of this literary masterpiece to captivate and alert its readers around the world more than seven centuries upon its composition.

CONCLUSION

Several translations of Jalaluddin Rumi's *Mathnawi* appeared in Bosnian since the beginning of the 20th century. However, the translation process does not mark the beginning of familiarization with Rumi's most famous work; in fact, translation marks but a new mode of reception of the text that for centuries was present in other reception modes, predominantly public readings and oral interpretations. First translations appeared when the original text became "alien" in Bosnia and the Balkans as they ceded to be an integral part of the geography of the Islamic world. Thus, translations became a necessity in a new social reality.

The existing translations reveal a multilayered and complex relationship between the *Mathnawi* and local culture. The translations did not follow linear historical progression but rather followed in line with transformations of the social and cultural context of Bosnia and the Balkans. The specific circumstances of *Mathnawi*'s public readings had a dominant influence on the development of these translation activities. Economic considerations also played a prominent role in the appearance of relay translations and adaptations.

The *mathnawi-khani* tradition as a remnant from the Ottoman period continued to influence the direction and approach of the *Mathnawi* translators in post-Ottoman times. They predominantly focus on the contents and the correct understanding of the message of the original text, and their target groups are primarily Muslim believers and followers. In other words, the resulting translations were renditions for particular purposes. The only exception is the first translation by Alija Sadiković who had recognized and acknowledged the literary value of the original.

We regard the utmost respect and awe that most of the translators exhibited towards the original text of the *Mathnawi* as the main obstacle to its complete and successful rendition into the Bosnian language. Although some translators engaged in translating the *Mathnawi* for more than a decade, the result was not more than a couple of volumes rendered into the Bosnian. It is paradoxical that such an important text for local culture, with canonical status and cult following, would be translated into the Bosnian language solely once and that as a relay translation from English.

Even though only one translator refers to an earlier Bosnian translation, methodologically, it is visible that all subsequent translations were a response or a reaction to earlier efforts. In other words, later translators exhibited an active stance towards earlier translations. Again, the first translation by Alija Sadiković can be counted as a significant exception because later translators seldom refer to it. This is primarily due to the fact that only fourteen opening verses were preserved in translation. However, it may also be caused by the fact that Sadiković did not belong to the circle of official commentators of the *Mathnawi*, i.e., was not a *mathnawi-khan*.

All the existing translations were checked through intermediary texts: either support translations, commentaries, or adaptations. The only exception is the first translation in the case of which we lack credible information. Therefore, comprehension of the *Mathnawi* on the part of translators presupposed an intermediary authority. The most prominent place should be accorded to the Ottoman tradition, most frequently through Turkish translations or commentaries from the Ottoman period. However, in the last decades a recourse was had to some English translations or simplified selections in Persian. This reliance upon commentaries and adaptations is undoubtedly expected in light of *Mathnawi*'s high status as a canonical text in local culture, as well as the fact that it is a long text written more than seven centuries ago.

Methodologically, the translations are varied: some are in verse, others in prose, direct or indirect. Some translations are partial and contain only a few stories or adaptations; others are heftier, leading ultimately to the sole complete translation of the *Mathnawi* into the Bosnian language. This variety is a result of the unwavering interest in this work in the post-Ottoman period. However, a new integral translation of the *Mathnawi* directly from the Persian original, that would be conducted with a keen interest and due consideration to both its formal and prosodic features as well as its contents, would certainly amount to a significant leap ahead in the process of translating the *Mathnawi* into Bosnian. It appears that the first Bosnian translation of the *Mathnawi* was closest to that goal.

Article Information

Ethics Committee Approval:	Exempt from the Ethics Committee Decision.
Informed Consent:	No participant
Financial Support:	No financial support from any institution or project.
Conflict of Interest:	No conflict of interest.
Copyrights:	No material subject to copyright is included.

Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited. (Munir Drkić, Ahmed Zildžić)

Copyright&License: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.

Cited as: Drkić, M. & Zildžić, A. (2022). Ottoman Tradition in The Post-Ottoman Times: A Century of Translating The Mathnawi into Bosnian. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, (48), 91-106. DOI: 10.21497/sefad.1218390

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albachten, Ö. B. & Gürçağlar, Ş. T. (eds.) (2019). *Studies from a retranslation culture. The Turkish context*. Singapore: Springer.
- Algar, Hamid. (2016). Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Online edition. URL: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bosnia-and-herzegovina>.
- Alvstad, C. (2017). Arguing for indirect translations in twenty-first-century Scandinavia. *Translation Studies*. Vol. 10. No. 2. 150–615.
- Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*. Vol. 4. 1–8.
- Brownlie, S. (2006). Narrative theory and retranslation theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*. Vol. 7. No. 2. 145–170.
- Drkić, M. & Zildžić, A. (2020). Tekst iznad kulture: historijat književnog prevođenja s perzijskog na bosanski jezik. *Književni jezik*. vol. 31. No. 1. 87–112.
- Drkić, M. (2014). Kulturna interakcija između Bosne, Orijenta i Evrope u prijevodu Rumijeve Mesneviije na bosanski jezik. *Sarajevski filološki susreti*. Knjiga I. Sarajevo: Bosansko filološko društvo. 252–264.
- Drkić, M. (2016). Ostrvo u okeanu Mesneviije. *Ostrvo Mesneviije*. Sarajevo: Bookline. 9–14.
- Drkić, M. (2018). Multidimensional presence of the Masnavi in Bosnian cultural tradition. *IV international Mevlana symposium: Hz. Mevlana and the brotherhood in Islamic world*. (99–110). Konya: Institute of Rumi Studies, Selçuk University.
- Duraković, E. (2014). Ka poetici Mesneviije. *Znakovi vremena*. Vol. 17. No. 64. 179–192.
- Gürçağlar, Ş. T. (2020). Retranslation. In Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (484–489). Third Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hadžibajrić, F. (1987). O prevodu drugog sveska Mesneviije. Rumi, M. Dž., *Mesneviija I*. prevod i komentar Fejzullah Hadžibajrić (pp. 1–2.). Sarajevo: Tekijski odbor Nakšibendijsko Mevlevijske tekije na Mlinima u Sarajevu (Katedra Mesneviije).
- Huković, M. (1987). *Život i djelo muderrisa Alije Sadikovića*. Sarajevo: Gazi Husrevbegova biblioteka.
- Imamović, V. (2004). Način prevođenja Mesneviije sa engleskog (13–20). Rumi, Dž. *Mesneviija III*. prijevod s engleskog Velid Imamović. Sarajevo: Buybook.
- Inan, M. U. (2020). Ottomans reading Persian classics: readers and reading in the Ottoman empire, 1500–1700. In: Hammond, M. (ed.). *The Edinburgh history of reading: early readers*. (160–181). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Karađozović, A. (1934). Dun'ja kao stara baba. *Islamski svijet*. No. 124. 17-18.
- Karađozović, A. (1935). Uobraženi Turkuša i dovtljivi terzija Čeker oğlu. *Islamski svijet*. No. 140. 17-18.
- Karahalilović, N. (2014). *Kritičko izdanje djela Perivoj slavuja (Bolbolestān) Fevzija Mostarca*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet. Online edition. URL: http://www.ff-eizdavastvo.ba/Books/Kriticko_izdanje_djela_Perivoj_slavuja_autora_Fevzija_Mostarca.pdf.

- Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In: Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (eds.). *Handbook of translation studies*. Vol. 1. (294–298). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins publishing company.
- Massardier-Kenney, F. (2015). Toward a rethinking of translation. *Translation Review*. No. 92. 73–85.
- Mešić, A. O. (2016). Predgovor. Rumi, Dželaluddin. *Mesneviya 1*. Tuzla: Behram-begova medresa. 3–21.
- Mulahalilović, E. (1982). Književni rad Ali efendije Sadikovića na arapskom jeziku. *Anali Gazi Husrevbegove biblioteke u Sarajevu*. Vol. 5. No. 7-8. 192–207.
- Naudé, J. (2010). Religious translation. In: Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (eds.). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. (285–293). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pym, A. (1998). *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Rumi, Dž. (2002). *Mesneviya 1 za djecu*. Preveo s perzijskog M. Kodrić. Sarajevo: Elementum.
- Rumi, Dž. (2004). *Mesneviya III*. prijevod s engleskog V. Imamović. Sarajevo: Buybook.
- Rumi, Dž. (2005a). *Mesneviya IV*. prijevod s engleskog V. Imamović. Sarajevo: Buybook.
- Rumi, Dž. (2005b). *Mesneviya V*. prijevod s engleskog V. Imamović. Sarajevo: Buybook.
- Rumi, Dž. (2007). *Mesneviya 2 za djecu*. Preveo s perzijskog M. Kodrić. Sarajevo: Elementum.
- Rumi, Dž. (2016b). *Ostrvo Mesnevije*. prijevod s perzijskog M. Drkić. Sarajevo: Bookline.
- Rumi, Dž. (2020). *Drvo vječnosti (99 priča iz Mesnevije)*. prijevod M. Đido. Sarajevo: Bookline.
- Rumi, M. Dž. (1985). *Mesneviya I*. Prevod i komentar F. Hadžibajrić. Sarajevo: Tekijski odbor Nakšibendijsko-mevlevijske tekije na Mlinima u Sarajevu (Katedra Mesnevije).
- Rumi, M. Dž. (1987). *Mesneviya II*. Prevod i komentar F. Hadžibajrić. Sarajevo: Tekijski odbor Nakšibendijsko-mevlevijske tekije na Mlinima u Sarajevu (Katedra Mesnevije).
- Rumi, M. Dž. (2009a). *Mesneviya I*. prijevod s engleskog V. Imamović. Zagreb: V.B.Z.
- Rumi, M. Dž. (2009b). *Mesneviya II*. prijevod s engleskog V. Imamović. Zagreb: V.B.Z.
- Rumi, M. Dž. (2016a). *Mesneviya*. prijevod A.O. Mešić. Tuzla: Behram-begova medresa.
- St. André, J. (2020). Relay. In: Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. (470–473). Third Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Ş. (2003) Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory. *Target*. Vol. 15. No. 1. 1–36.
- Traljić, Mahmud. (1998). *Istaknuti Bošnjaci*. Sarajevo: El-Kalem.
- Uysal, M. (2012). *Mesneviya za djecu*. S turskog prevela A. Kadribegović-Mehić. Sarajevo: Libris.
- Venuti, L. (2004). Retranslations: the creation of value. In: Faull, K. M. (ed.). *Translation and Culture*. (25–38). Special issue of *Bucknell Review*. 47(1).
- Washbourne, R. K. (2013). Nonlinear narratives: paths of indirect and relay translation. *Meta*. Vol. 58. No. 3. 607–625.
- Wawrzycka, J. & Michalycsa, E. (eds.). (2020). *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st century*. Leiden – Boston: Brill Rodopi.
- Zamānī, K. (1379 [2000]). *Šarh-e ḡāme'-e Masnawī-ye ma'navī*. Six vols. Tehrān: Entešārāt-e Ettelā'āt.
- Zarifi-baba, A. (1970). *Zbirka savjeta i uputa*. Sarajevo.
- Zildžić, A. (2006). Poslanica o prijevodu, prevodiocima i još ponečemu. *Odjek – Revija za umjetnost, nauku i društvena pitanja*. No. 1-2. 163–172.